

*Digitalt særtryk af*  
**FUND OG FORSKNING**  
I DET KONGELIGE BIBLIOTEKS  
SAMLINGER

Bind 54  
2015



# FUND OG FORSKNING

Bind 54

2015

*Digitalt særtryk af*  
**FUND OG FORSKNING**  
I DET KONGELIGE BIBLIOTEKS  
SAMLINGER

Bind 54  
2015



*With summaries*

KØBENHAVN 2015  
UDGIVET AF DET KONGELIGE BIBLIOTEK

Om billedet på smudsomslaget se s. 600.

Det kronede monogram på kartonomslaget er tegnet af  
Erik Ellegaard Frederiksen efter et bind fra Frederik 3.s bibliotek

Om titelvignetten se s. 356.

© Forfatterne og Det Kongelige Bibliotek

*Redaktion:*

John T. Lauridsen  
Ivan Boserup  
Jakob K. Meile

*Billedredaktion:*

Lene Eklund-Jürgensen

*Redaktionsråd:*

Else Marie Kofod  
Erland Kolding Nielsen  
Anne Ørbæk Jensen  
Marie Vest

*Fund og Forskning* er et peer-reviewed tidsskrift.

Trykt på Munken Premium Cream 13, 115 g  
Dette papir overholder de i ISO 9706:1998  
fastsatte krav til langtidsholdbart papir.

Grafisk tilrettelæggelse: Jakob K. Meile

Tryk og indbinding: Bording ½  
Printed in Livonia  
Oplag: 500 eks.

ISSN 0069-9896  
ISBN 978-87-7023-136-7

THE CHAVES DRAWING, THE GALVIN MURÚA,  
and the Miccinelli Claims Regarding Guaman Poma's  
*Nueva corónica*<sup>1</sup>

BY  
IVAN BOSERUP

1. Introduction
2. The Chaves Drawing and the Miccinelli Manuscripts
3. Cummins and the Motif of the Chaves Drawing
4. The Galvin Murúa (1): Summary Description of the Codex
5. The Galvin Murúa (2): Models of Understanding Before and After 2004
6. The Galvin Murúa (3): Migrations of Folios Suggested by Cummins and Ossio
7. The Galvin Murúa (4): Digression on Turner's Theory of "Unfinished Histories"
8. Cummins and the Provenance of the Chaves Drawing
9. What Is the Chaves Drawing, and Where Does it Come From?
10. Conclusions

1. INTRODUCTION

A few years before the year 2000, two drawings related to the Peruvian Amaterial of the Miccinelli Collection in Naples were discovered and immediately identified as made by the author, scribe, and illustrator of the *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno* (Peru, 1615; hereafter "the *Nueva corónica*" or *NC*), commonly attributed to the Andean Indian Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala (1560?–1616 or later),<sup>2</sup> but re-assigned by the Miccinelli manuscripts to the mestizo chronicler and Jesuit father \*Blas Valera

<sup>1</sup> Work on this paper began in early 2014 as a collaborative venture with Mette Kia Krabbe Meyer, Ph.D. and Research Librarian at the Royal Library and a specialist in documentary photography, with whom I had collaborated earlier (see Boserup and Krabbe Meyer 2012 and 2015). At an advanced point, however, Mette Kia had to concentrate on other research projects and I have had the responsibility for the final research and writing. I wish to thank her for her substantial contribution to the analysis of the numerous and complex issues raised by the Chaves drawing.

<sup>2</sup> For the date of birth of Guaman Poma I follow De la Puente Luna 2015 and Husson 2015b [This volume].

(1545–97).<sup>3</sup> One of these drawings, the “Contract drawing,” was in 2012 shown to be a post-1936 forgery (Boserup and Krabbe Meyer 2012; 2015). As for the other drawing, the “Chaves drawing,” it has been suggested in a recent publication (Cummins 2015) that it originally was part of the “Galvin” manuscript (1596) of the chronicle authored by chronicler and Mercedarian missionary Martín de Murúa (died 1616 or later), which was rediscovered in 1996—or of its lost exemplar known to have been completed six years earlier (1590). The present paper attempts to show that one and the same misconception of the then lost Galvin manuscript, which was first formulated some fifty years ago, lies behind both the forged Chaves drawing itself and the recent suggestion regarding its provenance and “possible” authenticity as a drawing made by Guaman Poma.

#### *Guaman Poma and Martín de Murúa*

In 2007, the *Nueva corónica* was inscribed on UNESCO’s *Memory of the World Register*. This frail paper codex of nearly 1,200 pages, which includes nearly 400 full page pen drawings, had been discovered in 1908 in The Royal Library (National Library of Denmark and University Library of Copenhagen) by the German scholar Richard Pietschmann (1851–1923), who in 1906 had published the *editio princeps* of the chronicle of Pedro Sarmiento de Gamboa (1532–92). At that time, Guaman Poma was unknown, both as an author and as a documented historical individual. However, news of the discovery spread quickly among scholars, and after the publication in 1936 of a complete facsimile edition of the *Nueva corónica* (Guaman Poma 1936), documents discovered in public and private archives in Peru and Spain have confirmed Guaman Poma’s historical existence and yielded precise data that underpin and supplement the autobiographical information given by the author in his own work.<sup>4</sup> As a unique—and sharply critical—Indian voice among the Spanish and mestizo chroniclers of colonial Peru, Guaman Poma’s book has in the second half of the twentieth century become one of the most studied, quoted, and reproduced original historical and literary Andean sources. The *Nueva corónica* was published in 1980 in a critical transcription with commentary by John V. Murra (1916–2006) and Rolena

<sup>3</sup> As in Boserup and Krabbe Meyer 2015, an asterisk (\*) added to a personal name indicates that an action or event related to that person is narrated exclusively in the Miccinelli manuscripts.

<sup>4</sup> On Guaman Poma and his work, see Adorno 2000, 2001, and 2008b.

Adorno (Yale University) (Guaman Poma 1987 [1980]), and in the twenty-first century in an un-retouched and free access digital facsimile by The Royal Library in Copenhagen (Guaman Poma 2004 [2001]).

In the meantime, the series of archival discoveries related to Guaman Poma had culminated in 1996 with the re-discovery by Juan Ossio (Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Lima) of the long lost Galvin manuscript (Earlier: The Loyola manuscript). This paper codex is today in the private domain (Peru, 1596;<sup>5</sup> property of Mr. Seán Galvin, County Meath, Ireland). Murúa's only known work is a "chronicle of conquest" or History of Peru, that has been recognized as an early precursor of Murúa's final and about three times more extensive version dated 1613 on its title page. It has since 1984 been preserved in the J. Paul Getty Museum (Ms. Ludwig XIII 16; Peru, 1613).

Today, the Galvin remains embellished by 113 images in color, twenty-five of which are paintings by one artist, recently identified as Murúa himself, hereafter "Murúa-the-painter(?)" (Cummins 2015). All the others are drawn and colored by Guaman Poma. The Getty includes thirty-five painted dynastic and other portraits in an interrupted series that c.1615 were supplemented—in all probability by Murúa himself—with four illustrated folios removed from the Galvin and transferred to the Getty, so that the version of his work finally submitted to the royal censorship authorities in Madrid could display a complete gallery of portraits of the consecrated dynasty of twelve sets of legitimate Inca kings and queens up to the Spanish take-over.

Published in 1946 from a late copy lacking nearly all drawings and annotations on formal details of the exemplar (Murúa 1946), but rediscovered in 1996 after having been out of sight for a whole century, the Galvin was later published in a modern facsimile edition (Murúa 2004). On the other hand, the Getty Murúa, discovered in 1951 and published for the first time a decade later (Murúa 1962–64), was published in facsimile four years after the Galvin (Murúa 2008).

The life dates of Martín de Murúa are not known. What is known is that he may have died shortly after 1615 (in Spain), like Guaman Poma (in Peru), and, as mentioned, that he had completed a first version of his

<sup>5</sup> This date is debated, however, and a central issue of the discussion in sections 4–7 below: Some believe that "1590" on the title page of the Galvin must be its date of completion as manuscript, while others (including the present author) see it as the date of completion of a work that may be manifested in many variant versions, so that the Galvin clean copy, probably completed as such in 1596 (or later), was still a work dated 1590 on its title page.

chronicle twenty-five years earlier, by 1590. Guaman Poma, as confirmed by the rediscovered Galvin, had a huge graphic impact on the latter manuscript around 1600. In fact, Guaman Poma heavily criticized Murúa in his *Nueva corónica*, both for historical defects of his chronicle and for his moral shortcomings, and he has included in his own work an unflattering drawing of Murúa clubbing an Indian woman in order to make her weave faster (NC [661]). In August 1611, Murúa was on his way back to Spain via La Paz, La Plata, Potosí, and Buenos Aires. He brought along both the Getty and the textually very outdated but uniquely illustrated Galvin, showing both of his manuscripts to leading ecclesiastics, and collecting their recommendations, later clean copied and included in the Getty (fols. 3–7). In Madrid, the Getty passed the ecclesiastical censorship of the Mercedarian order in 1615, and royal censorship in 1616, but Murúa’s chronicle remained unpublished till the twentieth century (see Adorno 2008).

#### *Primary and Secondary Miccinelli Manuscripts*

Coincidentally, besides the distinguished mention by UNESCO, the year 2007 also saw the publication in Bologna, Italy, of the controversial Miccinelli material (*Documenti Miccinelli*) by Laura Laurencich Minelli (Università di Bologna) (Laurencich Minelli 2007). This material consists of two brief manuscripts with *Addenda* and various other annexed material, mostly in Latin but including Italian and Spanish pieces, all preserved in the private collection of Clara Miccinelli, Naples. The two “primary” manuscripts are *Historia et rudimenta linguae Piruanorum* (History and basics of the language of the Peruvians) and *Exsul immeritus Blas Valera populo suo* (Blas Valera, unjustly exiled, to his people). These short manuscripts (files or mini-archives) include a web of extraordinary and interconnected claims in the domains of Peruvian history, literature, and a *kipu*-like syllabic recording “writing” system,<sup>6</sup> among which the most debated—and vigorously rejected (see Adorno 1998)—reassigns the authorship of the *Nueva corónica* to \*Blas Valera, as mentioned above. A precondition for this claim is another assertion of the Miccinelli manuscripts, confirmed neither in Jesuit nor other sources,<sup>7</sup> that \*Blas Valera’s official death in 1597 was faked, and that he

<sup>6</sup> See Domenici 2015 [This volume].

<sup>7</sup> The ARSI document mentioned below, signed *Filius et exsul immeritus indignus BV*, is dated 1618.



died in 1619 in Alcalá, Spain, after having in secret spent nearly twenty years in Peru, c.1597–1615. It is not the place here to retell even a fraction of the details of what one can call the “Blas Valera novel” of the Miccinelli manuscripts,<sup>8</sup> or to write the historiography of its reception and rejection since 1989 (see Domenici and Domenici 2003; Andrien 2008), but it seems apposite to make one general observation prior to the following discussion of the Chaves drawing, so termed after the name of its main motif, a certain “Don Francisco de Chaves.”

Besides the two “primary” Miccinelli manuscripts and their respective annexed material, some other archival discoveries, which can be called “secondary,” were discovered around 1997–98, when criticism of the two primary manuscripts was at its peak, that is, shortly before an international colloquium on the Miccinelli manuscripts that was held in Rome in September 1999 (see Cantù, ed., 2001). These secondary and “related” discoveries (*documenti incrociati* in the terminology of Laurencich Minelli) seem at first sight only to have had the function of confirming the authenticity and veracity of the two primary manuscripts, without adding new episodes to the “Blas Valera novel” itself. But on closer examination it can be argued that two of them, the *Contract* and the Chaves drawing, by virtue of their focus on the artwork of \*Gonzalo Ruíz supposedly acting as scribe and artist on behalf of \*Blas Valera, were designed to update the “Blas Valera novel” with pointed references to the then recently discovered Galvin’s spectacular corpus of colored drawings in the style of the illustrations of the *Nueva corónica*. The three secondary discoveries related to the Miccinelli manuscripts are the following:

1. The *Contract* was supposedly discovered by Laurencich Minelli by X-ray CT-scan of a decorated and sealed red wax medallion annexed to the *Exsul immeritus* manuscript. This artifact had allegedly remained intact through four centuries and was partly destroyed when opened by Clara Miccinelli on 29 May, 1998, in Naples, in the office of a lawyer and in the presence of witnesses. Besides a fragment of a letter supposedly written by Christopher Columbus, the medallion contained

<sup>8</sup> The “Blas Valera novel” that can be pieced together from the Miccinelli manuscripts coincides partly, but narrated from other angles, with the plot of the lively “docufiction” titled *Nerofumo. La doppia ombra del Gesuita maledetto* (Miccinelli and Animato 2003). Carlo Animato was then a journalist colleague of Clara Miccinelli specialized in games; his latest novel is *Roma Kaputt Mundi 2012 d. C. nelle carte segrete del Papa. La profezia dei Maya e la fine del mondo* (2012).



Fig. 1 (above, left): Guaman Poma, *Nueva corónica*, p. [375]. The Royal Library, GKS 2232 4°.

Fig. 2 (above, right): Guaman Poma, *Nueva corónica*, p. 372 [375]. Reproduced after the retouched facsimile, Paris 1936.

Fig. 3 (left): The *Contract*, Miccinelli Collection, Naples. Reproduced after Laurencich Minelli 2007.

- a signed *Contract* in Spanish stipulating the conditions under which the Indian “Guaman Lázaro Poma” would act as author of the *Nueva corónica* composed by \*Blas Valera and clean copied by Brother \*Gonzalo Ruíz. It was recently proved, however, that the sheet on which the *Contract* is inscribed includes a drawing that is a tracing of a drawing of the *Nueva corónica* as reproduced in the 1936 facsimile, since it repeats irrational errors made in Paris during the retouching of photographs taken *c.*1930 in the Royal Library in Copenhagen (see Figs. 1–3, and Boserup and Krabbe Meyer 2012; 2015). Annotations in the hands of \*Blas Valera and \*Gonzalo Ruíz on and below the drawing are by their mere positions equally revealed as forged, and consequently prove that *Exsul immeritus* and all its *Addenda* are recent forgeries, too.
2. The Chaves drawing (Fig. 4) is in all probability another secondary Miccinelli manuscript, fabricated in the late 1990s as a tracing of main parts of *NC* [525] (Fig. 5). Discovered “by chance” shortly before the 1999 colloquium in Rome, it was, like the *Contract* (and the third “discovery” mentioned below), taken to be yet another definitive proof of the authenticity of the two primary Miccinelli manuscripts. Since its publication, however, it has received no further attention, until Thomas B. F. Cummins (Harvard University) in a recent paper published by the Getty Research Institute in Los Angeles (Cummins 2015) has briefly taken up the idea that it could “possibly” be part of the oeuvre of Guaman Poma, more precisely a drawing by Guaman Poma that originally was part of the Galvin—or, better, of the lost six years older exemplar of the first three books of the Galvin.
  3. The third and last “external” and supposedly never before studied “secondary” manuscript was discovered in 1998 or 1999 in the Jesuit archive in Rome, Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (ARSI), a few footsteps from the Vatican State. It is a cryptic letter in Latin, signed Alcalá, 25 June 1618, *Exsul immeritus indignus BV*. It does seem to have been in the ARSI since the nineteenth century, as argued by its discoverer and editor Maurizio Gnerre (2001). Although Laurencich Minelli (and her supporters) has referred to it many times as a confirmation of the authenticity of the Miccinelli manuscripts, it may, rather, on closer inspection, be the opposite. It may be one of the few pre-twentieth century texts on which the “Blas Valera novel” was conceived, possibly in combination with one single original element



Fig. 4: The Chaves drawing, *Il scrittore*. Archivio di Stato di Napoli.



Fig. 5: Guaman Poma, *Nueva corónica*, p. 521 [525], The Royal Library, GKS 2232 4°.

of the primary Miccinelli manuscript *Historia et rudimenta linguae Piruanorum*, which Davide Domenici (University of Bologna) in a series of papers (2007a; 2007b; 2015 [this volume]) has isolated from its much wider, forged context, and assigned to the later seventeenth or early eighteenth century.

To complete this brief overview of the available sources, it must be mentioned that besides a dubious archival source from 1750,<sup>9</sup> two *printed* sources, Di Tommasi 1899 and Nardi 1952, have been adduced as mentioning manuscripts that are identical with the Miccinelli manuscripts published in 2007 by Laurencich Minelli. However, they are with few exceptions described so briefly and with so much stress on inconclusive outer aspects, that the original contents may have been corrupted, supplemented, or replaced in the late twentieth century, as will be suggested below in relation to *Addendum VI* of *Exsul immeritus*.

### *Plan of the Present Paper*

In the following sections 2 and 3, I will introduce in more detail the Chaves drawing and discuss the interpretation of its motif recently suggested by Cummins. This will be followed by sections 4 to 7, in which I will discuss key aspects of the Galvin Murúa, answering the criticism (Cummins and Ossio 2013; Ossio 2015; Cummins 2015) directed against the model of understanding of this manuscript proposed a decade earlier by Rolena Adorno and myself (2005; 2008)—a model that is incompatible with the provenance suggested by Cummins. Before concluding in section 10, I will therefore return in sections 8 and 9 to the Chaves drawing, discuss Cummins's view on its provenance, and finally argue that the Chaves drawing is a close parallel to the forged *Contract*, and that the forger (as producer), and Cummins (as interpreter), have taken for granted one and the same traditional—and since 2004 definitively outdated—misapprehension of the genesis of the Galvin.

## 2. THE CHAVES DRAWING AND THE MICCINELLI MANUSCRIPTS

The Chaves drawing was discovered at about the same time as the *Contract*. In contrast to the latter, the Chaves drawing is not part of either of the two main Miccinelli manuscripts, having been found outside of the

<sup>9</sup> For a critical assessment of this source, see Domenici 2015 [This volume], p. 68, n. 47.

home of Clara Miccinelli, but like the *Contract* it has been interpreted as a remarkable proof of the authenticity of the Miccinelli manuscripts due to its status as an external source and because it fits perfectly with some of the claims of the “Blas Valera novel.”

At some point in time between 1996 and 1999, Francesca Cantù (Università di Roma III) had encountered the Chaves drawing while preparing a critical edition of documents in the Castilian archives in Simancas and in the Archivio di Stato di Napoli related to the governance of Pedro Fernández de Castro, seventh Count of Lemos and viceroy of Peru until he in 1610 became viceroy of the Spanish Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and resided in its capital Naples. The Chaves drawing was annexed to the first of two letters addressed to Lemos, dated respectively 18 March 1610, and 31 October 1611, by Juan Fernández de Boán (*El licenciado Boán*, 1549–1615), a Spanish magistrate who as President of the *Audiencia* (High Court) in Lima 1592–1613 was interim viceroy (governor) of Peru in 1606 and 1607.<sup>10</sup> These two letters and the drawing have been thoroughly researched and professionally published by Cantù (2001), who has included in her investigation the drawing in the *Nueva corónica* (p. [525]) that bears most likeness to the Chaves drawing.

The Chaves drawing is today kept separately from the two Boán letters, in the Department of Drawings and Engravings, and referred to as *Il scrittore*, because it depicts a military man writing a letter to his king and emperor. On the depicted letter can be read *S[acra] C[atólica] [Caesarea] M[agestad] | Cruel uino enuenenado ...* (Your Holy Catholic [Imperial] Majesty | Cruel poisoned wine ...). The identity of the soldier is explicitly revealed as *Don Francisco de Chaves*, inscribed in a hand that is reminiscent of the hand of the *Nueva corónica*, like the few other inscriptions on the same drawing, and clearly identical with the main hand of the *Contract*. In a niche on the wall behind the soldier one sees a wine jar labeled *uino enuenenado* (poisoned wine), comparable to the identical inscription on the left-most wine barrel on the *Contract* drawing (Fig. 3).

Anyone who has ventured to digress into the world of the Miccinelli manuscripts will by the name Francisco de Chaves be reminded of another supposedly autograph manuscript allegedly preserved through four hundred years as an annex to the *Exsul immeritus* manuscript, the *Relación* (Report) of a captain \*Francisco de Chaves, supposedly present

<sup>10</sup> Archivio di Stato di Napoli, Segreteria dei vicerè, Scritture diverse, n. 2; 5. Part of the text of the second letter is in a code devised by the Neapolitan polymath Giambattista della Porta (1535–1615), exhaustively documented by Cantù (2001). The present paper does not discuss the contents and authenticity of the two Boán letters.

at the battle of Cajamarca on 16 November 1532. More than one Francisco de Chaves is known to have lived at that time, but none of them is documented to have been among the less than two hundred men who under Pizarro's orders disbanded the Inca army and caught Atahualpa, the thirteenth Inca king. However, on the tracing that constitutes the drawing on the *Contract* sheet, *Don Fran<sup>co</sup> de Chaues* has replaced the conquistador *Martín Fernández Ynseso* (i.e. *de Enciso*; 1470–1528) as the right-most military man onboard the symbolic caravel carrying Columbus, Pizarro, and others to the Indies (compare Fig. 3 with Figs. 1 and 2). In a remarkable way, both the *Contract* and the Chavez drawing convey common and unique information, as if they were the product not only of the same hand, but also of one and the same creative mind.

The Chaves *Relación*, dated 1533, is addressed to the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V (see Laurencich Minelli 2007, 427–48). According to the Miccinelli manuscripts, including the *Relación* itself, \*Francisco de Chaves had on the eve of the decisive battle witnessed \*Pizarro organize the poisoning of the General Staff of Atahualpa with sweet Moscatel wine laced with arsenic, and he had the following year decided to reveal this terrible crime to Charles V. However, \*Chaves never sent the letter, and through a series of coincidences it came into the possession of the young \*Blas Valera, who later handed it over to the Jesuit authorities in Peru. It was then submitted to the viceregal authorities, but \*Blas Valera stole it back since no one was willing to take any action on the basis of the scandalous revelations. Consequently, \*Blas Valera developed an intense hatred of the Spanish, and dreamed of converting the colony into an autonomous Christian Indian state under the Spanish crown. What came out of this, according to the Miccinelli manuscripts, was the *Nueva corónica*, composed by Father \*Blas Valera and clean copied and illustrated by another Jesuit mestizo from the Chachapoyas region, Brother \*Gonzalo Ruíz. This huge work was supposedly composed in order to be a not too provocative version of \*Blas Valera's revolutionary program, designed to help recruit popular support when time would come for it to be revealed. In contrast, the esoteric and "secret" Miccinelli manuscript *Exsul immeritus*, with all its *Addenda* and annexed material, is to be seen, according to the Miccinelli manuscripts, as a kind of intellectual testament of \*Blas Valera, written for the inner circle of schooled and dedicated adherents of his political program.

