

A PERSISTENT MYTH IN THE ETHNOHISTORY OF WESTERN MEXICO

Donald D. Brand

By "persistent myth" I mean erroneous concepts or downright wrong assumptions of "fact" with reference to the history of the peoples of Western Mexico just prior to the Spanish Conquest. Such errors are most common among the historians who live in Western Mexico which, for our purposes, is the northwestern portion of Mesoamerica—from the province of Zacatula to the province of Sinaloa inclusively (roughly, from Acapulco, Guerrero, to Los Mochis, Sinaloa, of today). The local literati have fallen into error in part because of a misplaced patriotism which tried to supply a prequest history that would compare with that of the peoples of Central Mexico, and more importantly because of the lack of archives containing records of the period of contact and conquest. Essentially all of the *relaciones*, legal *probanzas*, results of *visitas*, *pareceres*, and other kinds of *informaciones* of the first forty years and more—from 1521 well into the 1560's—were housed outside of Western Mexico. Even today, when so much of the sixteenth century documentation has been published and is more-or-less available, many of the writers in Colima, Guadalajara, Tepic and elsewhere, apparently prefer not to expose themselves to such intellectually disturbing materials. In addition to these local historians who do not avail themselves of documentation, unfortunately there have been historians and anthropologists of national scope and caliber who seemed to suffer from a Pro-Mexican and Anti-Tarascan bias in their interpretation of the documents.

I originally selected three kinds of topics to illustrate what I have termed "persistent myths." One has to do with a

boundary —the southwestern boundary of the so-called Mexican or Aztec Empire in Zacatula; a second is concerned with political organization —the nature of the native political states or entities in what became Colima, Jalisco and Nayarit; and the third is an origin and migration legend as attributed by Antonio Tello to the native chieftain Pantecatl. Because of the relatively short space available I will present only some material pertinent to the first topic.

The Provincia de Zacatula, as outlined in the *Relación de Zacatula* of 1580,¹ was a Spanish creation which extended from the Boca de Mitla (13 leagues west of Acapulco, in coastal Guerrero) to Tizupan about half way up the Michoacán coast. Early in the seventeenth century writers began to pontificate about the extent of the Mexican Empire. Antonio de Herrera (1601) ambiguously implied that the Mexican Empire extended up the southwest Pacific coast so far as to include Zacatula,² but Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl (writing

¹ The *Relación de Zacatula* is one of a group of reports prepared 1578-1586 in various administrative units of the Spanish Indies to help the Spanish Crown and Consejo de las Indias in the governance of the Indies. Each report was prepared on the basis of a questionnaire of 50 points, the answers being supplied by the most knowledgeable and competent citizens and natives. The best and most up-to-date description and discussion of the *relaciones* extant for New Spain will be found in Volume 12 of the *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, pages 183-395, Austin, 1972.

The original of the *Relación de Zacatula* is in the Latin American Collection of the University of Texas at Austin. It was edited and published by Robert H. Barlow in *Tlalocan*, Vol. II, Number 3, p. 258-268, 1947, from a copy made by the former owner Joaquín García Icazbalceta. Citations in this paper are to this publication.

² Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas (1549-1625) although never in the Indies was Cronista Mayor de las Indias from 1596 until his death, and had access to a very large body of documentation including materials that are no longer available. The material of interest to us is in the second and third *decadas* which were first published in 1601 in Madrid (along with the first and fourth *decadas*) under the title *Historia General de los Hechos de los Castellanos en las Islas i Tierra Firme del Mar Océano*. The best recent edition is the Madrid edition of 1934-1957.

In Dec. 2, lib. 9, cap. 1, Herrera has Cortés conversing with Montezuma in an attempt to determine the extent of the Mexican Empire and the location of the mines and placers of gold. Montezuma mentioned three sources of gold beginning with the Provincia de Zacatula toward the south. Since one of the other sources was specified as not being within the Empire, it is implied that Zacatula was within the Mexican Empire. However, the context including a mention of the return of Gonzalo de Umbria with gold taken by the Indians from the rivers of Zacatula makes clear that somehow Herrera has confused Zacatula with Sosola of Oaxaca. Actually, Herrera never specifically defined the limits of the Mexican Empire. Consequently, we learn very little from Herrera's statement (Dec. 3, lib. 3, cap. 9) that the Kingdom of Michoacán was located between the limits of the Mexican Empire and the district of what became the Audiencia de la Nueva Galicia.

c. 1608-1616) claimed up to the Gulf of California, and this claim was repeated by Antonio de Solís in 1684.³ In the eighteenth century Lorenzo Boturini in 1746 and Pablo de la Purísima Concepción Beaumont (writing c. 1776-1780), among the first to use Tarascan materials, claimed Zacatula for the Tarascan state.⁴ However, Francisco Javier Clavigero in 1780, exuding sweet reasonability, corrected Boturini and stated that the Kingdom of Michoacán did not include the "costas del mar Pacífico" which were Mexican "hasta mas alla de Coliman" as shown by the *Matrícula de los Tributos*.⁵

³ Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl (c. 1568-1648) wrote an *Historia Chichimeca* which was not published until the nineteenth century. I have used the Alfredo Chavero edition of 1891-1892, *Obras Históricas de Don Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl*, 2 volumes, TOMO II, *Historia Chichimeca*. In CAP. LXXIII Ixtlilxochitl has the Mexican Empire in its northern reaches extending from Pánuco to the "Mar Bermejo ó de Cortés."

