



Capítulo 11



ENTRE LA ESPADA Y LA PLUMA

El Inca Garcilaso de la Vega y sus *Comentarios reales*

EDICIÓN E INTRODUCCIÓN DE RAQUEL CHANG-RODRÍGUEZ



FONDO
EDITORIAL

PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DEL PERÚ

Entre la espada y la pluma
El Inca Garcilaso de la Vega y sus Comentarios reales

© Raquel Chang-Rodríguez, editora, abril 2010

De esta edición:

© Fondo Editorial de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 2010

Av. Universitaria 1801, Lima 32, Perú

Teléfono: (51 1) 626-2650

Fax: (51 1) 626-2913

feditor@pucp.edu.pe

www.pucp.edu.pe/publicaciones

Cuidado de la edición, diseño de cubierta y diagramación de interiores:

Fondo Editorial PUCP

Primera edición: abril de 2010

Tiraje: 500 ejemplares

Prohibida la reproducción de este libro por cualquier medio, total o parcialmente,
sin permiso expreso de los editores.

Hecho el Depósito Legal en la Biblioteca Nacional del Perú N° 2010-05318

ISBN: 978-9972-42-925-5

Registro del Proyecto Editorial: 31501361000273

Impreso en Tarea Asociación Gráfica Educativa

Pasaje María Auxiliadora 156, Lima 5, Perú

Modern Nativist Readings of Garcilaso in Peru¹

Thomas Ward

Loyola University, Maryland

*Seeing where we came from, and where we are at present,
comparing what we were and what we are,
we can then calculate where we will go and what we will be tomorrow.*

Manuel González Prada²

A common misconception about the Spanish conquest of America is that it was a lightning-bolt enterprise that quickly converted the region's inhabitants to Christianity and to the Spanish way of life. But in fact the conquest was uneven, and the Spanish needed to use local leaders to control the large masses of indigenous peoples who ever so slowly and inconsistently moved toward adopting a Mediterranean-style cultural and religious ideal. Based on his archival research in Mexico, James Lockhart concludes that «many basic features of pre-Conquest culture survived indefinitely» (1999, p. 98). The same could be argued for Tahuantinsuyo, the Andean region that had been conquered by the Incas. Even a century after what could be called the Forty Years War (1532-1572) in which the Spanish eventually defeated the Inca royal house, legislation promulgated in Lima suggests that colonial officials were still looking for ways to siphon off political power from hereditary elites known as *curacas* by mandating democratic elections for non-hereditary *alcaldes* thereby undercutting transmissible power among the nobles (Ballesteros, 1685)³. Pre-Conquest customs still persist. Religious beliefs regarding the dead reflect

¹ I am indebted to the Duke-UNC Consortium for Latin American Studies for a Title VI Education Summer Grant (2005) allowing me to study colonial legislation at Duke and first editions of sixteenth-century chronicles at UNC-Chapel Hill. April Brewer of the Rare Book Collection, Wilson Library, UNC, skillfully scanned the prologue to the second part of the *Comentarios reales*. I also wish to express my gratitude to Raquel Chang-Rodríguez for suggesting that I further explore the interesting field of Garcilaso's reception in the national imaginary. Her support has been invaluable. Finally, I want to thank Leslie Morgan, my colleague at Loyola, who gave this paper a crucial second reading, and the anonymous readers for *Review: Literature and Arts of the Americas* who offered many fine suggestions on an earlier version. Any errors, however, result from my inability to put into words this slice of Garcilaso's complex trajectory through the ages.

² «La muerte i la vida», González Prada ([1890], p. 286). All translations mine unless otherwise noted.

³ I am presently engaged with this colonial legislation as one tradition-smashing operation among many involved with seeding even more strangling vines of colonialism. The tentative title for this project is «The Formation of Latin American Nations: From Late Antiquity to Early Modernity».

analogous concepts from the period of Incan supremacy (Kaulicke, 2001, pp. 25-26), and in towns such as Mangas, Chiquián and Chilcas forms of dance and notions of geographical space have their verifiable origins in the Andes and in the Conquest, not in pre-1492 Europe (Burga, 1988). Since the nineteenth century, there has been an intense sociological and historical effort to measure Andean traditions, to recover them where they have been suppressed, and to favor their persistence in Peruvian society.

The past, therefore, becomes a powerful force, sometimes even more powerful than Peru's interest in inserting itself into the global economy, an interest that dates from the middle of the nineteenth century when nitrates and guano began to be exported to the British Isles and other places. While many Peruvians, especially members of the *civilista* political party, were interested in commerce, industrialization and exportation, others turned their attention back to the moment when Peru first had contact with Spain⁴. Peruvians who still felt the enduring heartbeat of pre-Hispanic modes of being, or those who felt conflicted about the nature of post-Conquest *mestizaje*, looked for written documentation to validate those feelings, reconfigure them, and then render them as a material manifestation of culture. Manuel González Prada (1844-1918) says it all in the epigraph to this paper when he encapsulates the ideology that served as motor for the burgeoning movement toward social science: «Seeing where we came from, and where we are at present, comparing what we were and what we are, we can then calculate where we will go and what we will be tomorrow» [«Viendo de qué lugar salimos i dónde nos encontramos, comparando lo que fuimos i lo que somos, puede calcularse adónde llegaremos i lo que seremos mañana»] ([1890], p. 286)⁵. This «where we came from» might refer to Spanish ancestry but it can also refer to the colonial era when Spanish culture blended with Andean culture which was committed alphabetically to paper during that time.

A favorite object of attention from the colonial era was the writing of the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega (1539-1616). The Incas were cultural and political elites who ruled over less powerful ethnic nations. Garcilaso's mother was a *ñusta*, or Incan princess, and his father, whose name he took later in life, was a conquistador who joined Pedro de Alvarado and his group of marauding adventurers as they participated in the conquests of Mexico, Guatemala, and finally Peru. From the early seventeenth century when he started publishing his own works, Garcilaso's bicultural roots and mixed-heritage understanding of Peru served as a cultural resource for subsequent intellectuals looking to put facts to their intuitions about the nation. He was uniquely suited to represent a heterogeneous nation because, as intellectual historian Antonio Cornejo Polar points out, «Garcilaso speaks sometimes as a faithful servant of Your Majesty, sometimes as a mestizo who is doubly noble, sometimes simply as a mestizo, some-

⁴ *Civilismo* was a political movement founded by Manuel Pardo who became president in 1872. The party was primarily interested in promoting business and overcoming the militarism that defined Peruvian governments during the first half of the nineteenth-century. It also played a decisive role in reconstruction after the War of the Pacific and remained a dominant force in Peruvian politics until the second decade of the twentieth century.

⁵ González Prada experimented with spelling in his first published book of prose, *Páginas libres* (1894). His goal was to spell words as they sounded. Later on in *Horas de lucha* (1908), in order to broaden his readership, he adopted standard Spanish orthography.

times as an Inca, and other times as an Indian» [«Garcilaso habla a veces como servidor fiel de su Majestad, a veces como mestizo doblemente noble, a veces simplemente como mestizo, a veces como Inca y a veces como indio»] (1994, p. 94). Thus post-independence thinkers of various stripes could find something in Garcilaso that spoke uniquely to them—even though he represented the imperial Incan view rooted in Cuzco, not the views of innumerable ethnic nations that inhabited the Andes.

