

This is an extract from:

Native Traditions in the Postconquest World

Elizabeth Hill Boone and Tom Cummins, Editors

Published by

Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection

Washington, D.C.

© 1998 Dumbarton Oaks

Trustees for Harvard University

Washington, D.C.

Printed in the United States of America

www.doaks.org/etexts.html

Three Experiences of Culture Contact: Nahua, Maya, and Quechua

JAMES LOCKHART

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

IN THE CONTACT EPISODES BETWEEN PEOPLES of the Western Hemisphere and Europeans, the nature and rate of cultural change on the indigenous side (change which does not usually preclude survival and continuity) seem to depend primarily on two things: first, the degree of similarity, that is, convergence, between the two cultures involved; second, the type and extent of contact between the bearers of the two cultures, for cultures can meet only through the medium of living, breathing individuals. This second element is actually dependent in part on the first. Without a quite strong convergence, there can be little normal, peaceful, mutually meaningful contact between the members of two separate societies. Cultural convergence is also an element in the attraction of outsiders, bringing in larger numbers of Europeans and intensifying contact. Europeans could build on societies structured somewhat similarly to their own and hence draw greater economic benefit from them. Economic benefit, especially leverage on the economy of Europe, was the motor of Iberian emigration, so that the characteristics of indigenous populations were by no means the only factor causing the Europeans to crowd into some regions and avoid others. As it happened, silver and similarity coincided reasonably well; until the late eighteenth century, the great bulk of Spanish immigration (which was also the majority of total European immigration) went to Mexico and the central Andes. It is the experience of this core, the central areas per se, where the most Europeans confronted the largest indigenous populations and where elements of convergence were strongest, with which I am concerned.

An earlier, unannotated version of this paper appeared in *Mester*, the student journal of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, University of California, Los Angeles. I wish to express my thanks to Kimberly Gauderman, who has joined me in studying Quechua and has been instrumental in procuring and copying dictionaries and grammars.

I am not, of course, the first or the last with such an interest, which has long dominated and continues to dominate the more or less Latin Americanist ethnohistorical literature, including the papers in the present volume. My particular angle has to do with identifying, analyzing, and following the evolution of a people's concepts and basic structures across a broad spectrum, not so much in their conscious statements on such matters as through their many types of records, often mundane, in which they use their vocabulary and reveal their thoughts more unselfconsciously. Such work naturally requires records written in the languages of the people involved at the time and place of interest. I have worked for years with the Nahuas less because of their centrality than because they have left us a large corpus of alphabetic texts in Nahuatl, written by themselves, in every nook and cranny of central Mexico from around 1540 to the late eighteenth century. In searching for cases to be used for comparison with the Nahuas—and that is the enterprise toward which I am gradually turning—I again must follow the trail of language; this time, for practical reasons, with more attention to the existence of scholarship that can guide me.

Yucatan and Yucatecan Maya leap out of the crowd of non-Nahua Mesoamerican languages and peoples. All Mesoamerican groups shared in the region's preconquest writing traditions, and all took up alphabetic writing after the conquest to some extent or other; Kevin Terraciano has located and is working with a mass of documents in Mixtec, for example.¹ The Yucatecans' Mayan cousins in Guatemala may equal them in the size of raw documentary heritage—though Matthew Restall (n.d.) is finding Yucatan apparently as thickly documented through indigenous texts as the Nahua world—but they lack the philological and linguistic tradition stretching from Ralph Roys (1939) to Victoria Bricker (1981) and Frances Karttunen (1985).

The third most accessible language of the sedentary peoples, at the moment, is Quechua. George Urioste (1983), now joined by Frank Salomon (Salomon and Urioste 1991), has edited the legends of Huarochirí, and has made the Quechua in Guaman Poma's chronicle accessible (Guaman Poma 1980); Bruce Mannheim (1991) has discussed the entire available corpus, drawing many linguistic and other conclusions from it. What is absent from the known writings in Quechua is the large body of mundane documents in Nahuatl and Yucatecan Maya written by native speakers for other native speakers and not done under

¹ Terraciano, a doctoral student in history at UCLA, is far advanced on a dissertation that amounts to a general cultural and social history of the Mixtec region across the postconquest centuries, based primarily on sources in Mixtec he discovered. Terraciano is extensively examining language contact phenomena; shortly we should be able to add the Mixtec example to the others.

Spanish auspices. None of the material studied to date has that character, and without it many things that are an open book in Mesoamerica can never be known.

The situation may change, however, and in a certain sense has already begun to. George Urioste has in his possession photocopies of some twenty pages of mundane Quechua of unknown archival provenience but undoubted authenticity, recorded by a clerk of the indigenous town of Chuschi in the central Peruvian highlands in 1679, consisting of complaints about the parish priest and extracts from local church or municipal records. The hand, tone, and language are very comparable with those of Mesoamerican records of the same genre and time. I will not be able to analyze these papers in appropriate detail here, not only because of my still small competence in Quechua, but also because, though Urioste gave me a copy of the materials a few years back, I do not feel that I have the right to make extensive public use of them. I will only mention an interesting detail or two and carry out some general comparisons with better known, if more rarefied, Quechua writings. The implications of the existence of the Chuschi papers, however, are enormous. The documents are in a practiced hand and follow mature conventions; the only conclusion one can draw is that this indigenous writer had long been in the habit of putting municipal and other records on paper in Quechua, and further that he cannot have been operating in a vacuum. There must have been others, in other places and times. We have every reason to think that a large mundane Quechua documentation existed in the seventeenth century and perhaps earlier and later. What has come of it is another matter, and the fact that so little has surfaced after so much searching is not a cause for optimism.

Though chosen for pragmatic reasons of linguistic accessibility, Yucatan and the central Andes make an excellent counterweight to central Mexico on other grounds as well, not only because they have been much and well studied on the basis of Spanish materials, but because Yucatan can legitimately represent the south of Mexico; it is culturally distinct from the center in several ways and was less directly influenced by Spaniards than either central Mexico or Peru, while the Andes, on the other hand, represent an entirely distinct culture area—the other half of the world of Western Hemisphere high civilizations.

THE NAHUA CASE

I will not enter into any detail here, because, on the one hand, I have been expounding the evolution of the Nahuas for a few years now, and have done so at length in a pair of books I recently published (Lockhart 1991, 1992), so that

the essence of the matter may well already have reached the ears of the reader; and, on the other hand, a full analysis would be far too lengthy.

