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INTRODUCTION

This essay tells the story of the efforts of Dominican friars to convert the Mixtec Indians of the Mixteca Alta in the sixteenth century. It depends on published documents and chronicles and for this reason focuses on the relatively well-documented city-state of Yanhuitlan. But I chose to concentrate on a small area for more positive reasons than just a lack of materials for the rest of the Mixteca Alta.

While Robert Ricard’s classic The Spiritual Conquest of Mexico describes the mendicant orders' efforts for all of New Spain, my aim is more modest: to analyze both the Dominican efforts and the Indian responses in one region. The Dominicans in sixteenth century Oaxaca (of which the Mixteca Alta is only a part) have been relatively ignored in comparison to the works in English, Spanish, and French on the Augustinians, Franciscans, and Jesuits. The Dominican story in Oaxaca, and the Mixteca Alta, is not that unique but it deserves to be told. Just as important as the Dominican effort is the Indian response to Christianization. By reconstructing both perspectives, I have tried to avoid an overly Eurocentric approach. But, of course, the very fact that almost all of the sources were written from a European perspective makes it difficult to achieve a complete picture of Mixtec society and its responses to conversion. In order to partially offset this imbalance, Chapter 1 presents a brief profile of Mixtec society at the time of Spanish contact, with a concentration on those aspects of the culture which might influence the conversion effort. Ronald Spores' The Mixtec Kings and Their
People (University of Oklahoma Press: Norman, 1967) is sound on Mixtec political Hispanization.

Describing in detail the conversion process on the local level helps to define the roles played by those undergoing conversion, local geography, the economy, and the indigenous political system. Ricard's work provides an insightful overview of the missionary effort, but the very breadth of it hinders a detailed description of Indian responses.

Local history such as this essay may help to reveal that conversion was not as automatic as the term "spiritual conquest" implies. More research has to be done which examines the Indian responses. Without this emphasis on the people undergoing conversion, a history of the Dominicans' efforts in New Spain might just as easily be describing that Order's experiences with the Moriscos in Granada or the Chinese of the Parián in Manila.

From a social historian's point of view, this essay suffers a disadvantage due to the fact that most of the material on the Mixtec's responses deals with the elites. The great majority of the population, the macehuales, is poorly represented in the sources. This over-emphasis on the Indian elite can only be offset by the future use of extant local, ecclesiastical, and notarial archives as was done by James Lockhart in his Spanish Peru, 1532-1560: A Colonial Society (Madison, 1968).

The thesis of this essay is that the conversion of the Mixteca Alta by the Dominicans was a gradual process beginning as early as 1529, but not achieving any widespread success until the 1570's.
A more complete conversion occurred due to the introduction of European crops, livestock, and technology and by the catastrophic epidemics of the period. The drastic population decline must have made the relatively small number of missionaries (The Augustinians, Dominicans, and Franciscans numbered only 800 for all of New Spain in 1569) more effective as the number of potential converts steadily diminished during the course of the sixteenth century. This small number of missionaries could more thoroughly Christianize a reduced indigenous population than the vast Central Mexican population at Spanish contact estimated by Cook, Simpson, and Borah. Those Indians who did survive the epidemics were attracted to the Church by the consolation it could offer them. (See John L. Phelan, The Millennial Kingdom of the Franciscans in the New World: A Study of the Writings of Gerónimo de Mendieta, 1525-1604 (University of California Publications in History, No. 52, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1956), 89.) Christianization and Hispanization would have been far less penetrating without the loss in population.

By the 1560's and 1570's a generation of Mixtec rulers had come to power who had been converted and educated from childhood in the Dominican monasteries. With the cooperation of these semi-Hispanized caciques widespread conversion steadily advanced. While the caciques and Indian nobility became partially Hispanized, the Indian macehual class continued to live in a way similar, in many respects, to the late pre-conquest era.

Originally, this study was to include a chapter on the demography of the sixteenth century Mixteca Alta. I have however
decided to eliminate it since the sources available to me were too
general and, more importantly, Borah and Cook's monograph on this
subject is to appear in the Fall of 1968 ("The Population of the
Mixteca Alta, 1520-1960." Ibero-Americana, No. 50. Berkeley and
Los Angeles, 1968).
Chapter 1
THE MIXTECA ALTA IN 1520

The Mixteca is a vaguely defined region stretching from Southern Puebla, into Eastern Guerrero and the state of Oaxaca west of the Valley of Oaxaca, to the Pacific. It constitutes the western third of the present-day state of Oaxaca. The region is subdivided into the Mixteca Alta, or the higher districts including Nochixtlán, Coixtlahuaca, Teposcolula, Tlaxiaco, and Yanhuitlán; and the Mixteca Baja, or the lower mountainous areas which drop off to the south, west, and north from the highland core. ¹ In general, the Mixteca Alta would conform to what is called Tierra Fría and the Mixteca Baja, Tierra Caliente; the dividing line is approximately 1,700 meters above sea level. ²

The climate range for the greater part of the Mixteca runs from temperate to cold. The terrain is very rugged. "There are some flats and valleys," writes Motolinía, "but in all that land there is none that passes a league in breadth. It is a very rich and populous country...."³ The mountainous regions of Oaxaca, the Mixteca included, suffer, however, from irregular rainfall, a plight common to most of Central Mexico. The summer rains are only sufficient "to sustain the vegetation characteristic of dry

² Barbro Dahlgren de Jordan, La Mixteca: su cultura e historia prehispánicas (revised edition, Mexico, 1965), 58. The 1954, first edition, will also be used below.
³ Motolinía (Toribio de Benavente), Historia de los indios de Nueva España, escrita a mediados del siglo XVI, 7-8, as cited in Borah, "Silk Raising," 24.
prairies." Except for a few fertile valleys (Yanhuitlán and Teposcolula) the area today is good only for large-scale cattle raising.  

The Mixteca derives its name from the people indigenous to the region, the Mixtecs. At the time of Spanish contact (c. 1520), the Mixteca was divided into many small political units, each consisting of a town with its surrounding lands and ruled by an hereditary cacique. A number of these smaller cacicazgos were often under the influence of a more important town due to its wealth, its importance as a religious center or the prestige of its ruling family. But, was the region ruled by a single ruler at the time of Spanish contact? Some colonial accounts suggest that there was a powerful ruler who controlled the entire region; but, according to Spores, there is no substantial evidence that a Mixtec monarch existed who ruled over a large Mixtec-speaking kingdom. Why was not one cacique able to dominate the region? Probably the limited Mixtec technology, the lack of fertile lands, and the barriers to communications created by the Sierra Madre del Sur prevented one cacicazgo from achieving domination. Another important reason for the lack

5. Cacicazgo includes the rights, properties, duties, and prerogatives pertaining to the hereditary title of cacique. Ronald Spores "The Zapotec and Mixtec at Spanish Contact," in Handbook of Middle American Indians, edited by Robert Wauchope and Gordon R. Willey (Austin, 1965-, multivolume), III (Part 2) 997. Also see Dahlgren de Jordan, La Mixteca (1954), 57.
of unity in the Mixteca was the interference of the Aztec tribute empire.  

The rugged topography of the Mixteca (especially the Mixteca Alta, which is the focus of this paper) also influenced settlement patterns. The terrain of the region largely determined the agricultural yield of the land and the population density. The fertile valleys of Yahnuitlan and Nochixtlán were densely populated while the mountainous regions, where more land was needed per family because of lower yields, were thinly settled. The pre-conquest settlement patterns in the Mixteca Alta varied: at one extreme were nucleated communities characterized by a central ceremonial complex surrounded by residential housing, with a haphazard street pattern; and at the other, a pattern of widely dispersed houses, each located next to its milpa. In this latter case the ceremonial center was sparsely or periodically occupied, with a series of hamlets scattered around it. The nucleus town or cabecera was the center of political, commercial, and religious activity for the dependent hamlets or sujetos, each of which was ruled over by a noble or principal appointed by the cacique. A similar pattern persisted under Spanish rule. Even the largest Mixtec communities, some of which exceeded 40,000 in total population at Spanish contact, can not, according to Spores, be considered urban centers, since in each instance the majority of the cacicazgo's population resided

7. For an excellent analysis of the Aztec tribute empire, see Robert Barlow, “The Extent of the Empire of the Culhua-Mexica,” Ibero-Americana, No. 28 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1949).
9. Spores, Mixtec Kings, 94.
in the outlying sujetos. 10

The settlement patterns of the Mixes provide a contrast with that of the Mixtecs. The Mixes live in a rainy, mountainous district of Northeast Oaxaca, and live in an even more dispersed settlement pattern than the Mixtecs. The Dominican chronicler, Burgos, describes the Mixes as living in scattered rancherías on mountainous slopes, and in inaccessible gorges. And Oscar Schmieder characterizes a typical Mixe settlement as being "a loose nucleus of dwelling around that of a leader, or a naturally fortified site, the rest of the population spread about on isolated ranchos in the surrounding forest." 11 The main difference between the settlement patterns of the two peoples is caused by terrain; the Mixtec, settled in more fertile lowlands while the Mixe settled in mountainous, forest areas. Thus, the former could support more dense populations than the latter.

Cortés writes, in his Cartas de Relación, that there were

10. Spores, Mixtec Kings, 101. Spores' population estimates are considered, however, to be far too low by Woodrow Borah. Borah says that Spores fails to acknowledge the importance of hillside urban settlement patterns in the Mixteca. In brief, Borah would say that administrative-religious centers were urban. These pre-Hispanic hill-side centers have been ignored, since after the conquest many of them were shifted entirely to level valley locations. Personal conversation with Woodrow Borah, May 4, 1968.

many villages and cities in the Mixteca Alta "...so well built that in Spain, they say, there could not be any better......They have seen this men a dwelling house and fort that is larger, stronger, and better built than the castle of Burgos." 12 This description, according to sixteenth century sources and twentieth century excavations, only applies to cacique palaces and temples. Only these structures were built of masonry. 13

The macehuales 1 or peasants 1 houses were constructed with walls of earth or adobe, covered with straw roofs, or, sometimes, with a flat roof of stone and earth. The relación geográfica of Tilantongo (c. 1580) states:

The buildings and houses of the indigenous peoples are similar to small cells: they have flat roofs, made of adobe and white stone and they are separated one from another considerably, because they have house and field together; the materials that they use are stone, wooden beams, boards and lime. 14

Beyond the fact that the Mixtec temples were constructed of masonry, there is little else known about them. There are several explanations for this: one, the Mixtecs placed great emphasis on caves and mountain peaks as places of worship; and two, zealous Dominicans initiated the leveling of pagan temples, later erecting

13. Dahlgren de Jordan, La Mixteca (1954), Ignacio Bernal excavated the religious-government center of Coixtlahuaca and found this to be true, 117-118.
their churches and monasteries on the foundations of the pre-conquest structures.

Information on land tenure pattern in the Mixteca is also scarce. There is, however, an indication that "soldiers and plebians" were assigned milpas by the rulers in proportion to their families' size. Burgoa, writing in the 1670's, notes: "all the hills and gorges are today marked with furrows from top to bottom, like steps" and the boundaries between milpas were adorned with stones. In Achiutla a population of more than four thousand families was spread over more than a league of land, consisting of very extensive low hills and a river valley. These lands were worked by the macehual population. To insure that they were diligent in their work, each year, a town crier was elected. At sunrise every morning he climbed to the highest building of the town and called the populace to work. Those who failed to obey were punished.

The Mixtec cultivated maize, beans, squash, and chile. In order to fulfill other dietary and medicinal needs they gathered wild plants, roots, fruits, and herbs. There was some hunting of wild animals while Mesoamerican hairless dogs, turkeys, and the stingless bee were domesticated. The Mixtec collected cochineal insects, for making dyestuff, from the leaves of wild nopal cacti.

17. Cochineal dyestuff is made from the dried bodies of a scale insect, the Dactylopius coccus or coccus cacti - it reproduces on the leaves of the nopal cactus. Fray Diego Duran, The Aztecs: The History of the Indies of New Spain, translated, with notes, by Doris Hayden and Fernando Morcasitas (New York, 1964) 345, note 65.
The emphasis, however, was on agriculture and gathering; the macehual population ate maize, squash, beans, chile, rats, snakes, and lizards, while turkeys, deer, dogs, and human flesh were reserved for the principales and caciques.\textsuperscript{18}

The Mixtec farmer had no other implement except the coa or digging stick. The use of metal tools was limited to a few awls and copper axes. Most everyday tools were made of wood, bone, or stone. The Mixtec, and other Meso-American peoples, lacked any kind of beast of burden. For the transportation of trade goods and tribute, tememes or human bearers were used.\textsuperscript{19} The existence of a multi-purpose animal such as the llama might have made more centralized government a reality in the Mixteca.

While Mixtec technology was at the neolithic level, they excelled in the crafts and fine arts. There is no known large Mixtec sculpture but the Mixtec did create finely worked objects such as mosaics of jade and turquoise, gold work, small carvings in hard stone, and polychrome pottery. They also produced pictographic books or codices; one chronicle, dating back to 692 A.D., contains data on military campaigns and dynasties. The high sophistication of their art indicates that the Mixtecs had craft specialists.\textsuperscript{20}

Some of the products of these specialized industries were used in trade with peoples of the coastal lowlands and as tribute items.

\textsuperscript{19} Spores, \textit{Mixtec Kings}, 28.
The Mixtecs received cotton, clothing, cacao beans, tropical fruit, dried fish, salt, and highly valued feathers from the lowlands in exchange for the highland region's food crops, maguey fiber and beverage, precious metals and stones, cochineal dyestuff, ceramics, and paper. The diversity of altitudes and climatic conditions within a small area led to a diversity of flora, fauna, and minerals which helped to stimulate trade.\(^{21}\)

The Aztec tribute role for the province of Coixtlahuaca, published in the Matrícula de Tributos and in the Codex Mendocino, gives an indication of the wealth of the Mixteca Alta. The eleven principal towns of this province included Coixtlahuaca, Nochixtlán, Teposcolula, and Yanhuitlán. The annual tribute list included: 400 bundles of women's huipiles and wrap-around skirts; two complete warriors' costumes with shields; two strings of precious stones (chalchiuities); 800 bunches of quetzal feathers; one royal emblem; forty sacks of cochineal; and twenty bowls of gold dust. The much smaller Mixtecan province of Tlachquiauco, containing only the centers of Tlaxiaco (Tlachquiauco in Nahuatl) and Achiutla, tributed as much gold dust as Coixtlahuaca but smaller amounts of clothing, cochineal, and quetzal feathers.\(^{22}\)

From 1480 until the Spanish conquest the greater part of the Mixteca Alta was under Mexican domination, but the local caciques were usually allowed to continue their rule. The Aztecs maintained

\(^{21}\) Spores, Mixtec Kings, 6.
\(^{22}\) Barlow, "Empire of the Culhua-Mexica," Ibero-Americana, no. 28, 112-118.
control by garrisoning soldiers in the area, and by the presence of their pochteca or merchants who served as the fifth column. Aztec expeditions against the Mixtecs after 1480 occurred in the reign of Tizoc (1481-1486), and then, after a lapse of twenty years, in 1506, 1509, 1510, 1511, and 1516. The 1509 expedition was sent in retaliation for the harassment of Mexican merchants by the Yanhuilantecos. Montezuma II sent an army of 200,000 men against Yanhuilán and Sosola. The large force attacked the fortress in Yanhuilán first, and stormed it, in spite of strong resistance. The Mexicans slaughtered many of the inhabitants without distinction of age nor sex, burned houses, and destroyed fields and fruit trees. One thousand inhabitants of the town were taken back to Tenochtitlán as sacrificial victims for a large religious festival.

Like the Aztec religion, the Mixtec religion was polytheistic.

Each town, in addition to worshipping a local idol or principal

24. Manuel Orozco y Berra, Historia antigua y de la conquista de México, III, 467-468, as cited in JM and MH, Códice, 10. See also Dahlgren de Jordan, La Mixteca, (1954), 64-67; and Durán, The Aztecs, 236.

Charles Gibson notes that war under the Aztecs, at least in their hostilities with Tlaxcala, was a ceremonial and traditional institution. The Aztecs made no effort to conquer or defeat an enemy conclusively. C. Gibson, Tlaxcala in the Sixteenth Century (New Haven, 1952), 28. Perhaps, this policy assured a supply of sacrificial victims while the total destruction and decimation of a town and its population would cause the source to dry up. Just as conquest and religious motives intermeshed with the Aztecs, so they were with the Spaniards as well. Military conquest and religious conversion were closely related in sixteenth century Spanish thought. C. Gibson, Tlaxcala, 28.
god, had a series of deities for different day-to-day occasions and different occupations. The _relaciones geográficas_ mention gods of the hunters, warriors, merchants, curers, and midwives. While most of the deities were common to the entire Mixteca Alta, two towns rarely had the same principal god. The most important deities were the same as the Aztec Tlaloc, Quetzalcoatl, Xipe Totec, and Tezcatlipoca with Mixtec names.

Each of the principal Mixtecan towns had a temple in its center or ceremonial precinct dedicated to its main god. These same towns also had temples devoted to the worship of other deities. The temples were usually found on the same location or nearby the churches built under the direction of the Dominican friars. Other sacred places of worship were: caves; mountain peaks; and altars in the houses of the caciques and principales, "where they made their offerings, sacrifices, and came to ask for help in their needs because these Mixtecans," writes Herrera, "were very religious in their gentility." A large part of the testimony of witnesses in the Inquisitional trial (1540's), involving the cacique and two principales of Yanhuitlán, dealt with the pagan ceremonies that they and their _papas_ or pagan priests performed in the privacy of their houses in order to escape the persecution of the Dominicans.

28. JM and MH, _Códice_, appendix 5, 42.
The Mixtecan religious hierarchy was administered by a head priest who ruled over the lesser priests and novices. According to Dahlgren de Jordan, it is not clear whether each community had a high priest or if they were just in the principal religious centers such as Achiutla and Tilontongo.\textsuperscript{29} The novices were usually chosen by the cacique from among the young nobles.\textsuperscript{30} Herrera notes that children of seven were placed in the "monasteries" where they were taught religion and good habits.\textsuperscript{31} The sacerdote Caxaa of Yanhuitlán testified in the trial of 1544 that in his childhood he had been ordered by the cacique to enter the temple and live with the priests. He became a regular priest when he came of age - probably twelve to fourteen years of age.\textsuperscript{32} The priests depended on the cacique for economic support, both for daily maintenance and for offerings to the deities. Special parcels of land were set aside by the cacique for the support of the priesthood.\textsuperscript{33}

The novice's year in the temple was a probationary period.

Only those who were not corrupted, that is, neither known a woman

\textsuperscript{29} Dahlgren de Jordan, \textit{La Mixteca} (1965), 266.
\textsuperscript{30} Jacques Soustelle, writing on Aztec practices, states that entrance into the calmecac or monastery was probably reserved in theory to the children of dignitaries but children of the trading class were admitted and Sahagun implies that children of the macehual class could also be admitted. J. Soustelle, \textit{Daily Life of the Aztecs} (New York, 1962), 169. For a descrip- of the life in an Aztec calmecac, see Soustelle, \textit{Daily Life}, 170.
\textsuperscript{31} Herrera, \textit{Historia general}, vol. 6, 324.
\textsuperscript{32} JM and NH, \textit{Códice}, Appendix 5, 42.
\textsuperscript{33} Herrera, \textit{Historia general}, vol. 6, 325.
nor tasted meat, were accepted into the priesthood. The novices were to fast for four or five days before major festivals, and they ate only herbs and toasted maize the rest of the year. They were expected to live a life of poverty. 34 One aspect of the rules of the priesthood differed greatly from Catholicism; the priests might serve for a period of time (from three months to twenty years), return to lay life, and then be called back to the priesthood. Priests also served as war captains and advisers to the caciques. But all priests were subordinate to the cacique who could have them executed for the violations of the rules of chastity and abstinence. The cacique usually received the same temple education as the priests. 35

Each priest was in charge of organizing the regular sacrificial ceremonies and festivals in honor of a particular god. The most common offerings made were copal and quail, as well as personal bloodletting which involved taking blood from one's ear or tongue. The Mixtec also practiced human sacrifice, but on a small scale when compared with the Aztecs.

The Mixtec yearly calendar was marked by a number of religious festivals. At the request of the priests, a town's cacique gathered all his subjects at the annual festivals celebrated to honor the most important deities. According to Dahlgren de Jordan the number of local festivals in pre-conquest times is difficult to determine. It is possible that the number of festivals varied in relation to

34. Herrera, Historia general, vol. 6, 325; Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 276.
35. Dahlgren de Jordan, La Mixteca, (1965), 262.
the relative religious importance of the various Mixtecan towns. In Yanhuitlán, for example, there were festivals in honor of four principal gods, while in Tilantongo they had ten major festivals. Other religious festivals were celebrated in Yanhuitlán in memory of the death of a deceased cacique Calcii, on the harvesting of the maize crop (near All Saints' Day), and extraordinary festivals were held during droughts. Many of these lesser celebrations continued clandestinely for at least two decades after the initial conversion effort in 1529-1530. Certain festivals lasted more than one day; "personal bloodletting" was performed by the nobles and priests while the entire community participated in great feasts, drinking, and dancing. Did the Catholic religious processions and ceremonies successfully take their place after the pagan religious institutions were destroyed?

