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Introduction

This grant was used to fund two trips to México and a continuing program of research in my local Family History Center of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Over the two trips, in March and July-August, 2002, I spent 21 days in México. I primarily worked in the Archivo General de la Nación, México City, where I searched for documents on Colonial Mixquiahuala and the surrounding region. The most important of these are a series of padrones, or censuses, from 1717-1718, which are discussed below. The 1718 padrón of Mixquiahuala is transcribed in Appendix 1.

I surveyed the AGN’s microfilm collection of parish records to see how sixteenth and seventeenth century records from the broader Mezquital region compared to those from Mixquiahuala. Note that these films contain the same images as the Genealogical Society of Utah rolls available from the LDS Family History Center, but are numbered differently. I also examined a series of microfilms from Ixmiquilpan, Hidalgo, in the Biblioteca Nacional de Antropología. These films included parish records from Ixmiquilpan and Alfayucan, as well as other Colonial municipal documents. I made several trips from México City to Hidalgo to visit Mixquiahuala and its neighbors and get a better feel for their geographic setting and how they related to one another.

In the United States I have consulted a total of thirteen rolls of microfilmed parish records, primarily those from Mixquiahuala itself but also some from Chilcuautla, Tepeilitlan, Tetepango, and other neighboring parishes. Over an estimated 400 hours, I have transcribed 6673 baptism, 1210 marriage, and 2460 death records. The contents of the rolls examined are described in Appendix 2, with their current transcription status. I have also explored U.S., Mexican, and Canadian libraries, where I have found detailed, and often unpublished, accounts of the population history of comparable communities in Hidalgo and Puebla.

In this report, I survey what I have learned until now from my research into the population of Mixquiahuala. I focus on Mixquiahuala and its subject communities, but also address the surrounding Teotlalpan (as defined by Cook 1949) and broader Mezquital region (using Othón de Mendizabal’s definition of the Mezquital as the area of the Rio Tula and Moctezuma drainages [Melville 1994]). Note that these results depart somewhat from the research questions in my initial proposal, as the records have drawn my analysis in somewhat different directions than I had originally intended.

I have only now begun to write results up for publication; Appendix 3 contains the single abstract that I have submitted based on this research.
Mezquital Padrones

The series of 1717-1718 padrones from the area now preserved in AGN Bienes Nacionales provide a wealth of detail on the communities of the Mezquital. In addition to simple demography, they shed light on naming practices, political structure, and the
integration of Spanish and indigenous populations. As far as I can determine, these documents have never been studied, so I provide a brief description of the contents of each.

The seven padrones discussed here appear to be part of a broader survey of the diocese of México, as several contemporaneous padrones from further afield were catalogued with them. In Mixquiahuala and several of its neighbors, they were associated with a visit of inspection by don Juan Corral de Morales, who reviewed the parish records and signed off on them at the same date. A similar visita occurred in Tepetitlan, from which no padrón survives, indicating that the original series was more complete than the extant one. As it is, they cover much of the area of the Mezquital, from Tula in the south, through Mixquiahuala and Chilcuautla north to Ixmiquilpan, and west to Chapantongo and Huichapan (see Figure 1, which also includes neighboring parishes from which no padrones are extant).

*Bienes Nacionales 808, exp. 16: Mixquiahuala, 1718*

This expediente comprises eight leaves. One pair is a church inventory, which was not transcribed. A full transcription of the remained is in Appendix 1. The padrón contains separate lists of the inhabitants of San Antonio Mixquiahuala and its sujetos San Agustin Tecpatepec, Tepeitic or Barrio de los Reyes, and the Hacienda de San Diego de los Pozos. Each list is subdivided by civil status: casados or married, viudos or widows, solteros, defined as single individuals of ten and up, and muchachos, or children aged three to ten. The first three lists are also separated by race, into indios and gente de razón, or non-Indians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Population of Mixquiahuala and its sujetos, 1718</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixquiahuala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Nicolas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pedro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecpatepec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestlalpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrio de los Reyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacienda de los Pozos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mixquiahuala and Tecpatepec were large villages, overwhelmingly indigenous, with a handful of Spaniards, *mestizos*, and *mulatos*. Although Tecpatepec was technically a *sujeto*, it had grown to a larger size than its *cabecera*, and is today a separate *municipio*. Each was divided into three barrios, but these subdivisions were quite different. Three quarters of the population of Mixquiahuala lived in a single barrio, that of San Nicolas. San Antonio, despite bearing the same saint’s name as the pueblo as a whole, and San Pedro were much smaller. The modern town is still divided into two barrios, San Nicolas and San Antonio, with no trace of the name San Pedro (Milton Flores, personal communication March 2001). The three barrios of Tecpatepec had more equal populations. In addition, San Juan was spatially distinct and has preserved its identity until today as the community of San Juan Tepa. Interestingly, San Juan is the only one of the six barrios that regularly appears in the parish records; the others may not have been spatially distinct. Aside from San Pedro, each barrio had its own nobility, marked by the titles *don* and *doña* and listed first in the padrón. Individuals are listed under a pair of names, the first drawn from a restricted pool of baptismal names and the second either a Spanish surname or, less often, a second baptismal name. Fewer women bear surnames than men. Each barrio contains several clusters of surnames, particularly among the nobility, suggesting that surnames were inherited and relatives often lived near each other.

Tepeitic was very different. Not only was it far smaller, but a full third of the population was non-Indian. Among the Indians, the nobility were graphically distinguished from the commoners by a line drawn to separate the list of names. Nine noble couples outnumber the five non-noble pairs and five non-Indian pairs. Most individuals, male and female, bear surnames.

The Hacienda de los Pozos list is not divided into racial categories, perhaps because there was no citizen/o ther distinction to be made, unlike a *pueblo de indios* where any gente de razón would be outsiders. Judging from parish records, the Hacienda list also omits the *hacendado*’s family: In 1729, Capitan don Diego de Zelada lived there with his daughter doña Antonia Maria de Zelada; she was born at the Hacienda in 1711. They certainly maintained a residence at the Hacienda throughout the intervening period, but they may have spent most of the time in Actopan or another larger town. Those who are listed are less likely to bear surnames than the inhabitants of the other communities, and none are titled don.
These communities were far smaller than they had been a century and a half earlier. In the 1548 *Suma de Visitas*, Mixquiahuala had 1349 inhabitants (Paso y Troncoso 1905:2:143-4). Tecpatepec appears in the same list with a population of 1394 under the name Talguacpa, which had *estancias* named Tecpatepec and Teticpan and a pueblo named Teapa (ibid.:2:219). By 1569, Mixquiahuala had 1559 adults, Tecpatepec 1297, and Tepeitic 480 (ibid.:3:63-66).

Spatially, the parish of Mixquiahuala was quite spread out (*Figure 1*). Tecpatepec is 15 km by road from the cabecera. Tepeitic is about the same distance, with the canyon of the Rio Tula in between. Today it is close to a half day’s walk from Mixquiahuala to Tepeitic, and the shortest route leads through Tuni, which belongs to the adjacent parish of Chilcuautla. In fact, in 1569, Tepeitic appears to have been an *estancia* belonging to Tula, despite being in the parish of Mixquiahuala. Although the Hacienda de los Pozos is not indicated on the map, it spread over lands immediately adjacent to the cabecera to the northeast. Adjoining both Mixquiahuala and the Hacienda de los Pozos was the Hacienda de Ulapa, which was subject to the more distant pueblo of Tetepango. In 1569, Ulapa or Uilotepeque was an estancia of Mixquiahuala; it is unknown when it moved to the jurisdiction of Tetepango.

*Bienes Nacionales 808, exp. 26: Chilcuautla, 1718*

This expediente was originally numbered 20. It comprises 12 leaves, beginning with a single page inventory of the ornaments of the church and convent of San Agustin in the pueblo of Nuestra Senora de la Asumpcion de Chilcuautla, signed by fray Manuel Calderón. The inventory is far shorter than that for Mixquiahuala, suggesting a poorer parish. The modern parish church of Chilcuautla was not dedicated until 1798, confirming this relative poverty (Kugel and Martínez 1998). The remainder of the document is a padrón of the parish, which I have transcribed. The first four pages list the occupants of the cabecera by household, with the ages of most individuals given. This is followed by a similar two page list of the inhabitants of the barrio Desaqualoya. The next page is headed *Muchachas de Doctrina de Chilcuautla*, while the one after that has two lists, of *Muchachos* and *Muchachas de Doctrina*. The second list of *muchachas* repeats the first portion of the first list. A comparison of the lists with the preceding household padrón suggests that the children may be listed both with their parents and en masse. The next two and a half pages list the casados, viudos, solteros, and muchachos of Tezcatepec in the same format as the Mixquiahuala padrón, followed on the same page by a similar listing for Tlacotlapilco (or Tlacuitlapilco). The Tlacotlapilco list ends after five solteros. The reverse of that leaf and the next two pages are in a completely different hand. Each is a list of *hijos de familia* from a specified barrio: Batad, Beati, and Llanos. Given the lack of children in the preceding Tlacotlapilco list, it is likely that these lists derive from that pueblo. Finally, the last three pages list the inhabitants of Tuni by category.
Table 2. Population of Chilcuautla and its sujetos, 1718

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Casados</th>
<th>Viudos</th>
<th>Viudas</th>
<th>Solteros</th>
<th>Solteras</th>
<th>Muchachos</th>
<th>Muchachas</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indios</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilcuautla</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descaqualoya</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muchachos de Doctrina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tezcatepec</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlacotlapilco</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrio de Batad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrio de Beati</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrio de Llano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunij</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total population of the doctrina, assuming that the separate muchachos de doctrina list does not repeat children listed elsewhere, is 1213. The separate listings of children make it difficult to be sure of relative population sizes, but the communities of Chilcuautla, Tezcatepec, Tlacotlapilco, and Tunij were all of the same order of magnitude. One important omission in these lists is race. It is likely that this is because the non-Indian inhabitants were not listed by Fray Calderón. The marriage records of Mixquiahuala make it clear that some individuals listed in Tezcatepec in particular were mestizos, but they may have culturally belonged to the indigenous community. This population is dramatically lower than that of 2800 for Chilcuautla and 1961 for Tlacuitlapilco reported in the Suma de Visitas from 1548 (Paso y Troncoso 1905:2:220). In 1571, there were 1218 tributaries (and thus more inhabitants) in Chilcuautla, 800 residents in Tlacuitlapilco, and 200 residents in Tezcatepec (ibid.:3:98-100).

The structure of this padrón can be compared with that of the modern municipio, as seen in Kugel and Martínez 1998, as well as what little is known of the communities' earlier history (Figure 1). The four pueblos retain their names and relative size, although all are much larger. Tunij or Tunij is now known as Tunititlan; apparently the change occurred when surveyors mapped the community and decided to Nahuatize the Otomi name (Milton Flores, personal communication March 2001). There is still a barrio named Zacualoya, just to the north of Chilcuautla. Tlacotlapilco has barrios named Santa Ana Batad and El Llano, and another named Bethí, which may be the same as Beati. According to a recent dictionary (Wallis 1956), "batha" actually means "llano," and the word is a common descriptive toponym throughout the Mezquital. While Tlacotlapilco now has seven outlying barrios, these three are roughly evenly spaced around it. Xochitlan is included as a sujeto on the map, because it appears to be such in other parish records, but it is not included in the padrón.
Most men in the list bear Spanish surnames. Some have two first names and at least one Otomi name (Siqui) appears in Tezcatepec. Far more women have two first names, and Denij ("flower") is a fairly common Otomi name. Muchachos as well as adults are listed with surnames, and when households are listed together, the children generally bear their father’s name. Eight men and five women in the cabecera bear the title don; none in any of the other communities do, although the lists of hijos de familia from Tlacotiapilco’s barrios name the alcalde of each barrio as dons.

*Bienes Nacionales 808, exp. 2: Chapantongo, 1718*

This expediente comprises eight leaves, bound with string and numbered 1 through 7 in the upper right corner. I have transcribed all of them. The last three sides are blank. The first five pages list the inhabitants of the cabecera, with the casados divided by barrio. The next two pages list the inhabitants of the pueblo of San Juan, followed by single page listings of the ranchería of Christobal Galban and the servants of the Hacienda de la Teneria. The next page is headed *Padrón de los Españoles, Mestisos y Mulatos*. In this listing, the population of the cabecera is followed by that of two ranchos. The population of Chapantongo enumerated here is dramatically lower than that recorded in 1570, when there were 1580 tributaries (Gerhard 1993:385). It is also more concentrated, with three barrios and one sujeto instead of the three estancias and fifteen barrios known from 1548, and the two sujetos of San Juan and San Pedro from 1571. The parish is much less indigenous, both biologically and culturally, than those of Mixquiahuala and Chilcuautla: Almost half the total population is non-Indian, both in the cabecera and the ranchos and rancherías that surround it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Population of Chapantongo and its sujetos, 1718</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapantongo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabecera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrio de los Remedios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrio de Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrio de San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería de Xristobal Galban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirvientes de la Hacienda de la Teneria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gente de razón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>castas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While adults all bear two names, the lists of muchachos include single baptismal names alone, making it impossible to connect them to their parents. Four men and one woman in the cabecera are titled don; three Spanish men also bear the title. No one in the other barrios or sujetos is titled. Most individuals bear two Spanish names, although a few women are named Deni.

