

Frances Mary Krug

“The Indian Municipality within a Spanish Urban Context: Seventeenth-Century Puebla”

p. 59-68

*La ciudad y el campo en la historia de México. Memoria de la VII Reunión de Historiadores Mexicanos y Norteamericanos. Papers presented at the VII Conference of Mexican and the United States Historians*

Gisela von Wobeser y Ricardo Sánchez (editores)

México

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México  
Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas

1992

466 + XII p.

ISBN 968-36-2347-6

Formato: PDF

Publicado en línea: 30 de noviembre de 2023

Disponible en:

<http://www.historicas.unam.mx/publicaciones/publicadigital/libros/276-01/ciudad-campo.html>



INSTITUTO  
DE INVESTIGACIONES  
HISTÓRICAS

D. R. © 2023, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México-Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas. Se autoriza la reproducción sin fines lucrativos, siempre y cuando no se mutile o altere; se debe citar la fuente completa y su dirección electrónica. De otra forma, se requiere permiso previo por escrito de la institución. Dirección: Circuito Mtro. Mario de la Cueva s/n, Ciudad Universitaria, Coyoacán, 04510. Ciudad de México



Frances Mary Krug\*

## The Indian Municipality within a Spanish Urban Context: Seventeenth-Century Puebla

Puebla de los Angeles was founded in 1531 by the Spaniards in an area sparsely settled by Indians. The reasons for the founding of the city were many, including to provide a convenient stopping place for merchants and other travellers between Veracruz and Mexico City; to initiate a settlement of prosperous, small-scale farmers without the complications of the distribution of encomiendas; to establish a fixed abode for the “vagabonds” who were viewed as unproductive members of early colonial society; and to segregate Indians and Spaniards in an attempt to avoid the perceived social ills of other parts of New Spain.

Despite these goals, it was soon apparent that Indian labor would be needed to help build houses and other buildings within the city, and therefore Indians were temporarily allocated to Spaniards as laborers. They were brought in from various communities to work in Puebla, including Tlaxcala, Cholula, Tepeaca, Calpan, and Huejotzingo. Although the Crown intended that after a few years forced Indian labor would no longer be necessary, it is clear that forced labor remained a fact of life in the Puebla area at least through the sixteenth century and facilitated increased, rather than decreased, demands on the Indian population.<sup>1</sup> One result of this continued reliance upon Indian labor in Puebla was that, contrary to the initial goals of the city’s founders, Indians began to settle permanently both in the area surrounding the city and even within the city limits themselves. What made Puebla’s situation somewhat different from other municipalities in New Spain was that there had not been a large functioning Indian settlement there prior to the arrival of the Spaniards. In Puebla the Spanish city was settled first; the Indian municipality developed afterwards. Therefore, Puebla provides a scenario different from other settlements: the Indian municipality that developed did so within a Spanish urban context, rather than the more usual case of the Spaniards’ presence affecting and altering already established Indian municipalities.

During my research comparing the Nahuatl historical annals of the Puebla-Tlaxcala region,<sup>2</sup> it became clear to me that these documents provide information about the Indian corporate entity in Puebla. Because of the nature of the genre, annals are good sources for certain types of information on Indian municipalities and poorer sources for others. On the negative side, annals do not provide us with a general view of Indian society because of their concentration on the affairs of a minority of the Indian population. On the positive side, annals usually deal with the elite of the Indian world and concentrate to a great extent on governmental matters. Because of their emphasis on the elite, annals provide much information on the activities of Indian government. They also provide

\*University of California at Los Angeles.

<sup>1</sup>See Hans J. Prem, “Early Spanish Colonization and Indians in the Valley of Atlixco, Puebla”, *Explorations in Ethnohistory*, eds. H.R. Harvey and Hans J. Prem (Albuquerque, 1984), pp. 205-228; and Julia Hirschberg, “Social Experiment in New Spain: A Prosopographical Study of the Early Settlement at Puebla de los Angeles, 1531-1534”, *HAHR*, 59 (1979), pp. 1-33.

<sup>2</sup>This essay is part of my ongoing dissertation research concerning 23 historical annals written in Nahuatl dealing with events in the Puebla-Tlaxcala region during the colonial period. The annals have a great deal of shared material and part of my research involves a clarification of the relationships of these annals to each other, following the lead of Charles Gibson and John B. Glass, who pointed out the fact that similarities existed in “A census of Middle American Prose Manuscripts in the Native Historical Tradition”, *Handbook of Middle American Indians*, 15 vols. (Austin, 1975), “Guide to Ethnohistorical Sources, Part 4”, Howard F. Cline, Volume Editor, vol. 15, p. 358.

valuable clues to the concerns of the Indian world, its attitudes and perceptions of Indian actions, and the actions of members of the Spanish world.

