Introduction

In 1534, a year after Pizarro's troops entered Cuzco, a new group of men led by Pedro de Alvarado landed on the northern coast of Peru, eager for their own share of glory and gold. One of these men was the young captain Garcilaso de la Vega Vargas, who would later become the father of the great historian Inca Garcilaso de la Vega.

The Spanish adventurers who sought fortune and social mobility in the New World certainly faced some difficult challenges, but the challenges faced by the Incas would be greater. In a cruel twist of fate, the great Inca Empire was defeated by a small band of one hundred and sixty-eight soldiers and their indigenous allies, and the complex and highly advanced system of Andean agricultural production began to collapse. Atahualpa (or Ataw Wallpa), the thirteenth Inca emperor, who had risen to power in the wake of a bloody civil war against a rival faction of Cuzcan elite just prior to the arrival of the Spaniards, was summarily executed by Pizarro with absolutely no regard for the Inca's royal status.

Captain Garcilaso arrived in Peru at precisely this critical moment. He was present during the heroic rebellion of the puppet prince Manco Inca, to whom Pizarro had delegated the throne of Cuzco but who rose up in rebellion against the Spaniards in 1536, only to be defeated and finally exiled to the jungles of Vilcabamba. Garcilaso also witnessed fierce disputes among the Spaniards themselves, as they vied for control of land, treasures, and the indigenous support necessary to consolidate local rule. The Spanish conquerors who remained in the New World to enjoy their newfound feelings of lordship eventually did take possession of land and gold—and women. In some cases, alliances were forged by means of indigenous women of the former Incan aristocracy. Such familial and political ties were of strategic value in terms of garnering respect—and tribute—from indigenous communities.

Captain Garcilaso chose a granddaughter of Tupaq Yupanqi, the tenth Incan emperor. Her name was Chimpu Uqllu, but she would later be baptized in the Catholic faith as Isabel. Although this relationship was never formalized through the sacrament of marriage, Isabel and the Spanish conqueror had two children, one of whom was named Gomes Suárez de Figueroa in honor of one of the captain's brothers. The children grew up in Cuzco, "amidst arms and horses," as Gomes Suárez would later recall when he wrote under the name of Inca Garcilaso de la Vega a continent away. Born in 1539, Gomes Suárez became a member of the first generation of

American-born descendants of Europeans and Amerindians in the Andes. Like the offspring of similar couples, he was a *mestizo*. The fact that this Spanish label was usually applied to stock animals of mixed breeding, makes it clear that a mestizo was considered a hybrid human being, often deemed suspect by both the invaders and the indigenous natives.

Raised primarily by his mother, Gomes Suárez learned the Quechua language in infancy. No later than the age of six, when his father began taking him on trips outside Cuzco to visit land holdings, did Gomes Suárez begin to gain fluency in Spanish. However, he might have been a competetent bilingual even earlier. His parents lived together for much of his youth until 1549, when his father married a young Spanish woman named Luisa Martel in Cuzco. And so it was that the young mestizo adolescent grew up exposed to both worlds, but always under the shadow of illegitimacy like so many of his generation. Nonetheless, Gomes Suárez would recall these early years with great nostalgia when he wrote as the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega, a name he chose in tribute to both sides of his Incan and Spanish lineage.

Gomes Suárez left Peru for Spain in 1560, where he stayed at an uncle's home in Montilla, near the city of Cordoba. His father had just died the year before, leaving him 4,000 pesos of gold to send him to Spain. Alonso de Vargas, his father's older brother, received Gomes Suárez into his home with open arms and treated him like a son. After several failed attempts to convince the Crown to acknowledge an inheritance from his father of land and servants back in Peru, Gomes Suárez decided to remain in Spain. He would never again return to Peru.

The rest is—literally—history. When he left Peru, Gomes Suárez could not have known that he would write the greatest history of the Incas of his era or that this history would become a pivotal work of Latin American literature. It was only in Spain that Gomes Suárez, who then began to use the penname Inca Garcilaso, decided to read what the Spanish historians had written about the Incas. He felt that most of these accounts were incomplete or false in some way, so he resolved to take up his pen and reconstruct Incan history by recalling the family tales and myths told to him by his Quechua-speaking relatives and by gathering other information from his mestizo friends who had remained in Peru. Although European sources were always present in his writing, Garcilaso permanently modified our understanding of Incan history and administration. More importantly, he created and articulated a new American identity.

* * *

The following is a study of this masterful text: the *Comentarios reales*. And I must begin by cautioning that—despite its good intentions—this study is a polemical work, at least in terms of its analytical methods and the conclusions drawn from them. Its approach to the greatest work of El Inca Garcilaso de la Vega will be multidisciplinary in focus and based on conceptual categories emerging from some of the most recent theoretical and methodological breakthroughs in the field of Latin American Colonial Literary Studies. Such an approach, however, will limit the scope of the analysis to particular aspects of the *Comentarios* and in no way intends to negate previous works of scholarship in the long and rich tradition of Garcilasist studies. Rather, the conclusions drawn herein, remaining faithful to the purpose of tracking Andean resonance, will serve as "commentary and gloss" on what previous experts have argued. By expanding the concept of traditional philology, I incorporate selected information from different disciplines, but only as much as the text allows. In this sense, I intend to recover the genuine spirit of classical and Renaissance philology, which did not limit itself to the comparison of manuscripts or editions, but rather explained the meaning and nature of a text based on all the pertinent elements for its analysis. Ultimately, by relying upon epistemological evidence and methodological rigor, this analysis approaches a familiar stage with a novel perspective. This time the stage will be equipped with a different backdrop: the potential alternative reading.

The idea of a possible new reading of Parts I and II (1609 and 1617) of the *Comentarios* grew from an awareness of the many textual elements that point to a non-European form of knowledge and system of narration. As one becomes more familiarized with the entire universe of 16th and 17th-century ideas, including the perspectives of diverse potential readers, many passages in the text begin to acquire different meanings. After all, this might have been Garcilaso's form of applying Scaligero's concept of tempering *varietas* (or harmonizing variety; see Scaligero: Book III, Chs. 25 and 28). However, the present study will privilege the potential reading performed by a reading subject whose position is analogous to that of the writing subject. Clearly, this study belongs within the realm of interpretation; the actual reception of the text will be of secondary importance. In any case, what do I mean by the writing subject and the reading subject? How are these terms useful and relevant, and to what extent can they be adapted to address Garcilaso's text?