*Bienes Nacionales 808, exp. 1: Huichapan, 1718 (Indians)*

This expediente comprises 24 numbered and tied together leaves, with the first and last blank. It is signed by fray Francisco Garcia de Avila, *cura ministro*. It follows a consistent format throughout. First are the casados of the cabecera, divided into barrios, and then hijos de familia, listed by barrio. Children are listed under baptismal names alone, but have their ages specified as well. Solteros are listed by barrio as well, with one page in the middle of the list of muchachos and the others afterwards. Finally come the lists of viudos, also by barrio. On f.12r a similar list of the population of the sujeto San Jose Atlan begins; it is also divided into two barrio lists. F.16v begins the list for San Sebastian Dacapâni, f.18v that for San Bartholome Tlaxcalilla. After the casados from San Bartholome follow those from San Miguelito Caltepantla, then the other categories from San Bartholome, and then those from San Miguelito. Finally, f.22r-23v contain lists for Santa Maria de Nopala and San Buenaventura de Juanacapa. The document ends with total population figures of 800 couples, or 1600 casados, 2052 muchachos, 244 solteros, and 224 viudos, for a total of 4120.

The total population of the parish is far larger than of the preceding ones, but it is spread across many more communities and a wider geographical area. Not only are there five sujetos, but Huichapan itself has fifteen barrios besides the cabecera: the Barrio de los Mexicanos, that de los Cantores, de Joseph Rojas, de Phelipe Luiz el Nandon, de Joan Luiz el Moso, del Peru, del Juan de Santiago, de Pedro Phelipe de la Encrusijada, de Joseph Phelipe Nidô, de la Sienguilla nombrado Bathâ, de Lazaro Martin, de la Comunidad de Mittêhé, de la Savinita, de Joan Martin el de la Otra Banda (presumably on the other side of the river), and de la Sienguilla nombrado Bathamanêy. San Jose Atlan has one additional barrio, de Miguel Garzia. Many, but not all, of the barrios are named after the first man listed in the padrón, indicating that the names are not permanent toponyms. Most men and many women bear Spanish surnames, the others two baptismal names. Surnames cluster within barrios: 12 out of 32 adult men in the Barrio de Juan de Santiago bear the eponymous surname, including Juan himself. Another clear difference is social: Out of the 4120 people in the parish, only three men and one woman bear the title don.
Although numbered separately, this padrón was prepared along with the preceding one, is in the same hand, and bears the same signature, dated June 2, 1718. It comprises twenty folios, the first one and last side blank. It is organized quite differently from that of the Indians. It begins with a list of 117 homes, each labeled with a sequential number and the owners’ names, followed by the names, ages, and relationships of the other members of the household. Some households were quite large, as seen in house 6, which had sixteen residents:

- Cassa de Diego Martín Baldes y Asuero, casado con doña María de Andrade y de Moctesuma, españoles, con los hijos siguientes
  - Angela Baldes y Moctesuma de 26 años
  - Josepha Baldes y Moctesuma de 25 años
  - Anttonia Baldes y Moctesuma de 21 años
  - Nicolas Baldes y Moctesuma de 20 años
  - Manuel Anttonio Baldes y Moctesuma de 17 años
  - María Anna Baldes y Moctesuma de 13 años
  - viuda de dicha cassa Francisca Baldes y Moctesuma con los hijos siguientes
  - Anttonio Joseph Redondo de 16 años
  - Christobal Redondo de 10 años
  - Marcos Redondo de 8 años
  - Maria Getrudis Redondo de 6 años
  - Francisco Redondo de 4 años
  - huerfanos de dicha cassa Anttonia Maria española de 7 años
  - y Efígenia yndia de 25 años

Each individual is racially labeled. Interestingly, the last two houses contain four *indias prinsipales*, or noblewomen, who are not called doña. Two of them are married to *coyotes*, a term which this document appears to apply to all Spanish-Indian mixes; the racial designation of the others’ spouses is unspecified.
This list is followed by one headed "Haziendas y ranchos de españoles, que tiene esta doctrina." Each hacienda listing follows the same format as the Spanish households, and most are about the same length, although some are much longer. Their names, in order, are the haciendas of Como Deje, Tepú, la Sieneguilla, Nasthá, Dândo, Tlaxcalilla, la Cruz, el Casadero, and el Astillero; the ranchos of el Sitio and de Joseph Trejo; the haciendas of Ðenguîz and Nimachû; the ranchos of Ðeccã and Mâxthõo; the haciendas of Mâxthõo, Ttzihâ, and San Francisco Buenavista; the rancho of la Batanza; the haciendas of Zindô, el Saucillo, Dâdo, San Ysidro Tocopán, Devegõ, Bathã, and Guadalupe; the rancho of las Casas Coloradas; the pueblo of San Joseph Atlan; the hacienda of Boyé; the rancho of Guxpi; the hacienda of Quatixithî; the ranchos of San Geronimo, Ttzeatthé, and Ttzothé; the hacienda of Naxcatzã; and the rancho of el Cangrejo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Population of Huichapan, 1718</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indios de pueblos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indios de haciendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Españoles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulatos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that categories are not subdivided by sex, that the viudo and soltero totals for españoles include coyotes, and that mulatos are not subdivided at all.

The overall population of the two padrones is presented in Table 4.

_Bienes Nacionales 808, exp. 5: Ixmiquilpan, 1718_

This is the longest of the padrones, bound together as a book. The first eight unnumbered leaves list the households of all non-Indians in Ixmiquilpan, Tlaxintla, the Hacienda de la Florida, and the Minas del Cardonal, signed by fray Luis Pantoja, ministro. Only a handful of children’s ages are given. Inserted into this are a pair of leaves in a different hand with a list of muchachos. The second portion is 58 numbered leaves in the same hand and with the same signature. These list the entire Indian population, with a running total in the upper right corner. The total population is 1225 non-Indians and 3667 Indians, slightly smaller than that of Huichapan and spread over approximately the same geographical area. Ixmiquilpan proper was predominantly a Spanish city, with the indigenous population distributed across the surrounding landscape in smaller communities.
### Table 5. Population of Ixmiquilpan, 1718

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ixmiquilpan de razón</td>
<td>1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardonal de razón</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacienda de la Florida de razón</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ixmiquilpan principales</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ixmiquilpan, Barrio de Don Ygnacio</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería de Mandô de la Otra Banda</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería de la Canoa</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrio de Bautista</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuestra Señora del Cardonal</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardonal principales</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo de Orisaua, Ranchería de Alvarado</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería de las Espinas</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería de los Zerritos</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería de la Savanilla, Barrio de Don Manuel de Vargas</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmagorda</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería del Decţe de Bs.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería de Capula</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería de Canjay</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería de Deuodeé</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlaisintía principales</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería de Dadô</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería de Tepé</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería del Portesuel</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería del Yé</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchería de Albertto</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel de la Nopalera, principales</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su ranchería</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bienes Nacionales 912, exp. 5: Tula, 1717*

The first seven pages of this expediente are a numbered list of 81 Spanish households like that found in the preceding document. The next seven numbered folios list the
Indian population of Tula, also by household, but without ages. After the cabecera follow the barrios of Tlacpa, Tepetlapam, Tlaguelilpa, Quetzalguapa, Panoaya, San Francisco, and San Pedro, and the gobierno of Tultengo. The next set of ten numbered folios contains the gobierno of Santa Maria Suxchitlan, the pueblo of Santa Ana, the barrio of Santa Maria Michimaloyaltongo, the pueblos of San Andres, San Francisco Tlaguelilpa, and Tezontepeque, and the barrio of Panuaia. Another set of twelve numbered folios contain the pueblos of San Marcos and San Lorenzo Xipacoaya, the barrios of Xalpa, Xilonenco, and Anthamahay, the pueblos of San Pedro Alpuyeca and San Miguel, the barrio of San Miguel, the pueblos of Santa Maria Ylucan, San Lucas, and San Juan Michimaloya, another barrio de San Miguel, the gobierno of Santa Maria Sacamulpa, San Pedro Tlaxcoapa, the barrios of Pepechoca, La Palma, San Bartholome, Tlaxcoapa, and El Serro.

The entire list is in one hand, and all communities are listed by household. Unlike that of Huichapan, this padrón includes many nobles of both sexes. There are very few Otomi names, either of people or places. Several Nahuatl names, as well as saint’s names, are repeated in different places, which could potentially confuse research into local records.

General Observations on the Padrones

As shown in Figure 1, these padrones provide an outline of the political geography and demography of the Mezquital in the early eighteenth century. They span a broad, contiguous area, with gaps for the parishes of Tepetitlan and Alfayucan. Although they all contain the same basic information, it is clear that the priests who compiled them had quite a lot of freedom in how they organized the lists. The parishes appear quite different from each other, ranging dramatically in size, nucleation, and social differentiation. Some have large non-Indian populations, others not. In the more southern parishes, the indigenous population lived in pueblos de indios which were occasionally subdivided into barrios, with a large native nobility spread across all communities. Both pueblos and barrios often bore Nahuatl names. Towards the north and west, Spanish haciendas and rancherías proliferated, and more Indians lived away from larger pueblos. At the same time, the pueblos were subdivided to a greater degree, particularly in Huichapan. Many of these smaller subdivisions bore Otomi names, and very few contained any one identified as an indio principal. In the Rio Tula valley, barrios are named as places. To the west, and to a lesser degree to the north in Ixmiquilpan, many barrios are named after individuals who may or may not be listed as residents. Paradoxically, this suggests that western settlements were still organized along older principles of community ownership by native nobles, despite the fact that almost no one was recognized as a noble. Early sixteenth century parish records from Mixquiahuala indicate that that community was then structured much as Huichapan was in 1718. Thus the records from 1597 describe different individuals as macehuales (commoners, subjects) of don Bartolome (Sanchez de Granada, although this is generally omitted), don Diego, Pablo Ximenez, don Felipe de Santiago, Pedro Lopez, don Luis del Aguila, Antonio de Mendoça, and don Felipe de Reynoso. Others belong to the estancia of Martin Ceron and the estancia de dueñas. It is unclear whether these labels mean that macehuales were personally subject to the named individuals, or
belonged to geographically defined communities. Some of these noblemen had many more macehuales than others, with don Bartolome in the lead. By the 1630s, the term "macehual de" is almost never seen. Instead, it appears that these subdivisions had metamorphosed into the barrios seen in 1718, with the term "barrio de don Bartolome" gradually replaced by "barrio de San Nicolas."

Mixquiahuala Parish Records

The parish registers from Mixquiahuala record vital events from all four communities of the 1718 padrón (see Appendix 2 for the detailed contents of the microfilm rolls; see Rabell 1990 for a general consideration of Mexican parish records). The series of events from the cabecera is obviously the most complete. That from Tepeitic appears to be least complete, because of its distance from Mixquiahuala and proximity to Tepetitlan and Chilcuautla. The Hacienda de los Pozos was immediately adjacent to the town, so it appears likely that its population was fairly well recorded. Tecpatepec is further than Tepeitic from the cabecera, but has a much larger population and maintained its own baptismal and burial registers at some periods.

Baptisms

The baptismal records from Mixquiahuala begin in 1577, among the earliest known from México. From that date until 1641 they are continuous, although there may have been brief periods when a priest was not present in the community. Although there is a book labeled 1646-1675, it contains only a handful of entries: single baptisms from 1648, 1671, and 1672, and 86 baptisms from 1674-1675. In 1670, a new book began to be kept in Tecpatepec. A separate book commenced in 1680 in Mixquiahuala. From that date, a continuous series of baptisms is available until the end of the Colonial period, although the Tecpatepec series of volumes has a gap between 1713 and 1727. It is unclear how comprehensive these records are. During the times that no records from Tecpatepec are available, some of the baptisms in Mixquiahuala are specified as being from the former town instead. In fact, even during the span of the Tecpatepec registers, some Tecpatepec baptisms were recorded in Mixquiahuala. All baptismal records include the names of the parents and one or two godparents; when a single godparent is listed, she is usually a woman. A fair number of babies are recorded as huerfanos, or de padres no conocidos. This phrase does not always mean that the parents were truly unknown. For instance, when doña Josepha de Tapia married Bernardo Dias in 1726, her parents were recorded as unknown. Yet according to a later legal proceeding (AGN Tierras 2580: exp.1), she was the illegitimate daughter of doña Maria de Tapia, who never married but had at least two children who were legal heirs to the de Tapia estates.

Children were generally baptized promptly after birth. In 1718, Br. Sebastian Rubio recorded the birth and baptismal dates of 38 children. The average delay between the events was 6.8 days; the minimum was one day and the maximum sixteen. On the other hand, Nicolasa, daughter of Nicolas de Charri and Juana Cantu, was baptized on
June 23, 1702. Her baptismal record specifies that her father was dead. In fact, he had been buried on July 15, 1700, almost two years before. If both records are correct, and there is no reason to suspect that they are not, then either the priest was cooperating with a fictive kinship designation, or Nicolas was at least fourteen months old at her baptism.

