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Introduction

The 2004 publication of the facsimile edition of Fray Martín de Murúa’s Historia del origen y genealogía real de los reyes ingas del Pirú, dated 1590 on its frontispiece and referred to here as “Murúa 1590,” is a revolutionary event in Andean and Spanish colonial studies. It was known until 2004 only through glimpses and brief reports (Jiménez de la Espada 1879, and later), various partial editions (González de la Rosa 1911, Urteaga 1922-25, Loayza 1946) and a complete one (Bayle 1946). Yet the source of these scholarly efforts was not “Murúa 1590” but rather a copy of it, made in 1890. “Murúa 1590” was, furthermore, confused with another manuscript work (Murúa 1613) by the same author. As a result, “Murúa 1590” has been the object of many speculative and unsubstantiated theories that have obscured, rather than illuminated, the character of the original. However, the Madrid facsimile, produced thanks to the vision and guidance of Juan M. Ossio, makes available for the first time the evidence that allows us to address four areas needing evaluation: first, the history of the “Murúa 1590” manuscript and its editions; second, the evidence of its making, fragmentation, and reconstruction; third, its relationship to the work (Murúa 1613) with which it is affiliated and to which, for half a century, since 1951, it has been compared; and fourth, the assessment of the views about it that have come to be commonplaces in need of interrogation. With these four objectives in mind, we turn to the matter that called attention to “Murúa 1590” in the first place, namely, its evidence of the intervention in its pages of the Andean chronicler, Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala.

In his Nueva corónica y buen gobierno (Copenhagen, Royal Library, Gks 2232, 4to) Guaman Poma included a short chapter on “previous chronicles” of the ancient history of Peru. He mentioned Fray Martín de Murúa by name, among others, and his lengthy comment on Murúa’s work exceeds even those that he
devoted to José de Acosta and Domingo de Santo Tomás, whose Peruvianist works Guaman Poma knew well. His comment reveals his intimate knowledge of the Mercedarian friar's work:

And another book was that of Fray Martín de Murúa of the Order of Our Lady of Mercy of the Redemption of Captives; he wrote about the history of the Incas. He started to write and he did not finish, or, better said, he neither began nor ended, because he does not declare where the Inca came from nor how nor in what manner nor from whence, nor did he declare if the Incas were legitimate rulers and how their line came to an end. Nor did he write of the ancient kings nor of the great lords or of other things, but rather everything [he wrote was] about [the Incas'] menacing and aggression against the gentle Indians and about how, frightened by them, the gentle Indians became idolaters, just as happened with the Spaniards of Spain, who were gentiles, and the Romans [who conquered them] had idols to Jupiter and to the calf (Guaman Poma 1615, 1090; our translation).

Guaman Poma complained that Murúa had written nothing about the provenance or legitimacy of the Incas, nor about the ancient dynasties that preceded them, and that Murúa had devoted himself instead to telling a tale of the Incas' menacing intimidation and conquest of other peoples, forcing them into idolatry, just as the Romans had conquered and imposed their gods on the ancient peoples of Spain. Guaman Poma would later correct this fearsome view of the Incas in his own work. Our interest here, however, is in the work that provoked the Andean chronicler's commentary, Murúa's Historia general del Perú in the version ("Murúa 1590") that he had the opportunity to illustrate with pinturas (water-colored line drawings) in the late 1590s.

The 2004 facsimile publication of "Murúa 1590" invites its immediate examination. Now we see for the first time not the final manuscript version of Murúa's Inca history (title page date of 1613) but most spectacularly this earlier one, more or less exactly as Guaman Poma would have known it.

The close relationship of Guaman Poma to Murúa's works first became evident with the 1946 publication of Constantino Bayle's edition of "Murúa 1590," based

---

1 Guaman Poma cited two of the Jesuit Acosta's works, De natura novi orbis (1581) and his missionary treatise, De Jennerum indigena salute (1588), as well as the doctrinal works published under Acosta's supervision by the Third Provincial Council (1583, 1584). He mentions Domingo de Santo Tomás's Lexicon o vocabulario de la lengua general del Perú (1569), remarking that Santo Tomás had mixed up the various Andean languages with the Spanish ("libro de vocabulario de la lengua del Cacato, Chinchaysuyo, Quichuana, todo redoblado con la lengua española") (Guaman Poma 1615, 1089-1090).
on the 1890 copy, Bayle reproduced five drawings whose affinities with those of Guaman Poma were self-evident. In 1961 Emilio Mendizábal Losack took up their study. Only one year later, Manuel Ballesteros Gaibreis’ 1962 publication of the first volume of his edition of Murúa 1613 revealed the presence of three more of Guaman Poma’s drawings. These newly revealed illustrations subsequently became the object of Ballesteros’ as well as Mendizábal Losack’s comparativist interests.

The intellectual, artistic, and affective relationships between Guaman Poma and Murúa have been discussed and debated at length over the past decades. From Mendizábal’s early suggestion that Guaman Poma had been Murúa’s illustrator the idea developed that Guaman Poma had been Murúa’s main or only informant. Simultaneously the problem of priority arose: Was Murúa inspired by Guaman Poma’s Nueva corónica, or was the latter inspired by Murúa’s Historia? This question was variously answered. For Ballesteros, Guaman Poma had inspired Murúa; for Ramiro Condurco Morales, it seemed more probable that Guaman Poma had the idea of writing an illustrated chronicle from having worked for Murúa over a period of time. The evidence of the Murúa/Guaman Poma relationship, nevertheless, was sparse, since Bayle’s edition seemed to reveal a very unfinished text, with places designated for chapters that were named but did not appear. In 1996, therefore, great expectations were aroused when the

---

3 Bayle (in Murúa 1946a, 146, 162, 182, 221, 225) reproduced a total of five drawings. We specify here their content and location in the 1590 manuscript and its 2004 facsimile. The first is “el triste Amaru” being led in rope or chains by the Spanish captain, clad in mail, “Loyola,” that is, the Inca prince Tupac Amaru being led into his captivity and execution by Martín García de Loyola (F5b). The second is the royal litter of the Inca (F4v). The third is a very poor rendition of Pachacuti Inca holding a flauta [headband] in hand, which is about to be placed on the head of an Inca captain: “Pachacuti yaco muy enriquecido suerte” (F5v). The fourth is the sleeping princess, “el sueño de la Inca” (F14v), and the fifth is the graphic of the “song of the fúnebre” (F13b bis recto).

4 Comparing the Bayle edition drawings with those of Guaman Poma, Mendizábal Losack (1961, 254) suggested that Guaman Poma probably made the drawings at Murúa’s behest: “la semejanza es tal que permitirá suponer que Murúa copió el dibujo de Waman Puma o, lo que sería más posible, que las últimas de la crónica de Murúa las realizó el propio Waman Puma por encargo del fraile Murúa.”

5 After initiating in 1961 the Guaman Poma/Murúa graphic comparison on the basis of Bayle’s edition of “Murúa 1590,” Mendizábal (1963) goes on to consider “Murúa 1613.” Ballesteros’ considerations concentrated on Murúa 1613. In 1978, he postulated that only two of the Murúa 1613 paintings were drawn by Guaman Poma: Huarcar Inca (“Modo de caminar de los reyes Incas”) and Chuquipullallani (“Modo de caminar de las cosas y reinas”) (fols. 67v/8r and 71/8r, respectively), and in 1981 he argued that Guaman Poma’s series of drawings of Incas and Cosas in the Nueva corónica y buen gobierno were the sources for Murúa’s paintings of the same subjects.
Peruvian anthropologist Juan M. Osio succeeded in tracking down the original “Murúa 1590” manuscript in a private collection in Ireland.5

In December, 2004, eight years after Osio’s announcement of his discovery, a facsimile of the manuscript, the Códice Murúa, appeared in Madrid, published by Testimonio Compañía Editorial.6 It includes ninety-one water-colored drawings that with near certainty can be assigned to Guaman Poma, and to which can be added the three such hand-colored drawings already known from the Murúa 1613 manuscript. The remaining twenty-one drawings, mostly “portraits” of Inca kings and their queens, probably were created by one or more artists other than Guaman Poma, except for the coats of arms included in the portraits of the Inca queens, which bear the compositional features and stylistic “hand” typical of Guaman Poma’s heraldic representations.7 See Appendix 1 for a survey of the distribution of the 150 drawings that are extant in the two Murúa manuscripts.

The publication in facsimile of the long-known “Murúa 1590” manuscript in its entirety is, simply put, a major event in Andean and Spanish American colonial studies. The new facsimile is an important witness to the Murúa/Guaman Poma relationship, and it is imperative to achieve a thorough structural and historical understanding of the remarkable document that it reproduces.8

As an antecedent to our analysis and interpretation of “Murúa 1590,” we examine the history of the Murúa manuscripts and the interpretations of their relationship that have developed over time. To date, this endeavor has not been undertaken systematically, but it is a necessary preamble to understanding the hypotheses that have been put forward regarding the relationship of the Murúa manuscripts. Following the codicological analysis of the earliest version of

5Pablo O’Brian (1996) announced the find in the Lima press, with an article featuring Juan Osio’s successful search. Osio’s (1998, 1999, 2000, 2000-2) announcements soon followed; his admirable persistence in his pursuit is attested by his 1982 article. Osio’s achievement fulfilled the quest of his predecessor and compatriot, Manuel González de la Rosa, who nearly a century earlier had attempted to recover the Murúa manuscript found by Marcos Jiménez de la Espada at Poyacme, González de la Rosa encountered only a late copy, and a bad one, part of which he published in 1911 (see below, section 1.7).

6The two-volume set consists of the facsimile (Murúa 2004, vol. 1), numbered and certified by the publisher, and an accompanying volume of Osio’s study (Osio 2004) and transcription (Murúa 2004, vol. 2). The general assessment of the principles and quality of Osio’s transcription lies beyond the scope of this investigation; a few comments will be made on it, however, as pertinent to our investigation. See below, notes 44, 83, 91, 137 and 142.

7See below, section 3.7.1, note 149.

8We have undertaken similar studies of the related manuscripts, Guaman Poma 1615 (Adorno 2002; Boserup and Adorno 2003a, 2005b, 2005c) and Murúa 1613 (Adorno 2004; Boserup 2004a).
Murúa's *Historia*, we consider the similarities and differences between this work and Guaman Poma's *Nueva crónica*, and we take another look at the literary and artistic relationships between the Mercedarian friar and his one-time Andean collaborator. We close with new insights into Guaman Poma's work's dependence on, and departure from, that of the Mercedarian friar about whom, as we have already seen, his remarks were never generous.  

In his presentation of Murúa 2004, Ossio suggests that the manuscript he publishes consists of an aggregation of materials brought together from earlier drafts of the *Historia*. Following Ballesteros and extending the Spanish historian's views, Ossio presents the newly found manuscript as an assemblage of pieces of various distinct manuscript drafts whose value resides in the preservation of their drawings and whose implications suggest the existence of many unfinished drafts like itself.

Our study points in another direction. We show that when correctly interpreted in its structure and development, "Murúa 1590" reveals itself to be not a loose assemblage of disparate elements but rather an object once crafted, then disaggregated, and finally reassembled. It is, in short, a single unitary entity. We argue, furthermore, that "Murúa 1590" turns out to have been produced in 1596 (or a little later) and that its first three parts are a fair copy of a lost manuscript, the "real" Murúa 1590. To demonstrate these findings, we divide our study as follows:

In Part One we trace the history of scholarship on Murúa's manuscripts from the seventeenth century to the present day. We analyse the texts of these early bibliographic citations and descriptions and show where they have been right, and where they have gone wrong. In general, early misinterpretations, once made, were carried forward, due primarily to the impossibility of directly examining the manuscripts in question. We undertake this part of our investigation in great detail because it is crucial to understanding how canonized views of the Murúa textual tradition have emerged and therefore how they have affected recent and current thinking about the character of, and relationship between, Murúa's works.

In Parts Two and Three, we analyze the "Murúa 1590" manuscript from structural and historical viewpoints, respectively. It is our contention that in spite of the inevitable limitation of information offered by a facsimile, it is possible, on its evidence alone, to make a nearly exhaustive codicological analysis of the manuscript. We show that what first seems to be an extremely complicated hybrid codex turns out to be the result of procedures undergone by one single manuscript, ninety percent of which has been preserved more or less intact. We

---

*Guaman Poma* (1615, 662-663) attributes to Murúa outrages of all sorts against the Indians of the parishes he served.
demonstrate, furthermore, that "Murúa 1590" is an expanded copy, produced starting in 1596 or later, of a version that was briefer, lacked illustrations, and had been completed in and/or dated 1590. The structural and historical approaches, we believe, are complementary, and together they corroborate the general model of the early history of the manuscript that we propose.

In Part Four, we consider the relationship of Murúa and Guaman Poma on the basis of this new understanding of Murúa's early, pre-"Murúa 1590" version of his Historia. We challenge the view that Guaman Poma became Murúa's informant and artist while working on his own Nueva corónica. Instead, we argue that Guaman Poma's work as Murúa's illustrator and his close acquaintance with his work became an important step in his own, later decision to become a "chronicler," not like Murúa but, in juxtaposition if not opposition to him, a "new" chronicler, telling his own truth on the basis of his knowledge of Andean historical tradition and the indigenous experience of colonial oppression.

We now turn to the emergence of "Murúa 1590" in Americana bibliography and its editorial history in relation to that of Murúa 1613. To do so, we must make reference to three manuscripts:

"Murúa 1590":

P(oyanne), the manuscript of which the newly published Códice Murúa is a facsimile, studied for the first time in 1879 by Marcos Jiménez de la Espada in the Spanish Jesuit house (Province of Castile) in Poyanne in southern France and currently owned by Mr. Sean Galvin, of County Meath, Ireland. It bears two titles. One was copied from an earlier and briefer version of the same work, Historia del origen, y genealogía Real de los Reyes ingles del Pirá. De sus hechos, costumbres, trajes, y manera de gobernarn. The other was added later and anticipated the title of Murúa 1613: Ystoria general e libro del origen y descendencia de los ynes señores deste [obscidental] Reyno obscidental del Pirá donde se fomen las conquistas y naciones y guerras civiles esta la entrada de los españoles, con su modo de gobernarn, condicion y trato, y la descripcion [sic] de las mas principales ciudades y villas destas amplissimas provincias.

L(oyola), the manuscript which is a copy of P, made in 1890 at the Jesuit house in Loyola, Guipúzcoa, Spain, where it is still housed.

Murúa 1613:

S(alamanca), the manuscript now housed at The J. Paul Getty Museum in Los Angeles, California, whose modern examination began in 1782 when Juan Bautista Muñoz came upon it in the Colegio Mayor de Cuenca in Salamanca,
Spain, and described its contents. This one carries on its title page the title, *Historia general del Pirú. Origen y descendencia de los Yacues. Donde se trata, así de las guerras civiles suyos, como de la entrada de los españoles, descripción de las ciudades y lugares del, con otras cosas notables.*

**Part One. Manuscripts and Editions of “Murúa 1590” (P) and Murúa 1613 (S)**

1.1. Earliest Traces of S

Murúa’s manuscript work made its way into the earliest bibliographic repertories that included writings on the Americas. In 1672 the great Spanish bibliographer, Nicolás Antonio (1617-1684), was the first to cite Murúa’s work (S). It appeared in Antonio’s two-volume *Bibliotheca hispaina, sive hispanorum ... notitia* (Rome, 1672):

F. MARTINUS DE MURUA, Cantaber, patria ex *Garnica* oppido, ordinis S. Marci de Mercede redemptionis captivorum, scripsit — *Historia general de los Indios del Pirú, circa annum MDCXVIII. cum iconibus vestium, armorum, ceterorumque indumentorum ejus gentis coloribus suis distinctis: que ex Bibliotheca domus Mauritiusi transit in Bibliothecam D. Laurentii Ramírez de Prado regii Senatoris, auctoribus mihi Fratre Petro à Sancto Cecilio ejusdem ordinis in M.S. ibello *De Familiis sive Scriptoribus, & Illustriss. D. Antistite Hydruntino D. Gabriele Adarzo Santanderio literis ad me datis (Antonio 1672, vol. 2, p. 86).* 10

F. Martín de Murúa, Cantabrian, native of the city of Guernica, of the Order of Saint Mary of Mercy and Redemption of Captives, wrote *Historia general de los Incas del Pirú,* around the year 1618 with images of the clothing, arms, and other attire of that people in different colors: from the library of the house [of the Order] in Madrid, it came into the library of the royal councilor, don Lorenzo Ramírez de Prado, as is attested by my sources, fray Pedro de San Cecilio of the same order in his manuscript booklet, “On authors of his family [order],” and by the illustrious bishop of Otranto, don Gabriel Adarzo Santander in a letter sent to me. 11

---

10 The posthumous 1788 edition of Nicolás Antonio’s work, under the title *Bibliotheca hispaina nova sive hispanorum scriptorum, qui ab anno MD ad MDCLXXXIV floresse, notitia,* also includes this entry (Antonio 1788, vol. 2, pp. 106-107).

11 Our translation. A recent Spanish translation misreads “vestium” as “bestiarum” and thus mistranslates the phrase “with images of clothing” as “with images of animals” (las imágenes de los animales) (Antonio 1999, 131).
It is evident that Nicolás Antonio referenced the S manuscript here, both because of the title “Historia general” and the date “circa annum MDCCXVIII.” Both comments refer to the manuscript that had been approved for publication in 1616.

Antonio’s remarks give us the track of the earliest movement of Murcia’s S manuscript in Spain. From the Mercedarian house it went to the library of don Lorenzo Ramírez de Prado, according to fray Pedro de San Cecilio and fray Gabriel Adarzo y Santander, the Mercedarians whom Antonio consulted. Both were involved in literary and historiographic matters pertinent to Mercedarian participation in the Spanish conquest of the Indies. Pedro de San Cecilio was the author of Anales de los Descalzos de la Merced, published posthumously in Madrid in 1669, in which he argued that a Mercedarian had accompanied Columbus on his first voyage.12 Gabriel Adarzo y Santander (1599-1674) is the author of works cited in Antonio’s 1672 Bibliotheca hispana sive hispanorum ... materia (Antonio 1672, vol. 1, pp. 384-385). Adarzo held the post of Provincial Secretary of the Order of Mercy in Madrid, and, according to Carmelo Sáenz de Santa María (1982, vol. 1, pp. xxiv-xxv), he was responsible for some sixty Mercedarian-theme interpolations made into the manuscript copy of Bernal Díaz del Castillo’s Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España, which, prior to its 1632 printing under the supervision of the Mercedarian order’s appointed chronicler, Fray Alonso Remón, had been housed in the library of Ramírez de Prado.13

Don Lorenzo Ramírez de Prado (1583-1658) was a distinguished man of state and letters. The king’s chief chronicler at the time, Gil González Dávila, praised don Lorenzo as a “well known and great benefactor of the histories of Spain and the New World, a true master (devourer) of humane and learned letters.”

