Language, Genealogy, and Archive: Fashioning the Indigenous Mother in the Comentarios reales and in Sixteenth-Century Mestizo Petitions

En el artículo se examina la figura de la madre indígena en los Comentarios reales (1609, 1617) de Inca Garcilaso de la Vega y en un conjunto de peticiones hechas por mestizos del virreinato del Perú en la década de 1580. Se propone que el sujeto escritural mestizo concibe a la madre nativa como fuente de legitimidad, autoridad e identidad, y se analiza esa concepción concentrándose en tres temas relacionados: lengua, genealogía y archivo. En la investigación se plantea una labor doble y simultánea al poner de relieve la importancia de la madre aborigen del mestizo - tema poco estudiado - y al yuxtaponer y subrayar la interrelación entre la historiografía y las peticiones oficiales - documentos jurídico-burocráticos del sistema notarial y de archivo de la monarquía hispánica. La yuxtaposición de escritura histórica y escritura notarial subraya la importancia de estos dos medios de comunicación durante la temprana edad moderna, y hace hincapié en la correspondencia y reciprocidad entre ellos.

In the Comentarios reales (Part 1, 1609; Part 2, 1617) Inca Garcilaso (1539-1616) makes reference to how despite the use of catechetical works like the trilingual (Spanish-Quechua-Aymara) Confesionario para los curas de indios (Lima, 1589), priests in viceregal Peru still have difficulty communicating with their native parishioners (“se entienden con ellos con tanta dificultad” [CR, Part 2, Book. 1, ch. 23, 3: 49]). The mestizo cleric and former Cuzco schoolfellow Diego de Alcobaza had sent Inca Garcilaso from Peru a copy of the Confesionario in 1603. This important pastoral work was produced in the context of the Third Lima Church Council (1582-83) with the participation of bilingual Peruvian mestizos of Inca Garcilaso’s and Alcobaza’s generation - the secular cleric Francisco Carrasco, and the Jesuits Bartolomé de Santiago and Blas Valera. These Hispano-Andean priests were also directly and indirectly involved in the collective mestizo petitions crafted in Lima and Cuzco in the early 1580s, seeking the repeal of a royal order that sought to exclude mestizos from the Peruvian priesthood. Inca Garcilaso’s reference to the Confesionario calls attention to the relevance of indigenous language knowledge in his own work of
historiography, and recalls for us the importance of the native language in the mestizo petitionary record of the 1580s that concerns me here. That record emphasized mestizos’ competitive advantage vis-à-vis Spaniards in matters of evangelization, noting explicitly that “[mestizos] saben y entienden mejor que los demás ... la lengua de los yndios, como lengua materna, e que a primis cunabulis [in the cradle] la aprendieron y mamaron en la leche” (Archivo General de Indias [AGI], Lima 126, f. 2r). In the Comentarios, Inca Garcilaso brings into relief the relevance of his own native language knowledge (“la lengua que mamé en la leche” [CR, Part 1, Book 2, ch. 27, 2: 80]) and fuses it neatly with his historiographic endeavour (“la relación que mamé en la leche”), by emphasising his role as translator-chronicler of the splendor of his maternal Inca ancestors (CR, Part 1, Book 1, ch. 19, 2: 32). As the foregoing references make clear, native language competence is intimately tied to the mestizo’s native mother.

In what follows I investigate the role of the indigenous mother in mestizo petitioning and history-writing, by positing that the native mother is fashioned as a critical source of legitimacy, authority, and identity in the Comentarios and in the mestizo petitionary record of the 1580s. The significance of the native mother is best appreciated and understood by focusing on three interrelated topics: language, genealogy, and archive. The relevance of language and genealogy is evident in the examples I have already noted. The importance of the archive requires making explicit at the outset that both history-writing and contesting notarial petitions engaged the colonial archive in significant ways. Residing since the early 1560s in Spain, Inca Garcilaso wrote his Comentarios at the periphery of history-writing about the “New World,” in relation to the “official” historiography Spanish historians associated with the royal court in Madrid were composing. Rather, in the Comentarios he offered the first history of Peru written from the perspective of a bilingual Quechua-Spanish speaker who embodied a bicultural Hispano-Andean experience - albeit a highly Hispanized and elite one. While in the petitionary record of the 1580s, upper strata mestizos from colonial Peru came together to collectively craft arguments that served as archival countermoves to the discriminatory practices that sought to exclude them from holding ecclesiastic and public office. In both history-writing and petitionary writing, shaping and setting straight the (archival) record were significant strategies and objectives. To understand those tactical manoeuvres and the role of the native mother therein, I outline first the historical context that led to the crafting of the mestizo petitions in late sixteenth-century colonial Peru, and then shift attention to the petitionary record in
HISTORICAL ANTECEDENTS

In the chapter entitled “Nombres nuevos para nombrar diversas generaciones,” Inca Garcilaso explains that “a los hijos de español y de indio, o de indio y española, nos llaman mestizos, por decir que somos mezclados de ambas naciones” (CR, Part 1, Book 9, ch. 31, 2: 373). He notes, however, that while proud to call himself mestizo (“me lo llamo yo a boca llena, y me honro con él [el apelativo]”), in the Indies to be given such a label is taken as an insult (“lo toman por menosprecio”) (CR, Part 1, Book 9, ch. 31, 2: 373). The negative views toward mestizos began to emerge in viceregal Peru in the 1560s, at a time when the first post-conquest generation of mestizos was in their early twenties and those Hispano-Andeans started asserting their rightful claims. Berta Ares Queija has documented the “proceso de diferenciación y enajenamiento” that in the mid-1560s targeted mestizos (“Un borracho de chicha y vino” 138-39). That marginalization process stressed their illegitimate birth, as the progeny of Spaniards and native women in informal unions. It also drew from Iberian discriminatory views that tended to combine religion, lineage, and proto-racialization, and that targeted people of non-Christian-European descent.

Writing to the king from Cuzco in 1572, Fray Juan de Vivero voices the “racial” aspect of those views, by noting that in Peru “nacen gran copia de mestizos de los cuales muchos salen aviesos por no les favorecer la mezcla o por criarse entre mulatos e yndios” (AGI, Lima 314, f. 3r). An especially damaging part of those views cast the mestizo’s native mother and her maternal milk in particular as the source of waywardness. Writing in 1572 from Cuzco to King Philip II, Viceroy Francisco de Toledo noted, “[e]n este reino hay un linage de gente que llaman mestizos [.] hijos de españoles e indias [.] los cuales con la libertad de la tierra y con la ynclinacion que se les pega de las madres ha salido de ruines costumbres” (Levillier 4: 125). In his influential De procuranda indorum salute (1577), the Jesuit José de Acosta stressed that despite their native language proficiency mestizos should not be entrusted to evangelize the natives because of the deficiency their indigenous lineage was thought to represent: “por los resabios que les quedan de haber mamado leche india y haberse criado entre indios” (Book 4, ch. 8, 517). Although views such as Toledo’s and Acosta’s were generally tinged with certain ambivalence - Acosta supported mestizo priests in the 1580s, while Toledo saw mestizos as part of “la nación española” rather than belonging to the república de indios - negative opinions by and large helped to cast mestizos as colonial subjects of
questionable religious conformity and royal fidelity. Their purported dexterity with weapons and their alleged role in rebellious plots contributed to anti-mestizo reports, and, more importantly, the arrival in Madrid of such accounts resulted in royal legislation that in the 1570s sought to ban mestizos from the priesthood, and also from carrying weapons and from holding public office (Ruan, “Andean Activism” 221; 223).

One such piece of exclusory crown legislation was a royal order or real cédula of 1578 instructing the archbishop of the viceregal capital at Lima “[q]ue no se dé órdenes [sacerdotales] a mestizos” (Konetzke 1: 514). The royal decree prompted Peruvian mestizos to rally together to collectively craft a contesting document collection in the 1580s. That petitionary record is significant, as Ares Queija has noted, because it represents “una de las escasísimas manifestaciones escritas realizadas a título colectivo por los mestizos peruanos en el siglo XVI” (“El papel de mediadores” 52). Moreover, the document collection chronicles an early chapter in the three-century long history of mestizo petitionary action seeking to counter discrimination before the Crown and the Church.

