

Código Chimalpopoca. Anales de Cuauhtitlán y leyenda de los soles.

Traducción directa del nahuatl por PRIMO FELICIANO VELÁZQUEZ. [Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Historia.] (México; Imprenta Universitaria, 1945. Pp. xxi, 161. Facsimilar reproductions. Paper. \$20.00 m/n.)

“Fuera de México, todo es Cuauhtitlán.” So runs a cheap mot of the *capitalinos*, which implies that since everything outside Mexico City is more or less Indian, it is unworthy of attention. Here, however, are the annals of Indian Cuauhtitlán—a thousand years of a world that never heard of Caesar—and their cumulative effect makes one incline, rather, to the quotation¹ with which Lehmann prefaced his edition: “As long as the world lasts, the fame, the glory of Mexico-Tenochtitlán will never perish.” For Tenochtitlán, read Cuauhtitlán, the elder city.

Cuauhtitlán is a town of the northwest of the Valley of Mexico, lying midway between the convent of Tepotzotlán and the Sierra de Guadalupe. The *Annals* make it clear that pre-Hispanic Cuauhtitlán was a whole province. During its apogee, from 1395 on, Cuauhtitlán included the entire ex-lake of Zumpango, with such centers as Zumpango, Tepotzotlán, Citlaltepec, and vanished San Francisco Otlazpan (which lay midway between Tepeji del Río and Jagüeyes). “Afterwards, on the arrival of the Castilians . . . the city of Cuauhtitlán decayed and dwindled” because of the loss of these towns.

These *Annals* picture Cuauhtitlán as a city-state founded, like nearby Tula, Hidalgo, after the ruin of Teotihuacán. The first inhabitants were new converts from nomadism, who moved their town around a bit, settled, and watched the blooming and destruction of Tula (twelfth century?) and the eventual formation of new centers—Azcapotzalco and Acolhuacan-Texcoco—in the 1200's and 1300's. (Nothing is said in the *Annals* of Tenayuca as ancestral to these cities.) A hundred-year struggle with Xaltocan (1298-1395) obscures the aggressions of Azcapotzalco, under which Cuauhtitlán fell shortly after her triumph (1408). In the overthrow of Azcapotzalco (c. 1430), Cuauhtitlán only exchanged masters: the *Matrícula de tributos* shows it as tributary to Tenochtitlán, as head of the province. The Spanish occupation dismembered ancient Cuauhtitlán, and Bernal Díaz notes that Alonso de Ávila was made *encomendero* of the town to keep him quiet. It passed thereafter to Gil González de Benavides, who held it in 1537.²

In this “immortal village,” in August of 1570,³ an unknown member

¹ From Chimalpahin.

² Santiago Montoto de Sedas, *Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de Ibero-América* (Madrid, 1927), I, 84.

³ Cf. paragraph 138.

of the conquered race sat writing its history, in Nahuatl, in a fluent script. He compiled his work from narrative songs of the type Garibay is so fruitfully studying, and from hieroglyphic paintings, and from the memories of the old men of Cuauhtitlán. Besides these local materials, he used a source from the Lake of Chalco, and another from Tezcoco. The origin of his Puebla material is not clear, and he may have had many other sources not discernible in his final text.

Two previous editions of the *Annals* have appeared. The first (1885) was bad and no longer requires comment. It contained two parallel versions into Spanish. The second edition was made in German by Dr. Walther Lehmann (1938). This third edition of Lic. Velázquez will make the document really available to Mexico for the first time.

If we compare the Velázquez edition with that of Lehmann, we miss the bilingual text (Nahuatl and translation) and the ubiquitous notes and tables which make the German edition verge on completeness. The Velázquez edition, however, has other things in its favor: a usable facsimile of the entire manuscript, a fine index of place and person names, a linguistic commentary, and an introduction which endeavors to connect the *Annals* with the work of Sahagún.

