Once upon a time, or in the 1520s, four Nahua warriors from central Mexico responded to a call for help from the great "Noble-woman of the Zapotec" in distant Oaxaca. She complained that the cannibalistic Mixtecs were threatening her children and had eaten members of a previous war party sent to help her. The warriors appeared before Hernando Cortés, the "Ruler of the Children of the Sun," and sought to convince him by staging a mock battle that they could succeed where others had failed. Impressed by this show of force, Cortés sent them to war. They fought their way through the mountainous Mixteca and descended into the Valley of Oaxaca, where they confronted and defeated the voracious Mixtecs amid a windstorm and earthquake. In victory, they were given a place for their descendants to settle. Then Cortés himself came to Oaxaca and as the uneasy alliance disintegrated, the Spaniards and Nahua prepared for war. As the battle commenced, the Nahua frightened and confounded the Spaniards by unleashing a flood of water from underground. When the humbled Spaniards sued for peace, the Nahua proudly proclaimed that they had defeated everyone, and had even captured a few black slaves. These "famous Mexicans" called their victory the "original conquest."

But there are two sides to every story. The Mixtecs naturally found this Nahua version of the "original conquest" a little distasteful. Their own account of these events differed considerably. They claimed to have welcomed and honored Cortés when he came
Figure 1: Mixtec map and painting of San Juan Chapultepec.
to Oaxaca, and to have given him and his men some land to settle when they were in need. All was well until he returned with a group of Nahua from central Mexico, with whom they began to fight. The Spaniards intervened and the Mixtecs forced the Nahua to surrender. The Mixtec ruler cooperated with Cortés and accommodated everyone's interests, even giving the Nahua a place to settle. Thereafter, Mixtecs, Nahua, Zapotecs, and Spaniards coexisted peacefully in the Valley of Oaxaca.

These two versions of the Conquest appeared in the 1690s, when a Mixtec and a Nahua community from the Valley of Oaxaca presented "titles" in their respective languages as claims to disputed territory. The documents were fraudulently dated from the time of the Conquest, almost two centuries earlier; representatives of the communities purported to have just found them before submitting them to Spanish officials. Both present interpretations of events surrounding the Conquest, relating how they came to possess the land which they claimed at the end of the seventeenth century.

In this chapter, we translate and explicate sections of the two lengthy manuscripts, written entirely in the Mixtec and Nahuatl languages. The Nahuatl version is ostensibly dated 1525 and consists of twenty-four pages; the eleven-page Mixtec document bears the date of 1523 and is accompanied by a simulated preconquest-style map.1 Our transcriptions and translations of the titles are among the first to be published in either language. In fact, the Mixtec title is the only such document in that language to be identified to date; the Nahuatl text represents the only known title to be written by a Nahua satellite community outside of central Mexico. This chapter addresses several issues relevant to the little-known titles genre, as well as more specific questions concerning the interaction of indigenous groups in the colonial period. The titles from Oaxaca attend to the complex topics of Mixtec and Nahua ethnic identity and historical consciousness. Our chapter begins by describing this eclectic genre of indigenous writing from colonial Mexico.

The Titles Genre

The titles genre constitutes one of the most discursive, unpredictable forms of indigenous writing found in local and national Mexican archives. Indeed, very few historians who have encountered such documents, and can read them, have known what to
make of them. Titles have only recently been recognized as a distinct genre, though their conspicuous claim to early colonial dates and bizarre pictorials have beguiled historians for some time. Stephanie Wood recently remarked that "the study of primordial titles is still in its infancy." James Lockhart confirmed that there have been very few studies of titles "first because only a small portion of the probably extant corpus has been discovered and second because of the enormous difficulty of the texts."³

The titles are in many respects unlike other indigenous-language sources. Rather than local records written for an internal audience, like most mundane documents, titles were aimed at a mixed indigenous and Spanish readership. Judging by language, handwriting, and dates of presentation, no known example predates the mid-seventeenth century. However, most purport to be early sixteenth-century accounts of the arrival of Cortés and the subsequent settlement and possession of lands. Many are accompanied by contrived preconquest-style pictorial components. Some modern scholars have adopted the term títulos primordiales (primordial titles) to refer to them: "título" denotes that the document is essentially a claim to land; "primordial" was added later by scholars in reference to the antiquated origins to which the titles usually lay claim. They were in some shape or form based on officially sanctioned Spanish land titles, though they rarely fooled Spanish officials and were usually promptly rejected.⁴ We refer to them here as simply "titles" or "false titles."

Some of the best known documents associated with false titles are the so-called "Techialoyan Codices" from central Mexico. These manuscripts are predominantly pictorial with glosses and short texts in Nahuatl, painted on native paper.⁵ Though the authors or artists intended to apply an ancient veneer to the manuscripts, European stylistic conventions abound.⁶ False titles customarily contain fewer pictorial elements than Techialoyans and were usually done on European paper.

Both the Techialoyan codices and the false titles belong to an oral and written Mesoamerican tradition of asserting and documenting claims to land, and the tendency of indigenous communities and caciques to dispute boundaries ad infinitum. The documents may have been designed for local audiences as well as tools for litigation.⁷ Some titles are little more than a founding leader's testament, with none of the more fantastic features associated with the genre; indeed, testaments accompanied both the Mixtec and Nahuatl titles presented below.⁸ Though the written testament in
colonial Mexico was based on a European model, the indigenous will evolved to become a title to individual lands and proof of hereditary succession; it had never been such an all-encompassing legal document in Spain. Both testaments and titles, like many other genres of postconquest indigenous writing, fulfilled many pre-conquest written and/or oral functions and retained remnants of ancient discourse.

Some of the falsified documents were produced in response to Spanish demands of title verification. The composiciones (legalization of land titles) resulting from this program date from the 1690s until the 1720s. Leaders of communities who failed to submit legal titles were forced to produce some record of their claims for the surveyors, whether maps and paintings or other written materials. Community representatives were frequently consulted to substantiate territorial boundaries.\(^9\) Official papers concerning land were prized and guarded possessions throughout the colonial period; those who had none would often suddenly "find" some. Retention of community landholdings was unlikely in the absence of such documents.\(^{10}\)

The title verification program reflected changes in early Mexican society itself. It was not until the late seventeenth century that the need for producing such titles arose, when indigenous demographic renewal and an expanding Hispanic sector exerted new demands for lands. The program attempted to repossess all "vacant" land, which was legally royal domain, occupied without formal grant or proper title. Consequently, in the proceedings and subsequent sale of genuine titles, the Crown and its officials gained additional revenue.\(^{11}\) Many indigenous communities were forced to respond to these increasing pressures, but few had the requisite Spanish legal documentation from the early colonial period. Some were tempted to produce their own titles, not fully aware of a legitimate title's format, content or language, and passed the manuscripts over to Spanish authorities as early colonial documents.

In addition to the verification program, other titles were produced to support claims to territory in disputes with neighboring indigenous communities. Though Hispanics were involved in the case presented below, the main issue concerned a dispute between Mexicapan and Chapultepec which may have originated around the time of the Conquest or even before. Internal conflicts also stimulated a demand for titles. The titles from Oaxaca involved a cacique (Spanish term for indigenous ruler derived from an Arawak
word) from Cuilapan who competed with both communities for lands; part of the dispute hinged on the question of whether the lands were held communally by Chapultepec, a subject settlement of Cuilapan, or belonged to the cacique’s estate. Land disputes arising from an unclear distinction between private and public domain within indigenous communities were endemic in the late colonial period. Internal conflict is further betrayed by the fact that many titles were apparently conceived outside of local power structures. Wood has suggested that titles did not always serve the interests of the greater community, but rather often catered to the concerns of caciques or competing groups, documenting private as well as community landholding. Factions which were outside of existing official power structures would have been more likely to rewrite history to their own advantage than nobles with official cabildo (indigenous Spanish-style municipal council) sponsorship. Thus, most titles seemed to have been produced in an "underground" fashion. Accordingly, many of the documents were written not by the skilled notaries of the community but by relatively untrained hands. The official Spanish format is either unknown, misrepresented, or combined with indigenous forms to create a new synthesis. As unofficial manuscripts, they tend to present a more unadulterated image of indigenous expression than genres which adhere closely to a Spanish model. They depict a popular, local impression of events, relying on stereotypes and vague remembrances of symbolic things past.

Many of these documents have been preserved in cases involving land disputes. Nahuatl-language titles are notorious in central Mexico, where a growing Hispanic population stimulated demand for land. The titles from Oaxaca originated in two neighboring communities across the river from the Spanish city of Antequera, the most densely settled part of the Valley in colonial times. The titles cannot be understood outside of the context in which they were written, and so we turn to the Valley of Oaxaca.

The Setting: The Valley of Oaxaca

Oaxaca stands at the crossroads of central and southern Mesoamerica, cradling over a dozen indigenous cultures and languages. The three major language groups of Mesoamerica (outside of the distant Maya and Tarascans)—the Nahuas, Zapotecs, and Mixtecs—converged, and bordered one another in the Valley of Oaxaca. In the centuries before the Spanish Conquest, Monte Albán
had declined as a classic site and was succeeded by myriad communities, united or disunited by shifting and unstable alliances and engaged in sporadic warfare. The Zapotecs were predominant in all three branches of the valley, while Mixtec and Nahua communities were clustered in the center; there were also some Mixtec groups scattered in more distant sections of the western branch. The Mexica and their central Mexican allies came to Oaxaca in various waves in the century before the Spanish Conquest, especially in the reigns of Ahuitzotl and Moctezuma II, and founded a tribute and trade post called Huaxyacac at the valley's intersection. Though they represented a very small minority, Nahua influence through intermarriage, third-party politics, and empire was considerable. In the sixteenth century, Dominican friars in the valley spoke Nahuatl as an intermediary language, employing bilingual Zapotec nobles as interpreters. The Dominican chronicler, fray Francisco de Burgoa, reported that many of the valley's caciques were fluent in Nahuatl at the time of the Conquest.\(^\text{14}\) Nahuatl appears to have also served as a \textit{lingua franca} among indigenous groups living in Antequera.\(^\text{15}\)

According to the \textit{Relaciones Geográficas} of Teozapotlan and Cuilapan, the first Mixtecs came into the Valley some three centuries before the Spanish Conquest by way of intermarriage. It is said that a lord from Mixtec Yanhuitlan married a sister-in-law of the cacique of Zapotec Teozapotlan, and Cuilapan was given to the couple as a gift. Cuilapan became one of the largest settlements in the valley by the late postclassic period (ca. 1300-1500). Teozapotlan (called \textit{Zaachila} in Zapotec and \textit{Tocuisi} in Mixtec) had been so prominent that the Mixtecs named the whole region \textit{Tocuisi ŋuku} or "land of the white nobles."\(^\text{16}\) Cuilapan eventually went to war with Teozapotlan, and the Zapotec lord fled to Tehuantepec.\(^\text{17}\) The Mixtecs then subjugated many Zapotec sites which had owed allegiance to Teozapotlan. Later, a tentative arrangement between Mixtec Cuilapan and Zapotec Tehuantepec against NahuaS from central Mexico was undone by another pact between the Zapotecs and NahuaS, crowned by the marriage of the lord Cosijoeza and a relative of Moctezuma. With Nahua support, Zapotec lords eventually regained control in the valley by the time of the Spanish Conquest.\(^\text{18}\)

The Spanish Conquest was relatively brief in most of Oaxaca. Francisco de Orozco and Pedro de Alvarado led small groups of Spaniards and a central Mexican contingent into the Mixteca, the coastal region and the Valley of Oaxaca with little incidence of
Figure 2: Map of Colonial Antequera and Indigenous Environs (Based on Chance 1976)
conflict. Indigenous alliances dissipated upon their arrival. Spaniards encountered effective resistance only along the perimeter of the region. After the Conquest, Nahuas who had accompanied the Spaniards, rounded estimated at four thousand, settled in and around Antequera, in San Martín Mexicapan to the southwest, in Villa de Oaxaca to the northwest, Jalatlaco to the northeast, and Santo Tomás Xochimilco to the north [See figure 2: Colonial Antequera].

The Spanish city of Antequera, located just east of the Nahua garrison at Huaxyacac (later Hispanicized to Oaxaca), eventually subsumed the settlement to the northeast called Jalatlaco and relegated it to an urban barrio. Its residents included Nahua from various central Mexican altepetl (local, sovereign Nahua state), Mixtecs from Cuilapan and nearby areas, Zapotecs from the Valley and Sierra, and even Guatemalans. Nahua culture was confined to a very small area, but Nahua apparently played a dominant role in the indigenous sector of Antequera. Across the Atoyac river, San Martín Mexicapan maintained its separate status, and was also divided into barrios representing various central Mexican altepetl.

Cuilapan remained the largest native community in the valley throughout the colonial period. Cortés attempted to move many smaller Mixtec settlements to Cuilapan in the early decades. By the time the Relaciones Geográficas were written in the 1570s, Cuilapan had seventeen subject settlements, including Santa Cruz Xoxocotlan and San Juan Chapultepec (called Niihuyoho and Yuchayta in Mixtec, respectively). In 1696, Chapultepec produced the Mixtec-language title in response to the claims of the cacique of Cuilapan, and the Nahuatl title of their neighbor, San Martín Mexicapan.