By itself, the Chaves drawing and its textual and graphic associations supposedly confirm the claim that it was not Guaman Poma but \*Gonzalo Ruíz who was the scribe and illustrator of the *Nueva corónica* and of the



drawn and colored frontispieces of books 2–4 of the Galvin manuscript mentioned above. According to the Miccinelli manuscripts, all these drawings, or many of them, had been sold to \*Martín de Murúa by an Indian, who on the *Contract* signed his name *guamanlazaropoma dichodonfelipedeayalaprincipe*—that is, “\*Guaman Lázaro Poma, called Don Felipe de Ayala, prince,”<sup>11</sup> an Indian who according to \*Blas Valera’s disparaging characterizations here and there in the Miccinelli manuscripts was poor, intoxicated, litigious, and vainglorious. The images made by \*Gonzalo Ruíz were supposedly used by \*Murúa in his manuscripts. As explained in the Miccinelli manuscripts, and in the *Contract*, \*Guaman Lázaro Poma had some years earlier acquired drawings from this artist for use in his legal cases about ancestral rights to land near Huamanga,<sup>12</sup> but later he had acquired drawings from him, which he sold as his own creations to the chronicler \*Martín de Murúa, threatening to disclose the exiled \*Blas Valera’s incognito return to Peru, and finally stealing drawings directly from \*Gonzalo Ruíz. It was supposedly this traffic that the Jesuit cell under \*Blas Valera’s leadership tried to stop through the agreements registered in writing in the *Contract*, and by involving Guaman Poma at a low level in the conspiracy of the dissident Jesuits. On the one hand, he was offered a cart and a horse in return for the permission given to the group to inscribe Guaman Poma’s name on the title page of the *Nueva corónica*, as if he were the author of the book that in reality was the work of \*Blas Valera; on the other hand, in order to make this false authorship seem probable, \*Lázaro was invited to contribute to the *Nueva corónica* with place names and folkloristic details from his home region in southern Peru: as mentioned above, the Gonzalo Ruíz attested in Jesuit historical sources, like the historical Blas Valera himself, originated from the Chachapoyas region (Department of Amazonas) in the northern part of Peru. Thus, in the context of the Miccinelli manuscripts, besides confirming the role of \*Gonzalo Ruíz in the genesis of \*Blas Valera’s *Nueva corónica*, the Chaves drawing not only confirms

<sup>11</sup> The extra name *Lázaro* refers to eighteenth-century copies of documents related to Guaman Poma’s court cases (1590s) on behalf of his clan, which were published for the first time in the 1950s in an ecclesiastical journal in Peru, and republished by Prado Tello and Prado Prado (1991). Guaman Poma prevailed in all cases until he was convicted by a judge, who had probably been bribed, of bearing a false name instead of his supposedly real one, Lázaro. He was sentenced to ten or twenty years of exile from his home town of Huamanga.

<sup>12</sup> See Adorno 1993 for a thorough discussion of the documents and their place and significance in Guaman Poma’s intellectual biography.

the authenticity of \*Francisco de Chaves's never dispatched *Relación* of 1533, the allegedly most ancient piece of the Miccinelli collection, and the proof of \*Pizarro's mega-crime and hence of the illegal status of the Spanish colonization of Peru: the Chaves drawing first of all by its very materiality makes quite manifest the importance of \*Gonzalo Ruíz in the context of the "Blas Valera novel." From playing a subsidiary role as \*Blas Valera's faithful amanuensis (the authentic Jesuit sources describe him as lazy), Brother Gonzalo Ruíz is transformed into a key character linking the newly rediscovered Galvin to the main claims of the Miccinelli manuscripts.

### 3. CUMMINS AND THE MOTIF OF THE CHAVES DRAWING

While the *Relación* of \*Francisco de Chaves has been discussed critically by Hampe Martínez (2001)—and its expressed views reassigned by him to a much later date than the alleged date of 1533—the Chaves drawing has hardly been mentioned since Cantù's discussion (2001).<sup>13</sup> However, as mentioned above, Cummins (2015) has recently ventured to state his opinion on the motif and possible origin of the Chaves drawing, together with his views on the authenticity of the Miccinelli manuscripts in general. Thus, in a footnote to his paper (2015, 58, note 15), Cummins condemns the Miccinelli manuscripts, including the *Contract*, on the basis of the mere fact that they are associated with the city of Naples: "... forgeries, something for which Naples is justly famous."<sup>14</sup> Cummins could have referred to internationally respected scholars who at an early stage, before 2000, when *Historia et rudimenta* was still the only published Miccinelli manuscript, rejected its authenticity with a wide range of specific and precise arguments (Juan Carlos Estenssoro Fuchs, Rolena Adorno, Xavier Albó, Francisco Borja de Medina, R. Tom Zuidema, to mention some of the pioneers who have addressed the issues critically from different vantage points). However, Cummins chose instead to document his opinion by referring to a journalistic account in *The New York Times* (12 August 2012) of the tragic despoliation in 2011 and 2012 of the National Girolamini Library in Naples, and to the disquieting Galileo scandal. Involving fake prints of rare books and one

<sup>13</sup> Laurencich Minelli 2007 and Numhauser 2007 mention and reproduce the Chaves drawing, but add no new observations.

<sup>14</sup> I note *en passant* that it is only a slip of the pen when Cummins (2015, n. 15) calls the Miccinelli manuscripts *desiderata* instead of *apocrypha*, *spuria*, *dubia*, or some other appropriate Latin synonym.

fake Galileo manuscript, these criminal stunts had been orchestrated around 2005 by one single crook, Marino Massimo de Caro (1973–), who in 2013 was sentenced to seven years in prison for looting the historical Girolamini Library. However, de Caro is not a Neapolitan,<sup>15</sup> and it is a singular injustice to blame Naples as such for De Caro's shameful spoliation of its cultural heritage. Furthermore, the high-tech Galileo forgeries were apparently not fabricated in Naples, nor even in Italy, but in Buenos Aires, Argentina, where De Caro, with a professional training as a *carabiniere* (the national military and civilian police of Italy), in 2004 taught the history of science before becoming the following year professor of investment economy at the University of Verona in northern Italy. In other words, the Girolamini and Galileo scandals do not contribute any more to an evaluation of the authenticity of the Miccinelli manuscripts—or of dubious documents surfacing in the Archivio di Stato di Napoli—than any other greed-driven scandal of which every modern nation or metropolis can boast. The evidence assembled by Cummins against the population of Naples in general and the Miccinelli manuscripts in particular may by some be found entertaining but it is immaterial and oddly lacking in scholarly seriousness. Far from being incriminating, it leaves the door open to a general acquittal of the Miccinelli manuscripts due to a lack of pertinent evidence.

Cummins writes (2015, 57, note 9) that the Chaves drawing depicts “the poisoning of Atahualpa.” It is possible that this succinct characterization should be understood symbolically, expressing on a high level of abstraction for example the following mixture of historically documented events and some of the extraordinary claims of the Miccinelli manuscripts: the defeat of Atahualpa's army in the battle of Cajamarca, and his later execution by garroting, as a consequence of \*Pizarro's poisoning of the Inca's general staff with sweet Moscatel wine laced with arsenic on the eve of the battle, which \*Francisco de Chaves intends to reveal in a report he is writing to the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V.

<sup>15</sup> De Caro was born in Bari in southern Italy in 1973, but was apparently residing in Verona in northern Italy when he became director of the most important historical heritage library in Naples, which he immediately began to loot with the help of national and international criminal networks. He was appointed Director of the Girolamini Library despite having no previous library expertise, and in spite of protests from the Neapolitan scholarly world, thanks to his close connections to ex-Senator Marcello dell'Utri, himself a close collaborator of former Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi. Following a Mafia trial, Dell'Utri was sentenced in May 2014 to seven years in prison.

Even better, taking one further step away from reality and into symbolic representation, one could say that by “the poisoning of Atahualpa” Cummins meant “the conquest of Peru”—if not, simply, of the New World. However, since Cummins further writes that “*the problem* [emphasis added] posed by the image is that it suggests that Atahualpa drank the wine by himself,” reality at last imposes itself, and it becomes clear that Cummins does have the real image in mind rather than any abstract symbolic meaning, but that he had hardly cast a glance at the drawing he was writing about. Cummins explains:

“This means of poisoning the *inca* is impossible, because according to Inca ritual etiquette for drinking, one always drank with a partner, exchanging toasts; see Thomas B. F. Cummins, *Toasts with the Inca; Andean Abstraction and Colonial Images on Quero Vessels*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002, 14–20).”

Cummins apparently concludes that the Chaves drawing is a forgery, since its motif is “impossible,” but in fact he has ended up by confirming its authenticity, since the only “problem” he has mentioned (besides the unbecoming reference to Naples as a city populated by forgers) is quite irrelevant to what the drawing actually represents—that is, a Don Francisco de Chaves depicted as a whistle blower in the very act of writing the report that would denounce Pizarro’s criminal act to Charles V. It is as though Cummins in relation to the Chaves drawing has succeeded in assembling arguments against its authenticity that all evaporate upon closer inspection. For even if the Chaves drawing did represent a fantasy that one could call “the poisoning of Atahualpa” (e.g. Atahualpa alone and offered *chicha* mixed with arsenic, and drinking it because he was thirsty), it would hardly amount to a serious piece of evidence of forgery that the artist of such a drawing from *c.*1600 had not been aware of the “Inca ritual etiquette for drinking” as described in the sources critically examined by Cummins in a book published in Ann Arbor in 2002. It is well known that in the *Nueva corónica* Atahualpa is depicted—in flagrant contrast to historical fact—as being beheaded, but no one has suggested that this “impossible” depiction in the *Nueva corónica* of the execution of Atahualpa *must be a modern forgery*.<sup>16</sup> Why, then, should a hypothetical

<sup>16</sup> On this particular issue, see most recently the analyses of Husson 2015a and Prévôtet 2015.

“execution by poisoning” of Atahualpa constitute evidence against the authenticity of the Chaves drawing?

There is no harm done in considering, for a few moments, whether the Chaves drawing may be an authentic drawing by Guaman Poma, like any other of the nearly five hundred drawings assigned to him. But it can hardly be Cummins’s inner conviction that its authenticity is a real possibility, when he calls it (2015, 63n38) “a possible fourth instance” of Guaman Poma’s art besides the *Nueva corónica*, the Galvin, and the map of Huamanga and the pair of portraits of Guaman Poma’s forebears, in an eighteenth-century copy of legal documents from *c.*1600. Such contradiction in Cummins’s convictions may explain why the drawing has not really interested him, and why he has looked at it so carelessly, confusing a Spanish soldier with king Atahualpa, and an inkwell with a cup of poison—to mention only a few of the flashing lights of the Chaves drawing that Cummins has not heeded. However, if we want to understand how Cummins, although he is convinced that the Miccinelli manuscripts (to which the Chaves drawing so clearly and in such detail refers) are forgeries, can seriously argue for the possibility that the Chaves drawing is an authentic drawing by Guaman Poma, we must look closer at what Cummins writes about the drawing’s possible origin before it entered the Archivio di Stato di Napoli. In order to do this, however, since Cummins favors a provenance of the Chaves drawing either from the Galvin manuscript from 1596 mentioned above, or from its lost exemplar from 1590, it is necessary to make a rather long digression on the Galvin manuscript itself, since there is no scholarly consensus regarding the genesis and early history of this historical source. As we will see, Cummins shares with Ossio a particularly radical view on the Galvin, based on uncommonly bold conjectures that are quite out of proportion with the well-documented and simple reality of the Galvin. It is thus only after section 7 that the examination of the origin and nature of the Chaves drawing will be resumed and brought to a conclusion.

Fig. 6 (next spread): The Galvin Murúa, original fols. 119v and 120r. Example of a verso with a textual addition (not Murúa’s hand, except lines 1 and 2) to the previous chapter on fol. 119r, and, filling the remaining space, a frontispiece to chapter 68 of book 3 “On how the Inca gave order to cultivate maize, coca, and *agi*.” Guaman Poma’s caption reads *ortelano del ynga* (the Inca’s gardener). Reproduced after Murúa 2004.

Consejo de Reyno del ycau fuera de lo qd se sabe de qd se sabe  
Respeto. Y como se dice de semantemian... y in dula mirados  
los templos y los Sacerdotes que alli Seruian, deuan de tener grandes here dades  
y propios; lo que se sabe de cierto es, que los templos Meditados Al Sol tenian  
las mas fertiles campos que Auia en todo el reyno: y esto proueyeron los yayas  
con gran cuy dado. Porque ya que viese años trabajosos, al menos los templos y mi  
nistros sintiesen menos el trabajo y neccsidad. Estas here dades eran labradas en  
Comun de todo el pueblo, y Primero que las del Rey y señores. Despues al Agosto  
y cosecha todo el pueblo cogia los frutos y los ponian en los graneros del tem  
plo. y de Alli se mantenian Todos los Sacerdotes. Tenian tam bien grandes hatos  
de ganados, de carneros y ouejas y Otros Animales de diuerjas maneras, y era el  
numero de los Carneros y ouejas que estauan con sagrados Al Sol, passa dos de vn mi  
llon, y estos hatos tenian grandes dehesas, que llamauan Moyas que eran dedi  
cadas Al Sol. Alli pacian los ganados, y como los Pastos eran grandes los gana  
dos estauan muy gruesos. Los pastores que en su lengua eran dichos Mi chi  
guardauan sus ganados con gran cuy dado y fidelidad, y de tanta reuerencia  
era este ganado, que Aunque no traxera Pastores estaua seguro de los yndios  
Porque sia caso vno to cara en la oueja, Aunque estuiera muerta creyera  
que el Sol la Auia de huir de baxo de la tierra. De estos Animales Sacrifica  
uan los Sacerdotes, y se mantenian, y auia para otros dos tantos ministros y  
un Sobraua. Todos los ganados y pastores se llamauan criados y criaturas del  
Sol, Por que estauan dedicados para su serui cio. Tenian los de Reyno

Los mias

Temple

los templos por auxilio, y refugio de los mal he chores  
Por que ninguno que acogia a sus y do los o templos era molesto ni preso, y  
por que esto se guardaua con todo rigor, y nuestros Espanoles no querian que a  
los yndios les valiesen las yglesias en vna junta que vno de los Obispos di yndias  
en Mexico, sepidio Al emperador don Carlos, quemandasse proueer en ello, y que  
valiesen las yglesias a todos los yndios, pues era prin legio atodo christiano por  
todo el Mundo. A donde la fee estaua publicada. Si tenian particularis leyes, o  
lugares mas sagrados que otros, como los tenian los Griegos y Romanos, no lo se  
ni lo he podido descubrir, y asime contentare, en lo que toca a este Pato co lo dicho:

Netra  
goy



artelano del ynga

capitulo 67 de como el yngaman  
 daua, que le hiziesen sementeras y  
 que sembrasen may y cocayagi

**M**andauale ynca, e spresamente, Portadores de xeyno, que le hiziesen grandes sementeras de may y cocayagi y de las demas legumbres y bianadas a esta causa, de mas de los grandes depositos que auia en todo este dho Reyno, de las quales toda la gente, e benia en general grande abundancia de comidas de los quales dho depositos saua el ynga lo que se auia de sacar, y dar a la gente de guerra y a los yndios Pobres y fuerades de tierra grandes depositos de xespeyo para los Repartir los años de sequedad y de hambre y para que se asis y amas auia de dar, y en este dho Reyno ni los pobres pasauan de necesidad por qd el ynga atenua gran cantidad de trigo y hazia grandes limosnas por todo el Reyno hasta las Indias que era hasta donde estauan los yndios sujetos y grande a raso se dauan las sementeras y no acudian como solian Bendecian las chacaras los Hefes de ellos y Roziaban con la que llaman sangre, con que hazian sus sacrificios la qual solian Repartir como agua bendita, las yndias de gran xarades labradoras y buenas trauidoras y los yndios muy que xerax y diestros fierros, comian carne humana, y de la auian a sus guaras y a la tierra y a la guerra, para que diessen sus frutos y hazian grandes fiestas y borracheras quando sembrauan, y quando bebian, a sus raras y raras tando de los yndios y milo conde de sus dioses para que les diessen buenas sementeras y de lo que comian y para que sus hijos y lo de mas para que fuesen, a los yndios y guaras, y en las fiestas Principales hazian sus ofrendas, a los Hefes de ellos pontifices para que ellos como ministros de dios y de las guaras y de los ofesores, en su nombre los quales dan muy de beber y xespeyos y andauan ellos con mucha riqueza y miraban los para que diessen a sus hijos y a los demas si auian de darlos. O morir como de la tierra, y darian buen fruto y en fin eran los mas y de las yndias y de las corrupcion y de las de las demonios y hazer otras muchas maldades y supersticiones, y sacrificauan muchas personas de personas, tambien auia y oy al presente y no yndios de guerra los quales comen carne cruda y humana, llamanse e si, y guaras y raxibes, los quales tienen muy perbersas costumbres y fealdades y siempre en tiempo de guerra se comen las carnes y lo mismo hazen con sus propias mugeres y hijos, o hijos y por esta causa llegan muy pocos de ellos a la vejez y por qd aunque se anbujos como los de qualquier calidad, y en enfermedad como de los, los matan y se los romen sin misericordia

## 4. THE GALVIN MURÚA (1): SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE CODEx

*Paper Types and Collations*

The Galvin is a paper codex, which in the printed facsimile edition (Murúa 2004) consists of 147 bound folios.<sup>17</sup> The material structure of a facsimile edition of a codex is rarely the same as that of the original, and Murúa 2004 is no exception to this rule, although some features closely imitate material aspects of the original in its current state, such as the facsimiled limp parchment cover, “real” worm holes, amateurish conservation endeavors of recent date, and full page pasted folios rendered as separate facsimile folios pasted onto facsimile folios (hereafter called “pasted folios”).

The material structure (or collation) of the Galvin has been investigated by Adorno and Boserup (2005, 236–37), later by Nancy K. Turner, conservator of manuscripts in the Department of Paper Conservation at the J. Paul Getty Museum in Los Angeles (Turner 2015, 88–89). With one exception,<sup>18</sup> the two collations corroborate one another, since they reach identical results although produced on the basis of different sets of data, that is, respectively, the facsimile edition (Murúa 2004) and the original Galvin codex, while it was on loan at the Getty Museum in 2007 and 2008. However, they give prominence to different aspects and different historical moments of the codex. While Adorno and Boserup have analyzed different kinds of data reproduced in the facsimile, which sufficiently reveal the original quire structure, Turner has based her collation on the codex’s present material state and graphically given prominence to the results of a conservation campaign of the nineteenth or twentieth century by which the size of each of the eight current quires had been very much modified. Thus, in at least six cases, one or both of the outermost folios of a quire had been fastened to an outermost folio of the previous

<sup>17</sup> Fols. [1–3], 8–141, [142], 143–45, [145bis], 146–50, and the blank fols. [155] and [156]. Two fols. are *paginated* 42/43 and 61/62, each reducing the count of folios by one in book 2 and book 3, respectively. Front matter: 3 fols; bk. 1 (27 chapters): 28 fols; bk. 2 (16 chapters): 16 fols.; bk. 3 (73 chapters): 73 fols.; bk. 4 (16 chapters): 17 fols.; back matter (*Ficción* and Table of contents): 11 fols. – These figures do not include the twenty-two folios pasted on fols. 1–3, 9, 10, 14–23, 44, 52, 63, 136, 137, 143, and 149. – As mentioned, four Galvin folios have by Murúa been materially recycled in the Getty Murúa, detailed in note 49.

<sup>18</sup> Fol. 13, a secondary folio that according to Turner has been made (recently?) conjoint with fol. 24.



or following quire. When liberated from these late, and of course quite superficial—and for our purpose less interesting—modifications, the original quires described in the two collations are identical.<sup>19</sup> Turner’s identification of many hitherto unregistered watermarks on the paper stock used for the basic clean copy constitutes an important step forward in the recording of key aspects of the Galvin, but it is regrettable that she apparently has been so deeply convinced that the twenty-two pasted folios are alien to the Galvin, that she has left them out of her collation, except in two cases, which will be further discussed below. It is also bizarre that Turner’s Galvin collation does not mention and include in one way or other the four folios transferred by Murúa to the Getty manuscript, since they contribute importantly to confirm the current high degree of preservation of the Galvin: three of these four migrated folios have quite obvious original locations in the Galvin. What must be retained from the two complementary collations is that besides quires 1a and 1b, the *structure* of the Galvin quires (2–7; fols. 24–[156]) has not undergone any *essential* change since its documented creation *c.*1596.

Leaving aside for a moment the twenty-two pasted folios, the material components of the Galvin in its present state are constituted on the one hand by a “primary” paper stock (watermark “EA-cross” in Turner’s terminology), which was used in 1596, and on the other hand, not more than approximately fifteen years later, by a “secondary” stock (of two paper types: “PD-hand” watermark [34 fols.] and “AM” watermark [4 fols.]).<sup>20</sup> The “primary” type of paper includes the Table of contents (fols. 148r–50r) written by the same fine scribal hand that in all probability has originally clean copied on primary folios all 132 chapters of the chronicle proper (currently fols. 24–142), as well as the following short *Ficción* (novel) about two young eloping lovers that are transformed into

<sup>19</sup> There is one exception: fol. 13 is in Turner’s collation a singleton assigned to quire 1b and attached to a loose half-bifolium of quire 2 (fol. 24), while Adorno and Boserup have interpreted fol. 13 as the second half of an original bifolium [0]+13 of quire 1a. In the latter collation, quires 1a and 1b thereby become regular insofar as both originally (from *c.*1615) have consisted of five bifolia, and insofar as the outer bifolia of 1a (0+13) and 1b (14+23) later broke into two singletons, as happened with the outer bifolia of quires 2, 3, 5, 6, and (since it was *c.*1615 replaced by a secondary bifolium) 7.

