



SOR JUANA'S NAHUATL

Camilla TOWNSEND (Rutgers University)

In the latter half of the seventeenth century, one of the most remarkable women in the world lived in a stone cell in the Convent of San Jerónimo in Mexico City. This was Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, famous as a poet and a philosopher, and later, as the author of *La Respuesta a Sor Filotea*¹, an extraordinary defense of a woman's right to study and to think. Her statement earned her the ire of the Church that had once supported her. Under threat from the Inquisition, she renounced her books and her connections to a worldly life; she died not long after in an epidemic of 1695.

Sor Juana's writings have long been studied as a crucial element of New Spain's baroque.² In recent times, they have been understood to provide a subtle and powerful critique of her hierarchical world's treatment of the Other—not only of women,³ but also of Afro-Mexicans and indigenous peoples, whom she frequently ventriloquized in her work. Her experiences as a colonial subject of the Spanish monarchy and as a woman in a male dominated church had allowed her to attain perspectives that eluded the majority of her male contemporaries. In her work, she insisted that the Other could be seen as central. Twenty years ago, Mabel Moraña put it thus:

...el villancico es en Sor Juana una exploración de los márgenes y de la alteridad en el interior de la “nación criolla”: el negro y el indio como márgenes del criollo, la oralidad como margen de la escritura, el náhuatl, el habla de los escalvos ... lo vernáculo y lo popular como márgenes de las formas canónicas, el paganismo supérstite como margen de la cristianización, lo pre- or para-hispánica como margen del proyecto imperial unificador y homogeneizante, la fiesta como margen de la doctrina, el Otro como margen del Yo. Sin embargo este margen (social, cultural, ideológico) aunque conserva su carácter periférico y subalterna dentro de la estratificación virreinal aparece enclavado, por la magia de la literatura y de la fiesta barroca, en el espacio mismo de la territorialidad criolla, mostrando lo exógeno (exótico, exterior, foráneo) como inherente a la Americano. Con este juego de interiorización de la exterioridad se cancela toda posibilidad de un proyecto criollo basado en la ilusión de una centralidad homogeneizante, exclusive y excluyente, como se los sectores que habitaban la periferia de la ciudad barroca hubieran traspasado sus muros en un ritual carnavalesco y subversivo, hasta lograr instalarse en el cuadrángulo acotado de la discursividad colonial.⁴

¹ The full text has been published numerous times in several languages. See, for example, Margaret Sayers Peden, ed., *Poems, Protest, and a Dream: Selected Writings of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz* (New York: Penguin Books, 1997)

² Octavio Paz, *Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, o las trampas de la fé* (Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1982).

³ Yolanda Martínez San Miguel, “Saberes Americanos: Constitución de una subjetividad intelectual femenina en la poesía lírica de Sor Juana,” *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana* 24, 49 (1999): 79-98. Stephanie Merrim, ed., *Feminist Perspectives on Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1991).

⁴ Mabel Moraña, “Poder, raza y lengua: La construcción étnica del Otro en los villancicos de Sor Juana,” *Colonial Latin American Review* 4, 2 (1995), 147.



In the 80s and 90s, many of us, as scholars and feminists, were eager to explore these aspects of Sor Juana. Marie-Cécile Bénassy-Berling said succinctly, “Es seguro que Sor Juana se consideraba verdaderamente hermana del vulgo de México.”⁵ Some sought specific evidence of her desire to humanize the marginalized in her decision to write occasionally in Nahuatl, the language of the Aztecs. We wanted to believe that she understood and spoke Nahuatl. Wrote Patrick Johansson in this same era:

Tanto San Miguel Nepantla, ranchería donde nació, como Panoayan, la hacienda que arrendaba la familia y donde creció, están situados en una región donde se hablaba el náhuatl hasta hace poco. Podemos pensar que la convivencia con los peones indígenas y sus familias hizo que Sor Juana se familiarizara tempranamente con esta lengua. ... Más tarde, en el convento de San Jerónimo, permaneció en estrecho contacto con hablantes nahuas, ya que la mayoría de las sirvientas eran de esta estirpe étnica.⁶

It seemed that Sor Juana's experiences in this regard, combined with her other experiences, led her to become a unique figure—a product of the Hispanic world who nevertheless wished to allow indigenous people to speak, and who took seriously their words. It was a beautiful idea, one that I myself cherished.