The Proceedings

Like many other cases in the Tierras section of the Archivo General de la Nación, this expediente is little more than a bundle of papers irregularly organized and haphazardly renumbered. Furthermore, some of the evidence was not preserved. Since the lengthy expediente contains many confusing and contradictory statements, we have done our best to reconstruct the proceedings. Typical of many legal disputes in New Spain, decisions were immediately appealed and the suit seems to have continued indefinitely. After at least two separate rulings and appeals, it is unknown how or when this case was ultimately resolved.
Nevertheless, the main contentions are reasonably clear and are highlighted by three indigenous-language documents which were preserved: a Mixtec-language title and painting dated 1523 from San Juan Chapultepec, a sujetó (subject municipality) of Cuilapan; a Nahuatl-language title and a testament dated 1525 and 1602, respectively, from San Martín Mexicapan. A fourth document exists only in translation—a Mixtec testament dated 1565, presented by don Andrés Cortés de Velasco and don Juan Manuel de Velasco, caciques of Cuilapan. The two titles from Oaxaca have been utilized by historians in the past, but none has acknowledged their spurious nature.22

In brief, the Mixtec community of San Juan Chapultepec, the Nahua community of San Martín Mexicapan and the Mixtec cacique of Cuilapan and Chapultepec, don Andrés Cortés de Velasco, all claimed the same land. The people of Mexicapan maintained that their Nahua ancestors came from the Valley of Mexico to Oaxaca in the 1520s, preceding the arrival of Hernando Cortés or any other Spaniard. They initiated the civil suit in 1688 and presented a Nahuatl testament of don Francisco de los Angeles y Vasquéz, ostensibly dated 1602.23 This was the first of many attempts by the feuding factions to produce documents, authentic or forged, to substantiate their claims to the land.

In 1693, after the cacique of Cuilapan responded with documents to protect his estancia de ganado menor (sheep or goat ranch), Mexicapan submitted additional papers and paintings.24 When the alcalde mayor (Spanish official in charge of a district), the representatives of Mexicapan, and the cacique of Cuilapan walked the borders together, it was clear that the documents provided by don Andrés made some impossible claims. In his defense, he could muster only "frivolous responses" to the alcalde mayor's questions.25 Consequently, Mexicapan was awarded the land and the officials proceeded to "pull up grass, throw stones and perform other acts of true possession."26 The cacique immediately appealed the decision.

At the same time, a faction from San Juan Chapultepec staked its own claim to the disputed land, challenging Mexicapan's possession as well as the cacique's pretensions to community lands. When they demanded that don Andrés Cortés de Velasco present his proof of ownership, he responded with the 1565 "title and testament" of cacique don Diego Cortés, which was translated into Spanish. Not to be outdone, the residents of Chapultepec retaliated with their own Mixtec title and painting, dated two years be-
fore the NahuaTL title and several years before the cacique's testament. The title of Chapultepec will be discussed below; the original version of the cacique's testament is missing from the expediente.27

By 1701, Chapultepec's title had failed to unseat Mexicapan from the land. They bitterly complained that despite the "obvious falsehood of the title" and its "insane contradictions and defects," Mexicapan still managed to maintain possession of lands to which they clearly had no right. Furthermore, they pointed out that the title from 1525 and the testament from 1602 were written by the same hand, a highly unlikely feat. Chapultepec accused a certain Juan Roque, an "intrusive, notorious Indian who had produced similar false titles" of forging the documents.28 Juan Roque was a resident of Mexicapan, married to Tomasa María of the barrio Analco in distant Villa Alta, another Nahua satellite settlement in the Zapotec Sierra. He testified that the controversial documents belonged to the community of Mexicapan and that Nicolás Miguel, a native of the NahuaTL-speaking barrio of Jalatlaco in Antequera, had been temporarily released from jail to translate the title. Roque admitted to translating the NahuaTL testament. Incidentally, his signature on an affidavit matches the handwriting of the title from 1525 and the testament from 1602. Juan Roque, then, appears to have written these falsified NahuaTL documents.

Simultaneously, Mexicapan's grant came under attack from the cacique of Cuilapan, who refused to accept the untenable grounds of the title and insisted that Juan Roque had obviously forged the documents.29 Despite the fact that Mexicapan's title had been fully discredited, they retained possession until 1707. After reviewing the evidence, a new alcalde mayor ruled in favor of Chapultepec and the heirs of don Andrés, thereby overturning the decision of a previous Spanish official in 1693. Predictably, Mexicapan challenged the decision. They acknowledged that even though the new alcalde mayor considered their titles "null and void of either value or effect," they had still retained "ancient and actual possession" for the past fourteen years, with houses and worked fields in the disputed territory.30 In 1709 Mexicapan petitioned the Audiencia (viceregal court and governing body) in Mexico City. As far as we know, the case dragged on throughout the eighteenth century and beyond.31 Similar disputes between the two communities apparently persist to the present.

The protracted proceedings between Mexicapan, Chapultepec, and the cacique of Cuilapan involved a number of separate but re-
lated charges, implicating Spaniards and other outsiders. For example, don Andrés Cortés de Velasco complained in 1674 that a certain don Diego de Ábalos owed him seven years of rent for using some of his cacicazgo (the estate or institution of cacique rule) lands. Alternately, Mexicapan, Chapultepec, Santa Ana, and Santo Tomás Xochimilco filed a joint complaint in 1691 against don Andrés Cortés de Velasco for usurping community lands and Cristóbal Barroso, a Spaniard, for damages caused by grazing animals. In 1696, Mexicapan accused Tomás Alonso, a mulatto mayor domo (estate custodian) of doña Margarita de la Cueva's hacienda, of allowing his animals to enter their land. Mexicapan claimed that the mayor domo had no title and attempted to deny them access to the entrance of the forest, where they gathered wood and pastured their animals, and which they had enjoyed since "time immemorial." Juan Roque, the alleged forger of Mexicapan's title, was among those who filed the complaint. Finally, a nearby estate owner named doña Margarita de Castillo filed a complaint in 1700 against a judgment in favor of Mexicapan. The assortment of related conflicts, to mention only a few, illustrate the dizzying complexity of land tenure near Antequera at the close of the seventeenth century. These were the circumstances under which indigenous communities were forced to present the following titles.

The Nahuatl Title

The "Noblewoman of the Zapotec" narrates the opening of the Nahuatl title, appealing to Cortés and the Nahuas for help in fighting the Mixtecs. This episode may be based on the historic rivalry between Zapotec and Mixtec contingents for control of the valley. The reference seems to mix preconquest and postconquest events, since the Nahuas arrived in the valley about a century before the Spaniards, and had temporarily allied with the Zapotecs against the Mixtecs. Her testimony legitimates Mexicapan's presence in the valley. She serves as both narrator and witness, introducing the Nahua characters and lending credence to their story. The noblewoman even advises the Nahuas to write these events on paper for posterity's sake.
Figure 3: The third page of the Nahuatl title, introducing the four warrior-rulers.
Nehuapol nisichuapile tzapotecal ca onicnotlatlanilito ca huey tlatoani tonati pilhua ytocayoca cortes ytechcopa huel nehcocolia oc sentlamantli tlacame nehmoyaotia yca mochti nopolhuantztitzi ca quinequi nehquixtilis notlal yhua tlen notlatqui ca melahuac onihualasito ynahuactzinco toeytlatoani tonati pilhua ytocayoca cortes onicnotlatlanilito ma nehmopalehuilis quimotitlanilis ypilchua para nehmopalehuilisque yca yni tlacame mixteco cani oquimocaquiti toeytlatoani tonati ypilhua ytocayoca cortes oquimotitlanili yupilhuantztitzi chicomenti yehuanti ca melahuac ca opoliuquequi yca opa oquimotitlanili oc nachunti aqui onehmopalehuilique ca melahuac mexicatlaca ca yoqui quimatisque yteh yni notlaquetzal ca melahuac onicnomaquili cani motlalisque yhuan ypilhua ytehcopa amo aqui quimoyaotis ypilhua ca yaxca ytlatqui yes ca yoqui onicnonahuatili mexicatlaca ca yechuanti quiamatlacuilosque san quen oquimomaquilique yca oquitlanque ca yca yaoyotica oquitlanque omostemacque ynin tlacame misteco aqui nexoymoaotia ca melahuac omostemacaque yoqui quimotlachequilisque yehuantzitzi mexicatlacal quenin oquimomaquilique cani motlalisque ypilchua ca melahuac ycuac otehpaleuiqui yni tlacame ca yca yno otiictlatlanique motlalisquiayta tonahuac ayac oquinequique yni yehuanti mixtecos yca yno oquinemactique yn itlal canpa yaca motlalisque ytocayoca acatepel ca melahuac yca yno otiachauaque ca ya quimopielia yaxca ytlaqi yoqui oquimotlanilique ca yoqui quimotlalilisque quenin oquimotlanilique ca tonati ypilchua quimomachitia quenin oasico canatiuc teponastli chimali macuahuil tlaminali omochiuc ahuiyol yaojotica yoqui motlatlanilisque yca moyectias ca oxi-ximatique ca melachuac yehuanti moteneuctica mexicanos ca melahuac yoqui omochiuc quenin onicmotlatlanilito toeytlatoani tonati ypilhua ca melauac oquimictique nopilhua yhua oquicaque sano yoqui sa can quinamiquiayta nopilhua quiquexcotonaya ynin tlacacuanieme mixteco yca yno onicnotlatlanilito tonati ypilhua ma nehmopalechuilis ca melauac notlal amo nehquixtilisque ca omochiuc ca tlen onicnotlatlanilito toeytlatoani tonati ypilhua ca yoqui quimomachitia mexicatlaca yhua motlachequilisque yoqui topan opano --- omochiuc
I, the Noblewoman of the Zapotec, went to ask the Great Ruler of the Children of the Sun named Cortés about the people who hate me and make war on me and all of my children, and who want to steal my land and property. It is true that I went before our Great Ruler of the Children of the Sun named Cortés, and asked him to assist me by sending his people to help with the Mixtec people. When our Great Ruler of the Children of the Sun named Cortés heard [our request], he sent seven of his children, who perished. The second time he sent four more, who helped me. It is true that the Mexican people likewise will know of my tale. It is true that I gave them and their children a place to settle, so that no one would make war on their children. It will be their property. Thus, I advised the Mexican people to write on paper exactly how it was given to them, because they won it. The Mixtec people who waged war on me surrendered because they [the Mexican people] defeated them. It is true that they surrendered, for the Mexican people will tell you in stories how they were given a place for their children to settle. It is true that when these people helped us, we asked if they would settle next to us. None of the Mixtecs wanted to accept them [the Mexican people], so they gave them a portion of their land to settle called Acatepetl. It is true that we left them with that and they now have their property. Thus they won it and have settled it. As to how they won it, the Children of the Sun know how they came bearing log drums, shields, obsidian-blade clubs, and arrows. It was happily done through war, as they wished. They were recognized as the truly famous Mexicans. It is true that it happened as I requested it of our Great Ruler of the Children of the Sun. It is true that they [the Mixtecs] killed my children and ate them. Likewise, my children who encountered these Mixtec cannibals were beheaded. Because of that I went to the Children of the Sun and asked: Help me. It is truly my land and no one will steal it. That which I requested of our Great Ruler of the Children of the Sun was done. Thus, the Mexican people know it and will tell others in tales what happened to us and what transpired.
The Zapotec noblewoman's exposition sets the stage for the four Nahua ruler-warriors of the second scene. The setting flashes back to the noblewoman's plea to Cortés for help. This section evokes the elaborate ritual and accouterments of preconquest warfare. A mock battle before Cortés suggests an ancient war song and dance, accompanied by the beating of the log drum.

tlacayacanque oc ahtopa oquitlanique

tlacachuepantzi ca nehuapol yhua normano tontalyeyecatzi noprimo omenti chimalpopoca atxayacatzi ca tehuanti otimononotzque quenin oticmotallanilito toyetlatoani tonati ypilhua quenin yni sihuapile tzapotecal oquimotlatlanilico quittlanisquiaya ypilhua para quipalehuisque ca oquimotitlanili chicomenti yni yehuanti yey ocualoc oc nahuinte ca opoliucque yca yno otonasto yxpanctzinco tonati pilhua cortes otictlatlanque timochti tinahuinte ca ma tehtitlanis ca tehuanti timotlapaloa timoyaotisique ynahuac ynin tlacame mixtecos otehomonanquili tonati ypilhua queni huelitis techuanti sa tinahuuinti yha chicomeiti opoliucque ca oticnanquiliqui ca tehuaiti tinahuuinti ca yaoyotica tictlanis ca otehmotlatlanili tonati ypilhua queni huel ticchihuasque auyli-ca otictomacahuaque yxpan tonati ypilhua otocontlalique otehnahati ma nacalaquisque ytec ahuiocali ma canasque ahuiol ca oticalaquique oticanaque teponastli otictilanque chimali macuahuil tlaminali ca oticonanque tecactli otiquisque oticonahuatlilique toyetlatoani tonati ypillhua otecmonquili aso ya cauali tlen oticanque aso yca yno ya cauali yca timahuiltisque ca oticnanquilique ca ya cauali ca ycuac yno otehmotlatlanili quenin tichihuasque ahuiyo1 aso melauac nanquitlanisque tlali para mopilchua ca ycuac yno otictlalique otehauatique tonati ypillhua amo momauctis tlen ticchihuasque ca quininalhuiaya camo nimomauctis ycuac yno otipeucqui otmahuiltique yca chimali macuahuit tlaminali ycuac yn oquimitalhui tonati ypillhua ma sa yxquich ca melachuac quitlanisque tlali oquineltoca eyca yno otehtitlanoi otiquisque tinahuuinte
First, the leaders requested it.