The source material for this essay is primarily a set of annals known as the “Códice Gómez de Orozco, 1524-1691”,<sup>3</sup> a document rich in material concerning the activities and concerns of the Indian corporation in Puebla. It was written in Nahuatl by an anonymous author and the majority of its text relates to the last half of the seventeenth century.<sup>4</sup> It is a typical colonial Nahuatl set of annals, following the expected format of a listing of years, next to which the descriptions of noteworthy events are placed. In general, the text is short and tersely written, and for any given year there are normally not more than two or three events listed. However, in the latter part, from approximately 1650 on, there is a definite change in style. Entries for individual years become quite lengthy and detailed, and the emphasis switches to a greater interest in local affairs. This style change coincides roughly with the time period when the author began to write down events within his own memory, since, given the time span covered by the annals, it is clear that no one person could have written down the events as they occurred. The author must have made use of materials written earlier, which he either used verbatim or altered to his own needs and locality. As to content, most entries in the annals can be placed into a fairly limited and predictable set of categories, including natural disasters and astronomical phenomena, news concerning government activities and officials (primarily important Spanish officials and members of the Indian *cabildo*), Church related news, and crime and punishment.

As expected, this set of annals provides many insights into the development of the Indian municipality within the context of Spanish Puebla. The first mention of the city is an entry concerning its foundation, which reads: “1533 [sic]. In this year the *altepetl* was set up. People from Tlaxcala set it up here at Cuitlaxcoapan. It was called the City of the Angels” (“1533 Nican ypan xihuitl yn omotlali altepetl quitlalique tlaxcalteca nican cuitlaxoapa motenehua suidad de loz angeles” [CGO, f. iv]).<sup>5</sup> The annalist credits the Tlaxcalans with settling the city, not surprising considering that the majority of the Indian laborers came from Tlaxcala, and that the author of this document was a resident in the Tlaxcalan-settled barrio of San Juan del Río. Of further interest is that the annalist credits the settlement of the city to Indians rather than Spaniards, and makes no comment on the “Spanishness” of the city.

The first reference in the set of annals to the Indian government within Puebla is in 1565. Here, the document states that Jerónimo Santiago was made *fiscal* at a time when there was no governor, adding that “just he spoke for the *altepetl*” (“san oc ye quitlatahuiaya ... yn altepetl” [CGO, f. 4r]). Santiago was said to be from Tlaxcaltecan, the section of Puebla where Indians from Tlaxcala generally settled, and although the context is somewhat unclear, he may originally have come from Tizatla, from a specific location called Tlatzcantitlan.<sup>6</sup> From other sources it is known that perhaps as early as 1537 there was an Indian charged with acting as a liaison between the Indian barrios and the Spanish *cabildo*,<sup>7</sup> and the system was subsequently expanded so that by 1561 the first Indian *alcalde* was named to perform similar duties.<sup>8</sup> However, none of this is indicated by the annalist.

Although there is no further information provided in this set of annals on the functioning of Indian government until 1601, another set of annals states that in 1600 a

<sup>3</sup>The manuscript is located in the Museo Nacional de Antropología, Archivo Histórico, Colección Gómez de Orozco, no. 184; hereafter it will be referred to as CGO.

<sup>4</sup>The document was likely written ca. 1690-1738

<sup>5</sup>All translations of the Nahuatl text included in this essay are mine. However, I would like to acknowledge the invaluable assistance provided by Arthur J.O. Anderson in his preliminary translation of the “Códice Gómez de Orozco” (part of a work in progress by Anderson and myself), and the many helpful suggestions of James Lockhart.

<sup>6</sup>“Tlatzcantitlan” could also be a descriptive term along the lines of “among the cypresses”.

<sup>7</sup>Fausto Marín-Tamayo, *La división racial en Puebla de los Ángeles bajo el régimen colonial* (Puebla, 1960), p. 35.

<sup>8</sup>Pedro López de Villaseñor, *Cartilla vieja de la nobilísima ciudad de Puebla (1781)* (Mexico City, 1961), p. 99.

governor named don Antonio de Luna was placed for the first time in Puebla.<sup>9</sup> In the 1601 entry in the “Código Gómez de Orozco”, the annalist states that the complete governmental system was set in place for the first time in that year, with three *alcaldes*, *regidores*, and *alguaciles* (CGO, f. 5r). In 1603 the second governor, don Juan Calson, was installed (CGO, f. 5r), and in 1610 the third governor, don Juan Bautista, who apparently was brought in from Tiztla to govern in Puebla (CGO, f. 5v). In this same year, the annalist reports that a cabildo was held at the *casa real* and three *altepetl* set up (CGO, f. 5v) - San Francisco (which included Tlaxcaltecapan), San Pablo, and Santiago (sometimes called Cholultecapan). No explanation is given as to why the *altepetl* were apparently set up nine years after the Indian cabildo.

