

"TRADUÇIDA EN LENGUA MEX.^{NA} Y DIRIG.^{DA} AL P.^E ORAÇIO
CAROCHI": JESUIT-INSPIRED NAHUATL SCHOLARSHIP IN
SEVENTEENTH CENTURY MEXICO

BARRY D. SELL,
ELIZABETH R. WRIGHT,
AND LOUISE M. BURKHART

Dedicated to Fernando Horcasitas
and his *El teatro náhuatl* (1974)

Father Horacio Carochi's celebrated *Arte de la lengua mexicana* (1645) marked the highwater mark of colonial grammatical studies of Nahuatl. The Jesuit's masterful description of the language also influenced scholarship on it far beyond the end of the colony. He helped lay the foundations of an increasingly sophisticated body of work on early Nahuatl that began appearing over 300 years after his grammar appeared.

Carochi inspired groundbreaking works like J. Richards Andrews' *Introduction to Classical Nahuatl* (1975) and Michel Launey's *Introduction à la langue et à la littérature aztèques* (1979), and well-used lexical resources like Frances Karttunen's *An Analytical Dictionary of Nahuatl* (1983). Karttunen and James Lockhart's influential *The Art of Nahuatl Speech: The Bancroft Dialogues* (1987) rests on an explicit contrast and comparison of Carochi's *Arte* with a huehuetlatolli document earlier described by Ángel María Garibay Kintana. Recognizing the growing interest in Carochi and anticipating even greater interest in the future, in 1983 the Instituto de Investigaciones Filológicas and the Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México jointly issued a photoreproduction of the 1645 edition. This spurred further use of the grammar by an ever-widening circle of scholars.

Significant progress continues to be made. James Lockhart has come out recently with a critical edition (2001) of the 1645 *Arte*. It is in an easy-to-read format, with the original Spanish/Latin and Lockhart's English translation on facing pages. In addition there are

numerous footnotes which bring the seventeenth-century Jesuit's work fully into the twenty-first century. Lockhart has also produced a series of language lessons influenced strongly by Carochi, *Nahuatl as Written: Lessons in Older Written Nahuatl, With Copious Examples and Texts* (2001). These and similar works facilitate scholarship on early Nahuatl texts. They also draw attention to Carochi's achievements and to the need to build on, extend, and add to them.

The above sketch is admittedly incomplete. Its main purpose was to highlight the very rapid and at times remarkable progress that has characterized the study of early Nahuatl during the last 30 years. A separate article would be needed to adequately mention even briefly the many contributions to Nahuatl philology made by *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl* alone, or to go into such minutiae as the use of Carochi by the late nahuatlato Arthur J. O. Anderson. We will focus on a very specific manuscript associated with Carochi's grammatical studies, illustrating in the process some aspects of Nahuatl scholarship circa 1640.

A. A MANUSCRIPT BECKONS

Some years ago John Frederick Schwaller wrote several pieces for *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl* (#18, 1987, 315-383) which described the Nahuatl holdings of the Newberry Library of Chicago, the Latin American Library of Tulane University, and the Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley.¹ In the section on the Bancroft Library he includes descriptive and summary mentions of several important manuscripts: M-M [Mexican Manuscript] 458, the huehuetlatolli document now known as the Bancroft Dialogues [see above]; M-M 455, a set of *cofradía ordenanzas* from 1552 which will soon be in published form,² and M-M 462, Don Bartolomé de Alva Ixtlilxochitl's Nahuatl translations of three Spanish Golden-Age plays and a comic intermezzo.

His summary listing of the plays (p. 368-369) is intriguing in spite of its brevity. The manuscript is a rather considerable 71 folios in size, includes four pieces of greatly varying length and content, the Nahua translator is identified as well as the Spanish authors of most of the pieces, and two of them are apparently dedicated to Jesuits, one of

¹ These and other pieces of a similar nature by Schwaller are now available from the Academy for American Franciscan History under the title *A Guide to Nahuatl Manuscripts Held in United States Repositories*.