As a scholar of the Nahuatl language, I decided it behooved me to explore Sor Juana's use of Nahuatl. Those who have written about the subject before, with rare exception, have not been familiar with the language, and so faced limitations in what they could achieve. I embarked joyfully on the project of studying Sor Juana's battle against the Othering of the indigenous people among whom she lived. The project, however, did not turn out as I had expected. It is not without irony that I report that my recent study of Sor Juana's Nahuatl has turned out to be an exercise in uncovering my own romanticization of a favorite subject. In three heart-wrenching steps, I have been forced by the evidence to move away from a mythical Sor Juana and to acknowledge a real one. In brief, my shattered dreams were as follows:

Supposition 1: Mexican scholars recently discovered a *loa* written in Spanish and Nahuatl by the young Juana, when she was about eight and living in San Miguel Nepantla, confirming our vision of a child not only extraordinarily precocious, but also fully bilingual. (However, the *loa* and the implications turned out to be a tissue of suppositions.)

Supposition 2: Even if the latter is an exaggeration, it nevertheless remains the case that as an adult, Sor Juana could write in elegant and courtly Nahuatl. After all, Angel Garibay asserted as much, and others have assumed that he was correct. (However, when I studied the Nahuatl of the surviving poems, I discovered that she most certainly did not have a full grasp of Nahuatl grammar.)

Supposition 3: Unwilling to be defeated, I retreated to a more post-modern and “politically correct” vision: perhaps Sor Juana herself was no expert in Nahuatl, but one of her Nahuatl poems is so famously good that it must show evidence of her having collaborated with a native Nahuatl speaker, perhaps someone who worked in the convent. (However, even here, as will be seen, I have been forced to acknowledge that this almost certainly was not the case.)

⁵ Marie-Cécile Bénassy-Berling, *Humanismo y religion en Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz* (Mexico City: UNAM, 1983), 203.

⁶ Patrick Johansson, “Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz: cláusulas tiernas del mexicano lenguaje,” *Literatura Mexicana* 6, 2 (1995), 461.



Let me proceed through my three sad revelations somewhat more slowly and deliberately, so that my readers have enough evidence to make their own decision. In 2001, the Mexican magazine *Letras Libres* published an article by Salvador Díaz Cintura and Augusto Vallejo Villathat that reverberated throughout the Mexican intellectual world:⁷ they asserted that in a photocopy they possessed of Manuscript 303 in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, they had found the *loa* in Spanish and Nahuatl mentioned by padre Diego Calleja in 1700 as having been written by Sor Juana when she was a child. Calleja never knew Sor Juana, but he knew many people known to her, and he clearly read her autobiographical writings. What he actually said in the biography he wrote was as follows: “No llegaba a ocho años la niña Juana Inés, cuando, porque ofrecieron por premio un libro, riqueza de que tuvo siempre sedienta codicia, compuso para una fiesta del Santísimo Sacramento, una loa.”⁸ Calleja did not claim that the *loa* was in Nahuatl. Nor is there any real evidence that the story is true at all; this might well have been Calleja’s version of certain stories Sor Juana herself told of her precocity as a child.⁹

A reading of the Díaz Cintura and Vallejo Villa journal issue, which includes a complete transcription of the piece, raises significant doubts. First, the authors acknowledge that the handwriting is definitely eighteenth-century, and there are no internal dates. They have found a listing of a document that *might* be this one elsewhere, in Boturini’s catalogue, but even that listing only gives a date of 1713. The authors deal with this problem by claiming that the piece was passed from hand to hand, recopied generation after generation. That was indeed common practice, but it is infinitely less likely in the case of a production of a girl-child, and one who was no longer part of the local community, if she ever had been. (The document is associated with Tlayacapan, while she was from Panoayan, both within the orbit of Chalco Amecameca, but by no means neighbors.) Second, the document consists of two sections which are clearly of entirely separate and independent production. One is a comedic poem in Spanish with some Nahuatl words and primitively constructed phrases thrown in; the other is an exchange between a Spaniard (speaking Spanish) and an *indio* (speaking fluent Nahuatl) about the nature of the Incarnation. I am far from the only one to have grave doubts about either of these adult-like pieces being the work of an eight-year-old Hispanic girl. Sara Poot Herrera has published an eloquent piece in a book put out in 2005 by the Universidad del Claustro de Sor Juana, showing how Díaz and Vallejo move easily between making a tentative suggestion and then assuming the possibility to be fact, using such possibilities to prove other possibilities, until there is no ground to stand on.¹⁰