The answer to both questions is simple. The definitions of the writing and reading subjects rest upon pragmatic criteria that basically recognize the entities present in the text. The notion of subject encompasses the re-

ciprocal relationship between the discourse the subject elaborates and the discourse that configures the subject. In this sense, it is not so much the discourse of the mestizo Garcilaso that matters as much as the conformation of *a* mestizo discourse. By this I mean that the *Comentarios* presents elements of different cultural traditions, explaining and modifying these elements in accordance with an oscillating and often inwardly conflictive perspective. The writing subject is, then, the immanent entity who manages all discursive production within his diverse roles as narrator, historian, translator, philologist, analyst, recitation giver, or simply commentator. None of these functions alone can fully convey the subject, but they do help to constitute it and are included within it. In the same way, the reading subject is that entity which, like a mirror, becomes the implicit recipient to whom the writing subject directs himself. In the case of Garcilaso's text, the "mirrored" reading subject refers to an entity analogous (in terms of cultural tradition) to the writing subject. The writing subject—defined as an entity that becomes manifest through diverse genres and narrative modes—is the theoretical concept which makes it possible to discern a series of meaningful textual breaches. I will use these breaches to trace the existence of a subtext, one whose meanings and designs are not necessarily congruent with the superficial linearity of the text.

Of course, just as there are genres and genres, there are discourses and discourses. In other words, to read the *Comentarios* and only recognize traces of the most prestigious discourses within 16th-century Humanism is to unintentionally betray the particular levels of meaning uncovered in this analysis. These *other* levels of meaning stem from a discursive tradition which is peculiarly Andean, and which, although transformed in the process of transcription into Spanish, retains something of its origins. The remnants of this Andean discursive tradition are not necessarily found in the explicit arguments of the text or in its overall style; they must be found, rather, in the subtextual realm of meaning, where one can discern certain kinds of resonance by reconstructing the imaginary of 16th-century Incan culture. Therefore, I will not just consider the text's relation to other printed sources or models, but will also explore the linkages between Garcilaso's text and a discourse that largely exceeds the written universe. I refer to the eminently oral tradition that native informants handed down to Garcilaso, and which, most importantly, Garcilaso transformed within the text into a system of internal meaning often difficult to perceive.

From a literary critical perspective, one is reminded of Genette's (1982: 39) concept of the various "hypotexts" which exist within a text, and which form the hidden residues of a "hypertext" which ultimately imitates

or transforms these residues. Applied to the case of the *Comentarios*, the "hypotexts" would be formed by multiple discursive threads with different levels of meaning and potential readings. My notion of subtext differs from "hypotext" (which is previous to the "hypertext") because the subtext is included *within* the "hypertext", and is therefore modeled within the limits of written discourse—creating that discourse and also being created by it. This study explores the resemblance of echoes of Quechua oral tradition and Cuzcan symbology found within the *Comentarios*, and argues that this resemblance forms part of the expressive mechanisms of the work. For the purposes of this analysis, the question of Garcilaso's actual relationship with his indigenous sources is irrelevant. What I privilege instead is a reading of the subtext within the text, for together they constitute the discursive entity whose complexity and integrity is the subject of this inquiry.

By no means am I advocating a return to the *indigenista* readings of Garcilaso's text that emerged in the 1930s. At that time, the belief in a "*Perú profundo*" (or "deep Peru") rising up against the excesses of literary cosmopolitanism, led Garcilaso scholars to overestimate the "authentically indigenous" elements of a work which was actually much more complicated. Nor do I intend to perform a "Peruvianist" reading of the *Comentarios*, despite any misleading appearances to the contrary. "Peru" after all, as the term is understood today, encompasses an immense variety of cultural expressions that are not represented in Garcilaso's work or by his particular era. What this study does advocate is the reinsertion of the text into its original context of cultural interchange. After all, it is a text which arose in direct response to an existing New World historiography whose ideological arguments furthered the interests of the dominant, i.e., Spanish, colonial subject (for a discussion of this concept, see Adorno 1988; for the nuances of the term "colonial" when applied to pre-Enlightenment Spanish America, see Mazzotti: In Press). Therefore, one must understand wathever element of resistance that exists within the *Comentarios* as a function of a very specific historical context and a very particular idea of homeland, or *patria*. This idea of homeland was regional and aristocratic, very far removed from the creole republican projects of the 19th century that were born of the Enlightenment and the development of a Creole ethnic tradition. With these considerations in mind, let us turn to some of the circumstances surrounding the origin of Garcilaso's text. For despite the historical distance, it is through an understanding of these circumstances that one can better appreciate the dimensions of what I call the potential alternative reading.

An essential starting point must be the author's own experiences as a member of a marginalized social group. Garcilaso, as we know, was an immediate cultural and biological product of the clash between the conquerors and the conquered in the capital of the Incan world. He spent his childhood and adolescence in Cuzco (from 1539 to 1560), accompanied by both his Spanish conqueror father and his Incan princess mother. The young Garcilaso lived between two worlds, receiving knowledge from both, but like others of his generation, always laboring under the cloud of illegitimacy.

Of course, this biographical starting point cannot alone serve as the premise from which to posit a "mestizo discourse." In fact, its importance lies precisely in recognizing the limits of its pertinence (that is, its relative im-pertinence) to our textual analysis. In contrast, my interest lies in comparing Garcilaso's text with a body of other works contemporary to it; works which, in one way or another, articulate a particular version of the historical discourse of the Incan royal court at Cuzco. The version I refer to would have been produced by the same social sector that Garcilaso claims to have used as a source in the writing of his *Comentarios*. While a recognition of the many hardships and discriminations that mestizos suffered under the colonial regime has led some critics to exalt the mestizo character of Garcilaso's work[1], this study insists that such exaltations function *only* in relation to well-known biographical data or to explicit declarations in the text. In this regard, there are indeed frequent invocations within the text to the narrator's "Incan relatives" and to the "Indians, Mestizos, and Creoles of the kingdoms and provinces of the great and extremely rich Empire of Peru" ("Prologue" to the Second Part). Such invocations alone would seem to provide sufficient evidence that Garcilaso explicitly directed his work towards an Andean public, as well as to an Iberian or European one.