The fourth Indian governor of Puebla, don Diego Pérez, did not take office until 1629 (CGO, f. 7r), and held the post until June 9, 1639, when the fifth governor, don Bartolomé Cortés took the staff of office (CGO, f. 8r). The sixth governor, don Blas de Galicia, accepted the position on June 24, 1652 (CGO, f. 9v), and held office from 1652 until 1679, when don Josef de Ribera became the seventh governor (CGO, f. 14v). Don Blas de Galicia is independently reported as governor at various times and during various events throughout this period, and thus must actually have held the office for such a long period.

Up to that point the Indian government in Puebla was not functioning in a standard way, although the annalist makes no comment on this. It would appear that from the foundation of Puebla in 1531 until 1565, when the annals indicate a fiscal was representing the interests of the Indian municipality, there was no clear formal organization among the Indians living in Puebla. Further, it took until 1600 for a governor to be named, until 1601 for a cabildo to be set up, and until 1610 for the three *altepetl* to be formally established. Examination of the rotation of the office of governor shows weaknesses in the system. The term of office for the governor on average was quite long, ranging from a minimum of three years for the first governor to a maximum of 27 years for the sixth. In addition, it is clear that the office was not rotating at year-end, as was customary in other communities. As we have seen, the annals indicate that two governors received the staff of office in June, with no notation by the annalist that this was out of the ordinary.

With the advent of the seventh governor there are indications of a gradual normalization of the governorship in terms of the length of office. Don Josef de Ribera held the office for two years, until 1681, when don Juan Andrés succeeded him. However, the latter's election is the first incident reported by this annalist of disagreement in deciding who would be governor. In this case the first nominee, Juan Agustín from San Pablo, was opposed by the representatives of San Francisco and Santiago because “he was already an old man and he did not have a house” (“*ye huenhuantzin yhuan amo quipie ycaltzin*” [CGO, f. 15v]). The cabildo met four times before it was able to decide on a candidate, don Juan Andrés from Santiago. It is significant that no mention is made in the account of any involvement by Spanish officials in this dispute.

Shortly after this conflict, the tentative moves made towards normalizing the term of office of the governor were threatened by an attempt to weaken the hold the Indian corporation had on the governmental system. In 1682 the governor's office was apparently held jointly by a “Chinese” named Mateo Xaen and a mulatto called Peña.<sup>10</sup> However, by 1684 the annalist reported that the Indians were reasserting their authority, since the person who held the office of governor in that year, don Felipe de Santiago, was an Indian. Along with an unidentified group of other Indians, he removed the mulattoes controlling the governorship (the annalist lists the two “governors” of 1682 and the *teniente*), so that “they will never again enter the cabildo of the [Indian] commoners because they did not respect the elders who represent people in the cabildo” (“*aoc..*

<sup>9</sup>This information is found in both “Ephémérides de Tlaxcala et lieux circonvoisins, 1519-1737” (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris [hereafter BNP], no. 378, f. 12) and in “Anales de Puebla y Tlaxcala, no.2, 1524-1674” (Museo Nacional de Antropología, Archivo Histórico, Colección Antigua, no. 274, f. 810).

<sup>10</sup>CGO, f. 16v. The text provides no explanation for the apparent co-governorship, but perhaps one of the two listed was *cobrador*.

calaquisque yn incabildo masehualtzitzintin ypanp.. ayocle ypan oquimittaya yn tetachcahuan yn pa.. sa yehuantin tetlatahuilia yn cabildo” [CGO, f. 21r]). The cabildo then petitioned the authorities in Mexico City for a decree providing that “never again will Christians,<sup>11</sup> mestizos, mulattoes, blacks, or Chinese enter the cabildo, only the [Indian] commoners will concern themselves with it” (“aocmo calaquisque cabildo ma qui..tiano ma mestiso ma molato ma tliltic ma chin.. sa mixcahuisque yn masehualtzitzintin” [CGO, f. 21r]). The decree arrived and was duly proclaimed.

There is another indication of an increasing normalization in the rotation of the office of the governor in the midst of this threat to the Indian corporation. The annalist reports that in 1684, don Felipe de Santiago was removed from the office of governor half-way through his term because he had had someone’s ears cut off. He was replaced by Melchor de los Reyes until mid-November, when he was reinstated as governor and “he just finished the year” (“sa oquitlami xihuitl” [CGO, f. 21v]), which implies the intent to have the governorship conform to a yearly rotation.