I, Tlacahuepantzín, along with my brother, Tonalteyecatzin, and my two cousins, Chimalpopoca and Axayacatzin, conferred as to how we would go to ask our Great Ruler of the Children of the Sun, and how the Noblewoman of the Zapotec came to request that he send his children to help her. He sent seven, of which three were eaten and four others perished. On account of that we went before the [Ruler of the] Children of the Sun Cortés and all four of us requested that he send us, for we dare to wage war on the Mixtec people. The [Ruler of the] Children of the Sun responded: How will it be possible with just four when seven have perished? We answered him that we four would win it through war. The [Ruler of the] Children of the Sun asked us [to demonstrate] how we would be able to do it. We joyously consented to put it on [a mock battle] in the presence of the [Ruler of the] Children of the Sun. He ordered us: Enter the fortress and wage war. We entered with the log drums, wielding shields, obsidian-blade clubs and arrows and wearing stone sandals. We emerged and sought the approval of our Great Ruler of the Children of the Sun. He responded that what we assembled was good, perhaps it was enough to entertain him. We responded: Good. Then he said to us: If you do it joyfully, perhaps you will truly win land for your children. Then we put it on [the mock battle] and advised the [Ruler of the] Children of the Sun not to be frightened by what we would do. He said: I will not be frightened. And then we started to play with shields, obsidian-blade clubs and arrows. The [Ruler of the] Children of the Sun said: That’s enough, it is true that they will win the land. He truly believed it for he sent us.

When the four warriors leave Cortés, the title abruptly shifts location for the third time. They fight their way through the Mixteca en route to the Valley of Oaxaca. The Nahua arrange a time and place to fight the Mixtecs, and the leaders inform the women and children of the event. Overwhelmed by Nahua military superiority and natural forces, the Mixtecs surrender to the “famous Mexicans.” The Nahua, then, claimed to have conquered
Oaxaca before the Spaniards. By elevating their status to that of conquerors, rather than aides or secondary allies, their tale bolsters all subsequent claims. The references to "our land next to the Zapotec" suggests a heavy price exacted for their "help." The section concludes with an amiable agreement among all parties which promises to last forever.
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First, the four of us left and arrived in the Mixteca [where] we won a little land for our children. Then we four emerged and went to war. The Noblewoman of the Zapotec and we enriched ourselves. We reached Totoltepetl where our log drums sounded. The Mixtec people heard it. They asked: What's that sound? They were told that the Mexican people had arrived. They [the Mixtecs] asked: What are they looking for? Let's go see. So they came to ask us [the Mexican people] why we came and what we sought. We responded that we came to see our land next to the Zapotec, and to see who is fighting with them and wants to steal our land. Then they replied: We are the Mixtec. What do you want, war? We responded: War it will be. Then they instructed us where and which day to meet them, so that we could play. They will advise their children which day to wage war as they informed us. We flew to the hill near the place called Mexicatepelyan, on the right hand-side, where we beat the log drums. They heard, and they assembled to the war song. Then on both sides the war leaders summoned the women and children. When they came to where we were, we started the battle; the wind blew and the earth moved and they were killed. We withdrew only when the Mixtec people said: Let it be, for you are truly the famous Mexican people. We will give you a place where your children can settle. Then they gave us our land, up to where it [now] ends. They gave it to us. We responded how we and the Zapotec people would settle once and for all. Then the Mixtec people said: It will not be possible. Let the Zapotec stay next to us and we will give you another place to settle. It is true that we said we would settle next to our children, so that none of them would be killed, and we would regard it as our
property. Then they replied to us: It will be all right after all. We left and consulted with the Ruler of the Mixtec people in order to live as brothers, so that we would not kill each other. Then we said: Let it be done. Let them also give us a place to wait for our children to be brought to settle. We will not turn back; we will be awaiting our children. Never again will there be war. Then they gave us a place to settle called Acatepetl where the four of us went and waited for our children to come.

This tale of war and peace with the Mixtecs is followed by a terse report that the alliance with the Spaniards has collapsed. Suddenly, a hostile Cortés invades the Valley of Oaxaca and begins to wage war on the Mexica. The Mexica retaliate by unleashing a torrent which bears a boat from beneath the ground, forcing the Spaniards to abandon their attack. Cortés appears startled and conciliatory upon this unexpected turn of events, but then becomes angry when the Mexica persist in raising the water. A furious battle ensues, and the Spaniards are forced to submit to the "truly famous Mexicans." The section closes with remarks and postscripts which herald their own victory within a specific Spanish context of war and conquest. Later, they boldly refer to their defeat of the Mixtecs and Spaniards as the "original conquest."
It is true that we went to rest near the hill called Huaxacatzin; also, they [the Spaniards] sat down and rested. It was there that they first sought to fight us. We climbed up Acatepec where we met those who had won the land. He [Cortés] rebuked us: Who would kill us and who wants to make us slaves? At that very moment we raised the water and a boat from beneath the ground. Cortés saw how no one dared to kill us. Then he told us: Let there be no more war. Let us live as brothers, we shall willingly settle next to the Mexicans as brothers. When they saw the water [still] ascending, the Spaniards were angry that we raised the water over the hill. They began to battle with great strength and fought us until we, the Mexican people, defeated the Children of the Sun. Then they said: That is enough, let it be. You are truly the famous Mexican people. Thus he [Cortés] declared. We believe in the true ruler God.

Just like the Spaniards we died in battle and we sought war.

We captured two blacks.

Also like the Spaniards, with war and gunpowder we won it.

Victory secured, the warrior-leaders exit. The fourth setting marks a transition in the document from fantastic narrative to mundane legal concerns. After the Conquest, leaders of various central Mexican altepetl establish barrios and walk the borders of their new jurisdictions. Though the boundary-marking section is not without interest, it is lengthy and generally conforms to the standard of the time. Most importantly, the contested lands are strate-
gically included within this passage, giving the appearance that this central issue had been decided long ago. The founders also establish Spanish-style government, though the officers' responsibilities reflect both a combination of preconquest and postconquest concepts of officeholding. In addition to keeping vigil over the borders and other tasks, the _alguacil_ must supply food and drink (most likely *pulque*) to the members of the cabildo. These events transpire in the absence of any Spaniards, yet they invoke Spanish institutions. According to the title, the community acted autonomously in compliance with God and the King.

caca tehui atitlazonteque tieyxti titlatoanime timotecayotia oc ahtopa tlatoani marquesado don fabiab de serbantes de velasquez tlatoani mexicapa san martin don fran⁰ de los angeles basques = tlatoani xuchimilco = don marcos de los angeles ca melahuac ca sase ca otitlatzonteque yoqui dios motlanahuatilia yhua Rey ca sase alguasil mayor yhua alguasil quenin quimocuitlahua yexca xohmilco san martin marquesado ca yehual ytequi yes quirrondosos quitlatzacuilitis yhua quitzacuas telpiloya aqui amo cuali sese juebes ytequi yes tetlamacos yhua tehmahuistilis tehatlitis semicac sese juebes ca yoqui otitlatzontequi queni tocabildo ca melahuac amo quemania tlamis ca sano yoqui mochiu ties ca sa ysel yni alguasil mayor quipias cuenta mochi cuaxohilque quetza cruscan tlanti ca sese yacu ycuenta quitotonis pintura ycuac yno tetlamacas teatlitis quinoztaque tlacame san pedro san jasinto cual huicasque tlen monequis cual huicasque neuctzintle monequis caya yoqui omochiuique obligar ----

cac san yxquih totlanahuatiz otitlalilque tieyxti para quipiasque topihua toxuihua semicac ca nymac yes yni orixinal conquista yca yno otimofirmatique tieyxti yni altepel cabesera ca toyxpa tieynti otiquixtique toamatlacuiloca ca nehuapol nitlatoani yni altepel san mar año 1525
don Fabian de Serbantes y Belasquez [signatures]
don Franco de los Angeles Basquez
don Marco de los Angeles
We three rulers decreed it: first, the Ruler of the Marquesado, don Fabian de Cervantes; the Ruler of San Martín Mexicapan, don Francisco de los Ángeles Vázquez; and the Ruler of Xochimilco, don Marcos de los Ángeles. It is true that once and for all we decreed as God ordered, along with the King, as to how an alguacil mayor and an alguacil would be responsible for three places: Xochimilco, San Martín and the Marquesado. It is his duty to patrol, and to punish and jail those who are bad each Thursday. It will be his duty to respect us and serve us food and provide us with drink on every single Thursday. In this manner we established our cabildo. It is true that this way that it is done must never stop. It will always be the alguacil mayor alone who will keep a record of all borders that stop at places with crosses, and with his account he will shed light on the painting. Then he will serve food and provide people with drink, and the people of San Pedro and San Jacinto will notify him of what he should bring. They will bring a little honey that is necessary. Thus it will be done as obliged.

These are all of our orders that we three have set forth for our children and grandchildren to keep forever. This "original conquest" will be in their hands. We three provide our signatures in this altepetl cabecera. We three witnessed our written document. I am the tlatoani of this altepetl of San Martín [in] the year of 1525.

[signed]

don Fabian de Cervantes y Velásquez
don Francisco de los Ángeles Vázquez
don Marcos de los Ángeles

In summary, the Nahuatl title consists of five sections or scenes. The first three feature the Zapotec-Mixtec conflict, which affords the Nahuas sufficient pretext to establish a foothold in the region, sanctioned by Cortés himself. Thereupon, they defend their newly won land from the Spaniards and establish an enduring settlement and a lasting peace in the Valley of Oaxaca. In the two final passages, the borders are marked in detail and local government is implemented. Each successive episode legitimates the Nahuas' historical presence in the area and, specifically, Mexicapan's possession of the contested land. But the Mixtecs of
Chapultepec espoused a different version of this same period, and presented papers which documented their own historic claim to the territory. Now we turn to these papers.

The Mixtec Map and Title

In 1696 sixteen citizens of San Juan Chapultepec introduced a Mixtec title to Spanish officials and protested that don Andrés de Velasco, cacique of Cuilapan, was usurping their lands. The document also implicitly responded to Mexicapan’s Nahuatl title. They had not presented their titles earlier because they could not find them and supposed that the papers were in the Mexico City Audiencia archive from a previous dispute. However, the nobles purported that they had only recently found a document and map in the Mixtec language dated 1523, antedating the Mexicapan title by two years. The nobles requested a translation of the papers into Castilian.

The "antique painting" constituted the first "page" of the title and was translated separately by Gerónimo Galván, an interpreter of Antequera, and Nicolás de los Santos, a bilingual noble of Atzompa. They remarked that some passages in the map contained "defective" letters and words which were incomprehensible. The remaining eleven pages of alphabetic text were translated by the cacique of Guaxolotitlan. His version is more of a summary than a translation, condensing or omitting parts that he could not read or understand; the cacique ignored the practically illegible second page. The paper was probably buried or water-stained to produce a convincing antiquated appearance.33

The map was designed, in the words of the presenters, "to be viewed as one speaks with the said title."34 The map does correspond loosely with a detailed border description in the text, serving as a guide for major landmarks. Chapultepec and its dependent are featured just left of center, defended at top by their cacique, don Diego Cortés Dzahui Yuchi. A brief text is located beneath don Diego’s coat of arms announcing that the map and title belong to San Juan Chapultepec, and that the border agreement has been verified by the people of Mexicapan.
Today, Monday, the eighth day of the month of February, the title and map/painting belonging to the ñuu and tayu of San Juan Yuchayta were made, concerning all the borders agreed upon and recognized by the Mexican people of the tayu of San Martin. Thus we conclude our title and map/painting in the year of 1523.

The title fluctuates between the first-person narrative and dialog of the cacique of Chapultepec, and the third-person reporting of the notary. First, Hernando Cortés came to Chapultepec (Yuchayta in Mixtec) with a group of Spaniards and was treated as a high lord (stoho). He then renamed and baptized the nobles of Chapultepec beginning with the cacique, to whom he granted his own name and the honorific title of "don." The cacique's new name, yya don Diego Cortés Dzahui Yuchi, combined Spanish and Mixtec appellations and titles. The latter may be based on the ancient calendrical naming system, but employs two day signs (rain and flint) and no number—an unlikely arrangement. Moreover, the ritual Mixtec calendrical vocabulary used for naming was not employed.