Surprisingly enough, the question of whether Garcilaso intended to direct the *Comentarios* to a non-European public remains a matter of debate. Although a historical analysis of the Andean *reception* of the work lies beyond the scope of this study, there is abundant evidence to suggest that the *Comentarios* did indeed play a role in the 18th-century indigenous and mestizo rebellions and movements for independence, the most notable of which was the 1780-81 uprising by the *curaca* José Gabriel Condorcanqui Tupaq Amaru II. It is also significant that nearly five hundred copies of the

---

[1] See, for example, L. E. Valcárcel 1939 and Ramírez Ribes 1993.

First Part of the *Comentarios* were listed among the volumes Garcilaso left behind at his death (Durand 1948: 243); copies that the author did not distribute among lettered intellectuals, humanists and other members of the Spanish public. I would also mention the likely contact that Garcilaso maintained with his "Cuzco relatives and friends," as he repeatedly declares in the text. Finally, there exists the possibility that Garcilaso expected an aural reception of his work; that from the outset of his writing, he contemplated a listening public—as well as a reading public—as receptors of the work. As we shall see in Chapter Two, the characteristics of the first edition firmly support the argument that the work was simultaneously and intentionally directed both to an Andean public and to a reception by learned Europeans. In this sense, Garcilaso wrote the *Comentarios* not only *for* his indigenous and mestizo relatives and peers but also *to* them. Of course, as I stated before, it makes little sense to speculate as to what a particular historical figure thought or did not think; the textual analysis will alone prove that the reformulation of an Andean perspective is an essential part of the *Comentarios* and one of the basic premises for any integral reading of the text.

Approaching the *Comentarios* from an Andean perspective facilitates an exploration of those narrative elements which could function as part of a discursive strategy of establishing authority *vis-à-vis* the contemplated Andean public, just as the text establishes its authority *vis-à-vis* the (no less contemplated) European public. Any brief incursions on my part into history, therefore, will only be useful as explicit correlates to the potential alternative reading, but must ultimately remain of secondary importance.

With this in mind, a brief review of the situation of mestizos in 16th-century Peru will be useful, if only to supplement existing studies of Garcilaso's work which already tend towards historicism. Any description of the likely dialogue between the *Comentarios* and the existing culture of humanism should be complemented by the description of another, equally-present dialogue between Garcilaso's text and non-European knowledge. This he acquired from direct contact with Cuzcan sources and personal affiliation with a social group whose written voice was unknown up to that point in the histories of both Europe and *Tawantinsuyu* (the Inca Empire).[2]

---

[2] When referring to terms in the Quechua vocabulary, like "Tawantinsuyu," I will follow the orthography of the Official Alphabet, approved in 1975 and revised in 1983 at the Primer Taller de Escritura Quechua y Aymara, in regard to the dialect variant of the Cuzco

There are many detailed studies on the historical condition of American mestizos in the 16th century, but at this point, some general references will suffice. Works by Rosenblat (Vol. 2: 151-55), Konetzke (1946a: 230-31), López Martínez (1971: 15-21), and Hemming (1980: ch. XVII) detail the colonial legislation which limited mestizos to artisan professions, effectively blocking them from public office. Laws also prohibited mestizos from bearing arms, possessing authority over Indians through *repartimientos*, or making use of Indian labor for purposes of transporting cargo. Since the Spaniards excluded illegitimate children from the system of inheritance, it was only on very rare occasions and under exceptional circumstances that an illegitimate mestizo (in most cases the offspring of an Indian mother and a Spanish conqueror) could inherit his father's property, even if he were the eldest son. Viceregal authorities looked upon mestizos as dangerous. Denied the possibility of social advancement because of their mothers' racial origins and their own illegitimate status, mestizos who failed to conform in every way were considered disruptive to the public order, and hence conspirators against the Crown. In May 1562, the Viceroy Count of Nieva wrote a letter from the City of Kings (Lima) to Philip II recommending that the king forever prohibit the union of Spaniards with Indians "for those who are born of such unions are of evil intent; and there are now so many mestizos and mulatos, of such evil intent, that we should, given their numbers now and how many of them there will be in the future, fear the damage and upheaval that will come to these parts; and from these unions we can expect nothing that will contribute to [our] peace and stability" (in Levillier 1926, v. I: 423). This view fell on fertile ground within the Viceroyalty of New Castille (or Peru) because of the various mestizo rebellions of the 1560s, which had attempted to eliminate the Spanish authorities (the 1566 and 1567 rebellions targeted governor Lope García de Castro), establish an alliance with the rebel Inca Titu Kusi Yupanqi at Vilcabamba, and redistribute lands among triumphant rebels (cf. López Martínez: 21-45 and Lisi 1990a: 24). In the rebel conspiracy of 1567, which was interregional in scale but aborted before a large-scale uprising could take place, two of

---

region which is known as Quechua II (or Quechua North-South as opposed to Quechua I or Central). I will make exceptions in cases of direct quotations, words which circulate frequently in Spanish (e.g., Quechua, Inca, Cuzco, chacra, etc.), and proper nouns cited in texts under consideration. Tawantinsuyu means the four (*tawa*) parts or provinces (*suyu*) united with each other (*ntin*).

the mestizo leaders, Juan Arias Maldonado and Pedro del Barco, were actually former schoolmates of Garcilaso's in Cuzco. Although the author recalled this shared past in the *Comentarios* (II, VIII, XVII), he made no mention of their role in the conspiracy and the reasons for their subsequent exile in Spain.[3]

By the mid-16th century, a generalized state of constant political turbulence existed, as the first generation of mestizos (including Garcilaso of doubly-noble lineage) began to question their social position. In fact, ever since the earliest decades of the Spanish invasion, when the processes of cultural imposition first got underway in the former Incan capital, the Incan nobility and their descendants had begun to develop certain survival strategies. These included incipient forms of ritual and iconographic syncretism, some of which Garcilaso documented in the *Comentarios*. A representative case is the Corpus Christi processions of 1551 and 1555, which the narrator claims to have personally witnessed (I, V, II and II, VIII, I). He recounts an incident during the second procession, when an ethnic Cañari *cacique* named Chilche insulted the Incas by recalling his own resistance to Manco Inca's 1536 rebellion against the Spaniards. Chilche apparently started waving around the severed head of an Incan warrior whom he had defeated and decapitated during the battle for Cuzco nineteen years earlier. While most of the Incan nobles at the scene rushed at the *cacique*, the eldest of them launched into a speech whose eloquence recalls the same style of discourse that Garcilaso previously attributed to noble indigenous personages (see *La Florida del Inca*, Garcilaso's 1605 history of Hernando de Soto's expedition, and many passages of the *Comentarios*). The speech suggested an identification between the Incan god Pachakamaq and Christ, and then credited divine intervention alone with the defeat of the Incas. In Chapter Three I will explore the possibility of an Andean belief in a providential concept of history, which is manifest in this and many other moments of the *Comentarios*. In terms of the religious processions themselves, modern scholars have often seen them as early manifestations of the kind of behavioral syncretism that will become more evident years later. There is an example in the ritual battles, or *tinkuy*, which occurred during colonial