Antonio de Solís y Rivadeneyra (1610-1686), was Cronista Mayor de Indias from 1661 until his death, and published in 1684 his *Historia de la Conquista de México, Población y Progresos de la América Septentrional, conocida por el Nombre de Nueva España*. In the Mexico 1968 edition, page 76, Solís includes within the Mexican Empire the Pacific coastlands from Cape Mendocino to Nueva Galicia inclusively which is even more comprehensive than the claims of Ixtlilxochitl, but Solís is careful to exclude the region between what became Nueva Galicia and Acapulco (which would mean excluding Zacatula from the Mexican Empire) since he gives a coastal extension from Acapulco to Guatemala.

⁴ Lorenzo Boturini Benaducci (1702-1755) in 1746 published an *Idea de Una Nueva Historia General de la América Septentrional*, which was bound with his *Catálogo del Museo Histórico Indiano* (paged separately). On page 26 of the *Catálogo* within section 14 *Historia de Michuacan*, Boturini wrote: "Partía sus confines con los de Mexico en Yxtlahuacan, distrito de Toluca, y de allí hasta la Mar del Sur, estendiendose 150 leguas, y desde la Provincia de Zacatula, atravesando azia el Norte hasta Zichu mas de 160 leguas, en cuyos terminos se incluan grandes poblaciones, como la Ciudad, y Provincia de Mechuacan, y las de Colima y Zacatula," etc. This description obviously was based in part on a 1594 document in his possession which had been prepared by Constantino Huitzimengari, a grandson of Tangahaoan II who was the last ruler of the Tarascan state.

Pablo de la Purísima Concepción Beaumont, O.F.M., (1710-1780) wrote about 1776-1780 a *Crónica de la Provincia de los Santos Apóstoles S. Pedro y S. Pablo de Michoacán* which was not published until 1874. I have used what is apparently the best edition, that in three volumes in the *Publicaciones del Archivo General de la Nación* (Tomos 17-19, Mexico, 1932). Beaumont used not only the standard published sources but also Franciscan manuscript materials and Tarascan materials which he collected or had prepared. In lib. I, cap. 6 of the *Crónica* (vol. 18, p. 34-35), Beaumont states positively that Zacatula was Tarascan. Actually, the map which Beaumont compiled shows the Tarascan state covering a much larger area than he described in the text, extending into northern Sinaloa.

⁵ Francisco Javier Mariano Clavigero, S.J., (1731-1787) is best known for his work in Italian *Storia Antica del Messico* published in Italy 1780-1781. This was soon translated into a number of languages including the Spanish. Actually, Clavigero wrote this work originally in Spanish, and several editions of the original Spanish work have appeared beginning with the four volume work edited by Mariano Cuevas in 1945 *Historia Antigua de Mexico*. This is the edition which I have used.

A century later Manuel Orozco y Berra in 1880 stated that Clavigero was wrong about Colima and had been fooled by the Coliman in the *Matrícula de Tributos*, but Orozco y Berra does not attempt to account for the mention of Coliman. Then he goes on to chide Boturini (whom he accuses of copying Beaumont, although Boturini died some thirty years before Beaumont wrote) for using some Tarascan sources to substantiate a Tarascan claim to Zacatula.⁶ Most writers up to the present claim Zacatula for the Mexican Empire, although George Vaillant did not in his text or endmaps for the *Aztecs of Mexico* (1941).⁷

The case for a Mexican Zacatula has been stated best by Robert H. Barlow in 1947 and 1949,⁸ and Barlow has been echoed weakly by Claude Nigel Byam-Davies in 1968 and by Herbert R. Harvey in 1971.⁹ I have been essentially a lone

The "correction" of Boturini occurs in note 2 at the bottom of page 58 of tomo I. Also in *Disertación VII Sobre Los Confines del Reino de Anáhuac* (tomo IV, p. 361-368) Clavigero expounds further on this matter.

⁶ Manuel Orozco y Berra (1810-1881) published his best known work *Historia Antigua y de la Conquista de México* in 1880-1882. I have used the 1960 edition prepared by Garibay and León-Portilla. On page 151 of tomo II is a one-sentence statement concerning Clavigero's error in including Colima within the Mexican Empire. On page 176 of the same tomo II is the statement that "Boturini copia la demarcación dada por Beaumont", and then Orozco y Berra goes on to criticize the use of Constantino Huitziméngari's 1594 *información judicial* because Orozco y Berra has already decided that Zacatula was a Mexican province, at least as far as the mouth of the River Zacatula (Balsas).

⁷ George C. Vaillant authorized endmaps for his *Aztecs of Mexico*, Garden City, 1941, which show the Mexican Empire or Area of the Aztec Domain as including no part of the coasts of Colima, Michoacán, or western and central Guerrero, thus excluding Zacatula. This agrees with his text.

⁸ In the 1947 publication of the *Relación de Zacatula* edited by Barlow (See Note 1), Barlow provides varied information and opinions in the footnotes and most specifically in footnote 13 on page 264 where he claims that Jolochuca was the first conquest made by Ahuitzotl, some time between 5 Calli, 1497 and 12 Tecpatl, 1504, in the Costa Grande (i.e. coastal lowlands west of Acapulco) using the corridor of Tetela del Río, Tlacotepec and Otatlan. Unfortunately Barlow does not document the data in this footnote since his one reference (Barlow, *Materiales para una cronología y otros estudios en Revista de Estudios Antropológicos*, VOL. VIII -) is specifically to a study in methodology with very little substantive content, and in general to a series of studies which he had planned for the future which did not materialize because of his death in 1951.