I am in the process of entering all of the records from before 1750 into a spreadsheet, which can then be connected with marriage and death records in a genealogical database. For statistical purposes, I have identified the sample from 1681-1730, which contains 4792 records from both Mixquiahuala and Tecpatepec, with few interruptions, as the most useful (Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. Baptisms in Mixquiahuala, 1681-1730</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691-1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711-1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721-1730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over this period, the average number of baptisms per year remained fairly steady, suggesting a more or less stable population size. The proportion of infants of unknown parentage also remained constant, between 16.4% and 18.9%. Over the same period in Tula, the illegitimacy rate was 17.5% (Malvido 1980a) The number of baptisms of castas, or gente de razón, increased steadily, from 1.7% to 11.3%, suggesting a growing non-Indian presence.

Marriages

The earliest marriage records date to 1574, and from then until 1644 there is a continuous series. This is followed by a 36-year gap, aside from a single información matrimonial from 1667. The next volume spans 1680-1693, followed by another gap until 1712. From that date until the end of the Colonial period, most marriages are recorded in multiple places. The volumes of informaciones matrimoniales contain the initial record of the couple’s coming to the priest for permission. If one spouse was from another community, the priest would send a letter to that parish asking if he or she was eligible for marriage. After the banns were read and the couple was married, another
entry would be made in the marriage book. Some marriages slipped through one or another crack, but the different sets of records can be combined and compared to produce a complete set of events. This larger set of marriages also includes those from Mixquiahuala who married elsewhere, because the cura kept a file of the letters sent to him from other priests. I am currently in the process of cross-checking the información matrimonial volumes against the standard marriage volumes.

Although it varied over time and according to the diligence of each cura, most marriage entries include the names, race, and birthplaces of the contractants; their parents’ names; and the names of up to four witnesses, often with their age and spouses. Few entries include the age of the contractants, contrary to the practice in many other parishes. However, the parents’ names allow many spouses to be matched to baptismal records. A sample of 144 females and 145 males provides mean ages at marriage of 19.7 and 22.6, with minimum ages of 13.7 and 13.8.

Because the birthplaces of the spouses are not always recorded, particularly when they were from within the parish, cross-referencing of records is necessary to fill out the picture of intercommunity migration. It appears that the majority of marriages were town-endogamous; although barrio identifications are rarely recorded in the later records, barrio endogamy also appears to be the norm. As might be expected, exogamous marriages tend to occur with neighbors: People from Mixquiahuala marry those from all three sujetos, as well as the Hacienda de Ulapa; those from Tecpatépec often marry those from the different sujetos of Actopan, or Tlacotlapilco; and those from Tepetitlán often marry people from Tez catepec and Tepetitlán. Most marriages also occur within racial categories. The nobility are more likely to contract geographically and racially exogamous marriages. This is most dramatically illustrated by the nobles of Tepetitlán, who married nobles from Mixquiahuala and Tecpatépec as well as mestizos from Tezcatepec and Tepetitlán rather than marrying commoners from Tepetitlán. When geographically exogamous marriages can be correlated with subsequent baptisms, they appear to have been preferentially uxorilocal until after the birth of the first child, perhaps so the new bride could learn basic parenting skills from her own mother. Subsequent children were generally born in the father’s home town, but in at least one case, after her husband’s death a widow returned to her birth place.

Deaths

The first records of deaths and burials date to 1645. From then to 1679, there is spotty coverage of the burials of adults. From 1685 through the end of the colonial period, one or more registers of burials survive for all years—after 1742, there were separate registers for Tecpatépec, and after 1769 for gente de razón. Very few entries record the date of death, but it seems unlikely that the delay was very long—at least in most cases. All specify whether or not last rites were performed; most, even of the nobility, state that the individuals were too poor to need a last will and testament. Until 1712, very few children’s burials were recorded; after that date, while there is almost certainly under-representation of children, there are also many recorded.
Entries usually include either the spouse or parentage of an individual, as well as his or her pueblo of residence. Older solteros and viudas are often described by civil status alone, with neither parents nor spouse listed. Later entries tend to be more complete, often listing the number of surviving children and occasionally their names.

Family Reconstruction

In a recent survey of Colonial Mexican population history, Robert McCaa has judged family reconstruction a hopeless endeavor among the indigenous population (2000:269-270). He points out the flaws in two earlier studies that attempted to use the methodology (Calvo 1984, Klein 1993), and concludes that no parishes have complete enough records of a stable enough population to make the endeavor worthwhile. One study that he omitted was Malvido's (1980b) proposal to use computer record-linking in her study of Tula's parish records. Her failure to publish anything else on that particular subject suggests that she did not meet with much success, either.

I was unaware of these previous studies when I began my attempt to link Mixquiahuala's records together into family histories, and while it is clear that Mexican records are in some ways more problematic than those of European populations to which this method has previously been applied, they also offer some advantages. Most importantly, marriage records generally include the names of both spouse's parents. Death records, although they do include only a fraction of the population, almost always include either the spouse or the parents of the deceased.

So far, my Mixquiahuala database does not include many complete families—that is, ones where the birth, marriage, and death dates are known of every member—but it includes several that are quite well documented. It may never be possible to judge how representative these families are of the general population, but we can observe some interesting patterns among them.

One example of a family shows the potential for family reconstruction. Maria Ysabel Ximenez, daughter of Gaspar Martin and Josepha Ximenez, was born July 06, 1675 in the Barrio de San Nicolas, Mixquiahuala, the first of nine known children. Six of her siblings predeceased their mother, who was buried September 23, 1700, leaving her husband and three children as heirs. Maria Ysabel married Francisco Martin April 02, 1692 at age sixteen in Mixquiahuala; he was almost eighteen, born April 19, 1674 to Diego Martin and Maria Salome. They had eight known children: Nicolasa (b. 7/7/1699), Bernarda (b. 6/15/1701), Manuela (b. 12/29/1703), Efigenia Maria (b. 12/19/1705), Teresa (b. 2/10/1708), Cayetano Martin (b. 8/18/1711), Agustina Francisca (b. 10/05/1713), and Manuela Maria (b. 1/06/1717). Maria Ysabel was buried October 13, 1722 in Mixquiahuala, at the age of 47. Three of her children, Efigenia Maria Ximenez, Cayetano Martin, and Manuela Maria Ximenez (also known as Manuela Martina) married in Mixquiahuala and had children of their own.
Although a single example like this one has no statistical value, it does highlight some patterns visible elsewhere in the data. These include early marriage, at least by early modern European standards, two to three year spacing between children, and high child mortality. It is also notable that when Maria Ysabel used a surname, it was her mother's, and when her daughters used a surname, they often used Ximenez as well.

Because of the gap in both birth and marriage records, it is difficult to trace any families before the 1670s. Hopefully, additional work on other archival materials, as well as records from adjoining parishes, will help to bridge this gap.

**Naming Practices**

Naming patterns in Mixquiahuala changed dramatically over the period sampled. In the earliest, Nahuatl records, almost all individuals have Nahuatl second names and Spanish baptismal names. A plurality of the men have animal names, particularly *Cuixtli*, or "hawk," a variant of the standard *cuixin*, while a plurality of the women have floral names. Once the records switch to Spanish, very few Nahuatl names appear, but many more Otomi ones do. By the late seventeenth century, few women and even fewer men have Otomi names, and by the early eighteenth century almost none do. The most common Otomi name is Deni, "flower," which is clearly tied to the profusion of floral names in the Nahuatl records. Otomi names, particularly Deni, do occur in some of the other 1718 padrones.

By the early eighteenth century almost all of the noblemen and many commoners are using inherited surnames. Some of these surnames occur as early as the late sixteenth century, although it is not yet clear whether any were passed through the same family over the intervening period. Many nobles have multiple surnames, and may appear in different records using different ones. Thus Manuel Joseph, son of don Agustin de la Cruz y Mendoza and doña Maria de los Reyes Sanchez y Granada, used the names de la Cruz y Mendoza, de Mendoza, and de los Reyes on different occasions. Females are less likely to use surnames at all times and even noblewomen who appear with surnames in some places may be referred to by two first names elsewhere. Women also used a smaller selection of names, with "Maria" in particular far more common than any one male name.

At the same time, women sometimes inherited and passed down names independently of their husbands, as in the example of Maria Ysabel Ximenez above. In some families, it appears that daughters used their mother's surname and sons their father's, for instance Manuel Joseph de Mendoza's sister Angela de los Reyes. In others, some or all sons may have used their mother's name. This suggests that indigenous inheritance patterns may have been more bilateral, although there may have been a patrilineal bias even before acculturation to Spanish norms.

There is one solid example of surname translation from Otomi to Spanish. Miguel Ntzehe, son of Juan Ntzehe and Ana Maria, married Chatarina de Aguilar in 1689. The
baptisms of seven of their children are recorded between 1691 and 1708. These entries are recognizable by the pairing of Miguel and Chatarina, both rare baptismal names, not by the last names. Miguel uses orthographic variants of Ntzehe four times, Martin once, de la Cruz once, and Benido once. Chatarina, or Catherina, uses de Aguilar three times, Maria three times, and Angela once. The reason for Martin and de la Cruz remains unclear, but Benido, or Venido, is a direct translation of Tzehe, which appears to be derived from the Otomi root for "to arrive." The N- or En- before Tzehe and many other Otomi names is a common prefix in personal names. Another Tecpatepec couple, Joseph Venido and Monica Juana, were listed in the padrón of 1718. They used a similar array of names over the course of twelve baptisms between 1674 and 1700: both Joseph Tzehe or Ntzehe, Monica Maria or Deni.

Another possible case of translation is provided by Nicolas de Aguilar, son of Diego Ntzni and Juana Maria, who married Magdalena de Torres in 1690. At his marriage, he used the name Ntzni; in all subsequent records until his burial in 1708, he used de Aguilar. While de Aguilar is not an unusual Spanish name, it is tantalizing to consider its root, aguila, which is nxöni (Urbano 1990, Wallis 1956—note that both my transcriptions and the variable priestly orthography make Otomi vowels even more difficult to interpret than usual!). Xini and Enxini appear to be other orthographic variants of the same name. Antonio de Aguilar and Melchora Maria baptized three children between 1682 and 1688; in two of the entries he is named Nxöni (the vowel is actually written with a character that is irreproducible on this keyboard but is known to be equivalent to that modern spelling).

Continuity among the Nobility

Because of the gap in the parish records, it is difficult to assess the precise level of continuity between the late sixteenth and early eighteenth century nobility of the three towns. However, there are numerous indications of a high degree of genealogical continuity, more similar to the situations documented at Teotihuacan (Münch 1976) and Atlacomulco (Bos 1998), and less similar to those recounted by Lockhart (1992). I will explore two cases of probable continuity between the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and the state of affairs recorded in the 1718 padrón: The Xuarez Sanchez de Granada family of Mixquiahuala, and the Ximenez family of Tepeitic.

Xuarez Sanchez de Granada

One of the preeminent families in the barrio of San Nicolas Mixquiahuala in 1718 were the Xuarez. The first listed, and oldest, was don Andres Xuarez Sanchez de Granada. He died in 1729 at age 80. Don Andres’ son don Antonio Ygnasio Xuares Granada (1688-1729) is described in parish records as an indio cacique. Don Antonio does not appear to have left any heirs to local authority, given that he was buried three weeks before his father and when his wife doña Maria de los Reyes died in July, 1767 it was recorded that she left behind "1 hijo y 1 hija de mayor edad, el hombre anda fuera del lugar no se sabe del."
Don Antonio’s younger and slightly longer-lived brother Andres Xuarez Sanchez de Granada (1693-1735) was never titled don and is not recorded as a holder of any cabildo office. Although he married in January 1718, and had his first child in March, he had moved from Mixquiahuala before the padrón was compiled that July—perhaps to his wife’s home town, although that is uncertain. By 1724 he had moved back. Their younger sister was doña Theresa Xuarez (b.1684), also called de los Reyes after her mother, married to don Joseph Guerrero and resident in his home of Tepeitic in 1718.

Don Pablo Xuarez lived in San Nicolas in 1718 with his wife, Maria Felisiana, both of unknown parentage and age. Five of their children were baptized between 1696 and 1711, and four of those lived to be married themselves. Only one, don Pedro Xuarez (b.7/9/1696), was called don. He married Juana Nicolasa Contreras, an orphan from Chilcuautla. His three sisters married into two prominent families. Juana Xuarez (1705-1737) married the widower Matheo Godines, who is described as both a mestizo and castizo and once given the don. Her younger sister Maria (1711-1737) married Matheo’s son Manuel Godines. They may have lived in the same household after their marriages, as their burials, along with those of Juana’s seven year old son Antonio and Maria’s 15 day old Nicolas, were recorded sequentially over a four day span in the 1737 matlazahuatl epidemic (on which see below). The middle sister, Ana, married Luis Belasques, who despite his lack of a don was described as a cacique of Atitalaquia.