The reception of Garcilaso's 1609 *Comentarios reales* during the French Enlightenment has been well documented (Zavala, 1992; Montiel, 1998; Díaz-Caballero, 2008). In the Peruvian context, Garcilaso serves not only as a springboard for the social imaginary, but also as a window into a lost world of pre-Peruvian people and history. One Peruvian critic has described him as a kind of lighthouse to guide lost cultural ships back to a national port in reconstruction⁶. By turning to the *Comentarios reales* for inspiration—as had Túpac Amaru in his famous 1780 rebellion, and as had the Congress of Tucumán of the United Provinces of Río de la Plata in 1816—late nineteenth-century sociologists and their successors found in Garcilaso's most famous work the raw data necessary to understand the nation as a cultural entity⁷. The *Comentarios*—which had finally come into print again in 1800-1801, not having been available since the 1722-1723 edition—also provided a yardstick to evaluate possible interactions between what the English sociologist Anthony Smith has called «the primordial nation» and what we understand to be the modern state (1988, pp. 7-13)⁸.

Ironically, it was well after the formation of an independent Peruvian state that Garcilaso's sturdy place in the national consciousness became dislodged, which is not as severe a fate as his book being banned, as after the Túpac Amaru uprising, but it was a readjustment of his privileged position in the intellectual firmament. That readjustment came in the wake of a flurry of first editions of hitherto unknown sixteenth-century chronicles of Peru's history, by Bartolomé de las Casas (1875-1876), Juan de Santa Cruz Pachacuti (1879), Pedro de Cieza de León (1877, 1880), Juan de Betanzos (1880), Bernabé Cobo (1890-1895) and Las Casas again in 1892. Other revelations were to come with the startling discovery in 1908 of Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala's *El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno* (1936).

Garcilaso's slippery footing on the Peruvian intellectual landscape was not just the result of philological discovery and editorial innovation or of the multiple voices employed by the author himself. José Antonio Mazzotti reminds us that this instability was also instigated by racial or even racist initiatives. He writes: «Especially since the nineteenth century, Garcilaso has been the cause of many ideological battles, whether fought by Hispanists, indigenists or mestizists»

⁶ The Garcilaso as lighthouse metaphor comes from Luis Velazco Aragón (1955).

⁷ Most likely Túpac Amaru read the 1722-1723 edition (Chang-Rodríguez 1991, p. 44). For further information on the appropriation of the *Comentarios reales* in Argentina, Peru, and other areas, see Guibovich (1990-1992), Mazzotti (1998), Fernández (2004, p. 154) and Díaz Caballero (2004, 2008).

⁸ I have chosen Anthony Smith as a theoretical frame for this discussion about ethnicity and nation because he understands the relationship between them in a way that escapes *a priori* theorists such as Benedict Anderson. For analysis by other scholars on the problems with Anderson's theory and its wide-spread acceptance see Castro-Klarén and Chasteen (2003).

(1998, p. 90)⁹. From these battles, Garcilaso's *Comentarios reales* begin to appear in relationships with the nation that are kaleidoscopic. While a kaleidoscope does not necessarily create harmonious images, the juxtaposition of the themes, images, and colors it creates can indeed be beautiful. Here, we look not so much at the broad strokes of the battle for the nation, for there is insufficient time or space to foreground the nuances of such a long-lasting dispute. We will simply examine three kaleidoscopic surfaces which had adapted elements of parts one and two of the *Comentarios reales* to form a national model, further integrating the colors and tones of Garcilaso's take on Andean culture into the apparatus of national memory.

Clorinda Matto de Turner: when Language and the Nation-state are One¹⁰

A fascinating feature of the late nineteenth-century intellectual environment in Peru was that women writers, such as Clorinda Matto de Turner (1852-1909), actively organized literary soirées and published in magazines and books; some contesting the notion of the male-dominated nation being confected out of history, sociology and colonial interpretations of culture; others not «contesting» what the men were writing but, as Gloria da Cunha reminds us, crafting their own interpretations on society, politics and philosophy, independent of men (2006, p. 12). These structures of culture, both gynocentric and male-oriented had to negotiate with new discoveries being made in the social sciences, «when the work of archaeologists, sociologists, and anthropologists began to actually demonstrate the cultural specificity of pre-Columbian cultures, particularly their differences from European culture» (Kristal 1994, p. 600). Recent research on Lima's socially minded literary women has established aspects of their intellectual contributions to the nation (Denegri, 1996; Guardia, 2007), including their interest in the historical novel (Ward, 2004a), but little attention has been paid to how the *Comentarios reales* contributed to their ideological paradigms. Efraín Kristal suggests this possibility, noting that novelist Juana Manuela Gorriti (1818-1896) turned to Garcilaso in her depiction of «Koricancha, the Plaza of the Sun». She develops the theme of Incas hiding treasure there from the Spanish, so that it might be found at a later date to be used in the struggle against them. Kristal refers particularly to two of Gorriti's short novels, *La quena* and *El tesoro de los Incas* (1994, p. 598). Kristal also looks at Clorinda Matto de Turner, but what he finds in her novels was not Garcilaso's footprint but an interest in the Quechua speakers of her time (1994, p. 599). His assessment of her fiction

⁹ Jerry Mumford references anthropologist John V. Murra and historian Karen Spalding as having a further role in «helping to dethrone Garcilaso's picture of an all-powerful state» (2008, p. 134).

¹⁰ I have selected Clorinda Matto, José de la Riva Agüero, and Luis E. Valcárcel for study here because their connection to Garcilaso is concrete and verifiable in their research, quoting practices, and ideas. Of course there are others who fall into this category—Juana Manuela Gorriti, Ricardo Palma, Luis Alberto Sánchez, Raúl Porras Barrenechea, José María Arguedas, Antonio Cornejo Polar—and there are still more authors whose debt to Garcilaso, while notable, is more difficult to prove in a systematic way, such as would be the case with Manuel González Prada's essays and José Carlos Mariátegui. The three chosen here are diverse and present one wide-ranging kaleidoscopic vision of the nation while having the laboratory advantage of being from one short period of time which runs from 1888 to 1939. Turning the kaleidoscope and adding others presents other composite views.

is correct on this matter for one must look to Matto's non-fiction prose to find unvarnished traces of Garcilaso. A framework elaborated by sociologist Anthony Smith, which includes nation, ethnicity and language, allows us to take a step beyond Kristal's interest in the novels of Matto de Turner and other women authors. We will turn now to Matto de Turner's two-part sociolinguistic essay «Estudios históricos» (1888), which is essentially a defense of the Quechua language and an affirmation of its importance for the Peruvian nation. There we find direct quotations from the *Comentarios reales*, both from Garcilaso himself and from his citations of the Jesuit chronicler-priest, Blas Valera.