² Available by the time this appears under Barry D. Sell, *Nahua Confraternities in Early Colonial Mexico: The 1552 Nahuatl Ordinances of fray Alonso de Molina, OFM*, with contributions by Larissa Taylor and Asunción Lavrin (Academy for American Franciscan History).

them the redoubtable Carochi himself. Schwaller elsewhere adds some detailed comments on the manuscript (p. 365). The most important are two seemingly paradoxical observations: 1), the strong link to Carochi is further explained, yet 2), relatively little work on the plays has been done. Concerning the latter, the only commentary of a substantive nature on the plays that Schwaller could point to are remarks by Garibay K. in his *Historia de la literatura náhuatl* (1953-1954). In addition one of the plays appeared in published form some years after Garibay K.'s wideranging study. William A. Hunter published in 1960 his *The Calderonian Auto Sacramental El Gran Teatro del Mundo: An Edition and Translation of a Nahuatl Version* (Middle American Research Institute Publication 27, p. 105-202, New Orleans, Tulane University).

These brief identifications of authors, content, location, and research potential later proved critical. In early 1998 Sell investigated the possibility of a *Nahuatl Theater* series that would include all early Nahuatl-language dramas in up-to-date transcriptions, translations and commentary.³ The very existence of the project hinged on finding a sufficient number of original texts to justify such a long-term, labor-intensive and difficult project. The pages of *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl* proved absolutely irreplaceable.

The first volume of *Nahuatl Theater* will be going to press soon. It will include (among others) plays from the Clements Library of the University of Michigan. These pieces were mentioned in a similar article by Schwaller in a later issue of *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl* (#25, 1995, p. 377-416). They are among the best known because they have appeared elsewhere: "The Three Kings," "The Sacrifice of Isaac," and "Souls and Testamentary Executors." Yet they had been presumed lost and were only located through Schwaller's 1995 article. By such means Sell found sufficient material to justify a four-volume project to Burkhart, who agreed to become co-editor of the entire series.

The second volume of the series will be dedicated entirely to Alva's translations of the Spanish pieces mentioned above. They are joined as editors by Elizabeth R. Wright, who has written about Lope de Vega and the social history of early Spanish theater. The very nature of the second volume—Spanish plays in Nahuatl translation—demands close collaboration between scholars from complementary fields. We are presently well advanced on translating and transcribing the Spanish and Nahuatl originals and have begun to analyze these rich materials.

³ Spurred initially by a generous offer of help by Gregory Spira who was then working in the Library of Congress. Spira agreed to help Sell locate and work on any Nahuatl manuscripts, including plays. This led to more elaborate plans.

We share some of our current results with the readers of this journal as a way of showing our appreciation and to encourage others to undertake similar projects wherever possible. We begin with some words about the Spanish texts and then move on to a close look at some aspects of the Nahuatl texts. We conclude with some brief thoughts on how our work fits in with current Nahuatl scholarship.

B. THE SPANISH PLAYS

In terms of the Spanish originals, ideally we would have been able to easily locate pre-1640 versions of the Castilian originals to which Alva could have had direct or indirect access. In reality, however, few manuscripts and even fewer records of performances survive. Interestingly, each of the texts Alva translated survived four centuries through a different channel, and by extension, shows a different facet of the social history of theater and authorship in the seventeenth century.

The most straightforward case of circulation is Lope de Vega's hagiographic drama about the birth of the Virgin Mary, *La madre de la mejor*. It appeared in the seventeenth part (Madrid, 1621) of a serialized dramatic anthology. We have no evidence of other surviving versions.

Calderón's eucharistic drama *El gran teatro del mundo*, the most famous of these plays today, is the one whose printed circulation is the most difficult to establish. The oldest known version of this allegorical religious drama (*auto sacramental*) is from 1655, though notarial records indicate performances from the 1640s, and scholars have generally agreed to a likely composition date around 1635 (Allen 1997, XXIII). This presents an exciting opportunity for volume two of *Nahuatl Theater* to contribute to early-modern literary studies because Alva's translation is the oldest known version of the *auto sacramental* most frequently read, studied, and performed.