Like the Nahuatl title don Diego's story attempts to portray an early-colonial consensus among the Mixtecs and Spaniards. The Nahuas are conspicuously absent, undermining their claim of rescuing the Zapotecs from the Mixtecs. On the contrary, the Nahuas appear as uninvited meddlers who disturbed a peaceful status quo. Like Mexicapan's account, the Chapultepec version emphasizes their indispensable cooperation with the Spaniards.
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Figure 4: Detail of Mixtec text and don Diego Cortés Dzahui Yuchi on Chapultepec’s map.
...niseenducha yya don diego cortes sihi nicuhui uhui niseenducha ndihi taca toho sihi nicuhui uni ñanchehe niseenducha...ca noo ca dzina ñoo cuiisi nicahua siyudad nicuhui cuachi huatuhui nducha cuhui cha ñe cu a cuhui nisica español e chee niquidzatnaño nani ñoho yutno nduhua

quihui dzahua nidzahuidzo don diego cortes quehe tno cuihi tno nani nisiya ndihi taca chee cuhui nano nisahatahuña yahu yya don diego cotes quihui dzahua ninocoondahuindyi sihi chee cuiisi chee cuhui nano nisahañahandii nocahua huehe ñoho cano

Title of don Diego Cortés of the ñuu of San Juan Yuchayta and the barrio of Santa Ana.
About the time when our lord Cortés first arrived, with a crowd of white people; he came to our ñuuuchayu, then he came out to meet us and name us. He received and named our cacique don Diego Cortés Dzahui Yuchi. [rain, flint]

...The cacique don Diego Cortés was baptized and second, all the nobles were baptized and third, all the commoners were baptized....Then, at first, he founded a city at the place called Ñocuisi, because there was no water where the Spaniards lived, those who made war at the place of the guaxe trees. [Ñunduhua, Huaxyacac, or Oaxaca]

And then don Diego Cortés responded in an elegant and honorable manner before all the great ones: I, lord don Diego Cortés, shall bestow unto you a gift. Then we lived together in peace with the white people and the great ones and we gave them a place to build the big church. ³⁸
Figure 5: The first page of text of the Mixtec title recounting the arrival of Hernando Cortés.
All was well until Cortés came a second time with a group of Nahuas from central Mexico, with whom the Mixtecs promptly went to war. Chapultepec formed a Mixtec confederation with Cuilapan and Xoxocotlan to confront the Nahuas. Cortés intervened and then the Mixtecs "pacified" or helped defeat the Nahuas, acting on Cortés' behalf. In compliance with Cortés' decision, and not because they were defeated, they then gave land to the Nahuas as a gift. In serving Cortés, they demonstrated their allegiance, won his authorization, and controlled the terms of the exchange. The map's borders have frozen this early agreement which now must be respected. In contending that they accommodated the Spaniards and Nahuas by generously ceding half of their lands, an act resulting in the displacement of their people to other nearby Mixtec sites, the title's authors imply that Chapultepec has done its part and cannot afford to lose more land. In fact, reciprocity is in order. Furthermore, don Diego Cortés of Chapultepec independently arranged this settlement with no interference from the cabecera of Cuilapan or its cacique. Chapultepec attempts to portray itself as an autonomous entity rather than a subject of Cuilapan, and a faithful ally of Cortés. To the Mixtecs, the Nahuas were nothing more than bellicose intruders, and should have been grateful for what they had.

nacuhui uhui sito niquisitucu stondi cortes ñaha caya chee ñocoo ninocuacañahaya dzini aniy ñocoyo nchacañaha stondi cortes

nisacha ñoordi quihui dza ninaandi sihi chee ñocoo yucu saminoo nisahatnahandi nduhua yuchaticaha noyoo nicuhui ndihi sihindi quihui ninandi sihi chee ñocoo

quihui dzahua niquisi chee cuiisi españole nisadzino nocha no ninandi quihui dzahua nidzandeendi sihi chee saminoo chee ñocoo saha dza yni stondi cortes marques quihui dzahua nisahañahandi ñoho coo -- chee ñocoo nduyu chee ñodzahui ñoo sa juº yuchayta si vario santana sihi vario yucucuii yya uni vario siñaha yuhu do ndiego cortes dzahui yuchi
The second time that our lord Cortés came he brought many Mexicans from the head palace of Mexico City, all in the company of our lord Cortés.

When they arrived in our ūnu, we went to fight with the Mexicans at the hill called Saminoo [Mexicapan] and we were defended by arrows from Yuchaticaha [Cuilapan], and Noyoo [Xoxocotlan] also supported us when we encountered the Mexicans.

And then the Spaniards arrived. They put an end to our fighting and then we pacified the Mexicans. Only because of the wishes of our lord Cortés the Marqués, we then gave the Mexicans some land to settle and we, the Ņudzahui, of the ūnu of San Juan Yuchayta [Chapultepec], the barrio of Santa Ana, and the barrio of Yucucuii, were the three barrios belonging to me, don Diego de Cortés Dzahui Yuchi.

Half of the commoners will settle there in the cabecera of Yuchaticaha the old [Cuilapan] and the other half will settle there at the entrance of the ūnu of Ņuyoo [Xoxocotlan], the big ūnu which borders with the yuhuitayu of San Juan Yuchayta [Chapultepec].

I, don Diego de Cortés, have given half of the lands belonging to us to the Mexican nobles of the tayu ūnu of San
It is a large ŋuu with seven barrios, which all together make up the four parts or cabeceras belonging to our lord the Marqués.

Today I mark the borders before all the nobles and elders of San Juan Yuchayta. I, don Diego de Cortés, willfully give my lands on which my grandchildren and great-grandchildren will live.

The remainder of the title enumerates the borders of Chapultepec. Finally, like many testaments, the document admonishes all those who attempt to interfere with the agreement. Though the lands are his, he entrusts them to Chapultepec and thereby lays the foundation for their present claim. By asserting that this final agreement was sanctioned by and served the interests of Hernando Cortés, the title explicitly warns that interlopers who challenged Chapultepec would pay a stiff penalty to the Marqués himself.

Thus, today I guard the title which belongs to me, don Diego Cortés, and my map which I entrust to the hands of all the nobles of my ŋuu, San Juan Yuchayta, so that they may acquire the tribute in gold for our lord Marqués, and for my grandchildren and great-grandchildren to keep and guard, to record and recount that which pertains to the lordly title. A 300 pesos penalty to he who attempts to interfere with our lord Marqués, for the title belongs to the ŋuu. It is said and done.

Diego Cortés, before me, the notary, don Luis de Salazar. Today, Tuesday the eighth day of the month of February, 1523.
The Mixtec narrative is more condensed than the Nahuatl account. Chapultepec did not need to legitimize its presence in the area and thus did not raise some of the concerns addressed in the opening scenes of Mexicapan's title: the invitation by the Zapotecs; the appeal to Cortés for permission to fight the Mixtecs; and the dramatic entry into the Valley of Oaxaca. The cacique of Chapultepec simply forged an agreement from the Conquest that he bequeathed to his descendants in testamentary form. Above all, the Chapultepec version asserts autonomy from the cacique of Cuilapan while affirming a lasting settlement with Mexicapan. Similar to the Nahuatl title, it denies defeat, establishes an alliance with the Spaniards, portrays a consensus approved by Hernando Cortés, and carefully establishes the boundaries marked immediately after the Conquest.

We now proceed from translations and summaries of the two titles to an interpretation of their linguistic, stylistic, and thematic characteristics. First, we approach the documents as complex speech and writing genres from late seventeenth-century Oaxaca, with attendant linguistic conventions and forms.

Language, Writing, and Discourse

The fact that Nahuatl and Mixtec alphabetic writing did not even exist in the early 1520s proves the titles' impossible dating. If genuinely dated 1523, the Mixtec title would predate the earliest extant example of Mixtec alphabetic writing by nearly half of a century. The language of these two documents confirms that they could not have been written in the early sixteenth century, or even the early seventeenth century; the orthography, vocabulary, and anachronistic content of the manuscripts also reveals that they are not copies of earlier sources. In both documents, the authors' vocabulary reflects a familiarity with Spanish, paradoxically combining late colonial Spanish loan words with remnants of archaic indigenous rhetoric and vocabulary.

The language of the titles exhibits many aberrant features which make them extremely difficult to translate. The unpredictable and unconventional orthography, grammar, and vocabulary are caused in part by the suspect training of the authors and by their conscious attempts to imitate an earlier style and language. Perhaps most importantly, these two titles were written outside of central Mexico and the Mixteca Alta, the central areas of Nahuatl
and Mixtec writing. Thus, the Nahuatl contains expressions and conventions which had since gone out of practice in central Mexico. The valley dialect of Chapultepec diverges considerably from those of the Mixteca Alta. Lastly, the titles were written in the late colonial period, just outside the Spanish city of Antequera.

This example of Nahuatl from Oaxaca is unique in that it was written by migrants of central Mexico rather than non-Nahuas using Nahuatl as a second language, as is the case with most Nahuatl written outside of central Mexico. Still, the title's orthography is characteristic of other "peripheral" Nahuatl documentation. Peripheral Nahuatl diverges from classical central Mexican Nahuatl in grammar, syntax, vocabulary, and idioms.\(^\text{41}\) Though peripheral Nahuatl clearly deviates from the better-known central Mexican standard, these variations may constitute an authentic form of Nahuatl.\(^\text{42}\) Despite its differences, the title exhibits many of the same changes as central Mexican Nahuatl documentation in contact with Spanish. The use of Spanish verbs and particles in central Mexican Nahuatl texts did not occur regularly until the mid-seventeenth century.\(^\text{43}\) In fact the rate of such change appears fairly homogenous; by the mid-seventeenth century Oaxacan Nahuatl had incorporated Spanish nouns, verbs and particles into its lexicon. All types of Spanish loan words are sprinkled throughout this document.\(^\text{44}\)

The language of the Mixtec title represents the Valley of Oaxaca dialect, which combines elements from older dialects of the Mixteca Alta and Baja. Influence from the Yanhuitlan area reflects a pattern of eastward migration from the Alta to Cuilapan in the centuries before the Spanish Conquest. The influence of the Baja dialect on Valley Mixtec is intriguing, considering the distance between the two regions.\(^\text{45}\) Regardless of the dialect, the quality and complexity of the grammar and vocabulary does not compare favorably with seventeenth-century documentation from the Mixteca Alta.

Like the Nahuatl title, the Mixtec document employs loan words which did not enter the language until the later colonial period, such as *siyudad, español, vario, título, mapa,* and *pena.* The language of the glosses on the Mixtec map/painting and the corresponding title indicates a separate authorship, as they exhibit different handwriting and orthographies.\(^\text{46}\) Despite the presence of loan words in the Mixtec title and map, the writings do not contain nearly as many linguistic indications of their later production as does the Nahuatl document. Although clearly not written in the
early sixteenth century, the language exhibits only minimal Hispanic influence. For example, there are no loan verbs or particles, as in the Nahuatl title. A comparison of the Nahuatl and Mixtec titles, confirmed by a preliminary survey of documentation from the Mixteca Alta, suggests that Mixtec did not change as rapidly or as evenly as Nahuatl in contact with Spanish. Many more sources need to be examined to determine the comparative rates of cultural interaction and linguistic evolution.

The writing style of the titles also betrays their late-colonial date of production. Its handwriting attempts to imitate the flourish of sixteenth-century paleography, while the map strikes the eye as bizarre or simply badly done. Glass and Robertson declined to even include this "crude" pictorial in their catalogue of Native Middle American Manuscripts because it is "too removed from the native tradition for inclusion in the census."47

Nevertheless, the documents evoke remnants of the form and function of preconquest writing. In function, preconquest and sixteenth-century codices painted on deer hide or native paper associated mythical and historical events with the genealogies of indigenous rulers in order to legitimate their power. The codices were mnemonic devices for speeches and performances before the local nobility.48 In form, the pictorial portion of the Mixtec title reveals a conscious attempt to imitate preconquest style. The map portrays ruling couples viewed in profile and facing each other, like the codex and lienzo tradition of depicting dynastic couples seated in the same manner on a reed mat. This convention represents the Mixtec yuhuitayu (yuhui means petate or "reed mat"; tayu is "pair" or "throne"), one of two terms employed for the local state or sociopolitical entity. The nuu was the term for the basic Mixtec "pueblo" in colonial documentation. The yuhuitayu (often simply tayu) was essentially a nuu with a royal couple ruling by direct descent.49 This "kingdom" or cacicazgo is akin to the Nahuatl petlatl icpalli (reed mat throne), though the Mixtec principle of direct descent bestowed greater authority to the female cacica (female cacique called yya dzehe tonihe in Mixtec).50 In this painting, four yuhuitayu are depicted as considerably scaled-down versions of the older, ornate style [see figures 6 and 7]. Alphabetic glosses complement place name glyphs scattered along the edges of the map.51

However, this "pintura y mapa" obviously mixes preconquest and postconquest elements. The drawings appear to be distorted representations of an earlier art style and betray certain European
Figures 6 and 7: Depictions of the Mixtec yuhuitayu.  
Above: from the Codex Columbino.  
Below: from the 1696 map of Chapultepec.
influences. Unlike their ancient predecessors, men have mustaches and women wear their hair unbraided. They lack the detail and fullness of preconquest figures as well as their elaborate clothing and regalia. Besieged by Nahuas, don Diego de Cortés Dzahui Yuchi defends himself with a nondescript coat of arms instead of the traditional Mixtec yusa (chimalli or hand-held shield) and brandishes a lance instead of an obsidian-blade club. Though hills are still prominent features bordering the map, they are more shaded blobs than the stylized glyphs of the earlier period. A smiling sun, leafy trees, and an attempt to draw perspective are all European traits. Other features of the map are plainly anachronistic; the four churches conspicuously displayed in the painting could not have been built within two years of the Conquest. The church is an important structure depicted in both titles and early pictorials. In many sixteenth-century Mixtec lienzos and codices, the church is centered, adjacent to the lord's palace. Here, the ruling couples appear before the churches, just as the codices depicted rulers seated by or inside the preconquest temple. Incidentally, Chapultepec's church is twice as large as any other on the map.