The translation is good from the linguistic point of view. If one be aware of certain historical events, errors are visible—thus there is no reason for translating *tlalpoliuh* as “se despobló con pestilencia” (paragraphs 210, 213, etc). It simply means “se conquistó”—literally, “se perdió la tierra,” and the reference is to the expanding empire of Motecuzuma, not to any wave of microbes. Such minor errors, however, are inevitable in the present stage of pre-Hispanic studies—and the original text is available in facsimile.

The writer does not care much for the arrangement of paragraphs in this edition: they are too often shotgun weddings of entirely different topics. (Lehmann's short verses are more readable.) On the other hand, the type is clear, misprints are almost non-existent despite the difficult text, and the impression is excellent.

It is to be noted that Lic. Velázquez made his translation twenty years ago, and that he does not seem acquainted with Lehmann's 1938 version. The editor of the volume has, however, included a concordance of paragraphs in the two editions. Both Velázquez and Lehmann add the short document (bound with the manuscript of the *Annals*) called “La leyenda de los soles,” which is invaluable for information on the cosmogonic suns and the antecedents of Tula. A third text (Breve relación de los dioses) is found in the original manuscript, and in order to call this edition “Códice Chimalpopoca” really ought to have been included. As a matter of fact, the name “Códice Chimalpopoca” seems

to me unfortunate. In Mexican prehistory codex has acquired a definite local meaning—a *pictorial* manuscript, and the resurrection of such names as “Códice Ramírez” and “Códice Chimalpopoca” only serves to augment confusion.

With the advent of this handsome edition, we need worry no longer about the text of the *Annals*, except for a little polishing and refining. What remains to do, is to make use of them. Any future edition should be of a different sort, equipped with maps and genealogical charts, and it should stress the *interpretation* of the document, which is as rich in literary as in factual value.⁴

I owe to Dr. Kroeber the appalling suggestion that a condensation of the *Anales de Cuauhtitlán* be attempted. Possibly the appended résumé will help readers to hew their way through its many matted vines.

R. H. BARLOW.

Azcapotzalco Tepanecapan.

PROVISIONAL RÉSUMÉ OF THE ANNALS OF CUAUHTITLÁN¹

I. CHICHIMEC ORIGINS (1-25). BEFORE 800 A. D.

(The “Chichimec” are any of the skin-clad, non-agricultural wanderers of Northern Mexico, from the sixth to the sixteenth century. At least some Chichimec were Otomí- or Pame-speaking, and some Huastec. The Chichimec of Cuauhtitlán distinguish themselves from the Otomí: their final affiliations are Nahua. The Chichimec pressed constantly down from the north, destroying higher cultures, becoming civilized, and being themselves destroyed by later waves.)

A. Supernatural episodes.

1. The goddess Itzpapalotl speaks.
2. The cosmic ages (“suns”).

B. First dynasties in Tula, Hidalgo.

C. First dynasties in Cuauhtitlán area.

1. Macuexhuacan.
2. Quaxoxouhcan.

D. Dynasty in Cusuhtitlán proper (21-22).

E. Chichimec invasions of Michoacan, Guerrero, Morelos, Puebla, and Tlaxcala (28)

II. HISTORY OF TULA (25-69).

(This Tula is the archaeological site in Hidalgo State. Cf. Acosta in *Revista de estudios antropológicos* and *Cuadernos americanos*. The *Annals* are especially complete regarding Tula, which lay nearby.)

A. Ce Acatl Topiltzin Quetzalcoatl (27-52).

(The semi-legendary civilizer whose calendaric personal name was Ce Acatl, and whose rank as priest-king was Quetzalcoatl. His birth, rearing, government, and downfall are described. Cf. Sahagún, Book III.)

⁴ Cf. the tragic passage, 212, where a child is taken prisoner and ransomed by a warrior who offers himself for sacrifice instead.

¹ The scattered Puebla data are excluded from this scheme.

