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**PUBLICATIONS**


**PRESENTATIONS**


1. Introduction

I will begin by telling how I came upon the records which form the basis of this study, how I first dealt with the materials and came to know something of the localities involved, and how the records themselves are constituted, for in this case these matters are very individual and unusual, and are essential for an understanding of the nature and significance of the whole work. As a graduate student I was soon caught up in the ethnohistorical approach and hoped to do research in Nahuatl sources. Being of a rather independent cast of mind, I was not satisfied with the fact that most of the known mundane Nahuatl materials, though ultimately coming from all over the countryside, have been found in central archives in Mexico City, above all the Archivo General de la Nación. I settled on the strategy of looking for records outside the reach of the central Spanish administration. I set out to the provinces, where indigenous communities continued to have local autonomy, in search of records not only made by their own hands for their own needs, speaking of personal, local priorities, but in collections with the original local proportions, not affected in any way by being drawn into the countrywide Spanish legal system.

Metepec and the first steps with the documents

It would not do simply to comb the Mexican countryside. The key would be local archivists and scholars who could provide information and access. And it is not easy to find out what places might be propitious, where provincial archives and especially notarial collections might be. From cursory internet work that I was able to do in the United States I knew that

---

1 A large body of known Nahuatl material, on which many monographs and articles have been based, has all these characteristics, but the selection process involved in litigation tends to remove it from the full local context and put it in another context. In these studies local conditions have to be reconstituted by reassembling large amounts of scattered material rather than assessing trends and proportions from local collections before they were tampered with.
Metepec, in the Toluca Valley immediately west of the Valley of Mexico, had a municipal historian. My first full day in Mexico was spent on the phone trying to track this person down; I never did, until finally someone on the government information line gave me the name of the current *historiadora municipal*. Her staff was friendly, and I managed to set up a meeting. She was well connected, kind, but not encouraging about the parish archive, which was where I would have the best chance of finding some testaments of indigenous people from the time before national independence. It took a series of miracles before I was allowed inside.

I was trying to track down a copy of Professor Teresa Harquín’s index to local documentation at the Centro de Escritores in Toluca, when someone overheard the story of my project. Walking over, without even introducing himself he said, “you’re lost,” “estás perdida.” He picked up the phone, dialed the number of the previous municipal historian of Metepec, and said he would put me on the right track. I in fact had some interviews with the previous municipal historian, who gave me advice about working in local archives, and, particularly important for this story, in the parish archive.

When I finally got up the nerve to present myself and my letter from UCLA, the vicar questioned me thoroughly, about my project, my credentials, my local connections. It was clear to me that his care, protective attitude, caution, and dedication has protected the patrimony of the local communities in a way other institutions have not been able to. One factor in my favor was that I had done my homework. I had tracked down a copy of the index of the parish archive from a museum worker and was therefore able to ask to see one specific uncatalogued file in a specific box. That’s how I got in, with special permission to photograph, which proved crucial first to be
able to prove to others that the material really existed and second for my study of it, for transcribing the corpus would have taken a year.²

In the archive, under low light, I pulled out the box I sought and found that the “file” I was looking for was actually two wooden boards sandwiching four loose piles of what appeared to be Spanish testaments, and tied together with a mecate. Sorting through the material, I came upon the first of the Nahuatl testaments, of a Rosa María, and was so excited that I photographed it five times. It quickly proved to be only one of many. But since at that point I was a mere neophyte in early Mexican ethnohistory, seeing that other materials I had sorted through, such as local cabildo records, were much earlier in time, I considered the very lateness of the testaments to diminish their importance. The irony is that the outstanding trait of this collection—its early nineteenth-century authorship—which is the source of its great value, I took to be its weakness. One can all too easily get caught up in judging things by supposed purity, authenticity, antiquity. It was these “late” testaments that launched my career as an academic.

With a large corpus of material collected, virtually unintelligible to any but a few experts, and difficult even for them because of its newness, I was faced with the challenge of reducing the material to order before anyone could make sense of it. I tackled the work of indexing and printing the digital files from different research trips, winnowing out duplicates, and building rosters of the individual testaments by date and place of origin, with far the largest chunk from San Bartolomé Tlatelolco. Careful reproduction and indexing was essential to the next steps, and if I may say so it was a daunting task and took much more time and effort than working with material from well organized archives. The rosters have been so important in the work, and will

² I am very fortunate to have had professional photographic experience.
continue to be for those who would study this dissertation, that they are included here as an appendix in order to make the footnotes potentially useful.

In sum, I was fortunate enough to be given access in several research trips to the parish archive housed within the Franciscan Convento de San Juan Bautista Metepec, founded in 1569. Among the four centuries of records contained in the archive, an unstudied gem turned out to be a large corpus of Nahuatl and Spanish testaments produced by indigenous notaries of the area during the first three decades of the nineteenth century. No comparable set this late is known to this day, and the existence of such a thing had not been suspected. The records are from smaller settlements in the Metepec orbit: San Bartolomé Tlatelolco with the majority, and Ocotitlan and Yancuictlalpan with significant sets.

San Bartolomé

The people who made the testaments on which this study is based are no longer with us, but their communities continue to thrive, and it was important to me to have some first-hand experience, especially of San Bartolomé Tlatelolco, source of the largest cache of documents, so that I made a point of going there in person in 2008. My first sight of San Bartolomé came at twilight, when the church towers were surrounded by storm clouds and the bells were ringing. We drove through cobblestone streets, slick with mist. The main square formed a semicircle with an arched doorway of carved stone that led into the church gardens.

From a distance, you could see large trees; up close, the canopy felt tall, though to my eye the shaggy-bark redwoods appeared less than a hundred years old. I was surprised to see plants at all, much less trees. After visiting other parishes in the valley, I expected this one to be
similarly paved over with pink brick, open to the sky. But this was the altepetl in my sources where people asked to be buried near copal, palm, cypress, and pirul trees. If any community could resist deforestation, it would be San Bartolomé.

I traveled with relatives, a group of adults and children. We skirted the perimeter from the entrance to the north to find a cement cross at a northern gate, facing the direction of Toluca, but it looked too new to be the cross talked about in the testaments I spent my days trying to translate. It grew darker, so we stepped into the sanctuary’s light. The walls sparkled white and gold, freshly restored. The interior was empty save for five men gathered in front of the altar, dressing a life-sized saint. They were the fiscales, though I didn’t know it yet, and the saint was being sent out for a celebration at a nearby parish. I approached one of the gentleman about local history; he suggested I ask to speak with “el fiscal Eduardo,” whom I promised to look up the next day.

Outside we continued exploring the grounds in the dark. It began to mist rain. Then something exploded, startling us. The fiscales began to detonate fireworks below the southern bell tower. Sparks lit the area briefly. The fiscales set off more rockets below the northern bell tower too. When we approached them, one of the men explained they were engaged in a battle with the clouds, chasing off the big storm looming above. This was important work, protecting the community’s church with fiery bursts and ringing. It is an old tradition, he said. Lightning

3 Altepetl was the Nahuatl word for any state and particularly for the local ethnic states that formed the basis of the Nahua world. Under postconquest conditions the word was often synonymous with the Spanish pueblo. The term has become basic to early Mexican ethnohistory, and I use it freely. The subdivisions of an altepetl were called tlaxilacalli; over the postconquest centuries many of them asserted and even gained quite full independence from the larger altepetl and called themselves altepetl. The main communities involved in this study, San Bartolomé, Ocotitlan, and Yancuictlalpan, all seem to have originally been tlaxilacalli, but by the time considered here thought of themselves as altepetl.
had struck the building recently and caused major damage. The bells and explosions receded to silence.

As the fireworks stopped we stood in darkness, but something kept us glued to the church. We were quite entranced with the place, the moment. Then the fiscales lit off extra fireworks, just to please the kids. Every time after that night I returned alone, but my first experience of it was as a shelter for children.

In subsequent visits I identified more flora. Pears, something that looked like nectarine, nisperos, calabacitas (squash), roses, lilies, giant yellow dahlias, narrow-leafed eucalyptus. Ferns grew from the mossy bark of the trees; their yellows, greens and browns contrasted with the silvery lichen on the north side of trunks. One grounds-keeper called the trees cedros, truenos (perhaps the eucalyptus) and gigantes (apparently the redwoods).

The day I went to meet the municipal historian, he never arrived. I chatted to one of his sons as I waited though the afternoon. I arranged another meeting. When we met he listed his long grievances with scholars of all stripes who come through asking for information. He didn’t like it that people flew through there, promising to send back their work, and then never were heard from again. He went on and on, so I made sure he felt heard. I also knew from my experience researching that I was being tested. I clarified that I was not an anthropologist, and did not come in with a predetermined set of questions to give him. What I most sought was his blessing, and a sense of context, a real connection to a real place. It would not be right for me to write my project in isolation, without having ever known, seen, been shaded by the trees of San Bartolomé. I began to win him over to my project; I set up another meeting for the next morning.
This day, he was waiting for me. But I forgot to tell you how I came by his name, don Pedro Valdez Martínez. I got that on the day I met the fiscales, another stunning encounter with the church. The whole group of them, six fiscales, were working collectively in the northern courtyard on the construction of future living quarters for the padres. A thick layer of dust from the masonry covered them. I recognized the kind eyes of the man who had told me about their tradition of keeping away the storms. When I asked him if he was the fiscal, he motioned to himself and his co-workers and said they all were “el fiscal.” In earlier times there was only one fiscal, a chief steward responsible for everything about the church, with perhaps a single deputy.

\textsuperscript{4} In earlier times there was only one fiscal, a chief steward responsible for everything about the church, with perhaps a single deputy.
each one, including the Topil, a literally giant man. The fiscales worked together without a visible hierarchy, with an egalitarian style of decision-making. I wanted to ask how their roles rotated, thinking of church officers in my documents. I told them of my project. They not only suggested I meet the cronista, the municipal historian, they gave me the name of Padre Manuel, who comes around to the parish only periodically, so I missed him. On another day, I spoke with the mother of a fiscal who had come to look for him. The groundskeeper chatted with her as if she were expected and had an official capacity. Did she prepare a common repast? I did not confirm her role.

But back to my trying to get into the good graces of the cronista. It was sunny but cold that morning so he suggested we have our meeting in his car, a beige van. He grilled me again about who I was, this time inquiring about my legal status and citizenship. That I was born in Mexico and had fixed my Mexican papers helped things along. The conversation twisted and turned. At one point, something he said prompted me to ask about the barranca, the ravine, which shows up in my documents. At another point I asked about the trees. He said that copal trees don’t grow there, only in warmer areas; nevertheless, in my early nineteenth-century sources they were the favored tree to be buried under. He said, “la campana es el alma de todo,” and “las campanas repican por alegría,” at which point I asked about them, for they play a large role in my testaments. I learned of a gendered ringing pattern they used to have at the moment just before someone’s death. For women, “tocan la consagrada campana” of 7 bells. For men, “tocan la agonías” of 5 bells. He confirmed that they also played bells in the

______________

5 Earlier a church would have an official or two called a topile in Nahuatl because of the staff he carried, topil in Spanish, who was approximately a lower constable but undertook all kinds of tasks.

6 “The bell is the soul of everything”; “the bells ring for joy.”
event of a storm, “también cuando viene un tormentón.” This arc led us to a verse from one of his poems:

las campanas de mi tierra
son voces del corazón
y su eco todo encierra
sentimientos de ilusión

– Valdemar (don Pedro’s nom de plume)

When I returned to the question of a barranca, he rifled through his portfolio, looking for something. He left the briefcase with me, telling me to look for a specific document that mentioned a ravine. I scanned the headings of papers grouped in manila folders: games, poetry, history—everything related to the last century. After quite a while, don Pedro returned with a testament: his own grandfather’s. In it he described his land, using the barranca del mostrante as a landmark, just like my sources from a century earlier.

Even though I cannot say this is the same barranca, it is a clear example of the local use of a barranca and a plant, as land markers into the twentieth century. The testament’s yellowed paper seemed a little longer than what I’d consider legal size, and the paper felt as thin as a sheet of blue-lined college bond. It was dated 1933; the stamps said 1937. The document’s testator mentioned his father: Pablo de Jesús, so we can mark the generation when this family shifted to Spanish-style naming patterns. It also noted that the land was not registered as a terreno de labor, almost the same as a term important in my much earlier collection of sources. His Santo padre inherited it from ancestors; the language defined it as inherited land, not acquired through purchase. Don Pedro said that at one point the laws changed and you were no longer allowed to donate/inherit land. You had to show that it was purchased. So these wills were drawn to prove

7 The bells of my homeland are voices of the heart, and their echo all encloses feelings of illusion.
ancestral lands were subsequently purchased and therefore legally owned, even if the price was only one peso, or if the full amount listed was never expected to be paid. It sounds like another round of colonial-period composiciones, harkening back to the reasoning that ancestral possession needed to be formalized beyond the act of inheritance. How legal reforms impacted San Bartolomé needs study. But I can say that the sheer fact that private ownership might be questioned (and must be plainly described) shows that the community retained a strong notion of corporate identity.

Later don Pedro took me to see the barranca; he inherited the land described in the will. He calls it his ranchito. The barranca don Pedro showed me is a ravine caused by a riachuelo, a little stream, that runs west to east, at a slight downward slope from the foothills of the volcano. As far as I could surmise it may mark a southern boundary for the town. However, I was taken to its western end, the point where it ran across, perpendicular to, their western boundary. In other words, if this is the barranca of the documents, it could mean irrigated lands were located generally to the south, but extended east and west as the ravine crossed San Bartolomé.

It’s also interesting that this stream crosses from San Juan Tilapan into the jurisdiction of Metepec at this western point I was taken to see. It is fed by many tiny potable trickles and ojos de agua (springs) seeping from the barranca. The ground is basically wet and frequently disturbed; as we walked along the elevated eastern bank of the stream’s ravine, a young man grazed his pointed-horn cattle right through us. This western area is called El Mostrante, named after the ubiquitous plant of the same name. It looks and smells like mint, which solved a puzzle

8 This word already figures in the Nahuatl wills of early nineteenth-century San Bartolomé, as we will see, but in a different meaning.
in the sources about what mostrante meant. We cemented our friendship because we both speak
together, I showed him how to touch nettles, which he called
chichicaztle. He was surprised I knew the plant, used it as medicine, and could pick it by hand.
And I was surprised he knew its Nahuatl name, but I didn’t say so. If my sources had taught me
anything, it's that Nahuatl profoundly influenced the evolution of Mexican Spanish.

And it was here, at his ranchito, where I met the Santisima Cruz that used to grace the
center of the church grounds, possibly the one referred to in the testaments. About forty years
ago they broke the stone, knocked it down, covered over all the graves of the ancestors,
antepasados, and put in a new cross at the north gate. Don Pedro didn’t offer details, but the old
one was lovingly set up again on his land, the stone repaired, and placed between the ojo de agua
and the barranca—it now overlooks the chasm, protecting the stream.

The traditional pueblos of my sources are still considered the provinces. But now San
Bartolomé, Ocotitlan, Yancuictlapilco, and Totocuitlapilco are literally just down the way from a
huge mall as Toluca merges with Metepec. A ten-minute jaunt down a narrow road takes you to
Ocotitlan. That’s how I realized the density of the whole area south of Metepec, how close the
towns are to each other, and each with architecturally impressive churches. It made me think of
the thousands of dollars we spend to visit churches in Europe, with no idea of the richness of our
treasures at home.

José Gonzáles Rodrigo, *Santa Catarina Del Monte Bosques y Hongos, Collección tepetlaostoc* 3, 1993,
p. 98, identifies mostrante or mostranza as *Mentha x rotundifolia*. See also Chichicastle. Julio César del
Río Lozano, *Organización de médicos indígenas de la Mixteca*, 2005, where Chichicastle is identified as
*Urtica chamaedryoides*. Real Academia (2001) considers mastranzo to be a plant commonly called
*herbabuena* (mint), though it is not (p. 1209).

The Nahuatl word is *chichicaztli*, the same except that Spanish changes a final Nahuatl *i* to *e.*
Recent resistance to rules barring the practice of burying people on church grounds (instituted when officials covered over the graves and took down the cross) tells us about what is important to the people of this particular parish. Recently they stirred up regional political trouble when the congregation buried their beloved fray José Quesada Romero. The name caught my eye, for Romero is the name of some of my independence-period notaries. Fray José (if he was fray) is buried on the church grounds, right in front of, (tlaixpan was the old Nahuatl phrase), the entryway door where apparently the santisima cruz used to be. The grave was fresh, the wet soil still mounded. He was one of their own, from San Bartolomé, and they wanted him to stay on church grounds, even if it upset the authorities who came with armed guards and orders to exhume. Father Quesada Romero was born in San Bartolomé and lived a life of love and devotion to his town. The feeling was mutual; there was no more fitting place for him to rest. The people of San Bartolomé continue to resist laws that don’t make sense to them. Even if the very stones are torn down, their hands collect, repair and rebuild them.

The corpus

I will now present detailed rosters of the early nineteenth-century testaments I have discovered for each of the communities involved. The late San Bartolomé corpus includes 95 unbound Nahuatl wills dating from 1799 to 1823. Table 1.1 gives the number of wills in Nahuatl for various years and the gender distribution of the testators.

---

11 What is said in this section on San Bartolomé comes largely from my joint article with Caterina Pizzigoni. In a will from 1815 in the collection it is declared that the female testator and her deceased spouse are chaneque of Totocuitlapilco, another tlaxilacalli in the Toluca/Metepec area. Yet the Spanish official to whom the will was take recorded it as from San Bartolomé; the conventions of the texts are nearly identical to those of San Bartolomé (as those of Yancuictlalpan for example are not); the notary has the same name as a known San Bartolomé notary. The wording seems to allow for the possibility (for chaneque means above all from, born in) that these people although originating in Totocuitlapilco moved
Table 1.1. San Bartolomé Nahuatl Corpus Totals by Year and Gender of Testators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in table 1.1, the distribution by date is highly uneven. Many years are entirely missing, and the two years of 1813, with 27 wills, and 1823, with 18, stand out from the rest.

Due to the above, I have for now retained the document in the collection, counting it under all categories of interest, although some uncertainty remains.
(though the 11 in 1811 are also worthy of note). Considering the number of women included, it may be that quite a few men were absent and even wounded or killed in battles. In some indigenous settlements of the country the number of male householders present had been seriously depleted by government levies for the militia, which may be a major factor in the present case.\(^\text{12}\) Epidemics are a possibility, and are in fact mentioned for 1813, in particular typhus, which seemed to affect the adult population, especially men.\(^\text{13}\) But in all likelihood the wills preserved are not all that were originally written; it is improbable for example that no deaths occurred at all for whole three-year periods. So I simply present the corpus as a large body of local Nahuatl documentation done in the first decades of the nineteenth century, in the midst of the independence upheavals, with a substantial number of texts from as late as 1823.

Among the collection from San Bartolomé are a number of texts in Spanish. For a time wills in Spanish and in Nahuatl were done concurrently. The earliest text in Spanish is from 1813 (see Table 1.2). A few more are from 1817 and 1821. Notice that three testaments were made in Spanish in 1823; compare this with the 18 in Nahuatl in the same year. But 1823 was the last year Nahuatl wills were included in the collection, whereas the Spanish set continues through 1825, with one last will from 1832. In the San Bartolomé collection, testament writing survived

\(^{12}\) See Van Young 2001: 83.

\(^{13}\) Van Young 2001: 74, Márquez Morfín 1993: 53–54. Various scholars have written about the epidemic that swept Mexico City and nearby areas in 1813, pointing to its more severe impact in smaller and mountainous settlements; see, for example, Bustamante 1982: 440, and Cooper 1965: 157, 178. Florescano 1969 has underlined the link between drought and hunger in 1809–11 and the 1813 epidemic, while other authors take the two phenomena as separate.

A local typhoid outbreak was identified as widespread by Gutiérrez and Canales, researchers who studied San Mateo Atenco, a municipality adjacent to the north east of Metepec. This local analysis of the epidemic that raged through provincial communities puts San Bartolomé’s numbers in context: they mirror what was going on regionally. The authors looked at baptismal, marriage and death records. Silvia Alejandra Gutiérres Hernández and Pedro Canales Guerrero, “Dos siglos de historia de la población San Mateo Atenco (1654–1840),” in *La proeza histórica de un pueblo: San Mateo Atenco en el Valle de Toluca Siglos XVIII–XIX*, ed. René García Castro and Ma. Teresa Jarquín Ortega.
strongly in Nahuatl in the first two decades of the nineteenth century, but was replaced with Spanish by 1824. The language used in these documents shows the influence of Nahuatl, as we will see in Chapter 2, demonstrating that Nahuatl concepts continued despite the transition to Spanish—a testimony to the strength of long-standing Nahuatl-language notarial traditions.

Table 1.2. San Bartolomé Spanish Corpus Totals by Year and Gender of Testators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Yancuictlalpan, people distinctly preferred Nahuatl for making their testaments during the period represented (see Table 1.3). Only one Spanish-language will is contained in the Yancuictlalpan collection. It is in this altepetl that we find the latest Nahuatl will of the whole corpus, made by Francisca Antonia on the 5th of August, 1825.14

14 Yan#12 was not recorded by the priest until October.
As will be seen, the strong female majority of testators continues, but the years 1811, 1813, and 1823 do not stand out with any heavy concentration of wills as they do in San Bartolomé.

In Ocotitlan, the situation with using Nahuatl for writing down wills is nearly inverse that of Yancuictlalpan (see Table 1.4). People in Ocotitlan preferred Spanish to record their wills, or the notaries preferred to write in that language; their Spanish was as rich in Nahuatl-language influence as the Spanish testaments of San Bartolomé. Nahuatl wills make up only 11% of the total testaments found from this time period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.4. Ocotitlan Spanish and Nahuatl Corpus Totals by Year and Gender of Testators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again female testators are the majority. Here as in San Bartolomé 1813 brings an extraordinary number of testaments, though 1811 and 1823 do not stand out as there (in the latter case perhaps merely because the collection ends before that year).

In the whole corpus, only two wills are connected to another community in the area, Totocuitlapilco, and one of these is counted in the San Bartolomé collection (see Table 1.5). However, both are listed here for reference. The small, inconclusive sample includes one Nahuatl and one Spanish will, from 1815 and 1826 respectively.
Table 1.5. Totocuitlapilco Nahuatl and Spanish Wills by Year and Gender of Testators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(counted in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bartolomé)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At independence as a whole, writing testaments in Nahuatl not only survived into this area, but in the largest and best documented community it was predominant until 1823 (Table 1.1). In Yancuictlalpan Nahuatl writing survived at least until 1825 (Table 1.3). In Ocotitlan the last example in Nahuatl is from 1813 (Table 1.4), in Totocuitlapilco 1815 (Table 1.5).

The transition to Spanish recordkeeping occurring at independence was not complete or universal; it was occurring at different rates in each community (see Table 1.6 for comparison of the collections). The Spanish records contribute disparate percentages of the total documents from each place: in San Bartolomé 18%; in Yancuictlalpan 8%; in Ocotitlan 89%; in Totocuitlapilco 50%. Because of continuity with the Nahuatl, it can be said that Spanish wills from the independence period offer much information about the transition.
The Gender Ratio

As surprising as the lateness of the corpus is the prominence of indigenous women as testators in this period. Table 1.7 illustrates the rate at which women and men participated in the record as testators.
Women represent the majority of testators, not only in San Bartolomé as previously reported\(^{15}\) but in all the pueblos in the corpus, indicating that factors affecting the gender ratio were a regional phenomenon. The data in Table 1.7 incorporate both Nahuatl and Spanish wills. Taking the Nahuatl wills of San Bartolomé alone, 63 of the 95 wills were made by women. This nearly two-to-one majority (66% women) holds true across the testator group of all four altepetl. An identical proportion appears in San Bartolomé with the addition of the Spanish texts. Including the Spanish wills with those in Nahuatl, the 76 women to 40 men show a nearly identical ratio, with women again marking 66% of the total testators. In Yancuictlalpan the ratio

\(^{15}\) Melton-Villanueva and Pizzigoni 2008.
increases, with women representing 75% of all testators. Of all people in Ocotitlan who left wills, women recorded 63%. In Totocuitlapilco, the sample of two is too small to be reliable, but for comparison it also shows women in the majority as testators, with no men represented.

In earlier periods, women's representation was large but generally not a majority; women commonly contributed 30–40% of the total numbers of wills extant from indigenous communities of the colonial period. In the whole of late sixteenth-century Testaments of Culhuacan, women represent nearly 38% of testators. In a large sample of eighteenth-century testaments of Toluca, the wills by women make up about 37% of the total in the immediate Toluca area, and 39% in the combined Calimaya/Tepemaxalco double altepetl. In various parts of the Rojas collection, including a large number of times and places, women represent 27%–41% of testators.

In sum, the proportion of indigenous women issuing wills remained high throughout the colonial period, but it was virtually always a minority. Against this background, it can be said that the gender proportions in the independence corpus are a most considerable break from the earlier situation. Given that continuity appears the rule in many other realms in the new corpus, this changed role for women will receive much examination.

---

16 TT, pp. 7–8. These overall percentages for Calimaya/Tepemaxalco are attained despite the fact that in central Calimaya women’s testaments (56%) outnumber men’s.

The historiographical context

The present study belongs to the movement that has taken shape in recent decades to use indigenous-language sources in work on early Mexican ethnohistory, and particularly to use Nahuatl in work on central Mexico. There would be no point in my describing this well known literature and reciting its many contributions. My main purpose here is much more limited: to point out how in some respects the source material for my work represents a most significant extension even of the vast corpus already variously studied, and to show how certain items in the existing literature provide the comparative perspective from which to judge the early nineteenth-century material.

For generations the Nahuatl sources that had received the most attention were oriented to the precontact period, such as the Florentine Codex. Yet it had long been known that the central Mexican archives contained many very different documents in Nahuatl, written during the postconquest centuries in the course of everyday activities. Systematic work on this resource finally began in the 1970s and snowballed in the 80s and 90s, continuing until today. The mundane corpus proved very diverse, but its backbone was and is testaments. At first the bulk of what was discovered tended to be from the time before 1650. The marvelous collection of the testaments of Culhuacan was done around 1580. The voluminous cross-regional collection of testaments organized by Teresa Rojas Rabiela does contain eighteenth-century material, but far

---

20 Cline and León-Portilla 1984.
more is from the time before 1650 (Stage 2).\textsuperscript{21} James Lockhart’s \textit{The Nahuas After the Conquest}, published in 1992, covers a wide spectrum of social and cultural history on the basis of Nahuatl documents which reach quite extensively into the eighteenth century, but the weight of the documentation still falls on Stage 2.

The first large-scale philological work done specifically on Stage 3, from 1650 forward, was Caterina Pizzigoni’s \textit{Testaments of Toluca} of 2007.\textsuperscript{22} It contains everything that could be found in the way of Nahuatl testaments for two large areas of the Toluca Valley, the surroundings of Toluca proper and the area of the large double altepetl Calimaya/Tepemaxalco. In the corpus of almost a hundred items, testaments from the second half of the seventeenth century are present in some number, and examples from the eighteenth abound. However, the last decade that is well represented is the 1760s, with nothing from the 1770s and only one item from the 1780s.\textsuperscript{23} Lockhart has declared that the production of Nahuatl mundane documents appears to slack off in general after the 1770s.\textsuperscript{24}

Thus the time after 1800, the independence period, has been left a mystery from the point of view of philological ethnohistory. It seemed that the great tradition of mundane writing in Nahuatl had come to an end by that time, and further that there was no avenue to approach the topic of internal community life in a way comparable to the studies done for previous centuries,


\textsuperscript{22} Haskett 1991 uses Nahuatl electoral documentation right up to 1800; the testaments he alludes to seem to be from earlier, however.

\textsuperscript{23} TT, p. 5. I understand that since that time Pizzigoni has located many more texts from the last two decades of the eighteenth century and even one or two from 1800, as will be reflected in her forthcoming \textit{The Life Within}, but has seen nothing substantial later than that, other than my own discoveries, of course, with which she gave me substantial help.

\textsuperscript{24} “Background and Course,” p. 19, summarizing various remarks made elsewhere.
that we could do no better than reports coming from the Spanish-speaking world and study of the activities of indigenous people who participated in the Hispanic world in various ways. Against this background, the discovery of a corpus of well over a hundred Nahuatl testaments from three Toluca-Valley communities in the first three decades of the nineteenth century has an obvious significance and makes a clear contribution. It adds a full generation to the scope of philological ethnohistory in central Mexico, and it opens up the mysterious independence period. In the new corpus, indicating a complex mixture of continuity and change which I will not attempt to anticipate here in the introduction, we find a startling majority of women as testators, against a background, as we have seen above, in which women were usually only a bit more than a third.

In trying to assess the local situation as shown in the nineteenth-century corpus, I have been very aware that no matter what may be new in it, the vocabulary, practices, and structures seen there are developed from what came before, and that the new cannot be separated from the old without some point of comparison. A very few works have supplied me that perspective. My material sticks close to the individual and the household. One prime source of knowledge on such matters in the postconquest centuries is Lockhart’s *The Nahuas*, and I have repeatedly drawn on it, especially for key vocabulary and general principles. Yet the work is at the macro level and in many aspects cannot descend to the kind of local detail I need. Moreover, the book being done when it was, with no local collections existing yet from the later period, Lockhart was not fully aware of the extent to which the household situation evolved in Stage 3.25

Cline and León-Portilla’s edition of the testaments of Culhuacan contains a corpus closely comparable to mine for around 1580 in the Valley of Mexico. It is an invaluable asset in

25 Lockhart himself presently says so, having found the material in TT to have been quite a revelation.
establishing an approximation of Nahua concepts and practices still close to the precontact tradition as a groundline. But a great deal of time had passed by 1800, and my materials are from the Toluca Valley, not the Valley of Mexico. The main indicated point of comparison in my work is Caterina Pizzigoni’s *Testaments of Toluca*, with a collection of Nahuatl testaments from a large section of the Toluca Valley dating from the mid-seventeenth century into the second half of the eighteenth, and much analysis in the same categories to which my own corpus naturally leads. I hope to publish my corpus in some form eventually, so that then there will be a series of three large sets of Nahuatl testaments from specific localities, complete with extensive analysis, from three successive epochs.

I have long been inspired by women’s studies and have devoted much attention to the relevant literature. My motivation in that respect continues strong, and surely the unexpected predominance of women testators in my corpus seems to represent a great opportunity. I follow the approach already taken by other historians of early Latin America who have studied women within a broader framework of gender, seeing women in the context of the whole society and looking to include members of both genders. The result is general social and cultural history with a gender coefficient, examining the gender factor comparatively at every step. I belong to this current and have proceeded accordingly.

Another aspect of the literature in philological ethnohistory is that it has inevitably concentrated on texts in indigenous languages as its main stock in trade. At the same time, those

---

26 Cline 1986 is a most useful work elucidating the collection.
27 For this reason the publication is referred to so frequently that I have abbreviated it as TT. Pizzigoni forthcoming, when it is published, will add perspective on many additional matters.
28 I would mention Komisaruk forthcoming, Pizzigoni forthcoming and TT, Sousa 1998, and various publications by Wood in the bibliography.
in this field have not wanted to neglect the great resources contained in Spanish documentation. Some ethnohistorians have made large efforts to integrate Spanish sources along with Nahuatl.\(^\text{29}\) A deterrent to these valuable attempts is that not only do the Nahuatl materials and the Spanish materials demand different skills and techniques, but they are usually found in entirely different repositories and in genres that can not be readily compared. In this respect my materials are heaven sent. The Spanish and the Nahuatl testaments were found in the very same collections, issued by the same kinds of people from the same places, with the conventions of the Spanish testaments based on the Nahuatl counterparts, and indeed the Spanish texts are often almost like rough and literal translations from the Nahuatl, very hard to understand without knowing the Nahuatl precedents. I have been able on the one hand to treat the testaments of both kinds within the same research framework, and on the other to study the special qualities of the Spanish texts in relation to those in Nahuatl. In doing this I believe I have done something very valuable and so far unique, though my hope would be that the field will have much use for this technique in the future.\(^\text{30}\)

**The structure of this study**

In considering how to organize the present study, my primary criterion was that its organization should reflect and emphasize the most salient aspects of the documentary corpus, which I take to be 1) the very existence of a large body of testaments in Nahuatl so late in time; 2) the unexpected fact that the majority of the testators are women; 3) that the corpus contains Spanish as well as Nahuatl texts, throwing much light on the nature and timing of the transition

\(^\text{29}\) Horn 1997 is outstanding in this respect, and so will be Pizzigoni forthcoming.

\(^\text{30}\) I was guided in this work by Lockhart 1991, an article on Nahuatl-speaker Spanish in the late period.
in recordkeeping, and 4) that the corpus features three separate collections from as many nearby settlements, facilitating the study of local variation.

Reflections of these points are so pervasive in the body of material that for the most part it did not seem advisable, indeed it seemed largely impossible, to have separate chapters devoted to each of them. Instead, points 2) through 4) are integrated as appropriate into chapters with a different topical definition. Whether the topic is religion, the household, or land, throughout the presentation the question about the degree and nature of female or male participation is repeatedly asked. Information from Spanish texts is often consolidated with that from Nahuatl texts in all the chapters, and at the same time any differences between the two are commented on. In various forms each chapter is usually organized into sections for each of the three main communities, with the predominant San Bartolomé always first. This kind of work maintains a rather delicate balance, on the one hand pointing out commonalities for the whole area but at the same time attempting to respect the distinct nature of each community. In this way important micro-regional variation comes to light, and each community can be shown to retain its separate identity across time.

In view of these procedures, some substantive material that might usually be found in the body of the work has, as the reader will have noticed, been included here in the introduction. The above tables on the dating of the documents, their authorship by gender, and the language in which they are cast, provide a basic orientation for the rest of the work and should be borne in mind in reading the chapters of the body, and the same is true of the discussion of the proportions of female and male testators.

Coming to the core chapters, I have responded to the first point—the existence of the corpus itself as a most significant fact deserving our attention—by having the first substantive
chapter deal precisely with the nature of the documents, that is, with their conventions and who wrote them and how these varied with the writer, the location, and the language. I was motivated also by the general lack of attention to these important matters in the literature.\footnote{The most important exception to this neglect in works of primary research is TT, which in the introductory study carefully analyzes the structure, content, and style of the testament corpus therein contained, noting local differences, and has a whole section on the most productive notaries involved. At the level of general analysis there is Horn and Lockhart, “Mundane Documents in Nahuatl.”} Studying the language, structure, and authorship of the vast body of Nahuatl testaments should be central to Nahua intellectual history. The auspices were especially good in this case because not only did a single notary produce the majority of the largest segment of the corpus, from San Bartolomé, but we have examples of the writing of his predecessor, his own father, with good evidence that the son learned everything from the father and inherited the office. To my knowledge no equally good example of this vital mechanism in the perpetuation of Nahuatl writing exists in the entire literature. Moreover, the chapter on writing was a good place to hold up the testaments in Spanish against those in Nahuatl, showing their continuing dependence on the Nahuatl model in language and structure.

Without a doubt this chapter came into being partly because seeing his name, his hand, and his work so much, I developed a strong personal interest in Cipriano Gordiano and an avid curiosity about everything related to him. But an unavoidable disadvantage of starting with testaments and notaries was that it postponed emphasizing the prominence of women, for not a single woman ever acted as a notary in the corpus or held any other formal local office. In this respect there was no change at all. But at least the testament of the woman who was wife of the first notary and mother of the second provided a vital link in the story.
For my second substantive chapter, therefore, I chose a topic which not only cried out for inclusion in a treatment of local life because of its abundant mention in the testaments, but also had the characteristic that women appeared to play a particularly prominent role in it, more than they had earlier. That topic is manifestations of local religion seen in the testaments, with inevitable emphasis on the rituals of death that loom so large in a final will and testament. For San Bartolomé this also gave the opportunity to develop a surprisingly full picture of the unusual churchyard with its trees and their importance in the burials of the local people. Asking to be buried near a copal tree was what first caught my eye, and one could say that the chapter took shape around that. Household saints also came in as a prominent feature, apparently not as emphasized as they had been in much of the Toluca Valley in the previous century, and yet the closer I looked the more they seemed to be there after all. In all these matters there was meaningful variation between communities.

After these two large chunks of the life of the area, the study finally turns attention to the most obvious content of the testaments and also the most basic component of local society, the household complex where everyone lived and the agricultural lands that everyone owned and worked. As one begins to study them, they seem to be the same topic, spoken of in a succession of bequests that form the core of a testament, with all the properties going to the same set of heirs. Land is even involved in both household matters and outlying agricultural parcels, and nowhere do we find statements specifically separating the two. But, following a long tradition, household property comes first in the body of the will and only then the outlying lands. Eventually I saw that land associated with the household was always called a solar, “house lot,” or some diminutive thereof, with sitio as a variant in Spanish, and the non-household properties were called tlalli, “land,” or tierra (de labor) in Spanish.
From these beginnings I came to realize that the household operated two related but quite separate systems, the home complex and scattered lands usually at a distance. This setup had actually been traditional in Nahua society since the time of contact and doubtless before, but it is remarkable to see it still functioning so late in time. I therefore divided the topic into two separate chapters, one on the home complex and the other on non-household lands. In both there proved to be substantial variation among the communities. The varying terminology they used in both realms could be studied to good effect. With both branches of the topic there was excellent information on ownership and inheritance strategy, which could be studied statistically, yielding enlightening results on gender roles and gender dynamics. The concentration of so many wills from the same time and place in a compact corpus, which facilitated and shaped all my work, was especially crucial in this area.

In these four chapters I believe I have caught a broad spectrum of local indigenous society and culture as it existed in the Toluca Valley in the independence period and at the same time dealt with the historiographical tasks indicated most clearly by the corpus. In the course of the research I have become aware of additional meaningful and related topics, however, and some of them are sketched out in an anticipatory fashion in the conclusion. I have tried to present a coherent body of new facts, findings, and interpretations in the present form of this study, but at the same time view it as an intermediate stage to be expanded in many directions in the coming time.32

32 See the abbreviations page to learn how the notes to items in the corpus are keyed to lists in an appendix. See also the appendix with full examples of testaments, which provide a different kind of experience and bring home many of the points made in the study in a different way.
2. The Culture of Writing: Testaments and Notaries at Independence

The Nahuas of central Mexico produced a vast corpus of alphabetic writing in their own language across the colonial period, much of it in the form of last testaments. It stretches across centuries, beginning in the mid-sixteenth and continuing through the seventeenth and the bulk of the eighteenth. But it was noticed some time ago that what in this field are called mundane Nahuatl texts began to become scarcer by the 1780s, and it was not thought that the tradition continued past 1800. The body of post-1800 testaments from the Metepec region of the Toluca Valley, which this writer discovered and obtained copies of, proves that here at least the tradition of Nahuatl testament writing continued in full force not only to 1800, but for more than twenty years thereafter, with some new wrinkles to be sure, but easily recognizable as being in the same genre as a hundred years before, and still featuring micro-distinctions between local communities.

In this sense one could say that remarkably little was new around the time of independence. The Nahuatl writing tradition changed neither more nor less than it had been changing, bit by bit, across the previous decades and centuries. But another factor, of huge significance in the long run, enters the picture in the form of testaments in Spanish, written by local people, in the same repositories as the Nahuatl texts. The timing varied in the communities studied, some going over to Spanish earlier than others (with Ocotitlan in the lead), but by 1830 Spanish had won out entirely. As great as the implications of the switch were, not everything was altered. The Spanish and the Nahuatl texts give much the same information and can be analyzed in the same way for many purposes. They retain most of the conventions of the Nahuatl corpus,
just translated into Spanish, and often very awkwardly, for the Spanish used shows many traces of Nahuatl vocabulary and grammar.

Thus the present chapter is organized in two parts, first dealing with the Nahuatl corpus and those who wrote it, and then the Spanish. Illustrating the similarities and divergences between the earlier period and independence, between the individual communities, between Nahuatl and Spanish texts, and at times between individual writers, demands an extremely detailed and technical manner of presentation, with which I hope the reader will have patience.

**Nahuatl testament conventions and notaries**

**San Bartolomé.**¹ Eighteenth-century Nahuatl testaments in the Toluca Valley were in a very specific notarial style corresponding to the area at that time; also, each subarea and within that even each tlaxilacalli had its own conventions and forms. What interests us here is to see how the nineteenth-century corpus compares with the equivalent in the Valley a century earlier. I will start with the largest chunk, the testaments of San Bartolomé. Because of the strong subregional variation in the Valley, placing the late San Bartolomé corpus in the overall setting would be very difficult; we need to begin with continuity and change in San Bartolomé itself. Here, in order to give a fuller sense of the documents, I present two schematic representations of the formulas in the different periods:²

---

¹ The following section on the Nahuatl testaments of San Bartolomé incorporates some pages of my 2008 *Ethnohistory* article jointly with Caterina Pizzigoni; they have been revised where appropriate, and much material has been added.

² The formulas for the early period are extrapolated from TT, nos. 22, 23, 24. In both templates, material in brackets is sometimes omitted. Material in parentheses is always present, but either is formulated generally instead of the specific words that would be used in a given testament, or specifies the Nahuatl word or phrase that is used.
San Bartolomé 1715–1731

Jesus, Mary, and Joseph
I take as my sign God the father, God the son, and God the Holy Spirit. Here I begin my testament, I named _____; my wife or husband is _____; we are citizens here in holy San Bartolomé Tlatelolco. I belong to my precious revered mother Santa María de la Asunción [or la Limpia Concepción]. My earthly body (notalnacayo, etc.) is very sick, but my soul is sound as our lord God would wish it. If I die, the bells (using campana) are to ring for me. My statement is to be carried out. And I say that my grave is to be (location). (same peroration), [or abbreviated to it is to be carried out.] And my precious priest is to perform for me [or favor me with] (a mass) [or a low mass].

Bequests.
And my intercessor, my executor [more often two], is to be _____; if he does it well, God will reward him. I have concluded my testament before my witnesses the fiscal _____, the deputy fiscal _____, and the church tepisque _____.

Today, (day) the __th day of the month of __ in the year of 17__. 
Notary [of the holy church] _____.

San Bartolomé 1799–1823

Jesus, Mary, and Joseph
I take as my sign God the father, God his precious revered son, and God the Holy Spirit. Jesus, Mary, and Joseph. Here I begin my testament, I named _____; my wife or husband is _____; we are citizens here in holy San Bartolomé Tlatelolco. I am to belong to my precious revered mother Santa María de la Asunción [or la Limpia Concepción]. [The part about body and soul comes here, often a bit different; body is cuerpo.] If I die, the bells (using campana) are to ring for me. My statement is to be carried out. And I say that my grave is to be (location). (same peroration), [or abbreviated to it is to be carried out.] And my precious priest is to favor me with (a responso or a low mass).

Bequests.
And my intercessor, my executor, is to be _____; if he does it well, God will reward him for me. I have concluded my testament before my witnesses the fiscal mayor _____, the deputy fiscal _____, and the alguacil [or topile, or mayor topile] _____.

Today, (day) the __th of (month) of the year 18__. 
Notary [of the holy church] _____.

____________________

3 Sometimes the statement of conclusion comes before mention of the executors.
As the two schemes show, the overall structure remains exactly the same. Many aspects of testament conventions peculiar to San Bartolomé in the eighteenth century are carried on into the independence period, such as designating the bells by the loanword *campana*, not by the Nahuatl term; or a statement that the testator belongs to the Virgin (Asunción or Limpia Concepción) instead of the more general formulation in the Toluca Valley of entrusting the soul to God; or again the mention of the priest in connection with a mass or responsory prayer. In addition, San Bartolomé testaments begin with the old-fashioned phrase “I take as my sign (the name of God the father etc.),” while many wills of the Valley in the eighteenth century (and most in the areas of Toluca proper and Calimaya/Tepemaxalco) began by speaking of the praise of the Trinity. Or the peroration of San Bartolomé wills was slightly different from the main convention of the orbit of Toluca proper (*neltiz notlatol*, my statement is to be carried out). Finally, the witnesses to the will were three or four church officials, starting with the chief fiscal (church steward), and no one else.

It is remarkable that the details and their sequence are as if frozen in time, showing that this settlement has lost little in the way of its testamentary culture by this late period, eighty years or so after the last document we knew about before the discovery of the late collection. Thus there can be no doubt of the persistence of a specific San Bartolomé testamentary style within an even broader cultural continuity.

We discover carryovers where we least expect them. One of the first things that strikes the reader of the late wills is that they are done on relatively small pieces of paper, a half sheet or even a quarter, reinforcing an impression that one may get of simplification and diminution compared to an earlier period. But in fact, one of the three eighteenth-century wills is already on a small piece, and it seems that here we have another practice going back to the earlier time.
Against this background of overwhelming retention of conventions, is there anything new? In fact there is, though many of the innovations may seem petty and involve only slight variations on eighteenth-century wording (for instance, the statement about belonging to the Virgin is now put in the future tense). Other changes in style are the fact that at the end of the names of the Trinity now comes a repeated Jesus, Mary, and Joseph that was not there earlier; or in the part about God rewarding the executor, the phrase “for me” is added; or again, earlier there were varying phrases for the activity of the priest, while now it is always “is to favor me with” (tlaocolia, and always in the nonstandard form “tlocolia”). Also, the eighteenth-century office name tepixqui, Spanish tepisque, has disappeared in the late corpus. More substantively, two of the three early testaments name two executors, whereas in the late period only one executor has become the convention in San Bartolomé, with only rare exceptions.

The largest change has been in the phrase speaking of the state of body and soul. The early wills use traditional Nahuatl expressions for the body, notably notlalnacayo, “my earth-body, my earthly body.” This and the other traditional phrase notlallo noçoquiyo, “my earth and clay, my earthly body,” are seen only exceptionally in the late corpus. The standard word is now the Spanish loanword cuerpo. Moreover, although the full expression about the sick body and sound soul as God would want it is seen occasionally in the late texts, it is usually streamlined in a way that leads to ambiguity, and the main notary of early nineteenth-century San Bartolomé repeatedly confuses it, robbing it of sense, as we will see shortly.

Even this innovation may have significance. Though it is never specifically mentioned in the Nahuatl corpus, it appears that the reference to the Virgin is also to a cofradía dedicated to her. A possible implication of the use of the future is that the testator is entering the cofradía at death. Other interpretations are also possible, however, such as that the testator will belong to or will be dedicated to the Virgin in the afterlife.
Now let us discuss the notaries on whom the testamentary style and conventions depend. It is because several notaries wrote wills in the nineteenth-century San Bartolomé corpus that we can speak of a general style, as in the template above. The situation is unusual, however, in that a single notary is overwhelmingly dominant: Cipriano Gordiano (Romero). In fact, his name is on no less than 85 of the 95 wills in Nahuatl. From various indications we can deduce that four of these were produced by other notaries in his name, and one incomplete will is in his hand, so that he actually did 82 of the 95, coming on the scene in 1810 and still writing many testaments in 1823, the last year texts of his are attested.

In the years before Cipriano Gordiano began his career, another Romero was active as a notary in San Bartolomé, his father don Francisco Nicolás Romero, of whose writing several examples are preserved. He stopped his activity at the same time that Cipriano began, with a slight overlap. From that alone we would tend to assume that don Francisco as Cipriano’s father trained him. Looking at the actual texts, one becomes sure of it. The two hands are virtually identical, and the styles almost equally so. It takes the very closest examination to detect some slight differences between the two. This is the most concrete example known for any time or place of family succession of Nahua notaries and of their handing on all their techniques, from calligraphy to vocabulary and conventions, from one generation to the next.

We are fortunate that Cipriano’s corpus contains some invaluable information showing how he and his father were tied into the community, how they were typical San Bartolomé citizens capable of conveying local lore to us faithfully. In 1811 Cipriano officiated as notary when his mother issued her testament, referring directly to both Cipriano and his father.\(^5\)

\(^5\) Sbt#25.
The father was still alive at that time; the mother calls him just Francisco Nicolás, not the resounding don Francisco Nicolás Romero he used when exercising his notarial office. Thus we are warned not to put too high an estimate on his social standing. Apparently Cipriano’s father held the bulk of the couple’s property, for his mother mentions no other property than three saints—Asunción, San Pascual, and Santo Tomás—which she leaves to Cipriano. The mother’s name is María Francisca, which in itself is undistinguished, but so were the names of most women in San Bartolomé, so that we can deduce nothing from that.

More is learned from the will of Dionisia Jacinta, Cipriano’s sister-in-law, issued in 1823 with Cipriano himself again officiating. By now Cipriano’s father had died; indeed, in view of the time of his retirement he had probably died some years earlier. This time he is called don Francisco Nicolás, with at least the “don” if not the Romero. The brother of Cipriano to whom Dionisia Jacinta had been married, now deceased, was named Victoriano Martín. Don Francisco Nicolás had left Victoriano a bit of a lot and a small piece of land (“of 4 reales,” the most frequently mentioned size) to be shared or divided between Victoriano and Cipriano. The implication is that he left Victoriano and Dionisia nothing else, and thus that he was a person in modest circumstances. Cipriano himself apparently acquired more land. It seems that he had a plot next to the one divided with his brother, and he also had one next to his compadre don Miguel Aparicio (and possibly more as well, for we lack Cipriano’s own testament). The picture in general is that Cipriano and his relatives shared all the normal customs of the community and if not exactly poor, were surely not very wealthy.

6 Sbt#90.
7 Sbt#91, 1823. The vagueness of the language used does not preclude the possibility that all three pieces are the same, but it hardly seems likely.
For some years Cipriano’s wills were almost indistinguishable from those of his father in all their conventions. Then around 1816 (that being the year of the first example of these things)\(^8\) he burst out into a rather more elaborate and pretentious style, adding several elements as if at the same time exalting San Bartolomé, attaining a classier product, and raising his own status, and he may indeed have become a more prominent person in the community. Now he added to the mere listing of the members of the Trinity the classic statement “three persons but just one very true God,” though he stumbled a time or two before he got it right. He now flattered San Bartolomé by calling it an altepetl, not seen in other local wills either from earlier or from his own time, and he had the testator call the patron saint “my precious revered father” and make him possessor of the altepetl. With the mass or responsory prayer he added that it was for the help of the testator’s spirit and soul. Sometimes he now doubled the peroration, adding “my will is to be done” to the usual “my statement is to be carried out.” And perhaps above all he now styled himself Cipriano Gordiano Romero, openly taking the high-sounding Spanish surname that his father had used. He never adopted the “don” that his father always assumed, though his stand-ins did put the don in his name for him on two occasions. The remarkable thing is that, though occurring in the second and third decades of the nineteenth century, his innovations in no way reflect the times, but are all elements that had been included in relatively elaborate wills for generations and were new only for the notary and the community at that time.

Cipriano had a beautifully legible hand, and he was a competent notary by the standards of the Toluca Valley as they were in both the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. His one great irregularity had to do with the portion of the will about the sick body and sound soul. From early

\(\text{-------------------------}\)

\(^8\) Sbt#68.
in his career to the last documents we know by him, he sometimes gave this part in the standard fashion, but more often reversed it, making the soul sick and the body sound, or both sick, or omitted one, or produced ambiguous phrases.