Having rejected the text of “nuestra pequeña autora” as Salvador Díaz insistently continues to call the writer of both pieces,¹¹ I moved with only some disappointment to the Nahuatl texts absolutely known to be to the work of Sor Juana in her adulthood. As I have said, I was prepared to find the elegant Nahuatl attributed to her by others in the past. I was, however, immediately disappointed. For the 1677 fiesta of San Pedro Nolasco, in her villancico VIII, she included a Nahua “tocotin mestizo de Español y Mejicano.”¹² The word “villancico”

⁷ Salvador Díaz Cintura, “La Loa de Juana Inés,” and immediately following, Augusto Vallejo Villa, “Acerca de la Loa,” *Letras Libres*, October 2001, 67-81. The piece’s influence continues to be felt. It is accepted uncritically, for example, in Enrique Flores, “Sor Juana y los indios: loas y tocotines,” *Literatura Mexicana*, 18, 2 (2007): 39-77.

⁸ Aprobación del Reverendísimo Padre Diego Calleja de la Compañía de Jesús a la *Fama y Obras Posthumas del Fénix de México, Décima Musa, Poetisa Americana, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz* (Mexico City: UNAM, [1700] 1995), 18.

⁹ “Respuesta a Sor Filotea,” in *Poems, Protest, and a Dream*, 12-14.

¹⁰ Sara Poot Herrera, “Sobre Una Loa Atribuida a la Niña Juana,” in *Aproximaciones a Sor Juana*, ed. Sandra Lorenzano (Universidad del Claustro de Sor Juana, 2005), 285-298.

¹¹ “Yoqui in Tlahuepoch Medea” o el Nahuatl en la Obra de Sor Juana,” in *Aproximaciones*, 95-100.

¹² Alfonso Méndez Plancarte, ed., *Obras Completas de Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1951), II: 41-42.



stems from *villano*, or peasant. Villancicos consisted of poems in short lines, reminiscent of the style of songs sung by the populace; in Sor Juana's time, they were often composed to be sung in church for religious holidays, perhaps merging for a time with a Christmas carol or other popular song. A "tocotin" was a Nahuatl term for a traditional song or dance based on pounding drum beats, and the word had become part of New Spain's Spanish vocabulary.

In Sor Juana's largely Spanish text, she mixes in a few Nahuatl words and phrases, unfortunately some with such egregious errors involved as to be reminiscent of nails on a blackboard:

Mati Dios, si allí

lo estoviera yo

These lines are intended to mean, "God knows if I were there..." but the verb *-mati* in Nahuatl is and always must be transitive; it *cannot* come out of a Nahuatl-speaker's mouth without an object pronoun attached (ie, *quimati*, etc). Almost as bad is:

También un *Topil*

Del Gobernador

Ca ipampa tributo

... prenderme mandó.

This stanza is intended to express, "An officer of the governor sent to have me arrested because of the tribute." But the form *topil* is possessed; it *cannot* come from a native speaker as *topil*, unless accompanied by a possessive marker. Some might think that Sor Juana either learned her Nahuatl from ignorant people who spoke poor grammar, or was consciously aping such people. But that argument misses the point: would the most ignorant and impoverished native French speaker say, "tu vais"? or "le livre est la mienne"? I think not. Yet the errors in the poem's Nahuatl are of this nature. Sor Juana was too clever to put on dialect so clumsily, I believe, given her other virtuoso performances in that regard.¹³ It is more logical to think that she did not really have a true command of the language.