Whereas the Mixtec map and title are vaguely reminiscent of preconquest pictorial practice, the Nahuatl title has all the flavor of indigenous speech and performance. As products of an oral tradition, titles retrieve events from the collective memory of local myth, where they are reshaped by each succeeding generation. The narrative of titles recounts past events real or unreal to suit present needs, just as the codices had combined myth and history to legitimate rulership. The Nahuatl title especially relies on dialog, narrative, and characters, like a drama or oral performance. The first three sections exhibit the most archaic and dramatic language and content because this part was most likely based on an older oral tradition. A specific style and language is adapted to each changing context; the straightforward language of the Nahuatl land survey, for example, diverges considerably from the rhetorical style of the mock battle before Cortés. Sections of quoted speech within the narrative make the title appear more intimate and believable, as if it were the product of "on-the-scene" reporting. The frequent assertion of truth (ca melahua, "it is true") imparts the character of a legal deposition to the narrative, if not plain propaganda. The fact that witnesses sign their names further "officializes" the title as an authentic document authorized by prominent community representatives.52 According to the Nahuatl title, the Zapotec noblewoman advised the Nahuas "to write exactly how it happened
on paper," thus providing a convenient motive for creating this would-be objective history.

Titles are like Nahuatl songs and annals in that they were often concerned with history and the altepetl. Immortalized culture heroes narrate titles just as they perform songs. The rhythmic and repetitive qualities of titles further associates them with song and discourse. León-Portilla has observed that chronicles and histories "contain a certain rhythmic style which undoubtedly helped in memorizing." In the Nahuatl title, the Noblewoman of the Zapotec speaks in rhythmic verse by prefacing each statement with ca melahuac. Similarly, the Mixtec text uses saha dzahua and quihui dzahua ("when" and "then") to pace the narrative. Semantic parallel phrasing and repetition of words or morphemes contribute to the titles' lyrical style. The titles are as difficult to follow as indigenous song because they violate temporal and spatial conventions, and lack the linear organization and conventions for encapsulating dialog of Western song and drama. They frequently shift back and forth from narrative to dialog, from the historical past tense to the active present. The non-linear narrative could be based on an indigenous cyclical conception of time, but it is more likely that the precise chronology and timing of events were either misconstrued or condensed by myth and speech conventions. The "telescoping" and layering of events is typical of the oral tradition. The elusive nature of titles is also due to the simple fact that this speech genre was not easily reduced to written form. Though titles were not exactly meant to be spoken or performed before an audience, they share many characteristics of song and drama because they are drawn from the oral tradition.

The variant metaphors and flowery speech of the Nahuatl title parallels the Hispanicized Mixtec pictorial component, signaling both retention and loss of ancient traditions. The Nahuatl employs an altered version of a metaphor for war, chimalli macualli (instead of mitl chimalli), revealing a faint familiarity with the conventions of high speech. The Mixtec portrays the cacique speaking elegantly, occasionally using words from the distinct lordly (yya) vocabulary. But the titles are a far cry from the reverential, eloquent forms characteristic of preconquest and early colonial discourse.

The most striking difference between the two titles is that the Mixtec version of the Conquest exhibits few of the more fantastic features of the Nahuatl title's shifting narrative, dramatic dialog and supernatural events. It remains to be seen whether these char-
acteristics, which have been observed in several other central Mexican Nahuatl titles, are singular to the Nahuatl title genre. In this sense, the Mixtec title resembles the Maya chronicles more than some of the fanciful versions from central Mexico. One may consider whether the shared characteristics of Nahuatl, Mixtec, and Maya titles represent the diffusion of a colonial genre or a common Mesoamerican oral and written tradition, or both.

Though far removed from the intended model, the style and language of the titles leave an impression of how some Mixtecs and Nahuas perceived early colonial writing. The painting demonstrates the extent to which alphabetic writing had supplanted the ancient pictorial tradition by the end of the seventeenth century. As a distinct genre, titles appear rather late in the evolution of indigenous-language writing (especially for Nahuatl), when literacy had spread far enough to reach non-nobles, such as the alleged authors Juan Roque and Nicolás Miguel. By this later period, Spanish had exerted considerable influence on indigenous language and writing, reflecting the overall interaction of Hispanic and indigenous society. If it is clear how writing and language were perceived nearly two centuries later, and reshaped within this new discourse genre, it is less clear how the titles' content reflects a general historical consciousness. In other words, what did they really think happened?

Historical Consciousness and Myth

Titles intertwine local history, oratory, myth and propaganda. In describing their content, both Woodrow Borah and Wood have evoked the image of a tapestry interwoven with "myth, fantasy and falsehood."57 Charles Gibson described the typical title as representing "an individual or collective memory of lands possessed or once possessed and endangered...[which] might be misguided or deliberately contrived to support a claim."58 And Lockhart demonstrated in a study of four titles from the Chalco region that the documents were in some cases "deliberately falsified."

Falsification was clearly intended in many titles, especially considering the aging process, the impossible dating, and the intentional archaic language and pictorials. In central Mexico, an underground network of writers producing Nahuatl-language false titles functioned in the late seventeenth century, as well as a Spanish-language title-forging business in the second half of the eighteenth
The issue of fraud and forgery raises the unsavory prospect that indigenous groups or individuals may have knowingly lied to obtain their goals. The scholars who first examined such manuscripts often denied the possibility of falsification. Only recently, in fact, have they been acknowledged as spurious. Wood has defended their false nature by calling them "the product of reasonable people trying to meet an impossible demand--to produce a written and/or pictorial record that they either never had or had lost."

If duplicity is suspected in a title's origin, how reliable is its content? The lack of distinction between how the authors genuinely perceived the past and what they contrived in order to achieve their immediate goals further complicates this question of historical accuracy. An understanding of traditional behavior and custom may have led authors to consciously distort historical events. Most central Mexican titles deny military defeat either at the hands of the Mexica or Spaniards, since such an admission would have been tantamount, in preconquest terms, to renouncing one's claims to disputed territory. The same phenomenon can be observed in the typical response to question fourteen of the Relaciones Geográficas, concerning preconquest tribute arrangements; practically every place claims that it never gave tribute to anybody, even when evidence plainly points to the contrary. The Nahuatl title claims that they were "invited" to Oaxaca and subsequently defeated both the Mixtecs and Spaniards. Similarly, it seems an affected Mixtec view of the Conquest when the Spaniards are cordially welcomed and their Mexican allies are "given" land in the spirit of cooperation. Such interpretations are likely based on an awareness of the relation between conquest and tribute in pre-Hispanic times. Titles are not simply empowering myth or confused history; by their nature, they manipulate and reinterpret events of the past to serve present and future concerns.

Nevertheless, a title's fabrication need not totally compromise its historical value; though submerged in fiction, fable, and deceit there is a factual residue to be gleaned from these versions of the past. In spite of their false nature, many titles were based on actual historical events distorted and reshaped as they were passed along orally from one generation to the next. The resulting concoction is a blend of the mundane and fantastic, an anachronistic account mixing preconquest and postconquest elements. As Miguel León-Portilla observed: "Although it is often difficult to separate legend from history, in some ways fantastic accounts may be consid-
ered historical, since they show traces of ancient forms of thinking and acting."^64

Indeed, titles preserve many traces of the ancient past. The Nahuatl title features four ruler-warriors who were preconquest Mexica tlatoque (Nahua caciques) and/or warriors especially known for their martial prowess. Three of these characters are mentioned in the Florentine Codex and the Cantares Mexicanos.\(^65\) The recollection of historical/mythical figures attests to the retention of central Mexican lore in Nahuatl satellite communities nearly two centuries after the Conquest. The Zapotec noblewoman of the Nahuatl title could also be an historical figure, since women appear to have ruled more frequently in Oaxaca than in Nahua society.\(^66\) Furthermore, her presence may represent a marriage alliance between Nahua and Zapotec nobles, such as the historic union between Ahuitzotl's daughter and the Zapotec lord Cosijoeza. The beleaguered Zapotec's tale of reliance upon the Mexica for protection may also have an historical basis. According to sixteenth-century sources, the Zapotecs forged an alliance with the Nahuas against the Mixtecs and other groups surrounding the Valley of Oaxaca.\(^67\) Interestingly, the two hills on which the Nahuas first confronted the Spaniards according to their title, Huaxacatzin and Acatepec, were sites of Mexica garrisons in the years before the Conquest.\(^68\)

The first part of the Nahuatl title focuses on war and subsequent tribute arrangements as a result of the so-called "original conquest." Yet this alliance between the Nahuas and the Zapotecs was created before the arrival of the Spaniards, and could not have been sanctioned by Cortés. The Nahuas exploited the Mixtec-Zapotec rivalry to establish a foothold in the area; implicit in Nahua aid to the Zapotecs was the promise of new lands and tribute. Similarly, "helping" the Spaniards on expeditions guaranteed the Nahuas land to settle and favored status in the conquered region. Clearly, fundamental preconquest conceptions of conquest and alliance dictate titles' content.

The Nahuatl title pays special tribute to preconquest warfare, its paraphernalia and protocol. War is depicted as ritualistic play, symbolized by the sounds of log drums, dramatic displays of arms and authentic battle accouterments like shields, obsidian-blade clubs, arrows, and stone sandals. The attention to detail is reminiscent of the ritual recorded by Sahagún's informants in Book Twelve of the Florentine Codex. Supernatural events such as earthquakes and floods round out the Mexica arsenal, wielded to defeat
both the Mixtecs and Spaniards. Women and children were invited to witness the fighting, perhaps according to preconquest protocol. The derogatory allusion to the Mixtecs as cannibals is probably an oblique reference to preconquest sacrifice directly linked to ritual warfare; in this context it appears as a barbarous act of the past, and a further justification of Mexico conquest. This indictment of the Mixtecs demonstrates an aspect of the Nahuatl title's appeal to a Spanish audience's sensibilities. The Nahuas attempted to validate their own conquest in Spanish terms. They affirmed at the end of the narrative that they wanted to fight, died (and killed) in battle, fought with gunpowder, and captured black slaves—"just like the Spaniards." This process of "regulation," whereby the speakers/writers strategically appeal to the ethical values of the addressee, is typical of this genre and has been observed in the Maya chronicles.69

In reference to better-known versions of this period, León-Portilla asserted that "native records of the Conquest are dramatic proof of the persistence of what can be called a deeply rooted historical consciousness."70 This assertion applies equally to the titles, which testify to the monumental effect of these apocalyptic events on all subsequent discourse. Yet this consciousness is tempered by a healthy disregard for the Conquest's negative repercussions; in both titles the actual Spanish Conquest is either denied or completely ignored.71

Once these events have transpired, titles proceed to all the symbolic events highlighting a community's evolution into a Spanish-style municipality, graced by God and King. First, community members received baptism and Christian names and then the local church was built, seemingly overnight. The founding of the local cabildo is another landmark event which conveyed status and legitimacy to the community.72 Despite being modeled on a Spanish institution, the offices retain preconquest responsibilities. The transition to municipal government is portrayed as an autonomous process undertaken by the community rather than an external imposition.

Finally, all titles focus on land. The survey of lands and borders witnessed by the indigenous community is the part of the document which most corresponds to Spanish procedures of investigation, and thus is the most predictable. Since the customary procedure of walking borders usually demanded a number of witnesses, many community members were likely familiar with this part of titles. Each side attempted to demonstrate that a boundary dis-
puted with another community was a matter which had been settled earlier, witnessed and approved by both indigenous and Spanish officials. Both sides also denied instigating the dispute. Accordingly, the Mixtec map contains a suspicious addendum to the main text: "no tenemos pleito con los mexicanos" (we don't have a legal dispute against the Mexicans). This curious statement does not appear in the original Mixtec passage. In reality, the dispute with Mexicapan and the cacique of Cuilapan is the very reason for the map's existence. Chapultepec had to portray an amicable resolution of conflict in the 1520s in order to support its claim in the 1690s, which might be jeopardized by admission of ongoing conflict.