The Mixtec religion was a true cult of the gods; the role of magic in the basic cult is negligible. According to Dahlgren de Jordan, the fundamental difference between a shaman and a priest is that the former, by means of his own formulas or magical cants, gains the control of a spirit in order to dominate the elements, perform cures and enchantments, while the latter is a humble servant and interpreter of his gods. She concludes that the members of the official Mixtec religious class were priests rather than shamans. Magic flourished, but apart from the official cult.

Chapter II

THE CONQUEST AND DOMINICAN PATTERNS OF EXPANSION

Hernan Cortés early in the conquest saw the need of organizing the conversion of New Spain's indigenous population. In his Fourth Letter to Charles V, of October 15, 1524, Cortés reminded the monarch of the necessity of providing for the "spiritual well-being" of the Indians. He requested that "religious of good life and example" be sent as soon as possible. Cortés, who was strongly anti-secular clergy, thought that the entire conversion should be undertaken by friars since canons and bishops were too costly to support. Further, Cortés believed that high ranking ecclesiastics often set a poor example which would only hinder the effort. He called for the establishment of monasteries, supported by a share of the tithes, manned by members of the Dominican and Franciscan Orders. In the same letter he requested that the King obtain from the Papacy broad powers for the Mendicants so that they would be able to administer all the sacraments.¹

The Spanish crown had already been granted a special papal dispensation with the declaration of the Patronato Real in 1508. Under this agreement the Papacy conceded special privileges to the Spanish crown including collection of all tithes and the right to nominate candidates for all benefices within the Empire.² But

² George Kubler, Mexican Architecture of the Sixteenth Century (New Haven, 1948), 1, 3.
in 1521, Leo X authorized the Mendicant Orders to go to the Indies to work among the King’s new subjects. In 1522, a new pope, Adrian VI, spelled out the special powers being granted the Mendicants: the friars were to have total "apostolic authority to do everything they might think necessary for the conversion of the Indians, wherever there were no bishops, or wherever the bishops should be two days’ journey distant, except for those acts that required episcopal consecration."3

By the time Cortés had written his Fourth Letter, the twelve Franciscans had already arrived in New Spain (May 13 or 14, 1524). The Dominicans, who had originally planned to land as a group of twelve with the Franciscans, were delayed and did not arrive until two years later. The Mendicants followed the precedent of the Apostles as suggested by the sending of twelve friars. Fray Pedro de Córdoba saw "the founding of a Church almost as excellent as was the Primitive Church" as the Dominican Order’s ideal.4

Coinciding with Cardinal Ximénez de Cisneros’ reform of the Franciscans in Spain was the internal reformation of the Dominican Order. Cisneros sought the purification of the clergy by reinforcing their preaching mission and vow of apostolic poverty.5

---

3. Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 22.
4. Pedro de Córdoba, Letter to His Majesty, May 28 (no year given), Colección de documentos inéditos relativos al descubrimiento, conquista y colonización de las antiguas posesiones españolas de América y Oceania, sacados en su mayor parte del Real Archivo de Indias (hereafter CDIAL) XI, 217, as cited in Pedro Borges, Métodos Misionales en la Cristianización de América (Madrid, 1960), 36.
5. Kubler, Mexican Architecture, 1, 13. Kubler clearly analyzes the pre-Council of Trent Church reforms carried out under the leadership of Cisneros in Castile.
Besides having undergone internal reform, the friars of the Mendicant Orders also arrived in the New World with some previous missionary experience. While the later Jesuits had experience in Asia that they could apply to the American situation, the Mendicant Orders benefited from their efforts to convert the Moriscos of Granada. The attempted conversion proved to be a failure, but the regulars learned from their experience. When the lone surviving Moorish Kingdom of Granada was conquered under Ferdinand and Isabella, friars were sent in and began to preach and convert the Moslems with some success. But then they were supplanted by secular clergy who proceeded to abandon the task of conversion, "leaving the Christianity of the Moslems in a lamentable state." All the Mendicant Orders came to favor a special status for themselves, separate from episcopal control, as a result of their experience in Granada. Their desire for independence from the episcopacy was assured, at least for a few decades, by the bulls of Popes Leo X and Adrian VI, mentioned above. Unfortunately, the extent to which the actual missionary methods developed in Granada were applied in New Spain is not clear.

The Spanish conquest and conversion of the indigenous population of New Spain often went hand in hand, but generally the conquest preceded conversion. Spanish soldiers and explorers visited the

6. "Repuesta de las religiosos de las Tres Órdenes Mendicantes de la Nueva España a S.M., México, 20 de enero de 1557," in Nueva Colección de documentos para la historia de México, edited by Juan García Icazbalceta (Mexico, 1892), IV, 10, as cited in Borges, Métodos Misionales, 29.
Mixteca Alta soon after Cortés learned from Montezuma that this region was the source of much of the Aztec's gold. The Aztec leader provided maps and guides for expeditions of Spanish soldiers who went to various parts of the tribute empire in the months following November, 1519, including one to the Mixteca Alta under Gonzalo de Umbria. This expedition, a peaceful one (probably passing through the Yanhuitlán-Nochixtlán valley), surveyed the districts of Sosola and Tamazulapan and returned with enthusiastic reports on the settlements and precious metals of the region.7

During the siege of Tenochtitlán Cortés decided to weaken the city-state by subduing its tributaries in the surrounding regions. As Cortés's army neared the Mixteca Alta, in October, 1520, representatives from eight important Mixtecan towns met the conqueror in Itzocan (today Izúcar de Matamoros) and submitted to him. They explained to Cortés that they would have submitted sooner but they had feared Mexican reprisals. Jiménez Moreno suggests that the Mixtecs surrendered voluntarily to the Spanish in 1520 because of their deep bitterness towards the Mexicans who had previously devastated their rich lands. In short, the Mixtecs saw their surrender as another phase in their "perpetual rebellion" against Tehnochtítlan.8 Dahlgren de Jordan thinks that "the conquest of

7. Spores, Mixtec Kings, 68; and Herrera, Historia general, dec. 3, lib. 9, cap. 1. Bancroft writes that Spaniards early entered the Oaxaca region, attracted by the "golden sands of the rivers." Hubert Howe Bancroft, History of Mexico (3 vols, San Francisco, 1883), 11, 37.
8. JM and MH, Códice, 11.
the Mixteca like so many other regions of Mexico was greatly facili-
tated by the rivalries among the inhabitants of the neighboring
towns. Close alliances among the Mixtecan towns were made diffi-
cult by two factors: the mountainous terrain impeded communications
and unity; and the constant need for sacrificial victims meant
that war was a continuous, ritualistic process.

Even though most of the Mixteca Alta peacefully submitted to
Cortés, it is likely that Francisco de Orozco's expedition against
Oaxaca in November and December, 1521, and Pedro de Alvarado on
his return from Tututepec in 1522, had military contact with the
Mixtecs. These expeditions established Villa de Segura de la
Frontera in the Valley of Oaxaca, which later became Antequera
(present-day Oaxaca de Juárez). At this same time many of the
followers of Orozco and Alvarado received allotments of the indi-
genous population of Oaxaca, including the Mixteca Alta, in en-
comienda. Cortés reserved for himself a large part of the Valley,
which came to be called the Marquesado del Valle de Oaxaca. A
grant in encomienda was solely the right to the labor services
of a specified number of Indians plus the right to collect a stip-
ulated amount of tribute. The Spanish encomenderos became the
recipients of the tribute that went to Tenochtitlán in pre-conquest
times. 10

The granting of encomienda caused an Indian uprising in 1523.

---
10. Spores, Mixtec Kings, 76.
Cortés responded by sending in an expedition under the command of Andrés de Tapia who put it down quickly. In December of that same year, Cortés rewarded his cousin, Francisco de las Casas, with the encomienda of Yanhuitlán, one of the first granted in the rich Mixteca Alta. Therefore, when Dominican friars began the evangelization of the inhabitants of the Mixteca Alta it was already occupied by Spanish encomenderos, who, at times, proved to be more of a hindrance than a help to the friars. The amount of time that the encomenderos spent in the areas of their grants is difficult to determine. Francisco de las Casas, for example, spent considerable time in Yanhuitlán in the late 1530's judging from the numerous complaints about his harmful influences on Indians whom the Dominicans were trying to wean away from paganism and into Christianity. But most of the encomenderos probably lived for most of the year in Antequera, Puebla de los Angeles, or Mexico City.

The original twelve Dominicans, who arrived in New Spain in 1526, included eight friars direct from Spain and four from Españaola, then the New World headquarters of the Order. Within a year of their arrival five of the twelve died, partly due to the exhausting trip, and four others returned home. The three who remained, Fray Vicente de las Casas, Fray (then Deacon) Gonzalo Lucero, and Fray Domingo de Betanzos, however, were to play an important part in the future work of the Order. In 1528 the Dominican ranks were

11. The details of the conquest and Spanish occupation of the Mixteca Alta are found in the following works: JM and MH, Códice, 11-13; Cortés, Cartas, 47, 77; and Bancroft, History of Mexico, 11, 37-38.
12. JM and MH, Códice, 15.
strenthened with the arrival of twenty-four additional friars from Spain.\textsuperscript{13}

Fray Domingo de Betanzos developed the most concrete plan for the expansion of the Dominican Order in New Spain. He envisioned a mission system in New Spain of twelve large convents (perhaps he chose this number because of its symbolic association with the apostles), each with thirty friars. Betanzos hoped that the friars "would go out from the monasteries two by two to visit the region ... confessing and preaching, as they do in some parts of Spain."\textsuperscript{14} This indicates that Betanzos did base his proposed model for a mission system on the Iberian experience. Betanzos thought, according to the Dominican chronicler Dávila Padilla, that placing the friars in large monasteries was the only way to maintain the strict observance and ceremony of the Order. Furthermore, if the Province were to survive, these monasteries should only be established in Indian towns. But even in these towns it is unavoidable if there are few religious "that neglect will be introduced, and the things that constant care taught them will be lost." Betanzos, a child of the Cisnerian reforms, wanted strict observance to be upheld. "Coins in company better conserve the fire," concludes Dávila Padilla, "and convents better conserve religion."\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{13} Spores, Mixtec Kings, 84.
\textsuperscript{14} Agustín de Dávila Padilla, Historia de la fundación y discurso de la Provincia de Santiago de México (Madrid, 1592, on microfilm), Libro Primero, 79.
\textsuperscript{15} Dávila Padilla, Historia, Libro Primero, 60.
Betanzos' plan never achieved realization, but the Dominicans did build three large monasteries in the Spanish towns of Antequera, Mexico, and Puebla de los Angeles. A Relación sent to the head of the Dominican Order in 1569, suggests that another school of thought existed in the early years in opposition to Betanzos. This group thought that the friars should live among the Indians "as the administration of the Sacraments and care of them had to be so continuous." This latter view prevailed, as all three Orders began to build vicarates among the Indians, each with, usually, two to four religious. "...Now it has been seen and experienced," continues the Relación, the first Betanzos plan was better for preserving us in religion, and the second better for the welfare of the natives...."16 The mission system that the Dominicans developed in the Mixteca Alta, and in the rest of the Bishopric of Oaxaca, more closely followed the second plan. But following Betanzos' idea, friars went out from the monasteries to proselytize in pairs. Even with twenty houses in the bishopric by 1569, there were still many districts without any permanent monasteries or visitas.

The Franciscans' early start gave them an advantage in choosing mission areas that the Dominicans and Augustinians were not able to overcome. The Franciscans' occupation of large areas at least partly dictated where the Dominicans would establish their missions. They were greatly outnumbered by the Franciscans who had already

16. "Relación de la fundación, capítulos y elecciones, que se han tenido en esta provincia de Santiago de esta Nueva España, de la orden de predicadores, hecha año de 1569," CDIAL, V, 453-454. This document contains a brief review of the differing points of view on the establishment of the Dominican mission system.
selected and occupied many towns in Central Mexico, and especially in the Valley of Mexico.\textsuperscript{17}

The Dominican territory of evangelization was thus much more limited than that of the Franciscans. They concentrated on two areas. First, a scattered series of establishments in the Valley of Mexico, and the present-day states of Puebla and Morelos, in competition with the Franciscans. The second region centered on the Mixteca and the Zapotecs. This second region came to be the exclusive domain of the Dominicans with the exception of secular competition. The Order established its first convent and hospital in Oaxtepec, to the southeast of Mexico City in Morelos. Robert Ricard believes that they placed it in Oaxtepec with the future evangelization of Oaxaca in mind. This mission and those in Izucar de Matamoros and Tepeji de la Seda served as liaison missions between the mother convent of Santo Domingo in Mexico City and the Mixteca.\textsuperscript{18}

Before the Dominicans arrived in Oaxaca (1529), the Franciscans had already founded a mission in Tehuacán at the northeastern edge of the Mixteca. But the relatively arid climate of the Mixteca, combined with the problems of its communications with the Zapotecs, probably discouraged the Franciscans, who ignored the South, and moved on to the west and north. Thus, through default, the Dominicans became the only Mendicant Order with an interest in Oaxaca.

\textsuperscript{17} Bancroft, History of Mexico, 11, 302. The Franciscans, however, did relinquish a few towns to the Dominicans.\textsuperscript{18} Ricard, \textit{Spiritual Conquest}, 69-70.
The first Dominicans entered Oaxaca in 1529 when the head of the Order in New Spain, Fray Domingo de Betanzos, sent Fray Gonzalo Lucero and Fray Bernadino de Minaya (then a deacon) to Antequera to establish a new monastery. Fray Gonzalo supervised the building of the first convent in Antequera, and Fray Bernadino is supposed to have built numerous simple chapels. The Dominican chronicler, Fray Francisco de Burgoa, claims that Fray Gonzalo visited Mixtec and Zapotec villages in the vicinity of Antequera, preaching and studying the local languages, while Fray Bernadino remained behind in the Spanish town. But a witness in the inquisitional process of 1544-45, involving the cacique and two gobernadores, or elders, of Yanhuitlán, testified that it was Fray Bernadino de Minaya who had baptized the defendants and established the first mission there. Whoever preached in the Mixtec and Zapotec villages and established the early mission is not of lasting significance, since the project was abandoned in 1530, as the result of a jurisdictional dispute within the Order. This was a beginning, however, which set the precedent for the later Dominican occupation of the Mixteca. There were no foundations made in the Zapotecas at this time.

The cause of the dispute within the Dominican Order was the insistence of the friars on Española that they should govern their

20. Francisco de Burgoa, Palestra Historial de virtudes y exemplares apostolicos, Fundada del zelo de insigues Heroes de la Sagrada Orden de Predicadores en este Nuevo Mundo de la America de las Indias Occidentales (Mexico, 1670), f. 6r0, as cited in Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 71.
21. JM and MH, Códice, 21, and appendix 5, 37-47. The confusion is only worsened by the fact that Fray Bernadino de Minaya was only
Order's establishments in New Spain. When the dispute broke out in 1530 the friar (or friars) at Yanhuitlán was recalled to Antequera. Betanzos left for Spain in the same year in an effort to block the efforts of the Dominicans on Española. The Dominican organization in New Spain was disrupted further in 1531, when the Prior from Española arrived to take control. Many of the friars responded by leaving their monasteries in protest, while others joined Betanzos in Spain. Finally, in 1535, Betanzos returned from Spain with what he had set out to achieve, an autonomous Dominican province in New Spain. Betanzos was elected the first provincial superior of the new province of Santiago de México at a chapter meeting held in Mexico in 1535.\textsuperscript{22} But, in the intervening five years the attempt to establish a network of missions in the Mixteca and Zapotecas had been completely paralyzed. At the time of the first provincial chapter meeting the Dominicans had only seven missions in all of New Spain.\textsuperscript{23}

A year before the Province of Santiago was established a royal cedula (of February, 1534) ordered that New Spain be divided into the dioceses of Mexico, Michoacan, Tlaxcala and Oaxaca. The

---

\textsuperscript{22} Spores, \textit{Mixtec Kings}, 84. The new province was created in a bull of Pope Clement VII of July 11, 1532.

\textsuperscript{23} Burgoa, \textit{Geográfica Descripción}, 1, 40-60.
boundary of each diocese was not to extend further than a fifteen league radius from the centralized bishopric. Thus, Oaxaca came under episcopal control during a period of stagnation in the development of the Dominican mission system.

The see of Oaxaca was first offered to Fray Francisco Jiménez, one of the original twelve Franciscans, but he did not accept the office. It may very well have been fortunate for the Dominicans that the Franciscan friar turned down this benefice. A Franciscan might have aided the brothers of his own order at the expense of the Dominicans. The bishopric was then granted to Juan López de Zárate, a secular, who held it from 1535 until his death in 1555.

Both Bishop López de Zárate and the Dominican friar, Bishop Julián Garcés of Tlaxcala-Puebla (served as Bishop 1526-1542) greatly aided the Dominican penetration of the Mixteca and the Zapotecas. Beginning in 1538, the fortunes of the Dominicans improved with the direct cooperation of the episcopacy. In that year Bishop Garcés of Tlaxcala invited the Dominicans to aid in the evangelization of the part of the Mixteca that fell under his jurisdiction. The fact that the Bishop was of their Order, undoubtedly aided the Dominican cause. At the urging of Bishop Garces, Fray Pedro Delgado, the newly elected Dominican Provincial, sent two friars into the Mixteca Alta, Fray Francisco Martín and Fray Pedro Fernandez.

24. Boundary disputes arose, however, since the bishopric borders were laid out on the basis of imprecise knowledge of the geography. Part of the Mixteca Alta, for example, was in the Bishopric of Tlaxcala-Puebla while most of the region was within Oaxaca. Bancroft, History of Mexico, 11, 391.
25. Bancroft, History of Mexico, 11, 391, 393.
Another exceptional example of episcopal cooperation came in 1548 when the Bishop of Oaxaca, López de Zárate, asked for the help of the Dominicans in his diocese. The Bishopric of Oaxaca had few secular clergy, and many of these did not have the proper language training to successfully convert the Indians. As early as 1544 Bishop López de Zárate had complained in a letter to Prince Regent Philip that his diocese would be too large for even three bishops. He noted that there were only two convents with a total of eight friars (Yanhuitlán and Antequera) within his entire bishopric.  

As a result of Bishop López de Zárate's invitation in 1548, the Dominicans began to thrust out in a number of directions from their Teposcolula-Yanhuitlán, Mixtecan headquarters. The chronicler Dávila Padilla writes concerning the support of the Bishop:

> He was very affectionate towards our Order, and such a devoted benefactor of our province,...all the houses that we wanted in his Bishopric, he gave us: and he invited us to establish others.  

Bishop López de Zárate of Oaxaca and Bishop Julián Garcés of Tlaxcala encouraged and aided the Order; their cooperation gave impetus to the Dominican expansion in Oaxaca, which began in the late 1530's and continued into the early seventeenth century. By the time of Bishop López de Zárate's death in 1555, the Dominicans had become firmly established in the densely settled areas of Oaxaca, inhabited by the more sedentary indigenous peoples, the

---

Mixtecs and Zapotecs.

Undoubtedly because of the Dominican preponderance in the bishopric a member of the Order, Fray Bernardo de Alburquerque, was granted the benefice in 1559, which he held until 1579. In 1581, the third Bishop of Oaxaca, the Dominican Fray Bartolomé de Ledesma, was appointed and he held the position until 1604. Therefore, the Dominicans in Oaxaca had the benefit of a highly cooperative secular bishop and two others, who were members of their Order, during the course of the sixteenth century. The practice of appointing members of the religious orders to bishoprics was not unusual in New Spain, but the Dominican monopoly in Oaxaca was unique. In most other bishoprics two or more of the orders were usually in competition for mission territories and for favors from the episcopacy. Ricard notes that, at times, the mendicant bishops in a competitive situation between orders would favor their own brothers over their rivals. But the Dominicans, not having any competition from the other orders in Oaxaca, did not benefit from this particular kind of favoritism.