In 1949 *Ibero-Americana: 28* was published which comprised R. H. Barlow's *The Extent of the Empire of the Culhua Mexica* which had been written in Berkeley in 1943 and somewhat amended in Mexico during the succeeding five years. Pertinent material will be found in Chapter II. The Tarascan Frontier, especially pages 8-15.

⁹ Claude Nigel Byam Davies: *Los Señoríos Independientes del Imperio Azteca*, Mexico, 1968. The pertinent material is in chapter III Yopitzinco pages 157-179

voice (in 1943, 1960 and 1971)¹⁰ in attacking the Mexican thesis and upholding the Tarascan cause. My contention is that the Tarascans in the 1460's under Tzitzic Pandacuare (who later gave the Mexicans under Axayacatl their greatest preconquest defeat in 1478) conquered most of the Pacific coastlands inclusively from Colima into western Guerrero to an uncertain point east of Zacatula and the mouth of the Río Balsas. However, much or most of these Tarascan conquests were lost by Tzitzic Pandacuare's son Zuanga in the period 1480-1520.¹¹ By 1521 the area of Zacatula proper, i.e., the delta and lower Río Balsas, had become an independent state. The main evidence for this is provided by Hernán Cortés in

and especially 166-167 where Byam Davies depends on Barlow and the sources used by Barlow for the Ahuitzotl conquests in coastal Guerrero.

Herbert R. Harvey's "Article 26. Ethnohistory of Guerrero", pages 603-618 of Volume 11 of the *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, 1971, probably was written about 1961 as were most of the other articles in this volume. The pertinent material is on pages 611 and 614.

¹⁰ Donald D. Brand: "An Historical Sketch of Geography and Anthropology in the Tarascan Region. Part 1," *New Mexico Anthropologist* VOLS. VI, VII, No. 2, p. 37-108, 1943 (frequently cited as of 1944 reprint). The most pertinent material will be found on pages 39-44.

Donald D. Brand and others: *Coalcoman and Motines del Oro. An 'ex-districho' of Michoacan Mexico*, The Hague, 1960. Some pertinent comment is on pages vii and 54-55, 56-58.

Donald D. Brand: "Article 28. Ethnohistoric Synthesis of Western Mexico," pages 632-656 of Volume 11 of the *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, which was written in 1961. Pertinent material is on pages 633-639, 644-647.

¹¹ The most authentic and detailed source of information about the preconquest and contact period Tarascans and the Tarascan state is the so-called *Relación de Michoacán*. This was composed (translated) by a Franciscan missionary from information provided by Tarascan priests and nobles in Tzintzuntzan in the Tarascan language about 1539-1541. It is known today only from a codex in the library of the Escorial and the copies (manuscript and printed) that have been made from the Escorial copy. It is not known if the original *relación* was in Tarascan or Spanish, nor is it certain that the Escorial has the original Spanish copy. Apparently the *Relación de Michoacán* was not known to scholars until some copies were made about 1780 (perhaps by or for Juan Bautista Muñoz), one of which (after passing through the hands of Edward King, Viscount Kingsborough or Henri Ternaux-Compans, Obadiah Rich, and Henry Stevens) ended in the private library of the archivist and historian Peter Force in Washington, D. C. Here in the home of Peter Force (often known as Colonel Force, although he rose from private to lieutenant during the War of 1812 and later became a major general in the District of Columbia militia), Charles Etienne Brasseur de Bourbourg in 1854 consulted and partially copied the *Relación de Michoacán*. Upon the appearance of volume 1 in 1857 (in discussion of sources) P. LXXV-LXXVI and volume 3 in 1858 (p. 52, 57-58, 77 where the Col. Peter Force manuscript copy of the *Relación de ... Mechoacán* is cited) of the four-volume work *Histoire des Nations Civilisées du Mexique et de L'Amérique Centrale*, Paris, 1857-1859, scholars in Mexico and Europe became aware of this ethnohistorical treasure which had effectively been lost for some three centuries. So the Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg (1814-1874) should be

his third letter of May 15, 1522. Cortés wrote that shortly after the fall of Tenochtitlan in August of 1521 an embassy had come to him from the lord of Michoacán. Cortés asked these Tarascans if it was possible to reach the Mar del Sur across their lands. The Tarascans replied that indeed it was possible but that currently to reach the sea it would be necessary to go through the lands of a great lord with whom they were at enmity.¹² Although Carl O. Sauer¹³ and others have interpreted this to be a reference to the ruler of Colima, it can only refer to Zacatula because (1) it would be ridiculous for the Spaniards and Tarascans to go far to the west to reach the Pacific across Colima when it was directly south of Tzintzuntzan and the Tarascan heartland, and (2) most importantly, in November of 1522 the Tarascans helped carry anchors and other materials for the ships that were to be constructed in Zacatula.¹⁴

The claim made by Barlow for a Mexican conquest of Zacatula rests on his interpretations of various lists of conquests by Tenochca rulers and the lists of tributary places in the *Matricula de Tributos* as copied in the *Codex Mendocino*. In 1946 Barlow¹⁵ outlined briefly the materials

credited with "discovering" the *Relación de Michoacán* as well as the Landa manuscript.

There have been three printed editions of the *relación* (1869 in Madrid, 1903 in Morelia, and 1956 in Madrid). The best edition is the facsimile edition of 1956 with transcription and notes by José Tudela, discussion of Tarascan words by José Corona Núñez, and all of the 44 original illustrations plus many other pertinent illustrations. Some of the pertinent material will be found on pages 166-168.