The late sixteenth-century mestizo record consisted of common notarial documents such as a set of poderes from Hispano-Andeans, granting their advocates power of attorney to represent their claims before Church and Crown authorities. It also included two lengthy probanzas or sworn testimony of friendly witnesses prepared in Cuzco and Lima, which were preceded by a set of preliminary arguments outlining the main issues of their claims. The nearly 120-folio dossier brought together some 140 mestizos from five cities in the viceroyalty (Lima, Cuzco, Arequipa, Oropesa [Huancavelica], and Loja). It was crafted to be presented at the Third Lima Church Council (1582-83), and eventually delivered and filed in the mid-1580s at the Council of the Indies in Madrid by Pedro Rengifo (c. 1541-?), a mestizo of Inca Garcilaso’s generation. A petitionary letter - written in elegant Latin in 1583 - was also dispatched to the Holy See in Rome, urging the pontiff to intercede on the mestizos’ behalf before King Philip II in Madrid. The concerted mestizo “activism” sought not only to repeal the royal order that barred them from the priesthood, but also to revoke the arms ban that targeted them, and the legislation that excluded mestizos from holding public office. Although the mestizos named in the record are all male, their advocacy also aimed to end the ban on mestizas becoming full dowry nuns, a restriction not affecting Spanish and criollo women. In relation to Inca Garcilaso, the mestizo petitioning of the 1580s anticipated the symbolic rehabilitation of Hispano-Andeans that was arguably sought in the Comentarios (and in earlier works like La Florida [1605] and Diálogos de
As expected, like in Inca Garcilaso’s work, language and its link to the native mother played a key role in the arguments set forth in the mestizo petitionary record.

LANGUAGE

In both the mestizo petitioning and in the Comentarios, native language knowledge functions as a cultural source and trait through which Hispano-Andeans shaped their competitive advantage in relation to others, like Peninsular Spaniards and American-born Spaniards or criollos. There are, however, important contextual and generic distinctions in terms of the two written media in question, history-writing and notarial petitions. In crafting their petitions in the Peruvian viceroyalty, through the colonial juridical-bureaucratic notarial system, mestizos strived to shape a linguistic lead as better suited agents of evangelization over Spanish and criollo priests. Writing in Spain from the position of an arguably upstart historian, through his Quechua-Spanish bilingualism, Inca Garcilaso sought in the Comentarios a historiographic advantage over prior and contemporary “New World” Spanish historians. The common element in both history-writing and petitionary record, however, is a writing subject of mixed Hispano-Andean parentage.

As Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino has noted, in the Comentarios “El Inca [Garcilaso] respalda su autoridad en el dominio de la lengua nativa” (134). Early on in the Comentarios, Inca Garcilaso sets out to underscore the linguistic advantage he brings to his historiographic endeavour. In the “Proemio al lector,” appealing to the rhetorical formula of false modesty and thus diffusing would-be historiographic polemics, Garcilaso explains that his narrative will not contradict what Spanish historians have written. Rather, he will offer “comento y glosa” to their accounts, and, more significant for our purposes, Garcilaso will serve “de intérprete en muchos vocablos indios” (CR, “Advertencias” 5). The role of linguistic intermediary (“intérprete”) is strategically transformed and expanded in the preliminary text entitled “Advertencias acerca de la lengua general de los indios del Perú.” Here Inca Garcilaso highlights the linguistic deficiencies of Spanish historians as a result of their lack of native language knowledge, and of Quechua in particular: “y porque me conviene alegar muchas cosas ... que dicen los historiadores españoles ... las he de sacar a la letra con su corrupción como ellos las escriben” (CR, “Advertencias” 5). He notes that “para atajar esta corrupción me sea lícito, pues soy indio, que en esta historia yo escriba como indio con las mismas letras que aquellas tales dicciones se deben escribir” (CR, “Advertencias” 5). “Being native” and writing like a native speaker of Quechua are of course tacit references to
Inca Garcilaso's mother, the Palla (Inca Princess) Chimpu Ocllo or "la Palla doña Isabel," as he refers to her in the dedication to Philip II of Diálogos de amor (1590). The linguistic lead Quechua knowledge brings for the historian Inca Garcilaso is underlined unequivocally in the first Book of the Comentarios: "el español que piensa que sabe más de él [el quechua], ignora de diez partes las nueve, por las muchas cosas que un mismo vocablo significa, y por las diferentes pronunciaciones que una misma dicción tiene para muy diferentes significaciones" (CR, Part 1, Book 1, ch. 19, 2: 32). Native language competence in fact allows Inca Garcilaso to say he offers a fuller, more encompassing history than the truncated accounts of Spanish historians: “ampliamos y extendemos con la propia relación la que los historiadores españoles, como extranjeros, acortaron por no saber la propiedad de la lengua ni haber mamado en la leche aquestas fábulas y verdades como yo las mamé” (CR, Part 1, Book 2, ch. 10, 2: 58). At the outset, Inca Garcilaso fashions his Andean mother tongue into the cornerstone of his historical narrative, in a strategic use of the native mother that affirms his maternal language (and lineage) as the ‘principios y fundamento’ of the chronicle, and that recalls the foundational role attributed to the first Inca’s deeds in the early sections of the Comentarios (“Y porque todos los hechos de este primer Inca son principios y fundamento de la historia que hemos de escribir” [CR, Part 1, Book 1, ch. 19, 2: 32]).

Native language proficiency also serves as the foundational stone in the claims that the mestizos set forth in their petitioning. In the preliminary arguments that frame the lengthy dossier, the mestizos pointedly underscore their superior native language knowledge vis-à-vis Spaniards and criollos (“saben y entiende mejor que los demás y con más perfección la lengua de los indios”), for they learned it from the earliest childhood (“a primis cunabulis”), and suckled it in their mother’s milk (AGI, Lima 126, f. 2r). Their greater native language competence is then strategically linked to the evangelizing mission entrusted to the Spanish monarchs: “el fin con que nuestro Santo Padre encargó a la magestad católica del rey de España la conquista, población y pacificación destos reynos” (AGI, Lima 126, f. 2r). To fulfill that mission, the most important requirement, the argument goes, “es de hacer la dicha enseñanza y doctrina” having the expected proficiency (“pericia”) “en la lengua materna de los dichos naturales [indios]” (AGI, Lima 126, f. 2r). As long as mestizo aspirants to the priesthood meet the required good virtue and good customs (“virtud y buenas costumbres”), they should in fact be chosen over Spanish postulants (“los demás españoles”) because of mestizos’ greater linguistic skill (AGI, Lima 126, f. 2v). The mestizos even argue that although Quechua (“la lengua general que llaman del ynga”) is now taught
at Lima’s university, there are many different languages in the various viceroyalty provinces, and few priests actually know those other native languages ("pocos sañardotes que las sepan" [AGI, Lima 126, f. 2v]). In doing so, the mestizos highlight the linguistic diversity beyond Quechua in the Andean region and therefore the advantage they have as individuals "nascidos en esta tierra [y] que se [h]an criado en las dichas partes y tienen mucho curso y perçia de las dichas lenguas" (AGI, Lima 126, f. 2v).

In their petitions the mestizos not only had native language proficiency going for them, they also had law on their side. The mestizo record includes two important official crown and church decrees. The first is a Latin language papal brief Pope Gregory XIII had issued in 1576, granting Hispano-Andeans a dispensation for the illegitimacy of birth that affected some, and underscoring also that such indulgence was meant to foster the creation of a mestizo-priesthood (Hyland 437). The other legal document is the one referenced in the preliminary arguments, a royal pronouncement of September 1580 for the founding of a Chair of Quechua ("cátedra") at Lima’s university. The order stipulated that a certificate from the Chair attesting to the fulfilment of the native language requirement was to be a prerequisite for priesthood ordination. The legislation also prescribed that a year from the date of the decree all priests of Indian parishes ("sacerdotes y ministros de doctrinas") must undergo an indigenous language examination, to be carried out by the Chair of Quechua (AGI, Lima 126, f. 14-16v). This royal decree came on the eve of the Third Lima Church Council (1582-83), the ecclesiastical gathering that saw the creation of important catechetical works like the already cited trilingual Confesionario (1585) Inca Garcilaso mentions - a work prepared with the participation of mestizo priests under the supervision of the prominent Jesuit José de Acosta (Durston 88; 97).

