
Indigenous Languages, Politics, and Authority in Latin America: Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives**Alan Durston****Publication Date**

30-05-2018

License

This work is made available under a Copyright Controlled by External Host license and should only be used in accordance with that license.

Citation for this work (American Psychological Association 7th edition)

Durston, A. (2018). *Indigenous Languages, Politics, and Authority in Latin America: Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives* (Version 1). University of Notre Dame. <https://doi.org/10.7274/24861672.v1>

This work was downloaded from CurateND, the University of Notre Dame's institutional repository.

For more information about this work, to report or an issue, or to preserve and share your original work, please contact the CurateND team for assistance at curate@nd.edu.



Indigenous Languages, Politics, and Authority in Latin America

Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives

Edited by

ALAN DURSTON and BRUCE MANNHEIM

INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES, POLITICS,
AND AUTHORITY IN LATIN AMERICA

INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES, POLITICS, AND AUTHORITY IN LATIN AMERICA

HISTORICAL AND
ETHNOGRAPHIC PERSPECTIVES

Edited by ALAN DURSTON
and BRUCE MANNHEIM

University of Notre Dame Press
Notre Dame, Indiana

University of Notre Dame Press
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
undpress.nd.edu

Copyright © 2018 by University of Notre Dame

All Rights Reserved

Published in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Durston, Alan, 1970– editor. | Mannheim, Bruce, editor.
Title: Indigenous languages, politics, and authority in Latin America : historical and ethnographic perspectives / edited by Alan Durston and Bruce Mannheim.
Description: Notre Dame, Indiana : University of Notre Dame Press, 2018. | Includes bibliographical references and index. | Identifiers: LCCN 2018011947 (print) | LCCN 2018013951 (ebook) | ISBN 9780268103712 (pdf) | ISBN 9780268103729 (epub) | ISBN 9780268103699 (hardcover : alk. paper) | ISBN 0268103690 (hardcover : alk. paper)
Subjects: LCSH: Indians of South America—Languages—Political aspects. | Indians of South America—Languages—Social aspects. | Indians of South America—Languages—History. | Indians of Mexico—Languages—Political aspects. | Indians of Mexico—Languages—Social aspects. | Indians of Mexico—Languages—History. | Indians of Central America—Languages—Political aspects. | Indians of Central America—Languages—Social aspects. | Indians of Central America—Languages—History.
Classification: LCC P119.32.S63 (ebook) | LCC P119.32.S63 I53 2018 (print) | DDC 498—dc23
LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018011947>

∞ *This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992
(Permanence of Paper).*

This e-Book was converted from the original source file by a third-party vendor. Readers who notice any formatting, textual, or readability issues are encouraged to contact the publisher at ebooks@nd.edu

To the memory of Sabine MacCormack

CONTENTS

	Acknowledgments	ix
	Introduction	1
	<i>Alan Durston and Bruce Mannheim</i>	
ONE	“The Discourse of My Life”: What Language Can Do (Early Colonial Views on Quechua) <i>Sabine MacCormack</i>	25
TWO	Colonial Written Culture in the Coixtlahuaca Basin, Oaxaca, Mexico <i>Bas van Doesburg</i>	59
THREE	The Politics of the Aztec Histories <i>Camilla Townsend</i>	105
FOUR	Toward a Guarani Semantic History: Political Vocabulary in Guarani (Sixteenth to Nineteenth Centuries) <i>Capucine Boidin and Angélica Otazú Melgarejo</i>	125
FIVE	Quechua-Language Government Propaganda in 1920s Peru <i>Alan Durston</i>	161
SIX	Mayan Languages: A New Dawn? <i>Judith M. Maxwell</i>	181
SEVEN	Xavier Albó’s “The Future of the Oppressed Languages in the Andes,” Revisited <i>Bruce Mannheim</i>	207

EIGHT	Building Differences: The (Re)production of Hierarchical Relations among Women in the Southern Andes <i>Margarita Huayhua</i>	231
	List of Contributors	247
	Index	249

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This volume was originally conceived by Sabine MacCormack (1941–2012), who invited most of the contributors and asked Alan Durston and Bruce Mannheim to take on editorial responsibilities. Now that it is coming out the editors would like to dedicate it to her memory. We thank Princeton University Press for allowing us to reproduce “‘The Discourse of My Life’: What Language Can Do,” chapter 6 (pp. 170–201) of Sabine MacCormack’s *On the Wings of Time: Rome, the Incas, Spain, and Peru* (2007), as her contribution to this volume.

We are grateful to the authors for their patience with a prolonged editorial process. We would also like to thank Stephen Little, Eli Bortz, and Rebecca DeBoer, of the University of Notre Dame Press, for shepherding the project through to its conclusion, and Elisabeth Magnus for her rigorous copyediting.

Introduction

ALAN DURSTON AND BRUCE MANNHEIM

Indigenous languages have been used to express new understandings of community, polity, and authority throughout the history of Latin American societies. Additionally, specific Amerindian languages have themselves embodied authority as varieties of special standing in the colonial regime, or as emblems of national or ethnic identities. Ethnographic research is revealing how speakers today employ socially stratified registers that index and reproduce hierarchies among them. This volume explores how indigenous languages have functioned as vehicles of social and political orders from the sixteenth century to the present. Our focus is on languages that have been prominent in multiethnic colonial and national societies and are well represented in the written record—Guarani, some of the Mayan languages, Nahuatl, and Quechua are the main examples, but certainly not the only ones.

The work assembled here challenges unspoken but persistent assumptions about the postconquest history of indigenous languages; once these assumptions are set aside, their long-neglected centrality to the political history of the region becomes evident. A first assumption could be termed the “assumption of linear decline”: that indigenous languages have, at best, “held on” in the face of the onslaught of European languages, with some merely declining more slowly than others. It is abundantly clear that indigenous languages expanded into new arenas in the wake of the Iberian invasions and that when they did lose ground the

gains often went to other indigenous languages.¹ For example, it appears that in much of the Andes (particularly Peru) Spanish lost ground to Quechua after independence in the 1820s; as late as the middle of the twentieth century Spanish monolinguals were rare in some Andean cities.² Similarly, in a pattern far from linear decline, the demographic falloff in Quechua monolingualism in the southern Peruvian highlands is relatively recent, a product of changes in the rural productive economy and in education in the second half of the twentieth century, rather than of colonial-era language policy.

A second assumption, deriving from an ideology of language both anachronistic and acontextual, construes indigenous languages as mono-ethnic and monocultural, defining clearly bounded populations.³ Mobility and mutability are the corollaries of enduring vitality: indigenous languages experienced wholesale changes as they acquired new roles and were adopted both by nonindigenous populations and by indigenous groups that had not originally spoken them. It is not just that agents of colonialism appropriated indigenous languages for purposes like religious conversion. Well into the twentieth century, indigenous languages were the common medium of communication shared by all, regardless of socioracial status, in large areas of Latin America (elites being distinguished by the fact that they also knew Spanish). This situation still exists in Paraguay, where the most spoken language is Guaraní. In their chapter on the Guaraní written record—whose extent and diversity will come as a surprise to many readers—Capucine Boidin and Angélica Otazú Melgarejo argue that this record is the product of a “third space” or “middle ground” that was neither indigenous nor European. While Jesuit missionaries had a major hand in the initial development of a written, colonial form of Guaraní, it was taken up and transformed by a variety of agents, indigenous, mestizo, and creole (of Spanish descent). A similar story emerges for the other widely written indigenous languages. To generalize this: languages as formal systems move across populations; they provide resources for the social construction of boundaries,⁴ particularly through differential access to linguistic repertoires, but the boundaries of a linguistic system—a named language or a named variety of a language—do not necessarily coincide with a social or political boundary.

A key implication of mobility/mutability is the need to study distinct registers of a language and how they are regimented. Scholars have often failed to notice socially grounded registers because they have tended to focus on the formal, written representation of grammars to the exclu-

sion of everyday contexts. Ethnicity is not the mechanical reflection of abstract knowledge of a set of lexical and grammatical forms or of an equally abstract heritage (inherited from where?). For speakers of K'ichee' Maya, ethnicity is an interactional achievement, arrived at through a complex layering of linguistic accommodation and differentiation: (1) foundationally at the hyperlocal level that is characteristic of Mesoamerica as a region, in which speakers from local settlements strive to differentiate themselves from neighboring settlements, drawing on historically Mayan and historically Spanish resources to do so; (2) a layer up, where, at a local level again, speakers differentiate themselves by class/ethnic affiliation through interaction between local varieties of Mayan and Spanish; and (3) at a pan-Mayan level, where Mayan intellectuals differentiate themselves from non-Mayans through a regimented purist register of K'ichee'.⁵ Each of these levels has a different, overlapping set of ethnic entailments, and each feeds into the others. These are ultimately observable only through detailed observation and analysis of linguistic behavior, as the more local points of differentiation are not necessarily within the purview of conscious control. The complexity of the linguistic repertoire within which K'ichee' speakers (themselves of multiple varieties) interact has not diminished—rather, it has expanded as Spanish colonialism, linguistic domination in republican Guatemala, and the pan-Maya movement have left linguistic accretions that, plugged into an older Mesoamerican “pueblo dialectology,” have provided a surplus of politically and socially charged varieties of K'ichee', controlled to a greater or lesser extent by speakers differently located.⁶

The proliferation of new registers takes a variety of forms. The spread of linguistic features from indigenous languages to local varieties of Spanish is not restricted to the usual second-language phenomena, such as the deployment of Quechua vowel space in second-language Spanish or the expansion of the periphrastic past tense (*he venido* instead of *vine*) or of the mirative (*había sido*) in Spanish, but in Vallegrande, Bolivia, can include the borrowing of ejectives (glottalized sounds) into Spanish, forming an affectively charged, “indigenized” register of the local Spanish.⁷ Another form of accommodation is the development of specialized or elite registers of the indigenous language, in which both grammar and lexicon are fitted to the categorial structure and semantics of Spanish or Portuguese. The elite overlay of southern Quechua, discussed in Bruce Mannheim's chapter, is an example of this. It developed among landed creoles and their descendants and continues to be spoken

to this day by first-language Spanish speakers who work with populations that are primarily Quechua speaking, such as workers in non-governmental organizations (see Margarita Huayhua, this volume). The process of accommodation can be deeply complex from a semiotic point of view, as William F. Hanks shows in his historical account of the emergence of what he calls *Maya reducido* on the Yucatán peninsula, remolding Yucatec Mayan to “the discursive practices of an emerging community of Christianized Indios.”⁸ *Maya reducido* overflowed the religious contexts in which it first emerged, shaping written Maya in public, secular venues, such as notaries. It is critical to note that neither is an instance of language change as it is normally understood.⁹ In both cases, Spanish-accommodated registers of indigenous languages have been added to regional repertoires, with specific social conditions within which they come into play.

This volume is the first to address the political uses of Latin American indigenous languages in historical perspective and is among the first to present a collection of interdisciplinary research covering different time periods and geographical areas. In this last regard it joins two recent compilations: *History and Language in the Andes*, edited by Paul Heggarty and Adrian J. Pearce (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), and *Iberian Imperialism and Language Evolution in Latin America*, edited by Salikoko Mufwene (University of Chicago Press, 2014). *History and Language in the Andes* brings together linguists and historians working on Andean languages (mainly Quechua) to show the potential for rethinking key assumptions of either field through the findings and methods of the other. Mufwene’s volume deals with the linguistic and sociolinguistic processes set off by Spanish and Portuguese colonialism, combining research on Iberian and Amerindian languages by linguists, anthropologists, and historians. Both volumes reflect a growing interest in multilingualism and “language ecologies”—the social, political, and ideological forces that organize the distribution of languages and language varieties in a society—that is also present in this volume. The research assembled here is methodologically and disciplinarily diverse—history, historical anthropology, linguistic anthropology, philology, and combinations thereof—but the contributors share a focus on indigenous languages as political objects and vehicles. As the ethnographic chapters by Huayhua and Mannheim remind us, languages are not merely abstract systems that peer out occasionally from historical or ethnographic accounts—rather,

they are the stuff of everyday social life. The deployment of distinct linguistic varieties in social interaction—ethnographically attested at the present time but also attested historically if only in fragmentary ways—lays bare the workings of social differentiation and social hierarchy.

BACKGROUND

The Amerindian languages that have left abundant written records are concentrated in three distinct areas: (1) Mesoamerica, (2) the central Andes, and (3) Paraguay. In Mesoamerica it is important to distinguish between central Mexico (where Nahuatl was the dominant language), Oaxaca (Mixtec, Zapotec, Chocho, and others), and the Mayan region. All three subareas are represented in this volume (Camilla Townsend's chapter deals with Nahuatl; Bas van Doesburg's with Chocho, Mixtec, and other Oaxacan languages; and Judith Maxwell's with Mayan languages in Guatemala and southern Mexico). Four chapters deal with different moments in Quechua's postconquest history (Sabine MacCormack, Alan Durston, Mannheim, and Huayhua). The third region, Paraguay, is represented by Boidin and Otazú Melgarejo's piece on Guaraní. This section offers general background on each area and goes on to provide some thoughts on periodization.

Mesoamerica is characterized by a high degree of linguistic diversity packed into a relatively small area. Ethnographers have noted a tendency toward localized microdifferentiation, with the home village as a moral center, which the linguistic anthropologist Paul Friedrich described as "pueblo dialectology."¹⁰ This heterogeneity speaks to the fact that in spite of millennia of close cultural and economic interactions the area was never unified politically, as the Andes were. Nonetheless, on the eve of the Spanish invasion Nahuatl had achieved the status of a *lingua franca* far beyond the regions subject to Tenochtitlan. The conquests helped spread Nahuatl yet further, because the conquistadors were accompanied by Nahua allies and because Nahuatl became the most widely used indigenous language among the Spaniards, particularly the clergy. Mesoamerica also stands out for its abundant written records in a number of indigenous languages. The abundance of community records in Nahuatl gave rise in the 1970s to one of the most influential and prolific schools in colonial Mexicanist historiography, the "New Philology," whose

main champion was the late James Lockhart. Lockhart and his students were the first to write the postconquest history of Mesoamerican polities on the basis of indigenous-language sources and paid special attention to the continued use of native terms for sociopolitical units and offices.¹¹ Townsend's chapter in this volume builds on this rich tradition of Nahuatl scholarship and scrutiny of indigenous sociopolitical categories. There is now an extensive and diverse historiography employing sources in Mesoamerican languages, and recent trends include a focus on multilingualism and language ecologies.¹² Multilingualism is an especially prominent issue in the Oaxaca area, where Mixtec or Zapotec, Nahuatl, and little-known languages such as Chocho could coexist in a single community. A distinctive historiography is emerging that explores the conditions of the exuberant multilingualism of the local archives and is exemplified by van Doesburg's chapter in this volume.¹³

Turning to the Andes, the historian is faced first of all with the vast geographical extent of Quechua, still spoken today from Colombia to northwestern Argentina. While Quechua is considered a language family, its most far-flung varieties are very closely related, suggesting that they represent a more recent, relatively rapid expansion. An important shift in thinking on this topic took place in the 1960s and 1970s, when the conventional model according to which Quechua originated in Cuzco and spread with Inka rule in the fifteenth century was disproven. Instead, it was proposed that Quechua first developed in central Peru and spread north and south in different waves, with most of the expansion taking place in pre-Inka times.¹⁴ This model is currently being refined by new research that places greater emphasis on the transformations of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—the time of the Inka and Spanish conquests.¹⁵ In the colonial Andes, Quechua was known simply as *la lengua general* (“the general language,” or “the lingua franca”) and was arguably more strategic to Spanish colonial interests than any other indigenous language, particularly because of its role as a lingua franca in the forced-labor system that fed the state-managed silver mining system.¹⁶ Nonetheless, the written corpus in Quechua from the colonial period is small by Mesoamerican standards, especially when it comes to texts of native authorship as opposed to the missionary literature authored by the European-born and creole clergy. Until recently, Quechua studies were the domain of linguists and had little parallel in the historiography. However, Quechua scholars have long been sensitive to how colonial

agents used and transformed the language, including semantic transformations of key terms.¹⁷ In recent years, a wider range of Andeanist scholars in different disciplines have been studying Quechua texts and taking an interest in Quechua's broader history—for instance, the dramatic spatial and demographic expansions and contractions of the language.¹⁸

Guarani, today the most spoken language of Paraguay, was part of a vast sphere of interaction that covered much of lowland South America. It is closely related to Tupinamba, a language spoken along much of the Brazilian coast that acquired lingua franca status in parts of colonial Brazil when it was carried inland by Portuguese slave raiders and colonists, their indigenous allies, and Jesuit missionaries.¹⁹ Languages of the far-flung Tupian family are spoken as far north as French Guiana, as far south as Paraguay, and as far west as the Peruvian Amazon. In the areas of the Rio de la Plata basin that were controlled by Spain, Guarani emerged as the local *lengua general*: the language of the Jesuit missions and of colonial Paraguay, as well as one of the most written Amerindian languages. A scholarship that reveals the full dimensions and characteristics of the historical Guarani literature has only recently emerged. This late development can be attributed in part to the fact that the early literature (from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) is dominated by Jesuit missionary writings and that writings of indigenous authorship and nonreligious writings date mostly from the late colonial and republican periods. Boidin and Otazú Melgarejo are part of a new generation of scholars who are revealing the importance of these “late” texts that many assumed had little potential to reveal the characteristics of a pristine, precontact Guarani society.