B. Second dynasty (52-69). To twelfth century.

1. Introduction of human sacrifice (from the Huasteca?)
2. Downfall of Toltec state. (1116? 1168?)
3. Places where Toltec dynasties survived (67).

(These include Tamazula, Oaxaca, where Cortés remarked on the advanced culture of the people, and Coaxitlahuacan whose Toltecs were finally destroyed by Moctezuma I.)

C. Post-Toltec inhabitants of Xaltócan (66).

(Carrasco² has suggested these were Otomíes who governed a large region extending to Metztitlán. Later on, Xaltócan was destroyed after a long war with Cuauhtitlán. Cf. Sec. IV C.)

III. FROM THE TOLTECA TO THE AZTECA-MEXICA (70-85). THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

A. Old tribes (wars in the south of the Valley between Greater Xochimilco and Culhuacán. Latter "Chichimequized" about this time).

B. New tribes.

1. The Chalca in Xico el Viejo (cf. Chimalpahin).
2. Chichimec dynasties in Tepeyaca and Cholula, Puebla. (Cf. *Historia tolteca-chichimeca*, and *Relación de Tepeyaca*. These join (Chichimec) Culhuacán in war on Xochimilco.)
3. The Mexica en route to the Valley and settled in Chapultepec. Middle thirteenth century. (The name Asteca abandoned previous to arrival in Valley. These ferocious immigrants—also Chichimeca—on very good terms with Cuauhtitlán from first contact in North of Valley.)
4. First notices of various tribes, Huexotzinca, Cuitlahuaca, etc.

IV. OUTBREAK OF HUNDRED-YEARS WAR BETWEEN CUAUHTITLÁN AND XALTÓCAN (86-114). 1298-1935.

A. Expulsion of Mexica from Chapultepec.

(The Mexica tribe with its cruel customs is expelled ca. 1298 by the Tepanec of Ascapotzalco who have been silently growing in power. Xaltócan helps in this expulsion and comes into conflict with Mexicophile Cuauhtitlán—which, if allied to Ascapotzalco or subject to it, is only nominally so.)

1. The ruler of Cuauhtitlán weds a refugee Mexican: their descendants (87-95).
2. The genealogy of the rulers of Tepotzotlán (96).

B. The expulsion of the Mexica according to the elders of Cuauhtitlán (97-100).

1. Song of the defeated Mexica (99).

(The full text of this early literary monument and historical source is preserved in *Unos anales históricos de la Nación Mexicana*, 234 ff; and is cited in the so-called *Cédula de Cuauhtémoc*.)

2. Mexican bondage in Culhuacán.

- a. Services in Xochimilco was (cf. above) (101-103).
- b. Expulsion from Culhuacán 104.

C. Military history: Cuauhtitlán and Xaltócan (108).

1. Borders of Xaltócan at various stages of war (108-110).
2. Sacrifice of Xaltócan at their sacred spring, Acapaxapocan (110).
3. A glance ahead: eventual rout of Xaltócan, 1395 (111).
4. A glance ahead: Xaltócan devoured by Greater Cuauhtitlán (112). (Cf. Sec. VC.)

² Thesis on file at Escuela Nacional de Antropología.