As Wood has observed, there is no nostalgia for earlier times in the titles, as in some of the high rhetoric or huehuetlatolli of the sixteenth century. The genre transformed historical reality by rewriting it from a present-minded perspective. In the titles from Oaxaca, a distinct ethnic identity played a prominent role in this reinterpretation of the past. Ethnic identity helped distinguish the community's historic right and unique origins. In spite of pretense and myth, the Mixtec and Nahuatl titles exhibit evidence of ethnic identity as functional in the 1690s as it was in the 1520s.

Ethnicity and Identity

In titles from central Mexico, James Lockhart has noted that a "broader ethnic awareness or solidarity is no more to be found in the titles than anywhere else." He described titles, like most Nahuatl-language documentation, as primarily altepetl-centered documents which tend to emphasize their identification with the local altepetl and calpolli-tlaxilacalli (subdivisions of the altepetl, frequently associated with barrios) rather than broader ethnic categories. The titles from Oaxaca also focus on the Nahua altepetl or Mixtec ñuu (or yuhuitayu), attempting to preserve or extend privileges in the name of that sociopolitical unit, represented by its elected leaders. The Nahuatl title describes how groups from specific central Mexican altepetl came to settle in separate barrios, retaining their corporate identity in distant Oaxaca. Likewise, Chapultepec's map and title focus on the narrowly defined interests of the community and its nearby dependent.

However, the two titles from Oaxaca also enunciate a broader, overarching ethnic identity and make repeated references to a distinct ethnic awareness. The titles exalt Nahua and Mixtec roles in the Conquest to the extent that the Spaniards were one more ethnic
group who were ultimately accommodated. The multiethnic setting of the valley contributed to such an acute awareness of origin and language. Ethnic solidarity is evident in both titles; the three Nahua-speaking communities of Mexicapan, Xochimilco and the Marquesado forged an alliance based on common ethnicity. Similarly, San Juan Chapultepec received help in fighting the Nahuas from the other two Mixtec yuhuitayu of the valley, Cuilapan and Xoxocotlan.

The Nahuatl title evokes events and dialog from a distant past which justify and explain the historic presence of the Mexicatlaca (Mexica people) in the area. The narrative features various indigenous ethnic terms: the Nahuas were known as mexica, mexicatlaca, and mexicanos; the Mixtecs were called mixteca, mixtecatlaca, and tlacame mixteco; the Zapotecs were zapoteca.tl. The title even mentions separate border markers demarcating the lands of the teomixtecal or "Mixtec deities" belonging to the Mixtec yuhuitayu of Chapultepec and Xoxocotlan.

Although the Nahuas who accompanied the Spaniards were from various central Mexican altepetl, they were collectively called "Mexica" or some derivative in the title, and were thus associated with the one prominent Nahuatl-speaking group from Tenochtitlan. It is unclear whether this reference to the Mexica was applied to Nahuas in general in the early colonial period, or if it was a later development affected by the Hispanic term. Twice in the document's opening sections, the last three letters of "mexicanos" were crossed out, perhaps in recognition that it was the Spanish version of the original Nahuatl term (mexica). Later in the document, however, the term was employed unabashedly. Sixteenth-century Nahuatl-language documentation from the Mixteca also called the Nahuas "Mexica." The widespread use of "Mexica" reflects the complexities of Nahua ethnic identity. The term "Nahua" does not seem to have been employed consistently by Nahuas themselves. It was most frequently employed in reference to their language, particularly in ecclesiastical publications (doctrinas, confessional manuals, dictionaries, etc.), rather than any profound cultural identification. Though it was probably the best term adopted, it is not common in the archival record.

The authors of the Mixtec title also exhibited a conscious ethnic identity, distinguishing themselves as tay nudzahui ("people of the rain place"), distinct from the tay nucoyo (Nahuas or Mexica) and tay español (Spaniards). Thus, the so-called "Mixtecs" did not go by that name. In Nahuatl mixtlan means
"place of the clouds" and *mixteca* is (plural of *mixtecatl*) "people of the cloud place." This name implies that Nahuatl speakers recognized the people of the area as a homogenous group and presumably derived this name from an association with the meaning of Ñudzahui (i.e., "rain" and "clouds"). After the Conquest, Spaniards and friars adopted the Nahuatl term, and they are still known as "Mixtecs" to this day.

In Mixtec-language colonial documentation and church publications from the Mixteca Alta, the term Ñudzahui has been attested dozens of times. The term is common in both the early and later colonial periods, and especially during the period in which Mixtec alphabetic writing seems to have reached a peak in quality and quantity, from the 1670s to the 1720s. The self-appellation appears in reference to language, the region, the people as a group, individuals, and cultural artifacts such as *metates* (grinding stones), clothes, paper, soap made from herbs and confraternity images (an image of Jesus Christ, for example). Judging by the context of its usage in the title and other documents, Ñudzahui identity was prevalent when accentuated by the presence of others, whether Spaniard, mestizo, mulatto, Nahua, Chocho, etc. Contact with Spaniards and other racial and ethnic groups occasioned the need to express one's ethnicity in writing. But the concept and term also existed in preconquest times. This broader cultural and linguistic identification, however, did not compromise a more specific, local identity with the indigenous community or one of its subunits. Such a well-defined sense of ethnic identity has not been documented for other indigenous groups of postconquest Mesoamerica.

The Ñudzahui also applied a broader designation to the Nahuas--*tay ñucoyo* or "people of the reed place." The term is based on the place name for Mexico Tenochtitlan *ñuu coyot*, instead of the more abstract "Nahuas." Thus, the terminology of both titles makes no distinction between the Nahuas and the Mexica. The Ñudzahui title also refers to the Nahuas as *saminuu*, a term apparently associated with warfare and conquest. This name has not been attested elsewhere in Mixtec-language sources and may be a more archaic, metaphorical term. Just as the Mixtecs associated the Nahuas with Tenochtitlan, they also named the Zapotecs after the largest site in the Valley of Oaxaca, Teozapotlan (called *Zaachila* by the Zapotecs). According to sixteenth-century accounts, *tay tocuisi* ("white noble people") was the term applied to the Valley Zapotecs, as Teozapotlan was called *Tocuisi*. The entire region of the Valley was called *Tocuisi ñuhi*. The Mixtec
title states that Spaniards settled in a place called Ñucuisi or "the white place," perhaps in reference to its Nahuatl equivalent in the Valley, Tlálistacá ("white land place"), or possibly Teozapotlán.84

Indicative of their late production, both titles refer to the Spaniards as "españoles."85 Both titles also employ unusual and enigmatic names for the Spaniards. The Nahuatl title curiously calls Cortés the "ruler of the children of the sun" and the Spaniards "children of the sun." It is unclear whether this is a completely contrived term or one based on myth. Perhaps it is akin to the legendary Nahuatl nickname for Alvarado, Tonatiuh ("sun"), in apparent reference to his light complexion. The term may be more complex, however, rooted in preconquest and/or postconquest myth.86 Similarly, the Mixtec title calls the Spaniards many complementary but rare names, such as tay cuhui nano "the great people" and tay cuisi "white people." The last term would accord with the interpretation of the "children of the sun" as a reference to skin color.87 The use of "whites" for Spaniards in the Mixtec parallels the use of "blacks" for Africans in the Nahuatl. Nahua continued to use the term tliltic ("[something] black") for Africans rather than the Spanish loan word negro throughout the colonial period.88

The most conspicuous aspect of identity absent from the titles is any reference to "Indians." In Ñudzahui-language documentation from the Mixteca Alta, Baja, and Valley, the term "indio" has not been attested a single time. Likewise, "indio" is extremely rare in colonial Nahuatl documentation.89 There is no evidence in indigenous-language sources that a generic "Indian" identity eclipsed Nahuatl or Mixtec ethnic identities, especially not by the end of the seventeenth century.90

Few studies have attended to indigenous ethnicity after the Conquest. Historians have traditionally focused on Spaniards or "Indians," or the interaction between the two. The titles from Oaxaca seem to diminish the theory or presumption that ethnicity was more salient in preconquest times, or that the Conquest and contact with Spaniards rapidly destroyed ethnic identity.91 In light of developing pressures for land on the community, identity may have been maintained or revived by drawing selectively on remembrances of the past and using them to cope with the reality of changing circumstances. As internally produced writings striving to articulate and confirm a community's historic right, these titles
testify to the vitality of indigenous identity and consciousness nearly two centuries after the conquest.

Conclusions

Historians have proposed that official titles, histories, títulos primordiales, the "Techialoyan" manuscripts, and Spanish-language forgeries constitute a continuum of documents representing indigenous attempts to protect and further the interests of the corporate community, or special interests therein. We further propose that the function and style of the indigenous title extends beyond land documentation to encompass a much broader spectrum of indigenous writing and expression which embodies certain preconquest characteristics. If the day-to-day documentation of notarial and personal records is juxtaposed with products of high culture (the huehuetlatolli of annals, songs, plays, and the chronicles of Chimalpahin and Tezozomoc), the titles genre seems isolated. Yet titles seem to display traits and traces of all genres: testamentary information (if not separate testaments); the boundary talk of land documents; the flowery and antiquated language of high speech; the repetition and rhythm of song; a pictorial component reminiscent of preconquest and sixteenth-century writing; the performance-oriented narrative of plays and speeches; the tendency of annals to focus seemingly haphazardly on symbolic events; and the legal conventions of official petitions and depositions. Titles constitute a collage of indigenous writing forms and functions. Some attempt to replicate preconquest pictorial style and convention, and serve as visual testimony to the lost but not entirely forgotten art of preconquest writing; others conjure up a spirited oral tradition. In spite of its anachronistic and inaccurate archaism, the false title still resembles more a syncretic, synthetic indigenous form than a Spanish title.

Many of the themes elaborated in the discussion of these titles, such as writing and discourse, historical consciousness and myth, and ethnicity and identity, are best studied from the perspective of native-language sources. Yet few of these indigenous-language sources have been studied from Oaxaca, where several distinct culture and language groups interacted both before and after the Conquest. The confluence of cultures and languages that characterizes this complex region runs through the Mixtec and Nahuatl titles from the Valley of Oaxaca. The two carefully constructed accounts of the Conquest bristle with local patriotism
and proud identity. One title declared victory over the Spaniards, the other spoke of cooperation for the common good. In the end, the titles emphasize triumph, accommodation, and adjustment over conflict and defeat. The titles merged indigenous and Spanish representations and genres to create a new history. Rewriting the past to suit present purposes, the Nahua and Ñudzahui authors transformed the Spanish Conquest of Oaxaca from certain defeat into self-serving history and myth. These accounts of the "original conquest" prove that the pen is mightier than the sword.

Notes

1. The two titles are located in the Archivo General de la Nación: Tierras, vol. 236, exp. 6. We gratefully acknowledge James Lockhart’s help with the initial translation of the first three sections of the Nahuatl title. We also thank Barry David Sell for his comments on the final transcription and translation of this document. The final translation is ours.


4. The ever-increasing number of identified "titles" in local and national archives, however, suggests that enough of them succeeded to encourage their production.

5. Borah 1991: 216-221 summarizes the main points of agreement and disagreement among scholars who have studied the "Techialoyan codices" and "títulos primordiales." For a more detailed discussion of the Techialoyans, see Robertson 1975; Wood 1984, 1989; and Harvey 1986.


13. Deviant orthography was often purposely employed to antiquate documents, so it is difficult to ascertain whether the language is simply "bad" or contrived to look out-of-date.
16. Similarly, the Mixtecs referred to the Valley Zapotecs collectively as *tay tociusi* or "white noble people"; the meaning of this term is unclear.
21. Taylor 1972: 22-23. Nearly all of the Mixtec communities were intact by the end of the colonial era. Mixtec pueblos included San Juan Chapultepec, Santa Cruz Xoxocotlan, San Pedro Ixtlahuaca, Santa María Atzompá, San Jacinto Amilpas, and San Lucas Tlanichico. Additionally, Santa Ana Tlapacoya, Santa Ana Zegache, and Zaachila each contained a Mixtec barrio, and there were also Mixtecs in the eastern Etla branch of the valley at Guaxolotitlan, Santiago Xochilquitonco, and Tenexpan.
22. In his study of land tenure in the Valley of Oaxaca, William Taylor mentions a certain Mixtec manuscript and map from a 1696 land dispute which he supposed "may be the original 1523 cacicazo title or a copy" (Taylor 1972: 40-41; 115). He subsequently interpreted the document as a description of the cacicazo lands and the foundation of the municipality. Taylor had considered the title's function but apparently not its falsified nature. John Chance also used the false titles in his study of colonial Antequera. Employing the Mixtec document, he claimed that Mexicapa was founded on land "ceded" by the Mixtec cacique of neighboring Chapultepec and suggests that it had seven barrios as early as 1523. He referred to the Nahuatl title as "a document of the period [which] suggests that by this early date [1525] the Spaniards had already introduced their concept of local government into these Indian towns" (Chance 1978: 32, 83). Like Taylor, Chance considered the document an authentic copy of an earlier original, though this is never stated or implied in the proceedings. Significantly, his interpretation of the document as an early- rather than a late-colonial product affects his perception of changing ethnicity throughout the colonial period. Chance's treatment of the document led Borah to the interpretation that "the first instances of European-style towns with Spanish-style government may well have been the new settlements of Indian allies close to Spanish, such as San Martín Mexicapa and Santo Tomás Xochimilco near Huaxyacac for Mexican and Tlaxcaltecan Indians" (Borah 1982: 269). It must be reiterated that at the time of these works, the identification and study of false titles was just beginning and little was known of the genre.