It will be well to give some illustrations, and indeed to start with Cipriano’s father don Francisco Nicolás Romero. Don Francisco already was using cuerpo instead of the traditional Nahuatl approximations to body, and soul was anima as it had already been for generations. He never made out-and-out errors in this department, but some of his formulations are ambiguous and may have led to what happened with Cipriano. Here is an example:

\[
Ca\ hue\ [sic]\ seCa\ teCuitiCa\ noCuerpo\ yhua\ noAnimatz\ que\ ñmonequiltzinos\ y\ t\theta\ 
Jesúsp\theta\ 
\]

My body is very greatly hurting (literally throbbing), and my soul is as our lord Jesus Christ would wish it.

However, the word for “and” here is ihuan, which most often connects nouns, rather than the usual auh, “and or but,” which most often connects whole clauses. Thus the passage could very well be understood as “My body and soul are very greatly hurting, as our lord Jesus Christ would wish it.”

In his first extant testament of 1810, Cipriano reproduces his father’s wording on body and soul literally the same. He was capable, however, of a fully unambiguous traditional rendering:

\[
Ca\ huel\ teCuitiCa\ noCuerpon\ y\ noAnimatz\ sa\ pactiCa\ que\ quimonequiltis\ y\ t\theta\ 
Jesúxp\theta\ 
\]

My body is greatly hurting; my soul is sound, as our lord Jesus Christ would want it.\(^9\)

\(^9\) Sbt#9.
But as early as 1811 Cipriano was making highly unorthodox statements. All he had to say on the body/soul matter in one will of that year was:

_huel seCa mococotiCA noanimatz_ 
My soul is very greatly sick.\textsuperscript{11}

Another will of 1811 has both body and soul sick:\textsuperscript{12}

_huel cenca tecuintica nocuerpo ihuan noanimatzin tecuintica quen quimo-nequiltitzinoz in tr\textsuperscript{0}_.
My body is very greatly hurting, and my soul is hurting, as our lord would want it.

There could be a complete reversal of the conventional phrases:\textsuperscript{13}

_huel cenca tecuintica noanimatzin ihuan nocuerpo quen quimonequiltis in tr\textsuperscript{0} D\textsuperscript{s}_.
My soul is very greatly hurting, and my body is as our lord God would want it.

Over the years Cipriano continued to produce versions that were occasionally standard, often ambiguous, and often fully unorthodox. Here are examples of both standard and unorthodox formulations from the last year when he was active, 1823. A fully orthodox version:\textsuperscript{14}

_ca cenca nechcocotica centetl nocuerpotzin inhuan noanimatzin çan pactica quen nechmotlanelanquilis in tr\textsuperscript{0}_.
My whole body is greatly hurting me, and my soul is sound as our lord would want it.

And a fully unorthodox version:\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{10} Sbt\#10, 1810.  
\textsuperscript{11} Sbt\#16.  
\textsuperscript{12} Sbt\#22.  
\textsuperscript{13} Sbt\#25, 1811.  
\textsuperscript{14} Sbt\#96.  
\textsuperscript{15} Sbt\#99.
My soul is greatly hurting me; my body is sound, as our lord would want it.

It is hard to know just how to interpret this phenomenon. Cipriano’s Nahuatl in general seems little different from what is seen in Toluca Valley Nahuatl documents of a century earlier, or even farther back. Some slippage with ecclesiastical concepts is seen here and there in the older corpus too, such as an impression that the Trinity is a fourth entity in addition to father, son, and Holy Spirit. Moreover, in the Nahuatl testament corpus overall, slips of all kinds are most frequent precisely in the formulaic portions and above all in the religious matter of the preamble, which tending to be the same every time caused the writer to lose concentration. Yet soul and body had been handled in the standard manner for centuries without anything comparable to Cipriano’s versions. If these had been new and strange categories in the sixteenth century, they were so no longer. Either the soul/body slot was a matter of great indifference to Cipriano, or he was really confused about it during his whole career, or both. He was the last Nahuatl notary in a settlement with a long tradition; perhaps here is an indication that the end was approaching.

We can get some perspective on the matter by seeing what San Bartolomé’s other notaries were doing with soul and body; the samples they have left are very instructive even if far fewer than Cipriano’s production.

16 For the seventeenth and eighteenth-century Toluca Valley, there are several instances in TT. In Cline and León-Portilla (1984) the members of the Trinity are once said to have been just one person (Doc. 41).
17 A supreme example of absentmindedness, carelessness, or indifference is in sbt#41, 1813. The entire contents of the soul/body slot is “quen nechmotlanequilis in tt9 Jesúxp9,” “as our lord Jesus Christ would want it for me,” with neither body nor soul mentioned at all.
Pedro Agustín wrote two Nahuatl wills, in 1803 and 1806. The first not only has the full traditional phrasing in orthodox form, but also retains the older indigenous -tlalnacayo instead of cuerpo for body.\textsuperscript{18}

\[ ca\ cenca\ huel\ mococota\ notlalnacayo\ auh\ noanimantzin\ ca\ san\ pactica\ quen\ quimonequiltizinoz\ in\ Dios \]
My earthly body is very sick indeed, but my soul is sound, as God would want it.

An example by the same writer in 1806 is much the same, except that by then he joins the new wave in San Bartolomé by going over to cuerpo.

Another notary, Mariano de la Merced, wrote some wills in 1813, and his phrasing too is orthodox (with cuerpo), as in the following:\textsuperscript{19}

\[ huel\ cenca\ mococoa\ nocuerpo\ ihuan\ noanimantzin\ ca\ çan\ pactica\ quen\ quimo-nequiltiz\ yn\ toteco\ de\ Dios \]
My body is really very sick, and my soul is sound, as our lord God would want it.

These counterexamples do not tell the whole story, however. It turns out that Cipriano was not alone in his unorthodoxy with soul and body. In a testament of 1815 Rufino Faustino wrote:

\[ ca\ huel\ chicahuac\ tecuitica\ noanimatzin\ quen\ nechmotlanequililis\ in\ totecolle\ Dios \]
My soul is very strongly hurting, as our lord God would want it for me. (The body remains unmentioned.)

We might wonder whether this testament was actually done in San Bartolomé; the testator is from Totocuitlapilco. Yet the organization and virtually all the vocabulary and conventions are in

\textsuperscript{18} Sbt\#3.
\textsuperscript{19} Sbt\#49; Sbt\#44, #48, and #61 are nominally by Cipriano Gordiano, but the style leaves no doubt that Mariano de la Merced did them. They handle body and soul much like #49.
the San Bartolomé style, and the person given at the end as fiscal menor for 1815 turns up in 1816 as San Bartolomé’s fiscal mayor.\textsuperscript{20}

We will also see some further hints of the same unorthodoxy in the region when testaments in Spanish are examined. Thus the notarial corps of San Bartolomé seems to have been in some confusion in the matter of body and soul at the time of independence. Most likely the traditional phrases had become obsolete outside of notarial formulas, and functioned more as a legal requirement. Over time, like the small print in a contract, the words lost individual meaning even to the notary who was writing them. The various discrepant or standard phrasings are by no means to be attributed to the testators; they depend entirely on the particular notary’s conventions and his state of mind at the time.

No other notaries in San Bartolomé had the impact of the team of Cipriano Gordiano and his father, and no one produced anywhere near as many testaments as Cipriano, himself responsible for more than four-fifths of all those in Nahuatl. Indeed, one would be inclined to wonder if the San Bartolomé canon was simply that of don Francisco and Cipriano personally. Yet the remaining writers stick close to the general format, confirming that it is specific to the pueblo (aside from its having been anticipated many years earlier). We also might wonder if father and son had great influence on any others who practiced in San Bartolomé in this time. The question cannot be answered definitively, but some phrases and conventions of others diverge from Cipriano’s standard, as we already saw in the matter of body and soul, so the

\textsuperscript{20} Sbt\#67. The verb \textit{choca} is used instead of \textit{tzilini} with ringing the bells, but that happens also in some well authenticated San Bartolomé wills. The clincher is that in sbt\#67 don Juan Crisóstomo is listed as fiscal menor, and in \#68, done the following year, he appears as fiscal mayor, a typical promotion.

Two other wills, \#79 and \#80, bear Rufino Faustino’s name, but everything about them shows that either there was another Rufino Faustino or someone else did a testament in his name. In these examples the soul/body statement is orthodox. For a closer discussion see below.
influence of the father and son was not all-embracing. To get a better idea of the situation, let us look briefly at some of the other writers.

Juan Domingo de la Cruz wrote a testament in 1799, the first of the late San Bartolomé collection, even before the earliest of don Francisco Nicolás Romero’s that is preserved.21 Overall he conforms to the general San Bartolomé pattern, but he has a picturesque beginning that appears occasionally in the general eighteenth-century Toluca Valley corpus, though it is unique for San Bartolomé:

\begin{quote}
\textit{toteCuiYoye Diose Ma YPaPa Yn imachio Cr\textasciitilde{}z ma xitehmomaQuixtilitziNo Yn ihuiCPa toYahua}
\end{quote}

O our lord, o God, for the sake of the sign of the cross deliver us from our enemies.

There are a few other divergences from the standard of Cipriano Gordiano. All mention of the state of body and soul is omitted, probably through inadvertence. The bells are there as usual, but they are to sound (\textit{choca}) instead of being rung (\textit{tzilini}). The phrase about finishing the testament is missing, and the executor is introduced much earlier than usual.

Basilio Martín, who did a testament in 1809,\textsuperscript{22} sticks a bit closer to the model, putting in the part about finishing the testament, though he too uses \textit{choca} instead of \textit{tzilini} for ringing the bells. The part about the body and the soul starts out standard enough but is truncated, so we cannot be sure what the intention was; at any rate, he uses the old wording -\textit{tlalnacayo} instead of the loanword \textit{cuerpo}. He uses the very old \textit{amatlacuilolli}, “document (writing on paper)” in addition to \textit{testamento}, but then, Cipriano himself did so on occasion.

\textsuperscript{21} Sbt\#1.
\textsuperscript{22} Sbt\#2.
Pedro Agustín’s testaments of 1803 and 1806\textsuperscript{23} were already considered for their treatment of body and soul, more standard or traditional than Cipriano’s. In one case he speaks in the heading of praising the Trinity, a common formula in the eighteenth-century Toluca Valley generally but veering from the San Bartolomé norm of taking the Trinity as one’s sign; however, in the other testament he uses the San Bartolomé standard. He also once uses *choca* with the bells, the other time *tzilini*. Otherwise he follows the general San Bartolomé model entirely.

An interesting case is Mariano de la Merced (the name often lacks the de la), who did some Nahuatl wills in 1813, one under his own name and three that were nominally by Cipriano Gordiano.\textsuperscript{24} We can deduce his authorship in those cases from special characteristics of his spelling. For example, Cipriano and his father almost always wrote the independent form of the pronoun “I” as “nehuatli,” with an *i* at the end that was not standard for central Mexican Nahuatl, though it was often seen in the Toluca Valley. Mariano Merced, however, wrote the standard *nehuatl*, and he did so whether he was writing under his own name or under Cipriano’s. Overall there is almost nothing other than the orthography to distinguish his style. He does have a particular way of doing “our lord God.” Generally this was “ttΩ Dios,” in San Bartolomé as elsewhere, but Mariano had a special form “toteco de Dios,” which apparently incorporates Spanish *de*, though there is no related Spanish phrase that would use the word. Of course in a sense this feature too is merely orthography.

Mariano’s case is interesting, for it shows that although he apparently worked as something like an assistant of Cipriano Gordiano for a time in 1813, he does not seem to have

\textsuperscript{23} Sbt#3, #4.
\textsuperscript{24} The numbers of the testaments were given just above.
been exactly his apprentice as Cipriano had been his father’s, even though the two very much belong to a common local tradition. Perhaps he was more of a stand-in when Cipriano was not available. Thus there seem to have been separate streams of notaries handing on skills and conventions to successors even in a place as small as San Bartolomé.

A complex situation arises with the name of Rufino Faustino. Two demonstrably different people wrote testaments in San Bartolomé under that name. Whether one was using the name of the other or they both actually bore the name remains a matter for speculation. Let us first deal with the one who did more wills. This Rufino Faustino wrote a will for Cipriano Gordiano in 1819 and two under his own name in 1820.\textsuperscript{25} His style overall is indistinguishable from the usual manner in San Bartolomé as seen in the template above. He does once use \textit{choca} with the bells (though also \textit{tzilini}), and once for body he uses the old \textit{-tlalnacayo} instead of \textit{cuerpo}. At one point he uses exactly the same unusual form, “toteco de Dios,” for “our lord God” as Mariano Merced. His statements on soul and body are all orthodox, unlike Cipriano’s.

The other Rufino Faustino has already been mentioned as following Cipriano Gordiano’s manner of reversing soul and body. In 1815, being in San Bartolomé, he wrote a will for a testator from Totocuitlapilco. His calligraphy is very distinct from that of the first Rufino, being very blocky and separating each succeeding syllable from the rest. The document overall is entirely on the San Bartolomé plan. It does not say “here in San Bartolomé” because the testator is from elsewhere (though probably living in San Bartolomé). Otherwise the only departure is that instead of saying “before my witnesses” Rufino writes “I say or declare my witnesses”

\textsuperscript{25} The one nominally by Cipriano is sbt#78; the other two are # 79 and #80. Traits making it possible to establish that 78 is by the same person as 79 and 80 include the unusual spelling “ytuaca” for the usual “ytoca,” “his name,” the insertion of an \textit{o} after \textit{-chpoch}, “one’s daughter,” and the use of a long pair of lines one over the other to separate sections.
(“niquitoa notestigos”). He uses *choca* instead of *tzilini* with the bells, as we have seen other local writers do, and like some other locals he does not abbreviate “our lord God” (though his spelling, “totecolle Dios,” is different from Mariano Merced’s “tote de Dios.”)\(^{26}\)

Overall it seems that during the independence period one can discern two lines of notaries in San Bartolomé, which might be called the Cipriano Gordiano school and the non-Cipriano school. The earliest writers of the latter (Juan Domingo de la Cruz, Basilio Martín, Pedro Agustín) and in later years Mariano Merced and Rufino Faustino (1) tended to share the characteristic of getting soul and body right, as well as some miscellaneous smaller features such as *choca* instead of *tzilini* in speaking of the bells ringing, or a written-out and unusual form of “our Lord.” Indeed, all the Nahuatl writers except Rufino Faustino (2) seem to have belonged to the other tradition, probably passing their manner of doing testaments from one to the next without any close intervention by Cipriano. Yet all adhered closely to a testament form and vocabulary very near to what it had been in San Bartolomé a hundred years before.

**Yancuictlalpan.** This community has left us a corpus of 11 testaments in Nahuatl dated from 1809 to 1825. Comparing them with those of San Bartolomé represents an ideal test case for the degree of uniformity or variety in the testamentary traditions of this subregion. As with San Bartolomé, a template or generalized scheme can serve to illustrate the local structure and formulas:\(^{27}\)

Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.

---

\(^{26}\) It probably uses the vocative (standard *totecuiyoe*) for the declarative, something that often happened in Nahuatl.

\(^{27}\) As with the San Bartolomé templates, material in brackets is sometimes omitted in actual wills. Material in parentheses is always present, but either is formulated generally instead of the specific words that would be used in a given testament, or specifies the Nahuatl word or phrase that is used.
Today, (day of the week) on the __th day of the month of ______ and the year count of ______.

I take as my sign the precious revered name of God the father, God his precious son, and God the Holy Spirit. May it be done, Amen. Jesus, [Mary, Joseph].

Know all who see this my memorandum of testament that my name is ________________; my (husband or wife) is named ______; we are citizens (chaneque) here in the altepetl of my [or our] consummate mother Santa María de la Rosa [Nativitas], Yancuictlalpan. I say that my body (-tlallo -coquiyo) is very sick; my soul is healthy. If in the future our lord God summons me [and I repay the death or mortal passion] of our lord Jesus Christ, [I place it entirely in his hands, and] first of all I say that I offer half a real for the holy places of Jerusalem; it is to be given. [My command is to be carried out and executed.] And I say that God will provide what my body is to be wrapped in (using a word related to native quimiloa). And I say that as to where my body will lie buried, they are to favor me with a place in the churchyard (teopan ithualco). [The help of my soul is to be that] a low mass is to be said for me within (one month, two months, etc.).

Bequests.

And I say that this is all that I have recorded before [my deity and ruler] God and those who are being made my executors who are to speak for me; if they do it well, God will give them their reward; they are ________ and ________. I say that I have made my memorandum of testament before all my witnesses, my lord alcalde current alcalde ______, my lord the fiscal of the holy church ______, and _______. Municipal notary ________.

Within a general similarity to the San Bartolomé form, this scheme shows a myriad of differences, which I will now point out. I am fully aware that many of them are insignificant in themselves, but the very fact of the difference in two communities in the same subregion, along with the high degree of internal consistency in each case, gives them significance.

Both schemes begin with the Stage 3 formula “Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.” Both invariably specify the date. But here the date comes at the beginning, in San Bartolomé at the end.28 The

________________________

28 In Yancuictlalpan the date must have been specified as the testament was being written, which was indeed the most common practice throughout the Valley in the eighteenth century. In San Bartolomé one can often tell that the date was added somewhat later, probably when the testator actually died or the testament was sent in to Metepec to be registered.
phrasing is very similar in each case, but Yancuictlalpan keeps more Nahuatl vocabulary, using the Nahuatl *metztli*, “month,” omitted in San Bartolomé, as well as giving the specific name of the Spanish month, and using the old language *xihuitl tlaphualli*, “year count,” not seen in San Bartolomé.

The heading proper, featuring the Trinity, is the same in every detail in both settlements. San Bartolomé says “I begin my testament”; Yancuictlalpan retains the old formula “Know all who see . . .,” and, in a wording widely spread in the Toluca Valley, adds “memorandum” to “testament.”

The parts identifying the testator and spouse and the connection with the community are basically the same in both places, though San Bartolomé was somewhat later and less consistent in using the word altepetl.

In the part on body and soul, Yancuictlalpan retains an older Nahuatl expression instead of the loanword *cuerpo* that had come to be dominant in San Bartolomé. Also, Yancuictlalpan never shows any sign of confusion about whether the soul or the body is sick, a la Cipriano Gordiano.

Both the bellringing and belonging to the Virgin, important invariable elements in San Bartolomé, are completely missing in Yancuictlalpan. Instead we see a flowery reference to the testator’s death, a common element in Nahuatl wills, and, as also more usual in them, placing the soul directly in the hands of God or Christ (here the latter) instead of the Virgin as in San Bartolomé.

In Yancuictlalpan the offering of half a real for the holy places of Jerusalem is standard; in San Bartolomé it is entirely missing. In addition, Yancuictlalpan has a simple formula saying
that God will provide the shroud, using traditional Nahuatl phrases having to do with wrapping. In San Bartolomé the shroud is not mentioned.

San Bartolomé always has the priest favor the testator with a mass or responsory prayer; in Yancuicultlapan the priest is not mentioned, and the rite is always a low mass. But Yancuicultlapan uses the verb “to favor with” (tlaocolia) with the burial place, always in the churchyard (using native vocabulary), whereas San Bartolomé gives much more exact locations and rarely if ever mentions the churchyard. Yancuicultlapan also specifies that the mass must be said within a certain time, which San Bartolomé does not.

The testaments of San Bartolomé end the body with a statement “I have finished (using tzonquixtia) my testament”; the equivalent in Yancuicultlapan is “this is all that I have recorded (using machiotia).” The formulations for naming executors are very similar though not identical, and the same with the mention of witnesses, who in both cases are officials of the community given in a descending rank order. In San Bartolomé they are always church officials, whereas in Yancuicultlapan secular officials are included and even emphasized. Also, in San Bartolomé, when the notary’s position is defined more closely, he is notary of the holy church, whereas in Yancuicultlapan he is notary of the municipality (república).

The exhortations after commands and bequests in Yancuicultlapan are similar to those in San Bartolomé but appear somewhat less consistently and vary somewhat more.

Overall, then, we see that the testamentary traditions of the two communities, almost invariant in each one of them, differ on a large number of points, many of which may concern community style and identity only. That is, a certain thing may be mentioned or not, or mentioned in a special local way, without there being any difference between the two communities as to actual practice. On the other hand, differences in the social reality can be
involved as well. In either case we see each community’s concern for maintaining its own tradition and asserting its own identity. Comparing San Bartolomé and Yancuictlalpan, we see that the latter uses much more indigenous vocabulary and older, traditional formulations. One could say that the Yancuictlalpan style is more conservative, and also that it is more like that of the Nahuatl testament style in general. Even by mid-eighteenth century, it would have seemed rather old-fashioned in the context of the Toluca Valley as a whole. Since early eighteenth-century samples of the local style, which are available for San Bartolomé, have not been found for Yancuictlalpan, it cannot be absolutely asserted that the style of the latter rests firmly on earlier precedent as it does in San Bartolomé, but it surely seems likely.

Two notaries wrote the 11 Nahuatl wills of Yancuictlalpan. Marcos Antonio did the first three, from 1809 and 1810, and Isidro de la Trinidad did the rest, from 1812 to 1825. Clearly Isidro succeeded Marcos, perhaps on his death. There are virtually no differences between their products beyond the smallest details of orthography and the fact that Isidro was especially prone to leave slots entirely unfilled. It would seem highly probable that in this small community Marcos trained Isidro. Both writers were unpredictable with word-final -tl, putting sometimes the standard -tl, sometimes the -tlí also seen in San Bartolomé, and sometimes even -lt! Isidro de la Trinidad did the testament of his wife Julian Viviana in 1823, in Spanish as a matter of fact. It is not as informative as the will of Cipriano Gordiano’s mother in San Bartolomé, but it reinforces the notion that Isidro was a typical and not outstandingly wealthy member of the community.

29 Yan#9.
**Ocotitlan.** Only three post-1800 Nahuatl wills from Ocotitlan have been found, from 1801, 1810, and 1813, but they are most useful nevertheless for purposes of triangulation. Here again is a template:

Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.
Today, (day) the __th of (month) of [the year] 18__. 
I take as my sign the precious revered name of God the father, God his precious [revered] son, and God the Holy Spirit. May it be done, amen. Jesus, [Mary, and Joseph.]
Here I named _______ begin [or issue] my testament; the name of my spouse is _____; we are citizens here in Santa María Magdalena Ocotitlan; Although my body (using -tlallo -coquiyo) is sick, my soul [is sound and] is just awaiting death, [from which no one can flee]. When [my precious revered father] God has passed sentence on me, I place my soul entirely in his hands, for I am his creation [or he created me], and I say first of all that half a real is to be given for Holy Jerusalem. [My statement is to be carried out.] And I say that God will provide my shroud (using a word related to quimiloa). My statement is to be carried out. And I say that they are to designate my grave for me in the churchyard (teopan ithualco) [or just it is to be in the churchyard]. My statement is to be carried out. And I say that the help of my soul will be a low mass [or responsory prayer] to be said for me [within twenty days]. My statement is to be carried out.

**Bequests.**
And I say that this is all that I have recorded [before God. I have nothing; I am very poor.] And I say that [I greatly implore] those who are to be my executors to speak for me; they are _______ ___ and __________. If they do it God will reward them. [The witnesses are:] Fiscal of the holy church, _______; fiscal teniente _____; [topile mayor, _____.] Notary, _______.

It will be seen that the Ocotitlan model shares a great deal with that of Yancuictlalpan and by the same token differs greatly from that of San Bartolomé (granted overall commonalities

---

30 Oco#1, #6, #22.
for all three). It is surely valid to speak of a more native vocabulary and more conservative conventions in Yancuictlalpan/Ocotitlan than in San Bartolomé, aside from particular facets the first two share as opposed to the third, like putting the date first instead of last. The first two in a meaningful way represent a unit over against San Bartolomé. Yet after all there are also some differences between Yancuictlalpan and Ocotitlan.

Let us begin by summarizing the traits Yancuictlalpan and Ocotitlan share as opposed to San Bartolomé. Both put the date at the beginning; both use a Nahuatl phrase instead of *cuerpo* for body and have an orthodox version of the statement about body and soul; both put the soul directly in the hands of the deity; both omit bells; both have a Jerusalem offering of half a real; both mention the shroud and use indigenous vocabulary for it; both call specifically for burial in the churchyard, using native vocabulary; both specify a term within which the rites are to be performed; both end the substance with the same formula.

Nevertheless, Ocotitlan veers somewhat from the Yancuictlalpan model. The date is given using less Nahuatl vocabulary; in this Ocotitlan and San Bartolomé are alike. Yancuictlalpan’s phrase “Know all who see . . .” is lacking; instead one finds, as in San Bartolomé, “I begin my testament” (or sometimes I issue it). The formula for describing death is different. Although both Ocotitlan and Yancuictlalpan specify a term for the performance of rites, in Ocotitlan it is twenty days, in Yancuictlalpan a month or two. The witnesses are officials in both cases, but in Yancuictlalpan mainly secular officials, in Ocotitlan church officials, as in San Bartolomé.

Thus even though the Yancuictlalpan and Ocotitlan models tend to strike one at first as the same, there are some differences. In most of them Ocotitlan is less conservative, or more like San Bartolomé, or both.
The three Nahuatl testaments of Ocotitlan were written by three separate notaries, Santos Alberto, Sebastián Fabián López, and Pablo Leonardo, all of them following the general model very closely, though occasionally leaving a word unsaid or a slot vacant. The latter two use the full traditional phrase *noyolia nanimatzin*, “my spirit and soul,” whereas the first uses only the Spanish loanword.\(^{31}\)

**Testaments in Spanish**

If the existence of a substantial corpus of Nahuatl testaments in the area studied as late as the independence period is of great significance, the fact that testaments in Spanish are found among them is hardly less so, for it tells us of the timing and nature of the transition. The general movement is toward Spanish, and only the exact timing varies from place to place.\(^{32}\) The first thing one notices in reading the testaments in Spanish is that the language is still strongly affected by Nahuatl, and that is true across the board. Some writers have a more fluent and standard Spanish, some less, but the traces of Nahuatl are seen everywhere, in all the texts and in all the communities. This characteristic is not special to the corpus studied here, but already held true for the whole Toluca Valley and beyond during the second half of the

---

\(^{31}\) I am not discussing the independence-period Nahuatl tradition in Totocuitlapilco even though eighteenth-century examples are available for comparison. The one late sample available in Nahuatl of a testament of a person from Totocuitlapilco (sbt#67) was written in San Bartolomé following virtually all of San Bartolomé’s conventions, as was shown above.

\(^{32}\) By all indications, other parts of the Toluca Valley had gone over to Spanish decades earlier, but until all extant texts have been discovered, the matter remains in doubt.
eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{33} Much study could be given to this aspect; here a few examples from a Spanish text done by Mariano de la Merced\textsuperscript{34} will suffice to give the flavor.

Nahuatl lacked prepositions and particularly the \textit{a} ("to") used in Spanish to indicate human objects, whether direct or indirect (\textit{veo a mi padre}, "I see my father"; (\textit{le}) \textit{doy la casa a mi hija}, "I give the house to my daughter"). In Spanish Nahuatl speakers were prone to omit this \textit{a}. Thus Mariano writes the following sentence, in which \textit{a} is missing before "mijo" (\textit{for mi hijo}):

\begin{quote}
\textit{huna tierra de a do reales que se nos fue Dexando Mi difunta Madre Se los boy dexando Mijo Juan fransisco}
\end{quote}

As to a piece of land "of two reales" that my deceased mother left us, I am leaving it to my son Juan Francisco.

The reader will notice some more unorthodoxies in this passage. The Spanish object prefixes \textit{se}, \textit{le}, \textit{lo}, \textit{la}, \textit{los}, \textit{las} were without close parallels in Nahuatl and were a mystery to Nahuatl speakers. Here the first \textit{se} is used wrong and would have been omitted in standard Spanish. The \textit{los} in "Se los voy dexando" should have been \textit{la}, referring to \textit{tierra}. Notice that the syntax of this passage, preposing the object and not giving the verb that applies to it until much later, is more Nahuatl than Spanish.

What is one to make of the use here of \textit{ir}, "to go," in "Se los voy dexando" and "se nos fue Dexando"? They are not normal Spanish. They represent the auxiliary of going -\textit{tiuh/-to} so much used in Nahuatl, in this case meaning to do upon dying.

\textsuperscript{33} Lockhart, \textit{Nahuas and Spaniards}, chapter 7. The Spanish in my corpus fits in perfectly with the picture given there. In fact, virtually all the common traits and expressions seen here are seen there as well.

\textsuperscript{34} Sbt\#40, 1813.
Since Nahuatl speakers’ first take on the Spanish _a_ was that it indicated persons (not noticing that it was used only with objects), through what is called hypercorrection they sometimes used this _a_ for human subjects too, as in the following sentence written by Mariano:

> _si ce acordare de mi_ A _mi Redentor Jesu cristo se lo hencomiendo Mi alma a mi santisimamadre La limpia Concepcion_

If my redeemer Jesus Christ should remember me [bring about my death], I commend my soul to my most holy mother La Limpia Concepción.

Here the redeemer is the subject of the verb to remember, and there should be no _a_. If _lo_ is to be used in the passage, it should agree with _alma_ and be _la_; since Nahuatl had no gender for object prefixes (or for anything else), Nahuatl speakers tended to prefer _lo_ for all direct objects, and even for indirect. Actually, the wording should be _le encomiendo mi alma_, not using either _se_ or _lo/la_.

In the same text one sees “_fui Casada de Juan Anselmo,”_ I was married to Juan Anselmo,” where normal Spanish would use _con_ instead of _de_. Nahuatl speakers were often vague in their use of Spanish prepositions.³⁵

Other unorthodoxies in the text have to do with finding equivalents for special phrases in San Bartolomé wills, which will be discussed a bit later. This text is dated 1813, and it can be said that with the years things moved in the direction of a more standard Spanish, but one still finds passages like the following one from a testament written by José María in 1825.³⁶

> _hod esta sePultado á Mi difuta Madresita_

---

³⁵ The text, like many others in Spanish, continues the tradition of Nahuatl texts by often omitting an expected syllable-final _n_, or putting one where it is not expected. This text has: _berdaderon_ for _verdadero_, _doblaran_ for _doblará_, _declaron_ for _declaró_, _aplicaran_ for _aplicará_, _pagaran_ for _pagará_, _cuiden_ for _cuide_, _primeron_ for _primero_, _estan_ for _está_.

³⁶ Sbt#117.
where my deceased mother is buried

Here a hypercorrect *a*, used with a subject instead of an object, still occurs. Gender agreement continues to be weak, the masculine “sepultado” referring to the female “Madresita.” This last word uses a Spanish diminutive, but the intention is reverential, and the diminutive is the equivalent of the Nahuatl reverential suffix *-tzin*, which was originally a diminutive. “Mi . . . Madresita” is a literal equivalent of Nahuatl *nonantzin*.

**San Bartolomé.** Now let us take the communities one at a time seeing to what extent the Spanish testaments reproduce or diverge from the conventions of the local Nahuatl corpus. As it happens, the Mariano de la Merced who wrote the text just used as an example of the language in the Spanish corpus also produced Nahuatl wills in the same year. If we take the Nahuatl text he did under his own name and compare it with the Spanish testament, we will see that Mariano reproduces every single item and element in the Nahuatl will as literally as possible, and his Nahuatl wills are a full rendering of the San Bartolomé model.

The effect on the reader can be quite different because of the frequent unorthodoxy of the Spanish, but the information is the same, especially if we already understand the Nahuatl, and it is clear that the underlying notions in Mariano’s mind were the same in both cases. Taking the overall close parallel as given, let us look at some particularly interesting renderings. Nahuatl wills of San Bartolomé usually say *nican tichaneque*, “we are citizens here,” though *chaneque* can also be residents, householders, or natives. It may be that the intention was more native, for in Spanish Mariano says “somos crioyos y nasidos deste pueblo de San Bartolome Tlatelulco”

---

37 See note 19 above.
38 For clarity, sbt#40 and #49 are being compared.
(criollos y nacidos). Such formulations occur throughout the Spanish corpus, not only in San Bartolomé, often using the word nativos. A side benefit is having reinforced for us that criollo did not mean someone of Spanish descent. Nor was it used as an independent noun, but in connection with a place, here criollos de este pueblo de San Bartolomé. It is possible that as in some other times and places it did not necessarily mean born in a place but growing up there, which would explain why a word meaning native so often accompanies it.

In both his Nahuatl and his Spanish wills Mariano puts a conventional statement that the testator’s soul is sound. The Spanish wording, however, is “mi alma estan en buena y sana,” which needs some word like “state” or “condition” to be complete and make sense. Nevertheless, this is not just a slip, for it is repeated the same in Mariano’s other Spanish wills.

Bellringing is as usual in this will, but here as in some other Spanish texts we learn something never made unambiguous in the Nahuatl corpus. There the loanword campana is always in the singular. We may think that probably there is more than one bell, but we cannot be sure. Here in the Spanish we see the plural campanas, and the question is settled.

In Spanish Mariano continues to put an exhortation after each command or bequest just as in Nahuatl wills, a feature an ordinary Spanish will would be without. The formula used is “cumplace mi palabra” (cúmplase mi palabra), “let my word be fulfilled,” which is not a very idiomatic expression. We soon realize, however, that it is a literal translation of the ubiquitous neltiz notlatol, “my statement is to be realized.”
In his Nahuatl wills Mariano is one of the few in San Bartolomé who when mentioning the Virgin in the preamble always puts Concepción instead of the more usual Asunción. It is the same in his Spanish wills, always Concepción.\textsuperscript{39}

As in Nahuatl wills of San Bartolomé, in his Spanish Mariano makes specific mention of the priest who will celebrate the mass. The term he uses is “mi santo padre.” \textit{Santo Padre} in Spanish, however, usually refers to the pope; Mariano seems to be searching for a properly reverential form to be the equivalent of the usual \textit{notepixcatzin}, “my priest” (with the reverential -\textit{tzin}.

The San Bartolomé collection contains 20 testaments in Spanish, done by a group of seven known writers and one to three writing anonymously for others. Six of the documents are already from 1813 and 1817. Three more are from 1821, and another three from 1823, the last year that Cipriano Gordiano worked as notary. Five are from 1824, two from 1825, and a final one from 1832. During Cipriano Gordiano’s time testaments in Spanish were a small minority, though continuing to be done over a decade; it appears that after Cipriano, testaments were written only in Spanish.

Overall the documents including the later ones continue to follow the San Bartolomé model in much the same fashion as we just saw that Mariano de la Merced did, sometimes more strictly and sometimes more freelies. Writers were now more free to adopt formulas common in Spanish testaments generally, and occasionally they did so, as in the following passage from a

\textsuperscript{39} Mariano de la Merced’s Spanish testaments are sbt#40, #60, and #62.
will of 1823, which gives much more in the way of a credo than was traditional in San Bartolomé:40

_Creo fiel y verdaderamente En el misterio de la Š.ćicima trinida y Creo En el misterio de la EnCarnacion del divino vervo y espero que E de yr a su gloria_

I faithfully and truly believe in the mystery of the most holy Trinity, and I believe in the mystery of the incarnation of the divine word, and I expect that I am to go to his paradise.

Such passages are not found in all the Spanish wills by any means, and rarely is such a wholesale introduction found in any other section. It seems that the writers were still mainly consulting each other instead of seeking inspiration elsewhere, with the traditional San Bartolomé model still at the root of most of what was done. Indeed, sometimes one sees hints even through the Spanish of traditional Nahuatl phrasing that was only an undercurrent locally. Thus an 1824 testament has the phrase “mi cuerpo y lodo,” “my body and mud,” in which we can see traces of the old phrase _notlallo noçoquiyo_, “my earth and clay or mud” to designate the body.

Whether it was a new tradition coming in with the change to Spanish or was a general trend that was shaping up, one notices that the Spanish wills tend to bring in the word “cemetery,” not seen in the Nahuatl texts, to give less specific directions about the physical location of the burial site, and speak less of burial near certain trees (though trees do come in sometimes).

San Bartolomé’s testaments in Spanish are mainly just like those in Nahuatl in matters of Christian doctrine, with sometimes the new wrinkles about the mysteries of the faith etc. that

40 Sbt#111, nominally by Cipriano Gordiano, writer not yet identified.
were illustrated above. That is, in both cases there is mainly nothing out of the ordinary, but the Spanish texts also contain occasional hints of the same unorthodoxies seen in the Nahuatl. The reader will remember Cipriano Gordiano’s troubles with body and soul. A Spanish will of 1825 by José María follows in exactly the same vein:

\[
\text{mi curpo y Mi alma Se alla mui enfermo}
\]

My body and my soul are very sick.

The San Bartolomé tradition of saying the soul is to belong to the Virgin in the slot where most Nahuatl testaments of all times and places give it to God sometimes arouses suspicion that Mary is more than an intermediary, but nothing more definite on this point is ever said in the Nahuatl texts. One of the Spanish wills, however, written in 1817 by Juan Máximo Mejía, goes a step further:

\[
en el poder de mi madre SS\text{ma mi señora de Assup..no pogo mi alma que es su eChura}
\]

I place my soul in the custody of my most holy mother my lady of Asunción, for it is her creature.

This is a version of the traditional phrase saying that the soul is to be returned to God because it was made by him, here applied to the Virgin, with huge theological implications if it were to be taken at face value. It probably in fact cannot be taken quite straight. It contains a strong element of the carelessness with formula that we see so much of; possibly there is some confusion too, however.

\[\text{\footnotesize\[41\text{ Sbt#118.}\] 42 Sbt#72.}\]
Yancuictlalpan. Of the 12 testaments in the late Yancuictlalpan corpus, only one is in Spanish, written by the same person who did the largest number of the Nahuatl wills, Isidro de la Trinidad. It is dated 1823, years after Isidro had begun writing testaments in Nahuatl (the first we have from him is from 1812), but he continued to produce Nahuatl testaments in 1824 and 1825, so the trend if any remains unclear. The testator is Isidro’s wife Juliana Viviana.

Isidro’s Spanish is quite a bit more advanced than that of Mariano de la Merced in San Bartolomé in 1813. He uses prepositions correctly, makes no mistakes with the object prefixes, and indeed parts could be taken simply for ordinary Mexican Spanish of the time. He writes y for ll, as in “yamados” for llamados, but he was not alone in that. When we get to his syntax, if we look closely, we see Nahuatl influence, as in the following passage:

\[
\text{mi Cuerpo en donde Se a de sepultar dentro del seminterio}
\]

My body is to be buried inside the cemetery.

Literally this says: “My body, where it is to be buried, inside the cemetery,” with an order and structure much more Nahuatl than Spanish. Or consider

\[
\text{nos mas dejo apuntado}
\]

That is all that I leave recorded.

The nos mas is for standard Spanish no es más, “it is no more.” In Nahuatl-speaker Spanish this phrase had been contracted and had become almost a single phrase nosmas, “no more.” In normal Spanish one might have said no dejo más apuntado.

As to the general structure and order of the will and the wording of the succeeding items, Isidro does follow the Yancuictlalpan Nahuatl model in a general way, but with quite a bit of deviation. And he too has a flowery doctrinal statement toward the beginning:

\[\text{Yan#9.}\]
en presencia de la SSS.ma  Trinidad. Ángeles y santos de la corte celestial protesto y digo. que quiero vivir. y morir Confesando todos mis pecados y Confío en Vuestra bondad. y misericordia me as de perdonar. todo lo que yo me faltare en mis culpas.

In the presence of the most holy Trinity and the angels and saints of the celestial court I say and protest that I want to live and die confessing all my sins, and I trust in your goodness and mercy; you will pardon me all that I should be lacking in my faults.

After a very good start, in the second half of it this passage veers somewhat away from good Spanish grammar and idiom. Isidro must have been improvising from his memory of things heard or read in Spanish and not actually copying something.

Ocotitlan. Of the three communities studied in depth here, Ocotitlan went over to Spanish first and most massively; of the post-1800 corpus of Ocotitlan testaments, 24 are in Spanish, 3 in Nahuatl. As was seen above, those in Nahuatl are dated 1801, 1810, and 1813; those in Spanish range from 1805 to 1820. Ocotitlan had thus gone over to Spanish definitively by 1814, and even all but one of the numerous testaments from the epidemic year of 1813 are in Spanish. The writer of the largest number of Spanish wills, twelve of them, was Pablo Leonardo, who also did one of the Nahuatl wills, so we can use him as our example.

Concentrating on a testament of 1813, we soon see that Pablo Leonardo’s Spanish is much like that found elsewhere here. Consider the following phrase:

\textit{mi esposa yamadose soverana María}

my wife named Soberana María

The form “yamadose” is highly characteristic of the Nahuatl-speaker Spanish of the time. In Nahuatl the derived forms of verbs retain prefixes indicating the transitivity, reflexivity, etc. of

\textsuperscript{44} Oco\#10.
the verb as it would be in the present-tense indicative. Thus from *se llama*, “he or she is named,” Nahuatl-speakers derived the past participle *llamádose*, the equivalent of standard Spanish *llamado*. Here we see in addition the Nahuatl-speaker unfamiliarity with gender, for the participle is masculine even though modifying a feminine noun.

The following phrase is used as part of the exhortation placed after bequests:

*nøy quien diga mañana u otro día*

No one is to say anything in the future.

This is an attempt to translate a common Nahuatl peroration on the order of *ayac ile quitoz moztla huipitla*, straightforwardly meaning what is given as the gloss of the phrase in Spanish—which literally says “there is not anyone who should say tomorrow or the next day.” In the Spanish phrase, “nøy” is a contraction sometimes seen among Nahuatl speakers for *no hay*, “there is not.” A word for something or nothing is simply missing. The puzzling “mañana u otro día” is a translation of Nahuatl *moztla huipitla*, literally “tomorrow, the day after tomorrow,” which was the most frequent Nahuatl expression for “in the future.” The Spanish version used here was very common with that meaning in texts written by Nahuatl speakers.

As to the structure and content of the Spanish testament, it follows the local Nahuatl model, and the version of it done by Pablo Leonardo himself, quite closely, though not slavishly. All the key elements, such as the offering for Jerusalem, are present.\(^45\) In this case there is no fancy religious passage coming directly from Spanish such as we have seen in the records of the

\(^{45}\) *Oco#4*, done in 1809 by Santiago Cristóbal, follows the Ocotitlan Nahuatl model perhaps even more closely than the will of Pablo Leonardo discussed here. It is interesting that the phrase “mi cuerpo y lodo,” found in an 1824 San Bartolomé testament as seen above, appears literally the same here. Perhaps new special conventions in Spanish were arising, and were shared across the whole region.
other communities. This is often the case in the Ocotitlan Spanish corpus, but a testament of 1805 has the following:

*Creyendo el ynefable Misterio de la santicima, Trinidad . . . y creo la encarnacion del Berbo divino y creo haquello que Cré Nuestra Madre La Santa yglecia Catolica Apostolica*

believing in the ineffable mystery of the most holy Trinity . . . and I believe in the incarnation of the divine word, and I believe that which our mother the holy apostolic Catholic church believes.

This passage in fact is a great deal like the one quoted above from an 1823 Spanish testament done in San Bartolomé. This writer, however, has not yet learned that the verb *creer* must be accompanied by *en*.

**Totocuitlapilco.** So far no Nahuatl testaments from Totocuitlapilco from the independence period have been discovered; the one with a testator from there was written in San Bartolomé using mainly that settlement’s conventions, as was seen above. One Spanish will done in Totocuitlapilco in 1826 is available, however, written by Antonio Ambrosio. Its Spanish is of the type we have come to expect. Its structure and conventions fall in the same general range as the testaments of the other communities studied here. In the absence of more examples, however, it is not possible to extrapolate a model reliably.

One approach is to compare this example with the earlier Nahuatl testaments known from the same community, especially the two issued in the eighteenth century. The resemblance is not very close, though the date is given in the same location, and of course the names of the

---

46 Oco#3,
47 Toto#1.
48 TT nos. 37 (1732) and 38 (1737).
witnesses. Bellringing is specified in both time periods. Yancuictlalpan measured land in the early period in *quahuitl*, in vigesimal numbers, and the 1826 text uses *palos* the same way, the word being a translation of the Nahuatl term. This at a time when most of the communities were describing land in different ways. But the order of the testator’s name and mention of the Trinity are reversed in the 1826 text compared to the earlier ones. Although the 1826 testament gives the testator’s name and affiliation in the expected place, the earlier testaments only name the testator, taking the community for granted. The earlier testaments have the Jerusalem offering; in the 1826 text it is missing. Overall, there are only tantalizing glimpses of carryovers, and surely nothing like what is seen in San Bartolomé. If some late Nahuatl texts had survived, and if we had larger numbers of Spanish testaments, things might look quite different.

**The Spanish testaments in perspective.** In all the communities, essentially the same things are seen. In these years they were all moving in the direction of Spanish recordkeeping, at slightly different rates. The Spanish used was in all cases heavily affected by Nahuatl. It was a version of the language much like African-American or Chicano English in this country, apparently learned more from peers and neighbors than from born Spanish speakers. The switch was of great ultimate importance, potentially opening the local people up to national developments of all kinds.

But in the first generation relatively little advantage was taken of the potential. Only some elaborate doctrinal statements on Christian religion can be detected as something newly brought in from a more standard Spanish. In general the Spanish testaments continued to have the same content, structure, and even phrasing as their Nahuatl predecessors, on which they were clearly modeled. In this way some very awkward Spanish was produced, but the result was not
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only that the first decades of Spanish texts were nearly as indigenous as their Nahuatl predecessors, but that they kept as much community differentiation.

**Conclusion**

Looking at the body of local writing at independence as a whole, the tradition of writing testaments in Nahuatl not only survived into this time in the area studied, but, in the largest and best documented of the communities, San Bartolomé, it was the predominant mode until 1823. In Yancuictlalpan it survived at least until 1825. In Ocotitlan the last example is from 1813. The situation in Totocuitlapilco is unclear. A substantial corpus thus exists that can be compared with the eighteenth-century corpus of Nahuatl testaments from the Toluca Valley generally, and in one case, San Bartolomé, with earlier testaments from that settlement specifically. Overall, the late corpus has changed quite little from the earlier, at just about the same rate as it had been evolving for a long time. In San Bartolomé, the degree of carryover is startling. At any rate, each community has its own very distinct style, though Yancuictlalpan and Ocotitlan form a group distinct from San Bartolomé, overall even more conservative. The micro-distinctiveness of Yancuictlalpan and Ocotitlan probably go back to well defined local styles in the preceding century, though for lack of extant material it cannot be demonstrated conclusively.

Yet it is not as though nothing had changed at all. We catch all the communities right at the point of transition to recordkeeping in Spanish. Little in the Nahuatl corpus betrays any impending collapse, unless it should be failure of Cipriano Gordiano through years of being the premier notary of San Bartolomé to master the important formula of the sick body and sound soul. The record itself does not tell us the reason for the change. A few writers were able to function in either Nahuatl or Spanish. Most, however, were confined to one language, in which they had probably been trained, so it seems in general that as new notaries came on the scene,
they could handle Spanish only. The great Nahuatl tradition of San Bartolomé ends abruptly with Cipriano’s retirement or death.

Employing this method of using Nahuatl-infused Spanish-language manuscripts holds out much promise for tracking the roots and development of modern Mexican Spanish. Whether the new wave of notaries mainly spoke Spanish instead of Nahuatl or were merely attuned to writing it is not clear. If they did speak mainly Spanish in their daily lives, it was a Spanish drenched in Nahuatl, and in their Spanish texts we can still not only detect the Nahuatl models but retrieve most of the same information, even about concepts, categories, and formulas, that we could from texts in Nahuatl.
It is clear that religion pervaded the life of indigenous people in the independence period, as it did before. Tracing religious practices in all manifestations in actions and thoughts is prevented by the limits of the documentary base, so the concentration is on certain aspects of which the documents themselves speak most. In this chapter two important facets of local religious life are discussed. A first and larger part deals with customs at death—above all masses or substitutes for them, and burial—while a second part analyzes the household saints cult. Although these two topics are far from being the entire religious realm of life, they are two very substantial blocks of it, and they can serve to illustrate a phenomenon seen wherever we look in the corpus for this study: that practices and structures from preceding times carried over overwhelmingly into the independence period, including the minute distinctions between neighboring settlements, but at the same time some reflections of the times emerge.

MASSES AND RESPONSORY PRAYERS

Against a background of continuation of the same practices as in previous generations, let us look first at a major shift that was occurring, representing the sharpest apparent deviation from previous times. At independence, in a reversal of earlier patterns, women, not men, were claiming the most elaborate rites. In eighteenth-century patterns of will-making in the Toluca Valley, men asked for more elaborate and expensive services than women. Independence-period wills changed decidedly in terms of who was making the majority of them. Many specific ritual traditions themselves continued in dynamic, living ways; but who participated in them changed along gender lines.
From the time testaments in the Christian/Spanish style were first made by Nahuas, they had two main purposes: to request and pay for a mass for the soul of the testator, and to bequeath his/her property to heirs. When there was no property, sometimes a testament was issued simply for the mass. In the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth century, a mass was still nearly universal; looking at the overall picture, only a few requested the cheaper responsory prayer, *responso*, instead of a mass, and a small fraction asked for no such service. In the communities covered by this study, some still had the virtually obligatory mass, but the best documented, San Bartolomé Tlatelolco, was using a two-level system in which the numbers of those requesting masses and those requesting only responsory prayers were almost equal.

**Women’s rites**

The predominance of women in respect to masses has two dimensions. In some localities it is merely the result of another important new factor in the independence corpus, that women’s testaments are much more numerous than men’s, so that the greater number of masses for women is simply a function of that, and the percentages for the genders have not changed. In our largest case study, however, we see women not only prevailing in absolute numbers of masses but in the proportion of them asking for masses as opposed to responsory prayers. Here the change is qualitative as well as quantitative.

Yancuictalpan is a case of the first kind describing women's majority in terms of requests.¹ There all 12 testators asked for a mass: 9 women, 3 men.

San Bartolomé presents a much more complex picture. Of the one hundred and fifteen testators overall, one was from outside the community; the gender breakdown for the remainder

---

¹ Two testaments from Totocuitlapilco represent inconclusive data, one mass each for a woman and a man.
is 73 women to 41 men. No less than 58 people, a majority, asked for the simplest rite: responsory prayers. Of these, 34 requests came from women and 24 from men. The other fifty-six testators in San Bartolomé chose the more elaborate masses. Within this group women outnumber men 39 to 17.

In the pueblo of Ocotitlan, of twenty-seven total wills, twenty-five people—17 women and 8 men—requested rites of some kind. Asking for responsory prayers were seven people, among whom 4 were women and 3 were men. Of the remaining eighteen who requested the more elaborate masses, 13 were women, 5 were men. Thus, in pueblos where both responsory prayers and masses were an option, a far greater number of women chose expensive masses than men.

In both San Bartolomé and Ocotitlan, then, a far higher percentage of women than men requested masses as opposed to responsory prayers. Further, it is significant that the only person in the whole corpus to request a high mass was female, Margarita Feliciana of San Bartolomé. Not only were women issuing more wills at independence, they also participated in more elaborate rites than men, overturning previous patterns. Over time women had come to be less prominent in Nahuatl wills in that once having taken part in large numbers as witnesses along with men, they had lost that function, and in fact they did not regain it in the corpus used here, but in the matter of death rites we see them not only retaining but expanding local custom. Overall more than twice as many women chose masses than men, implying that at this time women either had more resources than men or were more involved in the ritual life of the church, or both.