Don Hergnogenis or Geronimo Xuarez also lived in San Nicolas in 1718 with his wife, Pascuala Maria, a migrant from Tlacotlapilco, Chilcuautla, whom he married in 1693. In their marriage record, he is described as a huerfano. His name and title may indicate that he was raised in the house of one of the previous generation of noble Xuarez, or it may mean that he was actually a known illegitimate child.

Because of the gaps in baptismal records, it is difficult to connect these individuals from 1718 to earlier generations, but several nobles named Xuarez appear over the decades. Don Miguel Xuarez served as fiscal in 1634-35 and gobernador in 1636-37. Don Marcos Xuarez was gobernador in 1640. Don Nicolas Xuarez, the son of don Miguel, married Catalina Xuarez on September 1, 1642, and served as alcalde in 1648. He may be the same don Nicolas Xuarez Sanchez de Granada who served as alcalde in 1666 and was recorded as gobernador pasado in 1693. In 1691, don Nicolas served as a marriage witness and his age was recorded as 70, more or less—two years after the same priest described him as age 60. In the former case, he would have been old enough to marry in 1642. Although the latter don Nicolas was married to doña Juana Baptista, she is not referred to prior to 1675, while Catalina Xuarez was buried in 1657. Maria, the daughter of don Diego Xuarez and his wife Justina Xuarez, was baptized on July 13, 1636, but it is unclear how her parents were related to earlier or later members of the family.

Don Nicolas appears to be the first individual to combine the name Xuarez with Sanchez de Granada. As far as extant records indicate, he was also the last individual of that name to serve on Mixquiahuala’s cabildo. Don Juan de Granada was alcalde in 1712, but he is elsewhere named don Juan de los Reyes, not Xuarez. He was either of a different family or the son of don Andres Xuarez and doña Cecilia de los Reyes. In
Tecpatepec, there was a separate de la Cruz y Granada family, which may or may not be connected.

While the Xuarez name first rises to prominence in the 1630s, Sanchez de Granada appears fifty years earlier. The most prominent native in the sixteenth century records of Mixquiahuala is don Bartholome Sanchez de Granada, who appears in both the parish registers and outside sources as cacique, gobernador, and principal. Prior to 1617 he is the only man referred to as gobernador, with specific references in 1580, 1591, and 1603. It is likely that he served in that office for the entire period in question. The last specific reference to don Bartholome occurs in 1603; after that date and in to the 1620s, some individuals in the baptismal records are still referred to as "macehuales de don Bartholome," but it is possible that this either referred to a traditional geographical unit (the barrio of San Nicolas?) or another individual.

As of 1581, don Bartholome was married to doña Ynes de Santa Catharina. The baptisms of three daughters are recorded: Beatris (7/16/1581), Beatris (9/18/1582), and doña Paula (3/25/1585). The use of the title in doña Paula’s baptismal entry is exceptional. Two additional daughters, doña Maria Sanchez de Granada and Monica Sanchez, are known from later sources. They may have been born before the start of the baptismal series. Doña Ynes last appears as a godmother in 1600 and probably died within the next year. On August 18, 1603, don Bartholome remarried doña Christina de Santa Lucia. Although born in Mixquiahuala, she had previously been married to the late Pedro Sanchez, who although he was not given the don is described as an indio principal of Atitalaquia. She may have been beyond child-bearing years, as no children of theirs are recorded.

Don Bartholome’s daughter Monica Sanchez married Luis Tochi in 1613. In 1624, doña Maria Sanchez de Granada’s illegitimate, mestizo son Diego Sanchez married Pascuala del Espiritu Santo, daughter of Pedro Hernandez and Ysabel Hernandez. These known lines of descent do not appear to have maintained don Bartholome’s nobility. If the later Xuarez lines were descended from him, it is not yet clear how, but their use of the name Sanchez de Granada on numerous occasions, even if they normally went by Xuarez, indicates that they did claim descent from his family.

Ximenez

Given Tepeitic’s remoteness from the cabecera, it is not surprising that the baptismal and marital entries from the community appear incomplete. Nevertheless, there are enough entries to indicate noble continuity there, as well. In the 1718 census, ten out of the fifteen males, and twelve out of eighteen females, in the Barrio de los Reyes are titled don and doña. Five men and four women bear the name Ximenez. The first Ximenez recorded from Tepeitic are don Francisco Ximenez and doña Ana Maria, whose son don Joseph Ximenez married doña Juana de la Cruz in 1641. She was the daughter of don Pablo Ximenez and doña Maria Magdalena of Mixquiahuala. There are few if any other references to don Francisco; macehuales of a don Francisco Ximenez had a child baptized in Mixquiahuala in 1596, and there is no reason they could not have been from Tepeitic, but there is also no evidence that they were. In the same year,
other parents are called macehuales of Pablo Ximenez. While don Francisco does not appear again in the baptismal records, quite a few parents are described as Pablo Ximenez' through 1604, after which his name likewise disappears. Note that this Pablo is never referred to as don. A generation later, don Pablo Ximenez occupied a series of Mixquiahuala cabildo offices: gobernador (1635, 1641), regidor (1643), fiscal (1633, 1636-1638), while another Pablo Ximenez was sacristan (1638, 1640, 1642). The Mixquiahuala Ximenez family appears to be distinct from that of Tepeitic, despite this early marriage between them.

Another don Joseph Ximenez was father of two of the later Tepeitic Ximenez, but is unlikely to be the same man who married doña Juana, both because his wife was named doña Maria Magdalena and because his last child, Manuel, was not born until 1680 (Figure 2). His earlier children, don Juan Ximenez and don Manuel Ximenez, were both living in the Barrio de los Reyes in 1718. Like the first don Joseph, they both married women from outside Tepeitic: Maria Magdalena of Tezontepec and doña Bernarda de los Reyes of Tecpatepec. Such marriages went in both directions: doña Rosa Ximenez, who lived with her husband Joseph de Aguilar in the barrio of Nestlalpa, Tecpatepec, in 1718, was probably from the Tepeitic family. Her first daughter, Manuela de Aguilar, was born in Tepeitic and baptized January 13, 1706. By the time her son Miguel de Aguilar was baptized on May 1, 1707, his parents lived in Tecpatepec. Her daughter went on to marry don Bernabe Falcon of Tezcatepec, while her son remained in Tecpatepec to marry Chatarina Godines. When Miguel and Chatarina’s daughter was born in 1741, he was referred to as a cacique, although he still lacked the don.

Don Antonio Joseph Ximenez lived in Tepeitic in 1718 with his wife, doña Thereza de la Corona, who was born in Tecpatepec. She was probably the daughter of don Miguel de la Corona and doña Juana Garcia; her older sister, doña Maria de la Corona, married a nobleman from Actopan and settled in Tecpatepec. Among Antonio and Thereza’s children was don Francisco Ximenez, who married Nicolasa de Charri of Mixquiahuala in 1725. She was recorded in the 1718 padrón as a soltera de razón, and her parents, Nicolas de Charri and Juana Cantu Enríquez, bore the same surnames as two of Mixquiahuala’s parish priests, Diego de Charri and Martin Enríquez Cantu. They probably belonged to the regional Spanish/mestizo aristocracy. Nicolasa de Charri died five years after her marriage, and don Francisco remarried Maria Getrudis de los Reyes, an orphan from Chilcuautla.
Figure 2. Descendants of Don Joseph Ximenez of Tepetitc.
Language Use

Nineteenth and twentieth century ethnographic sources agree that the only indigenous language spoken throughout most of the Mezquital was Otomi (Grimes and Grimes 2001). The SIL divides "Otomi" into nine different languages (which others would call dialects), with a total of 223,000 speakers according to the 1990 Census. Mezquital Otomi is the largest of these, with 100,000 speakers.

Sixteenth-century sources present a slightly more complex picture. Fray Bartolomé de Ledesma’s 1571 Descripción del Arzobispado de México provides information on what languages the parishioners as well as their priests spoke. In each case from the Mezquital, every Indian spoke Otomi, but in many towns some also spoke Nahuatl. Thus in Mixquiahuala, "hablan todos la lengua otomi y algunos la mexicana [Nahuatl], en las quales les confieso y administro los sacramentos" (Paso y Troncoso 1905:63-6). In other parishes, the exact number of Nahuatl speakers is specified. In Acayuca, "no son hasta treinta que hablan la lengua mexicana," and in Tilquauhtla, "como hasta diez yndios que hablan la lengua mexicana" (ibid.:79-81). While many of the priests did speak Otomi, or were trilingual, a fair number only spoke Nahuatl and Spanish, and must have had great difficulty communicating with most of their parishioners.

In the Toluca valley, many towns that were primarily Matlatzinca-speaking had single Nahuatl-speaking barrios, which were the result of politically motivated colonization by Tenochtitlan (García Castro 1999). There is no evidence for such barrios in most of the Mezquital. One exception is provided by Huichapan, with its Barrio de los Mexicanos. Elsewhere, the early sixteenth-century parish records of Mixquiahuala occasionally describe an individual as an "indio mexicano," and a handful of men bear the surname Mexicano. But the scarcity of such references makes it clear that Mexicano identity was a rare thing which deserved to be explicitly marked.

Some marriage records from Mixquiahuala specify the language in which the couple and their witnesses spoke, and it is clear that the majority of the population, including the nobility, were speaking Otomi to their priests as late as the 1720s, even as Otomi names were disappearing (on which see below). The nobility were the first to abandon Otomi names, with some Spanish surnames appearing in the 1570s, yet even they were not comfortable speaking Spanish to the priest.

The Mezquital is not nearly as well represented by indigenous-language documents as some other regions of México are. This may be partly explained by lack of research: Far more historians have dug through archives in México and Spain looking for documents from the Yucatán, Oaxaca, Basin of México, and Puebla-Tlaxcala. But it also probably reflects cultural and administrative differences between different regions of New Spain. Within the Mezquital, there are clear regional differences in both the quantity of texts and the languages used.
The earliest studies of indigenous language sources focused on prose and pictorial histories. Only a handful of such texts survive from the Mezquital, most notably the Codex of Huichapan (Ecker 2001), which is an illustrated Otomi prose account of the history of Huichapan and the administration of the monastery there. More recent studies have explored the wealth of indigenous-language notarial documents, produced by members of indigenous communities both for internal use and submission in Spanish courts. Such documents as well are quite rare in the Mezquital. A search of the published literature as well as the indices of the Archivo General de la Nación revealed very few indigenous language documents from the region, especially compared to the Basin of México or Puebla-Tlaxcala. Despite the fact that Otomi was spoken throughout the Mezquital, the only Otomi-language documents that survive come from the western region (Wright 2001). To the east and south, Nahuatl was the preferred language. Thus while don Felipe Calisto de Santiago and his wife wrote their wills in Huichapan in Otomi in the 1690s (AGN Tierras 2118, exp.7), in 1696, don Antonio Cornejo de la Cruz of Tezontepec had the "testamentos de sus padres abuelos y antepasados, de sus tierras," translated from Nahuatl by don Nicolas de Abila, a mestizo who was not only cacique of Tepetitlan but also schoolmaster (AGN Tierras 1427, exp.6). Don Antonio’s documents survive only in translation; I have found very few extant examples in Nahuatl. Don Diego Daniel de Contreras of Tlahuelilpan left a will in Nahuatl in 1635. The municipal archives of Ixmiquilpan, as microfilmed in the BNA, contain a single Nahuatl document catalogued as "Súplico de condanación de tribute y servicio personal de un natural de Itzmiquilpan, 1667." The best known Nahuatl text from Tula is the book kept by the Cofradía del Santissimo Sacramento from 1570-1730 (Schwaller 1989).

| Table 7. Language use in pre-1650 Mezquital parish registers |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|                 | Nahuatl First | Nahuatl Last  | Otomi First   |
| Tepeji del Río  | 1561          | 1643          | 1571          |
| Chapantongo     | 1616          | 1623          | 1614          |
| Ixmiquilpan     | 1568          | 1587          | 1614          |
| Hueypoxtla      | 1569          | 1611          | 1590          |
| Mixquiahuala    | 1574          | 1590          | 1590          |
| Tula            | 1586          | 1648          | 1597          |
| Actopan         | 1604          | 1604          | 1546          |
| Zempoala        | 1605          | 1644          | 1627          |
| Alfaxayuca      | 1605          | 1647          | 1620          |
| Tepetitlan      | 1605          | 1647          | 1605          |
In the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, many parish registers were written in indigenous languages. By 1650, all known Mezquital parish registers are in Spanish. Tabulation of the pre-1650 records reveals a pattern strikingly similar to that of the other documents (Figure 3). Note that while Xilotepec’s parish registers are all in Spanish, they do not start until after 1650; the parish is indicated on the map for geopolitical context.

This distribution correlates with Precolumbian political geography (Figure 3). The entire area of the Mezquital was subject to Tlacopan, the junior member of the Triple Alliance, before the Spanish Conquest. The eastern portion belonged to the tributary province of Axocopan. The western portion all belonged to one of the largest tributary provinces, Xilotepec, which was a conquest state of its own prior to its subjugation by the Tepanecs in the early fifteenth century (Berdan et al. 1996:266). In between these two was a string of towns along the Tula River which did not belong to either province but had their own relationships with the Tepanec polity. Berdan and colleagues (1996) group these towns, from Chilcuautla south to Tula, with Chiapan (modern Chapa de Mota) into a "strategic province." Tula was the most important town in the entire region, politically and culturally, because of its prominence several centuries earlier as the capital of the Toltec Empire, which the Colhua Mexica saw themselves as the heirs to. Those parishes with records in Otomi all fall within Xilotepec; those with records in Nahuatl are within Axocopan or Chiapan. The two exceptions, Chapantongo and Tepeji del Rio, have some records in each language. Both are near the border between tributary provinces, and presumably were affected by their neighbors’ practices.