[3] Here, as in all instances when citing the *Comentarios,* the Roman numerals in parentheses will correspond to the Part, Book, and Chapter, respectively, of the fragment being cited. Also, I prefer to respect the original denomination, the *Segunda Parte de los Comentarios reales*, rather than the better-known *Historia General del Perú*, a title that was more the product of posthumous editorial decisions.

Christian religious festivals, but were indigenous in origin (cf. Zuidema 1991).[4]

In general, the continued presence in Cuzco of high-ranking Incan nobility (such as Pawllu Inka and Titu Auki, who were sons of Wayna Qhapaq and brothers of the rebel Manco Inca; and Alonso Titu Atawchi, a son of Waskhar Inka, the last "legitimate" Inca, who himself had been a son of Wayna Qhapaq) gave the indigenous population figureheads of authority right in their midst. This authoritative presence—though supervised by colonial rulers—made it possible to maintain an indigenous cultural identity even among the imposed symbols and practices of Christianity. It was this noble presence in Cuzco, together with the persistence of the rebel state at Vilcabamba and the emergence of a rebel movement known as Taki Unquy, that would later inflame the campaign to extirpate idolatries (cf. Millones 1964, 1965, and Millones, comp. 1990, as well as Duviols 1967, 1971, and Mills). These uprisings eventually led to the great extirpation crusade which took place in the Andean region from 1610 to 1650. The surviving, albeit Christianized, Incan nobility and other indigenous groups would reorganize themselves and display their native symbols and dressings in public events (see, for example, the Corpus Christi series of Cuzco in Wuffarden *et al*. 1996).

While acknowledging certain forms of cultural continuity, this study will demonstrate that the processes of religious syncretism that took place in 16th-century Cuzco constitutes only one aspect of a more widespread phenomenon that transcends the framework usually present in the term "syncretism". This is not to suggest that every moment of encounter between Spaniards and Incas resulted in mutual understanding and coexistence; on the contrary, the historical record suggests that the surviving Incan elite often acted ambiguously, maintaining secret ties with the exiled opposition at Vilcabamba and taking a position of oscillating support dur-

---

[4] See also Zuidema 1993, for an analysis of the European figure of the she-dragon known as Tarasca, used as the image of Mama Waku (or Mama Huaco) in colonial Corpus Christi processions. For important studies on the question of syncretism in art and architecture, see Gisbert 1980 (esp. 149-72) and 1987a. In the latter study, the characterization of a "mestizo style" within the Andean Baroque of the late 17th and 18th centuries is enormously useful in terms of understanding the distinctness of a culture which believed itself the legitimate heir of the Incan nobility. Also relevant to this discussion is the influential article by Rowe ([1954] 1976) on the "Incan national movement" of the 18th century and the influence of the *Comentarios*' over that movement. Two recent studies that apply a postcolonial theoretical framework to Andean "colonial" art are Dean 1999 and 2003.

ing the civil wars between the Spanish conquerors. Even in cases of unconditional loyalty to the Spaniards, there is little evidence of strict allegiance to the Crown. For example, during a dispute between Francisco Pizarro and Almagro the Elder for control over Cuzco, Pawllu Inka lent his support to Almagro (cf. Lisi 1990a: 19) and later to Almagro's son, the mestizo Almagro the Younger before seeing the city fall into the hands of the Spanish governor Vaca de Castro in 1542 (Vega 1974: 9-10). Nearly three decades later, Pawllu Inka's legitimate son, Don Carlos Inca—another former schoolmate of Garcilaso's—would become one of the leaders of the aborted rebellion of 1567, which involved mestizos and creoles alike (cf. López Martínez 1971: ch. 1).

We must understand the term "syncretism" in the widest possible sense. As a function of the object of this study, I use the idea of "discursive syncretism" to describe those passages in which Garcilaso superimposes elements from the two great traditions present in the *Comentarios* in ways that have often gone unnoticed. This is not to say that the *Comentarios* is a syncretic work in its entirety, but it does present numerous passages that testify to the dual origins of its conformation. In other parts of the work, the preferences of the writing subject seem to exhibit a pendulum-like movement, making the text multiform in nature and quite divergent from other works of 16th and 17th century New World historiography. On the other hand, this technique is apparently consistent with some Renaissance historiography and fiction that *entrelaza* or interweaves different passages and sources to create a colorful and varied textual "tapestry."

Why is there a need today for the kind of (sub)alternate reading being proposed here? To begin with, given all the events of the past few decades both within and beyond the academy, the enormous importance of Garcilaso's work has become increasingly evident. Until very recently, critics have only measured the text's importance in relation to its linkages with its primary written sources. That is, the emphasis has remained on the relationship between the *Comentarios* and the linguistic practices of the late 16th century (when Garcilaso began the text), and on the text's role in Jesuit debates over New World historiography (including the work of the Jesuit José de Acosta)[5]. Critics have also paid much attention to the author's strong ties to Andalusian philological circles, stemming from the text's re-

---

[5] For a summary of the conflicting tendencies within the Jesuit order (possibly caused by the distant influence of las Casas), and how they related to Garcilaso's work, see Brading (1986: 16-17) and Durand (1979). At the center of the debate was the thesis of the

current references to "disillusionment"—a favorite theme among critics of Spain's imperial decadence. Such analyses effectively minimize the importance of other aspects not directly linked to these topics and debates. The result is the prevalent reading of a Garcilaso very much enmeshed in the peninsular context within which he reached intellectual maturity.