Nicolás León in *Los Tarascos. Primera Parte*, Mexico, 1904, which is devoted to the "Historia primitiva, Descubrimiento y Conquista", has pulled together much material from the *Relación de Michoacán* and various chronicles of the sixteenth century, and covers the rule of Tzitzic Pandácuare through that of Zuanga (about 1454-1520) on pages 101-118.

José Bravo Ugarte in tomo 1 *Michhuacan, El Estado Tarasco* of his *Historia Sucinta de Michoacán*, 3 vols., Mexico, 1962-1964, pages 20-26 and 49-82, gives a very clear discussion of the Tarascan state and its development.

¹² Hernán Cortés: *Cartas de Relación*. I have used the Colección Austral 1945 Buenos Aires edition, in which the pertinent material will be found on page 227.

¹³ Carl Sauer "Colima of New Spain in the Sixteenth Century," *Ibero-Americana*: 29, Berkeley, 1948, page 5.

¹⁴ *Relación de Michoacán*, 1956 edition, pages 261-263.

¹⁵ See Note 8. The "Materiales para una Cronología del Imperio de los Mexica," appeared in 1946 in the *Revista Mexicana de Estudios Anropológicos*, volume 8, pages 207-215.

available for a chronology of the development of the Mexican Empire, and stated two very important conclusions or guidelines: All places conquered appeared in the same order in the different sources or lists for a given conquering city, and the sequence is chronologic in all the lists excepting the *Codex Mendocino*. Elsewhere Barlow¹⁶ gives the time for the Mexican conquests in Zacatula under Ahuitzotl as being between 5 *calli* or 1497 and 12 *tecpatl* or 1504. Unfortunately, Barlow (who died in 1951) never published the details for his conclusions.

A comparison of such lists as in the 1528 *Anales de Tlatelolco*, the 1566 letter of the cacique Pablo Nazareo in Latin, and the 1570 *Anales de Cuauhtitlan*, does show that the conquests of Ahuitzotl appear in essentially the same order and also provides us with a helpful variorum of the place names.¹⁷ Although the chronology seems to be an inferential matter gleaned from a variety of dubious sources, I will accept it. My pick is with the identification of places on the Ahuitzotl list with places in the greater Zacatula province. In the first place, most of these place names are descriptive and appear in other parts of Mexico, place names such as Coyuca, Acapulco, and Cihuatlán. There is no known gloss or commentary on the conquests in Zacatula to help us, such as we have in Durán,

¹⁶ See Note 8 concerning the Barlow edition of the *Relación de Zacatula* in 1947. Barlow assumed that the Ahuitzotl conquests in the Costa Grande began in or after 1497 because the names of presumptive Costa Grande localities follow in sequence after Amaxtlán which the "Anales de Tula, Hidalgo," *Tlalocan* volume 3, pages 2-13, 1949, stated was conquered in 1497.

¹⁷ Of the various sources listed by Barlow in 1946, I found three to be useful in connection with Ahuitzotl's conquests in the Costa Grande of Guerrero. The oldest is the collection of annals written about 1528-1530 in Tlatelolco in the Nahuatl which was translated into the German by Mengin 1939-1940, and then translated into the Spanish from the German by Heinrich Berlin with a resume and interpretation by Robert H. Barlow (*Anales de Tlatelolco*, Mexico, 1948). There are several documents, and Documento II Lista de los Reyes de Tenochtitlan, paragraph 64 on page 17, lists the conquests of Ahuitzotl. In March of 1566 the cacique Don Pablo Nazareo of Xaltocan wrote a letter in Latin to Felipe II, which was published by Francisco del Paso y Troncoso in Tomo X of his *Epistolario de Nueva España*, Mexico, 1940, with the original Latin on pages 89-108, and a Spanish version by Agustín Millares Carlo on pages 109-129. There is included a list of the Mexican rulers together with their conquests; those of Ahuitzotl are given on pages 98 and 119. The *Anales de Cuauhtitlan*, a document of about 1570 in Nahuatl, formed a part of an item in the Boturini collection which ultimately became known as the *Códice Chimalpopoca*. This document contains a Mexican conquest list within which the conquests of Ahuitzotl will be found in paragraph 241 of the 1945 edition *Códice Chimalpopoca*. *Anales de Cuauhtitlan y Leyenda de los Soles*, with

Torquemada, Tezozomoc, and elsewhere for conquests in the Valley of Toluca, in Oaxaca, etc.¹⁸

Acapulco is an exceptionally good example of a probably erroneous identification. In a joint letter of 1554 to the Viceroy Velasco, in reply to a request for information about the status and nature of preconquest tribute, Fray Toribio de Benavente (who came to New Spain in 1524) and Fray Diego de Olarte (who came with Cortés in 1519), both of them expert speakers of Nahuatl, stated that Acapulco as well as the Yopilzincos, Michoacán, and five other states had never been subject to Montezuma.¹⁹ In this connection it should be remembered that Montezuma followed Ahuitzotl in 1502.

photoreproduction from the Códice Chimalpopoca Manuscript and direct translation from the Nahuatl into the Spanish by Primo Feliciano Velázquez.