In 1685 don Miguel de los Santos was named eleventh governor in an apparently standard change of office (CGO, f. 22r). But in 1686, when the position changed hands again, a very serious problem arose. In this case the *alcalde mayor* wanted a mestizo named don Juan de Galicia<sup>12</sup> to be governor, a move that was rejected by all three altepetl (CGO, ff. 23r-23v). The Indian cabildo held two elections, but both nominees were rejected by the *alcalde mayor*, so both sides then sent to Mexico City asking for support for their position. A decree similar to the one received in 1684 was brought back by the Indian contingent, prohibiting non-Indians from the cabildo. So another election was held, this time with the *alcalde mayor* sending two witnesses of his choosing to observe. The man elected was again rejected by the *alcalde mayor*, and both sides again went to Mexico City to plead their case. Meanwhile, the *alcalde mayor* put an acting governor in place. When the *alcalde mayor* returned to Puebla in mid-February he stated to the cabildo “If you do not want don Juan de Galicia to be governor, then I will place him as *cofrador* and he will collect the tribute” (“amo nananquinequi yes g<sup>or</sup> yn don ju<sup>o</sup> de galisia nictlalis yes *cofrador* yehuatl cololoz yn tlacalaquili” [CGO, f. 23v]). Since this was a very important function of the Indian governor, this action significantly reduced the power of the office. Finally, don Miguel de la Cruz was chosen by the Indians to be the twelfth governor, and his election was confirmed by officials in Mexico City on July 8, but don Juan de Galicia apparently held the office of *cofrador* from February 21 on.

The narration of this event provides some insights into the Indian municipality in Puebla in the late seventeenth century. The annalist states that the mestizo don Juan de Galicia did have some support amongst the *huehuetque* (elders), with the account even mentioning four names. It is clear from this event that there were a number of factions within the Indian cabildo, including at least one supporting Juan de Galicia (consisting of the four individuals named by the annalist, “and others” [“yhuan oc sequintin” - CGO, f. 23r]) and one opposing him. However, the author alleges that the reason the four elders favored Galicia was solely because “he fed them and got them drunk” (“quintlacualti oquintlahuanti” [CGO, f. 23r]). It is also evident that it was important for the Indian cabildo to at least perceive that it was in control. The members’ continued appeal to Mexico City, and the lack of indication in the text that the Indians had lost in this power struggle, shows that the Indian municipality’s leaders still believed that they were in control. They felt victorious in getting an Indian elected as governor even though they had to concede the collection of the tribute to a mestizo. There is a strong anti-mestizo feeling apparent here. However, although the mestizo is associated with the *alcalde mayor* in terms of being his choice for governor, there is no intimation whatsoever that the *alcalde*

<sup>11</sup>That is, Spaniards.

<sup>12</sup>It is possible that this don Juan de Galicia was somehow related to don Blas de Galicia, who had been governor of Puebla from 1652 to 1679.

mayor was involved in any chicanery used to influence elders in the decision, a typical attitude of the annalist seen repeatedly throughout the text. Although Spaniards and things Spanish are viewed favorably, mestizos, mulattoes, blacks, and other non-Indian members of the Spanish world are viewed critically. Almost invariably the latter groups are reported only in the context of criminal activity or attacks upon the Indian corporate entity.

In 1687 the annalist reports that don Josef Lázaro became the thirteenth governor, but he died six months later after being kicked by a mule, and was replaced by his son of the same name, who “finished the other half of the year” (“oquitlami yn oc tlaco xihuitl!” [CGO, f. 24v]). There is no information given on whether or not Lázaro held the office of *cobrador*, but since the annalist normally does indicate if this is not the case, we can probably assume that he did. However, in 1688 the mestizo don Juan de Galicia (about whom all the fuss was made in 1686) actually became governor (CGO, f. 25v), an office he held for three years. Even when he gave up the office to don Diego de León, most likely an Indian, in 1691 (the last year covered by the annals), Galicia retained the office of *cobrador* (CGO, f. 29r). It is significant that there are no descriptions of disputes over the governor’s office after 1686, and the facts of who was governor in what years are merely recorded, as if it were completely normal that a mestizo should hold the office.