While Precolumbian Central Mexican writing was not phonetically tied to any specific language, it would generally have been read aloud within an oral performance tradition. The correlation between Prehispanic politics and Colonial literacy suggests that this oral tradition differed between polities. In Xilotepec, the nobility spoke Otomi and it was the
high status language as well as the majority one. In Axocopan and Chiapan, the nobility spoke Nahuatl, and it was the high status language despite being spoken by a minority. When a noble from Mixquiahuala or Tula read a pictographic manuscript, he probably did so in Nahuatl; one from Huichapan or Tepetitlan did so in Otomi. Even though alphabetic writing was introduced a full century after Xilotepec was conquered by the Nahuatl-speaking Mexica empire, the elites there still considered Otomi the proper language to write in.
Epidemic Disease

There has been a long-running debate among historians and anthropologists about the size of the Precolumbian population of Mesoamerica. Various sixteenth century demographic data have been used as a baseline to reconstruct how many natives there were prior to 1519, but this reconstruction depends upon estimates of the mortality inflicted by the series of epidemics that followed the Spanish Conquest. Some have estimated a mortality of up to 90% between 1519 and 1600, while others have argued for closer to 25% (McCaa 2000 considers both arguments and rejects the latter). Because detailed mortality reports do not exist for any of the sixteenth-century epidemics, scholars rely upon more general descriptions of the extent of each epidemic, as well as modern epidemiological accounts of the diseases that they think were responsible.

Eighteenth-century epidemics can be studied in greater detail. One of the most destructive was the matlazahuatl epidemic which raged across México between 1736 and 1738, otherwise known as the huey cocoliztli (Cuena 1999). Contemporary accounts report 40,000 deaths in México City alone. The name matlazahuatl was also used to describe an earlier pandemic in 1576-1580. What pathogen was responsible? Typhus, plague, smallpox, and most recently an arenaviral hemorrhagic fever have been proposed (see Marr and Kiracofe 2000 for a recent perspective).

While transcribing the Mixquiahuala death records, I discovered that they included detailed burial records from this 1737 epidemic. Over a fifteen-month span, starting at the end of February, 1737, 218 people were buried in Mixquiahuala and 380 in Tecpatépec. If we assume no change in population size between 1718 and 1737, this indicates a mortality of 53% and 57%. Not all of these deaths were necessarily due to disease, although the burial of Rita, daughter of Joseph Hernandez and Agustina Feliciana, on June 6, 1738 is followed by the statement "asta esta partida se murieron de la epidemia general que bulgarmente llamaron matlasahual." At the same time, in any epidemic situation, it is likely that under-registration of deaths was even greater than usual.

The deceased can be sorted into the two broad categories of unmarried (children and solteros) and married (including widows and widowers). In Mixquiahuala, 95 unmarried and 123 married died, equivalent to 52% and 54% of the 1718 population in each category, and in Tecpatépec 194 and 186 died, or 54% and 61%. Even if we assume that under-registration in the 1718 padrón, and population increase over the following 19 years, dramatically outweigh under-representation in the burial record, it is hard to argue for a mortality rate of under 40%, if not 50%. If a single epidemic could cause this high mortality in a single year two centuries after the Conquest, high estimates of sixteenth-century epidemic mortality seem eminently reasonable. By 1737, indigenous populations were no longer "virgin soil" for European pathogens to exploit. Also, the warfare and social disruption that made sixteenth-century populations more vulnerable to disease were no longer a factor.
The diversity of diagnoses indicates how difficult it can be to map historically described symptoms onto a modern disease definition. As Scott and Duncan (2001) have demonstrated, an examination of parish-level data can illuminate historical epidemiology. My analysis remains incomplete, but I can draw some preliminary conclusions about the spread and etiology of the disease.

An examination of the distribution of burials over time is complicated by the fact that two separate burial registers exist for Mixquiahuala. The first eleven epidemic deaths from 1737—marked by "que por ella comenzó la epidemia general" on February 28, 1737—are at the end of the 1712-1737 volume. The next volume, 1737-1748, picks up one day later. After the epidemic ends, burials continue in sequence through 1748. They are followed by a parallel register of Tecpatepec burials, beginning on March 2, 1737, after a five-page gap in the numeration of folios, and continuing through 1748. The second Mixquiahuala list consists of 22 unnumbered leaves inserted in the beginning of the 1712-1737 volume. The names and information recorded are almost identical—three individuals are listed in the unpaginated list and not the regular volume—and they occur in exactly the same sequence. But the dates of interment (and both lists specify "buried," not "died") differ dramatically, starting at the same point but extending over very different periods.

Fortunately, an outside control of chronology exists. Polonio Hernandez, husband of Magdalena Maria, was buried on either July 1, 1737, or February 14, 1738. On October 14, 1737, his son Nicasio was baptized, and that entry specifies that the child’s father was already dead. This means that the February date, if it is meaningful at all, refers to some late reburial or memorial, not the original interment of the corpse. I hope that a more thorough analysis of all local records from this period will reveal why two burial registers were kept.

Throughout the epidemic burial records, there are numerous cases of immediate family members (spouses and children) buried shortly after one another. As I reconstruct families, I can group some more distant relations. Table 8 lists fifteen burials of related individuals from Mixquiahuala and Tecpatepec. The six deaths in Mixquiahuala break into two mother-child sets, in each of which the two children follow their mother within two days. The twelve days that separate the two sisters suggest that Magdalena may have gotten it from Agustina.

<p>| Table 8. Matlazahuatl Deaths in Two Interrelated Families of Mixquiahuala and Tecpatepec |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Date of Burial | Age | Relationship |
| Mixquiahuala |
| Agustina Maria | May 12, 1737 | 44 | |
| Efígenia | May 14, 1737 | 12 | daughter |
| Manuela | May 14, 1737 | 6 | daughter |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Death</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena de Mendoza</td>
<td>May 24, 1737</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>sister of AM, sister-in-law of BB, daughter-in-law of YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>May 25, 1737</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilio</td>
<td>May 25, 1737</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doña Juana de la Cruz y Granada</td>
<td>June 11, 1737</td>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balthasar Briseño</td>
<td>June 18, 1737</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilio</td>
<td>July 20, 1737</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>grandson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ynes Maria</td>
<td>July 31, 1737</td>
<td>Over 68</td>
<td>mother of BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>August 2, 1737</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>grandson of BB; mother from MIX, born in MIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>August 14, 1737</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>daughter of Bentura Briseño, otherwise unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan de Aguilar</td>
<td>August 16, 1737</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>son-in-law of BB, father of Basilio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Briseño</td>
<td>November 29, 1737</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Briseño</td>
<td>March 26, 1738</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>son of BB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nine deaths in Tecpatepec follow a more complex pattern. Doña Juana de la Cruz y Granada and her husband Balthasar Briseño were buried a week apart. A month later their grandson Basilio was buried, and eleven days later Balthasar Briseño’s mother. She was followed by another of her great-grandsons, and then after two weeks by another Briseño child of unknown connection to the family and by Juan de Aguilar, Basilio’s father. Another Briseño of unknown connection was buried at the end of November, and one of Balthasar’s remaining sons in March.

It appears that the causative agent was regularly spread between immediate family members. Infection, or at least death, was not a given, since numerous spouses survived—some to remarry other widows before the epidemic had run its course. The fact that some individuals died six months or more after their spouses or children indicates that they either had not been infected by the earlier intimate contact, or that that infection did not render them fully immune.

**Dissemination**

Until this point, my focus has been on data collection and analysis, not writing. I have now submitted an abstract for a presentation at the 2003 annual meeting of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists on the 1737-1738 matlazahuatl epidemic. I am in the process of writing papers on language distribution in the Mezquital and birth seasonality. I am also collaborating with Dr. Barry Sell on the transcription,
translation, and study of the 1635 Nahuatl will of Don Diego Daniel de Contreras of Tlahuelilpan.

Conclusions

At this point it is hard to draw any conclusions from this project, as my collection of data is still ongoing and my analysis has only begun to scratch the surface. But it is clear that these data will allow me to analyze the population of Mixquiahuala and the surrounding region on many different levels, from the annual biological rhythms of birth and death, to the individual choices seen in marriages and migration events, and the social and linguistic structures visible in naming patterns and the inheritance of titles. For instance, on what occasions do specific individuals choose to use their mother’s surname, their father’s surname, or no surname at all? As I enlarge the genealogical database of the community, I can begin to ask more detailed questions, such as the relative reproductive success of nobles and commoners. At this point, I have collected enough data to begin this analysis, and I look forward to many fruitful results.
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Appendix 1. Bienes Nacionales 808:16

This expediente includes lists of the inhabitants of four communities within the doctrina of Mixquiahuala. In this transcription, all abbreviations are expanded and capitalization has been regularized according to modern norms. The orthography of the names has been left as in the original.

Part 1: A pair of leaves, written on all four sides, inserted into a pair of leaves with a church inventory, which was not transcribed.

Padron de la gente deste pueblo de San Antonio Mixquiahuala, hecho este año de 1718

Comienza el barrio de San Nicolas
[first column]
Don Nicolas de la Cruz casado con Joana Maria
Don Pedro Morales con Doña Antonia Ernandes
Don Pedro Joan con Thomasa Maria
Don Diego Joan con Augustina Gimenes
Don Andres Xuares con Doña Sesilia de los Reyes
Don Diego Morales con Joana Maria
Don Joan de Tapia con Doña Josepha de la Mota
Don Gaspar de Guerra con Maria de la Concepcion
Don Pablo de la Corona con Doña Petrona Morales
Don Antonio Ygnasio Xuares con Doña Maria de los Reyes
Don Ildefonso de los Reyes con Anna Briseño
Don Augustin de Mendoza con Doña Maria de los Reyes
Don Joan de los Reyes con Pasquala Maria
Don Pablo Xuares con Maria Felisiana
Don Hergnogenis Xuares con Pasquala Maria
Don Nicolas Morales con Bartola Maria
Nicolas de San Antonio con Thomasa Maria
Antonio de los Reyes con Pasquala Maria
Joseph Galbes con Ynes Maria
Antonio de la Cruz con Melchora de los Reyes
Miguel de la Cruz con Maria Michaela
Joseph de la Cruz con Nicolasa Maria
Joan Miguel con Magdalena Maria
Diego de la Cruz con Maria de Guebara
Mateo Cantú con Magdalena Morales
Joan Peres con Magdalena Maria
Pasqual Peres con Petrona Maria
Joan Redondo con Joana Maria
Miguel de la Cruz con Ynes Maria
Pasqual de la Cruz con Anna Maria
Gaspar Martin con Beatris Joana
Joan Martin con Chatarina Maria
Francisco Martin con Maria Ysabel
Joan Joseph con Maria Anna Flores
Filipo Martin con Francisca Maria
Pedro Ramon con Nicolasa Lopez
Antonio de Mendoza con Monica Maria
Diego de Mendoza con Andrea Maria
Antonio de Mendoza con Getrudis Joana
Augustin Gimenes con Antonia Maria
Joan Gimenes con Anna Maria
Pasqual Joan con Ynes Maria

Lorenso Cantú con Maria Gimenes
Miguel de la Cruz con Maria Magdalena
Joan de la Cruz con Joana Corteza
Manuel de la Cruz con Andrea Maria
Martin Nicolas con Getrudis de la Concepcion
Bernabe Martin con Bernabela Maria
Pablo Garsia con Anna Maria
Joan Garsia con Thereza Maria
Diego Garsia con Nicolasa Maria
Diego Ernandes con Anna Maria
Pablo Ernandes con Augustina Maria
Joseph de la Cruz con Getrudis Maria
Sebastian de la Cruz con Magdalena Cortesa
Diego de la Cruz con Josepha Maria
Pedro Nicolas con Magdalena Felisiana
Francisco Diego con Ynes Maria
Joan Nicolas con Maria Rosa
Miguel Nicolas con Joana Maria
Sebastian de la Cruz con Joana Ernandes
Ylldefonso Joseph con Anna Maria
Antonio Joseph con Angela Maria
Lorenso de Mendoza con Petrona Maria
Filipo Dias con Joana Ynes
Diego de Mendoza con Andrea Maria
Miguel de Mendoza con Sebastiana Mendoza
Martin de Mendoza con Nicolasa Maria
Bartolome Cortes con Luisa Maria
Joan Baptista con Maria Felisiana
Joan Antonio con Antonia Ernandes
Antonio Geronimo con Michaela Gimenes
Barrio de San Pedro
Joseph Gaspar casado con Maria Salomé
Filipo de Santiago con Joana Maria
Pasqual Nicolas con Maria Salomé
Diego Ernandes con Sesilia Maria
Lucas Nicolas con Getrudís Maria
Francisco de la Cruz con Thomasa Maria