A comparison of the sequence in these three sources is given below:

<i>Tlatelolco</i> 1528	Nazareo 1566	Anales de Cuauhtitlan 1570
Amaxatla	Amaxtlan	Amaxtlan
Yauhtepec	Chiyappan	Chiyappan
Cozcaquauhtenanco	Cozcaquauhtenanco	Cozcaquauhtenanco
Xolochiuhcan	Xolochiuhyan	Xolochiyuhyan
Tzohuipillan	Cozohuipilla	Cozohuipillan
Coyocac	Coyocac	Coyocac
Acalecan	Apancalecan	Apancallecán
Xiuiztlauacan	Xiuhtlan	Xiuhtlan
Acatepec	Acatlicpac	Acatlyyacac
Acapolco	Acapulco	Acapolco
Icxolotlan	Totollan	Totollan
-----pec	Tecpatepec	Tecpantepec
Nexpan	Nexpan	Nexpan
etc.	etc.	etc.

¹⁸ Diego Durán, O.P. (c. 1537-1588), about 1579-1581 wrote an *Historia de las Indias de Nueva-España* which was first published in two volumes with atlas, Mexico, 1867-1880. There is available the 1967 edition edited by A. M. Garibay. Juan de Torquemada, O.F.M., (c. 1564-1624), about 1604-1613 wrote the work which is most frequently known as the *Monarquía Indiana*. This was first published in 1615, and again in 1723. There is available a three-volume reduced facsimile of the 1723 edition issued in Mexico in 1969. Hernando Tezozomoc, correctly known as Hernando Alvarado Tezozomoc, wrote about 1598 and lived c. 1520 to c. 1610. His *Crónica Mexicana* was first published in 1844-1849, and is available (in a somewhat reduced but adequate form for our purposes) in the 1943 Mexico City edition.

¹⁹ In 1553 the crown requested the Mexican audiencia to obtain "Informacion Sobre los Tributos que los Indios Pagaban a Moctezuma." This royal cedula has been published in the *Cedulario de Puga* and most recently by France V. Scholes and Eleanor B. Adams on pages 17 to 23 of their *Informacion sobre los tributos que los indios pagaban a Moctezuma Año de 1554*, Mexico, 1957, which also contains the replies of thirteen Indian witnesses in Mexico City in 1554. The Viceroy Luis de Velasco and the Oidor Quesada, upon receiving the royal cedula, requested information from various religious, Indians, officials, et al. Among the replies was

Zacatula does not appear in any conquest list of the Tenochca, although it does appear as a tributary place in the *Codex Mendocino*. Harvey feels that Zacatula town was too weak to be worth mentioning since the Tarascans had stated (*Relación de Patzcuaro*) that in war they always defeated the people of Zacatula so (I quote) "it is doubtful that they were much of a problem for the Mexicans". What Harvey forgets is that the Tarascans almost always defeated the Mexicans also.²⁰

Barlow, who edited and published the *Relación de Zacatula* in 1947, in commenting on Xolochiuhyán (modern Joluchuca) in 1949 identifies it as the scene of (I quote)

a joint letter of opinion and information (*carta de parecer*) written in August of 1554 by Toribio de Motolinía and Diego de Olarte in Cholula to the viceroy. This was published by P. Mariano Cuevas, S. J. in his *Documentos inéditos del Siglo XVI para la Historia de México*, Mexico, 1914, as item xxxix, pages 228-232, entitled "Carta Parecer de Fray Toribio de Motolinía y de Diego de Olarte a Don Luis de Velasco el Primero. Cholula 27 de Agosto de 1554." In answer to the request for information the two knowledgeable friars wrote (page 228) "Y los que no estaban a Montezuma sujetos y tenían señorío por sí, son los siguientes: Michoacán, Tlaxcalla, los Yopilzincos, Meztitlán, Cholulan, Huexocinco, Acapulco, Acatepec."

For the convenience of the reader a partial list of the Tarascan and Mexican rulers is given herewith. The chronology is approximate.

<i>Tarascan State</i>	<i>Mexican Empire</i>
Tangáxoan I -1454 (Tangahoan, Tangajuan)	Montezuma I 1440 - 1468/69 (Moteuczoma, Moctezuma)
Tzitzic Pandácuare 1454 - 1479 (Tzitzispandacuare)	Axayacatl 1469 - 1481
Zuanga (Zuangua) 1479 - 1520	Tizoc 1481/82 - 1485/86 Ahuitzotl 1486 - 1502 Montezuma II 1502/03 - 1520
(Francisco) Tangáxoan II 1520 - 1530 (Cazonci Tzintsicha)	Cuitlahuac 1520 Cauahtemoc 1520 - 1521
Antonio Huitziméngari Constantino Huitziméngari	

The individuals listed under *Tarascan State* are in direct line of descent, i.e., Constantino is the son of Antonio who is the son of Francisco, etc.

²⁰ Harvey (as cited in Note 9, Article 26 in HMAI Volume 11) makes his statement on page 614. The *Relación de Patzcuaro* referred to by Harvey is one of the group mentioned in Note 1. The most recent publication of this *relación* will be found in the *Relaciones Geográficas de la Diócesis de Michoacán 1579-1580*, Segunda Parte, Guadalajara, 1958. The Harvey citation is on page 113.