12 Vázquez Nuñez 1968, 235; Penedo Rey 1973, xiv, clii. Referring to this Fr. Juan Infante, San Cecilio (1669, vol. 2, p. 141, cited by Vázquez Nuñez 1968, 29) declared: “Dívole el mundo a este señalado varón gran parte del beneficio que todo él recibió con el descubrimiento de las Islas Occidentales, por habiendo ayudado a Cristóbal Colón, fomentando sus intentos, apoyando sus razones; y dándole su mesa y celda en que vivir muchos meses en el Convento de la Merced de Córdoba.” Vázquez Nuñez (1968, 2829) describes San Cecilio as “uno de los hombres más curiosos de su siglo.”

13 León Pincio (1998, 75) remarks that he had examined the original Bernal Díaz manuscript in Ramírez de Prado’s library and that Fray Alonso Remón’s copy of it, at court at the time of León’s writing, had been corrected and was ready to print. This suggests that the Mercedarian interpolations already had been entered by 1629, which means that Remón himself, not Adarzo after Remón’s death as suggested by Sáenz de Santa María, was the likely author of the interpolations.

14 González Dávila (1969, vol. 1, p. 243) described don Lorenzo thus: “público y gran bienhechor de las historias de España, y de las del Nuevo Mundo, verdadero acaparador de las letras humanas, y curiosas.” Entradabasaguas (1943, 138) cited the original 1649 imprint, transcribing “acaparador” (master, devourer), which we have retained here, rather than the modern edition’s “amparo” (protector).
member of the Order of Santiago, don Lorenzo was a long-time councilor in the Real Consejo de Indias (1626-1654) as well as a member (from 1642) of the Real Consejo de Castilla (Schäfer 1935, vol. 1, p. 338). His vast library contained dozens of works on Americanist topics, including, most famously, the manuscript of Bernal Díaz's *Historia verdadera*. Several men of letters, including Antonio de León Pinelo, formally dedicated their own works to him.\(^5\) León Pinelo (1558, 163-164) acknowledged Ramírez's "universal learning" and also remarked on Ramírez's library holdings as a significant bibliographic resource for his own 1629 work.\(^6\) A manuscript like Murúa's 1613 work was no doubt highly prized by Ramírez de Prado, combining his Americanist interests in native cultures and Spanish interventions in the Indies.

Ramírez de Prado's relationship with the Mercedarians is easily documented through his relationship with Fray Alonso Remón, the chronicler of the Mercedarian Order who dedicated his 1632 edition of Bernal Díaz's *Historia verdadera* to don Lorenzo. Remón remarked that he returned to don Lorenzo in print the work that he had held in his library in manuscript, and he praised don Lorenzo's library collection as being so great in number and so excellent in its selection that it would be difficult to add a book that he did not already possess.\(^7\) Constantino Bayle (1946, 35, note 12) suggested that the Mercedarians could have given the Murúa 1613 manuscript to Ramírez de Prado in exchange for that of Bernal Díaz. Whether these were the circumstances or not, the Murúa manuscript went from the Mercedarian convent to don Lorenzo's library after León Pinelo put the finishing touches on his *Epitome* in the late 1620s.

Although León Pinelo did not have Ramírez de Prado's Murúa 1613 at his disposal in order to include it in his 1629 publication, Andrés González de Barcia included Antonio's 1672 or 1688 notice of it when he edited and expanded León Pinelo's *Epitome de la biblioteca oriental y occidental, náutical y geográfica* in 1737-38:

---

\(^5\) León Pinelo dedicated his *Tratado de confirmaciones reales* (Madrid, 1630) to don Lorenzo (Entrambasaguas 1935a, 102).

\(^6\) León Pinelo (1558, 163-164) remarked about Ramírez de Prado: "Con tan eruditas obras ha manifestado parte de sus universales estudios... De su librería, que es copiosísima, me valí para esta obra, lo que por ella consta."

\(^7\) Remón (in Díaz del Castillo, 1632, fol. 7r) declares: "A su librería de Vuestra Señoría tan grande en número y tan útil en elección apenas se puede añadir libro que no tenga, y a la liberalidad de su dueño nada se le puede dar que no haya dado, y así vuelvo a Vuestra Señoría impreso, lo que nos commetió manuscrito, en honra de los piadosos oficios de mi sagrada religión, y noticias ciertas de los notables hechos y de no pensados acercamientos que se vieron en las primeras conquistas de Nueva España." See Díaz del Castillo 1992, vol. 1, p. xxxii.

It is this mention in Barcia’s edition that has given rise to the erroneous notion that León Pinelo himself, in 1629, had listed Murúa’s manuscript. While León Pinelo did not mention Murúa’s Inca history in his “Historias del Perú” section (Title VIII of the “Biblioteca occidental”) or anywhere else in his 1629 work, Barcia, a century later, was able to expand to a total of one hundred and twenty entries the original list of twenty-four titles of manuscript and printed works on Peru that León Pinelo had cited in 1629.

Nicolás Antonio’s description of Murúa’s work continued to be a primary source of information into the early nineteenth century, notably in Antonio de Alcedo y Herrera’s 1807 *Bibliotheca Americana*.

Murúa, Martín de.—Nació en Garnica del Señorío de Vizcaya, entró religioso del Orden de la Merced, y escribió según don Nicolás Antonio: Historia general de los Quipos de los indios y otras antigüedades del Perú, con muchos retratos y dibujos de ellas, escrito el año de 1618.—Manuscrito. Estaba en la librería de don Lorenzo Ramírez de Prado, del Consejo de Castilla (Alcedo y Herrera 1964, vol. 2, p. 84).

As is evident, Alcedo, too, created his entry from Antonio’s description of the Murúa 1613 manuscript, save for the unusual reference to the work as a “history of the quipus.” Once again, the illustrations are the salient feature of the bibliographic description.

1.2. Juan Bautista Muñoz (1782) Discovers S But Does Not Copy It

The migration of Murúa 1613 from the personal library of Lorenzo Ramírez de Prado to the Colegio Mayor de Cuenca in Salamanca occurred a few years after the death of Ramírez de Prado in 1658. His widow, doña Lorenzo de Cárdenas y Valda, whom Nicolás Antonio described as a “leçtissima ac nobilissima iœmima,” sold the library after a long delay, which was due to the Inquisition’s inspection and inventorying of the library, removing prohibited books that Ramírez de Prado had possessed with ecclesiastical permission, and expurgating many others. The bulk of the library’s holdings were purchased by the Colegio.

---

18 Horacio H. Urrutia (1922, p. x) alludes to León Pinelo’s presumed mention of Murúa, and Porras Barrenechea (1946, p. x) erroneously states: “Pinelo afirmó también que ilustraban la obra retratos de los Incas y pinturas de insignias y vestidos.”
The sale of Ramírez de Prado’s library to the Colegio Mayor de Cuenca is confirmed by the investigations made at the Colegio Mayor in 1782 by the great Spanish cosmographer, historian, and founder of the Archivo General de Indias, Juan Bautista Muñoz (1745-1799). Muñoz identified the provenance of the Colegio Mayor’s library holdings which he examined, and which included the listing of the Murúa 1613 manuscript, as coming from Ramírez de Prado’s library: “Biblioteca del Colegio de Cuenca = Su fondo la de D. Lor.” Ramírez de Prado.  

Muñoz had searched for Americanist materials in the libraries of Salamanca, including the Colegio Mayor de Cuenca, Colegio de San Bartolomé, Colegio Viejo, the municipal archive, and those of the university and the cathedral, from July 29 to August 11, 1782. The Colegio Mayor de Cuenca was the site of Muñoz’s richest finds, including works of Hernando Colón and the Quinqueagens of Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo (Ballesteros Beretta 1954, xxiv). Thus the Murúa manuscript formed part of a larger Americanist collection in the Colegio Mayor de Cuenca’s library, just as it had done in that of Ramírez de Prado. Additionally,

---

17 Entrambasaguas 1943a, 88, 188-129. One of doña Lorenza’s petitions to the Holy Office during this time included a domestic appeal: not only had she lost many opportunities to sell the library at home and even abroad, but the floors of rooms where the books were kept were collapsing under their weight: “[M]e da gran pena que se me ha dado en no estar en este momento presente, pero lo que más me afecta es que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costa, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo de tomar los libros que se me han dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, y en tan poco tiempo, que se me ha dado en no estar a tiempo, y tan a mi costo, and in total, the damage was such that it was necessary to take the books away from the room in which they were stored, because they had been left there for so long that they had become useless.” (cited by Entrambasaguas 1943a, 216).

18 It was Marcos Jiménez de la Espada (1832, 456-457, note 1) who in 1832 first mentioned Muñoz’s discovery and examination of Murúa’s Historia general (identified, as noted, as 8) at the Colegio Mayor de Cuenca in Salamanca.

19 Real Academia de la Historia, Muñoz Collection, v. 93, f. 170. Entrambasaguas (1943a, 121, note 2), who examined the Muñoz Collection’s volume 85 in the early 1940s, transcribes this note. In his research in the Colegio Mayor de Cuenca, Muñoz may have been guided to the Murúa 1613 manuscript by consulting an inventory prepared by Andrés Navarro, a fellow of the Colegio, also in 1782, now Madrid B.N., MS 2952. According to Hobson (1976, 491, 495), who mentions this inventory, Murúa 1613 is listed on its fol. 32.

20 Ballesteros Beretta 1954, xxiv. The year was 1783, as asserted by Espada and repeated by Ballesteros (1962, vol. 1, pp. xxvii, xxxiii, xxxiv), and Osio (2004, 12). By early 1784, Muñoz was already in Andalusia, mostly in Seville, making preparations for the creation of the Archivo General de Indias after his September 1783, return to Madrid; he remained there, continuing his investigations and supervising the preparation of shipments of documents to be sent to Seville (see, e.g., Martínez 2000, 70-102).
Muñoz located the papers of Pedro de la Casa, president of the Real Audiencia of Lima (1546-19), at Salamanca's Colegio de San Bartolomé.

Muñoz discovered, examined, and described S, but he did not make a copy of it. This is an important fact which has escaped scholars for more than a century, from Jiménez de la Espada through Ballesteros and Ossio. The misunderstanding apparently began with Espada (1879, p. xxxvii), who turned Muñoz's discovery and mention of the work into a full transcription of it ("copiada por D. Juan Bautista Muñoz para su colección"). Ballesteros (1962, vol. 1, p. xxxi) repeated the unverified assertion ("Segunda copia.—Que bien pudiera ser la primera, que ordenó Muñoz y que se halla catalogada en su Colección"). Most recently, Ossio (2004, 12) assumed and emphatically reaffirmed the existence of a "Copía Muñoz" in a reference to versions of Murúa's works known up to the time of Ballesteros: "Un original desaparecido en el Colegio Menor" of Cuenca de Salamanca que fue visto y transcribo por el año de 1785 por el americanista español Juan Bautista Muñoz."

The careful examination of the Real Academia de la Historia's 1954-56 catalog of the Muñoz Collection reveals, however, that the pertinent Muñoz volume contained only limited reference to Murúa's work.24 Although volume A-120-cum-93-cum-75 disappeared from the Academy decades ago, the contents of this 398-folio volume are meticulously described, entry by entry and folio by folio, in the Real Academia's Muñoz Collection catalog (Real Academia de la Historia 1954-56, vol. 2, pp. 489-493).

In a brief, three-folio entry in his volume of nearly four hundred folios that was described in 1799 as consisting of an "index of manuscripts on the Indies," Muñoz made annotations pertaining to various books that he had examined in the Colegio Mayor de Cuenca in Salamanca.25 We discover that instead of a copy or even a substantive extract of the Murúa 1613 manuscript, Muñoz prepared only

---

23 Error for: Mayor.
24 Muñoz had produced 55 folio-size volumes on the subject of the Indies, and the tone which interests us was numbered 98 through Espada's day and beyond the early 1940s investigations, cited above, of Entrambasagües and, cited below, of Porras Barrenechea. Yet only 76 of these Indies-oriented volumes were among the 108 tomes that in 1817 had been transferred from the king's library to the Real Academia de la Historia. Hence, when the Academy produced its 1954-56 catalog, it made the decision to renumber consecutively the volumes in its possession, and it gave volume 98 the modern number of 75 in order to create a consecutive enumeration of the volumes actually present in the Academy at the time (Real Academia de la Historia 1954-56, vol. 1, pp. 148). Volume 98-cum-75 had an even earlier Royal Academy designation, as "A-120" (Real Academia de la Historia 1954-56, vol. 2, pp. 83, 480), and it has been cited as such by scholars, i.e., Beaumiran (1962, 35).
25 The volume is described as an "index of manuscripts" ("Indias, Indice de Ms.") and the entry in question, as "annotations about certain books" ("Anotaciones sobre algunos libros referentes a Indias"
a brief description of its contents and made a copy of the signature and rubric of the king's censor, Pedro de Valencia. The catalog describes these materials, and their full extent is confined to folio 217 of volume 93: “Se hace extracto de su contenido y se copia la firma y rúbrica de Pedro de Valencia, Censor de la Historia General del Perú... de Fray Martín de Murúa” (Real Academia de la Historia 1954-56, vol. 2, p. 491 [vol. 75, no. 1,723]). Like Entrambasaguas, and, also in the early 1940s, Raúl Porras Barrenechea examined the Muñoz Collection's volume 93 before its disappearance from the Real Academia de la Historia. It is thus to Porras Barrenechea (1962, 381; idem, 1986, pp. 480-481) that we owe the transcription of the full contents of Muñoz's annotations, which had been written in Muñoz's own hand, according to the catalog (Real Academia de la Historia 1954-56, vol. 2, p. 491). In the end, Muñoz's remarks about Murúa's S manuscript are limited to a single folio of the three described as consisting of "Anotaciones sobre algunos libros referentes a Indias de la Biblioteca del Colegio mayor de Cuenca, de Salamanca. Folios 214-217v." Porras Barrenechea copies from "p. 217v." of the Muñoz volume the full entry, which must have appeared under a transcription of the title page of S:

Un tomo en folio de 367 páginas, aunque hay algunas correduras por los que censuraron la obra, testados algunos trozos particularmente cuando se declara contra el vicio y crueldad de los españoles: Divide se en tres libros: 1º Desde el origen de los Incas hasta el establecimiento pacífico del dominio español; 2º Del Gobierno que los Incas tuvieron y ritos que guardaron, 3º Descripción General del Perú y de sus ciudades y villas. Van groseramente pintados los Incas con sus Coyas y mujeres, su modo de caminar en andas, las armas antiguas del Perú.

de la biblioteca del Colegio mayor de Cuenca, de Salamanca. Folios 214-217v.

2 The contents of the other 295 folios of volume 93 (there was an error in the folio's numbering, as the editor notes, jumping from "358" to "359") (Real Academia de la Historia 1954-56, vol. 2, p. 491) included other materials that Muñoz had located at the Colegio Mayor de Cuenca: a document bundle of materials presented to the Consejo de Indias in 1602-1604 and a copy of the already-mentioned index of the manuscripts held at the Colegio Mayor de Cuenca at the time (Real Academia de la Historia 1954-56, vol. 2, pp. 490-491 [vol. 75, nos. 1,720-1,722]; Entrambasaguas 1943a, 121, note 2).

3 The 1960s publication dates of Porras Barrenechea's work on Murúa are misleading: he carried out this work in the 1940s but it was not published until two decades later. His Los conquistadores del Perú won a national prize in 1945, but it did not appear in print until 1962 (Porras Barrenechea 1962, 52A, note 1), and his Fuentes históricas peruanas, published in 1965, reproduces the mimeographed version of the work that he had prepared in 1945 (Porras Barrenechea 1965, 8).
Proceden [un informe] de don Quiñones, Gobernador y Capitán General de Tucumán, aprobando la obra, fecha en Córdoba de Tucumán a 28 de Setiembre de 1614 (original). Aprobaciones también originales del Comisario del Santo Oficio Licenciado Franciscano de Trejo, fecha en Buenos Aires a 17 de Setiembre de 1614 y de otro Comisario de Inquisición en 25 de Agosto de 1611, y otras varias fechas en 1611, 12, 13, 14 y 15. La censura de Pedro de Valencia, dado el orden del Consejo en Madrid, a 28 de Abril de 1616 en que aprueban la obra (Colección Muñoz, Tomo 95, pág. 217 v.).

The brevity of this report and the three-folio entry that includes it is confirmed by Justo Pastor Fustérs authoritative 1850 survey of Muñoz’s work, which was based on the inventory of Muñoz’s collection made immediately after his death in 1799 (Pastor Fustérs 1827-30, vol. 2, pp. 202-233).28 Pastor Fustér describes the folio 214-217 entry of the volume as “Nota de libros de la Biblioteca del Colegio de Cuenca” (Pastor Fustérs 1827-30, vol. 2, p. 227).

To have discovered that Muñoz never made a copy of the Murúa 1613 manuscript has major implications for past and current theories about the number of extant or lost copies of his work and their relationship to the works at hand (see below, section 1.14.1). Although Muñoz did not make a copy of S, he was the first witness ever to record the existence of elements of the P manuscript, albeit unknowingly. His reference to images that depicted the Lucas’ manner of going about in procession (“su modo de caminar en andas”) describes two of the drawings that had been removed from P and inserted into S (see below, section 2.11.1, with Table 7).