As will be noted, Garcilaso turns habitually to Blas Valera, an early mestizo chronicler, to strengthen and amplify his arguments. Since Valera's *oeuvre* has mostly been lost, and because Garcilaso quotes from him so frequently, his name has come to be deeply associated with the *Comentarios reales* as they have been read across the ages¹¹. The question of Garcilaso's reception in the national era further becomes complicated when some ideas are his and some are Valera's, regardless of his care in proper citing procedures. Matto, however, directly acknowledges Blas Valera when she is discussing Garcilaso.

In his study on the *Ethnic Origins of Nations*, Smith brings up the «frequent confusion of language with ethnicity» during pre-modern eras (1988, p. 17). Smith makes the argument that «ethnicity is largely 'mythic' and 'symbolic' in character» (1988, p. 16). It would be an error to rule out these ingredients that gave rise to ethnic identities, but it is also a limited understanding of these identities that does not recognize the role of language, in a positive or negative sense, in the formation of nations, pre-modern or otherwise. Garcilaso preserves Blas Valera's sociolinguistic idea that after adopting Quechua, what Valera calls the 'language of the court' ['lengua cortesana'], the Inca's «vassals from different nations accepted each other as brothers, because they all spoke one language» [«vasallos de diversas nasciones se havían como hermanos, porque todos hablaban una lengua»] (*CR*, 1943 [1609], bk. 7, ch. 3). To Valera and Garcilaso, 'nations', what Smith would call *ethnie*, do not remain narrowly and explicitly limited to a particular tongue when they can come together in the lingua franca of the Empire. In this regard, Garcilaso clearly does not confuse ethnicity and linguistic categories.

There was no such thing as a linguistically unified Andes. Garcilaso recognized from his reading of Blas Valera that Puquinas, Collas, Urus, and Yuncas or Yungas, were distinct linguistic sectors (*CR*, 1943 [1609], bk. 7, ch. 4). These kinds of divisions have been verified in our time by scholars such as Julien (1987) and Browman (1994). Even among the Incas themselves there was linguistic diversity. Garcilaso mentions what appear to be three distinct languages when he sets out to correct Spanish chroniclers who were not aware of such heterogeneous subtleties hidden by the narrow-minded attitudes inherent in colonialism: 1) the General Language (translated directly from Quechua's *Runa Simi*), 2) another, a special upper class tongue, the Incas private

¹¹ For more on Garcilaso's quoting of Blas Valera, see Hyland (2003). Garcilaso's quotes that he attributes to Valera utilized in this article are so indicated. The Spanish-language citations of Valera herein quoted are Garcilaso's translation from Valera's Latin; the English, my translation of Garcilaso's Spanish. Since Valera's original Latin manuscript is lost, there is no other way to quote from him.

language (1943 [1609], bk. 2, ch. 16), and 3) yet another, which may have been distinct, ‘Cuzco’s language’ [‘la lengua de Cozco’] (*CR* 1943 [1609], bk. 7, ch. 4)¹². Garcilaso may have been referring to some type of Jaqi (the larger family to which Aymara belongs), or he may have been referring to Puquina. These are the two languages besides Quechua that M. J. Hardman theorizes were spoken in Cuzco before the Spanish arrived on the scene (1985, p. 627). It is probable that the third language was the (or «a») pre-Incan language spoken in Cuzco; another, the second, might have been the Incas’ ancestral language from their province of origin; and the first language, the General Language, or Quechua, which, as we will see, originated in two other provinces. It may be that these three languages were such an integral part of the elite social fabric that «the entire Inca court would for a while be trilingual» (Hardman 1985, p. 628). Though Spaniards sometimes recognized this intra- and extra-Incan linguistic diversity, their ignorance of Andean cultures and the arrogance that impeded their becoming aware of it limited their being able to achieve a more nuanced understanding of Andean civilization. In the end all new world peoples were just Indians, their nation-ness denied. Even in the republican era, the heritage of colonialism, and its corollary, what Aníbal Quijano has called «the racial axis», have remained «durable» continuing to ensure that ethnic diversity not be sanctioned (Quijano, 2008, p. 181). Heterogeneity was not discussed in Matto’s time and the debate on the national language was maintained within the mindset of a Quechua-Spanish dualist configuration. Clorinda Matto de Turner followed that framework, but with a twist. While Garcilaso the historian was describing the process of expansion of the General Language during both the pre-contact period and the early colony, the late-nineteenth-century essayist, after Quechua’s four-hundred years of diglossic relations with Spanish, was concerned with its passing into oblivion. She warns against «those who lobby for Quechua’s extinction» [«los que abogan por la extinción del qquechua»] (1893, p. 101)¹³.

Matto de Turner is aware that the Incas were polyglots. This she learned from Inca Garcilaso. But even though she deduces that the Incas’ lofty-sounding General Language sprung out of a vast Andean linguistic diversity, she knows that it eventually became the dominant

¹² For further discussion on the three Incan languages with attritional bibliography see Cerrón-Palomino (1995, pp. xii-xiii). The private language of the Incas is something of a mystery, especially since Garcilaso admits he didn’t speak it (*CR*, 1943 [1609], bk. 2, ch. 17). The key to unlocking the private-language mystery may not become apparent until the ambiguities associated with Blas Valera are cleared up. In the disputed papers that came to light in Italy during the twentieth century there is referenced testimony from the *curaca*, or local chief, Mayachac Azuay, who talks about a secret and sacred language known only to *amautas*, or wise men, the *aclla*, or virgins of the sun, and other elite keepers of culture (such as poets). This language was not codified in quipus but, as Hyland puts it, in «woven textiles along with images in jewels and small objects» (2003, p. 197). Since the guardians of these planes of expression were not *quipucamayoc*, the traditional male keepers of the quipus, but women weavers in the *acllabuasi*, or house of virgins, this private language appears to have been gynocentric. On women weavers see Bruhns & Stohert (1999). On the polemics surrounding Blas Valera, see the last chapters of Hyland (2003).

¹³ Since González Holguín’s *Vocabulario de la lengua general de todo el Perú llamada lengua qquechua o del Inca* (1608) some authors (not Garcilaso) have preferred the double q in the spelling of Quechua. Matto and her colleagues in *El Perú Ilustrado* (1887-1892), such as Tomás O’Connor d’Arlach, frequently used the double q in the spelling of the proper name. Later in this essay she will use the spelling «qqueshua» reflecting the lack of an established spelling norm.

language of empire. How did it all begin? She tells us that the General Language originated in Suttupampa and Catonera (1893, p. 93), provinces listed by Garcilaso as Cotapampa and Cotanera, which he describes as Quechua provinces. Garcilaso, reflecting ancient usage, refers to the «Quechua nation» [«nación quechua»] but not to the Quechua language (*CR*, 1943 [1609], bk. 3, ch. 12). He does not hint at the General Language also being called Quechua. Matto fills in Garcilaso's blanks when she suggests that in reality Quechua began to be disseminated with Inca Roca (it was Inca Viracocha who later went to these provinces after the Chanca war, according to Garcilaso) and that, much later, Inca Huaina Cápac came to speak it as his own. Sixteenth-century nomenclature is transformed (as it was already during that time by the Jesuit linguist Diego González Holguín) when Matto de Turner deduces that if the General Language was being disseminated, and if the General Language was Quechua, then it was in fact Quechua that was being disseminated. This is important since «the Emperor declared it the general and obligatory language of the people» [«el Emperador lo decretase como idioma general y obligatorio para el pueblo»] (1893, p. 96). Thus in her view, the provincial tongue becomes the language of Empire, the nation as *etnia* gives way to the nation as state, privileging the General Language now called Quechua. Matto extrapolates a connection not between nation as *etnia* and language but between nation as state and language when she refers to «the designation of Quechuas whose name also signifies the general language of Ancient Peru» [«la denominación de quechuas, cuyo nombre lleva también el habla general del Perú antiguo»] (1893, p. 97). Matto, in the manner of Garcilaso, refers to a linguistic process of diffusion that began in the pre-Inca period in Cotapampa and Cotanera, continued during the expansion of Cuzco's empire, and was further fortified during the interval of colonial occupation (when the Jesuits learned it in order to teach the gospel), and only declined during the republican era¹⁴.