Based on an analysis of the pictorial portion, Mary Elizabeth Smith noted the distinct possibility that both the document and painting had been artificially aged, doubting the painting's date based on its "deficient"
native iconographic style. She supposed that it was probably done in 1696, when it was presented (Smith 1973: 207). Glass and Robertson shared this view (1975: 75). Genaro Vásquez thought that the Nahua title was written in Zapotec (1931: 22).

23. The testament, translated by Juan Roque, enumerates the lands which belong to Mexicapa. But the language of the testament reveals that it could not have been written in 1602, as it contains Spanish loan vocabulary and phenomenon of a later period, including prepositions.

24. They were said to present "papeles, recaudos, mapas y pinturas." The painting was apparently lost.

25. AGN: Tierras, vol. 236, exp. 6, f. 20.


27. This 1692 Spanish translation of the 1565 Mixtec testament and title of don Diego Cortés was allegedly based on the original, which he claimed was in Mexico City. The testament's opening overlaps in content with the Mixtec title from Chapultepec, and is typical of many testament/titles. For example, don Diego (whose Mixtec name Dzahiii Yuchi is translated as "aguasero como cuchillo") speaks of Cortés' arrival and proclaims that he was the first to be baptized and given the honorific title of "don" in the church of Cuilapa, followed by the nobility, and then the commoners. The testament quickly dispenses with religious formula and launches into a full description of borders. The document concludes with a list of witnesses described as the "principales deste pueblo, hombres que hisieron la conquista, en el serro delgado de Theosopotlan." The last line refers to a competing claim: "Asi mesmo el título de don Jeronimo de Lan[da], padre de doña Magdalena Melchora, que el traya quando yo hasía testamentyo, no abla con berrdad el, no disse berrdad el, no tiene fuerssa." The precise nature of this claim is unknown. The overlapping content of the titles may indicate a common oral and/or written source on which the documents are based, or the possibility that one was seen first by authors of the other. AGN: Tierras, vol. 236, exp. 6, ff. 33-33v.

28. The officials of Chapultepec decried "la falsedad patente del título presentado por los naturales de San Martin...el dicho título es falso, avído y adquirido por la malicia de dichos naturales de San Martin y especialmente por Juan Roque indio yntruso de conocida malicia y factor de semejantes títulos...y sin embargo de todos los defectos de falsedad y nulidad ynsanosable patente justificados...adquirieron dichos naturales poseción de tierras que en ninguna manera les pertenesen" AGN: Tierras, vol. 236, exp. 6, f. 99.

29. Don Andrés Cortés de Velasco berated the alcalde mayor: "el que ynjustamente se amparo a dichos naturales con tan flacos fundamentos como fueron un quaderno supuesto y falso título que hiso Juan Roque yndio del mismo pueblo suponiendo ser antiguo...como se lo con prueba con la otra letra suya" AGN: Tierras, vol. 236, exp. 6, f. 135.
30. AGN: Tierras, vol. 236, exp. 6, f. 132.
31. For example, in 1760, a survey determined that Chapultepec possessed only half its fundo legal (the 1695 law which provided each community with a radius of 600 varas, measured from the parish church), so adjoining lands were taken from Mexicapa to make up the difference. Though Mexicapa was the community primarily responsible for Chapultepec's loss of land, they were forced to rent out many lands to pay off debts accumulated in various lawsuits. One of these lawsuits was the long-standing dispute with Chapultepec (Taylor 1972: 69).
32. That there are four rulers is significant, for this number is ubiquitous in Nahua organization and thought. See Lockhart 1992: 436-442.
33. Smith has confirmed this observation (1973: 207).
34. AGN Tierras, v. 236, exp. 6, ff. 10-11. The nobles requested a "licencia para traducir un título que tenemos que agora nuevamente hemos hallado en lengua misteca--traducir lo en la lengua castellana juntamente con una mamapa [sic] para ber como platica con el dicho título."
35. The actual sociopolitical terms employed in the documents have been retained in the translation, instead of using the rough equivalents of "community" or "pueblo." This terminology will be discussed in more detail below.
36. In the ritual calendrical vocabulary, "rain" is co and "flint" is cuisi. This could be alternatively considered a personal name, which would have been represented as a glyph in the preconquest codices. Early colonial Mixtec-language documentation, however, invariably employs the calendrical vocabulary for naming, accompanied by a Christian first name.
37. We have purposely separated the Mixtec text into "paragraphs" or complete statements, for the sake of matching the corresponding translation which follows below with the original language. The text contains no such identifiable breaks in its prose.
38. Some parts of this translation are exceedingly complex, because of the faded second page, the little-known Valley dialect, the inattention to conventional grammar, and the use of metaphors and contrived archaisms.

Much of the linguistic detail is covered below in the section on language, but there are a few questions of interpretation which bear directly on the translation. First, this section employs four terms in reference to groups of people: chee cuisi; españololes; chee niquidatnañu; and chee cuhui nano. "Chee cuisi" means "white people" and by extension could be understood as "clear [-skinned] people"; the term was translated by the cacique of Guaxolotitlan in 1696 as "Spaniards."

There are two reservations to this interpretation. First, such a reference to Spaniards, by a perceived difference in skin color, is almost unprecedented in both the Nahuatl- and Mixtec-language documentary
record. Second, the Mixtecs called the Valley of Oaxaca *Tocuisi Ñuhu*, after the most important Zapotec place, Zaachila (Reyes 1593: Prologue II, 91). By extension, the Zapotecs were called *tay tocuisi* ("white noble people"), much like the way Nahuas *tay ñucoyo* were associated with Tenochtitlan. Likewise, another prominent group in the area, the Chocho or *tay tocuii*, were associated with the color green. Perhaps the color reference for Zapotecs is associated with their entirely white traditional dress, still worn today by women in the Zapotec Sierra. But this is mere speculation. Due to the paucity of extant Mixtec-language documentation from the Valley, the term for Zapotecs has not been attested, whereas those for the Nahuas and Chochos have been. The mention of *Ñocuisi* "white place" may be a reference to either Zaachila (Tocuisi in Mixtec; Teosapotlan in Nahuatl), Tlalistaca (*Ñucuisi* in Mixtec, Zapotec unknown), or merely some fictitious place associated with the "white people."

On the other hand, there is good cause to support the translation of *chee cuisi* as Spaniards. Here and elsewhere in the title, many of the terms in reference to Spaniards suggest semantic parallels. The term *chee cuhui nano* or the "great people" is also unattested and is probably nothing more than a flatteringly false archaism; it may refer to "Spanish nobles," thus avoiding the more Mixtec-specific *toho*. The term *chee niquidzatnañu* seems like a contrived metaphor related to war and conquest. The following ñuhu and *nduhua* seems to refer to Oaxaca but could also be a tone pun for war: some of the older expressions for "batallar" and "conquistar" (*caha-nduvua-ñuhu; chihi-nduvua-ñuhu-ñaha*) involve thrusting an arrow *nduvua* into land *ñuhu*, reminiscent of the symbol for a conquered place in the Mixtec codices—an arrow sticking out of a place name glyph (Alvarado 1593: 33, 52). These ambiguous and curious expressions are typical of titles; the Nahuatl title similarly refers to the Spaniards as "children of the sun," perhaps in reference to their complexion. Also, considering the fact that Africans were usually referred to as "black" by both Nahuas and Mixtecs, we might expect to see more references to Europeans as "white." We know of only one example in Nahuatl where Spaniards were referred to as *iztague* or "whites" and possibly *chipahuacatlaca* as "light [skinned] people" (León 1611: 18 recto, quoted in Sell forthcoming: chap. 3). For a discussion of such racial and social terminology in postconquest Nahuatl, see Lockhart 1992.

After a careful consideration of all these factors, we have translated this term as "white people" in reference to Spaniards.

39. A further indication of its dubious date is the claim that the map and title were done on the same day (February 8, 1523), though one refers to the day as Monday and the other as Tuesday. Each was written, in fact, by a different author.

40. A consciousness of linguistic change is rather rare among indigenous writers. It is glimpsed, however, when Sahagún's informants con-
sciously attributed older words and expressions to speeches of the past. See Lockhart 1992: 283.

41. For example, one of the standard central Mexican absolutive suffixes "-tl" is commonly written as "-l" or "-t" in peripheral Nahuatl, suggesting that the "-tl" sound had only recently been developed in the central area and had not been adopted in Oaxacan Nahuatl. Therefore, words, such as tzapotecatl, appear in the document as tzapotecal. Also, "ch" and "h" were interchanged, rendering nehi- instead of nech,- and ypilchua in place of ypilhuan. In some cases, "ch" is replaced by "x". The glottal "h" in central Mexican Nahuatl is replaced by "c" so that moteneuhtica appears as moteneuctica. As in standard Nahuatl, "n" is frequently omitted and included.

Unlike central Mexican nouns, which are altered when possessive prefixes or plural markers are added, the basic word does not change in peripheral Nahuatl with these additions. Peripheral Nahuatl combines the possessive form with the agentive to create words such as toeytlatoani. When the Nahuatl plural can be formed by omitting the absolutive suffix, peripheral Nahuatl still adds the plural "-me". Thus, in central Mexico the "-tl" is dropped from tlacatl (singular) becoming tlaca in the plural; but in Mexicapa it was sometimes written as tlacame. The use of plurals further indicates Spanish-language influence; for example, Spanish ethnic terms are mixed with tlaca (people), as in tlacame mistecos.

The title also contains unusual vocabulary; the very first word of the document carries the "-pol" suffix which usually has a derogatory connotation, but its addition to the pronoun nehuatl may suggest some form of mock humility. Another rare term in this document is ytocayoca ("the place named") employed here to signify a personal name; alternately, the term ytocia is occasionally used with place names rather than personal names.

Also characteristic of peripheral Nahuatl is the use of nahuac as the main relational, whereas in central Mexican Nahuatl it specifically means "next to, near" (see Anderson et al. 1976: doc. #30). Other common features include: yca yno "with that" or "at that time"; ynin rather than yn (also attested in Anderson et al. 1976: doc. #23); inconsistent use of the clause introductory particle "ca"; the infrequent appearance of yhuan; and the lack of cuix as interrogative. Also, the second- and third-person singular and plural reflexive "mo" is frequently employed to mark first-person singular and plural; thus timotlasotiasque appears in the document, though we would expect titollasotiasque in central Mexico (see Anderson et al. 1976: doc. #30).

Finally, the imperative form rarely adds either the "xi-" prefix to the second person singular and plural or the "-can" suffix to the plural, as is customary in central Mexico. Thus, ma nehmopalehulis clearly means "(you) help us," but lacks the obligatory "xi-" prefix.
42. Peripheral Nahuatl has never been thoroughly studied and described. A comparison of Nahuatl documents from the Oaxaca region indicates many characteristics of peripheral Nahuatl which, to those trained in classical central Mexican Nahuatl, might appear as mistakes. Our preliminary work with Nahuatl written by members of Mixtec and Mixe communities suggests that some irregularities may be explained by the fact that the authors of these documents were only familiar with Nahuatl as a second language. In sixteenth-century Nahuatl documents from the Mixteca, some Mixtec influence on vocabulary and orthography can be detected. Most of these sources, however, appear in areas of languages which were probably never written in colonial times, such as Trique, Chatino, Cuicatec, Ixcatec and Chocho (though the latter was written in the colonial period). On the other hand, Nahuatl from this area could simply have its own conventions, which differ from the Nahuatl of central Mexico.

At present, one of the only published sources with examples of peripheral Nahuatl is the collection of mundane documents by Anderson, Berdan and Lockhart 1976 (see documents #23 and #30). For a translation and brief analysis of a document from the Sinaloa region, see Braun, Sell and Terraciano 1989.

43. Frances Karttunen and Lockhart have outlined the evolution of Nahuatl after the Conquest, based on a philological and linguistic analysis of Nahuatl-language writing from central Mexico. In the first stage (ca. 1521-1550, or roughly the first postconquest generation), Nahuatl altered very little, incorporating only Spanish proper names but pronouncing them according to the Nahuatl phonetic inventory. Nahuas also developed descriptive terms and neologisms in their own language for new items introduced by the Europeans. During the second stage (ca. 1550-1650), Nahuatl borrowed Spanish nouns freely rather than creating new words, but still pronouncing them with Nahuatl sounds. The borrowing of Spanish verbs, particles and expressions characterizes a third stage in the evolution of the language (ca. 1650-onward). See Karttunen and Lockhart 1976.