There was, after all, as I have said, a silver lining in this new conviction of mine: it left room for her to have needed an indigenous helpmeet or collaborator in what was her most famous Nahuatl production. For the 1676 feast of the Asunción, in her villancico VIII, she included a tocotin written entirely in Nahuatl and using "high speech," that is, the reverential grammatical form.¹⁴ It was fitting that she did this in a schematical sense, for the tocotin dances were traditionally performed not only on popular but also on high occasions among the Aztecs.¹⁵ Certainly it must have been this work of Sor Juana's, fully in Nahuatl and in the reverential style, that caused Garibay and after him Georges Baudot to make their statements.¹⁶ I have included the work here, together with a translation, as an appendix.

The first linguistic problems (perhaps I should say "issues") that come to view, though they have distressed some readers, can easily be explained by Sor Juana's brilliance and by the way in which she learned her Nahuatl. These do *not* in themselves dispel the notion that she was probably working with someone who spoke fluent Nahuatl. The poem is an indigenous

¹³ For more on this, see Moraña, "Poder, Raza y Lengua."

¹⁴ Méndez Plancarte, ed., *Obras Completas*, II: 17.

¹⁵ For more on performances among the Aztecs, see my "What in the World Have You Done to Me, my Lover?": Sex, Servitude, and Politics among the Pre-Conquest Nahuas as seen in the *Cantares Mexicanos*," *The Americas* 62, 3 (2006): 349-89.

¹⁶ See Angel María Garibay, *Historia de la literatura náhuatl* (Mexico City: Editorial Porrúa, 1953) and Georges Baudot, *La trova náhuatl de Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1992).



person's tribute to the Virgin Mary. In the second line, the speaker refers to her as *Zuapilli*, when anyone who has had even one class in Nahuatl knows that the word for "lady" is *cihuapilli*. Georges Baudot was so distressed by what he perceived as a copying error that he simply fixed it. But here Sor Juana was too clever for Baudot: She clearly sought a stanza of 6 syllables/ 6 syllables, then 7 syllables/ 7 syllables. When the word "cihuapilli" is pronounced with extreme rapidity (as it often is by native speakers) it does indeed sound like *zuapilli*. Salvador Díaz, despite his wishful thinking in certain regards, clearly has a command of Nahuatl, and he noticed the same phenomenon, poking gentle fun at Baudot in an article of his.¹⁷

Another problem for some has been the word *moayolque*, which appears twice (lines 9 and 26) and has flummoxed translators. But context makes clear that she meant *mohuanyolqui*, meaning "your relatives" or "your family" which would have been pronounced as she wrote it by many speakers (as the syllable-final "n" would be swallowed) and which she would have had no way of knowing was supposed to be represented the other way, if she had learned most of her Nahuatl from servants rather than scholars. Given her interest in dialect, it was even conceivable that she represented the word this way purposefully.

Having satisfied myself that the previously underscored problems with the tocotin are not really problems at all, I settled down to read thoughtfully what I assumed I would find was a competent production in Nahuatl—which I might then argue Sor Juana had received help with, since it seemed she was most likely not capable of writing it on her own. To my vexation, I quickly found that here, as in her other Nahuatl work, there were significant errors such as no Nahuatl native speaker would make (or have allowed her to make). Most crucially, she puts "totlazo cihuapilli" for "our precious lady", and "motlazo piltzintli" for "your precious son", again violating what is among the most basic rules of Nahuatl grammatical structure, the sharp distinction between the absolute and possessive state. Secondly, though she writes most of the poem in the reverential form, she abandons it inexplicably when speaking of Jesus himself. ("Tlaca ammo quinequi," meaning, "and if he does not want [to listen to you...]") The reverential form cannot be picked up and put down at will. A discourse occurs in high style, or it does not. There might conceivably be exceptions in certain rhetorical situations, but certainly not for Jesus. Thirdly (and lastly), though Sor Juana demonstrates knowledge of a verb tense which I will call the "subjunctive" here (for ease of communication with an audience of French speakers), she fails to recognize other occasions when it is needed. (The same problematic phrase "Tlaca ammo quinequi" is in violation of this norm as well, for example.)