A decisive difference between «Estudios históricos» and writing by other criollo elites is that Matto elects to use the connotation-neutral «Quechuas» to refer to non-European peoples. In the politically fragmented interval that began when a truce ending the War of the Pacific (1879-1883) was signed, Doña Clorinda could not argue for a multilingual paradigm for the nation even if she understood the nation's multicultural fabric¹⁵. At that juncture of great soul searching about the lack of national cohesion, a recognition of heterogeneity would not have been rhetorically helpful to her arguments. However, taking for granted the dominance of Quechua over other indigenous languages as a positive value was a nation-building attitude she may have assimilated from Blas Valera, who argues, «similarity and conformity of words almost always reconciles and brings true union and friendship to men» [«la semejanza y conformidad de las

¹⁴ William Rowe (1946, p. 190) casts doubt on these two peoples being Quechua suggesting that instead they were Aymara-speaking folk. Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino (2003, p. 33) seems to accept them as Quechua speakers. Irrespective of whether Rowe or Cerrón-Palomino is correct in his suggestion, what matters for us at the present juncture is that Garcilaso saw them as Quechua provinces and Matto recovers this idea from him.

¹⁵ The Treaty of Ancón, which formally ended the war, was signed on October 20, 1883. Tarapacá province was ceded to Chile at that time. The fate of Arica and Tacna was not decided until 1929 when Chile retained Arica, and Tacna reverted to Peruvian sovereignty.

palabras casi siempre suelen reconciliar y traer a verdadera unión y amistad a los hombres'»] (*CR*, 1943 [1609], bk. 7, ch. 3). Only Quechua had any chance of success in bringing order to the unstable plane of multiple languages competing to overcome the remnants of the Spanish colonial system. Operating within the criollo structure of power, Matto's best plan of attack was to lament that a Spanish-only political system had fostered a lack of knowledge of 'our mother tongue' ['nuestra lengua madre'] (1893, p. 99). She grieves «the low regard in which Quechua is held today, this language that should be the everlasting link that unites the Peruvian race» [«la poca estima que hoy se hace del qquechua, ese idioma que debiera ser el vínculo imperecedero de unión para la raza peruana»] (1893, p. 99). This defense of the language definitely encompasses a nativist position. It may also contain a twofold gynocentric posture, perhaps also derived from Garcilaso. First, Peruvian mothers have historically been Quechua-speaking starting with Garcilaso himself whose mother Isabel Chimpu Ocllo spoke Quechua as a first language. Second, domestic servants were frequently Quechuaphone and we also know that Matto de Turner, like her progressive contemporary Manuel González Prada, upheld the domestic ideal as a means of securing education for women. Thus, even if it was not Matto's intention, the domestic ideal becomes loosely associated with a Quechua ideal that was concomitant with demographics. This brings us back to language. We are now able to make a fantastic or even Utopian leap, insinuated but not stated in Matto's essay: if the Incas disseminated Quechua as an imperial language, so too could the Peruvian State. This conclusion is derived from the following sequence of logic: Since Quechua once originated in two provinces to become the language of empire, even though it was not the language of elites, it could now emanate from many provinces and become the language of state for all provinces, even though it is not the language of elites. Thus the Peruvian State becomes the successor to the Inca Empire.

Accordingly, Matto de Turner took it upon herself to defend Quechuas or 'Indians', the latter term she would give in to one year later and use in her novel *Aves sin nido* (1889) to communicate effectively with Eurocentric criollo compatriots laden with the weight of 'the racial axis'. The defense of the Quechuas and the assertion that the Quechua language was the bond that binds all Peruvians establishes a direct connection between the Empire and the Republic. Such reasoning coincides perfectly with González Prada's famous assertion in the «Discurso en el Politeama» that «the nation is formed by the multitudes of Indians who live along the eastern side of the mountain range» [«la nación está formada por las muchedumbres de indios diseminadas en la banda oriental de la cordillera»] ([1888], p. 89)¹⁶. It is perhaps no coincidence that Matto and González Prada during the same year of 1888 both asserted that indigenous people represented the Peruvian nation. This suggests that they were working in the same intellectual milieu and that, contrary to conventional wisdom, they may have been mutually influencing each other, as opposed to the oft-cited view that he influenced her. Even so, their mutual usage of the term 'Indian' in their most widely read works still sets up a tension between their discourse and a heterogeneous reality, a tension that was initially highlighted in Garcilaso's text as Incas

¹⁶ González Prada included the «Discurso en el Politeama» in *Pájaros libres*.

civilizing ‘barbarian’ nations by conquering them. In Matto’s essay, since she used ‘Quechua’, unlike the generic ‘Indians’ used consistently by González Prada in his «Discurso en el Politeama» and Garcilaso (who did at least use the accurate term ‘Inca’ when appropriate to refer to this elite group), she assimilates the ethnic identity of all the non-Quechua peoples that populate the Andes and the Amazon to Quechua, but, unlike Garcilaso and González Prada, she at least gets it right with respect to the Quechuas themselves. She aims to resolve this tension resulting from inaccurate representation by creating a progressive, albeit culturally insensitive, strategy to help the nation recover from the hangover of colonialism. She understood the need for a unifying proper name, a need poorly understood by González Prada. ‘Quechua’ is the time-honored former neologism she chooses to meet this exigency. Her unequivocal linking of the Quechua language with the modern nation should not be considered «confusion». Rather, it is the best possible attempt at social recognition for people of Andean origin, in that keyed-up postbellum atmosphere regulated by the hegemonic Spanish language.

Differences between Garcilaso and Matto can easily be explained by the fact that the former was writing in the northern hemisphere for both a seventeenth-century European-Spanish audience and an Andean audience composed of colonial subjects who had become literate in Spanish, while the latter was mainly writing for a modern developing nation in the southern hemisphere. If the chronicler was absorbed in his quest for linguistic accuracy and preserving the civilization of his progenitors for posterity, the essayist, as I have pointed out elsewhere (Ward, 2004b, pp. 178-198), was concerned about the degenerate quality of a Quechua-less historiography. She cautions about what that less-than-integral quality would mean for understanding the geographical space imprinted with Andean toponymical traces that gives palpable form to modern Peru. Matto’s linking of a general language and a generalized ethnicity in her two-part essay folds the past into the present and does so in a bilingual Garcilasian nation that is not solely Hispanic in nature.