Barrio de San Antonio
Don Nicolas Baptista con Joana Maria
Don Joseph Baptista con Maria Gimenes

[next side, first column]
Don Augustin de Aguilar con Doña Petrona Baptista
Don Joan de los Reyes con Angela Francisca
Antonio de los Reyes con Magdalena Maria
Nicolas Ernandes con Andrea Maria
Joseph Ernandes con Manuela Maria
Joseph Nicolas con Maria Salomé
Diego Damian con Magdalena Maria
Geronimo Damian con Bartolomea Maria
Diego Martin con Maria Rosa
Pablo Martin con Petrona Maria
Manuel Martin con Antonia Maria
Francisco Martin con Antonia de Mendoza
Gaspar de Mendoza con Thereza Gimenes
Joan de Mendoza con Angela Baptista
Martin de Aguilar con Pasquala Maria
Nicolas de Mendoza con Ynes Ernandes
Antonio de Mendoza con Pasquala Maria
97

Viudos deste pueblo de Mixquiahuala
[split columns]
Don Joan Granada
Antonio de San Joan
Pedro Gaspar
Pablo de la Cruz
5
Viudas
Michaela Gimenes
Nicolasa Briseño
Ynes Maria
Nicolasa de los Reyes
Nicolasa Baptista
Joana de Mendoza
Anna Maria
Nicolasa de los Reyes
Anna de los Reyes
Angela de los Reyes
Joana Maria
Magdalena Maria
Magdalena Felisiana
Maria Garsia
Angela Jasinta
Francisca Maria
Anna Maria
Anna Maria
Angela Maria
Magdalena Maria
Petrona Maria
[next split column]
Maria Gimenes
Magdalena de Torres
Maria Nicolasa
Luisa Lorensa
Antonia Lorensa
Nicolasa Lorensa
Augustina de la Cruz
Joana Maria
Maria Salome
30

Solteros de dies años para adelante deste pueblo de Mixquiagualala
Antonio de los Reyes
Joan de Dios
Buenabentura Felisiano
Pedro Juares
Nicolas Briseño
Bisente Pasqual
Hilario Pasqual
Gregorio Pasqual
Manuel Garsia
Solteras de diez años para adelante deste pueblo de Mixquiahuala
Doña Manuela de los Reyes
Doña Angela de los Reyes
Augustina Felisiana
Bartolomea María
Nicolasa de Mendoza
Lorensa de los Reyes
Maria Magdalena
Antonia María
Manuela Ynes
Paula Felisiana
Chatarina Felisiana
Andrea María
Maria Garsia
Maria Garsia
Bernarda Ysabel
Andrea María
Antonia de Guebara
Michaela Maria
Maria Josepha
Paula Lorensa
Antonia Lorensa
Maria Ernandes
Joana de la Cruz
Maria de la Cruz
Josepha Damian
Petrona Josepha
Magdalena Baptista
Petrona Damian
Maria Cortez
29

Muchachos de tres años hasta dies deste pueblo de Mixquiahuala
Don Salbador de Morales
Francisco Antonio
Antonio de los Reyes
Joan de los Reyes
Lorenso de los Reyes
Basilio de los Reyes
Apolinar de los Reyes
Joan de Mendoza
Joseph de Mendoza
Martin de los Reyes
Ysidro Juares
Pasqual Joan
Pablo de la Cruz
Augustin de la Cruz
Nicolas de la Cruz
Joan de la Cruz
Francisco de la Cruz
Ypolito de la Cruz
Joan Miguel
Pablo Peres
Joan Peres
Manuel Redondo
Diego Martin
Cayetano Martin
Joan de Dios
Filipo Ramos
Geronimo Gimenes
Antonio Gimenes
Joan Pasqual
Pedro de la Cruz
Nicolas Martin
Joan Ernandes
Matias de la Cruz
Luis Nicolas
Augustin Nicolas
Antonio Nicolas
Sebastian Nicolas
Manuel de la Cruz
Andres Joseph
Lorenzo Joseph
Gaspar Dias
Pedro de Mendoza
Manuel de Mendoza
Pedro de Mendoza
Antonio Baptista
Francisco Quadrado
Manuel Gaspar
Augustin de Santiago
Joan Nicolas

[next page, first column]

Joan de la Cruz
Miguel de la Cruz
Joan Baptista
Paulino Ernandes
Salbador Nicolas
Pasqual Nicolas
Miguel Damian
Diego Damian
Joan Damian
Miguel Martin
Joan Martin
Pasqual de Aguilar
Antonio de Aguilar
Manuel Gaspar
Filipo Joan
Salbador Felisiano
Domingo Felisiano
Antonio Felisiano
Joan de Torres
Clemente Baptista
Miguel Nicolas
Ramon de la Cruz
Muchachas de tres años hasta dies, deste pueblo de Mixquiahuala
Doña Estefania Morales
Doña Antonia Morales
Ynes Maria
Josepha Maria
Francisca Maria
Augustina Lorensa
Maria Felisiana
Anna Felisiana
Joana Tereza
Maria de los Reyes
Magdalena de los Reyes
Michaela Ysabel
Josepha Maria
Magdalena Joana
Efigenia Joana
Josepha Ysabel
Francisca Lopez
Manuela Lopez

Manuela Maria
Manuela de la Concepcion
Maria Bernabela
Filipa Ernandes
Antonia Ernandes
Antonia Lorensa
Maria Getrudis
Nicolas Getrudis
Luisa Maria
Magdalena Rosa
Manuela Maria
Juliana Maria
Francisca Joana
Antonia Petrona
Efigenia Francisca
Manuela Petrona
Magdalena Maria
Josepha Felisiana
Magdalena Josepha
Personas de razon deste pueblo de Mixquiahuala

Casados
Joseph Belasco casado con Maria Michaela
Bernabe Belasco con Ysabel Francisca
Pedro de Mesa con Magdalena Guerrero
Antonio Baptista con Maria de la Concepcion
Nicolas Montes con Anna Maria

Solteros deste pueblo de Mixquiahuala
Mathias de Espinosa viudo
Antonio Cantu
Joseph de Charri
Joan Thomas
Joseph de Meza
Joan de Meza
Pedro Belasco
Joseph Belasco
Francisco Joan
Miguel Peres

Solteras deste pueblo de Mixquiahuala
Nicolasa Cantú
Nicolasa de Charri
Joana Cantu viuda
Maria Dias viuda
Filipa de Espinosa viuda
Maria Josepha
Antonia Getrudis
Tereza de Meza
Manuela Belasco
Getrudis Belasco
Luisa Thomasa
Polonia Joana
Luisa Thomasa

Se compone este partido de San Antonio Mixquiahuala de mill trescientos y catorce personas grandes y pequeñas, y la razón porque esta cabecera de dicho Mixquiahuala tiene personas casadas siento y nobenta y cuatro——

--- viudos y viudas treinta y sinco----------------------------------------------- 194
--- solteros y solteras sesenta y una------------------------------------------ 035
--- muchachos y muchachas siento y beinte y una------------------------------- 061

que hacen el número de quatrocientos y onse----------------------------------- 121

El pueblo de Tecpatepec tiene doscientos y setenta personas casadas-----------

--- tiene viudos y viudas treinta y siete------------------------------------- 220
--- solteros y solteras siento y beinte y dos------------------------------- 037
--- muchachos y muchachas dosientas y treinta y seis---------------------- 122

que hacen el número de seisientas y sesenta y sinco------------------------ 236

El pueblo de Tepaitic tiene personas casadas beinte y ocho------------------

--- viudos y viudas catorse----------------------------------------------- 028
--- solteros y solteras veinte y dos---------------------------------------- 014
--- muchachos y muchachas cuarenta y tres------------------------------- 022

--- 043
que hazen el numero de siento y siete

La hacienda de San Diego de las Posos tiene personas casadas quarenta y seis

viudos y viudas catorse

solteros y solteras treinta y una

muchachos y muchachas quarenta

que hazen el numero de siento y treinta y una

que todas juntas de dichos pueblos y hacienda componen el numero de las mill tresientas y catorce personas

Y porque conste si lo firme en dicho pueblo de Mixquiahuala en beinte dias del mes de julio del año de mill setesientos y dies y ocho

Sebastian Rubio
Nicolas Lopes con Clara Perez
Gaspar Peres con Melchora de San Juan
Andres de los Reyes con Maria Olbera
Miguel Perez con Ana Maria
Juan Peres con Juana de Aguilar
Diego Perez con Sebastiana Ximenes
Aguztín Perez con Melchora de los Reyes
Gaspar Benido con Aguztina Juares
Juan Benido con Luisa Juares
Francisco Benido con Manuela Juares
Pasqual Hernandez con Paula Cortes
Nicolas Hernandes con Francisca Ysabel
Lucas Cortes con Maria Juares
Bartolome Cortes con Luisa Ximenez
Francisco Cortes con Chatarina Juares
Nicolas Cortes con Sisilia Hernandes
Manuel Cortes con Maria Ygnasia
Francisco Cortes con Sisilia Juares
Juan Cortes con Juana de la Cruz
Francisco Juares con Marsela Cortes
Joseph Juares con Juana Contreras
Anttonio Juarez con Maria Madalena
Cayetano Andres con Manuela Maria
Miguel de la Cruz con Beronica Ysabel
Francisco Juarez con Josepha Mendosa
Pasqual Juares con Pasquala de Aguilar
Nicolas Peres con Sisilia Ysabel

Sebastian Perez con Sisilia Maria
Miguel Martin con Sisilia de los Reyez
Martin Morales con Manuela de la Cruz
Diego Morales con Angelina de los Reyes
Anttonio Morales con Petrona Maria
Aguztín Peres con Madalena de los Reyes
Joseph Morales con Maria Cortez
Diego de la Cruz con Rosa Maria
Joseph Benido con Monica Juana
Juan Martin con Sisilia Benida
Alonso Martin con Lorensa Ynes
Francisco Martin con Pasquala Maria
Joseph de Aguilar con Doña Rosa Ximenes
Diego Phelipe con Angelina Juares
Joseph Belasco con Luisa Ysabel
Andrez Martin con Sisilia Maria
Luis Barrientos con Nicolasa Maria
Joseph Lopez con Manuela Perez
Manuel de la Cruz con Andrea Perez
Miguel Paderes con Manuela Lorensa

Barrio de Teapa
Don Agustin de Gebara con Doña Polonia Maria
Don Manual de los Reies con Aguztina Maria
Don Thomas de Guebara con Maria Mendosa
Juan Peres con Maria Benida
Andres Hernandes con Luisa Maria
Domingo Martin con Juana de San Juan
Pasqual Hernandes con Maria de San Juan
Juan Cortes con Juana de los Reies
Miguel Hernandes con Maria Ana
Anttonio de San Juan con Sisilia Maria
Diego Juarez con Ana de la Cruz
Francisco Barrientos con Micaela Ximenes
Diego Pasqual con Nicolasa Juares
Pasqual Ysidro con Geronima Gusman
Ysidro Francisco con Thomasa Despinosa

[next side]
Anttonio Ysidro con Nicolasa Maria
Martin Ysidro con Ana Rosa
Agustín Ygnasio con Sisilia Maria
Diego de Espinosa con Francisca Maria
Diego de Espinosa con Angela Maria
Juan Figueroa con Sisilia de Espinosa
Marcos Hernandes con Maria de Espinosa
Aguztin Ysidro con Melchora Garcia
Pablo Garsia con Ana Maria
Juan Simon con Maria Rosa
Francisco Nicolas con Francisca Maria
Diego Francisco con Juana Maria
Anttonio de Espinosa con Bernarda Maria
Manuel Juares con Juana de Espinosa
Francisco Basques con Grasiana Guebara

Barrio de San Juan
Don Anttonio Lopes con Doña Maria Rosa
Don Manuel de Tapia con Maria Lopez
Don Joseph de Tapia con Manuela de Aguilar
Anttonio Juares con Nicolasa Maria
Don Gaspar de los Reis con Maria de la Cruz
Don Pablo de los Reies con Paula de Aguilar
Don Diego Delgado con Agustina Juares
Thomas Delgado con Francisca Cortez
Joseph Lopes con Doña Madalena Osoria
Nicolas de Mendosa con Geronima Maria
Lucas de Aguilar con Melchora Cortes
Juan de Aguilar con Maria Juana
Diego Cortes con Pasquala de Aguilar
Juan Pasqual con Josepha de Figueroa
Nicolas Lopes con Josepha de Mendosa
Juan Martin con Nicolasa Osoria
Bartolome Ximenes con Maria Ynes
Xpthoual Ximenes con Andrea Ximenes
Matheo Ximenes con Madalena Oluera
Miguel Ximenes con Luisa Martina
Marcos Ximenes con Polonia Maria
Juan Ximenes con Clara de los Reyes