Influential ecclesiastical figures also helped to buttress mestizo claims for the repeal of the legislation on priesthood exclusion, by focusing specifically on native language competence. In the Lima probanza (the sworn witness testimony part of the mestizo dossier), the Jesuit José de Acosta underscored the contributions of the Jesuit mestizo priests Blas Valera and Bartolomé de Santiago in the preparation of the trilingual catechism ("[h]an hecho muy buenas traducciones en las lenguas del Cuzco [Quechua] e Aymara" [AGI, Lima 126, f. 43r]). Acosta testifies also that mestizo priests "[s]on muy útiles para doctrinar yndios por saber muy bien su lengua, e que los yndios les dan mucho crédito y les tienen afición" (AGI, Lima 126, f. 43r). The secular cleric Sebastián de Lartaun, bishop of Cuzco and participant at the Third Lima Council, had written the king on the topic in 1580. In his missive Lartaun noted about mestizos that "son los mejores
clérigos que tengo en mi obispado," and that the native people "[les] muestran más devoción que a los sacerdotes españoles como a hombres que son de su lenguaje" (Lissón Chávez 2: 824). Significantly, Acosta’s and Lartaun’s testimonials underscore how mestizos’ native mother tongue forged special pastoral bonds between Hispano-Andean clerics and their native charges. That linguistic affinity gave mestizos an edge over Spanish and criollo clerics, and such competitive advantage fit nicely with the philological and translation work that Acosta supervised in the crafting of multilingual catechetical works, as part of the Third Lima Council’s agenda - and involving mestizo clerics. For his part, bishop Lartaun had earlier collaborated with the mestizo and secular cleric Francisco Carrasco in the translation of a catechetical work (a cartilla) at Cuzco, an important centre for the study of Quechua (Durston 99; 74).

Native language proficiency was at the core of the multilingual catechetical projects that the Third Lima Council set out to achieve, and in their petitionary record the mestizos strove to capitalize on the benefits knowledge of their mother’s native language brought to the goals of the Church assembly, and to the Spanish monarchy’s larger evangelizing mission. Indigenous language competence was also at the heart of Inca Garcilaso’s professed advantage over Spanish historians. The importance placed on native languages by mestizo historian and mestizo petitioners alike finds common ground in the critical philology that humanist scholars developed in the Renaissance, and which was applied in areas like history-writing and the production of native language catechetical works. Margarita Zamora has amply documented the significance of humanist philology in Inca Garcilaso’s historiography, and in the Comentarios in particular. Like other historians of his age, Inca Garcilaso embraced critical philology as a means of historical inquiry, by which the focus on language served to determine precise meaning in documents, assess their authenticity, and verify their accuracy as reliable sources (Ostenfeld-Suske 27-8). Developed by Italian humanists like Lorenzo Valla (1407-1457) and Poliziano (1454-1494), the critical, philological method was also applied to biblical scholarship, and in Spanish America was influential in the translation work required in crafting multilingual catechetical works in indigenous languages - pastoral works that aimed to teach the basics of Christian doctrine to native Americans. In one of the preliminaries titled “Epístola sobre la traducción” of a key catechetical work that came out of the Third Lima Council (Doctrina christiana y catecismo para instrucción de los indios [Lima, 1584]), the significance of linguistic accuracy was underscored: “hemos tenido por necesario ... hacerse por nuestra orden y comisión una traducción auténtica del Catecismo y Doctrina Christiana que
todos sigan."

To achieve that goal, "se diputaron personas doctas y hábiles en la lengua," and the translation work was thereafter "visto y aprobado por los mejores maestros en la lengua" ("Epístola sobre la traducción"). Among those who reviewed and approved the Quechua translation was the mestizo Jesuit Blas Valera, who also served as translator of the Aymara text for the Council’s catechism (Cárdenas Bunsen, “Circuitos del conocimiento” 86). The mestizo Jesuit Bartolomé de Santiago and the presbyter mestizo Francisco Carrasco were also important native language specialists who worked on the trilingual catechism. Like the historian Inca Garcilaso, the competitive advantage of these Hispano-Andean linguists-translators lay in their respective native-speaker proficiency in the language of their indigenous mothers.

GENEALOGY

Writing about the significance of genealogy in colonial Spanish America, María Elena Martínez aptly explains that the histories and genealogies of Spanish-Native authors like Fernando de Alva Ixtlilxóchitl, Diego Muñoz Camargo, and Juan Bautista Pomar in New Spain “preserved an important matrilineal dimension,” despite the crown’s “stress on paternal descent” (115). Martínez writes that the appeal to “the worthiness of bloodlines originating in the pre-Hispanic past and conquest period” was characteristic of a broader body of colonial historiography, and cites Inca Garcilaso’s Comentarios as a prominent example (114). These genealogical preoccupations resulted from increased efforts in the mid-sixteenth century “to create an archival infrastructure” for preserving historical and genealogical information as a means of recognizing the descendants of conquistadors and of pre-Hispanic rulers and nobles (Martínez 125). Meant to regulate the system of privileges and royal rewards or mercedes, these archival practices and mechanism “produced and reproduced categories of identity based on ancestry” (Martínez 6). Notarial records like probanzas, petitions, and relaciones were among the kinds of documents used to validate one’s ancestry and services to the Crown, and the genealogical concerns and rhetorical formulas of such juridical-bureaucratic written forms were incorporated into the histories crafted by mestizo native Spanish writers. It is not accidental, as Martínez underscores, that the writing of these histories and the appropriation of the native past in particular took place “at the time when the crown was attempting to disenfranchise mestizos, the descendants of Spanish and Indian unions” (116). Through these histories and petitions, mestizos claimed their “double nobility,” as the descendants of both Spanish conquistadors and native women related to pre-Hispanic rulers.
Maternal native genealogy in the *Comentarios* functions in at least three significant ways: it serves as an important historiographic source, emphasizes Crown loyalty, and promotes the writing subject’s own noble Inca lineage. Garcilaso makes explicit reference to his native mother’s lineage in a chapter near the end of Part 1 (“Algunos de la sangre real escaparon de la crueldad de Atahuallpa”). There he writes that his mother was the niece of the last Inca king (Huayna Capac) (*CR*, Part 1, Book 9, ch. 38, 2:38r), while in the prologue to Part 2 he underscores his own ties to Inca royalty: “[soy] hijo de madre y palla e infanta peruana (hija del último príncipe gentil de aquellas opulentas provincias)” (“Prólogo a los indios mestizos y criollos” 3:14). Despite the genealogical intricacies posed by the two passages, they ultimately emphasize the writer’s ancestral ties to the *panaca* or royal family of Túpac Inca Yupanqui, Inca Garcilaso’s maternal great-grandfather, and predecessor of Huáscar and Atahualpa, who were fighting a civil war when the Spanish arrived in Peru in the early 1530s.\(^{31}\) I will return to the genealogical significance in the *Comentarios* of the warring brothers Huáscar and Atahualpa. For now, attention is focused on maternal ancestry as a historical source and as a means to emphasize allegiance to the crown.

One of the main sources for the Inca history chronicled in the *Comentarios* is the accounts that the young Gracilaso heard his mother and her relatives tell when they gathered in the maternal home in Cuzco.\(^{24}\) One family member stands out as an oral source of Inca history: Garcilaso’s maternal great-uncle, Cusi Huallpa (*CR*, Part 1, Book 9, ch. 14, 2:353). Generally referred to in the narrative as “Inca, tío,” “aquel Inca, tío de mi madre,” “aquel viejo Inca,” the Andean elder is more than a simple Inca informant, rather he is a record-keeper and spokesperson for the history of his people (Durand, “Garcilaso Inca jura” 8).\(^{25}\) The maternal great-uncle makes his appearance in the chapter entitled “El origen de los Incas, reyes del Perú,” where the author notes: “Después de haber dado muchas trazas, y tomando muchos caminos para entrar a dar cuenta del origen y principio de los Incas, ... me pareció que era mejor traza y camino más fácil contar lo que en mis niñezes oí muchas veces a mi madre y a sus hermanos y tíos, y a otros sus mayores” (*CR*, Part 1, Book 1, ch. 15, 2:25). Following the expressed plan that the account of Inca origins is best given “por las propias palabras que los Incas lo cuentan” (*CR*, Part 1, Book 1, ch. 15, 2:25), Inca Garcilaso goes on to reproduce a series of dialogues he claims to have held in his youth with his great-uncle (*CR*, Part 1, Book 1, ch. 15-17). The Inca senior’s voice is presented as a *relación* or account in Quechua, which Inca Garcilaso has faithfully translated and inserted into his narrative: “Esta larga relación del origen de sus Reyes me dio aquel Inca, tío de mi madre, a
The oral account of the maternal Inca elder along with the fact that it was spoken in the Andean mother tongue merge as factors for its development into a critical source for the history-writing project. But the author’s prestigious Inca lineage also functions in the historical narrative as a way to assert his native mother’s and his own allegiance to the Spanish crown. Two examples from Part 2 will serve to illustrate the point. The first is Gonzalo Pizarro’s rebellion against the Crown in the early 1540s, and the second the surrender (in the late 1550s) and arrival at Cuzco from Vilcabamba (via Lima) of the Inca rebel Sayri Túpac.