In brief, Nahua reactions or adaptations to the Spanish presence have the character of a broad, semiautonomous, and in large part subconscious process in which the Nahua component is as important as the Hispanic component—we are not dealing with simple imposition, and absolutely not with imposition by fiat. The process advances across the entire cultural spectrum in a parallel, often reciprocally reinforcing fashion. Over the postconquest centuries, three stages emerge quite sharply: Stage 1, a generation of little cultural change; Stage 2, about a hundred years from around 1545–50 to 1640–50, a time when change affected predominantly corporations, and Hispanic elements entered Nahua frameworks as discrete items; and Stage 3, after 1650 until today, a time of personal interpenetration of the two societies and more intimate, structure-altering change. The accompanying table, from my book *The Nahuas After the Conquest* (1992), can give some notion of the nature and scope of the phenomenon.

Language was crucial both to the investigation of the process and to its inner development. It was in the language of the texts the Nahuas wrote that the stages first presented themselves, and it is perhaps there that they can be seen most clearly. Structural changes in various realms of life manifested themselves to a large extent in altered concepts embodied in new or adjusted vocabulary. Thus my comparative undertaking must begin with language; I will briefly characterize the linguistic aspect of the stages.

Stage 1 involved describing introduced phenomena with the resources of native vocabulary and naming mechanisms, resulting in extensions and neologisms rather than loans (other than the borrowing of proper names). Stage 2 involved massive borrowing of Spanish vocabulary in the areas of new species and items, role definitions, economic, political, and religious concepts and procedures, and measurements of all kinds. But virtually all loans were grammatically nouns. Loans were naturalized phonologically and to an extent semantically; grammar and syntax could hardly be said to have changed. In Stage 3, as the result of large-scale bilingualism, Spanish verbs and particles were borrowed; idioms were translated, with some Nahuatl words becoming automatic equivalents of Spanish words in the process; Spanish sounds were acquired; new types of nouns were borrowed, including words for blood relatives and terms for which close equivalents already existed.

As stated, across the centuries adjustments in a large array of cultural realms ran parallel to those in language. Let us take one example, of special interest because the phenomenon projects partly into the Hispanic world and can be detected even in situations where we have no access to indigenous-language

sources—Spanish procurement of temporary indigenous labor. In Stage 1, the central Mexican *encomienda* (grant of the tribute and labor of an Indian group to a Spaniard) was in a monopoly position, diverting the indigenous *coatequitl*, or draft rotary labor, to the purposes of the *encomendero* through the authority of the ruler of the local ethnic state, the *altepetl*. At the beginning of Stage 2, the *encomienda* lost its labor rights, and in a system called the *repartimiento*, indigenous workers channeled through the *coatequitl* were assigned ad hoc for brief periods to any Spaniard showing need for them. Close to the time of Stage 3, the *repartimiento* collapsed in turn, and Spanish employers and indigenous temporary workers negotiated as individuals, outside the corporate framework. The complementary nature of the language and labor developments will be readily seen. For example, Nahuas of Stage 2, who understood a number of common Spanish terms, were more ready for contact with a broader range of Spanish employers in smaller groups, with less elaborate indigenous supervision; conversely, the change in the type of contact involved in the *repartimiento* caused more Nahuas to hear Spanish in everyday life, reinforcing Stage 2 linguistic developments and pointing toward Stage 3. Thus a thick web of reciprocally reinforcing phenomena helped the process along at any given point.

THE LOGIC OF THE STAGES

The three stages among the Nahuas have sufficient clarity, breadth of spectrum, and cross-regional uniformity as to suggest that they might represent a universal aspect of the contact of cultures, at least on the indigenous side of large-scale conquests or intrusions, as with the Gauls and the Romans or the Anglo-Saxons and the Norman French. If so, why has such a thing not been frequently noted? One possible reason is that the vast majority of cases of culture contact occur between peoples who already know each other, or at least know similar peoples, and who have already made adjustments and even belong within a single overarching cultural framework, depriving the process of the distinct starting point and sharp focus it possesses when two peoples meet who have been entirely out of touch, whether directly or indirectly, for many millenia. (Surely many of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Europe were foreign to one another, even unknown to one another, but they shared things as basic as iron, the horse, and disease microbes; and however distant they might be, a continuum of social and cultural contact across the vast expanse of the Old World had existed unbroken from prehistoric times.)

Something a bit similar to the Nahua stages is reported from North America, involving a different European nationality and indigenous groups very differ-

ently constituted from the Nahuas. On the basis of work with dictionaries, the historian James Axtell (in a lecture given at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, June 1992) reports a difference in the linguistic reaction of the Iroquois and the more coastal peoples, despite the fact that all belonged to the same language family. The Iroquois handled European introductions through descriptions using native vocabulary, whereas the others borrowed many English words (often phonologically and morphologically assimilated). That is, by the time dictionaries were being made, the isolated Iroquois were still in Stage 1, while the coastal peoples, who had had much more extensive contact with the English, were in Stage 2 (presumably having been in Stage 1 earlier).

Let us examine, then, the logic of the Nahua stages to see if there is anything about them that would distinguish the process in principle from a seamless continuum. If we take the stages as corresponding to degrees of contact—contact being defined as routine, peaceful personal interaction—we can say that, in addition to a general increase over the entire centuries-long process, Stage 1 corresponds to essentially no contact, Stage 2 to contact through formal corporate groups, and Stage 3 to contact through individuals. The same distinctions can be made in terms of language: in Stage 1, the Nahuas, even when thrown together with the Spaniards, only saw them or perhaps heard the sounds from their mouths, but did not understand what they were saying; in Stage 2, they understood largely through intermediaries and translators; in Stage 3, they understood directly. Stage 3 is the time of substantial bilingualism. In cultural phenomena more generally, Stage 1 represents no change (that is, no structural mental/cultural adjustment, however great the transformation of the external facts of the overall system). Stage 2 represents above all corporate change, with political, religious, and economic institutions coming to terms with Hispanic culture; during this time, indigenous corporations generally flourished. Usually, Hispanic elements were placed within a little-changed indigenous framework. Stage 3 represents change above all at the level of the individual; indigenous corporations experienced stress and fragmentation, and newly incorporated Hispanic elements began to alter the indigenous cultural framework itself. Clearly the entire process can be imagined as an unbroken continuum or progression, and even in the Nahua case there are plenty of long transitions from one phase to another, as well as different tempi in different realms of life. But the three stages do have enough of a basis in logical, expectable distinctions that one is moved at least to look for them elsewhere. One might expect, as indeed I still do, that variants of them will reappear in various situations, hastened by the presence of large numbers of Europeans and slowed by the opposite, more distinct or less, depending on local factors such as the

geographical distribution of the two parties in the area and their relative cultural constitution.

