

SOME INTERESTING OBSERVATIONS ON CHIMALPAHIN
BY USE OF HIS *DIFERENTES HISTORIAS ORIGINALES*

S. A. D. MESSIAEN

-Had it been another time or another place,
Chimalpahin might not have been quite so successful

Schroeder, 1991: xv.

*ix acatl xihuitl —1579— Ypan in yn ipan yc xxvi mani metztli mayo, martes, ye yohua yohualnepantla yohualli xellihui yn otlacat yn Domingo Francisco de Sanct Anton Chimalpayn Cuauhtlehuanitzin, yn inconeuh yn inpiltzin Juan Augustin Yxpintzin yhuan María Jeronima Xiuhtoztzin, huehue Chichimeca pipiltin, Tzacualtitlan Tenanco Chalco, ...*¹

The year 9-Reed -1579- Then was born on the 26th of May, on a Tuesday; it was already midnight, in the middle of the night, when the night was splitting, Domingo Francisco de San Anton Chimalpahin Cuauhtlehuanitzin, the beloved son, the beloved child of Juan Augustin Ixpintzin and of Maria Jeronima Xiuhtoztzin, old Chichimecan nobility, at Tzacualtitlan Tenanco Chalco.

In this way Domingo Francisco de San Antón Muñón Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin, as this is his full official name, claims a small role in his historical work *Diferentes Historias Originales*,² a title which —like it is in most of the cases concerning pre- and post-Hispanic sources— has been assigned much later. The out and out Indian, whose shorter name, Chimalpahin,³ is the more well-known version in the scientific arena, forms together with Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxóchitl and Alvarado Tezozómoc the party-colored historian's trío. At the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century, they put on pa-

¹ Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 28, 3 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 218v.

² Schroeder, 1991:20. He is the only known Nahuatl historian of his time who signed his work and gave it authenticity

³ Lehmann & Kutscher, 1958: XI claim that Bustamante and Terneaux-Compans corrupt Chimalpahin's name. Bustamante calls him Don Juan Bautista Muñón Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin, while Terneaux-Compans speaks of Don Juan Bautista Muñós Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin.

per their own historical version of their proper *altepetl* and it's relation with the great Aztecs.

Before this had to come, Chimalpahin spent the first years of his life in his native city. On the one hand, the Dominicans of the Amecameca monastery will have supplied him with the European minded religious and linguistic education.⁴ On the other hand, his parents and especially some elder villagers, the famous *huehuetque*, will have taught him the old Meso-American traditions like calendar, language, the reading and writing of the old pictographic signs (or what was left of them). The result was a unique cultural knowledge *métissage*, by which old know-how was reproduced or kept by use of new techniques.

Probably at the age of fourteen, he moved to Mexico-City. On Tuesday the 5th of October 1593 he entered the San Antonio Abad monastery at Xoloco⁵ and he was appointed as a *donado* or a *fiscal* in 1595. He devoted himself to the religious service of the San Antonio Abad chapter. He describes his function in the following terms:

...auh mazo nell ihui yn amo ymacehual ylhui ycnopilyni quiteauihuhti in quimocuitlahuia yn iteopancaltzin in isancta yglesiatzin in cenquizca yxtililoni mahuiztililoni in mocenquizca centlamachtiani in huey teltatzin S. Antonio Abbad yn ipan in tecpil altepetl hueycan ciudad México Tenuchtitlan, yn oncan omohuapauh ytequiuhiti ymamal mochihua ynic quittia quimocuitlahuia yn omoteneuh yteopancaltzin ysanctayglesiatzin sancto in ye yxquichica cempohuall on chicuacen xihuittl axcan ypanin ticate xihuittl de 1620.⁶

And although [Chimalpahin] did not deserve it that it would be his task to take care of the temple and the sacred Church of the most honored and respectful very learned great priest San Antonio Abad in the great and lovely city of Mexico Tenochtitlan, where he grew up; it became his task and duty to look after and to take care for the foresaid temple and sacred Church of the saint for 26 years until the present year 1620.

Driven by the interest to rescue from oblivition the history of his beloved native land from, Chimalpahin consulted different *amoxthli* or

⁴ Schroeder, 1991:20 & Romero Galván, 1983:18. I consider that Chimalpahin was already acquainted with the Spanish language in Amecameca. See Ricard, 1933:339: *Jamais en dépit des ordres formels de la Couronne, ils n'acceptèrent d'enseigner le castillan, si ce n'est à une élite: l'enseignement purement indigène, et, pour remédier à la multiplicité des langues, les religieux se contentèrent de répandre la connaissance du principal idiome indigène: le nahuatl*. On the one side a lack of good Spanish would not lead to an appointment as *donado* or *fiscal* at San Antonio Abad. On the other side, Chimalpahin can be reckoned to the local upperclass of his town, meaning that an education of a certain degree was spent on behalf of the boy.

⁵ Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 41-42, 57-2.

⁶ Zimmermann, 1963: I, 153, 10 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 234v.

native codices treating about the history of the home Lands. Like this he wrote in Nahuatl his *Diario* or a diary, a summary of short facts dealing with the period between 1589-1615 and the already mentioned *Diferentes Historias Originales*, a native history starting in 50 AD till 1612, divided into eight *Relaciones*. Assimilated in his *Relaciones* there is the *Memorial breve acerca de la fundación de Culhuacan*. Chimalpahin's work does not only contain information about the history of Chalco and Amaquemecan, but also about the different manors and kingdoms on the central plateau.⁷ According to Zimmermann, Chimalpahin started collecting data from 1608 on and wrote the *Relaciones* between 1620 and 1631.⁸ Following Romero Galván, Chimalpahin's sixth *relación* would be written in 1612;⁹ his seventh in 1629¹⁰ and the eighth 1620,¹¹ while he claims Chimalpahin started collecting data already in 1608.¹² Castillo presumes that Chimalpahin started already preparing his accounts from 1606 on.¹³ I for myself do have a strong preference for Castillo's opinion. It was the year in which Enrico Martínez's *Repertorio de los Tiempos Modernos* was edited, a book often used by Chimalpahin as we will see. It looks to me as if this book was probably a strong motive to put the native history within the European frame of world history. The major part of his *Relaciones* should have been ready around 1620.¹⁴ Chimalpahin's *Diario* stops on 14th October 1615.¹⁵

In Mexico-City his status must have been quite low, although he was part of the intellectual elite. But Chimalpahin's status paled before Ixtlilxóchitl's or Tezozómoc's social backgrounds. Chimalpahin himself claimed to have a certain noble descent, but the lack of the

⁷ León-Portilla, 1988: 1, 66-67.

⁸ Zimmermann, 1963-1965: I, VIII.

⁹ Romero Galván, 1983: 22.

¹⁰ Zimmermann, 1963-1965: i, 41, 9-10 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 149v.

¹¹ Mengin, 1949-1952: ff. 161r, 225r, 234v.

¹² Romero Galván, 1983: 22.

¹³ Castillo, 1991: XXVI. Another important argument for Castillo is next to Martínez's book the edition of the *Sermonario en lengua mexicana* by Juan Bautista, which Chimalpahin uses as a source in his diary. Castillo, 1991: XXVII suspects that the unexpected historical digression at the 1608 entry is linked to the oration held by Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxóchitl before the Indians of Otumba is in the same year.

¹⁴ Schroeder, 1991: 224-225, note 17 notices that Chimalpahin makes use of the word *axcan* (now) in reference to the year 1620. See Zimmermann, 1963-1965: 1, 151, 15 & 153, 16 & Mengin, 1949-1952: ff. 232r & 234v. In rel. II there is yet another reference, but this time to the year 1631, see Zimmermann, 1963-1965: I, 49-50, 54-3 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 61 r. & Castillo, 1991: XXVIII: *Finalmente, por alusiones del propio Chimalpahin podemos inferir, con bastante certidumbre, que la 8a Relación fue comenzada, o tal vez redactada en su totalidad, durante 1620; que para 1629 escribía las primeras páginas de la 7a Relación, y que en el transcurso de 1631 componía los últimos folios del Memorial breve.*

¹⁵ Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 146, 10.

honorable titles (like don or doña) is sufficient to presume that Chimalpahin was not the social equal of the two other historians.¹⁶ Chimalpahin did not earn his living with history writing, but there are some strong suppositions that he made a living by copying texts.¹⁷

Concerning his date of death, Boban, one of the first French americanists,¹⁸ claims Chimalpahin died in 1660. The last absolute date we know something from Chimalpahin is 1631.¹⁹ In 1631 he mentions the death of two of his uncles, don Diego Josepho Hernández and Don Cristóbal de Castañeda. This is his latest dated entry.

During a former research,²⁰ I have deepened myself into the sources linked to the *Diferentes Historias Originales*. The opinion O'Gorman shared for the sources used by Ixtlilxóchitl, is also applicable for these used by Chimalpahin:

*El esclarecimiento de las fuentes utilizadas por Alva Ixtlilxóchitl no es sino una parte del problema general a ese mismo respecto ofrece el conjunto de textos de la época colonial que tratan de la historia de México.*²¹

I concluded that Chimalpahin, as a compiler and an author, had used a great amount of sources. Most of them were of native origin. The total of Chimalpahin's sources was divided into four categories, which are mentioned hereafter.

¹⁶ Schroeder, 1991: 7-10. Although his grandparents were part of the old native nobility, the blue blood was partially evaporated out of his body (Tezozomoc). The double Spanish Christian name and the lack of a Spanish last name are good examples for this. Also the lack of political tradition within the family points to this (Ixtlilxóchitl). Romero Galván, 1983: 17 estimates Chimalpahin could have a higher social position than expected through his name.

¹⁷ Andersson; Schroeder & Ruwet, 1997: I, 7-8.

¹⁸ Boban, 1891: II, 163. Boban has never mentioned the source for his claim Chimalpahin died in 1660. Mengin, 1949-1952: I, 15 copies this without any critique. According to Romero Galván, 1983: 17 there are some clues Chimalpahin might have died in 1660, but is silent about the various clues. *Aunque se desconoce la fecha precisa de su muerte, hay indicios [?] que permiten afirmar que ésta ocurrió hasta 1660, en la ciudad de México, ...* Zimmermann, 1963-1965: I, 12 puts some questions (*unverbürgt*) around 1660. Illustrative for the maintainance of this misconception is the classification used by the Library of Congress, which also states that Chimalpahin died in 1660 (Anderson; Schroeder, & Ruwet, 1997).

¹⁹ Lehmann & Kutscher, 1958: XV; Zimmermann, 1963-1965: I, 49, 58 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 61r.

²⁰ See Messiaen, 1999: 37-96.

²¹ Ixtlilxóchitl, 1975: I, 47.

SOURCES USED FOR THE *RELACIONES*

HISTORICAL SOURCES

1. MEXICAN SOURCES

1) Spanish written sources from Mexico

Alonso de Molina

Enrico Martínez

Juan de Torquemada

Diego Durán ?

Juan de Tovar

Jerónimo de Mendieta

2) Colonial Nahuatl sources

Bernardino de Sahagún

Cristóbal del Castillo

Annals of Quauhtitlan

Hernando de Alvarado Tezozómoc

Codex Aubin

Gabriel de Ayala

3) Prehispanic Nahuatl sources

Native annals (at least 9 different ones)

Huehuetlahtolli

4) Informants

RELIGIOUS-EDUCATIVE SOURCES

2. RELIGIOUS-BIBLICAL SOURCES

Martyrologium Romanum

Apocryph fragments

Book of Genesis*

Book of Wisdom*

NEW-SPAIN

EUROPE

Maritime transit from Antwerp, Cadiz, Lisbon, etc.

+

smuggler

3. SPANISH SOURCES

López de Gómara

Petrus Comestor

4. ANTIQUE SOURCES

1) Humanistic editions

Flavius Josephus

Ovid

Marcus Antonius Sabellicus*

Coelius Rhodiginus*

Baptista Ignatius*

Sofocles*

Plato*

2) Ecclesiastical editions

Augustine*

Eusebius of Caesarea*

Firmanus Lactantius*

Rupert von Deutz*

John of Damascus*

Thomas of Aquino*

Saint Dionysius*

* = sources found in the *primera relación*.

The scheme containing Chimalpahin's historical sources is of course not complete yet²² We did our best to include as many sources

²² To illustrate Chimalpahin used other sources, we give here two examples. The first example illustrates the different sources he must have used in reproducing the Babylonian confusion of tongues or to show that there were different versions in the beginning of the 17th century.

Auh yniqu iuh omochihu in, yn aocmo ceme nepanol mocaquia, ynic cerca huey oncan impan hualla yn netentzacualliztli yn nellahtolpolloliztli yn nellahtolcucuepaliztli epohuallonmallactlamantli ipan ontlamanli y yancuic tlahtolli oncan quicuique in tlaca.^a

When the language of the people [of Babel] changed, it was divided, it was divided in this way, that there appeared there 72 new languages, ...