<sup>20</sup> The *current* fifteen PD-hand bifolia confirmed by aggregating the two collations are: 0+13, 1+12, 2+11, 3+10, 8+9, 14+23, 15+22, 16+21, 17+20, 18+19, 30+35, 32+33, 42+63, 52+53, 68+87. The two AM bifolia are 136+[156] and 137+[155]. The original primary (EA-cross) bifolium 43+62 was not replaced by a secondary bifolium during the conservation campaign of *c.*1615.

mountain peaks (fols. 144–49), and the Table of contents. However, the long sequence of clean copied folios of primary paper from fol. 24 (first folio of quire 2) has in ten cases been interrupted by one or two folios of the secondary paper stock. These secondary folios share material, codicological, and paleographical characteristics with the nineteen secondary folios that currently make up the Galvins's quires 1a and 1b (in all fols. 1–3 and 8–23): they may well have replaced a single original quire of primary paper that had been thoroughly dissolved and made into singletons, among which one was transferred to the Getty, serving there as frontispiece to book 4 (fol. 307).

The professional scribal hand is found exclusively on the 110 primary folios, never on any of the secondary folios. Furthermore, on the secondary folios, the foliation and the indication of the number of the current book and of the number and title of each chapter, all match the very explicit Table of contents of the Galvin, which, as mentioned above, is on primary paper and due to the professional scribal hand. This confirms that the contents of the Galvin, although the codex gives a first impression of being a very hybrid and disorderly construction, has remained nearly identical to what they were originally—in spite of some dramatic events *c.*1615.

Whether on primary or secondary paper, the format of all 132 chapters of the four books of the chronicle proper was and is both singular and extremely regular. The extent of the text of every clean copied chapter never exceeds one single page and was invariably inscribed by the scribal hand on the recto of a folio.<sup>21</sup> Since the chapters vary significantly in length, it was necessary to calculate the number of lines needed before ruling each page, and to adapt the letter size to the line spacing—and yet achieve a harmonious overall aspect of the clean copy. Furthermore, the intention at the origin was clearly to let the Galvin be illustrated with as many frontispieces as there are chapters. Thus, the Galvin (as much a picture book as a chronicle) would consist of 132 spreads or “openings” with a frontispiece (always to the left) facing a complete chapter (always to the right).

<sup>21</sup> The last chapter of bk. 3 extends over a recto and its verso, reflecting the documented fact that the Galvin is a clean copy of an earlier version in only three books to which Murúa added a fourth one on the occasion of the clean copying: there was no further book or chapter needing to be distinguished from the last chapter by a blank page. The Galvin scribe, however, created a rupture between books 3 and 4 by jumping the following folio (fol. 126, later filled by Murúa [126v], followed by Guaman Poma [126r]).

*Pasted Folios and Additional Material*

Among the twenty-two pasted folios that pertain to the third type of material that constitutes the Galvin, besides the primary (EA-cross watermark) and secondary folios (PD-hand and AM watermark), there are three (fols. 52v, 137r and 149r) which exceptionally have been pasted so as to display, instead of a painted or drawn frontispiece, the text of chronicle chapters (twice) and a page of the Table of contents. These three pasted folios are undoubtedly of the primary paper type, since all three are inscribed by the professional scribal hand, and hence parts of the original Galvin that have returned to their original location after having been removed. They had text on both sides, and were pasted onto bifolia of the secondary type, in exactly the same manner as the nineteen other pasted folios, which each include and display a frontispiece.

The pasted folio within the back matter (fol. 149) can illustrate more clearly than other pasted folios why many of the currently missing original folios of the Galvin may have been removed, like the three just mentioned, only as a consequence of the removal of other folios, since the original Galvin was a codex constituted all along of bifolia. Primary fol. 149 was part of the Table of contents. Its recto and verso listed chapters from 1 to 65 of book 3. One cannot imagine that this folio was removed in view of recycling somewhere else, so its removal must have been due to another reason. Since both available collations show that secondary folio 143 (onto which primary fol. 143 is pasted) is conjoint with secondary fol. 149, it can be fairly conjectured that fol. 149 became loose because it was desirable to remove fol. 143. The original folio in this position, preceding the *Ficción*, may in fact have been the otherwise homeless pasted folio on secondary fol. 3, displaying a praying *aclla* or Virgin of the Sun, and hence not too badly suited as frontispiece to the romantic mini-novel featuring the love of a shepherd and an *aclla*. Hence, primary fol. 149 probably became loose when primary fol. 143 was removed, and this primary bifolium was later replaced by a new, secondary bifolium. To this end, of course, the eleven bifolia of quire 7 had to be unbound, so that the new secondary bifolium 143+149 could be inserted as a fourth bifolium (counting from the sewing), and primary fol. 149 could be reinstalled in its previous and original location by being pasted onto secondary fol. 149. Fol. 143, however, if that is the original identity of pasted fol. III, did not resume its former location (as pasted folio), maybe because another folio had usurped its place, current pasted fol. 143. This folio has an image of an *aclla* (at her morning

toilette) but also text (additional text to bk. 3, ch. 43, which would have been out of context on fol. 3 of the front matter, so that the praying *acella* may have been relegated to a more noble but less appropriate location, pasted onto secondary bifolium 3+10. Original fol. 149 had no image to which should be given priority when pasted to secondary fol. 149, but as in the two other cases considered here (fols. 52v and 137r) it was the recto (or first page of the folio), inscribed by the professional hand, that was chosen to be displayed, while the text on its verso was given to a scribe or amanuensis to copy on the recto of the secondary folio. In this particular and unique case, both sides of fol. 149 were inscribed by the professional hand, because Murúa's idiosyncratic and spread-based format of the chronicle part of the Galvin was not applied by him to the short *Ficción* and the Table of contents. In other respects the loose page of the Table of contents seems to have been treated in exactly the same way as the vast majority of other pasted folios: before being obscured when pasted to secondary fol. 149r, the text on original fol. 149v was copied to secondary fol. 149v by a scribe or helper available to Murúa.

Indeed, Murúa may well have proceeded in an analog way with all the other pasted folios, but did not do so in every detail, since obscured text has in some cases not been copied (at least not in the Galvin) before being obscured. In these few cases (fols. I, II, III, and 143), Cummins and Ossio have been keenly interested in knowing what was "hidden," "concealed," or purposefully "not copied," and they have at the Getty Museum and with the technical help of Turner succeeded in reading nearly all of the "hidden" text on four out of four folios (Cummins and Ossio 2015). The truth is that nothing has on purpose been "hidden." The obscured texts (an outdated title page, an outdated dedicatory letter, odd quotations and notes on diverse matters) were obviously left as they were, and obscured because there was no point in copying them, as seen from Murúa's point of view *c.*1615, within the context of the Galvin.

Two hands have copied obscured texts, Murúa's (in all, five pages) and a helper (in all, sixteen pages) who—beyond the boundary of the chronicle's 132 chapters—also copied one side of the single page removed from the Table of contents.<sup>22</sup> Over the long reconstructed stretch from fol. 14 to fol. 23, Murúa himself copied the first obscured page

<sup>22</sup> Besides additional notes, etc., Murúa inscribed: fols. 1r, 3r, 8r, 9r, 10v (flipped), 14r, 23r, 35r, 42r, 126v, and 127v. Murúa's helper inscribed page 42, and fols. 8v, 15r, 16r, 17r, 18r, 19r, 20r, 21r, 22r, 44r, 53r/v, 63r, 136r, 137v, and 149v.

and the last, maybe trusting that the helper would do things correctly according to the frame he had laid out.

Returning to the primary folios (EA-cross watermarks) that have undoubtedly stayed in their original location, Murúa first, and then Guaman Poma, used the blank versos of books 2–4 to make additions. Murúa added textual material to a given chapter on the recto of the same folio, while Guaman Poma filled space left by Murúa with a frontispiece suitable for the following chapter—in accordance with Murúa’s original format of the chronicle part of the Galvin.

Such general observations seem to confirm the impression that most, if not each and every one of the twenty-two pasted folios of the Galvin are not alien to the Galvin, in contrast to what is implied by Turner’s collation, but were all, originally, integrated parts of the clean copied and partly illustrated Galvin Murúa.

## 5. THE GALVIN MURÚA (2): MODELS OF UNDERSTANDING BEFORE AND AFTER 2004

### *Historiographic Summary*

The history of research on the text and illustrations of the Galvin is long and interwoven with speculations on the nature of the original codex, right from the time of its initial discovery and summary description by Marcos Jiménez de la Espada (1831–98) in 1879 and 1892 (see Adorno and Boserup 2005, 121–38). The original codex, attractive today primarily because of its paintings and colored drawings, disappeared some years later, before any scholar had taken up the challenge of publishing the original, which remained lost in the private domain for more than a century. A copy of the text—and a few of the drawings—had been made *c.*1890, but this “Loyola copy,” which is still extant in the library of the Jesuit *Colegio* of Loyola in Azpeitia (Region of Guipúzcoa, Basque Country), did not reproduce paleographical and codicological details on which one could base a coherent understanding of the genesis and early history of the original. However, after the appearance of some partial editions in the early twentieth century, Constantino Bayle (1882–1953) in 1946 succeeded in publishing the whole Loyola copy, but he left it to the reader to find a coherent explanation of the many cases of apparently missing or incoherently drafted chapters.

When Manuel Ballesteros (1911–2002) had discovered the “other” and much more extensive manuscript of Murúa’s chronicle, the Getty,

and prepared an edition of it (Murúa 1962–64), he first imagined that the Galvin was merely an abbreviated and “edited” version of the Getty, but José Imbelloni (1885–1967) argued convincingly (1953, 120; Adorno and Boserup 2005, 138–40) that the relation between the two manuscripts was rather the opposite, that is, that the Galvin represented a much earlier stage than the Getty in the evolution of Murúa’s work. However, when his edition of the Getty was republished (Murúa 1986), Ballesteros still denied that the Galvin was a version in its own right, characterizing it as an unfinished draft, which—among other drafts and manuscripts—had preceded the only completed and “original” version: the Getty. Ballesteros apparently stuck to this opinion even after John H. Rowe (1918–2004) in 1987 had reported his successful reading in 1979 of obscured texts on the reverse of the four Galvin-folios recycled in the Getty manuscript. Rowe deduced from the appearance of the main scribal hand that the Galvin had been a finely crafted clean copy which, however, had been cannibalized, as evidenced by the four Galvin-in-Getty folios.

Rowe’s discovery was the first step towards a new and balanced appraisal of the Galvin, but he had of course still only accounted for some of the challenges presented by the lost Galvin, since he never had the occasion to see and try to explain any of the pasted folios within the Galvin itself. While Rowe’s findings have been buried in a Festschrift article, Ballesteros’s views on the Murúa manuscripts have since 1986 been available in the popular “Crónicas de America” series (Murúa 1986 was reprinted in 2001), and widely accepted. Even after having rediscovered the Galvin in 1996, Ossio has persevered in his adherence to Ballesteros’s vision of it as a disorderly assemblage of elements from other drafts and manuscripts (Adorno and Boserup 2005, 142–44).

Since 2004 a key issue of scholarly research regarding the Galvin has been the provenance of the pasted folios, and, more generally, to identify the “stages” by which the Galvin has become what it is today. While Adorno and Boserup have suggested that each and every pasted folio of the Galvin originate from the Galvin itself, Cummins and Ossio (with the more or less explicit agreement of Turner and Trentelman) have suggested that the pasted folios represent a gradual expansion of the Galvin by material addition of folios and quires including such material transferred from other manuscripts. Thus, as a preliminary result of their research, Cummins and Ossio (2013) have suggested that four of the twenty-two pasted Galvin folios and one other (fol. 141) originate from the *curacas*-version.

*Adorno and Boserup 2005*

Adorno and Boserup based their approach to the Galvin on (a) Murúa's own words in the prologue to book 4 of the Galvin (1598 or later) about this final book being added to a new clean copy of the *curacas*-version of 1590,<sup>23</sup> (b) the silence of the *curacas* with regard to illustrations in their very laudatory peer review of the version submitted to them in 1590,<sup>24</sup> (c) the extent and paleographical uniformity of the preserved parts of the basic clean copy, and (d) reflections on the basis of their collation of the Galvin codex. Thus, they have conceptualized the Galvin as a manuscript planned by Murúa to be submitted to the censorship authorities in Madrid, but never completed to his own satisfaction, and at some point declassified, redefined, and transformed to the status of a draft and a repository of images. Furthermore, based on observation of the symmetrical location of pairs of secondary folios, they suggested that all secondary folios were bifolia that were meant to make it possible in one single campaign to re-introduce folios that had previously become loose or for some reason been removed but were still available, creating at the same time placeholder-folios for removed folios that were not at hand any more, except some of the four Galvin-in-Getty folios, which Murúa apparently knew would remain unavailable. In other words, the daunting codicological and paleographical phenomena of the Galvin did not reflect *construction* (editing, addition, expansion), but *re-construction* (conservation) of the clean copy produced in 1596 in one single process. True, Murúa had on blank verso pages inscribed extra textual material to a number of the clean copied chapters, and Guaman Poma

<sup>23</sup> Murúa's autograph Preface to book 4, fol. 126v, is dedicated to Philip III (reigned from 1598) and hence written close to the year 1600: *Viendo la ocacion en las manos ... para sacar en limpio el presente libro no quixé ... contentarme con sola la ystoria y gouierno de los yngas [bks. 1–3] ... por ser muy falto sino hacerlo entero y cumplido poniendo aqui las grandezas y riquezas deste Reyno del Peru y la excelencias de la ciudade y villas que en el hay de españoles ... (para) que se pudiesen aprouechar de las curiosidades que en este Libro ay.* (Profiting from the opportunity ... of having the present book [bks. 1–3, 1590] clean copied, I could not feel content with the history and government of the Incas ... it would be very misleading if I did not complete it with the greatness and riches of this reign of Peru and the excellency of the Spanish cities ... so that one can profit from the curiosities in this book). Composed when Murúa's aim was still to send a Galvin-like version dedicated to Philip III, this Preface became irrelevant in later versions and has no correlate in the Getty.

<sup>24</sup> The copy of the review of the *curacas* copied on Galvin-in-Getty fol. 307v is in the professional scribal hand that has inscribed the Galvin clean copy, attested from the beginning of quire 2 (fol. 24).

had later added frontispieces in books 2–4 where Murúa had left blank areas (see, for example, Fig. 6), but this editing and expansion of the contents had nowhere taken place on added folios.

Before the reconstruction phase *c.*1615, that is, up to the submission of the Getty manuscript to royal censorship in 1616, the Galvin's original quire 1 had been much reduced (at least eight folios were lost, displaced, recycled elsewhere, etc., as were *ten bifolia*<sup>25</sup> of the following quires. Quire 1 was reconstructed, it seems, with only *ten* new bifolia of the secondary paper type, in two quires (1a and 1b) of five bifolia each, and quires 2, 3, 4, and 7 with *nine* new bifolia inserted into un- and re-sewn quires, all in all nineteen secondary bifolia (38 folios), on which were then pasted the original folios that were still at hand.<sup>26</sup> Twenty-two original Galvin folios were pasted onto twenty-two of the 38 new (secondary) folios. In most cases, the pasting took place only after clean copied text on the recto of the original folio had been copied onto the recto of the secondary folio, not, however, if the text was deemed to be outdated or irrelevant seen in relation to Murúa's aims with the reconstructed Galvin *c.*1615. For example, it made no sense *c.*1615 to copy a dedication to the long deceased king Philip II, no matter how exquisitely it had been clean copied in 1596.

It seems that a row of four folios in the far end of quire 7 were only removed later than *c.*1615, because their contents were confusing after the loss of folios of the chronicle proper: some cross-references to this area seem to have been crossed out earlier in the manuscript. However, the reconstruction of the Galvin, comprising a number of secondary folios which remained as "empty" chapters, clearly took place in one single and minutely planned campaign based on intimate knowledge of the Galvin's idiosyncratic chapter format, and much helped, no doubt, by the extant Table of contents. The aim of this *conservation* campaign must have been to produce a portfolio of images of Andean antiquities (with the chapters' background information) that could be the basis for illustrations of Murúa's final book (the Getty) if it passed royal censorship and found a printer willing to invest capital in the project (see Adorno 2008; Boserup 2015).

<sup>25</sup> Removed original bifolia of quires 2–7: 30+35, 32+33, 42+63, 43+62, 44+61, 52+53, 68+87, 136+156, 137+155, and 143+149.

<sup>26</sup> Original bifolium 43+62 was not replaced, since neither of its detached folios remained. Similarly, the reconstruction of original quire 1 was "condensed," taking account only of the then available remains of fols. 0–23 (texts and paintings).



In a few cases, Murúa had made extra textual additions, for example in lightly colored blank sky-areas at the top of Guaman Pomas frontispieces, but in all other instances, save for brief annotations that cannot be relatively dated, Guaman Poma's hand is the last that has touched the Galvin during the stages of its "making," necessarily at a point in time when Murúa was not active any more in the Galvin, but far advanced in further developing his chronicle, that is, rearranging and rewriting new versions with more and more contents until the final Getty version.

Giving Murúa time enough after the peer review of the *curacas* (1596), and the clean copying of books 1–4, to nevertheless dump the Galvin as royal dedication copy, decide how to proceed from there with his work, and make textual additions to chapters of books 2–4 on blank versos of the clean Galvin version of his chronicle, Adorno and Boserup deduced that Guaman Poma's posterior involvement in the history of the Galvin<sup>27</sup> had been "limited," and that it took place quite "late," that is, around 1600. Furthermore, they suggested that the *curacas*-version (1590) had not been illustrated, since there is no positive evidence to indicate that it was, and since the *curacas* had expressed great satisfaction with Murúa's prose style but not mentioned any illustrations.

#### *Cummins and Ossio 2013–15*

When Ossio had re-discovered the Galvin after its century-long disappearance, and when in 2004 he published his transcription of the newly discovered source, the twenty-two pasted folios seemed to him to confirm Ballesteros's vision of a manuscript made up of bits and pieces of other manuscripts (Ossio 2004, 11–25). This approach to the Galvin has been shared by Cummins in his research focused on the colored illustrations of the Galvin and Getty Murúa manuscripts, and after the Galvin in 2007 and 2008 had been on loan for technical examinations at the Getty Museum, five papers have appeared that from different angles reflect the remarkable persistence of Ballesteros's views even after the availability of the original Galvin. These five papers are: Cummins and Ossio 2013,

<sup>27</sup> Guaman Poma's involvement comprised: (a) Final drawn details on the paintings of Inca kings, as identified by Cummins 2015; (b) drawings of twelve coats of arms on the portraits of Inca queens; (c) frontispieces to chapters of books 2–4 and illustrations to the *Ficción* (preserved: eighty-eight drawings, full page or smaller); (d) annotations on drawings, see the corpus collected by Adorno and Boserup 2005, 241–43 (Appendix 6); (e) coats of arms in front matter.

and, in Cummins et al., eds., 2015, papers by Ossio,<sup>28</sup> Cummins, and Turner, as well as Karen Trentelman, senior scientist and head of the Collections Research Laboratory at the Getty Conservation Institute.

Cummins and Ossio have in their joint paper (2013) suggested that at least five of the illustrated and pasted folios of the Galvin originate from its five or six years older exemplar, the *curacas*-version (1590), transferred to and inserted into the Galvin in exactly the same manner as the four illustrated Galvin-in-Getty folios inserted into the Getty, that is, pasted full page onto blank folios or pages.<sup>29</sup> For Cummins and Ossio, however, the key evidence of a recycling of illustrated folios from the *curacas*-version of 1590 to the Galvin is based on their successful reading of the “hidden” texts mentioned above, achieved by using strong translucent light in the optimal research environment of the laboratories of the Getty Museum, and by combining this evidence with Turner’s collation of the Galvin made in 2007–08 and published in 2015. To date, Cummins and Ossio have described their approach and method by (a) referring to the *23 textos y acuarelas ... que fueron cortados y pegados* (23 removed and pasted texts and images),<sup>30</sup> and (b) exemplifying their preliminary results by listing and commenting on each of the suggested

<sup>28</sup> Ossio 2015 poses questions related to his and Cummins’s reading of four so-called “hidden” texts, omitting to mention Rowe’s name, his readings of obscured Galvin-in-Getty texts, and his ensuing important discoveries, which Ossio apparently does not agree with, since his understanding of the Galvin takes no account of them. Ossio’s discussion of opinions of Adorno and Boserup mostly takes his and Cummins’s own bold conjectures for given truths. I mention one instance among more where one of Ossio’s whims in few words reveals his insufficient familiarity with the basic facts of the Galvin codex, and at the same time exemplifies how his rash answers to his own queries appear narrowly conditioned by a prejudiced model of understanding of the Galvin: “The author probably intended to add more material to this book [bk. 3], because folio 87 ... shows a watermark that is inconsistent with the others in the same quire” (p. 16). Has Ossio overlooked that fol. 87 is part of the inserted bifolium 68+87 (secondary paper), cf. Turner 2015, 88? It is Nemesis, when Ossio in a footnote (p. 31, n. 19) authoritatively not only lauds Turner (2015) for “the first codicological study of the Galvin manuscript,” but also adds: “which all future studies should use as a basis for discussing the composition of the Galvin Murúa.”

<sup>29</sup> Cummins and Ossio 2013, 157: *todos ellos fueron pegados en folios en blanco los cuales en el Galvin todavía se ven pegados en páginas en blanco* (all of them were pasted onto blank folios, although those in the Galvin were pasted to blank pages).