Research using Amerindian texts has focused overwhelmingly on a period stretching from the mid-to-late sixteenth century to the mid-to-late seventeenth century. The great missionary linguistic and translation projects date to the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, a period that was also the high point of indigenous alphabetic writing in Mesoamerica and the Andes. Key Amerindian languages had a formally recognized status in colonial society. The initial development of the norms for writing a language was controlled by the Spanish clergy, but writing was then taken up for a variety of purposes by indigenous elites in Mesoamerica and (to a lesser degree) the Andes—internal administrative and historical records, correspondence, and even the transmission of non-Christian religious lore. While internal community

records in Mesoamerican languages continued to be kept in some localities throughout the colonial period, there was a marked decline after the mid-seventeenth century, and some genres all but disappeared.²⁰ One of the novel aspects of Townsend's chapter on Nahuatl annals is her focus on one of the last practitioners of the genre, Juan Buenaventura Zapata, who wrote in the mid-seventeenth century. The decline reflects the fact that the indigenous nobility of Mesoamerica and the Andes were becoming increasingly bilingual but also experiencing increasing difficulty in maintaining their leadership over indigenous communities. As indigenous communities became smaller and more egalitarian, they had less need for or access to writing. It is thus particularly interesting that indigenous writing in Guaraní took off just as it was declining, or even disappearing, in Mesoamerica and the Andes, a reflection of the fact that Paraguay was a frontier area with limited presence by the colonial government—in fact, Guaraní leaders assumed an even greater role in local government after the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767 (see Boidin and Otazú Melgarejo, this volume).

The decline of indigenous-language writing in Mesoamerica and the Andes can also be associated with a turn to a more unified, top-down vision of the state, on the model of Bourbon France, which in turn engendered a growing belief in the necessity and feasibility of the Castilian language as a unified language of statecraft. Antipathy toward indigenous languages in the colonial establishment increased under the Spanish Bourbons, particularly during the second half of the eighteenth century, when a far-reaching process of administrative centralization and standardization took place. The Bourbons actively promoted Castilian Spanish as a national language, and in 1770 Charles III issued a decree calling for the eradication of Amerindian languages.²¹ It is important to note, however, that Bourbon language policies had little effect and in many areas were blithely disregarded even by creole elites and by the clergy. During the Independence Wars (1810–25), decrees and proclamations urging indigenous support were translated into indigenous languages by both patriots and loyalists and were published in New Spain, Peru, and the new viceroyalty of Rio de la Plata.²²

Under the Habsburgs (prior to 1700), the church had been the main transmitter of political concepts; bilingual and multilingual catechisms and sermons explicitly referred to the nature and basis of the colonial order.²³ The religious underpinnings of secular power were undermined

by the secularization process undertaken by the Bourbons, and even more so by the Independence Wars and the rise of liberalism and nationalism. Accordingly, new textual genres and vocabularies had to be invented rather quickly, and a new symbolic role for indigenous languages appeared: that of the national language, embodiment of the historical continuity of a nation.²⁴ Once independence was achieved, national leaders quickly abandoned their interest in indigenous languages, or in any case stopped publishing in them. However, the endemic conflicts and political instability of the early national period (roughly 1820–80) are associated with a florescence of political writing in indigenous languages. Two large corpora are in Yucatec Maya and Guaraní: the first is a reflection of a prolonged period of Maya independence in Yucatán known as the Caste War (1847–1901), and the second is a product of Paraguay's War of the Triple Alliance (1864–70), when national leaders promoted a Guaraní-language press as part of a nationwide military mobilization (see Boidin and Otazú Melgarejo, this volume).²⁵

Indigenous languages received a new boost as political media in the early decades of the twentieth century as a result of two interconnected processes: (1) the rise of *indigenismo* and (2) movements that reacted against turn-of-the-century oligarchic modernization and its effects on indigenous peasantries. Both resulted in state institutions and practices that, at least, paid lip service to the inclusion of indigenous people in the nation-building process. During the Mexican Revolution (1910–20), Emiliano Zapata published manifestos in Nahuatl, and in its aftermath, Mexico's revolutionary government developed bilingual education programs for several indigenous languages.²⁶ Other countries such as Peru followed suit, if in a less systematic fashion (Durston, this volume). For the first time since the seventeenth century, centralized and more or less systematic programs for the instruction of Amerindian-language speakers were developed, this time focusing on notions of nationhood and modernity as part of a project of "soft assimilationism." In Peru, Guatemala, and perhaps other countries as well, authoritarian leaders sought to co-opt *indigenismo* and forestall social unrest by presenting themselves as protectors of the indigenous population and publishing indigenous-language proclamations (Durston, this volume).²⁷ Official interest in indigenous languages waned after World War II, however. Rapid urbanization, in particular, boosted Spanish and convinced policy makers and intellectuals that indigenous languages would soon be obsolete.

The extensive and diverse indigenous-language literatures of the 1750–1950 period have only recently begun to attract scholarly attention in large part because under the assumption of linear decline they were wrongly assumed to be pallid versions of material from the first years of the colony. As Boidin and Otazú Melgarejo note in this volume, scholars have long gravitated toward the earlier texts for their presumed proximity to preconquest cultures (though these texts were often fitted to their Spanish counterparts). It has also taken a long time for the scholarship to take into account the role of indigenous languages in the process of independence and nation building. While there is a large and distinguished historiography on the involvement of indigenous peasantries in these processes, historians have rarely asked how key concepts and discourses were expressed in indigenous languages. Somewhat counterintuitively, scholars of Quechua and Guaraní appear to have taken greater interest in these issues than Mesoamericanists, at least in relative terms—late colonial and republican political languages are now the most prominent theme in Guaraní studies.

Ironically, the blindness toward indigenous political languages and languages of politics extends to the present day. There is a disjuncture between the current preoccupation with the “new social movements,” in large part ethnically based, and our understanding of the ways in which these movements are mediated in large part through indigenous languages. Indigenous communities of North Potosí, Bolivia, have participated in a pan-indigenous movement, with communities represented across the ethnic divide between Quechuas and Aymaras. How are political rhetorics in the two (non-mutually intelligible) indigenous languages structured? What role do translators play in fitting the political and moral rhetorics of one language to another? What linguistic registers are their discussions conducted in?²⁸ Our current age of indigenous-language politics is characterized by the rise of ethnic militancy and concepts of plurinationalism—in effect, an explicit rejection of the Latin American nation-states in favor of earlier identities. Its origins date back several decades, to the struggles of the 1970s and 1980s that produced movements like the Aymara-centered Katarista movement in Bolivia and the pan-Maya movement in Guatemala (see Maxwell, this volume).²⁹ Yet these shifts in public, political rhetorics have had multiple, contradictory effects on the indigenous languages—as Maxwell (this volume) describes them, “steps forward,” “steps backward,” “steps side-

ways.” In Ecuador, the emergence of indigenous political movements in the 1990s gave rise to a standardized, unified variety of Quichua (as the Ecuadorian members of the Quechua linguistic family are known), called Quichua Unificado, based on highland varieties of Quichua, with a semantics at least partly regimented to Spanish. But Amazonian Quichua speakers struggle with Quichua Unificado, and many speakers are now bilingual in the two Quichua varieties—often along with other Amazonian languages.³⁰ Quichua Unificado is also brought into the classroom in Zapara-speaking areas of Ecuador, creating a space in which all three languages are aligned to each other semantically.³¹ In Bolivia, too, school primers written in a single, standardized Quechua sit unused in bilingual classrooms. At the edge of the Peruvian Amazon, a community school used by Matsigenka, Quechua, and bilingual Matsigenka-Quechua students received a bilingual Quechua-Spanish instructor one year and a bilingual Matsigenka-Quechua instructor the next.³² In all these cases, the tacit message (made explicit by the paucity of indigenous-language instruction at a secondary level and the utter absence of advanced study in indigenous languages) is to reinforce the dominance of Spanish as the only legitimate linguistic variety, public rhetoric notwithstanding. The bright exception to these patterns is the Guatemalan case, where Mayan communities have controlled both standardization and indigenous education, within limits (and with a somewhat distinct set of contradictions).

MAIN THEMES

The connecting threads of this volume can be grouped into four main categories: (1) political economies of language, (2) language choice and authority, (3) writing and polity, and (4) political concept formation. Every chapter deals at one level or another with the first topic, which concerns the changing standing and functions of indigenous languages relative to nonindigenous languages and to one another. The use of indigenous languages as sources of political authority (topic 2) is also a prominent topic throughout. The “writing and polity” topic is most prominent in the chapters by van Doesburg and Townsend, which reveal the close ties between indigenous-language writing and the construction and consolidation of indigenous polities. Finally, political concept building is an area where the use of indigenous languages to reproduce political

orders becomes particularly visible and concrete. Political terminology is discussed at length in the chapters by Boidin and Otazú Melgarejo and by Durston, while Townsend and Mannheim provide important methodological considerations.

Political Economies of Language

MacCormack's chapter on early colonial views on Quechua introduces many of the key themes of the book. MacCormack reminds us that the Iberian invasions happened at a time when the history and relative qualities of different languages were topics of great interest in Europe.³³ While humanists sought to restore Latin to its former glory, the vernaculars were being promoted as languages of learning and empire. Languages were regarded as essential vehicles of political order in two different ways. First, a common language was considered essential for a civil society. Second, some languages were thought to be more orderly and rational in their grammar and lexicon and to have the power to convey these qualities to their speakers. The Inkas were believed to have bestowed both forms of linguistic order on the Andes. Perhaps more than any other Amerindian language, Quechua was lionized by colonial writers as an embodiment of civility and a fitting vehicle for Christianity.

Whether the Inkas themselves viewed Quechua in similar terms is doubtful. While they did spread a particular variety of Quechua (whose origin and characteristics are subject to debate), it is not clear that there was an explicit policy in this regard or that they attributed any special qualities to that variety.³⁴ Spanish rule introduced new and essentializing ways of thinking about language—the humanist identification of grammatical and political order was a particularly idiosyncratic artifact. The praise and promotion of select indigenous languages was a double-edged sword that served to further their subordination and weakened other indigenous languages: indigenous languages were promoted insofar as they reflected qualities that European languages represented to a greater degree. The promotion of the “general languages”—one for each major region (Nahuatl in Mexico, Guaraní in Paraguay, Tupi in Brazil, and Quechua in Peru)—was also an implementation of the colonial logic of the two republics, separate and unequal.

Recent efforts to reintroduce indigenous languages to the public sphere have tended to reproduce colonial patterns of subordination, as

shown by Maxwell's chapter on Maya revitalization efforts. She points, for example, to the fact that Mayan-language educational materials in Guatemala are, by government mandate, translations of materials from the national curriculum, with the resulting "cultural infelicities." Huayhua's account of interactions in Quechua between Spanish-dominant bilingual officials and Quechua-dominant agriculturalists shows how the social dominance of the first-language Spanish speakers—and by extension of the Spanish language—is reproduced in the interactions below the participants' conscious awareness. All three contemporary chapters (Maxwell, Mannheim, and Huayhua) suggest that the use of an indigenous language in new contexts does not necessarily further the cause of revitalization and can in fact work against it. Similarly, César Itier's work on Quechua historical theater in early twentieth-century Cuzco stressed the detrimental aspects of the charisma of the language of the Inkas, arguing that the impulse to "cultivate" a presumptively archaic and pure Quechua has detracted from its standing as a language of multipurpose communication, much as sixteenth-century humanist cultivation of Latin detracted from its standing as an auxiliary language in Europe.³⁵

However, postconquest transformations in the roles and relative status of indigenous languages often diverged from colonial strategies and intentions. When we look closely at practices on the ground, as van Doesburg does in the Coixtlahuaca valley in Oaxaca, different patterns emerge, reflecting the strategies of local colonial agents and indigenous elites. While many regions underwent a strong homogenization process—for example, the spread of Quechua in the Andes and Tupi in Brazil—the colonial written record from one Oaxacan valley is in three different indigenous languages: Nahuatl, Mixtec, and Chocho. This pattern of stable multilingualism has much to do with religious and political orders. The elites that ruled over ethnolinguistically differentiated units within the larger polity, and the competing religious orders with which they allied themselves, favored the permanence of the less spoken languages and their use in the written record.

Language Choice and Authority

Indigenous languages have been employed as sources of authority and legitimacy by a variety of agents, ranging from clergymen seeking control over a specific group or territory to twentieth-century politicians.

Van Doesburg argues that the Dominican order in Oaxaca promoted the development of a Chocho written tradition, not because there was a large population that could be reached only in that language, but because it justified their claim to the Coixtlahuaca basin. Augusto B. Leguía, president of Peru in the 1920s, sought to burnish his nationalist credentials during the heyday of *indigenismo* by having his speeches published in Quechua translation.

Less is known about the linguistic strategies of indigenous elites. The issue is broached by Townsend, who discusses Nahua noble Juan Buenaventura Zapata y Mendoza's championing of Nahuatl in seventeenth-century Tlaxcala. Like his early contemporary, the Peruvian mestizo author Garcilaso Inca de la Vega (see MacCormack, this volume), Zapata was worried about the growing influence of Spanish and shows a penchant for using archaic Nahuatl terms instead of established Spanish loanwords. Both Zapata and Garcilaso were influenced by the humanist notion that political order depended on the correct use of language and were concerned about Hispanicisms as a form of corruption reflecting the decay of the polity. Townsend argues that by Zapata's time the original cellular structure of the Nahua annals had been forgotten, so that Zapata in some respects had more in common with a European historian than with his forebears. As Mannheim mentions in his contribution, lexical purism can compensate for, or obscure, deeper transformations.

By contrast, the nongovernmental organization workers in Cuzco discussed by Huayhua strategically deploy both Spanish (in Quechua-Spanish code-switching) and a Spanish-influenced register of Quechua (the "overlay," in Mannheim's terminology) to establish their authority over monolingual peasants. The *refusal* to use an indigenous language can be a powerful mechanism of subordination, as Carlos Monsiváis notes in a discussion of local politicians in Juchitán (Oaxaca, Mexico), who use Zapotec on campaign and Spanish to reject people's demands once they are in office.³⁶ Conversely, for local officials to *require* an indigenous agriculturalist to speak Quechua even though the agriculturalist also speaks Spanish can also work as a mechanism of subordination, as anthropologist Penelope Harvey observed.³⁷ Neither is merely a form of conjunctural subordination; rather, both send powerful messages about the institutional alignment of political power with the Spanish language. In these more recent contexts, indigenous languages are used to index not so much authority as community and solidarity, which can be easily denied when convenient for those in power.

Writing and Polity

One of the key achievements of the colonial historiography on indigenous languages, especially the New Philology, has been to clarify the circumstances under which written traditions emerged. In Mesoamerica these traditions are closely tied to the life of indigenous polities; as van Doesburg explains in his chapter in this volume, "Writing was a public activity, instrumental in integrating the community." The florescence of indigenous-language alphabetic writing in the Oaxaca region and elsewhere in Mesoamerica was the result of the superposition of the colonial institutional structure of the *cabildo* onto indigenous polities. The close ties between political structures and writing are also exemplified in Townsend's chapter, which shows that the peculiarly repetitive organization of Nahuatl annals is a product of the cellular structure of Nahuatl city-states. The Mesoamerican reverence for the written word as an embodiment of the polity no doubt has preconquest roots, but it also has colonial ones. It emerges powerfully in Maxwell's chapter on Maya revitalization, which chronicles how participants in projects to document and promote Mayan languages went to great lengths to protect their manuscripts during the genocidal violence of the 1980s, hiding them in pots and in the rafters of houses, and even having themselves buried with them.