An important clue is the number of new languages. According to Siméon^b this number was coming from the *Annals* of the Greek author Alexandros Eutyches,^c who claimed that the tower of Babel was built by 72 men. Gen. 11, 6-7 nowhere states a number of languages.^d Same story with Eutyches, where we found nothing of this matter:

[From] the first book: And the Lord said, he spoke, the people are united and all have the same language; and now they do this and now nothing will stop them to for fill what they have in mind. Let's go, let's descend and confuse their language, so they can't understand each other any more.^e

Another example treats the fall of Jerusalem. The most intriguing matter here is that Chimalpahin claims this happened in 73, while the fall really took place in 70. Around 73 there was only the fall of the last Zelotic fort of Massada. But there is also some discussion about this date.^f May be his correlation error, 73 in stead of 70, was provoked by another source.

11-House Year 73 - Ypan in yn tlapolloto Jerusalem yn tlahtohuani Vespasiano, ynic motzoncuic yn Jesu Christo ynic quimomictilique yehuantin Judiosme yn itech cruz, yn ihcuac yn o yuh ye nepa onpohualxihuil ypan ce xihuil Jerusalem momiquilitzino yn totecuioy Dios, yn ipan in ynic tlapollihuico.^g

It was then, when Vespasian, who took revenge for the Christ's death killed by the Jews on the cross, by destroying Jerusalem. It was at that moment already 41 years ago since the death of our lord God in Jerusalem, when [the city] was destroyed.

Siméon referred in rel. VII in a note^h to the *Jewish Antiquities* by Flavius Josephus. But Flavius Josephus writes in his *Jewish Antiquities* only some small matters about the fall of Jerusalem:

εἰσιν οὖν οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἡρώδου χρόνων ἀρχιερατευσάντες μέχρι τῆς ἡμετέρας ἡς τὸν ναὸν καὶ τὴν πόλιν Τίτος ἔλων ἐπυρπόλησεν ἐν οἷς πάντες εἰκοσὶ καὶ οὐκτὼ χιλιοὺς δὲ τούτων ἐτὶ πρὸς τοῖς ἑκατὸν ἐτῶν.ⁱ

^a Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 160, 41-43 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 149r.

^b Siméon, 1889: 30, note 2.

^c Patriarch of Alexandria, historian and theologian (Cairo, 877 - Alexandria, 940). Studied medicine, but became patriarch in 933. He composed *Nazim al-Jahwar* or *Annals*. It is a complete world history starting from the Creation till 938. It was an important source for the French chronicle writer William of Tyre.

^d Gen. 11, 6-7: *Arad Jahwe said: 'See, they are one people, they have the same language. And this is only the beginning of their doing; later we will not be able to stop them what they intend to do. Well then, let us descend and confuse their language, so no one can understand the language of his fellow.'*

^e Eutyclus, Alexandros. *The Book of Demonstrations. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 192-193 & 209-210 Scriptores Arabici 21-22*, Louvain, 1987, § 509.

^f According to Flavius Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities*. Cambridge (Mass.) - London, 1961-1965, book VII, 401 the fall of Massada took place on the fifteenth day of the month Zanthicus. This would correspond to May 2nd, 72 AD. Most of the scientists place the event in 73 AD.

^g Mengin, 1949-1952: I 18v & Zimmermann, 1962-1965: II, 155, 46-47.

^h Siméon, 1889: 33.

ⁱ Flavius Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities*. Cambridge (Mass.) - London, 1961-1965, book XX, 250. The period of 37 AD till 70 AD.

as we could recognize. The scheme is divided horizontally into sources present or written in New-Spain on the one hand and sources with European origins on the other, which were shipped legally or illegally

Now the number of those who occupied the high priesthood at the time of Herod till the day on which Titus conquered the temple and the city and put it flames, was 28 in total; it covered a period of 107 years.

Flavius Josephus writes in another work *The Jewish War*, that the fall of Jerusalem took place on September 26, 70 AD by Titus, son of Vespasian.^j As mentioned already above Chimalpahin could have used Flavius Josephus as a source. But from this citation we can see that he didn't use it for this entry, but he must have used another source. Fact is that Chimalpahin puts the fall of Jerusalem in 73 AD instead of 70 AD and that he relates this fall to the death of Christ. We suspect that he has filtered his information out of a Christian inspired source.

Two other sources, Alexandros Eutyches and William of Tyre, can be interpreted as if the fall of Jerusalem took place in 73 AD or later Eutyches writes about it as following:

[69 AD] *He (Vespasian) had two sons; he sent the one to the Land of the Barbarians; he conquered them (the Barbarians) in the West. He killed them and destroyed them; the other, with the name of Tifus, he sent him to the holy city (Jerusalem). He besieged the city for two years [69-70 AD], so that those who lived in the holy city starved and died; [...] He destroyed the city and the temple and put it in flames. The number of killed persons consisted of three thousand thousand (three million). Some people escaped to Sam (Syria), Egypt and to Gor (Persia). When the Christians, who had fled the Jews at that time, heard that Titus had destroyed the holy city and had killed the Jews, they returned to the ruins of the holy city and lived there again. They built a church and named a second [new] bishop with the name Simeon, son of Cleopas. This one was the brother of Joseph, who had clothed Our Lord Christ. This happened in the fourth year of the government of Vespasian. [73 AD]*^k

The same scenario can be found within the book of William of Tyre. It is even remarkable that he also based his book on Flavius Josephus's *Jewish War*. In the particular passage by Flavius Josephus the reader has to make some counts, before he can understand that the fall took place in 70 AD. May be it is possible that William has miscounted himself.

Postea vero regnante filio eius Salomone dicta est Ierosolima quasi Ierusalem Salomonis. Hanc ut referent egregii scriptores et Illustres historiographi Egisippus et Iosephus, Iudeorum id exigentibus meritis quadragesimo secundo post passionem domini anno Titus Vespasiani filius, Romanorum magnificus princeps, obsedit, obsessam expugnavit et expugnatam deiecit funditus, ita ut iuxta verbum domini non remaneret in ea lapis super lapidem.^l

Afterwards at the time of the government of his son Solomon, Jerusalem was called Salomon's Jerusalem. It is in this city that refers Greek authors and famous historians as Egisippus and Josephus. Titus, magnificent ruler of the Romans, son of Vespasian, besieged [Jerusalem], conquered the besiegers because of the revenging guilt of the Jews 42 years after the lord's suffering [74/75 AD] and drove away totally the conquerors and in conformity with God's word there was no stone left there.

If Chimalpahin has used one of these two sources, is doubtful. Eutyches's work had only a small reputation in Spain. The work of William of Tyre was better known in the Middle Ages and was well spread. Chimalpahin could have used copies of this work. But still it is impossible to prove a relation between these two. This is only to illustrate how difficult it is to make and prove relations between authors.

^j Flavius Josephus. *The Jewish Wars*. Cambridge (Mass.) - London 1961-1967 book VI, 407 writes that the fall of Jerusalem took place on the eighth day of the month Gorpiaeus, which corresponds to September 26, 70 AD.

^k Eutychieus, Alexandros. *Das Annalenwerk des Eutychieus von Alexandrien. Ausgewählte Geschichten und Legenden kompiliert von Sa'id ibn Batriq um 935 A.D. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 471-472 Scriptores Arabici 44-95*, Louvain, 1985, II, § 159-160.

^l Tyre, Guillaume de. *Chronique. Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievals 68*. Turnhout, 1986, I, chap. 8, § 2, r. 16-23.

to New-Spain. Vertically one can make a difference between the historical sources and religious-educative sources.

We could not classify all these sources *stricto sensu* in these coarse categories. For instance, the *Vocabulario* by fray Alonso de Molina seems to be more an educative source than a historical one. Though we have put the book into the historical category, because Molina is a part of the group of writers like Torquemada, Mendieta and Tovar influenced by the same historiographic environment. Another exception is Petrus Comestor. His *Historia Scholastica* was only edited in the Spanish language in 1699, but as it will be shown further on, there were at the time of Chimalpahin Spanish manuscripts and compilations circulating.

The manner under which the sources are ranged, might inform us about the importance Chimalpahin attached to his sources. One can recognize four major divisions. The longest list is the one containing the Mexican sources. This category is also most specified. Sources written in Spanish originate from Spanish or indigenous monks occupying themselves with the evangelization and stabilization of the new conquered territories. The subject of these sources is in most of the cases a history of the conquest with some attention for the indigenous aspects or an encyclopedial expose about the indian culture. Nahuatl sources stress prehispanic history in particular, less cultural aspects. It may be obvious that the author did not have impersonal feelings in selecting his sources.

The second longest list looks to be the one containing the antique sources. But the authors of the second group, the ecclesiastical editions, are exclusively used in the *primera relación*. Other sources were rarely used in the remaining *relaciones*. We can conclude that the accent lays clearly on sources produced or present in New-Spain.

All the references to the ecclesiastical-antique sources, like Augustine, Eusebius, etc. are probably not copied directly from these sources into Chimalpahin's manuscript. First of all the *primera relación* testifies to be a totally other genre in comparison to the other seven *relaciones*. Chimalpahin writes about the creation of the world day by day following the biblical canon. The contents of his *primera* shows some remarkable resemblances with the *Exercicio Quotidiano*, an in Nahuatl written religious essay. It is a kind of a manual for nahuatl speaking persons what to do to behave oneself as a good christian. The manual keeps the classical divisions: seven separately arranged prayers corresponding to the seven days of the week. Each time each prayer is illustrated with specific fragments taken from the Bible and corresponding with the specific day. We suspect that the *primera relación* is a kind of an

copy-paste document by the hand of Chimalpahin and based on some clerical or theological *sermonario*.

The largest category, the one containing the Mexican sources, is at the same time the less complete one. We are for sure Chimalpahin used a lot more sources than the ones which are listed. First of all we think about the indigenous sources. Because most of the sources Chimalpahin used at that time are lost forever now. Our scheme shows us that the Mexican sources are the most important ones. That's not astonishing at all if one knows that Chimalpahin was an indian and not a Hispanic. Not only is the list of Mexican sources much longer, but also the fragments of this specific list he copied are quantitatively numerous than the short fragments we have put in the category of the antique sources.²³ Rel. I is the most important part which contains links to the facts and authors from the antique sources. The other parts are only sporadically represented in this very same category. Most of times the fragments are related to religious events, like the deluge and the creation.

On the other hand, there are still some themes which can not be identified by us. Nevertheless we pretend to claim that this scheme is a good point to start in solving some problems concerning Chimalpahin. The four main categories with their typical stereotypes can maintain every time when new related sources are applied. Three of the four categories—the biblical, the antique and the Spanish sources—might be considered as almost complete. There are still some fragments (cf. note) of which we have no idea on which source Chimalpahin has himself based on. The proportions between these three categories are rather constant. In our view, the number of sources which could be put in these three categories is minimal. The reason for this is that the number of fragments that lend itself to this is limited. The remaining fragments, which could not yet be identified might be listed into the category containing Mexican sources or are by Chimalpahin's own hand. Besides one has to take in account that most of the short fragments coming from the three above mentioned categories could be based on some foot or marginal notes found in edited or hand written documents. We suspect that this was the case for Chimalpahin's links to Ovid and Flavius Josephus.²⁴

The fourth one, the Mexican sources, is far from complete. This is the category on which a lot of unidentified fragments can be applied.

²³ Cf. the corpus by Zimmermann, 1963-1965, of which the *historisch-spekulative Fragmente* contain only 14 pages in his total edition, which corresponds with 6 % of the *Relaciones*.

²⁴ See Messiaen, 1999: 89-91.

New identified fragments strengthen the importance of this category and confirm what we already have examined and claimed here for.

Now that our scheme containing Chimalpahin's sources is critically examined, I would like to provide a solution to the following problems by use of this scheme:

1. Which source is meant by *Escolastica*?
2. What was the influence of Henrico Martinez's *Repertorio de los Tiempos Modernos* on the composition of Chimalpahin's work?
3. How does the *primera relación* relate to the rest of Chimalpahin's *Relaciones*?
4. Did Chimalpahin study at the Colegio de Santa Cruz and how acquainted was the author with Latin?

1. The *Escolastica*

The *Escolastica* as a source turns up two times short after each other in rel. VII. In the different textual editions the source's recognition keeps misty. Siméon recognizes the word as something unfamiliar, due to italic in which it is printed in his 1885 edition, but he doesn't clarify the source in one of his many footnotes.²⁵ We were unable to inform on the edition by Seler.²⁶ Zimmermann mentioned no information on this issue,²⁷ nor did Silvia Rendón.²⁸ The most recent edition by Rafael Tena contains a list with cited sources used by Chimalpahin in his *Relaciones*.²⁹ Tena had filtered the *Escolastica* as a historical source, but could not trace or relate the source to a certain author. During our investigation we were able to trace this source, if not by coincidence.³⁰ With *Escolastica*, the *Historia Scholastica* by Petrus Comestor³¹ is meant.

²⁵ Siméon, 1968: 33 & 35.