<sup>30</sup> The number 23 is not a typo for 22. It is probably due to fol. 143, where text and image have been detached from one another and pasted in inverse order, probably because the image is not a frontispiece of a following chapter, but for once illustrates the text on the same page. It seems less probable that Ossio has included fol. 141 in the count of pasted folios (on fol. 141 as treated by Cummins and Ossio, see below, section 6).

five folios. In contrast to Adorno and Boserup they do not mention at all the clean copy aspect of the Galvin discovered by Rowe (1987), considering instead the Galvin to be an autograph manuscript that has expanded gradually (“produced in stages”), as Murúa needed it—and as described technically by Turner in her paper published two years later (2015). Cummins and Ossio write (2013, 152–53):

“... el manuscrito Galvin tal como existe actualmente es el resultado de una construcción en etapas. Contiene folios del manuscrito de 1590 así como añadidos y enmiendas que tuvieron lugar después de 1595. Por ejemplo, 23 textos y acuarelas en el manuscrito son folios que fueron cortados y pegados en folios que estaban en blanco. — — — No vamos a detallar estas distintas etapas, pero son múltiples; por ejemplo partes del manuscrito de 1590 (folio 1) preceden de modo inmediato a folios que fueron creados después de 1596 (folios 3 y 4). Estos folios post 1596 son seguidos por folios probablemente creados en 1590 (9v y 10r).”

(“The Galvin in its present state is the result of a construction in stages. It contains folios from 1590 as well as additions and emendations that were carried out after 1595. For example, 23 texts and watercolor images in the manuscript are folios that have been cut away and pasted to blank folios. ... We will not here detail all the stages, but there are many; for example, parts of the manuscript of 1590 [fol. 1] precede immediately folios that were created later than 1596 [fols. 3 and 4]. These post-1596 folios are followed by folios probably created in 1590 [9v and 10r]”)

Focusing their attention on graphics alone, Cummins and Ossio seem to have committed some basic errors in their approach to the Galvin. In general, when studying for example images embedded in the complex context of a codex structure and/or a structured text, lack of attention to codicological and paleographical evidence—or a selective interest in and use of such evidence assembled by others—involves the risk of falling prey to fallacies and other types of errors:<sup>31</sup>

1. By ignoring some of the most important evidence that can be extracted from the two available collations of the Galvin, that is, (a) the distinction between primary and secondary paper (as attested by watermarks), (b) the original presence, throughout, of the secondary paper stock in the form of bifolia on which all pasted folios are

<sup>31</sup> Apparently, Cummins and Ossio do not think that it is of importance to have and venture to state a clear opinion on some of the most fundamental paleographical issues: [Adorno and Boserup] llaman a éste [the hand of the clean copy] “amanuense 1”, aunque el amanuense podría ser el mismo Murúa. (Adorno and Boserup call him “Scribe 1”, although the scribe *could be* Murúa himself) (emphasis added). However, authors that are capable of clean copying 150 pages of their own text without changing a word are rare. If it happens, they have *acted* as a professional scribe, and that is the core issue in this discussion.

found, and (c) the presence on all rectos of the primary paper stock of a professional scribal hand, Cummins and Ossio have treated the Galvin as if it was not a clean copy with additional authorial inputs here and there (on verso pages, from a brief note to self to a full page addition plus a cross reference to the continuation on a final unused folio), but *throughout* as an autograph draft—as postulated by Ballesteros half a century ago. In other words, they confuse the concept of a draft with that of a clean copy.<sup>32</sup>

2. Cummins and Ossio have overlooked the all-important difference in the manner in which folios have been pasted in the Getty and the Galvin, respectively. In the Getty, they have *not* been attached by being pasted full page to blank folios, but by being pasted (tipped) at the gutter margin to an adjacent folio. Afterwards, a blank folio has been pasted full page over the text side of the inserted folio, since this text constituted a highly disturbing element in the flow of the Getty's chapters (see Boserup 2004, 82–84).<sup>33</sup> In the Galvin, all pasted folios were pasted on bifolia of the secondary paper stock. As further discussed below, the analogy between Galvin-in-Getty folios and the pasted folios of the Galvin is fallacious, putting *editing* and *conservation* into the same pot.
3. The previous fallacy presupposes even more basically a confused notion of “editing” in the material context of a codex structure, that is, that authorial editing can take place—except in single and very special situations—through the insertion of bifolia into existing quires. They overlook that every instance of an added bifolium will affect *two* symmetrically positioned locations within each quire. As shown by the two independent collations of the Galvin, there is nowhere in this codex a stub that may be interpreted as representing a blank bifolium

<sup>32</sup> In contrast, Turner has seen and stated clearly that the distinction between draft and fair copy is a decisive point of variance between the model of understanding of the Getty-team and that of Adorno and Boserup (2015, 107, n. 3): “The Adorno-Boserup model identifies the Galvin manuscript as having been written by a single scribe as a fair copy, and the unfinished qualities of the Galvin manuscript's present state being the result of that fair copy's “remaking” or [read: after] partial destruction, not the result of an additive process of “making,” as I argue here.”

<sup>33</sup> Boserup 2004a, 83: “Finalement Murúa a donc collé un feuillet vide ([84 bis]) contre le verso biffé du feuillet interpolé. Le feuillet vide n'a été inclus ni dans la foliotation ancienne secondaire, ni dans la foliotation moderne, puisqu'il formait une unité matérielle avec le feuillet précédent. On peut observer la même procédure pour les autres feuillets provenant de P [i.e. Galvin-in-Getty fols.]”

from the secondary paper stock, from which one half (one blank folium) had been severed because it served no purpose in Murúa's hypothetical editing (in contrast to the remaining half) and disturbed the flow of chapters. See further below.<sup>34</sup>

We will in the next section look closer at the five folios so far suggested by Cummins and Ossio to have originated from the 1590 *curacas*-version of Murúa's chronicle.

#### 6. THE GALVIN MURÚA (3): MIGRATIONS OF FOLIOS SUGGESTED BY CUMMINS AND OSSIO

Among the twenty-two pasted folios of the Galvin, those on fols. 1, 2 and 3 have been pasted without the text on the recto having been copied before being obscured by the pasted folio, and since Rowe had in 1979 discovered the 1596 clean copy of the peer review of the *curacas* on the reverse of a Galvin-in-Getty folio (Getty 207v; undoubtedly originating from the Galvin front matter), Cummins and Ossio had high expectations as to the revelations that might come out of reading the so-called "hidden" texts using non-ingressive technology available in the Getty Museum. One of the obscured texts (fol. IIr) turned out to be Murúa's never used dedication of his work to King Philip II (reigned 1556–1598), remarkably confirming Cummins's theory about the identity (Murúa-the-painter[?]) of the creator of the Galvin's twenty-five paintings, since the dedication includes the following words: ... *con el deseo de presentar a Va. Mag. ... [este] libro, dibujado de mi mano para que la variedad de las colores y la ynvención de la pintura ...* (... wishing to present to Your Majesty ... [this] book, illustrated by myself, so that the various colors and motifs of the painted illustrations ...).<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, Cummins and Ossio (2013) have successfully related the obscured texts of fols. I and II to texts of Guaman Poma in the *Nueva corónica*, now partly revealed as very much "inspired" by Murúa's comparable texts. Regrettably, however, these valuable parts of their paper contrast very much with their extraordinary conjectures regarding migrated folios, culminating with the gratuitous suggestion (pp. 166–69) that fol. 141 with the painting of the silver mountain of Potosí ... *podría ser parte de la etapa original en 1590 del*

<sup>34</sup> Including a discussion of the removed fols. [151–54].

<sup>35</sup> Against Rowe (1987), Cummins strongly rejects the idea that Murúa could be taking credit for work he has not done himself (2014, 55, n. 3).

*manuscrito* (... could be an element of the original stage in 1590 of the *curacas*-version of 1590).<sup>36</sup>

*Front Matter, Fol. 1: Title Page / Peruvian Landscape*

In 2007 and 2008, Cummins and Ossio succeeded in reading the text on the obscured side of the pasted-in folios of the Galvin, and they observed that the obscured Galvin title page (fol. 1r pasted onto fol. 1v) bears the date “1590,” as does the title page re-composed *c.*1615 (and taken as the date of completion of the Galvin in spite of the crystal-clear 1596 statement of the *curacas* to the effect that they peer-reviewed a version received five years earlier, and hence different from the Galvin):<sup>37</sup> Cummins and Ossio seem immediately to have interpreted “1590” as documenting unequivocally that the image on the visible reverse (fol. 1v), which represents an Andean landscape, was produced for the lost version of Murúa’s chronicle submitted in 1590 or 1591 to the *curacas* of Cuzco. However, Cummins and Ossio are aware that “1590” also appears on the more recent title page (fol. 1r), probably from *c.*1615, and correctly interpret this date as being nothing more than a copy of the date inscribed on its model. Even though Murúa took advantage of the re-construction of the Galvin to compose a new title, he left unchanged the date of completion (1590) of the three quarters of his work (books 1–3).<sup>38</sup> If Murúa *c.*1615 could still consider the Galvin to be a product of 1590, he would all the more have done so in 1596. But there is more: Cummins and Ossio have omitted to mention that there is in the Galvin another instance of “1590,” on a folio that is *not a pasted folio*, but a

<sup>36</sup> I have taken for granted that Cummins and Ossio here mean “version” and not “manuscript,” since there is no evidence that the *curacas*-version, viewed as a material manuscript, underwent *etapas* (stages).

<sup>37</sup> Ossio has since 1985 considered the peer review of the *curacas* to be a draft (2008, 11–15); Adorno and Boserup (2005; 2008) have argued in detail that the rediscovered Galvin proves Ossio’s postulate to be untenable.

<sup>38</sup> Four main variants of the title of Murúa’s chronicle are attested over the quarter of a century through which one can follow the stages in the development of Murúa’s chronicle. (1, Galvin, fol. 1r:) *La famosa ystoria de los yngas Reyes y señores del Piru ...*; (2, Galvin-in-Getty fol. 307v:) *Historia general e libro del origen y descendencia de los yncas señores deste Reyno obsidental del piru ...*; (3, Galvin, fol. 1r:) *Historia del orijen, y genealogía Real de los Reyes ingas del Piru*; (4, Getty, fol. 2r) *Historia general del Pirú, origen y decendencia de los yncas ...* Copies of ecclesiastical recommendations of Murúa’s work dated from 1611 to 1615 and bound together with the Getty (fols. 3–11) mention both the Galvin and the Getty in a number of different ways, including *La famosa ystoria*, i.e. the then still intact Galvin.

normal, primary folio inscribed by the professional scribal hand, that is, an integral part of the clean copy of 1596. At the end of the Table of contents, fol. 150r, one finds: ... *con que se da fin a este libro de la famosa ystoria de los yngas Reyes y señores que fueron deste rreyno del piru. año. de 1590* (... and with this chapter [bk. 4, ch. 16] ends the famous history of the Inca kings and rulers of this reign of Peru. Year 1590). Thus, the argument of Cummins and Ossio is fallacious, and there is no positive evidence that prevents the date “1590” from having been copied in 1596 from the title page of the lost *curacas*-version of 1590. On the contrary, the odds are definitely for “1590” being due to simple copying of such data as given by the exemplar of the Galvin.

The imprint date or colophon of a printed book focuses on the year of printing itself, *not* the time of production of the contents, and if a printed book is re-published, the year of printing is updated. This tradition has been dictated by the market since the fifteenth century. In contrast, when a manuscript is copied, the normal procedure for a scribe was to repeat the date given in the exemplar. It is a tradition of sound scholarship.<sup>39</sup> A paratextual note may sometimes focus on the scribe, his tedious work, and the date of completion of the copy, and sometimes such a note is repeated in the next instance and creates havoc in the chronology. Such elementary pitfalls are ignored at one’s peril.

*Front Matter, Fol. 2: Royal Dedication / Coat of Arms*

No specific argument for a 1590 origin of fol. II can be found in Cummins and Ossio 2013. Neither does Cummins 2015 argue for it. Since fol. I has fallen, fol. II also falls.

It can be assumed that the only reason why Cummins and Ossio have not, by some kind of implied “association,” re-assigned fol. III to the *curacas*-version, is that this pasted folio (praying *aclla*), as we have seen above, is very much out of place where it currently has been pasted, and it would have been absurd to remove it from the *curacas*-version in order to insert it in the front matter of the Galvin. We have seen above that the praying *aclla*’s relegation to the front matter can to a certain extent be explained materially, if she originally was the frontispiece to the *Ficción*, a position currently occupied by a rival *aclla*, pasted fol. 143 (on the recto, however,

<sup>39</sup> More and more often, today, publishers in some countries, as well as global online bookstores, carefully omit to reveal dates of both kinds.

rather than the verso, leaving the verso free, in principle, for the praying *acella*: fol. III remains without a totally satisfactory explanation).

*Book 1, Fols. 9 and 10: Portraits of Manco Capac and Sinchi Roca*

In the ultimate sentence of the passage quoted above as an exemplification of their model of understanding of the Galvin, Cummins and Ossio have stated without any further comment that pasted Galvin fols. 9v and 10r (see Fig. 7) “probably” originate from the 1590 version of Murúa’s chronicle: ... *folios probablemente creados en 1590 (9v y 10r)* (... folios probably created in 1590 [9v and 10r]). Since they are, respectively, the fourth and fifth pasted folios of the Galvin, it is possible that Cummins and Ossio, closing their eyes on the exceptional fol. 3, simply resume the chain of pasted folios (I and II) removed from the *curacas*-version and pasted into the Galvin. If that is the case, we must conclude that by initiating their common investigations with the front matter and the first dynastic portraits of the Galvin’s book 1, the method of Cummins and Ossio has not given any result, and has thereby, till now, only confirmed the model of Adorno and Boserup.

However, there is another possibility. Cummins and Ossio may in 2013 have had in mind the arguments later put forward on print by Trentelman in her report on the results of her analysis of colorants and palettes in selected areas of the paintings and drawings of the Galvin (Trentelman 2015). She points out (p. 122) that the painted portraits of fols. 9v and 10r (Inca king 1 Manco Capac and Inca king 2 Sinchi Roca) are distinguished from all the other examined images by the use of unmixed lead white: “Of all the illustrations in the Getty and Galvin manuscripts, these two are unique in being the only ones to contain areas in which the pigment lead white was used to create white features.” Boldly, and untypically, it must be said, for her stringent and fact-focused paper, Trentelman ventures an explanation outside of her area of excellence: “It is possible that these highlights were a later addition, perhaps by a different artist than the one who created the portraits” (pp. 121–2). This is indeed “possible,” as so much else, but is it also probable? At this point, Trentelman gives a general reference to Cummins 2015 (within the same book cover), where one expects to find her opinion confirmed, but the diligent reader becomes confused, for her evidence of “possible *later* addition” has in Cummins’s paper become evidence of *earlier* common origin, and Trentelman continues: “None-theless, the fact that white highlights and accents are found only on



these two illustrations suggests that they belonged to a common source before being pasted into the Galvin Murúa ...” (p. 122, see also p. 129). In the end, and true to his own and Ossio’s hypothetical identification of the *curacas*-version as the origin of all or most of the pasted folios of the Galvin, Cummins has brushed Trentelman’s suggestion aside and identified her “later addition” and “different artist” with his own Murúa-the-painter(?) acting in his own *curacas*-version up to 1590, the “common source before being pasted”: “It is clear that the first two Inca portraits in the Galvin manuscript, Manco Capac and Sinchi Roca, which are now placed facing each other, are entirely by Murúa’s hand, including all the details” (Cummins 2015, 50). This conclusion may very well be true, but it does not in any way amount to positive evidence for any of these two portraits to have originally belonged to Murúa 1590, as suggested two years earlier by Cummins and Ossio. Apparently, Cummins has realized, between 2013 and 2015, that neither the painter’s nor Guaman Poma’s artistic impact on the Galvin’s painted portraits (successfully identified by Cummins on the portraits of Inca kings) can be used to assign folios to this or that of the Murúa manuscripts. The painter—particularly if Cummins is right in identifying him with Murúa—could add finishing touches in the Galvin at any time, and Guaman Poma, we know, interfered anywhere there was some space for him to add Inca lore on the painter’s dynastic portraits. Thus, although the exact character of the relation between Murúa and Guaman Poma is still unknown, Cummins seems to be absolutely right, when he emphatically states regarding the drawn additions to the dynastic portraits that “there can be no doubt ... that Guaman Poma was employed to finish these details for Murúa’s images ...” (2015, 52). In other words, in spite of Cummins’s many acute observations of traces of Guaman Poma’s activity on some of the portraits of Inca kings, these details, however numerous and however varied, do not, in principle, differ from Guaman Poma’s drawings of Inca coats of arms on the portraits of the Inca queens, of which the great majority are *not* on pasted folios, but on primary folios of the 1596 Galvin clean copy (Galvin fols. 24–29 and 31; Getty fol. 63). In conclusion, it seems doubtful that Cummins still thinks that there is positive evidence that Galvin fols. 9v and 10r originate from the *curacas*-version.

Fig. 7 (next spread): Galvin Murúa, “pasted folios” on secondary bifolia fols. 9v and current (flipped) 10r [correctly 10v]. Dynastic portraits by Murúa-the-painter(?) of the first two Inca kings, Manco Capac and Sinchi Roca. Reproduced after Murúa 2004.

vicuitac ofacog tu cupim  
mama huaco azatac heta  
una quecha carman nypa  
vich carcan, manco capac  
quiquin cuyza suar mta  
ta -

ritaque enqta uel a  
cuyta a i tong o  
se en seruar ndi dnt  
quaboo mango capz man  
por sugeta  
y noioy

mango capac. l.  
Guma panaca. aylo -

llaca  
Zuqui  
Grasa de  
Nipa  
Sami  
ques morado.

esopa

ancallo

cupa

uru.



Sinchiroca. 2.  
Vauca panaca

Haca Augui

colcan panaca



Plus <sup>libro 4 de la historia</sup> Ultra

Eão fulcio .f.

collumās.  
eius.

elynga



cercos y minas de potoci -

## capitulo diez y seis de la villa ymperial de potosi y de sus riquezas

**A** lasientos de villa ymperial de potosi se llama una Potibiti Acausa que un natio de su nombre descubrio que se vio tan grande y rico de minas de plata despues de auer conquistado los Espanoles de Peru no de donde se canasado y numerables riquezas de plata, es e ser como muy grande como un grande acucar y muy alto Potitanle con un guilla como dos auedas y en su cima de este famoso cerro la corona ymperial. Por auer se descuberto y conquistado en tiempo de este cristianissimo y catolico Rey con los quintos que ay a no lozia de donde se intitularon stad baquilla, baquilla ymperial de potosi como tambien por ser de este cerro y mas ricas y riquizas y de los mas galanos y sumptuosos de todo el mundo aunque se temple es asperos y frío. Y assi mismo ay en este do reyno, otros muchos pueblos y lugares de espanoles y de canas madeyndios que no se ponen en este felice. Por buya de la probidad mas de que ay a mas de las yndias de muchos generos assi en el trage como en el lenguaje, ay ni mas ni menos como en espana castellanos los quales son los ynca del peru, y los sech lenos como los andaluzes y los collas como los gallegos y los V. ros como los castillos y los canas como los visayas nos y los ay maraques como los poruquezes y los de mas. Por ser siguiente y por ser tantas las naciones y yndias y valles y por poder saber tanta para ser na la, y papel para alo asentar, todo se deja, en un lenicio de un lagano de esta riqueza de plata, que de el se rodea ymperial villa de potosi a ser aido para a spana de la qual, ay participado y gozado entre dos los reynos y yndias del mundo, dejando fama por todo el, por la tierra mas rica y prospera, q. y gamas sea de descubrirse entre do el orbe y nea que es de baquilla, ay gran suma de yngenios que de debe de auer mas de quinientos donde se rene finallad baquilla, los quales muelen de la agua que cae de dos lagunas q. estan serpas a posta. Para dar de e fecho sobre el stad baquilla, en la qual ay un cerro poro, quias de yndios que se dice por su saciedad, auer mas de que ni entras mill animas que es de pueblo de gente mayor que ay en todas las yndias. Por auer tambien gran suma de gente de espanoles y de otros canos, assi negros como yndios de guerra que traen a cada dia gran suma de ellos a uender de los si bi. y guanace y de otras muchas partes tiene la mejor plata del reyno bastesida a si de plata, como de todo lo de mas. no se se se. Para el probey miento de la baquilla.

*Book 4, Fol. 141: Frontispiece of Chapter 16, On the Rich City of Potosí*

The last case discussed by Cummins and Ossio (2013, 166–68), Galvin fol. 141, is more complex than the previous two, and the one most in need of being critically reviewed, since this unique instance of unbridled conjectural criticism risks, if left uncommented, to become a precedent to wild speculations and undocumented suggestions of endlessly migrating folios from one manuscript to another.

The painting on Galvin fol. 141v (Fig. 8) is a symbolic image that in a spectacular way closes the chronicle proper, followed by the separate *Ficción* gorgeously illustrated by Guaman Poma, the Table of contents of all four books, and finally the single-page “Weaving schema of a famous *chumbi* (scarf).” Guaman Poma, when coming across this painting at a later point in time, added a down-to-earth caption similar to the topographical captions he also added to many of his drawings in the *Nueva corónica*. In keeping with the fantasy drawings of cities and landscapes, which he at that point had added as frontispieces to ten out of the fifteen previous chapters of book 4, he added the strictly factual caption *cerro y minas de potoci* (mountain and mines of Potosí). Guaman Poma seems, however, to have well remembered the image and its potent symbolism, cf. the *Nueva corónica*, pp. [1065] and [1066].