The third full-length drama in the manuscript, *El animal profeta y dichosa patricida San Julián*, sets the complicated issue of early-modern play authorship into particularly sharp relief. Alva identifies Lope as the author, but scholars have currently coalesced around an attribution to a lesser known but important playwright of the era, Antonio Mira de Amescua. In fact, a manuscript dated 1631 attributes the drama to Mira de Amescua, though another hand claims that the Mira attribution is erroneous, saying it is Lope's. Yet another version is an undated chapbook that attributes the drama to Lope. None of these gives us a text that would have circulated before 1640 with Lope's name. The only pre-1640 version we can find that includes the title

we find in Alva's version and that identifies Lope as author is in a 1631 anthology of his plays (Barcelona).

Here we have a sign of how fragile these dramatic texts were at the height of the Castilian theater's popularity. The date and place of publication, as well as the misspelling of the author's name and the identity of the dedicatee, suggest we have an illicitly printed edition. From 1624-1634 the *junta de reforma* that the Count Duke of Olivares organized as part of his broad project of reform prohibited the publication of theatrical texts within Castile, alleging that books of plays were detrimental to youth. His language recalls earlier prohibitions: "Y porque se ha reconocido el daño de imprimir libros de comedias, *nouelas ni otros deste género*, por el que blandamente hacen a las costumbres de la jubentud, se consulte a su Magestad" (cited in Moll 1974, 98).

Despite the repackaging of plays as tools for education, we can see that the fear lingers that they will corrupt the youth that Olivares seeks to train for service to the crown. The law specifically prohibited authors based in Castile, as Lope was, to go outside that jurisdiction to print works. So the version we have of this work may well have been printed in a Castilian city but stamped to suggest an Aragonese locale where the prohibition did not apply. In fact, the father of Juan Pérez de Montalbán, this volume's dedicatee, was a bookseller who was convicted in 1627 of violating this prohibition (Moll 1974, 100). This pirate edition is the closest we can get to the likely original that Alva used.

Finally, the fourth text Alva translated, the *entremés*, does not appear with any information that would allow for an identification of the Castilian original. Given the vast corpus, finding the original may be impossible. What we will be able to do is compare the Nahuatl version to the formulæ and patterns we find in Castilian comic intermezzi of the era.

A final word here on the importance Alva's use of these plays has for scholars of early-modern Spanish literature. This is a unique vantage point from which to judge the process through which the peninsula's popular and profitable entertainment form underwent canonization, to become institutionalized as the "Golden Age" theater enshrined in statues, street names, and curricula. As a now-classic study cautions, this canonical status, which can seem inevitable and natural in hindsight, should not be taken for granted where early-modern writing is concerned (Guillory 1993). Though Jesuits long used plays for educational purposes, Alva's choice of recent plays that come from the popular stage, his identification of playwrights, and the likely use made of such texts within the Carochi circle are signs of a development in

the international reading culture, whereby the seventeenth-century dramatic corpus became a standard-bearer of Hispanic language and culture. In short, Alva and his collaborators confer, or confirm, canonical status on the Castilian dramas as they used these Spanish texts to provide more Nahuatl fodder for Carochi's philological mill.

C. THE NAHUATL TEXTS

It is rare in ecclesiastical Nahuatl texts to get precise and accurate information about such crucial matters as the Nahuas who contributed to their creation. Almost unique among manuscripts is fray Bernardino de Sahagún's *Coloquios y doctrina cristiana* (critical edition by Miguel León-Portilla, 1986). Sahagún notes under "Al prudente lector" (p. 75) where the text "se boluió y limó" (the famous Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlatilolco), the year in which it was produced (1564), and the Nahuas who helped create it (among others, the learned Nahua Latinist Don Antonio Valeriano). Within the corpus of Nahuatl publications, the most comprehensive and revealing information about Nahua participation can be found in the "Prólogo" to fray Juan Bautista's *Sermonario* (1606). He lists a number of accomplished Nahua scholars and the works they assisted to completion. These usually unacknowledged giants of early Nahuatl scholarship include Hernando de Ribas who helped fray Alonso de Molina with his *Vocabulario*, the same Don Antonio Valeriano who assisted many clerical nahuatlatoque (in this instance providing the hundreds of Spanish glosses in Bautista's collection of Nahuatl sermons), and Agustín de la Fuente, Bautista's collaborator on all his publications.