V. TEPANEC EXPANSION: CULHUACAN AND CHALCO (115-137).

- A. Azcapotzalco destroys Culhuacán (1347).
1. Huactli of Cuahtitlán weds daughter of lord of Culhuacán (115)
 - a. Huactli sends their son to Culhuacán (118-120)
 - b. Son prophesies fall of Culhuacán to grandfather (120-121).
 2. Culhuacán is destroyed.
 - a. Its people scatter to Azcapotzalco, Coatlichan Huexotla, and Cuahtitlán (125-127).
 - b. The gods of Culhuacán and of Cuahtitlán (126-127).
 - c. Religious reformation in Cuahtitlán: non-idolators jailed (128).
 - d. General civilizing effect of refugees in Cuahtitlán (128).
(Culhuacán, despite Chichimec conquest, still preserved the high-culture traditions of Tula.)
- B. Azcapotzalco begins war against Chalco (which the Mexica continue).
1. The Chalca move from Xico el Viejo (129).
 2. Azcapotzalco attacks.
 - a. 1339-1375, Tepanec war in Techichco (123).
 - b. 1376-1457 Mexica war against Chalco (as vassals of Azcapotzalco until 1428) (131-132).
 3. Cuitlahuac (now Tlahuac) is captured 1392 (134).
- C. Cuahtitlán conquers Xaltocan, 1395 (134-135). Cf. Sec. IVC.)
1. Flight of Xaltocans to Tecaman (Tecamac, on east shore of Lake) and Metztitlan (Hidalgo).
 2. New borders established.
 3. Building of temple in Cuahtitlán.
 4. Other groups people Xaltocan.
 5. Visitors from Morelos.
- D. The Mexica found Tenochtitlán in 1318 as Tepanec vassals (129).

VI. THE TEPANEC WAR (138-171).

- A. Oppressions of Tezozomoc.
1. The Tepanec kill the Lord of Cuahtitlán in 1408 and reduce it to a *cuahtlahtolo* for nine years (139).
 - a. Tepanec of Toltitlan harass Cuahtitlán (138). The lords of Toltitlan to 1570.
 - b. New ruler installed in Cuahtitlán, 1418 (139).⁸
 2. The Tepanec kill the lord of Tezcoco, 1419 (140).
 3. Tezozomoc reports tributaries (141).
 4. Death of Tezozomoc, 1427: his sons (142).
 5. The Old Order upset by the usurpation of Maxtla (142).
- B. Oppressions of Maxtla (142-145).
1. Kills lord of Mexico-Tenochtitlán (143).
 2. Kills lord of Mexico-Tlatilolco (144).
 3. Flight of Nezahualcoyotl (144).
 4. Itzcoatl becomes ruler of Tenochtitlán (145).
- C. Song of the Tepanec Defeat (147-154).
1. Tezcoco matters.
 - a. The sons of Tezozomoc.
 - b. The marriage of his fifth son in Tezcoco (149).
 - c. The adventures of Nezahualcoyotl. (150).

⁸ This is another Tezozomoc, and Tepanec of the branch dynasty at Mexico-Tlatilolco. His sympathies are however against the rulers of Azcapotzalco.

2. Defeat of Cuauhtitlán, 1430 (155-156).
 - a. Magueyes planted in the plaza.
 - b. Slave market removed to Azcapotzalco.
 - c. Disasters of the war (prisoners, tributes).
 - d. Flight and suicide of ruler (156-157).
 3. Recovery of Cuauhtitlán.
 - a. New lord (158).
 - b. "Huexotzinguismo" (158-161).
 - c. Impaling of the Tepanec inspectors (162).
 - d. Tlatelolcan embassy to Huexotzinco (163-164).
 4. Nezahualcoyotl and his eastern allies to the rescue (165).
 - a. Overthrow of the sons of Tezozomoc in various centers (165-167).
 - b. Rescue of the daughter of the lord of Cuauhtitlán (165).
 - c. The protagonists of the war (168).
 5. Cuauhtitlán reorganized. End of the Song of the Tepanec Defeat.
- VII. THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE TO 1473.⁴ (MEXICO, TEZCOCO, TLACOPAN) (172-199).
- A. Peace comes to Cuauhtitlán.
 1. Victory fiesta and attempted attack of (Otomí) Cahuacán (173).
 2. Engineering works in Cuauhtitlán (175).
 3. Xaltocan repopulated by newcomers (182).
 4. Conquest of Cuauhtitlán by Itzcoatl, 1435 (184).⁵
 - B. The times of Moctezuma I and Nezahualcoyotl (185-197).
 1. Wars.
 - a. Cuitlahuac, 1441 (186).
 - b. Invasion of the Mixteca 1459-1461 (189).
 - c. Final defeat of Chalco, 1465 (191-192).
 2. Construction.
 - a. Nezahualcoyotl's temple (188, 194).
 - b. The Chapultepec aqueduct (192-193).
 - C. The Mexica in civil war (1469-1473) (197-199).
 1. The lord of Tlatelolco mistreats his wife (197).
 2. Cuauhtitlán fights on the side of Tenochtitlán (197).
- VIII. TENOCHTITLÁN FROM THE FALL OF TLATELOLCO TO THE ARRIVAL OF CORTÉS (200-220). (This is the epoch of Tenochcan supremacy and the creation of the set-up found by the Spaniards.)
- A. Empire extended from San Luis Potosí to Chiapas (*passim*).
 - B. Dedication of Great Temple, 1487 (202-204).
 - C. Administrative troubles in Chalco (203).
 - D. New fire of 1507: the sacrifices in Cuauhtitlán (211-212).
 - E. Tenochca kill the tzompantecuhtin of Cuitlahuac (218).
 - F. Huexotzinca are driven into the arms of the Tenochca by Tlaxcalan aggression (220).
- IX. NOTES (221-233).
- A. The major centers of highland history in different periods (221).
 - B. The native lords in 1519 (222).
 - C. Texcoco matters (223-226).
- ⁴ The year 1473 marks the death of Nezahualcoyotl and the civil war of the Mexica.
⁵ The *Código* of San Mateo Huichapán and the *Historia de los mexicanos por sus pinturas* say 1439.