Even before the Tlaxcalan and Oaxacan bishops came to the aid of the Order, the Dominicans reoccupied their mission in Yanhuitlán, sometime in 1535 or 1536, after a four or five year absence caused by the jurisdictional dispute between friars on Espanola and in New Spain. In Yanhuitlán the two Dominicans established a small ermita

30. Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 248-249.
and began the formidable task of extirpating paganism and instilling Christianity among the numerous inhabitants of Yanhuitlán and the surrounding region. The chronicler Dávila Padilla writes:

The task of the religious in those days was a great one in that land: for as there was not more than one convent, they used to go out from there through all the region, which is a very rugged and dry land, and without relief that there is now /the 1590's/, that it is a great thing to have houses of the Order in all parts of that province, where he who is visiting /preaching in the small rural chapels/ can seek shelter when he might have an occasion that would compel him to do so.31

The difficulties of the early years began to be alleviated in 1538 at the provincial chapter meeting at which Fray Pedro Delgado was elected provincial to replace Betanzos at the end of the latter's three year term. At the meeting Delgado ordered the conversion of the Mixteca; the Dominicans were to build churches and convents, with Crown authority, where the friars could keep their discipline.32 The newly elected provincial sent Fray Francisco Marín and Fray Pedro Fernández to aid in the conversion of the Mixteca Alta. They entered the region at Acatlán, and then moved on to Chila, and then to Yanhuitlán. There, they joined forces with the friars who had reoccupied the mission three years earlier. Probably no other monasteries were founded until 1541 when the Dominicans were forced out of Yanhuitlán due to the hostility of the encomendero Francisco de las Casas and the local Indian hierarchy. The friars, under pressure, moved to Teposcolula where

31. Dávila Padilla, Historia, Libro Primero, chapter on Fray Domingo de Santa María.
32. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 282.
they founded a new monastery. Throughout the sixteenth century the monasteries in Yahnuitlán and Teposcolula served as centers for Dominican expansion in the Mixteca.

The next stage in Dominican expansion came in 1548 after the Order's provincial, Fray Domingo de Santa María, received a letter from Bishop Juan López de Zarate asking him for friars to evangelize the Indians of Tlaxiaco. This was a Mixtecan town almost due south of Teposcolula and ten leagues southeast of Yahnuitlán. Bishop López de Zarate requested the friars' aid because the secular priest who had been placed in Tlaxiaco was very ineffectual since he did not speak Mixtecan. The first Dominicans sent to establish a monastery there, a town whose jurisdiction counted 4,000 married men in 1548, were Fray Gonzalo Lucero and Fray Benito Fernández. The Dominicans also established a monastery in the important Mixtec religious center of Achiutla in the same year.

Other Dominican establishments in the Mixteca include Coixtlahuaca, north of Yahnuitlán, founded sometime before 1552. Also to the north and northwest of Teposcolula and Yahnuitlán, the Order established a mission in Tonalá before 1556, and another in Tamazulapan before 1558. Finally, by 1562, the Dominicans had founded a house in Tecomaxtlahuaca, southwest of Teposcolula, and in Teutila

33. Yahnuitlán was abandoned by the Dominicans in 1541 and was not reoccupied by the friars until 1546-1547. In the interim, secular priests were appointed to the post by the Bishop of Oaxaca. JM and MH, Codice, 21-22.
34. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 305-306.
35. Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 71.
(near present-day Jalapa de Diaz), to the northeast of Coixtlahuaca.36

The Dominican convents in Zapotecas provide a contrast with the Mixtecan missions. The former were concentrated in the vicinity of Antequera in the Valley of Oaxaca, while the latter were spread throughout a large, mountainous region. The Zapotec mission system had barely begun by 1550, with only establishments in Etla and Cuilapan founded before that date. Northeast of Antequera in the region of the Northern Zapotec and Mixe peoples, only four missions were established: Ixtepeji before 1556; Villa Alta de San Ildefonso; Tanteze; and Totontepec.37 Other Dominican missions were established south of Antequera in Ocotlán before 1562, Huaxolotitlán in 1554, Coatlán soon after 1558; and to the southeast in Nejapa, Jalapa del Marqués and Tehuantepec where the Order had been since before 1556.38

The majority of the Dominican houses in Oaxaca extant in 1570 were founded after 1550. Of the seven houses established before 1550, four were in the Mixteca Alta and the other three, including

36. Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 71; and Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, chaps. XXV-XXVI.
37. According to Burgoa, even though Fray Gonzalo Lucero had worked in the Zapotecas area in the 1530's, by the early 1550's the Dominicans could not enter because it had come under the control of secular clergy. Since the seculars did not know the Indian languages, the inhabitants were largely neglected. López de Zárate, concerned at the plight of the local population, asked for Dominican help. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, I, 90.
38. Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 71-72.
Antequera, were in the Valley of Oaxaca. 39 Ricard includes twenty-three Dominican missions in Oaxaca on his "Sketch Map of the Mendicant Establishments about 1570." 40 Three of this number were pueblos de españoles, including Antequera with 300 vecinos (200 Spanish and 100 mestizos and mulattos), and Villa Alta de San Ildefonso and Nejapa, each with "20 Spanish vecinos, more or less." 41 The list of Dominican houses in Oaxaca in the "Descripción del Obispado de Antequera..." has twenty-four houses, but it contains six houses that Ricard does not name, while the latter lists four houses not noted in the former. While both of these lists are supposed to have been compiled around 1570, it is possible that at least some of the discrepancies can be explained by confusion between Nahuatl, Mixtec, Zapotec, and Spanish toponymics. About 1570, based on Ricard's map, the Dominicans had ten houses in the Mixtec region (including one in the Mixteca de Costa) and thirteen in predominately Zapotecan areas of Eastern Oaxaca. 42

39. The number might be eight if Villa Alta de San Ildefonso is counted; but evidently it was not permanently held by the Dominicans. See footnote #37 above.

40. Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, map, 62-63.

41. "Descripción del Obispado de Antequera, de la Nueva España, hecha por el Obispo del dicho Obispado, por mandado, de S.M.," in Relación de los Obispados de Tlaxcala, Michoacán, Oaxaca y otros lugares en el siglo XVI, edited by Luis García Pimentel (Mexico, 1904), 69. It is possible that a fourth town, which was a Spanish villa as well, Villa del Espíritu Santo or Guazacualco was occupied by the Dominicans before 1570. See Epistolario de Nueva España, edited by Francisco del Paso y Troncoso (16 vols., Mexico, 1932-1942), IV, 145, hereafter ENE. The towns on the Ricard map not listed in the "Descripción" are: Tonalá, Tanetze, Totontepec and Huamelula. Those towns listed in the "Descripción" not on Ricard's map are: Texupá, Xatepeque, Nochixtlan, Tequecistlán, Titiquipague, and Teozapotlán.

42. Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, map, 62-63.
The next available accounting of the number of Dominican houses in Oaxaca appears in Dávila Padilla's Historia. The Dominican chronicler writes that as of 1591 the Order had sixty-six houses in all of New Spain. Twenty-two of this number were in the "Mexican nation", seventeen in the "Mixtec nation", and twenty in the "Zapotec nation." Therefore, within approximately twenty years the number of Dominican houses in Oaxaca increased from twenty-three to thirty-seven. This sixty percent increase in the number of houses occurred during a period marked by high Indian population loss. In other words, the Dominicans in the decades of the 1570's and 1580's were filling in gaps in most areas of their Oaxacan mission system while the Bishopric's population was in rapid decline. The region in which the Dominicans expanded least after 1570 was in the tierra caliente belt along the Pacific coast where the indigenous population was the most ravaged. In the highland and mountainous regions, in spite of a population decline, the Dominicans consolidated their mission system.

If the Dominicans were still consolidating after 1570 while the potential number of converts was decreasing, how effective were their efforts in the earlier decades when there were fewer missions and friars to convert a larger Indian population? A correlation of total population under Dominican control with the number of friars in the region suggests that anything like a complete conversion in Oaxaca was impossible until the indigenous population

sharply declined and the number of missionaries increased.

In order to judge if the Dominicans in Oaxaca were hopelessly undermanned for their proposed undertaking it is necessary to have an idea of what was considered to be a suitable ratio of clergy to potential converts. Such a ratio was postulated at an Ecclesiastical Council held in Lima in 1583. The Council concluded that a curate should not serve more than 200 to 300 families. 44 Around 1570 the total number of Dominicans in the Bishopric of Oaxaca was somewhere between 110 and 117. 45 Thirty-five to forty of these Dominicans were at the main Oaxacan monastery in Antequera; many of this number were novices in the Order receiving religious and language training, while others served as instructors and administered to the needs of the 300 non-Indian vecinos of the city and their families. 46 Thus, probably no more than ten of the friars were involved in the conversion of the Indians in and around the city. In the twenty-three other houses listed in the "Descripción" there were only seventy-five additional friars. 47 It can be assumed that at least ten of this number held administrative positions and served the vecinos in the Spanish towns, thus leaving them with little time to devote to the conversion of the Indians. 48 This

47. "Descripción del Obispado de Antequera," Relación, 70-77.
48. Even though the number of Spanish vecinos probably did not exceed 400, they would proportionately require more friars because they participated more in the receiving of the sacraments than did the Indians. According to Ricard, for example, the
left approximately sixty-five friars for the task of converting and administering the sacraments to 64,600 family units. This meant that each friar was responsible for converting and serving almost 1000 families. Therefore, if we accept the ideal clergy-family ratio established at the Lima council of one friar to 250 families, each Dominican in Oaxaca was expected to convert and serve nearly four times as many families as the Church at that time considered to be satisfactory.

In discussing the conversion of the Quechua population in colonial Peru, Kubler writes that "if Christianization requires an ample working staff of curates and missionaries, the epoch of the most rapid Christianization may be assigned to the period in which the number of European workers was most rapidly expanded." This holds true for Oaxaca and the rest of New Spain as well; but the rapid decline of the indigenous population in the sixteenth century appears to have been a more significant factor in insuring widespread conversion. Even if the number of friars had remained constant in Oaxaca from 1570 to 1590, the ratio of friars to families would have dropped considerably closer to that suggested by the

Dominicans had two categories of converts: the "graduados" or "communiotlacat." These were those who commuted to communion whenever they desired; and a second group, the great majority who took communion at Easter, or in times of serious sickness but only after receiving permission from their confessors. Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 124-125.

49. "Descripción del Obispado de Antequera," Relación, 77. This document states that areas under Dominican control contained 64,600 tributaries out of a total bishopric population of 100,000 tributaries. Presumably the 35,400 tributaries not under the Dominicans were served by secular clergy or neglected.

Ecclesiastical Council held in Lima in 1583. But the number of Dominicans did not remain constant during that period. Fourteen new houses were established between 1570 and 1591, and assuming that each was manned by two or three friars, this means that an additional thirty to forty friars were available to convert a constantly decreasing indigenous population.\textsuperscript{51} Exact figures for the number of families under Dominican control are lacking for the 1590's; but Cook and Borah calculate that Central Mexico had an indigenous population of 2,650,000 in the 1565-1570 period which declined to 1,370,000 by the late 1590's.\textsuperscript{52} Assuming that the Oaxacan population declined at the same rate as in the rest of Central Mexico, this would mean that by the late 1590's an indigenous population about fifty percent smaller than that of 1570 was being served by a Dominican missionary force enlarged by fifty percent.

A rough estimate of the ratio of friars to Indian families in the late 1590's can be made by taking fifty percent of the 1570 tributary list (100,000),\textsuperscript{53} thereby arriving at an estimate of 50,000 for the late 1590's. According to the "Descripción del Obispado" the Dominicans in 1570 had 64,600 tributaries in their

\textsuperscript{51} Dávila Padilla, Historia, 79b. Based on a breakdown of the number of friars assigned to each house listed in the "Descripción del Obispado de Antequera," the average per house was about three, excluding the Antequera monastery which had thirty-five to forty. "Descripción del Obispado de Antequera," Relación, 69-77.

\textsuperscript{52} Sherburne F. Cook and Woodrow Borah, "The Indian Population of Central Mexico, 1531-1600," Ibero-Americana, No. 44 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1960). The document upon which the late 1590's estimate is based is the "información...sobre el estado en que se encontraba la sucesión de indios...en 1597," ENE, XIII, 3-48.

\textsuperscript{53} "Descripción del Obispado de Antequera," Relación, 69.
towns out of a total of 100,000 or approximately sixty-five percent. The growth of the Order in the bishopric and the aid of the Dominican bishops from 1559 to 1604 suggest that the Dominicans' share of tributaries increased from sixty-five percent to as high as eighty percent. Thus, by the 1590's the Dominicans probably had around 110 friars actively serving 40,000 families, or a ratio of one friar to every 364 family units. By a combination of Dominican expansion and indigenous population decline the missionary-family ratio was reduced from one to 1000 in 1570 to one to 364 in the 1590's. The ratio for the latter period was within reach of the ratio suggested by the Lima council of one to 200 or 300 families. By the 1590's the Dominicans had sufficient manpower to thoroughly evangelize Oaxaca.

But a problem remains. In a letter to Philip II in 1554, Viceroy Luis de Velasco notes that of 180 Dominicans in New Spain half were novices. That leaves ninety, from which lay brothers, the aged, and the sick, must be deducted. If this ratio of novices to ordained regulars persisted, it means that the ratio was even higher than estimated above, making the friars' task, even in the 1590's, a difficult one.55

Even if there were sufficient friars to thoroughly evangelize Oaxaca, the question remains: did the Dominicans thoroughly evangelize and convert the Indian population of Oaxaca in the sixteenth

55. Luis de Velasco to Philip II, February 7, 1554, in Mariano Cuevas, SJ, Documentos inéditos del siglo XVI para la historia de México (Mexico, 1914) 196-197, as cited in Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 53.
century? The answer is no; the Order's efforts were selective. With the exception of the region inhabited by the Chinantecs, the Dominicans generally concentrated on the densely populated and fertile areas where a tight network of houses could be built, such as in the Mixteca Alta and around Antequera in the Valley of Oaxaca. These areas of more sedentary peoples were better suited to the Spanish encomienda system than the mountainous regions where Chinantecs, Mixes, and Chontales lived in dispersed rancherías. Approaching this problem from more of a cultural perspective McAndrew states: "The Indians who had had the most advanced cultures before the Conquest were the first to be conquered and converted, and were therefore the most subject to new Spanish ways."  

As early as 1558, Fray Domingo de Santa María, then Provincial Superior of the Order, wrote to the Royal Council of the Indies requesting additional "good religious" to indoctrinate the Indians of Coatlán in the Southern Zapotec region, the Mixes, and the Chontales. The latter two were described as people who "live in rugged lands and villages...without roads, and these provinces or kingdoms until now, have not come into the faith, nor know what Christian doctrine is...although according to the indication that they have given they have an ardent desire to achieve salvation and to have friars and monasteries amongst them."  

57. "Carta de fray Domingo de Santa María, prior provincial, y definidores de la orden de Santo Domingo, al Real Consejo de las Yndias, solicitando que destinen buenos religiosos a la doctrina de los indios - Yahuitlán, 24 de enero de 1558," in Cartas de Indias, Ministerio de Fomento (Madrid, 1877), Letter xxiv, 129-130.
But the reduction of the Mixes did not begin until 1600 when the Dominicans undertook the task without any military assistance. The reduction and conversion of the Mixes had some successes from the Spanish point of view, but it never was complete. Ricard describes the Dominican houses in the Mixe region as missions of penetration, "represented by the precarious establishment of sporadic houses in zones of difficult relief, unpleasant climate, not yet pacified, on the border of unsubjugated territories." The Mixes would probably have been more completely Christianized and Hispanized if their lands had been more fertile and rich in mineral wealth. The poverty of the region did not attract Spanish laymen. As a result, the only contacts which the Mixes had with the Spanish world came through the Dominicans and the hated Zapotec traders and travelers.

The evangelization of the Mixes was unsuccessful due to a combination of factors including the lack of friars; the poor communications between villages and the ruggedness of the terrain; and the incomplete attempt of the Spanish to congregate the widely dispersed Mixe population into larger, more accessible villages and towns. A map of the vicariate of Totontepeque shows that in 1706 it had a total of twenty-one iglesias de visita, or rural chapels. The distances between visitas and the poor trails and roads meant journeys of a half day, an entire day, or more from

58. Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 78.
church to church. The house in Totontepeque never had more than three friars, but it generally had two, and at times only one.\textsuperscript{60} The resulting ineffectiveness must be patent when one compares this vicarate with one in a densely populated, fertile area such as Yanhuitlán or Teposcolula.

The Dominicans' failure to convert the Mixes and the Chontales revolves around their inability to reduce them to a more urban way-of-life. The topography of these mountainous regions did not permit the practice of agricultural techniques necessary for the support of a dense population. Only a massive infusion of friars into these regions would have insured a fuller conversion of the dispersed indigenous populations, but this would have been a difficult adjustment for the Spanish Dominicans who abhorred the "barbarity" of the Mixes and their non-urban environment. To an urban-oriented person of a Mediterranean culture, the semi-sedentary Mixes were considered brutish. The Dominicans were unable to adjust to Mixe conditions and the latter were unable to adjust to European forms.\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{60} Beals, "Algunos Aspectos...," 230; and Burgoa, \textit{Geográfica Descripción}, II, chapter LX, 188ff.

\textsuperscript{61} See the discussion of this topic in O. Schmieder, "The Settlements of the Tzapotecs and Mije Indians, State of Oaxaca, Mexico," \textit{University of California Publications in Geography}, vol. 4, 63.
Chapter III

MISSIONARY METHODS

In order to Christianize the Mixtecs it was necessary for the Dominicans to learn their language. Without a knowledge of the local language it would be almost impossible to administer competently the sacraments other than marriage and baptism.\footnote{1} The first Dominicans temporarily surmounted the language barrier by speaking Nahuatl to those Mixtecs who had had contact with Aztec tribute collectors, merchants, and soldiers.\footnote{2} But the friars soon learned the indigenous languages.

Two outstanding linguists among the first generation of Dominicans in Oaxaca were Fray Domingo de Santa María and Fray Benito Fernández. They both learned Mixtec, Zapotec, Chontal (spoken in Southern Oaxaca) and Nahuatl. Later, it became general practice for the Dominicans to study all these languages, except Chontal, simultaneously.

The Dominicans’ language problem in the Mixteca Alta was complicated by the existence of various Mixtec dialects. Just as the mountainous terrain of the Mixteca made it natural that it should be divided into a series of small kingdoms or cacicazgos, so too people who lived in distinct geographic parts of the region spoke

\footnote{1}{Ricard, \textit{Spiritual Conquest}, 47.}
\footnote{2}{Nahuatl became a lingua franca in New Spain. It was already widely spoken at Spanish contact, however, as it was the language of the Aztec tribute empire, but the regular clergy further spread its use. "Mexicana," writes Dávila Padilla, "...es vulgar corriente por toda la nueva España...." Dávila Padilla, \textit{Historia}, Libro Primero, 79a.}
different dialects. Both the chroniclers Herrera and Torquemada write that there were twelve dialects, but the Dominican grammarian, Fray Antonio de los Reyes, describes only four. Burgoa, writing in the 1670's, states that although there were language differences, the dialects were mutually intelligible. Burgoa, is contradicted, however, by the fact that Fray Benito Fernández had to write two editions of his *Doctrina Mixteca*, one in the dialect of Achiutla and Tlaxiaco and another in the dialect of Teposcolula.

Books written by the Dominicans concentrated on two topics: language study; and religious books in the Indian languages. The friars had books printed in, and about, the indigenous languages since their primary goal was to Christianize rather than Hispanize the Indians. Grammars and dictionaries were published to aid the friars in their language studies, while printed catechisms, confessionals, translations of the Gospel, the Epistles, lives of the saints, and manuals for regular services aided them in evangelization.

As early as 1529, Burgoa tells us, Fray Gonzalo Lucero began "writing the endings and voices of the Indian /Mixtec/ language."

---

3. On the conflict of the number of dialects, see Dahlgren de Jordan, *La Mixteca*; Burgoa, *Geográfica Descripción*, 1, 277. Burgoa writes: "aunque la Tenga los hace generalmente a todas unas en muchas partes la han diferenciado en silabas, y modo de pronunciarlas, pero todas se comunican, y entienden..."

4. Ricard, *Spiritual Conquest*, 49; Dávila Padilla also comments on how the variation of dialects made the learning of Mixtec more difficult and necessitated extra study. *Historia*, Libero Primero, 302a.

5. Ricard notes the prevailing belief among the friars that the indigenous population could be kept from contact with evil Spaniards if they did not know Spanish. *Spiritual Conquest*, 51-52.

But Fray Domingo de Santa María is considered by the Dominican chroniclers to be the first friar to write Mixtec language books. Dávila Padilla writes that Fray Domingo "was the first that wrote a work on the art and teaching of that language." At a Dominican chapter meeting after Fray Domingo's death, held in 1561, Fray Juan Cabrera was ordered to finish the deceased friar's Vocabulario Mixteca; and Fray Benito Fernández, along with two others, was ordered to complete Fray Domingo's Mixtec primer. At the chapter meeting held in May, 1587, Fray Antonio de los Reyes was ordered to finish and perfect a Mixtec grammar. Six years later, his Arte de la lengua Mixteca was published. This work remains the most complete work on Mixtec morphology, the origins of the pre-Hispanic cacicazgos, the different dialects, and Mixtec toponymics. In 1589, the newly elected provincial Fray Gabriel de San José, ordered Fray Francisco de Alvarado to compile a Mixtec dictionary, and in 1593 his Vocabulario en lengua mixteca was published. Alvarado based his work on all the previous Dominican studies beginning with Lucero's; he was also aided by Mixtecans who he praised as the "best teachers." No other significant studies were done on the Mixtec language for three

7. Dávila Padilla, Historia, Libro Primero, 209a; and Actas / de capítulos / provinciales de la Provincia de Santiago de México del Orden de Predicadores, 1540-1589 (manuscript in the Bancroft Library), as cited in Jiménez Moreno, Vocabulario, 26.
8. Actas, as cited in Jiménez Moreno, Vocabulario, 35.
hundred years after the publications by Reyes and Alvarado in the 1590's. This demonstrates both the excellence of these works and a waning enthusiasm for the study of indigenous languages after the late sixteenth century.