“Ahuitzotl's first breakthrough to the coast and [it] became his ‘frontier’ —against whom, is doubtful.”²¹ Here Barlow is guilty of being propagandistically selective since the actual statement in the *relación* reads “En tiempo de su gentilidad sujetaba el mexicano Montezuma en esta provincia los pueblos que hay desde Cayaco hasta Suluchuca donde tenia su frontera.” The *relación* goes on to say that these towns (i.e. from Cayaco to Juluchuca) gave tribute of food and arms for the *frontera*, and that the other towns of the province were independent and each had its own lord.²² Since this *relación* was written in the Villa of Zacatula in 1580, it seems obvious that the *frontera* was against the towns and peoples west of Joluchuca at least as far as Zacatula town. Furthermore, if the Mexican conquests had been between 1497 and 1504, during the rule of Ahuitzotl and of Montezuma —as seems quite probable, the older natives who had been interviewed to provide this information could have and surely would have obtained precise and accurate information from their fathers. In this connection, and applying Barlow's thesis of chronologic sequence and geographic grouping of places in conquest lists, it is interesting that if places listed by Barlow as being in the Costa Grande and conquered by Ahuitzotl but which are west of Joluchuca or east of Cayaco are eliminated we eliminate at least four entities including Acapulco, and this Acapulco/Acapolco is followed by Ixolotlan/Totollan and this Xolotlan is part of an Ahuitzotl conquest sequence from the coast of Oaxaca as given by Tezozomoc and others (Xuchtlán, Amaxtlán, Izhuatlán, Miahuatlán, Tecuan-tepec, and Xolotlan).²³

The tribute list in the *Codex Mendocino* adds some confusing notes. On folio 38 recto it duplicates the towns listed on page 16 of the *Matricula de Tributos*.²⁴ The list starts

²¹ *Ibero-Americana*: 28, as cited in the second paragraph of Note 8. Barlow's comment will be found on page 11.

²² *Relación de Zacatula* as published by Barlow, page 264.

²³ Tezozomoc: *Crónica Mexicana*, as mentioned in Note 18. The material will be found in Chapter LXXV on pages 151, 153, etc.

²⁴ Barlow (*Ibero-Americana*: 28 pages 1-7) provides an adequate description and discussion of the *Matricula de Tributos* and the *Codex Mendocino* as background to his analysis of the nature and geographic distribution of tribute given to the

with Cihuatlan which is followed by Colima. The place name Cihuatlan was so widely spread over ancient Mexico that it was not difficult to locate a Cihuatlan in the Costa Grande of Guerrero. However, Colima has become an embarrassment to be glossed over or ignored since nearly all modern scholars reject an extension of the Mexican Empire to the Colima west of Michoacán, and there is no other Colima known. The solution to the problem is simple and reasonable. The *Matricula de Tributos* apparently was prepared by native artists for the use of Cortés and probably in 1521 after the fall of Tenochtitlan. By this time Cortés had heard of Cihuatlan from the Tarascans, according to Cervantes de Salazar.²⁵ If this was the Cihuatlan on the lower Río Marbasco (Río de Cihuatlan) which forms part of the boundary between the states of Jalisco and Colima, then Cortés heard also of Colima. In any case, I assume that Cihuatlan and Colima were added to the *Matricula* for the information of Cortés and have nothing to do with the Zacatula region.

A further note of confusion is added by Alva Ixtlilxochitl who has a wonderful story of the conquest of Zacatula by a nobleman and two merchants from Texcoco about 1491. It seems that the armies of the empire had many times attempted to conquer the great city of Zacatula but "siempre volvían destrozados". Finally the three Texcocans, although prisoners in Zacatula, were able to take advantage of the drunken stupor

Culhua Mexica (= Mexican Empire = Aztec Empire). However, for more recent discussions see references in HMAI Volume 14, Census of Native Middle American Pictorial Manuscripts Numbers 196 (pages 160-161) and 368 (pages 225-226). I have used the *Matricula de Tributos* as published by Antonio Peñafiel in 1890 (*Monumentos del Arte Mexicano Antiguo*), which was adequate for my use despite defective publication, and the *Codex Mendoza* as published by James Cooper Clark in 1938.

As a matter of logic and justice, the Pro-Mexicanists should justify in detail their bias in favor of Mexican documents such as the above wherever such documents conflict with Tarascan documents of the sixteenth century.

²⁵ Francisco Cervantes de Salazar (c. 1515-1575) began a *Crónica* about 1554 which apparently never was completed. This was first published in 1914 as *Crónica de la Nueva España*, which is the edition I have used. On page 765, after mentioning that Cortés had obtained information from the two Tarascan Indians who had returned from the Michoacán borderlands with Parrillas which decided him to send Montañón to explore "la Provincia de Mechuacán, y la de las Amazonas, que los Indios llaman Ciguatlan", Cervantes de Salazar comments that this took place before the fall of Tenochtitlan or "muy poco despues".

of their captors, cut off the head of the lord of Zacatula, and obtained the surrender of the city.²⁶

It may be pertinent that most of the central and southern portion of the boundary between the dioceses of México and Michoacán, as established in the 1530's, approximated the frontier or march between the Mexican and Tarascan states.²⁷ The diocesan boundary crossed the river Balsas between Pezuapa and Ajuchitlan and reached the Pacific at the Boca de Mitla. This means to me that the Mexicans had abandoned the coastal stretch between the Boca de Mitla and Joluchuca before the coming of the Spaniards and only a few years after they had conquered it. This was probably because they were overextended strategically, and could not control the narrow corridór of access from the Balsas basin which was constricted between the Tarascans on the west and Acapulco and the Yopes on the east. The western boundary of the former independent state of Acapulco provided the southeastern boundary of the diocese of Michoacán at the Boca de Mitla.