THE MAYA OF YUCATAN

Many of the relevant linguistic facts for Yucatan have already been worked out by Frances Karttunen in her *Nahuatl and Maya in Contact with Spanish* (1985). I myself have intermittently pored over Roys' *Titles of Ebtun* (1939) across the years, and I have profited from the document collection, transcription, and study of loanwords carried out recently by Matthew Restall in his dissertation work (n.d.).

What we might expect, at least to the extent of testing it, is that Yucatecan Maya would go through a process closely analogous to that seen in Nahuatl but later or more slowly, in view of the smaller relative presence of Spaniards. To a great extent, this expectation is borne out. The significant body of loanwords entering Maya from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries was constituted very much like Stage 2 loans in Nahuatl and included a great many of the very same words (Karttunen 1985: 51–58). Loans were assimilated phonologically in exactly the same manner as in Nahuatl (Karttunen 1985: 57–58). Particles and verbs were borrowed only later, just as in Nahuatl, and they are not found, it appears, until well into the eighteenth century, a hundred years or so later than in Nahuatl texts (Karttunen 1985: 59–61). Among the particles, *hasta*, “until, as far as,” was prominent, as it was in Nahuatl (Karttunen 1985: 65). Verbs were borrowed using the infinitive as an invariant nominal stem, to which an indigenous verbalizer was added, plus normal inflectional endings—again, just as in Nahuatl (Karttunen 1985: 59). In Maya too, Spanish sounds were gradually acquired in the late period. (For many of the above points, see also Restall n.d.: 410–421, 505–512.)

If we look for differences in the process, they are not lacking, in some cases perhaps only apparent, attributable to the nature of the evidence, but in others surely involving substance. So far there is little sign of a distinct Stage 1. The first known documents in Maya are already in the equivalent of Stage 2. It is true that a word such as *tzimin*, “tapir,” for “horse,” puts us in mind of Nahuatl *maçatl*, “deer,” for the same animal, a prominent feature of Stage 1 among the Nahuas (Lockhart 1992: 270–272). The retention of *tzimin* over centuries (see Restall n.d.: 419) might be seen as consonant with generally slower movement in the Maya sphere, but I would not make too much of such a notion, since Nahuatl retained several Stage 1 expressions for European animals indefinitely even though it did soon go over to a loanword for horse. Since early documen-

tation and lexical work are more scarce for Maya than for Nahuatl, it could be that a fully developed Stage 1 in Maya would simply escape our notice.

It must give us pause, however, to note that although not very numerous, alphabetic documents in Maya are extant from the third quarter of the sixteenth century, polished in calligraphy, conventions, and vocabulary, with all the diagnostic traits of Nahuatl's Stage 2. Thus Maya would appear to have reached a crucial phase right on the heels of Nahuatl, and in relative terms actually earlier, since the whole Yucatecan experience with the Spaniards got off to a perceptibly later start. A very short time indeed would be left for a Stage 1 à la Nahuatl.

Here we see the first of several indications that although there were a progression and sequence over the centuries in contact phenomena in the Maya language, and the thrust and content of that progression were much as in Nahuatl, the stages were not as distinct. In view of the relative paucity of sixteenth-century Maya writing and, at the same time, its advanced and polished nature, one is nearly forced to imagine that the Stage 2 culture reflected in it initially affected only some people in some places, leaving others in something perhaps like Stage 1 for an unknown period of time.² In that case, the two stages would be in large measure simultaneous, lacking the impressive uniform, region-wide sequence of the Nahua world, where developments varied by region hardly as much as a decade, and relatively humble people in remote corners were quite *au courant*. Indeed, under the hypothesized conditions among the Maya, it would be artificial to speak of stages at all.

Extant Maya documents of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, much of the eighteenth, and even to a large extent the early nineteenth century are, however, fully describable by the characteristics of Nahuatl's Stage 2 (see Restall n.d.: 411–418, and text examples on pp. 448–464; Roys 1939). At the same time, such noteworthy stability represents another important difference between the two evolutions. Nahua documents can be dated fairly well—not that there is generally a need to do so—by stylistic and linguistic criteria even within Stage 2, which was barely a hundred years. Maya documents tend to have a notable sameness of vocabulary and documentary conventions over a very long period of time. The main trend one notices is a certain evolution in calligraphy and orthography (less, however, than among the Nahuas). If there was change during this time, it must have been more diffusion than progression. Essen-

² Nancy Farriss has tellingly suggested that climatic conditions probably account for the relative lack of sixteenth-century texts; most of those known to exist are preserved in Spain. The corpus could thus once have been much larger. Restall (n.d.: 414) speculates that almost all legal, religious, and political terminology was adopted before 1600.

tially, the long, stable period, except for its early start, does tend to confirm one's expectation of slower movement and later development in Yucatan.

Eventually, as I have already mentioned, the symptoms of Nahuatl's Stage 3—loan verbs and particles, and phonological change—do make their appearance; the new loans surface around the mid-eighteenth century, as I understand Karttunen. The timing, some hundred years later than with Nahuatl, fits well with the notion of a similar process in both culture areas, expectably delayed in the case of Yucatan. But the manner in which the change took place is very different. Though Nahuatl's transition from Stage 2 to Stage 3 can be seen as stretching over thirty or forty years in the middle of the seventeenth century, by the end of that time the language was strongly affected in every dimension across the entire macroregion. Among the Maya, on the other hand, phenomena of the new type are found scattered here and there in relative isolation, temporally and spatially, with most texts still hardly changed from the long, stable period. Even the quite numerous texts of the first decade of the nineteenth century can hardly be assigned to the equivalent of Stage 3. Matthew Restall, who has compiled a loanword list from what is doubtless the most extensive exploration among mundane postconquest Maya documents to date, reports in all the texts he has covered no particles at all and a loan verb or two only in the infinitive, used nominally (this quite early; n.d.: 414). The texts of the Cruzob, later into the nineteenth century, do have more of a Stage 3 feel (Bricker 1981: appendix), and today Maya fully meets the requirements of Stage 3. A hundred years or more of transition from the second to the third phase again raises the likelihood of numbers of people at a different point in the process simultaneously, for an extended period of time, and once more highlights the differences between the clear stages of the Nahuas and the Maya experience.