Xpthoual Ximenes con Magdalena Maria
Nicolas Ximenes con Lorensa Maria
Anttonio Martin con Aguztina Maria
Xpthoual Miguel con Melchora Maria
Thoruiuio Hernandes con Maria de Gusman
Xpthoual de Gusman con Chatarina Aguilar
Diego Ximenes con Anttonia de la Cruz
Juan Ximenes con Pasquala Peres
Diego Martin con Maria Gusman
Gaspar Juares con Micaela Hernandes
Juan de Gusman con Maria de la Cruz
Alonso Gusman con Pasquala Maria
Xpthoual Benido con Pasquala Aguilar
Ambrosio de la Cruz con Maria Ximenes
Agustín de Aguilar con Juana Ximenes
Baltasar Gaspar con Nicolasa de Aguilar
Nicolas Gusman con Ana Juares
Miguel de Aguilar con Beronica Maria
Don Manuel de la Cruz con Maria de los Reies
Andres Ximenes con Maria Pasquala
Baltasar Briseño con Juana de la Cruz
Juan Peres con Petrona Gusman
Manuel de Aguilar con Ana Ximenes
Xpthoual Martin con Juana Maria
Manuel Ximenes con Maria Gusman

135
Biudos=
Don Diego de los Reies
Diego Martín
Don Nicolas de los Reies
Pasqual de la Cruz
Agustín Juan
Phelipe Aguilar
Francisco Martin
Juan Martin

Y Biudas-----
Doña Theresa de los Reies
Doña Melchora de la Cruz
Doña Beatris de la Cruz
Doña Juana de los Reies
Ana Lopes
Beronica Gonsales
Micaela Ximenes
Maria Ximenes
Ana Martina
Nicolas Garsia
Pasquala de los Reies
Ana Cortez
Chatarina Aguilar
Francisca de Aguilar

Madalena Maria
Theresa Maria
Madalena Sanches
Ana Ysabel
Doña Nicolasa de Guebara
Agustina Maria
Maria de la Cruz
Petrona Ximenes
Doña Agustina de Guebara
Juana Peres
Sisilia Agustina
Luisa Maria
Ana de Aguilar
Luisa Juarez
Sebastiana Maria
29
Solteros------
Don Anttonio de Granada
Don Joseph de Granada
Don Nicolas de Granada
Don Diego de la Cruz
Joseph de la Cruz
Nicolas de la Cruz
Don Anttonio de Tapia
Miguel Perez
Anttonio Paderes
Joseph Paderes
Nicolas Despinosa
Phelipe Despinosa
Juan Simon
Anttonio Simon
Juan Barrientos
Pedro Garsia
Pedro de la Cruz
Anttonio Juan
Martin Juarez
Joseph Andrez
Juan Andres
Nicolas Juarez
Francisco Ximenes
Marcos de los Reies
Agustin Ximenes
Pablo Benido

[next column]
Miguel Martin
Martin Guerrero
Manuel de Aguilar
Nicolas Hernandez
Diego Hernandez
Manuel Cortes
Nicolas Cortes
Francisco Hernandes
Miguel Hernandes
Diego Hernandes
Thomas Lopez
Phelipe Perez
Domingo de la Cruz
Juan Diego
Xpthoual de los Reies
Salbador Despinosa
Pasqual Venido
Salbador de Aguilar
Bartolome de los Reies
Alonso Ximenez
Ylario de los Reies
Pablo Barrientos
Joseph de San Juan
Diego de Santiago
Bartolome Cortez
Nicolas de Aguilar
Manuel Juarez
Juan Ximenez
Juan Lopes
Juan Ximenes
Bernardo Dias
Sebastian de los Reies
Hernando Ximenes
59

Solteras
Doña Barbara de Granada
Doña Madalena de la Cruz
Micaela de la Cruz
Josepha de Guebara
Anttonia de la Cruz
Maria de la Corona
Pasquala Martina
Getrudis Martina
Phelipa Martina
Manuela Lopez

[next column]
Agustina Maria
Petrona Maria
Juana Maria
Manuela Benida
Maria de Mendosa
Lorensa Mendosa
Ana Mendosa
Maria Morales
Pasquala Maria
Thomasa Maria
Agustina de Aguilar
Maria Fransisca
Maria Despinosa
Manuela Garsia
Josepha de Gusman
Maria de Gusman
Petrona de Aguilar
Manuela de Aguilar
Juana de los Reies
Ysabel Cortes
Ana Cortes
Sisilia Peres
Ysabel Cortes
Ynes Cortes
Luissa Cortes
Josepha Rosa
Juana Martina
Maria de la Cruz
Geronima de la Cruz
Pasquala Gebara
Melchora Benida
Francisca de San Juan
Manuela Molina
Anttonia Pisana
Sisilia Fransisca
Efigenia Maria
Juana Anttonia
Petrona de los Reies
Rosa de los Reies
Maria Juares
Efigenia Ximenes
Efigenia de los Reies
Juana Mendoza
Doña Agustina de Tapia
Juana de los Reies
Francisca Ósoria
Juana Benida
Maria Cariaga
Ana Martina
Luisa Martina

[next column]
Doña Juana Lopes
Josepha Ximenes
Maria de Aguilar
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Muchachos de 3 años para dies
Pedro de la Corona
Manuel de los Reyes
Andres de los Reyes
Salbador de San Anttonio
Pedro de la Cruz
Thomas Paderes
Andres de Santiago
Lucas Lopes
Nicolas Lopes
Benito Peres
Anttonio Benido
Anttonio Hernandes
Juan Hernandes
Agustín Cortes
Diego Cortes
Nicolas Cortes
Joseph Juares
Nicolas de la Cruz
Miguel Juares
Eugenio Juares
Joseph Perez
Diego Perez
Salbador Peres
Phelipe Martin
Juan Martin
Joseph Morales
Anttonio Morales
Nicolas Morales
Honofre Peres
Salbador Martin
Bernabel Martin
Joseph Martin
Alonso Guerrero
Nicolas Martin
Miguel de Aguilar
Anttonio de Aguilar
Juan Phelipe
Xpthoual Phelipe
Miguel Phelipe
Manuel Martin
Juan Martin
Pedro Martin
Nicolas Peres
Martin Morales  
Juan Martin  
Pedro de la Cruz  
Miguel Tapia  
Manuel Juares  
Juan de los Reies  
Agustín de los Reies  
Sebastián Mendosa  
Nicolas Mendosa  
Ygnasio Mendosa  
Phelipe Mendosa  
Juan de Aguilar  
Lucas de Aguilar  
Antonio de Aguilar  
Juan Martin  
Diego Martin  
Martín Perez  
Agustín Ximenes  
Eugenio Ximenes  
Agustín Ximenes  
Matías Ximenes  
Pablo Martin  
Juan Martin  
Diego Miguel  
Nicolas Gusman  
Francisco Ximenes  
Martin Ximenes  
Manuel Ximenes  
Miguel Juares  
Miguel Ximenes  
Phelipe Ximenes  
Diego Alonso  
Manuel Ximenes  
Manuel Briseño  
Agustín Martin  
Pedro Martin  
Nicolas Peres  
Antonio Descamilla  
Juan de la Corona  
Honofre de la Cruz  
Nicolas Barrera  
Thomas Barrera  
Pedro Guerrero  
Benito Lopes  
Pedro Lopes
Pablo de Albarado
Marselo de los Reyes
Matheo Lopes
Diego de la Cruz
Pasqual Martin
Pablo Hernandes
Juan Martin
Diego Cortez
Nicolas Hernandes
Joseph Hernandes
Miguel Peres
Diego Juares
Salbador Ysidro
Manuel Ygnasio
Juan Garsia
Phelipe Santiago
Anttonio Basques
Juan Barrientos
Francisco de la Cruz
Nicolas de Guebara
Diego de Guebara
Salbador Juares
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Muchachas
Juana de la Corona
Sebastiana Corona
Efigenia de los Reies
Juana de los Reies
Getrudis de San Anttonio
Efigenia de San Anttonio
Maria de San Anttonio
Efigenia Paderes
Gregoria Peres
Quiteria Peres
Manuela Benida
Maria Rita
Maria Cortes
Getrudis Cortes
Theresa Cortes
Nicolasa Cortes
Quiteria Cortes
Nicolasa Maria
Ana Mendosa
Juana Mendosa
Maria Perez
Ysabel Maria

[Next column]
Theresa Morales
Ana Morales
Juana Peres
Josepha Rosa
Ysabel Rosa
Manuela Lorensa
Manuela Ximenes
Juana Ysabel
Josepha de los Reyes
Juana de la Cruz
Maria de Aguilar
Juana de los Reies
Nicolasa de los Reies
Efigenia Sanches
Rosa Sanchez
Nicolasa Maria
Ysabel Guebara
Clara Guebara
Nicolasa Guerrero
Rosa Quiteria
Nicolasa de Tapia
Maria Juares
Efigenia Juares
Ysabel Juares
Efigenia Mendosa
Rita Mendosa
Quiteria Aguilar
Josepha Maria
Nicolasa Peres
Theresa Lopes
Ana Ósoria
Ysidra Maria
Efigenia Ximenes
Agustina Ximenes
Theresa Ximenes
Maria Ximenes
Madalena Ximenes
Juan Ximenes
Andrea Ximenes
Luisa Martina
Ana Maria
Rita Gusman

[next column]
Rosa Gusman
Paula Gusman
Efigenia Gusman
Petrona Gusman
Maria Ximenes
Anttonia Ximenes
Juana Ximenes
Juana Maria
Francisca Ximenes
Maria Briseño
Josepha Briseño
Juana Escamilla
Jasinta de la Cruz
Luisa Corona
Ana de la Cruz
Francisca de la Cruz
Manuela de la Cruz
Juan de Tapia
Rosa Lopes
Maria Lopes
Madalena de los Reies
Manuela Lopez
Matiana Lopes
Francisca de la Cruz
Quiteria de la Cruz
Maria de los Reies
Thomasa Ximenes
Theresa Benida
Anttonia de San Juan
Maria Hernandez
Manuela Hernandez
Pasquala Hernandez
Getrudis Hernandez
Angelina Hernandez
Nicolasa Hernandez
Maria Cortez
Maria Pasquala
Aguztina Pasquala
Juana de la Cruz
Anttonia Juarez
Andrea Juares
Agustina Pasquala

Madalena Pasquala
Anttonia Pasquala
Pasquala Despinosa
Magdalena Despinosa
Pasquala Juana
Maria de la Cruz
Petrona Despinosa
Theresa Despinosa
Angelina Despinosa
Efigenia de Figueroa
Maria Despinosa
Micaela Garsia
Pasquala Maria
Chatarina de la Cruz
Beronica de la Cruz
Maria de Guebara
Manuela de Guebara
Paula Contreras
Theresa Dominga
Manuela Pasquala

[next column]

Padron de los de rason
Casados
Pedro de Umaña con Maria de Lugo
Joseph de Umaña con Juana Peres
Alonso Gonsales con Ana Maria
Manuel Barrera con Angelina de Guebara
Manuel Brauo con Anttonia Despinosa
Luis Domingues con Nicolasa Gomes
Juan de Dios con Josepha Gomes
Juan Seron con Margarita Neria

Solteros
Domingo de Billeda
Nicolas de Billeda
Pedro Brabo
Juan Barrera
Diego de la Cruz

Solteras
Doña Maria de Billeda
Doña Nicolasa de Billeda
Doña Clara de Billeda
Efígenia Domingues
Pasquala Gonsales
Anttonia Brabo
Maria Brabo
Theresa Seron
Juana Seron

Muchachos
Joseph Umaña
Manuel de Umaña
Salbador Seron
Miguel Domingues
Juan Domingues
Pedro Guerrero

Muchachas
Quiteria Brabo
Juana Guerrero
Petrona de Umaña

[pair of leaves, both written recto not verso]
Padron de la gente del Barrio de los Reyes

Don Antonio Joseph Ximenez casado con Doña
Thereza de la Corona
Don Diego Guerrero con Doña
Beronica Ximenez
Don Antonio Ximenez con Doña
Bernarda de los Rreyes
Don Manuel Ximenez con Doña
Ynes Garcia
Don Matias Falcon con Doña
Maria Ximenez
Don Joseph Guerrero con Doña
Thereza Juares
Don Miguel Guerrero con Doña
Theodora Rangel
Don Miguel Ximenez con Doña
Andrea de la Encarnacion
Don Andres Guerrero con Doña
Maria de la Cruz

Xtpbl Sanches casado con
Juana Morales
Melchor de los Reyes con
Manuela Maria
Fhelipe de Santiago con
Juana de los Rreyes
Pedro Miguel con
Efixenia Juana
Francisco Martin con
Francisca Maria

Don Juan Ximenes Viudo

Doña Luiza Ximenez Viuda
Doña Maria Ximenez
Doña Beatris de los Reyes
Luiza de Oropeza
Ysabel de Oropeza

Antonio Miguel soltero de dies años en adelante
Diego de la Cruz
Diego Guerrero
Saluador Ximenez
Francisco Ximenez
Juan Ximenez
Juan Falcon
13

Solteras
Pasquala Maria
Maria Efigenia
Getrudis Maria
Andrea Juares
Ana Ximenez
Maria Daniel
Cathalina de los Rreyes
Maria de los Rreyes
8