It is worthy of note that there is no mention of Acapulco (state, town, port or bay) by the Spaniards until 1528.²⁸ This is a most curious fact in the light of the search for a Pacific

²⁶ Ixtlilxochitl's edition of 1891-92 as mentioned in Note 3. The marvelous story of the Texcocan capture of Zacatula is given in tomo II *Historia Chichimeca*, cap. LXII, pages 279-281.

²⁷ On the basis of prior information sent from Mexico to Spain and resultant instructions from Spain, the Audiencia in 1535 established the boundary between the provinces and dioceses of Mexico and Michoacán which were to remain practically unchanged until 1863. Some of the pertinent documentation is cited by Bravo Ugarte in *Diócesis y Obispos de la Iglesia Mexicana (1519-1965)*, 1965 edition, pages 67-68. All of western Guerrero, including all of the Provincia de Zacatula in both Guerrero and Michoacán, was within both the province and diocese of Michoacán until the Intendency of Mexico was established in 1786/1792 when the former Alcaldía Mayor de Zacatula was removed from Michoacán and placed in the Intendency of Mexico. However all the parishes of the former Alcaldía Mayor de Zacatula remained in the Diocese of Michoacán until the Diocese of Chilapa was established 1863/1866.

It is interesting that Herrera (mentioned in Note 2), in Dec. 3, lib. 3, CAP. IX implies that the Kingdom of Michoacán was the basis for the territorial extent of the Diocese of Michoacán ("Reino de Michoacán que aora esta reducido a Obispado.")

²⁸ Cedulaario de Puga. I have used the 1878-1879 reprint of Vasco de Puga's work which was first published in Mexico in 1563, with the title *Provisiones, cédulas, instrucciones de su magestad, ordenanças de difuntos y audiencia*. The pertinent royal cedula of April 5, 1528 refers to the possessions of Cortés which are

port carried out by the men of Cortés between 1521 and 1525. That Zacatula on the Río Balsas was developed as a port years before Acapulco is heard of means to me that (1) the Mexicans controlled no part of the western and central coastlands of what is modern Guerrero, (2) the approach to Zacatula was across lands controlled by the Tarascans and the occupation and development of Zacatula was facilitated by the influence in Zacatula of the Tarascans who had become allies of the Spaniards, and (3) that the Spaniards under Juan Rodríguez de Villafuerte occupied or conquered the Costa Grande via Zacatula out of a base in Michoacán.

All of the above adds up to my conclusions that the Mexicans held a few towns on the Costa Grande for a few years, and that Zacatula town and area proper never was under Mexican control but was within the sphere of Tarascan influence.

to be placed in the Crown including "Acapulco y su tierra donde se hacen los navios del Sur," (tome 1, p. 82-83).

Cervantes de Salazar (in *Crónica*, described in Note 25, on page 807) states that Cortés sent out two Spaniards and some Indians to Zacatula 100 leagues from Mexico and two other Spaniards to Tehuantepec 120 leagues from Mexico "aunque por otras partes, entonces occultas, estaba mas cerca la mar del Sur." It would be difficult to find a more definite statement that Cortés did not know about the bay and possible port of Acapulco until after he was acquainted with the Zacatula and Tehuantepec areas and had commenced plans to build ships in these two areas.

Working Bibliography

Anales de Cuauhtitlan. Códice Chimalpopoca. See Velázquez.

Anales de Tlatelolco. See Berlin and Barlow.

"Anales de Tula, Hidalgo, 1361-1521," edited by R. H. Barlow and with translation from Nahuatl to Spanish, *Tlalocan* volume 3, p. 2-13, 1949.

Robert H. Barlow, "Materiales para una Cronología del Imperio de los Mexica," *Revista Mexicana de Estudios Antropológicos*, volume 8, p. 207-215, 1946.

Robert H. Barlow, "The Extent of the Empire of the Culhua Mexica," *Ibero-Americana*: 28, Berkeley, 1949.

Pablo de la Purísima Concepción Beaumont, *Crónica de la Provincia de los Santos Apóstoles S. Pedro y S. Pablo de Michoacán*, 3 vols., Mexico, 1932, as tomos 17-19 of the *Publicaciones del Archivo General de la Nación* series.

Heinrich Berlin and Robert H. Barlow, *Anales de Tlatelolco; Unos Annales Históricos de la Nación Mexicana y Códice de Tlatelolco*, Mexico, 1948.

Lorenzo Boturini Benaducci, *Idea de Una Nueva Historia General de la América Septentrional. Catálogo del Museo Histórico Indiano*, Madrid, 1746.

Donald D. Brand, "An Historical Sketch of Geography and Anthropology in the Tarascan Region," *New Mexico Anthropologist*, VOLS. VI, VII, p. 37-108 in No. 2 dated April-June 1943 but actually published in March of 1944.

"Article 28. Ethnohistoric Synthesis of Western Mexico,"
p. 632-656 of Volume 11 of the *Handbook of Middle
American Indians*, 1971.

Donald D. Brand and others, *Coalcoman and Motines del
Oro. An 'ex-distrito' of Michoacan Mexico*, The
Hague, 1960.

Charles Etienne Brasseur de Bourbourg, *Histoire des Nations
Civilisées du Mexique et de L'Amérique-Centrale*,
4 vols., Paris, 1857-1859.

José Bravo Ugarte S. J., *Historia Sucinta de Michoacán*, 3
vols., Mexico, 1962-1964.

Diócesis y Obispos de la Iglesia Mexicana (1519-1965), 2nd
ed., Mexico, 1965.