Above I said that Maya shows close equivalents of the Nahua Stage 3 phenomena, as indeed it does, but our evidence about one important aspect—the calques by which the Nahuas translated Spanish idioms—is so slight as to make us wonder if they were lacking, at least until recently. There are some hints, such as the phrase *calle chumuc*, the equivalent of *calle en medio*, “across the street” (some examples in Restall n.d.: 333). Perhaps closer examination will find more idiom translation than is immediately obvious. But even today, Maya seems to indicate possession in traditional ways, remaining without a full equivalent of Spanish *tener*, “to have,” whereas Nahuatl, starting early in Stage 2, developed its verb *pia*, “to guard, have custody, hold,” first to mean simply possession and then in Stage 3 to take on all the other meanings and uses of *tener*.

I will devote only a few words to the broader cultural picture; some of the relevant developments are just beginning to be studied, and I am at the present moment not fully conversant with all the studies that *have* been done (a lack I hope to remedy with time). Given that the documentary corpus in Maya tends to show the language in a state closely comparable to Nahuatl's Stage 2 from the second half of the sixteenth century all the way through the eighteenth, one could look for a similar longevity of other traits associated with Stage 2 in central Mexico. Both Nancy Farriss (1984) and Marta Hunt (n.d., 1976) have already pointed out the tendency of Yucatan to retain certain characteristics longer than central Mexico.

The *encomienda* lasted as a meaningful institution into the late eighteenth century in Yucatan, far longer than in central Mexico, where it faded drastically well before the onset of Stage 3 in the mid-seventeenth century. The labor picture is not yet clear to me. The Yucatecan *encomienda* lost its labor power, but I have not been able to determine when this actually happened (see Farriss 1984: 47–56). Over most of the stretch of time involved, a system of draft labor comparable to the central Mexican *repartimiento* persisted, as one would expect in a Stage 2. But labor for Spaniards was far less basic than in central Mexico, and the production of tribute goods far more. Given the different nature of the two economies, the long-lasting tribute goods obligation is perhaps the true parallel to the Stage 2 *repartimiento* among the Nahuas.

Maya municipalities did not noticeably fragment in our time period as their Nahua equivalents did in Stage 3, nor did personal names evolve into a complex system involving elements of Spanish origin (instead staying as Nahua names had been in early Stage 2 or even Stage 1). Some Spanish kinship terms were borrowed, but one does not see the transformation of same-generation terms found in Nahuatl sources. More or less historical writing in Maya continued to be in close contact with the preconquest legacy; in this it was like Nahua annals of Stage 2, not Stage 3, and songs were written down in the eighteenth century, a practice that ceased among the Nahuas in mid-Stage 2. The large monastery churches of Yucatan were apparently not supplemented by a plethora of sub-parish churches as in Nahua Stage 3. No Virgin of Guadalupe seems to have appeared on the horizon (if the movement of the Cruzob is any parallel, it came only later, into the nineteenth century). We have, then, a reasonable list of close parallels to the Nahuas' Stage 2 over the long time during which the language continued to show Stage 2 traits, suggesting the same interrelation and congruence across the board as with the Nahuas.

Some of these traits, however, have little or nothing to do with any cultural progression or sequence; they follow rather from the nature of Maya sociocul-

tural organization. The Yucatecan Maya polities failed to fragment not merely because the conditions for a Stage 3 were not met, but because the *cah*, the equivalent of the *altepetl*, lacked the clearly organized territorial and ethnic subunits that made the *altepetl* a fragmentation bomb waiting to explode. (The safety valve of the bordering region of Yucatan not under Spanish rule no doubt also had its effect.) The same aspect of *cah* structure explains the lack of a push for additional small churches inside the unit. The emphasis among the Maya on named lineages, absent among the Nahuas, made it virtually impossible for them to give up indigenous surnames, no matter what the general cultural context. Even so, the general lines of a picture familiar from the Nahuas' Stage 2 can be discerned; if we can ever trace the probably gradual movement toward something more or less equivalent to a Stage 3 in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, we will be able to judge better what might be sequential, what a persistent Maya-internal pattern.

THE QUECHUA SPEAKERS

The central Andes had the same combination of a large sedentary population and vast silver deposits as the Mexican region, so a closely comparable European influx took place. As we have seen, the process was highly uneven in Mesoamerica, varying sharply between central Mexico and the south, and the impact varied within the Andes region as well. Communication difficulties and other hardships (for Europeans) encountered in the Andean highlands meant that the Spanish occupation, in contrast to the Mexican experience, was far more intensive on the coast than in the interior. Since the Quechua world had been highland-oriented from the beginning, and the coastal peoples, like others in such locations, diminished quickly and drastically after contact, Greater Peru began to take on the aspect of a Spanish/African coast and an indigenous interior. It is true that a substantial Spanish presence was required at the silver mining sites of Charcas, in the area of the mercury mines of Huancavelica, along routes to these places, and at such a major highland center as Cuzco. Nevertheless, the centers and the overall distribution patterns of the two populations were distinct, unlike the central Mexican case, where in macroregional terms the patterns were identical, the Spaniards having simply fastened on the Nahua settlement pattern. In Peru, the two populations lived in relative isolation from each other, much as in southern Mesoamerica and even, one might judge impressionistically, more so.

Since contact propels the process of cultural change, my original expectation was that the Quechua speakers of the central Andean highlands would

remain in the earlier stages, linguistically and otherwise, at least as long as the Maya of Yucatan. Such linguistic evidence as we have, however, turns out not to point in that direction at all. Looking at texts produced by Quechua speakers—the Huarochirí Manuscript, the Quechua passages produced by Guaman Poma, and the Chuschi papers—we find all in agreement on the essentials. Judging by these materials alone, Quechua did experience Spanish influence very similar to what was seen with Nahuatl and Yucatecan Maya, but rather than a lag, comparable with Yucatan or greater, we see the opposite; all these texts are in most respects already in the equivalent of Stage 3. The Chuschi papers of 1679 fall within the time of Nahuatl's Stage 3, but the other two sets come from the first two decades of the seventeenth century and would put Quechua well ahead of Nahuatl chronologically—by thirty or forty years in absolute time and by even more relative to the beginning of the Spanish occupation in the area.

The only text that I have yet found opportunity to survey systematically is that of the Huarochirí legends. We may not know just where the writer of the manuscript was from, but the Quechua interference in his Spanish chapter titles and the letter substitutions in his versions of Spanish words leave no doubt that he was a native speaker of Quechua, or at the very least an indigenous person and not a native Spanish speaker. The text contains an impressive number of loans and is even more impressive for the number that are not nouns, compared to Nahuatl texts even of Stage 3. I have, as can be seen here in the appendix, counted 103 nouns, 8 adjectives (some of which could be interpreted as nouns), 7 particles, and no less than 24 inflected verbs; there are also 14 phrases and what might be called universal proper names approximating generic nouns.