Riva Agüero: When Indigenism and Hispanism are One

The association between the Inca Garcilaso and the early twentieth-century historian José de la Riva Agüero (1885-1944) is itself almost legendary. What did the early-twentieth-century historian find appealing about the seventeenth-century chronicler? Efraín Kristal notes that Riva Agüero reads Garcilaso as a ‘true history’ [‘historia verdadera’] (1993, p. 47). Yet this is not a true history in a rigorous historiographical sense, but in a hybrid sense that brings together two radically different traditions, one that emanates from the Late Horizon Andes and another imposed from Renaissance Spain both during and after the Forty Years War that concluded in its favor in 1572. Riva Agüero does not merely appropriate the Inca; he passes the Inca’s work through a Hispanic filter synthesizing even more his already doubly synthetic view (barbarians and Incas, Incas and Spaniards), creating a true history in a deeper cultural sense that included civilizing Incas and Christianizing Spaniards, but also opening a portal to understand an emerging social category: mestizos.

Any tension obtained from filtering Garcilaso's work through a Hispanist filter is successfully resolved when Riva Agüero holds up his predecessor as a constructive sociological prototype. In his doctoral thesis *La historia en el Perú*, Riva Agüero is intrigued by the fact that the *Comentarios reales* derive from two sources, Spanish chroniclers and Quechua stories that Garcilaso's relatives and schoolmates retrieved from quipus (1962-1997 [1910], v. 4, p. 55). Incan quipus were non-alphabetic recording devices made of knotted cords of different colors. The color and length of the cord, along with the position of the knot, denote semiotic meaning; the devices were a way of recording history. Garcilaso explains that the quipus «registered the people who went to war [...] those who were born and those who died each year [...] they even stated how many speeches and rational declarations the king had made» [«assentavan la gente que iba a la guerra [...] los que nascían y fallecían cada año [...] hasta dezir cuántas pláticas y razonamientos había hecho Rey»] (*CR*, 1943 [1609], bk. 6, ch.9). It is easy to see how the Spanish chronicles preserved the Hispanic side of things, but alas —as Riva Agüero warns— the Incan tradition was in danger of being wiped out, «it is an indisputable truth that after one-hundred years indigenous people had lost almost all memory of the Incan past» [«es verdad indiscutida que los indígenas al cabo de cien años perdieron casi todos los recuerdos del pasado incaico»] (1962-1997 [1910], v. 4, p. 73). This is an important observation, since the art of the *quipucamayoc*, he who was in charge of these accounts (*CR*, 1943[1609], bk. 6, ch. 8), has been indeed lost, although twentieth-first-century researchers such as Gary Urton have recently deciphered some of their attributes. Thus, Garcilaso's value becomes obvious. As José Antonio Mazzotti forcefully argues, Garcilaso was able to preserve the system of symbols utilized by Cuzco's elite as a kind of subtext that might be possible to decipher even today (1996, p. 28). Because the codification of *quipucamayoc* knowledge had been simultaneously folded into a Hispanic culture of the Renaissance that was expanding, it was available three centuries later for Riva Agüero to study, imbuing a nativist stain of thought into an expanding criollo ideal of culture¹⁷. Two intellectual traditions conjointly formed not only colonial society which is momentous, but also when the process of blending is taken into account, the actual process of forging the Peruvian nation can be recognized.

Garcilaso is not just an example of scholarly syncretism. Riva Agüero sees him as the «perfect type to come from mixing both races, the American and the Spanish» [«perfecto tipo de la mezcla de las dos razas, americana y española»] (1962-1997 [1910], v. 4, p. 38). This is more than a simple idea, because in accordance with early twentieth-century norms of racial stereotyping, Riva Agüero assigns characteristics to each race. He had done this in an early essay on the institutions of Tahuantinsuyo ([1902] 1962-1997, v. 5, pp. 33-39), and, as I have shown elsewhere, it was common in other writers during the period prior to his making a name for himself (Ward 2007). From Spanish predecessors, the Inca Garcilaso has inherited both «fervor» and «sharpness of wit» [‘fogosidad’/ ‘viveza’] and, from the ‘Indian’, «the affectionate sweetness and a certain candor which is commonly found underneath the proverbial lack of confidence and caution

¹⁷ Regarding the expanding culture of the Renaissance, see Burckhardt (1914); on the mechanics of how native cultures expanded their fields of identity during that time, see Ward (2001).

of our indigenous people» [«la dulzura afectuosa y cierto candor, que es muy común descubrir bajo la proverbial desconfianza y cautela de nuestros indígenas»] (1962-1997 [1910], v. 4, p. 38). Despite the stereotyping, there is recognition that both sides of Garcilaso offered something to a nation not yet independent for eighty years. That something, as Raquel Chang-Rodríguez has observed, was a neo-Platonic view of mestizaje in which «diverse races and cultures would be linked through love» [«diversas razas y culturas estarían ligadas por el amor»] (1991, p. 122). This neo-Platonic view of cultural mixing also had a basis in reality since Garcilaso's parents, whose love begot him, were of two disparate cultures. Later when he was living in Spain, the first book he produced was a translation of a neo-Platonic tract, León Hebrero's *Dialoghi d'amor* (rendered in English alternately as *The Philosophy of Love* and *Dialogues of Love*).

Riva Agüero continues along the same line of reasoning in a commemorative essay about Garcilaso (1962-1997 [1916], v. 2, pp. 1-62). In that tribute, he reveals a two-tiered hybrid notion of society by inserting the «mestizo from Cuzco» [«mestizo cuzqueño»], already a hybrid category, into «the first criolla generation» [«la primera generación criolla»]. This reorients Garcilaso, who had first referred to himself as an Indian in his translation of Hebreo's *Dialoghi d'amor* (1590), repeated it in *La Florida del Inca* (1605), and then later as a mestizo in the *Comentarios reales* (1609), but not as a criollo. In the former case, responding to the culture-negating aspect of the proper noun «Indian», Garcilaso states he is an «Indian» from Peru, different from an «Indian» from Hispaniola (1960-1965, bk. 2, ch. 10). In the latter case, he says that because his group had mixed Spanish-Indian parentage, «they call us *mestizos*» [«nos llaman *mestizos*»] (CR, 1943 [1617], bk. 9, ch. 21; his italics). Garcilaso, in his new role as a vaunted member of the first criolla generation, becomes for Riva Agüero a «superior first example of the alloying of spirits that gives rise to *Peruvianism*» [«primero y superior ejemplar de la aleación de espíritus que constituye el *peruanismo*»] (1962-1997 [1916], v. 2, pp. 57; his italics). Garcilaso moves in his time from Indian to mestizo and, three-hundred years later, Riva Agüero moves him still further along the racial scale to criollo, the most widely accepted ethnicity (or race in early twentieth-century terms) for the nation.