Thankfully this type of crucial information is explicitly presented in the Alva manuscript. The very first folio yields the following illuminating data: "Comedia del gran teatro del mundo traduçida en La lengua Mexicana Dirigida al P.^e Jacome Baçilio, Por el B d Bart.^e dalba" (1r).⁴ The only disappointment in the manuscript is the comic intermezzo that follows, which only says "entremes desta Comedia" (12v). Given the short length of this item (12v-15r) this is only a minor lapse, and this non-identification is consistent with the era's practices. The longest drama, spanning almost 40 folios, begins: "¶ Comedia famosa de lope de bega carpio del animal Propheta y dichosa patriçida traduçida en lengua mex.^{na} propio y natural ydioma Por el B.^r d. Bart^e

⁴ We can reasonably infer that the dedication to the play dates this piece at no earlier than 1642, the year that Basilio arrived in Mexico, began his novitiate, and started his study of Nahuatl.

de Alba el año de 1640" (17r). It ends with more clarifying information: "y Axcan omochiuh ynin comedia ynic omixtlapam miercoles a 18 de Abril 1641 aos" (55v). The last play starts with: "Comedia de Lope de Vega Carpio intitulada la madre de la mejor. Traduçida en lengua Mex.^{na} y dirig.^{da} al P.^e oraçio Carochi de la comp.^a de JHS" (57r).

The specific connection to Carochi is proven beyond any reasonable doubt by the presence of diacritics similar to those in the Bancroft Dialogues. However there is a marked difference between the plays. The first two pieces have no diacritics whatsoever. The fourth piece, *La madre de la mejor*, has approximately 160 items bearing diacritics. The third and longest piece, *El animal profeta y dichosa patricida*, has many hundreds of items marked with diacritics but they are very unevenly distributed. Some folios are heavily marked, others lightly so, and a few not at all.

The diacritics make a direct comparison of Alva's manuscript and the Bancroft Dialogues a necessary step in evaluating Carochi's methods. A significant clue is provided by the handwriting found in the two manuscripts. We begin with the main texts. Two practiced hands can be seen at work in Alva's manuscript, one in the two shorter plays and the entremés, and another in the longest piece, *El animal profeta*. Another distinct hand, as well-trained as the first two, can be found in the Bancroft Dialogues. The super- and subscript additions in the Alva and huehuetlatolli texts, somewhat hurried and less susceptible to comparison, are probably in the same hand, and are different from those in the main texts. At present we do not have incontrovertibly authentic examples of both Alva's and Carochi's handwriting. Hence the following are conservative hypotheses: that three of the pieces are Alva's original drafts and in his hand while *El animal profeta* is a reworking of an Alva draft by someone else; that the huehuetlatolli text involved a third person; and that the glosses and commentaries are by Carochi.

These inferences are supported by other considerations. Alva's confesionario of 1634 follows certain orthographic practices which are repeated in most of his manuscript. For example, he spells certain items in ways that differ notably from Carochi-approved texts. Take the items *tlen*, *miac*, and *noyan*, which we would ordinarily find (sans diacritics) as *tleyñ/tlein*, *miec*, and *nohuian* in the Bancroft Dialogues and *El animal profeta*. The distinction between the last play and the Bancroft Dialogues is also maintained for in the drama there are many outright errors, all of which indicate a work in progress. In addition the super- and subscript glosses and commentary are the work of an unusually perceptive reader. They draw attention to certain items, comment on specifics of meaning and pronunciation, and otherwise provide infor-

mation that would seem to be of interest and utility only to someone of Carochi's very particular philological turn of mind.