To find twenty-four verbs in a corpus of this size is stunning. Years of combing through Nahuatl texts have hardly brought the total of attested loan verbs from conquest to independence to fifty (though given the nature of the texts we can be certain the number borrowed in actual speech was greater).³ A fully consistent convention for incorporating Spanish verbs exists in the Huarochirí text, to that extent like Nahuatl and ultimately Maya, but very different in the nature of the stem used. Both Nahuatl and Maya used the nominal infinitive in its entirety as a base for derivational and inflectional suffixes. The Huarochirí Manuscript (and Quechua in general) adopts a simpler and more radical solu-

³ Barry Sell, in his ongoing doctoral dissertation research on ecclesiastical imprints in Nahuatl, has found well over one hundred loan verbs present in one way or another in the published writings of an eighteenth-century priest and Nahuatl grammarian working in the Guadalajara region.

tion—radical also in the literal sense—taking the actual Spanish stem (the infinitive minus *-r*; the same as the third person singular of the present in many cases)⁴ as the basis of a verb that is structured like any Quechua verb (sometimes the stem turns out to have the shape consonant-vowel-consonant-vowel, like many verb stems in Quechua), as in *pasa-* from *pasar*, “to pass,” thus *pasanqui*, “you pass.”

Since the Huarochiri Manuscript is the oldest known major all-Quechua running text by a Quechua speaker, we have no direct evidence that there was any lag time between noun and verb loans at all.⁵ There is, however, a hint or two of an earlier mechanism for borrowing verbs, one more like those found in Nahuatl and Maya, for the loan verb from Spanish *casar*, “to marry,” has as a stem not *casa-* but *casara-*, which I take to be the infinitive plus an epenthetic *a* added to give it the final vowel typical of a Quechua verb stem. This form is no

⁴ One is tempted to think that the third person singular present tense form, as doubtless the most frequently heard, provided the actual origin of the Quechua stem. The loan stems in the Huarochiri text, however, do not evince the vowel changes seen in the third person form of many irregular verbs. Moreover, they seem to retain the final vowel of the infinitive rather than the final vowel of the third person form, where the two differ. Thus we see *servi-* (as in Urioste 1983: 182) rather than *sirve-*, *destrui-* (p. 32) rather than *destruye-*, and *reduci-* (p. 48) rather than *reduce-*. It is nearly impossible to extract certainty from such examples, however, because the writer, like many other Quechua speakers, tended to merge *e* and *i*. Although *servi-* is the majority variant, *servi-* also appears at times (e.g., p. 146). *Prometi-* (p. 42) clearly involves *i* and *e* merging, since *i* would not appear in any form in Spanish. *Perdi-* (p. 182) is similar, but contains perhaps the most definite indication that we are dealing with a form of the infinitive, not the third person present, since the diphthong *ie* of *pierde*, the third person form, would not be subject to the same kind of merging.

From this evidence, it would seem that the Quechua loan stem derives from the infinitive (minus *n*) after all. The likelihood is increased by the exceptional, doubtless early *casara-* stem (see below). Yet modern loan stems put the matter in doubt once again. In one modern grammar, the stems regularly show third person vowel shifts whenever they occur in the Spanish verb itself: *cuenta-*, *entiende-*, *piensa-* (Bills et al. 1969: 441, 443, 445). Another grammar, though it attempts to deemphasize loan verbs, nevertheless confirms *entiende-* and has in addition the strange form *truequa-*, presumably affected by *trueca*, the third person form of *trocar* (Grondin N. 1971: 209, 316). At the same time, the final stem vowel is that of the infinitive, not the third person present, and here there can be no doubt of confusion because of merging: *bati-*, *escribi-* (Bills et al. 1969: 440, 441). All in all, perhaps the most likely analysis is infinitive origin with influence from the third person present.

⁵ Bruce Mannheim tells me of some notarial documents he has found in Cuzco, from an earlier time, apparently done by an indigenous person in both Quechua and Spanish. These texts may contain invaluable clues about the early period, and I look forward to their publication. Frank Salomon has also informed me of two letters in Quechua passed between Andean lords, which at present I have not yet had the opportunity to inspect. Any older text in Quechua that should come to light, however short, fragmentary, or uninteresting in its ostensible subject matter, has vast potential for delineating postconquest Andean cultural history.

vagary of the Huarochirí text, since, to anticipate, it is found in the Chuschi papers, in Guaman Poma (1980: 420), in González Holguín's dictionary (1952: 51),⁶ and in modern spoken Quechua from Bolivia to Ecuador. The Chuschi papers also have *pagara-* from *pagar*, "to pay," and this too is confirmed in modern grammars.⁷ I deduce that there was a time when Quechua toyed with the infinitive like the other languages, and that these two verbs were among the first borrowed, retaining what became an archaic form after the definitive strategy of incorporating verbs evolved. "To marry" by Christian rites and "to pay" money are indeed among the most likely candidates for the first Spanish verbs to enter the language on the grounds of being markedly new and at the same time basic to the postconquest situation.

Although mundane sixteenth-century texts in Quechua are not available to me, one can inspect the work of the pioneer fray Domingo de Santo Tomás, whose grammar and dictionary appeared in 1560. In a quick check, I have detected no loan verbs in the Santo Tomás corpus, and the dictionary certainly has neither *casara-* nor *pagara-*. Under words related to marriage, the dictionary gives expressions having to do with taking a man or a woman (Santo Tomás 1951b: 73–74). In his grammar, Santo Tomás includes a model speech or sermon in which the relatively few loanwords are all nouns: *Dios*, "God," used repeatedly, and *ángel*, "angel," *caballo*, "horse," *cristiano*, "Christian," and *diablo*, "devil"; the last is specifically referred to as a foreign word and explained (Santo Tomás 1951a: 189–207). *Caballo* also appears in the dictionary (Santo Tomás 1951b: 253).

We have some reason to think, then, that loan verbs were rather more problematic than nouns and came after a time of hesitance, resistance, or experimentation, but, on the basis of the known texts, the interval was not nearly as great as with Nahuatl, much less Maya. The Huarochirí document's loan verbs include the somewhat technical type predominant in Nahuatl, but have a distinctly broader semantic and pragmatic scope.