---

2 This count does not include sbt#67, which is included in Totocuitlapilco’s data.

3 Sbt#94.
Religious services of some kind for the testator remain almost universal in the corpus for this study. In San Bartolomé all the wills contain a request for a mass or responsory prayer except one in Spanish from 1824. All but two of 27 citizens in Ocotitlan requested the same services. Yancuictlalpan’s testators all asked for a low mass, as did the small sample of testators of Totocuitlapilco. Thus the connection between testaments and religious services was still strong as late as the 1820s. At some time, however, things changed. By 1933, a will in the personal family collection of municipal historian don Pedro Valdez Martínez of San Bartolomé no longer makes any mention of masses or other services, and mainly functions to document the legal categories and disposition of the land of the testator’s family. Was the tradition of using wills to request religious rites broken after the twentieth-century Revolution? Or had it happened earlier? The strong movement in the direction of responsory prayers instead of masses could have been a first step. We really need to follow local testaments through all the intervening decades, if they can be located.

Overall, customs in the area of study shifted from requesting mainly masses in the eighteenth century to more responsory prayers at independence, but this change exhibited strong subregional variation, and also responsory prayers seem to increase in epidemic periods, reinforcing the notion that they are above all an emergency measure or attempt to reduce expenditures. As we saw, in some communities, like Yancuictlalpan and Totocuitlapilco, everyone continued to request a low mass. Ocotitlan’s people too generally continued to favor low masses (18 masses, 7 responsos, 2 with no request), though with a significant shift to responsory prayers during the epidemic of 1813. People in San Bartolomé showed the strongest shift toward

---

4 Sbt#112.
requesting responsory prayers, even more pronounced during the epidemics of 1813 and 1823–
24. But to keep things in San Bartolomé in proportion, responsory prayers outnumbered masses
by only two requests, a nearly even split of 58 to 56. The masses include only one high mass;
clearly, at independence high masses, the most elaborate public rites, which once had been
frequent in some parts of the Toluca Valley, had became rare in the area of this study.5 When
Juliana Viviana of Yancuicatlalpan asked for an uncategorized mass “la misa Se me a de aplicar”
we learn from the priest calendaring her testament that by “la misa” she meant a low mass: a
misa rezada had become the normative request.6 It may well be, however, that the same was
already true in many places in the eighteenth century.

Equivalent rites

The language used for the rites appears to indicate a real or perceived recategorization of
services. Lázaro Martín requested “Vn rresponso Cantada” [sic, without gender agreement] in
1823, and Martina Bonifacia in 1824 requested a “responso grande.”7 In other words, it seems
that in a situation where fewer masses were being celebrated, responsory prayers were in some
cases being made more elaborate in compensation, taking on some aspects of the mass, as in a
“sung” or “high” responsory prayer. Without more information it is impossible to tell if and how
services were changing, but the language points to some type of hybridization of form. The most
likely reason is the need of the populace for cheaper equivalents of “greater” rites at a time of

5 That the high mass had ever been frequent in the area studied here is neither certain nor precluded. The
eighteenth-century wills available from San Bartolomé in the eighteenth century (TT nos. 22, 23, 24)
show respectively a mass with a vigil and two low masses. From Tocuitlapilco in that time (TT nos. 16,
37, 38) one testator had a high mass, one a low mass, and one a vigil plus some special arrangements but
not mentioning a mass, probably by mistake.
6 yan#9, 1823.
7 sbt#111, 1823; sbt#114, 1824.
economic and social crisis. It is possible, however, that the church’s ability to organize elaborate services may have been affected by the conditions of the times. The question arises as to whether church liturgy itself was changing to accommodate local needs at independence.

One thing that continued in a time of social upheaval was a variety of practice in different localities, which had already characterized the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth century if not before. At that time indigenous people in the immediate Toluca region were often requesting high masses, and never responsory prayers, while in the the Calimaya/Tepemaxalco region to the south, only masses with responsory prayers were spoken of. Three wills from San Antonio de Padua, a Calimaya tlaxilacalli, in that period, request responsory prayers only. But the eighteenth-century San Antonio de Padua data pool is too small to say that the practice was universal there, and responsory prayers appear nowhere else at that time as an important substitute for masses. Thus certainly the use of the responsory prayer has greatly increased, yet in both periods the ratio of masses to responsory prayers depended on the locality. In the corpus used for this study we continue to see a strong differentiation between neighboring pueblos.

“My priest”

The frequency of other customs also varied with the entity. In the late colonial period, testators in San Lucas Tepemaxalco (a Tepemaxalco tlaxilacalli) and in San Bartolomé Tlatelolco stood out in mentioning their priests as performers of the mass, whereas other communities did not. At independence San Bartolomé’s community continued to stand out in this respect. Using the reverential noteopixcatzin, “my priest,” or the augmented notlaçoteo-

\[8\] TT, pp. 14–15.
\[9\] TT, p. 15 n2, with one exception in San Lucas.
"pixcatzin, “my precious priest,” San Bartolomé testaments universally made a specific statement that a priest was to carry out the service. Only after 1824 did four people in San Bartolomé neglect to mention “my priest.” As often happens, without more background one cannot be sure whether this implies something substantive, such as a reorganization of the hierarchy, or a change in the community’s relationship to the priest, or simply an evolution in local testamentary conventions.

Part of the San Bartolomé formula was to request the priest to “favor” the testator with the service whether mass or responsory prayer. The wording seems to imply respect and affection on the part of both the priest and the testator. Yet it may have been a formula originating elsewhere that came to be adopted as part of the local conventions.

The specific words testators in San Bartolomé used for their priest varied over time. Noteopixcatzin was favored over notlaçoteopixcatzin in a ratio of 52 to 42 in wills written in Nahuatl, but in the late part of the period the preference shifted to the more formal notlaçoteopixcatzin. The most likely explanation is a late local adoption of the general eighteenth-century use of tlaço- more and more with ecclesiastical things, which happened particularly in connection with the tendency of the main notary of San Bartolomé, Cipriano Gordiano, to use more pretentious terminology of all kinds in the later part of his career, as will be explained.

---

10 Sbt#114, 1824; sbt#115, 1824; sbt#116, 1824; sbt#119, 1832.
11 In San Bartolomé the verb tlaocolia always appears in an unusual form with the a of the root omitted; for example see sbt#76, “notlasuteupiCatzi nehmotloConlis se Respusu.”
12 In the eighteenth-century wills from San Lucas Evangelista in which the priest is mentioned in connection with the mass, he “helps” (using palehuia) rather than “favors” the testator. In both situations the phrase is unvarying.
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elsewhere. Thus the unexpected trend toward more formality may not represent a changing relationship to the priest.

Typical phrasings in wills in Spanish include “y mi santo padre se me aplicaran huna Misa Resada,” or “Y mi padresito bicario me [ha left out] de dar una misa ReSada or “mi saserdote me a de désir una misa rresada.” Testaments in Spanish generally use the word padre, but also sacerdote, vicario, and padre coadjutor. The last two probably reflect the specific position held by the priest involved.

A careful look at the Spanish passages quoted just above brings to the fore the Nahuatl influence on usages and spelling, partly a reflection of the fact that the notaries were more familiar with Nahuatl, partly the result of direct modeling on local Nahuatl testament conventions. “Mi santo padre” appears to be an attempt to reproduce notlasoteopixcatzin, “my precious priest,” although in normal Spanish the phrase specifically means the pope. The phrase “se me aplicaran” is incorrect in standard Spanish; it should be either se me aplicará or me aplicarán; the writer was probably uncertain between the two, and also Nahua writers of Spanish of this time were extremely weak in their use of se. Further, note the use of the Spanish diminutive in “mi padresito.” Here -cito acts as a substitute for the Nahuatl -tzin reverential in noteopixcatzin “my priest.” The diminutive was actually used widely in the Spanish of Nahua towns in a reverential sense, and it is still in evidence in that sense in much provincial Mexican Spanish. Clearly, then, these Spanish-language documents were done against a Nahuatl

13 Respectively sbt#62, 1813; sbt#71, 1817; sbt#110, 1823.
14 Nahua writing Spanish were also prone simply to add an n as they so often did in Nahuatl, and that could have played a role here.
background to which they still belonged and without which they cannot be understood. Both the Spanish and the Nahuatl testaments belong to a single local culture.

Unlike the San Bartolomé model, testaments in Yancuictlalpan did not refer directly to the priest in requests for masses. They commonly preferred a phrasing like “a low mass is to be said for me,” without mention of a priest. The use of the Nahuatl verb *tlao cola*, “to favor with,” which in San Bartolomé connected the request for a mass with the priest, in Yancuictlalpan refers to the selection of a burial place. “They will favor me with a place in the courtyard” is common phrasing in Yancuictlalpan, with the subject of the verb left in the indefinite plural, virtually equivalent to the passive. “They” could include the executors and relatives, church staff (from priest to sacristan and grave diggers), or in a stretch, a cofradía. This wording is so pervasive that it is lacking in only two of the Nahuatl wills of Yancuictlalpan. As so often, we cannot say for sure whether services were provided in a different way in the two communities, with differing personal and institutional relationships, or whether in each case a traditional local wording is being carefully preserved.

Ocotitlan, like Yancuictlalpan, belongs to the majority group of Toluca Valley communities not mentioning the priest when requesting masses. It appears that the same is probably true of Totocuitlapilco. One will with a testator from Totocuitlapilco does mention the priest, asking him to favor her with a low mass, but this document apparently was actually made in San Bartolomé and simply follows San Bartolomé’s normal local phrasing. Earlier examples from

15 Yan#8 and yan #12.

16 The evidence that this testament was not actually made in Totocuitlapilco is strong. Though it is generally in San Bartolomé’s style, it is the only exception to San Bartolomé’s universal use of *nican*, “here,” with *tichaneque*, “we are citizens/residents/natives”; that is, the notary avoids the word “here” in reference to the affiliation of the testator from Totocuitlapilco. While in San Bartolomé, all wills claim
Totocuitlapilco lack mention of the priest.\textsuperscript{17} In Ocotitlan the custom is clear: a priest was not mentioned as the person to which they entrusted their requests for masses.

Another difference between San Bartolomé on the one hand and Ocotitlan and Yancuitlalpan on the other is that only the latter two give definite time frames for the celebration of the masses requested. Every person who made a will in Yancuitlalpan, with only one exception, specified a time limit for the mass. Most said within one month; a few said within two months. In Ocotitlan, people were even more specific in their allotment of time, and chose varied time frames. On Ana María’s testament a notation was made: “se aplicó misa resada dec 22 ’01 [or ’02, the writing is unclear].\textsuperscript{18} In that pueblo, most people gave a time limit of 20 days; a few fifteen days; a few one month; and two specified two months as an acceptable period within which to fulfill their request for a mass or responsory prayer.

This sort of stipulation was a definite and probably long-established feature of the tradition of Yancuitlalpan and Ocotitlan, and something not often seen in Toluca Valley texts of earlier times, though it is known outside the Valley. What meaning can we attribute to it? It would appear to have originated as an attempt to assure prompt performance of the rites. Was it feared that the clergy would not do their duty even after having been paid? Such complaints had indeed arisen in Mexico City in earlier times.\textsuperscript{19} But from many annotations on eighteenth-

testators are “citizens here in San Bartolomé,” the testator from Totocuitlapilco does not claim to be “here” in the Totocuitlapilco with which the testator and spouse claim affiliation, apparently because the will was issued in San Bartolomé. In fact, the document was found grouped along with San Bartolome’s wills and calendared with them. (Further arguments for a San Bartolome origin of the will are in the chapter “The Culture of Writing.”)

\textsuperscript{17} TT, nos. 16 (1652), 37 (1732), 38 (1737).

\textsuperscript{18} Oco#1.

\textsuperscript{19} For example in Chimalpahin, \textit{Annals of His Time}, p. 197.
century Valley testaments, it appears that masses were said promptly on payment; it was the *payment* that was often delayed for months or years after the testator’s death. No complaints about the performance of priests surface in the independence documents, but testaments were not the right venue for such complaint in any case. Again we cannot be sure that the time limits tell us anything about the relations between community and priest. What we know for sure is that they existed in some communities and not in others.

**Time**

A fascinating aspect of this temporal caveat is that it reveals local concepts of time-counting. In Ocotitlan at independence the most common time frame noted was twenty days, an apparent vestige of precontact systems.\(^{20}\) In the vigesimal system, 20 was of course a crucial number, and it appeared in many aspects of the calendar, especially in the twenty-day “month.” Particularly striking is that 20-day time frames were used in most of the Spanish language wills in the community too.\(^{21}\) Feliciiana Petrona’s phrasing is "Se de me dira huna miSa Rresada dentro de veinte dias." This feature of Ocotitlan wills implies a survival of preconquest mathematical/temporal cycles over centuries during which the dominant calendrical reckoning had become fully Spanish/Christian.

Yet Spanish concepts are not absent in the day counts. In Alejandro Marcos’s will issued in San Bartolomé, 1824, he asked for a responsory prayer to be said in 15 days, “p.\(^{a}\) el SuFragio de mi alma Sera un rEsponso dentro de quince dias.”\(^{22}\) This pattern also turns up in Ocotitlan, in

\(^{20}\) Oco#1, #2, #3, #5, #8, #11, #22, #24, and #26 all have 20-day deadlines.

\(^{21}\) All the wills in the previous note except oco#1 and #22 are in Spanish.

\(^{22}\) Sbt#116.
the testaments of three women. To this day, in Spanish-speaking countries you say ocho días, “8 days,” for a week, and quince días, “15 days,” for two weeks or a fortnight, because the present day is counted as well as the same day at the other end, this Monday as well as next. Thus, the use of “quince días” clearly shows Spanish influence, and stands alongside the use of indigenous vigesimal 20-day term in Spanish-language wills, much as in the distant precontact time when calendars with different base numbers were used concurrently in central Mexico. Indeed, the concurrent use of a local indigenous ritual/agricultural calendar at independence for broader purposes cannot be completely ruled out, even though we have no specific evidence of it in our locality.

No rites, or rites in exchange

Scattered through the record are some cases in which no service is requested. One person in San Bartolomé, despite leaving two pieces of land to heirs, made no request for a mass or a

---

23 Oco#4, #7, #9. Santiago Cristóbal was the notary who used the 15-day time frame in Ocotlan, spelling fifteen as either “quinse” or “quince.”

24 It is possible that there may be some correlation between services requested and cofradías, but the question is so muddy that I put the data forth tentatively and not in the main text. In the San Bartolomé corpus, it is normal for testators to say they are in the hands of Santa María de la Asunción (a large majority) or of La Limpia Concepción. Nowhere in the Nahuatl testaments is any connection with a cofradía mentioned. A Spanish text, however, states: "Soy Confradia [sic, for cofrade] de Mi madre Santisima Lipian comsepcion" in exactly the same place where the mention of the Virgin appears in the Nahuatl formula, adjacent to the request for bells to be rung (sbt#118). This confirms that the saints typically mentioned at this juncture relate to cofradías. A large question remaining is whether there are two cofradías or one. One can read the corpus as showing that whether Asunción or Concepción appears depends solely on what notary is doing the writing; any given notary will consistently mention one or the other through his texts, with rare exceptions. Though Asunción and Concepción are different advocations, they are both forms of Mary. Also, some cofradías had two advocations jointly. In the light of these uncertainties, one can still look to see if the rites requested vary depending on which of the two is mentioned. Of the testators who said they were in the hands of La Limpia Concepción, 13 asked for masses, 8 for responsory prayers. Those who said they were in the hands of Santa María de la Asunción were more evenly divided between masses and responsory prayers, with a small majority for responsos over time; 40 masses, 44 responsory prayers. The conclusion that somewhat greater resources may be associated with La Limpia Concepción cannot be drawn with any certainty.
responsory prayer, asking only for the bells to be rung and a gravesite at the entrance to the cemetery.\textsuperscript{25} Of the two people in Ocotitlan who failed to ask for a mass, Juan José left a piece of land, gave the usual half a real an for Jerusalem, and asked for burial in the patio of the church cemetery.\textsuperscript{26} Rafael Antonio had no property, but confirmed he had previously sold a lot and a piece of land for over 22 pesos; he made the usual offering to Jerusalem and requested burial in the cemetery.\textsuperscript{27} Two of these testators had some property; the third may have been in economic straits, having sold off all his land; yet the money amounts were fairly substantial. Thus no clear connection emerges between poverty and lack of services.

We cannot overlook the possibility that the lack of a service in these cases was a mere notarial oversight. Juan José’s will is surely written with little care; for example, it repeats in its entirety the entry with an offering for Jerusalem. Some Toluca Valley cases from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are known in which no mass was requested and the testator received one anyway.\textsuperscript{28} In addition, some settlements in the Valley had the convention of never mentioning the mass at all,\textsuperscript{29} which could have influenced some of these patterns. In the eighteenth century it did happen that some people didn’t request a mass and would directly or indirectly give their poverty as the reason,\textsuperscript{30} such situations do not appear in the record at independence.

\textsuperscript{25} Isidra Estefanía, sbt#112, 1824.
\textsuperscript{26} Oco#13, 1813.
\textsuperscript{27} Oco#21, 1813.
\textsuperscript{28} TT no. 1, 1671.
\textsuperscript{29} Caterina Pizzigoni, personal communication. The data will be given in her forthcoming \textit{The Life Within}.
\textsuperscript{30} TT, p. 14.
Even though it had been common throughout central Mexico in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries (Stage 2), after that land in the Toluca Valley was rarely sold specifically to cover the cost of masses.\(^{31}\) Clear documented examples of land sold to pay for burial and mass are virtually lacking.\(^{32}\) At independence, the practice remained rare. In the two instances where land is ordered sold to cover burial costs, a mass is not mentioned, but perhaps implied. In 1813 Juana Anastasia of Ocotitlan ordered that a piece of land of 2 reales\(^{33}\) be sold to pay for her shroud and burial.\(^{34}\) In 1823 don Miguel Aparicio of San Bartolomé ordered that his mother’s home be sold “for me to be buried with,” not specifically mentioning the mass he had requested.\(^{35}\) Thus although the sale of land and material goods to pay for masses declined greatly, the practice never died out entirely in cases of necessity.

Relatives were often named to organize and see to the payment for masses, just as in the eighteenth century.\(^{36}\) This duty might be left to the executor alone, but if someone besides the executor was asked to follow up, it was a family member (child, spouse, or others) who typically took care of these logistic details and in many cases was apparently expected to supply the money. María Antonia of Ocotitlan in 1814 asked two sons to pay for her mass “en esta Parroquia De metepeque” and to split the costs.\(^{37}\) In 1822 Gerónima Antonia asked two nephews

\(^{31}\) TT, p. 15.
\(^{32}\) The only one that seems to qualify is in TT, no. 74, 1652, in Totocuitlapilco, but this date is at the borderline of Stages 2 and 3.
\(^{33}\) The terminology of land measurement and evaluation will be discussed elsewhere.
\(^{34}\) Oco#14.
\(^{35}\) Sbt#91.
\(^{36}\) See TT, p.15, for the earlier pattern.
\(^{37}\) Oco#23.
to bury her and pay for her mass.\textsuperscript{38} Concepciona María asked her brother “to provide what will be needed in the way of expenses for the burial and my shroud, and he is to pay for my responsory prayer.”\textsuperscript{39} Carmen de la Cruz in 1832 asked his wife to pay for his burial and mass.\textsuperscript{40} Note that in all these cases specific instructions about payment were included. Thus at independence relatives were still being told to pay for the mass, in what amounts to a continuation of the pattern identified for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

\section*{BURIAL TRADITIONS}

Like public masses, traditions specifically related to burying the dead in the indigenous pueblos studied at independence show continuity with past practice, local diversity, and sometimes considerable growth or innovation.

\section*{Churchyard}

It appears that by the time studied there had been a shift, in that the great majority of burials were in the churchyard, whereas for the eighteenth century there is evidence that the majority were inside the church.\textsuperscript{41} It is not that burial in the churchyard was entirely new, for cases can be found as far back as the records go. We must also consider the fact of varying local customs. Some earlier examples are available for two of the communities figuring here, and they can be instructive. Of three cases in San Bartolomé, two, dated 1715 and 1731, involve burial

\textsuperscript{38} Sbt#88.
\textsuperscript{39} Sbt#99, 1823.
\textsuperscript{40} Sbt#119.
\textsuperscript{41} TT, p. 16. In the corpus used there, burial inside the church greatly outweighs burial outside for cases where the site is specified. Since many wills do not specify the site, some uncertainty remains.
outside; one of 1737 calls for burial inside the church near a saint.\textsuperscript{42} Although overall one can say that wealthier people tended to be buried in the church, less wealthy people outside, here the two who were buried outside owned far more than the one buried in the church. Some evidence is also available for Totocuitlapilco, though not as unequivocal. Of three earlier examples from there, one seems to be outside, with the other two not specific enough for certainty.\textsuperscript{43}

At independence this earlier trend toward burial outside the church becomes the norm, and in some pueblos, nearly universal. The main exceptions to outside burials appear in San Bartolomé, and even there only eight people out of the total corpus of 115 asked to be buried near specific saints (which entails being buried inside the church).\textsuperscript{44} Preferences within that group are restricted to two saints and evenly divided, with four choosing San Bartolomé and four choosing San José. (San Bartolomé was, of course, the patron saint of the community, and there was a cofradía of San José.) An important aspect of these indoor burials is that they are clustered around the 1813 epidemic and then nearly disappear, with only one documented after 1814; in 1820 Sebastián Isidoro asked to be buried facing San Bartolomé.

The word “cemetery” was introduced only late in the independence period, and only in Spanish testaments, not the ones written in Nahuatl. Of the 21 Spanish wills, only four use the word “cemetery.” The first is in 1817, and then the word appears three more times in 1824 to

\textsuperscript{42} TT, nos. 22, 23, 24.
\textsuperscript{43} TT, no. 16, 1652, calls for burial “ynahuac Sata yclesia,” “close to, near, or next to the holy church,” which should be outside. Nos. 37, 1732, and 38, 1737, call for burial “ompa huei theopa,” “at the big church,” a wording which could apply to either inside or outside.
\textsuperscript{44} Eight indoor burials in San Bartolomé can be found in sbt#30, sbt#48, sbt#50, sbt#58, sbt#60, sbt#62, sbt#66, sbt#79. An additional testament, by Laureano Rafael in 1810 (sbt#13), says that “my grave is to be at the church (nosepultora Yez teopa),” near his grandmother. Since teopan can be either inside or outside, and we do not know where the grandmother was buried, this example is inconclusive.
designate the cemetery portal and the cemetery proper in the phrase “dentro del sementerio.” The term patio, “churchyard,” was not used in this pueblo. The late introduction of “cemetery” into the Spanish is perhaps due to external factors such as the Campos Santos ordinances; however, nearly all burials took place outdoors even before the term gained currency. At no point does the Spanish loanword for cemetery get mentioned in the Nahuatl; one’s sense is that the shift comes from internal forces—by the time of the 1820 Campos Santos reforms, which restrict indoor burials in response to growing awareness of disease transmission, the outdoor tradition had already been long established.

The Totocuitlapilco evidence tells us little. In 1826 Petrona Angelina asked, in Spanish, to be buried “dentro del patio de Sf Sr migeel,” which may be considered an outdoor churchyard dedicated to Saint Michael. It is possible, however, that an interior area is indicated. In any case, with only one example, we can draw no conclusions.

Burial outdoors was nearly universal in Ocotitlan. In the one exception, Ana María asked to be buried indoors, "dentro de la yglecia." In the remaining Spanish testaments, all except one use the Spanish word for cemetery. Various spellings of sementerio appear, and the word is often paired with patio, though it is used alone twelve times. Paired with patio eleven times, it

---

45 See sbt#70 and sbt#72 for the testaments from 1817. For 1824, see sbt#112, sbt#115, and sbt#116 is quoted.
46 Toto#1.
47 In sbt#67 of 1815, the testator is from Totocuitlapilco, but it is shown in another chapter that the document was written in San Bartolomé using the traditions of that pueblo, and the testator may have been living there. In any case, the location specified is very obscure, and I will not go into it at this point.
48 Oco#2, 1805.
49 Oco#22, 1813, asks for a grave on one side of the Holy Cross and does not mention the cemetery. Being in Nahuatl, it would probably have said teopan ithualco, the churchyard, in any case, but that too is missing. We are left unsure of the intention, for a cross was usually prominent in the churchyard, yet a crucifix or Christ on the cross inside the church might be meant.
appears in the odd construction “patio del sementerio.” Two Nahuatl wills of Ocotitlan use teopan ithualco, "churchyard." It is of note that the Nahuatl testimonies do not use the Spanish loanword for cemetery despite the word’s near universality in Spanish, appearing as early as 1809.

In Yancuictlalpan, an outdoor churchyard burial also became nearly universal. In Yancuictlalpan 10 of the total 12 testators unequivocally asked to be buried in the churchyard, generally using the Nahuatl phrase teopan ythualco. One will, made by Nicolasa Bábara in 1820, asks for a place at the church, and though not conclusive, may also be outdoors. In the testament of Francisca Antonia, the only one to use the Spanish loanword for cemetery, it does not replace the Nahuatl word for churchyard but rather the terms are used together, as if the meanings were not exactly synonymous. She put it in visual terms, saying “in the church courtyard, facing the church courtyard inside the cemetery,” “ompa teopa ythualco yxpan tiopan ythualco ytiqui Siminterio.” Only one will fails to mention the burial place, and that may have been notarial oversight. Therefore, except for two dubious cases, Yancuictlalpan's testators all asked for burial outdoors.

50 Oco#4, oco#5, oco#7, oco#8, oco#9 oco#10, oco#14, oco#19, oco#21, oco#24, oco#25, and oco#27 use cemetery as a loanword alone, not paired. Oco#3, oco#11, oco#12, oco#13, oco#15, oco#16, oco#17, oco#18, oco#20, oco#23, oco#26 used a paired “patio del sementerio” construction. The phrase makes one think of the common teopan ithualco, “(in the) church patio (courtyard),” but as we see the words do not match.
51 See oco#1 and oco#6 for Nahuatl phrasing in Ocotitlan.
52 As in yan#4.
53 Yan#6 says, "they are to favor me with [a place] at the church (teopan).”
54 See yan#12.
55 Yan#10.
Trees

In San Bartolomé, the most striking thing about burial practices is not that people were buried outside, but the specifics about where outside. The most common request, to be buried “by the copal trees,” involved a custom peculiar to San Bartolomé which had originated at least a century earlier. Early in the eighteenth century, a cluster of testaments has a father and son asking to be buried at the same site near a copal tree (copalquahuît). Copal was a preconquest incense, and not only the resin but also the tree had strong religious significance, which it continues to have to this day in provincial communities.

Not only did this eighteenth-century affinity with trees continue in the independence, it had expanded. So many people in San Bartolomé asked for burial near the copal trees that there must have been a grove of them, and they began naming other trees as well in their requests. Each request specified burial near a certain kind of tree and sometimes described the particular tree. There were 17 requests for copal, the most favored tree. However, the cypress (tlatzcan), date palm (icçotl) and pepper (pirul) received 12, 5, and 2 requests respectively. The reference to specific species of trees paints a carefully defined landscape, where different species of trees corresponded to unique places on the church grounds; clearly not an undefined wooded area.

Across the years of the independence period, the nature of the requests evolved. The copal tree begins to lose its previous predominance, and the cypress (which was also a tree with metaphorical political and religious associations in precontact times) replaces it as the favored tree around 1823. The pepper tree came in late; it is not found in the record until after

56 TT, nos. 22 (Ambrosio Lorenzo, 1715) and 23 (Gregorio Juan, 1731).
independence.\textsuperscript{57} It was apparently introduced from South America. The date palm remained a minority choice throughout the period studied. (See Table 3.1.) The change to different species may point to a shift in environmental factors, like a diminishing water table, necessitating the planting of new types of trees.\textsuperscript{58} The municipal historian of San Bartolomé, don Pedro Valdez Martínez, emphatically declared that no copal trees ever grew there.\textsuperscript{59} The implication of the disappearance of the copal trees from the church grounds, and from local memory, is that that the trees were probably lost later in the nineteenth century. During the period studied, however, it is quite possible that the ground close to the copal trees filled up and it was necessary to find new burial places.

It remains unclear how many trees of each species existed; Nahuatl does not mark the plural of inanimate nouns. However, if 17 people requested to be buried near the copals, and we know that there had been such requests for at least a hundred years, it would follow that there was more than one tree. With cypresses, people specifically described them as large and small. In 1811 two people described their grave as near a large and a small cypress respectively.\textsuperscript{60} And in 1822 and 1823 three different people described their resting places as either near a small cypress or a big one.\textsuperscript{61} The implication is that the copal trees were well established (without mention of

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{57} This tree is mentioned exclusively in late Spanish testaments, spelled “piru” or “pirun” (sbt\#108 and #114, both dated 1824).
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{58} A paper at a 2010 Environmental History Conference in Portland affirmed that some traditional trees of Mexico City had died out because of increasing aridity.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{59} Personal interviews with don Pedro Valdez Martínez, summer 2008, in San Bartolomé.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{60} Sbt\#15, #20.
\footnotesize\textsuperscript{61} Sbt\#85, #93, #103.
small ones), and the cypresses were added later, either mixed intergenerational stands or separate areas of older and newer plantings.

### Table 3.1

San Bartolomé: Burial Naming Trees grouped by chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Copal</th>
<th>Date Palm</th>
<th>Cypress</th>
<th>Pepper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1799-1812</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813-1814</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815-1822</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823-1824</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to trees, landmarks for burial sites in San Bartolomé include the cross in the churchyard, sometimes called the Calvario, and a tower. It is notable that requests for burial near them fall off to almost nothing about halfway through the period studied. In all likelihood the ground near them was full.

**Cardinal directions and family**

Another way of indicating grave location in San Bartolomé was to say that it was in the direction of two important settlements of the Valley, Toluca and Calimaya. At first this was a puzzle to me, but once I had visited the church grounds, it became clear that Toluca represented
the north side, Calimaya the south side. This is in line with the longstanding Nahuatl habit of using set traditional expressions for the solar directions, east and west, and ad hoc expressions for north and south. Of the 115 wills in the San Bartolomé collection, 47 people specified the location of the grave in this way. At the beginning of the period the north greatly predominates, but by 1813 the south gains favor, taking over the majority position for the rest of the time recorded. The exact reason remains a mystery, but it may be as simple as shifting to an area where there was more room for burial.

The specification of toward Toluca or toward Calimaya is sometimes accompanied by indications of upper and lower. The grounds of San Bartolomé’s church slope downward from west to east. When Juana Ignacia is to be buried “in the direction of Toluca, in the lower part,” it follows that she means in the northeast quadrant of the churchyard.62

Many people of San Bartolomé requested burial near a family member, above all one spouse next to the other spouse who was already deceased, but also sometimes near parents and even deceased children. Those buried near parents appear to be mainly persons whose spouse had not yet died. Usually it is near the testator’s own father and mother, but in a case or two a man is buried next to his parents-in-law, anticipating his wife’s burial there later. In such cases the man had probably moved in with his wife’s family at the beginning of the marriage. Burials next to family were by no means new in San Bartolomé and in the Valley generally (see an example in San Bartolomé from the early eighteenth century where a son asks to be buried close

62 Sbt#106.
to his father, under a copal tree), but mention of them increases considerably over the period studied.  

The terms for churchyard and cemetery do not appear in San Bartolomé except in a few Spanish wills. The reason would appear to be that with such a large space and so many burials the more general designation was not useful, something much more specific being required. The word “cemetery” is first introduced in 1817 in a Spanish will. The separation of the grounds into a zone especially for burial, and another not open for it appears to be a new concept, though burial outside was not.

Yancuictlalpan and Ocotitlan are like San Bartolomé in burying people outside the church, but in contrast with San Bartolomé, they constantly refer to the churchyard. Having fewer burials and probably a much smaller space, they do not need such elaborate descriptions of location. In the Nahuatl testaments of both entities the term is the usual teopan ithualco. In all, for Ocotitlan, 26 of 27 people mention the churchyard, with the expression “patio del sementerio” appearing in Spanish as early as 1809. In Yancuictlalpan the churchyard was universally mentioned from the beginning, with the Spanish concept of cemetery appearing in the national period. The phrase “sepultar dentro del seminterio” used in a Spanish will of 1823, and “teopa ythualco yxpan tiopan ythualco ytiqui Siminterio” in a Nahuatl will of 1825 implies

---

63 See TT#23 Gregorio Juan, of San Bartolomé Tlatelolco (1731) for the testament of son who asks to be buried near his father.

I have only recently become aware of the complexities of chronological change across the period relating to these matters, including a possible relation to epidemic years, and I am currently carrying out more detailed research on the topic, which is integrated into chapter 5.

64 Sbt#70, #72, and #112 use cemetery; sbt#115 and #116 use churchyard.
that by this time a separate part of the general church courtyard was designated a cemetery in Yancuictlalpan.65

**Shroud**

A shroud or cloth to cover the body for burial had been used by indigenous people even before European contact and was universal in Christian burials in New Spain. It was not always mentioned in testaments, however. It could vary from a length of plain cloth to ordinary clothing to the habit of one of the Spanish religious orders as the most prestigious and expensive alternative. Practices evolved over time and varied with each region and community.

In the Toluca Valley in general through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries things tended to become more elaborate. Some seventeenth-century wills, in a tradition of humility, specify only a cloth or “rags” (tzotzomatli). By the eighteenth century that style is no longer seen. Wealthier testators requested (and paid for) a habit to be buried in, usually Franciscan. That was common only in a few of the larger settlements, however, and was hardly seen in outlying tlaxilacalli. Frequently no more detailed information was given; it was only said that the shroud or means of acquiring one already existed. Often the wording retained a flavor of humility, saying that God would provide the shroud, meaning that whatever relatives and executors came up with would be acceptable. Some communities ordinarily left the shroud entirely unmentioned. In earlier texts shrouds are often described using some form of the Nahuatl word quimiloa, “to wrap,” but as time went on the Spanish loanword mortaja became standard.66

65 Yan#9, # 12.

66 A large majority of testators used the word based on quimiloa "to wrap" in the eighteenth century Toluca corpus. For example, see Juan de los Santos' testament from San Juan Bautista (1756) with the phrasing moquimilos yn notlalo nozoquito, "my early body is to be shrouded." TT#33.
Mention of the shroud continues to vary by community at independence in the settlements studied here. In Ocotitlan and Yancuictlalpan the shroud is universally mentioned, with only one exception. Despite the fact that the Ocotitlan testaments are mainly in Spanish and those of Yancuictlalpan mainly in Nahuatl, both have the same minimal style, saying that God will provide the shroud. In the Nahuatl texts the earlier words related to quimiloa continue to be used. In our largest sample, San Bartolomé, the shroud remains entirely unmentioned, across the entire time covered, regardless of the notary doing the writing and regardless of whether the document is in Nahuatl or Spanish, with a single exception.67

In only one case in the corpus, in the small sample from Totocuitalpilco, does the more luxurious choice of being buried in a religious habit appear, and it is still Franciscan. An 1826 testament in Spanish mentions “mi murtaja y habito De San fraЄO.” (The Franciscan rope belt that was often included fails to be specified, but it may be understood.) In view of the fact that the communities studied are all outlying tlaxilacalli and not major centers, the rarity of habits as shrouds would have been expected in the eighteenth century too.

Bells

Tolling the church bells for the dead was a well established practice among indigenous people in central Mexico as early as the sixteenth century, but it is recorded only spottily. One would have thought the practice universal, but in fact from an early time bell ringing is mentioned in certain settlements and not in others, in both the Valley of Mexico and the Toluca

67 Sbt#115, the one exception, turns out to be by a notary of Ocotitlan and probably refers to Ocotitlan.
Valley.\textsuperscript{68} Through the eighteenth century bell ringing was standardly recorded in testaments in the surroundings of the city of Toluca, in Atengo, and a few other places, but not in most of the Valley. One of the places with bell ringing was San Bartolomé, which in the early eighteenth century showed certain affinities with the Toluca area, though it is closer to Metepec and ended up in the Metepec orbit. The three eighteenth-century testaments from San Bartolomé all mention ringing the bells. Although near the city of Toluca the word for bell tended to be the old \textit{miccatepoztli} (“dead-person iron”) or just \textit{tepoztli}, in San Bartolomé only the loanword \textit{campana} was used.\textsuperscript{69} Turning to San Bartolomé in the independence period, we find everything still the same, both the bell ringing and the words for it. Of San Bartolomé’s 115 testators, only 7 failed to ask for bells to ring for them,\textsuperscript{70} and in the testaments in Nahuatl the word \textit{campana} is always used. Written records thus show us a great deal about the retention of local custom, but there must have been even more. The municipal historian of San Bartolomé retains a civic memory of the gendered nature of the sound of bells, with different patterns of rings announcing the death of a woman and a man, and so it likely was in the time studied here.\textsuperscript{71}

\textsuperscript{68} It is still not entirely certain whether some communities actually did not toll bells for the dead, or whether they merely lacked the convention of recording it, or perhaps it was a gratuitous service not calling for recording.

\textsuperscript{69} TT nos. 22, 1715; 23, 1731; 1724, 1737, and passim (maybe get some more specific pp.)

\textsuperscript{70} The testators involved do not seem to have lacked the means to pay whatever the usual fee was. All except one of the wills (sbt#60) were issued from 1823 to 1832. All except one (#103) was in Spanish. (The others were #111, #114, #115, #116, #119.) It is possible that things were changing in the last part of the years studied, or that testaments in Spanish were taking a different turn, but the small numbers compared to the large San Bartolomé corpus prevent any firm conclusions.

\textsuperscript{71} Personal interviews with don Pedro Valdez Martínez, summer 2008, in San Bartolomé. See the section “San Bartolomé” in the Introduction.
In earlier Totocuitlapilco the bells were rung as well, and also using *campana*. The single sample available from Totocuitlapilco at independence shows the tradition continuing; the 1826 Spanish testament of Petrona Angelina has bells in the classic manner.

In the records of our other two communities at independence, Ocotitlan and Yancuic-talpan, with mainly Spanish and mainly Nahuatl texts respectively, bells are never mentioned at all. Comparable records from the eighteenth century or earlier are not available, but it is reasonable to assume that bell ringing also went unmentioned in those places in earlier times.

Although it was not exactly a funeral custom, an offering to the Jerusalem fund, ostensibly to contribute to the Christian mission in Islamic lands but likely ending up in the coffers of the church in New Spain, was a feature of many testaments in central Mexico, starting sometime in the late seventeenth century. It appeared in the Toluca Valley in the 1690s and was standard in many places by 1700. The church seems to have considered the offering obligatory, yet it is entirely unrecorded in many Valley pueblos. The amount offered also varied; in most places it was half a real, but in the large and important double altepetl of Calimaya/Tepemaxalco the amount was a full real, twice the usual.

72 TT nos. 16, 1652; 37, 1732; 38, 1737. Note that the tradition was already established in 1652. The 1652 testament is also the only one from the area studied here that specifies the charge for bell ringing; half a real is offered for the purpose.

73 Toto#1. Sbt#67, though concerning a person from Totocuitlapilco, was done in San Bartolomé using the conventions of that pueblo.

74 TT, p. 17 and passim.
In the independence-period corpus of our largest sample, San Bartolomé, the Jerusalem offering is almost entirely lacking. This represents a further development from the early eighteenth century. Of three testaments of that time available from San Bartolomé, two (dated 1731 and 1737) indeed omit mention of Jerusalem; the third (dated 1715) mentions the offering, though not specifying the amount. We could say that San Bartolomé earlier showed a tendency to ignore Jerusalem; by independence (and we cannot know how much before), that tendency had reached its culmination.

Three earlier testaments are available from Totocuitlapilco. One, dated 1652, lacks Jerusalem, but the document is decades too early for it to be expected; two, dated 1732 and 1737, contain the Jerusalem offering, while not mentioning the amount. But Jerusalem is missing in the one Totocuitlapilco will known from the independence period. The smallness of the independence sample precludes more definite conclusions.

In Yancuictlalpan and Ocotitlan, on the other hand, all the testaments include the Jerusalem offering. The amount is the half real that had been general over the whole Valley in the eighteenth century.

Thus wherever we look in funeral practices, from masses to burial to bell ringing and incidental offerings, in the independence period each community continues to evolve on its own,

75 The only exceptions are two wills in Spanish from 1824, sbt#115 and #116. The documents depart from the San Bartolomé norm in some ways and in such a large corpus one cannot say with certainty that they represent any trend. The amount of the offering is the usual half a real.
76 TT nos. 22, 23, 24.
77 TT nos. 16, 37, 38.
78 Spanish testament of Petrona Angelina, 1826.
79 A single testament in Ocotitlan, oco#5, though having the offering, fails to specify the amount.
on the basis of its own traditions, leading to a rich variety across the area studied. Often San Bartolomé stands apart from Yancuictlalpan and Ocotitlan, while the latter share many tendencies; but even those two settlements have their own special characteristics.

**HOUSEHOLD SAINTS**

The household saints cult came into its own in the Toluca Valley in the late seventeenth century. In the eighteenth century it was as firmly established as if it had always been there. Everyone who could at all afford it had a saint at home, and the wealthy had whole collections of them. The saints symbolized the household, were its patrons and senior residents. The most usual way to express one’s residence in a home was to speak of serving the saints there. The standard vocabulary for a home was “house, lot, and saints.” The principal heir would receive the house or most of it, the lot or most of it, and at least the lead saint of the collection, while when possible other heirs also received a saint and some land along with a house site to begin founding a new home. The household head and her or his heirs also usually owned lands for cultivation not directly part of the home complex, outlying land, and some of this land was conventionally dedicated not only to heirs who received them, but to the support of the saints, especially to keeping flowers, incense, and candles at the altar in the main residential building where they were to be found.80

Thus the saints were crucial and standard in indigenous homes across the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth century. Was the same still true in the independence period? One thing is clear, that the constant references to house and saints or house, lot, and saints no longer serve as the standard definition of the home in the present corpus as they did the earlier. Yet that concept still

---

80 See TT, pp. 22–25 and passim. A forthcoming monograph by Pizzigoni documents the picture Valley-wide and in great detail and supplies some background not footnoted here in detail.
existed; in one will of 1810 from Yancuictlalpan the entire ensemble appears: “I say that as to this house together with the lot and the images of God, the male and female saints, they are to stay in the house compound; I leave it to my son Francisco Joaquín and his wife named María Casimira to serve them [the saints].” Yet the rarity of the expression does not necessarily mean that the phenomenon itself had become rare. In the earlier corpus only about half of the testators speak of saints; many lacked a house and without one had no place for a saint, and in many cases it seems that the saints and even the house itself were taken for granted and not mentioned specifically. It is clear that the general ideal was to have a good collection of saints. The same type of unconscious omission probably holds true in the independence corpus as well, to some extent at least.

Also, with the great subregional variation that existed, the fact that saints were so frequently mentioned across the Valley does not mean that that necessarily happened in any given locality. Returning to the three available examples of early wills from San Bartolomé, we find that two of them fail to mention saints even while mentioning a house and lot, and the testators (male) were quite wealthy landholders. Only the third testator, a woman, mentions the

---

81 Yan#2, Margarita María. The original is: “Yhuan niquihtua . . . Yni Caltzintli Much ica solar Yhuan xiptlallotzitzihua Dios santos Yhuan Santas unCa moCauhtzinoa Ypan ithuali Yhuan Caltemiilt. niquin-noCahulilitia notelpoh fran.\^o Juaquin Yhuan Ysihua Ytoca Maria Casimira Para quihmotequipanilhuisque” The form “xiptlallotzitzihua” lacks a necessary possessive prefix. In standard orthography it should be ixiptlayotzitzihuan Dios, “images of God,” an archaic way of speaking of the saints that was long retained in the Metepec area of the Valley, though this is the only instance of it in the present corpus, and even here it is defined by the more general santos and santas. The form “Caltemiilt” involves some error on the part of the writer. The intention was caltemitl, which is a variant form of caltentli, a word for exit/entryway that partly replaced the earlier quiyahuatl, with the same meaning, by the eighteenth century. The phrase iihualli together with quiyahuatl was a standard expression for the physical aspect of the home at least from the sixteenth century forward. Here iihualli together with caltemitl still has that meaning.
saints together with the house. Thus it is possible that San Bartolomé in earlier times already lacked a strong convention of mentioning the saints, or even was not a place where the cult was particularly emphasized. The situation in Totocuitlapilco, from which also three earlier testaments are known, is somewhat ambiguous.

But if it is not possible to say for sure to what extent the household saints cult may have declined in the independence period, either locally or generally, we have ample evidence that it did still exist as a standard feature and that it retained the same general characteristics.

For one thing, the repertory of saints was still much the same. No less than 56 examples of saints within individual households are mentioned in the corpus, with appreciable numbers from San Bartolomé, Ocotitlan, and Yaucuictlalpan, as compiled in Table 3.2. Perhaps the numbers for any one place are too small to be given much weight, but taken together, and in view of the general congruence between them, they are strongly indicative. They show essentially that the saints were still those seen in the Valley generally through the eighteenth century. Manifestations of the Virgin were still prominent, accounting for 20 of the 56. As earlier, the Virgin of Guadalupe is in the lead, but far from entirely dominating the picture, for while 7 of 20 is impressive, that leaves 13 other Marian manifestations. As before, Christ provides a second but smaller block of “saints,” here 7. Male and female saints other than Mary and Jesus account for the other half of the group. And the genders continue to be thought of as

---

82 TT, nos. 22, 1715; 23, 1731; 24, 1737 (the one mentioning household saints).
83 In TT, no. 16, 1652, saints are not mentioned, but the will antedates the full development of the household saints cult by decades. In no. 37, 1732, Mauricia Josefa has magueyes belonging to “my precious mother,” probably Concepción, and has been serving her with them, most probably making cofradía offerings. There is no indication the saint is in the home. In no. 38, 1737, the wealthy don Francisco Pedro does not mention saints in connection with his house. At the end of the will, however, he leaves some lands undivided, saying they are just in common for his heirs to serve the saints. Corporate saints might be meant, but it is natural to imagine that the reference is to saints in the household.
Table 3.2  
HOUSEHOLD SAINTS IN THE PRESENT CORPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>San Bartolomé</th>
<th>Ocotitlan</th>
<th>Yancuictlalpan</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asunción</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candelaria</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divina Pastora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Señora de Agosto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>San Bartolomé</th>
<th>Ocotitlan</th>
<th>Yancuictlalpan</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Christ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crucifixo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divino Pastor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecce homo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Cristo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Señor de Chalma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Señor de la [Caña?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>San Bartolomé</th>
<th>Ocotitlan</th>
<th>Yancuictlalpan</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>God</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other male saints</td>
<td>San Bartolomé</td>
<td>Ocotitlan</td>
<td>Yancuictlalpan</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Felipe de Jesús</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jacinto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Manuel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Nicolás</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pascual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro &amp; San Pablo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Tomás</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other female saints</th>
<th>San Bartolomé</th>
<th>Ocotitlan</th>
<th>Yancuictlalpan</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa María Magdalena</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Inés</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosalia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Teresa de Jesús</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saint totals for all pueblos</th>
<th>San Bartolomé</th>
<th>Ocotitlan</th>
<th>Yancuictlalpan</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
separate categories, not just subsumed under the masculine *santos* as in Spanish. Rather *santo* and *santa* came into Nahuatl much earlier as separate loanwords, and we still see *santos* and *santas* when they are spoken of collectively. This is true not only in Nahuatl testaments but also in the Spanish testaments that took so much from them, even though it went against normal Spanish usage. As before, male saints greatly predominate over non-Marian female saints, 20 males to 8 females. The individual saints are still much the same, with for example San Antonio (de Padua) retaining his popularity in the Valley.

By the eighteenth century in the Valley overall, it was notable that few patron saints of altepetl and tlaxilacalli were found on home altars, so that the two spheres were quite separate. That largely holds true here as well. Not a single San Bartolomé appears in the collections of saints recorded in the settlement of that name. The same appears to be true in Yancuictlalpan, though it is possible that some of the Marys there were thought of as being associated with the patron, Santa María de la Rosa or Nativitas. In Ocotitlan, however, the patron saint is found in some homes; even so, she accounts for only 3 of the settlement’s total 22.

In the eighteenth century some saints coincided in name with members of the household, though the phenomenon was not as common as one might think. The same is true in the independence corpus. One is struck by the rarity of a case like that of a testator whose father was

---

84 As in sbt#77.
85 As in oco#17, “santos y santas.”
86 In some of these cases (and this goes beyond Santa María Magadalena) it is said only that the recipient of land is to serve the saint, without any explicit statement that the saint is in the home or is being left to the recipient. Nevertheless, within the general context it seems probable that the saint was in fact in the household.
named don Pedro de San Juan and who had in his house both San Pedro and San Juan. In such cases we tend to assume that the residents were named after the saints, though it is always possible that they would acquire saints to match their names.

In the Valley in the eighteenth century, saints were thoroughly integrated into the system of inheritance. Conceived of as a vital part of the home, they went to the same heirs who received the buildings and parts of the lot so that the identity of the principal home would be maintained, and also so that new households established by heirs would be fully equipped. Part of the arrangement was often that heirs who received lands outside the home proper did so with the obligation of using them partly to support the household saints or one of them, and sometimes the land went formally to the saint. The independence corpus does not prove that all of these things continued to be majority phenomena, but it does show that they continued to exist as a standard pattern.

A classic case for inheritance is that of Margarita María in Yancuictlalpan. Following the instructions of her late husband, who must have left her as the custodian when the children were little, she bequeaths the house, lot, and the saints in general to her son Francisco Joaquín, along with a piece of land elsewhere. To her daughter Francisca Tomasa goes a piece of land of half the size, along with one saint from the collection, San Felipe de Jesús. Throughout the corpus as here, the saints go parallel with the other property in the same proportion. Here the spouses of the children are mentioned as coheirs, which tends to include the saints as well as the real estate, though with the daughter’s saint only she herself happens to be mentioned. The mention of children’s spouses or not depends on the custom of the community. It originated in

---

87 Oco#6.
88 Oco#2, 1810.
two factors, one the desire of priests to keep good track of marriages, and the other the need to list spouses as co-owners on legal grounds, so that on the one hand their rights were assured and on the other in cases of sales and the like they could not later sue. In Ocotitlan and Yan-cuictlalpan it was the custom to mention spouses as joint heirs of all kinds of assets, saints included. In San Bartolomé much attention was given to listing the name of the spouse of the testator, even when deceased, but the names of spouses of heirs were not normally given. These matters vary with the community and the notary but are no different for saints than for other bequests, and this was nothing new, except that over time spouses of both genders came to be named more and more frequently.

Leaving pieces of land that were not part of the home complex to the heirs with the at least ostensible purpose of supporting the saints continued, as hinted just above, to be a feature of life in the independence period, frequently mentioned in the testaments. Not only did land go to every conceivable category of heir, depending on who was available, with the duty of serving a saint (and it was usually some specific saint, not the group of them as a whole), but as in earlier times some land went directly to the saints themselves. Thus while Florencia Martina of San Bartolomé divided one piece of land in equal parts for two nephews to have, with the obligation of serving the Virgin of Dolores, she gave another piece to the saint herself, for one of the nephews to serve her with it: “And I say I am leaving another piece of land at Santiago Çolco to the Virgin of Dolores; with it Isidro Trinidad is to serve her.”

The content of the cult was, as far as the records show, still the same as in the eighteenth-century Toluca Valley. The universal imperative then was to “serve” the saints, using forms of

89 Sbt#32, 1812. The Nahuatl is: “ynhua niquitohua oc se tlali santiago sulco ncnocahuililiti yehuatzi la virge de los dolores yc quimotequipanilhuis ysidro trinidad”
the verb *tequipanoa*. The concept and the word are fully preserved in the independence corpus and are also translated into the Spanish part of it using the word *servir*.