44. Examples of Spanish nouns as they appear in the text include: *normano* ("hermano" with the Nahuatl first-person, possessive prefix); *noprimo*; *toeylilatocatzi Rey*; *tobarrios*; *tomarques*; *laudensiatl*; *tocabildo*; *ofissyo*; *siudad*. Stage three phenomena of borrowing verbs and particles are evidenced by the following: *entregar*; *obligar*; *para*; and *hasta*. Finally, the use of *panos* (to occur) in the sense of the Spanish verb "pasar" is a calque also typical of stage three Nahuatl.

45. The Mixtec grammarian, fray Antonio de los Reyes, observed in 1593 that the Cuilapan dialect combined aspects of Yancuitlan and the Mixteca Baja. Reyes wrote: "La lengua de Cuylapa tiene mucho de la de Yanguitlan, de donde dizan aver salido sus señores antiguos, tienen tam-
bien de la Mixteca Baja, de que no se puede dar regla por ser singular con lo de Guaxolotitlan y algunos pueblos de aquella comarca" (Reyes 1976: VII). This fact has interesting implications for the patterns of migration from the Mixteca to the Valley.

Dialectal variation of written colonial Mixtec is often quite predictable; there are roughly six written dialects which are mutually legible and comprehensible, and were in all likelihood mutually intelligible. Possessive and personal pronouns most noticeably vary from one dialect to another; for example, the first-person pronoun in this document, *yuhi*, is written as *nduhi* in Teposcolula and *njuhi* or *nchuhu* in Yanhuitlan. For these same three areas, verbal pronoun suffixes (first-person) are "-yu", "-ndi", and "-nju" respectively. In this document, first-person plural is "-ndi", not "-ndo" like everywhere else. Mixtec also has a complete set of reverential pronouns which transcended dialectal differences, but these were not employed in the title. The text does, however, contain some terms from the reverential vocabulary as well as a few metaphors.

Many orthographic differences are the result of regional phonetic differences. I will use the Teposcolula area dialect as the standard form, the same used by Hernandez (doctrina of 1568), Reyes (grammar of 1593) and Alvarado (dictionary of 1593). In this document, the consonant "t" is written as "ch" before "a" and "i" (tay becomes *chatu*, ndata becomes *nduha*), and initial "nd-" is written as "nch-" before "a" and "e" (ndatu and ndehi become *nchatu* and *nchehe*). The vowels "a" and "e" are often interchanged (nisaiduta becomes *nischeuducha*), whereas "ai" (or "ay") is usually written as "ee" (tay becomes *chee*). In Mixtec, there is a sixth short vowel ("i") which has no equivalent in the Spanish phonetic inventory. The Mixtec tendency for nasal-initial consonants and vowel-final morphemes have a predictable effect on Spanish loan words, so that ndiego (Diego) and njua (Juan) and espanole (españoles) are typical occurrences (in the last example, there is also no plural marker in Mixtec). Like in the Baja, anih ("palace") becomes aniy, and huitina ("today" or "now") is written as *huicha*. These dialectical differences are confirmed by other documentation from the area. For example, in a document from Xoxocotlan in 1716, chee, yuhi, andihui, daya, and *nho* *hayihui* appear in place of their Teposcolula equivalents: tay, nduhu, andehui, dzaya, and *nhu* *hayehui*. Orthographic changes, once they are observed and recognized, do not hinder the translation as much as the rudimentary grammar and inconsistent orthography employed in the document. See Josserand 1983 for a discussion of modern dialectal variation in the Mixteca, and Terraciano forthcoming: chap. 3 ("Language and Dialect") for the colonial period.

46. The most obvious difference is that "bi" in the map is written instead of the "hui" and "vui" of the text (as in *nicubi, bichan*). There is generally more omission and intrusion of nasals in the map.
47. Glass and Robertson 1975: 75, note 42. Smith reproduced the map in her landmark work on Mixtec pictorial writing but concurred that there were no vestiges of preconquest native iconography. She translated its boundaries and notes its relation to the 1771 map of Xoxocotlan (1973: 202-210, figure 164 on p. 340; for map of Xoxocotlan, see figures 162-163 on pp. 338-339).


50. For some of the latest work on Nahua sociopolitical terminology, see Lockhart 1992; Schroeder 1991; Haskett 1991.

51. San Juan and Santa Ana are on the left; San Martín and the Marquesado are on the right. The glosses include the names for: Oaxaca (ñoduvua); Santa Catalina de Oaxaca (ñodzoduhua); the cabezera of the Marquesado (dzini ño marquesado); various churches (hue ño, hue ñoho, hue ñoho sam martin sihi siña chee ñoccoo); the road to Oaxaca (ychi ñoduhua); the road to Xoxocotlan (ychi ño yoo); the Atoyac river (yuchadzaño). See the interesting correlation between this map and the 1771 Map of Xoxocotlan in Smith 1973: 202-210.


56. Lockhart has observed that songs "appear to have been performed before an audience (idealized as a noble company) and at times have a strong flavor of theater or pageant." However, he has also noted that the "strictly speaking narrative element" is uncommon in ancient Nahuatl songs. Lockhart 1992: 394-395.


60. See Borah 1991 for a summary of this debate.


63. Thus, a title is more complex than merely a "document [which] reflects the Conquest and its aftermath as it was seen from a couple of centuries later" (Restall 1991: 127).

64. León-Portilla 196: 119-120.

65. Sahagún 1950: 82. Anderson and Dibble cite Tlacahuepantzin as one of the famous warriors in the reign of Moctezuma Xocoyotzin (ca. 1494), who were memorialized in song (1969: bk. 6, p. 13, note 11). Axayacatzin was tlatoani of Tenochtitan from ca. 1468 until 1481. See also
references to these personages scattered throughout the Cantares Mexicanos (Bierhorst 1985).

66. Women cacicas were common in Mixtec society. Cuilapa had a cacica named doña Isabela in 1529 (Chance 1978: 17). The Zapotec case is unclear at this point.

67. For a synthetic account of these events, see Spores 1965: 964-967.

68. Assuming Huaxacatzin can be be taken as Huaxyacac. Acatepec was referred to in the Relation of Teozapotlan as a garrison. Smith associates the hill called Yucuyoo depicted on the map with Acatepec (1973: 207-208).


70. León-Portilla 1969: 124.

71. Though it is true that the Conquest was not as violent in Oaxaca as in central Mexico, it is even played down in titles from places where it is known that the arrival of the Spaniards was extremely violent; battles are rarely discussed, but rather confined to laconic statements such as "Cortés came." Wood 1991; Lockhart 1982.


73. Wood 1991; see, for example, the speech of the Bancroft Dialogues. (Karttunen and Lockhart 1987)


75. Lockhart 1992: 115. Likewise, the Maya apparently had little sense of an ethnic or cultural identity or identification with any entity beyond the local cali. In fact, the Yucatec Maya may represent the extreme case in that there appears to have been no clear designation for themselves as a cultural group; they rather defined everybody else as dzulob or foreigners (personal correspondence, Matthew Restall). The absence in the documentation of such a term could be partly explained, however, by the lack of need to employ one. Of course, this may also be the same reason for its non-existence.

76. Stephanie Wood has also documented the use of false titles and codices among multiethnic or non-Nahua communities, involving the Matlatzinca, Mexico, and Otomi. She has even observed a few examples of an indigenous identity not compromising an immediate identification with the altepetl. See Wood 1984: 332-343; Wood 1991; Lockhart 1991 and 1992.

77. Similarly, Mexico [City] eventually eclipsed the term "New Spain" for the Viceroyalty and, of course, the Republic.

78. Just as the Mixtecs did not call themselves as such, Yuchayta did not call itself Chapultepec. In fact, Chapultepec is actually the Nahuatl name of the hill next to Yuchayta, named Yucutica, depicted on the map with a grasshopper glyph. Yuchayta means "river of flowers," not "grasshopper hill." This is an illustration of the rather haphazard Nahuatl naming pattern for foreign places which was adopted by the Spaniards.
Mixtec-language documentation never refers to the Nahuatl versions of place names.

79. Terraciano forthcoming: chap. 4 ("Ethnicity and Identity"). The term is first attested in the doctrina of Hernandez 1567 and also appears in Reyes 1593 and Alvarado 1593, as well as many locally produced notarial and personal documents. The reference to the image of Jesus Christ Jesus Cristo tay ŋudzahui is juxtaposed with an image of Jesus Cristo tay es-pañole. This ethnic deity resembles the Nahuatl title's mention of a leomixtecal or "Mixtec deity." See Terraciano 1991 for the attestation of the term in a 1684 murder note from Yanhuitlan, written in the Mixtec language.

80. Jansen 1982: 226-228 and note on p. 490. He also suggests that the name survives in many parts of the Mixteca today.

81. The reference to "place of reeds" is associated with Tula; this is probably an association of the Mexica with their mythical/historical Toltec predecessors, or merely a reference to the physical landscape of Tenochtitlan, or a more metaphorical allusion. The depiction of Ñucoyo in the Codex Sierra is very similar to the place sign for Tula in the Historia Tolteca-Chichimeca, except the latter has no corresponding Mixtec ŋuu frieze symbol at the base.

82. This word is related to the verb "to conquer." Alvarado lists "ganar conquistando" as yosamindi ŋuu, "to burn a place (ŋuu)." (1962: f. 114v.) The origin of the term may be associated with the Mexica tradition of burning conquered subjects' temples, as depicted in codices from the Nahuat area. Alternately, saminuu (i.e., not ŋuu) means "burnt face/eyes." In fact, Nahuas (Toltecs, Aztecs) were often represented in preconquest Mixtec codices with black circles painted around their eyes or blackened faces. This could be a homonymic device, unless the Mexica actually wore black around their eyes in battle. Alvarado lists "saminuu" as one of four definitions for "mexicanos." (1962: f. 149v). Other ethnic groups were also indicated by specific attributes.


84. It is unclear whether tay tociisi was reduced to tay cuiisi in reference to the Zapotec, as the term appears in this title. Due in large part to the paucity of Mixtec-language documentation from the Valley of Oaxaca, this term for the Zapotec has not been previously attested.

85. In the sixteenth century, Spaniards were called castillecatl by Nahuas and tay castilla by Mixtecs (the latter term was also used once in the title).

86. In 1910, Abraham Castellanos used myth to interpret the Mixtec Codex Columbino and spoke of the Spaniards as false "children of the sun" and "white men" who came from the east. He referred to the Quetzalcoatl myth of central Mexico which mistook the Spaniards as warriors sent by "our father the sun." To Castellanos, the real "children of
the sun" were the ancient indigenous ancestors. Mixtec myth involved the conquest of the sun. Regardless of the source or precise meaning of their associations, Castellanos' myths reveal that some of the terminology which appeared in the titles trickled down to the twentieth century.

87. As discussed above, the Mixtec title apparently refers to the Spaniards as "white people" (tay cui). This possible racial or simply descriptive reference is unique in the Mixtec-language documentary record. Nevertheless, this term would surely be an aberration in comparison to the dozens of attested cases of tay castilla and español.

88. Lockhart 1992: 115. The equivalent term for "black" meaning "African" has also been attested in Mixtec (dzoo).


90. In Jalatlaco, just northeast of Antequera, John Chance reported that residents considered themselves "indios" and were regarded as such by others. To support this claim he cites the fact that accusations of being "mestizo" were countered by the affirmation of Indian status ("indio puro") in order to justify claims to officeholding (1976: 620). We believe that this was more a legal, formulaic response than a genuine self-conception. In spite of the assertion that members of the Jalatlaco barrio were "urban" residents and therefore more likely to assimilate, it is questionable whether they truly considered and referred to themselves as "Indians." A systematic review of indigenous-language documentation from the area would produce a more reliable sketch of identity than Spanish-language sources. Chance also notes that by the mid-eighteenth century there was no evidence that residents of the Nahua barrios and pueblos (including Mexicapan) traced their ancestry to the Nahua (1978: 152). He calls this scenario the "demise of Nahua identity." The titles from Oaxaca, however, indicate a strong ethnic identity as late as the beginning of the eighteenth century.

91. Chance has contributed much to the subject of ethnicity in Oaxaca. He seems to waver on the question of whether indigenous groups in the Valley of Oaxaca retained or lost much of their ethnic identity. He proposed that each of the three groups "...succeeded in maintaining its language and ethnic identity well into the eighteenth century" (1978: 82). Yet he contends that "ethnicity was probably more salient in pre-Hispanic times than it was during the colonial period," due to a tradition of warfare and a language free from Spanish intrusion, but that the arrival of the Spaniards "changed all this" because "colonial policy treated each Indian community as a quasi-independent republica de indios." Eventually, "this policy of divide and conquer pushed regional ethnic ties into the background and heightened identification with one's community of origin" (1989: 10-11). We believe that identification with the socio-political
entity was neither compromised nor enhanced by ethnicity, and was always strong.
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