This close relation between indigenous polity and writing is less evident in South America or is present in different forms. The Quechua writings of indigenous authorship that have survived from the colonial period are mostly correspondence or petitions; the institutional records that abound in several Mesoamerican languages are few and far between, in part because the pre-Hispanic record-keeping technology of the *quipu* remained in use in the Andes.³⁸ The Guaraní record, on the other hand, exemplifies a peculiar association between writing and war. Guaraní authorities began producing official records in the late colonial period as Jesuit control declined and frontier warfare increased. Political writing in Guaraní flourished during the Wars of Independence (1810s) and the War of the Triple Alliance (1860s) and largely disappeared in the intervening periods.³⁹

This correlation between writing and war is not unique to Paraguay. In Mexico, writing in indigenous languages made comebacks to the public sphere during the Caste War in Yucatán and the Revolution of

1910.⁴⁰ Internal record keeping stopped at the time of independence, but independence, and the end of the Pax Hispanica, set the stage for a different sort of political writing: manifestos and communiqués in which political leaders addressed Indians in an effort to recruit them into political projects and new ways of imagining the polity.⁴¹ In the Andes, the Independence Wars saw a unique florescence of manifestos in Quechua and Aymara. Such texts would not reappear until the 1910s and 1920s, a period discussed in Durston's chapter on government propaganda in Peru. Although there were no full-scale military conflicts, this was a time of indigenous mobilization, often in the form of local uprisings, and of rapid political transformation. Government propaganda in Quechua sought to inculcate loyalty to a new authoritarian *indigenista* state, while radicals promoted Quechua literacy as a path to indigenous citizenship and cultural resurgence.

Political Concept Building

Indigenous-language writings invoked polity formally and performatively, but also denotatively, through the political vocabulary sets that are the object of Boidin and Otazú Melgarejo's "semantic history." A particularly fruitful period to study in this regard is the independence era, which saw a massive influx of new political concepts like "citizen" and "liberty." Here it is much more feasible to get a sense of a "before and after" than for the other great transformation in indigenous politics, that of the sixteenth century. But semantic history presents multiple challenges whatever the time period. The meaning and evolution of key terms are generally not well documented, and there is no tradition of commentary on this sort of terminology. Indigenous political categories do not have one-to-one European equivalents. Townsend warns against trying to give Nahuatl categories fixed reference, noting that this will not even work for the familiar *altepetl* (generally translated as "city-state"), because its meaning was independent of scale (similarly, the Quechua term *llaqta* can mean "town," "city," or "country"). In a contemporary context, Mannheim warns against assuming that the Quechua terms and expressions used in public discourse in Peru are acceptable or even intelligible to monolinguals: Quechua's condition as an "oppressed language" allows all sorts of calques from Spanish and invented traditions to proliferate.

There is great potential in the comparative study of transformations in political vocabulary in different languages. Boidin has stressed elsewhere that the development of a “language of political modernity” in Guaraní was part of a global process. The introduction of new concepts such as “nation” or “citizen” in Guaraní cannot be seen in isolation—the political vocabulary of Spanish was undergoing a similar process of transformation at this time.⁴² A research project led by Boidin and Itier is attempting to facilitate comparative study of how these developments are reflected in independence-era writings in Quechua, Guaraní, and other South American languages.⁴³

The trajectories of the terms *ava* (Guaraní) and *runa* (Quechua) illustrate the parallelisms and divergences in the development of key concepts (see the chapters by Boidin and Otazú Melgarejo, and Durston, respectively). Both were originally generic terms for “human.” In the colonial period they came to also have a meaning close to that of “Indian,” in opposition to a term that designated Spaniards (*karai* in Guaraní, *viracocha* in Quechua).⁴⁴ Both *ava* and *runa* were often avoided in independence-era proclamations, probably because their authors or translators did not wish to emphasize divisions between indigenous and nonindigenous in the context of the independence struggle. *Ava* seems to have dropped out of the political vocabulary in Paraguay, an increasingly mestizo nation, but *runa* was a key category in official discourse in Quechua in 1920s Peru, where the authoritarian *indigenista* state was grounded in the indigenous-nonindigenous divide.

SABINE MACCORMACK AND THIS VOLUME

Érase una vez, in the central plaza of Cuzco, at a moment when it still belonged to Cuzqueños, who might stop in the Café Ayllu to meet relatives or acquaintances. Going to meet a foreign scholar at one of the second-story hostels on the plaza, we were introduced to his traveling companion, who was sitting on the balcony sketching La Compañía, the Jesuit church, an imposing stone baroque structure that was rivaled only by the Cathedral of Cuzco, facing the plaza at a ninety-degree angle to La Compañía, the rivalry signaled by the towers that were added to the cathedral to make certain that it was taller than the Jesuit church, as canon law stipulated. The artist, Sabine MacCormack, was a classicist

and historian who specialized in late antiquity and had not yet transposed her interests in the intellectual and religious history of Europe to the early modern New World. But right in front of her eyes was a conflict between competing views of the colonization and evangelization of Peru, as was the field that was to shape a great part of her intellectual vision in the subsequent decades.

To say that Sabine MacCormack was a formidable intellectual is an understatement. She continued parallel tracks of research on late antique Europe and early modern Latin America;⁴⁵ her readership identified with widely different academic disciplines, but for Sabine the two tracks were synergistic. Her deep erudition in religion in late antiquity, theology, Latin, and church history opened up a more complex and nuanced understanding of religious transformation in the colonial Andes than had been hitherto possible. Her work showed the internal conflicts and interactions among and between European churchmen and Native Andeans in their full complexity. Her expertise in Latin and in the European imagination of the Roman world recast the historiography of the Andes.⁴⁶ The Romans were ever present as a model for understanding the Inkas, with Rome for Cuzco and Latin for Quechua. She recognized the importance of present-time ethnography of Andean peoples for understanding their active roles in shaping colonial Andean religion. But she also increasingly saw the accounts of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers in South America as ethnography in its own right.⁴⁷ Her two fields of concentration as a Europeanist and as a South Americanist allowed her to see the impact of the colonization of the Andes through reciprocal lenses, showing how American models transformed Spanish ideas of social welfare.⁴⁸

Her erudition was no less important in the classroom, where Professor MacCormack was an inspiring teacher and mentor. A brief question in an undergraduate class could provoke a thoughtful, half-hour lecture explaining the matter at hand in all its complexity, not as a soliloquy but as an invitation to dialogue. Her mentorship extended to colleagues as well, as she worked tirelessly to support the research of scholars in subsequent generations, both as an assiduous reader of manuscripts and in the behind-the-scenes ways in which a senior scholar can pay her intellectual debt forward. The book series she edited first at the University of Michigan Press and then at the University of Notre Dame Press, "History, Languages, and Cultures of the Spanish and Portuguese Worlds,"

totaling seventeen monographs, has helped shape various emerging fields in the study of Iberian cultural contact.

At Notre Dame, where Professor MacCormack was the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh Professor of Arts and Letters, with a primary appointment in the department of history, she found an intellectual home, bringing together her twin research agendas and a newly reaffirmed religiosity. Increasingly her attention turned toward language—rethinking the linguistic and rhetorical projects of the first grammarians of Andean languages—and to the project that she expected would be her last, a ten-year study of the life and writings of José de Acosta, the leading intellectual of the late sixteenth-century Jesuit world. These were left unfinished when she passed away suddenly, in 2012.

Under Professor MacCormack's tutelage, the Kellogg Institute at Notre Dame hosted the second Symposium on Teaching and Learning Indigenous Languages of Latin America (STLILLA) on October 30–November 2, 2011. Most of the papers dealt either with the teaching *of* indigenous languages or with teaching *in* indigenous languages (especially in the context of bilingual public education). Sabine also invited keynote speakers to address themes that did not directly concern pedagogical issues but that illuminated their broader contexts. As a historian, she was particularly interested in historical perspectives on the politics surrounding indigenous languages in Latin America. Following the conference, she asked several of the participants to contribute essays on language and history in Latin America and invited the present editors to coedit the project with her. The present volume brings this project to fruition. We hope that it will serve as a tribute to Sabine's vision and dedication to promoting the study of the indigenous languages of Latin America.

Notes

1. See the edited volumes *History and Language in the Andes*, ed. Paul Heggarty and Adrian Pearce (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), and *Iberian Imperialism and Language Evolution in Latin America*, ed. Salikoko Mufwene (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014); also Alan Durston, "Indigenous Languages and the Historiography on Latin America," *Storia della Storiografia* 67, no. 1 (2015): 51–65.

2. Adrian J. Pearce, "Reindigenization and Native Languages in Peru's Long Nineteenth Century (1795–1940)," in Heggarty and Pearce, *History and Language*, 135–64; Alan Durston, "Quechua," in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Latin American History*, 2015, <http://latinamericanhistory.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199366439.001.0001/acrefore-9780199366439-e-71>.

3. Judith T. Irvine, "Speech and Language Community," in *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, ed. Keith Brown, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Elsevier, 2006), 689–98.

4. Judith T. Irvine and Susan Gal, "Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation," in *Regimes of Language*, ed. Paul V. Kroskrity (Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research, 2000), 35–83; Judith T. Irvine, "Style as Distinctiveness: The Culture and Ideology of Linguistic Differentiation," in *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, ed. Penelope Eckert and John R. Rickford (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 21–43.

5. Sergio Romero, *Language and Ethnicity among the K'ichee' Maya* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2015).

6. Ibid.

7. Anna Babel, "Affective Motivations for Borrowing: Performing Local Identity through Loan Phonology," *Language and Communication* 49 (2016): 70–83.

8. William F. Hanks Jr., *Converting Words: Maya in the Age of the Cross* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 7.

9. Richard Diebold, who worked with the Huave language in Oaxaca, Mexico—a language isolate with approximately six hundred speakers in the late 1950s—identified similar accommodation patterns, which he regarded as a transitional step toward bilingualism. See A. Richard Diebold Jr., "Incipient Bilingualism," *Language* 37 (1961): 97–112.

10. Paul Friedrich, "Dialectal Variation in Tarascan Phonology," *International Journal of American Linguistics* 37 (1971): 164–220. On the village as a moral center in Zapotec, see Mark A. Sicoli, "Formulating Place, Common Ground, and a Moral Order in Lachixío Zapotec," *Open Linguistics* 2 (2016): 180–210, esp. 181–82.

11. Classic monographs in this line include James Lockhart, *The Nahuas after the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Central Mexico, Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992); Matthew Restall, *The Maya World: Yucatec Culture and Society, 1550–1850* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997); and Kevin Terraciano, *The Mixtecs of Colonial Oaxaca: Nudzahui History, Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001).

12. In 2012, a special issue of the journal *Ethnohistory* was dedicated to the uses of Nahuatl in colonial multilingual and multiethnic contexts: as a lingua franca, as a language introduced into new areas as a result of the Spanish conquests, and as a language used by the clergy and other non-Indians. In her introduction, Yanna Yannakakis raises the issue of multilingualism: “How did colonial subjects deploy different languages in everyday life, and why might they have chosen to use one language rather than another?” Yanna Yannakakis, “Introduction: How Did They Talk to One Another? Language Use and Communication in Multilingual New Spain,” *Ethnohistory* 59, no. 4 (2012): 673.

13. Michael Swanton, “Multilingualism in the Tocují Nudzavui Region,” in *Mixtec Writing and Society*, ed. Maarten E. R. G. N. Jansen and Laura N. K. van Broekhoven (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2008), 347–80; Bas van Doesburg and Michael W. Swanton, “Mesoamerican Philology as an Interdisciplinary Study: The Chochon (Xru Ngiwa) ‘Barrios’ of Tamazulapan (Oaxaca, Mexico),” *Ethnohistory* 58, no. 4 (2011): 613–52.

14. See in particular Gary J. Parker, “La clasificación genética de los dialectos quechuas,” *Revista del Museo Nacional* 32 (1963): 241–62, and Alfredo Torero, “Los dialectos quechuas,” *Anales Científicos de la Universidad Agraria* 2 (1966): 446–78. The two projects were carried out independently and published at approximately the same time, journal dates notwithstanding. For a new view of the prehistory of the Quechua languages, see Nicholas Q. Emlen, “Perspectives on the Quechua-Aymara Contact Relationship and the Lexicon and Phonology of Pre-proto-Aymara,” *International Journal of American Linguistics* 83 (2017): 307–40.

15. Paul Heggarty and David Beresford-Jones, eds., *Archaeology and Language in the Andes: A Cross-disciplinary Exploration of Prehistory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); César Itier, “Las bases geográficas de la lengua vehicular del imperio inca,” *Bulletin de l’Institut Français d’Études Andines* 42, no. 2 (2013): 237–60; and Simon van Kerke and Pieter Muysken, “The Andean Matrix,” in *The Native Languages of South America: Origins, Development, Typology*, ed. Loretta O’Connor and Pieter Muysken, 126–51.

16. See, for example, Alfredo Torero, *El quechua y la historia social andina* (Lima: Universidad Ricardo Palma, 1974); César Itier, “What Was the *Lengua General* of Colonial Peru?” in Heggarty and Pearce, *History and Language*, 63–85; and Adrian J. Pearce and Paul Heggarty, “‘Mining the Data’ on the Huancayo-Huancavelica Quechua Frontier,” in Heggarty and Pearce, *History and Language*, 87–109.

17. For instance, Torero, *Quechua*; Bruce Mannheim, *The Language of the Inka since the European Invasion* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991).

18. Heggarty and Pearce, *History and Language*.

19. On the Língua Geral Amazônica, see Denny Moore, "Historical Development of Nheengatu (Língua Geral Amazônica)" in Mufwene, *Iberian Imperialism*, 108–42. For a historian's perspective on the development of Tupinamba, see M. Kittiya Lee, "Language and Conquest: Tupi-Guarani Expansion in the European Colonization of Brazil and Amazonia," in Mufwene, *Iberian Imperialism*, 143–67.

20. Cf. Lockhart, *Nahuas after the Conquest*, chap. 7; Matthew Restall, Lisa Sousa, and Kevin Terraciano, eds., *Mesoamerican Voices: Native-Language Writings from Colonial Mexico, Oaxaca, Yucatan, and Guatemala* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 15–17.

21. "Real cédula para que en los reinos de las Indias se destierren los diferentes idiomas de que se usa, y solo se hable el Castellano," in *Documentos sobre política lingüística en Hispanoamérica (1492–1800)*, ed. Francisco de Solano (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1991), 257–61.

22. Robert M. Laughlin, *Beware the Great Horned Serpent! Chiapas under the Threat of Napoleon* (Albany: Institute for Mesoamerican Studies, University at Albany, 2003); Mark Morris, "Language in Service of the State: The Nahuatl Counterinsurgency Broadside of 1810," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 87, no. 3 (2007): 433–70; Alan Durston, "Quechua Political Literature in Early Republican Peru (1821–1876)," in Heggarty and Pearce, *History and Language*, 165–86; Bartomeu Melià, "La lengua guaraní dependiente en tiempos de independencia en Paraguay," *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 97, no. 2 (2011): 153–75.

23. For example, Georges Dumézil, "'El buen pastor,' sermón de Francisco Dávila a los indios del Perú (1646), traducido del quechua," *Diógenes* 20 (1957): 85–103.

24. For example, César Itier, "Quechua y cultura en el Cuzco del siglo XVIII: De la 'lengua general' al 'idioma del imperio de los incas,'" in *Del siglo de oro al siglo de las luces: Lenguaje y sociedad en los Andes del siglo XVIII*, ed. César Itier (Cuzco: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos "Bartolomé de Las Casas," 1995), 89–111.

25. On Yucatec Maya documents from the Caste War, see Victoria Reifler Bricker, *The Indian Christ, the Indian King: The Historical Substrate of Maya Myth and Ritual* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), chap. 4 and Appendix A; for Guarani texts from the War of the Triple Alliance, see the Guarani Ñanduti Rogue website at www.staff.uni-mainz.de/lustig/guarani/.

26. Miguel León-Portilla, *Los manifestos en nahuatl de Emiliano Zapata* (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, 1978); Alexander S. Dawson, *Indian and Nation in Revolutionary Mexico* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2004).