1.3. Disappearance of S

The S manuscript fell out of sight with the suppression of Spain’s colegios mayores. That is, in the 1770s Charles III had caused the six colegios mayores gradually to become extinct by allowing vacancies to go unfilled, and Charles IV (r. 1788-1808) issued a decree in September of 1798 to take over their properties (Beaujouan 1962, 42-43). Don Antonio Tavira y Almazán, the “bibliophile bishop” of Salamanca who, as a University of Salamanca professor had demonstrated his deep interest in bibliographic and educational history, inventoried the libraries of the colegios mayores between 1799 and 1802. All of Tavira’s work can be consulted at the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid (Beaujouan 1962, 43-45; Carabias Torres 1983, 29).
145). Charles IV was an avid bibliophile, and from his ascent to the throne in 1788 until 1811, the palace library expanded to some 20,000 volumes. Around 1800 he "appears to have decided to assemble a central archive of documents relating to Spanish history," and in the next eight years he amassed a large number of manuscripts, including those of Salamanca's colegios mayores of San Bartolomé and Cuenca (Hobson 1976, 487). Beaujouan (1962, 45) estimates that the manuscripts were transferred from Salamanca to the private library of the king, the Biblioteca del Palacio, in the final months of 1802 or the beginning of 1803. In one of the manuscript copies of the inventory of the Colegio Mayor de Cuenca library is found the notation: "Esta librería como la de todos los colegios mayores se traxo a Madrid al real Palacio para la biblioteca particular de S. Majestad" (cited by Beaujouan 1962, 35, note 5).

These holdings were subsequently "requisitioned," along with many other Spanish treasures, by Joseph Bonaparte, who acted as king of Spain from 1808 to 1813. When the French were defeated in the battle at Vitoria in 1813, with Lord Wellington commanding the Anglo-Portuguese and Spanish army, the war booty, delivered to Wellington the following day, consisted of some two hundred rolled-up paintings, state papers and private correspondence, drawings and prints, and some thirty-two print and manuscript volumes, one of which was the Murúa S manuscript (Hobson 1976, 485). Thus S became part of the library of Sir Arthur Wellesley (1769-1852), the first Duke of Wellington (titled as the duke of Ciudad Rodrigo in Spain), who in 1815 led the army that defeated the French at the Battle of Waterloo. Murúa's manuscript remained there, unknown to the scholarly world, for nearly a century and a half, until 1951 when Miguel Enguitán Requena, working on behalf of Manuel Ballesteros Gaibrois, located it in the duke's library and Ballesteros published it in 1962-64 (see below, section 1.10).

1.4. Marcos Jiménez de la Espada (1879): Discovery of P

Nearly a century after Muñoz examined S in Salamanca, Espada consulted, and took notes from, Muñoz's description of S. By way of introduction to his 1879 edition of *Tres relaciones de antigüedades peruanas*, Espada wrote a letter/prologue to the Count of Toresco that includes this description of Murúa's work:

> la Historia general del Perú, origen y descendencia de los Incas, pueblos, ciudades, etc., año de 1616, por el P.Fr. Martín de Murúa, arcediano, comendador y cura de Huata, copiada por D. Juan Bautista Muñoz para su colección, y que Pinelo cita con fecha incierta y añadiendo que la ilustraban los retratos de los Incas, y pinturas de insignias y vestidos de estos reyes.29

29 Our emphasis. "Carta al Excmo. Sr. D. Francisco de Borja Queipo de Llano, Conde de Toresco" in
By Espada's choice of terms to describe the manuscript and its author, it is evident that he is reporting information about S and that all the bibliographic data comes from Muñoz, not Pinoel. The source of the phrases, "Historia general del Perú, origen y descendencia de los Incas" and "comendador y cura de Huata," is the title page of S, no doubt as conveyed by Muñoz. The date of 1616 appeared in the Muñoz entry itself, as we saw that entry quoted in full by Porras Barnuevo (see above, section 1.2). However, Espada's reference to Pinoel can only be to Andrés González de Barcia's eighteenth-century edition of the 1629 Epitome, because León Pinoel himself apparently did not know of, because he did not reference, Murúa's work. The source for the phrase, "los retratos de los Incas, y pinturas de insignias y vestidos," is unequivocally Barcia's 1737-38 edition of Pinoel's Epitome (see above, section 1.1).

In this light, the anomalous reference to Murúa as "arcediano" is likely to be Espada's interpretation of the title of "elector de capítulo general," for so Murúa was identified, with respect to the provinces of Peru and sometimes Castile, in the approbations that precede the 1613 text (Ballesteros 1962, vol. 1, pp. 5-14). Bayle pointed out that the title of "arcediano" could not have corresponded to Murúa, and Ballesteros expressed the same misgiving. 30

Regarding Espada's assertion that Muñoz made a copy of Murúa's work, there is, as we have seen, absolutely no evidence for it. In any case, Espada's 1879 description of S gave rise to the erroneous notion that Muñoz had made a complete copy of the Murúa 1613 manuscript, and as we shall see, it is a statement that Espada repeated in 1892, when he described P. It is clear that Espada's information is hearsay and that he did not consult Muñoz's manuscript volume closely. If he had done so, he would have seen that Muñoz had not made a copy of the work.

In the same year (1879) as he published the Tres relaciones, Jiménez de la Espada came upon P ("Murúa 1590") at the Jesuit College in Poyanne in southern France.

Espada did not publish the results of his 1879 examination of the Poyanne manuscript until 1892. There he quoted the full title of P and explicitly pointed out the divergence of the titles of the two manuscripts. However, he was still

Jiménez de la Espada, ed. (1859, xxxviii). Espada briefly mentions Murúa's manuscript as he informs the count about a handful of works of Spanish authorship, written about Peruvian antiquities in the middle of the seventeenth century. Urcuela (1922, p. v) later cites Espada's description (which is of S) in his edition of L (copy of P).

Bayle (1946, 3) writes: "Lo de comendador y cura corre sin dificultad; lo de arcediano, tropieza en que es dignidad catedralica que no hubo en Huata, ni de suyo cabe en fraile." Ballesteros (1962, vol. 2, p. xxxv, note 32) added about such an office: "Lo que no parece muy probable, siendo fraile."
under the misapprehension that Muñoz had made a copy of the S manuscript, and that S was basically identical to P:

Historia del origen y genealogía real de los reyes indios del Pirú. De sus hechos, costumbres, trajes y manera de gobierno. Compuesta por el padre fray Martín de Murúa, de la Orden de Ntra. Sra. de la Merced, de la redención de Captivos, conventual del convento de la gran ciudad del Cuzco, cabeza del reino y provincias del Pirú. Acabóse por el mes de mayo del año de 1590.—Un tomo folio de 147 ff. y tres sin foliar de tablas al fin.—Original inédito. Contiene datos muy poco conocidos y de gran interés. Lleva láminas de dibujo incorrecto e iluminadas con poco arte; pero de ella pueden sacar gran partido los arqueólogos americanistas. The MS. existía el año de 1739 en el archivo del Colegio de la Compañía de Jesús de Alcalá de Henares. Yo le vi y puse con espacio en el de Poyane [sic] el año de 1879.—El tomo 28 [sic] de la colección de D. Juan Bautista Muñoz contenía una copia de esta obra, aunque con el título variado y con el año 1616, procedente del Colegio Mayor de Cuenca en Salamanca. El P. Murúa o Murúa era del mismo pueblo que San Ignacio de Loyola; fue comendador de su Orden, cura de Huata y doctrinero de Capachica.

Espada here merges new information about P, that is, its title, its date, its length, and a comment on its drawings, with earlier information about S. He repeats the date of 1616, identifies Murúa’s missionary posts, and adds Muñoz’s note about the location of the work at the Colegio Mayor de Cuenca, all of which pertain to S. His erroneous statement that the Muñoz Collection “contained a copy of this work” shows that he considered the manuscript that he examined (P) to

31 Espada’s remark about the “poor quality” of the drawings of P, notwithstanding their usefulness to archaeologists, is repeated verbatim by Vargas Ugarte (1952, 274) who also paraphrased Barle (1946, 36) when describing the 1859 Loyola manuscript (L), calling it a “bad copy, lacking the drawings (“obtiene bastante de la que examinó Jiménez de la Espada y es una mala copia, carece de las láminas, de dibujo incorrecto e iluminados con poco arte, pero de ellas pueden sacar gran partido los arqueólogos”).

32 Misprint for 93. Volume 23 of the Muñoz Collection in the Academia consists of 248 folios and gives accounts of various voyages of discovery: “Tomo 23. Volumen encuadernado en cartón, de 248 folios, conteniendo diversas relaciones de viajes y descubrimientos.” Another volume numbered 28, as catalogued at the time of Muñoz’s death in 1700, consisted of the first part of fray Pedro de Aguado’s Historia de Santa Marta y Nuevo Reino de Granada and was passed to the king’s library (Real Academia de la Historia: 1954-54, vol. 1, pp. viii, 23).
be the original version ("1590") of the work, and the manuscript consulted by Muñoz at Salamanca (5), which carried the royal authorization to print, dated 1616, to be a later copy of it.

One more statement made by Espada for which we have not found a source, and which must be looked upon with suspicion, is his assertion that $P$ was located in the Colegio Máximo de la Compañía de Jesús in Alcalá de Henares in 1739. Since, as we will see below, the $S$ manuscript was at the Colegio Mayor de Cuenca throughout the eighteenth century, Espada's statement, whether accurate or not, can only be meant to pertain to $P$. Though undocumented, we find it probable, on the basis of the clearer picture that we have today of $P$, that $P$ came to Spain in Murúa's lifetime, together with $S$ (see below, section 3.19). However, its whereabouts after Murúa's death, before $P$ came to the Jesuit refuge in Poyanne in 1669, nearly 250 years later, are as yet undocumented. Neither "padre M. Arcos de la Santísima Trinidad" (which may be his personal name by ordination or refer to a religious order of the same name, the Order of the Holy Trinity), nor "padre Colonia," both of whom are cited as parties to the donation of the manuscript, have been identified. The archival signatures, "Vs A.2.; Caj. 2", on the front of the binding are likewise unidentified to date.

We can, however, bring into focus $P$'s nineteenth-century entry into the Jesuit College in southern France and its return to Spain as part of the tumultuous political history of the late nineteenth century that affected the Jesuit order. Jiménez de la Espada's pursuit of Spanish manuscripts held in Jesuit repositories abroad came as a result of the Revolution of 1868 and the dispersal of Spanish Jesuit communities, primarily to France (Revuelta González 1999, 12). The official decree of the suppression of the Society of Jesus on October 12, 1868, promulgated by Antonio Romero Ortiz, Minister of Justice of the revolutionary government, provoked the quick action of padre Felipe Gómez (1811-1870) who, as Provincial of Castile, purchased a chateau in southern France as a place of study, work, and refuge for the most needy members of the order (Revuelta González 1984, vol. 1, pp. 101-102, 179, 267).

The Jesuits exiled from the Province of Castile quickly consolidated all the phases of their training, from the novitiate through theological studies, in the great house at Poyanne. For eleven years, from 1869 to 1880, it was the most important house of study of the Castilian Province (Revuelta González 1984, vol. 1, pp. 242, 527). Its library was progressively enriched with the collections that had belonged to the Jesuit houses at Loyola and León (Revuelta González 1984, vol. 1, p. 531), and the $P$ manuscript was among its holdings; Espada examined it at Poyanne in what would be that house of study's penultimate year, 1879.

The track of the $P$ manuscript from Poyanne to Loyola is glimpsed in the remarks of its first editor, Manuel González de la Rosa (1911, p. v), who noted that the manuscript moved from France to Guipúzcoa after the suppression of
the Jesuit college at Poyanne, which occurred with the suppression of all Jesuit colleges in France in 1880. Repatriation to Spain from Poyanne had already begun in 1878, with the reestablishment of the novitiate of the College at Loyola. Thus when the decrees of expulsion from France were applied at mid-year in 1880, the very last inhabitants of the Jesuit house at Poyanne left by order of the French authorities on June 30 (Revuelta González 1984, vol. 1, pp. 529, 1183). The gradual abandonment of the center of study at Poyanne evidently made possible the careful transfer of its library holdings, which were once again installed in Loyola. Revuelta González (1998, 121), whose studies on the Jesuits we have followed here, characterized the libraries of the Jesuit colleges as containing not only the materials necessary for the preparation of classes and collections of religious and scholarly journals but also incunables and other ancient and rare materials.

1.5. Loyola, 1890: P is Copied and Disappears

A copy of the P manuscript, which we identify as L, was made at Loyola in 1890. We owe this information to the first direct description of L, which was made by Rubén Vargas Ugarte at the “Archivo de la Santa Casa de Loyola (Guipúzcoa)” in his early 1930s survey of the libraries of Europe, where he examined and described some four hundred manuscripts related to the history of Peru, five of them at the Loyola archive (Vargas Ugarte 1935, v-vii, 354-356). His description includes the title of L, its length, and the date on which it was copied from the original. (The date of the copy was probably inscribed in the copy itself):


31 González de la Rosa (1911, p. v) writes: “La primera idea que hemos tenido de Morúa han sido las citas de Jiménez de la Espada, que vió el manuscrito en el colegio que tenían los jesuitas en Poyanne [sic].” Después de la supresión de dicho colegio en Francia, pasó el manuscrito a la casa central de la orden, en Loyola, donde se sacó la copia que hoy se publica.

Immediately following this account of P via L, Vargas Ugarte (1935, 354-355) goes on to transcribe Jiménez de la Espada’s 1892 description of the supposed copy of S in the Muñoz Collection, and, following Espada, he assumes that P and S were two copies of the same work: “El tomo 23 [sic] de la Col. de Muñoz contenía una copia de esta obra aunque con el título variado y con el año 1616.” Vargas Ugarte mentions that González de la Rosa had obtained a copy [of L], and that he had published a portion of the work. In his own survey of the Real Academia de la Historia’s holdings, Vargas Ugarte does not cite “volume 23” but by his comment on volume 93 he indirectly confirms that it did not contain any copy of a Murúa manuscript: “El contenido de los demás volúmenes de la [colección] M[uñoz] no ofrecen especial interés para el Perú, pues se reducen a índices de Mss. (tomos 92 y 93) o a obras ya publicadas, como el libro Tercero de las Guerras Civiles del Perú o Guerra de Quito, de Cieza” (Vargas Ugarte 1935, 313).

Vargas Ugarte’s is the first description of the L copy based on personal examination. Commenting on Murúa’s identification of his origin and missionary duties found in the prologue to part 4, he notes its location as 1126v of the lost original but as page 135 of the Loyola copy. He adds that he has not been able to see the original which, without doubt, he says, had existed at the Loyola archive as a donation by padre Marfa Arcos. The loss of P occurred between 1890 and the early 1920s. We know that in 1925 its proud, private owner was Castor Pereda Ruiz de la Peña, who emblazoned the last page of part 3 (1125v) of the L manuscript with his name.

Summing up, there had been one direct examination of S (Juan Bautista Muñoz in 1782), one direct examination of P (Jiménez de la Espada in 1879),

---

38 “El Dr. González de la Rosa obtuvo también copia del ms. y se propuso publicarlo en Lima, por entregas, pero sólo consiguió dar a luz las primeras” (Vargas Ugarte 1935, 355). González de la Rosa’s edition published, however, at least two-thirds of the L manuscript (see below, section 1.7).
39 The illegible left-hand marginal note on the facsimile’s title page is copied at the bottom of the title page of the 1890 L manuscript, and it refers to Guipúzcoa and fol. 126 (Ossio 2004, 11 [fig. 11]).
40 Also making note of the missing chapters, and of the 5 copied drawings (see above, note 2), Vargas Ugarte (1935, 355) writes: “No hemos logrado ver el orig, que, sin duda, existía en el Archivo y fue obsequiado, según se advierte, por el P. Marie Arcos de la Santísima Trinidad. En la copia se dice que los capítulos IV, V y VI del Libro Primo, se hallan en blanco en el orig. Asimismo el Cap. VIII del Libro Segundo. Al final de los Cap. XV y XVI del Libro Segundo hay una mina y otras dos, al fin de los cap. V y XII del Libro Tercero. De este libro se hallan en blanco los caps. IX, X, XVI y XXXV.”
41 Bayle (1940, 36) suggests that its disappearance was a consequence of the political turmoil of that era: “Yo lo puse de todo, el original, sin que nadie sepa cómo, falta del Archivo de Loyola: consecuencia de los trasvases a que obligaron los rojos y pretros.”
42 “Propiedad de Castor Pereda Ruiz de la Peña del Prado de Henar, Febrero 20 de 1925” (1125v).
and one direct examination of L (Vargas Ugarte in the early 1930s). While in 1935 Vargas Ugarte provided the fullest independent description of P on the basis of his examination of L, the prevailing notion, first generated by Espada, was that P was the original manuscript, that S ("1616") was its late copy, and that Muñoz had made a copy of S in the eighteenth century. No one has ever seen this "Muñoz copy" of S because it never existed.

1.6. After Espada: Confusion of S and P

As a result of their surfacing and disappearance, the confusion between the P and S manuscripts accompanied the early publication history of Murúa's work. In the preface to the first, partial edition of P in 1911, its editor, Manuel González de la Rosa, following Espada (1879, 1892) and thus repeating his error, stated that a more complete copy of the manuscript that he was publishing was located in the Muñoz Collection in the Real Academia. He prudently qualified his remark, however, by noting that he had not had the opportunity to compare them. He thus believed that there was one work existing in one original manuscript at Loyola and that there existed a copy of it, obtained or prepared by Muñoz, in Madrid. In other words, for him, our P and S were one and the same manuscript.

In 1922 Horacio H. Urteaga made the same assumption, that is, that there was one Murúa work existing in one original manuscript, that Espada had revealed its existence, that González de la Rosa had succeeded in obtaining a copy of it and publishing part of it, and that a copy of it was preserved in the Muñoz Collection in the Real Academia de la Historia.\(^{32}\)

In 1935 Vargas Ugarte (355; idem, 1939, 229), who examined L, also thought that the manuscript entitled Historia del origen y genealogía real (P), edited by González de la Rosa (actually, this was L, the copy of P), was the work that

\(^{32}\) "Existe otra copia, de fecha posterior, que se conserva en la colección Muñoz de la Academia de la Historia, vols. 13 o 23 [sic], que puede ser más completa, pero que no es original. Siento no haber tenido ocasión de compararla, después de obtener la copia [of L], en los últimos meses de mi residencia en París" (González de la Rosa 1911, p. vi). Vargas Ugarte (1932, 274) repeats Espada's error as transmitted by González de la Rosa: "González de la Rosa dice en el prólogo de su edición que en la Academia de la Historia de Madrid y en la Colección Muñoz existía otra copia."