The fingerprints of Carochi's collaborators become more visible once we consider a few of the added remarks in the manuscripts. An otherwise unidentified Don Miguel helped Carochi with the Bancroft Dialogues. A similarly unidentified Don Fernando appears several times in the Alva manuscript as an expert adviser. Typical is the following: "*Canel yollotica* esto no entiende d. fern.d parece que falta algo" (18v). It is difficult not to assume, though at present it is unprovable, that this second titled consultant was Alva's own brother, Don Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl, well known among specialists in early Mexican history as an interpreter and historian. Adding to the potential significance of this unknown "Don Fernando" is his apparent intervention in another text associated with Carochi's grammatical endeavors. In the abovementioned article by Schwaller in *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl* #18 (328-329) the same name appears in the manuscript *Camino del cielo* of the Newberry Library in Chicago. Schwaller not only points to the presence of diacritics in this third manuscript and its dedication "to Father Carochi" (328) but also quotes from a very suggestive gloss: "Don Fernando pone saltillo en teòcal, no se porque y dudo que se deva poner" (329). This raises the extremely difficult-to-answer question of just who was responsible for the diacritics in Alva's plays and the Bancroft Dialogues. Whether it was the same Don Fernando, Carochi himself, others trained in Carochi's diacritics, or a mix of all three, cannot be definitively determined at this stage of our research.

The above additions bring the number of people to at least six in a multifaceted collaborative program of linguistic scholarship. They reveal a circle of peers, advisors, and scribes which begins to resemble those formed around earlier nahuatlatoque like Sahagún and Molina. Even more collaborators must have been involved for the process by which Carochi produced foundational texts for his *Arte* was no relatively simple process of reading a Spanish drama, transferring the story into Nahuatl, and then writing down those interpretations on paper. Apparently drafts contributed by Alva and others would have been followed by one or a series of intermediate reworkings like that of *El animal profeta*. This process would have eventually culminated in polished texts like the exhaustively marked and (generally) orthographically consistent Bancroft Dialogues. Note also that at the beginning of *El animal profeta* the year 1640 is mentioned, and at the end 18 April 1641. It took some months to finish this one play alone.

Seemingly petty matters like the cost and availability of materials, the efficiency and reliability of postal services, and the speed at which

people could write using pen and ink must also be taken into consideration. Carochi and his collaborators lived in a very different era. They had no computers with programs that contain typesetting commands, no email to facilitate quick and almost instantaneous communication between scholars, no easy access to the types of fonts and special characters that would have facilitated his work. These sorts of technological and cost constraints—not to mention those involving seventeenth-century perspectives and scholarship—made his support network a true necessity. They also make his achievements even more remarkable.

Items with diacritics from Alva's manuscript are usually in close agreement with Carochi's system as exemplified in Frances Karttunen's *An Analytical Dictionary of Nahuatl* (1983). We offer a few samples from *El animal profeta*. The diacritics are read as follows: macrons are found over long vowels; breves indicate short vowels; grave accents on vowels mark the word- or utterance-internal glottal stops that follow; and circumflexes on vowels show that utterance-final glottal stops follow.

Analytical Dictionary of Nahuatl

tōtōtl "bird" (249)
 huexōtl "willow tree" (87)
 xōchitlah "flower garden" (325)
 xohxōchitlan "flower gardens" (325)
 tōptli "chest, container, wrapper" (247)
 teōtlac "afternoon, evening" (228)
 zātēpan "later, afterwards" (346)
 xolopihltli "idiot, fool, dolt" (330)
 xīcalli "gourd vessel" (323)
 xāyacatl "face; mask" (322)
 pīnacatl "large nonflying reddish beetle" (196)

El animal profeta

tōtōtl (17r)
 huēxōtl (28r)
 xōchitlā (19r)
 xōxōchitlā (18r)
 tōpco (21v)
 teōtlac (22r)
 cātēpan (30r)
 xolopitli (32v)
 xīcalli (38v)
 xāyacātl (43r)
 pīnācātl (43r)

This is a representative sampling of what sorts of items bear diacritics, i.e., nouns and particles. Very few inflected verbs are marked in ways that call our attention. However it should be noted that in at least one instance vowel lengthening occurs in an expected environment. Karttunen and Lockhart's critical edition of the Bancroft Dialogues (see above) notes that when the *l* of the derivational suffix *-ltia* drops out there "comes a lengthening of the vowel" and give as one example "*ahxitiā*" (91). This is confirmed, in its reverential form, in *El animal profeta*: "*omāxītico*" (63v).