Information in the annals provides insights into other aspects of the Indian municipality. We have seen above that three *altepētēl* were set up in 1610, namely San Francisco, San Pablo, and Santiago, and that each had one *alcalde*, *regidor*, and *alguacil*. The annalist also identifies a number of *barrios* of Puebla, but he clearly is a resident of the *barrio* of San Juan del Río with a pronounced feeling of loyalty and pride in events that took place there. He spends a great deal of time relating the details of the construction of the church of San Juan del Río by the Indian *cabildo*, and emphasizes in 1685 that the eleventh governor of Puebla, don Miguel de los Santos, “was a resident of San Francisco in the *barrio* of San Juan del Río” (“San fran<sup>co</sup> chane ypan *barrio* San ju<sup>o</sup> de Ryo” [CGO, f. 22r]), and that “this was the first time that this *barrio*, which used to be called Tlaxcaltecapan, had risen to the governorship” (“yancuica otlecoc yn yn gobernasion *barrio* montenehua tlaxcaltecapan” [CGO, f. 22r]). The fifteenth governor, don Diego de León, was also a resident of San Juan del Río (CGO, f. 29r), perhaps indicting the increasing importance of that section of Puebla.

Unfortunately, *barrio* affiliations of the governors are not provided consistently by the author. The only information we have is that the third governor was from Tizatlá (CGO, f. 5v), the eighth from Santiago (CGO, f. 15v), the eleventh from San Juan del Río (CGO, f. 22r), the twelfth from Santiago (CGO, f. 23v), the thirteenth from San Miguel (CGO, f. 24v), and the fifteenth from San Juan del Río (CGO, f. 29r). At least two governors (the ninth and fourteenth) were non-Indians, although no residence information is given for them. Thus, it is impossible at this point to make any judgment as to the circulation of the office of governor among the three *altepētēl*.

There is scattered information about the holders of other offices within the Indian government, but it is not nearly sufficient to arrive at credible conclusions about possible career patterns. For present purposes it is enough to note indications that there were indeed three *alcaldes*, although the evidence is less specific for *regidores*. Past office holders seem to have played a large role in decision making, and this annalist’s reporting of events demonstrates that theirs was an important voice even late in the seventeenth century. In at least two cases some or all of the members of the governing group were arrested by Spanish officials. In 1677 the past *alcaldes*, *regidores*, *alguaciles*, and all the elders were imprisoned from August 27 until September 15, when the Bishop released them. The arrest was made because they “favored” (“ypan otlatoque” [CGO, f. 14r]) the Indian governor, but no further details are given. One man died while being held in jail.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup>CGO, ff. 14r-14v. The dead man was a Juan Gerónimo, citizen of San Juan del Río. Since the governor involved was don Blas de Galicia, it is possible that the annalist’s inclusion of this incident could be related to the resistance he shows to don Juan de Galicia, if in fact don Juan and don Blas de Galicia were related.

In 1681, the elders of the three altepetl were jailed for a time, apparently because of something to do with the tribute collection (CGO, f. 15v), a standard occurrence in other communities at the end of the sixteenth century.

Numerous examples of the concerns of the Indian municipality in Puebla are found within the annals. As noted above, much of the detailed information concerning the office of the governor in Puebla relates to attempts by the corporation to deal with threats to its power and authority, and the same is true with other aspects of town government. For example, in the entry for 1685 the annalist describes an unsuccessful attempt to stop the practice of Indians renting houses from Spaniards outside of the Indian barrios (CGO, f. 22v). This incident reveals both the concern of the Spanish government that Indians were escaping their tribute obligations by renting houses from Spaniards, as well as the concern of the Indian corporation over the threat that such a situation posed to its control. It is clear that this situation was not new in Puebla, for as early as 1556 there were indications that the Spanish cabildo was attempting to stop Indians from living within the Spanish parts of the city without permission.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, in 1606 the Indian cabildo asked the viceroy to order that Indians not be allowed to live in the Spanish sections.<sup>15</sup> The order was granted, but obviously the problem continued.

Another evident concern of the Indian municipality in Puebla during the seventeenth century was church construction and renovation. Some of the information provided on religious ceremonies relates primarily to the Spanish sections of the city, as indicated by the activities taking place and the names of officials involved. However, a great number of the projects and ceremonies detailed were clearly Indian. Starting in 1616 a multitude of building projects are listed, including altarpieces, chapel construction, processions of images, and dome construction. As is to be expected, the majority of detailed information in this regard centers on the church of San Juan del Río, the barrio in which the annalist resided. However, he also lists information as to when a variety of churches and chapels were renovated, built, or consecrated within Puebla, normally with very little detail other than the date, what was done, and the name of the church. For the more detailed listings, the author at times includes the names of people involved in the projects. It should be stressed that the individuals participating in these building projects were definitely local Indians, and that there were Indian artisans planning and building churches, altars, portals, and belfries in Spanish styles and using Spanish techniques. Spanish artisans were normally only used when trouble was encountered or a particularly elaborate piece planned. In one case concerning the vault project at San Juan del Río, where a Spanish artisan was consulted, his advice was not taken and preference was given to the opinion of two Indian artisans whose plan for remedying the situation was less costly and disruptive to the church (CGO, ff. 25v-26r).