Loan particles are prominent in the Huarochirí Manuscript, chief among them the expected *hasta*. As happened with some words in Nahuatl too, usually

⁶ Although *casara-* appears prominently in the Quechua to Spanish section, the older forms used by fray Domingo de Santo Tomás dominate the corresponding part of the Spanish to Quechua section (p. 449). The form *casada* there is presumably a loan noun.

⁷ The confirmation is admittedly a bit indirect. Bills et al. (1969) gives *paga-* as the main form, illustrated in examples of actual usage (pp. 122, 202, 213, 445). Nevertheless, *pagara-* is found in the phrase *Dios pagarasunqui*, "thank you" (literally, "God will pay you"). The identical phrase is given in Grondín N. (1971: 60, 311). I presume that *pagara-* was once the normal form, more recently assimilating to the general rule while the yet more basic *casara-* resisted.

as a transitional measure, *hasta* is always accompanied by a native equivalent, *-cama*. Again, the same word and the same construction are found in the other texts and in spoken Quechua today. Very striking in the Huarochirí text is the frequent use of the conjunctions *y*, “and,” and *o*, “or” (the latter often accompanied by the indigenous *-pas*), even when no Spanish vocabulary is involved. The particles are all more or less on the same order as those seen in Nahuatl except for a *-mente* adverb of manner, *heréticamente*, “in a heretical fashion.”

Further work will be required to settle the issue, but I have the impression that the text includes some calques on Spanish phrases. Its loan nouns include the types familiar in Nahuatl’s Stage 2, but also embrace words for indigenous items or concepts already apparently well covered by native vocabulary, another sign of Nahuatl’s Stage 3. Indeed, the manuscript shows all of the diagnostic traits of Nahuatl’s Stage 3 except the phonological aspect, for judging by the orthography it does not appear that the writer had securely acquired any of the Spanish sounds lacking in or different from Quechua pronunciation.⁸

With the other two texts, I must for the moment rely on impressions. In a word, they have all the same signs and much of the same loan vocabulary, confirming that the writer of the Huarochirí Manuscript was not alone in his tendencies. Such agreement is significant enough when found in the writings of Guaman Poma, in time very close to the Huarochirí legends and in genre and auspices also somewhat allied, but it is even more striking when seen in everyday working documents done some sixty years later in a highland location. All three texts are more or less central Peruvian in provenience, but still there is a considerable breadth, especially considering Guaman Poma’s catholicity. Not only do the Chuschi texts have the same tendencies as the Huarochirí Manuscript, those tendencies are more pronounced. I have not made a quantitative survey, nor even a transcription, but it is already clear that loanwords are even more prevalent and verbs even more frequent. The contact phenomena of the three seventeenth-century sets agree closely not only with each other but with the situation reflected in modern dictionaries and grammars, so there is every reason to imagine that we are dealing with the real speech of native speakers and not some artificial idiom.

What is one to make of the overall situation of the Quechua speakers, then? It goes against every intuition to presume that the majority of Quechua speakers across the vast and remote Andean highlands shared the idiom, bearing

⁸ The topic awaits closer study. It appears to me at present that the primary deviance from normal Spanish orthography has to do with vowels and, to a lesser extent, with sibilants. A preliminary search has revealed none of the expected merging of letters for voiced and unvoiced stops.

strong traces of bilingualism, of the writers of the three texts. Bruce Mannheim has reported a marked difference between urban and rural Quechua today. That difference is probably not new. To explain the Andean situation, I hypothesize a bifurcation, much deeper and starker than that I have imagined in Yucatan. Greater Peru received a strong flow of Spanish immigration, but as I have said, it tended to concentrate on the coast, precisely the area where the indigenous population threatened to diminish to the disappearing point. In the Peruvian coastal region at any time after the mid-sixteenth century, the proportion of Spanish speakers to speakers of indigenous languages exceeded not only that seen in Yucatan, but anything seen in any part of central Mexico, including the main urban centers of Mexico City and Puebla. As I found in my research years ago on early postconquest Peru, many of the Quechua speakers on the coast were displaced highlanders working for Spaniards and highly open to all kinds of cultural influence (Lockhart 1968: 217–218). It would not be unexpected that coastal-urban Quechua should have reached something like Nahuatl's Stage 3 even earlier than Nahuatl. Quechua speakers who were employed by Spaniards—*yanacunas*, ecclesiastical and governmental aides—circulated widely across the hinterland, as the example of Guaman Poma shows. Such people could easily have spread a Stage 3 Quechua to mining regions, larger urban centers, and even to the local indigenous ruling groups who had to deal with Spaniards on an almost daily basis. Most of the highland population could have remained in something more like Stage 1 or Stage 2 indefinitely. I suspect, however, that certain high-frequency items such as *casara-*, *pagara-*, and *hasta* achieved wide currency in the general population from a relatively early time. At any rate, we have again a situation in which no clear progression of stages can be detected. On their first appearance, Quechua texts are already in a full equivalent of Stage 3; only hints of an earlier progression are seen, and any such evolution must have taken place with lightning rapidity, if there was a progression at all.

Looking about for broader cultural phenomena that might throw light on the Andean situation, I find relatively little that is unambiguous, partly because of the lack of a large corpus of mundane indigenous texts that is most revealing for the Nahuas and the Yucatecans, and partly because of my present rustiness with the Peruvian historical and anthropological literature. In the realm of temporary labor, we find some initial similarities with central Mexico, followed by very long-term stability at Stage 2. Temporary labor rights originally belonged to the *encomienda* alone, then before the end of the sixteenth century were channeled through the Peruvian equivalent of the *repartimiento*, the *mita*. To this point, the pattern and relative chronology of Peru and central Mexico

ran reasonably close, but thereafter the *mita* remained strong and quite central to the economy, virtually to independence, showing an even more marked and prolonged “Stage 2” aspect than in Yucatan. It must be remembered, however, that the Andes of all the regions of America had the strongest tradition of draft rotary labor from the beginning, involving the longest work periods and the greatest distances traveled, and it was no accident that the *repartimiento* here took on a Quechua name.