Even the inconsistencies in placing diacritics are generally the same in both the Bancroft Dialogues and *El animal profeta*. We pick two examples from the back of Karttunen and Lockhart's critical edition. The

first is *āmō* “no, not” which is “always written ... without a macron on the o” in the Bancroft Dialogues (200). Another item is *āxcān* “now, today” which is “written uniformly as *āxcān* without a macron on the second a” (200). When these two items bear diacritics in *El animal profeta* they follow the same patterns.

The relationship between the Bancroft Dialogues and *El animal profeta* grows closer still when considering the sources used by Carochi in his *Arte* of 1645. Among the more prominent ones are the Bancroft Dialogues and the *Florentine Codex*.⁵ To this list can now be added Don Bartolomé de Alva’s Nahuatl translation of *El animal profeta y dichosa patricida*. There are at least four instances of Carochi using the drama; below, we give one of the most complete and revealing examples.

We present these passages in order from newest to oldest. The first excerpt is from the English translation in Lockhart’s critical edition of 2001; next is the relevant passage from the 1983 photoreproduction of Carochi’s *Arte*. These are followed by the source passage from Alva’s text of 1640-1641 along with the Spanish original of 1631 on which it is based.

ACHĪC is an adverb ... with which it is shown that there is a difference between one person or thing and another, and between what is due to one and what is due to the other. ... If a murderer and an innocent person are in jail, the latter can say to the former, *Achĭc in tēhuātl ca ōtītēmicti, ca motlātlacōl in tictzaqua; auh in nēhuātl aĭc mā nel çazcē pīnacatl nomāc miqui*, It’s well enough that you are here, since you are a murderer and are paying for your sin, but I have never killed even a beetle. ... Some say *chĭc* instead of *achĭc*, but it is an abuse. (449)

AChĭc, es aduerbio, con que se muestra ... que ai diferencia entre vna persona, ò cosa, y otra, y entre lo q̄ à vna se deue, y lo q̄ à otra. ... Si estan en la carcel vn homicida, y vn innocente, puede dezir este al otro: *achĭc in tehuātl ca ōtītēmicti, ca motlātlacōl in tictzaqua; auh in nēhuātl aĭc mānel çazcē pīnacatl nomāc miqui*, aun tu no es mucho, que estes aqui, pues eres homicida, y pagas tus pecado, pero yo jamas he muerto, ni vn escarauajo. ... Algunos dizen *chĭc*, en lugar de *achĭc*, pero es abuso. (122r-v)

Tīçoc y Aĥĭc yn tehuātl tambien se dice chĭc in tēhuātl ca otitemicti ca motlātlacōl yn tictzaqua auh yn nēhuātl aĭc mānel çah çe pīnācātl nomāc miqui cuix ticnequi no yuh nitlaÿyōhuiz yn iuh titlaÿyōhuia (43r)

Bul. Tu que fuyste patricida
sufre, mas yo que en mi vida

⁵ See the introductory remarks by Miguel León-Portilla in the 1983 photoreproduction of the *Arte* (UNAM) and by James Lockhart in the recent critical edition of the same (2001).

he muerto vn escarauajo,
 porque tengo de hazer
 penitencia a tu compas? (12v)

A number of things become clearer once such examples as the above are placed in close proximity. The first is that Carochi's texts sometimes fail to indicate vowel length and glottal stop. The selection from Lockhart is consistently and completely marked (unmarked vowels are short) while those from the *Arte* and the play are not.

In addition there are numerous inconsistencies in notation between the grammar and the drama. Note that the long vowel in the last syllable of "motlàtlacōl" is marked in the play but unmarked in the grammar "motlàtlacol" and that the inflected verb "otitemicti" is unnotated in the play but gratifyingly notated "ōtitzemicti" in the *Arte*. Perhaps this was due to the lack of the appropriate characters in the printshop.⁶ Carochi's printed "pīnācātl" bears the requisite breves in Alva's "pīnācātł" just as it might have if it had appeared in the handwritten Bancroft Dialogues.