\(^{33}\) Referring to the "original" Murúa manuscript, Urteaga affirms (1922, pp. v-vi): "Fue revelada su existencia, por el infatigable americánista don Marcos Jiménez de la Espada... apuntaba que 'el año de 1616 se escribió o continuo de escribir La historia general del Perú, Origen y descendencia de los Incas, pueblos, ciudades, etc., por el P. Fr. Martín de Morúa, arcediano, comendador y cura de Huata'. De estos previsímos datos... Dr. Manuel González de la Rosa... supo... que la obra original fue guardada en la biblioteca de los Jesuitas de la Casa Mayor de la Compañía en Loyola, existiendo
Muñoz had supposedly copied, to the effect that there was one work existing in one original manuscript (P/S), from which a copy was made in the eighteenth century by Muñoz. Similarly, in 1946, Porras Barrenechea (p. xvi), citing Vargas Ugarte (1939, 229), who was following Espada’s 1892 statement, asserted that “the original manuscript of the Jesuits [P] first belonged to the Archive of the College of the Company in Alcalá de Henares, where Muñoz copied it, and later it was given by padre Arcos to the Jesuits of the College at Poyanne, where Jiménez de la Espada saw it.” Once again, and in addition to new erroneous assertions, such as Muñoz copying Sat Alcalá, by inference from Espada, in 1739 (which was some years before Muñoz’s birth), there was one Murúa manuscript (P/S), with a Muñoz copy.

None of these early editors of P through L had seen either P or S, so it is not surprising that they relied on Espada’s authority and did not query whether the variation in the titles reported for the work could represent anything other than a slightly different copy of the same work, but a copy nonetheless. The lack of significance that these early editors attributed to the manuscript’s variant titles is underscored by the way they entitled their own editions:

González de la Rosa 1911: Origen e historia de los Incas, obra escrita en el Cuzco (1575-90) por Fray Martín de Murúa.

Urteaga 1922-25: Historia de los Incas, Reyes del Perú por el R.P. Fr. Martín de Murúa.

Loayza 1946: Los orígenes de los Incas, Crónica sobre el Antiguo Perú escrita en el año de 1590 por el Padre mercedario Fray Martín de Murúa.

Bayle (in Murúa 1946a) was the first to carry forward the actual title of the work he was editing: Historia del origen y genealogía real de los reyes Incas [sic] de Perú, de sus hechos, costumbres, tregas y maneras de gobierno. Yet in 1946 Bayle (35-36), too, assumed that P, the “original” of L, had been fully copied by Muñoz in Salamanca, and that given the peripatetic life that documents sometimes have, it had ended up in the archive of the Jesuit house at Loyola. Bayle was correct as to the name of the city (Salamanca) where Muñoz had encountered a Murúa manuscript

una copia en la famosa colección de Muñoz, perteneciente hoy a la Academia de la Historia de Madrid” (Urteaga 1922, pp. v-vi).

41 “Vargas Ugarte” dice que el manuscrito original de los jesuítas perteneció primero al Archivo del Colegio de la Compañía de Alcalá de Henares, donde lo copió Muñoz y que luego fue subsecuio por el Padre María Arcos de la Santísima Trinidad a los Jesuítas del Colegio de Poyanne, donde lo vio Jiménez de la Espada. El Padre Vargas dice Murúa y no Morúa” (Porras Barrenechea 1946, xvii).
(Porras, citing Alcalá de Henares, was not), but Bayle was still in the dark insofar as he considered P and S to be one and the same manuscript. Once more, there was one Murúa manuscript, with a Muñoz copy.

To date, there is no conclusive identification of the donation statement found on the title page of the P manuscript: “It was given to the archive by padre M. Arcos de la Santísima Trinidad at the request of padre Colonia.” The statement about father Arcos on the title page of L, taken to be a copy of P/S, has been interpreted in a variety of ways. In 1911 González de la Rosa (p. x) cited the donation statement and suggested that it might register the manuscript’s donation to the first conventual archive that received it, perhaps in Cuzco, perhaps in Spain. In 1925, Vargas Ugarte (355), who saw the L manuscript personally at Loyola, stated that the P manuscript had been donated by padre Arcos to the Loyola archive. In 1946, Bayle (36, note 13) also cited the donation statement on the title page of the P manuscript, as he knew it from the Loyola copy. Like Vargas Ugarte, he interpreted the statement as the expression of its conveyance to the Jesuit house in Loyola, Guipúzcoa.

Additionally, Raúl Porras Barrenechea, whose second-hand information (from Espada 1892) led him to assert that Muñoz had copied the Murúa manuscript and that he had done so in Alcalá de Henares, identified this statement as pertaining to the manuscript’s donation to the Jesuit house in Poyanne, France. It could also refer to the Jesuit College in Alcalá de Henares, if Espada was right about P being housed there in 1739, prior to the 1767 expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain and its dominions. However, as we have seen, Espada’s 1892 report is faulty in more than one respect, and his information about an Alcalá provenance of P is corroborated by no source that is independent of that same report. At the time of this writing, the earliest documented location of “Murúa 1500” is Poyanne, and the parties and time of occurrence referred to in the donation statement have not yet been identified.

1.7. González de la Rosa (1911): editio princeps of P

As mentioned above, we owe the first, though incomplete, edition of Murúa’s P manuscript to Manuel González de la Rosa (1841-1911). This Peruvian bibliophile

---

and scholar spent several years in Europe, gathering manuscript sources on ancient Peru, and his aim was to publish a series of unedited works on Inca history, in a collection called "Historiadores del Perú." Apart from the Jesuit Bernabé Cobo's history of the foundation of Lima, González de la Rosa succeeded only in publishing a portion of it.  

Following up on Espada's references to Murúa's work, and knowing that he had examined the manuscript at the Jesuit house in Poyanne, González de la Rosa (1911, pp. x-xi) made an inquiry to "padre Uriarte, to whom I had written without knowing him, at the suggestion of a learned Spanish friend." This was the Jesuit historian and bibliographer, José Eugenio de Uriarte (1842-1909), who had been professor of patristics, Hebrew, and Holy Scriptures at the Jesuit college at Poyanne from 1875 to 1879 (O'Neill and Domínguez 2001, vol. 4, p. 3861). González de la Rosa further mentions that Uriarte was near death at the time that he wrote to him, and so the ailing Jesuit forwarded his request to a French colleague, the learned Ernest M. Riviére, S.J., in Toulouse. Padre Riviére requested a copy of the manuscript from the archivist at the Loyola house in Guipúzcoa on González de la Rosa's behalf. It was copied and sent by post to Paris, where González de la Rosa was residing at that time.

González de la Rosa's mention of Uriarte's ill health helps us date the time of his request and its fulfillment. It is important because Bayle (1946, 36) thought

---

6 González de la Rosa's projected collection was to have included not only his 1882 edition of Bernabé Cobo's 1639 Historia de la fundación de Lima, but also editions of the works of Pedro de Gaca de León, Juan de Betanzos, Cristóbal de Molina, Juan Polo de Ondegardo, Juan de Santander Pacheco, Tito Cosi Yunganqui, Giovanni Andía Oliva, and Fernando de Montesinos, as well as the Huarmendúi manuscript, the "premio de Yucay," and Iran Viceroy de Vehíbre's "Relación a Carlos V" (González de la Rosa, ed. 1882, xxx). His plan to publish Gaca's Segunda parte in London was aborted when he returned to Peru, and economic difficulties forced him to sell his important Columbus manuscript collection to the French collector and bibliophile, Henry Vignaud (1830-1922) (Porras Barrero 1965, 211).

Murúa's name did not appear in González de la Rosa's 1882 announcement of his publication plans because it would be another decade before Jiménez de la Espada announced in print (in 1892) his 1879 examination of the Murúa manuscript at Poyanne. See Riviére 1986 for a study of González de la Rosa's career and works.

8 Uriarte and Riviére were important Jesuit historians and bibliographers. Uriarte had aspired to cover all of Jesuit bibliography when the Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus by De Backer and Sommervogel appeared (1890-1932), and he thus decided to limit his efforts to the Jesuit writers of Spain; his work received the highest praise from Sommervogel himself (O'Neill and Domínguez 2001, vol. 4, p. 3861). In his own right, Riviére wrote a volume of corrections to the De Backer-Sommervogel Bibliothèque, entitled Corrections et additions à la Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus. Supplément au "De Backer-Sommervogel" (Toulouse, 1911-1930).
that González de la Rosa obtained his copy "a mediados del siglo XIX," which is far from the fact; if it had been that early, it would have been a copy made directly from Marúa's 1500 manuscript (P). The date was instead 1909, for that was the year of Uriarte's death. Upon González de la Rosa's receipt of the copy of the Loyola manuscript (this was L, but he thought it was P), and "even before reading it," he had two further copies made and dispatched, respectively, to Sir Clements Markham for use in his book on the Incas as well as to "another friend in Lima" (González de la Rosa 1911, pp. xxi). In his The Incas of Peru, Markham (1910, 10) confirms the date of receipt by stating that González de la Rosa obtained his copy from the Loyola archive in 1909.47

González de la Rosa then prepared his edition. Announced as inaugurating a series of works on Peru ("Materiales para la historia del Perú primitivo, que comienza a publicar y anotar Manuel González de la Rosa, miembro de número del Instituto Histórico del Perú, de la Sociedad de Americanistas de Paris, hoy su corresponsal, etc."), the volume was described on its title page as being of a very short press run ("muy corta tirada"). The rarity of the edition has yielded various accounts of its length. Urteaga (1922, vol. 1, p. vi) gave the impression that it was quite incomplete; he reported that the printers lost some two hundred pages of the materials that González de la Rosa had submitted to the press and that after his death his heirs received from the publisher only the fragmented manuscript copy, which later passed into Urteaga's hands. Vargas Ugarte (1935, 355; idem, 1952, 274) later explicitly described the edition as reaching to book 3, chapter 21. The copy that we have been able to examine covers two-thirds of the work, running to book 3, chapter 43. Since, however, the copy is truncated in the middle of the chapter, it is impossible to know the full extent of this mutilated copy, which lacks the thirty final chapters of book 3, the prologue and sixteen chapters of book 4, the Ficción, and the Tabla.48

This very first, apparently incomplete edition makes note of three drawings: the execution of Tupac Amaru (P, 651r), the depiction of the Inca and his queen with two young children (157v), and the scene of the Inca Pachacuti distributing honors (159v), which González de la Rosa describes, due to its poor description,

---

47 Although Pese (1985, 245) suggests that the Markham copy was apparently prepared simultaneously with the one made for González de la Rosa, the latter states (and Urteaga [1922, p. vi] corroborates), that he had one made for Markham, "when he was going to publish his final work on the Incas.

48 We examined the printed copy held in the Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Special Collections Library of Duke University. We wish to express our gratitude to César Rodríguez, Curator of the Latin American Collection of Sterling Memorial Library at Yale, Irene Munster, Latin American and Iberian Bibliographer at Duke's Perkins Library, and especially Elizabeth Dunn, Research Services Librarian in the Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Special Collections Library at Duke, for facilitating our access to this rare edition.
as a picture of the Inca as a child ("figura infantil del Inca"). We know that the copy sent to him from Loyola made verbal reference to these drawings, because he notes that, although present in the original, these depictions are missing in the copy he received (González de la Rosa in Munúa 1911, 70, 90, 96). The copy was prepared with some care because González de la Rosa was able to transmit some of the marginalia, consisting of a few notes found at the side and bottoms of various pages (f31r, f51v, and f56v, respectively).

Since González de la Rosa requested and received his copy by mail and had not seen the manuscript from which his copy was taken, he believed that in Loyola he had located the original Munúa manuscript (P): "This manuscript, which I believe to be original, is the same one that was in the Jesuits' convent in Poyanne and that later passed to the house at Loyola." In the 1920s the manuscript from which González de la Rosa's edition was made was still understood to be the original. Urteaga (1922, pp. vii) heralded González de la Rosa's discovery as being that of "the original and unpublished work that was preserved in the library of the Jesuits of the Casa Mayor de la Compañía in Loyola." Similarly, in 1946, as mentioned above, Bayle (1946, 35) assumed that González de la Rosa had his copy made in the middle of the nineteenth century, i.e. prior to the making of its 1890 copy, and that it was thus a copy of the "original."

There had been one important (but unheeded) exception to this misunderstanding: Vargas Ugarte (1935, 355), who had examined it in Loyola, understood it to be a copy of the original made at Loyola in 1890: "No hemos logrado ver el original, que, sin duda, existió en el Archivo."

Ironically, some of the fruits of González de la Rosa's unpublished labors were made available in English even before the first (and only) installment of his own Spanish edition was published. Clements Markham made much use of the copy of the Loyola manuscript, sent to him by González de la Rosa, in his

---

10"Este manuscrito, que creo original, es el mismo que estaba en el convento de los jesuitas en Poyanne [sic] y que pasó después a la casa de Loyola" (González de la Rosa 1911, p. 8). This means that he understood it to be P. Another indication that González de la Rosa thought that the copy from which he was working had been made from the original manuscript found in his edition's annotations. About the poor copy of a drawing of an Inca (Tupac Amaru, although he identified the figure as Titu Amuci because of the surrounding text), González de la Rosa (in Munúa 1911, 103 [bk. 2, ch. 15]) remarked: "Estos versos y esta leyenda aparecen en el pie de un grabado figurando un inca cautivo, y que no reproducimos aquí por ser una mala copia de que se conserva en el manuscrito original." (Urteaga and Romero [Munúa 1922, vol. 1, p. 105]) repeat this note in their own edition.)

30 Urteaga (1922, vii): "Tras no pocos esfuerzos, supo éste [González de la Rosa] al fin, que la obra original cínédita se guardaba en la biblioteca de los jesuitas de la Casa Mayor de la Compañía de Jesús."
1910 *The Incas of Peru.* In fact, Markham published as an appendix to that work a loose English translation of the romantic tale (*Ficción*) about the shepherd and the princess with which Murúa ends the P manuscript. Markham was a prolific translator of Spanish chronicles, and it was his stated intention to do a full translation of Murúa’s chronicle (Markham 1910, xi). This was a project that he envisioned in his octogenarian years but did not complete.

1.8. Urteaga (1922-25): *In the Footsteps of González de la Rosa*

Horacio H. Urteaga published in two installments, in 1922 and 1925, a fuller edition of the L manuscript in his series, “Colección de libros y documentos referentes a la historia del Perú,” which was the type of project earlier envisioned but not realized by González de la Rosa. Urteaga’s edition was based partly on the remains of González de la Rosa’s manuscript copy and his preliminary editorial work based on it, provided to Urteaga by Julio Sañudo after González de la Rosa’s death. Importantly, Urteaga obtained a fresh copy of parts of L, which was prepared for him through the offices of padre Ignacio del Olmo, Superior of the Jesuit College in Lima (Urteaga 1922, pp. vii). Urteaga (1922, p. vii) writes that padre del Olmo interested his colleagues in Loyola in the project so that they could complete for him, that is, for Urteaga, the fragmented book that he had collected from González de la Rosa’s heirs. Thanks to the dispatch of these new copies of missing sections, which supplemented the fragmented

---

54 Urteaga (1922, p. vi) mentions that Markham used Murúa’s work to great advantage, “as is proven by the references that he makes in his book [*The Incas of Peru*] to the Mercedarian chronicler.” Means (1928, 412) also recalls that Murúa’s manuscript work was “frequently used by him [Markham] while writing *The Incas of Peru*” and that afterward Markham sent his copy of the manuscript to Urteaga, although the latter does not mention it in his 1922-25 edition.

55 Markham (1910, 488-414) translates the tale’s title as “Fiction or story of a famous shepherd named Acaya-napo, and the beautiful and discreet princess, Chumpi-Llantu, daughter of the sun.” He announces it as having been “told to Fray Martín de Murúa, who was a Quichua scholar, in about 1585, by old Amauta well versed in Inca folklore.”

56 Markham (1910, vii) attributed the awakening of his passionate interest in the study of ancient Peruvian civilization to the American historian of the Spanish conquest of Peru, William Hickling Prescott, and for the pursuit of his own work he credited four Peruvian colleagues, including the author Ricardo Palma, as those with whom he had correspondence and from whom he received pertinent materials: “My most valued correspondents have been don E. Larrañaga y Unanue, don Manuel González de la Rosa, don José Toribio Polo, and don Ricardo Palma.”

57 Carlos A. Romero provided a brief biography of Murúa in the 1922 volume.

58 Urteaga (1922, vii) recounts the sequence of events that brought Murúa to him: “Para colmo de males, el desgloseamiento de un doble centenar de páginas, que habían sido entregadas a la imprenta, se perdieron en los talleres tipográficos, y la familia del señor González de la Rosa [sic] solo recuperó
González de la Rosa copy, he was able to publish his own edition. (The identity of the “friend in Lima” to whom González de la Rosa in 1909 had dispatched a copy of the manuscript is undetermined; it is evident that it was not Urteaga, given the latter’s account of the materials he acquired.)

As noted above, Urteaga thought that González de la Rosa had received a copy of the original manuscript, and that he, too, had received, thanks to padre del Olmo, a copy made from the original. Lacking in the Urteaga edition are the final twenty chapters, 54 through 73, of part 3, which are devoted to Inca political, religious, and social organization, ritual customs, and calendrics. Although Urteaga does not list those chapters in the table of contents (Murúa 1922, 245-253), his (1922, p. vii) mention, in the prologue to his edition, of the contents of these absent chapters suggests that he had had them, or perhaps just a copy of the complete table of contents, available. His reference to “certain dubious folkloric legends” suggests that he saw more than the title page and at least the Tabla’s reference to the “Ficción y suceso,” which might have inspired his comment about “leyendas folklóricas.”

If he had the actual chapters, he was unable, for whatever reasons, to publish them, either in the 1922 volume, covering parts 1-3, or in its 1925 sequel, which consisted of Murúa’s complete part 4.

In 1946 Francisco de Loayza published an edition based on Urteaga’s, correcting many of its Quechua terms. Since he included chapter 54, the first of the twenty chapters of part 3 missing in Urteaga’s edition, Loayza must have had access to the chapters possessed but not published by Urteaga some two decades earlier.

el manuscrito fragmentado. Así llegó a mis manos, gracias a la amabilidad de uno de los decanos del ilustre bibliófilo peruano, señor Julio Salindos... Yo debo aquí un tributo de agradecimiento al Rev. Padre l. del Olmo, superior del Colegio de los Jesuitas de Lima, y muy distinguido amigo, por el empeño que ha puesto en procurarme una nueva copia del manuscrito de Murúa, interesándose con sus hermanos de instituto en Loyola, para que me compren el fragmentado libro que recogiera de los párrafos del Sr. González de la Rosa. Gracias al envío de estas nuevas copias, es que he podido emprender la publicación, que hoy inicie, en este tomo IV de mi Colección de fuentes históricas peruanas."