The content of that service also continued to be the same. In a sense, living in a home was serving its saints, and to “serve,” not mentioning any object, could be taken either as to reside in a home and keep it up or to serve the saints there. At one time saints in homes had been kept in a building in the home compound especially for themselves, a *santocalli* “saint-house”, but already in the eighteenth century the term was virtually gone from the Valley, and it does not reappear in the independence corpus. Rather it seems that as in the eighteenth century the saints were kept on an altar in the principal householder’s own building of residence. Though an altar is not specifically mentioned, it is more than implied by the fact that whenever service to the saints is made more specific, the sources speak of the necessity of providing the by now classic flowers, candles, and incense.

Having a sketch of the general picture with household saints, let us now look at quantities and proportions in the particular settlements. In San Bartolomé the proportion of testators mentioning saints is quite low. Of 115 total testators, 16 left saints; of these, 13 were women and 3 men. This is a much smaller percentage of testators with household saints than in the eighteenth-century Toluca Valley corpus, in which it would approximate 50%. But in the eighteenth century more men had saints then women; here the proportion of women to men is

---

90 See for example the Nahuatl wording given in the note immediately above.
91 In the eighteenth century the main residential building was often called an *oratorio*, “oratory,” or in Toluca proper *ichantzinco Dios*, “the home of God,” in honor of the saints being there, but these terms do not appear in the independence corpus.
92 Sbt#89 mentions flowers and candles: “Ca llehuatli tlatequipanos yca xochitzitli cadelatzi.” Sbt#115 has candles and incense: “no Faltara belas saumerio.” Oco#24 calls for incense, candles, and flowers: “No les falta belas Saumerio los pasquas Grandes...” “las belas y flores...”
reversed and indeed much more than reversed; the percent of women with saints (at least mentioned saints) as compared to men is much higher than the percent of testaments by females, already a majority, and even higher than the percentages requesting masses, as opposed to men. A growth in women’s role in various aspects of local religion continues to unfold.

Looking back to the three eighteenth-century San Bartolomé testaments, though the number is too few to base firm conclusions on, we see hints that elements of the picture at independence may have had important local precedent. Of those three testators, only one mentioned saints, and that one was a woman.

The testaments of Ocotitlan at independence show a picture much more like that of the eighteenth-century Toluca Valley generally. A bit more than half had saints, 14 of 27, so close to the eighteenth-century proportion as to represent no change, and enough to make it clear that having household saints was an ideal for all Ocotitlan citizens; also enough to allow us to conclude that at least some other Ocotitlan citizens had saints at home that remained unmentioned, taken for granted. Further, men outnumber women 3:2 in terms of leaving saints to their heirs in Ocotitlan, also a continuity with the eighteenth-century.93

In Yancuictlalpan a quarter of the testators left saints in their wills, 3 of 12, thus much less than in Ocotitlan but a considerably larger percentage than in San Bartolomé. Two of the three were women.

Thus by the time of independence the situation with household saints in the area studied shows some apparent loss or reduction of the cult in that nowhere was it as openly proclaimed as

93 In terms of gender ratio, the proportion of testators leaving saints in Ocotitlan breaks down as 6 women and 9 men: oco#1, oco#6, oco#8, oco#10, oco#12, oco#13, oco#14, oco#16, oco#17, oco#19, oco#20, oco#23, oco#24, oco#25, oco#26.
an essential part of the home complex as it had been generally in the Valley in the eighteenth century. Yet it survived as a well understood feature in all the communities, with characteristics virtually indistinguishable from those seen in the eighteenth century. The greater role of women in religious matters, however, is reflected strongly with the household saints. The proportion of the local population with saints at home, at least those mentioned, varied greatly across the settlements from something resembling the eighteenth century in Yancuictlalpan to less in Ocotitlan to much less in San Bartolomé. A fascinating possibility, though not yet thoroughly documented, is that the differences already existed far back into the earlier time.

**REMEMBERING THE TESTATOR**

Nahuatl testaments of the Toluca Valley from the late seventeenth century forward through the eighteenth and on into independence have much to say about masses, burial, and other rites for the testator at death, and also about the household saints, which therefore provide the main topics for the present chapter. What of observances for the testator in the years following death? In the Nahuatl testamentary corpus overall, references to this matter are supremely scarce. In the late sixteenth-century Testaments of Culhuacan a testator once asks an heir to remember her (using *ilnamiqui*), and once there is a reference to the Day of the Dead. In the Toluca Valley Corpus of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries such things are equally rare, though some glimpses show that an executor would sometimes continue to arrange masses or responsory prayers for a testator for years after his or her death.94

---

94 See TT#16, by Esteban de San Juan in Totocuitlapilco (1652). He asks that the proceeds of selling a cow and calf be used "for me for my future vigil." He also asks for a field to be sold in order for it to "be used for me." In TT#74, by María Clara, in San Pedro Calimaya (1763) a little piece of land is sold for burial and mass: "sell it for my burial and for my mass."
In the independence-period corpus studied here, remembering still plays a very minor role compared to customs at death and household saints, but it does surface as a standard element a bit more than in earlier times, and we learn something about the practices associated with it. It is seen above all in the Spanish testaments of Ocotitlan. In 1816 Francisca Petrona, a widow proclaiming that she was following her deceased husband’s instructions, left the house, saints, most of the lot, and most of her other land to her daughter Simona Crisanta (together with Simona’s husband), with a chunk of the lot and one piece of land going to a granddaughter. One piece of the daughter’s land was given her specifically to support the saints with candles and incense. At the very end Francisca Petrona leaves another piece of land to her daughter (and son-in-law) “para que se acuerde de mi los dias pasquas Grandes,” “so that she will remember me on the major religious holidays.” The form the remembrance would take is not specified.95

In a scarcely less informative example from the same place, also in Spanish, in 1813 José Anastasio, having no children, bequeathed everything to his surviving wife. He left her three pieces of land, one to serve a saint, one with no comment, but the first and largest one (13 cuartillos) was again “para que se acuerde de mi,” “so that she will remember me.”96

The large San Bartolomé corpus contains only one reference to remembering the testator, and it is among the wills in Spanish. In 1824 Dominga Bonifacia made her son Marcelino Antonio her principal heir. In connection with leaving him the lot she says he is to serve three named saints with candles and incense and then adds “y se acordara de mi los dias pasquas y dia de todo santos,” “and he is to remember me on the major religious holidays and the day of All Saints,”

95 Oco#24.
96 Oco#12.
the latter being the same as the Day of the Dead. The duty is not specifically tied to any particular property but seems in a general way to be in return for the son’s inheritance.97

No other references to remembering the testator appear in the corpus, so that the total is two instances in Ocotitlan, one in San Bartolomé, and none in Yancuictlalpan. Even so, by their nature the statements imply a widespread local practice. One notices that all three references are in wills in Spanish. We may have here a difference in testamentary conventions rather than in the substance of community practice. Though the Spanish wills follow the Nahuatl model closely, they do strike out in some new directions, and perhaps this is one of them. That is, they may have begun mentioning something taken for granted in Nahuatl wills even though it had existed all along.

Both the phrase of remembering the testator and the mention of the Day of the Dead go back to the sixteenth century in Nahuatl wills, even if very rarely seen. There is every reason to believe that the practices surfacing in these wills of the independence period had existed all along in the Valley and in many other parts of central Mexico. The mention of special observances not only on All Saints but also on all the major feasts is to my knowledge new, but likely that too had long held true. The present instances tell us nothing about what form the remembrances took, except that tying them to certain pieces of land implies that expense was involved. Mention of the Day of the Dead calls to mind the kind of graveside observances well known in Mexico to this day. No doubt, as in some earlier Toluca Valley cases, what was hoped for was occasional masses or responsory prayers for the soul of the dead, but that would have been very expensive. Lighting candles in church as is done today would be a possibility, though

97 Sbt#115.
we have no specific evidence pointing in that direction. All mentions of flowers, candles, and incense in the present corpus relate directly to the household saints. If anything of that kind was done for the dead within the home, we do not yet know of it.

CONCLUSION

A description and analysis of customs at death and the household saints cult in some Toluca Valley communities during the independence period shows that they were still essentially those of the preceding century in the Valley, and that individual communities very much kept their special traditions, such as the very specific burial arrangements in San Bartolomé. At the same time, proportions have changed meaningfully in some respects; whether in response to the special conditions of the times or as part of an ongoing evolution is not always clear. The increase in San Bartolomé in cheaper responsory prayers compared to masses is startling, but it is not reflected in the other settlements. Everywhere we see the numerical predominance of women testators, but more than that, they have now taken over the previous leading role of men in religious matters in at least some ways. A larger proportion of them request masses than men do; a larger proportion of them mentions and bequeaths saints. The household saints cult is not as openly emphasized as before, though the same concepts and practices before are still known, and the saints’ place in the local record varies greatly, from much the same proportionately in Ocotitlan to a great deal less in San Bartolomé.

The transition going on from Nahuatl to Spanish testaments does not seem to affect practice in such matters as death rites and the saints, rather the Spanish texts are close equivalents of those in Nahuatl, but, through some new formulations possibly affected by testaments in the Spanish world, we do learn about a few things probably already existing but ignored in the Nahuatl genre, such as the continuing rites or services for the dead.
4. The Household Complex:  
House and Solar

In any sedentary society the household is a basic ingredient, and its physical layout and makeup is an important and suggestive part of the picture. That is all the more true in central Mexican indigenous society. In an overall sociopolitical organization of nested entities in a scheme emphasizing cellular organization, the local state (the altepetl) consisted of a number of constituent districts (tlaxilacalli), and they in turn consisted of households as the constituent units. The household members were organized elaborately by kinship, birth order, gender, and in other ways, but they were not viewed exactly as a “family” in the European fashion. Rather no word quite equivalent to family existed, and the corresponding unit was the residents of the household. Thus “house” had the same role in the language as “family” among us. That had been true in the Nahua world since before European contact, and it was still true among our inhabitants of San Bartolomé, Ocotitlan, and Yancuictlalpan in the independence period.

The classic setup of a Nahuatl household complex was a good example of cellular organization. A number of separate residential buildings stood on the sides of a central patio, oriented to the cardinal directions. Each one might contain a different nuclear “family” close related to the other residents. The complex stood on callalli, “house land,” ideally a good agricultural plot of 20 by 20 quahuitl\(^1\) from which the residents would draw their primary sustenance. The primary

\(^1\) See Chapter 5 on non-household land for a fuller notion of this basic Nahua unit of measurement.
inheritance pattern was to divide the different constituent houses and the land they were on among the heirs, some of whom would usually already be occupying what they inherited.²

In the Toluca Valley by the eighteenth century, strong elements of the traditional complex persisted, but some changes had taken place, due in one way or another mainly to Spanish influence. There were still buildings around a patio, often oriented to the cardinal directions, and agriculture was still often practiced on the land that held the buildings. But in many or most cases, instead of each adult pair having a separate building, there was a common main residential building, which in and around Toluca proper was often called *ichtzincó Dios*, “the home of God,” because of the saints who had an altar in it, instead of the separate building they had sometimes occupied earlier. It was also often called an *oratorio*, an oratory, a term found all around the Valley. Opposite the main residence would be a separate building for a kitchen, called by the Spanish loanword *cocina*. In a good many cases a pen for animals was mentioned, using the loanword *corral*. The agricultural use of the land around the house continued at least to some extent, but the Spanish word *solar*, “house lot,” was in the process of supplanting *callalli*, “house land,” and with subdivision the piece was often too small to continue its function as the residents’ primary support. With the change in the nature of the buildings, it was harder to apportion them to different heirs, so they more often went to a single heir as a unit, though subdivision of the solar as a place for heirs to build their own houses continued strong. By 1700 if not before, household saints had become such a defining characteristic of the household

² On the above see Lockhart, *The Nahuas*, chapter on household.
complex that it was normally referred to as “house, lot, and saints,” and all three elements played interlocking roles in inheritance strategy.\textsuperscript{3}

To what extent did the household complex in San Bartolomé, Ocotitlan, and Yancuic-talpan in the early nineteenth century still reflect the general picture in the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth? To that question we now turn, starting with the buildings.

**THE HOUSE**

As in most of the Toluca Valley already in the preceding century, testaments in our time and place no longer normally went into detail on the components of the household complex as they once had, but through scattered bits of information we learn enough to see that in general things did correspond to the situation across the Valley across the eighteenth century. This not only provides background for our topic here; at the same time the data here contribute to an extent to knowledge of the Valley overall, for only the records of the immediate area of Toluca are rich enough to tell the whole story. In any case, the fact that things in our area of study are recognizable from before does not mean that there has been no change at all or that there are no local idiosyncrasies, as we will see in the following.

Our documentation does not overflow with information on the house complex. It is necessary to pay attention to the smallest details and distinctions. I will go through each of the three areas gleaning what I can, and then see what can be deduced from the whole.

\textsuperscript{3} TT, pp. 22–25 and throughout. Because of locally varying writing conventions, the complex is thoroughly documented only in Toluca proper and its immediate environs, but there is every reason to think that things were much the same throughout the Valley.
San Bartolomé

The San Bartolomé testaments deliver virtually no direct information about the nature and configuration of the building or buildings of the house complex. Starting with the Nahuatl corpus, by far the most common term seen is caltżintli, the reverential of calli, house or houses. Thus in 1820 Estafanía María said, “I am leaving this house (caltżintli), which my deceased husband Miguel Bernabé left me, to my daughter named Inés Ignacia.”\textsuperscript{4} It does not appear that we can infer anything about the structure from the use of the suffix -tzin(tli). It is ambiguous in itself, for though it is mainly used as a reverential, it originated as a diminutive and still can have that connotation in certain contexts. The diminutive notion is of interest because, as we will see, the material overall tends to lead to the conclusion that many houses were humble or small even by normal indigenous standards. But in the previous century some areas of the Toluca Valley used primarily caltżintli, others primarily calli, apparently simply as an element of traditional style in that particular region.\textsuperscript{5} In the San Bartolomé corpus caltżintli is used 16 times, calli 4 times. One text uses both forms for the same building or complex.\textsuperscript{6} A single time an unambiguously diminutive form is used, calton(tli), “little house.”\textsuperscript{7} This might seem to mean that caltżintli is definitely not a diminutive, but with the flexibility of Nahuatl vocabulary, that cannot be taken as fully established.

\textsuperscript{4} Sbt\#80: “yni Caltżintli niccahuilitin Nochpocho ytuaCa [sic] ynes ygnacia honechemocahuilitiquis Difunto Nonamictzi Miguel bernabel.”

\textsuperscript{5} See TT, p. 22, where it is shown that in the eighteenth century the city of Toluca and its environs almost always used caltżintli, whereas in the large Calimaya/Tepemaxalco area plain calli was much more common.

\textsuperscript{6} Sbt\#96, 1823.

\textsuperscript{7} Sbt\#61, 1813.
Another term used, though only a few times, has definite implications of smallness, humility, and even provisionality and impermanence. Three times the texts call residences ranchitos, a term with quite a history. The word rancho first surfaces on the Caribbean islands in the conquest period for a temporary structure put together from whatever materials were available, essentially a shack.\(^8\) It was used especially for the huts around the edges of Spanish settlements where indigenous people doing work duty stayed during their stints, and it had a distinctly pejorative flavor. In Mexico over the centuries rancho had also come to mean a modest rural property in the Spanish style as opposed to the larger hacienda, but the original meaning also persisted.

Here we find it used by indigenous people in their own language referring to their own homes, the first time I have seen it in Nahuatl testaments. It is not reported for the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth century, and I am unaware of its use anywhere else either; if it occurs somewhere, it surely was not common. Perhaps it first came in in the independence period. Whether it retained its pejorative tone in the language of the people of San Bartolomé is doubtful, but surely it still meant something humble, and its connotation of smallness seems to be reinforced by the fact that in San Bartolomé it always has the Spanish diminutive -ito.

In one of the attestations, the word is applied to homes that two small children are to set up for themselves in the rather distant future. In 1806 María Josefa said, “as to a little piece of solar (lot) that my precious mother left me, now I am leaving it to my two little children, if God gives them life; one is named Tomás de Aquino, and the other is named Paulino Obispo. On it

\(^8\) See Lockhart and Schwartz, *Early Latin America*, p. 77.
they are both to set up their ranchitos.” In the two other instances, what is meant is the main residence of the testator. In 1817 Bartolomé Luis spoke of “the little piece of solar where my ranchito is, that my precious grandmother left to my precious late mother Felipa Monica, who then left it to me for me to be raised,” and he left it to his children in turn. However small and humble, the ranchito in this case seems to have been quite long-lasting. It is true that the testator may mean the lot was inherited from his grandmother and not necessarily the ranchito, but he does seem to intend to leave the latter to his children. A case in 1823 is virtually identical.

From time immemorial Nahuatl had had the distinction between calli, “house,” and the always possessed -chan, “one’s home,” that is, the place one makes one’s residence regardless of its physical attributes. The distinction persists in the San Bartolomé corpus. Since the business at hand was to bequeath physical properties, there is less occasion for -chan to appear, but there are five instances. Two of them have to do with offspring establishing homes in the future. In 1811 don Juan de los Santos, in bequeathing parts of his establishment to three sons, said he was giving the youngest, Manuel Urbano, a part of the solar “Capa quitlalis YChato,” campa quitlaliz ichanton, “where he will set up his little home.” In 1812 Diego de la Cruz used the same

9 Sbt#4: “Se pedasito Solarto onehmoCaguilili notlasonantzin ahcan niquinCaguililiti ome nopilguantoto tla dios quinmonemiltiis se yuca tomas de aquino yguan oq se ytuCa paulino ovispo yqui quitlalisque yrrahitos ymoneguantoto.” In the form “yrrahitos” for inranchitos, y- is the possessive prefix with an n missing as so often in Nahua writing; the double rr was standard even in Spanish; n is left out again after a; h is instead of ch, as often in late Nahuatl texts.

10 Sbt#73: “i pedasito sularito Capa Ca noRaChito uquimoCahuililitia notlasusitzi Nutlasunatzi metztiCaPCa felipan MuniCa AxCan unehmoCanhuililitquis ypa nihuapa [sic] quesqui tonali.” The word of interest is “noRachito,” noranchito, where no- is “my.”

11 Sbt#102. This time only three generations are involved. The same ambiguity about the longevity of the ranchito as opposed to the solar obtains here too. The key phrase is almost identical: “se pedasu soLar Capa Ca noRaChito,” a piece of solar where my ranchito is.”

12 Sbt#19.
phrase, giving his little solar to his three small children “yc capa quitlalisque ychatoto,” “where they will set up their little homes.” The diminutive is perhaps especially appropriate when speaking of what small children will do in the future, but it is also used once for the testator’s own home. In 1823 Dionisia Jacinta, in dividing her solar, says that “Cayetano Román is to take the lower part, where our little home is.”

(As in English, “home” sometimes verges on the meaning of “house.”) In two other instances -chan is used in another sense in which the diminutive is not appropriate, but in the first three examples smallness is emphasized, almost as though it were a formula and would be applied to any home in San Bartolomé.

When the Spanish testaments of San Bartolomé mention a house, they all use the simple, and uninformative, word casa (6 instances); once we see pedazo casa, “a piece of a house,” implying that what the testator was living in was a subdivision of a larger complex.

Although I am treating the buildings of the household complex separately and will move to its land later, here I need to anticipate some land-related aspects because they have to do with the role and nature of the house. In the traditional Nahua scheme, the house and the land it was on were an inseparable unit in which the house had priority; the function of the land was to serve the house, as indicated by its name callalli, “house land.” In San Bartolomé as in our other communities, and indeed over most of the Toluca Valley already in the eighteenth century, the land the house was on was called a solar, borrowed from the Spanish for a house lot in an urban

13 Sbt#90: “Connanas Cayetano Roma yc tlatzitlaConpa Capa Can toChato.”
14 In sbt#8, 1822, the house the testator is bequeathing is called the home of his wife, meaning no doubt that she grew up there and inherited it: “i caltzintli ychatzinco nosihuhuatzin.” In sbt#91, 1823, the same thing is said of the testator’s mother: “yno Cali yChatziCo notlasunatzin metztiCaPCa,” “that house was the home of my late mother.”
15 Sbt#119, 1832.
setting. It is useful in the present context to consider the relative positions of house and solar in the corpus.

Traditionally both the house and its land were mentioned in testaments; though I have not carried out systematic research on the point, my impression is that the same was generally true for the Toluca Valley overall in the eighteenth century. The picture in San Bartolomé is as seen in Table 4.1. The expected combination of house and solar is seen 24 times, but 30 times only a solar is mentioned; 4 times only the house is mentioned. The last type of case is in line with the traditional predominance of the house; since the houses must have been standing on something, we can safely assume that that there was at least some strip of solar and that it was taken for granted, treated as secondary. But that accounts for very few of the cases. In over half of the total, no house is mentioned, only a solar or solares.

**Table 4.1. House and solar in San Bartolomé**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nahuatl testaments</th>
<th>Spanish testaments</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House and solar both mentioned</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only solar mentioned</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only house mentioned</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How are we to assess the cases which mention only a solar? Sometimes it is fairly clear that there is really no house on the property. Just above we saw that María Josefa left a little piece of a solar for her two small boys to put their ranchitos on some day. If there was already some kind of house on the solar, surely she would have given it to one of the boys, and they wouldn’t both have had to start from scratch. If we ask, where then did María Josefa live, the
answer is that her husband was alive, and she must have been living in a house owned either by him or his relatives.\textsuperscript{16} Thus in an unknown number of cases the solares seem to have actually been empty, either secondary possessions with the main residence owned by another relative, or the testator was destitute and in straits.

At other times it seems that a house of some kind is assumed. In 1811 Petrona Martina left her little lot (solarito) to her four children for the eldest to raise them there, not speaking of any new home being established. Her husband was dead, so it could not be that he owned the main residence.\textsuperscript{17} Apparently Petrona Martina simply spoke in terms of the lot rather than the house of some kind that must have been on it. Another such case is that of Bernardino Antonio, who owned much land but mentioned no house, only two different solares; surely a person of such substance would have had a residence.\textsuperscript{18} Such instances imply that the house was not of very much value and that owning the solar was given priority.

In the majority of cases it really cannot be determined whether there was a house on the solar or not, but since these bequests come before non-household land bequests in the testament, in the position in principle allotted to the house, it stands to reason that often some sort of residence was there, and it either was of very small monetary or other value, or at least was taken as secondary to and included with the land, reversing the traditional situation in which the house was primary.

\textsuperscript{16} Sbt\#4, 1806. The case presents other problems. Although the husband is alive and María Josefa speaks once of having his permission, she leaves a third son, probably an infant, in the care of his godmother. The husband must have been impoverished, disabled, or perhaps mortally ill. Sbt\#31, 1812, also mentioned above, in which the testator left a solar to his children to set up their homes on, has the same implications of emptiness.

\textsuperscript{17} Sbt\#18.

\textsuperscript{18} Sbt\#30, 1812.
In the cases where both house and solar are included, the house is universally mentioned first, in both Nahuatl and Spanish testaments, just as it traditionally been. The only instances in which that is not true are instructive; in the two testaments where the testator describes the home as a ranchito, the solar comes first, in the expression “a piece of a solar where my ranchito is.”

Thus perhaps the use of the word ranchito is not a slur on San Bartolomé’s stock of houses in general, but an admission that the residence so denominated is more hut-like than usual. Caltzintli and calli may indicate something very respectable, meeting local standards, which may not have slipped much compared to earlier, and ranchito may indicate something that does not meet those standards, or at least the testator chooses to say so. One can imagine a core of relatively solid residences, others that were more like huts and shacks, and a good many solares empty, some in cases where the owner really needed a base, others secondary properties with other relatives holding the headquarters. In several ways the San Bartolomé materials seem to hint at homes being simple, humble, small, but such a picture would need to contain evidence of a more concrete type before we could put full confidence in it.

As seen in Chapter 3, some San Bartolomé residences harbored household saints in the now traditional fashion, but such examples are not very numerous, and above all there is no trace of the standard way of referring to the household complex in texts of the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth century: house, solar, and saints. More of the reality of the cult may have been there than shows through in the corpus, but the open symbolism of the saints representing the identity of the household is not present. Nowhere is the main residential building called an oratortio.

______________________

19 Sbt#73, #102.
20 The expression ichantzinco Dios, the home of God, would not be expected because it seems not to be attested outside the surroundings of Toluca city.
Ocotitlan

In the overwhelmingly Spanish corpus for Ocotitlan, the house is almost always called simply *casa* (9 times). The only variation is *casita* once; this surely looks like a most common Spanish diminutive, but we must remember that in the post-Nahuatl Spanish of this time, the diminutive was often used as the equivalent of the Nahuatl reverential suffix, as in calling a priest *padrecito*, so that this form may have been intended as meaning the same thing as *cal tzintli*, the predominant form in San Bartolomé.\(^{21}\) This example does tell us something, though; the casita was of adobe, “de adobes.” Perhaps not a startling piece of information, rather just what we would expect, but at least it shows a solid and permanent manner of construction and not thatch or the improvised materials that one would associate with a rancho. In the whole corpus used here only the Ocotitlan testaments say anything about what the houses were made of. The Ocotitlan texts also yield another bonus; a testator says that one heir of a property is to get the whole patio, “todo el patio.” The word remains unmentioned in either Nahuatl or Spanish in the San Bartolomé corpus, though in all likelihood every house complex in all three areas had an open central patio.

As in San Bartolomé, somewhat more testators mentioned a solar only (10) than both house and solar (9). In all cases in which both are mentioned, the house comes first. The implications are the same as in San Bartolomé.

\(^{21}\) *Oco#26*, 1819: “cacita.” Adobe is mentioned also in *oco#24*. In Spanish the distinction between house and home is rarely made, but the single relevant Nahuatl document of Ocotitlan, when the testator says that the heir is to reside on the solar being bequeathed, uses the verb *mochantia*, “to make a home for oneself,” based on *-chan.*
Also as in San Bartolome, there are household saints, in fact many more of them relatively speaking, but even so the complex is never called house, solar, and saints, nor is there any mention of the word oratorio.

**Yancuictlalpan**

The nearly all Nahuatl corpus of Yancuictlalpan is small but rich for our present purposes. The house is called *caltzintli* nearly all the time, as in San Bartolomé (8 times), with only one occurrence of the unambiguously diminutive *caltonli.*\(^{22}\) The great majority of the testaments mention both house and solar (8); only one mentions the house only, and one the solar only.

Surprisingly, the few Yancuictlalpan testaments contain strong traces of the concepts of earlier times about the house complex, not only the dominant phrase of the eighteenth century that is lacking elsewhere in the corpus, but a form of an even earlier widespread formulation. It is all contained in a statement of Margarita María in 1810:\(^{23}\)

```
niquihtua Yni Caltzintli Much ica solar Yhuan xiptlallotzitzihua Dios santos
Yhuan Santas unCa moCauhtzinoa Ypan ithuali Yhuan Caltemiilt niquinno-
Cahulilitia notelpoh fran.\(^{20}\) Juaquin Yhuan Ysihua Ytoca Maria Casimira Para
quihmotequipanilhuisque
```

I say that as to this house together with the solar and the images of God, the male and female saints, they are to stay there in the patio and entryway [the house

---

\(^{22}\) Yan#1, 1809.

\(^{23}\) Yan#2.
compound]; I leave it to my son Francisco Joaquín and his wife named María Casimira to serve them [the saints].

Although a bit more filled in than usual, this description of the complex names the three elements of house, solar, and saints in the usual eighteenth-century order. Generally in Yancuictlalpan only the house and solar are mentioned, and only one other text in the Yacyuictlalpan set to give the classic combination so neatly (another did so in effect, as we will see).24 The concern that the saints as a defining element stay in the house is typical of the eighteenth-century outlook.

Even older is the phrase *ithualli caltentli* as a metaphor for the household complex. The classic phrase was actually *ithualli quiyahuatl*, “patio (and) exit,” a typical older Nahuatl expression in which a pair of words convey a larger whole of which they are part.25 It is very rarely seen even in eighteenth-century materials, much less nineteenth. But it has undergone some modernization. In the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries (Stage 2), the word for exit/entry to a house complex (and other things) was *quiyahuatl*, most often seen in the locative form *quiyahuac*. From the mid-seventeenth century on (Stage 3), it began to be replaced by the word *caltentli*, literally the edge of the house, so that *quiyahuatl* became rarer.26 The form used here to pair with *ithualli*, the patio, is “caltemiilt,” standard spelling *caltemitl*, which is an alternative form of *caltentli*. Thus an ancient metaphor for the traditional compound, specifying two

---

24 Yan#2, 1810, speaks of “Yni Caltzintli Much ica solar Yhuan xiptlalotzitzihua Dios santos Yhuan Santas,” “this house including the solar and the images of God, the male and female saints.” The other text referred to is yan#7, discussed below.

25 Lockhart, The Nahuas, pp. 59–60. It referred not just to the physical aspect of the compound but to the connection between the people and the space.

26 See for example Here in This Year, ed. by Camilla Townsend, passim.
of its typical features, a single exit/entry for the whole and an internal patio, is still being applied to the household complex of the early nineteenth century, though in a somewhat updated form. As it happens, despite the wording, no more specific reference to the single entryway/exit and the fully encircling fence or wall without which it would have lacked its meaning is found in the entire corpus studied here.

Nor is the passage quoted above the only example of the phrase’s use in Yancuictlalpan. The following is found in the 1821 testament of Lucas Pedro:27

niquituhua yni Caltzintli mochi quenami Ca nicahuitia nosihuatzin ytoCa Juan ana yCa Se notelpoh ytoca meregildo Crisensio Ca niCatia ypan ituali yhuan Caltemitl para tlatequipanoque quimotequipanilhuisque mochintintzitzin Santos yhuan Santas.

I say that I am leaving this whole house, as it is [in its present condition], to my wife named Juana Ana along with a son of mine named Hermenegildo Crescen-cio; I leave them in the patio and entryway to serve; they are to serve all the male and female saints.

Note that this example also pairs the house complex and the saints, though the solar is left unmentioned in this case.

An even more spectacular passage from a Yancuictlalpan tells us more about the layout of the buildings than the rest of the entire corpus. The following comes form the 1825 testament of Francisca Antonia.28

27 Yan#7. The phrase is also used a second time in the testament: “ypan ituali yhua Caltemielt.”
28 Yan#12.
niquitua yni Caltzintli quenami Ca nicahuilia yni Sala notelpoch Jose Ginio yhua
noxhuiga Se ytoCa ysidro Bonifasio oc Se ytoCa noberto de Jesus Bonifasio
niquinCahuilia tlaco Coral muchi yca Cosina patio para Jose Ginio much yCa
solar neltis mochihuas notlanahuatil yhua niquituhua Jose Ginio yhua ysihuahuatzi nimocahuilia santa teresa de Jesus nuestra Señora de Guadalupe Señora
Santa Ana nouxhihuia Señor San Antoni Divino Pastor la DiVina pastora

I say that as to this house I leave this sala to my son José Eugenio; and to my
grandchildren, one named Isidro Bonifacio and the other named Norberto de Jesús
Bonifacio, I leave half the corral along with the kitchen. The patio is for José
Eugenio, including the solar. My order is to be realized and carried out. And I say
that to José Eugenio and his wife I leave Santa Teresa de Jesús, Nuestra Señora de
Guadalupe, and señora Santa Ana. To my grandchildren [I leave] lord San
Antonio, the Divino Pastor, and the Divina Pastora.

Here for once we have the entire typical ensemble of the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth
century: a main residence, a kitchen across the patio, a corral as part of the compound. The main
residence that earlier was usually called an oratorio is here called a sala, literally a general room
for living and receiving. The same meaning has been seen in Nahuatl documents elsewhere.²⁹
Although not in a clear order, the three elements of house, lot, and saints are all present and
essential. The by now familiar term caltzintli, house, is seen at least in this case definitely not to
be a diminutive but to embrace an assembly of three different structures, the main one of which
must be quite impressive to judge by the number of saints it houses.

²⁹ See Lockhart, *Nahuatl as Written*, p. 138. The example is from the Chalco region in 1736. The text also
uses the metaphor ithualli quiyahuatl (p. 135).
Although the compound is in what one could call an eighteenth-century style, it is treated in a fashion going back beyond that to the sixteenth century and doubtless earlier. That is, instead of the house complex being given to one heir, an attempt is made to divide it among the heirs in the same way as when it consisted of multiple dwellings. Under the current conditions, there is an obvious tension in the arrangements; the grandchildren would live in the kitchen, and the son would have no kitchen. Doubtless various kinds of adjustments were made. But one sees why dividing a “house” was something quite rarely seen.

**A word on the household complex in the three localities**

The Yancuictlalpan material puts the corpus from San Bartolomé and Ocotitlan in a different light. Here for once a house complex is spelled out in some detail because of a quixotic subdivision attempt and turns out to be entirely typical of the state of things in the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth century, and also fully developed rather than skeletal, and furthermore it is located in time far into the period dealt with here, 1825. One is induced to think it unlikely that this could be a phenomenon in isolation, but rather that comparable complexes existed both in Yancuictlalpan and in the other two communities, hiding under the simple label of *caltzintli* or *casa*. We can now be sure that the simple, unelaborated mention of a house does not imply that it is limited to a single structure. We can be sure that the underlying notion of the eighteenth-century complex survived in the whole area under consideration. The very fact that attempts to subdivide it were few everywhere tends to point in the same direction. Among the households registering both a house and a solar in San Bartolomé and Ocotitlan, particularly in view of the presence of household saints in those places, there must have been quite a few complexes rather like Francisca Antonia’s in Yancuictlalpan. Yet it remains significant that the saints were no
longer a major identifier of the complex in San Bartolomé and Ocotitlan, nor even in the majority of households in Yancuictlalpan.

I would by no means assert that archetypal complexes on the model of Francisca Antonia’s were the only kind of households in existence, or indeed make any statement at all on proportions. The two larger sets of testaments contain hints of the small size or humble nature of some complexes—if they deserve that name—that are lacking in Yancuictlalpan. In San Bartolomé some houses are called ranchitos, homes are called small, and for a majority of testators no house at all is listed; Ocotitlan shares at least the last tendency. None of these characteristics holds for Yancuictlalpan. Perhaps Yancuictlalpan, at least the slice of it we see in the testaments from there, was a better-off community than the other two, or more conservative, or both. That a sector of local society in San Bartolomé and Ocotitlan had very humble housing seems beyond doubt.30

THE SOLAR

In the above we have already dealt with the land aspect of the home in its relation to the houses. Nowhere in the corpus are there especially revealing passages to open a view for us as with the house complex. Nevertheless, through attention to the merest details again something can be learned. Nowhere in the three main settlements does one find the old callalli, house land, or indeed any other traditional indigenous vocabulary in this respect, such as the land going with, pertaining to, belonging to the house. All the words are Spanish in origin, with forms of solar greatly dominant, aided by pedazo and pedacito to emphasize fragmentation, and especially in

30 I do not attempt to draw on any of the contemporary assessments of indigenous housing by people in the Spanish sector, for they invariably denigrated “Indian” accommodations to the utmost, picturing them as hovels.
Spanish the additional word *sitio*, a site (for a house), a synonym of *solar* that was seen with ever more frequency in the Spanish world.

**San Bartolomé.** As with the house, with the solar too the expressions used in San Bartolomé attest to small size and constant subdivision. In the Nahuatl testaments the word *solar* appears unmodified 15 times, whereas the Spanish diminutive *solarito* comes up 14 times unmodified, plus 9 more with the double diminutive *pedacito solarito*, “a little bit of a little solar.” The Nahuatl diminutive *-ton* is also used, though less; *solarton* appears unmodified 3 times, and 4 more in combination with *pedacito* or *pedazo*. The wording *pedazo solar* occurs 6 times; it does not stress smallness, but does indicate that there has been subdivision. A single time the wording *pedazo solar sitio* is seen, showing at least some penetration of the newer term into the Nahuatl texts.\(^{31}\) Of the total of 51 cases, 30 specifically indicate small size and 6 more subdivision.

The Spanish portion of the San Bartolomé corpus is more muddled because of the introduction of *sitio* as an approximate equivalent of *solar* and tending to take its place, but the overall picture is similar. In only 5 cases is *sitio* or a combination of *sitio* and *solar* left unmodified.\(^{32}\) *Solarito* occurs twice. In 3 cases the diminutive *pedacito* is used in connection with *solar* or *sitio*. In 6 more it is *pedazo*. Thus of 16 cases, 5 are specifically diminutive, and 6 more show subdivision.

\(^{31}\) Sbt#108, 1823. Omission of *de* is normal in the Nahuatl reproduction of Spanish phrases, but the order of the words in *solar sitio* goes against Spanish usage. *Solar de sitio* is impossible in normal Spanish; it would always be *sitio de solar*. Nevertheless, as we will see, this expression occurs in the testaments in Spanish.

\(^{32}\) Sbt#84, 1821, has *solar de sitio*, which as seen in a note just above reverses the normal Spanish *sitio de solar* and is in line with the general idiosyncrasy of Nahuatl-speaker Spanish in the area at this time. In three other expressions as well, *solar de sitio or solarito de sitio* is used, showing this to be the norm in San Bartolomé (sbt#62, 108).
Indications of measurements are scarce with San Bartolomé solares, and since the value of the measurements is uncertain, things are left unclear even then. A testament of 1809 in which a house is present speaks of the “solarto sa matlactli yhuan yey sorCo.” “the little solar of only 13 surcos.” Not only by the diminutive but by saying “only” 13 surcos, the testator indicates that the solar is below average size. The equivalence of the surco to any other measurement and in particular to the quahuitl is not established. It is clearly much smaller than the quahuitl. In the body of materials here it runs up as far as 90 but never to 100 or over. One implication is that there could be 100 surcos in a standard plot of 20 by 20 quahuitl, which was the typical original size of a piece of house land, later considered a solar. If so, there would be 5 surcos to a quahuitl, and 13 surcos would be a mere 2.6 quahuitl, possibly 20 feet (by the original 20 quahuitl, perhaps around 150 feet). But this is enough speculation; it can at least serve to show something of the state of knowledge and lack of knowledge on these matters. In another testament, of 1815, a solarito is of 15 surcos, only a bit larger than the one just seen. In 1813 Rosa María mentions 10 surcos at the edge of the road; this scrap was carved out of a larger solar and may have been meant as a site to establish a home, but it was in the nature of a crumb to a granddaughter who got nothing else, and probably not too much should be made of its small size.

Beyond this, one can only say that the average solar in San Bartolomé must have been somewhat larger than those for which the measurements were just given, but that in view of the fact that most have been subdivided at least once, they must usually have been smaller than the original 20 by 20 quahuitl. Most testators had only one solar (before further subdivision); only

---

33 Sbt#7.
34 Sbt#67.
35 Sbt#50.
two cases show unequivocal evidence of the testator holding two different ones simultaneously.\textsuperscript{36}

A traditional element in Nahua culture was the \textit{temazcalli} or sweat house (Spanish \textit{temescal}). Even during the previous centuries when we know that this institution was standard, it appears with extreme rarity in Nahuatl testaments. Yet one turns up in San Bartolomé, on a pedacito de solarito, in the 1819 testament of Domingo Manuel. He had a full-scale home complex and several parcels of non-household land; at the end of his bequests he leaves a little piece of a lot, “se pedasito sularito,” to his sister, mentioning a temazcalli in connection with it, though the passage remains puzzling in some respects. By its location in the will and by its heir this property seems separate from the house complex and main solar.\textsuperscript{37} Though an isolated instance, this can serve as a reminder of the persistence of often unmentioned indigenous culture traits in these communities. And if there was one temazcalli in San Bartolomé and the other communities, there were probably more.

\textbf{Ocotitlan.} In the overwhelmingly Spanish corpus of Ocotitlan, small size and subdivision are also evident in the terminology for solares, but not to the same extent as in San Bartolomé. The term \textit{sitio} is not in fashion here; everything is in terms of solares. Unmodified \textit{solar} occurs 11 times; \textit{solarito} 4 times; and \textit{pedazo de solar} 6 times.\textsuperscript{38} Thus the unmodified term has a slight majority over indications of smallness and subdivision, whereas in San Bartolomé 47 of 67 cases showed such indications.

\textsuperscript{36} Sbt\#15, 77, 108. Things are often quite hard to judge because the testator will speak of giving separate lots to different heirs, and after close examination and reflection it becomes apparent that these are all parts of the single main solar the testator is living on.

\textsuperscript{37} Sbt\#77.

\textsuperscript{38} This includes the Nahuatl oco\#6, 1810, with “pedaso solar.”
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Ocotitlan yields more in the way of solar measurements than San Bartolomé. A solar described in 1809 measured 10 palos, i.e., quahuitl. That is, it was still half of a full original site of 20 by 20 quahuitl. In 1813 a solarito is given as measuring 23 varas, a vara being a little less than an English yard, here 69 Spanish feet, a reasonable size despite being called small, not too far off half of 20 quahuitl. Probably we are to assume the full original 20 quahuitl in the other dimension. The same holds true for a pedazo de solar “going as far as the tejojote and up to where it borders on the solar of Vicente Ferrer,” for which 18 varas is given. In another case this question is solved, for a second dimension is given. In 1817 a solar measured 50 varas north to south and 43 varas east to west; This would be 150 by 129 Spanish feet. It sounds very close to the full 20 by 20 quahuitl in one direction, only slightly diminished in the other.

In 1812 a solarito was given as measuring 23 surcos, larger than the examples of solares in surcos in San Bartolomé, conceivably equal to 4.6 quahuitl (by 20). Another solar was of 4 reales, a type of measurement to be treated in Chapter 5, possibly equal to 15 or 20 quahuitl. As we see, the people of this time had no compunction about using different measuring systems, presuming they would all be understood and that the equivalences were well known.

Extrapolating a bit, the examples can be interpreted as varying from virtually a full original plot of 20 by 20 quahuitl to half that to hardly more than a fifth. This type of variation

---

39 Sbt#3. The relevant passage is: “se pedasito solarito yderecho temascalit niCopilrotytlanatiltzin [sic] notatzi AxCa nicmaCatinoerma ytoCa Concepisiona maria viuda,” “As to a little piece of a little solar (with rights to?) a temazcalli that I [?] by order of my father, now I am leaving it to my sister named Concepción María, widow.” The loanword derecho, law, right, justice, is quite rare but must be the meaning, for words of native origin were always used when saying “straight” (the other meaning of derecho). The form “niCopilroty” appears to be a verb based on a loanword, but I have not yet deciphered it, nor am I even entirely sure that the transcription is right.

40 Oco#24, 1816: “otro pedaso de Solar al lado de Sur que compone diéz y ocho varas hasta onde esta el texoxote y hasta honde linda con el Solar de Visente Ferrel.”
probably prevailed in San Bartolomé too, with Ocotitlan perhaps tending more to the larger sizes; but I recognize that such an impression is anything but fully established.

In San Bartolomé we see almost no direct evidence of the agricultural use of solares. In Ocotitlan there is at least a little. The larger parcels, including those once subdivided, were fully practical units for maize agriculture. One solarito was described as in the barranca, the ravine, so perhaps not in the central cluster of settlement, and it was to “serve San Antonio,” that is, to provide revenue for the support of the saint, just as was often said of fully agricultural non-household land. In another case, just referred to, all the signs indicate agriculture; the problem is in the other direction, why the piece was called a solar. The description runs: “a solar of 4 reales on the road going to San Miguel, bordering on the land of doña Manuela Ortega.” As we will see in the next chapter, a parcel of 4 reales was the most common type of non-household land in San Bartolomé. It was non-household land, not solares, that was usually described as on the road to somewhere; and this piece borders someone’s land, not someone’s house. Possibly some properties were on the borderline between being a solar and being non-household land.

Yancuictlalpan. The sample is small here, but the unmodified word solar is used 6 times, while there are only 2 instances of diminutives, solarito and pedacito de solarito. Once again Yancuictalpan comes out on top of such comparative tests.

As usual the indications with measurements are tantalizing rather than definitive. One testament actually fails to use the word solar at all, but is clearly talking about it when giving 15

---

41 Sbt#14, 1813: “un Solar de cuatro reales en el camino que ba para San migel linda con la tierra de Dña manuela ortega.”

42 Yan#1, 1813, and #3, 1810. Yan#6, 1820, uses the expression “Sentel Solar,” centetl solar. This might just mean one solar, a solar, but centetl is also used in the sense of something being whole and might mean a whole, undivided solar.
surcos and the house to the son, another 15 surcos to the daughter.\textsuperscript{43} This would make a solar of 30 surcos for the testator, perhaps 6 quahuitl and a reasonable size, but the children would have very small house lots. In another case, in 1809 María Petrona’s solarito is itself already only 15 surcos, and she specifically calls her house small (a \textit{caltontlî}).\textsuperscript{44} In another instance, to which much attention was already given for its information on the house compound, it is hard to decide for sure what the intention of the original is about the solar. In 1825 Francisca Antonia left some of the buildings of her complex to her son, some to two grandsons, along with saints in each case, without any mention of the solar or what land each of the heirs might take, except that one of them was to get the patio.\textsuperscript{45} They would surely take the land the buildings stood on. The testator then proceeded to give 90 surcos to her daughter and son-in-law, along with yet more saints. The question is whether this is non-household agricultural land or a section of the solar that held the houses. That the testator is dividing the home place among all the heirs is clear, and that saints go to the daughter too implies that the bequest is to help her establish a home. Yet 90 surcos is a large amount, perhaps almost all of an original plot of 20 by 20 quahuitl. I tend to think that this is indeed a portion of an extra-large solar, for the testator shows unusual assets not only by trying to divide the buildings but by owning a plethora of saints, yet I cannot claim certainty for this impression.

In one case we have definite proof that a solar was being used for maize agriculture. In 1821 Mariano Domingo left to his wife and son “a solar where 6 cuartillos of maize enter, next to

\textsuperscript{43} Yan\#11, 1825.

\textsuperscript{44} Yan\#1. She did not attempt to subdivide the solarito, but possibly that was because she had no other heir than her husband in any case.

\textsuperscript{45} The whole passage is quoted in the main text above.
cultivated fields of Isidro Trinidad and José Santos.”

The 6 cuartillos are a quarter of a fanega, the main size of agricultural land in Yancuictlalpan, and maize is specifically mentioned, in the same phrase used with regular agricultural land. Indeed we would suspect that this is simply a piece of agricultural land; the neighboring properties are called cultivated fields (milli). Yet though no house is mentioned, this solar comes at the place in the will where the home establishment fits in the scheme, after the preamble and before other tlalli (non-household land).

A word on solares in general. If we look at the picture overall for our three communities, the vocabulary used gives some indication that solares were smallest and most subdivided in San Bartolomé, next in Ocotitlan, and least in Yancuictlalpan. When it comes to trying to estimate actual sizes through measurements, the picture remains somewhat the same. But neither method can be considered as giving definitive comparative results; perhaps we can at least say that there was variation, a somewhat different pattern in each community. Overall, some solares seem to have survived at close to their original size of 20 by 20 quahuitl, which was fully efficient for maize agriculture, but most had been subdivided, probably several times, so that solares were of various sizes from still very viable agricultural plots to strips that could hardly have been very productive in that way. One vaguely discerns that there was an indistinct line between solares and non-household land, some solares functioning simply as agricultural land despite the name.

INHERITANCE

Inheritance strategy plus the number of surviving offspring accounts for the size and make-up of the household complex of the individuals of the community in any given generation.

46 Yan#8: “se solar canpa calaqui chicuase cuatillos tlaoli momilnamiqui ysidro trinidad yhua Jose santos.”
The local demographic picture is beyond my resources for the moment, but on the basis of the corpus I can grapple with inheritance strategy.

**San Bartolomé.** The pattern in which, when there were two heirs, one received the house and half the solar, the other one the other half to establish a home on, was already a dominant trend in the Toluca Valley by the eighteenth century.\(^47\) Sometimes more than one heir shared the rest of the solar, but one would get the whole house, consonant with the changed nature of the buildings by this time. The pattern continues strong in San Bartolomé in the time studied here. I will use a semi-statistical plan in talking of these matters, for the nature of the language in the sources makes it hard to talk of them with as much confidence as when dealing for example with whether a solar is mentioned or not, or whether a testator is male or female. As was seen above, there is every reason to think that in many cases when only a solar is mentioned, there was actually some sort of house there too. But even more of a deterrent is that when there are multiple heirs the sources often, or indeed most of the time, do not specifically distinguish between segments of an existing solar that are carved out of the main one and whole separate solares. Very often they tend to give a first impression of separate solares when further analysis and familiarity with our people’s habits makes it much more likely that they were segments. Thus before many phenomena can be counted, I must judge the particular situation and classify it. With this understood, in the Nahuatl corpus I count 14 cases in which I consider it clear that one relative is receiving the house and some of the solar, one or more other relatives the rest of

\(^47\) See TT, passim. The point will be much more strongly established in Caterina Pizzigoni’s forthcoming *The Life Within*, a study of indigenous society in the whole Valley in Stage 3, the second half of the seventeenth century and all the eighteenth.
the solar to build on. Two other cases of division probably fit this pattern but are not specific enough to be included definitively.

In an archetypal situation, one heir receives the house and half the solar, one other the half without the house. In a testament of 1812, Nicolás George says: “I am leaving this house and half the solar to my nephew Miguel Bernabé, and I am leaving the other half solar, below, to my child named Bernabé Antonio.”48 The language here leaves no doubt. The allocation is classic, though the classic heir of the house is the oldest son, not a nephew. Probably the nephew is grown and the son is little, and there is a custodial aspect. A fully classic example occurs in the testament of Guadalupe María in 1813: “I am giving this house with half the little solarito to my eldest child Marcos Nicolás; I am giving the other half, on top, at the edge of the road, to another child of mine named José Pioquinto.”49 Or the son could get the house and half, the daughter the other half. In 1823 Dionisia Jacinta says: “Cayetano Román is to take the lower part where our little home is; a daughter of mine named Petrona Josefa is to take the upper part near the solarito of Hilaria María.”50 Notice that here the text does not actually say half, and in fact piece, part, or the like is more common. Often the division may indeed not have been in half, though in this case dividing the solar in the middle is specified elsewhere in the text.

48 Sbt#14: “Yni caltzitli Ynhua tlaco solar nicnoCahuililiti nosobrinotzi Miguel Bernabel Ynhua oc no tlaCo soLar Yc tlatzitlaconpa nicCahuililiti noCone YtoCa Bernabel Ant∞.

49 Sbt#52: “Yni Calztzitli YCa tlaCo solarito nicmaCati nocone YaCapatli marCus NiColas Ynhua oc no tlaCo Yc tlacpaCopa nicmaCati oc se noCone YtoCa Jose pioquinto Yqu itecon hotli.”