If thorough grammars and dictionaries were necessary for the sound linguistic training of the Dominicans, some consideration must be given to the degree to which Mixtec Christianization was influenced by the delayed printing of such basic works. Clearly, Dominicans who learned Mixtecan after the appearance of the publications of the 1590's must have had a better command of the language than the pioneers of the first half century (1540-1590). The lack of published works, however, was probably compensated for by the passing around of hand-written copies of grammars and dictionaries. The extent to which the conversion of the Mixtecs was hindered by such subtle communications problems is difficult to measure, and the Dominican chronicles are of little help. It is almost impossible, from a study of the chronicles, to gauge the relative fluency of the religious since the discussion of the subject is enmeshed in hagiography. Friars are described as being able to learn Mixtec or Zapotec almost instantly, and to speak it so well that they appeared to have been born and raised among the Indians. Perhaps, the friars' zeal and desire to save souls

11. Perhaps, by contrast with the Mixtecan situation, the Dominican Fray Pedro de Cordoba, produced a Zapotecan Vocabulario in the early decades and, according to Burgoa, it was still used by all friars working in the Zapotecan region in the 1670's. Geográfica Descripción, 1, 221.
did indeed drive them to rapidly learn these languages. In at least one instance, however, Burgoa notes the difficulty and confusion which resulted from the lack of grammars in the early years. It seems clear, nevertheless, that the regulars consistently mastered the indigenous languages better than did the seculars. Fray Francisco Marín, for example, displayed great linguistic agility. He was stationed at one house where he had to preach a sermon for a half hour in Mixtec and then switch to Chochona for a second half hour.

While the Dominicans were slow to publish grammars, they did publish a considerable number of religious books in the early years. By 1572 the Dominicans had published five in Zapotec and five in Mixtec. The first doctrina written in Mixtec became the most widely used. In 1539 Fray Domingo de Santa María wrote his Doctrina Christiana "with admirable elements and advice in order to teach it..." to the Indians. Later it was printed and widely used in the Mixteca. And in his Inquisitional trial the cacique of Yanhuitlán, Don Domingo, stated in a written declaration (dated July 8, 1545) that he knew "the christian doctrine...in the form and manner that it is printed in the Mixtec language." Dávila Padilla writes that

12. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 251 and 86, respectively.
13. See examples of this in Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 305, and 330-331.
15. Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 49.
16. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 284; and Dávila Padilla, Historia, Libro Primero, 209a.
17. JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, 46.
Fray Benito Fernández's doctrina (see above) was published in Mexico City in 1550.  

Although the Dominicans produced language and religious books, they did not write any ethnographic works to aid them in the conversion of the Mixtecs. Fray Antonio de los Reyes' *Arte de la lengua mixteca* was the closest equivalent to the works of Sahagún or Fray Diego de Durán's *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España e Islas de Tierra Firme*. The latter work is the only well known ethnographic study written by a Dominican and it concentrates on the Aztecs. Perhaps, the absence of studies on the Mixtecs can be explained by the slow start of their conversion, contemporaneous with the conservative spirit that came to prevail in the episcopacy and among what Ricard calls the anti-Indian faction of the regulars in the post-Trentine Church. At the time, it was feared that works on Indian antiquities would only stimulate Indian heresy.

---


A good example of the contrast in attitudes before and after the post-Trentine conservatism became widespread is provided by a description of the decoration inside the old church (built c. 1540) of Yanhuitlán. The church had no retablo nor "decent paintings," the ornamentation consisted only of paintings done by Indian artists in a "form analogous to the Codex Sierra." JM and MH, *Códice*, 30. By contrast, among the acts passed at the First Mexican Synod, held in 1555 under the auspices of Archbishop Fray Alonso de Montúfar, was one that Indians not be permitted to paint religious images without the painter and his work first being examined, in order to determine his orthodoxy. *Conciliis Provinciales, primero, y segundo, celebrados en la muy leal ciudad de México, presidiendo al Ilmo. y Rmo. Senor D. Fr. Alonso de Montúfar, en los años de 1555, y 1565*, edited by Archbishop Francisco Antonio Lorenzana (*Mexico, 1769*), cap. XXXIV, 91-92.
In the early decades of the conversion, the continuing worship of pagan idols and the presence of temples proved a problem to the Dominicans. The friars soon realized that they could not thoroughly convert the Mixtecs until they extirpated the omnipresent symbols of paganism. In the face of overt and covert resistance the religious ordered the destruction of Mixtec idols and temples. When Fray Dionisio de Vargas, stationed in Yanhuitlán in the late 1530's, sought to destroy certain idols in the town, the Indian gobernadores tried to persuade him not to with a bribe. 20

The local Indian rulers also used their influence over their subjects to thwart the zealous friars. During Fray Dionisio de Vargas' stay in Yanhuitlán (late 1530's) pagan temples still stood beside the early, crude church. The friar tried to have them destroyed. Soon after the destruction began a piece of stone fell on one of the workers and as a result the gobernador, Don Francisco, seeing this as an omen that the gods were angered, ordered a halt to the demolition. The remains of the temples were not totally destroyed until around 1544 when the local rulers were tried before the Inquisition. 21

Just as rulers of an important town could influence their own subjects they could also pressure the rulers of weaker or subject towns to resist the Dominicans. In the Proceso of the Inquisition, the tlatoani or hereditary cacique of Molcaxtepec testified:

20. JM and MH, Códice, 22.
21. JM and MH, Códice, 30, and see text of testimony in appendix 5, 42.
It could have been five years ago, more or less, that wanting Padre fray Domingo /de Santa María/ to burn the demons of Anguitlán this witness brought his own /Idols/ from the pueblo of Amolcastepeque, that he rules, and the said Don Francisco ordered this witness to return the said demons to his pueblo and to worship them and have them as gods as he used to before and not to give them to the friars nor to any other person and that until today he has had them out of fear of the said Don Francisco and that he wants to give them so that they will be burned and that he asks God for mercy.22

Another source of hindrance to the Dominicans' efforts to extirpate paganism were Spanish laymen. Fray Jordán de Santa Catalina preached in the villages near Villa Alta de San Ildefonso, in the Zapotec region, and destroyed many idols by burning them. But the local inhabitants undoubtedly suspected a plot when a group of the friar's countrymen followed him from village to village, retrieving the remains of the images from the still smouldering ashes.23 Finally, the Dominicans were at times confronted with the opposition of encomenderos, who, ironically, were responsible for the conversion of their Indian tributaries. In 1541, the Vicar Fray Domingo de Santa María wanted to punish one of the ruling elite of Yauhuitlán, Don Francisco, for performing sacrifices in his house; but the hostility of the other nobles and of the encomendero, Francisco de las Casas, prevented it. Las Casas was alleged to have repeatedly told his Indians that he was "the bishop and pope in their town." The combination of Indian and encomendero hostility forced the Vicar to move the convent to nearby Teposcolula in that same year.24

22. JM and MH, Códice, appendix 5, 41.
24. JM and MH, Códice, 22 and 27.
The Dominicans, and the other Mendicants too, found their most loyal allies in their war against paganism among the Indian children, especially those of the nobility. Upon coming of age this first generation of devoutly Christian, partially Hispanized rulers assured the friars of widespread success.

The Dominicans' conversion methods were not all as negative as the destruction of idols and temples. They tried to make Christianity palatable to the Mixtecs, by adapting their methods and teachings to the Indian culture and outlook. None of the Dominican Mixtec catechisms are available for analysis, but the doctrina of Fray Pedro de Córdoba, O.P., is in print. This Doctrina cristiana, in Nahuatl, made an effort toward adaptation in contrast for example, to the Franciscan Fray Alonso de Molina's catechism. The Dominican catechism emphasizes the sacrifices the missionaries had made to ensure the "spiritual health" of the Indians, who, otherwise, would have been doomed to hell like their ancestors. The Doctrina contrasts the omnipotent Christian God with the impotent pagans gods of the Indians. In order to explain the power of the Christian God, Fray Pedro de Córdoba develops a concrete example:

25. Fray Pedro de Córdoba's Doctrina cristiana was published in Spanish in 1544 in collaboration with Fray Domingo de Betanzos, O.P., and Fray Juan de Zumárraga, O.F.M., Archbishop of Mexico (1528-1548). This doctrina was designated as the doctrina larga by the bishops at the ecclesiastical conference of 1546. It was to be used, according to Ricard, for the instruction of Indians who were to receive more advanced training. In order to use it for this purpose it was translated into Nahuatl, and in 1548 a bilingual Nahuatl-Castilian edition was published. Ricard, *Spiritual Conquest*, 105.
Tell me beloved children can you put all the earth or all the sea in your hand; it cannot be done; but you can put a little earth or water in your hand, because your hand is small and the earth and sea are very large. But if your hand was as large as the earth or the sea it could easily fit. In this way I give you a comparison, which you can understand, showing that your hand is very small, and that the power of our great God is very great. Thus, we cannot understand how he performs his marvels.

Fray Pedro de Córdoba's Doctrina also condemns the Meso-American Indian practice of making blood offerings. It warns the Indians that the Christian God would be offended if men were sacrificed to Him. Another point stressed by the Doctrina is that God knows all, sees all, including man's thoughts. In other words, one's intended sins are as evil as sinful acts. In sermons eighteen and nineteen, for example (of the forty in the catechism), the author points out that wishing misfortune on others and the desire to commit adultery are sinful. There was a fear that the Indians would confuse actual sin and the sin of intention. The Dominicans, and other Mendicants too including Sahagún, sought to ensure both the outward and inward religiosity of the Indians.27 The friars must

27. This discussion of Pedro de Córdoba's Doctrina cristiana is based on Ricard (Simpson translation), 105-106, and the resume of the catechism found in Appendix II of Ricard, "Conquête Spirituelle," 353-356. In 1944 Ediciones Cultura Hispanica published a facsimile reproduction of the 1548 edition entitled Doctrina Cristiana en lengua española y mexicana por los religiosos de la Orden de Santo Domingo, Colección de incunables americanos, I (Madrid, 1944).
have encountered great difficulty trying to clarify such abstract concepts to relatively simple people, whether they be Mixtec or Castilian peasants. The difficulty in the Mixteca Alta was compounded by the language barrier.

The Dominicans, and the other Mendicant Orders as well, realized that the Indians' religious systems were not based on dogmas and "basic truths," but on legend and history. They adapted their teaching methods so that the Christian precepts were taught not in a Eurocentric, systematic way, but in the form of historical narrative, conforming more to the indigenous tradition. 28

The Dominican chronicler, Fray Agustín Dávila Padilla, considered the preaching techniques of Fray Gonzalo Lucero particularly important because he adapted his style to his Indian audience. Lucero kept the "capacity" and the taste of the Indians in mind when he preached; he considered the Indians "phlegmatic," necessitating the continual repetition of points. The friar saw as his first task the "unhinging" or removing of the Indians' pagan thoughts; only then did he think that he could teach them the "truths of the Faith." One of the "disorders" from which the Indians suffered was that they "revered the Sun, the Moon, and the Stars, giving insensible creatures honor that is due the Creator." In order to convince the Indians of the falseness of their beliefs, Lucero resorted to audio-visual techniques to demonstrate God's power over the universe. With

28. Borges, Métodos Misionales, 89. Also see Ursula Lamb, "Religious Conflicts in the Conquest of Mexico," Journal of the History of Ideas, XVII (1956), 528. She writes: "The cosmos of the Aztecs was explained by legend and not revealed by religion."
the aid of a globe (representing the earth), which caused a sensation among the Indians, Lucero explained that the Sun and the other planets only did what God ordered, making turns around the earth (sic) and giving it light. Lucero would then explain that:

the entire universe was subject to God's will...that everything owed its existence to God.../and/...that God had established certain laws for the governing of rational beings. He explained that God gave prizes to those that followed the laws and punishment to those who broke them.

Fray Gonzalo particularly emphasized these points: 1) the immortality of the soul is either eternal reward or eternal torment; 2) redemption by Christ for those who believe in him with intense faith; and 3) the necessity of doing good works in the present life.

"The Indians," writes Dávila Padilla, "accepted the doctrine of the immortality of the soul because even in their heathen state they acknowledged it." In order to vividly illustrate God's power to reward and punish, Lucero carried with him a series of lienzos or paintings. When he arrived in a village he had the paintings hung in a prominent place where all could see them. After giving his regular sermon Fray Lucero, using a pointer, explained the significance of the paintings. The missionary thought this technique made it difficult for the Indians to ignore the sermon. After Lucero's careful explanations the most able Indians would repeat the points made to the others. Dávila Padilla optimistically

writes that by the end of the program "the audience was left with
a yearning for Heaven and an abhorrence of Hell."\textsuperscript{31}

What kinds of scenes did the lienzos depict? One, for example
pictured "a sinner being burned by the flames of Hell for eternity."\textsuperscript{32}
Davila Padilla discusses some of the reasons why Lucero thought that
the use of the lienzos made it difficult for the "phlegmatic"
Indians to ignore the sermons. Since the Indians were reputed to
be so subject to their senses the friar used "corporal" paintings
to teach them obedience. Lucero also consciously used images and
parables concerning material things in his sermons.\textsuperscript{33} By using the
lienzos, Lucero was, at least unconsciously, conforming to a pre-
Hispanic technique of religious education; sculpture and murals de-
picting religious scenes and gods adorned both the interiors and
exteriors of Meso-American temples. Another example of continuity
within change are the picture writings used for giving moral instruc-
tion to children described by Alonso de Zorita. A Franciscan friar,
Andrés de Olmos, translated the speeches from the Indian language.
"He \textsuperscript{7}Olmos\textsuperscript{7} says," writes Zorita,

\begin{quote}
that he had some principales write down the substance
of the speeches in the Indian language, and they did
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{31} Davila Padilla, Historia, Libro Primero, 323b.
\textsuperscript{32} Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 43. For a detailed descrip-
tion of Lucero's lienzos see Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 106-107.
\textsuperscript{33} Davila Padilla, Historia, Libro Primero, 322a, and 323b-324a.
Burgoa writes of the preaching technique of another Dominican,
Fray Pedro de Aranda, who worked in Tlaxiaco (Mixteca Alta)
in the second quarter of the seventeenth century, at least
seventy-five years after Lucero: "He was very eloquent in
preaching and he knew very well the Mixtecan words and the details
of the manner in which they expressed things. Always, when he
spoke with the Indians, he tried to introduce doctrinal matters
this without his being present. They took the text from their picture writings, which they understand very well; and he did not change a word, save to divide the material into paragraphs and sentences for a better understanding of the meaning. He asked them to take out the names of their gods, substituting the name of the true God and of Our Lord.34

It is difficult to determine from a study of the chronicles how widely the techniques of Lucero and Olmos were used in the conversion of the Indians. Other examples of Dominican creativity in indoctrination are lacking but Mendieta describes Indian religious assistants using lienzos.35 When considering Lucero's use of paintings it is important to remember that he did not use his audio-visual techniques to compensate for an inability to speak Mixtecan. He was one of the first Dominican students of that language.36

While the friars devoted much of their time to catechizing the Mixtecs, their limited numbers demanded that other means be adopted to hasten the conversion process. One solution was to use the most fully converted Indians to help convert their neighbors. Burgoa reports that the Dominicans often recruited the first baptized

by discussing their ancient customs and how to remedy them. He used Mixtecan metaphors and figures of speech.34 Geográfica Descripción, I, 314.

34. Alonso de Zorita, Life and Labor in Ancient Mexico; The Brief and Summary Relation of the Lords of New Spain, translated with an introduction by Benjamin Keen (New Brunswick, N.J., 1963), 140. Charles Braden states that Olmos wrote a Mixtec grammar in which a moral code is published closely paralleling that cited by Zorita. Religious Aspects of the Conquest of Mexico (Durham, 1930), 254. But Ricard, who has an extensive bibliography of works written by the Mendicants, lists ten works by Olmos but not a Mixtecan grammar. Spiritual Conquest, 408-409.


36. See Jiménez Moreno, editor, Vocabulario, 11-12.
in a village to help convert the others. The baptized would "bring their idols, repent their errors, and bring their children for baptism." 37

Mixtecs were also more formally incorporated into the Dominicans' conversion efforts and the Church's institutions. In the Dominican monastery towns in the Mixteca Alta Indians held offices within the church. In Yanhuitlán, for example, there were twelve Indian cantores (singers) who were each paid three gold pesos annually and an Indian Maestro de Capilla who received six gold pesos per year. 38 Less frequently, a particularly devout convert would be made a donado or lay brother of the Order. Diego Osorio, for example, the cacique of a town near Achiutla, upon the death of his wife withdrew from his family and other responsibilities "to serve only Our Lord." He began to spend every day in church and he learned to read and write "and employed this ability in praying and reading edifying books." He received the sacraments frequently and devoted himself to working for the Dominicans. After requesting that the prelate of Achiutla accept him as a slave, he was made a donado. On the feast days on which no sermons were given, he would present devout spiritual discourses to the entire congregated town; when the mass was over he was very efficacious in his reasoning, with great example from the saints, and as he spoke to them in his mother tongue, and they saw his color, and nation, they accepted with great profit his doctrine, and they venerated him with particular love and joy. 39

37. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 43.
38. JM and MH, Códice, 20, note 74.
Here Burgoa unwittingly hits on one of the major difficulties of the colonial Mexican Church. The failure to develop an Indian clergy in the sixteenth century meant that the Church remained a foreign institution led by foreign ecclesiastics. The negative effects of this on the indigenous population are immeasurable. 40

Another office filled by Indians was that of fiscal who must have been especially important to the under-manned friars in the sixteenth century. Indian fiscales were appointed by the bishops in order to aid the regular and secular clergy gather Indians at the doctrinas (parochial churches), and served as informants on the behavior of married Indians. They reported to the clergy those Indians who had mistresses, or those who were regularly drunk. The fiscal was especially needed by the clergy in towns without permanent monasteries or churches where newly won converts might more easily apostatize into idolatrous practices. 41

Without the help of these auxiliaries the conversion would have been far less complete. The relatively thinly spaced monasteries, with often only two friars in each one, were responsible for their comarcas or surrounding regions. In Tlaxiaco, for example, there were just two friars, and according to Burgoa one of them was always away preaching and administering the sacraments, walking from doctrina to doctrina. At a later date (not given) the total number of friars was augmented to four. Tlaxiaco's comarca was so extensive

40. For an excellent discussion of this problem see Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 217-235.
that it was divided into three rumbos or routes to make evangelization more efficient. Each of the routes, or series of iglesias de visita, was named after a saint: San Antonio, San Mateo, and Santiago. 42

While the Dominican iglesias de visita were usually simple structures made of perishable materials, their monasteries and churches were often large and elaborate. 43 But the Dominican monasteries existing today in the Mixteca Alta were not built in the early years of the spiritual conquest. Usually a temporary house and church would be erected on or near the site of a destroyed pagan temple. Then, some years later, permanent, masonry buildings would be constructed. The construction of a large monastery and church required the cooperation of both the Spanish encomendero and the local lord or cacique.

In the case of Yanhuitlán, the Dominicans did not have the cooperation of either the encomendero or the cacique until around 1550. The first encomendero interfered with the conversion efforts of the friars and was disinclined to aid them in the construction of a church and monastery. 44 Even when the encomienda was inherited

42. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, I, 308-309. For a description of the Dominicans' monthly trips to the town of Almaloyas, subject to the lord of Yanhuitlán, see Burgoa, I, 387. Finally in 1587, a house was established there.

43. For a discussion of the Franciscan building of iglesias de visita in Tlaxcala, see Charles Gibson, Tlaxcala in the Sixteenth Century (New Haven, 1952), 48.

44. JM and MH, Código, 14. Burgoa, probably unaware of the obstructive tactics of Francisco de las Casas (the father), credits this encomendero with greatly aiding the Dominicans. Geográfica Descripción, I, 290-291. This view is also disputed by Kubler, Mexican Architecture, I, 19.
by Gonzalo de las Casas in 1546, the original encomendero's son, the situation did not immediately improve. In 1548 Emperor Charles V issued a cedula ordering all encomenderos to cease obstructing the friars' efforts to preach and teach the Catholic doctrine wherever they wished to go. 45 Another royal cedula was issued later in the same year calling for the construction of monasteries, in regions such as the Mixteca Alta, where they were needed. This cedula also stated that in Crown towns his majesty would pay the entire cost of construction, while in towns held in encomienda the cost would be shared by the Crown and the encomendero. In both cases the local Indian residents were expected to provide the necessary labor. 46 In reality, however, the Crown's and encomendero's funds for ecclesiastical construction came from the tributes paid by the Indian population. Almost the entire burden fell upon the local inhabitants. 47 It was probably the second cedula which helped to persuade Gonzalo de las Casas to aid the Dominicans in Yanhuitlán.