However, new approaches and contributions within the field of Colonial Literary Studies have begun to undermine the idea of a uniformly Renaissance author constituted at the expense of his Incan origins and native Quechua language.[6] Thanks to recent work on Andean symbolism by a certain sector of anthropologists, ethnohistorians and Andean iconographers, it has become possible to locate within the *Comentarios* various traces of a subtext richly steeped in Cuzcan symbology. The old dichotomy of the Hispanicized Garcilaso versus the indigenous chronicler Guaman Poma (or Waman Puma) simply collapses when challenged by

---

demonic origin of pre-Christian idolatry, a theory derived from a certain reading of Augustinian doctrine that bestowed a malignant character on any religious expression outside Christendom (see Saint Augustine, *The City of God* II, 1 and IX, 22). This conception later included the inhabitants of the New World. In contrast, as we shall see, the *Comentarios reales* tended to see a "natural enlightening" behind the Incan religious practice of homages to "the true God" (I, II, II). This study argues that Garcilaso's proposal corresponds to a very peculiar adoption of the theme of *praeparatio evangelica,* one that also is related, in important and subtle ways, to certain elements of a pre-Hispanic Cuzcan imaginary. The Jesuits were also involved in political debates, as evidenced by those Jesuits who became the most vocal opponents to Viceroy Toledo's decision, in 1572, to execute the exiled Tupac Amaru I, the last Incan ruler. Several of these Jesuits suffered persecution and imprisonment during the years immediately following the execution (Vargas Ugarte 1963-1964 I: 147ss. and Lisi 1990a: 29). The text of the *Comentarios* was solidly based upon the manuscripts of the mestizo Jesuit Blas Valera and belongs to the group of chronicles known as "post-Toledan" (Porras 1962). In this sense, Garcilaso's text upends the image of Incan rule offered by authors like Sarmiento de Gamboa, who portrayed the Incas as tyrannical and inspired by Lucifer.

[6] Studies by Rabasa (1991 and 1994), Fernández, Garcés and Delgado are examples of recent contributions. However, for a critique of Delgado, see Mazzotti 1994. A general map of Garcilasist Creole reception can be found in Guíbovich 1991 and Mazzotti 1998. See also Martínez-San Miguel (on the *Comentarios*) and Voigt and Steigman (on *La Florida*) for a reflection on the need to acknowledge the Andean and transatlantic dimensions of Garcilaso's writing. Silvia B. Suárez is useful for an examination of the "intermediary [mestizo] identity" in the *Comentarios*. For a recent postcolonial reading of El Inca based on the First Part of the *Comentarios*, see Greene. For a challenging approach to postcolonial theory when applied to Latin American colonial writers, especially Garcilaso, see Castro-Klarén.

this new conceptual apparatus, which manages to respect all of the text's specificity and complexity but which also confronts the text for exactly what it is: a text.[7] Criticis are also beginning to question and reformulate another conventional image—that of Garcilaso as an unconditional defender of the Andean people. As I will show, the central narrator engages in some blatantly ethnocentric exaltations of the Cuzcan royalty (to the disparagement of other Andean ethnicities), and actually privileges the conqueror-*encomenderos* as the central protagonists in an idealized historical process. (This vision is presented in a carefully-measured way throughout the *Comentarios*).[8]

Although one could explore the European influences on Garcilaso's text as possible sources for hermeneutic exercises, this will not be the focus here. Of course, such influences cannot be ignored, for intertextuality is precisely one of the most consistent elements in the text itself (as shown by the enormous number of quotations from other historians which the text includes). However, in the spirit of complementing the usual approach to Garcilaso, I will examine precisely those aspects of the *Comentarios* that are the least obvious today: i.e., the transformations brought to bear upon the Cuzcan imaginary and his use of particular discursive strategies to infuse the work with authority from the perspective of a potential Andean and

---

[7] Defenders of a Hispanicized Garcilaso appear as early as Riva Agüero ([1916] 1918), who believed that Garcilaso's mestizo character was of value only in terms of the whitening, "Latinist" essentialism of the period and because of Garcilaso's doubly noble lineage. In response, proponents of *indigenismo* (see L. E. Valcárcel 1939) attempted to rescue an anti-Hispanic Garcilaso, or at least one less Hispanicized than in the version advocated by Hispanicists like Riva Agüero. With the 1936 publication of the first edition of Waman Puma's *Nueva Corónica*, a new perspective in the field of Andean Studies began to extol its differences with texts by Garcilaso, arguing that Waman Puma was a better representative of "Andean thought." Recent examples of this tendency are works by Wachtel (1973), Seed (1991) and Lafaye (1994). For a summary of the debates between Hispanicists and *Indigenistas* over Garcilaso versus Waman Puma, see Arguedas ([1975] 1977). What would be most helpful would be an examination of the reception of the *Comentarios* throughout its nearly four centuries of existence. This would help to identify certain critical traditions which relied upon specific aspects of Garcilaso's text to formulate their proposals of nationhood. Where the present study falls in relation to these other works on cultural identity and imagined nationhood will be seen throughout the next chapters.

[8] See Susan Isabel Stein for a recent analysis of Garcilaso's political stand regarding the *encomienda* system. For a general view of Garcilaso's political thought, see James E. Fuerst.

mestizo reading subject. It is not enough, for example, to point to the models of Thucydides, Tacitus and the 16th-century Italian historians to explain the eloquence and style of the interventions made by noteworthy indigenous personages. One must also be attentive to the evocation and simulation of a Quechua orality which is not necessarily transcribed in the syntax of Quechuanized Spanish, but which becomes evident through particular textual recurrences. The existence of such recurrences suggests that the written narrative may be imitating a formulaic system analogous to that of the declared Incan oral source. Likewise, it is not enough to refer to historians like Gómara and Palentino when studying the particular way Ataw Wallpa's troops carried out the massacre of opposing Cuzcan nobles during the ritualized war of succession in the years just prior to the arrival of the Spaniards (*Comentarios* I, IX, XXXVII). As it turns out, Ataw Wallpa's formation of three walls of soldiers evokes the spatial organization of the *chaku,* or Incan hunt (which in turn recalls the formation of walls at the *Saqsawaman* fortress). Furthermore, the site of Ataw Wallpa's final victory would also be significant to a familiarized reader, for the *Yawar Pampa*, or "field of blood", was the same site where the Incas had triumphed over the Chanca people in the mythical national battle that cleared the way for Incan imperial expansion. Through such evocations, the text both recognizes Ataw Wallpa (perhaps in spite of itself, given its stated support for Waskhar Inka as the genuine heir to the Inca throne) and repeats Ataw Wallpa's implicit gesture of legitimization, thus revealing once again the possible Andean origins of the subtext.