After reconsidering his initial support of the rebel Gonzalo Pizarro, who as a result of encomienda system reforms (the New Laws of 1542) rose against the king, Gracilaso’s father left the family home in Cuzco to join the royal forces at Lima. In retaliation, Pizarro laid siege to the Garcilaso de la Vega household, where the toddler Gómez Suárez de Figueroa (Inca Garcilaso) along with his mother and other family members resided. The siege lasted eight months and as Inca Garcilaso writes, “[p]ereciéramos de hambre si no nos socorrieran los Incas y Pallas parientes [de mi madre], que a todas las horas del día nos enviaban por vías secretas algo de comer” (CR, Part 2, Book 4, ch. 10, 3: 242). Through his maternal Andean familial ties (and networks) Inca Garcilaso underscores in the narrative his family’s loyalty to the Crown vis-à-vis those rebellious subjects like Gonzalo Pizarro. But Garcilaso writes that the family was aided too with food rations by the curaca García Pauqui, an Andean chief loyal to his father: “Un cacique de los de mi padre ... se puso a riesgo de que lo matasen, como lo habían amenazado” (CR, Part 2, Book 4, ch. 10, 3: 242). In this way, Garcilaso not only stresses his maternal Andean family’s royal fidelity but, through the courageous actions of an Andean lord, mitigates doubts about his father’s loyal adherence to the king.

The second example focuses squarely on the author’s Inca ancestry. The passage fashions Inca Garcilaso into his mother’s representative before the Inca rebel Sayri Túpac, who had negotiated the terms of his surrender with the Viceroy Andrés Hurtado de Mendoza, and had arrived in Cuzco in the late 1550s. The episode is significant in the narrative, for it offers the reader a dialogue that purportedly took place between the young Inca Garcilaso and Sayri Túpac. Garcilaso reports that, “Yo fuí [a besarle la manos] en nombre de mi madre a pedirla licencia para que personalmente [mi madre] fuera a besárselas.” During the encounter Sayri Túpac tells the young Garcilaso “Dile a mi tía que la beso las manos, y que no venga acá, que yo iré a su casa a besárselas y darle la norabuena de
nuestra vista" (CR, Part 2, Book 8, ch. 11, 4: 145). The use of the familiar “tú” in the passage and the assertion of the familial bloodline (“Dile a mi tía”) are noteworthy in underlining the author’s Andean noble lineage. The Inca rebel Sayri Túpac had put down his arms and through a negotiated surrender had pledged allegiance to the Spanish crown, and as a result brought peace to the viceroyalty - albeit short-lived. Moreover, royal fidelity is further reinforced in the narrative through an account of Sayri Túpac’s subsequent Christian baptism: “pidió el príncipe [Sayri Túpac] el Sacramento del Bautismo ... Bautizóse juntamente con el Inca Sayri Túpac la infanta su mujer, llamada Cusi Huarcay” (CR, Part 2, Book 8, ch. 11, 4: 146).

The uses of genealogy help to frame the narrative and to shape the record. This is most apparent in how Inca Garcilaso favours his own maternal Inca family ties to Huáscar while portraying Atahualpa as a traitor and as illegitimate Inca ruler. As noted earlier, the brothers Huáscar and Atahualpa were fighting a civil war when the Spanish arrived in Peru (in 1531-33). In the last nine chapters of the Comentarios (Part 1), Inca Garcilaso chronicles the rivalry between the Inca brothers, the military victory of Atahualpa and subsequent imprisonment of Huáscar, as well as the bloody persecution campaign Atahualpa carried out against Huáscar’s descendants. At various points in the narrative Inca Garcilaso refers to Atahualpa as a traitor and bastard brother (“el desdichado Huáscar, que lo prendió el traidor de Atahualpa, su hermano bastardo” [CR, Part 1, Book 4, ch. 16, 2: 137]), underscoring in particular Huáscar’s pure royal blood and primogenitor status, and therefore his rightful legitimacy as king over Atahualpa. The question of purity of blood is, according to the narrative, the reason for the bloodshed Atahualpa unleashes against Huáscar and his descendants: “A falta de los hijos de la legítima mujer, era ley que podía heredar el mayor de los legítimos en sangre, como heredó Manco Inca a Huáscar ... Por esta ley destruyó Atahualpa toda la sangre real, hombres y mujeres, ... porque él era bastardo y temía no le quitasen el reino usurpado y se lo diesen a algún legítimo” (CR, Part 1, Book 4, ch. 10, 2: 129). Among those of rightful royal blood Atahualpa persecuted and executed were the family members of the Palla Chimpu Oclo - Inca Garcilaso’s mother, and, more generally those of the panaca or royal family of Túpac Yupanqui and of Huáscar. Not all perished, as the last chapter of Part 1 makes clear (“La descendencia que ha quedado de la sangre real de los Incas”). However, it is especially noteworthy that Inca Garcilaso emphasizes and shapes his own Andean genealogy as representing that of the rightful and legitimate descendants of the Incas. This strategic use of genealogy not only lends authority and legitimacy to his own historiographic endeavour, but also
helps to advance the interests of those relatives and friends in Cuzco, some of whom had travelled to Spain seeking royal rewards and privileges.28

The interrelation of mestizos’ genealogy and royal rewards figures prominently in the Hispano-Andean petitionary record. Crown rewards and privileges are linked directly to the reciprocal obligations between the monarch and his subjects, and to the concept of distributive justice whereby the king “had the responsibility to recognize services that individuals preformed for the Crown and reward them according to their worth” (Burkholder 63). In their petitions mestizos highlight such reciprocal duties by noting the significance of their paternal lineage: “[h]abiendo nascido vasallos de vuestra alteza, hijos de españoles que tanto le han servido y merecido en el descubrimiento, conquista, población, recuperación dells [provincias]” (AGI, Lima 126, f. 1r). But Hispano-Andeans also stress their important maternal genealogy, with a specific emphasis on familial bonds to the pre-Hispanic rulers of the land: “y ser descendientes muchos dells por línea materna de los señores dells [provincias] y caciques e indios principales, en cuya posession vuestra magestad subcedio” (AGI, Lima 126, f. 115r). Due to their prestigious ancestry, mestizos argue, their honour and good lineage should not be diminished and tarnished, as the priesthood interdiction does (“no se deue hazer semejante ynjurya”). Rather, it is the king’s duty “to honour and encourage” them (“honrrallos y animallos”) so that with “estudios y ocupaciones virtuosas, se apliquen a ... enseñar y do[c]trinar a los dichos yndios en sus diuersas lenguas, con ydiomas naturales y propios...” (AGI, Lima 126, f. 1r). The record goes on emphatically to say that “por la línea materna está vuestra alteza obligado a su protección, tutela y amparo, por [h]auer subçedido en la posesion de sus antepasados” (AGI, Lima 126, f. 1r).