46 Describing the contents of Murúa’s work, Urteaga (1922, p. vii) noted that it contained the history of the reign of each Inca king, along with their queens, as well as the accounts of the principal deeds of the Incas’ captains. He adds: “Comprende además un estudio sobre la organización social y política del Perú incaico, descripción de fiestas, y relación de los ritos y fábulas de los indios; hasta inserta leyendas folklóricas, y termina con las noticias, acerca de la fundación de las ciudades, en los primeros años del siglo XVII.”

47 Loayza (1946a, v) states: “Los dos tomos editados por Urteaga ... nos han servido para el presente libro, con la diferencia de dar los dos tomos íntegros en uno sólo; y corrigiendo además algunos de los muchos vocablos hechos.”
1.9. Constantino Bayle (1946): Crucial but Ambiguous Insights

A major event in the study of Murúa's work was the 1946 publication, by Constantino Bayle, S.J., of the whole of L, based on a fresh copy that he had ordered to be made for his use. The importance of Bayle's work consisted not only of his preparation of a full and complete version of L, but also his speculative assessment regarding the Murúa textual tradition.

Bayle (1946, 36-37) understood that L was a copy, but he found it to be so full of contradictions, being both finished and unfinished, that he denied, in an implicit polemic against González de la Rosa and other early editors, that L's then-lost model P could have been Murúa's "original" manuscript made ready for printing in 1590. He could not imagine that Murúa would send to press a bulky book so scandalously unfinished ("un manoteo escandalosamente descuidado"); the L copy showed that P had contained spaces which seemed earmarked for chapters that apparently had never been written. Bayle (1946, 40, 42) suggested two models, or visions, of the textual tradition that had resulted in L. On one hand, he hypothesized the existence of an earlier manuscript (we call it X) as the source of P and that he dubbed "the true original" ("el auténtico original"). He thus called the P manuscript "a copy, and a bad one": "I do not believe the manuscript lost from Loyola to have been the original, but rather a copy, and a bad one" ("el manuscrito extraviado de Loyola no lo creo el original, sino copia, y mala").

On the other hand, and as an alternative to the first possibility, Bayle suggested another model which implied that P had undergone change before the L copy was made. This was probably prompted by a particular observation he had made concerning the text on f143r which he identified as being out of place, being in reality an appendix to f195r. As we shall see below, the 2004 facsimile contains

---

58 Osio (2004, 13, note 2) assumed that Bayle used the copy made for González de la Rosa. As we have seen, the fate of González de la Rosa's efforts would have made such a reuse by Bayle impossible. In any case, Bayle (1946, 38) expressly states that he had a copy made for his use: "Me procuré copia de la copia que quedaba en Loyola.

59 Bayle (1946, 38) remarked on the manuscript's shortcomings: it was dogged with obstacles that made its reading a torment or a riddle, and it required a great deal of attention to supplement what was missing, to right its wrongs, and to put in their place the marks of punctuation, the guides to sense: "Yo que nos pone el original o copia de Loyola es positivamente ruidoquiero decir, encierrado de tropoques, que conviene la lectura con frecuencia en tormento o acertijo. Necesita buena porción de atención en suplar lo que falta, en enderezar lo inexacto, en llevar a su sitio los puntos y comas, guías del sentido."

60 [E] apéndice sobre las Virgenes escogidas que servían al sol y al templo (nue es sino repetición ampliada del capítulo 43 del libro III), evidentemente fuera de lugar, a no tomarlo como entrada...
evidence, which had not been available in copies or editions of L, to the effect that f14r contained a reference to the text now found on f14r.

This and probably other similar insights led Bayle to suggest, in a hypothetical fashion, the following alternative model: Instead of P being a "bad copy" of a hypothetical earlier manuscript X, P had been constructed in such a way that whole chapters could easily have dropped out of the codex. "The only explanation that would redeem author and scribes," he argued, "is to imagine that each chapter filled a separate folio or double folio ("cuadernillo") and that the wind, or negligence, had carried away those chapters that are now missing." 61

We will see below that this is what happened, although due neither to editorial carelessness nor the acts of God and nature. As we can now observe directly in the P facsimile, the inconsistencies denounced by Bayle in Murúa's 1590 version of his Historia are due to three circumstances, which Bayle could intuit but not prove: First, P was originally composed in such a way that the text of each of its 132 chapters was contained on one single folio; second, at some stage in its early existence, P was fragmented, and while some folios were lost or displaced, others remained at hand and were subsequently reinserted into the codex; and third, L was a "fair copy" of P and did not reproduce the changes of hand, layout, or physical structure of P, thus obscuring the evidence of P's complicated early history.


The next event in Murúa studies was the rediscovery in 1951, by Manuel Ballesteros Calbóros, of the S manuscript, the Historia general del Pirá. Origen y descendencia… which, as mentioned above, had appeared in Nicolás Antonio’s bibliographic repertory for the first time in 1672 and was cited in 1892 by Jiménez de la Espada as having been examined (this was so) and copied in full (this was not the case) in the early 1780s by Juan Bautista Muñoz at Salamanca’s Colegio Mayor de Cuenca. Twenty years later, S again fell out of sight. From 1802 or 1803, S was removed with the rest of the library of the Colegio to the private library of the

al idilio entre el pastor Acosta y la discreta Cuniquillanta, renueva de la obra" (Bayle 1946, 27). Martí Piqué (1989, 49) has identified Murúa’s source for this long addition as Jerónimo Román y Zamora’s 1575 Repúblicas del mundo. De la República de las Indias Occidentales. (1875, vol. 1, pp. 115-118), as noted by Osio (2004, 248, note 236). Murúa quotes bk. 1, ch. 8, from the second edition, 1595. See below, section 3.5.3, for other Román quotations in P.

61 "La explicación única razonable y exacta de autor y anahuenses pudiera estar en que los capítulos llevaban sendos cuadernillos, y que el viento, o la murienda extraviaron los que se echan menos" (Bayle 1946, 57).
king in Madrid, and from 1813 it became part of the private collection of the dukes of Wellington (see above, section 1.3).

The manuscript was still in the ducal collection when it was located in 1951 by Ballesteros' assistant, Miguel Enguidanos Requena. Ballesteros Gaibrois published S in 1962–64, and in 1979 the Salamanca/Wellington manuscript was sold at Sotheby's to the antiquarian book dealer H. P. Kraus in New York. Subsequently purchased from Kraus by Peter and Irene Ludwig of Aachen, Germany, the S manuscript became part of their private manuscript collection. In 1983, when the Ludwig Collection was sold, S was among the illuminated or illustrated manuscripts purchased by The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles. Since that time the S manuscript has been accessible to scholars.62

Ballesteros announced his discovery of S in 1951 at the First International Congress of Peruvianists, held in Lima in August of that year.63 He was then convinced that he had found Bayle's "authentic original" (the hypothetical manuscript we call X) (Ballesteros 1953, 255). Echoing Bayle once more, in 1952 at the Thirtieth International Congress of Americanists, Ballesteros again referred to S as "el verdadero original" and "el original definitivo" (Ballesteros n.d. [1954], 239, 240). As for the problems arising when one compared P and S (supposedly identical with X, P's original), Ballesteros, in contrast to Bayle before him, was confronted with the hard fact of the extant S manuscript. How could the orderly, much longer and very differently organized S/X have become the disorderly P (still known only through L)? Ballesteros postulated that heavy editing, not only abbreviation, but also interpolation, had occurred from S to P. Like Bayle (but without mentioning him on this point), Ballesteros proposed that P was a poor ("torpe") copy of S, that it was not really a copy as much as an abridgment, and that it had been not the work of a copyist but rather of an "abreviador" who cut out everything that seemed to him superfluous. In Ballesteros' view, P was, in short, an abridgment that had suffered interpolations ("Lo conocido [P] es sin duda un abregé interpolado" [of S]) (Ballesteros 1953, 259).

In short, Ballesteros did not grasp that Bayle had expressed himself in speculations and hypotheses, and he took Bayle's "mala copia" model literally, all too willingly assigning to the manuscript he had discovered the most prestigious role in the textual tradition. He also maintained this S → P relationship in subsequent publications, latest in a paper written as part of his 1953–54 exchange with José

---

63 Although in his later papers about Murúa Ballesteros (1962, ibid. idem, 1981, ibid. idem, 1987, 27) stated that his 1954 presentation remained unpublished, it had appeared in print in 1953, in Letras, the journal of the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Lima; see Ballesteros 1963.
Imbelloni. This scholar found inadequate Ballesteros’s assertion that the hand at work in P (as known through L) was that of “an arranger, more than a copyist” ("más que un copista, un ‘arreglador’"), who was knowledgeable about ancient Andean civilization and made interpolations into the manuscript (Ballesteros 1953-54, 108, 114).

Ballesteros never considered seriously Bayle’s alternative model of P, that is, that an intact P had undergone changes, “its folios carried away by the wind or by negligence,” before L was produced. Imbelloni’s unsettling questions, however, would eventually lead Ballesteros to reconsider his early model and propose a new one for the relationship between S and P.

1.11. José Imbelloni Challenges Ballesteros (1953-54)

In José Imbelloni’s (1946, 41-48) examination of accounts gathered in the early colonial era regarding a central figure in the Inca historiographic tradition, the ninth Inca, Pachacuti Yupanqui, Imbelloni had used the Urgenda edition of Murúa (based on L), and he pointed out the divergent if not contradictory meanings that Murúa had assigned to the epithet “pachacuti.” On one hand, Murúa had assigned to “pachacuti” the meaning of “he who turns the world upside-down” and, on the other, he had defined it as “he who is exiled and disinherited from that which is his.” The appearance of the S manuscript in 1951 intensified these divergences by adding others, for S and P presented different versions of the biography of Pachacuti Yupanqui, and attributed the same deeds, that is, the conquest of the Cuzco region, to Pachacuti Inca, as the son of Viracocha Inca, on one hand, and, on the other, to the captain Pachacuti, son of Manco Inca. Imbelloni invited Ballesteros to explain how the Pachacuti material in S and P would fit with his model of the transmission (inspired by Bayle), in which S was the source of P.

At greater length, now, Ballesteros explained these conflicting versions as the result of an interpolator and of the divergence between the imperial and provincial outlooks of the respective informants. In his reply to this explanation, Imbelloni (1953-54, 118-122) granted that, because their disciplinary perspectives were different, he and Ballesteros sought different things of Murúa’s work: As an historian, Ballesteros' interest was documentary, seeking positive data that historians could use in the critical reconstruction of classical Cuzco. As

---

"Imbelloni (1946, 84) stated: “Murúa, por fin, en tamaña incertidumbre y variabilidad de explicaciones, se decide por consignar dos significados distintos del epíteto Pachacuti, casi como si dijera: a ti, lector, la tarea de elegir cual más te gusta y conviene. El primero es ‘sobre la tierra’, ya conocido por nosotros en sus muchas variantes, y el segundo ‘apritado y desheredado de la suya’, que tiene, en cambio, el privilegio de la originalidad (Libro II, cap. I, pág. 69).”
an anthropologist, Imbolloni's quest was to make sense of the evidence of the knowledge of the learned men and priests of ancient Peru so far as it could provide insight into the psychic and spiritual life of Inca civilization. Imbolloni furthermore allowed that the passages in question would have to have been written by someone who knew well Peruvian history and culture, but he found implausible the explanation of an "arreglador." By what criteria and with what goals, he asked, would such an anonymous, well-informed party introduce these contradictory variants?

Imbolloni proposed a simpler solution, one found in other cases such as that of Fernando de Montesinos' works, which he cited. Imbolloni suggested that the pertinent criterion was not likely to be a different editorial hand but rather sequential interpretations over time, that is, that the explanation of the chronicle's conflicting accounts lay not in the intervention of other parties but in the passage of time that produced "successive influences and the progressive development and fullness of information." To Imbolloni, P and S were simply two different editions, by the same author, of his work, reflecting changes over time in his ambitions, knowledge, and compositional skills.

1.12. Ballesteros (1962-87): In the Footsteps of Imbolloni

Ballesteros considered seriously Imbolloni's objections to his hypothesis of an S → P relationship, and he later formulated his response in his 1962-64 edition of S. By that time, Ballesteros had changed his view of S as being the source of P. Although he did not mention Imbolloni, he was surely under the influence of his 1953-54 exchange with him. Ballesteros now considered P and S to be

---

65 "Se pregunta el profesor madrileño [Ballesteros] a qué peso y con qué esperanza introdujo ese informado aminor tal variante en el texto, y en verdad eso queda para nosotros inexplicable" (Imbolloni 1953, 120).

66 Imbolloni (1953, 120): "Por mi cuenta pienso que la más sencilla explicación sería imaginar que hubieron de la misma crónica dos textos sucesivos que recibieron sucesivas influencias y progresiva plenitud de información, tal como sucede con otro famoso libro de crónicas peruanas, el de Fernando de Montesinos, cuyos dos manuscritos... representan dos estados sucesivos de elaboración." In this view, Imbolloni anticipated John Rowe's arguments about the relationship of S and P as two related but distinct versions of Inca history (see below; section 1.13). The phenomenon of successive passes over a manuscript, revealing changing perspectives over time, is evident in Guaman Poma's autograph manuscript. See, for example, Adorno 1989: idem, 2002.

67 On that earlier occasion Ballesteros (1953-54, 98, note 6) had acknowledged Imbolloni's work as the inspiring source for his interest in Americanist studies: "Mi influencia en la Americanística tuvo como mentor un libro, libro decisivo en mi formación y aficiones: La Espíritu Indígena, de J. Imbolloni. Con esta declaración queda patente mi antigua devoción por la obra y pensamiento de Imbolloni."
much less closely related than he had previously thought. He suggested that P (known only through L) was nothing but “a transcript of drafts and notes,” thus saving the status of S as the “true” and “definitive” original. Likewise, in 1987 Ballesteros suggested that P might be a “copy of drafts” or “in its own right an uncleaned-up version (“un sucio”) that preceded the original.” He briefly elaborated his view that S, the “original,” did not coincide with what was known from the copy (L) of “the Loyola manuscript” (P): instead of P’s four awkwardly assembled parts or books, in which some chapters had been reworked and others removed or reduced, S was conceived according to a logical and solid plan, comprised of three books and expanded from 132 to 163 chapters. Ballesteros thus explained the unfinished, chaotic character of P and the “firm and logical structure” of S no longer as a process of decay from S to P but rather as an evolution from P to S.

Ballesteros was well served by heeding Imbelloni’s arguments and vigorously separating P and S, but he could not refrain from extolling his own discovery, the S manuscript, at the expense of the untidy (“sucio”) and poorly done (“torpe”) P manuscript. In this attempt to exclude P from the need for serious scholarly attention, Ballesteros must have been unaware that nearly ten years earlier John Howland Rowe (1918-2004) had discovered four folios of P within S, and argued that P had once been a complete and coherent edition of Murúa’s Inca chronicle.

1.13. John Rowe (1979): Discovery of Folios Belonging to P

While S was in the possession of H. P. Kraus in New York (see above, section 1.10), five of its folios were subjected to closer examination. These five folios contained full-page, water-colored drawings on one side, while the other side,

---

68 “No parece el mismo caso el de la copia de Loyola [P] y por eso he sugerido la posibilidad de que fuera traniego de borradores o memorales previos” (Ballesteros 1982, p. xxix).  
69 “Mes de Loyola, del Archivo de la Compañía de Jesús en esta población. Quizá sea copia de borradores—pues no coinciden los libros y capítulos de la obra—en sí mismo un más anterior al original” (Ballesteros 1987, 15).  
70 “El original [S], aparte de la autenticidad escasa, no coincide con lo ya conocido por la copia [L] de los Loyola [P] y en vez de cuatro libros, torpemente adornados [en P], con refundición de capítulos y desglose de otros, tiene tres libros conforme a un esquema sólido y lógico, con un total de 108 capítulos” (Ballesteros 1987, 18-19).  
71 It is true, as stated by Ossio (2004, 20), that Rowe’s original report on the manuscript and on the relation between P and S has remained unpublished, but Anton von Euw had quoted it extensively in the catalogue of the Ludwig Collection (von Euw 1982). Furthermore, but simultaneously with Ballesteros 1987, Rowe published a brief summary of the results of his 1959 investigations (Rowe,
which contained prose text, had been obscured by pasted-on blank folios (Boscorup 2004a, 83-84). The folios were carefully separated (degued), and the contents of the hidden pages were revealed. Kraus supplied Rowe with photographs of these and other sample pages of S and commissioned him to make an assessment of the scholarly value of S. In his unpublished 1979 report, Rowe demonstrated that one of the examined folios came not from an external source but had in fact been transposed from within S itself, while the four others originated from another manuscript of Murúa’s Historia. Rowe correctly surmised that this other manuscript was P, the long-lost “original” of the Loyola manuscript copy (L) published by Bayle. 72 On the basis of having seen for the first time elements of P itself, independently of the testimony of L, Rowe defined P as neither an interpolated derivation of S nor a copy of early drafts of it, but rather an early, completed edition of the Historia, from which pages had been cut out and reused in S. Rowe’s work revealed, in essence, that both Bayle and Imbelloni had had very important insights: “the wind,” in Bayle’s metaphor, had carried whole chapters away from P, and the relationship between P and S, as grasped by Imbelloni, was not one of copy-to-original or original-to-abridgement, but simply of two successive and independent versions or editions of a work produced by one and the same author.

Unaware of Rowe’s findings, Ballesteros could not know that the “untidy” appearance of P as witnessed by L reflected the excision and loss of numerous folios of P. But now that P itself is known and its facsimile published, we can confirm definitively not only Rowe’s overall analysis and assessment of P, but also the tenet of Bayle’s conjecture (1946, 37) that P consisted of separate folios or double folios (“cuadernillos”), each one corresponding to a chapter. We know now that they were single folios, and that the loss of any one of them meant the disappearance of the prose text of a whole chapter together with the illustration that served as frontispiece to the next one.

1987). For a detailed presentation of Rowe’s findings, see Adorno 2004. Rowe had only access to photographs of selected folios of S. For an amendment, based on autograph, to Rowe’s description of the way P-folios were inserted into S, see Boscorup 2004a, 83-84.