There is, I believe, a clear explanation for all of this. Sor Juana gets the possessive form quite right when she speaks of "tonantzin" ("our mother"), the term by which Mary was routinely referenced in religious discourse in Nahuatl-speaking villages. She also does fine with "your flesh" and "our sins", other staples of prayers and sermons. The word "cihuapilli", unpossessed, as she has it, normally appeared in references to The Lady, as they also often called Mary. (They did not say "Our Lady" as was typical in Spanish.) And "piltzintli" (child) was a classic, much-used word that had even entered Spanish vocabulary. So, she had frequently heard these last two words in their absolute, unpossessed forms, and used them exactly thus, even when she herself rendered them possessed (or tried to); whereas she had heard "tonantzin" (our mother) used in its possessed form correctly hundreds of times and so had no trouble getting the possessive form right in that case. The same was true of "your flesh" and "our sins."

In a comparable sense, the phrase "quinequi" is a staple of Nahuatl daily conversation. ("He or she wants it or needs it," or "does she or he want it or need it?") It thus makes sense that Sor Juana suddenly forgot the reverential form she was self-consciously trying to use when

¹⁷ "Yoqui in Tlahuepoch Medea," in *Aproximaciones*, 98.



she came to what was undoubtedly to her a long familiar term, perhaps even used on a daily basis with certain servants.

In other words, Sor Juana did just fine when self-consciously operating from a grammar chart (as when she was applying the reverential form, presumably), or using apt phrases she had heard in village religious services throughout her childhood, or had heard from servants then and since, but she fell down on the job specifically when she was using a long familiar term or phrase that she uncritically assumed she could insert wherever she wanted to within a sentence composed (in Spanish) in her head. She was, in a sense, a victim of “the chaos of her haphazard studies”, to use the words applied by Frederick Luciani.¹⁸ She had an extraordinary talent at making sense of the disparate readings that came her way without formal education, but that talent could not render her fluent in a foreign language.

With this level of error present in Sor Juana’s villancico, it is not reasonable to think that she had a native Nahuatl speaker working with her as an active agent. The nature of the errors tells us that she was stubbornly, proudly perhaps, writing this piece herself. Of course, one might argue, I should have foreseen this: to think that it was likely in the seventeenth century that she would think of a servant as a collaborator or critic in intellectual endeavors, or that a servant would be able to perceive *herself* that way, was indeed to let my twenty-first-century imagination run away with me.

There remains another, very important question: just how far do I have to go with my new, more realistic view? Must I follow where such views usually lead? That is, must I become cynical? Must I begin to accuse Sor Juana of using the Nahuatl language and culture to promote her own *criollo* Mexican agenda? Of disempowering native words still further by ensnaring them in Spanish thoughts, stripping them of their own grammar and framework to suit herself? No, I truly think not. Perhaps Octavio Paz was right when he wrote years ago: “In her songs and villancios Sor Juana made clever use of the popular speech of mulattos and criollos, and even of the Indian language Nahuatl. She was motivated not by nationalism, but by its exact opposite, a universalist aesthetic that delighted in recording picturesque details and in highlighting specificities.”¹⁹ That is, she truly delighted in the reality of the indigenous people around her, even if she did not truly speak their language.

In certain profound ways, Sor Juana was indeed crossing borders, attempting to meet others halfway. First, the theme of the tocotin could not have been more indigenous: the beloved Mary is affectionately addressed, specifically as intercessor, and in the most earthy of ways. (If Jesus will not listen to his mother, she is told to remind him that she gave him flesh, gave him life from her breast.) It is no secret that these elements are indeed reminiscent of the Mary who surfaced in indigenous people’s seventeenth-century imaginations.²⁰ In validating the subordinate Mary as a source of power and wisdom—here and elsewhere in her work—Sor Juana necessarily validates the perspectives of women and of the indigenous.²¹

Furthermore, although the tocotin’s structure bore almost no resemblance at all to traditional Nahuatl song, it bore a strong resemblance to rhyming, almost European-style ditties in Nahuatl that at least some indigenous people were apparently beginning to write and enjoy. One of Sor Juana’s more remarkable contemporaries, a man just a bit younger, was don Manuel de los Santos y Salazar, the scion of an indigenous noble family in Tlaxcala who

¹⁸ Frederick Luciani, *Literary Self-Fashioning in Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz* (Lewisburg, Pennsylvania: Bucknell University Press, 2004), 101. Luciani speaks with affection and respect for his subject; he is more impressed at her ability to impose orderly narratives, given the randomness of reading which an autodidact pursues in isolation.

¹⁹ Paz, *Sor Juana*, 57.