Maternal blood ties to pre-Hispanic Andean rulers served to emphasize the Crown’s obligations toward mestizos, and also worked in mestizo petitions to highlight Hispano-Andeans’ kinship bonds to the native people they sought to evangelize. In their 1583 Latin letter requesting Pope Gregory XIII’s intercession before the king, the mestizos stressed the point: “porque estamos unidos a ellos [los nativos] por la sangre, podemos velar más convenientemente y con más facilidad por la salud de las almas de estas gentes no sólo porque no intentamos marcharnos a ninguna otra región, sino ... porque no ignoramos la lengua materna” (cit. in Ruan, “Identidad mestiza” 182). The letter’s argument is strategically crafted to underscore the mestizos’ blood connections to the natives and to the land, in contradistinction to the Spanish priests who lack those same ties and abandon therefore their pastoral duties in Indian parishes once they have enriched themselves (“después de emplear seis o
siete años en acumular riquezas, en absoluto preocupados por la salvación de las almas, se vuelven de nuevo a España” [182]). The Latin letter is especially rich in references to maternal genealogy. It highlights the pontiff’s responsibility to protect mestizos and intercede on their behalf, for their native mothers were among the latest to join the Christian fold: “[nuestras] madres han sido llamadas, las últimas, entre los habitantes del universo, al seno de la Iglesia” (cit. in Ruan, “Identidad mestiza” 184). It also brings into relief the native mother’s Christian fidelity, regardless of her neophyte status: “Nuestras madres, una vez recibida la fe cristiana, verdaderamente nunca la han abandonado” (cit. in Ruan, “Identidad mestiza” 184).

The native mother’s firm devotion is also evident in the petitionary record on the subject of the interdiction on mestizas becoming full-dowry nuns, where the rhetoric of limpieza de sangre is expressly brought to the forefront:

las dichas donzellas [mestizas] ... no [h]an desmerecido por parte de sus madres ni padres o infamia ni mala algun... pues aunque las dichas yndias hubieran en algún tiempo sido yñfeles y de gentilidad, ora que vinieron en conocimiento de la ley de Jesu Cristo nuestro señor ... no quedó mala alguna por donde sus descendientes queden en alguna nota o infamia, como lo quedarían los que descendientes de moros o judíos conversos. (AGI, Lima 126, f. 4v-5r)

Although couched in Old World cultural shorthand, in their argument mestizos reformulate the rhetoric around purity of blood in order to distinguish the native mother’s neophyte status from that of new Christians on the Iberian Peninsula, like moriscos and conversos. On the topic of their native mother’s genealogy, the petitionary mestizo documents aimed to alter the colonial record which sought to discredit them because of their indigenous lineage. In that regard, Hispano-Andeans intended to correct and reshape the historical memory that the notarial record helped to craft, for colonial authorities and for petitioners themselves. That historical memory has much to do with the colonial archive, the topic to which I now turn.

ARCHIVE

A useful point of reference for a discussion on the subject of the archive is the definition Sebastián de Covarrubias offered in the Suplemento al thesoro de la lengua castellana (1611) in which it is described as: “El cajón o armario donde se guardan las escrituras originales, privilegios y memorias. Este tienen los reyes de Castilla en villa de Simancas con gran orden y
Custodia y después de ellos todos los señores, las ciudades, las iglesias, los conventos, y comunidades.” Covarrubias underscores the Greek origin of the term (arkheion or public hall) and notes in Latin that the archive is “a repository of books or a public space in which our acts or those of citizens are customarily kept.” The reference to the royal archive at Simancas is significant, for Charles V established there a document repository in the early 1540s, and in the history of European archives Simancas has come to be seen as the first early-modern state archive. Also significant in Covarrubias’ definition is the emphasis on the archive as a public space in which a record of the acts and presumably the ‘voices’ of citizens are stored - a view emphasizing a dynamic perspective of the archive rather than that of a static and staid repository of official papers.

Modern scholarship has also called attention to the archive’s dynamic qualities. In Along the Archival Grain, Ann Stoler explains that she views and treats “archives not as repositories of state power but as unquiet movements in a field of force, as restless realignments and readjustments of people and the beliefs to which they are tethered” (32-3). Stoler focuses specifically on colonial archives and her views are part of a larger trend that has come to be known as the “archival turn,” a perspective that sees archives not only as sources of the past but also as “cultural artifacts of fact production, of taxonomies in the making, and of disparate notions of what made up colonial authority” (Stoler, “Colonial Archives” 90-91). Drawing from Stoler, Kathryn Burns offers an Iberian take on the colonial archive, by noting that notarial “document making was like chess: full of gambits, scripted moves, and countermoves. Archives are less like mirrors than like chessboards” (Into the Archive 124). Stoler and Burns propose a dynamic model of the forces at work in the making of colonial archives, involving negotiated participation of state agents and contested actions of colonial actors, and the associated ensuing archival “realignments” and “readjustments.”

In terms of the Comentarios and the mestizo petitionary record, the native mother plays an important role in the negotiated realignments and readjustments in the colonial archive. In Garcilaso’s work the native mother is fashioned into an important “archive” of Inca (oral) history, while in the mestizo petitions the emphasis on the native mother aids in crafting arguments that counter discriminatory views toward mestizos, and serves also as a source that lends confidence and authority to mestizos’ claims. I offer in what follows two illustrative examples from the Comentarios and the mestizo petitionary record.

In Part 1 of the Comentarios, Inca Garcilaso shapes his native mother’s house in Cuzco into an important repository of Inca history. It is in the
maternal home where his mother’s Inca relatives gather and it is there that
the young Gómez Suárez de Figueroa listens to his maternal great-uncle’s
oral accounts on the origins of the Incas: “Otras cosas semejantes ... me
dijo este Inca en las visitas y pláticas que en casa de mi madre se hacían, ...
y pésame de no haberle preguntado otras muchas para tener ahora la
noticia de ellas, sacadas de tan buen archivo, para escribirlas aquí” (CR,
Part 1, Book 1, ch. 17, 2: 29). The archive that Inca Garcilaso’s great-uncle
represents is in fact a repository of oral memory and is meant to stand for
the real and symbolic storehouse of Inca oral traditions from which the
Hispano-Andean author draws - and which he melds with European
sources of historiography.35 His great-uncle’s voice is especially significant,
for in the narrative it is a primordial source of the foundation myth of
Cuzco, the political centre of the pre-Hispanic Inca world. The oral Inca
archive embodied by his great-uncle represents the incorporation of non-
European archival sources into the narrative and becomes also part of the
competitive advantage that the Hispano-Andean writer has over other
Spanish historians of Peru.

But Andean archives are not limited to the oral histories that the
maternal Inca elder relates. Other sources that Inca Garcilaso characterizes
as archives include the accounts his Cuzco schoolfellows sent him and
which they gathered from their native mother and her relatives: “Los
condiscípulos, ... cada cual de ellos dio cuenta de mi intención [de escribir
historia] a su madre y parientes, los cuales, ... sacaron de sus archivos las
relaciones que tenían de sus historias y me las enviaron” (CR, Part 1, Book
1, ch. 19, 2:31). The “archives” that Inca Garcilaso refers to here are the
knotted cords or khipus (“cuentas y nudos”) on which the Incas recorded
their conquest of various Andean regions from which his mestizo
schoolfellows’ native mothers hailed.36 Here the native mother is
associated with non-European and non-alphabetic Andean forms of record
keeping or archives, sources not readily available to Spanish historians. By
shaping into important archival sources the oral accounts of his Inca
relatives on his mother’s side, and the Inca history recorded in khipus kept
by his schoolfellows’ maternal families, Inca Garcilaso reimagines the
colonial archive as a site where Andean and European sources coexists
and nourish each other in the history-writing process he undertakes.37

In its dialogue with the colonial archive, Inca Garcilaso’s work of
historiography had to engage by necessity the wider constellation of
historical writing (previous histories of Peru, for example) and related
topics on the writing of history about the Indies, like the legitimacy and
authority of the historian’s sources.38 Notarial records, like the mestizo
petitionary dossier, were more specific in their arguments and goals, and
they engaged the juridical-bureaucratic sector of the colonial archive, a space proximate to and overlapping with historiography. The first example I provide from the mestizo petitionary record appeals to the legal order inherent in the notarial system. Here it bears recalling the etymology of the term archive. As Stoler aptly points out, archive comes from “the Latin *archivium*, ‘residence of the magistrate,’ and from the Greek *arkhe*, to command or govern” (“Colonial Archives” 97). In the mestizo dossier, the issue hinges on Hispano-Andeans’ mixed nature and its relation to the legality of the royal legislation which bars them from the priesthood:

> ... conforme a derecho lo dispuesto e hordenado cerca del darse de las hórdenes [sacerdotes] a los que son meramente españoles, ... se entiende también estar dispuesto con las dichas personas que fueron hijos de españoles ... y de mugeres yndias naturales destos reynos, pues es regla llana y vulgar que lo mixto viene debajo de lo simple, mayormente en lo favorable, e asy no [h]ay de derecho prohibición por donde no [h]ayan de ser hordenados los dichos mestizos... (AGI, Lima 126, f. 1v)

The syntax of the passage is complex, but in it the mestizos appeal to law (“conforme a derecho”) as they reformulate in the colonial legal record the relationship between what is mixed (*lo mixto*) and what is unmixed (*lo simple*), and as such cast mestizos as people of greater worth and value (because of native maternal lineage and language) than those who are sole descendants of Spanish or criollo parents. The mestizo call to legal order is also evident in the second example I offer: their insistent petitioning and lobbying of the Third Lima Church Council, the Holy See in Rome, and the Council of the Indies in Madrid.