The encomendero, his differences with the friars settled, provided large numbers of laborers from his encomienda to work on the project which was in progress by 1550. Burgoa, who spoke with old Indians who had witnessed the construction, says that Las Casas

45. Cédula del Emperador, 1548, as cited in Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, I, 301-302.
46. Cédula Real, Valladolid, September 1, 1548, as cited in Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, I, 302-303.
47. For a description of an analogous case in Peru, see Kubler, "Colonial Quechua," Handbook, II, 360. McAndrew notes that the Dominicans were able to acquire more lavish ornamentation in their monasteries than the other Orders since they "kept most of the tithes they were ordered to collect." Earlier, the Dominicans, along with other Orders, had protested against tithing
designated 6,000 Yanhuitecans to work in crews of 600 each to carry the stone, water, lime, and timbers to the site. Other more highly skilled Indians aided the Spanish masters in carving stone moldings and other architectural details. 48 The widespread participation of the community must have helped to bring them more completely into the Church and created a new kind of communal solidarity. The very sumptuousness of the building must have inspired religious fervor.

The church and convent of Yanhuitlán is one of the finest examples of sixteenth century Mexican ecclesiastical architecture. It is situated upon a raised platform built under the direction of the Dominicans. Resting on its elevated base, the Church's great size is further accentuated by the two large bell towers and its impressive main facade and entrance. The walls are of finely cut stone and mortar, and the interior is distinguished by graceful vaults and delicately carved moldings. Four centuries and several wars later (during which it served as a fortress) travellers still remark on the building's beauty. 49

The participation of most of the community in the church's construction helped to fulfill a need performed in pre-Hispanic

---

48. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 291-292. For a detailed description of the church's architecture, see Burgoa, 1, 293-296. At his personal expense, Las Casas had a master builder and a painter come to Yanhuitlán from Spain. A noted Spanish painter, Andrés de Concha, who had worked on the Escorial did the retablo. 293.

49. "Letter of P. Bernabé Cabo of March 7, 1630," in JM and MH, Códice, appendix 9, 49. Also see footnote #48 above.
times by the renovation of temples at the beginning of each new fifty-two year calendar cycle. The Mixtecs were accustomed to working for the state-supported religion. The building of churches and monasteries after the conquest was a substitution for a pre-Hispanic custom. The fact that the churches were generally built on the same sites as the earlier pagan temples must have made this substitution easier.  

While the construction of ecclesiastical buildings spiritually uplifted the Indians, they were, at the same time, forced to meet the often extravagant demands of the religious and the encomenderos. Woodrow Borah writes of the Dominican establishment in Yahnuitlán:

One of their larger projects, the great fortress convent and church of Yahnuitlán, has walls of dressed stone, the thickness of which must be measured in meters. It was built in twenty-five years, almost entirely by hand labor, even to the carrying of stones and other materials. A medieval European city of the same size as Yahnuitlán but making far greater use of animal traction power, would have required centuries to construct a comparable cathedral church.

While Yahnuitlán had one of the most impressive of the monasteries and churches built in New Spain, it was by no means atypical. Many other Indian towns held by the Dominicans, and the other Orders as well, had equally large churches and convents. The

50. For a brief discussion of the significance of the Aztec calendar, see George Valliant, Aztecs of Mexico (Baltimore, 1965), 204. On substitution see Kubler, Mexican Architecture, 1, 177-178. Later, however, we shall see the difficulties this led to when the Yahnuitcans were told to invoke the pagan gods whose temples lay in ruins below the first church (1540's).

speed of construction and the dependence on Indian power to perform the most demanding tasks, as indicated by Borah, must have "consumed the strength and cut short the lives of many inhabitants." Sometimes the Indians resisted. Kubler, for example, writes that Indians were reported to have substituted ashes for lime in the mortar during construction work in Mexico City in 1538. If not discovered, it would cause buildings to collapse. But the Indians' intentions are not clear. There are no indications of anything like this occurring in Yanhuitlán. By 1583 anti-Mendicant feeling was so strong among the episcopacy in New Spain that the Dominicans ordered the early completion of their buildings in a more moderate style. As the building of churches was analogous to the communal construction of temples before the conquest, the Catholic festival calendar was analogous to its pagan antecedents. Both the pre-Hispanic and Catholic calendars set aside specific days for religious festivals. Mendieta writes that there were specific days of the year for each of the gods which were "celebrated just as we have certain days dedicated to certain saints, for in this the devil

52. JM and MH, Cédice, 17.
53. Kubler, Mexican Architecture, 1, see 167-168, on putting ashes in the mortar; see 58 for 1583 order to terminate construction in a simpler style. As early as 1564 the Dominicans addressed a letter to the Council of the Indies defending themselves against charges concerning the sumptuousness of their monasteries. They write: "...in their construction we have done no violence to the Indians, who, indeed, wish to honor their villages, because they have no churches in them other than the monasteries... And, finally, these houses do not belong to us, but to Your Highness." Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 173.
seems to have imitated among the idolatrous and deluded Indians the plan which the Catholic Church has adopted for the worship of God and the reverence of the saints.\textsuperscript{54} The outward similarities of the two religious calendars made substitution relatively easy once the religious and the secular clergy had destroyed the pagan temples and idols, and brought about the disintegration of the indigenous priesthood and its overt religious celebrations.

Early in the conversion the Indians of New Spain were encouraged to participate in most of the major Spanish religious festivals. In fact, the Church considered an Indian's absence from certain festivals a mortal sin.\textsuperscript{55} They were required to attend services every Sunday, as well as Good Friday and Saturday, Easter Sunday, and the Nativity. Attendance was also compulsory for Indians on the calendar days dedicated to the Circumcision, the Ascension, Corpus Christi, the Nativity of the Virgin, the Purification, the Anunciation, the Assumption, and the festival days dedicated to Saint Peter and Saint Paul. Besides these major festivals, each month contained other minor Church holidays in which at least part of the Indian community would participate in a service or procession.\textsuperscript{56} The paternalistic Church did, however, taking into consideration the poverty of the Indians, excuse them from fasting on many regular festival days.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{54} Mendieta, Historia, 97, as cited in Braden, Religious Aspects, 73.
\textsuperscript{55} Lorenzana, editor, Concilios provinciales primero, y segundo, 65-69.
\textsuperscript{56} Kubler, "Colonial Quechua," Handbook, 11, 405.
\textsuperscript{57} Lorenzana, Concilios provinciales, 69.
The introduction of this "ritual calendar," which gave one-fourth of all the days of the year a special religious significance, must have been an invaluable aid to the friars. The calendar commemorated the main events in the genealogy and life of Christ, as well as honoring all of the Apostles. "By this means," writes Kubler, "the ritual calendar itself became a lengthy catechetical exercise; the parishioners learned the contents of the New Testament through direct participation in its festivals."58

Despite fears of Indian heretical practices, they were allowed to dress in their traditional costumes for the celebration of Church festivals. Burgoa, writing of festivals in Yanhuitlán, says: "in the dancing at the festivals, there are so many couples that they take up the entire distance of the body (cuerpo) of the church, with such splendor of green feathers, that sometimes they reach five hundred /feathers/ with which they make luxuriant awnings from head to feet..."59 But the same author also relates that Fray Gonzalo Lucero, in leading the celebrations of a festival (sacrosanto cuerpo de Nuestro Bien) in Chila, prohibited dancing during the processions. Lucero would allow them to dance only before and after the procession because "with the masquerading and gitanerías of the dances with which they used to entertain themselves...they lost that time that they should have occupied themselves in going,

59. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, I, 287. In order to appreciate the number of participants one must consider the great size of the church in Yanhuitlán.
burning with love of such a great benefit.  

The Indians' cofradías or sodalities played an important part in the celebration of these religious festivals. The first mention of cofradías in the Mixteca Alta, however, is in the will of the cacique of Yanhuitlán, Don Gabriel de Guzmán, written in the 1570's. The will specified that all of the cofradías of Yanhuitlán march with candles in his funeral procession. It is possible that cofradías were not established until Catholicism had begun to take root among the Mixtecs, twenty to thirty years, or a generation after the initial conversion attempt.

Catholicism was also instilled in the Indian population through the playing of ecclesiastical music. Burgoa emphasizes the ability of the Mixtecs to play instruments and sing, but he fails to indicate when they began to develop these new skills. In Yanhuitlán the choir was led by two boys. They were so skilled they composed the verses of the hymns that the choir sang in Mixtec. In addition to the hymns, they also sang the standard liturgical music: the Credo, Gloria, Kiries, and the Salve. The Mixtecs learned to play European wind instruments: bassoons, oboes, and horns.

Until organs were installed in the churches, the Mendicants, according

60. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 47-48.
61. JM and MH, Códice, appendix 4, 34. Don Gabriel was a member of all the cofradías in Yanhuitlán.
62. Jiménez Moreno says, based on his researches on Yanhuitlán, that "by 1570 or 1580 the Indians were interested in Christianity to the extent of founding their own cofradías." Heritage of Conquest, Sol Tax, editor., 252.
63. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 287.
to Bancroft, used flutes as a substitute.64 The use of choirs
and instrumentalists in the frequent processions and services held
in the monastery towns added to the pagentry, splendor, and attract-
iveness of the new religion. The Crown, however, issued a cédula
in 1561 calling on the Audiencia of New Spain to do something about
the "great excess" of instrumentalists and singers in the monasteries,
"that continues to grow, not only in the large towns, but in the
small ones...." First, the cédula complains about how they "grow
up from childhood in the monasteries, then they go out singing and
playing their instruments, they are great idlers, and from child-
hood they know all the women of the town, and they destroy all the
married women and maids and do other vices related to the idleness in which they have been raised." But the second complaint
appears to have been the true reason for the Crown's concern:
"in many towns the said instrumentalists and singers do not pay
tribute, and burden the tribute on the poor." Undoubtedly, the
Crown, in serious economic straits, was seeking to lengthen the
tribute lists.65

The Dominicans, a highly intellectual order, did little formally
for the education of the Indians. Fray Alonso Franco does mention that
Fray Jordán de Santa Catalina established a primary school in
Yanhuitlán, in which he taught reading, writing, and the catechism

64. Bancroft, History of Mexico, II, 271.
65. Royal Cédula, Toledo, February 19, 1561. Documentos inéditos
o muy raros para la Historia de México, Genaro García, editor,
vol. 15, 141-142, as cited in JM and MH, Códice, note 6, 31.
to more than 400 pupils. This is the only mention of a primary school in the Dominican chronicles and, apparently, the order did not establish any secondary schools in its missions in New Spain. The Dominicans, the most orthodox of the Orders, feared that the Indians would misinterpret any complex religious teachings they might learn, and thus commit idolatries. For this reason the Dominicans were opposed to the teaching of Latin to the Indians.

The Dominicans did, however, frequently bring the children of the Indian elite into their monasteries. There, they received a basic education and became thoroughly Christianized. But, based on the Dominican experience in Yanhuitlán, this kind of training was ineffective unless it was continued over a period of years. The first Dominican in Yanhuitlán, Fray Bernadino de Minaya, taught a few of the children of the nobility to read and write in the year 1529-1530. Among his students was a nephew of the then cacique of Yanhuitlán, Don Domingo, who received baptism at the time. After a year the monastery was closed, due to the internal jurisdictional problems within the Order, until 1535 or 1536. Thus, the initial education received by the students in 1529-1530 was not reinforced. In October, 1544 an Inquisitional Proceso was initiated to investigate the heretical activities of the same

66. Alonso Franco, Segunda Parte de la Historia de la Provincia de México Orden de Predicadores en la Nueva España, Fray Secundino Martínez, editor (Mexico, 1900), Libro Primero, 57, as cited in Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 210.


68. See page 11 above.
Don Domingo, who was then cacique, and two principales who had also been baptized in 1529-1530.\textsuperscript{69}

Don Gabriel de Guzmán, the cacique after Don Domingo, however, was under the influence of the Dominicans in the monastery continuously for many years. He fully cooperated with the Dominicans until his death in 1591.

The Franciscans, unlike the Dominicans, established a few outstanding educational institutions such as the College of Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco. The Dominicans were hostile to this institution and other such attempts to give the Indians higher education.\textsuperscript{70}

The Franciscans also brought sons of the nobility into the monasteries in order to educate them. Their primary goal was to instruct the young Indians on how to lead a Christian life. Cortés supported the Franciscans' call for cacique cooperation in this effort by warning that those who disobeyed could suffer grave penalties.

The children learned willingly and rapidly. Later, the destruction of images and temples was carried out "with the energetic cooperation of the caciques' sons."\textsuperscript{71} Under the close guidance of the Mendicants, children of the Indian nobility of New Spain became agents of religious instruction. Sending the children of the local nobility to a nearby monastery after the Spanish conquest was analogous to both pre-Hispanic Aztec and Mixtec practices. In both of these Indian cultures

\textsuperscript{70} Ricard, \textit{Spiritual Conquest}, 225-226.
\textsuperscript{71} Gibson, \textit{Tlaxcala in the Sixteenth Century}, 33-34.
education was centered around the temple and the priesthood. Thus, the practice of the friars serving both as priests and as teachers of children within the monastery must not have been a surprising occurrence to the Indians.

In the pre-Hispanic period the children of the nobility were brought into the temple school to prepare for the priesthood and high civil office. But, under the Spanish the children were not prepared for the Catholic clergy. The Ecclesiastical Council held in Mexico in 1539 did decide that Indians could receive ordination to the four minor Orders, porter, reader, exorcist, and acolyte. None of these positions, however, were considered sacramental. The ceremony of ordination for these Orders was very different from that of the sacramental ordination.72

In May, 1544 the Dominican Fray Domingo de Betanzos clearly expressed his Order's opposition to allowing Indians into the clergy. In a letter to the Emperor Betanzos writes:

That the Indians should not study because one cannot expect any benefit from it; first, because they will not be ready to preach for a long time, since in order to preach it is necessary that the preacher have authority among the people, and this does not exist among these natives, because truly they are vicious, besides that it is these popular ones who study, and they are not serious persons, nor do they differentiate from the common people in their dress nor in their conversation, since they act the same way in these things as do the lower class people.73

73. A postscript to: "Parecer de los frailes de la orden de Santo Domingo de la Nueva España, sobre repartimiento." in St. Dominic of Mexico, May 4, 1544, CDIAI, vol. 7, 541-542.
Betanzos also was afraid that the Indians were not firmly enough rooted in the Faith to avoid preaching heresies to their people. The Indians also lacked the ability, according to Betanzos, to understand "with certainty and fairly the things of the faith and its reasons" and their language (Nahuatl) was not considered complete enough to explain the mysteries of the Faith without making "great improprieties that easily can cause great errors."74 The judgment of Betanzos is, however, questionable. In the early 1530's he was supposed to have questioned the rationality of the Indians and whether they should even be baptized.75 Also, Betanzos' understanding of the complexity of Indian social structure could not have been very great if he was not aware of the sharp class distinctions. Most of the Indian society was "proletarianized" by the late sixteenth century, but this was not yet the case in the 1540's. Further, Betanzos can not be considered much of a judge of the sophistication of the indigenous languages since he was usually preoccupied with the internal administration of the Order and never learned one.

Betanzos' opposition to creating a native clergy, however, was not unique. Opposition was widespread, among Spanish settlers and clerics alike, to both Indians being ordained or even the creation of a native clergy which would only minister to the indigenous population.76 Thus, at the expense of making the Indians second-

75. Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 90. For another view of Betanzos' attitude see, Lewis Hanke, The Spanish Struggle for Justice in the Conquest of America (Boston and Toronto, 1965, second printing), 12. Also see Phelan, Millennial Kingdom, 90-91.
class Christians, devout men such as Diego Osorio did not achieve any higher Order than donado despite the positive impact he made upon his Mixtec audience. 77

The Dominicans and other Mendicant Orders consciously tried to set a good example for their new converts, at least, partly, offsetting the failure to establish an Indian clergy. Fray Gonzalo Lucero, who used such imaginative preaching techniques, "saw good actions as being more important than words in teaching the Indians." 78 The friars believed gaining the love and respect of the Indians to be prerequisites of successful Christianization. Strict adherence to their vow of poverty was seen as being essential to the Dominicans in order to achieve their goals: they wore old robes; walked barefoot over the most rugged trails of the Mixteca Alta from doctrina to doctrina; they prohibited the asking of money from the Indians for the support of the Church; and they opposed the tithing of the Indians (at least, in the early decades), "lest they might think that the missionaries had come among them for personal profit." 79

77. Burgos, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 350. Also, see above, 54-55.
78. Dávila Padilla, Historia, Libro Primero, 324b.
79. Quote from Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 130. For examples of good deeds, often described hagiographically, see: Dávila Padilla, Historia, Libro Primero, 303b; and Burgos, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 280 and 341. On the wearing of old robes, see Dávila Padilla, Historia, Libro Primero, 46-47, 50b, and 300b-301a. On walking barefoot, see: Dávila Padilla, Historia, Libro Primero, 50b-51a, and 300b-301a. Regarding not asking the Indians for money, see JM and MH, Códice, note 73, 20. The Dominican chapter meeting held in Mexico in 1576 prohibited that the friars ask the Indians for money and ordered that they explain to the Indians that they had no obligation to aid the monasteries with alms.
Gradually, however, as the initial enthusiasm of the Mendicants waned, they often became more concerned with worldly riches than with spiritual riches. In a chapter meeting held in 1535 the Dominicans voted not to own income-producing property, but to live exclusively on alms. But by 1541 they had changed their position. And in 1578 the Mexico City Cabildo complained that the Augustinians and Dominicans together owned more than half of the property within the city. 80

In 1563 a Spanish vecino of Yanhuitlán, Alonso Caballero, complained to the Visitador, Licenciado Valderrama, that the Dominicans imported products into the town and sold them at exorbitant prices, exploited the indigenous population by forcing them to produce products that the friars could sell and by exacting unjust fines and taxes. Caballero further accused the cacique Don Gabriel of collaborating with the Dominicans to exploit the poor. 81 The testimony of this dissatisfied vecino, who was clearly jealous of the Dominicans' power and influence in Yanhuitlán, must, however, be accepted with caution. But it is undeniable that by the 1560's and 1570's the Mendicants, demoralized by episcopal encroachments upon their authority and by disputes between creoles and peninsulares within the Orders, had lost much of their earlier zeal and idealism.

80. McAndrew, Open-Air Churches, 39-40.
81. From a memorial sent to Licenciado Valderrama by Alonso Caballero, a vecino of Yanhuitlán, 1563. Cartas del Licenciado Jeronimo Valderrama y otros documentos sobre su visita al gobierno de Nueva España, 1563-1565, (Mexico, 1961), France V. Scholes and Eleanor Adams, editors, 297-302. This letter appears to be the only known explication of these charges against the Dominicans in Yanhuitlán.
Chapter IV

THE MIXTECAN RESPONSES TO CHRISTIANITY: PATTERNS OF REJECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

What were the Mixtecs' responses to the conversion efforts of the Dominicans? We can not draw a precise line and say that before such a date paganism reigned, and then, after this time, conversion was achieved. But there are indications from the available sources that the initial two decades, at least in Yanhuitlán (1530's and 1540's), were difficult ones for the Dominicans. Where the initial establishment of a house in another town did not occur until the 1550's, nearly full conversion was probably not achieved until the late 1570's or 1580's. In the case of Yanhuitlán and other towns in the Mixteca Alta, the initial decades of the conversion effort were marked by the resistance of the indigenous population. This resistance, which can be divided into two forms, covert and overt, appears to have been led by the traditional native nobility with the close cooperation of members of the dispossessed Indian priesthood.

Covert resistance, taking the form of the practice of pagan rites, probably was the most widespread. Even the most zealous friars could not discover the many places where the Mixtecs could secretly perform their religious rites. The only evidence for the continuation of pagan practices and apostatizing by converts are the Inquisitional trial held in Yanhuitlán in the mid-1540's and from discoveries of sacred rites or burials reported
in the Dominican chronicles.¹ Often the Dominicans, and other Mendicants as well, learned of the location of these sites only through the cooperation of the more devout converts, especially children. How much apostatizing went on undiscovered, and, therefore, not recorded for the benefit of the modern historian, can not be determined. One can surmise, however, that if widespread apostatizing occurred in monastery towns it must have been rampant in the doctrinas which were visited only infrequently by a solitary friar.