The painting of fol. 141v shows “the silver mountain” consubstantially united with *el ynga* (the Inca) and sustaining the two crowned columns that symbolize the authority and power of Spain. The title and text of the chapter (fol. 142r) facing the frontispiece painting (fol. 141v) underscores the unique importance of *la grandísima riqueza de plata que del cerro .... ha salido para España, de la cual han participado y gozado en todos los Reinos y provincias del mundo, dejando fama por todo él ser la tierra más rica y próspera que jamás se ha descubierta en todo el orbe* (the enormous importance of the richness of silver, that from the mountain ... comes to Spain, in which one shares and from which one benefits in all the world’s kingdoms and provinces, spreading fame everywhere that it is the richest and most prosperous country that has ever been discovered in the whole world). The same theme can be found in the additional text, which Murúa later inscribed on the blank verso of fol. 142 (blank

Fig. 8 (previous spread): The Galvin Murúa, fols. 141v and 142r. Frontispiece by Murúa-the-painter(?) to chapter 16 of book 4 “On the imperial city of Potosí and its riches.” Guaman Poma’s caption reads *cerro y minas de potoci* (mountain and mines of Potosí). Reproduced after Murúa 2004.

and never liable to host a frontispiece since the chapter is not followed by more chapters or books of the chronicle proper). This additional text of chapter 16 calls the mountain “*bolsa de Dio*” (God’s purse), and refers directly to the image on fol. 141v (... *como se ve por esta pintura. Pues dize el inga, “ego fulcio colum[n]as eius”*<sup>40</sup> – *como señor y poseedore deste gran serro con lo qual el piru queda contento y españa pagada* (... as one can see on this painting. For the Inca says: “I sustain her columns”—as master and possessor of this great mountain by which Peru is thankfully satisfied, and Spain is paid its well-earned due), referring back to an earlier statement to the effect that in return for Spain’s gift to Peru of Christianity, salvation, etc., Peru delivers to Spain the fruits harvested from the entrails of the rich mountain, worth between six and seven million ducats per year. This politically correct comment of Murúa-the-chronicler to the Inca-focused and potentially subversive image by Murúa-the-painter(?) underscores the latter’s adequacy as an ambivalent frontispiece to the final and “concluding” chapter of the chronicle: *Capitulo dies y seis de la uilla ymperial de potosí y de sus rriquesas* (Chapter 16 on the imperial city of Potosí and its riches).

Under normal circumstances, the frontispiece on fol. 141v would seem to be very well adapted to the final chapter on the city of Potosí, with its focus on the *cerro rico* (rich mountain), and necessarily made after May 1596, since it is the frontispiece of a chapter in the fourth book and thus on no account a part of the material submitted to the *curacas* in 1590. However, no image can feel secure when image-hunters are on the lookout for potentially migrated folios to redefine and move around. Thus, Cummins and Ossio would very much prefer the painting to have been made for the *curacas*-version, that is, they have wished to liberate it from book 4 and the clean copy of 1596. For intrepid scholars, the road from wish to proof is short and easy.

Cummins and Ossio (2013, 166–68) propose that the drawing was originally on a folio (with a blank reverse) situated in the front matter of the Galvin—or rather, as they add on second thoughts: the front matter of the *curacas*-version! But was there any front matter in that version, and why in the front matter? Because the *curacas*-version, one must remember, had no book 4 on Peru’s cities. Furthermore, in that position, according to Cummins and Ossio, the Potosí-drawing illustrated extremely well the riches of *Peru in general* rather than those of Potosí

<sup>40</sup> Ossio 2004, p. 246, transcribes “Ego Juicio colognas eius.” The image has “Ego fulcio collumās eius.”

in particular, although (!) Murúa, they suggest, after May 1596, nevertheless found it better adapted to illustrate the new chapter on the city of Potosí and its famous mountain. The insertion, they further explain, was done by the scribe *in scribendo*, since today fol. 141 has on its recto the text of chapter 15 on the city of La Paz, and the texts and images flow without the slightest indication of migration and reworking from fol. 140 to 141 and from fol. 141 to 142.

It is clear that with such misuse of the methods of serious codicological investigations there is literally no end to the number of Galvin folios, whether pasted or not, that with a little bit of fantasy and resolve can be demonstrated to belong to the *curacas*-version—or to any other draft or manuscript, for that matter.<sup>41</sup>

Is there any apparent evidence that substantiates the absurd multi-conjecture of Cummins and Ossio? Since they thank Turner for her help in codicological matters in general, and in particular in relation to fol. 141 (2013, 167, note 26), they may have relied on information imparted to them from her investigation of material evidence of the composition of the ultimate quire of the Galvin codex, i.e. that fol. 141 “is” a singleton. Cummins and Ossio would then have seen in this fact an opportunity to speculate on the possibility to detach fol. 141 from its present location and redefine its original location as somewhere in the (possible, but not evidenced) front matter of the *curacas*-version. However, the collation published two years later by Turner (2015, 88–89) indicates, firstly, that fol. 141 is not a unique, migrated singleton, but one of a series of four *current* singletons (fols. 141–44), and, secondly, that all four were *originally* the first halves of *bifolia* of which the second halves (fols. [151–54]) had been removed, but not reinstalled by being pasted to four new secondary bifolia, contrary to fols. 136+156 and 137+155 (or whichever other scenario one can imagine that allows for secondary fols. 136 and 137 to include pasted primary Galvin folios). In other words, Turner’s collation of quire 7 disproves the too self-complacent series of speculations of Cummins and Ossio.

In spite of a generous harvest of new and precise data on the Galvin, it seems impossible, on the basis of the evidence that has hitherto been made available from the technical examinations of the Galvin (collation and colorants), to make an unequivocal case for the presence of illustrations in the *curacas*-version of Murúa’s chronicle, and for the recycling of

<sup>41</sup> For a model of how to proceed with a complex, autograph, and much reworked codex (as Cummins and Ossio erroneously believe the Galvin to be), see Derolez 2015.



any such illustration in the Galvin. As mentioned above, it must be kept in mind in order to avoid serious fallacies, that the transposition of Galvin images to the Getty, known since the 1980s, serves a very precise and unique aim, that is the completion of a series of royal portraits up to the submission of the Getty manuscript to the royal censorship authorities in Madrid, and it cannot be compared to the pasted folios of the Galvin or be taken as a manifestation of a particular inclination of Murúa to move illustrated folios from one draft or manuscript to another.

*A Few More Words on “Hidden” Texts*

Cummins and Ossio have successfully read hitherto obscured front matter texts of the pasted folios of the Galvin, promptly and generously closing some annoying gaps in the available evidence. These texts throw new and important light on aspects of Guaman Poma’s reuse, not to say plagiarism, of texts he read in the Galvin and apparently copied for his own future benefit. According to Cummins and Ossio, such “hidden” texts are manifested both in the Galvin and by the Galvin-in-Getty folios, but the “hiding” of the latter folios, as shown above, is not at all analog to the obscuring of text on pasted folios. Because they believe that these texts were deliberately “hidden” rather than simply left un-copied and obscured because the texts had become obsolete, Cummins and Ossio have also speculated a lot on the possible reason for “hiding” them, and seriously inquired how Guaman Poma could have had access to such texts that Murúa had carefully “hidden”—without, however, reaching any conclusion at all.<sup>42</sup> Around 1615, there was no need to copy texts without relation to images, so texts on pasted fols. Ir, IIr, and IIr were simply left to be obscured. In contrast, when Galvin-in-Getty folios were pasted along the gutter margin to Getty folios with a minimal amount of adhesive, the texts on the reverse of the images disturbed the flow of the Getty text, and blank folios were pasted full page on them so as

<sup>42</sup> For example (Cummins and Ossio 2013, 159, regarding Galvin-in-Getty fol. 307): *Cuando y porqué Murúa decidió oscurecer o, mejor dicho, ocultar este texto no es claro* (It is unclear when and why Murúa took the decision to obscure or, better said, to hide this text). Rowe (1987) famously accused Murúa of lying about his sources; did he lie about having himself made the paintings of the Galvin? Probably not, as argued by Cummins 2015. However, even if he did lie in his dedication to the king about this matter, there is no reason to believe that it was the reason why fol. IIr was left obscured. What characterizes all the un-copied and obscured texts is that their contents were obsolete and disturbing in the c.1615 context of both the Galvin and the Getty.

to make irrelevant and disturbing text invisible (see Boserup 2004a, 83; von Euw 1982, 309).<sup>43</sup> Until *c.*1615, the Galvin was undamaged, and Guaman Poma, busy as an artist in the late 1590s throughout the still intact Galvin, would have had ample occasion to read, copy, and keep for his own future use all the front matter texts of the Galvin.

#### *Default Assumptions and Positive Evidence*

Referring to Adorno and Boserup (2008, p. 15 and n. 38), Cummins seems to suggest that they naively imagine that they have proved the non-existence of illustrations in the *curacas*-version by pointing out that there is no positive evidence that supports the assumption (2014, 58, n. 16). However, what Adorno and Boserup wrote in 2008, and that Cummins is unhappy about, was that the *curacas*-version “probably” was not illustrated (since no positive evidence to the contrary had been produced). Cummins further summarized the point of view of Adorno and Boserup, setting his own point of view to be the simple and unquestionable truth against which all other opinions must fail miserably. He thus takes for granted the existence of his and Ossio’s hypothetically illustrated *curacas*-version: “As *the* illustrations [in the *curacas*-version] are not mentioned in the [*curacas*-]letter, ... Adorno and Boserup presume *the* illustrations did not exist initially,” and “There may have been a [un-illustrated] working draft prior to *the one* [the *curacas*-version] that *is extant* [by way of its migrated folios]” (explicitations and emphasis added). However, such dogmatic polemics lead nowhere. Illustrations in the *curacas*-version can only be mentioned with the definite article, and the *curacas*-version itself

<sup>43</sup> Cummins (2015, 41) disregards the Galvin’s inserted bifolia when he writes that the same working process was used for inserting folios into the Galvin and the Getty: “... Galvin images that were pasted onto blank folios in the Getty Murúa ... we see *the same working process in both manuscripts, an important point, to which I will return*” (emphasis added). He thus ignores not only Boserup 2004a (see also Adorno and Boserup 2005, 208–9; 2008, 35–36), but also Turner’s precise annotation in the Getty facsimile. Adorno and Boserup (2008, 36) wrote that Murúa *intended* to paste the Galvin-in-Getty folios to blank frontispiece *pages* of the Getty, but instead, another technique was used (by another than Murúa, misunderstanding his instructions?); in fact, bifolia make all the difference between a major conservation campaign and occasional additions of singletons. Cummins’s often unprecise mention of material facts of the Galvin and Getty is further evidenced on p. 41, where he writes about the pasted-in folios with dynastic portraits of Murúa-the-painter(?), ignoring or misunderstanding Turner’s collation: “These folios, which have been pasted onto blank folios *and combined with additional new quires*, are from the earliest known redaction” (emphasis added). Which *additional* new quires besides the blank folios?

can only be called “extant” if there is positive evidence that there were illustrations in it, and that extant folios do originate from it, respectively.

Adorno and Boserup have no vested interests in the lack of illustrations by Murúa-the-painter(?) in the *curacas*-version of 1590. If Cummins and Ossio come up with solid evidence to the contrary, rather than dogmas and speculations rooted in Ballesteros’s outdated view based on a fraction of the evidence available since 2004, related scholarship will of course take a fresh start from that point, but neither Cummins nor Ossio has to date produced any such positive evidence. What Adorno and Boserup have maintained again and again through a decade is that after the appearance of Murúa 2004 the default assumption regarding the Galvin’s twenty-two pasted folios is that each and every one of them originates from the Galvin itself. They have also maintained that their model of interpretation offers simple explanations of otherwise inexplicable codicological, paleographical, and literary-compositional evidence of the Galvin.

#### 7. THE GALVIN MURÚA (4): DIGRESSION ON TURNER’S THEORY OF “UNFINISHED HISTORY”

##### *“Construction by Stages”*

The attractively produced collection of essays entitled *Manuscript Cultures of Colonial Mexico and Peru. New Questions and Approaches* (Cummins et al., eds., 2015) contains in its initial Peruvian section four papers (pp. 11–64 and 85–138) that from diverse specialized disciplines and vantage points address the issue of the genesis and early history of the Galvin. Through numerous cross-references, a strong case is apparently built for the model of understanding of the Galvin suggested by Cummins and Ossio (2013), diametrically opposed to that of Adorno and Boserup (2005; 2008; Boserup 2015).<sup>44</sup> Turner’s paper is particularly important for the

<sup>44</sup> In October 2008, Adorno and Boserup were kindly invited to contribute to the volume, but declined, having already argued at length for their views on the Galvin and Getty Murúas (Adorno and Boserup 2005; 2008), and were generously allowed during a seminar at the Getty in October 2008 to verify on the original Galvin codex the opinions they had formed regarding the codicological structure of this manuscript on the basis of the facsimile published in 2004. Regarding the materiality of the Getty Murúa, its paleography and transpositions of folios, etc., Adorno and Boserup have had access to a copy of the complete microfilm copy owned by the J. Paul Getty Museum, and they had thoroughly collated the codex (cf. Adorno 2004; 2008; Boserup 2004) during several

present discussion of the possible provenance of the Chaves drawing, since it addresses evidence on binding and codicological data of the Galvin assembled when the codex was on loan in the Getty Museum for technical examinations. In fact, Turner 2015 establishes retrospectively, one can say, the theoretical foundation of the understanding of Cummins and Ossio (2013) of the Galvin as a manuscript that has evolved through successive material “reworkings”—i.e. extractions, additions, transpositions, etc., of folios with new or additional *contents*. On the way, the Galvin is elevated to be a particularly representative example of a distinct *species* of Early Modern manuscripts invented by Turner and termed by her “unfinished history,” as stated in the startling title of her paper: “Accounting for Unfinished History. How Evidence of Book Structure Provides a New Context for the Making of the Galvin and Getty Murúas.” In her own words, Turner proposes “a hitherto-unrecognized bookmaking context” for the Galvin as well as the Getty (and the *Nueva corónica!*), all pertaining to her postulated category of “unfinished history.” Turner distinguishes between, on the one hand, what she calls

“a traditional context of western European illuminated text manuscripts, where books were copied from an exemplar into loose bifolia and bound upon completion”

and, on the other hand:

“the European notarial tradition of accounting, or “record-keeping,” book structures—specifically, blank stationers’ books and archival bindings that allowed for sections and folios to be added over time” (Turner 2015, 86).

Is there any sense in comparing medieval illuminated luxury parchment codices produced as copies of more or less frozen versions of devotional books<sup>45</sup> with Early Modern creative composition on a paper medium, in some cases including the author’s own drawings, maps, schemas, etc.? Do such a contrasting comparison yield an adequate starting point for proposing a novel “bookmaking context,” when the genres, broadly speaking, differ as water and fire? However dubious the implications of such a comparison may be, if understood as a theory

visits to the Getty Museum in 2001–3, each time being given excellent study conditions and curatorial help in the Special Collections Reading Room.

<sup>45</sup> Some of these are known to have been reworked at later points in their early history, but this must not be confused with creative authors’ editing of their own works.

of how creative writing in the Early Modern era was practiced—that is, how authors would revise, expand, or reduce the *contents* of their written works—Turner’s theory perfectly fits Cummins and Ossio’s model of understanding of the Galvin as quoted above in section 5: *el resultado de una construcción en varias etapas* (the result of a construction in diverse stages) (Cummins and Ossio 2013, 152). Both Cummins and Ossio refer to Turner’s paper with great satisfaction in their respective papers from 2015, Cummins hailing it as a “scrupulous and rigorous study of the real manuscript”—in contrast, sad to say, to the “preliminary work, which has required radical revision,” produced by Adorno and Boserup (Cummins 2014, 57, note 9).

There is, however, a problem. Turner’s theory fits Cummins’s and Ossio’s idea of the Galvin’s genesis, but it does not fit the evidence of the Galvin, nor does it contribute to an understanding of the Getty Murúa and the *Nueva corónica*, be they considered as manifestations of Turner’s vague concept of “unfinished history” or as what they both are: completed and clean copied *finished histories*. Turner’s inclusion of these two codices in her investigation—the *Nueva corónica* “by association”—defeats comprehension. What are the facts? Is there evidence that these three codices represent “unfinished histories”? In the Getty, professional modern rebinding has erased much evidence on how the few but real instances of authorial “reworking” were originally made. However, it seems clear that Murúa achieved them by pasting (tipping) new or removed folios to other folios at the gutter margin (see Boserup 2004a, Table 3: on fols. 19–21).<sup>46</sup> In the *Nueva corónica*, besides at least one similar case of tipping a bifolium (four pages) to an adjacent folio (pp. [978–81], Adorno and Boserup 2003, 128), the basic clean copy has been expanded with two small quires containing the famous “Camina el autor” chapter (pp. [1104–1139]), but in contrast to what Turner’s theory of bookmaking in the domain of “unfinished history” would suggest, Guaman Poma did not integrate them immediately into the bound or stitched book block (see further below). Finally, with regard to the Galvin, if one excepts the pasted folios that Adorno and Boserup have suggested and argued represent repair and conservation

<sup>46</sup> In the Getty, reworking is most clearly exemplified by the “unnumbered chapter” (Boserup 2004a, 88). Being a pragmatic man, Murúa left it in this state in view of it being integrated in the overall chapter numbering when the Getty would be typeset, instead of renumbering all the following chapters of book 1. A significant example is also the added “unnumbered” chapter between chapters 8 and 9 of book 3, a bifolium in Murúa’s hand tipped to fol. 328v, see Murúa 2008, fol. 329r. Nothing of the kind is attested in the Galvin.

(re-construction), Turner does not give one single example of “reworking” of *contents* by the addition of material with more contents than there were before, neither by tipping extra folios (singletons), nor by addition of secondary bifolia requiring the kind of un- and rebinding that her paper purportedly deals with. What Turner’s collation shows and *confirms* is, firstly, an initial codex structure of seven quires, and, secondly, the removal of 22 bifolia, followed, thirdly, by a *conservation campaign* aiming at recreating the partly dismantled codex with 19 new bifolia and the 22 removed original folios that were still available.

Believing in Cummins and Ossio’s idea that the Galvin was “produced in stages,” Turner discusses how the contents of manuscripts can be expanded, but she does it by focusing on one very particular technical variant—exemplified by the Galvin, she thinks—which, however, turns out to be something quite different: a conservation campaign.

#### *Pre-Bound Stationary*

Turner considers “pre-bound stationary” to have been a normal basis on which to compose and expand “unfinished histories.” However, the evidence Turner has at hand within the narrow range of the three illustrated Peruvian manuscripts that are extant and taken into consideration by her is a certain variation of the size of quires of each manuscript. In the Galvin, as shown by her collation, if we go back in time as far as possible, the number of bifolia of each of the quires 2–7 is: 9, 11, 14, 10, 12, and 11, foliated 24–150 without breaks (including small, occasional irregularities), and inscribed with numbered chapters of books 1–4 (1–27, 1–16, 1–73, and 1–16, likewise without breaks). Does this look like a narrative inscribed in some kind of standardized, pre-bound stationary? Would the quires not have had the same size? Or shall we believe, for example, that these quires in a piece of pre-bound stationary all had ten bifolia, which over time were reduced by one bifolium and expanded by eight bifolia? Turner deals with the matter in a purely theoretical manner, and as her “new bookmaking context” is undocumented in relation to the reality of the Galvin, there is no other way than to revert to the traditional concept of how the manuscripts of creative authors were “made” manually from a stack of blank sheets folded and assembled in quires that eventually were stitched or bound.

Like the Galvin, the *Nueva corónica* and the Getty Murúa also have varying sizes of quires without any evidence of reworking by addition

of bifolia through authorial un- and rebinding. Regarding the *Nueva corónica*, this codex displays many types of authorial reworkings (Adorno 1980, xxxii–xlvi; 2002, 23–30). Of particular relevance here is the “Camina el autor” chapter. It fills two small quires, tailored to the size of the chapter (nine bifolia, or thirty-six pages), and it was planned to be inserted between two quires where one chapter ends and another begins (the only neat way to add a whole quire in the highly structured medium that a codex represents), but Guaman Poma did not immediately un- and rebind; instead, this chapter was tucked in loosely where it belonged, but later, in spite of Guaman Poma’s very extensive repagination, which defined precisely where “Camina el autor” belonged, it was eventually stored elsewhere in the codex and at some point also fastened there during rebinding in the nineteenth century carried out within the Royal Library and without sufficient codicological analysis of the book, but the two quires (and some other) were re-assigned to their intended and correct locations in 1927.<sup>47</sup>

The Getty is very regular, but it does have two quires half the size of all the others, and thus testifies, together with the *Nueva corónica* and the Galvin, against the relevance, for such exceptionally high-profiled and exquisitely clean copied manuscripts, of the concept of “pre-bound stationary.” Some may today, comparing with print and with mediaeval luxury codices, find Early Modern dedication copies primitive, rough and irregular, and the workmanship evidently varies greatly according to historical and social context. *Mutatis mutandis*, however, the professional scribal hands of Early Modern times created in *their* social and historical milieus the equivalents of medieval luxury manuscripts, uniquely planned and crafted, and appreciated for the fine materials and careful work invested in achieving the finest possible result.

### *Watermarks*

Due to the high quality of the photography and reproduction work of the Galvin facsimile, Adorno and Boserup were in a few cases capable of identifying watermarks. Sufficiently, in fact—by combining these data with other types of codicological data—to be able to reconstruct the *original state* of the Galvin (Adorno and Boserup 2005, Appendix 2, 236–38), which for quires 2–7 corresponds throughout to what can be deduced from the annotation to Turner’s collation primarily

<sup>47</sup> For a discussion of the completeness of the *Nueva corónica*, see Boserup 2004b.

displaying the *present state* of the codex. However, Adorno and Boserup could not in the facsimile edition identify the locations of twelve “interquire singletons,” but they identified correctly the extent of the single quires by settling on that single solution of the “problem” that abided most simply to the material “rules” of the construction of a codex. The resulting mapping of the quires turned out to render otiose all speculations regarding the addition of folios or quires up to the dismantling and conservation events *c.*1615, which included the distinctive addition of seventeen bifolia to support the pasted reinsertion of the twenty-two previously removed folios, as well as the representation by “empty” chapters of a similar amount of lost or unavailable folios—including the four Galvin-in-Getty folios.