27. For the case of Jorge Ubico in 1930s Guatemala, which closely parallels the slightly earlier regime of Augusto B. Leguía in Peru, see Sergio Romero, “¡Cuanto sufrir! Sólo la fe de indio me ha mantenido firme . . .”: Jorge Ubico y el indigenismo del presbítero Celso Narciso Teletor,” *Mesoamérica* 56 (January–December 2014): 1–23.

28. This is a contemporary counterpart to Yannakakis’s question about colonial New Spain: “How Did They Talk to One Another?”

29. There is an extensive literature on the language revitalization efforts of the last decades. See, for instance, Florencia Mallon, ed., *Decolonizing Native Histories: Collaboration, Knowledge, and Language in the Americas* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012); Kendall A. King, *Language Revitalization Processes and Prospects* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2000); and Rosaleen Howard, *Por los linderos de la lengua* (Lima: Institut Français d’Études Andines, Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, Fondo Editorial de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 2006).

30. Michael Wroblewski, “Amazonian Kichwa Proper: Ethnolinguistic Domain in Pan-Indian Ecuador,” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 22 (2012): 64–86. On Quichua Unificado versus “Quichua auténtico” in Saraguro, Ecuador, see King, *Language Revitalization Processes*, 93–97.

31. Anne-Gaël Bilhaut, “L’école zápara en Equateur (Haute Amazonie): Politique et construction de l’identité dans un contexte ethnique,” *Anthropo-Children* 3 (2013), <http://popups.ulg.ac.be/2034-8517/index.php?id=1743>.

32. Nicholas Q. Emlen, “Language and Coffee in a Trilingual Matsigenka-Quechua-Spanish Frontier Community on the Andean-Amazonian Borderland of Southern Peru” (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2014), 59. For a comprehensive overview of political and social contradictions of the process of standardization in the Andean region, see Howard, *Por los linderos*.

33. See, for instance, Peter Burke, *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

34. Mannheim, *Language of the Inka*, chap. 2; Itier, “Bases geográficas,” 237–60. Nevertheless, late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Spain saw the emergence of a newly essentializing identification of a people and a language. See Kathryn A. Woolard, “Bernardo de Aldrete and the Morisco Problem: A Study in Early Modern Spanish Language Ideology,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 44 (2002): 446–80.

35. César Itier, *El teatro quechua en el Cuzco*, vol. 2 (Lima: Instituto Francés de Estudios Andinos; Cuzco: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos “Bartolomé de Las Casas,” 2000), 89; Peter Burke, “*Heu domine, adsunt Turcae*: A Sketch for a Social History of Post-medieval Latin,” in *Language, Self and Society: A Social History of Language*, ed. Roy Porter and Peter Burke (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), 25–30.

36. Carlos Monsiváis, *Entrada libre: Crónicas de la sociedad que se organiza* (México, D.F.: Ediciones Era, 1987), 154.

37. Penelope Harvey, "Lenguaje y relaciones de poder: Consecuencias para una política lingüística," *Allpanchis Phuturinga* 29/30 (1987): 105–31.

38. Alan Durston, "Native-Language Literacy in Colonial Peru: The Question of Mundane Quechua Writing Revisited," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 88, no. 1 (2008): 41–70.

39. Melià, "Lengua guaraní"; Capucine Boidin, "Textos de la modernidad política en guaraní," *Corpus: Archivos Virtuales de la Alteridad Americana* 4, no. 2 (2014), doi: 10.4000/corpusarchivos.1322.

40. Bricker, *Indian Christ*; León-Portilla, *Manifestos en Nahuatl*.

41. The first examples date from the Independence Wars: Laughlin, *Beware*; Morris, "Language in Service"; Alan Durston, "Quechua Political Literature in Early Republican Peru (1821–1876)," in Heggarty and Pearce, *History and Language*, 166–71.

42. Boidin, "Textos."

43. Entitled LANGAS (General Languages of South America), the project is developing an online repository of texts with a sophisticated lexical search tool (www.langas.cnrs.fr/temp/index.htm). Also see Capucine Boidin, Joëlle Chassin, and César Itier, eds., "Dossier: La propaganda política en lenguas indígenas en la época de las guerras de independencia sudamericanas," *Ariadna Histórica: Lenguajes, Conceptos, Metáforas*, suppl. 1 (2016).

44. Something similar happened with the Nahuatl word *macehual*. It is generally glossed as "commoner," but its basic meaning was "human being." In the seventeenth century it was used with the meaning of "Indian." See James Lockhart, Susan Schroeder, and Doris Namala, eds., *Annals of His Time: Don Domingo de San Antón Muñón Chimalpahin Quauhtlehuanitzin* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006), 17.

45. Sabine G. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), *The Shadows of Poetry: Vergil in the Mind of Augustine* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), *Religion in the Andes: Vision and Imagination in Early Colonial Peru* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991), and *On the Wings of Time: Rome, the Incas, Spain, and Peru* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007).

46. MacCormack, *On the Wings*.

47. Sabine G. MacCormack, "Ethnography in South America: The First Two Hundred Years," in *Cambridge History of the Native Peoples of the Americas*, vol. 3, pt. 1, *South America*, ed. Frank L. Salomon and Stuart Schwartz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 96–187.

48. Sabine G. MacCormack, "Conciencia y práctica social: Pobreza y vagancia en España y el temprano Perú colonial," *Revista Andina* 35 (2002): 69–110.

CHAPTER 1

“The Discourse of My Life”

What Language Can Do (Early Colonial Views on Quechua)

SABINE MACCORMACK

When writing the prologue to the posthumously published second part of his *Royal Commentaries*, the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega reminisced about an incident that had occurred soon after he had published his first book, the translation of León Hebreo's *Dialogos de amor*.¹ The chancellor of Córdoba Cathedral, having seen the book, wanted to meet the translator. Garcilaso was reluctant to call on the eminent gentleman but in the end was persuaded to do so,

and I brought him one of those volumes handsomely bound and embossed. Even though he was in bed with gout, he was in every respect very kind to me, and the first words with which he greeted me were these: “Someone from the other hemisphere, born in the new world, far away beneath our hemisphere, a man who with his mother's milk has drunk the general language of the Indians of Peru, how does he venture to set himself up as interpreter between Italians and Spaniards, and, given that he has presumed thus far, why did he not pick on some ordinary book rather than the one that Italians esteem the most, and the Spanish understand the least?” I answered him that it

had been the temerity of a soldier, for this is how soldiers perform their greatest deeds, and if they emerge victorious they are praised for their bravery, but if they die in the attempt, they are dismissed as fools. He laughed a great deal about my response and often repeated it to me during subsequent visits.²

Here as so often elsewhere, Garcilaso addressed a much-discussed issue of the day obliquely and with his customary self-deprecation. He himself had reflected on language on many occasions and had interspersed the *Royal Commentaries* with episodes involving translation from Quechua into Spanish and vice versa, as well as the relationship between the two languages. These were contributions to a well-established discussion. For by 1590, when Garcilaso's translation of León Hebreo was published, many people in Spain—scholars, officials, writers, and poets—had thought about language, in particular about the relationships between different languages, in some detail. At the most fundamental level, the issue was language instruction, the teaching and learning of Latin and in due course of Quechua and other Amerindian languages. Next came translation: in the Peninsula this was for the most part the translating and reworking in Spanish of Latin and Greek literature, law, and history. In the Andes and the Americas at large, by contrast, the texts that most urgently required translating were Christian ones, the creeds, prayers, and hymns that were used in daily worship. But these American translations of Christian devotional texts were made in light of earlier experience in the Peninsula of translating Greek and most especially Latin literature into Spanish. Finally, the nature of translation, of what can be translated and how, depends on the translator's estimation of the relationship between the original and the target language and also of the relationship between the cultures in which the languages in question were spoken, this being an issue that was considered repeatedly in the course of the sixteenth century.

When the chancellor of Córdoba Cathedral asked Garcilaso why of all possible books he had been intent on choosing the *Diálogos de amor* to translate, he was insinuating that the conceptual equipment of "a man who with his mother's milk has drunk the general language of the Indians of Peru" was perhaps not entirely equal to such a task. Comprised within this insinuation was the assumption that, language being the vehicle whereby we form concepts, Garcilaso's native Quechua could not

have equipped him to understand, let alone translate, a platonizing dialogue on love. Garcilaso's response about the temerity of a soldier likewise suggests more than it states. The frontispiece of the first part of the *Royal Commentaries*, which was published in 1609, displays Garcilaso's coat of arms with the words *con la espada y con la pluma*, "with the sword and with the pen." Tacitly, Garcilaso was here evoking his paternal forebear, the poet Garcilaso de la Vega, whom he himself described in the account of his ancestors as the "mirror of knights and poets, the man who lived his life as heroically as all the world is aware, and, as he himself states in his works, he lived wielding the sword at one time, and the pen at another."³

The poet Garcilaso's sonnets, elegies, and eclogues were familiar to every educated person. Their beauty and learning could be appreciated all the better after 1580, when Fernando de Herrera published his voluminous commentary tracing and elucidating the poet's echoes and reminiscences not only of Spanish but also of Latin and some Greek poets and philosophers, among them Vergil, Horace, and Ovid. The Inca Garcilaso himself had internalized Vergil's account of the genesis of the war between Trojans and Latins in the *Aeneid* to such an extent that he wove one of its central themes, the imperceptible burgeoning of discord in human hearts, into his account of the Peruvian civil wars. No one, therefore, was better equipped than Herrera to appreciate the intertextualities and translations that Garcilaso the poet wove into his verses.⁴ Another of Inca Garcilaso's paternal forebears was the poet Garcí Sánchez de Badajoz, some of whose poems likewise evoke Roman antecedents, and whose work Garcilaso was hoping to edit and publish—although he did not live to accomplish this task.⁵ In light of all this, and also in light of the Spanish fascination with lineages, the gout-ridden old chancellor would not have failed to appreciate the subtext of Garcilaso Inca's soldierly response.

Among the gateways to the multifarious erudition that pervaded Spain around the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were the grammatical works of the humanist Antonio Nebrija, in particular his Latin grammar of 1480, a parallel text of that grammar in Latin and Castilian, which appeared in 1488, and his Castilian grammar of 1492—all three the first of numerous subsequent editions and adaptations. These grammatical works were accompanied by a Latin-Castilian dictionary, of which a Catalan adaptation was published in Barcelona in 1507. Like Nebrija's grammatical works, his dictionary became influential

both in and far beyond the Spanish world.⁶ Furthermore, the grammars and the dictionary, and their diverse revisions and adaptations, provided the framework within which, some seventy years later, the missionary friar Domingo de Santo Tomás, a friend of Pedro Cieza de León, organized his Quechua grammar and lexicon. These two small volumes, published in Valladolid in 1560, were, as the author wrote, the first to confine the “general language of Peru” within rules so that it could be learned by outsiders.⁷

The enormous linguistic diversity of the Americas astounded and puzzled the Spanish. Oviedo noted that Columbus had encountered different languages on each of the Caribbean islands where he landed. Oviedo himself observed that on the mainland, within a single province, the languages were as distant from each other as Biscayan was from German and Arabic and that therefore, “in the space of one day’s journey of five or six leagues, among peoples settled next to each other as neighbours, one group of Indians does not understand the other.”⁸ This state of affairs, he thought, was the upshot of the confusion of languages after the building of the Tower of Babel and had helped and accelerated the Spanish conquest. For had it not been for such extreme linguistic fragmentation, and hence, as Oviedo understood matters, political fragmentation, how could the Spanish have subjected so many people living at so great a distance from Europe?⁹ In short, Oviedo considered the American mosaic of languages to be a consequence of sin that evangelization and “union with the Christian republic” would remedy.¹⁰

In the Andes, the position was rather different, at any rate as understood by Spaniards. For here, the invaders had encountered Inka officials in even the most distant outposts of Tahuantinsuyu,¹¹ and Inka officials were ubiquitous elsewhere, which created an initial impression not just of political but also of linguistic cohesion. Besides, the Inkas had required regional lords to send their sons to live in Cuzco for protracted periods, whence they returned home speaking “the language of the Inka.” Finally, intermarriage between Inkas and local aristocrats was frequent—it was, in effect, a deliberate part of Inka policy. Hence, the Spanish came to appreciate only gradually that throughout the Andean world Quechua, described by Domingo de Santo Tomás and others as the “general language of Peru,” was spoken as an administrative language alongside numerous local languages.¹² However, awareness of the ubiquity of Quechua led missionaries to think of the Inka Empire as a *praeparatio evangelica*, a

preparation for evangelization, the work of divine providence. As José de Acosta put it in 1590:

In Peru and New Spain, when the Christians entered, those kingdoms had reached their peak, and stood at the height of their power; for the Inkas ruled in Peru from the kingdom of Chile up to and beyond that of Quito, which is a thousand leagues; and they were greatly respected and wealthy in gold and silver and in every kind of riches. . . . At this time, the Almighty judged that the rock of Daniel that shattered the kingdoms and monarchies of the world, should also shatter those of this other New World. And thus, just as the law of Christ came when the monarchy of Rome had reached its peak, so it was in the Indies of the West. . . . And there is here a remarkable detail, that when the lords of Mexico and Cuzco were conquering regions, they were also introducing their own language.¹³

This meant, Acosta continued, that it was possible to preach the gospel in one single language, not many different ones. Indeed, by his time, contrary to what had been envisioned initially by those who formulated policies in the Peninsula, Quechua rather than Spanish had become the primary language of Christian instruction, just as in Mexico missionaries taught primarily in Nahuatl, the principal language of the Aztec Empire.¹⁴

But during the early years of contact this outcome was not obvious. The issue at that time was not merely, or even predominantly, religious because what had to be demonstrated was that Quechua was a civilized language, not some conglomerate of barbarous communications incapable of giving linguistic shape to anything beyond what was accessible to the five senses. To make this argument, Fray Domingo appealed to Antonio Nebrija's grammatical works. Throughout, Nebrija revealed the orderly definable qualities of language, using examples from Latin and sometimes Greek to explain the particularities and regularities of Castilian, specifically the distinct qualities and uses of the parts of speech, the declension of nouns and the conjugation of verbs. Among Nebrija's concerns was to show that the Castilian vernacular of which he composed the very first grammatical analysis was as orderly and systematic as Latin, and that even though Castilian differed from Latin in having more parts of speech, one of which was the article, nonetheless, the grammatical "foundations and principles" were the same for Castilian

as for Latin and also for Greek.¹⁵ Fray Domingo was eager to show that these same qualities prevailed in Quechua. His Quechua grammar would thus reveal, he wrote in his dedication of the work to Philip II,

the exceptional order and regularity—*policía*—of this language, the abundance of words, the accord they have with the things they refer to, the diverse and notable ways of speaking, the gentle and agreeable sound that the pronunciation of this language brings to the ear, the ease with which it can be written with our characters and letters; how easy and sweet is the pronunciation of this language, which is ordered and adorned with the properties of declination, and the remaining properties of the noun, and with the moods, times and persons of the verb.¹⁶

Readers of the Roman orator and educator Quintilian, Fray Domingo continued, would see that Quechua, “regulated and enclosed under the same rules as Latin,” was not a barbarous and deficient language, lacking “moods, tenses, cases, order, regularity and concordance,” but ought to be described as “polished and delicate.” “Such being the language,” he wrote, “the people who use it should be counted not as barbarous but as possessing social order, *policía*: for according to many passages by the Philosopher, there is nothing whereby the quality of a person is more clearly revealed than in the speech and language he uses, for these give birth to the concepts that emanate from the intellect.”¹⁷ Proof of all this was the fact that “throughout the dominions of that great lord Guayna Capac” Quechua was spoken “by all the lords and leaders and by a great many commoners”—in short, like Latin, it was the lingua franca of a great empire.¹⁸

The general statements that Fray Domingo made in the prefatory parts of his *Arte* were articulated step by step in the body of the work, in the designation and analysis of the eight parts of speech in accordance with Nebrija’s designation and analysis of the eight parts of speech in Latin, and in the subdivision of the parts of grammar into orthography, pronunciation, etymology, and syntax,¹⁹ progressing thereby from studying the letter to studying the syllable, the word, and finally the sentence.