Nonetheless there are other instances where Carochi simply used what he was given or had marked himself. The only overt marking of short vowels in the selected passages above are in the same exact item (i.e., pīnācātl/pīnācātł) and no others. Similarly where Alva's text shows inconsistency in marking a glottal stop but consistency in marking a long vowel, Carochi does exactly the same: "tehuātl" and "nèhuātl" in the play, "tehuātl" and "nèhuātl" in the grammar.

The gloss near the beginning is very revealing: "Añhic yn tehuātl tambien se dice chic in tēhuātl" which is consistently marked and is echoed in Carochi's grammar. Carochi notes at the end of the relevant paragraph in his *Arte* that "Algunos dicen *chic*, en lugar de *achic*, pero es abuso." It is difficult to imagine that anyone other than the Jesuit himself made this note in order to call attention to a passage that he planned to use later in his grammar.

A careful comparison of the Spanish original, Alva's translation, and Carochi's use of the last poses some difficult problems. While the Jesuit evidently asked his colleague and friend to provide translations, it is not clear who provided what to whom. Did Carochi pick the plays and give them to Alva, or did Alva—responding to a request for Spanish texts in Nahuatl translation—select this and the other pieces him-

⁶ See Carochi's comments on this in his section on "DEL CUIDADO QUE SE DEVE poner en hazerse à pronunciar bien esta lengua" in which he notes "conviniera acentuar las syllabas, como sé hará en esta Arte escrito de mano, que si se imprime no [se] podrá acentuar tan puntualmente por falta de caracteres" (1983 [1645], 2v). Brackets mine.

self? We are inclined to the former but cannot rule out the latter. Hence it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions about Carochi's interpretations of the Nahuatl. Did he have the Spanish originals in front of him when he provided Spanish equivalents of the Nahuatl, or did he (singly or assisted by Alva and/or other native speakers) translate directly from the Nahuatl into Spanish without reference to the Spanish originals? Again, the most likely possibility is that Carochi maintained quality control by providing the originals and then comparing/contrasting them to Alva's Nahuatl renditions. This would be in agreement with the exquisite care he showed in his philological and grammatical studies. However other possibilities cannot be ruled out.

The relationship between originals, translations, and Carochi's use of them is further complicated by the adaptations of Spanish texts made by all native speakers of Nahuatl. It is a given that Alva adjusted the Spanish texts to make them fit Nahua sensibilities: characters were slotted into traditional Nahua sociopolitical categories; they obeyed the verbal protocols appropriate to their status, age, and gender; Mexican flora and fauna generally replaced their Spanish equivalents; and so on. There are also adaptations which speak to strictly colonial perceptions.

In this regard, one of the most conspicuous features in Alva's *El animal profeta* is the renaming of some protagonists. Whereas in the other three pieces characters still retain names based on the Spanish texts, in this play some bear strictly Nahuatl names or Spanish names that have been considerably Nahuatlized. To pick just two examples: one of the lead characters, Irene (renamed Malintzin),⁷ has been approached in her house by a servant of Julián, Vulcano (renamed Tiçoc).

Ma. ȳ Tleyñ motōcā
Tiçoc ȳ Ca nitiçoc mēxìcatl yn notatzin auh tlàtòcāmēxìcatōcāytl
yn techmacayā yn nohuian otlamāmauhtīq̃ [18r-v]

Ire. Como os llamays?
bul. Yo, Bulcano,
que tuue vn padre Romano,
que por costumbre tenia
ponernos por apellido
el nombre de vn Dios, y ansi
Bulcano me llamó a mi.
que es vn Dios muy conocido. [2v]

⁷ Carochi specifically points out that "*Malintze*" is derived from "Maria" (1983 [1645], 9r) although Spanish "Marina" is a possibility as well.

Some scholars of early Mexico saw parallels between the classical pagan antiquity of the "Old World" and the pre-Christian era of the "New World." This view was shared by a number of clerics and is strikingly illustrated here by Alva's translation (or the copyist's reworking) of Lope's text.