In other realms, comparability is hard to find.⁹ Indigenous municipal corporations much like those in central Mexico and Yucatan were formed in the later sixteenth century, bringing the Andean region in that respect into Stage 2. Instead of a rotating “governor,” though, as among the Nahuas in Stage 2 and later, the undisguised preconquest local ruler, with full dynastic trappings—called *cacique* by the Spaniards and *kuraka* by the Quechua speakers—held forth more as in Stage 1 with the Nahuas. (Yucatan was half way between the two; the presiding officer was usually called a *batab*, using the indigenous term for local ruler, and held office for a long period of time—perhaps ideally twenty years—but was not strictly dynastic and was tightly integrated with the *cabildo*, often not the case in Peru [Restall n.d.: 150–155].) The secular trend for sociopolitical entities was neither the unilinear fragmentation process of the Nahuas nor the stasis of the Yucatecans, but a wave of consolidation attempted by the Spaniards, followed by a redispersal which may have tended to reestablish something like the original pattern.

As to the indicator of church building, large ecclesiastical structures were hardly built in the Andean countryside in the sixteenth century; the affiliations of later structures are not yet clear to me. The reason for the difference is not primarily the place of the Andean region in any sequence at any particular time, but the lack in the Andean highlands of the strong Mesoamerican tradition wherein a splendid stone temple was the primary symbol of the sociopolitical unit. Likewise, aspects of the stages having to do with writing and written genres cannot be applied readily to the Andes because of the lack of the Mesoamerican writing traditions that prepared the Mesoamericans for the full-scale incorporation and adaptation of European-style writing in their own languages by a single generation after contact. I will leave it to others to say whether the Virgin of Copacabana or the Señor de los Milagros compares in any way to the Virgin of Guadalupe as a Stage 3 symbol of a new protonational entity transcending the individual indigenous corporations and embracing both Span-

⁹ In the following, I rely in part on my own Peruvianist work and direct knowledge, but also, in a general way, on Bakewell 1984, Cook 1981, Fraser 1989, Spalding n.d. and 1984, Stern 1982, Wethey 1949, and Wightman 1990.

iards and non-Spaniards. Parts of the Andes, through the seventeenth century and perhaps longer, were maintaining Christianity and indigenous religion as separate, relatively unintegrated cults, a situation not seen in large measure in central Mexico after Stage 1; something of the kind did hang on longer in Yucatan and other peripheral areas.

Whereas with Yucatan I imagine I can see enough to satisfy myself that the region long remained in a perhaps ill-defined but recognizable Stage 2, generally as well as in language, only certain aspects of the Andean picture over the postconquest centuries are reminiscent of Stage 2; other aspects point to an even earlier phase, while some elements of the sequence seen in Mesoamerica are missing because of pronounced differences in Mesoamerican and Andean culture. It would probably take much more in the way of indigenous-language sources to detect any Stage 3 traits beyond those already seen in language itself; so far, none are evident. The Andean example, as I provisionally glimpse it, does not seem to manifest even the rough simultaneity and congruence across many realms seen in Yucatan. Such a state of things would be compatible with the bifurcation (perhaps multifurcation) that I postulated above in speaking of the language situation.

In general, the nature and sequence of certain cultural developments in the postcontact period are much the same wherever we look, although clearly it is by no means inevitable that a certain point in the sequence should ever be reached unless local conditions are favorable. Under the right conditions, even a reversal of the sequence is imaginable. In two of the three examples, there is a broad congruence and relative simultaneity of certain phenomena, both linguistic and nonlinguistic; in the third example, the Andean region, that does not presently appear to be the case. If, however, with further research two or more separate spheres can be identified and characterized, a greater congruence in each may yet emerge.

The clear three stages of the Nahuas do not appear in the other two examples. If Yucatan were more fully understood from the moment of contact until today, I think the three stages would be more recognizable than they are at the moment, but they will never have the clarity and relative uniformity of the Nahua case. I provisionally attribute the well-defined stratification of the Nahua experience to two factors: first, the fact that here alone did a large immigrant population meet a large indigenous population head on, and second, that the Nahuas appear to have had more cultural common ground with the Europeans than any other indigenous group, making it possible for them to build their adjustments onto their own traditions in virtually every sphere,

Three Experiences of Culture Contact: Nahua, Maya, and Quechua

leading to a tightly interlocking system that tended to evolve as a unit. Consequently, I hardly expect more examples of a fully developed three-stage sequence. Nevertheless, every indigenous society coming into contact with Europeans went through a somewhat related experience, and proceeding from the better-known cases to the lesser known, we should be able to identify universals and come to understand much more than we do now about the principles of variation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BAKEWELL, PETER J.
1984 *Miners of the Red Mountain: Indian Labor in Potosí*. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- BILLS, GARLAND D., BERNARDO VALLEJO C., AND RUDOLPH C. TROIKE
1969 *An Introduction to Spoken Bolivian Quechua*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- BRICKER, VICTORIA R.
1981 *The Indian Christ, the Indian King: The Substrate of Maya Myth and Ritual*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- COLE, JEFFREY A.
1985 *The Potosí Mita, 1573–1700: Compulsory Indian Labor in the Andes*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif.
- COOK, NOBLE DAVID
1981 *Demographic Collapse: Indian Peru, 1520–1620*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- FARRISS, NANCY M.
1984 *Maya Society under Colonial Rule: The Collective Enterprise of Survival*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- FRASER, VALERIE
1989 *The Architecture of Conquest: Building in the Viceroyalty of Peru, 1535–1635*. Cambridge University Press, London.
- GONÇALEZ HOLGUIN [GONZÁLEZ HOLGUÍN], DIEGO
1952 *Vocabulario de la lengua general de todo el Perú llamada lengua Qquichua o del Inca*. Universidad Nacional de San Marcos, Lima.
- GRONDÍN N., MARCELO
1971 *Runa simi: Metodo de quechua*. Imprenta “Quelco,” Oruro, Bolivia.
- GUAMAN POMA DE AYALA, FELIPE
1980 *El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno* [1615] (John V. Murra and Rolena Adorno, eds.; Jorge L. Urioste, trans.). 3 vols. Siglo Veintiuno, Mexico.
- HUNT, MARTA ESPEJO-PONCE
n.d. Colonial Yucatan: Town and Region in the Seventeenth Century. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1974.
1976 The Processes of the Development of Yucatan, 1600–1700. In *Provinces of Early Mexico* (Ida Altman and James Lockhart, eds.): 33–62. UCLA Latin American Center Publications, Los Angeles.
- KARTTUNEN, FRANCES
1985 *Nahuatl and Maya in Contact with Spanish*. Texas Linguistic Forum 26. Department of Linguistics, University of Texas, Austin.
- LOCKHART, JAMES
1968 *Spanish Peru, 1532–1560*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.
1991 *Nahuas and Spaniards: Postconquest Central Mexican History and Philology*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif., and UCLA Latin American Center Publications, Los Angeles.