50 Sbt#90: “Connanas Cayetano Roma yc tlatzitlaConpa Capa Can toChato oc se nohpuchoc [sic] ytoCa petrona Josefa Connanas yc tlacpacConpa ynahuac ysularito ylaria maria.”
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There were many different senior/junior combinations depending on the situation: grandson and granddaughter; daughter and granddaughter; nephew and niece; son and nephew.\textsuperscript{51}

When there were more than two eligible and needy heirs, especially children, one heir would get the house and some part of the solar while the remainder would be redivided among two more, or even three more.\textsuperscript{52}

It was not really a violation of this pattern to leave the whole house and lot to a single heir when there was only one. That seems to account for four cases.\textsuperscript{53} Also, it is apparent, and this was not a new thing, that testators were reluctant to carry out a division when one of the heirs was custodial, the other very small, as with a daughter-in-law and her children, the testator’s grandchildren, so that the younger generation would eventually replace the older and there would be no need for division, or when all the children were very small and might well not survive to adulthood.\textsuperscript{54}

In any case, more properties with house and solar were divided in this fashion than were not. The situation is different with properties that are defined only as a solar or some diminutive or subdivision thereof, even though we know some of them had residences on them, and can suspect the same of many more. With properties of this type, 20 went to a single heir (13 in the Nahuatl corpus, 7 in the Spanish), whereas only 8 were divided between two or sometimes three heirs. Another five went to multiple heirs in common under the same conditions as just seen with

\textsuperscript{51} Sbt\#14, 50, 75, 94
\textsuperscript{52} Sbt\#5, 19, 95, 96, 119.
\textsuperscript{53} Sbt\#6, 72, 80, 117. These attributions are not exactly definitive. That no other heir is mentioned in a will does not invariably mean that no other was available; intentionally ignoring someone for a variety of reasons was not unheard of.
\textsuperscript{54} Sbt\#65, 85, 88, 97, 99, 102 have custodial situations; sbt\#102 has two small children.
house and solar properties. The reason for the difference escapes me; the availability of heirs should have been no different for testators who had houses and solares than for those who had only solares. Perhaps in some indirect way the phenomenon shows the smaller value of the properties without houses and indicates that in fact many included no residence.

The extensive subdivision of home properties had not begun with the generation of the testators. Sometimes that emerges clearly in the documents. In 1823 Esteban Ramón said: “as to a piece of solar, a site [for a house], that my late precious father don Domingo Ramón, deceased, left me, my solar is in between my uncle Martín Julián and my deceased uncle Juan de los Santos; now I am leaving it to my wife Estefania María Victoria.” That is, the grandfather of the testator left his solar in three parts to as many sons; the testator as son of one of the sons who died now holds his portion, which is in the middle of the other two, now held by his uncles, and he is carefully delineating what he is leaving to his wife and what he is not. In these situations, and perhaps in most, we must imagine a collection of relatives of various generations living in close proximity on what was originally the full-sized solar of some ancestor.

Consider the case of Eugenia Gertrudis, who made her will in 1823:

And I say that as to the house where I am raising my little children, that their precious late father left us, now I am leaving my child Cosme Damián in the house to serve [the saints]; my statement is to be carried out, my order is to be fulfilled.

55 Sbt#92: se pedasu solar sitio yn unehmocanhuitiliitia notlasutatzi metztiCaPCa Dn domigo Ramon difoto Ca nosular nepatla de notiotzitzi Martin Julia ynhua notiotzin difoto Juan de los santos AxCa nicCahuitiinin nosihuahuatzi estenfania maria vitoria.”
And I say I am leaving to another son of mine, Luis Antonio, likewise another piece adjacent to this same solar, he is to take it; my statement is to be carried out.

And I say I am likewise leaving another piece adjacent to this solar to another daughter of mine, Agustina Rosa, she is to take the part next to her younger brother Luis Antonio; my statement is to be carried out, my order is to be fulfilled.

And I say I am leaving another piece likewise adjacent to this solar to another daughter of mine named Dolores Cornelia; she is to take the part next to her younger sister. My statement is to be carried out, my order and the order of her father the late Juan de los Santos is to be fulfilled.56

These bequests might be taken as separate contiguous solares owned by a real estate magnate, but attention to the word pedazo, “piece,” will tell us that here a single solar held by the testator and previously by herself and her husband is being divided among four children in a form of the pattern discussed above: the eldest son is getting the house with some of the solar, and the younger son and two daughters are getting abutting portions of the larger solar. Each bequest

56 Sbt#96: “= ynhua niquitohua ynpan i Caltzitli Capa niquihuapahua nopilhuatoto uCa otehmoCahuili ytlasutatzi metzticaPca AxCan uCa nicCacti yConetzi Cosmi damia nicCacti ypa Cali para tlatequipanos neltis notlatol moChihuas notlanahuatil = ynhua niquitohua oc se noCone Luis Antonio sano Iloqui nicCahuiliiti oc se pedasu ysaligiCa yni sular Conanas neltis notlatol ynhua niquitohua oc se pedasu sano [f. 2, verso, 503] ysaligiCa yni sular nicCahuiliiti oc se nohpuh Angostina Rosa Conanas yc ynahuac ylleermanito luis Antonio neltis notlatol moChihuas notlanahuatil = ynhua niquitohua oc se pedasu seno [sic] ysaligiCa yni sular nicCahuiliiti oc nohpuh [sic] ytoCa Dolores Cornelia Conanas yc ynahuac yllemanita neltis notlatol moChihuas notlanahuatil ynhua ytlanahuatil yatatzin Juan de los santos difoto.”
usually has a background of previous bequests, whether openly expressed or not. Here we see that the father left the whole property as yet undivided to his wife and four children, and the wife has held it undivided until now, when at death she is, as already agreed with her late husband, dividing it as we see.

To this point I have been treating inheritance from the point of view of how the property was allotted and letting the important question of gender fall where it may. Indeed, so did the testators to an extent, for it is clear that in many cases they had no real choice, making bequests to whoever was available. But in the above we have already seen quite a few examples of favored treatment of males. Now let us investigate this question more systematically. We already know that a large majority of the testators were women. The central fact in gender roles in the present connection is that women made more bequests of household property than men did, but males received more bequests than females. Thus the exceptional predominance of women in the San Bartolomé corpus (and also in the other communities) was not being carried through to the next generation in the matter of home ownership; rather things were moving in the direction of the traditional male predominance, and the women themselves were in large part responsible for doing it.

Table 4.2 exhibits the situation with house and solar ownership as to gender. The number of women holding this kind of property was 36, to 28 men. Women made 73 bequests of this kind to men’s 57. Thus the role of men was already substantial, but they were a distinct minority in the group of San Bartolomé testators. Through the bequests that situation was reversed, as can be seen in Table 4.3. The most frequent inheritors of houses and solares were sons (50%), with daughters the next most common (21%). Nephews were the next most popular inheritors (11%), with brothers the fourth most common (6%). Grandsons and husbands tied for fifth place in
terms of preference (2%), with granddaughter, sister, niece, wife, and unclear inheritors tying for sixth place (1.5%) and a single daughter-in-law at the very end. In all, as seen in Table 4.4, there were 91 male inheritors (70%) to 39 female (30%).

In attempting to account for this reversal one can only conclude that the female predominance in the testaments of the independence period was contingent or temporary, not indicating a basic structural change in gender roles (though there appear to have been qualitative changes in some departments of life). The apparent reason is the simple absence of men related in some way to the turmoil of the times (I will return to this topic in Chapter 5). The traditional system in which males were preferred in the inheritance of household property, with females subordinate, in the expectation that primarily sons would carry on the testator’s household while daughters would primarily marry and go to another household, seems to have been ingrained in women as well as men, and they continued to act as always despite the changed conditions.
Table 4.2

House and Solar Ownership
San Bartolomé

- Number of female testators owning house/solar: 73
- Number of house/solares left by women: 36
- Number of male testators owning house/solar: 28
- Number of house/solares left by men: 57
Table 4.3

House & Solar Inheritors
San Bartolomé Numerical Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to Testator</th>
<th>Number of Bequests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>daughter-in-law</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman of unk. relation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclear inheritor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niece</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sister</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>granddaughter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husband</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grandson</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brother</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nephew</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughter</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ocotitlan. The pattern of house and half the solar for the preferred heir, the other half solar for a second heir, is known in Ocotitlan too, but cannot said to be dominant. At least the primarily Spanish sources are not communicative enough to demonstrate that it is. Here is one full example, however:

Digo y declaro que la Cacita de adobes y el solarito que me deJaron Mis difuntos Padres Juan Manuel y Ynez Sebastiana aora les Boy degando mi nieto Fransisco xavier y Mi hija Caudia Maria del dh. Solarito Se an de partir por yuales partes pero la cacita siempre se le quedara mi nieto Fran.cO Xabier para que les Sirba el Santo Cristo y Santa ynez, y Ntña Señora del Rosario Se la llebara mi hija Maria Claudia
I say and declare that as to the little house of adobe bricks and the solarito that my deceased parents Juan Manuel and Inés Sebastiana left me, now I am leaving it to my grandson Francisco Javier and my daughter Claudia María. They are to divide the solarito equally, but my grandson Francisco Javier is always to keep the little house to serve Santo Cristo and Santa Inés, and my daughter María Claudia is to take Nuestra Señora del Rosario.57

But this pattern obtains only twice, whereas 5 times house and solar go undivided to a single person, and twice they are undivided for more than one heir.58 When only the solar is mentioned, it goes undivided to a single heir 7 times and is divided only twice. The predominance of undivided solares applies to San Bartolomé too. But judging by our sample, there was relatively speaking less division of all kinds in the bequests of Ocotitlan than in those of San Bartolomé. Yet at a glance the majority of cases seem to be motivated by the lack of additional heirs, so one must not make too much of the difference, or perhaps attribute it to local demography rather than inheritance strategy.

Turning to the matter of gender, we find that though women controlled more household property, the gender divide between owners and inheritors is less pronounced in Ocotitlan. A total of 19 people—10 men and 9 women—owned houses and/or solares and transferred them to heirs in their testaments. These owners made a total of 27 bequests, of which 12 were left by men and 15 by women.

57 Oco#26, 1819, testator Paulino Santiago. It is not a mistake that the two names of the daughter are reversed the second time they occur; the phenomenon was quite common.
58 In addition to oco#26, #2 of 1809 is of house-and-half plus half type, though some deduction must be applied to show it. Examples of house and solar to a single heir are oco#5, 12, 14, 17, and 25. An undivided house and solar goes to more than one heir in oco#10 (to wife and son) and #20 (to wife and four small children).
Sons were favored as heirs for houses as in other pueblos (see Table 4.5). Among the testators, 7 men and 4 women bequeathed houses, and the same proportion prevailed into the next generation; 7 males and 4 females inherited houses. The picture when solares are included is similar: 8 sons to 6 daughters as inheritors, but this is a higher proportion of daughters than in neighboring communities.\textsuperscript{59}

**Yancuictlalpan.** The small sample in Yancuictlalpan fails to show a single example of the pattern of giving the house and half the solar to the preferred heir, the other half of the solar to a second heir. In fact, it contains an example, dealt with in detail above, of dividing the buildings as well as the solar, the traditional pattern that had prevailed when there were separate dwellings for the residents of the complex. Perhaps Yancuictlalpan was truly more conservative in inheritance policy as it was in some other ways, including the retention of ancient terminology (*caltentli ithualli* for the house complex, as seen above). In another case too a testament speaks of a future division of the house and solar between heirs, but so vaguely as to allow for almost any bequest pattern.\textsuperscript{60}

The dominant pattern for house and solar in the sample is for them to be bequeathed undivided: to a single heir, 6 times, and once to two heirs.\textsuperscript{61} The Yancuictlalpan records have only one example of a property in which only the solar is mentioned; it goes undivided to two heirs.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{59} Ocotitlan had a tradition, though not too often actually carried out, of naming the spouse of the heir for legal purposes; that is not taken into consideration here.

\textsuperscript{60} Yan\#5, 1819. House and solar are left to the testator’s brother and little son for now, with the former clearly in charge; later it is to be divided in an unspecified way.

\textsuperscript{61} To one heir: yan\#1, 2, 3, 6, 10, 11. To two heirs, yan\#7.

\textsuperscript{62} Yan\#8, 1821 (to wife and son).
In matters of gender, as in San Bartolomé nearly all structures go to men, but most of the people who left testaments were female; of the 12 testators, 9 were women and 3 were men. They left 8 structures to men, 3 to a daughter or jointly to a female and her spouse. In at least one case a woman gave preference to a son even though a daughter was specifically available. In 1825 María Bernardina gave the house and 15 surcos of the lot to her son José Gabriel, the other
15 surcos to her daughter María Genevieva. Nevertheless, in this otherwise uniform picture of women testators favoring males, in 1824 Bárbara Manuela gave the house, solar, and even most of the non-household land to her daughter Miguela Gerónima even though there was also a son, who got nothing more than half of one of the non-household parcels. Even this example might fit within traditional notions, by which sometimes when a son was already established elsewhere and had done well for himself, perhaps through a separate inheritance from the other parent, any other child would be preferred in the bequests. Two men who specifically mentioned houses left them in charge of custodians for their small sons.

CONCLUSIONS

The eighteenth-century layout of the house compound, with a general residence on one side of a patio and a kitchen on the other, seems to have been prevalent at independence in the communities involved, though rarely indeed is it specifically mentioned. One reason for believing in its predominance is the frequent pattern in San Bartolomé of giving the house and half the solar to a preferred heir, the other half to a second, rather than trying to divide the now almost indivisible house complex. Yet this pattern is much more obvious in San Bartolomé than elsewhere. The complex has changed in that “house, lot, and saints,” is no longer the normal way of speaking of it. Yet the saints are still there in close association with the home, especially in Ocotitlan, where they come up constantly, and in Yancuictlalpan, where some echoes of the old phrase occur. In San Bartolomé the records allude in various ways to the humility or small size

63 Yan#11.
64 Yan#10.
65 Yan#5, 1819 (to brother and son) and yan#7, 1821 (to wife and son); a man leaves a solar alone to wife and son (yan#8, 1821).
of the residence, but in the other communities this element is not prominent; probably there was a continuum from buildings as well developed as those of the previous century to provisional, impermanent structures (and indeed we must assume the existence of many such in the previous century too).

Subdivision of the solar, already carried out extensively in previous generations, continued apace in the time studied. Most solares, that is, the pieces of land the house complexes were on, had been divided at least once, and many into several parts. A few remained at or close to the original 20 by 20 quahuitl, perhaps 150 feet square; others were half that, and many seem to have been as little as around 20 feet (in width, for the implication of so often giving only one measurement implies that often the original 20 quahuitl was retained in one direction). In many if not most cases, a web of multigenerational relatives was living in close proximity on subdivisions of the original solar. The division must have cut into the traditional agricultural use of what once was the callalli, the house land, but now is universally called a solar. Yet we do have evidence of continued use for maize agriculture, and on full or half solares it would have been perfectly feasible. It is notable that the evidence of subdivision and very small solar size is much stronger for San Bartolomé than for the other communities, and is weakest for Yancuictlalpan.

Thus in its most basic aspects—the buildings, the land they were on, the shape in which the complex was transferred to the next generation—the household is much as it was in the eighteenth century. Probably both buildings and land were diminished from earlier, but that is hard to demonstrate conclusively, and seems to vary from one place to the next, with the most obvious pressure on the situation in San Bartolomé. The great question is how the predominance of women as testators and owners of property in the documentary corpus affects the system. The answer is that aside from the absence of men, it affects it surprisingly little. Majorities of women
owning household property as testators turn into majorities of males inheriting that property. In some cases the ratios are fully reversed, in others there is more gender equality, but everywhere males continue to be preferred as heirs of houses and solares, as they had been in the preceding centuries. Apparently the women testators in the corpus never changed their mindset on matters concerning the household no matter what the conditions were. What is behind the absence of men, beyond the fact that it must in some way be connected with the independence movement, remains to be seen, and also whether it is absence or death, and whether the women testators actually inherited the household property they have or simply became owners de facto by virtue of being its custodians. Such matters must have great priority in the research agenda.
5. Non-household Land

María Josefa, in leaving her outlying land to her two little sons, told them to split the parcel exactly in half, a commonly requested arrangement. This, her “little piece of land,” was inherited from her mother. The consequences of repeated subdivision are clear in this case: “I leave it to them for the two of them to be raised with if God gives them life; they are to divide it equally; a few furrows (surcos) will come to each of them.” María Josefa’s story encapsulates much of what was happening in terms of land tenure within indigenous communities at independence: everyone is making the best of what they have. And as described in this chapter, people did this by keeping their land within the control of their communities, and weaving kinship ties to the land in ways that supported their interests and expectations, while the individual portions, or pieces of land, grew ever smaller, or so it seems.

Since land was very much involved in the household complex itself, and the common and very important non-contiguous plots were neither specifically defined as such nor precisely located, it has been difficult to establish the difference between the two realms and to study non-household land as such. This chapter, based on data from San Bartolomé, Ocotitlan, and Yancuictlalpan, treads into this complicated territory, beginning with San Bartolomé.

---

SAN BARTOLOMÉ

When people bequeathed their non-household parcels of land, they generally spoke in terms of pieces of land as opposed to the solar generally used for household land. The dominant, nearly exclusive expression was ce tlalli, literally “one land,” with the meaning in effect of one piece of land. In Nahuatl it was not necessary to say a piece specifically, as in Spanish, although through Spanish influence the loanword pedazo sometimes appeared in conjunction with tlalli.2 Significantly, the term was frequently modified as tlaltontli with the -ton diminutive, “a little piece of land.” Indeed, though I have not counted every instance, the diminutive form seems to be used more often than the word unmodified. In the same way, pedazo appears most often in the diminutive, pedacito.

The two great terms found in Nahuatl texts of central Mexico and across centuries are tlalli, land in general or generically, and milli, a piece of land set up for cultivation and understood to be under cultivation presently. The fact that in San Bartolomé tlalli was so thoroughly preferred for land that one owned and was bequeathing oneself does not imply, however, that land called tlalli was not being cultivated. Again and again we see signs of maize cultivation on the plots to which it referred. Once the term tlalli de labor occurs,3 as an equivalent or translation of Spanish tierra de labor, land for cultivation. That is surely the intention in all the other cases too.

Ironically, the word referring specifically to cultivation, milli, is also found frequently, although in the San Bartolomé Nahuatl corpus it occurs only once meaning a property of the

2 Sbt#63, “pedaso tlali”; sbt#30 and 104, “pedasu tlaltotli.” More examples could be adduced ad infinitum.
3 Sbt#61.
testator’s. In 1813 Martina María had a *miltontli*, a little cultivated field, that she had inherited from her godmother for confirmation, and now she left it in turn to her two daughters. It is most instructive that Martina María also refers to the very same parcel as a *tlaltontli*, a little piece of land. Beyond this instance, all the many uses of *milli* refer not to the testator’s land but to property bordering on it and used to define its location. The nearly universal expression is *imiltenco*, “at the edge of (next to) a field of (so-and-so).” A good example is in the same document we are discussing; the very same plot is called “yno tlaltotli ymilteCon Juan de la Cruz,” “that little piece of land next to a field of Juan de la Cruz.”

It is of course out of the question that all the holdings of the testators were just pieces of land and all the properties bordering on them were cultivated fields. Clearly the two words are two different ways of referring to the same thing, and for reasons not yet understood, usage fastened on piece of land for one’s own property and cultivated field for anyone else’s. Or one could say that the expression *imiltenco* had been frozen with *milli*, “cultivated field,” in it. In any case, both *tlalli* and *milli* refer to non-household land in contrast to *solar*, land with a house on it or at least planned for that use. Thus when we consider it closely, a terminological distinction between household and non-household land is being made even though at first glance it seems that a special term for the latter is missing.

The sheaf of about twenty testaments in Spanish from San Bartolomé in the same period, from as early as 1813 to 1832, gives us another perspective on land terminology and throws light back on the larger Nahuatl corpus. Non-household land that is owned by the testator and bequeathed is nearly universally called by the term already mentioned, *tierra de labor*, land for

---

4 Sbt#39, “miltotli.”
cultivation (of grains). This corresponds to the *tlalli* and *tlalontli* of the Nahuatl testaments and fully confirms the previous finding that the parcels were under cultivation. It also explains where the Nahuatl phrase *tlalli de labor* came from. *Pedazo* and *pedacito*, “piece” and “little piece” of land, are also liberally used in the Spanish, though perhaps not to quite the same extent as in the Nahuatl wills.

The neat opposition of *tlalli* for one’s own land, *milli* for someone else’s, however, does not carry over into the Spanish corpus. The properties of neighbors are used to locate parcels in Spanish wills just as in those in Nahuatl, but in many cases the bordering property is left unmentioned and only the name of the owner given. When the bordering parcel is mentioned, the word *tierra*, “land,” is almost always used, erasing the distinction so strong in the Nahuatl terminology. Only once, in the latest dated text in the series, issued in 1832 by Carmen de la Cruz, do we find *milpa*, the word used in Spanish to designate a cultivated field in the indigenous style, taken originally from Nahuatl *milpan*, “in the field(s).” In fact, however, it is twice being used in the same way that *imiltenco* is in the Nahuatl texts, in the phrase “colinda con la milpa de . . .,” “borders on the milpa of,” which is probably a direct translation of *imiltenco*. (Even in this text, in another instance of mentioning a bordering property, *tierra* is used.)

One wonders why *milpa* was not used more and earlier in the Spanish texts. It may be that the word, so universal in Mexico today, did not attain its dominance as early as we often imagine, but I realize that nothing can be concluded from my small sample. It does appear, nevertheless, that though the Spanish wills cluster temporally at the end of the collection, in

5 Sbt#119.
1823, 1824, and 1832, the main local ways of speaking of land in Spanish were stable during the whole time covered here. The earliest of the Spanish wills, from 1813, already uses tierra, and tierra de labor is dominant from 1817 forward.

The Nahuatl and the Spanish parts of the San Bartolomé corpus, then, are in close agreement on land terminology, and the frequent use of diminutives in both emphasizes the smallness of plots, at least partly because of the constant subdivision that had long been going on and that we see continuing in these texts.

### Systems of measuring land

Measurements were quite rarely specified for household land, to describe the solar or pieces of it. With land beyond the household complex, information on size was very frequently given, but in a variety of ways, some of which resist interpretation, and furthermore it is difficult and sometimes, so far, impossible to work out equivalences between them. Three systems of measurement are found in the San Bartolomé corpus. First, the traditional indigenous method, already fully established when the Spaniards arrived, used longitudinal measurements of length and width in terms of the quahuitl, “[measuring] stick,” with 20 by 20 quahuitl as the size of the primary unit, and most numbers in specific measurements based on multiplying or dividing 20. The quahuitl (also in some places called the matl) varied from place to place, but often was something over seven feet. Second, the Spaniards introduced a very different, less precise system, measuring land by the amount of seed that could be sown in it; the fanega was the basic

---

6 Sbt#40.
7 The first example in sbt#70.
8 See for example the document from eighteenth-century Azcapotzalco (Beyond the Codices, ed. by Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart, Doc. 17) in which the local variant of the quahuitl was equivalent to two and a half Spanish varas.
unit, though in practice its subdivisions, the almud and the cuartillo, are more frequently seen. Both these systems had existed across the Toluca Valley in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with one or the other dominating some areas, while in some areas both were used.\textsuperscript{9} The two are still found in San Bartolomé at the time of independence. In addition a newer system, not yet documented to my knowledge for other times and places, came in during our period: a method of giving the size of a parcel in terms of money, most frequently 4 reales (half a peso) or 2 reales (a fourth of a peso), and sometimes a full peso. In the following I successively discuss these three systems.

\textbf{Traditional measurement in quahuitl.} In San Bartolomé in the first years of the nineteenth century, the quahuitl remained so normative that in the Nahuatl texts the word itself was never employed when using it in measurements but was taken for granted, with the vigesimal nature of the numbers helping in identification. Thus in 1809, in the earliest example, María Josefa left a piece of land “of 20” to her grandsons, and in 1813 Guadalupe María left a piece of land described the same way to her son.\textsuperscript{10} In 1812 Florenciana María left a piece of land “of 40” to her nephew (the text also contains two bequests of pieces of 4 reales, using another system).\textsuperscript{11}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{9} See TT, p. 26 and passim.
\textsuperscript{10} sbt\#8, second and fourth bequests, and sbt\#52, second bequest. Both times the Nahuatl is “sepuhualpa,” \textit{cempohualpan}, with the relational word -\textit{pan} used sometimes to indicate quantities and here translated as “of.” The majority of mentions of quahuitl measurements in the San Bartomé corpus use this construction -\textit{pohualpan}.
\textsuperscript{11} sbt\#32, fourth bequest. The Nahuatl is “hopohualmani,” \textit{ompohualmani}, in which the number is bound to the verb \textit{mani} “to be spread out.” The expression, which is seen in many places and times, had become so formulaic that instead of “it spreads out for 40” it is best translated as “of 40.”
\end{flushleft}
We have every reason to think that this system had long been the one prevailing in San Bartolomé. In two testaments from there that are preserved from the years 1715 and 1731, all non-household land is measured in even 20s, 40s, and one 80, in one dimension only, using the same phrases and avoiding actual use of the word quahuitl. A household lot is measured in surcos, a unit which we will discuss shortly.\textsuperscript{12}

It will be useful to list here all the occurrences of quahuitl measurements in the San Bartolomé independence period corpus, as a basis for some further thoughts. In 1809 Victoriana María left eight bequests using quahuitl measurements. Two pieces of 20 were bequeathed whole, without subdivision. She left another two pieces of 40, subdivided evenly among sons and daughters, leaving them 20 each. And one piece of 20, “next to the well,” she divided between a nephew and a son (which would have resulted in 10 each, though that is not specified).\textsuperscript{13} In 1810, Nicolás George left a bequest of land of 40 to a nephew.\textsuperscript{14} In the same year, Lucaria Crisóstoma left her father’s piece of land of 20 to her daughter,\textsuperscript{15} and Manuela Lugarda left two different pieces of land of 20 to her nephew and a female first cousin, respectively.\textsuperscript{16}

Notice that all the examples of the quahuitl system mentioned so far are from the years 1809 through 1813. After that its use dropped precipitously. The only other example is from

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} TT, nos. 22 and 23. In one case a second dimension is given, 20 by 40, where two ordinary parcels were side by side.
\item \textsuperscript{13} sbt\#5, second through sixth bequests.
\item \textsuperscript{14} sbt\#14, see third bequest. Presumably “George” is the same name now known as Jorge, but the spelling is so unusual that I have left it as it is.
\item \textsuperscript{15} sbt\#11.
\item \textsuperscript{16} sbt\#10, third and fourth bequests.
\end{itemize}
nearly ten years later, 1822, when Tomasa Martina left a piece of 40 to her daughter.\textsuperscript{17} The reason for the timing of the change is left to our speculation. One cannot help noticing that it coincides with momentous events of the independence movement, which may indeed have had an impact, yet at present no more can be said on the subject for lack of evidence.

Another line of thought is that possibly the change coincides with the switch from the older generation of local notaries to the younger, from don Francisco Nicolás Romero to his son Cipriano Gordiano. This would imply that the different systems were readily equivalent and that the choice of one or the other was more a matter of taste. In fact, however, of the early set of testaments using the quahuitl system, only three are by the father (1809, 1810), whereas four are by the son (1810, 1812, 1813). The single retarded example, from 1822, is also by the son. It is true that the son at first duplicated almost all aspects of the father’s style and then soon varied some of them, apparently in a personal quest for independence and a more elaborate style. But we are left with the impression that the notaries were mainly reporting measurements as given to them by the testators. and that the quahuitl system actually became less prominent in San Bartolomé after 1812–1813, without actually disappearing.

If we look to the Spanish testaments of San Bartolomé, we find a use of the quahuitl system in 1824. Whereas in Nahuatl the word itself is avoided, the Spanish document uses its translation, \textit{palo} (stick). Dominga Bonifacia bequeathed two pieces of 20 palos each.\textsuperscript{18} All other non-household land in the Spanish wills, from 1813 to 1833, is measured in other ways or left without measurements. The lone example, though, does show that the quahuitl system remained in the local consciousness at least that long, and probably much longer.

\textsuperscript{17} Sbt#85.
\textsuperscript{18} Sbt#115, second and third bequests.
From the examples given above, one will see that wherever it was used, the quahuitl system retained its ancient characteristics. It was still strongly vigesimal; every single bequest is of either 20 or 40 quahuitl. It also retained another trait that had characterized it from the beginning. In all cases only one measurement is given. We can only conclude that just as in the system over the previous centuries, the other measurement is presumed to be 20, as in the ideal 20 by 20 basic plot. This is so even though the quahuitl system was competing with others, which are sometimes mentioned in the very same document. Here is another hint that the systems were readily convertible for the people of the time, even if we now often have trouble establishing the conversion factor.

The quahuitl system as practiced for agricultural land traditionally leaned heavily toward round numbers; if it went below something even in terms of 20s, it would usually be 10, or at most 5. Yet a set of subdivisions of the quahuitl had existed since precontact times and can be found used in sixteenth-century texts in the Valley of Mexico. No hint of this terminology remains in the San Bartolomé corpus, and as we have seen, all quahuitl measurements are even in vigesimal terms. Nevertheless, another more exact way of measuring land longitudinally did exist, and had already been in evidence in the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth century, if not earlier. In several cases in the San Bartolomé material we see the term surco, a loanword from Spanish meaning “furrow.” Although the word is of Spanish origin, it is by no means sure that that is true of the basic measurement itself. The same measurement appears occasionally in eighteenth-century texts of the Toluca Valley as cuemitl, an indigenous term meaning furrow like the Spanish word, and it may well be that the word surco originated as a translation of this term. Only further research in materials of the Spanish sector can definitively decide the question of which came first. In the eighteenth century the surco was used when it was desirable to give
smaller measurements that did not come out even in quahuitl, or specify fractions that were left over after an even quahuitl number.\textsuperscript{19}

The use of surcos to give uneven fractions of plots specified in quahuitl is not documented in the San Bartolomé testaments, though similar thinking was at work. Their connection with subdivision is clearer, sometimes indirectly, sometimes directly. In 1799 Apolonia Felipa left a little piece of land of 60 surcos to her daughter.\textsuperscript{20} In 1810 Nicolás George, among other bequests of land, some given in quahuitl, left a piece of 62 surcos to his nephew.\textsuperscript{21} In 1813 Martina María left a piece of land of 34 surcos to her son.\textsuperscript{22} Almost twenty years later the son still had what was apparently the same piece, now in his Spanish testament calling it a tierra de labor.\textsuperscript{23} If the conversion factor of five surcos to one quahuitl holds in such cases, these parcels amount to roughly two thirds and one third of a standard plot of 20 by 20 quahuitl. (Some tiny

\textsuperscript{19} See TT, p. 26. The surco was also often used with solares. Pizzigoni at that time speculated that there might be two surcos to a quiahuitl. Her further research, included in her forthcoming book on indigenous society in the Valley of Toluca in Stage 3, comes to the conclusion that although the equivalence still cannot be considered to be established definitively, the most likely ratio is five surcos to one quahuitl.

\textsuperscript{20} sbt\#1. The wording is “se tlaltotli YePuhuali SorCo.”

\textsuperscript{21} sbt\#14, sixth bequest. The wording is “Yepuhuali yhua ome sorco,” “60 and 2 surcos.” One might be inclined to interpret this as 60 quahuitl plus 2 surcos, but that is not the intention. In the same text 40 quahuitl are given as “opohualpa,” \textit{ompohualpan}, with the \textit{-pan} construction that is universally used to indicate quahuitl in the corpus except in a case or two where \textit{-mani} is used instead. The simple number without one of these modifiers does not indicate quahuitl. Also, nowhere else is a plot as large as 60 quahuitl mentioned.

\textsuperscript{22} sbt\#39, second bequest. The wording is “se tlaltotli de sepuhuali yhua matlactli ynhua nahui surCon,” “a little piece of land of (using \textit{de}) 30 (20 + 10) + 4 surcos.” Again one might want to interpret this as 30 quahuitl plus 4 surcos, but not only, as in the previous note, is \textit{-pan} lacking, but 30 is not an even vigesimal number like all the other occurrences of quahuitl numbers in the corpus.

\textsuperscript{23} See \#119, fifth bequest for the land from Carmen de la Cruz’s mother, given in turn to his daughter in 1832.
pieces in the corpus of very few surcos, 10 to 15, seem to be broken-off bits of household lots and not non-household land.\textsuperscript{24}

In other cases surcos are definitely used in connection with subdivision.\textsuperscript{25} In 1818 Bartolomé Luis said he was leaving “a little piece of land of 20 surcos to my little children to divide in half.”\textsuperscript{26} This plot of only 20 surcos was itself no doubt the product of subdivision, and now it is being divided in two again, which will result in pieces of only 10 each, but since the term \textit{tlalli} is being used, they are apparently still thought of as for cultivation and not as house lots. In 1823 Eugenia Gertrudis left a little piece of land to her two sons, giving 23 surcos to each.\textsuperscript{27} The bequest catches the eye in that surcos do not otherwise appear in odd numbers in San Bartolomé; what has happened is that the testator owned 46 surcos and subdivided them. Thus again and again we see that plots in surcos are what is left over from repeated subdivision of larger parcels originally measured in quahuitl.

\textsuperscript{24} Of the 103 bequests of solares/household lots, two are definitely measured in surcos, each time used on its own, without another value. In sbt\#7 (1809) the phrasing is “little solar, just 13 surcos.” In sbt\#67 (1815) we see “little solar, . . . 15 surcos.” In sbt\#50 (1813), second bequest, Rosa María says "To my grandchild María Francisca I am leaving ten surcos at the edge of the road." In this case the word “solar” is not used in the bequest, but the context shows the piece to be carved out of the house lot. In sbt\#54 (1813) Bartolome Felipe says “nocone ytoCa Julia sidoro nicmaCati matlactli sorco honechmotloConlili notatzi,” “to my child named Julián Isidro I am leaving 10 surcos that my father granted me.” The will mentions no house and no other land, so that this bequest, coming in the usual place for house and lot, probably refers to a lot parcel.

\textsuperscript{25} In sbt\#64 (1814), third bequest, María Bernardina says that she is leaving “se pedasito tlaltotli,” “a little piece of land,” to four children, and the word \textit{surco} is used in connection with what each is to take, but parts of the statement still resist interpretation, and no more can be said at the moment.

\textsuperscript{26} sbt\#73, third bequest: “se pedasito tlaltotli [sic] sepuhuali surCo . . . quimotlapanisque Nepatla nopolhuatoto.”

\textsuperscript{27} sbt\#96, fifth bequest: “se pedasu tlaltotli Ca ymilteCon Juan estevan niquiCahuilili sano yoqui umeti nopolhua Conanas Cosmi damia sepuhuali ynhua lley surCo yc ymilteco sano lle Juan estevan oc se noCone Luis antonio Conanas oc no sepuali yhua lley surCo ycmilteCon ytillotzi D\textsuperscript{8} Marti Julia,” “I am likewise leaving a little piece of land next to a field of Juan Esteban to two children of mine; Cosme Damián is to take 23 surcos next to a field of the same Juan Esteban, and another child of mine, Luis Antonio, is to take another 23 surcos next to a field of his uncle don Martín Julián.”
Measurement by surcos also shows in another way that it is an offshoot of the quahuitl system. Here too, only one measurement is given. It seems we must assume in this case as well that the other dimension is 20 quahuitl, that all the subdivision was normally applied to one dimension of the original plot, leaving the other at the full 20, for otherwise giving the number of surcos in only one direction would tell us very little. As to temporal distribution, most occurrences are dated in the time up through 1813, as with the quahuitl, but instances in 1815, 1818, and 1823 give the impression of the surco persisting more strongly; possibly by this time one could say that the surco was no longer a secondary measurement. As an aside, the term does not appear at all in the Spanish testaments of San Bartolomé, a fact which might or might not be significant.

**Measurement by grain sown.** As already briefly mentioned, a system of measuring land by its capacity to hold seed was used by the Spaniards and had been known also among indigenous people in many parts of the Toluca Valley by the mid-seventeenth century, if not before. It was based on the fanega, an amount of grain usually considered to be about a bushel and a half, with 12 almudes to each fanega and 4 cuartillos to each almud. To give a notion of the sizes involved, there is some reason to think that in the Toluca Valley one almud was the equivalent of 10 quahuitl (by 20).²⁸

Though broadly understood and predominant in some places, in the eighteenth century use of the fanega system in the Toluca Valley was greatly scattered. In San Bartolomé in the early nineteenth century it was barely present, in contrast to Ocotitlan and Yancuictlalpan, as we will see.

____________________

In the eighteenth century parcels as large as a fanega were quite rare in the valley, and even pieces of half a fanega were not too common, but they were expected among the more wealthy. In the San Bartolomé corpus there are none at all. A single text has a puzzling grain measure that appears to read *medio día*, which for the present I will not draw any definite conclusion about.\(^{29}\) There is not a single occurrence of the almud, which was the staple of the system in the eighteenth century in areas where it was dominant. Only the smallest unit, the cuartillo, appears in San Bartolomé, and only in two testaments in Spanish, dated 1823 and 1824. Lázaro Martín left his brother a tierra de labor in which 3 cuartillos of maize seed fit; the piece was thus three-fourths of an almud.\(^{30}\) Ascencia María bequeathed three pieces of tierra de labor, all called small, all of 2 cuartillos, half an almud.\(^{31}\)

\(^{29}\) The examples appear in the last testament of the series in Spanish, sbt#119, the 1832 will of Carmen de la Cruz. There are three of them, all basically alike. I will quote one: “el pedaso de tierra de labor qe me dejo mi padre de medio dia de sembradura,” “the piece of tierra de labor that my father left me, of a *medio día* of seed.” The inclusion of *sembradura* leaves no doubt that in some fashion the example belongs in the category of measurement according to seed capacity, but everything else is uncertain. The word *mediodía* was sometimes used to mean the south, but not only is that use not seen in the Toluca Valley, in some of these same phrases another direction is mentioned, precluding this meaning. Looking at the fanega system, the only thing that is at all similar is *media fanega*, half a fanega, quite frequently seen in general, and often abbreviated to just *media*. But *medio día* is too distant from either version to be a plausible solution, aside from the fact that parcels as large as half a fanega are absent from the whole San Bartolomé scheme of things. A reasonable explanation might be that the reference is to the amount of seed that can be sown in half a day, but I cannot put forward this solution without further examples and further evidence, nor could I say what such a measure might be equivalent to in the fanega/almud/cuartillo hierarchy.

\(^{30}\) Sbt#111 (1823). The Spanish is “un pedacito de tierra de lavor que oCupa tres Cuartillos de mays de sembradura que me lo Fue dejando a mi difunto padre Dn Pascual de los reyes aora se la voy dejando a mi Ermano ciliverio Martin,” “as to a little piece of tierra de labor that takes 3 cuartillos of maize seed, that my deceased father don Pascual de los Reyes left me, now I am leaving it to my brother Silverio Martín.”

\(^{31}\) Sbt#113 (1824) The three entries are basically the same; the first runs: “un pedacito de tierra de lavor . . . la cual dha tierra su cavida de dos Cuartillos de mays de sembradura,” “a little piece of tierra de labor . . . , into which land 2 cuartillos of maize seed fit.”
In the Nahuatl corpus for San Bartolomé, there is no direct appearance of the usual fanega/almud/cuartillo terminology, but it seems likely that in one case the system is being used through a Nahuatl translation of one of the words. In 1811 doña Simona María bequeathed to her son “se tlali de se tlaxelolpa,” in standard orthography ce tlalli de ce tlaxelolpan, “a piece of land of one tlaxelolli (a division, something that is divided out).”32 As explained in more detail in the section below on Yancuictlalpan, this word seems to mean a cuartilla, one-fourth of a fanega or 3 almudes.

Another way of measuring land that appears in the San Bartolomé corpus does not go by seed capacity, but is similar in that it is not longitudinal. Among Spaniards there was a unit called a yunta, a yoke (of two oxen), the amount of land plowed by a yoke, and consequently it is sometimes seen among indigenous people too. One single example occurs. In 1811, among nine other bequests of non-household land, Rosa María left “se tlali . . . de se Yotapa,” “a piece of land of one yoke.”33 Intuitively we would take a yoke to be a large amount of land, and that notion is to some extent confirmed by the fact that the piece described that way here comes first of all the holdings (size is not given for the others), and that this testator seems to have an unusual amount of land. However, I have not yet been able to find any equivalence for the yoke in any other system. Did a yoke of land define the amount the oxen could plow in a day? In an hour? In a week? Fortunately the term plays a minimal role in San Bartolomé.

Measurement by money value. In San Bartolomé in the time studied, the vast majority of non-household land is described in terms of pesos and reales, or rather peso and reales, for

32 Sbt#17. The Spanish de used in the phrase makes one think of a Spanish origin; yet the Nahuatl equivalent -pan is also used.
33 Sbt#15, third bequest. As with tlaxelolli just above, this expression says “of” twice, once with the Spanish de and again with the Nahuatl -pan.
only once does the amount go above one peso, and indeed reales are mentioned far more frequently than the peso, 98 times to 12. For those less familiar with these matters, there are eight reales in a peso; the silver real was the primary coin in circulation. In the Nahuatl part of the corpus, the word for real is tomin, as it had been for centuries, but in the Spanish corpus “real” itself is used, as in the Spanish world in general. The reales system, as we can call it for convenience, is the most striking and unusual aspect of the land situation in San Bartolomé. It is not shared by communities elsewhere other than a minority appearance in neighboring Ocotíti.

Whereas both the quahuitl and the fanega/almud/cuartillo had long been well established in the Toluca Valley, the reales system was new, or at least I have so far seen no evidence in my own work or in the literature of its previous use, either in the Valley or anywhere else (though probably there was some antecedent).

In discussing the quahuitl system we saw that it was dominant in San Bartolomé in the first decade of the nineteenth century, then quickly faded. The trajectory with reales is a mirror image. As shown above, the year 1813 could be taken as the end of the reign of the quahuitl, considering the pattern of its occurrence in the sources. But if we follow the reales as well, we see that reales had already taken over the majority role in 1811, the year of their first appearance, continuing in 1812 and 1813 even though some quahuitl were still present (and from then on as far as the Nahuatl records go). As I noted when speaking of developments from the quahuitl end,

---

34 When the Spaniards first came to Mexico and were dealing mainly with gold, the word tomin was used for an eighth of a peso, both as a coin and as a value. Nahuatl quickly borrowed tomin (differently stressed than the original), which became the general word for money or cash as well as designating an eighth of a peso. The economy quickly moved in the direction of silver, and the Spanish world went over to speaking of reales instead of tomines, but Nahuatl kept its tomin as the equivalent of a real as well as in the more general meaning. See Lockhart, The Nahuas, Ch. 7.
the change coincides with dramatic events of the independence movement, although it is not possible to fill out the correlation with demonstrable facts.

Let us examine the characteristics of the system of reales as it is seen in the Nahuatl corpus. The expression generally used is on the pattern of what is seen in a text of 1814,\textsuperscript{35} a piece of land “de ume tomipa,” standard \textit{de ome tominpan}, which we can translate as “of 2 reales,” though “of” is conveyed twice, once by the Spanish \textit{de} and once by the Nahuatl \textit{-pan}. Occasionally the \textit{-pan} is omitted, as in a text of 1813,\textsuperscript{36} with “de nahui tomin,” “of 4 reales.” When the amount is a full peso, the phrase is still the same, usually like the “de se pesupa,” \textit{de ce pesopan}, “of one peso,” in a text of 1817,\textsuperscript{37} or occasionally without \textit{-pan}, as in a will of 1813, “de se peso”\textsuperscript{38}.

These examples also illustrate the amounts specified in the San Bartolomé corpus, which correspond to the fact that there are eight reales in a peso and that whenever in the general economy a price was less than a peso, the most common amount was four, being half, and when it was less than that, two, being half again. Of the mentions of parcels using this system, the great majority are of reales; to be precise, taking the amounts as the testators state them before further subdivision, there are 54 cases of 4 reales, 7 of 2 reales, only 3 of 3 reales, and a single example with a fraction, $2^{1/2}$ reales; parcels of 1 peso occur 11 times, and a 2-peso parcel just once (See

\textsuperscript{35} Sbt#66. 
\textsuperscript{36} Sbt#61. 
\textsuperscript{37} Sbt#100. 
\textsuperscript{38} Sbt#50.
Table 5.1).\(^{39}\) As we would expect, full-peso parcels appear in the testaments of those with the most land, and often as the first item in the land bequests.

The sizes of the parcels need to be given a double look, registering again how they appear from the point of view of the heirs, after extensive subdivision. In Table 5.2 we see the result of the fact that nearly all the pieces of 1 peso were divided into two pieces of 4 reales, and a great many of 4 reales were divided into two of 2 reales.

**Table 5.1**

![Bar chart showing the distribution of testators' portions of non-household land valued in reales.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of 2 pesos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of 1 peso</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of 4 reales</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of 3 reales</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of 2 and a half reales</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of 2 reales</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One naturally searches for some equivalence between the quahuitl system and the reales system, so that we could better understand the longer-term evolution as to the size and

\(^{39}\) Sbt#88, 1822.
distribution of parcels of land. Since the transition was so quick and so complete, it stands to reason that there was some straightforward correspondence between the two, that the same parcels were simply relabeled; parcels in both systems are mainly non-contiguous, as non-household land had long been in the Nahua tradition. No evidence in the San Bartolomé materials definitely points to an equivalence. Nothing prevents our speculating, however. The most common sizes in the quahuitl system in San Bartolomé in the first years of the nineteenth century are 20 and 40 quahuitl, as they had been at least since the early eighteenth. The most common “sizes” in the reales system, taking it as we find it in the testaments before further subdivision, are 4 reales and 1 peso. In each case the smaller size is the more common. Thus one possibility is that 4 reales equals 20 quahuitl (by 20) and 1 peso 40 quahuitl (by 20). A real
would be the equivalent of 5 quahuitl. Another hint is that both 20-quahuitl and 4-real pieces are often called small. Yet another is that 2 reales seems to have been the practical lower limit on subdivision of non-household land, and 10 quahuitl, which would be the corresponding size at a ratio of 1 to 5, had traditionally played that role in the quahuitl system. Nevertheless, I realize that these coincidences are far from definite proof, and I must leave the question of equivalences unresolved for now. I will be making another attempt later in this chapter, in the section on Ocotitlan, where a document gives an equivalence between reales and the fanega system, resulting in 4 reales equaling 1½ almudes, possibly 15 quahuitl. I will discuss the further ramifications at that point.

Additional perspectives on the reales system come from the body of testaments in Spanish from San Bartolomé in the time studied. The system shows up here too, as early as 1813 and continuing to 1825. It is perhaps not quite as dominant as in the Nahuatl corpus, for many parcels are left without measurement, three testaments have some form of measurement by seed sown, and one uses palos (i.e., quahuitl), yet reales are spread across more texts and describe more parcels than any other method in the testaments in Spanish. The distribution of sizes is similar to that seen in the corpus as a whole: one parcel of 1 peso, 6 of 4 reales, and 2 of 2 reales. The phrasing is often what we would expect from the Nahuatl, such as a tierra de labor “de guatro Riales,” “of four reales,” \(^{40}\) though frequently one sees an interesting a, “at,” added, as in a

---

\(^{40}\) Sbt\#72, 1817.
tierra de labor “de a 4 r,” which says both “of 4 reales” and “at 4 reales.” The implication is something like “at the rate of.”

This still advances us very little beyond the meaning of the Nahuatl, where the -pan often used appears to have the same sense as in parallel phrases in the corpus not related to money, “of,” though it would be possible to interpret it as “worth,” a meaning that -pan sometimes had with money amounts. One of the notaries doing documents in Spanish, however, uses a phrase that gives some further insight, although it does not settle everything. In two testaments of 1821 Máximo Calisto writes that such parcels “earn” the amount specified, as in “pedaso de tierra de labor que gana 4 rr." “a piece of tierra de labor that earns 4 reales.” The same phrase occurs four times, used with both 4 reales and a peso.

Thus the amount specified is not the value of the land (it is too low for that anyway), but what it earns in some specific period, which common sense tells us must be a year. The next question is in what way the amount is earned. If it is the value of the crop, then the annual income from agriculture of most of these households would only be a peso or two, which would fall short even of paying the tribute, much less taking care of other expenses. The crop would surely have had a considerably higher value than the amounts specified in the measurements; much of it would have been directly consumed rather than sold anyway. A more likely explanation is that what is specified is what the land rents for by the year, if rented. The gender ratio of the testaments of San Bartolomé in these years, reinforced by general accounts of the

41 Sbt#118, 1825.
42 It is possible that this a in Spanish corresponds to the -pan in the phrase in Nahuatl, though I would not yet want to take a position on which one may have motivated the other.
43 Sbt#81, 82.
situation in indigenous settlements of central Mexico, shows the widespread absence of men who would have cultivated the plots. Renting would be a natural solution. The amount of such rent would have had to be far lower than the value of the yield to make renting worthwhile, and in any case the amounts in reales are too conventionalized to correspond to actual rents, aside from the fact that they are probably keyed to the quahuitl system.

**Location and description of lands**

Pieces of non-household land are described in the texts as on the road to different places, next to widely separated landmarks, or bordered by different neighbors, all in the same testament, so there is no doubt that as in previous centuries the holdings of an individual were usually widely scattered. There is no apparent difference between the Nahuatl and the Spanish parts of the San Bartolomé corpus in this respect. Despite the continuity from earlier times, we have seen many indications that lands were shrinking, not least their frequent division into hardly viable scraps. One may wonder how the community coped. A full answer cannot be given, perhaps, but it is clear that chaos did not prevail, that ownership and inheritance procedures were respected. The manner of description tells us something of how things worked. Although in many cases care was given to locating parcels in a variety of ways, an official from the outside could never have found them or reliably identified them by the information given. It was sufficient, however, within the framework of what the testator owned as understood by the family and neighbors. The implicit appeal was to the consensus of the local community, just as it had been for generations.

In mentioning neighboring property owners as a way of identifying plots, the people of San Bartolomé were not as pedantic as Nahua landowners in some times and places, who insisted on giving the neighbors on all four sides and specifying the direction. One neighbor was sufficient, and no direction was given, as in “a piece of land above, on the hill, at the edge of a
field of the deceased don Diego Nicolás.”

As we see, it was common to mention an owner who had already died; in these cases no one of equal prominence had apparently yet come into the land. Mentioning the neighbors was particularly useful when a piece was being divided: “I am giving another piece of land of 1 peso to the same two children of mine. They are to divide it in half at 4 reales each: Cosme Damián is to take the part at the edge of a field of the late Pedro Pascual, and my other son Luis Antonio is to take the part at the edge of a field of his first cousin Luis Paulino.”

Nevertheless, this type of identification is used most often with a property not being divided.

Named places are often used to identify land. I have found 45 such instances in the corpus, and given the difficulty of reading and interpreting many of the words in the texts, there may be more. In both Nahuatl and Spanish, a parcel was often located as being on the road to somewhere, the large centers of Metepec and Toluca being most common, but sometimes it was the road to the nearby Santa María Yancuictlalpan or to other settlements with saints’ names that are harder to identify. Some parcels are at named places that seem to be contained within San Bartolomé’s jurisdiction; the most prominent of these is Tepantitlan. One parcel is on the border with neighboring Ocotitlan. Frequently mentioned is Ocotitlantzinco; when we see formulations such as on the road there or toward there, it seems as if Ocotitlan itself may be meant. But there was a tradition of smaller settlements related to an original one having the same name plus

44 Sbt#6, Tiburcia Valeriana, 1809: “se tlali tlacpac ypa loma ymiltetzico difoto Dñ diego nicolas.”
45 Sbt#96, Eugenia Gertrudis, 1823: “oc se tlali de se pesupa niquiCahuiliti sano lloqui umeti nopilihuana nahui tomipa quimotlapanisque nepatla Conanas Cosmi damia yc ymiltCo pedro pasqul difoto oc se noCone Luis Antonio Conanas ymiltCo [sic] yprimoermando Luis paulino
46 Sbt#78.
-tzinco, and since some properties are said to be at Ocotitlanztinco, it may refer to an entity inside the borders of San Bartolomé.