Turner’s investigation of the Galvin offers a valuable addition to the common fund of evidence regarding the Galvin, since she has registered all watermarks on original, non-pasted folios, thus documenting that the original clean copy derives from one single paper stock (EA-cross watermark), as is the case for watermarks of the other two identified paper stocks, AM and in particular PD-hand, which together cover the seventeen secondary bifolia.<sup>48</sup> Regrettable, as mentioned above, is the lack of exhaustive information on watermarks of the twenty-two pasted folios, since they constitute the key to the understanding of the conservation campaign of *c.*1615, which radically and forever degraded not the then already maimed contents of the Galvin, but in particular the hybrid appearance of its first 23 folios (quire 1).<sup>49</sup>

<sup>48</sup> I take the opportunity to apologize for an error of registration of the watermark of the original Galvin and Galvin-in-Getty paper stock: “EA-cross” (see the collation of Turner 2014, 88–89), *not* “AM-cross.” The error, initially committed in Adorno and Boserup 2005, p. 151, and repeated in Adorno and Boserup 2008, p. 17 with Appendix 2, in relation to Galvin-in-Getty fols. 79, 84, 89, and 307, was unfortunately also repeated by my fault in Murúa 2008, pp. 65, 66 and 72 in the annotation to the four folios.

<sup>49</sup> The facsimile edition displays clearly a PD-hand watermark on 2r, (bifolium 2+11) not registered by Turner. So, too, on fol. 23 (bifolium 14+23). Apparently, Beta-Radiography or similar non-invasive technology was not used to complete the collation of watermarks not visible with the naked eye. The lack of any marking of pasted folios without visible watermark (all except fols. 16 and 52) has in Turner’s collation had the further negative consequence that secondary folios are only marked (in red) when a watermark is “visible.” This significantly skews the impression given of the materiality of quires 1a and 1b, as well as bifolium 52+53 and fol. 63 (originally conjoint with current fol. 42/43 marked red). As noted above, neither the existence nor the watermark evidence of the four Galvin-in-Getty folios have been registered in Turner’s collation made on 9 April 2008 (Turner 2015, 107, n. 4). The watermark evidence of the four Galvin-in-Getty fols (primary paper stock) is: (1) no watermark on Galvin [front matter] (coat of arms of



By chance, however, some very important data of the pasted folios have been included in Turner's collation (2014, 88–89), that is, in the annotation to fols. 16v and 52v, both marked "EA-cross on pasted." Together with Galvin-in-Getty fol. 89, this makes three instances of pasted folios from the same paper stock as the basic clean copy of the Galvin, and hence matching the model of Adorno and Boserup, but of course not settling the debated main issue: Do the registered phenomena reflect *construction* (addition) or *reconstruction* (conservation)? Since neither the watermarks of the *curacas*-version nor those of the lost Galvin folios are known, that issue can only be decided by comparing the degree of meaningfulness of the result of the two "models of understanding."

### *Evidence of Rebinding and Editing*

Turner has shown through a series of measurements that the Galvin has been rebound and recalibrated so as to host a manuscript that has expanded in thickness by thirteen millimeters (2015, 101). This seems to account, on the one hand, for the *loss* of about twenty original bifolia on thin paper, and, on the other hand, for the *addition* of approximately the same number of new bifolia on somewhat thicker paper,<sup>50</sup> plus the full page pasting-on of twenty-two of the original folios on thin paper. Turner agrees with Cummins and Ossio that the Galvin has been "constructed in stages" (Cummins and Ossio 2015, 152), and she argues that it is very easy to unbind and rebind the kind of limp parchment binding in question (provided that no glue is used on the back of the quires in order to stabilize the book block, which does, however, happen, as Turner concedes), implying that this could very well have happened a number of times in the Galvin, and that un- and rebinding by the author was a customary aspect of the "bookmaking

Peru) = Getty 307; (2) no watermark on Galvin 32 (queen Raba Ocllo) = Getty 79 (no watermark, as expected on original Galvin bifolium 32+33); (3) no watermark on Galvin 52 (Inca king in procession) = Getty 84 (no watermark, as expected on original Galvin bifolium 52+53, but Turner's collation does not reveal that original 53 has been pasted on secondary fol. 52); (4) EA-cross on Galvin 61 (Inca queen in procession) = Getty 89 (watermark, as expected on original Galvin bifolium 44+61).

<sup>50</sup> Besides the more than ten original bifolia of quires 1a + 1b, the following ten original bifolia were removed from the codex structure: fols. 30+35, 32+33, 42+63, 43+62, 44+61, 52+53, 68+87, 136+156, 137+155, and 143+149. Bifolium 54+62 was not replaced by a secondary bifolium.

context” of “unfinished history.” However, Turner’s own description and illustrations (both of the original binding and of the 3-D model of the Galvin binding she has created) suggest only two, very distinct, thicknesses: one being the original binding of the clean copied manuscript book, and one being the single final rebinding after completion of the c.1615 conservation campaign and rebinding, rather than a series of rebindings. It seems, therefore, that the evidence of rebinding collected by Turner confirms that the expansion of the book block was the result of one single conservation campaign of the Galvin—as completely as it could be achieved after a major partial dismantling that involved significant losses.

The fact that the Galvin displays no example of *materially manifested* “reworking” of the *contents* does not imply that Murúa did not rework or at least add more textual material to the clean copied text during a certain period of time, until Guaman Poma, so to say, “closed” the Galvin by filling out all remaining blank spaces with his drawings. The Galvin nowhere has any trace of authorial or editorial reworking of contents through removal-cum-addition of folios, bifolia, or quires—in contrast to what is found in a few cases in the Getty and the *Nueva corónica*. The Galvin thus does include additions of text to the existing and unchanged clean copy, all on verso pages: none has taken place in connection with the addition of folios. Some overly long additions overflowing the readily available verso page were originally made to continue on the last blank pages following fol. 150v.<sup>51</sup> When the Galvin was full, what happened was not that the volume was unbound and further quires added at the

<sup>51</sup> Cross-references in Murúa’s hand evidence that additional texts may have been inscribed on up to six unused blank folios following the Table of contents and the final “schema of a famous *chumbi*” (150v). They are all missing today (cut away as useless, since without images, is a fair guess), except the original and illustrated fol. [155], which was pasted onto fol. 143r, because here, exceptionally, Guaman Poma had found space for an illustration, although there was no new chapter to introduce with a frontispiece: the reference at the end of book 3, chapter 43 (fol. 95r) *en este Reyno Uuo mayor, fo. 155* is picked up in the current state of the Galvin by pasted-on fol. 143r beginning with *En este Reno del piru abia mayor Primor* ... On original fol. 143r, finding space for a drawing but no chapter to introduce with a frontispiece, Guaman Poma, exceptionally, had illustrated a text situated *above* his drawing, but when the folio was reinstalled, the sequence was inverted, so that the drawing came to precede the illustrated text, as *all* images in the Galvin do (except the displaced fol. IIIv [praying *aclla*]). It testifies to the great care and deep understanding of the layout and evolution of the Galvin, with which the repair of the Galvin was carried out—probably by Murúa himself or under his direct supervision. It may also indicate that Murúa intended the Galvin to be used eventually by a printer of the Getty manuscript, who would have to

end or here and there. Instead, one must envision that Murúa created a new version of his chronicle, partly copying, partly rewriting and expanding the text on the basis of the Galvin's clean copy with additions and quotations that he had collected in the meantime; this in turn became a new draft eventually further edited and clean copied by a professional scribe or by Murúa himself. Turner's "additive process" is too simplistic (and too much inspired by modern word-processing) to give an adequate impression of the complexity of pre-digital creative writing, and of how many aspects of the Galvin represent quite normal phases of work in such a process.

Ballesteros's vision of numerous "parallel" drafts, although evidence is lacking, was in a way much closer to probable historical reality than a one-size-fits-all concept of an "additive process" involving un- and rebinding. However, Ballesteros was misled by the scanty evidence available to him, and he misrepresented the Galvin as merely chaotic, while the new Galvin evidence since 2004 confirms that the conservation campaign was meticulously carried out according to a sensible plan, although it involved much copying.

Copying by hand was until Word-processing part of any writing process. The Galvin Murúa (before it was disassembled, etc.) did not in one editing phase metamorphose into the Getty Murúa. An unknown number of intermediary versions are not evidenced, because only the last of a series would be preserved (cf. the Getty and the *Nueva corónica*), with the exception of textually outdated versions with, for example, precious images which were difficult and tedious to copy correctly (as exemplified by the Galvin and the very poorly illustrated Loyola copy). Murúa-the-painter(?) may have continued to add details to his Galvin paintings as long as he thought he would use this particular manuscript as a presentation copy for the king. Having abandoned this plan and begun work on the next version, he redefined the Galvin into a kind of all-purpose notebook and artistic portfolio for storing material for later use—not least his own(?) paintings, and the artwork of Guaman Poma.

Along the path of such a repetitive process of copying and rewriting, Murúa may have learnt many lessons, for example, that it was not smart, as he had done in the Galvin (and possibly in the *curacas*-version) to predefine all chapters to consist of exactly one handwritten page each.

be instructed correctly in how images and texts were related to one another in the rich repository of "Indian" images of the Galvin.

Nor was it smart to illustrate versions of his work that would anyway risk being turned into drafts.<sup>52</sup> There is no other way to explain the abyss between the *text* of the Galvin and the *text* of the Getty, although Cummins, with a reminiscence of a formula of Ballesteros's "uncleaned-up draft," seems to seek to minimize the chasm: "the Getty Murúa, a *cleaner* and *substantially revised* version of the Galvin manuscript" (Cummins 2014, 35; emphasis added). The truth, however, as Cummins as the main editor of the Getty facsimile (Murúa 2008) will surely agree, is that the Getty, with its *c.*400 folios against the *c.*150 of the Galvin, reflects thorough restructuring and cover-to-cover rewriting that in the context of the highly structured codex format cannot be accounted for by a merely "additive" process involving un- and rebinding. An unknown number of intermediary versions of Murúa's chronicle must have existed, and have all been discarded as new and better versions were created; see Adorno and Boserup 2008, 24–27 ("From the Galvin through X to the Getty Murúa") and 48–61, Appendix I ("Overview of the Transformations of Murúa's History from the Galvin Manuscript to the Getty Manuscript"). Murúa kept the Galvin. It came in handy at least for completing the series of dynastic portraits of the Getty, but could not be used according to Murúa's probable hopes in a printed version of the Getty. It was, however, preserved through centuries as a costly treasure because of its colored illustrations and in spite of its many frustrating flaws that have been begging for satisfactory historical explanations.

### *Conservation Campaigns*

The pasted folios of the Galvin and the Getty—for the most part unregistered in Turner's collation—constitute the key to the understanding of the specific aim and technique of what should properly be called *The conservation campaign of c.1615 of the Galvin Murúa*. Cummins, Ossio, and Turner have all mistaken *conservation* for *reworking*, that is, two very different activities, not to say contradictory and irreconcilable.

<sup>52</sup> When writing against the denial of Adorno and Boserup of the existence of any evidence of illustrations in the *curacas*-version, Cummins and Ossio describe illustrations as "always" an "intrinsic part" of Murúa's conception of his work (2013, 168): *los manuscritos de Martín de Murúa siempre tuvieron ilustraciones y fueron parte intrínseca de su concepción*. See also, in similar terms, Ossio 2014, 15, and Cummins 2014, 53. Still, the fact that the Galvin and the Getty are illustrated must be reckoned to be a not negligible part of the reason why these two manuscripts have survived, in contrast to a number of lost versions that probably had no illustrations.

The conservation applied *c.*1615 to the partly dismantled codex was of course done using another technique than modern, professional manuscript conservation,<sup>53</sup> and it may therefore be liable to be mistaken for authorial or editorial reworking, *if* the contents, the preserved texts, as well as foliations, chapter counts, etc., are not adequately taken into consideration. After all, the Galvin, like the Getty Murúa and the *Nueva corónica*, is not only a manifestation of a highly structured medium (the codex format), but also of highly structured contents (a historical narrative, a chronicle, paginated or foliated, and subdivided in numbered books and numbered chapters). When reflecting over the early history of an Early Modern manuscript, it is Hubris to disregard such evidence.

As explained above, the conservation technology of adding new bifolia, because of its symmetrical manifestation in a quire, is very impractical compared to pasting along the gutter margin, a technology that Murúa knew well and used in the Getty in relation to the Galvin-in-Getty folios. What Turner's collation shows, as does the facsimile, is that there is not in the Galvin one single example of a superfluous or removed half of a secondary bifolium, thus making it extremely improbable that the technology of inserted bifolia as exemplified by the Galvin was ever meant to be used for anything else than the reinstallation of removed folios on place-holders for those same removed folios, as far as possible in their original place and sequence in the flow of the text of the chronicle. Mildly exaggerated, the operation succeeded perfectly in 99 % of the cases.

At first sight, Turner's collation does display phenomena that can be mistaken for "reworking." In a dozen instances, singletons have in the Galvin been fastened by being pasted at the gutter margin in different ways, but as the annotation of Turner's collation clearly indicates, all these instances are (likewise) nothing else than *conservation phenomena*, maybe the professional conservation campaign launched by Sotheby's before the Galvin facsimile was produced in Madrid in 2004 (see Ossio 2004, 7), which seems to have consisted only of some repairs of earlier and very amateurish conservation still visible on the photographs of the facsimile edition. However, it is quickly realized that all these singletons reflect one common cause of damage, attested likewise in the Getty Murúa (see Turner's folio-by-folio annotation to Murúa 2008 and Adorno and Boserup 2008, Appendix 2). The outermost bifolium of a quire will often,

<sup>53</sup> The modern variant would instead of full bifolia, which have necessitated much copying in the case of the Galvin, consist in inserting narrow folded stubs onto which each original folio would be pasted (tipped) along its gutter margin.

especially if some adhesive has been applied to the back of the quire block, be much more endangered than the inner bifolia. The outer bifolia will be stressed when the book is opened and one or the other, or both folios, risk breaking away—and be lost or displaced. Under a later conservation campaign, they may easily become fastened not to their own original quire but to the outermost folio of the previous or following quire, making it difficult afterwards for scholars, for whom these data matter, to reconstruct a correct original collation unless they experiment with different models of reassignments of such “inter-quire singletons,” until everything fits into a schema of regular quires. Except, evidently, for detected *real* irregularities that indicate material “reworking”: all collations made on bound material are, of course, to a varying degree hypothetical. Such tedious reconstruction of the original state of the Galvin has been done by Turner, resulting (for quires 2–7, and if carefully studied) in strictly regular quires devoid of any traces of material reworking of the contents. Compared, for example, with the Getty manuscript, where a number of irregularities in a basically regular structure are revealed by the collation *and* coincide with much other evidence of material “reworking” that results in modified or expanded contents, nothing of the kind is evidenced in Turner’s collation of the Galvin or the Galvin itself. If one abstracts from all evidence of ancient and recent *conservation*, and from textual and graphic additions on the verso pages, the Galvin reappears in its pristine state (a clean copy) without any material reworking.

The Galvin’s original clean copy has remained as it was inscribed. It was the object of conservation on at least three occasions, once after having undergone substantial losses: four single folios had been transferred to the Getty manuscript; more than twenty other folios were for unknown reasons unavailable; lost or split bifolia were replaced by new (secondary) bifolia on which to paste remaining original folios, but original bifolium 43+62, neither half of which remained, was not replaced with a secondary bifolium, but the missing chapters 2:8 and 3:10 were nevertheless represented as “empty” *pages* of two secondary bifolia, that is, original 42+63, 43+62, and 44+61, were replaced as 42/43+63 and 44+61/62. This conservation campaign, *c.*1615, was very invasive and involved quite a lot of copying (by Murúa and one amanuensis), but viewed as conservation it was undoubtedly more durable than the technique used for the tipped Galvin-in-Getty folios.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Some rewriting may have been done in connection with the conservation campaign of 1615. In the extant original table of contents, the first two chapters had the following titles:

Apparently, no folio of the re-constructed Galvin was lost during the next four centuries. Since every folio of the clean copy had in 1596 been clearly foliated and had on its recto a numbered chapter, and the Table of contents was extant and complete, it was never a problem to rearrange loose folios correctly, although fol. 10 was at some point flipped, thus deviating uniquely from the Galvin chronicle's overarching format (but not that of the *Ficción*): never two images in one spread. Fol. 10 therefore also happens to display inverted traces of the visit of a bookworm between 1615 and the recent second conservation campaign (see Fig. 7).

#### 8. CUMMINS AND THE PROVENANCE OF THE CHAVES DRAWING

After having censured Adorno and Boserup for their “preliminary work,” Cummins (2015, 57, note 9) abruptly changes register and introduces his brief discussion of the Chaves drawing with the following statement: “It is also possible that another image [by Guaman Poma (added by I.B.)], now in the State archive in Naples, depicting the poisoning of Atahualpa, *may have come from the Galvin manuscript*” (emphasis added). Cummins may be a little too rash when settling the question of authorship with two not very deep probing art historical observations concerning the Chaves drawing: “It appears by style to be by Guaman Poma, and it is in color,” adding three possibilities as to its provenance: “If it is not from the Galvin manuscript and is not a falsification, it is <from><sup>55</sup> the only other known source of a colored image by Guaman Poma.”

The first two options (Galvin or forgery) are straightforward. What Cummins has in mind with the third provenance option, “<from> the only other *known* source of a colored image by Guaman Poma” (emphasis added), is a hard riddle: *we* happen to know that Cummins and Ossio have hypothesized that dynastic portraits painted by Murúa-the-painter(?), *possibly* with embellishments in the hand of Guaman Poma,

*Capítulo primero del origen y principio de los yngas, fol. 8, and Capítulo Segundo del principio de los yngas fol. 9.* The table of contents has been corrected by Murúa so as to host one more initial chapter: *Capítulo proemial de como los religiosos del orden etc., fol. 8; Capítulo primero del nombre de los Reyes del Piru, fol. 8, and Capítulo Segundo del Principio de los Reyes yngas, fol. 9.* This corresponds to the present state of the front matter, where the two apparently new chapters dealing with the Mercedarian order and the name “Inca” have replaced the first of the two rather similarly worded chapters on the origin of the Incas. The middle new chapter (fol. 8v) is in the hand of Murúa's helper c.1615, cf. above, note 22.

<sup>55</sup> This word seems to have been omitted.

and *possibly*, hence, with original drawings all by Guaman Poma, *may* originate from the *curacas*-version although currently pasted in the Galvin, but this does not make their hypothesis into *known facts*. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the Galvin, or its direct model (exemplar), the *curacas*-version, mentioned a Captain Chaves and his existential dilemma as whistle blower by inclination.

Cummins does not refer explicitly to the two Boán letters, to the first of which, according to Cantù (2001), the Chaves drawing was an annex when she by chance stumbled upon it. To date, the Chaves drawing has only been discussed by Cantù herself and by Laurencich Minelli (2007). Cummins mentions (2014, note 15) Cantù's paper, and there is no doubt that he has at least cast a glance at her reproduction of a photograph of the Chaves drawing, since he has registered, on the one hand, a person sitting all by himself, and, on the other, a jug of poisoned wine in a niche in the background, helpfully labeled *uino enuenenado*. As mentioned earlier, if Cummins had studied more closely all three items as published by Cantù, he would evidently have recalled that the Miccinelli manuscripts include a *Report* to emperor Charles V by \*Francisco de Chaves, which the latter, according to the narrative of the Miccinelli manuscripts, never dispatched. Furthermore, since Cummins is aware (2015, note 15) that the role assigned to \*Gonzalo Ruíz in the Miccinelli manuscripts consists in having clean copied the *Nueva corónica* and drawn or clean copied its nearly 400 illustrations, it is bizarre that Cummins has not suspected that he might fall into a trap if he seriously suggested that the Chaves drawing "may come from the Galvin manuscript" (or the *curacas*-version, if that is a correct interpretation of the mysterious third option), since this would amount to a statement of trust in the authenticity not only of the Chaves drawing but also of key parts of the plot of the Miccinelli manuscripts. Cummins must have overlooked, when hastily glancing through Cantù's diligent study of the Chaves drawing, that by way of two anagrams the Chaves drawing cries out the name of \*Gonzalo Ruíz, a hint easily combined with the fact that \*Blas Valera in *Addendum VI* tells that \*Guaman Lázaro Poma was in the habit of selling to \*Martín de Murúa drawings made by \*Gonzalo Ruíz—the alleged illustrator of the *Nueva corónica* and hence also of the many drawings of the Galvin Murúa "in the style of Guaman Poma."

Cummins's suggestion regarding the origin of the Chaves drawing, published a decade after the appearance of the Galvin facsimile and fifteen years after Cantù's paper, may at first glance seem to be a new and original discovery, but since he has made no secret of his acquaintance



with Cantù's paper (2001), he could have shown the courtesy of crediting her not only for merely pointing to the "style of Guaman Poma," as Cummins does, but also because she fifteen years ago identified and helpfully discussed in some detail (p. 486) the particular drawing of the *Nueva corónica* to which the Chaves drawing is most closely related: p. [525], see Fig. 5 (Cantù 2001, 512, Fig. 4).

In fact, Cummins could also have credited Ossio, whom Cantù (p. 486) had graciously thanked for having commented on the Chaves drawing at the international colloquium held in Rome in September 1999. She has reported that Ossio "immediately" after her presentation of her discovery remarked that the framing of the Chaves drawing reminded him of the framing of drawings in the Galvin manuscript discovered by him only three years earlier (cf. Figs. 6–8), thus confirming the suggested authenticity of the drawing. Ossio could also in 1999 have referred to the four Galvin-in-Getty images that have the same type of framing and had since *c.*1980 been identified as originating from the Galvin (three of them with drawings by Guaman Poma), but he apparently did not.