An examination of some of the testimony presented at the Proceso Inquisitorial [held intermittently in Yanhuitlán between 1544 and 1546 to investigate the cacique and two members of the local nobility] will indicate the extent and forms that Mixtec apostatizing took. The trial resulted from a dispute between

¹ The key source on the trial is the Códice de Yanhuitlán, chapter IV, 21-29, and appendix no. 6, 37-47. The latter contains extensive excerpts from the witnesses' testimony. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, volumes I and II contains more detailed information on Mixtec apostatizing than does Dávila Padilla, Historia. How valid is the testimony given against the defendants in the Inquisitional trial? It is very difficult to thoroughly evaluate its credibility over four hundred years later. But the very breadth of background of the witnesses for the prosecution (priests, Spanish officials, Indian officials and commoners), and the corroboration nature of much of the testimony suggests that most of it was true. We know that Don Domingo, the cacique, after imprisonment was allowed to continue to rule, but the fact that the fate of the apparently more idolatrous defendants is unknown, leaves some questions unanswered. Wigberto Jiménez Moreno appears to accept the testimony. For further discussion of this question of validity, see below.
the "impetuous and impulsively temperamental" Visitador Don Pedro Gómez de Maraver and the encomendero of Yanhuitlán, Francisco de las Casas. Maraver, dean of Oaxaca, and a delegate of the Inquisitor Tello de Sandoval, initiated the trial after the encomendero had denied that the Indians of Yanhuitlán were idolatrous. The testimony suggests that in Yanhuitlán, in the early 1540’s, three groups can be defined at different stages between pre-Hispanic paganism and conversion to Catholicism: 1) some Mixtecs, including members of the priesthood called papaš, were still not baptized, practiced "personal bloodletting" and made sacrifices to their cult of gods; 2) another, which included the defendants, were baptized, practicing Christians but they also supported the papaš and participated in their rites; and 3) finally, there were those Mixtecs who had apparently become devout Christians, rejecting their pagan past. It is difficult to estimate the relative size of these groups since the baptismal records are not extant. By far the largest group were those who practiced both religions, followed in order of size by the devout converts, and the unbaptized. The ratio of unbaptized to the other groups was probably higher in the outlying doctrinas that were under less Dominican influence.

The native priests or papaš mentioned in the trial testimony lived outside of Yanhuitlán. The priest Caco lived in the nearby

---

2. JM and MH, Códice, 26.
3. There are no figures available to confirm these estimates. They were arrived at from a consideration of the testimony given during the trial. See, JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, and the chapter devoted to the conversion, 21-29.
estancia of Cuaxcatepeque, while Xiquibe lived in Jicotlán, and Caxe, who was the guardian of the "demons" of Yanhuitlán, lived in the estancia of Molcaxtepec. They probably resided outside the monastery town in order to avoid the notice of the friars and the secular clergy, after 1541, when the Dominicans abandoned the convent and moved to Teposcolula. Don Juan, the cacique of Molcaxtepec, testified that the papas went from place to place dressed normally and shaved so that nobody would recognize them. When they arrived where they were to perform their next rite, they would stain themselves with paint and don their priestly garb. They performed their rites, as in pre-Hispanic times, on mountain tops, and inside caves. Another witness testified that the three defendants had special "apartments and private rooms" in their houses where they kept their "devils and idols, and their priests sacrificed.

The ruling class served as patrons of the priests, but, according to one witness, they were also supported by a secret tithe or tribute payment. Don Juan, Gobernador of Etlantongo, testified that it is "public and notorious that the 'papas' who are in charge of the demons have certain houses in all the pueblos and estancias of Anguitlán /sic/ that tribute and pay the tribute of the demon when it is necessary, and that the 'papas' ask for and collect it, and customarily every year they ask for charchores /?/, pigeons, stones, blankets, plumes for the demon, and copal..."

4. JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, 38.
5. JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, 41.
6. JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, 39.
Aside from the regular rites in which the priests and defendants performed personal bloodletting, sacrificed quail, and burned copal, there were special ceremonies held on extraordinary occasions. The witness, Don Juan (see above) testified that the co-defendants of the cacique Don Domingo, Don Juan and Don Francisco, sacrificed slaves to their idols. He also stated that when Don Francisco’s wife died he held a large drunken feast to honor the "demon", and had her buried in his house so he could sacrifice to her.\(^7\) Another witness accused Don Domingo of committing bigamy by going to the pueblo of Tiltepeque and taking his niece as a second wife. Don Domingo married her "with all the rites and ceremonies that they used to perform before they were Christians..."\(^8\)

Burgoa describes an incident which suggests that even in, or perhaps especially in, death many caciques who had converted to Catholicism in middle age reverted to the indigenous religious rites. By some means, perhaps through an informant, Fray Benito Fernández discovered a cave near Achiutla which was used as a cacique burial place. He went to the tomb "followed by a great multitude of incredulous and faithless Indians, awaiting the disastrous end with which their gods had to punish the daring" of the friar.\(^9\) Fray Benito entered the cave alone while the Indians stayed back either because, according to Burgoa, they were afraid or they were

---

7. JM and MH, Códice, appendix no. 6, 39.
8. JM and MH, Códice, appendix no. 6, 39.
ordered to remain outside by their leaders. Inside, the friar
came upon row after row of caciques' corpses, adorned in rich,
traditional costumes, jewels and gold. When he got closer, "...he
recognized some of the caciques' bodies, that just recently had
died, and to whom he had communicated, in towns very distant from
that place, and that he had taken for good christians." 10

Burgoa also describes an oracle who resided in Achiutla, an
important pre-conquest religious center. Many caciques and prin-
cipales came to this site "from distant provinces", even after
baptism, since it was held in great veneration. 11

While the Indian elite participated in these secret ceremonies,
the larger group of baptized macehuales or nominal christians,
participated in Christian rites. Their participation, according
to testimony, was, at times, hardly orthodox. They would attend
the regular church services, but simultaneously they would parti-
cipate, inwardly, in pagan rites and invoke their gods. An example
of the coexistence of the Christian and pagan religions was the
practice of making offerings of copal before entering the church.
The two defendants, Don Juan and Don Francisco, were supposed to
have told the townspeople to do this. The smell of copal was
supposed to have "saturated the atmosphere of Yanhuitlán" to such
a degree that one friar testified to the Inquisition that "in the

10. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 340. Fray Fernández also
discovered many idols of stone, gold and wood plus some codices.
He destroyed as many of these objects as he could.
11. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 276. Also discussed on
pages 318-319.
afternoon as well as in the morning...all smelled of copal."¹² Also, while in church, they placed a type of tobacco or medicinal herb called pície¹¹ in their mouths "so they could not understand what the friars preach."¹³ While in church they were told by their leaders to invoke the gods and to worship in that part of the building under which the pre-Hispanic temple had stood.¹⁴ Don Cristóbal of Nochixtlán testified, in support of this accusation, that the defendant Don Francisco told the Indians to attend mass but that they should remember that they are on the patio where the temples and houses of their gods once stood. The gobernador also ordered them to worship the pagan god; those who refused, would be killed.¹⁵

The defendants also nominally participated in the Christian rites. One witness, for example, testified that the three defendants had told him that "they had two hearts, with one they serve the devil, and with the other they do not understand the things of God."¹⁶ Another witness¹ testimony illustrates this point very well. Don Martín, a principal of Teposcolula, testified that after a long, secret six day festival and consultation in which the defendants

¹² JM and MH, Códice, 26.
¹³ JM and MH, Códice, 26, and appendix 6, 41. For a definition of pície see Alonso de Molina, Vocabulario castellano-nahuatl, nahuatl-castellano (Mexico, 1966, second edition, first edition published in Mexico, 1571), 448.
¹⁴ JM and MH, Códice, 26, and appendix 6, 41.
¹⁵ JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, 40.
¹⁶ JM and MH, Códice, 26.
sacrificed many quail and birds and the last night they
all got drunk, they sacrificed, and they offered a large
amount of copal to the demon and then on the following day
Don Domingo requested that the Vicar who was then in Yan-
huitlán perform a mass for him in the chapel he had in his
house. The Vicar said the mass...[but]...they did this
only for the purpose of ridiculing the things of our holy
Catholic faith. 17

Besides taking part in ceremonies directed by both Indians and
Spanish priests, the defendants were also supposed to have consulted
diviners, one of whom told them:

that they not believe...the doctrine, but that they serve
the devil, because the Christians will soon be finished,
and they will go to Castile, and [the Indians] will begin
to serve the devil. [Thus] they [must] not anger him
because he will kill them and it will not rain. 18

Jiménez Moreno believes that the nobility and the macehuales
heeded these warnings whenever they sounded promising. Then they
would return to their pagan rites: sacrificing children to the
rain god Dzauí (Mixtec for Tlaloc) in time of drought; killing
slaves when one of their lords fell ill or died; piercing them-
selves with sharp thorns; and offering fowl, feathers, and precious
stones at sacred altars on the tops of mountains, inside caves,
or in their houses. 19

Certainly, the early 1540's was a time for questioning the
efficacy of worshipping the Christian God. In a declaration on
the case before the tribunal, the Visitador Maraver stated on

17. JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, 40.
19. JM and MH, Códice, 26, and appendix 6, 39.
February 22, 1545, that there had been drought and hunger in the Yanhuitlán region for three years.\(^\text{20}\) It was in times of suffering that the temptation to apostatize was greatest. A sacristan named Andrés of Yanhuitlán's church had told the witness Fray Bernaldo de Sancta María that he had heard two Indians talking as they walked along the road: "...now it does not rain and it is an unproductive year, the principales of Yanhuitlán have ordered that we sacrifice and call to the demons so that it will rain...."\(^\text{21}\) Another witness testified that as a result of the drought and near famine conditions the defendant Don Francisco renounced his Christian baptism and asked that many others do the same. Don Francisco allegedly told them that it had not rained because they had been baptized. He also ordered everyone to get intoxicated, perform personal bloodletting sacrifices, and call to the rain god Dzuai.\(^\text{22}\) Another catastrophe of this period, the severe epidemic of 1545-1546, must have also made the indigenous population question the

\(^{20}\) JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, 42.

\(^{21}\) JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, 43.

\(^{22}\) JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, 44-45. Burgoa describes a similar case involving Fray Jordan de Santa Catalina and the cacique of another town. The cacique asked the friar: "Father Jordan, what God have you given us? who is so useless, and does not meet our needs, now that we are suffering this great drought... and because of you we threw our gods out of our houses, who sent us rain when we lacked it, and asked for it, now I find myself obliged, in order that my people do not perish, to leave this new God, that you have given us, and return to the old gods, that know and understand us, if you do not obtain rain from your God, and remedy this damage." The friar, then, according to Burgoa, realized "how few roots the faith had struck in their understanding...." But the errant cacique was brought back into the fold. The friar prayed for a long time, a furious rain fell, and the cacique begged for mercy! Geográfica Descripción, I, 111-112.
efficacy of the Christian God.

Besides the various forms that covert resistance took, opposition to the Dominicans also was manifested in more direct ways. The most overt resistance to the friars' conversion efforts is described by Burgoa. When Fray Benito Fernández first arrived in Achiutla, the important pre-Hispanic religious center, he attacked the Mixtecs' beliefs and rites. Immediately, the Indians began to conspire against him. They decided to starve the friar by barricading him in his dwelling, and by not providing him with any food. The plan was foiled, however, by some faithful "poor Indians" of the town who found a way to secretly provide the friar with food. When the leaders of the plot realized that their scheme was failing, they released Fray Benito. According to Ricard, this kind of overt resistance was exceptional. 23

But violent resistance to conversion, and especially the extirpation of paganism did occur. The victims in some cases were Indian children. Two different witnesses testified that when Fray Dionisio was vicar (in the late 1530's) some boys had told him that Don Francisco, who was the supreme priest, and another Indian, "killed three boys of the Church in a cave of demons located in the estancia of Tacolula." The priests were alleged to have gotten intoxicated, "and after killing the youths, pulled out their hearts and offered them to the devil, then, they cooked certain parts of

23. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 330-331; and Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 264.
the bodies and ate them." A comparable case is more widely known. It is the story of the three children of Tlaxcala who were martyred while collecting idols for the Dominicans.

Another form of overt resistance to conversion was the open hostility of nominal converts and non-believers towards devout Indians. The non-believing Yanhuitecans ridiculed the devotion of the converts, accusing them of succumbing to intimidation. The cacique of Nochixtlán, Don Juan, testified that some Indians of Yanhuitlán had ridiculed the witness and others, yelling: "There go the Castilian Christians, the chickens..." When they passed through the town. The witness said they were called gallinas because they did not, or dared not, sacrifice. The Yanhuitecans also cut off the trousers (calzones) of those who wore this Spanish-type dress, as they were associated with conversion, and called them cowards. Another example of overt hostility involved macehuales from Teposcolula who attended Yanhuitlan's market. There, the visitors were told by some inhabitants of the town "to leave because they [the Teposcolucans] wanted to be Christians like those of Castile."

The resistance of the Yanhuitecans to conversion in the 1530's and early 1540's was probably reinforced by a unique circumstance,

24. JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, see the testimony of Don Cristóbal, gobernador and alguacil of Nochixtlán, 40, and that of Don Juan, the hereditary cacique of Molcaztepec, 41.
25. It is described by Motolinia, Historia; also see Dávila Padilla, Historia, 81.
26. JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, 44; and Jiménez Moreno in Sol Tax, editor, Heritage of Conquest, 276.
27. JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, 40.
the support of the encomendero Francisco de las Casas against the
friars. In the course of the trial the Dominicans charged that
las Casas had obstructed the indoctrination of the Indians and had
 meddling in ecclesiastical affairs to the point where he demanded
that nobody be baptized or married without his permission. He was
also supposed to have prevented the Dominicans from punishing the
Indians for committing sins and vices. Las Casas also, allegedly,
protected the Indians from the friars when they were caught prac-
ticing idolatries. Finally, the encomendero was accused of in-
sulting and swearing at the Dominicans. 28

Many of the witnesses testified that it would be to the town’s
benefit if the encomendero were to leave. 29 The open hostility
of Las Casas and his obstructionist tactics in supporting his
Indian wards against the Dominicans, though unusual in New Spain’s
colonial history, undoubtedly encouraged the apostatizing and still
pagan Mixtecs of Yanhuitlán. The Dominicans and the other orders
could more easily contend with a recalcitrant Indian than an influ-
cential Spanish encomendero such as Las Casas, who was married to
a cousin of Cortés. 30 Dominican-encomendero relations only im-
proved in Yanhuitlán in the late 1540’s after the encomienda was
inherited in its second life by the original grantee’s son, Gonzalo
de las Casas.

28. JM and MH, Códice, 14, and appendix 6, 43.  
29. JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6; see the testimony of Luis Delgado,
past teniente de corregidor in Yanhuitlán between 1536 and 1538,
43; testimony of Fray Domingo de Santa Marfa, 43; and the testi-
mony of Fray Martín de Santo Domingo, 43-44.  
The lingering influence of pagan religious practices and beliefs persisted in Yanhuitlán, and probably in other Mixtecan towns as well, until the older pre-conquest generation of leaders, deeply imbued in Mixtec religious beliefs from childhood, were replaced by the next generation. The two elder gobernadores who were defendants in the trial, Don Juan and Don Francisco, represent the generation molded before the Dominicans even arrived in the Mixteca Alta. At the time of the trial, in 1546, Don Juan was fifty-five years old and Don Francisco was seventy-eight. Thus, at the time of their baptisms in 1529, Don Juan was thirty-eight and Don Francisco sixty-one. The former was well into middle-age, considering life expectancy (especially Indian) in the sixteenth century, and the latter was an elderly man. Neither one could be easily transformed into a devout Christian convert, especially when it is remembered that the convent in Yanhuitlán was closed in 1530 for five or six years.

It is the third defendant, Don Domingo, the cacique of Yanhuitlán, who is the most difficult to analyze. He was born in 1510, was nineteen when he was baptized in 1529, and thirty-six in 1546. Don Domingo was, probably, still young enough at baptism to be influenced by the religious teachings of Fray Bernadino de Minaya. Also, when he was nineteen and twenty, this same friar taught Don Domingo to read and write. In a written declaration to the

tribunal in his own defense in July 1545 he claimed that he was a
"good christian" and that he knew the "christian doctrine...in the
form and manner that it is printed in the Mixtec language."32

Don Domingo was seized on January 26, 1545 and sent to Mexico
City as a prisoner. He was not released until almost two years
later, on December 6, 1546, and only then in the custody of a
Dominican friar. His penalty, if any, was probably monetary, and
he was allowed to retain his cacicazgo.33 The Inquisition held
the two elder defendants, against whom the majority of the testi-
mony was directed, more responsible than the younger cacique,
especially since Don Francisco had served as Don Domingo's regent.34

Don Domingo returned to Yanhuitlán upon being released from
prison and served as cacique until 1558. He apparently cooperated
with the friars in the early years of the construction of the monas-
tery and church.35 Don Domingo de Guzmán can be seen as a trans-
itional figure between the older generation of apostates represent-

32. See Don Domingo's declaration to the court, dated July 18, 1545
   in JM and MH, Códice, appendix 6, 46.
33. Don Domingo, in his written declaration, adamantly denied the
   charges brought against him, charging that many of those who had
   testified against him had reasons for being his enemies because
   of disputes between Yanhuitlán and their respective towns. JM
   and MH, Códice, appendix 6, 46. Jiménez Moreno believes that
   the actual Códice, consisting of pictures drawn in a Hispano-
   Indian style, was compiled to serve as a defense for the cacique.
   The drawings argue that it was not Don Domingo's fault that the
   friars had to withdraw from Yanhuitlán in 1541, and present a
   history of what had occurred in the town since it had come under
   Spanish domination. Códice, 27.
34. There is no information in the available documents on the punish-
   ments that Don Juan and Don Francisco received.
35. See pages 56-57, above.
ed by Don Juan and Don Francisco, and the following generation of devout converts to Christianity including Don Gabriel de Guzmán who became cacique in 1558.

Don Gabriel was the heir apparent to the cacicazgo of Yanhuitlán, but as he was too young to assume the position on the death of his mother María in the early 1540's, Don Domingo was designated as cacique-regent until he reached his majority. 36 In 1558, after Don Domingo died, Don Gabriel took office. He was about twenty-two years of age at that time. In other words, he was born in about the same year (1536) that the Dominicans reopened their monastery in Yanhuitlán. During his youth Don Gabriel was raised under the watchful care of the Dominicans except during the years 1541 to 1546-1547 when, again, their monastery was closed. During these years secular clergy occupied Yanhuitlán. Thus, from the time of birth, Don Gabriel received religious training and a basic education from the friars (and seculars in the early 1540's). His generation was the first not to have extensive knowledge of pre-Hispanic religious practices. Don Domingo was more of the Hispano-Indian colonial world than the pre-conquest Indian world.

Those who had the strongest ties with the pre-Hispanic world were the older men such as Don Juan and Don Francisco. The indigenous priests mentioned in the trial were generally older men too. When they died there was no formal regenerative force remain-

36. Spores, Mixtec Kings, 134.
ing to pass on the traditional religious heritage to the younger generation. Gradually, over about two decades after initial Dominican contact in 1529, the upholders of the traditional religious practices died. While alive, the papas and older nobility put up the strongest resistance to conversion; for the former to surrender would mean losing everything, and for the latter, sincere conversion meant loss of power and additional wives. 37 With the death of this older generation came the end of serious opposition to conversion, for after the temples and idols were destroyed only they had remained as figures symbolic of the Mixtecan religious past.

With the destruction of the pre-Hispanic religion, Christian ceremonial life replaced the pagan. All those who desired a substitution probably began to participate in the ritual of the Catholic Church. The church became the new center of community activity. There were also some economic advantages to conversion and cooperating with the Dominicans. But these rewards were, usually, only realized by the caciques and the nobility for this was not an egalitarian society. The macehuales continued to follow the directives of their traditional leaders. 38

37. McAndrew, Open-Air Churches, 65.
38. A more detailed discussion of the crops and livestock introduced by the Dominicans and Spanish laymen will be presented in the next chapter. Ursula Lamb, discussing the Aztecs, writes of the problems arising from the spread of Christianity: "While the Christian creed must have been satisfying to Indians able to comprehend it, the Christian way of life set the earliest converts upon a lonely road. Aztec ritual had dealt most elaborately with war, tribal destiny (political action), agriculture, and trade. The Christian Indian found no significant sanction of this once vital content of his life, nor was the conquered subject permitted a political life of any scope." "Religious Conflicts," Journal of the History of Ideas, vol. XVII (1956), 538.
Just as the pre-conquest caciques had close ties with the Indian priesthood, the more hispanized native rulers, such as Don Gabriel, and the friars often closely cooperated with one another. Don Gabriel aided the Dominicans in organizing the more than six thousand laborers used in the construction of the monastery and church. In his letter to the Visitador Valderrama in 1563 Alonso Caballero, a vecino of the town, complained that the Dominicans had persuaded Don Gabriel to have a "sumptuous house" built in order to retard the completion of the monastery, "because if they finish they will lose the Indians' interest and the surplus tribute that they are ordered to give." The Spanish vecino claimed that building the cacique's house was a great burden since it kept the monastery from being completed, and therefore prevented the Indians from working their lands and earning enough to pay the tribute due their encomendero. Here the cacique cooperated with the friars, representatives of the Spanish Crown, to the detriment of his subjects.