Another way of identifying holdings was to locate them near a landmark or other prominent feature. A very unusual one is the habitat area for mostrante, an introduced herb that looks like mint and to this day grows in the ravine of the water course running from west to east across the settlement. One small piece of land is identified as “next to the mostrante”; another is simply called mostrante land, and virtually the same appears in Spanish as well. Some land is described as at the edge of the ravine, probably the same one so prominent in San Bartolomé today. A well known sandy patch of land was also used to identify some parcels in both Nahuatl and Spanish. Human-made landmarks were employed as well. One of the most popular was a bridge, apparently the only one in the area, so that Puente actually seems to have become the name of that locality. Also seen are boundary markers, and an irrigation ditch.

---

47 Sbt#20, 1811: “se tlaltotli mostratetitlan.” Another example of the same phrase in sbt#5, 1809.
48 Sbt#49, 1813: “se tlali Mostrante.” In the Spanish texts we twice find a parcel (sbt#82, 1821) “que se nonbra mostrante,” “which is called mostrante.” The meaning may actually be that the area is called that, not the specific piece of land.
49 Sbt#30, 1812: “ycteco BaraCa,” itenco barranca. Notice that the loanword barranca is used for the ravine instead of the usual indigenous atlauhtli.
50 Sbt#88, 1822, “yteCo Xali,” itenko xalli, “at the edge of the sand,” and virtually the same in sbt# 95, 1823, and sbt#14, 1810. The Spanish phrase, in sbt#88 and sbt#111, is “en la orilla de la arena,” also “at the edge of the sand.”
51 In Nahuatl texts, in sbt#6 and 15 (the word being written “puete”), also in sbt#15 “puetetitlan,” which can be translated as next to the bridge but also sounds like a place Puentetitlan; in Spanish texts, sbt#116, twice, spelled the standard way as puente, saying once “se nombra puente,” “it is called Puente,” and another time “se haya en puente,” “it is located in Puente.”
52 In sbt#15, “mogonera”; in sbt#17, “moJonera.”
53 Sbt#12, 1810, “se tlali yteco saxa sa Jaspar,” ce tlalli itenco zanja San Gaspar, “a piece of land at the edge of the San Gaspar irrigation ditch.”
The most frequent such identifier was the Calvary; whether it was the same one in the churchyard used as a reference point for burials is not clear, but for those concerned there was obviously no ambiguity.

These phrases not only locate parcels, for us today they do much to give us the flavor of the San Bartolomé landscape. Another type of landmark shows us a more social aspect of the scene. It is clear that as had been the case with indigenous land in the Toluca Valley for a long time, most parcels in San Bartolomé in our time were held by individuals and inherited from relatives. But a block of the passages identifying parcels relates to corporate landholding. At times a plot is described as being *tequimiltenco*, literally “at the edge of the cultivated field for tribute or duty.” The term *tequimilli* could refer to a parcel cultivated by the whole corporate entity, the altepetl or tlaxilacalli, for public purposes, especially to pay general tribute. But the word was also used by the late colonial period for a field dedicated to a saint or cofradía and worked by the devotees and members. We may suspect that such is the meaning in these cases.

That interpretation is all the more likely because in some cases a cofradía is specifically mentioned in the same way as the tequimilli. It is probable that the two are the same thing, although we cannot be sure. In these phrases the wording is on the order of *cofradiatenco*, “at the edge of the cofradía,” not specifically mentioning land, but with the non-household land located all around the countryside, it is hard to see any other meaning than at the edge of the or a field of

---

54 In sbt#5, “yCuitlapa Calvario,” “behind the Calvary”; sbt#27, “yxpatziCo santo CalBario,” “facing the holy Calvary, and sbt#61 and 62A similar; sbt#33 uses “CalBario” as a locative, “at the Calvary.” In Spanish sbt#111 has “tras del Calvario,” and sbt#115, “detras del calbario,” both “behind the Calvary”

55 In sbt#5, 1809, “tequimilteco” twice; the same form in sbt#10, 1810, sbt#26, 1811, and sbt#85, 1822; in sbt#48, 1813, “tequimiltenco.”

56 See Lockhart, *The Nahuas*, p. 544, n. 117, for an example of this meaning in Tepemaxalco in the seventeenth century.
the cofradía.\footnote{In sbt#10, 1810, “CofradiateCo”; in sbt#73, 1818, “yten[co] Confradia”; in #91, 1823, almost the same.} Most instances leave the cofradía unnamed, but once it is “at the edge of the cofradía of the lord Santiago.”\footnote{Sbt# 88, 1822, “se tlali Ca yteCon Cofradia de SË satiago.”} There is one instance using a cofradía as a landmark in the testaments in Spanish too, it also specifies the cofradía of Santiago.\footnote{Sbt#114, 1824, has “esta Pegado Con la Cofradia Sôr Ssntiago,” “it abuts on the cofradía of the lord Santiago.”} Whether the others were of Santiago too remains to be seen. One would expect the largest holding of this kind to have belonged to the cofradía of Asunción/Concepción, and there was also a cofradía of San José.

A puzzle in this same realm is the occasional use of the “community” (\textit{comunidad}) as a boundary marker in the same way as tequimilli and cofradía. The word usually referred to the community treasury or corporate holdings of the altepetl or tlaxilacalli whose revenues would go into the community chest. In a Nahuatl text of 1809 a small piece of land is described as “yteCo Comonidar,” \textit{itenco comunidad}, “next to the community.” (the piece is also located in the “Puente” area).\footnote{Sbt#6.} As in the other cases, a cultivated field must be meant. Among the Spanish texts we find in one of 1825 a piece of non-household land “com lidero de la comoñidad de Señor saralbador,” “bordering on the community of Señor Salvador.” One way to interpret this is that another entity, a tlaxilacalli, is on the border of San Bartolomé. But just as likely is that there is a cofradía of San Salvador in San Bartolomé. The use of the word \textit{comunidad} could be explained by the fact that cofradías were administered by members or past members of the local municipal councils, and their funds and expenses were a large item in the local municipal council funds.

\footnotetext[57]{In sbt#10, 1810, “CofradiateCo”; in sbt#73, 1818, “yten[co] Confradia”; in #91, 1823, almost the same.}
\footnotetext[58]{Sbt# 88, 1822, “se tlali Ca yteCon Cofradia de SË satiago.”}
\footnotetext[59]{Sbt#114, 1824, has “esta Pegado Con la Cofradia Sôr Ssntiago,” “it abuts on the cofradía of the lord Santiago.”}
\footnotetext[60]{Sbt#6.}
\footnotetext[61]{Sbt#118.}
budget. From the materials presently available, not all these matters can be sorted out, but it is clear that a corporate/religious element was interspersed among the holdings of individuals in the countryside. 62

Saints and non-household land

As seen in Chapter 3, the household saints cult does not play as prominent a role in the early nineteenth-century San Bartolomé corpus as we might have expected from our knowledge of trends of the previous century in the Toluca Valley, nor even so great a role as in neighboring Ocotitlan, but all the elements are still there. In the indigenous household economy there had been and still were two separate components, the home complex with its solar or house-land, and scattered plots of non-household land. In their actual structure the two were hardly related, brought together essentially only by the fact that the same people owned and depended on both, and that both were bequeathed to the next generation in a single operation. The saints cult provided another tie between the two systems in that often the saints in the home were specifically supported from parcels of non-household land; either the saints might be the nominal owners of such land, or a household resident who owned it might have the duty to contribute to the saint from it.

Another puzzling locative expression, possibly also corporate in nature, occurs in sbt#10, 1810, where a piece of land is described as “sesoteCo.” This is probably censotenco, at the edge of the mortgage [land].” Mortgage-like arrangements, often set up to provide a steady income for masses for a certain purpose, were much more common among Spaniards than among indigenous people, but sometimes a local municipal corporation or a church entity would undertake one, and that may be the meaning here. Another instance (sbt#95, 1823) is the redundant “yteCo sesuteco.” These examples sound as though there were only one such holding, well known, in the area, but another (sbt#107, 1823), says “yteCon se cesu,” presumably tienco ce censo, “next to [a piece of] mortgage [land], implying there may have been several such things in the San Bartolomé landscape.

62 Another puzzling locative expression, possibly also corporate in nature, occurs in sbt#10, 1810, where a piece of land is described as “sesoteCo.” This is probably censotenco, at the edge of the mortgage [land].” Mortgage-like arrangements, often set up to provide a steady income for masses for a certain purpose, were much more common among Spaniards than among indigenous people, but sometimes a local municipal corporation or a church entity would undertake one, and that may be the meaning here. Another instance (sbt#95, 1823) is the redundant “yteCo sesuteco.” These examples sound as though there were only one such holding, well known, in the area, but another (sbt#107, 1823), says “yteCon se cesu,” presumably tienco ce censo, “next to [a piece of] mortgage [land], implying there may have been several such things in the San Bartolomé landscape.
The classic formulation of bequeathing land directly to the saint still persisted in San Bartolomé. In 1812 Florencia María left a piece of land at Santiago Colco to the Virgen de los Dolores, adding that her nephew Isidro Trinidad was to use it to serve her. In the same testament she also adopted the other method, leaving a piece of land to two nephews, the same Isidro Trinidad and Juan Máximo, to divide equally among themselves, at the same time saying that they were to serve the Señora de Dolores with it. There was in fact little or no difference between the two arrangements; in both cases a relative of the testator actually held the land and used it partly for his own purposes, while having the duty of supporting the household saint with some of the yield. Traditionally, as in this case, a piece of land was dedicated to a single saint, but also on occasion to all the saints in the household, and that is what we appear to have in the case, dated 1813, of Rosa María, who left three pieces of non-household land to her main heir, her grandchild Juan Antonio, and then specified that he was to serve four saints “there”: San Jacinto, Santa María Magdalena, and Señora de Agosto, which sounds like the household’s full

63 Sbt#32: “se tlali santiago sulco nicncahuililiti yehuatzi la virge de los dolores yc quimotequipanilhuis ysidro trinidad,” “I am leaving a piece of land at Santiago Colco to the Virgen de los Dolores; with it Isidro Trinidad is to serve her.”

64 Ibid.: “se tlali ocotitlatzico untli sa ye no yehuatli nosobrino ysidro trinidad ynhua Juan Macximo quimotlapanisque nepatla yc quimotequipanilhuisque S de los dolores,” “The same nephew of mine, Isidro Trinidad, and Juan Máximo are to divide a piece of land on the Ocotitlantzinco road equally; with it they are to serve the Señora de Dolores.” Another bequest of this type is found in sbt#37, 1813. The wording is confusing, but the upshot seems to be that the testator leaves a piece of land to her son and grandson jointly, for both of them to serve the Virgin of Guadalupe. Another example seems to have the same intention; in sbt#94, 1823, Margarita Feliciana leaves a piece of land to her godchild and nephew Juan de los Santos “to serve in the house” (“yc tlatequipanos ypa Cali”), that is to support any saints in the house. In sbt#49, 1813, a rather indirect connection between saints and the land is seen. Paula María leaves a piece of land to her husband, but if he dies it is to return to the house and saints under her brother: “Mocuepas ypan caltzintlin ycatzinco santotin.”
complement. In this case one could say that the saints are linked to the non-household land in general.

In one instance a testator shows a long-term concern with non-household land supporting a household saint. In 1828 Gerónima Antonia left a piece of land to her daughter Agustina María for her sustenance (literally for her to eat a tortilla from). In the case of her death the parcel is to come back within the purview of the house, which the testator’s compadre and nephew is inheriting, and with it he and his successors are to serve the Señor de Chalma.

The evidence shows us, then, that the kind of connection between household saints and non-household land still existed in the San Bartolomé jurisdiction in the time studied in forms indistinguishable from what prevailed in the Toluca Valley in the previous century. The relative paucity of examples would seem to show a quantitative reduction of the phenomenon, but much may be hidden, left unmentioned in the sources and taken for granted.

**Inheritance**

The San Bartolomé corpus contains a large enough number of bequests of non-household land that some quite serious statistical results can be obtained, and also these results can be compared with those for household property. The topic has many ramifications and can become very complex. Let me state in a few words the core of what seems to me to arise from this research: corresponding to the larger number of women testators, women hold more land than men; yet males, without obtaining a monopoly, inherit more non-household land than females

65 Sbt#50: “santos nahuitzitzi s asshole Jacinto s asshole María Magdalena s asshole Francisco s asshole señora de Agosto oCa quimote-quipanilhuis Ju. Anttő,” “Juan Antonio is to serve four saints, San Jacinto, Santa María Magdalena, San Francisco, and the Señor de Agosto there.”

66 Sbt#88: the phrase about the tortilla is “ypa quiCuas se TlaxCali quequi [sic] tonali monemitis,” “on it she is to eat a tortilla as long as she lives.”
do. This picture of males getting the majority, females a substantial minority, is just what had
held true in the indigenous world in central Mexico for centuries. It appears that there has been
no revolution, indeed no detectable change, in local society’s inheritance policies when it comes
to gender. How, then, did the women come to own so much land as testators in the San
Bartolomé corpus? It seems to come down to the death and absence of many men in ways related
in some fashion to the independence conflicts. Women took over for the absent men, but they
seem to have thought no differently about inheritance of land than they had before, and things
were on course to restore the previous balance, or looking at it another way, imbalance. Another
aspect is that though in the texts women testators appear as owners and exercise the right to
bequeath the parcels, there is no way of knowing to what extent they have actually inherited the
properties and to what extent they are acting in a custodial capacity and carrying out instructions
previously given by other relatives, often male.67

Against this background, then, let us look at some figures (see Table 5.3). We find that
249 bequests were made, often several in the same testament. Women were responsible for 154
bequests, or 62% of the total, while men contributed only 95, or 38%. Yet males received 164
bequests, 66% of the total, and females only 85, 34%. Thus the percentages by gender are
virtually reversed between testators and inheritors. The same point is made in terms of number of
testators and heirs in Table 5.4.

67 There are several instances in TT where in the Toluca Valley in the previous century a woman
bequeathes property to heirs saying that she is following the instructions of her husband or other relative,
and other cases where that is not said but the situation seems to be the same.
These numbers include the whole San Bartolomé corpus, Nahuatl and Spanish. What happens if we separate out the smaller number of Spanish documents (which are a subset in the compilations just above and can also be seen in Table 5.3).

Table 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Non-household Land Inheritance by Language and Gender in San Bartolomé Testaments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female testator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male testator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female inheritor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male inheritor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of 45 individual inheritors, 29, or 64%, are male and 16, or 35%, female. Thus the gender proportions are close to those seen in the corpus as a whole, showing once again that despite language differences the people who made Spanish testaments are in most things like those who made Nahuatl testaments, that both belong to a community-wide culture and situation. Let us also look back and compare inheritance between non-household land and household property, taking the house and solar as a unit (see Table 5.4).
First, there are many more bequests of non-household land than of household property, 249 to 130. Second, the proportions as to gender could be said to be broadly similar, but there are some interesting distinctions. Put in percentages (the absolute numbers can be seen in the chart), the picture is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Household property</th>
<th>Non-household land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female testators</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male testators</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female inheritors</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male inheritors</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By these compilations women testators hold an even larger percentage of non-household land than of household property. As both testators and inheritors males come off better in the
household, females of course the opposite. The reversal of proportion by gender between testators and inheritors is 26% with the household, 28% with non-household land. In view of the irregularities in the sources themselves and the size of the samples, perhaps it is best to emphasize the similarity of the picture with possession and inheritance of the two kinds of assets and not try to make too much of the differences.

A statistical approach has shown us some basic aspects of property holding and inheritance of non-household land. Many more features of the system could be discovered by examining the details in each household, but a large-scale effort of that kind exceeds the present framework and is reserved for the future. Meanwhile, quite a few examples in the corpus show us a feature of inheritance that should not be neglected. The testators appear as individuals holding land, and they leave it to individuals, overwhelmingly children and other younger relatives. Yet sharing seems to be important in the scheme. We can see something of this in the very nature of the bequests. Again and again we see bequests that split a piece of land of 4 reales into two pieces of 2 reales for two heirs. Yet the testators have many more pieces of 4 than of 2. One explanation is that subdivision is right at this point reaching a crisis and can go no further. Another explanation is that very often the two heirs do not in fact split the land but share it.

In 1823 Esteban Ramón explains that a piece of land of 1 peso comes to himself and his younger brother at 4 reales each, that the lower part comes to him specifically, and now he leaves only that part to his daughter.\(^{68}\) It is quite clear that until the present the 1-peso piece has not

---

\(^{68}\) Sbt#92: “se tlali yn otimotlapanicitaten noermanitotzin D\(\text{M}\) Mariano Jose yno tlali Capa loma techcaverohuah nanahutomipah nehuatl nehaverohuah yc tlazitlacopa ymilteCo paulino de santos AxCa nicCahuiliti nohpuch Bartola luisa,” “as to a piece of land that my younger brother don Mariano José and I are dividing—that piece of land is on the hill, and 4 reales comes to each of us—; the lower part next to a field of Paulino de Santos comes to me; now I am leaving it to my daughter Bartola Luisa.” Note the use of the loan verb *caberoa*, from *caber*, to fall one’s lot, be one’s share, come to one.
been actually divided off. In another nearly identical case it is specifically said that the division
is only now to be carried out. In 1823 Perfecto Martín says that his father gave a piece of one
peso to him, for him and his brother to divide, and now it is to be divided by length and what
comes to him go to his son. It would seem that many such arrangements, which in principle
were divisions, but since they were not yet carried out, were actually sharing, involved small
children too young to take care of the properties, or an older sibling acting as custodian of a
whole property for a younger sibling not yet grown. Things would often stay that way until one
of the parties at death needed to leave his/her part to an heir.

Even more enlightening is another example. In 1823 all the property Alejandra María has
is two pieces of land in different places, each shared with her younger sister Antonia Trinidad;
now she leaves her part to her sister. Here the planned division never took place at all. In this
time of combat and epidemics, many people with shared properties must have died without an
heir, and the land as in this case would usually go to the surviving person who had a partial claim
to it. Enough cases of this kind could halt or reverse the implications of constant subdivision,
though the size of the holdings we see in the sources seems to put a severe limit on any such
trend.

**Some other aspects of non-household land**

The contents of the testaments of San Bartolomé at this time, both Nahuatl and Spanish,
make clear that the vast majority of non-household land (and household property too, for that

---

69 Sbt#100: “se tlali de se pesupa Ca ypa hui utli de santa ria [sic] nativitas yno tlali nehmomaquia [sic]
notlasutatzi Dn Juan de los satos timotlapanisque noermano usevio leunardo AxCa no nehCaverohua
nicCanhuiilti noCone Marselino vernaldo ynhua motlapanas yno tlali yc huic [sic],” “As to a piece of land
of 1 peso on the main road to Santa María Nativitas, my precious father don Juan de los Santos gave me
that land for me and my brother Eusebio Leonardo to divide; I am leaving what comes to me to my child
Marcelino Bernaldo; and that land is to be divided by length.”
matter) was received through inheritance from relatives, above all parents, and again transmitted through inheritance to relatives, above all children. Redistribution of land by the local corporation remains unmentioned. One thing that had been fairly common in the indigenous sector of the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth century is nearly missing in the San Bartolomé corpus: the purchase of land. But none of the Nahuatl wills of San Bartolomé mention such a thing, and it comes up only once in the Spanish texts. In 1824 Alejandro Marcos mentions, among several properties that are as usual inherited, “otra tierra que la Compre,” “another piece of land that I bought.”

Although the main evidence for what the non-household land of San Bartolomé was used for are some scattered references incidental to the use of the fanega/almud/cuartillo system that it was maize seed that was sown, as was mentioned above, there still can be no doubt that maize cultivation was the main activity. In texts of the Toluca Valley in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a certain number of yokes of oxen appear in connection with maize cultivation, especially with those who are wealthier. Not a single oxen is mentioned in the San Bartolomé corpus. Nor are other animals. Even if there had been oxen before, they might have been confiscated or consumed during the independence conflicts. Other animals are progressively less mentioned even in the eighteenth-century records, so that their absence in the San Bartolomé texts may not imply that they did not exist.

The testament corpus inevitably gives the impression that the people of Sant Bartolomé gained their livelihood overwhelmingly through maize agriculture, but viewed critically it only shows that that was a very large part of it. We know that public markets existed everywhere, and

---

70 TT, passim.
71 Sbt#116.
that regional trading went on. We know that the Toluca Valley contained many Spanish enterprises which employed indigenous people. With the present source base, such things cannot be studied properly, but they do project into our corpus once or twice, and it would be good to mention them.

In 1822 Gerónima Antonia left a large piece of land, of 2 pesos, to her nephew Juan Ricardo, saying that she did so because “he helped me with money, 5 pesos with which my daughter and I helped ourselves in our work.” 72 The use of the loanword trabajo for the work would seem to imply that it was some sort of European-style activity, and the circumstances imply that it was independent entrepreneurial activity and not working for someone else. In 1832, in a testament in Spanish, Carmen de la Cruz said that “I and my wife Hilaria de los Angeles have received no advances.” 73 If it were only the husband, one might think of salary advanced for working on a Spanish hacienda and debts going back to that, but it seems less likely with the wife involved as well. All that we can say is that there was some common system in the community of people receiving advances of money whether on work or for a product, by what agency one cannot say, but here we glimpse an entirely different dimension of the local economy.

**OCOTITLAN**

The corpus of testaments available at present for neighboring Ocotitlan in the independence years differs considerably from that for San Bartolomé. It is smaller, consisting of 27 texts, the majority are dated 1813 or before, with only five dated 1814–1820, and testaments in

72 Sbt#88: “Ca llonehmopalehuili meliotzi MaCuili pē yc utimopalehuique nohpotzi ypa totravajo.”
73 Sbt#119: “Ilo y mi Esposa ylaria de los angeles no tuvimos ningunos adelantos.”
Spanish are greatly predominant, only three being in Nahuatl. In the following, I concentrate on comparison with San Bartolomé and do not attempt to give as full a picture, which would involve much duplication.

**Systems of measurement and sizes**

All three systems studied for San Bartolomé exist in Ocotitlan too, but the proportions vary greatly. Quahuitl appear only in two early Nahuatl texts; the fanega/almud/cuartillo system has an overwhelming predominance, though with special wrinkles; the reales system surfaces but does not take over as in San Bartolomé.

**Quahuitl.** Only two testaments, both in Nahuatl, mention quahuitl, but they show the essence of the system retained at least up to the time they were written. In 1801 Ana María left her daughter “se tlali senpualmani,” “a piece of land of 20.” In 1810 Jacobo Santiago left a piece of land of 40 to his son and a brother, each getting 20. From this alone we see that vigesimal numbers are still the norm, that 20 and 40 are still the most common sizes, that the word “quahuitl” is taken for granted if a certain suffix is added, and that the other measurement is also left unmentioned, presumed to be 20. These examples use the phrase with -mani rather than the -pan predominant in San Bartolomé, but -mani appears once in San Bartolomé too, and there is little or no difference in meaning. In both documents, though tlalli, “land,” is used for the testator’s own property, bordering property is designated as milli, “cultivated field,” in the same

---

74 Oco#1.
75 Oco#6: “se tlali onpa onoc yxtlahuaca unpualmani ynachuac atihua poso axca niccahuilia notelpoch Juan chrisostomo sepualmani yhua oc senpuamanici conanas noermaotzi don pedro martin monepan-tlaxelos,” “now of a piece of land on the plain, of 40, near the well where people get water, I leave to my son Juan Crisóstomo 20, and my brother don Pedro Martín is to take the other 20; it is to be divided in half.”
phrase *imitenco*, “at the edge of someone’s cultivated field.” All this is identical to usage in the San Bartolomé texts of the same years and shows a common cultural assemblage.

Furthermore, the temporal trend with quahuitl is similar in both areas. The 1810 example is the last in the Ocotitlan Nahuatl corpus, in the Nahuatl texts of San Bartolomé the quahuitl falls off sharply in 1811–1813. The contexts are somewhat different, however. In Ocotitlan there are no later relevant Nahuatl documents, whereas in San Bartolomé the quahuitl virtually disappears within the Nahuatl corpus itself. In both areas we find a reference or two to the system in the Spanish corpus. In 1813 Luisa Gervasia left a “tierra ques de veinte palos,” “a piece of land of 20 palos (= quahuitl, as we have seen)” to her husband, the only such mention in the Spanish testaments of Ocotitlan.

**The fanega system.** In the Ocotitlan Spanish corpus, which accounts for 24 items of the 27, the land of the testators is overwhelmingly called just *tierra*, “land,” and not *tierra de labor* as in San Bartolomé, although the term does turn up once, and the basic meaning seems no different. The diminutive *tierrita* is also frequently seen; both by themselves mean a piece of land as in Nahuatl. *Pedazo*, “piece,” occurs only three times with household land, being mainly used in connection with *solar*. The primary system for measuring land in the Spanish texts, from the first relevant one in 1809 to the last in 1820, involves subdivisions of the fanega referring to the amount of maize seed to be sown in the land. Repeatedly what is to be sown is specifically said to be maize, either in the full phrasing *de maíz de sembradura*, seed maize, or abbreviated as

76 Oco#22, 1813, is in Nahuatl but is limited to ritual matters, the testator claiming to own no property.

77 In oco#3, 1809: a “tierra de labor ques de Seis Quartillos de sembradura.”

78 Oco#10, #27.
maize alone.\textsuperscript{79} Often, as in the standard phrase in Spanish, the seed 
iccede, “fits,” into the land, but other times the word is 
\textit{entra}, “enters,” which seems to translate back the usual Nahuatl phrase using the verb 
\textit{calaqu}\textsuperscript{i} (to enter).\textsuperscript{80}

No parcel described is as large as a fanega, so the most basic word does not come into play, nor does the term \textit{media fanega}, half a fanega; the largest piece recorded is just over 3 almudes or a quarter fanega. The system as employed in Ocotitlan has some peculiarities. In many areas of the Toluca Valley, in the eighteenth century at least, the fanega of 12 almudes and the media fanega of 6 almudes are part of the normal vocabulary, but for a fourth of a fanega one usually sees 3 almudes.\textsuperscript{81} Nevertheless, the term \textit{cuartilla}, one fourth of a fanega, 3 almudes, did exist, and the people of Ocotitlan made use of it as part of their repertoire in addition to the normal term \textit{cuartillo}, one-fourth of an almud. The texts are in such an individual and inconsistent Spanish that it can be hard to be sure about such things; we see much switching precisely of \textit{a} and \textit{o}, for these new Spanish speakers were often unsure about the gender of words. But in these texts masculine \textit{cuartillo} meaning a fourth of an almud is always in the plural (actually spelled “quartillos, quartius,” etc.), or in the diminutive though with the same meaning (“quartillitos”),\textsuperscript{82} whereas feminine \textit{cuartilla} meaning a fourth of a fanega is always in the singular. If there remains any doubt, a testament of 1813 resolves it. Juana Anastasia has a piece of land of one cuartilla of which she leaves half to her son and 3 cuartillos to each of two daughters. The son’s half must be 6 cuartillos, which added to the 3 each for the daughters makes

\textsuperscript{79} As in oco#5, 1810, and oco#12, 1813.
\textsuperscript{80} For example, \textit{cabe} in oco# 7, #8, #24; \textit{entra} in oco#5, #7, #23.
\textsuperscript{81} This is true throughout TT.
\textsuperscript{82} For example, oco#3, “Seis Quartillos”; oco#5, “siete quartius”; oco#12, “tres quartillitos.”
12 cuartillos, 3 almudes, one fourth of a fanega of 12 almudes. The term *media cuartilla* is also used; it would be an almud and a half.

The general practice in the Toluca Valley had been to use cuartillos only up to three, four being an almud, five being an almud and a cuartillo, etc. The Ocotitlan people kept on adding up cuartillos to six or seven, so that the word *almud* is rare even though quantities of an almud and over are not. In one case cuartillos were counted up to over a cuartilla, to thirteen, which amounts to a full cuartilla and one cuartillo over. The sizes in the corpus are as in Table 5.5: These would have been quite normal sizes for an area using the fanega system in the previous century. One parcel is over 3 almudes, 6 are of 3 almudes, 6 are over 1 almud, 2 are of 1 almud, and only one is under an almud. In Calimaya/Tepemaxalco in the seventeenth/eighteenth centuries, 3 almudes was the most common size. The same is true here, though it is called a cuartilla. The second most common size is the half cuartilla of 1 almud and 2 cuartillos.

---

83 Oco#14: “Digo que una tierra se aya Junto del camino de metepeque me la deJo difunto marido atanacion Jose de una quartilla de mais de Siembradura aora se la boy deJando mi hiJo andres viviano la mitan y tres quartillitos le boy deJando a miJa polonia Maria otro tres quartillitos le boy deJando otra hiJa llamados Juana Vagelista para que Le sirba Señor San Salvador y Santa Maria Magdalena,” “I say that there is a piece of land next to the road to Metepec that my deceased husband Anastacio José left me of a cuartilla of maize seed; now I am leaving half to my son Andrés Viviano, and I am giving 3 cuartillitos to my daughter Apolonia María, and I am leaving another 3 cuartillitos to another daughter named Juana Evangelista to serve el Señor San Salvador and Santa María Magdalena.”

84 Oco#7, 1811 “entra de mais de Siembradura media quartilla”; also in oco#8, 1812; oco#12, 1813; oco#14, 1813; oco#24, 1816.

85 This can be seen in TT, passim.

86 Oco#3, #5.

87 Oco#12.

88 For one parcel the number of cuartillos has not yet been deciphered, in oxo#10.

89 TT, introductory study, p 26.
Table 5.5: Sizes of land in Ocotitlan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sizes of non-household land parcels as expressed in the sources</th>
<th>Sizes rationalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 cuartillos</td>
<td>3 almudes, 1 cuartillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cuartilla</td>
<td>3 almudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 cuartillos</td>
<td>1 almud, 3 cuartillos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 cuartillos</td>
<td>1 almud, 2 cuartillos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>half cuartilla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 almud</td>
<td>1 almud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 cuartillos</td>
<td>3 cuartillos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reales system. Despite the dominance of a version of the fanega system, the reales system occurs in the Spanish corpus of Ocotitlan too, and entrenched in the sense that is taken for granted. In documents of 1812 and 1813, two non-household parcels of 4 reales are mentioned, in the same terms as in San Bartolomé, de cuatro reales.\(^90\) Another piece of 4 reales presents a problem in that it is called a solar; yet it is on the road to San Miguel, next to a tierra, and seems to be treated simply as agricultural land.\(^91\) The only other example in Ocotitlan is in the same document, a “tierra ques de dos reales,” “a piece of land that is of 2 reales.”\(^92\) Thus despite the paucity of examples, the reales system so prominent in San Bartolomé has to some

---

\(^90\) Oco#8, #13.  
\(^91\) Oco#16, 1813: “un Solar de cuatro reales en el camino que ba para San migel linda con la tierra de Dñña manuela ortega ora Me la deJo mi ermana mariana de Santiago or Se lo boy deJando mi sobrina margarita SerFanisa,” “a solar of 4 reales in the road going to San Miguel, bordering on land of doña Manuela Ortega, that my sister Mariana de Santiago recently left me, now I am leaving to my niece Margarita Gervasia.”  
\(^92\) Oco#16, 1813.
extent penetrated into Ocotitlan too, and the sizes mentioned are the two most common in San Bartolomé.

In one of the cases, reales coexist with quahuitl (palos). In another and supremely interesting case, the fanega system is used to try to explain the reales system, to give an equivalence—something that one searches for in vain in the San Bartolomé materials. In 1812 Antonio Francisco leaves a piece of land on the road to San Francisco, on the hill, beside the milpa (using that word) of the deceased doña Rafaela Martina, to Isidro Antonio, then explains that said land “declara de Cuatro Reales o de cuartilla de maíz de seBradura,” literally “declares of 4 reales, where half a cuartilla of maize seed fits.” Here is perhaps a Rosetta Stone after all, setting up an equivalence between the reales system and the other systems prevalent in the area. Half a cuartilla in the fanega system, or $1\frac{1}{2}$ almudes, is equated with 4 reales, the most common size in the reales system; and indeed this is the most common single size in the fanega system in the Ocotitlan corpus. If we resort to the equivalence between the fanega system and quahuitl that was mentioned above, of 10 quahuitl to 1 almud, 4 reales would be 15 quahuitl. Earlier in the chapter, in the San Bartolomé section, using different evidence, I was speculating that 4 reales might be equivalent to 20 quahuitl, which is at least somewhere near. I by no means insist on these equivalences or even that they are necessarily the same in San Bartolomé as they are in Ocotitlan, but we begin to have some sense of the general order of size.

From this passage, it appears that there may not necessarily be a set equivalences as such, even within each district. As faulty as the ungrammatical “declara” is, it gives the impression that the piece of land was set or assessed by someone at 4 reales, perhaps considering water availability, productivity, and other factors beyond simple size. Yet the existence of common sizes everywhere in the three systems leads us back to the thought of a general equivalence.
Whatever it was, it would seem still to have relied on the unmentioned 20-quahuitl second dimension of the original system.

A very high proportion of lands in the Ocotitlan corpus are measured in one of the above systems or other. When they are not, usually the names of bordering landholders are given, and whereas in San Bartolomé only one neighbor’s name was given, here it may be two, and the directions may be specified. Thus one piece of land is “next to the land of doña María [Hinojosa?], widow, on the north side, and on the south it borders on the land of the deceased Vicente Guzmán.” In one text neighbors are given for all four cardinal directions.

**Inheritance**

Many aspects of inheritance of non-household land in Ocotitlan are familiar from San Bartolomé, but landholding by testators is more balanced by gender. Of the 18 people who owned non-household land, 9 were female and 9 were male, an equal number of each. However, the women controlled more land than the men. Of the 35 total bequests of non-household land, 20 came from women and 15 from men. But when we look to heirs in terms of gender, we find the same phenomenon as in San Bartolomé; males are preferred. Of the 35 bequests of non-household land, females received 15 and males 18. Admittedly the reversal is not nearly as great as in San Bartolomé, and the relative position of female and male heirs is more balanced, but the trend is in the same direction.

Of the total 35 bequests, 13 can be analyzed for multigenerational patterns, though never more than three: a parent of the testator, the testator, and an heir of the following generation (see

---

93 Oco#24, 1816: “Junto la tierra de Dña Maria y Soja Viuda al lado de norte y por el Sur linda con la tierra difunto Visente Gusman.”

94 Oco#25, 1817.
Males dominate among the parents named, 8 fathers to only 2 mothers. Though in many cases the land must have been strictly speaking the joint property of both parents, testators mainly named their fathers when they recalled who gave them their parcels. Note that though the original owners were so predominantly male, among the testators to whom they gave land the gender balance is restored, 7 males to 6 females. We cannot, however, deduce that the original

Table 5.6
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Owner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95 In three of the cases where the origin of the land is known, it had belonged to a husband, which of course reduces the number of generations involved to two. No wives are mentioned in this capacity.
owners maintained such a balance in their own bequests overall, for we do not have their testaments. It is quite possible that they favored males, and as was happening in the whole larger area at this time, more than the expected number of females appear among the testators.

With the third generation, the heirs of the present testators, we see a similar development, more females than expected, which in this case is an indisputable fact: 8 females and 5 males became the new owners on the basis of the bequests of the present testators.\textsuperscript{96} With a sample this small, it is hard to know whether Ocotitlan indeed had a tradition of relative gender balance in inheritance, a view to which one is tempted, or whether the result arose from unavoidable choices in each case. Thus a man with no sons was bound to give his land to a daughter; a man with no children to his wife, etc. If Hilaria María gave her tierra de labor, coming from her father, to her son Esteban Francisco, that has to be seen in the context of her giving the main house and lot to another son Félix Antonio, and yet another lot of a large enough size to be taken seriously agriculturally (10 palos) to her daughter Cruz Bernardina, in that case following the instructions of her deceased husband.\textsuperscript{97} If Feliciana Petra gave a piece of land coming from her husband to her daughter Simona Cristina, it was because Simona was her only surviving child and also inherited the house; another piece of a lot went to a granddaughter, probably the only child of Simona.\textsuperscript{98}

At times, in Nahua land inheritance one can discern a tendency, though never apparently very consistent, to keep property that comes from the maternal side of the family in the hands of

\textsuperscript{96} Actually, not all the heirs were of the third generation; 9 were daughters, daughters-in-law, and sons, but 4 were siblings and wives.
\textsuperscript{97} Oco\#3, 1809.
\textsuperscript{98} Oco\#24, 1816.
females, that from the paternal side in the hands of males. Nothing of that type seems to develop here. Take the promising-looking case in which Basilio Julián gave his own father’s land to his son, but spoiled it by giving half to his daughter.99

As in San Bartolomé, the vast majority of land seems to be acquired by inheritance from relatives, but again a sale or two appears in the corpus. In a type of transaction very rarely seen even by the eighteenth century (in the sixteenth it had been common), Juana Anastasia ordered a piece of land, a “tierita” of 2 reales, to be sold to pay for her shroud and burial.100 One testator, Rafael Antono, seems to have a sale of non-household land in progress at the time of the testament and wants no one to contest it; it is to a citizen of Ocotitlan and his wife for the fairly substantial sum of 9 pesos, 3 reales.101

Saints

Household saints are even more closely connected with non-household land in Ocotitlan than in San Bartolomé. In one maximal case, Diego Gertrudis left a piece of land to her younger sister and added, “digo dara seis pesos para que se aga mi padre Señor - San Antonio,” “I say that it will contribute 6 pesos so that my father Señor San Antonio will be made,” that is, from its yield 6 pesos will be collected so that an image of him will be constructed.102

99 Oco#10, 1813.
100 Oco#14, 1813.
101 Oco#13, 1813: “digo y declaro que un a tiera que Se lo bendo a Dn felix Antonio casado con tomasa Juliana becinos de es dcho pueblo y en la cantidad de nuebe pesos con tres Reales no y – quien diga mañana u otro [sic],” “I say and declare that as to a piece of land that I am selling to don Félix Antonio, married to Tomasa Juliana, citizens of this said pueblo, for the amount of 9 pesos and 3 reales, no one is to object to it in the future.”
102 Oco#11, 1813.
Of those who bequeath non-household land, more mention that it is to serve a saint or saints, 8 of them, than do not, 7 of them. Guadalupe is the most common, mentioned 5 times, but 7 other saints receive mention in the same way, and Santa María Magdalena, the local patron saint, twice. Also at times the land is to serve not only the mentioned saint but the household saints in general, the santos y santas, mentioning the two genders separately as was done in documents in Nahuatl. A typical statement is “I am leaving another piece of land to my husband Félix Mejía to serve my Señora de Guadalupe and the male and female saints.”103 One testator left land with the condition that the heirs remember her with candles and flowers on major religious festivities.104

YANCUICTLALPAN

The Yancuictlalpan corpus is small, 12 testaments from 1801 to 1825; 8 of them, all in Nahuatl, mention non-household land; the corpus is uniform, with little difference from the first text to the last. As in San Bartolomé, non-household land is called tlalli throughout, without even the variation of the diminutive, with a single exception where a testator’s main parcel of household land is called a milli.105 Otherwise, here as in San Bartolomé only bordering properties are referred to as milli.106 Properties are identified much as elsewhere, as on a road to somewhere, next to someone, next to the tequimilli, but are not particularly elaborate. An

103 Oco#16, 1813: “otra tierra . . . Se lo boi degando a mi marido felis mexia para que le Sirba mi Soña de Guadalup y lo Santos y Santas.” In a Nahuatl text (oco#1, 1801), the land is given “para tlatequipanos,” “to serve,” the saints being understood.
104 Oco#24, 1816.
105 Yan#12, 1825.
106 Yan#2, #6, #7, #8, #10. In some cases the same phrase is used as in San Bartolomé, imiltenco; in other cases it is the verb milnamiqui, for cultivated fields to meet.
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unusual detail, unique in these records, is that one property was next to an hacienda, a large-scale Spanish property.  

**Measurement and sizes of non-household land**

Judging by the corpus preserved, Yancuictlalpant was not a place of wealthy landholders, considerably less so than San Bartolomé and Ocotitlan. Of those who had non-household land, 6 had two pieces, 2 had one; no one had more. None were of large size; I will now go into the question of just what the size was. It is clear that the measurement used falls within the fanega system in some way, for several times we see the telltale phrase *calaquil tlaolli*, “shelled maize enters or fits.”  

The predominant unit used, however is puzzling. Of 8 pieces of non-household land for which a measurement is given, 6 are the same: *centlaxelolli*, 1 tlaxelolli, one division, and at times the word seems to have implications of not just any division, but of a quarter of something.  

In an occurrence of this word in a Nahuatl texts of the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth century, the contemporary Spanish translator rendered *centlaxelolli* as “vn quartillo,” a cuartillo or one-fourth of an almud.  

If the predominant size of Yancuitlalpan land was really so small, the area was impoverished indeed. I think that although it may be that *tlaxelolli* was used at times for a cuartillo, here it is being used rather for the cuartilla that we saw in Ocotitlan, a fourth of a fanega, 3 almudes. This notion is confirmed by the fact that one of the other sizes

---

107 Yan#7, 1821: “momilnamiqui asienda.”
108 As in yan#6, 1820. Sometimes (as in yan#7, 1821) the verb used is *yehui*, possibly meaning “is sufficient”; in any case, the basic meaning is the same.
109 In Molina’s dictionary *tlaxelolli* is defined as a division, but one of the examples refers to quartering something.
110 The example, from San Miguel Aticpac in 1737, is in Pizzigoni, *Testaments of Toluca*, p. 75, explained in n. 4.
appearing in the Yancuintlalpan corpus is a *tlaco tlaxelolli*, half a tlaxelolli.\textsuperscript{111} Half a cuartillo would be a pitifully small size, and half cuartillos are in fact not seen in the records. But half a cuartilla, a media cuartilla, did occur, and does in the Ocotitlan corpus, meaning an almud and a half, 6 cuartillos. Indeed, the only remaining fanega-system measurement in Yancuintlalapan is *chiquace cuartillos*, 6 cuartillos, another way of saying half a cuartilla.\textsuperscript{112}

Thus the apparently prevailing size of Yancuintlalpan holdings was 3 almudes, which was also the most common size in Ocotitlan and was something like an average for areas using the fanega system in the eighteenth century. Here, however, this size is the upper limit.

The reales system has left no trace in Yancuintlalpan, reminding us of the extent of local variation in these communities even though they shared so much. The quahuitl is also missing, that is, directly, for aside from the longitudinal measurement *surco* being used for solares, it appears twice with non-household land in Yancuintlalapan, and as we saw earlier, in the San Bartolomé section, there it functioned to give amounts that were fractions of the even vigesimal numbers in quahuitl. Here, when something is described in surcos, no general term such as *tlalli* is used. One of the pieces is small, 14 surcos, but the other, of 90 surcos, would probably be most of a standard plot of 20 by 20 quahuitl.\textsuperscript{113} In the use of surcos for uneven sizes in an area mainly relying on the fanega system, we have a reminder that the fanega system as used among indigenous people was still implicitly built on the notion of the 20 by 20 quahuitl parcel.

\textsuperscript{111} Yan#2, 1810: “tlahco tlaxelloli tlaoli.”
\textsuperscript{112} Yan#8, 1821: “chicuase cuatillos.”
\textsuperscript{113} Yan#7, 1821; yan#12, 1825.
Saints

Although household saints show a quite strong presence in Yancuictlalpan, the statements seen elsewhere that lands are bequeathed to heirs to serve saints are lacking. Instead we occasionally see admonitions that the land is to be used to serve God and the king. In 1810 Juana Nepomucena left a piece of land to her son Francisco Casimiro “para Ypan quimotequipanilhuis Dios nuestro Señor yhua tuhueYtlahtohtzin Rey ma Dios quimopieli Campa moestica,” “to serve on it God our lord and our great ruler the king, whom God keep where he is.” Service to the altepetl can also be included; also in 1810, Margarita María left a piece of land to her son and daughter-in-law “para tlatequipanosq. Ypan Yaltepetzin tuSenquiscanantzin Yhua quimotequipanilhuisque tutlahtohCatzin Rey ma D. quimopiele Campa moezttica,” “to serve in the altepetl of our consummate mother [Santa María Magdalena, the patron] and to serve our ruler the king, whom God keep where he now is.” Here God is unmentioned. In another instance, of 1821, God is also left out, but the king still remains, and service to the past and present officers of the municipality is included. Mariano Domingo gave a piece of land to his wife and son “para tlatiquipanos quitequianilhuis tutlatocatzin Rey yhua noseñores pasados yhua noRepuca,” “to serve; they are to serve our ruler the king and my lords the past officials and my municipal

\[114\] Yan#3.
Serving the municipal officials apparently means doing the normal duties of the altepetl and is the same thing as serving the altepetl.\textsuperscript{116}

Since no earlier documentation is presently available for Yancuictlalpan, it is impossible to know whether these stipulations had long been traditional in the community, perhaps going back centuries, or whether, especially in reference to the king, were inspired by resistance to the independence movement or were suggested by Spanish ecclesiastics or loyalist officials at a higher level. It is surprising to see this sort of thing continuing as late as 1821. At any rate, these are local phenomena, and nothing of the kind appears in either San Bartolomé or Ocotitlan.

\textbf{Inheritance}

In the Yancuictlalpan corpus, 78\% of the testators are women, the highest proportion in all three bodies of material, surpassing San Bartolomé with 67\% and Ocotitlan with 50\%. In San Bartolomé 66\% of the inheritors are male, reversing the gender proportions of the testators. In Yancuictlalpan (see Table 5.7) the same phenomenon is observed, but weaker; of 23 total bequests of non-household land, 13, or 57\%, were to males, with 10, or 43\%, to females. Only Ocotitlan gave female heirs a larger proportion In Yancuictlalpan, unlike the other areas, it was the almost universal custom to mention spouses as coinheritors along with married children. This was so regardless of gender, that is, whether the biological child was female or male. The spouse

\textsuperscript{115} Yan\#8. The word for the present municipal officers is “noRepu\textsuperscript{ca},” norepublica, in which rep\textsuperscript{ublica} does not mean republic but the municipality and particularly the body of higher municipal officers. It has nothing to do with the independence movement but had been in use in this meaning since the seventeenth century.

\textsuperscript{116} The same kinds of things are said in connection with some bequests of household property. In yan\#3 the same Juana Nepomucena just mentioned leaves a little piece of solar to her son “para Ypan tlatequipanos Ypan altepeelt Yhua quimotequipanilhuis tuhueYtlahtohCatzi ReY ma Dios quimopieli Campa moestica,” “to serve in the altepetl on it and serve our great ruler the king, whom God keep where he is.” Another such reference is in yan\#5, 1819.
was named, not just taken as an anonymous an anonymous adjunct. Thus in 1810 the same Margarita María referred to just above left one piece of land to a son and his wife, another to a daughter and her husband. 117 I take it that this feature is simply part of the particular record-keeping tradition of Yancuictlan (it is something that is seen across central Mexico in Nahuatl texts, perhaps increasing with time), for in theory spouses were normally partners in owning property, and sales were made to both. It is true that a good many Yancuictlan bequests go jointly to males and females, but that seems to be motivated in most of the particular cases by a

117 Yan#2: one piece to “notelpoh franco Juaquin Yhuan YSihua Maria Casimira,” “to myu son Francisco Joaquin and his wife Maria Casimria,” and the other to “se nohpoh Ytoca francaf tomasa Yhuan Ynamicztin Ytoca Andres Dionicio,” “to a daughter of mine named Franisca Tomasa and her husband named Andrés Dionisio.”
custodial function of the older of the pair. Yet I do not exclude the possibility of a tendency toward gender symmetry in inheritance in Yancuictlalpan.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

In all three of the subareas considered here, the traditional system of scattered non-household land distinct from the household complex continued in full force despite national turmoil and the shrinking of available lands. Actually, given uncertainties about the way the land was measured, it is debatable how much they were shrinking in relation to the remaining population of the communities. In all the communities we see females in possession of more of the land than they would have held at any previous time; but at the same time we see them bequeathing it in a way that moves in the direction of the previous male predominance, so that rather than a change in principle in the role of women in landholding, we would seem to have the results of the death and absence of many men in the emergencies of the period.

Despite the uniformities across the small region studied, we find substantial differences, in the way of classifying the land, in the gender proportion of testators and heirs, and also in the amount of land held, although with the competing systems lacking very clear equivalence, that remains quite obscure. The differences are largely in terms of whole communities, each of which maintains a distinct profile. The fact that some sets of records are predominantly in Nahuatl, some in Spanish, and some mixed does not seem in itself to correspond to any systematic distinction in these respects.

As we have seen, in the largest community, San Bartolomé, among the testator group over 60% of non-household land was held by women, but among the inheritor group that was reversed to the point that almost the same percentage was held by males. In Ocotitlan the percentages were less extreme, but even so males ended up with 57% of the land. In Yancuic-
In Tlalpan the percentage of land held by female testators was the largest of all, and in this case female heirs retained 51%, but the ratio still changed in favor of males for that generation. With the small size of two of the groups, a real question remains as to whether there are substantial differences as to gender roles with land in the different communities, or whether, if we had a hundred texts for each, they would look much the same. At least we can say that in all cases there was an unusually strong role for landholding by females in the generation of the testators, and that in all cases it moved in the direction of the previous male predominance in the generation of the heirs.

The records show a great diversity, indeed an apparent chaos, in the ways land was classified and measured, both between the three communities and, in two cases, within them. The situation makes some types of analysis difficult and others impossible, at least for now. In two of the areas the traditional quahuitl, the longitudinal measurement running in twenties, based on an ideal basic plot of 20 by 20 quahuitl, seems still to have been dominant in San Bartolomé in the early part of our period, but it soon faded from prominence; in Ocotitlan it was at least present, though we can say no more. In Ocotitlan and Yancuixtlalpan the Spanish-derived fanega/al-mud/cuartillo system was dominant and may long have been. In San Bartolomé in the time around 1811–1813 the quahuitl system was to a large extent replaced by a system classifying land by money amounts, the reales system, which appears in Ocotitlan as well, though not in a dominant position; in Yancuixtlan it appears not at all. Why the reales scheme came in is at present not known. It in some way is hooked to annual income of the land, most probably rental income. Appearing so suddenly, and coinciding with dramatic events of the independence movements, it could have been connected with emergency administrative action on the part of the
Spanish government, or a concentrated movement among economic actors in response to a crisis. Further research in other archives may elucidate the matter.

Meanwhile the main task is to try to correlate the systems. They seem to designate the same kinds of holdings, and probably the same sizes of holdings. Nothing indicates that the holdings themselves were torn out of their usual process of inheritance and subdivision. In all systems they are scattered. The people involved no doubt were able to translate each set of measurements into the other without trouble, and had no compunctions about using two or even all three systems in the same testament.