²⁶ There is traduction of rel. VII by Seler, Eduard. *Einige Kapitel aus dem Geschichtswerke des Fray Bernardino de Sahagún aus den Aztekischen übersetzt*. Stuttgart, 1927, XVI-574 p.

²⁷ Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 204 notices the fragment, which he claims comes from a Spanish translation. *Dieser in die 7. Relation eingeschachtelte Exkurs über den Turmbau zu Babel usw. ist angesichts der aztekischen Formenbildung ganz zweifellos aus dem Spanischen übersetzt, ohne dass die Vorlage bekannt geworden ist.*

²⁸ Rendón, 1965

²⁹ Tena, 1998: II, 389.

³⁰ We had a flashback to one of our tough exams some years ago.

³¹ Comestor was born around 1100 in Troyes in France. He established himself in 1159 in Paris and became a canon at the cathedral school of the Notre Dame. Between 1169 and 1175 he wrote a *History to be used in School*, which connects the Christian and Jewish history together. Comestor used Flavius Josephus as an important source on Jewish history. The *Historia Scholastica* describes the biblical history from the Creation till Ascension Day. His nickname 'comestor', he got for his insatiable hunger for books and knowledge.

So there are two fragments at the beginning of rel. VII, in which Chimalpahin cites literally his source, the *[Historia] Scholastica*. Both fragments tell us about the history of the Tower of Babel. Chimalpahin justifies the different languages in the Americas by use of this Bible tale.

*Yh[uan] no ypan yn oc centetl amoxtili ymotenehua Es[co]lastica oncan ytech mopohua, yuh quihtohua yuh quitenehua, ca yc oquinepano o netech quipannepano o moch quihuicalti, yn iuh commottiliaya, ynic zan no yhuan ito[loz] tenehualoz, ynic tepan cahuaniz yn itenyo Nemrod, ynic molnamiquiz mochipa yn itoca, zan no yhuan oquimohuicalti in nechachamahualiztli y netopaliztoliztli, yn za ye no yuhque yn oc cequintin y yehuantin*³²

In yet another book, called *Scholastica*, where it is spoken, where it is said, where it is expressed, that by uniting each other, by being together, by becoming a group, like it was seen, that at the same time Nimrod's opinion became aware and was spread between the nations that his name will always be remembered. But he was lead by pride and conceit; the other people were just like him.

The other fragment corresponds closely:

*Auh oc no centetl amoxtili yn za no ytoca Escolastica yn oncan iuh ipan quihtohua ipan onhualla centlamantli yn cenca huey ynic chicahuac, tlapaltic tlahuellhecatl yc omohuitectiquiz, oquimyahtiquiz y yehuatl, yn oquichiuhca yn oquiquetzca tlachihualtepehuillatzli, in motenehua Torre, yehuatl yuh quichiuh yn innepohualiz yn innechachamahualiz yn innetopaliztlahtol y yehuantin in tlaca macehuallin. Oncan tlami yn yn teoamochtlahtolli.*³³

And yet another book, also called *Scholastica*, tells about it that there rose a big wind, which was so heavy and strong, that [this wind] blew away and destroyed this high fortification, called the tower, which had been built by the people, which was conceived by the transitoriness and the conceit of this vulgar people. There ends the history from the Sacred Book.

Chimalpahin based himself in first instance on the Sacred Book (*teoamochtlahtolli*). The way he uses Comestor, author of the *Historia Scholastica*, has to be seen as back-up information. The *Scholastica* was literally a classic example. The book was in the high and late middle ages a particularly common used hand book for theology students. Different translations were circulating in the popular languages.³⁴ Petrus Comestor devotes a complete chapter to the history of the fa-

³² Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 159-160, 57-4 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f 148r.

³³ Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 160, 48-55 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 149r.

³⁴ Schryver, 1994: 148.

mous Tower of Babel. Chap. XXXVIII called, *De Turri Babylon* (About the Tower of Babel) states as following:

*Post obitum vero Noe convenerunt duces in unum, in campum Sennaar, et timentes diluvium consilio Nemrod coeperunt aedificare turrim, quae pertingeret usque ad caelos, habentes lateres pro cemento. Descendit autem dominus, ut videret turrim, animadvertit, ut puneret, et ait: Venite et confundamus linguam eorum, ut non intelligat quisque vocem proximi sui. De hac turri dicit Josephus: Dii ventos immittentes everterunt turrim et voceen propriam unicuique partiti sunt. Propterea Babyloniam contigit vocari civitatem.*³⁵

After Noe died, the leaders assembled together in the plain of Sennaar, and while they still feared the deluge, they consulted Nimrod. They started to build a tower reaching heaven. It was made of bricks piled up with lime and cement. Then the Lord came down, so he could see the tower. He was angry, so he punished them and said: Come and let us confuse their languages, so that none will understand the language of his fellow-man. [Flavius] Josephus said about the tower that the gods destroyed it by using enormous winds and they divided each one by his own language. This is the reason why they called this city Babel.³⁶

Chimaphin's and Comestor's fragments refer to the unity of the nations, Nimrod's conceit, the tower reaching the sky and the destruction by winds. Between the two Chimalpahin's two fragments, the author cites besides Flavius Josephus. This Jewish author was also an important inspiration for the oeuvre of Comestor. All the references form an important argument that the so called *Escolastica* can only be the one from Comestor.

Now it is proven what we have to understand with *Escolastica*, we will investigate in how far this work was present and read in the New World. The first Spanish edition by Antonio González de Reyes dates only from 1699 on.³⁷ This is not the one used by Chimalpahin. However there were circulating sixteenth century editions in the French and Latin language. The last Latin and French editions before 1620 are one from Lyon in 1542 and the one from Paris in 1545 respectively.³⁸ At the Colegio de Santa Cruz in Tlatelolco there was a Latin copy of the 1534 edition.³⁹ Spanish readers were of course long before 1699 acquainted with the oeuvre of Comestor. At the time of king Alfonso X in the second half of the thirteenth century a *Historia General* was written containing as an important source Comestor's *Historia*

³⁵ Comestor, 1925: I, 46-47.

³⁶ Babel means confusement.

³⁷ Palau y Dulcet, "1948-1977: art. "Comestor".

³⁸ *Catalogue Général*, 1897-1981: art. "Pierre le Mangeur".

³⁹ Mathes, 1982: 63.

Scholastica. Chimalpahin could have used a copy of Comestor's book or of the *Historia General*. There were plenty of them. Even Portuguese copies were found at the monastery of Alcobaça.⁴⁰ Even in the Low Countries a translation of Comestor's *Scholastica* became famous by the work of Jacob van Maerlant's *Rimebible*.⁴¹

Chimalpahin could eventually also made use of different marginals, which were written on books or on manuscripts. In old fac similé editions we still can see these sort of marginal notes. These notes do not figure at the end of the book or at the same page beneath the text, like we know nowadays. But they figure next to the line where they refer to. Most of these marginals contain information regarding relations between the author's claim and antique or ecclesiastical authors. Chimalpahin could inform himself on the subject by reading these marginals, which correlates the history of the Tower of Babel with Flavius Josephus's comment. In short terms, Chimalpahin could have used a source X, which was based on fragments and traditions found in the books of Petrus Comestor and Flavius Josephus. This is no big matter to us. What is important is that Chimalpahin used fragments which are part of certain text tradition containing among them Comestor's *Scholastica*.

2. What was the influence of Henrico Martinez's *Repertorio de los Tiempos Modernos* on the composition of Chimalpahin's work?

Enrico Martínez⁴² or Heinrich Martin was born between 1550 and 1560 in the wealthy city of Hamburg. His parents went to Spain when he still was a young boy. He stayed there during his youth and devoted himself to the study of cosmography and mechanics. Honored by the title royal astronomer, he went to Mexico in 1589. The marquis of Salinas instructed him to build digues around the city, which were to be getting the water out of the capital. From 1598 on he was a Dutch and German interpreter for the Inquisition and combined this job with editing. One of his books is the *Repertorio de los tiempos modernos e historia*

⁴⁰ Comestor, 1925: I, XX-XXIII.

⁴¹ Gysseling, Maurits (ed.) *Rijmbijbel van Jacob van Maerlant. Corpus van Middelnederlandse Teksten, Reeks II, Deel III*. Leiden, 1983, IX. This book contains two major parts. The first part (verses 1 till 27081) is a translation of Comestor's school history. The second part (verses 27082 till 34859) tells us the events the Jews had to undergo from the reign of Roman emperor Caligula (37 AD) till the capturing of the Zelotic fort of Massada by the Romans (73 AD). The second part is a compilation and adaptation by van Maerlant of Rufinus of Aquileia's (4th century AD) Latin translation of *The Jewish War*.

⁴² For more biographic data see, Maza, Francisco de la. *Enrico Martínez, cosmógrafo e impresor de Nueva España*. Mexico, 1943.

natural desta Nueva España, which was edited by himself in 1606⁴³ en la *Emprenta del mesmo autor*. A second edition, in 1948, is a reprint of the 1606 edition.

Chimalpahin cites the author by his name in rel. IV and starts to take over literal passages from the *Repertorio*.

Chimalpahin ⁴⁴	Translation	Martínez ⁴⁵
<p><i>1-Tochtli</i> [50 n.C.] <i>Auh ce tlaatl tlamantini anozo no-huampa, ytocha Henrico Martines, nahuatlalto ynquissision yn Mexico, yuh quimomachiztia, quil mach, oquimittato yn ompa ypan ce provincia Europa ylocatocan Curlant, ynmacehualpan yn Polonia reyesme yn tlahtoque, yn ompa tlaca yn ipan omoteneuh altepell Curlant; ...</i></p> <p><i>Ynin tlahtolli ca amo huel mellahuac momati azo yuhqui anozo amo yuhqui, yeca huel mellahuac yn iuhqui tonacayo yn ompa tlaca no yuhqui in innacayo, ynic yehuatl ypanpa tenehuilia yn ompa chaneque Curlant.</i></p>	<p>And the learned person, the distinguished geographer, Enrico Martinez, interpreter at the Inquisition at Mexico-City, said according to his wisdom that he knew a province in Europe, wich they call Kurland and wich is governed by the Rulers of Poland, of which the people look the same like us (Chichimecs);...</p> <p>It is not know of this is true. As such it is true that our body resembles theirs, that there is a connection with the inhabitants there in Kurland.</p>	<p>Lo que acerca de esto puedo afirmar es haber visto y estado en una provincia de Europa llamada Curlant, que está en altura de cincuenta y seis grados, longitud cuarenta y cinco, estado de los duques de ella que son vasallos de los reyes de Polonia, la cual provincia es poblada de una gente de la misma traza, color, condición y brio de los indios de esta Nueva España, excepto que son algo más corpulentos, como los Chichimecas, ...</p>

It is remarkable to see that the connection of descent between the Chichimecs and the inhabitants of Kurland was the object of fruitful copying. We can find this parallel in the *Monarquía Indiana* by Juan de Torquemada,⁴⁶ also in book IV, chap. 7 of the *Origen de los indios del Nuevo Mundo* by fray Gregorio de García (ca. 1560-1627). Even Juan

⁴³ Palau y Dulcet, 1948-1977: art. "Martínez".

⁴⁴ Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 154, 40-43 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 117v & Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 154, 50-52 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 117v.

⁴⁵ Martínez, 1948: 121 [trad. II, cap. 8].

⁴⁶ The thesis that the indians should descend from the inhabitants of Kurland was first stated by Acosta in 1590. Unfortunately we could find no such claim in Acosta, 1987. Torquemada, 1975-1983: I, 46. & Torquemada, 1969: I, 30: *Henrico Martínez (Hombre Sabio en Astrologia, y Cosmographia) en su Repertorio, que imprimió en Lengua Vulgar Castellana: demás de lo referido, en este Parrafo pasado, afirma, aver visto en una Provincia de Europa, llamada Curlant, que está en altura, de cincuenta y seis Grados, longitud quarenta y cinco, Estado de los Duques de ella, que son Vasallos de los Reyes de Polonia; la qual Provincia es poblada de una Gente, de la misma traza, color, condicion, y brio de los Indios desta Nueva-España: excepto que son algo mas corpulentos, como los Chichimecas, ...*

de Solorzano Pereira (1575-1653/1654) writes about it in his work *De indiarum iure* and his Spanish translation *Politica Indiana*.

The influence the work of Martínez exercised on the composition of Chimalpahin's *Relaciones* was relatively a major one. The indian author drew more than once from the *Repertorio* like the fragments regarding the geographic knowledge at that moment and some historical data regarding the history of Spain and the voyages of discovery.