Cantù, Laurencich Minelli, Ossio, Cummins, and others unnamed, all seem to have been fooled by the bait that was laid out in front of them in the form of the Chaves drawing. It is difficult to understand why Cummins in a paper (2015) that in other respects is brilliant and tightly argued has been tempted so many years after the publication of Cantù's paper (2001) to opt for the authenticity of the Chaves drawing and its origin either from the Galvin manuscript or from its exemplar the *curacas*-version. However, it is in keeping with the paper co-authored with Ossio (2013), where the two scholars have developed their views on the genesis of the Galvin Murúa, deeply inspired by—or dogmatically dependent on—the views of Ballesteros. As we have seen in the case of Galvin fol. 141, it is a problematical standpoint, since it sets no limits to the types of undocumented events that one is allowed in one moment to imagine could have happened within the Galvin, and in the next moment to consider as something evidenced, proven, and even "*known*."

#### 9. WHAT IS THE CHAVES DRAWING, AND WHERE DOES IT COME FROM?

As measured on the 1:1 facsimile edition of the Galvin (Murúa 2004), a full page Galvin image, including the frame, is 19.5 × 27.5 cm. In contrast, the Chaves drawing, as measured on the original in the Archivio

di Stato di Napoli in 2007 and again in 2014, including the frame, is  $12.5 \times 19.5$  cm. Measured without the frame, the Chaves drawing corresponds in width exactly to the frameless drawings of the *Nueva corónica* (12 cm), while the height of the Chaves drawing (19.5 cm) exceeds the open-ended height of *Nueva corónica* images, including both the running head and the title of the image (17.5 cm), by about 2 cm (cf. Figs. 4 and 5). Hence, considered within the limits of the corpus of nearly five hundred *Nueva corónica* and Galvin images “in the style of Guaman Poma,” the Chaves drawing is a unique hybrid fabrication combining characteristics of both distinctive parts of the corpus: its size emulates the *Nueva corónica*, known since 1936, while its framing emulates the full page Galvin-in-Getty images published by Ballesteros in 1962.

The Chaves drawing is blank on the reverse. Could it have come from the Galvin’s front matter? We have no information on at least three lost folios of the original front matter, but a drawing with a dramatic motif like the Chaves drawing would belong to the body matter, that is, the chronicle proper. Furthermore, since paintings and drawings in the chronicle part of the Galvin were all added after the clean copied chronicle text, it was materially impossible at any point in time to extract an image from the Galvin that would not have text on its reverse. Can Cummins, then, have had in mind, and intended to express, that the Chaves drawing was *made for* the Galvin?<sup>56</sup> The answer is obviously negative, if the setting is the early seventeenth century rather than the late twentieth. Not only is Chaves not mentioned at all in the Galvin, although the chapters where he could have been mentioned as would-be whistle blower are extant, but the size of the image does not fit, and neither in the Galvin nor in the Getty is there any documented precedent of the addition of migrated odd-sized images. However chaotic it may seem at first sight, the Galvin is anything but a *collage* of images in many different formats from many different sources. Ballesteros’s vision was totally off the mark. In the real world of the rediscovered Galvin, Murúa would have had no use of the Chaves drawing, and even in the

<sup>56</sup> It is more in keeping with the narrative of the Miccinelli manuscripts to suggest that the Chaves drawing “*was made for* the Galvin manuscript,” since the Miccinelli manuscripts have not taken into account that drawings once acquired for Murúa’s work could come into the hands of other characters of the narrative. According to the first Boán letter, \*Guaman Lázaro Poma supposedly delivered “some drawings” to Boán, including the Chaves drawing, as payment for judicial help, confessing, however, to have stolen them from a *mestizo* called Ruiruruna (\*Blas Valera’s maternal grandfather), and in the Boán letters and in Miccinelli and Animato 2003 an alias \*Blas Valera.

fantasy world of the Miccinelli manuscripts neither \*Gonzalo Ruíz nor \*Guaman Lázaro Poma could have made a lucrative business out of offering artwork such as the Chaves drawing to Martín de Murúa.

All this is evident today, since both the Galvin and the Getty are available in facsimile editions, but this was not so in the late twentieth century, when it would have been obvious to imagine not only that the Getty Murúa (until 1984 in the private domain in Cologne, Germany, since then available for study in the J. Paul Getty Museum in Los Angeles), but also that the Galvin (disappeared since *c.*1900) had the same format as the *Nueva corónica* (of which there had existed a widely known facsimile since 1936), and that the migrated Galvin-in-Getty folios had a blank reverse. Ballesteros had only seen the original Getty briefly in the home of the seventh duke of Wellington, and he made his edition in Spain on the basis of photostats produced for him by the Bodleian Library. The format of the Getty, that is, its folio size, is mentioned by Ballesteros in his first edition (Murúa 1962–64), but elsewhere than one would search for this information—it is only mentioned in a quotation of the pioneer Americanist historian Juan Bautista Muñoz (1745–1799)—and the quotation is left out of Ballesteros’s second edition of the Getty (Murúa 1986; 2001, in the widely used *Historia 16* series). Neither does Bayle, in his edition of the Loyola copy of the Galvin (Murúa 1946) indicate the size of the Galvin. Only Jiménez de la Espada mentioned the size of the Galvin in his brief descriptions of the manuscript. In other words, a well-informed student of Andean matters about to make a drawing of a kind that could be believed to have been made *for* the Galvin, and knowing that there were three Guaman Poma-like drawings pasted into the Getty Murúa (with supposedly blank reverses), would imagine these drawings to be of the same size as those in the well-known *Nueva corónica* facsimile. In the same way, but inversely, Cummins (2015) has taken for granted that the Chaves drawing would match the full page frontispieces of the Galvin: it is often mentioned that the Galvin and the Getty differ in relation to coloring from the *Nueva corónica*, but very seldom that they also differ radically from it in their basic dimensions, folio against quarto.

The *Nueva corónica* drawing to which Cantù referred (2001, 486) for *una composición de escena análoga* (an image with a motif that bears some analogy [to the Chaves drawing]) is *Nueva corónica* p. 521 [525] (see Fig. 5). As measured in 2007 and 2014, on the original in the Archivio di Stato di Napoli, graphic elements in the Chaves drawing such as the table and the chair have exactly the same dimensions, except the

“horns” of the chair, which are taller on the Chaves drawing.<sup>57</sup> This confirms the suspicion that this drawing, basically, is a tracing of *Nueva corónica* p. [525] of the 1936 facsimile of the *Nueva corónica*. As in the case of the *Contract* drawing, some graphic elements of the Chaves drawing are absent from its model in the *Nueva corónica* (and *vice versa*), and thus counterbalance the overwhelming and revealing likeness to p. [525] of the facsimile edition, see the “missing” Indian and the “added” wine jar in the niche on the wall behind \*Francisco de Chaves labeled *uino enuenenado*—like the left-most wine barrel on the *Contract* drawing (Fig. 3). Furthermore, numerous details, such as the folds of the table cloth (falling unnaturally near Francisco de Chaves’s knees) are more naturalistic on *Nueva corónica* p. [525], revealing a forger’s awareness of the necessity to introduce variation into the basic, forged tracing of p. [525], as can also be observed in the case of the relation between the *Contract* and its model, as described in Boserup and Krabbe Meyer 2012 and 2015.

There are five “helpful” textual elements inscribed on the Chaves drawing. The problem facing the forger was that he could not spell out: “If you find me, please alert Professor Laurencich Minelli, University of Bologna.” The message had to be delivered in more concealed ways, so that even scholars reputed for their sagacity would be induced to believe that the image had come *from* the Galvin or had been made *for* Murúa’s manuscripts four hundred years earlier. Hence the verbal alerts: *uino enuenenado*, *Don Francisco de Chaues*, *S.C.[C.]M.*, and not less than two nonsensical anagrams—a device totally absent from the *Nueva corónica*, but much appreciated by the playful forger, it seems.<sup>58</sup> Furthermore, while neither the Galvin nor the *Nueva corónica* can boast of including one single artist’s signature on any of their five hundred drawings, the

<sup>57</sup> While the construction of the Spanish-type chairs depicted by Guaman Poma in twenty-five instances in the *Nueva corónica* (22) and the Galvin Murúa (3) all include joints of a type called “drawbored mortises,” located where they should be so that the chair does not fall apart if one tries to sit on it, this is not the case for the chair on which Francisco de Chaves is seated, which has a couple of construction errors never committed in the *Nueva corónica* (I thank Marianne Alenius for this observation). As on the *Contract* drawing, some apparently insignificant details of the Chaves drawing were added in freehand after the tracing of the main elements. It is of course not easy for a forger to strike the right balance between identity and diversity when emulating an original drawing by tracing, so that it turns out “in the style of,” but not so much that its origin is too easily revealed.

<sup>58</sup> Among the childish proofs of \*Blas Valera’s authorship is “NAREAL” in “CORONA REAL” of NC [1189], read as nearly an anagram of VALERA.

Chaves drawing twice includes, as observed and analyzed by Cantù (486), eleven letters that sum up to the false message: *GONZALO RUIZ [me fecit]*.<sup>59</sup> This was too much, by any standard, and it should have ruined the credibility of the forgery, even in the eyes of Cantù and Laurencich Minelli. It did not, however. Wishful thinking had the upper hand in the heydays of the Miccinelli manuscripts.

I argued above that besides the format of the drawing, adapted to a book of quarto size rather than folio size, the materiality of the Chaves drawing (a loose sheet with a blank reverse) was the obvious choice for a forger *c.*1998, if we take into consideration the information that in the late twentieth century was at hand to others than a few specialists. But it was also a wrong choice, since it linked the forgery to the tradition of a particular modern interpretation of the Galvin: the vision of Ballesteros.

## 10. CONCLUSIONS

### *The Galvin Manuscript and Cummins and Ossio*

In 1996, Ossio succeeded in tracking down the long lost Galvin Murúa, as Ballesteros half a century earlier had rediscovered the Getty Murúa. Ballesteros initially believed that the Galvin had been an abbreviation of the Getty, but he let himself be convinced that the relation was the inverse, that is, that the Galvin was a still chaotic and cannibalized draft, probably one among a number of similar drafts or “parallel manuscripts.” Ballesteros’s second vision of the Galvin was partly challenged by Rowe (1987), who was the first to see and analyze original Galvin text pages on the previously obscured reverses of Galvin-in-Getty folios, and to refer some of them to precise locations in Bayle’s 1946 edition of the Loyola copy of the then lost Galvin. Rowe further identified the basic text of the Galvin as a coherent and professionally calligraphed clean copy, peer reviewed and in principle ready to be submitted to the Spanish censorship authorities. Ballesteros did not react to Rowe’s findings, and neither Rowe nor Ballesteros ever saw or suspected the existence of secondary bifolia and pasted folios, which together with other aspects of the conservation campaign *c.*1615 create an immediate impression of pervasive disorder and hybrid provenance. Over the years and with remarkable persistence, Ossio has maintained Ballesteros’s second vision of the Galvin, ignoring the most important findings of

<sup>59</sup> The anagrams are: *granizo o luz* [= hail or light] and *zuraz no ligo* [no sense in Spanish].

Rowe even after he had discovered the original Galvin (Ossio 2004), followed in this respect by Cummins (see Cummins and Ossio 2013, 153, n. 8). The rediscovered Galvin, however, proves that Rowe was right on the key issue of the status of the basic text of the Galvin.

Focusing their attention on the “hidden” texts and the unique corpus of illustrations—in particular the paintings of the initial series of dynastic portraits of Inca kings and queens—Cummins and Ossio have together made important discoveries and suggested valuable new interpretations (2013; Ossio 2015; Cummins 2015). But with regard to the twenty-two folios pasted onto inserted bifolia from two secondary paper stocks, they have underestimated the importance of Rowe’s discoveries, and they have failed to revise their common adherence to Ballesteros’s misconception of the unique history of the Galvin. In their quest for alien material within the chaotic draft envisioned by Ballesteros, Cummins and Ossio have approached the Galvin as if it were a quarry from which they could hew sensational remains of earlier manuscripts, and by disregarding the fundamental difference in the way folios had been inserted into the two Murúa manuscripts they have postulated that folios removed from the lost five or six years older *curacas*-version of Murúa’s chronicle had in the same way as the four Galvin-in-Getty folios been transferred by Murúa to the Galvin (Cummins and Ossio 2013; Cummins 2015). On closer examination, however, none of the evidence adduced by them for these hypothetical instances of migration and recycling of folios is compelling.

The discussion of the pasted folios of the Galvin, which Adorno and Boserup since 2005 have considered to be manifestations of mere repair and conservation of the Galvin codex, may well continue. The stakes are not so much a matter of the exact date of production of a number of painted images within a range of six years (1590 to 1596), but the type of professional relations and exchanges (artistic, literary, ethnographic, etc.) maintained by Guaman Poma and Martín de Murúa. In other words, the codicological interpretation of the pasted Galvin folios in the end concerns the place and role of Murúa’s chronicle project in general, and of the Galvin in particular, in the intellectual biographies of each of the two chroniclers.

#### *The Chaves Drawing and the Miccinelli Manuscripts*

The year 1996 also witnessed the first publication, in a respected Italian academic journal, of one of the two main Miccinelli manuscripts,

*Historia et rudimenta*, including the main tenets of its “Blas Valera novel” (Laurencich Minelli et al. 1996), but its plot had evidently been thought out some years before 1989, the year of publication of the very first public mention (and partial publication) of the Peruvian Miccinelli material (Miccinelli and Animato 1989), which, however, had not aroused any public or professional interest. Hence, the coded Italian texts of *Historia et rudimenta* supposedly authored by the Jesuit Father and chronicler \*Giovanni Anello Oliva (1574–1642) were composed<sup>60</sup> without any awareness of Rowe’s discoveries (unpublished till 1987), not to mention Ossio’s much later discovery of the Galvin Murúa. By 1998, however, news of the discovery of nearly one hundred colored drawings by Guaman Poma must have compelled the forger to react with some preemptive initiatives. The problem facing the forger was that if \*Blas Valera was only responsible for the intellectual contents of the *Nueva corónica*, while \*Gonzalo Ruíz, as stated in *Historia et rudimenta*, fol. 4v (Laurencich Minelli 2007, 536) only clean copied \*Blas Valera’s text and drawings, one would expect the Miccinelli manuscripts to inform through \*Oliva’s coded narrative about the close connection between \*Martin de Murúa and the “real” illustrator of his manuscripts, \*Gonzalo Ruíz.

The solution to the problem of integrating at this late stage Murúa’s manuscripts into the fictional world of the “Blas Valera novel” was solved, it seems, by developing two of the novel’s available characters in at least three new “pieces of evidence.” On the one hand, the insignificant \*Gonzalo Ruíz was bolstered as an artist in his own right. In *Historia et rudimenta* he had no other role to play than to clean copy the work of \*Blas Valera: *ricopiare il manuscrito* and *ricopiare i disegni eseguiti dal P[adre] Valera* (copy the manuscript; copy the drawings made by Father Valera) (Laurencich Minelli 2007, 536). Now, in the Miccinelli material that surfaced around 1998, \*Gonzalo Ruíz was expressly mentioned as having made—for \*Guaman Lázaro Poma—the exemplars of drawings copied into legal documents published in the 1950s and later in more accessible form (Prado Tello and Prado Prado 1991): the map of Huamanga and the portraits of two of Guaman Poma’s forebears. On the other hand, \*Guaman Lázaro Poma was now introduced as having made a business out of selling drawings made by \*Gonzalo Ruíz to none other than \*Martín de Murúa. The three “secondary” Miccinelli manuscripts, probably triggered by Ossio’s discovery of the Galvin Murúa, are *Addendum VI* of *Exsul immeritus*, the *Contract*, and the Chaves drawing:

<sup>60</sup> On this forged part of *Historia et rudimenta*, see Domenici 2015 [This volume].

1. Among the substantial amount of new Miccinelli material presented to the public for the first time at the 1999 colloquium in Rome, a single-page manuscript mentions Murúa—but not by his own name. It is \*Blas Valera's autobiographical *Addendum VI* (Laurencich Minelli 2007, 414–25). \*Blas Valera here mentions Murúa in connection with the agreement about \*Guaman Lázaro Poma's false authorship of the *Nueva corónica* and the signed agreement “hidden in a small and safe place,” that is, the *Contract* “discovered” in 1998 inside a wax medallion allegedly annexed to *Exsul immeritus* (Laurencich Minelli 2007, 416, see also Plate xxi). *Addendum VI* is supposedly in the hand of \*Blas Valera, dated 1618. \*Blas Valera tells in Latin how the secret group of dissident Jesuits was blackmailed by \*Guaman Lázaro Poma:

*Huamanus enim petivit a Fratре G[onzalo], pro silentio, eum pingere plurimas tabulas aquatis coloribus, ut illas velut sua vendere posset Petri Nolasci cuidam discipulo* (Laurencich Minelli 2007, 416).

(For in return for his silence, Guaman Poma demanded that Brother Gonzalo paint a great many watercolor images, so that he could sell them as his own creations to one of Peter Nolasco's [1189–1256; founder of the Mercedarian Order] followers [i.e. Martín de Murúa]).

The two lines quoted from *Addendum VI* state with precision the extra role assigned to \*Guaman Lázaro Poma, including a “learned” circumlocation of Murúa's name (“a pupil of Peter Nolasco”) that for naive readers underpins the authenticity of the passage and of the source in general. It is noteworthy that the other Miccinelli manuscripts, usually so generously informative on concrete details, nowhere give a hint as to how a prospective reader of *Additamentum VI* should solve the riddle of “Peter Nolasco's followers,” and his passion for images of Peruvian historical events and antiquarian motifs—many centuries before Jiménez de la Espada in 1879 discovered the Galvin.

2. The *Contract* and the Chaves drawing have many characteristics in common, and they can as two “secondary” forgeries be considered to form a pair, probably produced at the same time, c.1998, although “discovered” in two different collections in Naples, the Collezione Miccinelli and the Archivio di Stato di Napoli, respectively. “Discovered” in May 1998 within a sealed wax medallion annexed to *Exsul*



*immeritus*, the *Contract* was immediately interpreted by Laurencich Minelli as a definite proof of the most controversial claim of the first published Miccinelli manuscript: \*Blas Valera's authorship of the *Nueva corónica*. In the *Contract*, \*Gonzalo Ruíz plays a central role, composing the text of the agreement, and illustrating it with a drawing, which, however, alludes to the theme of Pizarro and his poisoning project so strongly that it diverts critical attention from the most important message of the *Contract* text: the artistry of \*Gonzalo Ruíz, so highly appreciated by \*Martín de Murúa that the greedy \*Guaman Lázaro Poma has endangered the security of \*Blas Valera's secret group of dissident Jesuits.

3. The first presentation of the Chaves drawing took place at the 1999 colloquium in Rome (Cantù 2001). Considered as a forgery made with a particular aim in mind, it is a strong material manifestation of \*Guaman Lázaro Poma's trade with images created by \*Gonzalo Ruíz, but again this important message is camouflaged by the graphic focus on one of the central themes of the "primary" Miccinelli manuscripts: the *Relación* of \*Francisco de Chaves. It had allegedly made a deep and life-long impression on young \*Blas Valera, and it happened to have been published for the first time the year before the 1999 colloquium (Laurencich Minelli et al. 1998).<sup>61</sup> The Chaves drawing's most explicit expression of its real aim and most important message are the two anagrams of \*Gonzalo Ruíz's name, easily analyzed within the context of the Miccinelli manuscripts in general, and in particular of the hand of \*Gonzalo Ruíz emulating that of the *Nueva corónica*. The forger had to create a drawing "in the style of Guaman Poma" that would give meaning as a commodity offered for sale to \*Martín de Murúa 18 March 1610—the date of the first Boán letter, to which the Chaves drawing was annexed.

#### *Cummins and the Curacas-Version of Murúa's Chronicle*

It is on the general background of Ballesteros's vision that Cummins has been tempted to suggest that the Chaves drawing "may have come from the Galvin manuscript" or rather from the *curacas*-version of 1590,

<sup>61</sup> The issue of the authenticity of the Chaves drawing has no necessary consequences for that of the two Boán letters, to the first of which the Chaves drawing was annexed when discovered by Cantù (2001); the letters have therefore been left without further comments in the present study.

“the only other known source of a colored image by Guaman Poma,” thereby implicitly postulating that Guaman Poma contributed drawings to Murúa’s early chronicle manuscript of 1590 in the same way as we know that he did six years later to the Galvin. However, Cummins has overlooked that Guaman Poma’s impact on the Galvin is of a very particular kind, filling empty spaces in a degraded manuscript with as many drawings as possible, a setting that cannot without more ado be transposed to the *curacas*-version. Again, as with the aim and pasting method of the migrated Galvin-in-Getty folios, Cummins has been too rash in extrapolating identical material settings from one manuscript to another.

The Chaves drawing is a modern forgery, planned on the background of Ballesteros’s misconception of the Galvin, and fabricated, in the same way as the *Contract* drawing, by including some variations in a tracing of a drawing in the 1936 facsimile of the *Nueva corónica*. In the late 1990s, the forger of the Chaves drawing had good reasons to adhere to Ballesteros’s vision of the Galvin and produce a drawing that would fit the expectations of contemporary scholars to a drawing coming from (or made for) Murúa’s illustrated chronicle manuscripts.

Dependent likewise on Ballesteros’ vision, and convinced that he had identified in the Chaves drawing a material piece of evidence that confirmed his and Ossio’s model of understanding of the Galvin and its relation to its exemplar, the *curacas*-version, Cummins laid his professional skepticism and caution aside, hardly glanced at the Chaves drawing, and followed his guide right into a trap, unwittingly turning himself into a supporter of the authenticity of the Miccinelli manuscripts and the “Blas Valera novel.”

I have tried to demonstrate that Cummins—like Cantù and Laurencich Minelli before him—has been trapped into considering the Chaves drawing to be an authentic drawing by Guaman Poma / \*Gonzalo Ruíz, because he has shared with the forger an erroneous view on the Galvin, but also that it would be wrong to suspect Cummins of being a true and serious supporter of the Miccinelli manuscripts. On the other hand, I have wanted to suggest that it is high time, at half a century’s distance from Ballesteros’s first printed edition of the Getty manuscript (Murúa 1962–64), to say a definitive farewell to his views on the Galvin, since they continue to mislead renowned and appreciated scholars such as Cummins, Ossio, and Turner into speculations that do not match the reality of the rediscovered original Galvin manuscript (Murúa 2004).