These are but two examples; there are many more. Taken together, they demonstrate the need for a reading that is familiar with the discursive traditions of the Cuzcan royal court and with its inherent system of symbols. My potential alternative reading will center on the forms of coincidence between those elements stemming from European historiography, Neo-Platonism and 16th-century philology, and elements originating from a Cuzcan discursive tradition. These Incan characteristics map out a privileged route of access into the subtext, the space where the supposed oral "hypotext" is transformed. In short, to understand Garcilaso's palimpsest, one must constantly shift from one tradition to the other, always recognizing the specificity of the *Comentarios* at times when we cannot understand the text solely in reference to the canonical books of its era, or our own.[9]

---

[9] Here I remain committed to the development of Foucault's notion of discursive formations as "systems of dispersion" ([1969] 1972: 37). Because this study is multidisciplinary

In that case, it is imperative to begin by briefly describing some of the specific characteristics of Cuzcan discursive tradition. According to the chronicles, when an Inca assumed the throne of the Empire, he would order professional singers to compose a history of his ancestors praising the accomplishments and merits of his father, his immediate family, and all the previous rulers related to him. The descendants of the new Inca, whether rulers or not, would continue the tradition. Apparently, such historical songs had ritual purposes and were performed at certain religious festivals through recitations and chants not unlike "live" performances today. A better understanding of the principal features of this ritual chanting can help to establish its relevance to the *Comentarios*. Several authors from the period, including Juan Díez de Betanzos (*Suma* I, Ch. XVII), Cieza de León (*El Señorío*, Chs. XI and XII), and Bartolomé de las Casas (*Apologética historia*, Ch. CCXLIX, v. 2: 391, and Ch. CCLIX, v. 2: 422), present good descriptions of the discursive practice of historical songs. It functioned not only as a system for recording history, but also as a manipulative device with the immediate goal of modeling social behavior. As Cieza points out,

> [t]hose who knew the ballads sang very loudly to the Inca, looking right at him, about what his ancestors had done; and if one among these kings happened to have been remiss, a coward, vice-ridden or a loafer who failed to swell the Empire's coffers, [the singers] would order that this wastrel be remembered very rarely or not at all. And they followed this [order] so closely that if someone were to be recalled, it would only be so as not to forget his name and successors; but everything else about him was kept silent, with no singing of the songs that were sung about the good and the brave (Spanish original in Cieza [1552?] 1985: 56).[10]

Clearly, official Incan history was highly selective. It made use of a system of recitation which Cieza calls "ballads" ("*romances*"), possibly because of the verse recurrences which aid in memorization and are common

---

in character, it must necessarily expand its methods of analysis in order to recover an object or *monument* that can only become discernible through substantial modification—and "dispersion"—of the most common elements in critical studies on Garcilaso. The reader will ultimately be the judge as to the merits of this aperture and its blurring of the borders within colonial literary studies.

[10] All translations into English are original unless otherwise noted.

in this type of "epic" discourse. As Lisi (1990) has noted, however, the characteristics of this narrative form and its method of delivery suggest it is fundamentally different from the epics of classical Greece or medieval Spain. In terms of this hypothetical Incan "epic" genre, we must acknowledge that the songs are not European-style "*chansons de geste*" or epic ballads, but serve instead as only one part of a broader and more complex ritual context.[11]

Chapter One of this study will delve into greater detail on Incan historical memory, tracing the influence of both oral sources (*taki*) and visual sources (*qillqa* and painted clothes) on the configuration of some Andean texts written during the early colonial period.[12] In particular, I will revisit three key texts from the first decades after the Spanish invasion of Cuzco in order to locate interferences from the purported oral Quechua sources. The texts I refer to are: *Relación de la descendencia, gobierno y conquista de los Incas* [1542], which a group of record-keeping, Incan elders called *khipukamayuq* (or *quipucamayos*), composed for Governor Vaca de Castro; *Suma y narración de los Incas* [1548-1556] by Juan Díez de Betanzos; and *Ynstrución*…[1570], also known as *Relación de la conquista de Perú*, by Titu Cusi Yupanqui or Titu Kusi Yupanqi, the penultimate Incan ruler in exile. In each of these texts I will explore the contact points between the Cuzcan historical accounts which served as a primary source and the written Spanish into which they were transcribed. I will pay careful attention to any interpolations, additions and omissions in these transcriptions. For even if one assumes that the aforementioned songs or ballads constituted the likely genre on which some chroniclers based their texts, there is no way that they could have faithfully reproduced these ritualized chants in the Spanish written versions. The latter would have been subjected to very different formal rules and a totally different understanding of history. Furthermore, the colonial texts were driven by the particular interests of the colonial administration in Cuzco during the first decades of occupation. It is also quite possible that voices other than the actual "reciters" acted as primary sources during the inquiries that the Spanish transcribers made. In any case, the three aforementioned texts clearly underwent a composition process, which produced transformations

---

[11] Catherine Julien (2000) also offers a tentative classification of Inca historical genres (i.e. genealogy and biography) based on her reading of several chronicles.

[12] On the *taki* as a form of pre-Hispanic ritual representation, see Millones (1992: Ch. 1). On visual sources, see Julien (Introduction).

peculiar to the contact between the Cuzcan and the Spanish systems of historical narration. The result was a type of writing characterized by what I have chosen to call "chorality," in recognition of the principal Cuzcan source upon which it was based (i.e., the historical song) and the polyphonic features of its written form.[13]

The notion of "choral writing" as a specific type of polyphony serves as the premise for my scrutiny of the *Comentarios* in Chapter Two. Given that the author acknowledges his maternal relatives as one of the sources for his text, it is crucial to explore the relationship between our author's declared source (Cuzcan, oral, and aristocratic) and the sources for the texts analyzed in Chapter One. These were relatively contemporaneous (1542-1570) and were also of Cuzcan origin. In light of this kind of textual analysis, the "literary alibi" that Garcilaso offers, i. e., that Incan orality (the voice of Garcilaso's great-uncle Cusi Huallpa) is the real source of part of the text, begins to acquire material consistency. In Part I, Book I, Chapter XV of the *Comentarios*, the narrator states that he often heard his indigenous relatives telling stories about the Incan past. It would have been in 1554 or 1555 ("when I was fifteen or sixteen") that Garcilaso first heard (and later remembered) mythical tales of the founding of Cuzco, epic sagas of Incan conquests, and descriptions of the organization of the Cuzcan state. Upon the chilly heights of the old imperial capital, in the midst of the Spanish soldiers but in unabashed fulfillment of their traditions, the Cuzcan elders passed on their form of recording history.