ZIMMERMANN 1963-1965	MARTINEZ, 1948	SUBJECT	RELACIÓN
II, 150-153, 50-34	119-120 [trat. 2, chap. 7]	World division	II
I, 119-120, 49-53	140 [trat. 2, chap. 26]	Events concerning Columbus, 1484	III
I, 128, 5-31	140 [trat. 2, chap. 26]	Discovery of America, 1492-1493	III
I, 129-130, 13-47	141-142 [trat. 2, chap. 26]	Events in America, 1493	III
I, 131, 19-43	142 [trat. 2, chap. 26]	Events in America, 1494	III
I, 132, 4-18	142 [trat. 2, chap. 26]	Events in America, 1495	III
II, 154, 40-52	121 [trat. 2, chap. 8]	Chichimecs resemble inhabitants from Kurland	IV
I, 121, 10-27	140 [trat. 2, chap. 26]	Events concerning Columbus, 1484-1492	VII

As an illustration we would like to give an example. Take first of all notice to the same sequence of the events discussed by Chimalpahin and Martínez. Look at the Spanish loan words, which Chimalpahin copied literally one by one.⁴⁷ In rel. II Chimalpahin describes the world like Martínez did. We restrict our example to Asia.⁴⁸

Chimalpahi ⁴⁹	Traslation	Martinez ⁵⁰
De Asia Auh ynic onteti cemanahuatl yn tlalli motocayotia Asia, ynin cemicac oqui- tocateneuhque yn amoxtila-cuillohua- nime, yehica ypampa ca ypan catca ypan peuh tzintic yn achto yn hue- huey teuhcyotl yn tlahtocayotl, ynic cemanahuac yn quenin n iuh ye- huanlin catca, o ypan teuhctico otlahtocatico in motenehua Assirios, yhuan Persas, yhuan Medos. Auh yhuan zan no yhui huel motenehua yn teohuamoxtilacuiloipan, yehica, yn ipan ycatzino yn totecuiyo Dios yn	About Asia And the second part of the world, the land that is called Asia; it is always named by the writers of books, because major dynasties sprung out there. How many (dynasties) were in this (part of the) world is [known] by this way. There were the dynas- ties, governments of the so called Assyrians and Persians and Medians and it is said in this manner, in the book written by priests (Bible) that already God	De Asia La segunda parte del mundo, llamada Asia, ha sido siempre muy nombrada de los escritores, porque en ella hubo las prime- ras monarquías del mundo, como fue la de los Asirios, Per- sas y Medos. Y asimismo es muy celebrada en la sagrada Escritu- ra porque en ella fué por Dios creado el primer hombre; en ella nació Cristo Nuestro Reden- tor y padeció muerte y pasión, por salvarnos. En ella fué

⁴⁷ As been noticed by Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 203.

⁴⁸ For the full version Chimalpahin copies, see Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 150-153, 50-34 & Mengin, 1949-1952: ff. 13r-14v.

⁴⁹ Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 151-152, 18-11 & Mengin, 1949-1952: ff. 13r-14r.

⁵⁰ Martinez, 1948: 119 [trat. II, chap. 7].

Chimalpahi	Traslation	Martinez
<p>De Asia <i>tlachihualtic in yehuatl achto tlacatl yn Adan; yhuan n ipan in motlaca-tilitzino in yehuatzin Christo, totema-quixticatzin, yhuan ynicmolla-yhi-yohuiliti, ynic motonehuiti, ynic otechmomaquixtilli. Auh ca zan no ypan yn omicuillo yn oc cenca huel yn ixquich teohuamoxtli omottalli yn moponhua in ye huecauh huehue-tlapohualiztalhuicaliztli amoxtli catca, yhuan in yancuic tlaxexeloliztla-pohualizamoxtli. Auh ynic xexeliuh-tica yn Asia, ca oc cenca macuilmampa, yn iuh motta yn macuilli yn huehuey tlahtocayotl, yn axcan ye ypan tocahuiuh yn catqui yn xexeliuh-tica. Ca ynic ceccan catqui oncan zan ic cen netechanticate yn Europa, yn oncan tlamachmo huey tlahtohuani yn motenehua ynic quinotza Gran Duque yn itocayocan Moscovia. Auh yn icocan oncan yn tlapachohiia yehuatl huei tlahtohuani yn motenehua yn quitohua Gran Chan Emperador, inhuey tlahtocauh in motenehua Tartaros; auh yniqu excan oncan yn mitohua yn tequiti tlacoti yn ica yxquich yhuelli yn huey tlahtohuani yn motenehua Turco; ce ypan in yn catqui yn motenehua Tierra Sancta, yn tlateochihualtalli Jerusalem. Auh ynic nauhcán ca ye in huey tlahtohuani yn itoca Sophy, rey yn ompa Persia, auh ynín iaxca tlailli, ca ye ytech ontzonquiza, ye conquaxochnamiqui yn itlal yn Turco, ye tonatiuh ycallaquampa, auh ynic nehuan mochipa moyaochiuhticate. Auh ynic macuilmán yhuan yn ca ye tlatzacua yn Asia, ca ompa yn motenehua la India de Portugal, yhuan yhuan yn hueycan yn motenehua Gran China.</i></p>	<p>About Asia Our Lord made there the first man, Adam, and that there the honored Christ, our redeptor, was born and that he endured burdens and pain, by which he liberated us. And that is precisely the way it is written down in the priest book. And the [book] is divided in old book of all things known (Old Testament), it is fixed, it is written down in old times and the new book (New Testament) is written about all things known. And Asia is divided like this; the first ones are the ones who live together [in the neighborhood of] Europe. There the people obey the great prince, the so called and revered sovereign monarch of the so called place of Moscow. And the second is where one bows for the great governor, the so called great-khan, the emperor. His sovereignty is from the so called Tartars. And the third is there, which is called, where labor has been performed. He is the great governor of those who are been called Turks. There is situated the so called Holy Land, the land made by God and Jerusalem. And the fourth is the great sovereign, whose name is king Sophy, there in Persia. And at present the land ends there and they are having flowery wars⁵¹ with the land of the Turks in the neighborhood where the sun sets (West) and therefore they are continually at war to each other. And the fifth and the last [kingdom] in Asia is the so called Portuguese India and the vast [lands] which are called Great-China.</p>	<p>De Asia escrita casi toda la sagrada historia del viejo y nuevo testamento. Dividise la Asia principalmente en cinco partes, según los cinco imperios en que en nuestros tiempos está distribuida. La primera parte, que está continuada con Europa, obedece al gran Duque de Moscovia; la segunda gobierna el gran Chan Emperador de los Tártaros; la tercera parte ocupa la potestad del Turco; en ésta está la Tierra Santa. La cuarta parte es el del Sophy, rey de Persia, cuyas tierras confinan con las del Turco por la parte Occidental, y así traen de ordinario guerra. La quinta y última parte de Asia es la India de Portugal y la gran China.</p>

⁵¹ In the manuscript there is written *conquaxochnamiqui: conqu[ist]a, conquest + xoch[itl]*, flower + *namiqui*, to meet someone. We have translated it like Chimalpahin used the term in his experience as flowery war.

According to these circumstances Martínez's information might be called recent. The author mentions the Safawid (Sophy) dynasty, which only governed Persia since 1602. Another interesting remark is that nor Chimalpahin, nor Martínez use the word America in the passage dealing with this specific continent. They both call the continent the New World (*yancuic cemanahuac*). In the *Relaciones* America as a term never appears. Nevertheless the term was used a hundred years before for the first time,⁵² but was only used frequently from the 19th century on as a distinctive mark of the continent's own identity.

Martínez's *Repertorio* is according to us the most important source in forming Chimalpahin's European image building and his knowledge of the early discoveries, due to the almost exclusive use of this source for these kind of subjects. Some fragments from rel. III⁵³ en VIII⁵⁴ are based on a Martínez like source. Rel. VIII contains mainly a summary of historical facts of Mexican and American events within a limited European framework. We suspect that this information was provided by source of Mexican origin.

A second remark concerns the way in which Chimalpahin deals with this source. He translates the information as good as he can, like he was afraid that a misinterpretation of his side would lead to an incorrect world view or false historical events. We suspect that Chimalpahin's knowledge of the 'humanistic' world concepts at the time were rather limited and that Martínez's book was the most important source to get used with this concepts.

⁵² It was in 1507 that the German cosmographer Waldseemüller gave in his *Cosmographia introductio... insuper quattor Americi Vesputii navigationes* the continent the name America from Amerigo Vespucci.

⁵³ Zimmermann, 1963-1965: 140-141, 49-20 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 115r. Fragment about the discovery of Mexico 1519. Cortés's name is written in the classical Spanish form, i.e. Fernando in stead of Hernando (cf. Martínez, 1948: 149ev). Nevertheless we suspect that there could also be used a native source as appears from the Náhuatl sentence *Oticmihyohuilli oticmociyahuilli, ca mochantzinco ca mopaltzin ca mopetlatzin yn otiqualmomachilti*, what means: You have been tiring yourself by coming this way, you have looked for your home, your *petate* and your seat. *Petatl* and *icpalli* are the radix from respectively *mopetlatzin* and *mopaltzin*. It is a typical Náhuatl expression for sovereignty and rulership. Cf. Siméon, 1965: 153. Icpalli: *marque de la puissance chez les anciens chef, gouverneur, père, mère, etc.*

⁵⁴ Zimmermann, 1963-1965: 175-178, 21-55 & Mengin, 1949-1952: ff. 266v-272v. Fragment about the Spanish royal house. Chimalpahin must have used a source treating exclusively the reign of emperor Charles V, because the source doesn't speak about the government by Philip II. The fragment ends with a description of the transfer of Charles's body from the monastery of San Yuste to the Escorial in Madrid (1574). At that moment Philip II was reigning almost twenty years.

3. How does the *primera relación* relate to the rest of Chimalpahin's *Relaciones*?

Rel. I forms, apart from some loose standing fragments from the other *Relaciones*, together with Rel. VIII the non-chronological-annalistic part of the *Diferentes Historias Originales*.⁵⁵ The eighth one has an absolutely different genre than the first one. Rel. VIII stays situating itself in a historical context and is titled as followed: *La genealogía y declaración de la Descendencia y linaje è generacion y Origen de sus antepasados del señor Don Domingo hernandez Ayopochtzin*,...⁵⁶ Like the title says, Chimalpahin tells in it about the genealogy and origin of his grandfather, Don Domingo Hernández Ayopochtzin. It contains some judgments of values about the meaning of history and some references of the (native) sources, his grandfather consulted. He closes with a description of Spanish dynastic history since Ferdinand and Isabella till Charles V as a comparison to the native dynastic history as a legitimate claim for female succession.⁵⁷

The first *relacion* with the title *Book about the [Creation] of the sky and the earth and of our first father Adam and our first mother Eve*, is an introduction on the Christian history. Man gets a place in the Creator's general historical plan. Because the *primera* has another genre than the other *relaciones*, we had a close look at the contents of the *primera*.⁵⁸ Afterwards we will look at the text's formal aspects. Finally we will compare this text to another religious tinted text by Chimalpahin.

⁵⁵ Cf. Tena, 1998: 356: *Quizá se pueda afirmar que la primera relación funge como prólogo o introducción de la obra completa, y la octava, como apéndice.*

⁵⁶ The complete title is as following: *La genealogía y declaración de la Descendencia y linaje è generacion y Origen de sus antepasados del señor Don Domingo hernandez Ayopochtzin, laqual descendido de la generacion del Viejo Totoltecatl Tzompachtli, y por otro nombre tlaxylotlac teuhctli, que es su appellido, Primer Rey que fue de Teotenanco cuixcoc Temimilolco yhuipan. Este Rey es el tronco y principio de todos los Reyes y señores è principes que ha abido desta generacion naturales en este nuestro pueblo de Amaquemecan en vno de los dichos dos Primeros cinco señorios è principales barrios y cabeçeras que llama Tzacualtilan Tenanco Chiconcohuac que son llamados Ezilapictin Azlanilaca chichimeca, chicomoztoca, cuixcocca, temimilolca, yhuipaneca, cacâca, teotenanca. Compuesta y ordenada por Don Domingo de S. Anton Muñon chimalpahin quauhlehuanitzin, nielo de [dicho señor Don domingo hernandez Ayopochtzin, [na]tural en el dicho Pri[n]cipal barrio y cabeçera o señorio de tzacualtilan tenanco chichoncohuac (que es de[ci]r) el lugar de las siete cuebras) Amaquemecan, Pro[vin]cia de chalco, que aunque indigno, se ocupa y tiene cuida[do] la iglesia y casa de el glorioso y santísimo Pa[tri]ar[cha] de los Monges, Antonio Magno Abad, de la muy noble y gran ciudad de México tenuchtilan, [don]de se crió desde muy niño, a cuyo cargo esta de [natu]ral por la dicha yglesia y la casa, de mas de vefinte] y seys años hasta el día de hoy y presente año de 1620. (Zimmermann, 1963-1965: I, 145 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 225r.)*

⁵⁷ See Tena, 1998: 355-364 for a detailed overview of rel. VIII.

⁵⁸ As Zimmermann, 1963-1965 had not edited rel. I in his critical edition, we have used the paleographic analysis and translation by Tena, 1998: I, 28-51 & MENGIN, 1949-1952: ff. 1r-7v. The sequence of the different folios is not regular. See Castillo, 1991: XXX-XXXIII for his critical analysis and the new constructed sequence concerning rel. I. The sequence is as following: 1r-1v-6r-6v-7r-7v-4r-4v-5v-5v-2r-2v-3r-3v.