Perceptive readers will also have noticed that Lope's versified drama has been replaced by the Nahuatl equivalent of prose. These and many other features of Alva's work deserve the kind of extended treatment that is not possible at the moment. However it does speak again to the need to examine carefully and in great detail the Spanish originals and Alva's interpretations.

D. SOME FINAL THOUGHTS

The last 40 years of Nahuatl scholarship began with a strong focus on those few colonial texts that spoke primarily of the precolonial era. It then moved more and more to an examination of the colony by investigating the vast notarial corpus. The first thrust is exemplified by Arthur J. O. Anderson and Charles E. Dibble's critical edition of the twelve-book *Florentine Codex* (1950-1982). The second found expression in such books as S. L. Cline and Miguel León-Portilla's presentation of the largest single cache of Nahuatl wills, *The Testaments of Culhuacan* (1984) and Cline's later *Colonial Culhuacan, 1580-1600: A Social History of an Aztec Town* (1986).

Yet there has always been interest in authors and works that are not strictly part of either category. The variegated products of the great Nahua annalist Chimalpahin and the plays gathered together in Fernando Horcasitas' *El teatro náhuatl* (1974) may perhaps be best described as the raw materials for wideranging cultural or intellectual history. These sorts of writings often do not have the same kind of raw data or "facts" that are the staple of many investigators, but they offer fascinating glimpses into the affective landscape and cognitive architecture of their authors. Luis Reyes García's recent *¿Cómo te confundes? ¿Acaso no somos conquistados? Anales de Juan Bautista* (2001) is a recent example of this kind of material.

Our work on Alva's translations is part of a convergence of various trends in current scholarship on early Nahuatl and Nahuas with complementary developments in related fields. In the process we engage not only Nahuas but Spaniards, not only New Spain but Spain, not only local scholarship but the worldwide diffusion of Hispanic culture through the person of Carochi, an Italian Jesuit and grammarian resident in Mexico.

Carochi's request to Alva was meant, in part, to serve the immediate practical purpose of providing examples for his upcoming *Arte*. The knowledgeable Nahuatl-speaking cleric accomplished far more than that. Alva also provided literary or dramatic writings which could easily have served as models for other texts as well as (potentially) for actual theatrical performances. Alva's translations demonstrate, in a very tangible way, how native and non-native scholars worked together to produce a document of lasting scholarly significance.

WORKS CITED

- ALVA, Bartolomé de, *Tres comedias*, M-M 462, Berkeley, Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley, ca. 1640-1642.
- ALLEN, John J. and Domingo Ynduráin, "Prólogo," *El gran teatro del mundo*, eds. John J. Allen, and Domingo Ynduráin, Barcelona, Crítica, 1997, xxiii-lxiv.
- BAUTISTA, fray Juan, *Sermonario*, México, Melchor Ocharte, 1606.
- CAROCHI, Father Horacio, *Arte de la lengua mexicana*, ed. Miguel León-Portilla, photoreproduction of the 1645 original edition, México, UNAM, 1983.
- , *Grammar of the Mexican Language*, ed. and trans. James Lockhart, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 2001.
- GUILLORY, John, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- KARTTUNEN, Frances, *An Analytical Dictionary of Nahuatl*, Austin, University of Texas Press, 1983.
- MOLL, Jaime, "Diez años sin licencias para imprimir comedias y novelas en los reinos de Castilla: 1625-1634," *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, Madrid, 1974, núm. 54, p. 97-104.
- SAHAGÚN, fray Bernardino de, *Coloquios*, ed. Miguel León-Portilla, México, UNAM, 1986.
- SCHWALLER, John Frederick, "Nahuatl Manuscripts Held by the Bancroft Library of the University of California, Berkeley," *Estudios de Cultura Náhuatl*, México, UNAM, 1986, núm. 18, p. 361-383.
- VEGA CARPIO, Lope de, "El animal profeta y dichosa patricida San Julián," *Las comedias...parte veynte y cinco*, Barcelona, Sebastián de Cormellas, 1631.