All these topics were briefly mentioned by Quintilian in his *Institutio oratoria*,²⁰ and Nebrija and Fray Domingo both appealed to him as the ultimate authority on matters of language. But they both recognized that

their task was profoundly different from Quintilian's. In the first place, as Nebrija noted, Quintilian had written about the education of children and boys whose native language was Latin, and who therefore were only learning *latini sermonis artificium*, "the art of Latin speech," not the language itself.²¹ Quintilian thus dealt with what would be the main themes of Nebrija's Latin grammar, the particulars of declension, conjugation, and syntax, in a few short paragraphs. In the second place, regarding Spanish, Quintilian was more directly relevant, for here Nebrija noted the presence of several issues raised by Quintilian's Latin in his own Spanish vernacular. This was the case especially regarding spelling and pronunciation. In the footsteps of Quintilian, Nebrija thought that one should spell as one pronounces and pronounce as one spells,²² noting that different groups of people will pronounce differently and that the sounds used by one language are not all the same as those used in another. It was therefore important to identify the sounds or phonemes of each language and to differentiate correct from incorrect usage, making allowance for the fact that all languages change.²³

Quintilian's framework was relevant for Nebrija not just in the abstract sense but also because Spanish was derived from Latin: as Nebrija expressed it, Spanish was "corrupted Latin," in which many words had changed while still remaining recognizable. For example, with time, Latin *caupo*, "innkeeper," had become Spanish *copo*; *taurus*, "bull," had become *toro*; and by a more complex set of shifts, *facere*, "to do," had become *hazer*, and *factum*, "something done," had become *hecho*.²⁴ Quechua, by contrast, had nothing whatsoever to do with either Latin or Spanish. However, Fray Domingo saw the finger of providence in the fact that two Quechua phonemes, "ll" as in *llacta*, "a village," and "ñ" as in *ñavi*, "eye," were also peculiar to Spanish, and in Quechua's resemblance, as he saw it, to Latin and Spanish "in the art and craft" of its usage.²⁵ It was therefore possible for the reader of Fray Domingo's *Arte* to memorize declensions and conjugations just as Nebrija's student of Latin would have done: in either case, the relevant material was set out in tabular form. Yet Quechua also offered numerous usages that were absent from or different in Latin and Spanish and could not be presented to the reader in the old established visual format of grammatical manuals.²⁶ Take the plural: it was formed in Quechua with the suffix *-cona* or *-cuna*, but according to Fray Domingo this suffix was not used to express plurality for inanimate things. Instead of saying *pircacuna*, "walls,"

therefore, people said, *achca pirca*, “many walls,” or *pixin pirca*, “a few walls,” and Fray Domingo asked himself why this was the case: “The reason for this difference that I can think of at present is that this *-cona*, apart from its principal meaning, which is to indicate plurality, seems in some way to denote calling out, or calling for attention. For example, *guarmecona*, apart from meaning in plural ‘the women,’ seems also to signify what we would express in Castilian with *Ola mugeres*, ‘Hello, women,’ because we call out only to an entity that understands or hears, and for this reason they customarily add *-cona* to animate things.”²⁷ However, although this specific usage was new to those familiar with European languages, in more general terms such problems were not new to grammarians. Quintilian and Nebrija had both drawn attention to the importance of the usage chosen by speakers, *consuetudo loquendi* or *uso*, and Fray Domingo resolved the *cona* question in accord with these precedents:

The principal reason in this matter of nouns and manners of speaking is usage: for speaking in this particular manner and not another depends on the will of the first inventors of the language, and of those who first made use of and spoke it, and the same is the case regarding all the other ways of speaking, of the verbs, tenses, and nouns in this language, which are more or fewer than those in Latin and Spanish. For in the realm of each language, the most important issue is usage, which is to say the manner in which those who speak the language express themselves appropriately.²⁸

In the footsteps of Quintilian, Nebrija divided grammar into the rules and usages that had to be taught (the methodic part) and the literature that should be imitated (the historical part).²⁹ Nebrija thought that to reform Latin as written by Spanish scholars in conformity with classical Latin, as distinct from the Latin of medieval universities that was familiar to most educated people, he could best deploy his efforts in expounding the classical rules and usages.³⁰ Domingo de Santo Tomás, in accordance with his purpose of providing instruction in Quechua, also concentrated on these but added a brief foray into the “historical” branch of grammar by concluding the *Arte* with a model sermon of his own composition, for the use of prospective missionaries.³¹

This small text cannot be placed on the same footing as the corpus of Greek and Latin literature that awaited Quintilian’s students, or even those of Nebrija. The sermon did, however, make a beginning in creat-

ing for future students of Quechua a corpus of texts in alphabetic writing that was to grow exponentially during subsequent decades. Like this later literature, Fray Domingo's sermon displays some uniquely Andean features that were designed to highlight both the potential and the limitations of translation: the potential, since the sermon demonstrated that "the things of our holy faith" could be talked about in Quechua, and the limitations, since Fray Domingo reordered the story of salvation in light of what an anticipated Andean listener might most easily identify with.³² The model sermon thus did not begin with Creation and Adam and Eve, which would have merely substituted an alien account of human origin that required much explanation for one that was familiar and made sense locally.³³ Instead, Fray Domingo began with a definition of human nature, death, and afterlife. Also, in light of the deep-seated Andean habit of pairing concepts, social functions, features in the landscape, cultures, and societies as moieties, Fray Domingo spoke not of a human being's body as such but of "our flesh and bones," *aychallanchic tullullanchic*, and not of the human soul but of "our heart and creative spirit," *songonchic camaquenichic*.³⁴ In both instances, he replaced a single European concept with a paired Andean one. In short, in accord with the old established principle of accommodation in the exegesis of scripture—itself a legacy of European classical antiquity—he accommodated Christian doctrine to correct Quechua usage, which was what Quintilian, thinking about Latin, had described as *consuetudo loquendi*.³⁵ In theological terms, this amounted to reconceptualizing fundamental Christian doctrines so as to make them accessible to Andean Christians from within their own culture.³⁶

In the context of grammatical instruction, *consuetudo loquendi* worked in two directions, so that in Fray Domingo's *Arte* acquainting Andean people with Christian teaching went hand in hand with explaining the workings of Andean customs and social relations to Spaniards. The latter would thus learn how in the Andes oaths were sworn, how people greeted each other, by what terms kinship was expressed, and how names were given.³⁷ Here also, Latin and the Roman past had their uses because they could render Andean customs meaningful by amplifying the realm of comparison beyond the confines of sixteenth-century Spain. "It should be noted," Fray Domingo wrote,

that just as Latin and Spanish have names known as patronyms, that are passed on from parents, grandparents, and brothers to sons and

descendants, or else these names are passed on from lands to those who are at home there, for example Scipiones from Scipio, Catones from Cato, Romans from Rome; Mendozas, Guzmanes, Andalusians, etc.; so this language of the Indians has patronyms of all these kinds. For if a lord is famous for something, his sons take his name, and not only the sons but all the descendants, whence they derive the lineages that are known as *ayllo* and *pachaca*.

Fray Domingo then proceeded to give some examples of how patronyms functioned in the Andes:

All those who come from that first lord who was named *Mangoynga* call themselves *yngas*, and this lineage contains other particular names and lineages, the chief of which is called *capac ayllo*; another is *ygnaca pañaca ayllo*, another *çucco pañaca ayllo*, and many others like them. In Cuzco there are also two further principal lineages, one called *Maras toco*, and the other called *Xutic ayllo*, which was derived from another leading man called *Xutic toco*. These two were called by the epithet *toco*, which is to say “window,” because the Indians of Cuzco believe that they both emerged from the two caves that are in the village of Pacaritambo, from which they say the said *Mango ynga* emerged, for whose service they say those two Indians emerged. From which it appears that the said two Indians took the epithet *toco* from the cave whence they emerged, and their descendants, and those of *Mango ynga* took theirs from them.³⁸

These methods of taking names from notable ancestors and from places of origin or residence were observed, Fray Domingo added, throughout all the “nations and provinces” of Peru, the issue being that these features of the language used by Andean people, comparable as they were to analogous features in Latin and Spanish, demonstrated that political order, *policía*, was as rooted in the Andes as it was in the Old World.

The question as to whether Amerindian societies possessed *policía*, and if so, which ones and in what sense, was repeatedly discussed in early modern Spain. The term *policía* itself was elusive. In his dictionary, Nebrija translated it as *civilitas*, which fitted with the derivation of *policía* from the Greek *polis*. Cieza, with whom Domingo de Santo Tomás had shared some of his information about coastal Peru, perceived little or

no *policía* in the chiefdoms of Colombia and Ecuador that he described as *behetrías*,³⁹ but he thought that the Inkas possessed it in the highest degree. Domingo de Santo Tomás agreed entirely, and in the dedication of the *Arte* to Philip II argued that not only the people but also their language was deeply imbued with *policía*: "My principal intent in offering this little manual to your Sacred Majesty has been that in it you may see clearly and manifestly, how false is the view of which many have tried to persuade you, that the people of the kingdoms of Peru are barbarians, and unworthy of being treated with the same gentleness and liberty as your other vassals. Your Majesty will know this to be utterly false when from this manual you realize how great is the *policía* that this language possesses."⁴⁰ Fray Domingo was not the first to describe language by recourse to political terminology. For in his Spanish grammar, Antonio Nebrija explained the transformation of Latin into Castilian and the derivation of related words one from another in metaphorical terms as a process resulting from the "kinship and proximity," *parentesco y vezindad*, that letters have among each other: "Letters have among each other such great kinship and proximity that no one should be surprised, as Quintilian says, that some letters pass and corrupt themselves into others."⁴¹ Quintilian did indeed comment on this topic, but without any political metaphors.⁴² For Nebrija, by contrast, connections not only between letters but also between parts of speech could be rendered more tangible by means of such metaphors, as he made clear when writing about the syntax of Castilian: "We will state how the ten parts of speech should join and be in agreement with each other. This topic . . . is described by the Greeks as syntax. We ourselves can call it order or the joining of parts."⁴³ The Spanish terms *ayuntar*, "to join," and *concertar*, "to be in agreement," as well as *ayuntamiento*, the "joining of parts," all suggest political and legal meanings. *Ayuntamiento* was not merely a joining of parts, for its primary meaning was "municipal government." Similarly, *ayuntar* and *concertar* described the action of making a formal agreement between parties.⁴⁴ These political and legal overtones become all the more explicit when Nebrija goes on to explain that "the first concord and agreement is between one noun and another,"⁴⁵ because the terms *concordia* and *concierto* both denote states of affairs that are public and political.

"Language," according to Nebrija's celebrated phrase from the prologue of his Spanish grammar, "is the companion of empire."⁴⁶ He went on to say that this grammar would be useful to Queen Isabel's future

subjects in their endeavors to learn Castilian. The book would also help to improve the Castilian language so that it could become a fit vehicle to communicate the queen's triumphs to the world. There was in addition a more subtle, less propagandistic dimension to the phrase, which Nebrija also explained. Languages, like the societies that speak them, rise and decline. The Hebrew language was in its childhood when the Israelites were living in Egypt, flourished along with religion in the time of Moses, grew to maturity with King Solomon, and thereafter began to be dismembered along with the kingdom. As for Latin, it rose from humble beginnings along with the city of Rome, attained a first flowering in the time of the dramatist Livius Andronicus, and grew until, in the time of Augustus and the birth of Christ, there lived "that multitude of poets and orators who transmitted to our time the plenty and delight of the Latin language, Cicero, Caesar, Lucretius, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Livy, and all the others who followed until the time of Antoninus Pius. From that time, when the empire of the Romans began to decline, the Latin language diminished along with it." Castilian was in its infancy under the early kings of Castile and León, began to show its power in the time of Alfonso the Wise, "and in this way grew until the monarchy and peace that we ourselves enjoy." At that point, when "we may more appropriately fear the decline of Castilian than hope for its ascent," Nebrija composed the *Gramatica de la lengua castellana* so as to give the language a certain permanence and fixity, just as in their day the Greek and Roman grammarians had done for Greek and Latin.⁴⁷

Domingo de Santo Tomás did not worry that Quechua might be declining, although he was aware of changes taking place in the language. Just as, according to Quintilian, words from the languages of Italy and especially from Greek had made their way into Latin, so in the time of the Inka, words from other Andean languages had entered Quechua,⁴⁸ and after 1532 a host of terms were coming in from Spanish, some of which Fray Domingo registered in his dictionary.⁴⁹

The Inca Garcilaso also observed changes in Quechua, "the language I drank with my mother's milk," but thought about them in quite different terms. Among the books in his library were a commentary on Nebrija and a copy of Pero Mexia's *Historia imperial y Cesarea*, which chronicled the history of the Roman Empire from Julius Caesar down to the accession of Charles V.⁵⁰ Where Nebrija had reflected on the decline, *caducar*, of Latin, one of Mexia's themes, derived from Flavio Biondo's

history of Rome, was the decline, *declinación*, of the Roman Empire, the time when Rome was experiencing not merely those ordinary losses and recoveries that were the inevitable product of politics and war but the ever more serious inroads on its power and territory that led to the formation of new "kingdoms and new lordships."⁵¹ Whether it was thanks to his reading of these volumes or thanks to his experience of speaking Quechua with his mother and her people and Spanish with his father, language and empire were inseparable in Garcilaso's mind. Domingo de Santo Tomás thought that because of the greater mobility and commercial activity that the presence of the Spanish in the Andes had brought about, more people were speaking Quechua in his day than in former times,⁵² which made it the ideal vehicle for evangelization. Garcilaso agreed regarding evangelization. The Inkas had employed Quechua to unite people who were divided by different languages to live in harmony "as though they were of one family and kin group, and they lost the unsociability that arose from their not understanding each other."⁵³ "By this device the Inkas domesticated and united a great variety of different nations of conflicting religion and customs whom they brought into their empire, welding them—thanks to use of a common language—into such union and friendship that they loved each other like brothers. This is why many provinces that were not incorporated into the Inka Empire, attached to and convinced of this benefit, have learnt the general language of Cuzco, and many nations of different speech understand each other by means of it."⁵⁴ As the Jesuit Blas Valera, from whose papers Garcilaso derived some of his material for the *Royal Commentaries* had written, by disseminating a common language the Inkas "governed their entire empire in peace and tranquillity, and their vassals from different nations treated each other as brothers because they all spoke the same language."⁵⁵ Nothing was more advantageous to the Christian faith, therefore, than that missionaries should teach in the general language of the Inka.