1. Lords.
 2. Tributaries in Morelos (cf. Ixtlilxochitl).
 3. Tribute (of latter?).
- D. Tributaries to the North: Veracruz.
1. Division of tribute from Tuxpan (227).
 2. Tributaries of the Tenochca in Veracruz (and elsewhere?) (228).
- E. Division of certain tribute among the Allies (229-232).
- F. Tribute from Oaxaca (233).
- X. MILITARY HISTORY OF EMPIRE OF THE MEXICA (234-242).

Descripción de la Nueva Galicia. By DOMINGO LÁZARO DE ARREGUI. Edición y estudio por FRANÇOIS CHEVALIER. Prólogo de JOHN VAN HORNE. [Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Publicaciones de la Escuela de Estudios Hispano-Americanos de la Universidad de Sevilla (No. general, XXIV), Serie 3a., No. 3.] (Sevilla: Imprenta de Hijos de A. Padura, 1946. Pp. lxxi, 161. Maps. Paper.)

Publication of this short description of Nueva Galicia increases to three the number of readily available sources for this area from the early seventeenth century, the others being the works of Mota y Escobar and Vázquez de Espinosa. Each of these writers had his special interests and his deficiencies, and in the main they supplement each other well. Arregui was the only one of the three to spend many years in rural living in the back country of Nueva Galicia—he owned lands in Tepic—and the only one who took part in military expeditions against the Indians of the Sierra Madre Occidental and of the coastal valleys to the northwest. He is, therefore, especially authoritative on Indians and *entradas*, and gives important information on Jesuit activity in Sinaloa.

Arregui's manuscript was completed in 1621, more than a decade after that of Mota y Escobar, and some years before that of Vázquez de Espinosa.* He seems not to have known the account of Mota y Escobar, nor the two great series of *relaciones geográficas* that had already been compiled. In Arregui we have a practical man, one without scholarly pretensions, who knows what he knows and spends little time on second-hand information. Thus his account of mining activity in the plateau country to the east is very superficial. Zacatecas he dismisses in four hundred words, though that city was in his time the largest in the audiencia district and the third largest in the viceroyalty, being surpassed only by Mexico and Puebla. But for the western part of the audiencia district he brings important new information. He gives a vivid account of the relationships between the sedentary Zaya-

* Just when Vázquez de Espinosa traveled in Nueva Galicia is not known. For a detailed review of his work see *Acta Americana*, I (1943), 159-164.