After continued lobbying at the Third Lima Council, the assembly’s bishops ruled in favour of mestizos in the provincial clergy. Thereafter, acting as representative and spokesperson for Peruvian Hispano-Andeans, the mestizo Pedro Rengifo filed the document collection at the Council of the Indies in Madrid, and lobbied there for four years until the crown issued a formal repeal (in 1588) of the royal ban excluding mestizos from the priesthood. The mestizos’ 1583 Latin letter to Pope Gregory XIII was likely influential too. The documentary record shows that the pope did intercede on behalf of the mestizos by communicating his concerns to King Philip II on the crown’s exclusion of Hispano-Andean priests (Ruan, “Identidad mestiza” 171). The Peruvian mestizos who prepared the petitionary record were keenly aware of the colonial legal system and of its concomitant archival practices and workings, and they sought to engage the colonial archive’s juridical-bureaucratic system in order to have their
claims heard and recorded for posterity. Central to the success of their petitions was the significance given to the native mother in their arguments, as well as the historical context of the Third Lima Council which favoured native language proficiency for priests, and which depended on mestizo translators for the catechetical works it produced. Mestizos also capitalized on colonial archival practices aimed to recognize the descendants of pre-Hispanic rulers as well as those with Spanish conquistador and early settler ancestry. It is worth noting, however, that the mestizos’ success in having the royal ban on the priesthood repealed did not mark the end of their struggles. In the seventeenth century, mestizos continued to face discrimination in the provincial church (and in the secular sphere), as Alcira Dueñas has amply documented in *Indians and Mestizos in the “Lettered City.”*  

**EPILOGUE**

In the foregoing discussion and analysis of the indigenous maternal figure in the *Comentarios* and in the late sixteenth-century petitionary record, I have aimed to combine two simultaneous operations and objectives: to bring to the forefront the relatively little-researched topic of the native mother in the works of mestizo writing subjects, and to juxtapose and underscore the relationship of narrative history and notarial petitionary records. The interest in the mestizo’s native mother grew out of investigations on the document collection Hispano-Andeans prepared in the viceroyalty of Peru in the early 1580s, as a response to Crown legislation that sought to marginalize and exclude them from the priesthood and from holding public office. In the reports that led to exclusionary legislation like the interdiction of mestizos in the priesthood (in 1578), royal and church officials cast the native mother as the cause of mestizos’ ills. As a reply to such negative views, in their petitions the mestizos recast their indigenous mother as a source of legitimacy and identity through which they reformulated their place and role in viceregal Peru. Writing in late sixteenth-century and early-seventeenth century Spain, aware of the mestizos’ depreciated status, Garcilaso strategically shaped his native Andean maternal genealogy into a wellspring of authority and legitimacy, for his own narrative history of pre-Hispanic and colonial Peru.

The juxtaposition of narrative history and mestizo notarial petitions stems from the significant correspondence scholarship has identified between these two widespread forms of early-modern writing (Adorno, “History” 154-171). To put it succinctly, the New World brought about new historiographic demands (i.e., problems of description and of
understanding new lands, peoples and languages), chief among them was the need for a new ground on which to anchor issues of authority, authenticity, credibility, and, more generally, claims to “truth” (Ostenfeld-Suske 15-16). To shape that new ground, New World history-writing looked to legal-bureaucratic notarial writing and drew from there elements such as the sworn eyewitness testimony common in probanzas, for example, as well as the notarial rhetoric and legal authority documents such as informaciones, relaciones and the like provided (Ostenfeld-Suske 17). Some New World histories, like Bernal Díaz del Castillo’s Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España (composed 1550-84, published 1632), referred explicitly to, and cited as legitimate sources of historiographic authority, the probanzas or certified testimony of witnesses to the writer’s deeds - legal-notarial records which were filed at the Council of the Indies (Adorno, Polemics 17-75).

The attention given to native language and genealogy in mestizo historiography and petitionary record underscores the correspondence between these two forms of writing. The indigenous mother tongue and maternal lineage are prominent topics in Inca Garcilaso’s narrative history and in the mestizo petitionary dossier and related writings like the Latin letter to the pope. Maternal language and genealogy represent grounds for truth-claims, that is, legitimate sources of authority and credibility for the Hispano-Andean writing subject. The mestizos’ emphasis on native language competence was endorsed by the historical circumstances of the Third Lima Council and its favourable indigenous language policy. Writing in Spain in the wake of this policy, Inca Garcilaso shaped his Quechua competence into a key type of knowledge needed to compose the history of the Inca world and the subsequent Spanish conquest - a critical historiographic advantage vis-à-vis other New World historians. In post-conquest Spanish America, native maternal genealogy was sanctioned by the monarchy’s archival practices, part of a juridical-bureaucratic system which fostered and supported a fetish-like obsession with matters of lineage and ancestry, extending also into historiography. As it is clear by now, language and genealogy did not exist outside of the colonial archive. Rather, the mestizo writing subject’s formulation of the native mother tongue and maternal ancestry were conscious efforts at effecting realignments and readjustments in the colonial record. Garcilaso’s reformulation of the maternal home in Cuzco as the foundational oral archive for his narrative history represents a novel and active engagement with the colonial archival practices. The emphasis on reshaping the mother’s home at Cuzco into a historical repository not only puts into relief the historian’s eye/aural-witness testimony, but also brings to the
forefront the important role Garcilaso gives the native mother in reconfiguring and re-conceptualizing the colonial record. The stress I have placed on the native mother as source of history serves as an interpretative counterweight to critical views that underscore only Garcilaso’s paternal lineage vis-à-vis the colonial archive.41

Finally, it is worth noting that mestizos experienced mestizaje in diverse ways, which is another way of saying that being a mestizo was largely context dependent, as Joanne Rappaport has aptly pointed out.42 Hispano-Andeans negotiated their genealogical identification in accordance with situational contexts, that is, depending on what sort of affiliations mattered when advocating in Madrid, Lima or in Cuzco. Inca Garcilaso sought to insert himself into the history-writing field in Spain, and although in fashioning himself into a legitimate New World historian he privileged his maternal language and genealogy, he also tended to move between identities, alternating his narrative voice from “speaking like a Spaniard” to “speaking like an Indian.”43 The petitioning mestizos capitalized on their noble maternal Andean lineage but also made repeated reference to and use of their conquistador or early settler ancestry. But not all mestizos could claim “twice noble” status and many did not have access to well-connected families. Some mestizos drew attention away from their native mother; others were forced to leave the Indian communities where they lived because of their mestizo status, while some passed for criollos or went unmarked.44 Mestizaje was fluid and ambivalent, and people made strategic uses of their maternal native lineage to shape self-identity and the related legitimacy and authority it brought to a Spanish-Native writing subject.45

Brock University

NOTES

1 Inca Garcilaso conceived the Comentarios as a single work in two parts. Part 1 chronicles the history of the Incas and appeared in Lisbon (Pedro Crasbeeck, 1609), while Part 2 focuses on the Spanish conquest of Peru and was printed posthumously in Córdoba (Viuda de Andrés Barrera, 1617), with the title Historia General del Perú. In citing the Comentarios reales I indicate the part, book, chapter, volume and page, and use the initials CR for both parts.