72 En Jansen, Rowe (1979, 2) corrected Ballesteros’ confusing use of the term “original” applied to S: “Ballesteros has been insisting since 1551 that Murúa wrote a single work, that [the S manuscript is] the “original,” and that [P] is an early copy of it or one based on Murúa’s preliminary notes.” Osio (2004, 17) suggests that Ballesteros confused the notion of “original” with that of “final version.” More probably, Ballesteros used “original” not in any chronological meaning, but rather in reference to its relationship to its author, in the sense of “autograph,” including possible scribes working under the author’s supervision. In the time period (1550–1560s) during which Ballesteros worked with S, it was the only available autograph manuscript of Murúa.

1.14.1. Ossio against Rowe

Turning now to the latest analysis of P, Ossio agrees with Ballesteros, who (1962, vol. 1, p. xxxi) had mentioned the possibility that P might have been a transcript of previous drafts or notes (“la posibilidad de que fuera un manuscrito borrador de manuscritos previos”). Ossio expands Ballesteros’ idea. While to Ballesteros the disorder of P could be due to careless or haphazard copying of previous drafts and notes, Ossio (2004, 13) sees in P an aggregation or compilation of such drafts: “algunos borradores que pudieron haber sido plasmados en la copia [read: el manuscrito] de Loyola [P]”. Thus he suggests that P consists of elements of three separate “drafts”: one which we can call “P itself,” that is, the basic manuscript and its main text; another draft (“otro borrador”) from which proceeded the twenty-two pasted-on folios (and two of the folios added to S); a third draft which he identifies as being the source of the two other folios added to S.

Ossio ventures to suggest a palpable identity for one of the two “other drafts,” a manuscript that was presumed more than half a century ago to be in Bogotá. Ballesteros identified this presumed copy with the missing (actually, as we have shown, nonexistent) “copia Muñoz.” Yet what was for Ballesteros a speculative and inconsequential hypothesis, becomes, as appropriated into Ossio’s draft-theory, an historically impossible construction: If the “Bogotá manuscript” is identified as the “copia Muñoz” and as the source of elements of P and/or S, then folios of a late 18th century document become elements of 16th and early 17th century manuscripts.

52 Ossio (2004, 17-20) identifies this “other [second] borrador” as follows: “Uno de ellos debió proporcionarle el material que fue adherido a 22 de las páginas del manuscrito [P] en que se basa este facsimil.” On pasted-on folios, see below, sections 2.7 and 2.8; on folios in S, see below, section 2.11.

53 Ossio (2004, 17) identifies this “other [third] borrador” as follows: “y otro, a por lo menos tres, que se pegaron al que perteneció al Duque de Wellington [S].” One of these “three,” however, has always clearly belonged to S (see below, section 2.11).

54 Bailey (1946, 36) presented the information that a Mercedarian historian in Quito told him of a copy in Bogotá about which Bailey subsequently had been unable to acquire confirmation: “El historiador mercedario fray Joel L. Monroy escribe desde Quito que en Bogotá se conserva una copia. Dios lo pague: he preguntado allí y no he recibido contestación, asesó por los trastornos de los correos.” Active in the 1920s-30s, Monroy was a provincial of the Mercedarian order in Ecuador, where he served as the province’s inspector general and published works on the first century of the Order’s history in Ecuador (Vásquez Núñez 1988, 100, 228-229).
Bayle’s suggestion and Ballesteros’ further speculations about earlier manuscripts or drafts within P have guided Ossio in building his theory about a patchwork assemblage of extrinsic pieces brought together (“plasmados”) in the P manuscript. His argument is based on his assertion that Rowe was wrong, and that the four folios that migrated to S do not derive from P. This denial of Rowe’s theory is closely related to Ossio’s conviction that the twenty-two folios that are pasted into P also belong to a manuscript other than P, and these two theories, one can say, stand or fall together.

1.14.2. Ossio against Ossio

In his Introducción (2004, 21), Ossio rejects the idea that any of the water-colored drawings inserted into S might have migrated from P to S.

However, in the commentary to his transcription of the text, he follows Rowe’s theory. In part 1, chapter 21 (128r) Murúa describes the coat of arms of the Inca kings and refers the reader to a depiction of it among the front matter folios of P; “Las armas ... inca ... las cuales están pintadas al principio de este libro.” Ossio remarks that such a drawing is not extant in P but rather in S (S, f13v), and he suggests as a matter of fact that this folio in S has migrated from P, and, furthermore, that this is also what happened in the case of other drawings added to S. He writes: “Este dibujo no figura en este manuscrito [P] pero sí en la Historia General [S]. Como ocurre con otros dibujos debió haber sido removido de aquí [P] para ilustrar lo que sería la versión final de la crónica de Murúa [S]” (Ossio in Murúa 2004, vol. 2, p. 96, note 46).

26 Ballesteros (1982, vol. 1, p. xxxi) wrote: “3. SEGUNDA COPIA. – Que bien pudiera ser primera, que ordijón hace Muñoz y que se halla catalogada en su Colección, conservada en la Real Academia de la Historia, de donde también faltan. El P. Bayle observa que el mercedario Fra Joel L. Monroy escribió desde Quito que en Bogotá había una copia, ¡pero ésta!” Ossio (2004, 17) suggests: “De no ser un original este manuscrito [of Bogotá] podría, como lo sugiere Ballesteros (1982, vol. 1, p. xxxi), ser, al igual que el de Loyola, una copia [the “copia Muñoz”] del que fue adquirido por el museo Getty [S].” As we have seen (section 1.2), the “Muñoz copy” never existed, so Ballesteros was identifying a nonexistent entity with one whose existence is hearsay at best. Ossio (2004, 17), in his turn, asserts that the Bogotá manuscript, “as Ballesteros suggests,” could be the presumed Muñoz copy of the Getty manuscript (S). “Like that of Loyola,” Ossio here inadvertently takes Ballesteros’ early position that S came before P, and thus he carries forward two of Ballesteros’ errors (“Muñoz” = “Bogotá”, S P). Hence, in his search for Murúa’s “bordadores,” Ossio falls prey to historical anachronism by making eighteenth-century phantoms (the “Muñoz” and “Bogotá” copies) into early versions (“bordadores”) of P and S.

Being analogous to Rowe’s model for the migration of folios from P to S, Osio’s explanation here would seem a quite plausible suggestion. However, in the case of the Incas’ coat of arms it is actually impossible, because this S-folio carries a watermark (Latin cross on shield above the initials “GM”), which is “the” watermark of S, but not attested in P. Beyond that, folio 13 in S appears to be the other half of an intact double folio, which formally denies its potential migration from P. It is evident that nothing prevented Murúa from having the Inca kings’ coat of arms depicted twice: in P (lost), and in S (extant).

Two pages later, Osio once again follows Rowe rather than his own draft-theory (Murúa 2004, vol. 2, 98, note 50). Concerning the portrait of queen Rafa Oclo, missing in P (its assigned location in P is given as f33r), he writes: “El dibujo de esta coca fue trasladado a [S]” (Murúa 2004, vol. 2, 98, note 50). In its context, this statement can only be understood as “moved to S from here, that is from P.” This, we can note, is perfectly true.

Below, we will show that there is no need to equivocate about these migrated folios. The rejection of Rowe’s understanding of P is ill-founded. The theory of P as an aggregate of elements taken from a number of drafts falls apart if P is closely analyzed. We devote the following Parts Two and Three of our study to this task.

Part Two. The Elements and Structure of P

We now turn to the physical description and analysis of the P manuscript. Being confronted with the Madrid 2004 facsimile places an overwhelming amount of information before us, and making sense of it requires that we proceed, in general, from its more accessible elements to its more complex dimensions. The effect will be cumulative, with each new layer of information superimposed on the previous one. Thus we attempt to build a picture, slowly revealed, of the “Murúa 1590” manuscript. The challenge is manifold, because after we have all the elements before us (Part Two), we then must account (in Part Three) for the sequential developments of the manuscript’s initial construction, fragmentation, and subsequent reconstruction. Before doing so, we begin with a consideration of the opportunities and limits of facsimile cloning.

2.1. What is a “Clone”?

Being in the hands of a private collector, P is not available for autoptic examination, and the following analysis is based on the 2004 facsimile, the Codice Murúa.

58 We recorded the watermarks and quite structure of S in January 2002, when examining the manuscript at the Getty Museum (see Boserup and Adorno 2000c, and Boserup 2004a).
It is presented as a "clone" of the original manuscript, and the photography is of very high quality, but one very much misses a thorough description of the original manuscript as an artifact (codex). In the section of the Introducción dedicated to "El código", Ossio (2004, 22-25, note 5) states that apart from three brief encounters with the original, he has only had access to filmed, photographic, and scanned reproductions of it. These are far from satisfactory working conditions for the editor of a "clone." Ossio further refers to future physical and chemical investigations (of ink, paper, dyes, watermarks, etc.) to be done with the support of the technicians of The J. Paul Getty Museum, and he acknowledges the possibility that there may be certain omissions in his description of the manuscript. Nowhere is it stated whether the technicians of Testimonio Compañía Editorial in Madrid have had direct contact with the original manuscript, or whether they had to construct the "clone" exclusively from photographic reproductions. The latter arrangement is the more probable.

On a number of points, the rearrangements and various instances of physical damage inflicted on the manuscript over time have been imitated. For example, the uneven edges of every single folio have been individually trimmed, in imitation of the original (or a photograph of the original), and worm holes are not just dots or blots on the photographic reproductions; many of them, but far from all (compare fol. 11 and 12), are rendered by "real" holes in the paper, and it is a matter of trust whether one is convinced that all imitated edges and worm holes correspond exactly to the original, and that no important part of any letter in a partly cut off marginal note has been truncated more than in the original. Likewise, the simulation of ancient paper is remarkable, but the watermarks are photographic renderings, not real watermarks, and they are visible under strong light from above, not by applying light from behind the folio; in the majority of cases, where there is prose text on one side and a drawing on the other, the watermark cannot be discerned at all, in spite of the quality of the photography. When folios in the original are pasted on top of one another, as happens in twenty-two cases, the facsimile faithfully renders them by double-layered folios – except for one remarkable error, fol. 136, which is single-layered in at least some copies of the facsimile. The pasted-on folios have not been detached.

Paper Conservator Nancy Turner, The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, has in June 2005 kindly confirmed the appearance of the GM type watermark on S. 133.


"Ossio (2004, 22, note 5) remarks: "Hago esta aclaración pues mi contacto directo con el manuscrito hasta el momento ha sido solo por breves momentos en tres oportunidades. En consecuencia no descarto que pueda cometer algunas omisiones."

The copy of the facsimile owned by the Royal Library, Copenhagen, numbered 53, thus has only 21 pasted-on folios. After having been made aware of the error, Testimonio Compañía Editorial
(deglued) prior to the "cloning," and the pages in the facsimile that have been pasted together will of course turn out to be blank, if they are separated from one another. Similar, but not quite so obvious, is the fact that the quire structure, and hence the sewing and binding, of the "clone" differ throughout from that of the original, as we will see below.

Under such circumstances, the scholar must be on guard. How far can one rely on the facsimile itself to reveal, in spite of all appearances, the failings of the cloning? The error mentioned above, related to fol. 136, can be considered to be harmless, since the anomaly of fol. 136 is readily seen and verified, and since Osio's Introducción in one place (Osio 2004, p. 24, note 12) refers to this folio as double-layered. Neither will one be led astray more than momentarily by the list (ibid.) of the 22 double-layered folios, where the penultimate, fol. 143, representing the morning toilette of an ancilla [virgin of the sun], is referred to as "uno que representa a Chiquilllanco y Acoyapara." (There are three such full-page drawings that conclude the Ficcion appended to the Historia proper, fl. 46r-fl. 47v.) These are some of the minor challenges that face the reader. But what to do with fol. 10? Here, something is obviously amiss.

Folio 10 is the only instance in the manuscript with frontispieces on facing pages, thus interrupting the regular rhythm of alternating pages with textual and pictorial content. Two sets of worm holes that go right through the parchment front cover and folios 1-17 bear witness to the fact that fol. 10 has been reversed (recto is verso and vice versa). The reader's first reaction is that this error must be imputable to the Testimonio technicians, not unlike that of the single-layered fol. 136, since no explanation is given in the Introducción or elsewhere. Our investigation, however (see below, section 2.6.1), will demonstrate that fol. 10 as a single, loose folio was inserted into the manuscript after it had been fragmented and its quires had been for the most part reconstructed. For some time, fol. 10 stayed correctly in place (cf. one bookworm's activity), but it was later reversed and, still later, another worm perforated fol. 10 in its reversed position. Hence, in this case, the "clone" faithfully reproduces the manuscript as it appears today, including an error committed under a "repair" of the codex.

The lack of precise codicological information offered in the Introducción contrasts, as we will see, with the editor's willingness to theorize about the history of the manuscript. Yet it is helpful that the editor and publisher have not attempted to put fol. 10 back into its originally intended place without knowing how and why the reversal had taken place and without mentioning that the suggested that the faulty copy be returned and exchanged for a copy where an extra layer had been added on fol. 136. The copies numbered 31 and 32 also have fol. 130 as a single-layered folio. The copy purchased by the Sterling Memorial Library, Yale University, numbered 62, has a double-layered fol. 136.
erroneous repair had been undone in the facsimile. The fact that fol. 10 at some point in time was loose is a clue to understanding the otherwise daunting quire in which it is located. In the end, the manifest irregularity of fol. 10 is one of the cornerstones of our analysis and model of the manuscript’s structure and history. Although it would have been helpful to at least mention the irregularity of fol. 10 in the Introducción, its current placement corroborates the notion that the 2004 facsimile of “Murúa 1590” can be considered faithful to its original, and that with caution it can be used, in the place of the original manuscript, for the kind of investigation that we have undertaken here.

2.2. The Length, Contents, and Foliations of P

The facsimile consists of 147 folios. There is also a flap between folios 145 and 145bis. The 147 folios are made up of eighteen quires of eight folios (or 4 double folios) each, and one quire of half size, that is, two double folios with one folio represented by only a flap: (18 x 8) + 4 – 1 = 147. It is not stated in the Introducción whether a flap is also found in the original P manuscript in this place. In our model of the original (see Appendix 2) there is no flap.

The two ultimate folios are entirely blank, except for the photographed wear and tear, humidity stains, and watermarks. Thus, the facsimile consists of 145 inscribed folios.92 Nine of these, however, are mostly blank, being inscribed only with running heads and chapter titles, and thus appearing as blank or “empty” when compared to the remaining folios. This explains the late annotation found on the third of the three unnumbered folios that initiate the manuscript, “tiene ciento quarenta y cinco fojas, entre escritas y blancas.”93 The note helpfully proves that no loss of folios has occurred since that annotation was made.

The facsimile shows that “Murúa 1590” is a work consisting of four parts: the Historia proper, the Ficción, a Tabla (Table of Contents) which encompasses both the Historia proper and the Ficción, and, on the verso of the last inscribed folio of the Tabla, a “Memoria” describing the weaving pattern for a chuspi, or girdle of finely woven cloth, to be worn by the Inca queens during important feasts. In its present state, only three folios (unnumbered) precede the first numbered folio, which is designated as number 8 in the second foliation entered in the manuscript. As will be argued later (see below, section 2.6.1), the front matter (up

92 Osio (2004, 22) describes the quantity as “approximately 145 folios”: “El total de folios es alrededor de 145 como señala el mismo autor en la portada que inicia el primer libro.” The note, however, is not in the hand of Murúa. On p. 28, Osio assesses the length of the manuscript as “144 or 145 folios.”

93 “Fox,” means “folios,” that is, “hojas.” Osio (2004, 75, note 1) transcribes this annotation as “Tiene ciento quarenta y cinco folios (2) escritos y blancos.”
to fol. 8, that is, up to the first folio referenced in the Tabla) originally consisted of one more folio than the 7 evidenced by the numbering of fol. 8.

The Historia proper is divided into 4 parts. It is apparent from the Tabla that originally they were not designated as "books" (this identification was instituted later), but rather were introduced by unnumbered headings:

Tabla de los capítulos que ay En este presente libro, De la famosa y storia y Relación, Del origen, principio y generalidad [sic] de los grandes Reyes y señores que fueron deste Reyno del pirú (chapters numbered 1-27) (f148r)

Tabla, de los susos y grandes y famosos hechos de los Principes ymiantes y capitanes Hijos de los Reyes yngas y señores que fueron deste reyno E. provincias del pirú (chapters numbered 1-16) (f148v)

Tabla, del gobierno que los yngas y señores tabieron, antes que los Españoles les viniesen a Este reyno del pirú (chapters numbered 1-73) (f149r)
Tabla de la declaración del nombre deste reyno del pirú, con la declaración de las ciudades (added: de españoles) que ay En el (chapers numbered 1-16) (f150r)

Three foliations are found. Basically, they do not conflict, and they are in harmony with all the references found in the Tabla. What seems to be the earliest foliation is written with a thin pen nib, often partially or completely cut away under later binding. It can be seen, for example, on (138r). Because of an internal reference on fol. 95 recto to fol. "155" (see above, section 1.9, and below, section 2.2.2), this foliation may have continued beyond the currently ultimate inscribed folio (in the latest foliation: "150"), but, if this was the case, that numeration was subsequently cut away.

The second foliation is inscribed beneath the earlier foliation, and a broader pen nib has been used. It appears immediately above the top line of the frame that adorns nearly every page of the manuscript. It runs from 8 to 143 inclusive, that is, from the first chapter ("capítulo prohemial") of part 1, up through the sixteenth and final chapter of part 4. Because of a double irregularity, which consists of two folios being paginated (one is identified as pages 42 and 43, the other as pages 61 and 62), we can infer that this foliation is secondary, based on the earliest foliation and on the Tabla.

Apparently, a third foliation runs from 144 to 150, carelessly omitting 145(bis). The description given by Jiménez de la Espada in 1892 (see above, section 1.4), "un tomo folio de 147 ff. y tres sin foliar de tablas al fin," does not match the current foliation perfectly, although the Tabla does start on fol. 148. Usually, in early modern Spanish manuscripts and imprints, the Tabla was not foliated, and
this may explain Espada’s inexact report.

As will be shown later, the originally blank folios at the end of the manuscript must have been six in number, rather than the two that are extant, thus bringing the total number of folios up to 158.