Inherent in many of the annalist's descriptions of events are some clear indications of his attitudes and perceptions of the events. Because the annalist is obviously closely associated with the Indian elite in Puebla (as evidenced by his high degree of literacy and his familiarity with Spanish as well as Indian governmental and religious affairs), the attitudes and perceptions he exhibits are representative of a portion of the Indian world. Although he has a definite bias in favor of San Juan del Río, this is typical and does not detract from the applicability of his more general perceptions to a larger group.

The annalist's view of both his own world—the Indian side of Puebla—and the Spanish world are clearly expressed. One example that typifies his worldview concerns a crisis related to breadmaking in the city in 1682.

<sup>14</sup>Villaseñor, *Cartilla vieja*, pp. 91-92; and Marín-Tamayo, *La división racial*, p. 22.

<sup>15</sup>Marín-Tamayo, *La división racial*, p. 22.

“...Also in this year the Spaniards began to raise the price of maize for no good reason. They placed its price at a peso for a half a basket even though there had been good harvests; God had granted a good yield of maize as well as wheat. But the Spaniards began to raise prices in the month of August, for no good reason. Then at the beginning of the month of September, fifty Spaniards agreed that only they would make bread. Then they went up before the *alcalde mayor* and obliged themselves that only they make bread to feed Puebla. And then city officials summoned the [Indian] commoners and told them they were taking breadmaking away from them; they set a penalty for them and gave them a day’s time to stop making bread, and only the chosen Spaniards would make it. But they really couldn’t keep it up. It was done inside the city for only two days, and during those two days there was already hunger. On Monday, the 21st day of the month of September, right on the day of St. Matthew, on Monday and Tuesday, there was hunger; neither bread nor tortillas was found, neither in the marketplace nor in stores. And if someone secretly baked a bit of something with old flour and took it to the market, even tortillas, the Spaniards would fight over it. Even though it was someone of very high rank, the [Indian] commoners no longer paid him respect; whoever was first got the bread. There was nothing but weeping. Then everyone got worked up, priests along with the Spaniards and [Indian] commoners, so that everyone took the side of the [Indian] commoners. The [Indian] commoners gave a letter they wrote with their hands to the *alcalde mayor*. Then the *alcalde mayor* went up to his palace, then all the nobles and some of the elders cried out to him saying, “Bread, bread, Captain, we’re hungry, we’re hungry!” Then the *alcalde mayor* heard it and they read him the letter, which said that all the service of our great ruler the King would be lost if they made us relinquish our trade, breadmaking. Let the Spaniards do all the different services and pay the tribute –and when the *alcalde mayor* heard it he quickly orderd that a decree be issued and proclamation made that the [Indian] commoners should make the bread. And he gave instructions that the Spaniards be arrested and the chosen Spaniards then fled...”<sup>16</sup>

There are a number of interesting facets here. The precipitating factor in this crisis, according to the annalist, was that the Spanish had raised the price of corn “for no good reason” in the face of a good harvest of both corn and wheat. There is also the statement that the Spaniards were incapable of feeding the city, while the Indians were more than capable in that regard. In addition to this pride in the accomplishments of the Indian world there is a somewhat unrealistic perception of the strength and power that the municipality had over the situation. When the lack of bread reached a crisis point, the annalist reported that the actions of the Indian corporation in bringing the matter to the *alcalde mayor*’s attention and threatening to no longer pay tribute were the only factors in his quick action to reinstate breadmaking as an Indian pursuit. Here the author perceives the power and influence