Francisco Cervantes de Salazar, *Crónica de la Nueva España*,
Madrid, 1914.

Francisco Javier Clavigero, S. J., *Historia Antigua de México*,
4 vols., Mexico, 1945, edited by Mariano Cuevas,
S. J.

Codex Mendoza, 3 vols., London, as edited by James Cooper
Clark.

Hernán Cortés, *Cartas de Relación de la Conquista de Méjico*,
Buenos Aires, 1945.

Claude Nigel Byam Davies, *Los Señoríos Independientes del
Imperio Azteca*, Mexico, 1968.

Diego Durán, O. P., *Historia de las Indias de Nueva-España
e islas de la Tierra Firme*, 2 vols., Mexico, edited
by A. M. Garibay K.

HMAI = *HANDBOOK of Middle American Indians*, general
editor Robert Wauchope, Middle American Research
Institute, Tulane University, printed by University of

Texas Press, Austin. Fifteen volumes have appeared. Volume 11, 1971, contains Art. 26. Ethnohistory of Guerrero by Herbert R. Harvey and Art. 28. Ethnohistoric Synthesis of Western Mexico by Donald D. Brand. Volumes 12-15, 1972-1975, contain a Guide to Ethnohistorical Sources with contributions by various authors.

Herbert R. Harvey, "Art. 26. Ethnohistory of Guerrero," in *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, vol. 11, p. 603-618, Austin, 1971.

Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas, *Historia General de los Hechos de los Castellanos en las Islas y Tierrafirme del Mar Océano*, 17 vols., Madrid, 1934-1957.

Constantino Huitziméngari's *información judicial* of 1594 has been partially published by Orozco y Berra (see below, II, p. 207-209), which has been copied by N. León (see below, p. 2-4) and Bravo Ugarte (see above I, p. 21, 1962).

Información sobre los tributos que los Indios pagaban a Moctezuma Año de 1554. See Scholes and Adams.

Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl, *Obras Históricas de Don Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxochitl*, 2 vols., Mexico, 1891-1892, edited by Alfredo Chavero.

Nicolas León, *Los Tarascos. Primera Parte*, Mexico, 1904.

Matrícula de Tributos. Published by Antonio Peñafiel in *Monumentos del Arte Mexicano Antiguo*, volume of text and an atlas, Mexico, 1890. Pertinent material is in Chapters 13-15 and plates 228-259.

Fray Toribio de Motolinía y Diego de Olarte, "xxxix. Carta Parecer de Fray Toribio de Motolinía y de Diego de Olarte a Don Luis de Velasco el Primero. Cholula 27 de agosto de 1554," in *Documentos Inéditos del Siglo XVI para la Historia de México*,

Mexico, 1914, edited by P. Mariano Cuevas, S. J., p. 228-232.

Pablo Nazareo. "Carta al rey don Felipe II, de don Pablo Nazareo de Xaltocan...Mexico a 17 de marzo de 1566," the original Latin on p. 89-108 and modern Spanish version on p. 109-129, in *Epistolario de Nueva España 1505-1818*, compiled by Francisco del Paso y Troncoso, Tomo x 1564-1569, Mexico, 1940 (Biblioteca Histórica Mexicana de Obras Inéditas, Segunda Serie.)

Manuel Orozco y Berra, *Historia Antigua y de la Conquista de México*, 4 vols., Mexico, 1960 edition edited by Garibay and León-Portilla.

Vasco de Puga, *Provisiones, cédulas, instrucciones de su magestad, ordenanças de difuntos y audiencia*, Mexico, edition of 1878-1879 in two volumes.

Relación de Michoacán. *Relación de las Ceremonias y Ritos y Población y Gobierno de los Indios de la Provincia de Michoacán (1541)*, facsimile edition prepared by José Tudela, Madrid, 1956, with transcription of the text, notes, commentary and introduction by Tudela and discussion of Tarascan words by José Corona Núñez.

Relación de Patzcuaro. The most recent edition of the "Relacion de Patzcuaro" is in *Relaciones Geográficas de la Diócesis de Michoacán 1579-1580*, Segunda Parte, Guadalajara, 1958, p. 107-117.

Relación de Zacatula. Published by Robert H. Barlow as "Relacion de Zacatula, 1580," in *Tlalocan*, volume II, 1947, p. 258-268.

Carl O. Sauer, "Colima of New Spain in the Sixteenth Century," *Ibero-Americana*: 29, Berkeley, 1948.

France V. Scholes and Eleanor B. Adams, "Informacion

sobre los tributos que los indios pagaban a Moctezuma Año de 1554," in *Documentos para la Historia de México Colonial* IV, Mexico, 1957, p. 17-23.

Antonio de Solís y Rivadeneira, *Historia de la Conquista de México, Población y Progresos de la América Septentrional, conocida por el Nombre de Nueva España*, Mexico, 1968.

Hernando Alvarado Tezozomoc, *Crónica Mexicana*, Mexico, 1943.

Juan de Torquemada, O.F.M., *Monarquía Indiana*, 3 vols., Mexico, 1969.

George C. Vaillant, *Aztecs of Mexico*, Garden City, 1941.

Resumen

Entre varios conceptos erróneos que han persistido acerca de los límites del imperio mexica, del tarasco y de varios señoríos independientes de Occidente, el autor plantea el tema del papel de Zacatula en el marco político de Mesoamérica prehispánica. Concluye que este puerto clave nunca formó parte del imperio azteca sino que se encontraba dominado por el estado tarasco.