Three Experiences of Culture Contact: Nahua, Maya, and Quechua

- 1992 *The Nahuas After the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Central Mexico, Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif.
- MANNHEIM, BRUCE
1991 *The Language of the Inka since the European Invasion*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- RESTALL, MATTHEW B.
n.d. *The World of the Cah: Postconquest Yucatec Maya Society*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1992.
- ROYS, RALPH L. (ED. AND TRANS.)
1939 *The Titles of Ebtun*. Carnegie Institution, Washington, D.C.
- SALOMON, FRANK, AND GEORGE L. URIOSTE (TRANS. AND EDS.)
1991 *The Huarochiri Manuscript: A Testament of Ancient and Colonial Andean Religion*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- SANTO TOMÁS, FRAY DOMINGO
1951a *Grammatica o arte de la lengua general de los indios de los Reynos de Peru* (Raúl Porras Barrenechea, ed.). Universidad Nacional de San Marcos, Lima.
1951b *Lexicon o vocabulario de la lengua general del Peru llamada quichua* (Raúl Porras Barrenechea, ed.). Universidad Nacional de San Marcos, Lima.
- SPALDING, KAREN
n.d. *Indian Rural Society in Peru: The Example of Huarochiri*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1967.
1984 *Huarochiri: An Andean Society under Inca and Spanish Rule*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, Calif.
- STERN, STEVE J.
1982 *Peru's Indian Peoples and the Challenge of Spanish Conquest: Huamanga to 1640*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.
- URIOSTE, GEORGE (ED.)
1983 *Hijos de Pariya Qaqa: La tradición oral de Waru Chiri (mitología, ritual, y costumbres)*. 2 vols. Foreign and Comparative Studies, Latin American Series, no. 6. Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.
- WETHEY, HAROLD E.
1949 *Colonial Architecture and Sculpture in Peru*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- WIGHTMAN, ANN M.
1990 *Indigenous Migration and Social Change: The Forasteros of Cuzco, 1520–1720*. Duke University Press, Durham, N.C.

APPENDIX:

WORDS AND PHRASES OF SPANISH ORIGIN IN THE HUAROCHIRÍ LEGENDS*

Nouns: abuela, abuelo, aguinaldo, alcalde, andas, ánima, animal, año, aposento, araña, arco, brazo, brujo, caballo, calle, campana, cantarillo, cañaveral, capítulo, caracol, cielo, cofre, conde, corregimiento, costumbre, cristiano, cruz, cuerpo, cuidado, cuñada, diluvio, dios, doctor, doctrina, don, doncella, enemigo, esquina, fanega, fe, fiesta, forastero, frezada, frontera, fuente, garabato, iglesia, indio, junio, juramento, latín, maestro, manga, marzo, mayo, media (fanega), mesa, mestizo, milagro, misterio, mortero, muchacho, mundo, noviembre, oficio, oración, oveja, padre, parte, pascua, patio, peligro, perdón, platero, plato, plaza, predicación, procesión, provincia, punta, real, reducción, romano, rosario, sabio, sacerdote, sarampión, señal, señor, señora, sobra, sobrino, teniente, tiempo, tijeras, trabajo, traición, trompetero, ventura, vestido, virgen, víspera, zarcillo.
Total: 103

Verbs: casar (casara-), confesar, conquistar, convidar, destruir, enamorar, envidiar, gastar, heredar, juntar, menospreciar, ofrecer, pasar, perder, perdonar, pintar, prometer, reducir, renovar, rezar, sentenciar, señalar, servir, visitar.
Total: 24

Particles: hasta (and hasta que), heréticamente, o, porque, si, sino, y. Total: 7

Adjectives: azul, blanco (?), crespo, entero, loco, mayor, rico, segundo (a).
Total: 8

Phrases, proper names: Ave María, Cabrillas, cara a cara, Cieneguillas (a place or settlement), Corpus Christi, digo, espíritu santo, gato montés, Jesucristo, Lima, padre nuestro, quiere decir cuatro, Santa María, Todos Santos. Total: 14

* I have used the 1983 Urioste edition. Words in the chapter headings in Spanish, though generated by the same writer, were of course not included. The present list should be considered provisional. Though I surveyed the text carefully and checked my findings more than once, my experience with similar work on Nahuatl sources leads me to believe that lists like this one need to evolve for several years before they reach final form because of inadvertent omissions and problems of analysis. I have adopted modern Spanish spellings and have used the citation form, including the full infinitive of verbs; in texts, the *r* would be missing in all cases except with *casar*.

TABLE 1: THE THREE STAGES AMONG THE NAHUAS, AND SOME OF THEIR IMPLICATIONS

	1	2	3
Language	1519 to ca. 1545–50	ca. 1545–50 to ca. 1640–50	1640–50 to 1800, in many cases until today
Temporary labor mechanisms	Essentially no change Encomienda (whole indigenous state assigned long term to one Spaniard)	Noun borrowing, no other change Repartimiento (small parties divided among Spaniards for short periods of time)	Full range of phenomena of bilingualism Informal, individual arrangements between Spaniards and Indians
Government of the local states	Tlatoani (king) and nobles as always	Hispanic-style town council, cabildo (manned by tlatoani and nobles)	Fragmentation of local states and more idiosyncratic forms of officeholding
Terminology of noble rank	No change	Applied to members of the cabildo	Disappears, replaced by mature naming system, precisely locating every individual in society by rank
Naming patterns	Christian (first) names	Complex stepped naming system gradually develops	Mature naming system, precisely locating every individual in society by rank
Kinship	No change	Marriage concepts and terminology adopted	Terms for siblings, cousins, nephews/nieces, and in-laws change to conform with Spanish
Songs	?	Genre mixed prequest-postquest in content, prequest in form, with verses indicated by vocables, pairing of verses, and symmetrical arrangement of pairs	Rhyme, meter, line length, indefinitely continuing set of verses with no numerical pattern
History	?	Annals divided equally between pre- and postquest	Annals almost exclusively postquest. Syncrretizing, atemporal legends called “titles” are written down
Records	Pictorial/ideographic-oral	Pictorial/ideographic-alphabetical (latter dominant)	Primarily alphabetical
Art and Architecture	?	Great idiosyncratic monastery complexes built; frescoes and decorative carving in mixed Hispanic/indigenous idiom	Small Spanish-style parish churches built; art mainly European in style
Religion	God, baptism	Saints proliferate, one per sociopolitical unit	One saint, Guadalupe, takes on national significance

(after James Lockhart, *The Nahuas After the Conquest* [1992: 428])