Don Gabriel further displayed his devotion to the Dominicans in 1576 by donating land to the order for their support. The cacique and his wife, Dona Isabel de Roxas, willed a "pedaso de milpa" named Yuchadichagh to the Order, "so that the fathers enjoy the benefits of these lands." In the statement, probably composed

39. Kubler, Mexican Architecture, gives other examples of cases where the Mendicants used their influence with caciques to exploit Indian labor, vol. 1, 146.
40. Scholes and Adams, editors, Cartas del Licenciado Valderrama, 301.
with the aid of the friars, Don Gabriel states: "I left them
[the lands] by all my own choice, without anyone having asked me
that I do it nor did they urge or force me...." He closes by making
specific requests for when he wants masses sung for him, his wife,
and his children, in the future.\footnote{41} Evidently this was not an
unusual occurrence since a year earlier (1575), the cacique of
Santiago Teiyuu, Gabriel de Rojas, also gave a milpa to the Dom-
inicans "that live now and forever in Yanhuitlán, without a limit
of time, from which they will be given the harvests of wheat and
maize for the sustenance of all the fathers...."\footnote{42} This practice
was in keeping with pre-Hispanic support of religious institutions.
Alonso de Zorita writes: "the Indians set aside much good land
for the service of their religion. Lords and other individuals
left these lands to the temples, and other persons rented them,
or worked them for the temples out of devotion."\footnote{43}

The only documented examples of devotion by the macehuales
were their expressions of grief upon the death of a particularly
beloved friar. Burgoa writes that when Fray Gonzalo Lucero died
after many years of preaching in Oaxaca, his body was escorted
by a procession of Dominicans, a few local Spanish settlers, and
many Indians from Mixtepeque to Tlaxiaco. By the time the pro-

\footnote{41} JM and MH, Códice, appendix 3, 34. The lands donated to form
the capellanía or chaplaincy measured 760 varas by 190 varas by
650 varas by 275 varas.

\footnote{42} JM and MH, Códice, appendix 3, 33-34.

\footnote{43} Zorita, Brief and Summary Relation, 262. Also see, Charles
cession arrived in Tlaxiaco, at dawn the next day, more than 2000 Indians had gathered from neighboring villages to add to the town's normally large population. Burgoa describes the Indians as accompanying the friar's body with tears and sentiment. 44

Christianity was gradually accepted in Yanhuitlán and in other monastery towns after about a generation of resistance. One should not generalize, however, from the Dominicans' experiences in the large towns, and conclude that the indigenous population of Oaxaca or the Mixteca Alta was converted by 1580 or 1600. The Indians living in isolated villages in mountainous country were often neglected. There, conversion, if it occurred at all, must have been superficial at best.

44. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 56-57. See Dávila Padilla, for a description of the response of the population of Achiutla to the death of Fray Benito Fernández, the friar who was almost starved to death by the people of this town after he had attacked their religious rites and destroyed their idols (see above, 80). Historia, Libro Segundo, 601b-602a.
Chapter V

CULTURAL HISPANIZATION

Our primitive religious not only tried to illuminate these Indians with the light of the Gospel and Faith of Our Lord Jesus Christ, but to teach them in polity, and in the cultivation of their lands, teaching them to cultivate with the plow, and plant wheat, which is brought from Spain, and other seeds.

An important part of the Dominicans' conversion effort in the Mixteca Alta was the introduction of European crops, livestock, and some basic technology. These innovations were part of a plan to "civilize" the Indians and also to make the Dominican-run communities and monasteries more self-supporting. The introduction of these communally organized enterprises benefited both the Mixtecs by allowing them to earn enough money to pay their tribute more easily and the Dominican conversion effort as well. Dominican sponsored silk raising, cochineal dyestuff production, and livestock enterprises made the Mixtecs economically dependent on the Church. While these enterprises were often run on a communal basis by the Dominicans, the Indian nobility and caciques also increased their personal wealth by investing in private ventures. Individual investment in livestock or silk raising was, with few exceptions, the exclusive privilege of the Indian elite and Spaniards. The Mixtec lords and nobility having gained these grants with the aid of the friars, repaid the order in land grants, by organizing labor for church construction, and by the example of their religious

1. Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, 1, 279.
The Dominicans played an important part in the introduction and development of the silk raising industry in the Mixteca Alta. The friars were probably not the first to introduce silk cocoons into the Mixteca Alta. MaríA de Aguilar, the wife of Francisco de Casas (the first encomendero of Yanhuitlán), was given some silk grains by her cousin, Hernan Cortés. Hence, it was probably introduced in Yanhuitlán around 1537 at a time when the Dominicans faced opposition from the Las Casas family and the local Indian population. Silk raising did not succeed in Yanhuitlán at this time.

Woodrow Borah believes that the Dominicans brought the Marin brothers, experts in sericulture, from Spain in the late 1530's to the Mixtecan Crown town of Tejupán where they rapidly established a flourishing industry, teaching the art to the native populace at the same time. They probably chose Tejupán since the indigenous type of mulberry tree grew there in abundance. Judging from the

2. For examples of Mixtec cooperation with the Dominicans, see Chapter IV above, especially 86-88.
3. See Woodrow Borah, "El Origen de la sericultura en la Mixteca Alta," Historia Mexicana XIII (1963), 6; and Burgos, Geográphica Descripción, I, chapters XXIII and XXVI; and Dávila Padilla, Historia, Libro Primero, 209b. The basic work on this subject is Woodrow Borah, "Silk Raising in Colonial Mexico," Ibero-Americana, no. 20 (1943). Borah appears to have changed some of his earlier conclusions on the introduction of sericulture in the article published in Historia Mexicana.
4. Gonzalo de las Casas, Libro intitulado arte para criar seda, desde que se recieue una semilla hasta sacar otra (Granada, 1581). This treatise by the second encomendero of Yanhuitlán does not mention the friars' contribution. Perhaps, this can be explained as being a holdover from the feud between his family and the Dominicans in the 1530's and 1540's. Folios 1v-2v, as cited in Borah, "El Origen," Historia Mexicana, XIII, 6.
speed with which the Dominicans developed and spread sericulture in many towns of the Mixteca Alta, they must have used both the skills of the Martín brothers and those of the inhabitants of Tejupán. In 1544, Juan de Zárate, Bishop of Oaxaca, wrote a letter to Prince Philip complaining that the Indians of Teposcolula raised 2,000 pounds of silk and paid only 900 pesos (de oro en polvo) in tribute. This was the leading center of sericulture in the Mixteca at the time and by no coincidence it was also the Dominicans' headquarters after abandoning the monastery in nearby Yanhuitlán in 1541.

Another important center for the development of sericulture was Achiutla where the Dominicans founded a monastery in 1548. There, the friars persuaded the inhabitants to plant over two square leagues of mulberry trees. From these trees the Indians raised, according to Burgoa, "such soft, smooth, lustrous silk that none other in the world could compete with it." The industry grew steadily under Dominican direction, making the Mixteca Alta the outstanding silk raising center of New Spain for over a half century.

5. Borah, "El Origen," Historia Mexicana, XIII, 11-12. It is possible that some of the Dominicans, being from the silk raising provinces of Valencia and Murcia, were familiar with the art and helped to spread it in Mexico. See Borah, "Silk Raising," Ibero-Americana, no. 20, 25.
8. In 1542, it was reported that so many mulberry trees were being planted that the harvest would greatly increase. "Relación de Bartolomé de Zárata vecino y regidor de México, sobre historia y gobierno de Nueva España, 1544," Epistolario de Nueva España, Francisco del Paso y Troncoso, editor, vol. IV, 146. Nochixtlán (which means lugar de grana or place where cochineal grows) in 1581 was producing little of the valuable dyestuff because most of the town's energies were devoted to sericulture. "Relación de Nochixtlán, año 1581," PNE, vol. IV, 210.
During this half century (1540-1590) the majority of the silk was raised by the Indian communal enterprises. Two different systems were used for raising silk on a community-wide basis. Under the less efficient system, each adult male got an equal share of the graine, whether wealthy or poor. Each man, in his own dwelling, raised the larvae in crudely constructed baskets; when the cocoons were spun, they were turned over to the town. This system was unsatisfactory since the yields and quality of the silk produced was poor. The other communal method of silk raising proved to be far more satisfactory. It involved the building of community silk houses where all the town's crop of cocoons were raised together. The silk was sold by the town after it had been spun into thread. The labor was provided either by the town's citizens or by hired, skilled workers. Generally, the silk produced in this way was of a higher quality than that produced by the first method.

The community run system allowed the inhabitants to earn enough to cover their tribute payments and communal expenses. Also, since it was operated by the community, the workers were not coerced while, at the same time, being supervised by specialists. The concentration of all the inhabitants' investments in one enterprise gave them sufficient power to compete with the Spanish settlers' silk houses. In fact, the Mixtecs' communal businesses often squeezed out their

10. Silk houses in the Mixteca were usually built of adobe and averaged 100 by 30 feet in size. In the 1540's Viceroy Mendoza complained that silk houses were being constructed in preference to churches. Borah, "Silk Raising," Ibero-Americana, no. 20, pp. 25, 46-47.
Spanish competitors. Silk production fell from 9,000 pounds in 1542 (it was probably higher in the 1560's and 1570's) for the diocese of Oaxaca (almost all production was centered in the Mixteca Alta) to 1500 pounds in the early 1590's. The primary causes of this decline were probably the drastic population decline due to epidemics, especially that of 1575-1576, and the competition from the China silk trade.

Closely tied to the Dominicans' development of community silk industries was the establishment of community treasuries (cajas de comunidad). The profits from the former made the creation of the latter possible. Before the community treasuries were founded caciques frequently would levy a "pro rata contribution" on every tributary when their towns lacked the funds necessary to pay for its festivals, church constructions, support of their clergy, or hospitals. Caciques could often collect more than was needed, and pocket the difference. The caja de comunidad was founded by the profits from the sale of the harvest of the community enterprise,

12. See Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 143-145; and Borah, "Silk Raising," Ibero-Americana, no. 20. Ricard, writing before the definitive demographic studies of Cook, Borah, and Simpson, does not consider depopulation a factor.
13. See Dávila Padilla, Historia, Libro Primero, 301b; and Borah, "Silk Raising," Ibero-Americana, no. 20, 46. Also see: "Instrucción que dio el virrey de Nueva España al licenciado Lorenzo Lebron de Quiñon, para la visita que le tenía encomendada a la provinicia de Guaxaca, y otros pueblos y provincias - En México, a 20 de julio de 1558." ENE, vol. VIII, 210f. By 1581 Nochixtlán had a hospital for the poor and sick, established by the principales, which was supported by one sementera that the community cultivated each year "in order to feed the poor that come to be cured." PNE, vol. IV, 211.
whether it was silk, grain, cochineal, or livestock. By making the macehual’s assessment a certain amount of labor it eased the burden of Spanish domination. When the gold that could be panned out of the local streams declined in the 1540’s, Indians were often forced to travel long distances from their towns and villages to find enough of the precious metal to meet the tribute demands. Hence, the transfer to a labor contribution, at a time when the Indians were not integrated into the money economy, removed a bothersome burden.

The Dominicans’ efforts to create community treasuries must have harmed their relations with the local caciques who resisted the loss of power. A Spanish vecino and the native rulers testified that the town of Cuestalabaca’s caja de comunidad was held by the friars in the monastery. The Visitador Valderrama demanded in 1565 that friars should not have control over the cajas de comunidad. The friars, however, saw their participation in the Indians’ temporal affairs as part of their duties.14

Another industry which the Dominicans communalized was cochineal production. Unlike silk, the cochineal insect, which was used to make a purple dyestuff, was indigenous to the Mixteca Alta. The cochineal lived on the nopal or prickly pear which grew wild in the region. In pre-conquest times the Mixtecs had to go from

14. Dávila Padilla writes that Fray Francisco Martín “served as mayordomo to direct them in temporal affairs.” Historia, Libro Primero, 301b. On the caja held in the monastery of Cuestalabaca, see Scholes and Adams, Letter to Valderrama, from Alonso de Caballero, Valderrama, 299; on Valderrama’s view of the friars’ control of cajas de comunidad, see Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 149.
tree to tree, scattered over the countryside, to collect the small insects. The Dominicans taught the Indians to grow the nopalies in large orchards of small trees, greatly increasing their harvest. Dávila Padilla writes that Fray Francisco Marín helped increase both the cochineal and silk harvests by planning and directing the execution of irrigation projects for the mulberry and nopal orchards. This introduction of irrigation technology proved to be especially valuable in periods of low rainfall.

Cochineal began to grow in importance in Oaxaca after 1550 as the silk weaving industry grew, resulting in the need for dyes. During the entire sixteenth century the raising of cochineal remained an Indian monopoly. Indians were not used by Spaniards to raise nopal, and without this labor supply they could not compete with the Indian production on individual plots and on Dominican-organized community lands. Cochineal production continued to be an important industry until the 1870's when analine dyes were developed. Perhaps, this continued cochineal production made the sharp decline in sericulture at the end of the sixteenth century less damaging to the overall economy of the Mixteca Alta. The economy was not solely dependent on one crop.

17. In 1575 cochineal was valued, conservatively, at 50 pesos per arroba. Lee, "Cochineal Production," The Americas, IV, 462. By the 1650's, according to Burgos, an arroba of cochineal brought 100 pesos, or a one hundred percent price increase in seventy-five years. Geográfica Descripción, I, 30. An arroba is a weight of about 25 pounds.
Besides the introduction of sericulture and the modernization of cochineal raising, the Dominicans also encouraged the development of community livestock raising. It, too, was seen as another way to fill the community treasury, for the purpose of paying tribute and maintaining churches and hospitals. A royal cedula of 1551 conceded to the Indians the right to raise any livestock that the Spaniards raised, but estancias de ganado mayor (cattle, horses, or mules) were only infrequently granted to a particular cacique or principal.\(^{18}\) Dávila Padilla is the only Dominican chronicler who mentions the friars' efforts to introduce livestock in the Mixteca Alta. The ubiquitous Fray Domingo de Santa María is credited with having established livestock estancias in the Mixteca.\(^{19}\) And in 1561, the Dominican Provincial Fray Pedro de la Peña reported that his order was encouraging the establishment of estancias and the raising of sheep and goats.\(^{20}\)

The records of Viceregal grants of estancias de ganado menor are incomplete, but if those listed are representative of all granted, the majority went to Indian communities and the rest to

---

18. José Miranda, "Origines de la ganadería en la Mixteca," in Miscellanea, Paul Rivet octogenario dictata, vol. II (Mexico, 1958), XXXI Congreso Internacional de Americanistas, 787-788. Miranda notes that Indians were allowed to raise as many pigs as they wished, 788. The "Relación de Nochixtlán" notes that pigs were raised there in great quantity, along with sheep and goats. PNE, IV, 210.


20. Mariano Cuevas, Historia de la Iglesia en México, II, 487, as cited in Ricard, Spiritual Conquest, 143.
the Indian nobility.\textsuperscript{21} Out of fifty-seven estancias granted in the Mixteca between 1560 and 1598, forty-one went to Indian communities, fifteen to caciques and principales, and only one to a macehual. Yanhuitlán, the most populous town in the region, was granted two estancias and five of its subject villages (sujetos) also received grants.\textsuperscript{22} These large estancias alone contained around 14,000 head of sheep and goats and occupied twenty-one square miles of grazing lands. While New Spain's viceregal government limited the number of estancias, they liberally granted permission to own small herds of ganado menor to communities, nobles, caciques, and macehuales. These much more numerous grants ranged from about three hundred head to macehuales to one thousand head to nobles and communities.\textsuperscript{23} The first of the small grants to a macehual, listed by Miranda, was not until 1576, the year that a devastating epidemic began. This is probably no coincidence since as the population sharply dropped, vacant lands became available for

\textsuperscript{21} An estancia de ganado menor was a square 3,000 pasos de Salomón by 3,000 pasos de Salomón equalling four-ninths of a square league or three square miles. Each grantee was allowed to have 2,000 sheep or goats on his land. L.B. Simpson, "Exploitation of land in Central Mexico in the Sixteenth Century," Ibero-Americana, no. 36 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1952), 17 and 21.

\textsuperscript{22} Miranda, "Origines," Miscellanea, II, 790-792. Six out of every seven estancias granted were in the Alta region of the Mixteca, concentrated around the following important towns: Coixtlahuaca, Nochixtlán, Tejupán, Teposcolula, Tlaxiaco, and Yanhuitlán. 795.

\textsuperscript{23} Miranda, "Origines," Miscellanea, II 792-794. These small flocks were more for personal consumption than for profit. Only caciques and principales, generally, made large profits.
sheep grazing. 24

By the late sixteenth century Simpson estimates that the large Indian estancia grants totaled 238,000 sheep in the Mixteca Alta, and Miranda arrives at a total of 300,000 (including the small herds of ganado menor) Indian owned sheep in the region. Approximately two-thirds of the total, or 200,000 head, were in the Mixteca Alta. 25 Simpson's estimates reveal that the Mixteca Alta was the only region in New Spain where the Indian holdings of sheep (238,000) outnumbered the Spanish (157,500). 26 This demonstrates the degree to which the Mixtecs with Dominican guidance were organized and, therefore, able to more than hold their own against Spanish settlers. Also, it apparently indicates a relatively small Spanish population in the region as compared with Puebla, Tlaxcala, or the Valley of Mexico. 27 Nevertheless, the only Mixtec group which directly profited from sheep raising was the native elite. The community estancias helped ease the burden of tribute for the macehuales, but this was offset, in the long run, by the damage that sheep did to crops and

24. Miranda, "Origines," Miscellanea, II, 793. For a complete analysis of the hypothesis that European fauna spread in New Spain as the indigenous population declined (by 80-90 percent in the sixteenth century), see Simpson, "Exploitation," Ibero-Americana, no. 36.
27. Apparently there were no pueblos de espanoles in the Mixteca Alta. See 31, above. For a comparison of the number of Spanish vecinos in different regions of New Spain, see Woodrow Borah, "New Spain's Century of Depression," Ibero-Americana, no. 35 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1951), table 4, p. 11.
soil erosion caused by over-grazing. 28

Livestock raising increased the wealth of the Mixtec elite (nobility and caciques), and helped to ensure their traditional authority in spite of the pressures of a reduced labor force due to epidemics. How did this new industry change the lives of Mixtec macehuales? Many became shepherds, working for Spaniards, the community, the Mixtec nobility, or for themselves. European livestock filled a gap in the Mixtec's material culture since the only domesticated animals that they had had in pre-Hispanic times were the turkey and the dog. Sheep, goats, and pigs, and cattle to a lesser extent, provided the Indians with meat, wool, skins, and tallow. Like the maguey or century plant livestock were especially useful since they had numerous by-products. 29 The fact that macehuales began to own flocks of ganado menor by the late 1570's indicates that they must have been widely accepted at all levels of Mixtec society. Wool not only filled a need it displaced cotton. "On the plateau the warmer and more easily manufactured woolen sarape replaced the cotton manta, which had been a major article of tribute

28. Miranda, "Origines," Miscellanea, 11, 796; Simpson writes: "Over grazing and burning in a land of long dry seasons and torrential summer precipitation, contributed, probably to a diastrous degree, to the erosion pattern characteristic of old sheep land of the central plateau. "Exploitation," Ibero-Americana, no. 36, 23. The cacique of Yanhuitlán held two "sitios de estancia de ganado menor" but instead of sheep, he owned 1500 goats. JM and MH, Códice, appendix 4, 35.

29. For an invaluable analysis of Indian acceptance and rejection of European fauna and flora in Peru, see Kubler, "Colonial Quechua," Handbook, 11, 354-359.
and commerce up to the decade 1560-1570." 30

Miranda lists only two estancias of ganado menor, both for horses, belonging to caciques in the Mixteca Alta. Only the Indian nobility and officials were allowed to ride on horseback and permission to own pack animals was only rarely given. But after 1597 Indians did not need a license to own up to six beasts of burden. Another ordinance of the late sixteenth century allowed farmers to own oxen and mules for pulling plows and carts.31 The effect of this last ordinance in the Mixteca Alta was probably minimal. The coa, or digging stick, remained the basic agricultural implement and the rugged terrain of the region probably precluded the widespread use of wheeled vehicles. Neither ganado menor or ganado mayor could possibly have been supported in the Mixteca Alta if the population had not declined so sharply in the sixteenth century.32

The only major food crop that the Dominicans introduced in the Mixteca Alta was wheat. Burgoa states that the friars taught

30. Simpson, "Exploitation," Ibero-Americana, no. 36, 25; also see Juan de Torquemada, Monarquía indiana (Mexico, 1943, 3 vols.), 1, 611, as cited in Simpson, 4.
32. Woodrow Borah estimates that the Mixteca Alta "had a dense sedentary population at the time of the Conquest, which may have exceeded the long-term carrying capacity of the land." "Sources and Possibilities for the Reconstruction of the Demographic Process of the Mixteca Alta, 1519-1895," Revista Mexicana de Estudios Antropológicos, XVI (1960), 159.
the Mixtec to cultivate with a plow, and to plant wheat. Besides wanting to make their communities self-sufficient by raising a cash crop, the Dominicans also needed wheat for making the Host, even though their administration of communion to the Mixtec was rare. Wheat, like silk, cochineal, and livestock was raised on a communal basis and profits went to the community treasury to meet the town's expenses and pay the tribute. Wheat, unlike livestock, did not greatly alter the lives or environment of the Mixtec. While the Indians grew wheat they did not usually consume it; they paid tribute with wheat and sold it to Spanish settlers. Alonso de Zorita, based on his experience in New Spain in the years 1556-1566 writes concerning this crop:

The Indians should not be made to grow wheat, for this causes them great hardship. They do not understand how wheat is grown, and do not have plows. As a result, they have to pay Spaniards to sow and cultivate the wheat fields for them; this is a great burden for the Indians.