Table 1: Summary of Foliations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Visible foliations (earliest, secondary, and latest)</th>
<th>References in the Table</th>
<th>Non-extant foliation</th>
<th>Number of folios</th>
<th>Sequential numbering of folios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front matter</td>
<td>[one folio], [1-6]</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title page of part 1</td>
<td>[7]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>8-34</td>
<td>8-34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title page of part 2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>36-51</td>
<td>36-51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37-52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title page of part 3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>53-125</td>
<td>53-125</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54-126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title page of part 4</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>127-142</td>
<td>127-142</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>128-143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title page of Fasciam</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasciam</td>
<td>144-147</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>[145bis]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>145-149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabla + Memoria</td>
<td>148-150</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150-152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final folios</td>
<td>[154-156]</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>153-158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3. Quires, Sewings, and Watermarks

The basic physical structure of a codex consists of the quires, each one symmetrically unfolding its folios from the central point, the sewing. The quires may all vary in the number of double folios included, and single folios may have been excised or inserted here and there (by pasting or sewing). However, unless changes have been made in every single quire, any codex of substantial length will display a symmetrical rhythm which, when found, is essential for a correct understanding of any deviation from that rhythm. In parchment manuscripts, the difference of texture of the fleshy and the hairy side of the folios is a primary witness when searching for possible irregularities in the quire structure, just as watermarks in paper manuscripts are of great help in ascertaining whether a codex has been manipulated after its initial construction, that is, whether losses, additions, transpositions, or substitutions of folios have occurred.

As mentioned, watermarks are occasionally visible on the photographic reproductions of the 2004 facsimile, quite easily when the folio is blank on both sides, and with great difficulty, if at all, when there is writing and a drawing. Two types of watermarks are found; one depicts a Latin cross within a shield, with the initials AM (16 instances identified, referenced below as ‘AM’), the other, a gauntleted hand holding a flower, and the initials PD (3 instances identified, referenced below as ‘PD’). This is evidence of two stages in the construction of the manuscript, as will be demonstrated below.

In two cases, the photographic reproductions of the facsimile reveal sewings of the original codex. One of these sewings, between fols. 8 and 9, is immediately visible, the other, between fols. 32 and 33, is hard to find unless one looks for it exactly there. In both places there is also a modern sewing in the ‘clone.’ Because of this co-occurrence of modern and ancient sewings, one might suppose that the modern structure corresponds throughout to the ancient one, but this is not the case. For the greater portion of the manuscript, from fol. 24 through fol. 135, it is possible to identify with certainty the original manuscript’s organization into quires. As mentioned, it differs throughout from that of the facsimile.

---

81 Osso (2004, 22) describes the watermarks of the P manuscript but does not chart their distribution.

82 See Briquet 1968, vol. 3, nos. 5677–5704 (attested Genova 1565). It can be seen on fols. 55, 57, 60, 71, 74, 78, 79, 80, 85, 90, 99, 91, 92, 108, 146, penultimate, and ultimate. The paper used by Guaman Poma in his Nueva corónica manuscript contains the same watermark-type (initials AA, Al, GM), see Adorno and Boscpu 2005b, 133–140, with reproductions (We here signal an erratum: the first paragraph on p. 135 should be deleted).

Once the interior bulk of the manuscript has been analyzed and mapped into its physical components, it also becomes possible to make plausible conjectures about the original structure of the first and last quires (see below, section 2.6, and Appendix 2).

2.4. Primary Folios and Replacement Folios

When the watermarks and a number of other characteristics mentioned above are compiled into a single array the folios of P fall into three groups: primary folios, replacement folios, and pasted-on folios.

Table 2: Primary Folios and Replacement Folios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watermarks</th>
<th>Foliation</th>
<th>Drawings</th>
<th>Layers</th>
<th>Number extant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary folios</td>
<td>AM type</td>
<td>Early and new; regular throughout</td>
<td>Yes, many</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement folios</td>
<td>FD type</td>
<td>Only new; two irregularities</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Single (13) or double (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasted-on folios</td>
<td>[No data]</td>
<td>[No data]</td>
<td>Yes, many</td>
<td>Added layer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic for the understanding of the structure and history of P is the distinction between primary folios and replacement folios, and the fact that pasted-on folios invariably have been mounted on replacement folios. This coincidence of pasted-on and replacement folios makes it possible to conjecture a causal relation, that is, to infer that replacement folios were inserted into the yet unbound manuscript because of the need to anchor and support the pasted-on folios. The implications of these basic facts is that pasted-on folios are nothing other than primary folios of P that have been removed, that replacement folios are substitutes or dummies for such removed primary folios, and that in 22 cases (out of 35) these dummies support the reinstallation of 22 primary folios into P.

Primary folios correspond, folio by folio, to the references in the Tabla. At first sight, this is also the case with the replacement folios (as one would expect), but there are two exceptions. These exceptions are linked, and they are the result of one single error, committed when the replacement folios were produced. The Tabla refers chapters 7 and 8 in part 2 to fols. 42 and 43, respectively, and chapters 9 and 10 of part 3 to fols. 61 and 62, respectively. However, the manuscript here
consists not of twice two folios, as one would expect, but of twice one folio. In
either case these folios have not been foliated, but paginated, so that the count
was maintained, and references in the Table were matched by corresponding folio
numbers. From this double error we can infer, first, that the secondary foliation
followed upon the insertion of replacement folios, repeating and bridging the
earlier, initial foliation of the primary folios; second, that while the entries and
folio references of the Table were produced on the basis of the chapter titles
on primary folios, the chapter titles that are found on replacement folios were
produced on the basis of the Table; and third, that in the original manuscript
one single quire encompassed the replacement double folio 42/43 and 61/62
and that there must have been a sewing, that is, that the center of the quire must
have been located, between fols. 52 and 53.

2.5. The Seven Original Quires of P

With the clues gleaned up to this point, it is possible to reconstruct the codex in
its original structure, which turns out to be quite different from the structure of
its "clone." As shown in Appendix 2, the original 158 folios (or 79 double folios)
were arranged in 7 quires varying in size from 18 to 28 folios (or 9 to 14 double
folios). All these primary double folios carried the "AM" watermark. Later, 46
primary folios (or 23 double folios) were removed. There still remained, in place
and intact, 112 primary folios (or 56 primary double folios) in a codex-structure,
forming the bulk of the six last of the original 7 quires. Still later, replacement
double folios were added to the mutilated manuscript, whereby the original
quires were more or less recreated. However, a few deviations occurred. The
missing replacement double folio next to 42/43 + 61/62 have already been
mentioned. In addition, as explained in detail below (see below, section 2.6.1),
the first quire was reconstructed with only 9½ double replacement folios instead
of 12, arranged not as one quire, as originally, but as two small quires of 4½ and
5 double folios, respectively (see quires 1a and 1b in Appendix 2). While all the
other quires had to be reconstructed with the same structure that they had had
originally, the replacement of one large quire (quire 1) by two smaller ones
(1a and 1b) was made possible, that is, it was an option, because there did not
remain intact any primary double folio of the original quire 1.

The operation of adding replacement double folios to the remaining primary
double folios would have been futile, unless material was at hand that could be
added to the replacement folios by writing, by pasting, or by some other means.
In 22 cases out of a total of 46, a previously detached single primary folio was
available and could be reinstalled on, that is, pasted onto, a replacement folio.87
Only one side of these reinstalled primary folios would be visible when they were
pasted onto their respective replacement folios. Therefore, replacement folios
that carry on one of their sides a pasted-on folio with a frontispiece illustration characteristically carry on their other side a previously made copy of the text that would become obscured and permanently lost from the moment it was pasted face-down onto the replacement folio.

In a few cases, when both sides of a detached primary folio contained only prose text, the side of the folio that contained the neatly calligraphed and framed chapter title was chosen to be displayed. In all the remaining instances, that is, when the pasted-on folio carried a drawing, it was the side of the folio with the drawing that was chosen for display, while the other side (with prose text only) was copied before being pasted face-down onto the replacement folio and obscured.

The structure of the five central quires (nos. 2-6; fols. 24-135), as evidenced by double replacement sheets, is shown in Appendix 2. Quire 1 containing the blocks of the facsimile consists exclusively of replacement folios and pasted-on folios, and quire 7, which is the one folio that has been much restored, will require further detailed consideration (see below, section 2.6).

Our suggested model can be verified by locating the sewings in the original manuscript. They should appear between the eight pairs of folios numbered 8/9 (sewing photographically visible in the facsimile), 18/19, 32/33 (a sewing also photographically visible), 52/53, 77/78, 102/103, 124/125, and 145bis/146. If the sewings are not found in these locations, the explanation must be that the facsimile has been reconstructed in modern times, with the whole manuscript being cut apart into single folios and subsequently reassembled into new pairs, sometimes conjoining now-single primary folios to now-single replacement folios into synthetic or hybrid double folios. Such a course of events is extremely improbable, and we do not suggest that it has ever taken place. However, if it did occur, our proposal retains its validity as representing the state of the original codex before such comprehensive, latter day dismantling and restructuring took place.

Under normal circumstances, only one of the halves of a double folio in a folio size codex carries a watermark.\(^8\) Hence, for example, if it is correct that fols. 68 and 87 were created out of the same double folio (see Appendix 2, quire 4), only one of them should carry that double folio’s single watermark. This does not appear to be the case: the half of the double folio occupied by fol. 68 has

---

\(^8\) One more removed folio (fol. 42) must have been available, but it was not reinstalled due to the fact that a replacement double folio was missing in quire 3. (Fol. 42 will be discussed further in sections 3.11 and 3.17).

\(^8\) Normally should not be taken for granted. In the case of Guaman Poma’s manuscript, Copenhagen, GKS 2232 460, three small quires (nos. 21, 25 and 26) are made of what Adorno (2002, 13) has called “composite double sheets.” These are constructed out of two single quarto-size folios pasted together at the gutter. See Bossemp and Adorno 2000c, 114, 136-138.
no watermark, but its other half, fol. 87, carries the “PD” marking. Similarly, in quire 2, fols. 30 and 33 have the “PD” watermark, but the corresponding halves of the double folios they are part of, that is, fols. 32 and 35, do not.

The 112 primary folios that are still in place in P must contain 56 “AM” watermarks. In the facsimile, where the watermarks are rendered photographically, we have been able to locate sixteen, all of which comply with the quire-structure we propose in Appendix 2. That is, there is no occurrence of twice watermark or twice no-watermark on any of the hypothesized double folios on which the facsimile has allowed us to identify watermarks. This constitutes so strong a corroboration of the proposed model that we believe that localization of the remaining 40 “AM” watermarks need not be given high priority.89

2.6. The First and Last Quires

While the end point of quire 1 and the starting point of quire 7 are sufficiently evidenced, the structure of qui res 1 and 7 requires a few supplementary explanations.

2.6.1. Quire 1

There were originally 23 numbered folios preceding the first folio of quire 2, as evidenced by the extant foliation that goes from “8” to “23.” When the codex was produced, the sum of the folios of this quire must have been an even number (because of being made up of double folios). If we suppose that there was a folio (probably the very first) that remained unnumbered, the original number of folios in the quire becomes 24 (12 double folios). Currently, instead of 24 folios or 12 double folios, we are faced with 19 replacement folios (9½ double folios) + 15 pasted-on folios. The visible sewing between fols. 8 and 9 pertains to the reconstructed quire, and it appears after only 4 folios (3 unnumbered folios and fol. 8). This suggests that two small qui res of replacement folios were substituted for the original large quire.

At first glance, it seems improbable that the reconstruction of the very first quire of P should be so anomalous, with two small qui res rather than one single large one, since all the following qui res were reconstructed so as to correspond as much as possible to their original state. However, primary double folios were

89 Beta-radiography would reveal the watermarks on single as well as double-layered folios. The radioactive source is said (Schommer 1987) to have no effect on the paper. For beta-radiographies of the watermarks in Copenhagen, KRS 2232 4to (Chaman Poma), see the illustrations in Bascur and Adorno 2000c.
extant in all the following quires, and this determined the number of replacement double folios that were needed, as well as the place they would occupy in the reconstituted quire structure. There was no such guidance (and constraint) in the case of the first quire. Available from quire 1 when P was reconstructed were 15 removed primary folios, 14 of which belonged originally to quire 1, and one, the displaced primary fol. 143 (adoring acclia), belonging to quire 7. They were to be arranged and pasted onto replacement folios. The last 10 of these 15 detached folios formed an uninterrupted sequence. It is a fair guess that they were allotted one small quire (quire 1b) of 5 double replacement folios (fols. 14-23).

There remained five detached folios, three containing front matter, and two containing a prose chapter and a frontispiece. The first one consisted of the prose text of chapter 1 (subsequently renumbered as chapter 2) and the frontispiece of the following chapter. The second one consisted of the prose text of chapter 2 (subsequently renumbered as chapter 3) and the frontispiece of the following chapter. Quire 1b started with chapter 6 (subsequently renumbered as 7). Hence, a small quire (1a) of 8 replacement folios (4 double folios) was constructed, which would host the required minimum: 3 front matter folios and 5 chapters with frontispieces. Various scenarios can be imagined for the sequence of events. Eventually, the chapter numbers were changed so as to comply with the Tabula, and one of the folios (currently fol. 8) was used to inscribe an introductory chapter ("capítulo prohemial") and a copy (under a variant title) of the original chapter 1 (for details, see below, section 2.10). Thus the count fell one folio short of what was actually needed. As a result there was no replacement folio left in the quire to support the detached primary folio containing chapter 2 (subsequently renumbered as 3) and the frontispiece of chapter 4. However, this logistical error was remedied by the addition of one single replacement folio, which eventually became fol. 10, tucked in loosely between the yet unnumbered replacement fols. 9 and 11. In order to reduce the risk of the additional single folio later being misplaced, a catch-word ("Cap. 4, ") was inscribed in the lower right-hand corner of the recto (currently f10v), referring to the frontispiece of chapter 4 on the verso of this same folio.

Fol. 10, as mentioned earlier (section 2.1), is reversed in the facsimile. However, it was correctly in place when the quire was foliated. The foliation "10" is inscribed in the upper right corner of the folio's original recto (currently its verso) but, being partly obscured by a later repair, it is barely perceptible in the facsimile. Fol. 10 was still correctly in place when running heads were inserted. Thus, "Libro primero de la historia" appears on versos, "general del Piru" on rectos, as was the case with fol. 10 in its original orientation. It remained correctly inserted still later, when a first bookworm fed on the front cover parchment and on fols. 1-17 (a photographically reproduced worm-hole is also perceptible on f18r), as clearly demonstrated by the facsimile. Later fol. 10 was reversed, so that the worm holes
do not fit. This possibly occurred through misinterpretation of the catchword, if its reference to chapter 4 was understood as targeting the chapter proper (its titles and text) on f11r, rather than its frontispiece on f10v. Subsequently, another bookworm fed on, and left its traces in, the first ca. 15 folios.

Table 3: Summary of Quire 1a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foliation</th>
<th>Replacement double folios A-D</th>
<th>Recto of replacement folio</th>
<th>Verso of replacement folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st unnumb'd</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Title page of work</td>
<td>Pasted-on: Andean Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd unnumb'd</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Pasted-on: Coat of arms of Mercedarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd unnumb'd</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Title page of part 1</td>
<td>Pasted-on: Adoring aella (was fol. 143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Capitata paludinal</td>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Copy of chapter 2</td>
<td>Pasted-on: Frontispiece of chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Single folio]</td>
<td>(was 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy of chapter 3</td>
<td>Pasted-on: Frontispiece of chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(was 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Title of lost chapter 4</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Title of lost chapter 5</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Title of lost chapter 6</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.2. Quire 7

This quire also contains a number of anomalies compared to the regular central quires of P. The clue to the reconstruction of this quire has already been mentioned (section 1.9): Bayle (1946, 27) pointed to a displaced textual element in P that can be identified in the facsimile as being fol. "155", referenced on primary f95r. There is no extant folio with such a high a number in P, but the reference obviously targeted the primarily folio that is now the pasted-on folio (aella's morning toilette) on replacement fol. 143.

Bayle wrote that the "Appendix" of part 3 (= fol. 143) was "nothing but an expanded repetition of chapter 43 of part 3, evidently out of place, if one does not take it as a preambule to the idyll between the shepherd Acoyrarapa and the discrete Chuquillantu, which serves to conclude the work."36 The 2004 facsimile confirms that the folio in question has been relocated from one site to another.
in the P manuscript. It is now fol. 143, but it must originally have been numbered "155", and the text written on it belonged to chapter 43 of book 3, as Bayle had suggested on the basis of his copy of L. As can be seen on the facsimile's f95r, there is a reference to fol. "155": "en este Reyno Vuo [hubo] mayor fº 155."91 We conjecture that this note was not carried forward to L, because Bayle makes no mention of it. The expression is completed in the "Appendix" text (f143r, formerly fol. "155"), so that it reads "En este Re[y]no del Piru alía mayor primor en este negocio de Virgenes que serúan a los templos." (In this kingdom of Peru there was the greatest excellence in this occupation of virgins who served in the temples). This single example of the cutting and pasting, relocation, and restamping of a text within a manuscript shows that Bayle had detected that the P manuscript, as it appeared when it was copied in 1890, had been subjected to fundamental reworking at some point in its history.