But Quechua was declining, Garcilaso thought. In his opinion, far fewer people spoke it now than formerly,⁵⁶ and entire Quechua-speaking provinces were reverting to their original languages.⁵⁷ This brought on a "confusion of languages" reminiscent of that of the Tower of Babel, thanks to which "Indians whom the Inka ruled with a handful of judges are now barely controlled by three hundred governors."⁵⁸ Garcilaso was not alone in complaining about the ever-increasing administrative tangles

of colonial Peru.⁵⁹ Further, the Quechua language itself, no longer taught by teachers whom the Inkas had sent out from Cuzco, was losing its character because of the importation of phonemes, constructions, and vocabulary from Spanish.⁶⁰ In short, with the collapse of the empire of the Inkas, their language fell into decline: "When the imperial power of the Inkas came to an end, and because of the general forgetfulness that came with the wars that arose among the Spanish, there was no one to remember this instrument that was so well suited and necessary for the preaching of the Holy Gospel."⁶¹

That language declines with political power had already been observed by Nebrija, who produced the examples of the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans to illustrate the phenomenon, implying the likelihood that Castilian also would at some point decline; his grammar of Castilian was designed to arrest or slow down that process. A century later, in Garcilaso's time, this theory of linguistic change and decline required defending against advocates of primordial languages, among them Basque, one of whose protagonists claimed that it predated the Romans in Spain and was, in effect, the language spoken by the first settlers who came to the Peninsula after the building of the Tower of Babel.⁶² Spanish itself was defended as a primordial language dating back to Babel in the course of the debate about the expulsion of the Moriscos of Granada.⁶³ Nearly half a century later, the issue of primordial languages was discussed once more in Peru, when the missionary Hernando de Avendaño suggested to his Andean listeners that not only Spanish but also Quechua was a primordial language, taught by God to one of the seventy-two families whom he dispersed over the earth after the building of the Tower of Babel. Avendaño even created a Quechua term to describe such a divinely infused language: it was a *mama simi*, in Spanish *lengua matriz*, a language that was a mother of other languages.⁶⁴

In the Spanish debate about primordial languages, Garcilaso's friend Bernardo Aldrete, the linguist and historian, reiterated in compelling detail the case that Nebrija had outlined for Castilian as the offshoot and descendant of Latin, the language that had formerly been the vernacular spoken in Spain. As the Florentine humanist and architect Leon Battista Alberti had already observed over a century earlier in his grammar of Tuscan, when Latin was the vernacular it did not have to be studied and learned laboriously; rather, like Alberti's Tuscan and later Aldrete's Castilian, it was spontaneously spoken by everyone, even the illiterate.⁶⁵

What had been taught in Roman schools was not the language itself but elegant usage, what Nebrija had described as *Latini sermonis artificum*. To illustrate these issues, Aldrete cited Roman epitaphs, milestones, official inscriptions, and literary, historical, legal, and theological texts.⁶⁶ He also demonstrated that in the course and aftermath of the Visigothic and Muslim invasions the language had changed, absorbing some Gothic and much Arabic vocabulary to become the Castilian that was spoken in early modernity.⁶⁷ That the "conquered receive the language of the conquerors" was evident not only from the history of the Roman Empire but also from that of the Americas, where the Inkas and Aztecs had imposed their language along with their power, just as the Spanish were doing in Aldrete's own day.⁶⁸

An eloquent illustration of these realities came from topographical names, such as for the river Baetis, which the Arabs renamed Guadalquivir.⁶⁹ The ubiquity of such linguistic changes was demonstrated by the name of Peru. As Aldrete learned from Garcilaso, the Inkas referred to their land as "Tahuantinsuiu, with which they designated the four parts of the Kingdom."⁷⁰ Realizing that *Peru* was not a term used by Andean people, Cieza often described the former empire of the Inkas as "the land we call Peru," and Acosta attached an explanation to the enigmatic term: originally, Peru was the name of a river near the equator which by osmosis was extended to describe the entire empire of the Inkas. A similar story involving a river that gave its name to the land of Peru had already been told by Oviedo and Francisco López de Gómara.⁷¹ Quoting the latter, Garcilaso transformed this explanation into an anecdote about miscommunication between Spaniards and Amerindians—this being a genre of narration that had been multiplying in the course of the sixteenth century⁷²—and recounted that the first Spaniards to sail along the Pacific coast of South America had captured an Indian, demanded to know what his land was called, and out of his confused and frightened responses derived the name Peru.⁷³ As the Jesuit Blas Valera, many of whose notes Garcilaso incorporated into the *Royal Commentaries*, expressed it, the name was "imposed" by the Spanish and was "a name given by chance and not a proper name."⁷⁴

The differentiation between a name imposed by chance and a proper name, coming from Blas Valera and quoted by Garcilaso, both being writers of great linguistic finesse, invites scrutiny, as it touches on theories about the nature of language that interested grammarians of the time.

The difference between imposed and natural names had been explored by the Roman scholar and antiquarian Marcus Terentius Varro in *De lingua Latina*, of which several editions circulated in the sixteenth century, one by Antonio Agustín, bishop of Tarragona.⁷⁵ Varro distinguished between names imposed on things by a person's fiat or will and names arising from nature.⁷⁶ At the first origin of language were names imposed by human will, which were followed by further names derived from these first names: "There are only two kinds of origin of words, imposition and inflection; the first is like the fountain, the second like the river."⁷⁷ According to this principle, Varro clustered words by interlocking their sound with their meaning, associating, for example, *humus*, "ground," with *humatus*, "buried," and *humilior*, "downcast," and also with *humor*, "moisture," which led him to *udor*, "dampness."⁷⁸ Simultaneously, Varro speculated about words being formed either by the fiat of the human will, arbitrarily, or else organically, by associated sounds and meanings. The formidable Francisco Sánchez el Brocense, professor of Greek at Salamanca, took up this theme, but in his *Minerva*, a treatise on Latin grammar published in 1587, he was prepared to allow only that it was "in the original language, whatever it was, that names and etymologies were derived from the nature of things."⁷⁹

Blas Valera, Aldrete, and Garcilaso were too deeply aware of the reality of historical and linguistic change to think of Quechua, or even Latin, as an original language, let alone the very first original language. After all, Varro had derived many Latin words from Greek as from an ancestor tongue. However, Garcilaso did portray the Inkas as having created civilized society in the Andes by means of teaching the arts of political living and above all by propagating a common language.⁸⁰ In this sense, Quechua, the language whereby even people who were not Inka subjects learned to treat each other peaceably and as "friends and confederates," stood in the place of an originary language, the civilizing function of which was disrupted by the intrusion of Spanish.⁸¹ Tahuantinsuyu, the "Fourfold Domain," accordingly was a proper name that had flowed as a river from Varro's source, whereas Peru was an arbitrary name, imposed by the conquerors' fiat. There could be no more powerful token of conquest than the loss of the name of one's *patria*.

Evangelization, however, remained the order of the day, and Garcilaso thoroughly approved of the enterprise, more so since here the civilizing, humanizing impact of Quechua was once more becoming evident.

Thousands of Andean people congregated to work in Lima, Cuzco, and La Plata, and most of all they took their turns every year at working in the silver mines of Potosí, where for some time Blas Valera had been stationed as a missionary. It was perhaps here that he observed, in a passage that Garcilaso quoted, that the Andean workers, thrown together from different parts of the land, were united by the general language of the Inka so that "when they return home, with the new and more noble language that they learnt, they themselves seem more noble, more cultured and more alert in their understanding, and what they appreciate most of all is that the other Indians of their village honour and esteem them because of this royal language that they learnt."⁸² Moreover, according to Valera, clergy and Spanish civic authorities observed that "the language of the Inka court possesses this peculiar capacity, worthy of being celebrated, that it bestows on the Indians of Peru the same benefit as the Latin language does on us, for apart from the advantage it offers for their negotiations and commercial dealings, for other temporal affairs and for their spiritual welfare, it makes them more acute of understanding, more teachable and ready to learn, and out of savages it turns them into political and cultivated beings."⁸³ This very same process, as Garcilaso stressed repeatedly, had also taken place in the time of the Inkas. A few years earlier, his friend Aldrete, quoting Pliny, had described the civilizing impact of Latin in the Roman Empire, making the additional point that precisely because, as Pliny had written, Latin "had drawn the savage languages of so many nations into conversation by the exchange of speech," it was in due course possible to use it as the language of evangelization.⁸⁴

All the more reason, therefore, for Garcilaso to urge that Quechua should be maintained in its purity and elegance and that it should be pronounced and construed correctly, avoiding the infiltration of Spanish semantics, syntax, and vocabulary.⁸⁵ Several of Garcilaso's friends were Jesuits, and he had a special appreciation for the work of this order in the evangelization of Peru. In 1607, two years before the *Royal Commentaries* were published in Lisbon after much delay, there appeared in Lima a Quechua grammar by the Jesuit Diego González Holguín, the labor of many years. Garcilaso appears not to have seen this work, but he would have appreciated the author's commitment to portray the language of the Inka in its own right and not as a construct of Latin. Much had happened in the world of grammar after the publication of Nebrija's

Introductiones Latinae, during the years that Domingo de Santo Tomás spent in Peru and subsequently. The linguist Francisco Sánchez el Brocense wrote his *Minerva* both as a companion volume and as a response to the *Mercurius* by the Italian scholar Augustinus Saturninus, the first edition of which appeared in 1546, followed by two further ones ten years later. El Brocense disagreed with his predecessor on many matters, but the two were at one in making the sentence, *oratio*, into the basic unit of grammatical analysis, rather than beginning, as Nebrija had done, with the sounds, letters, and parts of speech.⁸⁶

This was a notable shift. In part it was determined by the different purposes of these later grammatical works from those of Nebrija. Nebrija had written primarily to advance the teaching of Latin to the young, but the methodology of beginning with the parts of speech also appears in his Spanish grammar. Saturninus and el Brocense wrote for those who were already fluent in Latin with the intention of explaining, not the traditional divisions of grammar, letters, syllables, and parts of speech, nor yet the historical and methodological aspects of grammar, but language in itself. *Grammatica est ars recte loquendi*, “Grammar is the art of speaking correctly,” no more, no less.⁸⁷ Domingo de Santo Tomás, who had modeled his work on Nebrija, used Latin as a blueprint whereby to explain Quechua, making allowance for the many junctures where Latin did not help. The reason for the presence of Latin was, as we have seen, both political and didactic.⁸⁸ All the readers of Fray Domingo’s grammar would have learned Latin, which was therefore a good place to begin explaining an additional foreign language. Furthermore, a grammar designed for language instruction such as Nebrija’s and Fray Domingo’s must inevitably translate concepts and vocabulary from the learner’s language to the language to be learned, and González Holguín was confronted with having to perform this same task. He had to get from Spanish with Latin to Quechua.

Whether or not González Holguín knew of Saturninus and el Brocense, their method is in evidence in his *Arte*, which from the beginning invites the learner to form clauses. Whenever possible, the basic unit of analysis is not the isolated part of speech but the clause and then the sentence. Since therefore syntax was being learned from the beginning along with accidence, rather than having to be taken on as a separate enterprise once declension and conjugation had been mastered, the *consuetudo loquendi* of Quechua speakers stood at the forefront from the outset.

This shift in overall methodology that distinguishes the grammatical work of González Holguín from that of Domingo de Santo Tomás goes hand in hand with numerous differences regarding particulars. Some of these arise from the further study of Quechua by missionaries during the years after Fray Domingo published his work, and others from the Jesuit grammarian's distinct methodology and outlook. Regarding plurals, for example, González Holguín described not only the principal plural suffix *-cuna* but several further ones conveying different plural meanings, and he also explained certain idiomatic uses of plural constructions, such as the plural pronoun in *camchic runa*, or *camcamchic runacuna*, meaning literally, "you people," but in fact conveying vituperation, "you wicked people."⁸⁹ On another issue that Fray Domingo had written about, González Holguín thought no such thing as patronyms existed in Quechua. The passage in question, like several others, reads as though it had been written as a response to the friar's discussion of this same topic:

This language has no patronyms, and we cannot maintain that family names or surnames, whether of an entire lineage such as Inca-roca, or of social groups, such as Hanan Cuzco and Hurin Cuzco, or of the provinces, like Cuntisuyo or Collasuyo, or of ancient surnames like Quispipuma Huaman (Shining Puma, Falcon) are patronyms. For these names do not follow the rule that is given in the grammar books, that they must be terms derived by means of some addition or extension from other terms of kinship, using a particle for this purpose, such as the Latin particle—*des* in *Aeneas*, *Aeneades*, "those of the lineage of Aeneas." Nor yet are there in Quechua patronyms constructed with an adjectival noun derived from a proper name, as in *Saturnia proles*, the "descendants of Saturn." In Quechua we find nothing like this, but there are names and surnames. Also, patronyms are not indispensable, since they do not occur in languages other than Latin and Greek.⁹⁰

González Holguín chose never to spell out the conceptual revolution that is latent in this last sentence, but it is implicit throughout his *Arte*. Like Fray Domingo, González Holguín drew comparisons between Quechua and Latin wherever he thought this would help the learner. But unlike Fray Domingo, and unlike Nebrija, he did not think of Latin as

a possible model on which one could attempt to build a universal grammar. As a result, his *Arte* contains analytical and descriptive categories that had not so far appeared in European grammars but were useful, and indeed fundamental, for describing and analyzing Quechua.⁹¹ This feature helped to transform the traditional relationship between the learner's language and the language to be learned, because the latter acquired from the former the leading role in forming concepts. If concepts that had been formed in relation to Latin or Spanish turned out to be useful in relation to Quechua, González Holguín welcomed this fact, but it was incidental to the main issue, which was that the learner was to internalize as dominant those concepts that derived from the behavior of the Quechua and not of some other language.⁹² In the concluding book of the *Arte*, which deals with elegant composition in Quechua, González Holguín spelled out what all this amounted to in actual practice: "The first law to succeed in composing in Quechua should be to flee from the Castilian manner of speaking, because it arranges the sentence and its parts in an order opposite to this language. Example: 'I go to the church to hear a sermon about the most holy sacrament.' The Indians begin where Castilian finishes, and finish where it begins: 'About the most holy sacrament the sermon to hear to the church I go,' 'Sanctissimo sacramento sermonta uyaric yglesiamanmi rini,' and this is the order that is elegant here, not ours."⁹³

At issue was, as always, the *ars recte loquendi*, "the art of speaking correctly." Saturninus and el Brocense, early contemporaries of González Holguín, wrote about this art for scholars, people comfortable with reading a long and difficult book in Latin. González Holguín by contrast wrote to provide practical training for ordinary conversation and for delivering sermons in Quechua, and this was also what Domingo de Santo Tomás had worked for. If sacred oratory was to engage listeners and convince, it had to be elegant, abundant, and free of barbarisms. In aspiring to this goal, Fray Domingo and González Holguín joined hands with Quintilian, who had written the *Institutio oratoria* to train the young in oratory so as to prepare them to plead cases in the law courts and to administer the Roman Empire. The brief comments on grammar that attracted the attention of Nebrija and Domingo de Santo Tomás only served to remind educators that before a boy could begin his formation as an orator he had to be able to speak correct and cultivated Latin, this being the essential preliminary to an appreciation of Latin literature. Appreciation of literature, of the portrayal of human emotion and motiva-

tion in narratives in verse and prose, in fiction, history, and law, in turn opened the door to informed and ethical participation in public life. To say something, one had to know something. Nebrija, his humanist Italian predecessors, and his Spanish successors were deeply committed to reviving and handing on this knowledge, but as it turned out they passed on a learned, much more than a political and administrative, kind of knowledge such as Quintilian had envisioned.⁹⁴

Except in the Americas. Domingo de Santo Tomás, González Holguín, and their many fellow missionaries had all undergone some form of classical training. Often they came away with no more than a smattering, but some missionaries were men of significant learning. In writing their grammars and lexica, therefore, Domingo de Santo Tomás and Diego González Holguín assumed this prior formation in what was to be said and focused on how to say it eloquently. They wrote for adults who were educated already, whereas Quintilian's main theme had been the content of young people's education and how to impart it. The missionary's task was to run Andean parishes, *doctrinas*, to teach the Christian doctrine, to educate, inform, and inculcate *policía*, and to practice—on every Sunday and holy day—the art of sacred oratory. Convinced that Quechua was the appropriate vehicle in which to accomplish these tasks, the missionaries were as interested in perpetuating the purity and elegance of the language of evangelization as Quintilian had been in perpetuating these same qualities in Latin.⁹⁵ Preaching for better or worse was a political activity, an active, sometimes militant participation in the *república cristiana*. Indirectly, but nonetheless in a vital, creative way, the effects of which are still with us, the missionaries were among Quintilian's most influential students. And Quechua, for all that in the outcome it turned out to be not at all like Latin—a point that González Holguín made very clear—proved to be the vehicle of interchange, communication, and identity in the Andes, much as Garcilaso Inca thought it was and ought to be.⁹⁶

NOTES

Originally published as chapter 6, "'The Discourse of My Life': What Language Can Do," in *On the Wings of Time: Rome, The Incas, Spain, and Peru*, by Sabine MacCormack, 170–201. Copyright © 2007 by Princeton University Press. Reprinted by permission.

1. The *Dialogos de amor* was Garcilaso's first published work: *La traducción del Indio de los Tres dialogos de amor de Leon Hebreo, hecha de Italiano en Español por Garcilaso Inga de la Vega* . . . (Madrid: Pedro de Madrigal, 1590). Cf. the facsimile with a good introduction by Miguel de Burgos Núñez (Seville: Padilla Libros, 1989). In the dedication of the *Dialogos* to Maximilian of Austria, Garcilaso mentions his further literary plans: "Y aunque entiendo que mi atrevimiento es demasiado en esto, todavía tengo propuesto de gastar lo que de la vida me queda, en escribir." For the works in question (the *Florida* and *Comentarios reales*) he requests Maximilian's patronage: "Me atevere con el favor de V.S. à no bolver las espaldas à las dos empresas." Garcilaso echoed the *atrevimiento* of this dedication in his defense of the *Dialogos* in the episode mentioned below. For "the discourse of my life," see Garcilaso Inca de la Vega, *Comentarios reales de los Incas*, pt. II, ed. Carmelo Saenz de Santa María, vol. 3 of *Obras completas del Inca Garcilaso de la Vega*, Biblioteca de Autores Españoles (hereafter BAE) 134 (Madrid: Atlas, 1960), 211a: "Adelante en el discurso de mi vida conocí muchos de los que se nombran en la historia." On Garcilaso the historian, see Franklin Pease, *Las crónicas y los Andes* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1995), 367–96.

2. Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. II, ed. Saenz, vol. 3 of *Obras completas*, 14a: "Un antártico nacido en el Nuevo Mundo, allá debajo de nuestro hemisferio y que en la leche mamó la lengua general de los Indios del Perú, qué tiene que ver con hacerse interprete entre italianos y españoles, y ya que presumió serlo porqué no tomó libro cualquiera y no el que los italianos más estimaban, y los españoles menos conocían? Yo le respondí que habia sido temeridad soldadesca que sus mayores hazañas las acometen así, y si salen con victoria los dan por valientes y si mueren en ella, los tienen por locos."

3. Garcilaso de la Vega, *Relación de la descendencia de Garcí Pérez de Vargas*, ed. Carmelo Saenz de Santa Maria, vol. 1 of *Obras completas del Inca Garcilaso de la Vega*, BAE 132 (Madrid: Atlas, 1965), 236b. See further, on Garcilaso's name changes, punctuating the evolution of his self-perception, and his career as a writer and historian, Christian Fernández, *Inca Garcilaso: Imagenación, memoria e identidad* (Lima: Fondo Editorial Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, 2004), chap. 2.

4. See Garcilaso de la Vega, *Obras de Garcilaso de la Vega con anotaciones de Fernando de Herrera* (Seville: Alonso de la Barrera, 1580; facsimile, Madrid: CSIC, 1973), 101, soneto 7. Here, imagining himself to have escaped from an unhappy love, the poet wrote:

tu templo i sus paredes è vestido
de mis mojadas ropas, i adornado

como acontece a quien à ya escapado
libre de la tormenta, en que se vido.

[The walls of your temple have I decked out
with my drenched clothing and adorned it
as happens to one who has escaped
free from the storm where he was caught.]

In his commentary (108–9), Herrera cited Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.766–69, about the wild olive tree where shipwrecked sailors used to dedicate offerings of thanksgiving along with their clothes; Herrera also cited Horace, *Odes* 2.5, which is a misprint for *Odes* 1.5.

5. Patrick Gallagher, *The Life and Works of Garcí Sánchez de Badajoz* (London: Tamesis Books, 1968), 65:

El cuerpo tengo de un rroble
los brazos de un pino alvar,
mi corazon es de piedra,
mis entrañas de un sillar:
callo tengo fecho en ellas,
de sufrir y de callar,
ya no siento la tristeza,
ni me da pena el pesar

turning round Dido's accusations against Aeneas in *Aeneid* 4.365–68 with the simile of the oak in *Aeneid* 4.441–46.

6. See Germán Colón and Amadeu-J. Soberanas, introduction to facsimile edition of Elio Antonio de Nebrija and Gabriel Busa O.S.A., *Diccionario latin-catalán y catalán-latín* (Barcelona: Puvill Libros, 1987).

7. Domingo de Santo Tomás, *Lexicon o Vocabulario de la lengua general del Perú*, ed. Raúl Porras Barrenechea (Lima: Universidad Nacional de San Marcos, 1951); Domingo de Santo Tomás, *Grammatica o Arte de la lengua general de los Indios de los reynos del Peru* (Lima: Universidad Nacional de San Marcos, 1951).

8. Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo y Valdés, *Historia general y natural de las Indias*, ed. Juan Pérez de Tudela y Bueso, vol. 1, BAE 117 (Madrid: Atlas, 1959), 202b. "Cosa es maravillosa que en espacio de una jornada de cinco o seis leguas de camino, y próximas y vecinas unas gentes con otras, no se entienden los unos a los otros indios."

9. Oviedo, *Historia general y natural*, ed. Pérez de Tudela, vol. 1, 203a: "Estas diversidades de sus lenguas han seído las principales armas con que los

españoles se han enseñoreado destas partes, juntamente con las discordias que entre los naturales dellas continuamente había.” In this same chapter, Oviedo discusses the dispersion of humanity across the earth after the building of the Tower of Babel, and the original seventy-two languages that gave rise to all the rest, “que me parece a mí que son incontables.” On the confusion of languages, Oviedo cites the standard sources of the day: Gen. 11:1–9; Augustine, *City of God* 16.11; and Isidore, *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX* 9.2, ed. W. M. Lindsay (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), and adds his friend Pedro Mexía, *Silva de varia lección* 1.25, ed. Justo García Soriano (Madrid: Sociedad de Bibliófilos Españoles, 1933).

10. Oviedo, *Historia general y natural*, ed. Pérez de Tudela, vol. 1, 203a, “unión de la república cristiana.”

11. Pedro Pizarro, *Relación del descubrimiento y conquista del Perú*, chap. 5, ed. Guillermo Lohmann Villena (Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 1978), 18, about the Isla de Puná: “Estava en esta isla un ynga del Cuzco por governador que tenía alli el Ynga, que governava a Puerto Viexo, a la isla y a Túmbez.”

12. See Bruce Mannheim, *The Language of the Inka since the European Invasion* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991), 31–60. He mentions sources about the “thicket of languages” spoken in the Andes at the time of the invasion; all postdate the period of first contact, when the initial impression of the ubiquity of Quechua came into existence (36). It was greater familiarity with the Andes that brought Spanish awareness of linguistic diversity alongside the general language. Here, as so often, Cieza led the way. He evidently thought that Quechua was much more than an administrative language; see below, note 68.

13. José de Acosta, *Historia natural y moral de las Indias*, ed. Edmundo O’Gorman (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1962), 372, referring to Daniel 2:34, where Daniel explains to Nebuchadnezzar the meaning of his dream vision of the statue with a head of gold, chest and arms of silver, belly of bronze, legs of iron, and feet of clay, that is struck by a stone.

14. See the *real cedula* of 1550, addressed to the viceroy of New Spain and reissued for Peru, ordering that Spanish be the language of evangelization, in R. Konetzke, *Colección de documentos para la historia de la formación social de Hispanoamérica, 1493–1810*, vol. 1 (Madrid: CSIC, 1953). In effect, the missionaries were instrumental in forming Quechua as the language of evangelization; about the process, see Alan Durston, *Pastoral Quechua: The History of Christian Translation in Peru, 1550–1650* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007).

15. Antonio de Nebrija, *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, bk. 5 and prologue, “Rudimentos y principios,” ed. Antonio Quilis (Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1980). On the presence of the article in Castilian, see *Gramática* 3.1.

16. Santo Tomás, *Grammatica*, fol. Av recto and verso.

17. Ibid., fols. Av verso–Avi recto.

18. The application of the term *lingua franca* is my own, but it is suggested by Fray Domingo's repeated comparisons between Quechua and Latin throughout the *Arte* and by the political terminology with which he describes language, on which see further below.

19. On the designation and analysis of the eight parts of speech, see Santo Tomás, *Grammatica*, fol. Bi verso of the prologue to the reader, "los términos, nombres y verbos y demás partes de la oración," and Bii recto, "En esta lengua, como en la latina y en las demas, ay todas las ocho partes dela oración"; see also Santo Tomás, *Lexicon* prologue fol. +v verso, stating that here the model is Nebrija's Latin dictionary. On pronunciation, see Santo Tomás, *Grammatica*, fols. Bi verso–Bii recto; Antonio de Nebrija, *Introductiones latinas contrapuesto el romance al latín* (ca. 1488), ed. Miguel Ángel Esparza and Vicente Calvo (Munster: Nodus Publikationen, 1996), 98, calls this part "Prosodia et syllaba." Fray Domingo omits explicit discussion of Nebrija's third part of grammar (etymology and diction), but it is implied throughout his *Gramática*; the fourth part of the *Gramática*, syntax, is at fol. 61v ff.

20. Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 1.1.24ff., ed. Donald A. Russell (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), on education of children going from letters, to syllables (1.1.30), words, reading (1.1.32), and interpretation (1.1.35).

21. Antonio de Nebrija, *Introductiones Latinae* (Salamanca: Industrias Gráficas Visedo, 1981), preface addressed to Pedro Mendoza. On the difference between ancient and late antique Latin grammars written for those who already knew the language, and Latin grammars of subsequent times, written for those who were learning Latin, see W. Keith Percival, "Italian Affiliations of Nebrija's Latin Grammar," in his *Studies in Renaissance Grammar* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), number XII.

22. Nebrija, *Gramática* 1.5.

23. On identifying the phonemes of each language, see Nebrija, *Gramática* 1.4, mentioning Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 1.4.7–12 on necessary and superfluous letters, and Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 7.119, ed. Harris Rackham (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), on Greek letters that are also recognized in Latin. On *consuetudo* and spelling, see Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 1.4.12–17 and 1.7.1–32, n30, "Ego, nisi quod consuetudo obtinuerit, sic scribendum quidque iudico, quomodo sonat," with which Nebrija agreed (see *Gramática* 1.4). See Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 1.6.43, on preferring the *consuetudo* of the day to that of long ago.

24. Nebrija, *Gramática* 1.7.

25. Santo Tomás, *Grammatica*, prologo a la S.M. del Rey, Av verso.

26. Nebrija's *Introductiones Latinae* present as much information as possible in tabular form to facilitate learning by heart, and Domingo de Santo Tomás followed; even so, Quechua did not lend itself to the same kind of systematization as Latin.

27. Santo Tomás, *Grammatica*, chap. 2, fol. 3v, "Quarta propiedad" of nouns.

28. Ibid., chap. 2, fols. 4v–5r.

29. Nebrija, *Introductiones Latinae*, dedication to Pedro Mendoza, with Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 1.9.1.

30. See the preface to Nebrija, *Introducciones latinas*, prologue to Queen Isabel, 5–6.

31. See Gerald Taylor, *El sol, la luna, y las estrellas no son Dios . . . La evangelización en quechua (siglo XVI)* (Lima: Institut Français d'Études Andines, 2003), 19–43, for an edition, translation, and commentary of this text. Taylor suggests the sermon might have been "un trabajo colectivo" (20).

32. In light of the practice of preaching in Spain, one could argue that Fray Domingo arranged his model sermon in accord with established custom by focusing on the listener; see Fray Diego de Estella, *Modo de predicar y modus concionandi*, chap. 22, ed. Pio Sagüés Azcona (Madrid: CSIC, 1951), 307, "ut corda alloquatur, insuper et populum ignarum doceat, et bonis etiam moribus instruat. Ad hoc autem eligito utilia satis loca Scripturae, et jucundos nimis et placidos dicendi modos; non ea qua subobscura, sterilia et speculativa sunt." See also chaps. 26 and 27, on pleasing and moving the listeners, but with appropriate decorum.

33. Before writing the *Grammatica* and *Lexicon*, Fray Domingo's missionary work had been primarily on the Pacific coast; for a coastal myth of origins, see Agustín de Zárate, *Historia del descubrimiento y conquista del Perú* 1.10, ed. Franklin Pease and Teodoro Hampe Marínez (Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 1995); for a different kind of coastal myth of origin (origin of noble men and women and of ordinary people from eggs of gold, silver, and copper, respectively; and origin from two pairs of stars, the parents of nobles and ordinary people), see Antonio de la Calancha, *Corónica moralizada del orden de San Agustín en el Perú* 2.19, ed. Ignacio Prado Pastor, 6 vols. (Lima: n.p., 1974–82), 934–35. No help is offered in these myths for the story of Adam and Eve.

34. Santo Tomás, *Grammatica*, fol. 88r, cf. fol. 86r: "Cada lengua tiene su phrasis y modo particular de hablar."

35. Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 1.6.3: "Consuetudo vero certissima loquendi magistra, utendumque plane sermone ut nummo, cui publica forma est." On the principle of accommodation, see Robert Lamberton, "The Neo-

platonists and the Spiritualization of Homer," in *Homer's Ancient Readers*, ed. Robert Lamberton and John J. Keaney (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), 115–33; Amos Funkenstein, *Theology and the Scientific Imagination from the Middle Ages to the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), 213–43.

36. This culturally open method of evangelization was displaced in the next generation by ever greater insistence on Christian doctrine as formulated in Europe; see now Juan Carlos Estenssoro Fuchs, *Del paganismo a la santidad: La incorporación de los indios del Perú al catolicismo, 1532–1750* (Lima: Instituto Francés de Estudios Andinos, 2003).

37. Santo Tomás, *Grammatica*, fols. 57r, 67r–70v.

38. Ibid., fols. 56v–57r: "Llámanse *yngas* todos los que proceden y son de aquel señor primero, que se llamo *Mangoynga* y este linage, tiene entre ellos otros particulares nombres y linages: que el principal se llama *capac ayillo* otro *ygnaca pañaca ayillo* otro *çucco pañaca ayillo* y assi otros muchos. Ay assi mismo en el Cuzco otros dos linages principales, llamado el uno *Maras toco* y otro llamado *Xutic ayillo* que se tomo de otro hombre principal, llamado *Xutic toco* Los quales ambos se llamaron por sobrenombre *toco* que quiere dezir, ventana, porque creen los Indios del Cuzco que estos dos salieron de dos cuevas que estan en el pueblo de *Pacaritambo* donde dizen que salio el dicho *Manga ynga* para cuyo servicio dizen que salieron los dichos dos indios, Donde paresce, que los dos indios dichos tomaron sobre nombre *toco* de la cueva donde salieron, y sus descendientes, y los de *Manga ynga* lo tomaron dellos." This is a somewhat different story from the one discussed by Gary Urton, *The History of a Myth: Pacaritambo and the Origin of the Inkas* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990). For more on patronyms, see Nebrija, *Gramática* 3.3, ed. Quilis, 167–68.

39. The term is derived from the *bebetrias* of the Duero valley, communities that were thought to have gained independence from the Moors by their own unaided efforts, and with that had also gained the right to choose their own lords; see Sabine MacCormack, *On the Wings of Time: Rome, the Incas, Spain, and Peru* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007), chap. 7, nn20–28.

40. Santo Tomás, *Grammatica*, prologo a la S.M. del Rey, Av verso.

41. Nebrija, *Gramática* 1.7, ed. Quilis, 123.

42. Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 1.7.11–29.

43. Nebrija, *Gramática* 4.1, ed. Quilis, 203.

44. Sebastián de Covarrubias, *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española* (Madrid: Turner, 1984), "AYUNTAR: del verbo latino *iungere*: quando dos cosas distintas se allegan la una con la otra. Ayuntar, congregar, y de allí ayuntamiento, que es consistorio o cabildo. CONCERTAR . . . latine, componere.

Concierto, acuerdo, composición, avenencia, consonancia. . . . Ir concertados o de concierto, ir ya prevenidos y comunicados de lo que han de hazer.” The *Diccionario de autoridades* of the Real Academia Española (Madrid: Gredos, 1984) s.v. “ayuntar” cites the preface of Alfonso X, *Partida* 1.1.1, along with *Recopilación de las leyes destos reynos hecha por mandado de Felipe Segundo . . . con las leyes que después de la ultima impresión se han publicado por Felipe Quarto* (Mexico City: Porua, 1987) book 7, title 1, law 1, “en que fagan sus ayuntamientos y concejos, y en que se ayunten las Justicias y Regidores y oficiales a entender en las casas cumplideras.” Cf. *Diccionario de autoridades* s.v. “ayuntamiento,” where from the same book, title, and law the following words are quoted: “de aqui adelante cada una de las dichas Ciudades y Villas fagan su casa de ayuntamiento, y Cabildo, donde se ayunten.” The *Diccionario* s.v. “concertar” also has some legal quotations, along with several other political renderings.

45. Nebrija, *Gramática* 4.1, ed. Quilis, 203, “la primera concordia y concierto es entre un nombre con otro,” meaning a noun and an adjective.

46. Eugenio Asensio, “La lengua compañera del imperio: Historia de una idea de Nebrija en España y Portugal,” *Revista de Filología Española* 43 (1960): 399–413. See also Giuseppe Patota in Leon Battista Alberti, *Grammaticetta: Grammaire de la langue Toscane* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003), xxxii–xl.

47. Nebrija, *Gramática* prologue, ed. Quilis, p. 101, line 22, “Por estar ia nuestra lengua tanto en la cumbre, que más se puede temer el decendimiento della que esperar la subida.”

48. Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 1.5.55 on *verba Latina* and *verba peregrina*, and 1.5.58 on Greek words.