CONTENTS OF THE *PRIMERA RELACIÓN*

- 0. Introduction and exposition of what will come.
- 1. First chapter: Everything starts with God/Creation.
 - A. Reasons why a manuscript has to start with the Creation (citations).
 - 1) Plato, About the World's Composition.
 - 2) Plato, Letters.
 - 3) Sophocles, Sentences.
 - 4) Sulla.
 - B. Examples of those who start their writings with the Creation (*authoritates*).
 - 1) Classical authorities.
 - Diogenes Laercius, Live of the Philosophers.
 - 2) Early-Christian authorities.
 - Lactantius Firmianus, Divine Institutions.
 - Eusebius of Caesarea, Ecclesiastical History.
 - Augustine, The State God.
 - Augustine, Confessions.
 - 3) Authorities from the Middle Ages.
 - Celius Rhodiginius, Antique Lessons.
 - Sabellicus, Commentary on the Live of the Emperors (= Ejemplos).
 - 4) Ancient Jewish authorities.
 - Moses, Author of the Book of Genesis.
 - C. Conclusion: I also have to start with God['s history].

1^{bis} Loose fragmenta about the Creation.

- 2. Second Chapter.
 - A. The story of the Creation.
 - 1) Monday: creation of heaven and earth + theological thesis about the creation of the angels.
 - 2) Tuesday: the water falls.
 - 3) Wednesday: creation of the plants.
 - 4) Thursday: creation of the stars, planets, the sun and the moon (cf Martínez & Dante, *Divina Comedia*).
 - 5) Friday: creation of the water animals (fishes and birds).
 - Augustine and Ruperto Abad, Commentary on the Book of Genesis: water animals contain:
 - a) Fishes form the running water.
 - b) Birds from the vapor (clouds).
 - 6) Saturday: creation of all the other animals and finally of man.
 - B. Reason for the primateship of man.
 - 1) Distinction between man and the animals.
 - Physically: hands which can produce instruments and which can tend.

- Mental: soul and consciousness.
 - a) God = 1 divinity = 3 persons.
 - Father.
 - Son.
 - Holy Spirit.
 - b) Soul = 1 'person' = 3 'potencies' (*huehuelliztli*).
 - Memory (*tlalnamiquilliztli*).
 - Comprehension (*tlamachilliztli*).
 - Will (*tlanequilliztli*).
- 2) Man is free. He can save himself (\Leftrightarrow predestination theory).
- C. Commentary on the creation of the angels: the good and the bad angels.
- D. Commentary on the proportions between the heavenly bodies: eleven heavens of which are seven planets (cf. Dante, *Divina Comedia*).
 - 1) First heaven: Moon (planet I).
 - 2) Second heaven: Mercurius (planet II).
 - 3) Third heaven: Venus (planet III).
 - 4) Fourth heaven: Sun (planet IV).
 - 5) Fifth heaven: Mars (planet V).
 - 6) Sixth heaven: Jupiter (planet VI).
 - 7) Seventh heaven: Saturnus (planet VII).
 - 8) Eighth heaven: fixed stars.
 - 9) Ninth heaven: crystal heaven.
 - 10) Tenth heaven: *primum mobile*-mobile heaven.
 - 11) Eleventh heaven: empyreum, God's residence.

In studying rel. I we noticed the text's compact structure. Fragment 1^{bis} is the only exception in this structure. It is something that should not be there eventually. It's a short digression on Adam and Eve, but it doesn't correspond with the previous structure. We even had the feeling Chimalpahin might have used another source or had another purpose when he started this page due to the sentence *nican ompehua*, here starts, here begins...

The scheme does need some explanatory notes. The first chapter is a sort of an account why the author has to start his *Relaciones* with the Creation. The argumentation might be divided into two parts. First he cites some awards from classical authors as his witnesses.⁵⁹ The second part contains citations of classical, early-Christian, medieval and Jewish authorities whose writings also began with God's Creation.⁶⁰ So Chimalpahin's conclusion is clear:

⁵⁹ Tena, 1998: I, 30-32 (*Ynic oniquittac... till... ytzonquizea y nepepeuhcayotl*) & Mengin, 1949-1952: ff. lv-6r.

⁶⁰ Tena, 1998: I, 32-36 (*Auh i yehuantin yn aquique ilacuilloque...till...octacatl machiyotl*) & Mengin, 1949-1952: ff. 6r-6v-7r.

*Auh çano yuh nicacicaytla y nehuatl ca no nonpehuaz yhuan ytechpatzinco yn t[ol]t[ecuiy]o Dios,...*⁶¹

And in view to the fact, like this way thus, I too should begin with God our Lord;...

Chimalpahin has built up most of his argumentation in a scholastically way. This method was used in at the peak and in the late middle ages to claim a theory - in most cases a religious theory. The method was developed in the *Sic et Non* by Abelard (1079-1142). A theory should be defended by producing some arguments in favor (*sic*) and by invalidating the arguments against (*non*). Chimalpahin makes use of this method, but not quite convincingly. He cites some positive arguments, but is silent about arguments against his 'theory'.

The second chapter might be divided into four parts. In the first one Chimalpahin describes the chronological sequence of the Creation in six days.⁶² He has mistaken himself from the official version. In the official version light and dark are created first, then heaven and earth. The third day is devoted to falling of the water and the creation of the plants. The rest of his story is in conformity with the catholic canon.

The third part contains the most elaborated story. Chimalpahin names two reasons for the primateship of man.⁶³ The reasons why God has created man and what task man has on earth. In the first place he sees an important difference between man and the animal in form as in mind. The formal aspect (a human can produce instruments and use them) is something he derived from the Aristotelian philosophy.⁶⁴ The mental aspect is a mixture of ideas from Augustine and from Thomas of Aquino. An almost impossible synthesis view to the fact that Augustine's theory was strongly influenced by neo-Platonism, while Thomas of Aquino drew a great deal from the concepts from Aristotle. The concept of the Holy Trinity has been refined by Augustine,⁶⁵ while

<i>Augustine</i>		<i>Chimalpahin</i>	
God	Soul	Ziel	
Father	To be	Memory	<i>Tlalnamiquilliztli</i>
Son	To know/to be acquainted with	Knowledge/Acquaintance	<i>Tlamachiliztli</i>
Holy Spirit	To live	Will	<i>Tlanequilliztli</i>

⁶¹ Tena, 1998: I, 36 & MENGIN, 1949-1952: F. 7r.

⁶² Tena, 1998: I, 38-44 (*Ynin tlatolli...till...yn quimochihhuilliz yn tlacatl*) & Mengin, 1949-1952: ff. 4r-4v-5r-5v.

⁶³ Tena, 1998: I, 44-50 (*Auh maço nellihui...till...illatitech yn tlacatl*) & Mengin, 1949-1952: ff. 5v-2r-2v-3r-3v.

⁶⁴ Storing, 1994: I, 162.

⁶⁵ Storing, 1994: I, 206. The comparison of concepts between God with his three divinities and the soul with its three potencies is quite similar to that of Augustine.

concepts like potency, capacity (*huellitiliztli*) are clearly derived from Aristotle.⁶⁶ A second reason for primateship is the fact that man is free to live. Man has his own destiny in his own hand, also concerning his salvation. This is an idea by the hand of Thomas of Aquino. Augustine is opposed to this theory. He exactly proclaimed a strict and severe predestination, which was weakened by the Church after his death.⁶⁷

The third part contains a small commentary on the creation of the angels. He had already touched the subject above in describing the creation of the first day. It is sufficient to say that he discusses the theological problem concerning the creation of the angels.⁶⁸

Finally the astronomical image is the subject of his writing, all be it very short. This image is a complete copy of the medieval Ptolemaic cosmology.⁶⁹ Copernicus's new ideas from the 16th century are not a focus point.⁷⁰ Chimalpahin has again made an appeal on the astro-

Dante, Divina Comedia	Martínez, 1948: 5 [trad. I, chap. 3]	Chimalpahin (Tena, 1998: I, 50) ^a
1. First heaven: the moon	1. First heaven: the moon	1. First heaven: the moon
2. Second heaven: Mercurius	2. Second heaven: Mercurius	2. Second heaven: Mercurius
3. Third heaven: Venus	3. Third heaven: Venus	3. Third heaven: Venus
4. Fourth heaven: the sun	4. Fourth heaven: the sun	4. Fourth heaven: the sun
5. Fifth heaven: Mars	5. Fifth heaven: Mars	5. Fifth heaven: Mars
6. Sixth heaven: Jupiter	6. Sixth heaven: Jupiter	6. Sixth heaven: Jupiter
7. Seventh heaven: Saturnus	7. Seventh heaven: Saturnus	7. Seventh heaven: Saturnus
8. Eighth heaven: fixed stars	8. Eighth heaven: fixed stars	8. Eighth heaven: fixed stars
9. Ninth heaven: primum mobile/mobile heaven	9. Ninth heaven: cristal heaven	9. Ninth heaven: cristal heaven
10. [Empyreum] ^b	10. Tenth heaven: primum mobile	10. Tenth heaven: primum mobile
		11. Eleventh heaven: empyreum

^a Chimalpahin's cosmology is a reconstruction based on Martínez's. Chimalpahin mentions there are only eleven heavens including seven planets, but doesn't enumerate them!

^b Dante does not count the empyreum to the class of heavens. He does this, because of the symbolic value of the number nine in his work.

⁶⁶ Storing, 1994: I, 160.

⁶⁷ Storing, 1994: I, 236.

⁶⁸ Tena, 1998: I, 50. (*Auh pican occepa...till...yn ilhuicatl ytic*) & Mengin, 1949-1952: f 3v.

⁶⁹ Tena, 1998: I, 50. (*Yhuan pican mitohua...till...yn mitohua motenehua [planetas]*) & Mengin, 1949-1952: f 3v.

⁷⁰ Tena, 1998: I, 50. Chimalpahin speaks of eleven heavens, which are placed one above the other and of which seven stars are called planets. This cosmological view corresponds a lot with the images of Dante and Martínez. Nevertheless there are some small differences. In Dante's *Divina Commedia* numbers play a primordial role, because of their symbolic significance, while Martínez, an astronomer himself, completely copies the medieval geocentric system: *Mundo es llamado todo lo contenido dentro de la superficie suprema del primer móvil, que son los cielos y elementos, y es figurado en especie y forma globosa perfectamente redonda, y en el medio de él se imagina un punto que se dice centro, el cual es rodeado de todas las cosas que esta universal máquina del mundo* (Martínez, 1948: 3 [trat. I, cha. I]).

nomical content of Martínez's *Repertorio*, but the author has limited himself to copy only the ideas and not the text.

In studying the text's formal aspects we discovered some interesting differences in comparison with the other *relaciones*. First of all, the lines are closer to each other than for example rel. II. The hand writing is quite similar with the other *relaciones*, but in the first one it is a little bit smaller. It seems like the author was writing his *primera* in a less possible number of folios. May be this is an explanation for the deviant writing style, but it is also possible to see it as an evolution in the author's writing style. May be it is possible that there is a significant lap of time in the redaction and writing down of the *primera* and the other *relaciones*. Finally his almost classical margins are missing and the number of interpolations is minimal.⁷¹

Another document, which is now generally accepted as being written by Chimalpahin is the *Exercicio Quotidiano*. This manuscript is preserved in the Newberry Library at Chicago⁷² and counts 43 folios. The remarking signs, crosses, etc were made by the writer himself, while on the small paper format no margins nor interpolations appear. The genre is in some particular lines the same as the *primera*. The purpose of the *Exercicio* is included in the title:

Comiença vn Exercicio en lengua mexicana sacado del sancto Euang[eli].º y distribuido por todos los dias de la semana contiene meditaciones deuotas muy prouechosas para qualquier xpiano.⁷³ que se quiere llegar a dios.

It is a document that gives support to the (new) Christian in sustaining his (new) belief.⁷⁴ It is composed following the seven days of the week, of which each day treats a certain passage extracted from the New Testament with a clear commentary for the listener and finally ending with a prayer. This kind of manuscripts will be propagated along Mexico. The purpose was that the text was read before a small audience to support each other.

⁷¹ An example might be seen at Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 5v.

⁷² Newberry Library of Chicago, Ayer Fund, nbr: 1484. Anderson; Schroeder & Ruwet, 1997: II, 9. See for an detailed description of the manuscript: Schwaller, 1986: 317-343.

⁷³ Read christiano.

⁷⁴ Anderson; Schroeder & Ruwet, 1997: II, 10. The *Exercicio* was a part of a Náhuatl doctrinal encyclopaedia, which was composed by Sahagún with the purpose to help the christians persevering their belief. He has used many times passages or references from the New Testament.