2 Alcubiza himself likely used the Confesionario in the Indian parishes in his charge, given that the Third Lima Council required the use of this particular

3 Alcobaza is named in the petitionary record in the Cuzco probanza as one of the mestizo clerics in Indian parishes ("los cuales están en doctrinas de indios") (Archivo General de Indias [AGI], Lima 126, f. 72v; transcribed in Barriga 2: 233). Also explicitly named in that record are Santiago and Valera (AGI, Lima 126, f. 43r). Carrasco appears to have had a more active role and is named in the Cuzco poder or power of attorney as one of the advocates for mestizos at the Third Lima Council ("damos e otorgamos nuestro poder ... a Francisco Carrasco, clérigo presbítero" [AGI, Lima 126, f. 104v]).

4 On the native mother in Inca Garcilaso see Chang-Rodríguez, “Inca Garcilaso’s Mother.”

5 Brading has argued that the Comentarios "should be interpreted as a carefully meditated, sustained rebuttal of the imperial tradition of conquest history, that school which began with Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo, reached an early climax in Francisco López de Gómara, and was finally consolidated by Antonio de Herrera" (3).

6 Martínez notes that in Spanish America the concepts of “race” and limpieza de sangre “were strongly connected with lineage and intersected with religion” (12-3). Kathryn Burns addresses the issue of “race” in colonial Peru by making reference to Iberian Moors, Jews, and new Christians like conversos and moriscos ("Unfixing Race" 57-71).

7 Schwartz and Solomon note that in Spanish America "mestizaje (‘miscegenation’)“ was viewed “as a social evil,” but that “although early colonial Iberians ideologically deplored miscegenation, they also connived at it in pursuit of tangible interests” (3[part 2]: 443 and 501). The pioneering study on race mixture in Latin American history is Magnus Mörner, Race Mixture in the History of Latin America.

8 Ares Queija explains that the attribution of wayward behaviour to mestizos "se debía - según la opinión mayoritaria de la época - a que se criaban con sus madres indias, a la inclinación que de ellas se les pegaba y, en definitiva, a que lo 'mamaban en la leche'" ("Mancebas de españoles, madres de mestizos" 32). See Brewer-Garcia for additional details on the topic of native milk and mestizos. For the topic in Inca Garcilaso see Pardo.

9 In a March 1572 report to the king, Toledo writes about mestizos that "no biuen en barrios ni pueblos juntos ni es nazon distinta de la española” (Levillier 4: 131).

10 See Dueñas, Indians and Mestizos in the “Lettered City” and Ruan, “Andean Activism.”
For details on the probanzas that make up the bulk of the petitionary record mestizos prepared in the 1580s, see my forthcoming article “The Probanza and Shaping a Contesting Mestizo Record in Early Colonial Peru.”

Hispano-Andeans’ positive views of mestizaje contrasts sharply with that of the native Andean author Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala, who saw mestizos as exploiters of natives, advocated against mestizo priests, and linked the growth of the mestizo population to the disappearance of the Andean ‘race’ (Adorno, Guaman Poma xli).

It is worth noting that in crafting their petitions mestizos relied on the intervention of the escribano público or public notary, a significant mediator and participant in the production of notarial records. As Burns aptly explains, the “notary (escribano) was a kind of ventriloquist - someone who could give other people an official ‘voice.’ He knew the state-sanctioned forms through which agency could be constituted in writing” (Into the Archive 2-3).

Hyland notes that a first brief was issued by Pope Pius V in 1571, conceding “the American bishops the power to dispense with all irregularities [like illegitimacy of birth] for the conferral of Holy orders” (437).

The September 1580 royal cédula officially approved the Quechua Chair at the University of San Marcos in Lima, which Viceroy Toledo had initially created there in the late 1570s (Durston 79).

The other important multilingual (Spanish-Quechua-Aymara) pastoral works that came out of the Third Lima Council were: Doctrina christiana y catecismo para instrucción de los indios (Lima, 1584), and the Tercer catecismo y exposición de la doctrina Christiana por sermones (Lima, 1585). Along with the Confesionario, these became required catechetical works for priests in native parishes (Durston 88). A supporting linguistic piece for the cited catechetical works was the Arte y vocabulario en la lengua general del Perú llamada Quichua, y en la lengua Española (Lima, 1586). Facsimiles of these works are available online at the World Digital Library. Cárdenas Bunsen (“Circuitos del conocimiento”) argues that Blas Valera directed the composition of Arte y vocabulario.

At the beginning of Chapter Four, Zamora writes that “Garcilaso defined his task in the Comentarios as a reinterpretation of Inca History; and, that his metahistorical remarks revealed a filiation with a philosophy of language which clearly reflects the influence of humanist philology” (62). It is worth noting that in the Comentarios Inca Garcilaso adopted the standardized Quechua orthography and lexicographic transcription the Third Lima Council instituted in its catechetical works (Cárdenas Bunsen, “Circuitos del conocimiento” 102-04).

Zamora offers commentary on the importance of philology for biblical scholarship in Spain with reference to Nebrija, Fray Luis de León, and Erasmus
She also notes that “[t]he monumental task of study and preservation of the Amerindian tongues undertaken by the missionary friars was the cornerstone of Christian evangelical efforts in the New World” (17). Referencing a chapter in the *Comentarios* (Part 1, Book 7, ch. 4: 250-52), where Inca Garcilaso cites Blas Valera on comparing Quechua and Hebrew phonology, Cárdenas Bunsen aptly underscores the convergence of “la filología quechua y la filología bíblica” (“Circuitos del conocimiento” 105-06). On language, religion and America, see Durston 31-37. It is worth noting that Garcilaso privileged the Quechua language spoken at Cuzco. Citing Valera, Garcilaso fashions Cuzco Quechua into the “lengua cortesana” of the Incas (*CR*, Part 1, Book 7, ch. 4: 248-50). On Quechua, its varieties, and its pastoral uses in the colonial period, see Durston 37-49.

Blas Valera was a renowned Latinist as well as a Quechua and Aymara scholar. At the Jesuit College at Lima (Colegio de San Pablo) he taught Quechua (“la lengua general del ynga”) (Cárdenas Bunsen, “Circuitos del conocimiento” 85), and also Latin (Ruan, “Identidad mestiza” 161). When the Third Lima Council multilingual pastoral works were crafted in the early 1580s in Peru, Valera and Inca Garcilaso were separated by an ocean. In the 1590s, however, the Jesuits exiled Valera to Cádiz, Spain. After Valera’s death in 1597, Inca Garcilaso inherited the mestizo Jesuit’s manuscripts, parts of which he incorporated into the *Comentarios*. Inca Garcilaso first cites Valera as one of his important sources in the chapter entitled “Lo que dice un autor acerca del nombre Perú” (*CR*, Part 1, Book 1, ch. 6: 13-15).

Martínez notes that Bautista Pomar was one of the first mestizos to write a regional history, the *Relación de Texcoco* (1582) (325n78). Ixtlilxóchitl wrote a historical account of Texcoco and its governors, *Historia de la nación chichimeca* and had previously written *Relación histórica de la nación tulteca* (c. 1600). Muñoz Camargo was responsible for various works, including *Descripción de la ciudad y provincial de Tlaxcala* (completed in the 1580s) (325n78). Inca Garcilaso composed the *Comentarios* in the 1590s.

Referring to the *Comentarios*, Martínez writes that “[c]olonial Spanish American literature thus shared rhetorical formulas with *probanzas*, petitions (e.g., for cacicazgo titles), and accounts (*relaciones*) submitted to the Spanish king. Law, history, and literature converged and helped to produce certain (genealogical) narratives of the past” (115). For additional details on the relationship between history-writing and notarial records, see also Rolena Adorno’s cogent explanation in “History, Law, and the Eyewitness.”