Muchachos de tres a diez años
Bernardo de los Rreyes
Pedro Ximenez
Dimas Ximenez
Antonio Ximenez
Melchor Guerrero
Francisco Falcon
Agustin Sanches
Joseph Sanches
Baltazar Guerrero
Antonio Ximenez
10

Muchachas de tres a diez años
Thereza de la Corona
Josepha Falcon
Cathalina Ximenez
Manuela Sanches
Quiteria Maria
Roza Maria
Maria Thereza
Rita Maria
Maria Catarina
10
Cassados
Joseph de Seruantes con
Maria Bernal
Francisco Bernal con
Maria Christina
Juan Bernal con
Manuela Sanches
Nicolas Bernal con
Thereza Sanches
Joseph Martin con
Ana Bernal
 5

Soltero de dies años en adelante
Joseph de Seruantes
Mateo Bernal
Thomas Bernal
Manuel Seruantes
Antonio Seruantes
 6

Muchachos de tres a dies años
Saluador de Seruantes
Roque de Seruantes
Juan de Seruantes
Jazinto de Seruantes
Juan de Seruantes
Saluador de Seruantes
Joseph Bernal
Saluador Bernal
Manuel Bernal
Francisco Bernal
Juan Rramon
Joseph Bernal
 23
Solteras de diez años en adelante
Ysauel de Seruantes
Manuela de Seruantes
Lugarda de Seruantes

Muchachas de tres a diez años
Melchora Bernal
Polonia Bernal
Juana Martina
Pasquala Martina

Memoria y padrón de la gente que ay en la Hazienda de San Diego de los Possos
Casados=
Miguel Pasqual con Francisca Rosa
Pasqual de la Rosa con Juana Maria
Geronimo Pasqual con Juana Angelina
Juan Pasqual con Juana Ysabel
Francisco Anttonio con Juana Rossa
Anttonio Pasqual con Ysabel Maria
Marcos Anttonio con Madalena Maria
Pedro Anttonio con Pasquala Maria
Thomas Hernandes con Pasquala Maria
Diego Anselmo con Francisca Maria
Alonso Martin con Angelina Maria
Marcos Hernandes con Maria Josepha
Diego de la Cruz con Agustina Maria
Pedro de la Cruz con Efigenia Petrona
Diego Geronimo con Manuela Maria
Juan de la Cruz con Ynes Maria
Pedro Sanchez con Francisca Maria
Juan de los Reies con Petrona Juana
Juan de Santiago con Maria Rosa
Joseph Mendosa con Maria Ynes
Francisco Peres con Maria de la Cruz
Miguel Martin con Juana Rosa
Bartolome Mendosa con Angelina Maria

23
biudos y biudas
Anttonio Martin
Pedro Sebastian
Nicolas de la Cruz
3
Sisilia Maria
Francisca Madalena
Chatarina Maria
Juana Maria
Micaela Maria
Maria Sanches
Angelina Maria
Maria Juana
Francisca Maria
Petrona Maria
Madalena Maria
11

Solteros
Lorenso Pasqual
Baltasar Anttonio
Juan Anttonio
Francisco Anttonio
Aguztin Martin
Miguel de la Cruz
Diego de la Cruz
Aguztin de la Cruz
Manuel Joseph
Pedro Anttonio
Juan de Dios
Juan Martin
Juan de la Cruz
Geronimo Juan
Phelipe Geronimo
15

Muchachos
Anttonio Joseph
Pedro Nicolas
Manuel Joseph
Alonso Martin
Joseph Miguel
Aguztin Miguel
Nicolas Martin
Fernando Joseph
Pablo Martin
Anttonio Pasqual
Marcos Anttonio
Xpthoual Pasqual
Pasqual Martin
Manuel Joseph
Juan de Dios
Diego Geronimo
Joseph Manuel
Alonso Geronimo
Geronimo Juan
Salbador de la Cruz
20

[next column]
Solteras
Manuela Maria
Maria de San Joseph
Manuela Juana
Maria Anttonia
Anttonia Maria
Maria Juana
Nicolasa Maria
Francisca Maria
Getrudis Maria
Anttonia Juana
Maria Anttonia
Josepha Maria
Aguztina Maria
Maria Manuela
Sisilia Pasquala
Getrudis de la Cruz
16

Muchachas
Manuela Maria
Madalena Maria
Nicolasa Maria
Josepha Maria

65
Beatris Maria
Madalena Maria
Nicolasa Maria
Maria Manuela
Leonor Maria
Manuela Pasquala
Francisca Gregoria
Quiteria Josepha
Monica Maria
Maria Josepha
Getrudis Maria
Anttonia Maria
Melchora Josepha
Thereza Maria
Petrona Maria
Juana Maria
20
Appendix 2. Parish records examined

Records are listed under their Genealogical Society of Utah microfilm numbers. Note that the same films are catalogued under different numbers in the AGN. Films are listed by town, and within that in numeric order, with Mixquiahuala first and the others in alphabetical order.

Page counts are approximate: When the original pages were numbered, these numbers were used, but not all volumes were numbered. When no numbers were present, microfilm frames were counted if the volume was of interest, but these counts are inexact due to duplication of some images.

"Transcribed" does not mean that a full, word for word transcription was prepared; instead it means that all vital events (births, marriages, burials, etc.) were entered into a spreadsheet, including all names and dates in each entry, and marginal notations were made of any ways in which that entry differed from the norm. Other passages of text, such as church inventories and records of inspection visits, were generally transcribed more literally.

657692
Mixquiahuala, Baptisms
Largely transcribed.

- 1577-1623: ca 140 ff., first in Nahuatl, then Spanish; partially transcribed.
- 1623-1632: ca. 40 ff., continuously numbered from previous; partially transcribed. Includes two entries from 1681.
- 1646-1675 (fragmentary volume), f.23 (1 baptism, 1648), 1 f. (1 baptism, 1671), f. 96 (1 baptism, 1672), ff. 104-110 (86 baptisms, 1674-1675); transcribed.
- 1670-1694, Tecpatepec: 82ff.; transcribed.
- 1680-1695: 98 ff. (874 baptisms); transcribed.
- 1694-1713, Tecpatepec: 28 ff. (299 baptisms); transcribed.
- 1695-1712: 158 ff. (1485 baptisms); transcribed.

657694
Mixquiahuala, Baptisms
Largely transcribed.

- 1776-1798, gente de razón: 83 ff; untranscribed.
- 1632-1641: 46 ff. (389 baptisms), includes 121 marriages from 1633-1644, several burials, and several inventories; transcribed.
- 1712-1724: 100 ff. (1013 baptisms); transcribed.
- 1724-1730: 74 ff. (601 baptisms); transcribed. Includes one burial record.
- 1731-1741: 95 ff. (815 baptisms); transcribed.
- 1741-1748: untranscribed.

658850
Mixquiahuala, Información matrimonial
Largely transcribed.

- 1712-1721: ca. 100 ff.; transcribed.
- 1720-1749: more than 250 ff.; partially transcribed. Includes register of información matrimonial from Mixquiahuala and Chilcuautla, and various related documents inserted into the volume.

658869
Mixquiahuala, Marriages
Largely transcribed.

- 1574-1590: 45 ff., in Nahuatl; partially transcribed.
- 1590-1631: 212 ff., continuation of preceding volume in Spanish, including church inventories; partially transcribed.
- 1680-1693: 87 ff. (161 marriages); transcribed.
- 1721-1736: 146 ff. (360 marriages); transcribed.
- 1727-1749, Tecpatepec: 47 ff. of baptisms (456 baptisms), largely transcribed.
- 1736-1750: ca. 270 ff.; partially transcribed.

658873
Mixquiahuala, Burials
Largely transcribed.
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• 1645-1684: 15 ff. (144 burials); transcribed. Series has gaps from 1661-1667, 1669, 1672, 1674-1679.

• 1685-1712: 33 ff. (293 burials); transcribed. Includes some buried in Tecpatépec.

• 1712-1737: 94 ff., with inconsistent numeration (834 burials); transcribed. Begins with separate, unpaginated list of deaths from 1737 matlazahuatl epidemic, 22 ff. (202 burials).

• 1737-1748: 104 ff. (875 burials); transcribed. Ff.1-41 cover Mixquiahuala from the epidemic through 1748; ff.42-46 missing; ff.47-104 begin with the epidemic in Tecpatépec but then include burials from both through 1748.

• 1742-1770, Tecpatépec: ca. 143 ff.; partially transcribed.

• 1748-1771: more than 122 ff.; partially transcribed.

• 1769-1804, gente de razón: 3 entries transcribed.

658877
Mixquiahuala, Información matrimonial
Partially transcribed.

• 1667: one marriage; transcribed.

• 1670: miscellaneous document.

• 1712: f.160 from baptismal book on roll 657692 (3 baptisms); transcribed.

• 1713-1791: more than 100 loose leaves; partially transcribed. Primary contents are requests from other parishes for approval for Mixquiahuala natives to marry there, and letters from Mixquiahuala to other parishes for the same purpose. Also includes various non-matrimonial documents, such as formal complaints to the priest by abused wives.

• 1852: 6 ff. (32 marriages).

711589
Chilcuautla, Baptisms
Individual records of interest transcribed.

• 1658-1679: more than 140 ff.

• 1700-1711: 118 ff.

711603
Chilcuautla, Marriages
Partially transcribed.

- 1885: 6 ff., actually confirmations.
- 1684-1697: 70 ff. (204 marriages), largely transcribed.
- 1702-1728: 160 ff, including one leaf of baptisms from 1719; partially transcribed.
- 1729-1735: 86 ff., continuation of preceding volume with new numeration.

748900
Chapa de Mota, Baptisms
Not transcribed.

- 1611-1636: 102 ff.
- 1660-1673: 91 ff.
- 1673-1691: 142 ff.
- 1677-1715, San Felipe: 46 ff., includes church inventories.
- 1677-1692, San Luis: 45 ff.
- 1690-1712, San Bartholome: 73 ff., continued on next roll.

684235
Xilotepec, Baptisms
Not transcribed.

- 1680-1684: 97 ff.
- 1688-1694: 97 ff.
- 1694-1707: 197 ff.
• 1705-1734, San Agustin: unnumbered.

644191
Hueypoxtla, Marriages
Not transcribed.

• 1569-1608: unnumbered, primarily in Nahuatl.
• 1593-1625: unnumbered, Nahuatl and Spanish, includes church inventories.
• 1673-1716: unnumbered, includes church inventories.

668607
Tepetitlan, Marriages
Individual records of interest transcribed.

• 1605-1642: more than 240 ff., primarily in Otomi.
• 1641-1651: 54 ff., Spanish with some Otomi.
• 1659-1684, gente de razón: 17 ff.
• 1659-1680, indios: 66 ff., in same volume as preceding but separately numbered.
• 1684-1711: 71 ff.
• 1684-1755, gente de razón: 43 ff.
• 1711-1734, indios: 95 ff.
• 1734-1753, indios: unnumbered.

638662
Tetepango, Baptisms
Not transcribed.
Mainly loose and damaged, bound in the nineteenth century.

• 1645-1663, Axacuba: 40 ff.
• 1652-1671: 9 ff., includes some burials.
• 1659-1667: 13 ff.
- 1676-1679: unnumbered, includes one 1643 marriage, burials and other paperwork.
- 1676-1680, Axacuba and Tetepango: ff. numbered 10-38, 41, 54-55.
- 1605-1643: ca. 111 ff., including some burials.
- 1680-1693: 98 ff., examined in 1718 visita (although no corresponding padrón survives).
Appendix 3. "The 1737 Matlazahuatl Epidemic in Mixquiahuala and Tecpatepec, México."

By: Alexander F. Christensen, Rutgers University-Camden, Camden, NJ 08102

Abstract submitted for the 2003 annual meeting of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists, Tempe, AZ.

Estimates of the magnitude of early colonial indigenous population decline in Mesoamerica range from 25% to 90%. Because detailed mortality reports do not exist for sixteenth-century epidemics, scholars rely upon general descriptions of their extent, as well as modern epidemiological accounts of the diseases that may have been responsible.

Eighteenth-century epidemics can be studied in greater detail. One of the most destructive was the *matlazahuatl* epidemic which raged across México between 1736 and 1738. Contemporary accounts report 40,000 deaths in México City alone. The name *matlazahuatl* was also used to describe an earlier pandemic in 1576-1580. What pathogen was responsible? Typhus, plague, smallpox, and most recently an arenaviral hemorrhagic fever have been proposed.

The parish records of Mixquiahuala and Tecpatepec, Hidalgo, México include burial records from 1737-1738, which can be tied to a 1718 nominal census as well as birth and marriage registers. Family reconstruction indicates that the causative agent was regularly spread by interpersonal contact between immediate family members. Over the 15 month span of the epidemic in these towns, 218 people were buried in Mixquiahuala and 380 in Tecpatepec. If we assume no change in population size between 1718 and 1737, this indicates a mortality of 53% and 57%. In Mixquiahuala, 95 unmarried and 123 married individuals died, equivalent to 52% and 54% of the 1718 population in each category, and in Tecpatepec 194 and 186 died, or 54% and 61%. The high mortality and familial transmission suggest that neither typhus nor a zoonotic hemorrhagic fever was responsible.