Whether the raising of wheat was such a hardship for the Mixtecs is not known. But based on Simpson's study, it is clear that unlike silk, cochineal, and livestock production, which were controlled by the indigenous population, the raising of wheat was largely in the hands of Spaniards. Spaniards held grants to 204 caballerías of agricultural land, while Indians (probably both individuals and

33. See quote at beginning of this chapter from Burgoa, Geográfica Descripción, I, 279.
34. Zorita, Brief and Summary Relation, 251.
communities) held only 35 caballerías. Also, out of seven flour mills in this region in the late sixteenth century, Spaniards owned five and the Indians only two. Clearly, wheat farming and milling was dominated by Spaniards. Wheat was not more widely accepted by the Mixtecans because maize filled an analogous need in their diet. Similarly, European spices and vegetables which were closely related to Meso-American species were rejected by the Mixteca and other Indians. Nevertheless, whether the Mixtec consumed wheat or wore silk clothes is unimportant; the production of these crops became a part of his daily life.

The three main European products introduced by the Dominicans into the Mixteca Alta, silk, wheat, and livestock, were tithed by the Church. But the episcopacy had to collect the payments itself to avoid the Indians being cheated by tax farmers. Tithing the Indians was vehemently opposed by both the regular clergy and the native rulers. The Dominicans and the other religious Orders saw the bishops' attempts to tithe the Indians as part of the episcopacy's

35. Simpson, "Exploitation," Ibero-Americana, no. 36, 65. A caballería was a rectangle measuring 1,104 varas de Castilla by 552 varas de Castilla, or 105.4 acres. A vara de Castilla equals 0.8359 meters. Simpson's definitions of the various units of land measurement are invaluable. See pp. 17 and 20.
38. An idea of the size of the Mixtec production of these three products can be obtained by a comparison of this tithe collections. In 1568, the total tithe amounted to 63 pesos and 1 tomin, while thirty years later, in 1598, it had increased more than sevenfold to 459 pesos. Woodrow Borah, "The Collection of Tithes in the Bishopric of Oaxaca During the Sixteenth Century," Hispanic American Historical Review, XXI (August, 1941), 405.
plan to weaken their position, while the bishops claimed that the
funds from Indian tithes were needed to maintain and extend parishes
under the control of seculars. But the friars argued that the
tithes burdened the Indians who supported their churches through
contributions to community treasuries. Seventeen Mixtecan gober-
nadores complained to Philip II that they faithfully supported their
churches, providing them with rich ornamentation and that they
were building new churches and supporting the clergy without receiv-
ing any part of the tithe that the bishops collected.\textsuperscript{39} And the
provincials of the three Mendicant Orders argued, in a letter to
the king, that if the poor Indians continued to be tithed so severely
they would stop raising silk, wheat, and livestock.\textsuperscript{40} Borah con-
cludes that while the friars probably made their claims out of
self interest, since they did not want the seculars to widen their
control or obtain new financial sources, their arguments also con-
tained an element of truth.\textsuperscript{41}

The Dominicans in Oaxaca, however, were too weak in the 1540's,
when tithing of the Indians began, to oppose it forcefully. In
any case, the Mixteca Alta was then one of the wealthiest areas in

\textsuperscript{39} "Seventeen Indian governors of towns of the Mixteca to the King,
January 20, 1560," \textit{ENE, XVI, 70}.

\textsuperscript{40} "Letter to the King Don Philip from the provincials of the orders
of St. Dominic, St. Francis, and St. Augustine justifying the
excesses that were attributed to them, Mexico, January 25, 1561." 
\textit{Cartas de Indias, Ministerio de Fomento (Madrid, 1877), Carta XXX,
150}. The provincials argued that the bishops complained about
them because they defended the Indians who did not pay tithes, 147.

\textsuperscript{41} Borah, "Silk Raising," \textit{Ibero-Americana}, no. 20, 81. Borah explains
the details of tithe collection in his article, "Collection of
Tithes," \textit{HAHR, XXI, 486-509}. 
New Spain. Its inhabitants could probably afford to pay a tenth of the harvest profits placed in their community treasuries. The bishop of Oaxaca at this time, Juan López de Zárate, being a poor man, collected every tax allowed. All crops introduced from Spain were tithable. This made little difference in the sixteenth century but set a precedent for the future. Also, all crops raised for the support of cofradías and the community treasuries, even maize, were tithable. 42

But within a few years after the death of Bishop Zárate in 1555, the Dominicans began to pay only what they considered to be a reasonable share to the canons from the bishopric in Antequera. Once a year the canons made the long, tortuous circuit of the Mixteca, going from town to town collecting the tithes on silk, wheat, and the increase of livestock over the previous year. In parishes controlled by seculars the canons collected the full tithe, but in the Dominican parishes they only received "the royal two-ninths of one-half and the shares of the bishop and of the cathedral chapter."

The cathedral's share for construction and repairs, plus the part that usually went to the parish priest were retained by the friars or the community treasuries. The portion withheld, about two-thirds, was used to support the Dominicans' parishes. While this practice at first caused alarm among the canons, it soon became custom. Borah suggests that the episcopacy would not have acquiesced so quickly if the new bishop, Fray Bernadino de Alburquerque, had not

42. Borah, "Collection of Tithes," HAHR, XXI, 404-407.
been a former provincial of the Dominican Order.\textsuperscript{43} The Dominicans in the Mixteca Alta held a dominant position. The wealth that the Order attained through withholding part of the tithe, the organization of community enterprises, and the sale of wine and other goods at inflated prices, gave them independence and the opportunity to build a series of beautiful churches and monasteries.\textsuperscript{44}

Aside from a few Crown and episcopal authorities, the only other powerful Spanish group in the Mixteca Alta, besides the Dominicans, were the encomenderos. The extent to which the encomenderos directly influenced their tributaries is difficult to determine. The sources are vague as to where encomenderos and Crown corregidores (the administrators of crown towns or districts) generally resided. Generally, they probably spent most of the year either in Antequera, Mexico City, and some even returned to Spain.\textsuperscript{45}

But even when they did not reside in the town where they held


\textsuperscript{44} Scholes and Adams, editors, \textit{Cartas del Licenciado Valderrama}, 297; Charles Gibson also discusses Mendicant involvement in business enterprises, \textit{The Aztecs}, 124.

\textsuperscript{45} The corregidor of Teposcolula (who also had another corregimiento) had the town's Indians build him a house in Antequera without proper payment and this was alleged to be a widespread practice among crown officials. "Memorial to His Majesty, undated (some-time during Bishop Zárate's term in 1535-1555), ENE, vol. XV, 126-127. Also, the second encomendero of Yanhuitlán, Gonzalo de las Casas, returned to his birthplace in Trujillo, Extremadura in 1580 where he had a "very fine house and good estate." He died in 1591, but in the intervening eleven years his son, Francisco (El Mozo), cared for the encomienda while living in Mexico City. Upon his father's death, Francisco received Yanhuitlán in encomienda. JM and MH, \textit{Códice}, 15.
Indians in encomienda, the encomenderos' policies and demands, carried out by their agents, affected the Indians' lives. The encomenderos, though few in number (only 108 in all of Oaxaca in the 1560's) had an influence on a large part of the population since their grants were in the areas of densest population at Spanish contact. Nevertheless, encomendero-Mixtec contacts were few in comparison with the Spanish encomenderos in Paraguay who settled down and inter-married with the Guarani.

While mestizaje occurred in the Mixtecan towns, it was negligible by comparison with Paraguay. Mestizos, mulattoes, and Afro-Indians (zambos) were prohibited by law from residing in New Spain's Indian towns although, to judge from the repetition of cédulas on this matter, it was flagrantly violated. But the only mention of mestizaje in Oaxaca is in the "Descripción del Obispado de Antequera," which states that one hundred of Antequera's three hundred vecinos were mestizos and mulattoes. Unlike the Guarani of Paraguay, where the Jesuits only arrived late in the sixteenth century, the Mixtecans were exposed to as many, or more, aspects of sixteenth century Spanish material culture and technology by the Dominicans as by Spanish encomenderos and settlers.

Despite the Dominicans' unfortunate experiences with Francisco de las Casas of Yanhuitlán, which appears to have been exceptional, they staunchly supported the encomenderos in their struggle to retain their grants. Fray Domingo de Betanzos openly expressed the Order's opposition to the expropriation of encomienda grants. And in 1544 the Dominicans advocated perpetual encomienda. They argued that the perpetuity of the Faith and Christian religion among the Indians depended on Spaniards permanently living there. But the Dominicans warned that the Spaniards would not permanently remain unless they became rich, which was impossible without having Indians under encomienda. It was necessary to have Indians, the friars argue, in order to mine, raise silk, sheep, livestock and farm or trade and profit from these ventures. ".../A7nd those that do not have them, can not in any way do it...." Further, the friars reasoned:

in a well ruled commonwealth it is necessary that there be rich men, in order that they can resist the enemies, and the poor of the land can live under their protection, as it is in all the kingdoms where there is policy,... good order, and stability, as there is in Spain and other kingdoms.50

Further, the Dominicans claimed that the poor Spaniard would leave if the rich left, and both were needed to resist the Indians.

The Dominicans compared the sense of responsibility that encomenderos have toward their Indian "children," since they want

49. Colección de Documentos para la Historia de México, vol. II, 190-197, as cited in Kubler, Mexican Architecture, 1, 18. All the Orders came to favor encomienda.
to preserve their property, with the irresponsibility of corregidores. While the encomenderos help the missionaries Christianize the Indians, corregidores are only concerned about their salary and collecting tribute without any benefits going to the Indians. Also, according to the friars, both the Indians and corregidores are poor and can not give alms to the churches, hence, only in encomienda towns are they well built and richly ornamented. By contrast, they claimed that the churches in corregimiento towns, except where there were friars, were the shame of Christianity. Finally, the encomenderos were seen as essential in the temporal life of the Indians since they treated them better and as a consequence the Indians have more businesses (grangerías), as the Spanish do, and, as a result, they like the Spanish better. In the spiritual life the encomenderos were vital,

...because seeing the frequency with which the Spaniards participate in the Sacraments, the veneration in which they hold the churches and the ecclesiastics, the alms they give to the poor, the moderation and polity they demonstrate in their customs, and above all the steadfastness and constancy that they demonstrate towards our catholic faith, they are encouraged by this, and they are allured by good example to improve their customs. 51

Clearly, the Dominicans, and especially Betanzos, were in at least informal alliance with the encomenderos. Aside from the apparently unique feud between the friars and Las Casas in Yanhuitláén, it appears that the Dominicans and encomenderos cooperated with one another. For the Mixtecs, however, this debate over the

importance of the encomendero did not have great importance. Until about 1550 both encomendero and corregidor received food, fuel, fodder and labor services from the town under his charge. For the Mixtecs there was little difference whether they provided these goods and services to a corregidor, an encomendero, or to the Indian rulers. The Mixtecs paid tribute to the rulers of distant Tenochtitlán in the pre-Hispanic era and to the kings of Spain or the absentee encomenderos afterwards.

Until the early seventeenth century, at least, the traditional hereditary lords of Yanhuitlán remained in power. The Spanish concept of primogeniture had considerable influence on Mixtec succession after 1550, but it was "tempered" by indigenous custom. The Dominicans could, also, play a determining role in the succession of caciques. Although the inquisitional trial of Don Domingo, cacique of Yanhuitlán, did not end in his removal from office it did demonstrate the power of the Church to insure the orthodoxy of Indian rulers. In the case of Don Carlos, cacique of Tecxoco, for example, the Inquisition (represented by Archbishop Zumárraga) found the accused guilty of idolatry and sentenced him to death.

The pre-conquest ruler in the Mixteca Alta, and in most of

52. Gibson, The Aztecs, 81-83. In the 1550's corregidores began to receive a substantial salary, but they continued to demand goods and services from the Indians under their jurisdictions. The Aztecs, 84.
53. For a detailed discussion of the synthesis of Spanish and Mixtecan rules of succession, see Spores, Mixtec Kings, 152-154.
Central Mexico, had tripartite duties: 1) administrative; 2) religious; and 3) war. Under Spanish rule the Mixtec cacique kept many of his administrative functions within the new Hispanic municipal institution of gobernador. Only head towns (cabeceras) such as Yanhuitlán had a gobernador while the dependent hamlets (sujetos) apparently continued to be ruled by appointed local nobility. Often in the first decades after the conquest the office of gobernador was indistinguishable from that of cacique since the hereditary lord held both positions. It appears that in the Mixteca Alta the combining of these two offices in one person may have occurred with greater frequency than in areas which were more disrupted by the conquest, Spanish settler penetration, and epidemics. But in most areas, especially the Valley of Mexico, the two offices came to be held by different persons. The elected (non-cacique) gobernador was generally of noble birth in the early decades after the conquest. The office was often introduced by the Spanish when there was a dispute in the succession of a cacicazgo or when the heir was too young to assume office. The latter occurred in Yanhuitlán when the first Indian gobernador, Don Domingo, served as regent until the young heir, Don Gabriel, reached his majority.55 The religious functions of the cacique were, likewise, greatly modified within the framework of the colonial Church, and his posi-

55. See Gibson, The Aztecs, 167-168; see above, 85; and see, Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán, Formas de Gobierno Indígena (Mexico, 1953), 36-37. Spores, Mixtec Kings, chapter five, presents an excellent summary of "native rule" in sixteenth century Mexico.
tion as a leader of warriors was completely destroyed under Spanish domination.56

While the cacique's governmental and ecclesiastical roles were modified under Spanish rule, in the eyes of the Mixtec macehual the ruler's power did not appear to diminish. Through Spanish indirect rule the pre-Hispanic office of tlatoani, or natural lord, remained the source of authority for the Mixtec commoners. The cacique was deprived of his special relationship to the pre-Hispanic gods and priesthood as a result of the friars' destruction of these institutions. But, as these institutions were crumbling, the generation of caciques represented by Don Gabriel gradually developed a symbiotic relationship with the Dominicans.

Just as the elite of the cacique Don Domingo's generation directed the resistance to conversion, Mixtec leaders of Don Gabriel's generation aided the friars by their devotion to the new religion. The example set by these fully Christianized Mixtec rulers paved the way for widespread acceptance of Catholicism among their subjects.

As lay religious leaders, with the cooperation of the Dominicans, the caciques' prestige and authority over their subjects was reinforced. Both the friars and the Indian rulers benefited from this relationship.57 But it is debatable whether the colonial Church

56. See above, Chapter IV, especially, 83-89.
57. See Chapter IV, above, on the resistance and cooperation of the Mixtec elite.
was an adequate substitute for the destroyed pre-conquest religion. The conversion to Christianity, after all, meant the destruction of the very core of the Mixtec's highly ceremonial and ritualized culture.\textsuperscript{58}

The impact of the extirpation of the pre-Hispanic religion and the spread of Catholicism upon the Mixtec commoners is poorly documented. Tentatively, we can only surmise that they followed the example of their traditional leaders in resistance and acceptance of the new religion. The commoners' dress became Hispanized but land usage, subsistence patterns, residence, and even some elements of community organization remained unchanged despite the Spanish influences.\textsuperscript{59} Aside from Christianization, probably the most significant change that occurred in the Mixteca Alta in the century after the conquest was the sharp population decline.\textsuperscript{60}

Despite this population decline the major towns of the Mixteca Alta retained their traditional leaders and successfully adapted to the Spanish intrusion at least until the early seventeenth century. This is in striking contrast to the Valley of Mexico, and other areas more densely settled by the Spanish, where, beginning around 1550, Indian lands were alienated and traditional cacique rule was

\textsuperscript{58} Elsie Clews Parsons writes: "When the ceremonial life of a highly ceremonialized community is suppressed, far more of its general culture goes by the board than in the subjection of a people whose culture is less ritualized and less developed." \textit{Mitla, Town of the Souls} (Chicago, 1936), 519.

\textsuperscript{59} See the study of contemporary Juxtlahuaca, Mixteca Alta by Kimball Romney and Romaine Romney, \textit{The Mixtecs of Juxtlahuaca, Mexico} (New York, 1968), 2.

\textsuperscript{60} The scope of this catastrophe will become more apparent when Cook and Borah's study appears in the Fall of 1968. "The Population of the Mixteca Alta, 1520-1960," \textit{Ibero-Americana}, no. 51 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968).
undermined as Indian commoners and mestizos became gobernadores of indigenous communities. How can this difference be explained?

The relative isolation of the Mixteca Alta from the impact of Spanish colonists is one explanation. There is evidence demonstrating that there were fewer Spanish vecinos in the Mixteca Alta than in many other areas of New Spain. Fewer land and livestock grants were given to Spaniards in this region, than in more heavily colonized areas, which would impinge on the local economy. And the region also lacked gold and silver mines which attracted colonists to regions such as the Chichimeca country in the sixteenth century. Similar to the Araucanian territory of Chile, the poor mineral resource base of the Mixteca Alta helped to insure more isolation than if precious metals had been abundant. Far denser Spanish settlement and greater Indian labor exploitation would, otherwise, have been the result in both regions.

The Mixteca Alta had relatively few colonists; nevertheless, it was exposed to Hispanic influences in other ways. Both Yanhuitlán and Nochixtlán were on the secondary route between Mexico City, Antequera, and the primary Pacific seaport of the Peru-Mexico trade


On an integration-isolation continuum the Mixes, described in Chapter II above (36-39), could probably be placed closer to the isolation pole than the Araucanians whether the measurement was taken in the sixteenth or the twentieth centuries. The Mixtecs would be closer to the integration pole than either of these groups in the century after the conquest.
of Huatulco. The impact of this route on the Mixteca Alta can not be fully documented. It is known, however, that the towns on the route had to provide laborers for maintaining the road and mesones for travelers.63 But, on the other hand, using the number of speakers of Indian languages as a criterion, it appears that contact with Spaniards did not lead to widespread Hispanization. Modern studies demonstrate that Oaxaca, and the Mixteca Alta, in particular, is one of the strongest bastions of aboriginal tongues in Mexico. In 1950 only Nahuatl and Maya had more bilingual speakers than the two main Indian languages of Oaxaca, Zapotec and Mixtec.64 The Mixteca Alta has remained more indigenous in character than most parts of Mexico due to a pattern of relative isolation from Spanish cultural and social influences which began in the sixteenth century. From a Mixtec perspective, however, this isolation from over-powering outside influences was also apparent even during the height of the Culhua-Mexica tribute empire.

The major exception to this pattern of isolation was the Dominican penetration described in this essay. Their evangelistic monopoly in the Mixteca Alta, combined with their propagation of

64. See Densidad de la población de habla indígena en la República Mexicana, Memorias del Instituto Nacional Indigenista, vol. 1, no. 1 (Mexico, 1950), introduction by Manuel German Parra, and charts on pp. 57-60; and for the number of speakers in 1950 see Robert C. West and John P. Augelli, Middle America: Its Land and Peoples (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1966), 316.
new community enterprises and institutions, reinforced this pattern. The strength of the Mixteca Alta's new economy prevented Spaniards from filling slots in these Dominican-introduced enterprises. The diversity of the undertakings gave the economy enough resilience so that when one industry declined (sericulture in the 1590's) others still remained viable (ganado menor and cochineal dyestuff production). This Hispanicized economy allowed, within a few decades after the permanent establishment of monasteries in the large towns, a prosperous Christianized elite to emerge who made Mixtec conversion a reality. The story of economic dislocation, equalization of society, soil erosion as sheep flocks grew, and despair, were all direct or indirect results of the lethal epidemics which struck the Mixteca Alta and New Spain beginning as early as the 1540's. But the combined strength of these destructive forces apparently was not felt in the Mixteca Alta until the early seventeenth century. Despite the widespread decay, the religion spread by the Dominican friars remained. Catholicism solaced the Mixtecans, a society in a spiral of decline.
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