CONTENTS OF THE *EXERCICIO QUOTIDIANO*

0. Introduction:

- A. Appeal to the reader: this text is for everyone who has been baptized.
- B. Promise during the baptism
 - 1) Belief in God
 - 2) Love for God
 - 3) To live following:
 - The ten Commandments.
 - The five Commandments of the Holy Church.
 - To resist against the seven capital sins (to live following the seven virtues).
- C. Conclusion: This exercise will help you to keep your promise.

1. Monday

- A. Fragment John 3, 16: God gave away his Son to the world.
- B. Commentary on the fragment.
- C. Appeal to the auditor:
 - 1) Strengthen yourself and your soul through belief
 - 2) Christ died at the cross for our sins.
 - 3) Honor the Holy Sacraments.
- D. Prayer to God, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

2. Tuesday

- A. Fragment Luke 2, 8-11: Appearance of the angel to the shepherds.
- B. Commentary on the fragment: Christ's submissiveness (cf the shepherds)
- C. Prayer to Mary.
- D. Appeal to the auditor: we live in sin because of
 - 1) Pride \Leftrightarrow Modesty
 - 2) Greed \Leftrightarrow Denial of worldly matters
 - 3) Lust \Leftrightarrow Virginity, chastity
 - = Man = Christ
- E. Prayer to Joseph.

3. Wednesday

- A. Fragment Math. 2, 11-12: Epiphany
- B. Commentary on the fragment.
- C. Prayer to the three kings.
- D. Appeal to the auditor
 - 1) gold = God's love and charity.
 - 2) incense = belief in God.
 - 3) myrrh = repentance.

4. Thursday

- A. Fragment Luke 2, 46-48: Jesus between the scribes in the temple.
- B. Commentary on the fragment
- C. Prayer to Mary: pains of the mother (dolor matris).
- D. Prayer to Joseph: pains of the father (dolor patris).

- E. Appeal to the auditor: do what God desires from you in spite of the pain to your parents!
5. Friday
- A. Fragment Math. 3, 16-17: Christ's baptism.
 - B. Commentary on the fragment (with the dogma of the Saint Trinity).
 - C. Prayer to John the Baptist.
 - D. Appeal to the auditor: Belief in God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.
6. Saturday
- A. Fragment John 13, 34-35: White Thursday.
 - B. Commentary on the fragment: the institution of a new covenant between God and his chosen people.
 - C. Appeal to the auditor:
 - 1) What is God's nature? There is only one God, but there are three persons: the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.
 - 2) Who are my fellow-men? Everyone is your fellow-man, treat him like you would be treated yourself
 - 3) What is pure love?
 - Care for the own soul:
 - a) Sacraments
 - b) God's word (gospel)
 - c) Sermons, *doctrines*, etc.
 - Charity
 - D. Prayer to the Holy Spirit
 - E. Appeal to the auditor: the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are all mighty and one.
7. Sunday
- A. Fragment Luke 22, 15-20: Last supper.
 - B. Commentary on the fragment: to remember the last supper in the mass through the Communion.
 - C. Prayer to God the Father: enlighten my spirit, so I stay free of sins.
 - D. Appeal to the auditor:
 - 1) Clarification of the consecration.
 - 2) Necessity to have a 'pure soul' in undergoing the Communion.
 - 3) Comparison of the Communion: bread and wine, body and blood.

8. Colophon

Again a remarkable ordered structure might be deducted from the text, although the train of thoughts is sometimes complicated. Also this fragment has minimal erasures. That the piece is a copy, becomes clear at folio 37v. The copyist has taken over the wrong line from the original and has erased the incorrect line. The erased text was intended for the next line.⁷⁵ Nevertheless there are some possibilities in which Chimalpahin could have made some small adjustments. We have found

⁷⁵ Anderson; Schroeder & Ruwet, 1997: II, 174.

two examples, where the copyist has written a small explanation to a line. On folio 14r there is a description of myrrh:

... *teocuitlatl in mirrhain* *in chichic pahztintli*, *yhuan in Encienso*...⁷⁶
 ...gold, myrrh, ^{a bitter salve,} and incense

It is as if the copyist wanted to make clear to his audience what mirrha exactly was. Another example testifies the rather deep religiosity of the copyist.

...*auh in nehuapol in ni^{ye}l tlatlacohuani*...⁷⁷
 ...and I, ^{great} sinner;...

What is important next to these fragments are the great number of Spanish loan words and that all seven biblical fragments are written down in Latin. The translation of each fragment follows directly and is close to the original fragment.

We can question ourselves in how far the *Exercicio quotidiano* could tell us something about the composition of the *primera relación*. Both texts are written/copied by Chimalpahin. At what time there are written down, we have to guess. But we can be quite sure that due to the powerful contents of both texts, these were not written at the beginning of his *copista* career, but at a more mature moment.

Concerning the formal aspects we notified some resemblances. Both manuscripts lack the margins, which are typical for Chimalpahin's historical accounts in the *Relaciones*. Both manuscripts are also written down in a neat form, although this is more clearer in one manuscript than the other. This forms one the reason that the *Exercicio* can be seen as a copy of a Náhuatl original.

The *Exercicio's* internal structure is from the one hand clear and from the other one logical. Each meditation is illustrated by a fragment and a commentary and contents a prayer for the pious auditor. Regarding rel. I we see some differences, although there are some reasons to claim that rel. I is partly created in Chimalpahin's mind. The most important reason is the fact that the story of the Creation is in conformity with the official catholic version, but Chimalpahin has, due to ignorance or due to own opinion, adjusted some days of the creation. We can't imagine that a monk would commit this kind of slovenliness. A second argument consists of what we called fragment

⁷⁶ Anderson; Schroeder & Ruwet, 1997: II, 146.

⁷⁷ Anderson; Schroeder & Ruwet, 1997: II, 156.

1^{bis}. The structure does not correspond into the whole part and might be seen as something what should not be there. It does show that rel. I is compiled. A third argument is that some passages are written in the 1-form, next to the usual we-form.⁷⁸ The *Exercicio* is less easy to be compared with, because of the more impersonal style in which it is written. The moralistic narrator becomes central in this text and he is not per definition the same as the author or the copyist.

It might now be obvious that the writer has based himself on Spanish sources (may be even Latin sources) for the composition of rel. I. This becomes clear when Spanish loan words occur in titles (*Divinas Instituciones*, *Libro de la Ciudad*) or as an explanation of some citations (*ciudad* as untranslated term for city, *angelosme*, etc.). If we claim that Chimalpahin has used partially his own creativity in composing rel. I, he must have used also something or someone else for the rest of the *primera*. At first instance Chimalpahin could have procured himself some information by the channel of education.⁷⁹ A second argument is that he cites a large scale of authorities. Viewing Chimalpahin's appointment at an ecclesiastical institution and the proximity of some large libraries, the author had as well the motive as the occasion to draw from the works he cited.⁸⁰ These works he cites literally with the only difference that he

⁷⁸ For instance Tena, 1998: I, 36 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 7r: *Auh çano yuh nicacicaytta y nehuatl ca no nonpehuaz yhuau ytechpatzinco yn t[ol]fecuiyo Dios; ... And view to the fact, like this way thus, I too should begin with God our Lord;...*

⁷⁹ Cf. the analysis by Ricard, 1933: 353-356 of a *doctrina dominicana* from 1548, which was used in education. It consists of lessons about the Ten Commandments, the Holy Sacraments, the antropogenese of God, etc. See also the possibility that Chimalpahin has formed some ideas of theological dogmata and theories educated to the indians by means of self studying Ricard, 1933: 124-125: *On y distingue deux parties très nettes. D'abord, les prières et les vérités essentielles, que tout le monde, en principe, devait connaître, que l'on enseignait à l'église et sur quoi étaient interrogés tous les candidats aux sacrements, baptême, mariage, confession, communion, confirmation: le signe de la croix, le Credo, le Pater Noster, L'Ave Maria et le Salve Regina, les quatorze articles de la Foi - dont sept se rapportent à la divinité et sept à l'humanité de Jésus-Christ - les dix commandements de Dieu et les cinq commandements de l'Eglise, les sept sacrements, le péché véniel et le péché mortel, les sept péchés capitaux et la confession générale; cette dernière, exceptionnellement, est placée à la fin de la doctrina. La seconde partie est constituée par des vérités complémentaires, dont la connaissance n'était pas jugée indispensable à tous. Aussi ne l'enseignait-on qu'aux enfants élevés dans les couvents. [...] Cette seconde partie comprend: les vertus cardinales et théologiques, les œuvres de miséricordes, les dons du Saint-Esprit, les sens, les facultés de l'âme, les ennemis de l'âme, les béatitudes, les corps glorieux et les devoirs des parrains.*

⁸⁰ In Mexico there was a large number of religious books. Cf. Ricard, 1933: 345-352: *Essai d'inventaire en langues indigènes ou relatifs aux langues indigènes écrits par des religieux entre 1524 et 1572*. See also Mathes, 1982: 45-77 who makes a reconstruction of the books which were present at the library of the colegio de Santa Cruz in Tlatelolco between 1535 and 1600. Mathes, 1982: 83 has classified 335 books according to a number of categories: Bible and commentaries: 44; law: 12; theology: 62; philosophy: 43; history/geography: 15; secular literature: 26; liturgy: 7; missals/catechisms/handbooks: 33; articles and regulations: 21; sermons and homilies: 58 and finally church scholars: 14.

stops mentioning his source with the name of the book or the author, while in the *Exercicio* the chapter is clearly mentioned. There is also a (strong) possibility that Chimalpahin used informants drawn from clerical-religious sphere. These informants will have given him rather unintended some of their ideas. One can think at the numerous sermons which were held at *plazas* or within churches. This could be an explanation for the not so conformist ideas for the Creation story. Finally there is also the possibility that he has taken some ideas and concepts out of religious inspired writing or out his numerous copy works. The *Exercicio* could be such an example regarding the Saint Trinity. Important is the fact that we suspect that Chimalpahin himself has rigged up the whole concept (Trinity - soul)⁸¹ The contents of rel. I consists of some contradictory ideas. Chimalpahin uses both Augustine as Thomas of Aquino in his argumentation regarding the primateship of man. It is as if some arguments and ideas haunt through the mind of the author, ideas he has heard once somewhere. The strong Aristotelian term 'potency' (*huellitiliztli*) is used in combination with Augustine's 'neo-platonistic' tinted comparison between the God's three persons and the soul's three forms. Also the soul's three forms are rather liberally translated by Chimalpahin and are not easy to compare with the forms Augustine meant. Due to this fragment's copy and paste character we are convinced that Chimalpahin has tried to unite several different ideas, of which he thought they corresponded to each other. If Chimalpahin

⁸¹ Maybe Chimalpahin has made use of the same method he describes in rel. VIII: *Auh ynin libro ynic huel qualli neltiliztlahtolli yn itech tecpantica, oncan ytech cequi onicixtli in huehueltlahtolli, onicnehehuilli onicetilli yn ulahtolllatecpanaltzin yetiuh yehuatzin omoleneuhtzino don Domingo Hernández Ayopochtzin*. And from this book, which mentions lots of beautiful and trueful words, I drew a fragment from the huehueltlahtolli [the word of the elders de oral tradition], which fragment I compared at once and which I combined with the writing of the so called don Domingo Hernández Ayopochtzin (Zimmermann, 1963-1965: I, 156, 36-39 & Mengin, 1949-1952: ff. 239v240r.). See also the remark of Ricard, 1933: 328-329 concerning the Saint Trinity: *Fray Juan Bautista nous a expliqué l'origine de deux erreurs relatives au dogme de la Trinité qui, nous dit-il, sont extrêmement fréquentes chez les Indiens. La première porta sur l'unité divine, et elle est due au fait que les missionnaires ont employé en nahuatl une phrase amphibologique, qui peut avoir une signification orthodoxe, No ay mas de vn Dios, el qual es Padre, Hijo y Spiritu Sancto, tres personas, vn solo Dios, mais qui est susceptible également d'une interprétation parfaitement hétérodoxe, Dios es Padre, Hijo, y Spiritu sancto, tres personas, vna sola dellas verdadero Dios. Presque tous les Indiens, affirme fr. Juan Bautista, ont pris la proposition dans ce dernier sens, et croient que le Fils est le seul Dieu. L'autre erreur porte sur la distinction des personnes. Certains missionnaires font préciser en effet au sujet du Père, du Fils et du Saint-Esprit, trino en personas, y vno en esencia. Mais la phrase aussi est obscure et beaucoup d'Indiens ont compris que Dieu est une seule personne qui s'appelle de trois façons différentes. Chimalpahin has reproduced the dogma in a correct way, but he pottered when he was comparing the soul in a theological way. Tena, 1998: I, 48 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f 3r.: ...yehica yn iuhqui yehuatzin t[ot]fecu[ty]o Dios ca za huel cetzin auh yn iyeitiliztinz huel cececcan moquixtlicate yn cecenme ynic ilacatzitzintli personas.... And so is it that God our Lord is one, but his in his being three each of the persons differ from each other.*

would have copied the text, we consider the chance as good as marginal that there was such a text on hand for his *primera relación*. Secondly we consider it as almost impossible to find two such clashing concepts, one from Thomas of Aquino (Aristotelian), the other from Augustine (neo-platonic), in one text. There is however a possibility that the *primera relación* was written down after the redaction of the *segunda*.⁸²

Conclusion

- 1) Some irregularities (fragment 1^{bis}, misinterpretations, conflicting ideas, unclear terminology) let us suspect that Chimalpahin has composed rel. 1 by himself, but has used therefore a number of sources to form his ideas (informants, books and education).
- 2) The particular logical structure might be explained, because rel. 1 was a neat version. The author has probably developed his ideas on rough draught.
- 3) Due to the powerful contents and the supposition that some kind of well-reading and theological knowledge was needed, we suspect that rel. I was composed during the author's mature age.
4. Did Chimalpahin study at the Colegio de Santa Cruz and how acquainted was the author with Latin?