Even though Riva Agüero offers enthusiastic (but sometimes measured) praise for Garcilaso's chronicle, he insists on reading it as a mixed-heritage paradigm for the nation. As a matter of fact, Riva Agüero is incapable of going beyond admitting that Garcilaso's history has «value» (1962-1997 [1910], v. 4, p. 107)¹⁸. Having «value» is a subjective appraisal of this national paragon. Thus despite Riva Agüero's methodical approach to historiography, despite the 400-plus pages he dedicates to the chronicler, his fraternal or even familial embrace of Garcilaso takes on an intuitive quality. As Smith would say, with Garcilaso he feels the connection with that which came before. That is, Riva Agüero feels Garcilaso in the nation, just as he feels the nation in Garcilaso. This is the sense in which Garcilaso can be read as a «true history».

¹⁸ In the context of the polemics of his time, he admits the *Commentaries* are less than «an immaculate source on Incan history» (1962-1997 [1910], v. 4, p. 107).

The ethnographic material that Garcilaso preserves is important, but it is not ineluctably what is most important for Riva Agüero. It is the process, the possibility whereby Garcilaso was able to close the cultural gap caused by what Walter Mignolo has called the colonial difference (2000, 2005). He did this by establishing what Sara Castro-Klarén has characterized as «a dynamic of double valence, to create an epistemological and aesthetic space where double voicing was possible» (2008, p. 130). That Garcilaso was able to achieve such a pivotal yet delicate feat allows Riva Agüero to conceptualize 'Hispanic' in a way that partially disintegrates «the racial axis» described by Quijano, recasting the «double valence» into a praise and even an ideal that necessitates an «alloying of spirits». That is to say, twentieth-century hybridity becomes some kind of 'link' (Mignolo, 2005, p. 37) or 'connector' (Mignolo, 2008, p. 229) that diminishes the difference between Euro-Hispanism and Indo-Hispanism and allows Riva Agüero, despite his reputed conservatism, to take a forward step out of the heritage of colonialism.

Valcárcel: When Two becomes Three

Iberian imperial power controlled Peruvian historiography and the timbre in which it was presented from the year 1532 onward, even establishing the ideological framework for the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega's writing. Censorship had become institutionalized on the Iberian Peninsula itself in 1502 when a *pragmática*, or edict, was promulgated ordering that no manuscript in the domains of the Catholic monarchy could be published without the express permission of said monarchy. This order was expanded and centralized by King Charles V and Prince Phillip in 1554 and then again 1558 (see Santander Rodríguez, 1994, p. 133). Another kind of control, spiritual control, was exercised with the Inquisitorial Index. These indices were published by the Sorbonne in 1542, 1544, and 1547, and by the University of Louvain in 1546 and 1550. The Spanish Sacred Office issued three others, in 1551, 1559 and 1583-1584 (Santander Rodríguez, 1994, p. 134). Garcilaso was living in Spain by the time of this last index and may have been familiar with it. Back on the temporal side of power, as Amalia Sarriá makes clear, the 1502 and the 1558 edits continued to govern the form and content of books published in Spain over the next century. Even if Garcilaso was not thinking about literary activities during his early years in Spain, the 1558 decree would have been in the air. The young Peruvian arrived on the peninsula just three years after its promulgation, in 1561, and spent varying amounts of time in Seville, Extremadura, Montilla, and Madrid during his first year (Chang-Rodríguez, 2006, p. 47). In any one of these places he most likely heard mention of these restrictions which may have lodged themselves in the back of his mind. By the time the 1583-1584 Index was released Garcilaso was busy at work composing the works that would make him famous. Just two years later, by 1586, he had completed his translation of the *Dialoghi d'amor*, and as Raquel Chang-Rodríguez notes, he had already established the outlines of *La Florida del Inca* and the *Comentarios reales* (2006, p. 51). It seems logical that Garcilaso would have had both State and Inquisitorial censorship at the forefront of his mind when he was committing to paper not only his translation of León Hebreo but also his knowledge and ideas about the New World. This is especially true since,

living in Spain, he would have been aware that his knowledge was heterodox knowledge, not at all what would have been common in the Iberian mainstream. Thus imperial power, if it did not give form to these early works of Andean historiography, did at least shape it to a degree.

It was inevitable that at some point there would be a backlash to correct the excesses of censorship and what could be called the anti-Incan historiography of Hispanicism, institutionalized during the years of Viceroy Toledo (1569-1581), persisting throughout the colonial era, and surviving well into the twentieth-century¹⁹. The flashpoint of this countercurrent came in the form of a genre-smashing nativist biography that incorporated elements of both essay and novel, *Garcilaso de la Vega visto desde el ángulo indio* (1939), by Luis E. Valcárcel (1893-1987). This biography represented a firm shift of meaning in the prologue to Garcilaso's other great work of Peruvian history, the *Historia general del Perú*, known also as the second part of the *Comentarios reales*.

In this biography Valcárcel virulently attacks Spanish behavior and the mindset that serves as its motor as he skews the horizon of understanding back toward the indigenous world in a sociological way of recovering Garcilaso that sets him apart from Renaissance-minded Riva Agüero and even from fellow indigenist Matto de Turner who was interested in inserting Quechua speakers into a modern and progressive world-system. *Garcilaso de la Vega visto desde el ángulo indio* is an attempt to establish a new cultural vector for the nation of Peru. Yet as we will see, despite its indigenist pretensions, it is not solely a nostalgic turn back toward pre-contact roots. It is an effort to establish an additional «racial axis» to support a nation being transformed by mestizaje.

What Valcárcel is reacting to is a national history written on the coast that omits the Andean. Censorship in Peru of what could be purchased, what could be owned, and what could be printed was enforced from 1570 to 1813 through edicts and indices associated with the Inquisition (see Guibovich Pérez, 2000, pp. 27-34). Reflecting on what he doesn't see in history, Valcárcel asks the question: «What people is this one that finds itself completely absent from its own history!?» [«¿Qué pueblo es éste que se halla por completo ausente de su propia historia?»] (1939, p. 47)²⁰. Valcárcel complains, for example, that criollos get special and decorous treatment even when they were instrumental in subordinating Quechua speakers. He laments the notable case of the first powerful Viceroy in Peru, none other than Toledo himself, who has been treated as a glorious figure in history (1939, p. 48). This man should not have a special place in Peruvian history because he had ulterior motives in his actions. He needed to make the Incas look like tyrants to justify the Spanish conquest (1939, p. 48-49).

There are many ways Garcilaso can serve as an antidote to the hegemonic Hispanic tradition. One reconstituting medicine can be found in the title of the prologue Garcilaso wrote for the second part of the *Comentarios reales*, «To mestizo Indians and criollos of the Kingdoms

¹⁹ Regarding sixteenth-century Spanish historiography on Peru, see Fossa (2006); regarding the anti-Incan historiography fostered during the Viceroyalty of Toledo see Porras Barrenechea (1986) and Castro-Klarén (2001).

²⁰ Valcárcel may have combined the inverted exclamation mark with the question mark to impart greater intensity to his rhetorical question.

and Provinces of the Great and Wealthy Empire of Peru» [«A los Yndios mestizos y criollos de los reynos y provincias del grande y riquísimo Ymperio del Peru»] (1617, Prólogo, n/p). There is a certain ambiguity to this title regarding punctuation usage both as employed by Garcilaso and as it pertains to our time.