49. Santo Tomás, *Lexicon* prologo al lector, pp. 14–15 (modern pagination), about Spanish vocabulary and many terms of particular provinces.

50. José Durand, “La biblioteca del Inca,” *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 2 (1948): 239–64. The commentary on Nebrija was no. 46; there were two copies of Pero Mexia’s *Historia imperial*, nos. 79 and 82.

51. “Reynos y señorios particulares.” Pero Mexia, *Historia imperial y cesarea en la qual en summa se contienen las vidas y hechos de todos los Cesares, emperadores de Roma, desde Julio Cesar hasta el Emperador Carlos Quinto* (Anvers: Pedro Bellerio, 1578), 214, introduction to the reign of Theodosius II. See J. G. A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, vol. 3, *The First Decline and Fall* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 240–57.

52. Santo Tomás, *Lexicon* prologo, fols. +iii verso–+iiii recto.

53. Garcilaso Inca de la Vega, *Comentarios reales de los Incas*, pt. I, in vol. 2 of *Obras completas del Inca Garcilaso de la Vega*, ed. Carmelo Saenz de Santa Maria, BAE 133 (Madrid: Atlas, 1960), 247, “a como si fuesen de una familia y parentela y perdiesen la esquivéz que les causaba el no entenderse . . . [the

Inkas] los trajeron mediante la lengua a tanta union y amistad, que se amaban como hermanos."

54. Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 247a, translation with help from Garcilaso de la Vega, *Royal Commentaries of the Incas and General History of Peru*, trans. Harold V. Livermore (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966). "Con este artificio domesticaron y unieron los Incas tanta variedad de naciones diversas y contrarias en idolatría y costumbres como las que hallaron y sujetaron a su imperio; y los trajeron mediante la lengua a tanta unión y amistad, que se amaban como hermanos. Por lo cual, muchas provincias que no alcanzaron el imperio de los Incas, aficionados y convencidos de este beneficio, han aprendido después acá la lengua general del Cozco, y la hablan y se entienden con ella muchas naciones de diferentes lenguas."

55. Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 248b: Valera explained how the Inkas sent language teachers to the various parts of the empire: "Con este concierto regían y gobernaban los Incas en paz y quietud todo su imperio, y los vasallos de diversas naciones se habían como hermanos porque todos hablaban una lengua." On Valera, see Sabine Hyland, *The Jesuit and the Incas: The Extraordinary Life of Padre Blas Valera, S.J.* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003).

56. Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 247a, 248b–249a quoting Blas Valera.

57. *Ibid.*, 249a, listing Trujillo, Quito, the Collas, and Puquinas.

58. *Ibid.*, 250a.

59. This often took the form of complaints about the litigiousness of Andean people; see Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala, *Nueva crónica y buen gobierno*, ed. John V. Murra, Rolena Adorno, and Jorge Urioste (Madrid: Historia 16, 1987), 591–92; cf. Jorge A. Guevara Gil, *Propiedad agraria y derecho colonial: Los documentos de la hacienda Santotis Cuzco (1583–1822)* (Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 1993), see esp. 92ff.

60. For the fact that Quechua was no longer being imparted by teachers from Cuzco, see Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 246b, "pusieron en cada provincia maestros Incas de los de privilegio." On linguistic importations from Spanish, see Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 3b. Garcilaso is writing "a comentario y glosa y de intérprete de muchos vocablos indios" for Spanish authors who misunderstood them. He proceeds to discuss Quechua pronunciation, the Quechua plural, and other differences between Quechua and European languages. Words were changing their meaning as the society changed, as when persons of lowly birth usurped Inka titles; see Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*,

pt. I, ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 40b, commenting on a passage in Ercilla; see MacCormack, *On the Wings*, chap. 7, nn77–78.

61. Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 248b–249a, “acabándose el mando y el imperio de los Incas no hubo quien se acordase de cosa tan acomodada y necesaria para la predicación del santo Evangelio por el mucho olvido que causaron las guerras que entre los españoles se levantaron.” See also 246b about the private language of the Inkas, “como pereció la república particular de los Incas, pereció tambien el lenguaje de ellos.”

62. Balthasar de Echave, *Discursos de la antigüedad de la lengua Cantabra Bascongada: Conpuesta por Balthasar de Echave, natural de la Villa de Cumaya en la Provincia de Guipuzcoa, y vezino de Mexico* (Mexico City: Henrrico Martínez, 1607). On the historiographical dimension of Spanish origins, see María Rosa Lida de Malkiel, *Túbal, primer poblador de España*, offprint from *Abaco* 3 (1970).

63. See Kathryn Woolard, “Bernardo de Aldrete and the Morisco Problem: A Study in Early Modern Spanish Language Ideology,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* (2002): 446–80.

64. Fernando de Avendaño, *Sermones de los misterios de nuestra Santa Fe Catolica, en lengua castellana y la general del Inca: Impuganse los errores particulares que los indios han tenido* (Lima, 1649), sermon 9, 109–12.

65. See Alberti, *Grammatichetta*, 9 (preface), cited in Vivien Law, *The History of Linguistics in Europe from Plato to 1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 235. On Alberti’s vernacular project, see Maria Antonietta Passarelli, *La lingua della patria: Leon Battista Alberti e la questione del volgare* (Rome: Bagatto Libri, 1999); Giuseppe Patota, *Lingua e linguistica in Leon Battista Alberti* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1999).

66. Bernardo Aldrete, *Del origen y principio de la lengua Castellana ò Romance que oi se usa en España* 1.7–12, ed. Lidio Nieto Jiménez (Madrid: CSIC, 1972).

67. Aldrete, *Del origen y principio* 2.6, ed. Nieto Jiménez, 178–81 (listing archaic Castilian vocabulary to show language change); also 3.14 and 3.15 (listing Gothic and Arabic vocabulary in Castilian as spoken in Aldrete’s time, respectively).

68. Aldrete, *Del origen y principio* 1.22, “los vencidos reciben la lengua de los vencedores,” in this context meaning that the inhabitants of the Peninsula, once defeated, accepted Latin as their language, as later they accepted Arabic. At p. 144 he refers to Peru’s *lingua general* as described by Cieza and José de Acosta, *De procuranda Indorum salute* 1.9, ed. and trans. L. Pereña and others (Madrid: CSIC, 1984–87), about the general languages of Mexico and Peru as

vehicles of evangelization. The passage by Cieza that Aldrete had in mind appears to be 1.41, fol. 60, "todos los de este reyno en más de mill y dozientas leguas hablaban la lengua general de los Ingas, que es la que se usava en el Cuzco. Y hablávase esta lengua generalmente, porque los señores Ingas lo mandavan: y era ley en todo su reyno, y castigavan a los padres si la dexavan de mostrar a sus hijos en la niñez. Mas no embargante que habalvan la lengua del Cuzco (como digo) todos se tenían sus lenguas, las que usaron sus antepasados." Aldrete's work aroused much contestation (cf. Woolard, "Bernardo de Aldrete"), so that in a subsequent volume he reiterated his arguments with more evidence: *Varias antigüedades de España, Africa y otras provincias: Por el Doctor Bernardo Aldrete Canonigo en la Sancta Iglesia de Cordoua* (En Amberes a costa de Iuan Hasrey año de MDVXIV).

69. Aldrete, *Del origen y principio* 3.12.

70. Aldrete, *Del origen y principio* 3.13, ed. Nieto Jiménez, 356.

71. For Oviedo's account, see his *Historia general y natural* 39.1, ed. Pérez de Tudela, vol. 1, 340b–41b. According to Bartolomé de Las Casas, *Apologética historia sumaria*, ed. Edmundo O'Gorman (Mexico City: UNAM, 1967), chap. 248, p. 562, the name Peru was derived from the valley Piura, where the Spanish founded the city of San Miguel.

72. Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, 1.5; he himself produced another example of the genre, see Garcilaso de la Vega, *La Florida del Inca* 6.15, ed. Sylvia Hilton (Madrid: Historia 16, 1986).

73. Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, 1.4.

74. Ibid., ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 14^a, quoting Blas Valera: "Este nombre fué nuevamente impuesto por los españoles a aquel imperio de los Incas, nombre puesto a caso y no propio, y por tanto de los Indios no conocido antes, por ser bárbaro tan aborrecido, que ninguno de ellos lo quiere usar. Solamente lo usan los españoles." See further José Durand, "Perú y Ophir en Garcilaso Inca, el Jesuita Pineda y Gregorio García," *Histórica* 3, no. 2 (Lima 1979): 35–55; chapter 7 below, note 9.

75. See the survey of editions of Varro's writings in Marcus Terentius Varro, *De lingua Latina libri qui supersunt cum fragmentis ejusdem. Accedunt notae Antonii Augustini, Adriani Turnebi, Josephi Scaligeri, et Ausonii Pompaie* (Biponti 1788), xxxiv, citing Agustín's as the first critical edition of *De Lingua Latina*. I have not been able to consult Antonio Agustín, *De nominis propriis . . .* (Tarracone: Ex officina Philippi Meii, 1579), of which there was another edition from Barcelona 1592, a work that would appear to be relevant in the present context.

76. Daniel J. Taylor, *Declinatio: A Study of the Linguistic Theory of Marcus Terentius Varro* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1974), 14–32.

77. Marcus Terentius Varro, *De lingua Latina libri* 8.4, ed. L. Spengel and Andreas Spengel (New York: Arno, 1979).

78. Varro, *De lingua Latina libri* 5.23–24.

79. Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas (*alias* El Brocense), *Minerva, o De causis linguae Latinae*, chap. 1, ed. E. Sánchez Salor and C. Chaparro Gómez (Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura, 1995), 38.

80. Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, 1.15. Note chap. 14, ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 24b–25a: before the Inkas, “los que se entendían en un lenguaje se tenían por parientes; y así eran amigos y confederados. Los que no se entendían por la variedad de las lenguas, se tenían por enemigos y contrarios, y se hacían cruel guerra, hasta comerse unos a otros, como si fueran brutos de diversas especies.”

81. Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, 7.1, ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 247a, “por sola ella [i.e., the Quechua language] se han hecho amigos y confederadores donde solían ser enemigos capitales.”

82. Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. 1, bk. 7, chap. 4, ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 250b, y cuando se vuelven a sus tierras, con el nuevo y más noble lenguaje que aprendieron, parecen más nobles, más adornados y más capaces en sus entendimientos; y lo que más estiman es que los demás indios de su pueblo los honran y tienen en más por esta lengua real que aprendieron. For a discussion of this and related passages in Garcilaso, see César Itier, “Lengua general y quechua cuzqueño en los siglos XVI y XVII,” in *Desde afuera y desde adentro: Ensayos de etnografía e historia del Cuzco y Apurímac*, ed. Luis Millones, Hiroyasu Tomoeda, and Tatsuhiko Fujii (Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology, 2000), 47–59. Unlike Garcilaso, contemporary linguists distinguish the Quechua spoken in Inka times from that generated by the missionaries; see Durston, *Pastoral Quechua*.

83. Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, 7.4, ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 250b–251a: “La lengua cortesana tiene este don particular, digno de ser celebrado, que a los indios del Perú les es de tanto provecho como a nosotros la lengua latina, porque además del provecho que les causa en sus comercios, tratos y contratos, y en otros aprovechamientos temporales y bienes espirituales, les hace más agudos de entendimiento, y más dóciles, y más ingeniosos para lo que quisieren aprender, y de bárbaros los trueque en hombres políticos y más urbanos.”

84. Aldrete, *Del origen y principio* 1.4, ed. Nieto Jiménez, 33, quoting Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 3.41.

85. On two misconstruals of Quechua current in Garcilaso’s time, see *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, 2.4–5, discussing different meanings of *huaca*, *pacha*, and *p’acha*.

86. Augustinus Saturninus, *Mercurius Maior sive grammaticae institutiones*, ed. Manuel Mañas Núñez (Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura, 1997). The analysis of phonemes, letters, parts of speech goes back to the late Roman grammarians Donatus and Priscian; see *Grammatici Latini*, ed. Henricus Keil (Hildesheim: Olms, 1961), vols. 2–3 (Priscian) and vol. 4 (Donatus).

87. Sánchez de las Brozas, *Minerva*, chap. 2, ed. Sánchez Salor and C. Chaparro, p. 46, line 13.

88. Cf. Fray Domingo on patronyms, above at note 38. But Diego González Holguín stated at some length that there was no such thing as patronyms in Quechua; see his *Gramatica y Arte nueva de la lengua general de todo el Peru, llamada lengua quichua, o lengua del Inca* (Lima, 1607), fol. 99r ff.; this is quite clearly and explicitly a contradiction of Fray Domingo, even though González Holguín does not mention him.

89. González Holguín, *Gramatica y Arte*, fols. 8–9v; fol. 13v. Compare above at note 27.

90. González Holguín, *Gramatica y Arte*, fol. 99: "Nombres patronimicos no los tiene esta Lengua, ni se puede dezir que lo son los nombres apelativos o sobrenombres, ora sean de todo un linaje, como (Incaroca) o de los vandos, como (Hanan Cuzco, Urin Cuzco) o de las provincias como (Cunti suyo, Colla suyo) ora sobrenombres antiguos, como (Quispipuma huaman) porque no guardan la regla de patronimicos que dan las Artes, que son vocablos deduzidos con alguna añadidura o composicion de otros vocablos de parentesco, con particula para esto, como en Latin (des) de (Aeneas, Aeneades) los de aquel linaje de Aeneas. Ni por via de nombre adjectivo sacado del nombre proprio, como (Saturnia proles, Los hijos de Saturno). Aca no hallamos cosa que corresponda a esto, sino los nombres y sobrenombres, ni es cosa necessaria, pues no es comun a otras lenguas sino a la Latina y Griega." González Holguín was not thinking of Norse languages in which patronyms are frequent, but this does not compromise the point he is making, which is that patronyms are not a universal feature of language.

91. For example, González Holguín, *Gramatica y Arte*, fols. 4v–5v, on declining adjectival participles.

92. For example, González Holguín, *Gramatica y Arte*, fol. 54: "quedan todos nuestros romances reducidos a la Lengua," and not vice versa.

93. González Holguín, *Gramatica y Arte* 4.1, fol. 119: "La primera ley para acertar a componer sea huyr del modo de hablar castellano, porque dispone la oracion y sus partes al reves que esta lengua. Exemplo. Voy a la yglesia a oyr sermon del sanctissimo sacramento, los yndios comiençan por donde acaba el romance, y acaban por donde comienza del sanctissimo sacramento el sermon a oyr a la yglesia voy sanctissimo sacramento sermonta uyaric yglesiamanmi rini, y este orden es aca elegante, y no el nuestro."

94. Anthony Grafton, *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450–1800* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), and *Commerce with the Classics: Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997); Peter Miller, *Peiresc's Europe: Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), traces the emergence of “learned sociability” and its transformation into a social and political virtue that reached beyond the world of learning.

95. Note especially the prologue to González Holguín, *Gramatica y Arte*, bk. 4.

96. Garcilaso saw Quechua as an expression of Peruvian collective identity; see Garcilaso, *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, preceded by “Advertencias acerca de la lengua general de los indios del Perú”; at the end of these comments on the language, Garcilaso describes it as “la lengua general del Perú.” In the *prólogo* to *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 13a, Garcilaso mentions the *Dialogos de amor*, by León Hebreo, as “libro . . . que anda traducido en todas lenguas hasta en lenguaje peruano” (*Comentarios reales*, pt. I, 9.19, ed. Saenz, vol. 2 of *Obras completas*, 351a). In *Comentarios reales*, pt. II, 1.7, ed. Saenz, vol. 3 of *Obras completas*, 26a, Garcilaso refers to Giovanni Botero Benese, *Le relationi universali di Giovanni Botero Benese, divise in quattro parti* (Venice, 1605). Botero also saw Quechua as the Peruvian language; see *Relationi universali*, 230, on the three different landscapes of Peru, “piani, e Sierra, and Andi (quella è voce Spagnuola, questa Peruana).” For more on “Peruvian,” see Garcilaso’s *prólogo* to *Comentarios reales*, pt. I, ed. Saenz, vol. 3 of *Obras completas*, 14b, on the “librea natural peruana” that was to be seen in Cordoba during the celebration of the beatification of Ignatius Loyola. Note also that “La lengua general de todo el Peru llamada Qquichua o del Inca” is part of the title of Diego González Holguín’s dictionary.