²⁰ See Louise Burkhart, *Before Guadalupe: the Virgin Mary in Early Colonial Nahuatl Literature* (Albany: Institute for Mesoamerican Studies, 2001).

²¹ Martínez San Miguel, “Saber Americanos.”



managed to enter Puebla's Franciscan convent as a novice (despite his native blood).²² He left before he took his vows, but while in Puebla, he apparently met Manuel Fernández de Santa Cruz, who became Bishop of Puebla in 1677. The relatively liberal bishop, who also encouraged Sor Juana for a time,²³ became his patron, and insisted that he attend university in Mexico City. After he graduated, Fernández de Santa Cruz gave the young indigenous man a parish in his diocese.²⁴ Besides doing his parish duties, don Manuel spent his life collecting indigenous historical annals and generally trying to keep Nahuatl culture alive. At one point, in his declining years, he wrote a religious play in Spanish and Nahuatl, and in it he included a *tocotin* which was in its structure much like Sor Juana's, despite the fact that thematically it begins by celebrating the power of pagan gods.²⁵ The first two stanzas are as follows:

Yn Constantino axictini	Constantine arriving
Quinmahuiztilia iteohuan	honors his gods
Ica onhuelhelitini	for that reason he was able
Oquinxico in iyaohuan	to overcome his enemies
Ma nohuian yectenehualo	May everywhere be praised
Yn Constantino tlapaltic	valiant Constantine
Ylhuililtic ymacehualtic	deserving
Nohuian mauhcattalo	to be feared everywhere.

Many of don Manuel's papers ended up in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and I think he is far more likely than Sor Juana to have been behind the recently unearthed early eighteenth-century dialog between Spaniard and Indio on the nature of the Incarnation. Conservatively, it is fair to say that the person who wrote Sor Juana's 1676 villancico could not possibly have been the person who penned the dialog, which demonstrates absolute fluency in Nahuatl; whereas don Manuel or one of his many friends and relatives could have done so. In any case, it seems that both indigenous and Spanish creoles were party to the creation of the mixed poetic form we have seen here. How widespread it was or wasn't in the popular singing of the day we cannot know.

In sum, Sor Juana may not have been the paragon we have wanted her to be, either in the sense of herself absorbing and reflecting Nahuatl language and culture, or the sense of working actively with native speakers. On a certain level, she did in fact use a smattering of the Nahuas' language to objectify them. Yet what she was, was nevertheless extraordinary: she was not the remarkable product of some fictive, imaginary world of our own academic creation, but of the real world of human relations in which we, too, live. Perhaps that renders her more interesting, not less.

²² For more on don Manuel see my *Here in This Year: Seventeenth-Century Nahuatl Annals of the Tlaxcala-Puebla Valley* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010), 21-28.

²³ It was later he who took the pseudonym of "Sor Filotea" and published an essay of Sor Juana's, together with his chiding commentary, and who thus elicited her "Respuesta a Sor Filotea."

²⁴ Peter Villella, "Indian Lords, Hispanic Gentlemen: The Salazars of Colonial Tlaxcala," *The Americas* 69, 1 (2012), 18-19.

²⁵ James Lockhart, *The Nahuas After the Conquest* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), 400. The full text of the play in transcription and translation is found in Louise Burkhart and Barry Sell, eds., *Nahuatl Theater: Volume 4: Nahua Christianity in Performance* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009).



SOR JUANA INÉS DE LA CRUZ, ASUNCIÓN 1676, VILLANCICO VIII, TOCOTÍN

Tla ya timohuica totlazo Zuapilli, [sic] maca ammo, Tonantzin, titechmoilcahuiliz.	If you leave, our precious lady, our mother, let it not be that you forget us.
Ma nel in Ilhuicac huel timomaquitiz, ¿amo nozo quenman timotlalnamicitiz?	Although in Heaven you will rejoice, will you not perhaps remember us?
In moayolque mochtin huel motilinizque; tlaca amo, tehuatzin ticmomatlaniliz.	All your family will suffer greatly if you yourself do not reach out your hand to them
Ca mitztlacamati motlazo Piltzintli [sic] mac tel, in tepampa xicmotlatlauhtili.	He obeys you, your precious Son, thus for people's sake plead with him.
Tlaca ammo quinequi, xicmoilnamiquili ca monacayotzin oticismiquiti.	If he does not want to listen remind him that your flesh you gave to him.
Mochichihualayo oquimomitili, tla motemictia [sic]	Your breast he drank of, if he was to be satisfied



ihuan Tetepitzin.

when he was small

Ma mopampantzinco

Because of you

in moayolcatintin,

those who are your family

in itla pohpolin,

those who are clean

tictomacehuizque.

we will become deserving.