Alberto Blecua explains that writing in medieval manuscripts applied different norms for punctuation depending on the period and the region (1983, p. 140). After the 1440s when Gutenberg's printing press achieved more wide-spread usage, punctuation practices could still be a matter of personal preference. Blecua explains that there were also different methods of transcription used by printers (1983, p. 137). These methods may have had a bearing on transcription of punctuation, as well as individual preferences. Conversely, there were efforts to establish punctuation conventions as was the case with preceptor Alonso Víctor Paredes's 1680 *Institución y origen del arte de la imprenta*. Paredes simply explains, «with the interpolated clause, or comma, we divide a clause or period into its smallest parts» [«con el inciso, ò coma, dividimos la clausula, ò periodo en sus partes mas menudas»] (1984, p. 20)²¹. Thus on the one hand, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century publishing lacked clearly defined universal norms; yet, on the other, there were preceptors such as Paredes, and others, who were concerned with establishing exactly this type of norm (see Mediavilla, [2000], 2007). What interests us here is the presence or absence of punctuation marks in the expression «indios mestizos» rendered in English as «mestizo Indians» since English adjectives do not agree in number with their subject as is the case in Spanish. Specifically we ponder what the insertion of a comma between «mestizo» and «Indian»—in Spanish or English—would imply.

As suggested, there are two ways to read this title. One way is sans comma, as printed in the first edition of 1617 and replicated in the 1722 and 1918-1920 editions as well as in the 1960-1965 complete works published by the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, implying that Garcilaso was directing his work toward 'criollos' and a subset of 'Indians' known as 'mestizos'²². This grouping of mixed-heritage peoples with the indigenous makes sense since neither of them could realistically aspire to be *vecinos*, or citizens, during the early colonial era. Generally, only people of pure Spanish blood could expect membership in that elite category. Walter Mignolo explains that «the 'purity of blood' principle was formalized at the beginning of the sixteenth century, in Spain, and established the final 'cut' between Christians, Jews and Moors». Later the concept «was adapted to the Spanish colonies in the Americas too» (Mignolo, 2000, pp. 27-29). Mignolo warns that the dividing lines did not become commensurate with skin color until the nineteenth century (2000, pp. 30-31). In the sixteenth century it had to do with religion and that means it had to do with power.

Getting back to the category of *vecino*, Garcilaso himself states that «for *vecinos* [...] lords of vassals are understood, those who have *repartimientos* of Indians» [«por *Vecinos* [...] se entienden

²¹ I have left intact Paredes's use of diacritical marks in this quote.

²² Curiously, the 1800, 1829, and 1972 Spanish editions, like the English editions of 1688 and 1966, suppressed the prologue altogether. The issue as to why Spanish editors would suppress the prologue is intriguing and could bear further study. As for the English, perhaps Livermore (Garcilaso, 1966) took the lead from the 1688 edition.

los Señores de vasallos, que tienen Repartimientos de Indios» (*HG*, 1722 [1609], bk. 8, ch. 1). The few members of Incan nobility who were granted «Repartimientos de Indios»—literally a dividing up of indigenous peoples among those in power—were generally an exception, although paradoxically, they were also of pure blood, Incan blood. Yet they did not seem to have been included in the category *vecinos*²³. If a mestizo child were recognized by his father or was the product of a legitimate marriage, *vecino* status might have been acknowledged. Such cases were rare. In a word, mestizo-Indian and criollo were two general classes of people where an individual might be both literate and conversant in Spanish.

Another would be the *indio ladino*, or Ladino Indian. This term was not embraced by Garcilaso but, before continuing our discussion, it should be first explained to establish the larger multicultural picture. This category represents another type of mestizaje, one that was perhaps less biological and, as Rolena Adorno suggests, more religious, cultural and linguistic (2008, p. 24). Adorno cautions that the term was coined by outsiders to be used within outsider, or colonialist, discourse (2000, p. xlv). Elsewhere she elaborates on the expression: «it was not used by natives for self-identification except when dealing with Spanish-speaking outsiders» (1991, p. 233). The Inca Garcilaso does not employ the *indio ladino* label in his prologue's title limiting his interest to mestizo Indian and criollo. He may have eschewed the term because it did not take into account indigenous notions of nobility or social station. Adorno explains that instead, «it brought together under a single rubric a diverse constellation of social types» (1991, p. 233). Garcilaso may have taken into account the process that James Lockhart has called «cultural convergence» (1999, p. 204) within his conceptualization of «indios mestizos» thereby making it multifaceted, or at least more inclusive. As we will now see, in later centuries there is another reason editors and commentators might choose to insert a comma between the noun and its modifier thereby making the modifier into a noun on its own field of semiotic meaning.

The second reading of the prologue's title is Valcárcel's. In his rescuing of the prologue which had been omitted from the 1800-1801 and 1829 editions, he disregards the punctuation of the 1617, 1722, and 1918-1920 editions. By inserting a comma between the adjective and the noun in the expression «indios mestizos y criollos», he updates Garcilaso to reflect a different ethnological reality, implying that the work was directed at three separate groups: «Indians, mestizos, and criollos» (1939, p. 22). In the face of a large corpus of secondary commentary on Garcilaso, it would indeed be daring to assert that Valcárcel was the first to insert the comma although that may be the case. However, we can make several assertions to try to clear up the murkiness of sociological understanding as it evolved through the centuries. First, there are very few editions of the *Historia general del Perú*, less than a dozen, and many of these are of limited press runs or are anthologies making rare the extremely few complete editions before the publication of Valcárcel's 1939 *Garcilaso de la Vega visto dese el ángulo indio* (1617, 1722,

²³ Even in the case of the relationship between *encomenderos* and ethnic *curacas*, described by Guillermo Lohmann Villena as one of connivance, the Spanish overlord wielded power over the *curaca*, appointing the most docile one who would join in with him on mutual enrichment schemes (2001, p. 53). This type of arrangement while beneficial for the *curaca* does not imply a voting seat in the *cabildo*, a privilege only awarded to *vecinos*.



Ilustración 13: Prologue, second part of *Comentarios reales* or *Historia general del Perú*, Córdoba, 1617. Cortesía de la Flatow Rare Books Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

1800-1801, 1829, 1918-1920). This scarcity assigns greater cultural value to them in mapping out Garcilasian trajectories in the Hispanic world.

Second, as late as the 1722 edition of the *Historia general*, the prologue appeared without the comma, reading, «A los indios mestiços, y criollos». When the unnamed editor of that edition (who may have been Andrés González de Barcia Carballido y Zúñiga according to the WorldCat database) respected the comma between «mestiços» and «y criollos», but did not insert one between «indios» and «mestiços», he allowed the noun «indios» to maintain its semantic relationship to «mestiço», an adjective (*HG*, 1722 [1609], Prólogo, n/p). This suggests that while the comma resided in his editorial comfort zone, he did not see the need to insert one between the two elements that comprise «indios mestizos». Since the 1800-1801 and 1829 editions omitted the prologue all together they are of no help to us in determining an ideological shift in Peru, though perhaps this could be the case for Spain, yet more in a political than in a sociological sense.