One of the problems scientist have when studying on Chimalpahin is related to his education. There is already a long discussion going on in the scientific arena if Chimalpahin has studied at the Colegio de Santa Cruz.

The Colegio de Santa Cruz, situated in the center of Tlatelolco, was a well known educative institution, which was headed by the Franciscan monks. The institution stood under the high protection of the first

⁸² In rel. II Chimalpahin places the theme of the Creation, the deluge and the live of Christ in a historical frame. (Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 147-150, 1-16 & Mengin, 1949-1952: ff. 9r-12v.). This is already proclaimed in rel. I (Mengin, 1949-1952: ff. 1r-1v.): *Auh ye quin çatepa miloz motenehuaz yn iuh nenque achto totalzin Adán yhuan yn achto tonantzín Eva, yhuan ynic mopilhuatique moxinachoque y nohuian ypa cemanahuatl yn ip[a oncan cahuitl], yhuan ynic momiqui[jlique; yshuan] yn tleyn ipa xihuítl mochiuh yn apachihui[lliz]tli ynic poll[ioh]uac yn ipa yloca Noé yn milohua motenehua diluvio*. But afterwards it shall be said how out first father Adam and out first mother Eve lived, how they had children and how their seed spread out over the whole world in this time and how they died. And [it will be said] in which year the flood began, which is also called deluge, when everything died at the time of Noe. In this view this would mean that Chimalpahin had already a copy of rel. II in front of him before starting with rel. I. On the other hand if Chimalpahin had made a scheme how his *Diferentes Historias Originales* should look like, it can be interpreted as if rel. I was redacted before rel. II. Personally we agree with the first idea, especially for the mature contents of rel. I.

vice-royalties of New Spain. The institution's purpose was to bring to the children of the indian elite a humanistic education.⁸³ The Colegio's program consisted necessarily of Latin, philosophy and theology.⁸⁴ In the middle of the 16th century it was one of the most important culture bearers of Mexico-City,⁸⁵ although its decline was coming soon. One of the strongest reasons was the rejection of the idea by the Mexican Council in 1555, allowing Indians to become priest. So the humanistic program has lost its most primary function. Latin, logics and philosophy disappeared from the time-table.⁸⁶ Financially the college saw the treasury's bottom after the vice-royalties had withdrawn their support.⁸⁷ Nevertheless, there was still enough potential albeit for a much more select group.⁸⁸ At the beginning of the 17th century the college would

⁸³ Torquemada, 1969: III, 113 [lib. XV, chap. 48]: ...y estos fuesen Niños de diez, a doce Años, Hijos de los Señores, ò Principales, de los Maiores Pueblos, ò Provincias de la Nueva-España, trayendo aquí dos, ò tres de cada Cabecera, ò Pueblo Principal, porque todos participasen deste Beneficio.

⁸⁴ Ricard, 1933: 264. Mathes, 1982: 81: The dominant Latin character is illustrated by the large preponderance of Latin titles in the library: 268 Latin titles on 335 books.

⁸⁵ The knowledge of the indian college students is illustrative at Torquemada, 1969: III, 115 [lib. XV, chap. 48]: ...y no contendo con esto, mandòle decir el Credo: y diciendolo bien, arguiòle el Clerigo una palabra que el Indio dijo, Natus ex Maria Virgine, y replicòle el Clerigo. Nato ex Maria Virgine. Como el Indio se afirmase en decir Natus, y el Clerigo, que Nato, tuvo el Estudiante necesidad de probar por su Gramatica, como no tenia raçon de emendarle así, y preguntòle (hablando en Latin) Reverende Pater, Nato, cuius casus est? Y como el Clerigo, no supiese tanto como esto, ni como responder, huvo de ir afrentado y confuso... See also the large number of writers (Sahagún Olmos Valeriano, etc.) who acted as teachers at the college Torquemada, 1969: I, 607 [lib. V, chap. 10] en III, 442 [lib. XX, chap. 26].

⁸⁶ Torquemada, 1969: III, 115 [lib. XV, chap. 48]: Enseñoale a los Indios, Cambien la Medicina, que ellos usan, en conocimiento de Yervas, y Raices, y otras cosas, que aplican en sus Enfermedades: mas esto todo se acabò y aora solo sirve el Colegio de enseñar a los Niños, que aquí se juntan (que son deste mismo Pueblo de Tlatelolco, con algunos otros de otros Barrios) a Leer, y Escribir, y buenas Costumbres.

⁸⁷ Torquemada, 1969: III, 114 [lib. XV, cap. 48]: Algunos Años (que respecto de los presentes, podemos llamar tiempos Dorados) fue favorecida esta Obra, todo el tiempo que governò su Fundador Don Antonio, y despues su sucesor Don Luis de Velasco el Primero: que siendo informado, no bastava la Renta del Colegio, par sustentar tantos Colegiales, hizo dello Relacion al Emperador (de Gloria Memoria) y de su Mandato, les ayudava cada Año, con ducientos Ducados de Castilla (que todos estos Favores, se podrán ver en el tiempo de su Gobierno) mas despues que èl murió, ni ningun favor se les ha mostrado: antes por el contrario se ha sentido disfavor en algunos, que despues acà han Governado, y aun deseo de quererles quitar lo poco que tenían: y el Beneficio, que se les hace a los Indios, es aplicarlo a Españoles; porque parece bien por mal empleado, todo el bien, que se hace a los Indios, y por tiempo perdido, el que se gasta con ellos.

⁸⁸ Mathes, 1982: 34-35 & 37: Mientras que en lo general los estudios del colegio se limitaron a la enseñanza de la lectura y la escritura a los pequeños indígenas, Alonso de Molina, Bernardino de Sahagún, y despues de 1578, Pedro Oroz, dedicaron el centro al estudio del latín y el náhuatl, con las traducciones e informes etnohistóricos efectuados por un pequeño grupo de alumnos avanzados.

A fines del siglo XVI, el Colegio Imperial de Santa Cruz, pese a sus tribulaciones, continuó la tradición franciscana de los estudios de lingüística y etnología. Juan Baptista enseñó el náhuatl a Juan de Torquemada, y siguiendo el ejemplo de Bernardino de Sahagún, Jacobo de Mendoza Tlaltenzin, Alfonso Izhuezcatocatzin y Pablo Nazareno sirvieron de informantes a Fernando Alvarado Tezozomoc, Juan Bautista, Alonso de Zorita y Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxóchitl, cuyas obras permanecen como clásicos de la etnología e historia mexicanas.

limit itself by procuring only elementary education for the children from Tlatelolco.⁸⁹

If we could prove by use of Chimalpahin's sources that the author was acquainted with Latin, this could be a strong argument in claiming Chimalpahin had studied at the Colegio in Tlatelolco. A possible lack of Latin could also tell us something about his degree of education. Before starting with producing arguments, we would like to outline the discussion about this subject in a historical perspective.

There is a large black hole between his birth in 1579 and the moment he was appointed as a *donado* in 1595. The only thing we know in this interlapse is the fact he entered the monastery of San Antonio Abad in 1593. It is a great mystery what the young indian did in the meantime during his stay at the capital, but there is a possibility he devoted himself to education. It is at this point that the discussion starts between the older and the younger generation of americanists. Ángel Maria Garibay Kintana claimed just like León y Gama did that Chimalpahin was a student at the so called college.⁹⁰

Romero Galván is not quite as sure as the gentlemen above, because nor in his *Relaciones*, nor in his *Diario*, Chimalpahin refers to the fact he was a student at this college.⁹¹ Chimalpahin however mentions that on Tuesday October 5, 1593 he entered the monastery of San Antonio Abad in Xoloco.

*Yn ipan axcan a 5 de octubre de 1593 años ypan martes yn onicallac yn teopanchantzinc notlazottatzin señor Sant Antonio Abbad yn nican Xoloco nehuatl Domingo de Sant Anton Muñón Chimalpahin, ompa nochan Tzaqualtilan Tenanco Amaquemecan Chalco.*⁹²

Today October 5, of the year 1593, it was then Tuesday, I entered, Domingo de San Antón Muñón Chimalpahin, original from there, Tzacualtitlan Tenanco Amaquemecan Chalco, the honorable church from our lord señor San Antonio Abad, here at Xoloco.

According to Schroeder⁹³ Chimalpahin could not have studied at the Colegio, because he was already at the age fourteen in 1593, when he entered the church of San Antonio Abad. So there was no time enough to study at the Colegio.

⁸⁹ Gibson, 1964: 382-383.

⁹⁰ León y Gama quoted in GLASS, 1975: 15; Garibay, 1954: II, 229: *Tezozómoc y Chimalpain deben ser enumerados aquí, aunque en otro lugar se estudiarán un poco más. Ambos, colegas de Tlatelolco, ...*

⁹¹ Romero Galván, 1983: 18.

⁹² Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 41-42, 57-2.

⁹³ Schroeder, 1991: 7.

Chimalpahin describes even in his work that in 1620 he was working for San Antonio as *donado*⁹⁴ or *fiscal*⁹⁵ for twenty six years already.⁹⁶ Siméon drew already the reader's attention to the fact Chimalpahin counts inclusively, a typical native way of counting. Besides Siméon states: *Il en fait ordinairement autant pour tous ses calculs*.⁹⁷ This would mean that he only was appointed *donado* or *fiscal* in 1595. Although Chimalpahin entered already San Antonio Abad, he must have occupied another function between 1593 and 1595.

Another possible contradictory is coming from fray Juan Bautista who was teaching Náhuatl at the college during no less than 30 years. In his *Sermonario* dating from 1606 he mentions the most important names of his students, but Chimalpahin does not appear on this list.⁹⁸

Nevertheless Chimalpahin would have been a good candidate to get an honorable note in the authorious book. The fact of being absent is at least a clue that if the author had studied at the Colegio, he must have left less to none impression. Or could it be that his low social status explains the absence? Was he not important enough to get a place on the list? Or were Chimalpahin's writing ambitions yet unknown to the small intellectual clique in Mexico-City?

Chimalpahin's *Diferentes Historias Originales* could procure us further clues in the same direction. If we could find Latin terms or sources in his work, these sources could tell us something about Chimalpahin's linguistic knowledge and about the importance of these sources in relation to his *Relaciones*.

Going back to our scheme containing the sources for Chimalpahin's *Relaciones* we can point three groups of sources which could be written in Latin. They are the biblical sources, the antique sources and the *Historia Scholastica* by Petrus Comestor, which is classified under the Spanish sources.

From the last one we know that there were enough Spanish translations at the time of Chimalpahin and that there is also a strong possibility he based himself on the marginals from other works to get his information. So we have enough reasons to presume that acquaintance of Latin was not indispensable for this book.

⁹⁴ Anderson; Schroeder & Ruwet, 1997-: I, 5. Schroeder, 1989: 22 describes *fiscal* as a native church steward and catechist, working under the supervision of a priest.

⁹⁵ A sort of a lay brother.

⁹⁶ Zimmermann, 1963: I, 153, 7-16 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 234v.

⁹⁷ Siméon, 1968: XX, note 1. A shade is necessary. Chimalpahin counts inclusively in rel. VI and VII, the ones translated by Siméon.

⁹⁸ Fray Juan Bautista quoted in Schroeder, 1991: 7.

The works we have classified under the biblical sources were present in Mexico, but were also translated into Spanish and even Náhuatl. The Spanish monks were clever enough to understand that Christianization would be much easier if the monks would learn the native languages than if the Indians would acquaint themselves Spanish. This is for instance one of the reasons why Náhuatl and other native languages had still an important place within Mexican society before independence and still have now. The monks learned the Indian's languages and needed dictionaries like fray Alonso de Molina's to fill their desire to perfection. Apart from this there existed also manuscripts in which the highlights of the biblical history were drawn in the same pictographic writing as that in Aztec times to make clear to the native population how to understand the most necessary biblical concepts. All these sources lacked Latin knowledge for the reader or auditor. It is even so that according to Serge Gruzinski⁹⁹ popular antique works knew translations into native languages to improve cultural assimilation and education.