---

[13] For purposes of clarification, the concept of polyphony that I use throughout this study is based, in part, on Bakhtin's definition (1984: 7). He calls polyphony the conversion of voices within a narrative into a number of meaningful discourses that are separate and autonomous in terms of ideology and worldview. In the present work, the analysis of the multiplicity of declared subjects will be somewhat different because of the emphasis that I place on the stylistic features and the cultural resonance that appear in the subtext of the *Comentarios*. Thus, my concept of polyphony encompasses the tracing of verbal signs that emerge from or imitate a discursive tradition of the Cuzcan royal court. The need to bridge the enormous distances between languages and conceptions of space separating both cultures results in a final product that frequently displays internal contradictions. In this sense, Garcilaso incurs *imitatio* by *electio,* or the selection of different and heterogeneous materials (see Darst: 8-13). This brought about a process of "multiple imitation," along the lines of Cicero's metaphor of the bee that sucks from many different flowers (see Pigman and Navarrete [21-22] for the use of the concept of multiple imitation in texts of the Spanish Golden Age). At the same time, Garcilaso's polyphony very often presents itself as a series of discursive superimpositions, set into the form of narrative or descriptive choruses which, as I will argue, we can only discern by isolating the Andean subtext.

According to statements by the narrator, the young mestizo Garcilaso had the privilege of witnessing this in person,.[14]

Chapter Two's exploration of the remnants of an oral, indigenous account within the *Comentarios* will extend beyond issues of thematic resonance. Of particular importance in the exploration will be an idea suggested some time ago by José Durand (1955), a Peruvian scholar whose valuable work has been systematically ignored by subsequent critics. Durand claimed that the composition of the *Comentarios* was an on-going and changing process, and that the final version of the work (including its different styles and uneven emphasis on narrative rhythm) was the result of Garcilaso's decision to add the chapters on the Incan wars and Incan expansion only after completing his description of peace-time Incan social organization. In other words, the diachronic account and the synchronic description differ not just in content, but also in style and in the timing of their compositions.[15] According to Durand's claim, the "warrior" sections were only included during the final years of composition, and did not form part of the original plan for the *Comentarios*. And yet, curiously enough (as Chapter Two will discuss), these "warrior" sections correspond to a

---

[14] After leaving Peru at age twenty, the author's long residency in Spain (from 1560 to his death) certainly facilitated his humanist formation and his apprenticeship of the European culture of the period, which he mastered in an exemplary way. Perhaps because of the undeniable presence of this legacy or because of a glaring unfamiliarity with Andean culture, many critics have neglected the importance of Garcilaso's Cuzcan period, his critical early years of primordial images and acquisition of a first language (the language known today as *qhapaq runa simi*, or Imperial Cuzcan Quechua). Abundant information on the historical Garcilaso can be found in Varner, Castanien, Porras (1955), Miró Quesada (1971), and others.

[15] I will cite Durand at length to underscore the importance of his observations:

> I am convinced that the Inca Garcilaso did not at first include within the *Comentarios reales* those parts which referred to the political history of the conquests and wars of the Incas, but that these were later additions. I believe that this [fact] could shed much light, in future studies, on the literary structure of the work. It also explains why the work demonstrates an uneven interest in how it will be read and even different narrative techniques. I base my observations on a letter-dedication to Philip II, dated from Christmas time of the year 1589, in which Inca Garcilaso says: 'Now that this account of the Florida is concluded, I will begin another on the customs, rituals, and ceremonies which, under the gentility of the Incas, lords as they were of Peru, were practiced in these kingdoms, so that Your Majesty can read of them from their origin and beginnings'. This indicates […] that he did not mention the conquest, although he does speak of it later, when in the Prologue to *La Florida* [1605], he describes the

narrative model that seems to be evoking the repetitiveness and formulaic tone of the declared oral source. Even though the use of fictitious sources was a common literary strategy of the period (*à la* Cide Hamete Benengeli),[16] The existence of this oral source cannot be entirely ruled out. I will examine the relevance of such an evocation as a function of the discursive authority that the text aspires to achieve *vis-à-vis* a potential public whose familiar cultural references would have included a similar type of narration about the history of the Incas.

That Incan narratives were organized through particular formulas is, in fact, evidenced by the historical account presented by twenty-two direct descendants of Tupaq Inka Yupanqi to the Spanish authorities at Cuzco in May of 1569. By doing so, they tried to establish their membership in this Inca's royal *ayllu* or *panaka,* and thereby reclaim land and tribute privileges. The document or *Memoria*, which has been examined by John Rowe (1985), includes a list of the descendants of Tupaq Inka Yupanqui, an inventory of all the lands and fortresses conquered by that Inca ruler, and a declaration by ten witnesses who came of age in the pre-Hispanic period. According to Rowe, the organization of the historical account of the pre-Hispanic Incan conquests follows a sequence that could have been recorded in the *quipus*, or knotted cords, which served as mnemonic devices for oral narration. Rowe (1985: 198) states that "a large part of the text in the *Memoria* is composed of formulas or stereotyped phrases that connect or explain the names". In other words, the account—written in the Spanish of its time—was organized according to an enumerative technique which

---

> *Comentarios reales*, saying that he has begun 'working, forging and polishing the account of Peru, of the origin of the Inca kings, of their old stories, idolatries and *conquests*, their laws and the organization of their government in peacetime and *during war'*. Clearly the elaboration of his work was a complicated process, one which needs further study. (1955: 76-77, original italics)

Durand's hypothesis receives corroboration from a passage of the *Diálogos de Amor*, the first book written (translated, actually) by Garcilaso, which is based on the 1535 original Italian version of the book by the Jewish philosopher Jehudah Abarbanel, better known in Spain as León Hebreo. Published in 1590, the *Diálogos* carry another dedication to Philip II (dated 1586, from Montilla) in which Garcilaso declares his initial blueprint for the *Comentarios*, writing: "I intend to go beyond and write a summary of the conquest of my land, but spending more time explaining the customs, rituals and ceremonies in that land and in its ancient past." (Non-numbered leaf)

[16] In *Don Quixote*, Cide Hamete Benengeli was the imaginary author from whose manuscripts Cervantes claims to have copied his story.