## SUMMARY

IVAN BOSERUP: *The Chaves Drawing, the Galvin Murúa Manuscript, and the Miccinelli Claims Regarding Guaman Poma's Nueva corónica*

Among the many extraordinary claims of the Miccinelli manuscripts kept in a private collection in Naples and published in 1989 and later, one of those most urgently in need of being closely investigated has concerned the authorship of one of the treasures of the Royal Library of Denmark: the autograph manuscript of the *Nueva corónica* (Ms. GKS 2232 4°). Authorship of this manuscript has traditionally been assigned, in accordance with its title page and other evidence, to the Andean Indian Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala (1560?–1616?). Yet, in spite of the flat rejection of the Miccinelli material by the vast majority of leading specialists of the history and literature of early colonial Peru (see Adorno 1998; Zuidema 2001), the Miccinelli claims continue to find adepts at large and sometimes arouse new, fruitless debates.

In 2012, however, it was revealed that a drawing included in one of the key manuscripts of the Miccinelli collection, a *Contract* which states that the *mestizo* chronicler and Jesuit Father Blas Valera was the real author of the *Nueva corónica*, is basically a tracing of a drawing of the *Nueva corónica* as reproduced from a retouched photograph in the facsimile edition of the *Nueva corónica* that was published in Paris in 1936 (see Boserup and Krabbe Meyer 2012; 2015). Following up on this material proof of the presence of recent forgeries within the Miccinelli collection, the present paper discusses the authenticity of a closely related drawing (the Chaves drawing) discovered c.1998 in the State Archives of Naples. This latter item turns out to be, in all probability, another recent tracing of a drawing of the *Nueva corónica*, based on the 1936 facsimile edition.

The reason for discussing the Chaves drawing so many years later is a suggestion made in 2015 by the art historian Thomas B. F. Cummins (Harvard University). According to Cummins, the Chaves drawing is an authentic creation of Guaman Poma (see Cummins 2015). It is argued, however, that Professor Cummins's superficial examination of the drawing and his advocacy of its authenticity are closely related to a theory developed by him in 2013 together with the renowned Peruvian anthropologist Juan Ossio (Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Lima) and supported by Conservator at the Getty Museum Nancy K. Turner (2015). Their view, which is inspired by an outdated suggestion of the historian Manuel Ballesteros (1911–2002), is that the Chaves drawing may originate from the manuscript of the long lost illustrated chronicle (1596) of Martín de Murúa (the *Galvin Murúa*) supposedly consisting to a large extent of illustrated folios originating from other sources.

The evidence of the *Galvin Murúa* itself does not, however, corroborate this view (see Adorno and Boserup 2005; 2008). Hence, as in the case of the demonstrably fake *Contract*, it is argued that the Chaves drawing was produced in the late 1990s and “dropped” in the State Archives of Naples so as to be innocently “discovered” by a scholar working there, and later promoted as “external” evidence of the authenticity and historical reliability of the two main Miccinelli manuscripts. By stepping right into this trap nearly twenty years after others have been lured into it (Cantù 2001; Laurencich Minelli 2001; 2007), Cummins has taken the risk of being counted among the supporters of the Miccinelli manuscripts and of stirring up once more an international debate on the status of forged or corrupted material, which one can hope, however, will be thwarted at an early stage by the present analysis.

## WORKS CITED

*Manuscripts*

- Copenhagen. Det Kongelige Bibliotek: GKS 2232 4°, Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala, *El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno*. (1615). (Cited NC or *Nueva corónica*).
- Los Angeles. The J. Paul Getty Museum: Ms. Ludwig xiii 16, Martín de Murúa, *Historia general del Piru, origen y decendencia de los Yncas*. (1613). (Cited Getty or Getty Murúa).
- Naples. Archivio di Stato di Napoli. Department of Maps and Engravings: *Il scittore, c.1610*. (Dubious). (Cited Chaves drawing).
- . —. Segretaria dei viceré: Scritture diverse, 2; 5. (Cited Boán letters).
- . Collezione Miccinelli: Blas Valera, *Exsul immeritus Blas Valera populo suo*, 1618. (Dubious). (Cited *Exsul immeritus*).
- . —. *Contract*, 1614. (Dubious). (Cited *Contract*).
- . —. Francisco de Chaves, *Relación*, 1533. (Dubious). (Cited *Relación*).
- . —. *Historia et rudimenta linguae Piruanorum, c.1637–38*. (Dubious). (Cited *Historia et rudimenta*).
- Property of Mr. Seán Galvin: Martín de Murúa, *La famosa ystoria / Historia del orijen, genealogía Real de los Reyes ingas del Piru, de sus hechos, costumbres, trajes, y manera de gouierño ... 1590*. (1596). (Cited Galvin or Galvin Murúa).

*Printed Works*

- Adorno, Rolena. 1980. "La redacción y enmendación del autógrafo de la *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno*," in Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala, *El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno*, edited by John V. Murra and Rolena Adorno, Translations from Quechua by Jorge L. Urioste. 3 vols. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, vol. 1, pp. xxxii–xlvi.
- . 1993. "The Genesis of Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala's *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno*," *Colonial Latin American Review*, vol. 2, pp. 53–91.
- . 1998. "Criterios de comprobación: el manuscrito Miccinelli de Nápoles y las crónicas de la conquista del Perú," *Anthropológica*, vol. 16, pp. 369–94.
- . 2000 [1986]. *Guaman Poma. Writing and Resistance in Colonial Peru*. 2nd edition with a New Foreword. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- . 2001. *Guaman Poma and His Illustrated Chronicle from Colonial Peru*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press & The Royal Library (In English and in Spanish).
- . 2002. “A Witness unto Itself: The Integrity of the Autograph Manuscript of Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala’s *El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno* (1615/1616),” *Fund og Forskning i Det Kongelige Biblioteks Samlinger* (Copenhagen), vol. 41, pp. 7–106. (Reprinted in Adorno and Boserup 2003).
- . 2004. “La censura de la *Historia general del Perú* (1611–1613), de fray Martín de Murúa,” in Ignacio Arellano and Fermín del Pino Díaz, eds., *Lecturas y ediciones de Crónicas de Indias. Una propuesta interdisciplinar*, pp. 37–76. Madrid and Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert.
- . 2008a. “Censorship and Approbation in Murúa’s *Historia General del Piru*,” in Cummins and Anderson, eds., 2008, pp. 95–125.
- . 2008b. “Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala,” in Joanne Pillsbury, ed., *Guide to Documentary Sources for Andean Studies 1530–1900*. 3 vols. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, vol. 2, pp. 255–68.
- Adorno, Rolena, and Ivan Boserup. 2003. *New Studies of the Autograph Manuscript of Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala’s Nueva corónica y buen gobierno*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
- . 2005. “Guaman Poma and the Manuscripts of Fray Martín de Murúa. Prolegomena to a Critical Edition of the *Historia del Piru*,” *Fund og Forskning i Det Kongelige Biblioteks Samlinger* (Copenhagen), vol. 44, pp. 107–258.
- . 2008. “The Making of Murúa’s *Historia General del Piru*,” in Cummins and Anderson, eds., 2008, pp. 7–75.
- Adorno, Rolena, and Ivan Boserup, eds. 2015. *Unlocking the Doors to the Worlds of Guaman Poma and His Nueva corónica*. (Acts of the Second International Colloquium on Guaman Poma, held in October 2013 in the Royal Library in Copenhagen). Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press. (Danish Humanist Texts and Studies, vol. 50)
- Albó, Xavier. 1998. “La *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno*. ¿Obra de Guaman Poma o de jesuitas?” *Anuario de la Academia Boliviana Eclesiástica* (Sucre, Bolivia) 3 [Anuario 1997], pp. 185–219. (Also published in *Anthropológica* [Lima] 16, 1998, pp. 307–48).
- Andrien, Kenneth. 2008. “The Virtual and the Real: The Case of the Mysterious Documents from Naples,” *History Compass* 6/5 (2008), pp. 1304–24.

- Animato, Carlo, and Clara Miccinelli. 1989. *Quipu. Il nodo parlante dei misteriosi Incas* (Foreword by Paolo A. Rossi), Genoa: ECIG, Edizioni Culturali Internazionali Genova. (For the 2nd ed., see Miccinelli and Animato 1998).
- Borja de Medina, Francisco. 1999. "Blas Valera y la dialéctica 'exclusión-integración' del otro." *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* (Rome) 68 (136), pp. 229–68.
- Boserup, Ivan. 2004a. "Quelques observations sur l'évolution matérielle et textuelle du manuscrit de Salamanque (Getty Museum, Ms. Ludwig XIII 16) de l'*Historia General del Perú* de fray Martín de Murúa," in Ignacio Arellano and Fermín del Pino Díaz, eds., *Lecturas y ediciones de Crónicas de Indias. Una propuesta interdisciplinar*, pp. 77–94. Madrid and Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert.
- . 2004b. "A New Interpretation of Guaman Poma's Calculations on the Title Page of the *Nueva crónica y buen gobierno*," *Fund og Forskning i Det Kongelige Biblioteks Samlinger* (Copenhagen), vol. 43, 2004, pp. 87–116.
- . 2015. "Los manuscritos de Guaman Poma (II): Las etapas de la evolución del manuscrito Galvin de la *Historia general del Perú* de Martín de Murúa," in Husson, ed., 2015, pp. 71–127.
- Boserup, Ivan, and Mette Kia Krabbe Meyer. 2012. "Afsørende streger. Kontrakttegningen fra Napoli-dokumenterne og Det Kongelige Biblioteks *Nueva crónica* under lup." *Magasin fra Det Kongelige Bibliotek*. Copenhagen (Det Kongelige Bibliotek), vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 9–18.
- . 2015. "The Illustrated *Contract* between Guaman Poma and the Friends of Blas Valera: A Key Miccinelli Manuscript Discovered in 1998," in Adorno and Boserup, eds. 2015, pp. 19–64.
- Cantù, Francesca. 2001. "Guaman Poma y Blas Valera en contraluz: los documentos inéditos de un oidor de la Audiencia di Lima," in Cantù, ed., 2001, pp. 475–519.
- . 2003. "Collezionisti e manoscritti andini. Note sui nuovi documenti relativi a Blas Valera," in Davide Domenici, C. Orsini, and S. Venturoli, eds., *Il sacro e il paesaggio nell'America indigena* (Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Bologna, 2002, in honor of Laura Laurencich Minelli), pp. 319–32. Bologna: Clueb.
- Cantù, Francesca, ed., 2001. *Guaman Poma y Blas Valera. Tradición Andina e historia colonial. Actas del coloquio internacional, Istituto Italo-Latinoamericano, Roma, 29–30 de Septiembre de 1999*, Roma (Antonio Pellicani Editore).
- Cummins, Thomas B. F. 2002. *Toasts with the Inca: Andean Abstraction and Colonial Images on Quero Vessels*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- . 2015. “Dibujado de mi mano. Martín de Murúa as Artist,” in Cummins et al., eds., 2015, pp. 1–34.
- Cummins, Thomas B. F., and Juan M. Ossio A. 2013. “Muchas veces dudé Real Mag. aceptar esta dicha ympressa’: La tarea de hacer *La famosa historia de los reyes incas* de Fray Martín de Murúa,” in Juan Carlos Garavaglia, Jacques Poloni-Simard, and Gilles Rivière, eds., *Au miroir de l’anthropologie historique. Mélanges offerts à Nathan Wachtel*, pp. 151–70. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes. (Amériques).
- Cummins, Thomas B. F., and Barbara Anderson, eds., 2008. *The Getty Murúa. Essays on the Making of Martín de Murúa’s Historia General del Piru, J. Paul Getty Museum Ms. Ludwig XIII 16*. Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute.
- Cummins, Thomas B. F., Emily A. Engel, Barbara Anderson, and Juan M. Ossio A., eds. 2015. *Manuscript Cultures of Colonial Mexico and Peru. New Questions and Approaches*. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute. (Copyright 2014). (Issues & Debates).
- De la Puente Luna, José Carlos. 2015. “El capitán, el ermitaño y el cronista, o cuándo nació el autor de la Nueva crónica y buen gobierno,” in Husson, ed., 2015, pp. 129–60.
- Derolez, Albert. 2015. *The Making and Meaning of the Liber Floridus. A Study of the Original Manuscript, Ghent, University Library MS 92*. Turnhout (Belgium): Harvey Miller Publishers (An imprint of Brepols Publishers).
- Di Tommasi, Emilio. 1899. *Catalogo della collezione di libri, manoscritti e disegni incasici e messicani raccolti e annotati dal Cav. Dr. Emilio di Tommasi*. Naples: Emilio Prass.
- Domenici, Davide. 2007a. “La Lettera Apologetica de Raimondo de Sangro y el documento Historia et Rudimenta Linguae Piruanorum: Una comparación,” in Laura Laurencich Minelli and Paulina Numhauser Bar-Magen, eds., *Sublevando el Virreynato*, pp. 245–99. Quito (Abya Yala).
- . 2007b. “Variantes del sistema de quipus silábicos en los documentos de Nápoles,” in Manuel Casado Arboniés, Alejandro R. Diez Torre, Paulina Numhauser, and Emilio Sola, eds., *Escrituras silenciadas. História, memória y procesos culturales*, pp. 257–76. Alcalá de Henares (UAH).
- . 2015. “Disentangling Knots. Real and Fictional *kipu* Systems in the *Naples documents*, Garcilaso de la Vega’s *Comentarios*, Guaman Poma’s *Nueva crónica*, and Raimondo de Sangro’s *Lettera apologetica*,” *Fund og Forskning i Det Kongelige Biblioteks Samlinger* (Copenhagen), vol. 54 [This volume], pp. 31–87.

- Domenici, Viviano, and Davide Domenici. 2003. *I nodi segreti degli Incas. Gli antichi manoscritti Miccinelli riscrivono la tragica storia della conquista del Perù*. Milano: Sperling & Kupfer Editori.
- Estenssoro Fuchs, Juan Carlos. 1997. "¿Historia de un fraude o fraude histórico?" *Revista de Indias*, vol. 57, pp. 566–78.
- Guaman Poma de Ayala, Felipe. 1936 [1615]. *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno. Codex péruvien illustré*. [Facsimile edition]. Avant-propos de Paul Rivet. Introduction par Richard Pietschmann. (Travaux et mémoires de l'Institut d'Ethnologie 23). Paris: Université de Paris. Institut d'Ethnologie. (Reprinted, *ibid.*, 1968 and 1989).
- . 1987. [1615/1980]. *El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno*. Edited by John V. Murra and Rolena Adorno, translations from the Quechua by Jorge L. Urioste. Revised ed. 3 vols. Madrid: Historia 16. (Reprinted 2001).
- . 2004. [1615/2001]. *El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno*. Digital edition of Guaman Poma 1615 [Ms. GKS 2232 4°] and Guaman Poma 1987 [1615/1980]. *The Guaman Poma Website*. <[www.kb.dk/permalink/2006/poma/info/en/frontpage.htm](http://www.kb.dk/permalink/2006/poma/info/en/frontpage.htm)>.
- Hampe Martínez, Teodoro. 2001. "Una polémica version sobre la conquista del Perú: ¿Es auténtica la Relación de Francisco de Chaves (1533)?" in Cantù, ed., 2001, pp. 343–61.
- Husson, Jean-Philippe. 2015a. "A Little Known but Essential Element of the Cultural Context of the *Nueva corónica*: Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala's Native Sources," in Adorno and Boserup, eds., 2015. pp. 163–87.
- . 2015b. "The Issue of the Date of Birth of the Chronicler Guaman Poma de Ayala, as Debated at the Colloquium in Poitiers in 2010," *Fund og Forskning i Det Kongelige Biblioteks Samlinger* (Copenhagen), vol. 54 [This volume], pp. 15–29.
- Husson, Jean-Philippe, ed. 2015. *La memoria del mundo inca: Guaman Poma y la escritura de la Nueva Corónica. Coloquio Internacional, Universidad de Poitiers (Francia), 21 y 22 de octubre de 2010*. Lima: Fondo Editorial de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú and Apus Graph Editores.
- Jiménez de la Espada, Marcos. 1892. "El *cumpi-uncu* hallado en Pachacamac," *El centenario. Revista ilustrada*, vol. 1, pp. 450–70.
- Jiménez de la Espada, Marcos, ed. 1879. *Tres relaciones de antigüedades peruanas*. Madrid: Ministerio de Fomento.
- Laurencich Minelli, Laura. 2007. 'Exsul Immeritus Blas Valera Populo Suo' e 'Historia et Rudimenta Linguae Piruanorum.' *Indios, gesuiti e spagnoli in due docu-*



- menti segreti sul Perù del XVII secolo*. Bologna: Clueb. (Copyright 2005). [With Spanish and Italian translations of Latin texts, translations into Italian of Spanish texts, and translations into Spanish of texts and introductions in Italian]. (A Spanish-only edition was published in 2009 by Chachapoyas Municipalidad Provincial).
- Laurencich Minelli, Laura, Clara Miccinelli, and Carlo Animato. 1996. "Il documento seicentesco «Historia et Rudimenta Linguae Piruanorum»,” *Studi e materiali di Storia delle Religioni*, vol. 61 (1995), pp. 363–413. [Published 1996].
- . 1998. "La lettera di Francisco de Chaves a Sua Maestà il Re. Un inedito del xvi secolo,” *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*, vol. 64, pp. 57–90.
- Miccinelli, Clara, and Carlo Animato. 1998 [1989]. *Quipu. Il nodo parlante dei misteriosi incas*. 2nd ed. Genova: ECIG, Edizioni Culturali Internazionali Genova. (For the 1st ed., see Animato and Miccinelli 1989).
- . 2003. *Nerofumo. La doppia ombra del Gesuita maledetto*. Milan: Sperling & Kupfer. (French translation, *Nerofumo*. Paris: Éditions Métailié, 2007).
- Murúa, Fray Martín de. 1946. *Historia del origen y genealogia real de los reyes Incas del Perú. De sus hechos, costumbres, trages y manera de gobierno*. Introducción, notas y arreglo por Constantino Bayle S.J. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- . 1962–64. *Historia general del Perú, origen y descendencia de los Incas por Fray Martín de Murúa*. Introducción y notas de Manuel Ballesteros-Gaibrois. 1–2. Madrid: Instituto "Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo" (Bibliotheca Americana Vetus 1–2).
- . 1986. *Historia general del Perú. Edición de Manuel Ballesteros*. 2 vols. Madrid: Historia 16 (Crónicas de América 35).
- . 2004. *Historia del origen y genealogia real de los reyes Incas del Perú. De sus hechos, costumbres, trages y manera de gobierno*. [Facsimile edition]. Madrid: Testimonio Compañía Editorial.
- . 2008. *Historia General del Piru. Facsimile of J. Paul Getty Museum Ms. Ludwig XIII 16*. Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute.
- Nardi, Gino. 1952. *Maggiore Riccardo Cera*. (Conosciamoli meglio. Reduci italiani delle due guerre 1). Naples: Arti Grafiche dot. Amodio.
- Numhauser, Paulina. 2007. "Documentos Miccinelli: un estado de la cuestión,” in Davide Domenici, ed., *Per bocca d'altri. Indios, gesuiti e spagnoli in due documenti segreti sul Perù del XVII secolo*, pp. 45–73. Bologna: Clueb.

- Ossio A., Juan M. 1985. *Los retratos de los incas en la crónica de fray Martín de Murúa*. Lima: Oficina de Asuntos Culturales de la Corporación Financiera de Desarrollo [COFIDE].
- . 2004. *Códice Murúa. Historia y genealogía de los reyes incas del Perú del Padre mercedario Fray Martín de Murúa: Estudio*. Madrid: Testimonio Compañía Editorial. (Companion volume to the facsimile edition [See Murúa 2004] of the Galvin manuscript (Introduction, 7–72; edition, 73–258).
- . 2008. “Murúa’s Two Manuscripts: A Comparison,” in Cummins and Anderson, eds., 2008, pp. 77–94.
- . 2015a. “New Assessment of the Hidden Texts in the Galvin Manuscript of Fray Martín de Murúa,” in Cummins et al., eds., 2015, pp. 11–34.
- . 2015b. “Mito e historia en torno a la fecha de nacimiento de Guaman Poma de Ayala,” in Husson, ed., 2015, pp. 163–82.
- Prado Tello, Elías, and Alfredo Prado Prado, eds. 1991 [c.1560–1640]. *Phelipe Guaman Poma de Ayala: Y no ay Remedio ...* Lima: Centro de Investigación y Promoción Amazónica.
- Prévôtet, Audrey. 2015. “A Central Aspect of the Intellectual, Religious, and Artistic Context of the *Nueva crónica: Lives of Saints*,” in Adorno and Boserup, eds., 2015, pp. 331–53.
- Rowe, John H. 1987. “La mentira literaria en la obra de Martín de Murúa,” in *Libro de homenaje a Aurelio Miro Quesada Sosa*, vol. 2, pp. 753–61. Lima: Talleres Gráficos P.L. Villanueva Editores.
- Trentelman, Karen. 2015. “Colorants and Artists’ Palettes in the Murúa Manuscripts,” in Cummins et al., eds., 2015, pp. 116–38.
- Turner, Nancy K. 2015. “Accounting for Unfinished History. How Evidence of Book Structure Provides a New Context for the Making of the Galvin and Getty Murúas,” in Cummins et al., eds., 2015, pp. 85–115.
- Von Euw, Anton. 1982. “XIII 16 Martín de Murúa: *Historia general del Perú*,” in *Die Handschriften der Sammlung Ludwig*. 3 vols. Köln: Schnütgen-Museum der Stadt Köln: Vol. 3, pp. 309–15.
- Zuidema, R. Tom. 2001. “Guaman Poma, Blas Valera y los escritos jesuitas sobre el Perú,” in Cantù, ed. 2001, pp. 365–85.