Most of the antique sources are ecclesiastical editions - a small number are humanistic ones - which are used in rel. I. They are cited by their Spanish title like *La Ciudad de Dios, Ejemplos, De las divinas instituciones* and two times by their Latin title [*De*] *Constitutione mundi and Lectiones*.¹⁰⁰ However there are no Spanish or Latin citations, like in his *Exercicio Quotidiano*. On the one hand he could have thought that these citations were incomprehensible for his Náhuatl readers or auditors.¹⁰¹ On the other hand it was an excellent opportunity to let them show how erudite he was by showing a number of Latin titles.

Apart from some Latin titles there is only one Latin term in the whole of the *Relaciones*. It deals with the astrological sign *gemini*, which Chimalpahin mentions at the entry of his birth.

9-Riet 1576 - ... y huallathuic, miercoles, ynic ye 27 mani metztli mayo, ypan netlazotaliztli motenehua: signo geminis ye chicuacemilhuitia, yn lhcucac otlacat omoteneuh Domingo de Sanct Anton.¹⁰²

And it was early in the morning, on Friday May 27, under the sign of twins (*translated from Latin*) our mutual love, which [was reigning] six days, when the so called Domingo de San Antón was born.

⁹⁹ *La culture des élites intellectuelles dans la ville de Mexico durant 1560-1630*, lecture held by Serge Gruzinski at the Catholic University of Louvain (KUL), Belgium on January 5, 1999.

¹⁰⁰ Tena, 1998: I, 30 & 34 & Mengin, 1949-1952: ff. I v. & 7r.

¹⁰¹ Anderson; Schroeder & Ruwet, 1997: II, 10 note 20.

¹⁰² Zimmermann, 1963-1965: II, 28, 6-9 & Mengin, 1949-1952: f. 218v.

Chimalpahin translates the term *gemini* as *netlazotlaliztli*, which Siméon on his turn translates as "*amour mutuel*".¹⁰³ The transitive verb *tlazotla* is the central radix, which means to love. The prefix *ne-* is used with reciprocal verbs meaning each other or as significance that the reciprocal verb is substantivied. Then it gets the suffix *iz-tli*, a second indication that it becomes a substantive verb.¹⁰⁴ Literally one can translate *netlazotlaliztli* as the loving of each other. The translation made by Siméon is functional in this sense. Remarkably the number two nowhere appears in this description, while it's basically the significance of *gemini*. On the contrary, Chimalpahin bases himself on a more visual interpretation of the astrological sign *gemini* than the proper significance.

His description in the Bible Society Library Papers of the same astrological sign is even unclear. There he says the following about *gemini*:

*ypa[n] quicuepa yn ilhuicamatinime yn ome[n]tin pipiltzitzinti mohuatequi yuh quihthua ca ym omextin tlacati ynic cenca mottlazotla ynic ayc mixnamiqui.*¹⁰⁵

Those who are ignorant, translate it as two children who embrace each other. They say it like this way, when the two children are born, they love each other some much that they never quarrel with each other.

Chimalpahin writes down what does not interfere with *gemini*, but he doesn't explain precisely what the sign means. Besides this misinterpretation corresponds with Chimalpahin's first fragment about *gemini*, meaning mutual love. This fragment is a textual copy which we found in Martínez's *Repertorio*.¹⁰⁶

El tercer signo llamado Géminis figuraron los poetas por dos niños abrazados, diciendo ser dos hermanos tan amados entre sí que nunca tuvieron contienda,...

The same visual interpretation might be seen when Chimalpahin describes the sign Sagittarius "*ypan quicuepa centauro tlacamazatl*"¹⁰⁷ (one translates it as centaur or human deer). Chimalpahin again has made an appeal to Martínez.¹⁰⁸ He doesn't put a good face on the matter.

¹⁰³ Siméon, 1889: 293.

¹⁰⁴ Karttunen, 1992: 160.

¹⁰⁵ Anderson, Schroeder & Ruwet, 1997: II, 128.

¹⁰⁶ Martínez, 1948: 22 [trat. I, chap. 16].

¹⁰⁷ Anderson, Schroeder & Ruwet, 1997: II, 128.

¹⁰⁸ Martínez, 1948: 24-25 [trat. I, chap. 22]: *El noveno signo del zodiaco se dice Sagitario y es figurado por un Centauro tirando flechas,...* The Inquisition was particularly opposed against

Nowhere we found the expression *niquicuepa* (I translate it), but *quicuepa* (one/he translates it).

Ground on our own experiences regarding Chimalpahin's *Relaciones* there are few arguments that are in favor for his Latin knowledge. He was acquainted with it, due to the fact he cited some titles. The only important motive for the *conscious* lack of Latin would be that his public was not used to understand Latin.

The *Exercicio* on the contrary, explodes with Latin texts. Each of the seven fragments is cited in a Latin form and is afterwards translated. We do know that this manuscript is copied by Chimalpahin. If Chimalpahin was not acquainted with Latin, we might expect to find some writing mistakes in the manuscript. Apart from some small changes between e and a and i and y, the text was copied correctly. This should mean Chimalpahin was at least acquainted with this foreign language,¹⁰⁹ but more than that we don't suspect. The author spent more than twenty years in the monastery of San Antonio Abad. By this way of living he was constantly in contact with the church's language and had all the time of the world to acquaint himself with it. We cannot exclude for 100 % that he could have studied at the Santa Cruz college, but it is obvious now that if he studied over there, it was of little influence on his future writings. It seems that Chimalpahin had learned the most of his knowledge during his stay in San Antonio,¹¹⁰ where he experienced a lot as a *copista* and by copying the works and books from illustrious predecessors. May be it were the copies that became his principal teachers.

any form of astrology or the spreading of it. In 1616 the Inquisition had proclaimed a decree forbidding any form of astrology. The punishment could be total excommunication. The Inquisition argued as following: *No hay ningún arte o ciencia humana capaz de manifestar las cosas venideras cuando dependen de la voluntad del hombre, porque esto ha sido reservado por Dios Nuestro Señor a Sí Mismo, con Su Sabiduría Eterna* (Leonard, 1976: 136). The relation between the inquisitorial decree and Chimalpahin's astrological knowledge would lead to two suppositions. First of all it could point out, if Chimalpahin was acquainted with the decree and he followed it, he would have written rel. VII before 1616, date of the emission of the decree. Secondly, if Chimalpahin was not aware of it or ignored the decree, the Inquisition was not as authoritarian and powerful as it was in Spain.

¹⁰⁹ We agree with what was already suspected by Anderson, Schroeder & Ruwet, 1997: II, 9.

¹¹⁰ We agree with the opinion of Romero Galván, 1983: 18: *Lo cierto es que, habiendo sido o no alumno del Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco, fue en la capital de la Nueva España donde consolidó su formación,...*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACOSTA, José de, *Historia natural y moral de las Indias*, Madrid, 1987, 515 p.
- ANDERSON, Arthur J.O., Schroeder, Susan & Ruwet, Wayne (eds.), *Codex Chimalpahin: society and politics in Mexico Tenochtitlan, Tlatelolco, Texcoco, Culhuacan, and other Nahuatl altepetl in central Mexico : the Nahuatl and Spanish annals and accounts collected and recorded by don Domingo de San Antón Muñón Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin*. Norman, 1997, 2 v.
- BOBAN, Eugène. *Documents pour servir à l'histoire du Mexique. Catalogue raisonné de la collection du M. E. Eugène Goupil*. Paris, 1891, 2 v.
- CASTILLO F., Victor M. (ed.), *Memorial breve acerca de la fundación de la ciudad de Culhuacan*. Serie de Cultura Náhuatl Fuentes 9. Mexico-City, 1991, LXVIII-157 p.
- Catalogue Général des Livres Imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Paris, 1897-1981, v. 231.
- COMESTOR, Petrus. *Eine deutsche Schulbibel des 15. Jahrhunderts: Historia Scholastica des Petrus Comestor*. Berlin, 1925, 2 v.
- DURAND-FOREST, J. de, *Extractos de la Primera Relación de Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin (Manuscrito No. 74 de la Colección Goupil-Aubin de la Biblioteca Nacional de París)*. Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl México-City, 1990, 20, 65-76.
- GARIBAY K., Ángel María, *Historia de la literatura náhuatl*. Mexico-City, 1954, 2 v.
- GIBSON, Charles, *The Aztecs under Spanish Rule*. Stanford 1964, XII-657 p.
- GLASS, John B. (ed), *Compendio de la historia mexicana. The Lesser-Writings of Domingo Chimalpahin 7 & Contributions to the ethnohistory of Mexico 3*. Lincoln Center (Mass.), 1975, 24 p.
- IXTLILXOCHITL, Don Fernando de Alva, *Obras Históricas*. Mexico-City, 1975, 2 v.
- KARTTUNEN, Frances, *An analytical Dictionary of Nahuatl*. Norman-London, 1992, XXXIV-349 p.
- LEHMANN, Walter & Kutscher, Gerdt (eds.), *Das Memorial breve acerca de la fundación de la ciudad de Culhuacan und weitere ausgewählte Teile aus den Diferentes Historias originales de los reynos de Culhuacan y Mexiko, y de otras provincias. Quellenwerke zur alten Geschichte Amerikas, aufgezeichnet in der Sprachen der Eingeborenen 7*. Stuttgart, 1958, XXXIX-240 p.

- LEONARD, Irving A., *La Época Barroca en el México Colonial*. Mexico-City, 1976, 333 p.
- LEÓN-PORTILLA, Miguel, *Chimalpahin's Use of a Testimony by Sahagún: The Olmecs in Chalco-Amaquemecan*. In: J. Jorge Klor de Alva; H.B. Nicholson & Eloise Quiñones Keber (eds.). *The Work of Bernardino de Sahagún: Pioneer Ethnographer of Sixteenth-Century Aztec Mexico*. Albany, 1988, 179-198.
- MARTÍNEZ, Enrico, *Repertorio de los Tiempos Modernos*. Mexico-City, 1948, XLVII-317 p.
- MATHES, Miguel, *Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco: La primera Biblioteca Académica de las Américas*. Mexico-City, 1982, 103 p.
- MENGIN, Ernst (ed.), *Diferentes historias originales de los reynos de Culhuacan y Mexiko, y de otras provincias. Liber in lingua mexicana manuscriptus ut est conservatus in Bibliotheca Nationis Gallicae Parisiensi sub numero LXXXIV. Cum praefatione in lingua britannica, gallica, germanica et hispana*. Copenhagen, 1949-1952, 2 v.
- MESSIAEN, S.A.D., *Grandeza Mexicana. Een beeld van Mexico-Stad aan het begin van de 17^{de} eeuw aan de hand van de historische bronnen voor Chimalpahins "Diferentes Historias Originales"*. Louvain, 1999, 160 p. (Unedited thesis, manuscript)
- PALAU Y DULCET, Antonio. *Manual del Librero Hispanoamericano*. Barcelona, 1948-1977, 27 v.
- RENDÓN, Silvia (ed.), *Relaciones originales de Chalco Amaquemecan. Biblioteca Americana: Serie de literatura indígena 40*. Mexico-City, 1965, 367 p.
- RICARD, Robert, *La "Conquête spirituelle" du Mexique. Essai sur l'apostolat et les méthodes missionnaires des Ordres Mendicants en Nouvelle Espagne de 1523-24 à 1572*. Paris, 1933, XIX-396 p.
- ROMERO GALVÁN, José Rubén (ed.), *Octava relación: obra histórica de Domingo Francisco de San Antón Muñón Chimalpahin Quauhtelhuauhtzin. Serie de Cultura Náhuatl Fuentes 8*. Mexico-City, 1983, 199 p.
- SCHRIJVER, Reginald De, *Historiografie: Vijfentwintie eeuwen geschiedschrijving in West-Europa*. Louvain, 1994, 424 p.
- SCHROEDER, Susan, *Chimalpahin & the kingdoms of Chalco*. Tucson, 1991, XXII-264 p.
- SCHWALLER, J.F., *Nahuatl Manuscripts in the Newberry Library*, Chicago. *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl 18*, Mexico-City, 1986, 317-343.
- SIMÉON, Rémi (ed.), *Annales de Chimalpahin sur les Sixième et Septième Relations (1258-1612)*. Paris, 1889, XLIV-353 p.

- SIMÉON, Rémi, *Dictionnaire de la langue Nahuatl*. Graz, 1965, 12-LXXV-710 p.
- STORIG, H.J. *Geschiedenis van de Filosofie*. Utrecht, 1994, 2 v.
- TENA, Rafael, *Las ocho Relaciones y el Memorial de Colhuacan*. Mexico-City, 1998, 2 v.
- TENA, Rafael, *La Estructura textual de las Relaciones primera y octava de Chimalpahin*. *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl*, Mexico-City, 1998, 28, 355-364.
- TORQUEMADA, Fray Juan de, *Monarquía Indiana*, Mexico-City, 1969, 3 v.
- Zimmermann, Günter (ed.), *Die Relationen Chimalpahins zur Geschichte Mexikos. Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandkunde 68 & 69*. Hamburg, 1963-1965, 2 v.