Totlatlacol mochtin

All our sins

tïololquitzizque;

we will throw out;

llhuicac tiazque,

to Heaven we will go,

timitzittalizque:

we will see you.

In campa cemicac

Everywhere and forever

timonemitiliz,

will you live,

cemicac mochihuaz

forever will be done

in monahuatiliztin

your will.



WORKS CITED

- BAUDOT, Georges. *La trova náhuatl de Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz*. Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1992.
- BENASSY-BERLING, Marie-Cécile. *Humanismo y religion en Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz*. Mexico City: UNAM, 1983.
- BURKHART, Louise. *Before Guadalupe: The Virgen Mary in Early Colonial Nahuatl Literature*. Albany: Institute for Mesoamerican Studies: 2001.
- and Barry SELL, eds. *Nahuatl Theater: Volume 4: Nahua Christianity in Performance*. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009.
- CALLEJA, Padre Diego. *Aprobación. Fama y Obras Posthumas del Fénix de México, Décima musa, Poetisa Americana*. Mexico City: UNAM, 1995.
- DIAZ CINTURA, Salvador. "La Loa de Juna Inés." *Letras Libres*, October 2001: 67-81.
- . "Yoqui in Tlahuepoch Medea' o el Nahuatl en la Obra de Sor Juana." *Aproximaciones a Sor Juana*, ed. Sanra Lorenzano. Mexico City: Universidad del Claustro de Sor Juana, 2005.
- FLORES, Enrique. "Sor Juana y los indios: loas y tocotines." *Literatura Mexicana* 18, 2 (2007): 39-77.
- GARIBAY, Angel María. *Historia de la literatura náhuatl*. Mexico City: Editorial Porrúa, 1953.
- JOHANSSON, Patrick. "Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz: cláusulas tiernas del mexicano lenguaje." *Literatura Mexicana* 6,2 (1995).
- LOCKHART, James. *The Nahuas After the Conquest*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- LUCIANI, Frederick. *Literary Self-Fashioning in Sor Juan Inés de la Cruz*. Lewisburg, Pennsylvania: Bucknell University Press, 2004.
- MARTINEZ SAN MIGUEL, Yolanda. "Saberes Americanos: Constitución de una subjetividad intelectual femenina en la poesía lirica de Sor Juana." *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana* 24, 49 (1999): 79-98.
- MENDEZ PLANCARTE, Alfonso. *Obras Completas de Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz*. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1951.
- MERRIM, Stephanie, ed. *Feminist Perspectives on Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1991.
- MORAÑA, Mabel. "Poder, razy a lengua: La construcción étnica del Otro en los villancicos de Sor Juana." *Colonial Latin American Review* 4, 2 (1995): 139-54
- PAZ, Octavio. *Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, o las trampas de la fé*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1982.
- PEDEN, Margaret Sayers, ed. *Poems, Protest, and a Dream: Selected Writings of Sor Juan Inés de la Cruz*. New York: Penguin Books, 1997.
- POOT HERRERA, Sara. "Sobre Una Loa Atribuida a la Niña Juana." *Aproximaciones a Sor Juana*, ed. Sandra LORENZANO (Mexico City: Universidad del Claustro de Sor Juana, 2005).



TOWNSEND, Camilla. "What in the World Have You Done to Me, my Lover? Sex, Servitude and Politics among the Pre-Conquest Nahuas as seen in the *Cantares Mexicanos*." *The Americas* 62, 3 (2006): 349-89.

-----. *Here in This Year: Seventeenth-Century Nahuatl Annals of the Tlaxcala-Puebla Valley*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

VILLELLA, Peter. "Indian Lords, Hispanic Gentlemen: The Salazars of Colonial Tlaxcala." *The Americas* 69,1 (2012): 1-36.