It is known from the eighteenth century that there was an equivalence between the fanega and quahuitl systems, that is, that an almud would be equivalent to so many quahuitl (by a 20-quahuitl second dimension). One version of this equivalence is 10 quahuitl to an almud. In the Ocotitlan materials there is an equivalence between the fanega system and reales: one and a half almudes to 4 reales, the most common size. At this rate, 4 reales could have been 15 quahuitl. In carrying out various kinds of speculative analysis on the San Bartolomé materials, I arrived at a possibility that 4 reales could be 20 quahuitl. This is not the place to carry these considerations into greater detail, but two things should be said. First, if 10 (by 20) quahuitl are equivalent to an almud and 4 reales is equivalent to an almud and a half, then the sizes of parcels we see in our three areas do not indicate a severe drop in size of the average landholding at the time of independence despite the first appearances. The relative lack of larger pieces and and the scarcity of larger ensembles of holdings by a single person, however, are striking. Second, these equivalences make sense only if we presume that the people involved were still thinking of the uniform 20-quahuitl width as the basis of plots in all systems, so that none of them had moved too far from the quahuitl system that had prevailed in central Mexico for many centuries.
6. Conclusion

As I write this, the approaching bicentennial commemorations of Mexican independence bring home to me how little research has been devoted to the indigenous communities of that period, even by the ethnohistorians of early Mexico. I hope that my documentary discoveries and the study they have led me to will not only throw a first light on the internal functioning of the indigenous world at independence but will help stimulate further research on the topic. My experience tends to imply that large documentary resources exist. It also shows that this epoch should not be treated as an isolated “independence period” but should be tied to the preceding centuries as an indispensable context, which I have done. It implies further that this epoch with its signs of beginning transition should be tied to the succeeding years, which my present resources have not allowed.

The collections of Nahuatl testaments used here—especially of course that from San Bartolomé—equal any that are extant from the sixteenth, seventeenth, or eighteenth centuries and retain all the characteristics of the three-century tradition of the genre. The existence of such a large corpus dating from the first three decades of the nineteenth century, at a time when the great tradition of Nahuatl recordkeeping was thought to have lapsed, has significance both for substantive developments and for historiography. Substantively, it shows Nahuatl writing flourishing much later than we had thought, and it is a prime symptom of the full survival of a whole interlocking series of local patterns and structures from the eighteenth century into this period of turmoil and national transformation.¹ Indeed, the corpus is packed with direct evidence

¹ It also shows how low the explanatory value of Hispanic legislation is. Through the later eighteenth century governmental decrees had increasingly insisted that documentation from indigenous communities be in Spanish, and this has been thought to relate to the diminution and before long disappearance of
of such survival, to the extent that the whole time from the second half of the seventeenth century through the third decade of the nineteenth can in many ways be treated as a unit. Historiographically, the corpus makes it possible to push the philological ethnohistory of central Mexico at least a full generation forward in time, giving scope for the exercise of the full array of techniques and concepts that have proved so productive for previous centuries.

Testaments from my best documented community, San Bartolomé Tlatelolco, could be compared with those from the same settlement a century earlier and proved to be superficially almost identical, at the same time that they varied substantially from the models prevalent in other settlements of the area. They show the same micro-local variation and micro-local retention of culture that we see in all aspects of the life of these communities. True, there were innovations in the form and style of the testaments, but often they were minor, or were new only to the locality and had existed for generations in more elaborate wills in the Toluca Valley and even elsewhere. But some things were truly new, like the introduction in San Bartolomé of the Nahuatl recordkeeping. But now ever more Nahuatl texts from the last decades of the eighteenth century are coming to light, and my whole corpus postdates 1800. Not only did many local people ignore the directives, but local Spanish priests did so too, registering the Nahuatl testaments and keeping them in their archives as a matter of course, as well as carrying out the rites they requested. For an explanation of the survival of Nahuatl writing in a certain area in a certain time, the true factors seem to be local custom and the type of training that local writers received, primarily from each other.

I do not say that researchers will now immediately find large collections of early nineteenth-century Nahuatl testaments all across the landscape of central Mexico. Such collections are extremely rare for the earlier centuries too. Larger collections have usually been built up from scattered individual finds in central archives, as with TT and Rojas Rabiela 1999–2004. Also, it may well be that the Toluca Valley is an unusually auspicious area with especially strong retention of the tradition. Perhaps it is no accident that so much collection and study related to late-period Nahuatl writing concerns the Toluca Valley, not only TT but much work by Lockhart and Wood. Furthermore, it is quite possible that within the Toluca Valley the Metepec subregion kept the tradition longer than others. For many years we have known of a Nahuatl testament from Metepec dated 1795 (Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart 1976, Doc. 6). Yet after my surprising finds I do not discount the possibility of others, either in the Valley or anywhere in the Nahua world. The eastern regions, including Tlaxcala, Cholula, and other centers, are known to have held onto Nahuatl speaking and writing tenaciously, and the prospects would seem especially good there.

2 I do not say that researchers will now immediately find large collections of early nineteenth-century Nahuatl testaments all across the landscape of central Mexico. Such collections are extremely rare for the earlier centuries too. Larger collections have usually been built up from scattered individual finds in central archives, as with TT and Rojas Rabiela 1999–2004. Also, it may well be that the Toluca Valley is an unusually auspicious area with especially strong retention of the tradition. Perhaps it is no accident that so much collection and study related to late-period Nahuatl writing concerns the Toluca Valley, not only TT but much work by Lockhart and Wood. Furthermore, it is quite possible that within the Toluca Valley the Metepec subregion kept the tradition longer than others. For many years we have known of a Nahuatl testament from Metepec dated 1795 (Anderson, Berdan, and Lockhart 1976, Doc. 6). Yet after my surprising finds I do not discount the possibility of others, either in the Valley or anywhere in the Nahua world. The eastern regions, including Tlaxcala, Cholula, and other centers, are known to have held onto Nahuatl speaking and writing tenaciously, and the prospects would seem especially good there.
loanword *cuerpo* for body, finally abandoning the equivalent native-based expressions used in Nahuatl writing in the previous centuries. It is typical, though, that the other communities did not adopt the innovation, and even some writers in San Bartolomé lagged behind. All in all, one could say that looking at the early nineteenth-century Nahuatl corpus, it had changed neither more nor less than Nahuatl writing had been changing generation after generation for centuries. Perhaps it was ominous that the premier notary of San Bartolomé in his productive career never fully mastered the basic formula of the sick body and the sound spirit and soul.

The San Bartolomé corpus contains a unique and stunning example of how writing and the notarial office were perpetuated in Nahua communities, in a way that has nothing to do with the independence period but had doubtless been happening for centuries. The premier notary of the time up to around 1810 was replaced by his son, who then dominated the scene for more than a decade. The first texts done by the son are almost indistinguishable from those of the father, from whom he had clearly learned everything; then over the years the son develops some special characteristics of his own, drawing on a larger traditional repertoire of expressions and conventions.

But though this father-son team dominated the scene in their time, San Bartolomé had a surprisingly large corps of other writers capable of serving as notaries. In their orthographies and conventions separate and competing lineages can be detected, pointing to a sustainable pool of notaries and a systematic transmission of intricate skills—all home-grown and nourished. The system as it functioned in the early decades of the nineteenth century appears as alive as ever, and to have the same characteristics it had always had.

Yet one crucial element was changing. Some of the notaries were beginning to write testaments in Spanish. It did not happen all at once or at exactly the same rate in the different
communities. Perhaps it started with some writers who could and did function in either Nahuatl or Spanish, like Mariano de la Merced in San Bartolomé, Pablo Leonardo in Ocotitlan, or Isidro de la Trinidad in Yancuictlalpan. But the increasing tendency was for new notaries to function in Spanish only, probably not actually trained to write Nahuatl, and before 1830 no new Nahuatl testaments were being produced anywhere in our communities. This development is of great significance, indicating perhaps the time when these indigenous communities were opening up to the national culture in a new way. Yet for the moment, the more striking aspect was how little changed.

Like the Nahuatl writing tradition, the local Spanish tradition was home-grown. Surely the writers had not been instructed by anyone expert in Spanish grammar, style, or documentary form. Instead, the testaments have the same content, structure, and phrasing as their Nahuatl predecessors, which served as the models. In this way some very awkward Spanish was produced, awkward until the moment you realize they are using Nahuatl concepts and structure to explain things in a way which would be readily understandable to their peers. The Nahuatl texts are like maps to understand those in Spanish, and the opposite is also sometimes true, showing for example that chane in the Nahuatl, which is citizen, resident, or native, was probably meant primarily in the Nahuatl as native, born locally. The same kind of differentiation by community, the same sort of variation by individual writers and lines of writers, obtained in the Spanish corpus as in Nahuatl.

On the historiographical side, the upshot is that the Spanish corpus can be used alongside the Nahuatl for many research purposes, aggregating the two together while using the same categories applicable to both. On the substantial side, it becomes clear that despite this large
development in language, initially there was little cultural loss or even change; the local com-
munities were virtually as indigenous as ever.

In religious life as seen through testaments, we begin to detect some effects of the fact
that, distinct from the Nahuatl testament corpus over the centuries, in which women usually
contributed a bit over a third of the testators, here in texts of the independence period women
constitute a large majority. Whereas in previous centuries it was men, perhaps simply because
they had more property, who had the most elaborate and expensive funeral rites, here women
have taken over that position—not just that there were more of them, but that they had more
elaborate rites per person. Another aspect of this part of the study was a reconstruction of the
burial practices and even the physical setting of the churchyard for San Bartolomé, showing
particularly a special role for trees that went back at least a century and is still very much in
evidence today. Of interest is the household saints cult, which at first glance seems to be less
loudly proclaimed than it had been a century earlier, especially in San Bartolomé, but on closer
inspection we see that all its elements survive, including in San Bartolomé itself.

A large part of the study is devoted to the house complex and the non-household lands
that together were the framework for the life of a couple, their children, and usually a plethora of
close relatives nearby. Again continuity strikes us in the face; the complexes seem to be of the
type predominant in the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth century, the scattered non-household
land is on the same plan as before, and especially the inheritance strategy remains the same,
preferring males while giving females a significant minority of the properties. The broader
implication is that the female majorities among the testators and property holders in the corpus
seem to be an artifact in some way of phenomena specific to the time of the independence
movements, which have not yet affected the outlook of the local population, including women, on matters of domestic structures, inheritance, or gender.

As in all other departments, within the framework of some regional commonalities, here too we see much variation from community to community. An impression of smallness and diminution arises, but it varies from one pueblo to the next and in any case is hard to pinpoint. Three different systems of classifying or measuring non-household land coexisted in the area. The newest and most puzzling was a classification of parcels in terms of money amounts, 2 or 4 reales or a peso, which became dominant in San Bartolomé. It is clear that no large-scale reorganization of landholdings took place, but much remains to be solved, and I wish to return to these matters in talking of the agenda for further research.

**Research directions**

During my work on the household and the associated land regime, one avenue I took to try to determine the reason for the reversal of the gender situation with property was to investigate possible patterns that might operate cross-generationally or in a patrilineal or matrilineal fashion, or both simultaneously. But if such a thing as having alternating gender over generations can sometimes be found—a line of inheritance from female to male to female to male for example—it may be an artifact of the gender of whoever survived in that particular set of relatives. If we look for separate lines of inheritance from the side of the father and of the mother, we soon find that direct descent from the matrimonial couple trumps all other considerations, that their children win out as long as there are any, regardless of gender. Siblings or nieces and nephews come in only when there are no children or when a previous generation, for whom the collateral relatives of the present testators were in the direct line, had already committed a certain inheritance to them.
Some cases of deliberately carrying the mother’s inheritance on to a daughter while the father’s goes to a son do show up, and Testaments Nos. 2 and 7 in the documentary appendix are partial examples. They take place, however, within the framework of a general preference, shared by both male and female testators, for male children without ignoring female children, just as in traditional Nahua inheritance strategy, and if there are no male children, preferring the female children over collaterals. To repeat, this is equally true of male and female testators. When something goes to a collateral relative even if children are available, the reason is usually that the children are small and the collateral relative gets a reward for custodial service. In the end the reason for the apparently unusual features of gender developments in the corpus as to property holding is clear enough, as already mentioned: that the female numerical predominance among testators, and probably in the local adult population, was the product of crises of the time and that the general strategies and attitudes of the local people, whether male or female, had not changed, a testimony to the strength of culture despite adversity.

The factor most prominent in causing any changes in property holding and inheritance seems to have been the demographic situation, of which the absence of men is the most obvious element, but other things may have played a role too, especially the epidemics in removing possible heirs.\(^3\) In the coming time I mean to carry out systematic counts in all the testaments of the corpus of family size and composition as to gender and age, to the extent these things can be determined. There will be a limit to what can be deduced from the present corpus, not only

\[^{3}\] It does not seem likely that the epidemics would have had a differential impact as to gender, in particular any tendency to remove men more than women. For the epidemic year of 1813, the San Bartolomé corpus contains 20 testaments of women, 9 of men. This does point on the face of it to the presence of more women, but it also shows that more died and that they were as affected by epidemic disease as men were.
because of its finite size and its vagueness about age, but because Nahuas were perfectly capable of simply not listing in their wills any children who were not to inherit anything, above all infants likely to die before growing up, but also females when there wasn’t enough property to go around. Minute examination of each situation will help show the extent to which the simple lack of other heirs determined the choices made. But I also hope to glean demographic information, both systematic and fragmentary, from the larger archives and from sources in Spanish.

The topic of landholding shows similar research dynamics, particularly as to the size and number of properties. There is strong evidence of constant subdivision of both home complexes and non-household lands over generations, continuing in the current generation. The apparent effects of the process are emphasized by the use of many diminutives in describing the properties, especially in San Bartolomé. We know too in a general way of a long process of Hispanic encroachment on indigenous lands. Many testators mention only one or two landholdings, but others have more, and a few a large number. Some communities appear to be faring better than others. In the near future I plan to work out statistically the average number and size of holdings for both testators and heirs, both aggregated and differentiated by gender and community, and also do what I can to achieve a somewhat reliable equivalence between the three different systems used to measure land. With this done, it will be possible to put comparisons with the preceding century on a firmer basis.  

There should also be a meaningful tie between further research on local demography and that on properties. The tendency of testators to divide their holdings almost ad infinitum, to give

---

4 Pizzigoni forthcoming will contain massive though selective statistical assessments of these matters for the Toluca Valley in the late seventeenth century and the eighteenth, providing a point of comparison.
something to various heirs no matter what the drawbacks, is shown very forcefully in the corpus. But subdivision must be measured against family size. If only some of the heirs were living to adulthood, if family size was stable or decreasing, whether it be from epidemics, flight, wars, or whatever reason, then many subdivisions would not actually take place even if planned and decreed. Thus perhaps much can be learned by measuring apparent property owning against apparent family size, and also comparing the data with the situtation in the Toluca Valley in the previous century.

Another research challenge relating to (non-household) land is the abrupt introduction of the reales scheme of assessment or measurement at the beginning of the second decade of the nineteenth century, becoming predominant in San Bartolomé and at least present in Ocotitlan. Some things I have been able to establish fairly clearly: that the new system did not involve an actual reorganization of landholdings, but that the same scattered landholdings were reclassified, and also that there was some sort of equivalence between the new system and those that already existed. Indeed, the ancient method of retaining an unspoken 20 quahuitl as the second measurement must have been basic to all of them.

The reales system is in some way hooked to annual income of the piece of land, probably rental income, particularly because the amounts cited are small and rents would have had to be well under the value of yields to make renting worthwhile. But the amounts are too *conventionalized* to correspond to actual rents. Appearing so suddenly, and coinciding with peak events of the independence movements, the system could have been connected with emergency administrative action on the part of the Spanish government, but then it should have been more widespread, beyond one or two communities. A concentrated movement among economic actors in response to a crisis is another possibility. These are matters that go beyond the capacity of the
corpus to solve. In the central archives I hope to find more enlightenment, perhaps relevant decrees, perhaps land litigation that explains the reales system, perhaps information showing that it was more widespread than I can presently detect.

The chapters of the body of this study reflect my estimation of the most important topics the documentary corpus presents, or to put it another way, the topics on which they deliver the most abundant, direct, systematic new information about local society and culture. And in truth, for economic reasons one cannot devote one’s whole life to a dissertation, but must make certain strategic decisions, trusting to expand the work in the future. Some relevant topics that did not at present get their own chapters or large sections are naming patterns, titles, kinship, and local officeholding. I will sketch out here what I see about these matters in advance of a more systematic treatment at a later time.

Names abound in the corpus, no different whether Nahuatl or Spanish—of testators, spouses, parents, heirs, witnesses and officials. My first impression was that everything was very familiar from naming patterns of the late colonial period or Stage 3 in the Nahua world generally, and particularly as seen for that time in the Toluca Valley. Indeed, all in all that is undoubtedly the case, but as one becomes more familiar with the nineteenth-century material some new features emerge after all. The ascending hierarchy of second names, from apparent first names (saints’ names), to names involving religious terminology, to Spanish surnames, continued as before, with all names quite easily identifiable as indigenous rather than Hispanic despite containing no elements that were indigenous by origin. It continued to be true that few

5 What I say here on names, titles, kinship, and officeholding started with material in Melton-Villanueva and Pizzigoni 2008, pp. 374–75 and 384, though it varies from it very considerably, making both subtractions and numerous additions and revisions.
second names were carried from one generation to the next and that the second names of the members of most nuclear families bore no relation to each other. But one notices that some names rare or lacking in the eighteenth century are now part of the common repertoire. Among these are names emphasizing the Holy Family, like Mariano, José María, María Josefa. Also Guadalupe is ever more common as a second name and now can appear as a first name as well. It may be that these introductions were reducing the distance between indigenous names and Hispanic names. Other names rarely or never seen earlier include Máximo, Perfecto, Píoquinto. New women’s names are perhaps less frequent and striking (as had always been true, ever since precontact times), but names like Eleuteria, Lucardia, and Fausta were now more common than before. I have even seen Píoquinta used for a woman.

Along with names go kinship terms. As with names, my impression has been that words for kinship were still the same as what is seen in eighteenth-century Toluca Valley texts. The Toluca Valley in Stage 3 innovated the use of -cihuahuatzin, “one’s woman,” to mean wife, with -namictzin, “one’s spouse,” restricted to husband. That is still exactly what is found in the present corpus, and the same is true of such terms more generally. In some respects the late corpus makes some things in the eighteenth-century materials clearer. In the early nineteenth-century materials, it is clear that -hermanito and -hermanita are not just one’s little brother or sister, but one’s younger brother or sister even if grown. In some cases the texts use -coneuh, originally the child of either gender of a woman, to mean specifically one’s son as opposed to one’s daughter. In retrospect it seems likely that both of these developments were already taking place in the eighteenth century. In the coming time I mean to compile and analyze all examples

---

6 TT, p. 13.
of kinship terms in the corpus and compare the results with what is known of eighteenth-century practice.

By Stage 3 in central Mexico, the title “don” had become an important social marker, essentially designating those who held or previously had held higher local office, either municipal or in the church organization. This meaning and use of the don continued virtually universal in the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth century.\(^7\) If we look at the descriptive labels that Spanish-speaking priests wrote on the testaments of the independence-period corpus, we would think that the don had faded from use, for it is absent, but in fact it is only that the Hispanic world was no longer recognizing the title with indigenous people. Looking at the body of the testaments and especially at the lists of officials as witnesses, we see that within the indigenous world the don retains exactly the same meaning and importance as in the eighteenth century. Men who hold office as fiscal, deputy fiscal, or alcalde always bear the don, while those in lower offices do not, just as before.

The association of the don with local office meant that the feminine version of the title, doña, did not have the same structural role. Having once been normal for any high-ranking indigenous woman, with some vestiges of that still being seen in the Toluca Valley in the seventeenth century, by the eighteenth remarkably few women in the extant Toluca Valley corpus bear the title.\(^8\) In the early nineteenth-century corpus, and especially in San Bartolomé, however, several women have the doña, three among the testators and many more among heirs and neighbors. Perhaps this fact can even be related to some new respect for prominent women in the

\(^7\) TT, p. 12.
\(^8\) Ibid.
absence of so many men, but for now I cannot be sure that it is not simply a micro-local characteristic or a cross-regional trait of the times.

At contact and for decades thereafter, the highest rank in the central Mexican indigenous world was *tlatoani*, the dynastic ruler of an altepetl. By the eighteenth century the word in that sense was gone, at least absent from normal everyday documentation in Nahuatl. At times the word the Spaniards used, *cacique*, which itself was borrowed from an indigenous language in the Caribbean, was employed instead. But among Hispanic people and in their wake among indigenous people too, the word changed drastically in meaning by the eighteenth century, basically simplysignifying a prominent indigenous person. In that sense the term is found once in the general Toluca Valley corpus for the eighteenth century, in reference to a woman. It appears once in the Spanish portion of the present corpus as well, apparently again with the meaning of some sort of local prominence, for the person involved shows no other signs of high rank or great property, or even the don or mention of officeholding.

I have already mentioned an important facet of the local officeholding system in the hierarchy of officials according to whether they receive the title don or not. The ecclesiastical offices—fiscal, deputy fiscal, topile (perhaps mayor and menor), and notary—and the municipal offices—alcalde, regidor mayor and regidor segundo, alguacil mayor and perhaps a topile, with a municipal notary—are the same in our corpus as they would have been anywhere in the Toluca Valley in the eighteenth century, that is, in the case of an altepetl which had previously been only a tlaxilacalli and lacked the governor and greater elaboration of the ancient complex altepetl.

9 Ibid., and testament no. 43, Tepemaxalco, 1762.
10 In sbt#72, Sebastiana Fabiana says, “Y mi esposo Jose Anselmo cacique,” “and my spouse José Anselmo, cacique.”
What catches one’s attention is that in San Bartolomé and Ocotitlan the witnesses are always the church officials, and in Yancuictlalpan they are always the municipal officials, another example of the micro-local distinctions that we find everywhere. In Yancuictlalpan an adjustment to the times surfaces: in testaments of 1824 and 1825 the alcalde is called *alcalde nacional*, the only direct allusion in the whole corpus to Mexico’s independence.\(^{11}\) The other officials are still the same, and even the alcalde simply receives an addition to his title; obviously there has been no actual reorganization.

In the above I have already several times alluded to the need to go to sources operating within a larger scope, doubtless in central archives and often in Spanish, in order to learn more about some important matters, including demography in relation to inheritance strategies and property holding, and also the reales system of land assessment as part of the several concurrent systems of land measurement, all of which need to be understood better in order to assess trends. In my research I have come to suspect that the local inhabitants were by no means relying exclusively on their non-household lands but that they also, at least many of them, traded independently across the region, did craft manufacture for sale, or worked in the Hispanic sector, and only in materials from that sector am I likely to be informed on this point. Sources of this type can also help with comprehending local institutions and officeholding, confined in the testaments virtually to witness lists, and throw light on the interactions of people generally.

My interests do transcend what can be learned from the testaments. I follow environmental history and would like to add that aspect to the story. Such matters as disease, biology,

\(^{11}\) Yan#10 and 12.
food, and geography appear only tangentially in the sources and need further context; I remain hopeful of finding just that, and more, in the broader archival world.

This does not mean that I at all repent of having concentrated first on my testament corpus. It provides an internal, local view that has true coherence and authenticity, a center. Surely it can and must be supplemented with outside sources, but if one starts on the outside without the local sources, the converse is not true; the center is lacking. In this project I have found that the real distinction to be made is not between Nahuatl sources and Spanish sources, as we often think, but between things produced locally, both Nahuatl and Spanish, and things with an external view.

I would not abandon the path that the testament corpus has dictated, but would retain a regional and even subregional focus, by all means expanding the view to any other nearby communities about which much can be found (I especially yearn to open up Totocuitlapilco, of course) and perhaps to Metepec itself to a certain extent. But the thick web of mutually reinforcing perspectives from people and communities close to each other has great explanatory and also emotional power, as opposed to a broader theater.

The emotional essence to me is a community by whose well established, ingrained, interlocking practices some of the fruits of daily tasks tending the maize fields on the family’s land go for devotional purposes, and the lands go on to the next generation with the same purpose, with household saints and ancestors in mind. For me, culture appears in this instance as that shared language of food, prayer, soil, and family that allows us to thrive in the face of

12 I am indebted to Robin (Lauren) Derby for inspiring me by her work in quest of this most overlooked of languages. See Derby 1998.
unspeakable adversity, and allows us to find home—no matter where our bodies or souls are driven.

**A final word**

The deepest impression I had in working with the testaments came not from a single testament but from a set of two, when I realized that Juana Anastasia died so soon after her husband José Anastasio, in the epidemic year of 1813. On July 29th José left all four of his properties to her, but only five days later Juana Anastasia made her testament in turn. Because José left everything to his wife, their three children were probably very young. He asked that the largest piece of land be used to remember him, but in Juana’s testament that wish was left unmentioned. What is happening in this situation to the home, the land and the responsibilities to the land, to the saints, and to José’s memory? Did the rapid death of the parents disrupt these traditions? Just as epidemics swept through indigenous communities throughout the colonial period, this tragedy continued to impact them at independence. Such cycles of disease persisting into the independence period deserve further study, and also the indigenous pueblos’ resilient strategies to retain, adapt, and add to their ancient corporate traditions.

---

13 Their testaments are oco#12 and 14. The smallest piece of land is considered to be of 3 cuartillos in José’s testament but is called of 2 reales in Juana’s. Here is another bit of evidence on equivalences, which since I have noticed it only in the last days before finishing the dissertation, I will not try to integrate into the discussion in Chapter 5. The new example, however, does agree with the one there. The previous example, also from Ocotitlan, equated 4 reales with 6 cuartillos; here 2 reales are equated with 3 cuartillos.

14 Juana left the house and saints to her son Andrés Viviano and most of the land to him too, some of it specifically to serve the saints, with smaller pieces for the two daughters, not saying anything about the father.

15 For a list of epidemic cycles see pp. 448–51 in Gibson 1964.
Appendix 1.
Lists of Testaments
4 Keys to the Sources

Here are successive lists of the entire testament corpus used in the present study, first from San Bartolomé Tlatelolco, second from Ocotitlan, third from Yancuicatlalpan, and fourth from Totocuitlapilco. All are preserved in the archive of the Convento de San Juan Bautista in Metepec, in Caja 40, sin foliar. The numbers assigned follow the order of the originals but are not indicated in the archive. Footnotes throughout the work lead to these lists, using the abbreviations that are also explained elsewhere: sbt, oco, yan, and toto plus the number in the list.

1. San Bartolomé Tlatelolco’s Testaments 1799–1832

In this list the notaries’ names are abbreviated. BM is Basilio Martín; CG is Cipriano Gordiano; dFNR is don Francisco Nicolás Romero; FNM is Félix Nabor Mulia; JDDIC is Juan Domingo de la Cruz; JGC is José Guadalupe Camacho; JM is José María; JMM is Juan Máximo Mejía; MC is Mafímo Calisto; MdLM is Mariano de la Merced; PA is Pedro Agustín; RF is Rufino Faustino; SC is Santiago Cristóbal.

Some numbers are missing because of duplications discovered after the compilation was made, and one, 62A, was added. The list numbers go to 119; the actual total is 116.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Testator</th>
<th>Notary</th>
<th>Language (Nahuatl unless noted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Apolonia Felipa</td>
<td>JDdlC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Dominga Efigenia</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Marcela Martina</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>María Josefa</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Victoriana María</td>
<td>dFNR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Tiburcia Valenciana</td>
<td>dFNR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>José Abdon</td>
<td>dFNR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>María Josefa</td>
<td>dFNR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Pascuala Eleuteria</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Manuela Lugarda</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Lucaria Cristóstoma</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Bernabel Antonia</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Lauriano Rafael</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nombre</td>
<td>Año</td>
<td>Estado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Nicolás George</td>
<td>dFNR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Rosa María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Juana María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>doña Simona María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Petrona Martina</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>don Juan de los Santos</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Francisca Javiera</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Margarita María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Francisca Javiera</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Valentina María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>María Francisca</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>doña Lucaria María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Dominga María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Simona María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>María Josefa</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Bernardino Antonio</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Diego de la Cruz</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Florenciana María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Basilia Antonia</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Dominga María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Miguel Antonio</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Teresa Calista</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>doña Fausta María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Martina María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Valentina María</td>
<td>MdlM Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Brígida Dionisia</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Margarita María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Cristina Sinforosa</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Leonarda María</td>
<td>CG (nominal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Secundina Andrea</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>don Félix Bernabé</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Manuela María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Fausta Rufina</td>
<td>CG (nominal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Paula María</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Rosa María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Ciriaca Cayetana</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Guadalupe María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Vicenta Isidora</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Bartolomé Felipe</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Melchor Antonio</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Ignacia Petrona</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Vicente Antonio</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Año</td>
<td>Nombre</td>
<td>Localidad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Victoria María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Luciano Guadalupe</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Luisa Trinidad</td>
<td>MdlM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>don Andrés Antonio</td>
<td>CG (nominal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Felipe de la Cruz</td>
<td>MdlM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Marina Cayetana</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Juan de los Santos</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>María Bernardina</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>Aparicia Feliciana</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Margarita María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Candelaria Martina</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Asencia Pasquala</td>
<td>JMM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Alejandro Justo</td>
<td>JMM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Sebastiana Fabiana</td>
<td>JMM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Bartolomé Luis</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Santos Venancio</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Petrona Francisca</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Bernardino Gregorio</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Domingo Manuel</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Lucas Florentino</td>
<td>CG (nominal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Sebastián Isidoro</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Estefania María</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Eleuteria Severiana</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Tiburcio Valentín</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Clara María</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Juan Gregorio</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Tomasa Martina</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Mariano Rafael</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Lugarda María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Gerónima Antonia</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Joaquín Benito</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Dionisia Jacinta (Casilda)</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>don Miguel Aparicio</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Esteban Ramón</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>María Albina</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Margarita Feliciana</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>don Hilario Dionisio</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Eugenia Gertrudis</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Martín Gordiano</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Cipriana Faustina</td>
<td>CG (nominal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Concepciona María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Año</th>
<th>Nombre</th>
<th>Año</th>
<th>Nombre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Perfecto Martín</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Simón Marcelino</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Alejandro de la Cruz</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>don Pedro Esteban</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Lorenzo Bernardino</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Juana Apolonia</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Juana Ignacia</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Alejandra María</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Juan Esteban</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Petrona Luciana</td>
<td>CG (nominal)</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Lázaro Martín</td>
<td>CG (nominal)</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Isidra Estefania</td>
<td>JM</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Ascencia María</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Martina Bonifacia</td>
<td>FNM</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Dominga Bonifacia</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Alejandro Marcos</td>
<td>JM</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>María Josefa</td>
<td>JM</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>Mauricio Mateo</td>
<td>JM</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Carmen de la Cruz</td>
<td>JGC</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95 Nahuatl
21 Spanish
### 2. Ocotitlan’s Testaments 1801–1820

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Testator</th>
<th>Notary</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>Ana María Santos Alberto</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Ana María José Sebastián</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Hilaria María José Sebastián</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Luisa María Santiago Cristóbal</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Salvador Miguel Juan Félix Mejía</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Jacobo Santiago Sebastián Fabián López</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Francisca María Santiago Cristóbal</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Antonio Francisco Marcos Alejandro</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Teresa Quiteria Santiago Cristóbal</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Basilio Julián Pablo Leonardo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Diega Gertrudis Pablo Leonardo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>José Anastasio Pablo Leonardo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Juan José Pablo Leonardo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Juana Anastasia Pablo Leonardo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Juana María Pablo Leonardo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Luisa Gervasia Pablo Leonardo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Manuela Antonia Pablo Leonardo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>María Gerónima Pablo Leonardo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Martín Pedro Pablo Leonardo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Pablo de Santiago Pablo Leonardo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Rafael Antonio Pablo Leonardo</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Ramona María Pablo Leonardo</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>María Antonia José Toribio</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Feliciana Petrona Toribio Antonio</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Juan de los Santos Ponciano Guadalupe</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Paulino Santiago José Sebastián</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Anastasia de la Cruz Pedro José</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Yancuictlalpan’s Testaments 1809–1825

The notaries’ names are abbreviated; MA is Marcos Antonio, and IT is Isidro de la Trinidad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Testator</th>
<th>Notary</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>María Petrona</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Margarita María</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Juana Nepomucena</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Florentina Evangelista</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Dionisio Calisto</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Nicolasa Bábarra</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Lucas Pedro</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Mariano Domingo</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Juliana Viviana</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Bárbara Manuela</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>María Bernardina</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>Francisca Antonia</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Totocuitlapilco’s Testaments 1815 & 1826

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Testator</th>
<th>Notary</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>Petra Angelina</td>
<td>Antonio Ambrosio</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Ana María</td>
<td>Rufino Faustino</td>
<td>Nahuatl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(also sbt#67)
Appendix 2.
Notaries in the Corpus

(N) after a name indicates that that notary worked in Nahuatl; (Sp) indicates that he worked in Spanish.

1. Notaries in San Bartolomé 1799–1832

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Testaments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan Domingo de la Cruz (N)</td>
<td>JDdlC</td>
<td>sbt1, 1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilio Martín (N)</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>sbt2, 1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Agustín (N)</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>sbt3, 4, 1803–06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don Francisco Nicolás Romero (N)</td>
<td>dFNR</td>
<td>sbt5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cipriano Gordiano (N)</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>sbt 9 and many more, 1810–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariano de la Merced (N and Sp)</td>
<td>MdM</td>
<td>sbt49, N; sbt 40, 60, 62, Sp; may have written under the name of CG; all in 1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufino Faustino (N)</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>sbt79, 80; also possibly 78 for CG, 1819–20 (spacing is different, hand more sophisticated, formulas considerably different than toto2/another RF?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Máximo Mejía (Sp)</td>
<td>JMM</td>
<td>sbt70, 71, 72, 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máximo Calisto (Sp)</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>sbt81, 82, 83, 84, 1821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José María (Sp)</td>
<td>JM</td>
<td>sbt112, 116, 117, 118, 1824–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Félix Nabor [Mulia?] (Sp)</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>sbt114, 1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago Cristóbal (Sp)</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>sbt115, 1824; also oco4, 7, 9, 1809–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Guadalupe Camacho (Sp)</td>
<td>JGC</td>
<td>sbt119, 1832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Notaries in Ocotílan 1801–1820

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Testaments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Santos Alberto (N)</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>oco1, 1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 José Sebastián (Sp)</td>
<td>JS</td>
<td>oco2, 3, 26, 1809–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Santiago Cristóbal (Sp)</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>oco4, 7, 9, 1809–12; also sbt115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Juan Félix Mejía (Sp)</td>
<td>JFM</td>
<td>oco5, 1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sebastián Fabián López (N)</td>
<td>SFL</td>
<td>oco6, 1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Marcos Alejandro (Sp)</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>oco8, 1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Pablo Leonardo (Sp and N)</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>oco10 through 21 (Sp), oco22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 José Toribio (Sp)</td>
<td>JT</td>
<td>oco23, 1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Toribio Antonio (Sp)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>oco24, 1816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Ponciano Guadalupe (Sp)</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>oco25, 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Pedro José (Sp)</td>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>oco27, 1820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Notaries in Yancuictlalpan 1809–1825

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Testaments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Marcos Antonio (N)</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>yan1, 2, 3, 1809–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Isidro de la Trinidad (N and Sp)</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>yan 4 through 8, 10 through 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N), 1812–24; yan9 (Sp), 1823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Notaries in Totocuitlapilco 1815 & 1826

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Testaments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Antonio Ambrosio (Sp)</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>toto1, 1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rufino Faustino (N)</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>toto2 (also sbt67), 1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There may be two notaries with the name RF; see list no. 1 here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3.
Sample Documents

Since the corpus of Nahuatl and Spanish testaments on which this study is based is so new, and is referred to constantly in the body of the study, it is well to provide some full samples of the documentation. I have chosen eight items from the three communities, five in Nahuatl and three in Spanish. In making the choices I became acutely conscious of the fact that with a sample of this size I could not adequately represent the genders, the years of production, the crucial terminology, the styles, but at least each item represents some of these things, and the whole will give the reader a better notion of the corpus. I plan to put much effort in the coming months and years into making more of the documents available in some form, and indeed I hope all of them.

Each item includes a full transcription accompanied by a full translation, in facing columns. For the present purpose the different entries and bequests are more clearly separated for the eye than they often are in the originals, and successive numbers are added at the beginning of each entry in order to be able to identify words and passages readily. Let it be clear that the originals contain no such numbers. Each document is preceded by an introduction which points to and explains some of the text’s most striking features, especially unraveling the situation as to the inheritance strategy, which is often complex and by no means immediately obvious. The Spanish texts are translated too, which given the expected readership of this study may seem superfluous, but the Spanish is so special that it can use interpretation. In some cases it is not certain just what the writers meant, but some stab is made. The Nahuatl texts too are very unorthodox. Some features are discussed in the document introductions, and many slips in the originals and puzzling forms are addressed, but if all such things were mentioned, there would be no end.¹

¹ A great many aspects of the corpus are shared with eighteenth-century Toluca Valley writing in Nahuatl, and the reader can find much guidance in TT, especially pp. 35–39.

Notary don Francisco Romero (sbt#5).

This testament is an example of the work of don Francisco (Nicolás) Romero, father of the main notary of the Nahuatl portion of the San Bartolomé corpus, Cipriano Gordiano (Romero). See Chapter 2 for more on don Francisco’s style.

The testator is a widow holding a house complex and numerous non-household lands. The home complex is treated in a variant of the predominant inheritance pattern for San Bartolomé, the whole house and half of the solar going to the eldest son and the other half being divided between two younger sons. The non-household land, still measured in quahuitl in even 20s and 40s, is apportioned quite equally to all the children, including daughters, with a nephew also included, although the eldest son again comes off best.

In ¶9 and ¶11 the tequimilli referred to is most likely land held by a cofradía, as explained in Ch. 5.

In ¶10 we see the interesting term “xulalteCo,” xolaltenco, “at the edge of the solares,” that is, at the edge of a settlement organized in streets and lots. The word was common and is seen in Toluca Valley texts of the previous century. It shows its age in its spelling, for the actual word solar is always written with s in the present corpus, and the x in xolaltenco harks back to a time when Spanish s was pronounced differently.

In ¶4 don Francisco writes “nehuatli,” “I,” with an unorthodox added i, that being his usual style, and he does the same with “ycsotli,” standard icçotl, “palm tree,” in ¶6.

In ¶5, “Canatzi” is for campanatzin, with a missing syllable.

In ¶10, “nitohua” is for “niquitohua,” niquitoa, “I say.”

In ¶14, there is an extra y in “yyca,” standard ica, here “with, along with.”

In ¶15, “yonictziquixti” is for oniczonquixti, “I have concluded it.” The y is often added to the preterit o in Stage 3 texts. The writer probably intended “yonictzoquixti.”
December 27, 1809.
San Bartolomé.
Victoriana María, widow of Domingo Julián.
Low mass.
Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.

Here I sign myself with the precious revered name of God the father, God his precious son, and God the Holy Spirit. May it be done, amen. Jesus =

I named Victoriana María, widow, here begin my testament. My late husband was Domingo Julián; we are citizens here in San Bartolomé Tlatelolco =

My body is very greatly hurting, and my soul is as our lord Jesus Christ would wish it for me. If I die, I am to belong to my precious mother Santa María de la Asunción, and the bells are to ring on my behalf. My statement is to be carried out. =

And I say that my grave is to be near a palm tree, in the direction of Calimaya. It is to be carried out. =

And I say that my priest is to favor me with a low mass. My statement is to be carried out. =

And I say that my priest is to favor me with a low mass. My statement is to be carried out. =
8. yhua niquitohua noConetzi Juan Alvino nicahuiliti cali yhua tlaCo solar yhua oc tlaCo nocone ytoCa lusiano martin quimotlapansiq yetermanito ytoCa pablo bernavel neltis notlatol =

9. yhua niquitohua se tlali sepualpa tequimil-teCo tlatzitla niCahuiliti noCone Juan Alvino neltis notlatol =

10. yhua nitohua [sic] oc se tlali oCotitlatziCo xulalteCo momilnamiq D. Mariano horicion Nicahuiliti noCone Juan Alvino sepualpa neltis notlatol =

11. yhua niquituhua niquituhua oc se tlali tequimilteco hopualpa AxCa niquimacati nopil-hua sepualpa marCelina vrigida oc sepualpa pablo bernavel neltis notlatol =

12. yhua niqtuan se tlali atlaComoltitla sepualpa quimotlapansque ysovriso noCone yto-Ca lusiano martin yhua thomas Juan neltis notlatol =

13. yhua niqtohua mostratetitlan hopohualpa niquiCahuiliti nocone luciano martin yhua yermanita sipriana Geronima nepatla quimo-

And I say that I am leaving my child Juan Albino a house and half a solar; the other half to be divided by my child named Luciano Martín and his younger brother named Pablo Bernabé. My statement is to be carried out. =

And I say that I am leaving a piece of land of 20 [quahuitl] at the lower edge of the tequi-milli to my child Juan Albino. My statement is to be carried out. =

And I say I am leaving another piece of land of 20 in Ocotitlantzinco, at the edge of the settlement, abutting on a field of don Mariano [Horacio?], to my child Juan Albino. My statement is to be carried out. =

And I say that now I am giving another piece of land of 40 at the edge of the tequimilli to my children, 20 to Marcelina Brígida, the other 20 to Pablo Bernabé. My statement is to be carried out. =

And I say that as to a piece of land of 20 at Atlacomoltitlan, my child named Luciano Martín and his nephew Tomás Juan are to divide it. My statement is to be carried out. =

And I say that I am leaving 40 next to the place where the mostrante grows to my child Luciano Martín and his younger sister Cipria-
14. yhua niqtohua oc se tlali yCuitlapa Calvario se pedasito nicahuiliti nocone yyca [sic] yermanita Juan Alvino yCa siliria martina q-motlapanisque neltis =

15. yhua niqtuam Noalvasi Ca yehuatzí martín serafín yhua visente florensi ytlá quali quimochiuilis Ca tt³ D§ qmoxtlahuilis nopapa Ca yonictziquixti [sic] notestamento ymixpazíCo notestigos fiscal mayo de la santa yglesia Dn Luis Ysario fiscal Dn Jose Ramon AxCa mierColes a 29 de nouieBre 1809 aOs es³ D³ fronco romero na Gerónima; they are to divide it down the middle. My statement is to be carried out. =

And I say that as to another piece of land behind the Calvario, I am leaving a little piece to my child with his younger sister, to Juan Albino with Cirilia Martina; they are to divide it. It is to be carried out. =

And I say that my executors are Martin Serafín and Vicente Florencia; if they do it well, our lord God will reward them on my behalf. I have concluded my testament in the presence of my witnesses: the fiscal mayor of the holy church don Luis Isario and the fiscal don José Ramón, today Wednesday the 29th of November of the year 1809. Notary don Francisco Romero.
2. Testament of Mariano Rafael, San Bartolomé Tlatelolco, 1822.

Notary Cipriano Gordiano (sbt#86).

This is the first of two examples of the work of Cipriano Gordiano, San Bartolomé’s principal notary during the core of the time studied. The testament was done late in Cipriano’s time of activity, when he had acquired his mature style, including for example the elaborate categorization of San Bartolomé in the identification of the testator (¶3).

In Chapter 2 it is seen how Cipriano during his whole career circled around the matter of the sick body and the sound soul, rarely getting it right by orthodox notions. Here (¶4) he has the body sick in the expected way, but the soul is left hanging with nothing said about it; one could even interpret the phrase as implying that the soul was sick too. In ¶3, after correctly describing the Trinity as three persons but one very true deity, Cipriano adds “persunas” again, perhaps as if he were saying that the whole Trinity was a person too, but most likely he simply absent-mindedly repeated the word as he was hastening through the formulaic part.

Here we see how bequests of the previous generation still have a large effect on the present generation’s bequests. The testator’s father had left the home solar in equal parts to the testator and to his younger brother. Apparently the lot had never been rigorously divided, and the testator is at some pains to have the two parts identified and respected. Then he divides his half, giving more than half of it (and using the Spanish más de) to his son Francisco Martín, the lesser part to be divided again between two little daughters.

In the testament’s kin terminology, note that -coneuh, traditionally a child of either gender from the mother’s point of view, is used to mean one’s son, and -ichpoch, traditionally one’s grown daughter, acquires a diminutive (-ichpochton) and is used for small daughters, before puberty.

In bequeathing non-household land too, the testator prefers his son. Such land is all
classified by the reales system (see Chapter 5), and the pieces are all of the most common size, 4 reales, though one is to be subdivided. The son gets two pieces of 4 reales, the two daughters divide a single piece at 2 reales each. It is interesting that the non-household land that the son gets comes from the testator’s father, whereas the piece to be divided by the daughters comes from the testator’s deceased wife, the mother of the girls. Thus in this case non-household land from the paternal side stayed with males over three generations, whereas land from the maternal side went to females. Doubtless this is more than accidental; yet the principle was by no means always followed. Here too the daughters got a section of the solar coming from the father’s side. In the wife’s original will (sbt#22, 1811) she merely left the land to her husband with no further comment; she had inherited it from her father.

In ¶1, remember that the Spanish classification was done by a Spanish priest, who wrote the word *indio*, not included in any of the Nahuatl texts.

In ¶3, notice that Cipriano like his father often put an unorthodox final *i* on *nehuatl*, “I.”

In ¶4, “Aspcsio” is a slip for some form of Asunción, and “hua” lacks the usual “y” of *ihuan*, “and.” In some late texts the *i* or *y* is actually left out much of the time.

In ¶6 an *o* has been left out of “notlasutepixCatzi,” standard *notlaçoteopixcatzin*, “my precious priest.” As it stands it means “my precious guardian.”

In ¶7 and ¶9 *qui* has been omitted from “nitohua” for *niquitoa*, “I say it.” The same omission occurs in the work of other writers too, since this phrase comes up at the beginning of virtually every entry.

In ¶11 “notlanatil” lacks *hua*, representing *notlanahuatil*, “my order.”

In ¶13 “oc n ome” is for standard *oc no ome*, “the other two.”

In ¶14, “quimoChilis” lacks *hui* and represents standard *quimochihuiliz*, “he will do it.”
1. Abril 14 de 1822
April 14, 1822.
San Bartolome
San Bartolomé.
Mariano Rafael
Mariano Rafael,
Yndio Viudo de
Indian, widow of
Maria Valentina
María Valentina.
Misa resada
Low mass.

2. Jesus Maria Y Josepe
Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.

3. Ca niCa ninomaChiotia yCa ytlasumahuis-
Here I sign myself with the precious revered
stoCatzi Dios tetatzi yhua Dios ytlasumahuis-
name of God the father, God his precious
piltzi ynhua Dios espirito santo lle persunas
revered son, and God the Holy Spirit, three
san se huel neli teutl persunas Ma y moChihua
persons, but one very true deity and persons
Amen Jesus Maria y Jose = Ca niCa nicpe-
[sic]. May it be done, amen. Jesus, Mary and
hualtia notestameto Nehuatli notoCa Mariano
Joseph. I named Mariano Rafael, widower,
[y]toCatzi Maria valetina Ca niCa tiChaneque
here begin my testament. My deceased wife
ypan illaltepetzi notlasumahuistatzi santo s
was named María Valentina. We are citizens
Bartolome tlatelolCo
here of the altepetl of my precious revered

4. Ca seCa huel moConCotiCaCtiqui noCuer-
father holy San Bartolomé Tlatelolco.
potzi ynhua noAnimatzi ytl la nehmolna-
My body is very greatly ill, and my soul. If
miquilis y trO christo ninomiquilis Ca yse-
our lord Christ remembers me and I die, I am
mactziCo nipuhuis notlasumahuisnatzi sata
belong entirely in the hands of my precious
maria Aspcsio [sic] hua [sic] nopapa tzilinis
revered mother Santa María de la Asunción,
Capanatzi neltis notlatol =
and the bells are to ring on my behalf. My
5. ynhua niquitohua nosepultora lles ynahua-
statement is to be carried out. =
tztiCo nosihuahuatzi metztiCapCa yc tlazitla-
And I say that my grave is to be in the lower
Conpa neltis notlatol =
part, next to my late wife. My statement is to
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6. ynhua niquitohua notlasutepixCatzi [sic] nehmotloColi Misa resanda neltis notlatol =

7. ynhua nitohua [sic] oCa Ca se pedasu sular yno utehmoCahuillitia notlasutatzi metztiCaP-Ca Dn Luresu tribocio difoto noermanito difoto Andres de la Cruz Ca ye nestiCa tle tollaxCa

8. AxCa yn oume surco lloquimalhui notatzi sipre tiConanasque Ca yno sular yc se tlapal yCuaxuxteCo Da Loriana maria yc tlacpac-Conpa yhua noermanito Ca tlen iyaxCa yc tlazitlaCopa yc yCuaxuxteCo Nilas [sic] huadalope difoto =

9. ynhua nitohua [sic] AxCa yno tle nollaxCa nicCahuilliti noConetzi frasisCo Martin Conanas mas de tlaCa ynhua oc umeti nohopCho-toto Conanasque yno oc se peduasu ycteco utli sano lloqui quimotlapanisque nepatla se ytoCa Lureza tribosia oc se ytoCa Clara maria neltis moChihuas notlanahuatil Amo aqui tle quitos mostla huipitla neltis notlatol =

10. ynhua niquitohua oc se tlali Ca tepatitla de And I say that my precious priest is to favor me with a low mass. My statement is to be carried out =

And I say that there is a piece of solar there that my deceased precious father don Lorenzo Tiburcio left to my deceased younger brother Andrés de la Cruz and me; it is apparent what our [respective] property is.

Now our father said that we are always to take two surcos each. Of that solar [my part is] on one side at the boundary of doña Lauriana María in the upper direction. and the property of my younger brother is below, at the border of Nicolás Guadalupe deceased. =

And I say now that as to what is my property, I am leaving it to my son Francisco Martín; he is to take more than half, and another two little daughters of mine are to take that other piece at the edge of the road. Likewise the one named Lorenza Tiburcia and the other named Clara Maria are to divide it in half. My order is to be executed and realized, no one is to say anything in the future, my statement is to be carried out. =

And I say that as to another piece of land at
nahui tomipa sa ye no utehmo Cahuilitia notlasutatzi metzti CaPCa sanohe noermanito difoto lle nestiCa tle tollaxCa

11. AxCa tle nollaxCa Ca ymilteCo Do moricio difoto yc toluCa Copa Axca nicCahuiliti noConetzti frasisCo martin neltis moChihuas notlanatil [sic] Amo aqui tle quitos neltis notlatol =

12. ynhua niquitohua oc se tlali de nahui tomipa Ca ymilteCo trivocio valetin sanolle utehmoCahuili notlasutatzi AxCa nicCahuiliti salleno ye noCone fransisCo Martin neltis notlatol =

13. ynhua niquitohua oc se tlali de nahui tomipa Can AtlaConMoltitla unehmoCahuiliti nosihuahuatzti metzti CaPCa AxCa niquiCahuiliti umeti nohpo Chototo se ytoCa Lureza trivocia Conanas ume tomipa oc se noCone ytoCa Clara Maria Conanas oc n ome [sic] tomipa neltis notlatol moChihuas notlanahuatil =

14. ynhua niquitohua NotepatlatoCa noAlvacia mochitzinos Ca llehuatzi noermanito Ma-

Tepantitlan, of 4 reales, that my same late father left to me and my same deceased younger brother, it is apparent what is our property.