Third, there are other indicators that Garcilaso saw two social categories, not three. For example, in the first chapter of book 8, he discusses «how Indians, and Spaniards celebrate the holiday of the Sacred Sacrament» [«cómo celebraban indios, y españoles la Fiesta del Santísimo Sacramento»] (*HG*, 1722 [1609], bk. 8, ch. 1). Why doesn't he mention mestizos celebrating the Holiday of the Sacred Sacrament? Also in this chapter, Garcilaso talks about Spaniards, and the distinct «Indian» nations differentiated by the dissimilar languages in which they sing their songs. But he does not talk about mestizos in this regard either. To my mind, when Garcilaso refers to the historical actors during the events he describes that run from Manco Cápac to Túpac Amaru he does not perceive mestizos as being actors even though some, such as Garcilaso himself, were born during [toward the end of] that historical cycle²⁴. When he does talk about mestizos, it generally occurs in biographical or ethnographic passages such as chapter 31 of book 9 which points to a post-Túpac Amaru Peru²⁵. To insert a comma between «indios» and «mestizos» is to make a sociological assessment that does not occur to Garcilaso or to his seventeenth-and eighteenth-century editors.

By interpolating a comma between Indians and mestizos, Luis E. Valcárcel updates Garcilaso's prologue to reflect a different ethnological reality. The demographics are striking. Claudio Esteva-Fabregat calculates Peru's 1962 population to have been 4 834 093 indigenous people, 1 293 640, people of European extraction, and 3 078 292 mestizos, along with 518 231 people of African heritage (1995, p. 329)²⁶. The mestizo category, limited in Garcilaso's time, had become 27.7% in 1962 compared to 46.64% indigenous, 18.56% white, and 5% black (1995,

²⁴ Aurelio Miró Quesada has noted a fundamental historical unity between both parts, the *Comentarios reales* and the *Historia general del Perú*, the history in the first beginning with Manco Cápac and the history in the second ending with the assassination of Túpac Amaru I. The history of the second is integral to completing the historical frame of Incan succession dealt with in depth in the first (1996, p. 17).

²⁵ The chapter's title is revealing: «New Names to Name Diverse Generations» [«Nombres nuevos para nombrar diversas generaciones»].

²⁶ People of Asian heritage, for some reason, are not reflected in these statistics.

p. 329). That is to say, just twenty-three years after Valcárcel's proposal, the dual Spanish-Indian construction that was prominent in written texts of Garcilaso's century is demographically proven to be a tripartite criollo-Indian-mestizo configuration. While this triangular understanding of the social fabric still does not accurately reflect the mosaic of multilingual Andean, Amazonian, and coastal cultures that make up the modern republic²⁷, it does at least make room for the fastest growing category, the insurgent mestizos, an emerging «racial axis», chipping away at the power of the other two.

This is important because, for Valcárcel, Garcilaso's *Comentarios reales* is no mere historical document; it is also a window on the future. Valcárcel writes, «Indians, mestizos and criollos, those from Garcilaso's time and their descendants over three centuries, will have in Garcilaso not only their annalist but also their prophet» [«Indios, mestizos y criollos contemporáneos y sucesores en tres siglos tendrían en Garcilaso no solo a su analista sino también a su profeta»] (1939, p. 22). «Prophet», in a new social context defined by the inserted comma, implies that «los indios, mestizos y criollos del Perú» equally receive Garcilaso's *Comentarios reales* as the «Tablets of the Law» [«Tablas de la Ley»], something akin to an «indigenous Bible» [«Biblia india»] (1939, p. 22).

Inherent to Valcárcel's nativist arguments is a tilting of the scales toward a greater recognition of indigenous contributions to Peru's history, while implying for both Amerindians and mestizos the possibility of recovering an identity taken away from them by the Pizarros (conquistadors), Toledos (viceroys), and Areches (royal prosecutors). Valcárcel's reading has value not as an absolute, but as an explicit comma-inserting model for later cultural historians. This includes two vital critical editions of the second half of the *Comentarios reales*. The authoritative Argentine edition by Ángel Rosenblat, either following Valcárcel's lead or independently arriving at the same conclusion, also includes the inserted comma (*HG*, 1944 [1617], v. 1, p. 9). The same is true for a widely quoted Peruvian edition, the one edited by José Durand (*HG*, 1962 [1617], p. 55). In the same comma-inserting category should be mentioned the ones offered by Gustavo Pons Muzzo (*HG*, 1979 [1972] [1617]) and Aurelio Miró Quesada Sosa (*HG*, 1996 [1617], p. 245) as well as an anonymously edited 1959 edition²⁸. A conclusive study of all editions, Spanish, English, Peruvian, and of course French might be of interest to the debate on how the notion of race was formed and permuted through the centuries, including those editions that omitted the prologue altogether, such as the 1800, 1829 and 1972 Spanish-language editions published in Spain as well as the 1688 and 1966 English-language versions. Finally Antonio Cornejo Polar's inclusion of the comma based on his quoting of the Durand edition further

²⁷ Garcilaso, of course, was also aware of cultural heterogeneity during his time: «También es de notar que aquella confusión y multitud de lenguas que los Incas, con tanto cuidado, procuraron quitar, ha buuelto a nacer de nuevo, de tal manera que el día de hoy se hallan entre los indios más diferencias de lenguajes que había en tiempo de Huaina Cápac» (*CR*, 1943 [1609], bk. 7, ch. 3). Part of the difficulty is that the language groups are not clearly pegged to territorial boundaries. One reason for this, as Cerrón-Palomino explains (1995, pp. ix-x), stems from the Incan system of *mitmas* which relocated people from one linguistic area to another.

²⁸ Some databases suggest Miró Quesada was the editor of the 1959 edition, but I could find no evidence of this in either of its two volumes.

codifies its use in the prologue (Cornejo Polar, 1994, p, 96) guiding the projection and very nature of Peruvian cultural studies.

Conclusions

These three polemicists—Clorinda Matto de Turner, José de la Riva Agüero, and Luis E. Valcárcel—have differing concerns regarding Garcilaso. All read in their own ways the multiplicity of identities encapsulated in the *Comentarios reales*, engendering shoulder to shoulder a kaleidoscopic system that refocuses aspects of the nation in the past, liberating it from colonialist constructions while projecting it toward new complex identities concomitant with the ethnic populations of Peru. Anthony Smith is again helpful in understanding what is happening when these three cultural champions are read in unison. He writes: «in the short term, rival ‘histories’ may divide the community or sharpen existing class conflicts; but over the long term, the effect of their propagation and inculcation is to deepen the sense of shared identity and destiny in a particular community» (1988, p. 26). This debate brings Peruvian intellectuals together, and tightens the bonds that bind them to the nation in its full richness. Garcilaso’s Inca forbears brought diverse *ethnie* together into an Inca-centric paradigm that he himself fortified with his narrative, expanding the parameters of those Late Horizon Andean homogenizing cultural constructions as he fused them with the European Renaissance. He then becomes a memory operating in the minds of nineteenth- and twentieth-century sociologists of diverse schools as the nation advances in its quest to understand, coloniality-free, the trajectories of the pan-*ethnie* known as Peru. For what are *ethnie*, Smith asks rhetorically, «if not historical communities built upon shared memories» (1988, p. 25). Such partisan memories foster the nativist debate and create a shared identity, the necessary kaleidoscopic device for the multicultural nation-state.