<sup>16</sup>CGO, ff. 174-18r. “Saanno ypa xihuitl yn san oquinenpehualtique yn caxtilteca oquitlasotilica yn tlaolli se peso ypatiuh oquitlali que yn tlaco cocohuacali auh huel omotlamochiuhca ynic acon yuhqui tlaolli yuh trigo yn omochiuhca yn oquimotemaquilaca yn dioz auh sa oquinenpehualtica yn caxtilteca yn oquipehualtique quitlaqotilia ypan metztli agosto niman ticalaque metztli de septiembre auh niman oncan omonotzque onpualliommatlacti caxtilteca ynin san yehuantin quichihuasq yn pantzin niman otleoque yxpan *alcalde mayor* ynic omobligaroque ynic san yehuantin quichihuasque pan ynic quitlacualtisque yn suidad de loz angeles auh niman yn justisia ...tlaca oquinnotzque yn masehualtitzintin ynic quinquixtilisque y tlaxcalchihualistli oncan oquinpenatique ynic tonalli oquimacaque termino ynic amo quichihuas yn pantzin san oc yehuantin yn caxtilteca yn omixquesque quichihuasque auh amo huel oquisustentaroque sannica ome tonalli ynic omochiuh yn itec suidad ynin ome tonali ye yc oapismicoaya ypan tonali lunes yc sepualiose 21 tonali mani metztli septiembre huel ypan ylhuitzin sa matheo lunes yhuan martes yn ohuapismicohuaya aocmo nesia ma pa ma tortillas yn tianquisco ma tienda auh yn aquin ychtaca oquimochihuilli yn se mita cacasoli yn conaxitiaya y tianquisco ma toltilla san ypan omomiciaya yn caxtilteca manel huel momahuistilia aocan quipoaya masehualtintli yn aqui achtoa sa yehuatl quihuicaya yn tlaxcalli sa choquistli omania auh niman onca omacomunque ynic muchi tlacatl yuhqui teopixque yuh caxtilteca yuhqui masehualtitzintin ynic mochi tlacatl npan omomanque ym masehualtitzintin oquimacaque se amatl oquichihque masehualtitzintin ymatica yn *alcalde mayor* yquac ye ontleco *alcalde mayor* ypalasio niman muchin pipiltzintin yhuan sequintin huehuey tlaca oquitzatzilique oquihuique pan pan pa señor capitan ye tapismiquisque ye tapismiquisque auh yn iuh oquicac yn *alcalde mayor* yhuan oquipohuilique yn amatl yn iuhqui oquitotia ynic mochi polihuis yn itequipanolocatzin yn tohueytlatocatzin Rey yntla techcahualtisque yn toofisio yn tlaxcalchihualistli ma yehuantin yn caxtilteca quichihuacan yn quexquich tlatequipanolistli yhuan yn tlacalaquili auh yn iuhqui oquicac yn *alcalde mayor* niman isihuca otlanhauati mochihuas yn acto ynic niman omotlastihuetz pregon ynic quichihuasque yn masehualtitzin yn pantzin auh yn caxtilteca otlatequiuhiti quintzatzacasque auh yn yehuantin niman ocholoque yn caxtilteca yn omixquetzca”.



of the Indian corporate entity to be paramount and reports no other considerations, such as complaints from within the Spanish community about the shortage of bread.

Although the author clearly does not view in a positive light the individual Spaniards who raised the prices of food, in this and many other instances he exhibits a great deal of respect, awe, and positive feelings towards Spaniards in general. In this case the author is clearly dismayed that Spaniards were fighting over old pieces of bread in the marketplace, but also adds that the situation was serious enough that the Indian commoners did not act with as much humility as previously, for whoever was first at the market would get whatever bread was available. Still, the Indians did appeal to Spanish authority with reportedly excellent results, and as far as the annalist is concerned justice was served with the banishment of the individual Spaniards who had caused so much trouble for the rest of the city.

Other instances reveal that the Indian municipality expected certain behavior from Spaniards and was disappointed when faced with individuals acting differently. For example, the annalist reports at length on criminal activities in which Spaniards were involved. In one instance, the author states that the accused Spaniard “was really someone in Puebla” (“huel tepilhua cuitlaxcoapan” [f. 20v]), implying that this was unexpected behavior for a Spaniard in his position. From the annalist’s viewpoint Indians, mestizos, and mulattoes committing crimes rated little more than the normal recitation of who, when, where, and why, but the involvement of Spaniards was cause for concern, particularly when the Spaniard was an important individual.

For the most part Spanish individuals encountered in these annals, aside from local religious figures, are mainly limited to important governmental officials. The comings and goings of the viceroy, bishop, and alcalde mayor are painstakingly recorded, and this annalist, unlike some others, has a fairly clear idea of the function of such officials.<sup>17</sup> Although he often makes mistakes in the spelling of officials’ names, he understands the position of viceroy and how it differs from that of the King, and his reports of ceremonies marking the deaths and crownings of royalty make it clear that he understands the position of the King relative to the rest of the Spanish governmental system. At one point, in 1680, he even reports on the presence of “the two cabildos, the Bishop and canons, and the court functionary, alcalde mayor, alcalde, and regidores” (“yn ome cabildos yn señor obispo yhuan canonigos yhuan justisia tlaca alcalde mayor alcaldes rregidores” [CGO, f. 15r]) at the ceremonies welcoming the Viceroy on his visit to Puebla.