As the progeny of Spanish conquistadors and of indigenous women descended from the previous rulers of the land, mestizos fashioned a “twice noble” status – “the children of both Spanish and Andean elites” (Burns, *Colonial Habits* 22).
Mazzotti notes "la pertenencia de Garcilaso a lo que quedaba del Qhapaq Ayllu, panaka o familia real de Túpac Inca Yupanqui" (Coros mestizos 46). Mazzotti also clarifies that Túpac Inca Yupanqui [Túpac Inca Yupanqui, in Mazzotti’s Quechua usage] was the "bisabuelo del autor de los Comentarios" (Coros mestizos 113). Commenting on the last will and testament of Inca Garcilaso’s mother (which he transcribes [298-301]), Miró Quesada writes that "según Garcilaso, su madre ... era hija de Huallpa Túpac, hijo a su vez de Túpac Inca Yupanqui: y que por lo tanto, era sobrina de Huayna Cápac y prima de Huáscar y Atahualpa" (294). Rappaport aptly notes that "we can think of archival inscription as a space in which the process of identification unfolded and was negotiated, rather than as a simple repository of historical evidence of stable identities and unchallenged genealogies" (78).

"Es así que residiendo mi madre en el Cuzco, su patria, venían a visitarla a casa cada semana los pocos parientes y parientas que de las crueldades y tiranías de Atahuallpa ... escaparon" (CR, Part 1, Book 1, ch. 15: 25).

The great-uncle’s significance as a source of the Inca past is analysed by Mazzotti (Coros mestizos 107-118). In looking at the maternal Inca elder, Chang-Rodríguez places the emphasis on the “voice” of Inca Garcilaso’s mother (Cartografía garcilasista 222-25).

Baptized in Cuzco as Gómez Suárez de Figueroa, the Hispano-Andean author gradually changed his name in Spain to Garcilaso de la Vega in the early 1560s. For details see Mazzotti, “Garcilaso en el Inca Garcilaso” and Miró Quesada (92). Garcilaso’s father was the early settler Sebastián Garcilaso de la Vega, who arrived in Peru in the early 1530s but was not among the first conquistadors. Historians like Francisco López de Gómez, Agustín de Zárate and Diego Fernández associated Garcilaso’s father with the rebel Gonzalo Pizarro in their narrative histories (Miró Quesada 88-9). In the Comentarios Inca Garcilaso reflects on such an association (CR, Part 2, Book 5, ch. 23: 259-60 and Book 8, ch. 15: 4: 164).

Huáscar’s execution at Atahualpa’s behest is narrated in Part 2: “Mataronle cruelísimamente haciéndole cuartos y tasajos, y no se sabe dónde lo echaron” (Book 1, ch. 33: 3: 65).

In the last chapter of Part 1, Inca Garcilaso mentions Don Melchior Carlos Inca and Don Alonso de Mesa, who are said to be at the royal court with their petitions ("residen en la corte en Valladolid"). Also mentioned in the final chapter are a number of notarial documents ("poder in solidum ..., y probanza de su descendencia") his Inca relatives sent from Peru in 1603, including a painted rendering on fine silk of their genealogy: “pintado en vara y media de tafetán blanco de la China el árbol real, descendiendo desde Manco Cápac hasta Huayna Cápac y su hijo Paullu” (CR, Part 1, Book 9, ch. 40, 2: 384).

Mazzotti (citing Manuel Burga) stresses that in the Comentarios Inca Garcilaso
seeks to promote the interest of those in Peru associated with his own maternal lineage (Coros mestizos 47).

29 In one of the preliminaries of Part Two of the Comentarios Inca Garcilaso writes: “porque de ambas naciones [de indios y de españoles] tengo prendas ... las cuales son haber sido mi padre conquistador y poblador de aquélla tierra, y mi madre natural de ella” (“Prólogo” [“De las Posadas, jurisdicción de Córdova, 7 de noviembre 1589"]).

30 In the preliminaries of Part Two of the Comentarios Garcilaso offers the following reference to the Christian conversion of his mother: “La conversión a nuestra fe, de mi madre y señora, más ilustre y excelente por las aguas del Santo Bautismo, que por la sangre real de tantos Incas y Reyes peruanos” (“Dedicación del libro y dedicatoria ... a la gloriosísima Virgen María”).


32 “archion armarium librorum seu locus publicus in quo acta nobis seu civium recondi consueverunt.” I thank Andre Besson for the translation provided here.

33 Duchein writes that “[t]he classic example of [the] prefiguration of the modern ‘national archives’ was the creation in 1542 of the Archivo de Simancas in Spain, where little by little all of the records of the councils, courts, chanceries, secretaries, treasuries, etc. of the Castilian Crown came together until they were concentrated there by 1567” (16).

34 Early modern conceptions of the “archive” were by no means fixed but were rather fluid and in flux, even for official royal historians of the Indies such as Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas. As Brendecke notes, “Herrera had little interest in Simancas as a site for his work. He held a much more general concept of ‘archive’ and carried out his own historical practice primarily with unpublished manuscript histories from the archive of the Council of the Indies, out of which he could compile his own historical narratives” (281). “[T]he small lockable case (arca), the private collection of documents (archivillo), and the actual state archive (archivo) existed in parallel,” explains Brendecke (268).

35 Garcilaso’s own conception of a personal and family Andean “archive” merits further consideration vis-à-vis the multiple early-modern imaginings of the archive Brendecke describes.

36 Mazzotti examines the Andean oral traditions Inca Garcilaso incorporates into his work, which include “una simultaneidad y un contrapunteo de las diversas voces del texto,” “variaciones formuláicas” in “actos fundacionales” of the narrative, and “resonancias versales ... de la poesía quechua pre-hispánica” (Coros mestizos 105). For details on the Spanish sources of the Comentarios see Cárdenas Bunsen, “Polémica versus representación.”
[L]as particulares conquistas que los Incas hicieron de las provincias de sus madres, porque cada provincia tiene sus cuentas y nudos con sus historias anales y la tradición de ellas” (CR, Part 1, Book 1, ch. 19, 2: 31).

Garcilaso acknowledges some proficiency in “reading” khipus (“Yo traté los quipus y nudos con los indios de mi padre, y con otros curacas” [CR, Part 1, Book 6, ch. 9, 2: 205-06]). He was likely aware that in colonial legal and administrative proceedings judges generally admitted the cords [khipus] and their content as evidence in matters and disputes native Andeans brought forward before authorities in the Peruvian viceroyalty (Puente Luna 26).

The relationship between Garcilaso’s Andean (oral Quechua and khipu) archival sources and claims on historiographical truth is a topic beyond the scope of this article but merits further consideration.

For details, see the example of the lobbying in Madrid of the Peruvian mestizo Juan Nuñez Vela de Rivera in the 1690s (Dueñas 50-51 and 153-158).

Given Garcilaso's continued contact with those in colonial Peru, like his childhood friend Diego de Alcobaza, he was likely aware of the active petitioning his fellow Hispano-Andeans began in early-1580s Peru, in the context of the important Third Lima Church Council (1582-83), and which continued at the Council of the Indies in Madrid until the late 1580s.

I am thinking in particular of González Echevarría’s interpretation of Garcilaso’s paternal lineage in the Comentarios (Myth and Archive 71-84). For a cogent critical view of González Echevarría’s interpretation see Durand, “En torno a la prosa del Inca Garcilaso.”

A key point in Rappaport's The Disappearing mestizo (which focuses on the New Kingdom of Granada) is that classification was context dependent, so that being classified a mestizo was significant in certain situational contexts but mattered less in others, allowing mixed-parentage persons to go unmarked or to be classified in non-mestizo categories (62, 139 and 232). Rappaport cites (139) Antonio Cornejo Polar who has rightly noted that “Garcilaso vivió su mestizaje de muy diversas formas” (Cornejo Polar 20).

"Cuando los historiadores españoles van tan asidos a la verdad de la historia, huelgo más de repetir sus palabras, sacadas a la letra, que no escribir las mías, por hablar como español, y no como indio. Y así lo haremos siempre, si no fuere donde faltare algo que añadir a la relación que tuvieron” (CR, Part 2, Book 1, ch. 33, 3: 65; my italics).

Rappaport explains that "mestizos were legally barred from residing in indigenous repartimientos because of the moral and economic harm they caused there" (157). Repartimientos were indigenous communities with tributary obligations (Rappaport 305). But mestizos also “disappeared” into indigenous communities and colonial authorities even reclassified some mestizos as tribute-paying Indians (Rappaport 73-4).
I thank the editors of this RCEH monographic issue, Raquel Trillia and Ranka Minic-Vidovic, and the two anonymous readers who reviewed the manuscript for their thoughtful comments as this article took shape.
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