would have been derived from a vertical and transversal reading of the *quipu* cords, which normally hung down from a thicker cord to which they were tied. A vertical and transversal reading of the *quipu*-source would account for the repetition of place names and the fact that landholdings close to Cuzco are mentioned immediately after the names of holdings further out in the same direction. Ascher and Ascher (1981: 74-79) have suggested that *quipus* were most likely used, not only as statistical instruments, but also as archives of historical events. Radicati (1964: 56-89) agrees, and even posits that the organization of the *quipus* into different series of cords is the key to interpreting what he calls the "extra-numerical *quipus*." Urton (2002) has also advanced the study of extra-numerical *quipus*, proposing a system of binary composition. The question of historical *quipus* will be another point of discussion in Chapter Two. For now, it is important to simply recognize that scholarly work on this topic has proven invaluable as a guide to imagining the possible internal organization of the indigenous account that served as the source (or was evoked as a source) in those chapters of the *Comentarios* dealing with Incan conquests. Obviously, my study remains at all times within the realm of *what is possible to abstract* from Garcilaso's narrative. As mentioned earlier, any questions about the author's conscious or unconscious intentions, or about the verifiable historical reception of the work, must be left aside for the time being.

Turning to the second half of this study, Chapter Three will focus on the metaphoric and symbolic aspects of the *Comentarios* that seem to indicate a superimposition of semantic planes. The meaning of each metaphor or symbol evoked will differ, depending upon the tradition (Cuzcan or Renaissance) within which it is located. As this chapter will show, many of the images from the Andean world having to do with historical and spiritual evolution, categories of time and space, and descriptions of nature—images which have traditionally been attributed solely to prestigious European influences—can also be read as part of a metaphorical system grounded in Incan cosmogony (about which quite a bit is now known, thanks to recent work in Andean anthropology and historiography). Chapter Three will also emphasize the importance of acknowledging that the dualist perspective of the *Comentarios* is itself limited and limiting. That is, the text's use of implicit Incan symbols is clearly oriented to the interests of a specific sector of Cuzcan elite. It is possible to notice the specificity of this Cuzcan perspective even without any reliance upon the historical information offered by explicit textual declarations. The fact that these declarations expressly and constantly confirm the Catholic faith of the author does not necessarily invalidate all possible resemblance of some Incan symbols.

Chapter Four of this study will explore similarities between several passages in the two Parts of the *Comentarios* and certain iconographic images that existed in the pre-Hispanic and colonial Andean worlds. I will examine the overt and covert presence of Cuzcan symbols, including the images of the rainbow, the thunderbolt, and the pairs of serpents, birds and felines. In addition, I will place special emphasis on the images of Spanish conquerors. As I will show, the mythification of these historical figures within a Cuzcan framework becomes an indispensable component of the narrative's underlying rationale of an ideal unity between Christian *encomenderos* and Incan royalty. Finally, this chapter will look beyond passages directly related to the never-realized "Holy Incan Empire," as Brading termed it (1986: 22), to reexamine the strategy and praxis of the syncretic discourse that acts as an authorizing mechanism for the work as a whole.[17]

The Epilogue will review the results of the analysis carried out in the four chapters of the book in order to then suggest the overall significance of the potential alternative reading of the *Comentarios*. Here I will not only summarize the importance of situating Garcilaso's text within its specific political and social context, but above all, I will discuss the qualities of this text as an unrivaled example of an early and problematic transcultural discourse.[18] I will also underscore the need to reformulate some of the traditional rules of the game when it comes to literary criticism on Garcilaso. Only by doing so, I will argue, can scholars reach a fuller understanding of the colonial subjectivity present in the *Comentarios* and its distinctive and peculiarly polyphonic voice. As this study will show, the colonial subjectivity of the *Comentarios* becomes manifest in the text through the traces of a chorality that involves fusions and polarizations

---

[17] I prefer to use the term "syncretic," despite its apparent harmonic connotations, instead of "hybrid." The latter offers interesting insights, but, unfortunately, has derogatory and biologist implications in Spanish. For "hybridity" in language, see Bakhtin (1981: 358); for "hybridity" in postcolonial theory, see Bhabha (1985: 154 and 1994). A recent discussion of the term in art history can be found in Dean and Leibsohn 2003. Cornejo Polar (1997) also analyzes the ideological risks of the biological metaphor of "hybridity" and reaffirms his use of the term "heterogeneous" for works of diverse cultural origin. García Canclini responds to Cornejo in 2003.

[18] The Epilogue will include a discussion of the concept of "transculturation," which Rama (1982) elaborated from the works of Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz. The discussion will center on its relative applicability to the "colonial" field, and will suggest some theoretical adjustments as a result of the present study.

much more complex than those commonly encased within the label of "the harmonious mestizo," which many critics have so often, and simplistically, applied to Garcilaso.[19] In contrast, the polyhedral perspective of the *Comentarios* constitutes the beginning of a totally new concept of order and national space in the Andes. This new vision, which was frustrated in its neo-Incan and pro-mestizo hierarchical impulse during the colonial period, would later be frustrated again through the multiple manipulations and distortions of the Creole republican period. Unfortunately, many recent critics of the *Comentarios* seem more concerned with making known their own political and literary affiliations than with restoring the genesis and plurivocality of Garcilaso's work to its own context. By closely examining the different compositional levels within the *Comentarios* in light of a possible alternative reading, this study intends to fill in some of the lacunae left by conventional Garcilaso critics whose work tends to be informed by either a wholly-canonical, literary approach or a reductionist, biographical-historicist one.

One final point must be made. For the purposes of this analysis, it has been of fundamental importance to utilize the *princeps* editions of the First Part (Lisbon: 1609) and the Second Part (Cordoba: 1617) of the *Comentarios,* precisely because of the peculiarities they present in terms of the text's prosodic rhythm, orthographic organization, and paragraph structure. In fact, the present study insists upon an immediate return to these original editions, for modernized versions have led more than one contemporary critic to make dubious pronouncements about concepts and forms that Garcilaso himself either never articulated in his writing, or articulated in a very different way.

And so, properly cautioned, it is time to turn the page and begin the analysis.

[19] The analysis by Cornejo Polar (1993) of one fragment of the *Comentarios*, has gone far in showing that the notion of a "discourse of impossible harmony" constitutes a better approach to the complexity of the text than the approach traditionally taken by most Garcilasist critics.