Now I am leaving what is my property next to a field of the late don Mauricio in the direction of Toluca to my son Francisco Martín; my order is to be done and realized, no one is to say anything, my statement is to be carried out. =

And I say that as to another piece of land of 4 reales next to a field of Tiburcio Valentín, that my same precious father left me, now I am leaving it to my same child Francisco Martín. My statement is to be carried out. =

And I say that as to another piece of land of 4 reales at Atlacomoltitlan that my late precious wife left me, now I am leaving it to my two little daughters. The one named Lorenza Tiburcia is to take 2 reales; my other child named Clara Maria is to take the other 2 reales. My statement is to be carried out; my command is to be executed. =

And I say that the one who is to become my intercessor and executor is my younger
Cos bronio ytla quali quimoChilis [sic] Ca Dios quimoxtlahuilis nopapa Ca Ilonictzo- quixti notestameto ymixpatziCo notestigos fisCa [sic] mayor de la sata Madre yglesia Dña Rafael Angel ynhua fisCal menor Juan Antonio Alhuasil mayor Bicente ferel Mallor topile puciano ferfeto Esnipo sipriano Gordiano Romero
15. Axcan mierColes A 10 de bril [sic] de 1822 años

brother Marcos Bruno [?]; if he does it well, God will reward him on my behalf. I have concluded my testament in the presence of my witnesses: fiscal mayor of the holy mother church don Rafael Angel, fiscal menor Juan Antonio, alguacil mayor Vicente Ferrer, topile mayor Ponciano Perfecto, notary Cipriano Gordiano Romero.

Today Wednesday the 10th of April of the year 1822.
Again we see a product of Cipriano Gordiano’s late period. And again we see unusual things in the area of body and soul. Here (¶4) the soul completely escapes mention; the body is sick all right, but then it is said that that is as God wishes it for the testator, which usually applies to the healthy soul. On death (¶5) the testator is to belong entirely in the hands of Santa María de la Asunción, with God left unmentioned, not the normal thing at all, but perhaps the Virgin is intended only as a channel to God.

In this will as in the previous one by Cipriano (no. 2 here), daughters are called -chpoch, and a son is called -coneuh, though the plural of sons is -telpochhuan, using the traditional word applied to grown sons.

The picture as to inheritance by gender is complex here. With non-household land, males win out completely. The older and younger sons get 4 reales of land each, and another piece of 4 is divided between them at 2 each. A nephew seems to come in for 4 reales, but the picture is complex here and can use some explanation. It appears that the father-in-law of the testator had a field of 1 peso and left half of it, 4 reales, to the testator’s husband, and the other half to another son, the testator’s brother-in-law. Both heirs subsequently died; the testator’s husband left his 4 reales to the testator, and her brother-in-law left his to his son, the testator’s nephew. But apparently the 1-peso field was never physically or formally divided, and the testator is now merely confirming her nephew in the possession of the 4 reales that he already holds.

When we come to the household property, things turn out the opposite. A little solar goes to two daughters, half each. This is probably only a consolation prize for the daughters. No house is mentioned on the property. Very likely the males had already inherited the main house and solar when their father died.

In ¶3, “persunasa” with an extra a at the end is probably more than just a mistake; like
many writers of the Toluca Valley, Cipriano sometimes adds a vowel after a final consonant to keep it pronounceable. The form “muChia” here leaves out hu in the phrase ma in mochihua, “may it be done.”

In ¶7, “tlatzitliConpa,” standard tlatzintlancopa, “toward the lower part,” the second i should be a. A very similar substitution repeats in ¶10. “Conas” and “conas” have a syllable missing from conanaz, “she is to take it.” This mistake is so common in Nahuatl writing that it could almost be considered a convention.

In ¶8, milteCon has an initial y or i missing and represents standard imiltenco, “at the edge of . . .” The same thing happens again in ¶10.

In ¶10, “quimopanisque” lacks tla and represents quimotlapanizque, “they will divide it between themselves.”

In ¶11, “quimalia” has ni missing and represents standard quimanilia, “he takes it.”

In ¶12, “nofiCal” is missing an s in standard nofiscal, “my fiscal.” In the form “Gordano,” Cipriano Gordiano misspells his own name.

1. Agosto 23/822  
San Bartolomé  
Lugarda Maria  
Viuda de  
Pedro Pasqual  
Misa resada  
August 23, 1822.  
San Bartolomé.  
Lugarda María, 
widow of  
Pedro Pascual.  
Low mass.

2. Jesus Maria Josepe  
3. Ca niCa ninoMaChiutia yCa ytlasuMahuis-
toCatzi Dios tetatzi ynhua Dios yntlasuma-
huispiltzi ynhua Dios espirito santu lle per-
sunasa [sic] ce huel neli teutzitli Dios Ma y 
Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.  
Here I sign myself with the precious revered name of God the father, God his precious revered son, and God the Holy Spirit, three persons but one very true deity God. May it be
muChia [sic] Ame Jesus y maria y Jose =
4. Ca niCa nicpehualtia notestameto Nahuatl notoCa Lugarda Maria nonamictzi metztìCap-
Ca difoto ytoCatzi Dò pedro pasqual Ca niCa tiChaneque ypa yn illaltepetzi notlasumahuit-
tatzi santo sì Bartolome tlátelulCo Ca seCa moConCotiCa setetle noCuerpòtzi que neh-
motlanequilis tto Dios
5. yntla ninomiquilis Ca yseMactziCo ni-
pohuis notlasuMahuinatzi santa maria Asu-
pocio ynhua nopanpa tzilinis Capanatzi neltis
notlatol ynhua niquitohua nosepultora lles
ynahuactziCo nonamictzi metztìCaPCa ye
Calvario neltis notlatol =
6. ynhua notlasuteupixCatzi nehmutoColis se-
tetli Misa resada para ypaehuiluCa lles no-
Animatzi mochictzinos neltis notlatol =
7. ynhua niquitohua se sularito yno utehmo-
Cahuillilitquisque notlasutiutzi Manuel Jose uquimoCahuillitiquis notlasutatzí metztìCaPca
Julia de santiago AxCa nehuatlí unehmoCa-
huili axca niccahuiliti umeti nohpoChhua se
ytoCa Maria de la LoZ oc se ytoCa Bartola
Lohuisa quimotlapanisque nepatla de trave-
done, amen. Jesus, Mary, and Joseph. =
I named Lugarda María here begin my testa-
ment. My late husband was named don Pedro
Pascual, deceased; we are citizens here in the
altepetl of my precious revered father San
Bartolomé Tlatelolco. My whole body is very
ill, as my lord God would wish it for me.
If I die, I am to belong entirely in the hands of
my precious revered Santa María de la Asun-
ción, and the bells are to ring on my behalf.
My statement is to be carried out. And I say
that my grave is to be close to my late
husband at the Calvario. My statement is to be
carried out. =
And my precious priest is to favor me with a
low mass in order to be the help of my soul.
My statement is to be executed and carried
out. =
And I say that as to that little solar that my
precious uncle Manuel José left us on death,
that he left to my precious late father Julián de
Santiago, and that now my father left to me,
now I am leaving it to two daughters of mine.
One is named María de la Luz, and the other is
named Bartola Luisa; they are to divide it in

8. ynhua niquitohua se tlali de nahuī tomīpa Ca tepatitla Ca milte Con [sic] Dñ Martín gregorio AxCa nicCahuiliti noConetzi Manuel siriCo Connanas Amo Aquī tle quītos mostla huipitla neltis notlatol muChihuas notlatol =

9. ynhua niquitohua oc se tlali Ca saCamolī sano de nahuī tomīpa Ca ymilteco Juan de la Cruz AxCa nicCahuiliti oc se noConetzi ynto-Ca reymodo Julia Connas neltis notlatol mo-chihuas notlanahuatil =

10. ynhua niquitohua oc se tlali de se p8supa Ca milteCo [sic] Juan Alverto yc tlatzintli-Copa [sic] unehmoCahuiliquis nonamictzin metztiCaCCa yno tlali de nahuī tomīpa AxCa niquiCahuiliti umetli notelpoChohua Conanas-que uome tomīpa Conanas noCone Manuel siriCaCo yc toloCaConpa oc uome tomīpa Conanas oc se noCone ytoCa Reymodo julia yc CalimallaConpa Conanas nepatla quimopa-

half, sideways. María de la Luz is to take the lower part; Bartola Luisa is to take the upper part. My statement is to be carried out, my order executed. =

And I say that as to another piece of land, in Tepantitlan, of 4 reales, at the edge of a field of don Martín Gregorio, now I am leaving it to my son Manuel Siriaco; he is to take it. No one is to say anything in the future, my statement is to be carried out, my statement is to be executed. =

9. ynhua niquitohua oc se tlali de saCamolī sano de nahuī tomīpa Ca ymilteco Juan de la Cruz AxCa nicCahuiliti oc se noConetzi ynto-Ca reymodo Julia Connas neltis notlatol mo-chihuas notlanahuatil =

And I say that as to another piece of land, newly cleared, likewise of 4 reales, at the edge of a field of Juan de la Cruz, now I am leaving it to another son of mine named Raimundo Julián; he is to take it. My statement is to be carried out, my order is to be executed. =

And I say that as to another piece of land of 1 peso, at the edge of a field of Juan Alberto, my late husband left me the lower part; that land is of 4 reales. Now I am leaving 2 reales to my two sons; they are each to take 2 reales. My son Manuel Siriaco is to take the part toward Toluca; my other son named Raimundo Julián is to take the other 2 reales, toward Calimaya. He [Manuel Siriaco] and his
nisque [sic] yllermanito neltis moChihuas
notlanahuatil =
11. ynhua niquitohua yno oc nahui tomipa lle
quimalia [sic] llehuatzin nosubrinotzi DÍ
Martin gregorio neltis notlatol =
12. ynhua niquitohua notepatlatoCatzin mo-
Chictzinos noAlvasia Ca llehuatzin DÍ tomas
Julia ytla quali quimoChilis Ca ttO Dios qui-
moxtlahuilis nopena Ca llonictzoquixti no-
testameto ymixpatzinCo nofiCal [sic] Mallor
de la sata Madre yglesia DÍ Rafel Angel fis-
Cal menor Juan Antonio Alhuasil Mallor
vicente ferel yhua EssÍO de la sata madre
yglesia sipriano Gordano [sic] Romero
AxCan Lunes 19 de AGosto de 1822 ayños
[sic]
younger brother are to divide it equally. My
command is to be carried out and executed. =
And I say that my nephew don Martín Gre-
gorio is to take those other 4 reales. My state-
ment is to be carried out. =
And I say that the one who is to become my
intercessor and executor is don Tomás Julián;
if he does it well, our lord God will reward
him on my behalf. I have concluded my testa-
ment in the presence of my fiscal mayor of the
holy mother church don Rafael Angel, fiscal
menor Juan Antonio, alguacil mayor Vicente
Ferrer, and notary of the holy mother church
Cipriano Gordiano Romero.
Today Monday the 19th of August of the year
1822.
Notary Máximo Calisto (sbt#81).

The general characteristics of the Spanish of the wills in the corpus are discussed in Chapter 2. Against the background of a general familiarity of the terms used in the religious beginning here, notice the use of the word *misterio* (¶3), which has no equivalent in the Nahuatl texts. The part about into whose hands the soul is to be delivered (¶7) falls into some duplication and confusion. The way it is rendered into English here is one possible interpretation; there may be others. In many of the Nahuatl wills too, however, more emphasis seems to be put on the Virgin than on God in this capacity.

In ¶3 notice that *criollo* does not mean a person of Spanish descent but a local person.

There is an apparent difference here between inheritance policy with the house compound and with the non-household land. The latter goes to expected heirs, the husband and the son undivided, with the father doubtless in a custodial capacity and expected to leave it all eventually to the son. Notice by the way that this is one of only two texts in the corpus using the expression that a piece of land “earns 4 reales.”

With the house and house site, again the husband has a custodial role, but he is eventually to divide the property equally between the son and a younger brother of the testator. It is likely that the testator’s mother had already given the testator instructions to give part of the lot to the younger brother, who may have been an infant at the time of the mother’s death. There is also the question of what is to be divided equally. Probably it is only the site, with the house remaining in the hands of the son, but the language is not clear.

In ¶8, “enguales partes” for *en iguales partes* is probably more than an inadvertent slip. Nahuatl speakers often left an initial *i* off a word, thinking it was like their ubiquitous particle *in*. 
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1. Junio 6 de 821  
San Bartolomé  
Eleuteria Severiana  
casada que fue con  
Bernabe Antonío  
Misa rezada.
2. Jesus Maria y Jose  
3. En el nombre de la Santísima trinidad padre  
Hijo y espíritu Santo y así mismo Creo fiel y  
verdaderamente en el misterio de la Santísima  
Trinidad AMen Jesus Marí a y Jose Aquí  
Comienzo mi testamento yo me llamo Eleu-  
teria Severiana y mi primer ànunsio Bernabel  
antonio Crioyos y nasidos deste pueblo de S.ño  
Bartolomé. Tlatelulco ===
4. y si aCaso fuere la dibina voluntad de mi  
Señor Jesu cristo me llamare sera Mi alma  
entregada por que me allo enferma si acaso  
fuere servido mi Dios que en manos de nues-  
tra madre Santisima entrego mi alma ===
5. y que por mi se doblara las Canpanas agase  
y se Cunpla mi palabra ===
6. yten Digo y declaro que mi Casa mi sepul-  
tura de onde se an de se an de sepultar Mis  
guesos de onde esta sepultados mis Hijos por  
lado de Calimalla Cunplase mi palabra ===
7. yten Digo y declaro que mi Santo padre por mi se me aplicara una misa Resada que sera para alivio de mi alma Cunplase mi palabra ===

8. yten Digo y declaro que esta Casa con un pedasito de sitio que me lo fue deJando a mi difunta madre Bernabela antonia ora se la boy dejando a mi Marido Bernabel antonio y mi Hijo Marcos Bruno de Jesus y mi ermanito Felipe de Jesus se reenpartira enguales [sic] partes para abajo bernabel antonio para arriba Felipe de Jesus Cunplase mi palabra ===

9. yten Digo y deClaro otra tierra de labor que gana la dh. a tierra 4 rr. 8 que me lo fue deJando mi difunta madre ora se la boy dejando mi marido y mi Hijo Marcos Bruno cunplase mi palabra ===

10. yten Digo y declaro que mi albasea para que cuide mi testamento pongo que sera sil-bestre ysidoro si lo ysiere vien que Dios se lo pagara por mi ===

11. yten Digo y declaro que lla acabe mi testamento en presensia de mis testigos Fiscal mayor D. N Bisentе anastasio Fiscal teniente Item, I say and declare that my holy father is to dedicate to me a low mass, which will be for the relief of my soul. Let my word be carried out. ===

Item, I say and declare that as to this house with a little piece of a house site that my deceased mother Bernabela Antonia left me at death, now I am leaving to my husband Bernabé Antonio, and my son Marco Bruno de Jesús and my younger brother Felipe de Jesús are to divide it equally, Bernabé Antonio below and Felipe de Jesús above. Let my word be carried out. ===

Item, I say and declare that as to another piece of land for cultivation, which said piece of land earns 4 reales, and my deceased mother left it to me at death, now I am leaving it to my husband and my son Marcos Bruno. Let my word be carried out. ===

Item, I say and declare that as my executor to take care of my testament I establish that it will be Silvestre Isidoro; if he does it well, God will reward him for me. ===

Item, I say and declare that I have finished my testament in the presence of my witnesses the fiscal mayor don Vicente Anastasio, fiscal
Macsimo polinario alguasil mayor sebastian aparisio yo el escribano de la Santa Madre yglesia Macsimo Calistro á 5 dias del mes de Junio de 1821

teniente Máximo Apolinaro; alguacil mayor Sebastián Aparicio, and me Máximo Calisto notary of the holy mother church, on the 5th day of the month of June of 1821.
5. Testament of Tiburcio Valentín, San Bartolomé Tlatelolco, 1821.

Notary Máximo Calisto (sbt#82).

Notice that as in Testament 2 the word indio in the heading is written by a priest from the Spanish world and not by the local notary. The word never appears in the locally-produced part of the corpus either in Nahuatl or in Spanish. The initial formula of the text is almost the same as in Testament No. 4, by the same notary, including the strange wording having to do with the destination of the soul.

This text has the only other attestations than the one in No. 4 of the phrase of “earning” the amount used to assess the land, once 1 peso (¶11) and twice 4 reales (¶12, ¶13).

The testator has considerable property by the standards of the time and place. His wife is deceased and he has two sons who are probably small, so he needs someone to act custodially. He finds a solution in his siblings, especially his younger brother Victoriano Guadalupe, who will be in charge of the home and the two boys. Victoriano will apparently get a portion of the house complex and divide the rest later among the sons, in what way is not clear. He also gets one whole piece of non-household land. The testator’s sister also gets a piece of 4 reales, possibly as a reward for additional custodial help.

The two boys get most of the rest of the non-household land, the older approximately equally with the younger.

A large unknown in the picture is that a don Rafael Angel, unidentified in any way, gets the largest parcel in the estate, a piece of a full peso.

In ¶4, the form “estefani” for Estefania is no mistake; Nahuatl speakers frequently left out the second of two vowels at the end of a word, thus “audienci” for audiencia, etc.

In ¶12, the mostrante, a mint-like plant growing in parts of San Bartolomé, is explained further in the Introduction.
1. Diciembre 7 de 1821
San Bartolomé
Tiburcio Valentín
Yndio Viudo de
Juana Estefania
Responso
2. Jesus Maria Y Jose
3. En el nombre de la Santisima trinidad padre
yJo y espiritu Santo a y asimismo Creo Fiel y
verdaderamente En el Misterio de la Santisima
trinidad AMen Jesus Maria Y Jose —
4. Aquí Comienso mi testamento yo me llamo
Tiburcio Valentín y mi primera anunsi que
Fue Juana estefani Crioyos y Nasidos deste
pueblo de San Bartolomé Tlatelulco == y si
acaso Fuere la divina voluntad de mi Señor
Jesucristo me llamare sera mi alma entregada
por que me allo enfermo si acaso Fuere servi-
do mi Dios que en manos de nuestra madre —
Santisima entrego mi alma —
5. y que por mi se doblara las Canpanas agase
y se cunpla mi palabra__
6. yten Digo y deClaro que mi Casa mi se-
purtur de onde se an de sebultar mis guesos
de onde estase seputltada mi diFunta primera

December 7, 1821
San Bartolomé.
Tiburcio Valentín.
Indian, widower of
Juana Estefania.
Resporsory prayer.
Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.
In the name of the most holy Trinity, father,
son, and Holy Spirit, and likewise I believe
faithfully and truly in the mystery of the most
holy Trinity, amen. Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.
—
Here I named Tiburcio Valentín begin my
testament; my first wife was Juana Estefania;
we are criollos and native of this pueblo of
San Bartolomé Tlatelolco. = And if it should
be the divine will of my lord Jesus Christ to
call me, my soul is to be delivered, for I am
sick; if it pleases my God, I deliver my soul
into the hands of our most holy Mother. —
And the bells are to ring for me. Let my word
be executed and carried out. —
Item, I say and declare that my house and
grave where my bones are to be buried is
where my deceased first wife is buried. Let
anunsia Cunplase mi palabra —

7. yten Digo y deClaro que mi Santo padre por mi se me aplicara un responso que sera para alivio de mi alma Cunplase mi palabra —

8. yten Digo y declaro que esta Casa Con todo el sitio que me lo fue deJando a mi diFunta Madre Maccimiana maria ora se la boy deJando ha mi ermano vitoriano guadalupe y tomas Julio y Felisiano de Jesus se rreConpartira enguales partes Cunplase mi palabra —

9. yten Digo y deClaro otra tierra de labor que me lo Fue deJa,o mi difunta madre ora se la boy deJando mi ermanito Bitoriano guadalupe Cunplase mi palabra —

10. yten Digo y deClaro otra tierra de labor que me lo fue deJando mi diFunta madre ora se las boy deJando mis dos HiJos que esta en el Camino de toluCa Colinda D.n Santos manuel se rrecompartia enguales partes Cunplase mi palabra ___

11. yten Digo y deClaro otra tierra de labor que me lo fue deJando mi difunta madre Mac-

my word be carried out. —

Item, I say and declare that my holy father is to dedicate a responsory prayer to me, which will be for the relief of my soul. Let my word be carried out. —

Item, I say and declare that as to this house with all the house site, which my deceased mother Maximiana María left me at death, now I am leaving it to my brother Victoriano Guadalupe, and to Tomás Julio and Feliciano de Jesús; it is to be divided in equal parts. Let my word be carried out. —

Item, I say and declare that as to another piece of land for cultivation that my deceased mother left me at death, now I am leaving it to my younger brother Victoriano Guadalupe. Let my word be carried out. —

Item, I say and declare that as to another piece of land for cultivation that my deceased mother left me at death, now I am leaving it to my two sons; it is on the road to Toluca, bordering on don Santos Manuel. It is to be divided in equal parts. Let my word be carried out. —

Item, I say and declare that as to another piece of land for cultivation that my deceased
cimiana maría que se nonbra mostrante ora se
la boy deJando Don Rafael angel que gana la
dicha tierra un peso Cunplase mi palabra —

12. yten Digo y deClaro otro pedaso de tierra
labor que gana 4 rr.⁸ q.⁹ se nonbra mostrante
ora se la boy deJando mi ermana Lucaria
maria Cunplase mi palabra —

13. yten Digo y declaro otra tierra de labor
que gana 4 rr.⁸ ora se la boy deJando mi HiJo
tomas Julio cunplase mi palabra —

14. yten Digo y deClaro otra tierra de labor
que me lo Fue deJando mi padre de Santo pila
ora se la boy deJando mi HiJo Felisiano de
Jesus Cunplase mi palabra —

15. yten Digo y declaro otra tierra de labor
questa en el camino de toluca Colinda pablo
bernabel ora se las boy jeJando mis dos HiJos
se rreconpartira enguales partes Cunplase mi
palabra —

16. yten Digo y deCLaro otro pedasito de tie-
rra de labor que me lo Fue deJando a mi di-

mother Maximiana María left me at death, now I am leaving it to don Rafael Angel; the said land earns 1 peso. Let my word be carried out. —

Item, I say and declare that as to another piece of land for cultivation that earns 4 reales, that is [at the place called] mostrante, now I am leaving it to my sister Lucaria María. Let my word be carried out. —

Item, I say and declare that as to another piece of land for cultivation that earns 4 reales, I am leaving it to my son Tomás Julio. Let my word be carried out. —

Item, I say and declare that as to another piece of land for cultivation that my father of holy baptism left me at death, I am leaving it to my son Feliciano de Jesús. Let my word be carried out. —

Item, I say and declare that as to another piece of land for cultivation that is on the road to Toluca, bordering on Pablo Bernabé, now I am leaving it to my two sons; it is to be divided in equal parts. Let my word be carried out. —

Item, I say and declare that as to another little piece of land for cultivation that my deceased
Funto padre ora se la boy dejando mi ermanito Bitoriano Guadalupe. Confío en mi palabra.

17. Yten Digo y declaro que mi alvasea para que cuide mi testamento pongo que será Don Simón Marcelino — si lo ysiere vien q. Dios se lo pagara por mi —

18. Yten Digo y deClaro q. lle aCave mi testamento en presencia de mis testigos Fiscal mayor D. Vicente Anastasio, Alguacil mayor Sebastián Aparicio, y el escribano de la santa madre iglesia Máximo Calistro. Hoy, martes 20 de noviembre del año de 1821.

father left me at death, I am leaving it to my younger brother Victoriano Guadalupe. Let my word be carried out. —

Item, I say and declare that as my executor to take care of my testament I dispose that it be don Simón Marcelino; if he does it well God will repay him for me. —

Item, I say and declare that I have finished my testament in the presence of my witnesses the fiscal mayor don Vicente Anastasio, the alguacil mayor Sebastián Aparicio, and the notary of the holy church Máximo Calisto. Today, Tuesday the 20th of November of the year 1821.
6. Testament of Jacobo de Santiago, Santa María Magdalena Ocotitlan, 1810
Notary Sebastián Fabián López (oco#6).

Here the traditional quahuitl system of measuring land is retained, with even numbers in vigesimal terms. Indeed, the whole document is quite traditional and conservative. We see no indication that Ocotitlan is about to go over to Spanish recordkeeping definitively and that the last known Nahuatl testament of Ocotitlan will be issued in 1813.

In the main Jacobo de Santiago favors his son as heir; there seem to be no other surviving children. The testator calls the son his -telpoch, which was traditionally the word for a grown son, but we cannot be sure here, for by this time the term was sometimes used for male children of any age. The son Juan Crisóstomo gets the home solar and the first piece of non-household land. With a second larger piece, he is to take half, the other half going to the testator’s brother. In saying “our precious mother doña Josefa left it to us at death,” the testator seems to admit that the other half belonged to the brother all along.

In ¶4, the form “Sipiriana” for Cipriana, with its extra i (epenthesis) between p and r, is a reminder of the troubles Nahuas had pronouncing consonant clusters. In this same entry the possessive prefix no- is missing on “Sihuatzi” to make it be “my wife.” In this entry once again, in “onchmotlatzontequilili” an e is missing after the first n to make nech, the first person object prefix.

In ¶9, in “nusatatzi” tla is missing after nu to make the word the equivalent of notlacoxtatzin, “my precious father.”

In ¶10, an i is missing in “mochuas” to make the equivalent of mochihuaz, “it is to be done.”
1. Enero 30 de 1810.
Ocotitlan.
Jacobo Santiago viudo de
Sipriana Maria
Misa Resada =

2. Axcan domingo a beynte y ocho de enero
de mil ohosientos [sic] y dies años

3. Nica ninoMachiotia yca ytlasomahuistocatzi
dios tetatzi yhuan dios ytlasopiltzi yhuan
dios espiritu Santo ma y mochihua Amen
Jesus —

4. nica nicpehualtia y notestamento yn nehuatl
notoca xacobo de santiago nica nichane
San[. . ] maria magdalena Ocotitlan nibiudo y
Sihuatzi [sic] metzticatca difunta primero Si-
piriana maria ahui masihui mococoa y notlalo
yn nosoquio ahui nanimanzi ca San huel
pactica ca san quichixti miquistli ah yntla
onchmotlatzontequilili [sic] dios ca ysenmac-
tzinco nictlalia noyoliantzi in nanimanzi ca
yehuatzi onechmochihuili nica can tlalticpac
ma y mochihua ame

5. yhuan huel achtopa niqitoa motemacas
me.º Santa Jerusalen neltis notlatol

6. yhua niqitoa yn noquimilica yes ca dios

January 30, 1810.
Ocotitlan.
Jacobo Santiago, widower of
Cipriana María
Low mass. =

Today, Sunday the 28th of January of the year
1810.

Here I take as my sign the precious revered
name of God the father, God his precious son,
and God the Holy Spirit. May it be done,
amen. Jesus.

Here I begin my testament, I named Jacobo de
Santiago, citizen here in Santa María Magda-
lena Ocotitlan, widower; my late first wife as
Cipriana Marí a, deceased. Although my earth-
ly body is sick, my soul is very sound; it is
expecting death. When God has passed judg-
ment on me, I place my spirit and soul entirely
in his hands, for he made me here on earth.
May it be done, amen.

And first of all I say that half a real is to be
provided for holy Jerusalem. My statement is
to be carried out.

And I say that my shroud is to be what God
quimonextilis neltis notlatol
7. yhua niquitoa yn canpa noSepultura yes onpa teopa ytichualco neltis notlatol —

8. yhua niquitoa sentel misa rresada nopan mitos neltis notlatol
9. yhua niquitoa Se pedaso solar onechmocahuilili nusatatzi [sic] moetzticatca don pedro de San Juan axca niccahuilia notelpoch Xacobo Chrisostomo ñpa mochantis para ye quitequipanihuis San pedro y San Juan neltis notlatol –
10. yhua nuquitoa oc se tlali ñca mantoc ytenco otli de sa miguel ymiltenco don anastasio axca niccahuilia notelpoch Juan chrisostomo neltis mochuaso [sic] notlatol

11. yhua niquitoa oc se tlali onpa onoc yxtlahuaca unpualmani ynachuac atihua poso axca niccahuilia notelpoch Juan chrisostomo Sepualmani yhua oc senpuamani conanas noermanotzi don pedro martin monepantlaxelos otechmocahuililitiquis totlasonantzi metzticatca doña Josepa ayac tleyn quitos mostla huiptla neltis notlatol — manifests. My statement is to be carried out.

And I say that where my grave is to be is in the churchyard. My statement is to be carried out.

And I say that a low mass is to be said for me. My statement is to be carried out.

And I say that as to a piece of a solar that my late precious father left me, now I leave it to my son Jacobo Crisóstomo; there he is to make a home for himself to serve San Pedro and San Juan. My statement is to be carried out.—

And I say that as to another piece of land at the edge of the road to San Miguel, next to a field of don Anastasio, now I leave it to my son Juan Cristóstomo. My statement is to be carried out.

And I say that as to a piece of land at the plain, of 40 [quahuitl], next to the well for getting water, now I leave 20 of it to my son Juan Crisóstomo, and my brother don Pedro Martín is to take the other 20; it is to be divided in the middle. Our precious mother doña Josefa left it to us at death. No one is to say anything about it in the future. My statement is to be carried out.—
12. yhua niquitoa ca san ixquich onicmachioti yxpätzinco dios ca amo tley nicnopielia —
13. yhuan niquitoa y noalbeseatzitzihua ca yehuatzi don Leonardo Jose yhuan yehuatzi don felis bayLuis? nopa motlatoltisque neltis mochīhuas notlatol —
14. yn yehuantzitzi notestigos fiscal mayor Agustin Jose zerrno [sic] fiscal teniente alberto sisto y thopile mayor basilio antonio Es.no de la santa yglesia zebastían fabian Lopes

And I say that that is all that I have recorded before God, for I have nothing [else]. —
And I say that my executors are don Leonardo José and don Félix [Bailón?] ; they are to speak for me. My statement is to be carried out and executed. —
My witnesses are the fiscal mayor Agustín José Serrano; deputy fiscal Alberto Sexto [?]; chief topile Basilio Antonio; the notary of the holy church Sebastián Fabián López.
7. Testament of Feliciana Petrona, Santa María Magdalena Ocotitlan, 1816.

Notary Toribio Antonio (oco#24)

This is one of the best developed testaments in Spanish to be found in the entire corpus, and it shows a much larger vocabulary and fluency than some of the more rudimentary examples. Yet the writer still does not command many facets of Spanish, or masters them only at times. If he usually understands the use of Spanish a, which many Nahuatl speakers did not, as in “se la dexo a mi nieta,” “I leave it to my granddaughter” (¶9), he is still capable of writing “Se la dexo mi hija,” meaning “I leave it to my daughter,” but omitting the necessary a.

Most of the time adjectives and articles agree with nouns in gender here, a difficult point because Nahuatl had no grammatical gender, but at times we see violations, as in “Se la dexo al mismo mi hija,” “I leave it to my same daughter,” with a mixture of masculine and feminine. Even the daughter’s second name appears as both Crisanta and Crisanto. (Not to speak of Cristina, but that is a different problem. All over the Nahua world notaries had difficulties with the ever-repeating names of their clients.) The grammatical number of verbs was also a problem for the writer, probably because coming from Nahuatl he hardly pronounced the n that creates so many plurals. Thus an n is missing in the passage (¶15) “les Ruego A mis abases para que able por mi,” “I implore my executors to speak for me; “able” is for hablen.

Throughout, the writer uses a word order as in “difunto mi marido,” “deceased my husband,” instead of mi difunto marido or mi marido difunto.

Nahuas had problems with the ie found in many Spanish words; they would write just e, or just i, and having become aware of the diphthong they would write it where it didn’t belong. Both things happen here: “quin” (¶9) and “quen” (¶10) for quien, “who,” and “Siembradura” (¶10) for sembradura, “seed.”

In ¶9 and repeatedly, the writer uses “mañana u otro dia,” a literal translation much used in Nahuatl-affected Spanish, taken from moztla huiptla, literally “tomorrow [or] the day after
tomorrow,” with the meaning in the future, in the coming time.

Some of the writer’s vocabulary is truly impressive, but he did not always fully understand the normal Spanish use of words that he had acquired. In “esta casa hubicada de adove” (¶9) the writer means “this house built of adobe,” but the word ubicado normally means located, not built. The phrase “compone quarenta y Sinco varas” means “measures 45 varas,” but the verb componer is not comfortable here.

In ¶4, it is hard to know what to make of the phrase “nadie eche a perder delante.” It occurs at the place where a Nahuatl will says aquen ca or catqui, that there is nothing wrong with the spirit and soul, that it is undamaged, and I believe that such must be the approximate intention of this passage.

Much more could be said on the language of this document. It illustrates many of the points discussed in treating testaments in Spanish in Chapter 5.

In its inheritance policy, the testament follows familiar patterns. The house and half the solar go to the testator’s daughter (along with the son-in-law, who is always mentioned along with her), who seems to be her only surviving child. Another piece of the solar goes to a granddaughter, no doubt the daughter’s daughter, to build a house there. Three pieces of non-household land go to the daughter, one small one to the granddaughter. The granddaughter would probably get it all anyway someday, for the daughter seems to have no other children, but the granddaughter may be of age and not yet established, so the grandmother goes out of her way to do something for her directly. As we see occasionally, the testator is following instructions given her by her deceased husband, who left her the property. Her role is partly custodial, as we will see again with a woman testator in Testament No. 8 from Yancuictlalpan.

The household saints are very important here, with Guadalupe the first of three named, and there are more, called images, a minority phenomenon in the Toluca Valley and the Nahua world generally, but seen sometimes in the Metepec area specifically, as also happens in Testament No. 8. Though imagen was always part of the vocabulary of Spanish priests, the word
here is probably a back translation of Nahuatl *ixiptlatl*.

The testator did not go so far as to give her granddaughter one of the saints, as one might have expected her to. It is made clear that the home saints are to have candles and incense on the main religious holidays, and one of the fields is bequeathed with that as the main ostensible purpose. The testator is unusual in bequeathing land with the duty of remembering her specifically, attaching that condition to two pieces, one to the granddaughter and one to the daughter. It is not that they are simply to think of the testator, but to have candles, flowers, and incense for her on the big holidays, whether at the church, the grave, or at home is not clear; testators also hoped that heirs would occasionally have a responsory prayer or a mass said for them.

1. Mayo 25/816.
Ocotitlan
Feliciana Petra
Viuda de Miguel
de la Cruz.
Misa rezada.

2. Jesus Maria y Jose

3. Oy dia Miercoles A dies y siete de Abril del Año de mil ochientos dies y seis haora me percigno en el Nombre de Dios padre Dios hijo y Dios espiritu Santo tres personas distintas y hun Solo Dios Berdadero Creo en el misterio de la Santisima trinidad —

4. haora pongo y comienso Mi testamento

May 25, 1816.
Ocotitlan.
Feliciana Petra,
widow of Miguel
de la Cruz.
Low mass.
Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.

Today Wednesday the 17th of April of the year of 1816, I sign myself in the name of God the father, God the son, and God the Holy Spirit, three different persons and a single true God; I believe in the mystery of the most holy Trinity. —

Now I issue and begin my testament so that all
who should see this testament should know that I am named Feliciana Petrona; I was married to my deceased husband Miguel de la Cruz; we are criollos and natives of this pueblo of Santa María Magdalena and the Señor of Ocotitlan. I say that my body is sick and in bed, but my soul and heart are very content [and undamaged?], awaiting death. If God should remember me and bring about my death, in his hands I place my soul, which is of his making, and he redeemed it with his precious blood; and I implore my eternal father to take me to enjoy his sweet company in his holy paradise, but my body I send to the earth of which it was made. —

First I say that half a real is to be given to the holy places of Jerusalem. Let what I order be carried out.

And I say that God will provide my shroud. —

And I say that where my body will be buried is at the church, in the cemetery, where my deceased husband is buried. Let what I order be carried out. —

And I say that for the aid of my soul a low mass is to be said for me within twenty days. Let my word be carried out.

5. y lo primero digo que Se dara medio Real a los santos lugares de Jerusalem que Se cumpla lo que mando

6. y digo que mi mortaxa Dios lo hallara —

7. y digo que honde Se sepultara mi cuerpo halla en la yglesia en el Siminterio honde esta enterrado difunto mi marido haga lo que mando —

8. y Digo para el Sufragio de mi alma Se me dira huna miSa Rresada dentro de veinte dias que se Cumpla mi palabra —
9. y digo y declaro que esta casa ubicada de adove Con la mitad del Solar que Compone quarenta y Sinco varas al lado de Norte que me dexo difun [sic] Mi Marido ha ora Se la dexo A mi hija Simona Crisanta y Su Marido polonio Basilio que ellos Se queda en la casa para que le Sirba ha Mi madre Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe y S.or San Nicolas y Santo Niño y todos lo himagens No les falta belas Saumerio los pasquas Grandes No hayga quin les Diga Nada mañana u otro dia que Se Cumpla lo que mando —

10. y Digo que otro pedaso de Solar al lado de Sur que compone diez y ocho varas hasta onde esta el texoxote y hasta honde linda con el Solar de Visente ferrel ha ora Se la dexo a mi nieta antonia trinidad para que ponga su casa No haiga quen [Se] le diga nada mañana u otro dia que Se cumpla lo que mando

11. yten Mas Digo y declaro que otra tierra Se halla Junto la tierra de difunto Juan Serrano que cave una quartilla de Siembradura de mais que me dexo difunto mi marido Miguel de la cruz ahora Se la dexo mi hija Simona Cristina y Su marido polonio Basilio para que diaSacara las belas y flores que Se cumpla lo que And I say and declare that as to this house [built] of adobe, with half of the solar, which measures 45 varas on the north side, that my deceased husband left me, now I am leaving it to my daughter Simona Crisanta and her husband Apolonio Basilio for the house to be kept by them to serve my mother our lady of Guadalupe and lord San Nicolás and the Santo Niño and all the images. They are not to lack candles and incense on the great religious festivities. No one is to say anything to them in the future; let what I order be carried out.—

And I say that as to another piece of the solar, on the south side, measuring 18 varas as far as where the tejojote is and where it borders on the solar of Vicente Ferrer, now I leave it to my granddaughter Antonia Trinidad to put her house there. No one is to say anything to them in the future; let what I order be carried out.

Item, I say and declare that as to another piece of land located next to a piece of land of the deceased Juan Serrano, where a cuartilla of maize seed fits, that my deceased husband Miguel de la Cruz left me, now I leave it to my daughter Simona Cristina [sic] and her husband Apolonio Basilio so that on [the days
mando —

12. yten y declaro que otro tierra que esta en el llano Junto la tierra de marcial ugenio que me dexo difunto mi marido ahora Se la dexo al mimo mi hija Simona Crisanta y Su marido polonio Basilio que Se cumpla mi palabra —

13. yten mas Digo y deClaro que otro pedaso de tierra de media quartilla Se la dexo a mi nieta antonia trinidad No haya quin le diga nada mañana u otro dia que Se cumpla lo que mando y Se acordara de mi —

14. yten mas Digo y declaro que otra tierra que me dexo difunto mi padre Juan Luis que Se halla en Frente del Calbario Junto la tierra de Dña Maria ySoja Viuda al lado de norte y por el Sur linda con la tierra difunto Visente Gusman haora Se la dexo a mi hija Simona Crisanto y Su marido polonio Basilio los que se nombraro arriba para que Se acuerde de mi los dias pasquas Grandes que Se cumpla lo que mando —

15. y Digo que lla cumpli lo que me mando of festivities] they will bring out candles and flowers. Let what I order be carried out. —

Item, I declare that as to another piece of land that is on the plain, next to a piece of land of Marcial Eugenio, that my deceased husband left me, now I leave it to my same daughter Simona Crisanta and her husband Apolonio Basilio. Let my word be carried out. —

Item, I say and declare that I leave another piece of land of half a cuartilla to my granddaughter Antonio Trinidad. No one is to say anything to her in the future; let what I order be carried out. And she is to remember me. —

Item, I say and declare that as to another piece of land that my deceased father Juan Luis left me, that is located in front of the Calvario, next to a piece of land of doña María [Hinojosa?] on the north side and bordering on the south with a piece of land of the deceased Vicente Guzmán, now I leave it to my daughter Simona Crisanta and her husband Apolonio Basilio, who were named above, so that they will remember me on the days of the great religious festivities. Let what I order be carried out. —

I say that I have carried out what my deceased
Difunto mi marido no tengo Mas que poner y les Ruego A mis alBaseas para que able por mi que es D.\textsuperscript{11} Jose lionardo y Rafael Antonio y Si asi lo hara que de Dios tendra el premio —

16. Y Nosotros hisimos el testamento como testigos yo el fiscal mayor de la Santa Madre yglesia D.\textsuperscript{11} Martin Diego fiscal teniente Jose Antonio tupile mayor Manuel trinidad Es.\textsuperscript{no} de la Santa yglesia Toribio - Antonio

husband ordered me; I have no more to dispose. And I implore my executors, who are don José Leonardo and Rafael Antonio, to speak for me, and if they do, they will have their reward from God. —

And we made the testament as witnesses, I the fiscal mayor of the holy mother church don Martín Diego, and the fiscal teniente, José Antonio; the chief topile, Manuel Trinidad; and the notary of the holy church, Toribio Antonio.
8. Testament of Margarita María, Santa María de la Rosa Yancuictlalpan, 1810.

Notary Marcos Antonio (yan#2).

This testament is one of those retaining the tradition of identifying the home complex as “house, solar, and saints.” Here in ¶9 the wording is “yni Caltzintli Much ica solar Yhuan xiptlallotzitzihua Dios santos Yhuan santas,” “this house together with the solar and the images of God, the male and female saints.” Even the mention of santos and santas separately was a Toluca Valley tradition. Rarer was use of the word “images,” but it was still known in the Metepec region. Here the form “xiptlallotzitzinhua Dios” lacks the necessary possessive prefix; the standard form would be ixiptlayotzitzinhuan Dios,” “the images of God.”

In Yancuictlalpan bequests, it was sometimes emphasized that the heirs were to use the land inherited to serve the altepetl and the king, and such a statement is made here in ¶10.

The inheritance strategy in this text is within the normal range. The home complex and the largest piece of non-household land go to the son. A smaller piece of land goes to the daughter. Both children were married, and as was the Yancuictlalpan custom, both spouses are mentioned after the primary heirs. The daughter also gets a saint, which is taken as a gesture, to help show continuity with the home, from the main collection that the son retains. The pieces of land are of one cuartilla and half a cuartilla, one cuartilla being a very respectable size and the most common in Yancuictlalpan (see Chapter 5 for further explanation).

An aspect of the bequests which should not be ignored is that the testator specifically says she is carrying out the orders of her late husband, presumably issued in his testament. Thus though the testator has been functioning as owner and has the power to make bequests independently, she has also been acting as a custodian, and the bequests originated with the husband (not that the wife would have disagreed with them).

Notice that the witnesses to testaments in Yancuictlalpan are a set of officials of the local municipality, not the church officials used in this capacity elsewhere, and the writer is the
municipal notary, not the notary of the church. The alcalde, two regidores, a chief and lesser
constable, and the notary, are probably the bulk of the local municipal officials. Note that the
fiscal of the church is present too, however.

The writer has the habit of reversing some letters, especially with the absolutive ending
-tl. Thus in ¶3 xihuitl, “year,” appears as “xiuhilt,” and the same thing happens in ¶4 with
“nehhualt” for nehuatl, “I”; in ¶9 Caltemiilt is for caltemitl, “entryway,” and in ¶10 “Yeh-
huault” is for yehuatl, “that.” In ¶8 “sentle” is for centetl, “one” (often “sentel” in the corpus.)

Throughout, the writer often uses ll as the equivalent of y, as in “lles” for yez, “it will be,”
though sometimes he means a true Nahuatl double l, as in “tlapohualli,” “count.” He also
frequently indicates what was traditionally a glottal stop by h, as in “niquihtua” for niquitoa, “I
say,” where a glottal stop came before the t.

In the last line of ¶4, in the phrase “yhuan noanimantzin quenin Can que San huel
pactica,” “and as to how my soul is, it is very sound,” the que seems to be a loan of the Spanish
conjunction, something rare and late in the story of language contact phenomena in Nahuatl.
Notice the unelided “noanimanztin,” often seen in the Toluca Valley as opposed to the elided
nanimantzin more common in the Valley of Mexico (but not lacking in the Toluca Valley either).

In ¶10, the form “tiilhuia” is puzzling. It comes just before reference to the road to
Calimaya. Often one sees an expression such as inic tihui Calimaya, “by which we go to
Calimaya,” and perhaps something like that was the intention. Or there was an expression
tiquilhuia, “that we call,” and the intention might be “what we call the Calimaya road.”

________________________
1. Julio 18 de 1810.
Yancuictlalpan
Margarita María Viuda de Juan Gregorio
Misa Resada
2. Jesus María y Jose
3. Axcan Martes Ypan Caxtoli tonalli mani Metztli de Mallo Yhuan xiuhilt tlapohualli 1810 Ninomachiotia Yca Yn itlazonmahuis-tohCahtzi Yn Dios tetahtzi Dios ytlazonpiltzin Yhuan Dios Espiritu Santo Ma mochihuan Amen Jesus —
4. Ma quimatica muchinti Ynn ahiique quitasque Yni Nomemorial testamento neh-hualt ntuca Margarita Maria viuda nonamictzin Ytoca Juan Gregorio Difunto niCah tichanihque Ypan Yaltepetzi noSenquiscanantzín Santa María de la Rosa natibitas llanquictlalpa Niquintus Ca huel mococua notlalo nosoquio Yhuan noanimantzin quenin Can que San huel pactica
5. intlan mustla noso huiptla nehmonochilis Yn totecullo Dios Ca Ysenmactzinco nicno-Cahuililia nolloliantzin Yhuan noanimantzin Ca nitlachihualtzin Yhua nitlamaquixtiltzin ni nochihuas mostla huiptla

July 18, 1810.
Yancuictlalpan.
Margarita María, widow of Juan Gregorio.
Low mass.
Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.

Today Tuesday on the 15th day of the month of May and the year count 1810, I take as my sign the precious revered name of God the father, God his precious son, and God the Holy Spirit. May it be done, amen. Jesus. —

May all those who see this my memorandum of testament know that my name is Margarita María, widow; my deceased husband’s name was Juan Gregorio. We are citizens here in the altepetl of my consummate mother Santa María de la Rosa de Nativitas, Yancuictlalpan. I say that my earthly body is very sick, and as to how my soul is, it is very sound.

If in the future our lord God calls me, I leave my spirit and soul entirely in his hands, for I was made by him and will be saved by him in the future.
6. Yhuan huel ahato niquihtua Ca nichuen-chiuhtia Melio para los Santos lugares de Jerusalen motemaCas neltis mochihuas notlanahuatil

7. Yhuan niquihtua noquimiliuhca lles Ca Dios quimonextilis Y niquihtua Campa tuctos notlalo nosoquio Ca ompa teopa itualco neh-motlaocolilisque neltis mochihuas notlanahuatil —

8. Yhuan niquihtuan Ypalehuloca lles noanimantzin Can sentle Misa Rezadaнопan mih-tus Ypan Se Metztli neltis mochihuas notlanahutil —

9. Yhuan niquihtua Yni Caltzintli Much ica solar Yhuan xiptlaltotzitzihua Dios santos Yhuan Santas unCa moCauhtzinoa Ypan ithuali Yhuan Caltemiilt niquinnoCahulilitia notelpoh fran.\(^{\text{CO}}\) Juaquin Yhuan Ysihua Ytoca Maria Casimira Para quihmotequipanilhuisque

10. Yhuan niquihtua oc se lali önca önoc mani tiilhuia [?] Calimalla ohtli de Sentlaxelloli tlaoli nicYnCahuilhtiia Sanno Yehhualt notelpoh fran\(^{\text{CO}}\) Juaquin Yhuan YSihua Maria Casimira para tlatequipanosq.\(^{\text{E}}\) Ypan Yaltepetzin tuSenquiscanantzih Yhuan quimotequipanilhuisque tutlahtohCatzin Rey ma D.\(^{\text{S}}\) quimo-

And first of all I say that I am making an offering of half a real for the Santos Lugares de Jerusalen; it is to be provided. My order is to be realized and carried out.

And I say that God will provide what is to be my shroud. And I say that as to where my earthly body is to lie buried, they will favor me with a place in the churchyard. My order is to be realized and carried out. —

And I say that the help of my soul will be that a low mass will be said for me within a month. My order is to be realized and carried out. —

And I say that as to this house together with the solar and the images of God, the male and female saints, they are to stay in the house compound; I leave it to my son Francisco Joaquín and his wife named María Casimira to serve [the saints].

And I say that another piece of land lies on the road [going to?] Calimaya, of one cuartilla of maize; I leave it likewise to my son Francisco Joaquín and his wife María Casimira to [serve] in the altepetl of our consummate mother. And they are to serve our ruler the king; may God keep him where he is. My
piele Campa moezttica neltis mochihuas notlanahuatil —

11. Yhuan niquihtua őc se tlali ónCa ónoc mani huelli öhtli Yteh Yehui tlahco tlaxelloli tlaoli titumilnamique nosobrinohtzi Serafin Mariano nicquihCahuilitia se nohpoh Ytoca franCa tomasa Yhuan Ynamictzin Ytoca Andres Dionicio nicneltilia tlen ömotlanahuatilihtia Difunto nonamictzi metzticatca para Ypan tlatequipanosque neltis mochihuas notlanahuatil —

12. Yhuan niquihtua nohpoh franCa tomasa nicnocahuilitia nosenquiscatahtzin S,F S,n felipe de Jesus neltis mochihuas notlanahuatil amaquin tlen quihtus mustla huiptla

13. Yhuan niquihtua Ca Sann ixquih onicmachioti ixpantzinc Dios Yhuan llenhuatintzitzin noAlbaseas mochiquhtzinoa YCa huelt niquinotlatlauhtilia lle nopa motlahtoltisque mostla huiptla Ca tla quali quimochihuilsique Ca Dios quimotlaxtlahuilmaquilis Ca Yehuatz D,n Andres Dionicio Yhuan Yehhuatzi D,n Serafin Mariano

14. Yni ye önicciuh Yni nomemorial testamento nehhualt Ca mochintintzitzin imixpan-

order is to be realized and carried out. —
And I say that another piece of land lies on the highway; half a cuartilla of maize fits in it. It borders on a field of my nephew Serafín Mariano. I am leaving it to a daughter of mine named Francisca Tomasa and her husband named Andrés Dionisio. I am carrying out what my late deceased husband left ordered. It is so that they will serve on it. My order is to be realized and carried out. —

And I say that I am leaving to my daughter Francisca Tomasa our consummate father lord San Felipe de Jesús. My order is to be realized and carried out. No one is to say anything in the future.

And I say that that is all that I have recorded before God and those who are becoming my executors, so that I greatly implore them to speak for me in the future. If they do it well, God will give them their reward. They are don Andrés Dionisio and don Serafín Mariano.

I have made this my memorandum of testament before all my lords officers of the mu-
tzinco noS.res oficial de Rep.ca S.f Al.de Actual D.n Cesario matias Re.dor Ma.or D.n S.los cesario Re.dor Seg.o Mateo de la Cruz Alg.sil Ma.or Anastacio pedro topile Jose Ramon S.f fiscal de la S.ta Yglecia D.n Juan fran,co El Escriño de Rep.ca MarCos Antonio nicipality, the lord present alcalde don Cesario Matías; regidor mayor don Santos Cesario; regidor segundo Mateo de la Cruz; alguacil mayor, Anastasio Pedro; topile, José Ramón; fiscal de la santa iglesia, don Juan Francisco. The notary of the municipality, Marcos Antonio.
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