There are many indications that the annalist viewed events in Spanish Puebla with a great deal of awe and respect. He evinces nothing but sympathy for the celebrations held relating to royalty and religious figures, total support for Christianity, and no hint of any anti-Spanish feeling or pro-English sentiments in the long descriptions of preparations to combat English invaders.<sup>18</sup> In 1683, for example, the annalist states after describing the gathering of Spanish, mulatto, and black militia companies and the dressing up of the bishop in the attire of war, that “it really terrified people when it happened. Nothing like it had been seen since the coming of the Faith” (“huel temamauhti yn omochiuh yn ayc omottac yn ixquich cahuitl ohuala tlaneltoquilistli” [CGO, f. 19r]). He also describes in great detail religious ceremonies held in various years, featuring masses and processions throughout the streets of Puebla. He was particularly impressed with an instance in which one of a group of visiting friars from Rome in 1684 was struck by lightning while preaching and then, when revived, told the crowd: “I have gone before our Lord God there in heaven. He told me that he will pardon you for your sins” (“ye onihua yn ixpantzinco yn totecuio diox yn onpa ylhuicac ye onechmolhuilili ynic amechmotlapopolhuilis yn amotlatlacol”) [CGO, f. 20v]). According to the annalist, everyone was so impressed with these friars from Rome that “at night no one wanted to sleep” (“auh yn oyohuac ayocac y

<sup>17</sup> Many annalists typically confused the office of viceroy with that of the King, and did not perceive the difference between the two.

<sup>18</sup> Two instances of such preparations can be found, in 1683 (CGO, ff. 18r-19r) and 1685 (CGO, ff. 22v-23r).

yolocacoochia” [CGO, f. 20r]) and “everyone thought these friars amotlatlacol were saints” (“mochi tlacatl oqui ynin teopixque ca santome” [CGO, f. 20v]). Perhaps these ceremonies were particularly well received because “some gave sermons in the manner of the Mexica” (“yn sequin oquimochihuilique sermo mexicacopa” [CGO, f. 20r]), that is, in Nahuatl.

Of course, many such “Spanish” events were not totally a concern of the Spanish world and would have involved members of the Indian community, both in the participation of the Indian cabildo in the festivities and in a general participation by the Indian municipality. It is clear throughout the annals that although the annalist is conversant with Spanish culture, he is much more at ease with the familiar Indian world. The dichotomy between the Indian and Spanish worlds is further indicated by the social information contained in the annals. The annalist clearly distinguishes between members of the Indian world and those of the Spanish, in which latter grouping he specifically includes all non-Indian individuals. The emphasis on the concern of maintaining the solidarity of the Indian world in the face of an intrusive Spanish one shows us the author’s orientation perhaps more clearly than anything else. Although there are many indications in the annals that the Indians of Puebla were quite respectful of Spanish culture, the retention of their corporate existence is the more dominant theme.

In general the annalist is unconcerned with everyday events in Spanish Puebla except as they affect the Indian sections, as seen above where a group of Spaniards failed at breadmaking. Entries naming specific local Spaniards are almost always terse statements concerning census taking, deaths, or parts played in religious or governmental ceremonies. Events within the Spanish sections of Puebla included are, for the most part, correctly reported, but not nearly with as much detail as in the annalist’s descriptions of events concerning the Indian municipality. Indian Puebla is, in many respects, the center of the annalist’s world despite his obvious degree of Hispanization, and like many influential members of the corporation he views it as interesting, powerful, and influential. However, as seen above, Indian government was not functioning smoothly in Puebla. Besides the difficulties in yearly rotation and intrusion by the Spanish community into the office of the governor, other problems are indicated by the annalist, all representative of problems faced increasingly by other Indian communities near the end of the sixteenth century. Since Puebla apparently did not have a functioning Indian cabildo until the early part of the seventeenth century, however, it is not unexpected that these problems did not surface there until a correspondingly later time. It is significant that the Indians of Puebla were able to form a government similar to that of other Indian communities at a time when the whole system was undergoing various changes. The system obviously still retained a great deal of appeal by the closing decades of the sixteenth century.

It is unfortunate that the annalist provides little detail of the functioning of the Indian municipality in the first half of the seventeenth century. Consequently the most we can say with certainty is that it did exist, and apparently worked from a position of strength, if the cabildo’s difficulties in choosing a governor in 1681 and its resistance to non-Indian intrusion in 1686, as reported by the annalist, were indeed the first times the governorship was seriously threatened. Evidence exists to indicate that the situation was not without difficulties for the corporation, however, as in the early concerns over Indians living outside the Indian barrios and the settling of non-Indians within the Indian sections of Puebla. The last half of the seventeenth century in Puebla (the time period for which the most detailed information is available) was a time of troubles for the Indian corporation, for just as the functioning of government was becoming normalized, threats to the independence of the cabildo became apparent. However, it was also a time of perceived strength and influence over Spanish policies as well as a period of extensive church construction projects undertaken by the Indian municipality. It is evident from the annals that the Indian municipality that developed within the context of Spanish Puebla had made a concerted effort to be like other Indian communities, and as such came to suffer from many of the same problems and concerns.