Thus, the text and drawing appearing on the folio pasted onto fol. 143 originally filled primary fol. "155" and they constitute today the continuation of the text found on f95r. We can make several inferences from this finding. First, the last quire (7) of the codex went on to fol. 156 and consisted of 22 folios, like the two previous quires. Second, primary fol. 143 is either lost, or it is to be identified with the folio pasted onto the already-mentioned third unnumbered folio in quire 1a. The second alternative should, in our view, be preferred, because the drawing features an acclla, or ñusta, that is, a chosen virgin or a princess (she is unidentified), adoring the sun. Primary fol. 143 was situated between the end of the chronicle proper, and the shepherd-and-princess tale, "Fictión y sucesos." Occupying f143v, the drawing of the adoring acclla would then have served as frontispiece to the story, which begins on f144r. In its current context, the adoring acclla serves as frontispiece to a chapter on the noble deeds in Peru of the Mercedarian order. We must add that the adoring acclla on the third unnumbered folio in quire 1a, along with replacement fol. 143 and its pasted-on folio (acclla's morning toilette), are the only elements in P that appear in bewildering contexts.92 Third, while the facsimile, like the original P manuscript

---

90 See note 60.
91 Osio's transcription (María 2004, vol. 2, 177) is incorrect: "en este reyno uno mayor" ["in this kingdom one greater"]; it is incomplete, lacking "fº 155."
92 The text on the reverse of the adoring acclla drawing can partly be seen, and it appears to be the same block type handwriting style used for other quotations from printed works (see below, sections 2.9 [*13"] and 3.5.3). If it was originally primary fol. 143, it would in the earliest phase have been blank, separating the Historia from the Fación (compare f93v between parts 3 and 4). Subsequently, it could receive the additional prose text referred to on f144r ("no demas está fol. 143, página 2") and, on the reverse, a drawing serving as a frontispiece to the Fación. Whatever the case may be, this pasted-on folio, together with the other two unnumbered front matter folios, constitute the only
contains only 152 folios (unnumbered fols. “151” and “152” are blank), P had once contained four more primary folios ([153]-[156]), which were parts of the double folios to which the extant fols. 136-139 belong. Referring to Table 4, primary double folios A, B, and H had been removed, and three single primary folios were later reinstalled on replacement fols. A1, B1, H1, and H2. While primary fols. 151 and 152 are still in place (with watermarks “AM”), the blank primary fols. 153 and 154, as well as the blank replacement fols. “155” and “156”, were removed. There are no traces of them in the 2004 facsimile. The removal of fols. 153-156 weakened fols. 136-139 at the other end of the quire.\footnote{“155” in the call-out on f55r has here been taken to be a correct reference although two pieces of evidence suggest that the referenced page (currently f145r) had been directly adjacent to f150r: First, the inscription “virgenes escogidas que servían al sol y al templo” on f150r is difficult to explain if not referring to fol. “155,” where it corresponds to the text and (word for word) to the short explanatory phrase inscribed on the drawing; Second, fol. 141, the corresponding half of the double folio that contains fol. 151 (see “F1” and “F2” in Table 4), shows evidence (in the 2004 facsimile) of having been refastened after having been loosened. We have discovered these contradictions in quire 7 by examining the evidence available in the facsimile; inspection of the original manuscript can perhaps resolve the issue.}

### Table 4: Summary of Quire 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foliation</th>
<th>Double folios</th>
<th>Primary folio, recto</th>
<th>Primary folio, verso</th>
<th>Replacement Folio, recto</th>
<th>Replacement Folio, verso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Copy of cap. 10</td>
<td>Pasted on folio; Primary</td>
<td>F136 verso = frontisp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of cap. 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Pasted on folio: Primary</td>
<td>F137 = cap. 11</td>
<td>Copy of f137 verso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Cap. 12</td>
<td>Frontisp. of cap. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Cap. 13</td>
<td>Frontisp. of cap. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Cap. 14</td>
<td>Frontisp. of cap. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Cap. 15 (+ &quot;lo demás está fo. 143&quot;)</td>
<td>Frontisp. of cap. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Cap. 16</td>
<td>Addition to cap. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>[→3rd unnumbered recto, obscured text (cont. of H1r)]</td>
<td>[→3rd unnumbered verso, adorning 野心]</td>
<td>Pasted-on folio: Primary &quot;153&quot; (野心's morning toilette)</td>
<td>Blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Start of 野心</td>
<td>Cont. of 野心</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td>Cont. of 野心</td>
<td>Cont. of 野心</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145bis</td>
<td>K1</td>
<td>Cont. of 野心</td>
<td>Cont. of 野心</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEWING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>K2</td>
<td>Cont. of 野心</td>
<td>Cont. of 野心</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>J2</td>
<td>Cont. of 野心</td>
<td>Cont. of 野心</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Table, p. 1</td>
<td>Table, p. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Table, p. 1</td>
<td>Table, p. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Table, p. 5</td>
<td>Memoirs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Blank (&quot;AM&quot; watermark)</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Blank (&quot;AM&quot; watermark)</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>(Lost)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>(Lost)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>[→143r, 血兒's toilette]</td>
<td>[→143r, blank]</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>(Lost)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>(Lost)</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>(Lost)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7. The Insertion of Replacement Folios and Pasted-on Folios

The purpose of replacement folios, simply put, was to support the re-installation of extant primary folios exactly where they had been located before being removed. The pasting of detached folios onto replacement folios normally
followed a pattern whereby the side of the detached folio selected to be visible, if a recto, would be pasted onto the recto of a replacement folio and, if a verso, would be installed on the verso of the replacement folio. This was done with folios carrying prose text on both sides, such as, for example, fols. 137 and 149; since both sides were easily copied prose texts, the default higher priority of the recto was respected and made visible, while the verso was obscured (after having been copied).

Basically, this also happened in the case of detached primary fol. 53, but it was pasted onto the verso of replacement fol. 52, and the now-lost verso text of primary fol. 53 was copied onto the recto of replacement fol. 53, spilling over onto the verso of replacement fol. 53. It happened because primary fol. 52, which would contain on its recto the title page of part 3, and on its verso the frontispiece of chapter 1 of part 3, was not at hand. (It had been inserted into the S manuscript, see below, section 2.11). Hence, there was much space available for reinstallation of primary fol. 53. Obviously, it was the recto of primary folio 53 that was chosen for display because it contained the carefully calligraphed chapter title.

In all other cases, that is, when there was a drawing on the folio to be reinserted, the drawing (on the verso) was chosen for display, since it would be much more difficult to reproduce the carefully water-colored drawing than to copy the chapter's title and prose text.

In a few cases (fols. 42 and 143), on which we have already commented, the regular procedure described above has not been followed. First, primary fol. 42 must have been extant, because the text that was on its recto (part 2, chapter 7) has been copied onto "folio 42 recto," which is, in fact, page 42, since there is here only one replacement folio where two are needed, but the folio itself with its drawing could not be pasted onto the "verso" because this "verso" was actually page 43, which was reserved for the text of chapter 8. Second, replacement fol. 143, as already mentioned, was not used for the re-installation of what had been primary 143, but rather for that of primary "155." As we argued above (section 2.0.1), primary 143 is the detached folio now pasted onto the third unnumbered replacement folio of the manuscript, where its drawing of an "adoring adelia" serves as the frontispiece of the "capitulo prohemial" on the Mercedarian order.

Several of the primary folios were no longer available when the reconstruction of the P manuscript took place. Thus, the replacement folios were left blank or "empty" on both sides, bearing only a running head and the number and title of the missing chapter, based on the information found in the Tabla. These blank replacement folios are eleven in number: fols. 11, 12, 13, 30, 32, 33, 35, 61, 62, 68, 87. To these we can add one more: replacement fol. 52, which would have
been blank on its verso (the recto has a short version of the title of part 3), if it had not been taken over by primary fol. 58, as detailed above.

Finally, another type of anomaly in connection with replacement folios and their pasted-on folios should be mentioned. The folios pasted onto the three unnumbered folios at the beginning of the manuscript have text inscribed on their reverse but, in contrast to the other pasted-on folios, these prose texts were apparently not copied and saved before being obscured by pasting. (Fol. 143, the nolla's morning toilette, seems not to have any prose text inscribed on its reverse).

2.8. The Drawings on the Pasted-on Folios

The 22 folios pasted into the P manuscript are all primary folios of P that have been reinstalled in it.

Primary folios were removed so that their drawings could be used for some other purpose. Thus, 19 of the 22 pasted-on folios in P, and all five pasted-on folios in S, contain drawings. Concerning the three pasted-on folios in P that do not include drawings, it is apparent that they were detached only because they happened to be the corresponding halves of double folios that did contain drawings:

Table 5: Folios Detached from P that do not Include Drawings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detached folio without drawing</th>
<th>Other half of same double folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53 (current 52 verso) Text only</td>
<td>52 (currently in the S manuscript). Full-page drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149 Text only</td>
<td>149v (currently opposite Br). Full-page drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 Text only</td>
<td>“155” (currently fol. 143). Text + drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 Blank (lost)</td>
<td>156v Text + drawing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that folios 136 and “155” were removed suggests that not only folios with full-page drawings, but also some with smaller ones were being removed in order to be recycled. Primary “155,” which became folio 143, had a drawing at the bottom of the page; when the folio was reinstalled, drawing and text were cut apart and the two parts pasted in inverse order, with the drawing at the top of the page and the text beneath it.95

95 The top-to-bottom reversal may have been carried out to follow the standard pattern of P in which drawings (being frontispieces) introduce, rather than follow, the texts they accompany. The drawing
Quire 1, which is the only one in the codex to have been totally fragmented, contained all the portraits of the twelve kings and two of the twelve portraits of queens (cuyas) of the Inca dynasty. Out of a total of 46 primary folios that were removed from P, 24, or more than fifty per cent, belonged to quire 1. The portraits of queens were hosted mainly in quire 2. Five folios with portraits of queens were removed, due, in part, to the thorough fragmentation of quire 1 and, in part, to the specific need for two portraits of queens in the S manuscript (see below, sections 2.11 and 3.18).

The folios to be pasted were trimmed on all four sides, as one would do with images that are to be pasted into an album. With a few exceptions, the trimming followed the outer border of the drawn frames that surrounded the drawings as well as the chapter titles and chapter texts. This trimming can have occurred immediately before pasting onto the replacement folios. In contrast, the four primary folios of P that came to be inserted into S (see below, section 2.11) were not trimmed, being installed into that manuscript by another technique.

For unknown reasons, primary fol. 23, with a drawing representing queen Champa Coya, has been very severely trimmed. One third of the primary folio has been cut away, possibly in order to remove the coat of arms that occupied the upper left corner of the portrait. After reinstallation, part of the frame was redrawn, so that the page would look as much as possible like the others in the series. While the other pasted-on folios apparently were inserted before the running heads were inscribed, the opposite is true in this case: the word “Historia” in the running head is partly hidden by the pasted-on folio. We will return to fol. 23 in section 2.10.

2.9. Hands and Styles of Handwriting

Having analyzed the elements that constitute P, we can now turn our attention to an examination of the hands and the styles of handwriting. Leaving aside two late notes on the front matter folios concerning Murúa’s origins and the length of the manuscript, respectively, and an owner’s mark dated 1925 on f125v, the hands and handwriting styles found in P correspond to the main structural divisions of the manuscript that we have identified. Thus, the following examination

on “153” was the only one in P that violated this order; by being positioned beneath its accompanying text, it illustrated it. By cutting apart drawing and prose text and reinstalling them with the drawing on top, the reinstall reproduced P’s customary pattern of presentation.

The transparency of the paper throughout the manuscript allowed the frames on either side of each primary folio to be drawn so that they coincided.

See Boerup 2004a, 83-84.
corroborates the fundamental importance of distinguishing between the primary folios and the replacement folios of P.

The main hand, P1, is found on the rectos of primary folios of the Historia (including f125v), and on both sides of the folios of the Ficció, Tabla, and Memoria. It has inscribed the calligraphed and regular main text of the P manuscript, that is, the “fair copy” (“sacar en limpio”) mentioned in the prologue to part 4 (f126v). It is responsible for more than seventy-five per cent of the manuscript’s text, but its first appearance, due to circumstances analyzed above, is on fol. 24 (part 1, chapter 17), that is, at the beginning of the first of the extant quires that have been inscribed on primary folios.

On the versos of primary folios, and occasionally in corrections or brief additions on rectos, we find P2. It is a cursive hand, making short or long additions to the main text, often with little or no regard to the previous neat layout and execution of the basic fair copy. It displays many variants, apparently depending on a variety of factors. Brief additions by P2 are also found, as mentioned, on a few primary rectos, and on five of the replacement folios of quire 1 in part 1 (the “capítulo prohemial” and chapters 2, 3, 7, and 16 [f8r, f9r, f10v, and f110v]), and one of the replacement folios of quire 2 (f110v; see Table 6). P2 has also made corrections in the Tabla and redefined the divisions of the codex from unnumbered parts into numbered “books”. Likewise, it has inscribed the main title page and the title pages of the three first parts/books (all on replacement folios, that is, the rectos of the first and third unnumbered folios as well as f35r and f5dr). Furthermore, P2 has inscribed the titles of some of the “empty” chapters as well as some of the running heads throughout the whole manuscript.

On the drawings, whether by Guaman Poma or by the other artist(s), P2, using many handwriting styles, is responsible for all the short phrases identifying the pictorial subjects on drawings that have not been inscribed by Guaman Poma, whom we identify below as P4. Finally, P2 has inscribed the Latin epigram above and below the coat of arms of the Mercedarians (front matter). We identify it as P2’s calligraphic handwriting, used when not jotting down additions, rather than inscribing portions of the main text. It should be mentioned that in the S manuscript, this variant of the P2 hand (identified as S3 in Table 6) has inscribed not only the last part of the main text of S and the whole Tabla of S, but also the title page information of S (including a 4-line Latin epigram)

98 The P2 hand, in its neater variants, shares a number of common traits with a document that was inscribed and signed by Murúa, as his hand can be seen in a document reproduced (but unidentified) by Osio (2004, 53), Ballesteros (1992, vol. 1, pp. xxxiv, note 21, and p. 49), who reproduced the signature from that document, identifies it as a petition written on November 7, 1565, by Murúa from the Mercedarian convent in Cuzco when he was its procurador (see Barriga 1942, vol. 3, pp. 352–53). Murúa was seeking, on behalf of the convent, the return of certain usurped agricultural lands.
as well as other elements of the front matter (copies of numerous letters of recommendation).

In four instances, and embedded in textual additions inscribed by P2, we find P3. The P3 hand inscribed extensive quotations from a printed work, Jerónimo Román y Zamora’s Repúblicas de la Indies Occidentales, bk. 1, 2nd edition, 1595 (see below, section 3.5.3). It is a clear and regular block-type hand, imitating printed text. Comparison of orthographic habits in these passages and a passage copied from the same edition of Román y Zamora by P2 (f77v) seems to prove that P3 cannot be a non-cursive or calligraphic variant of P2, but rather represents a scribe executing a one-time assignment for P2. The four literally transcribed quotations are all found in part 3, and they come from four consecutive chapters (7-10) in the printed source.

On forty-three drawings (from f43v till the end), P4, alias Guaman Poma’s particularly well known hand, has inscribed captions, that is, shorter or longer phrases identifying the pictorial subjects; see Appendix 6.

The obscured texts of pasted-on folios that were not copied onto replacement folios by P2 were copied by P5, a professional scribal hand apparently accustomed to copy charters and other official documents (with flourishes in signatures, etc.) rather than literary works. In part/book 1, P5 is responsible for the text of chapters 1, 8, and 9 through 15 (f8r, f15r, f16v-f22r, respectively), as well as for the chapter titles of “empty” chapters 4-6 (f11r-f13r) in quires 1a and 1b. In book 2, P5 has inscribed the text of chapters 7 (f12r) and 9 (f14r), in book 3, the second half of chapter 1 (f53r and f53v), and all of chapter 11 (f63r), and in book 4, chapter 10 (f136r) and the second half of chapter 11 (f137v). Finally, P5 has copied a page of the Tabla obscured by pasting (f149v).

P1, P2, and P4 are found on the four folios that have migrated from P to the S manuscript. P2 is found throughout S (in a number of more or less neat and more or less relaxed variants, called “S3” in Table 6). Neither of the two scribal hands of S (S1 and S2) are attested in P.

Table 6: Summary of Hands in the P and S Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P1</th>
<th>P manuscript</th>
<th>P folios in S</th>
<th>S manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scribe</td>
<td>Main text (Historia 1-4, Faccini, Tabla, Memoria)</td>
<td>Cañones’ letter, title page of part 3, chapter texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.10. The Chapter Numbering of Part 1 of P and the Identity of P2

The early chapters of book 1 inscribed on replacement fols. 8, 9, 10, 14, and 15, include some anomalous phenomena. They are surveyed in more detail in Appendix 3. The manuscript, as can be inferred from the Tabla (f148r), originally contained the following chapters:

Capítulo 1. Del origen y principio de los Yngas (primary fol. 8)
Capítulo 2. Del principio de los Yngas (primary fol. 9)
Capítulo 3. Del gran Mango Capac ... (primary fol. 10)

The replacement fols. 8-10 contain:
Capítulo prehemial ... (f8r, inscribed by P2)
Capítulo 1. Del nombre de los reyes del Pirú (f8v, inscribed by P5)
Capítulo 1 (corrected to: 2). Del origen y principio de los Reyes yngas ... (f9r; by P2)
Capítulo 2 (corrected to: 3). Del gran Mango Capac ... (f10r–f11v, by P2)
The numbers of the extant chapters 7 and 8 have been corrected from "6" and "7", respectively, but the numbers of the empty chapters 4, 5, and 6, have not been corrected, and they must have been inscribed after the numbering of extant chapters had been revised and made to comply with the original numbering found in the Tabla. There are no further deviations between the numbers identifying the chapters throughout the manuscript and those assigned to them in the Tabla.

Several observations can be made. First, the "capítulo prohemial" (8r), which originally had no correlate in the Tabla of P, and which is inscribed by P2, prefigures the long inserted chapter on the Mercedarians in the S manuscript. Second, the title of chapter 1 on 88r ("On the name of the Incas kings") does not match its contents (the political organization in the Andes before the rise of the Incas), which, however, matches the original title of the chapter in the Tabla tolerably well ("Del origen y principio de los ygas"). Meanwhile, in the S manuscript, the nearly identical contents of chapter 1 have at last been subsumed under a matching title: ("De cómo antiguamente no hubo en este Reino Rey ni señor universal hasta los ygas"). Third, P2 initially reduced the chapter numbers by one when copying from the removed primary fols. 9, 10, 14, and 15 (only the title on 115r). He subsequently abandoned the effort, assigned P5 to copy the capítulo primero, and reverted to a numbering of the chapters that matched the Tabla references. Fourth, there may be a connection between the peculiar status of fol. 10, loosely tucked in and later incorrectly fastened, and P2's initial bypassing of the original chapter 1 and renumbering of the first 8 chapters. Various scenarios can be imagined, but the exact causal relationship is difficult to ascertain. Fifth, the uncorrected numbering of chapters on fols. 11, 12, and 13, indicate that chapter titles were inscribed on "empty" replacement fols as one of the last procedures of the work of reconstruction. They were copied from the Tabla by P2. This fits well with the fact that running heads were inscribed later than the pasting of trimmed primary fols onto replacement fols. There is only one exception, folio 23, the severely mutilated drawing of queen Chimpo Coya (see above, section 2.8), which slightly overlaps the running head; it may first have been left aside and only pasted on, after some hesitation due to its mutilated, as one of the very last acts in the complicated reconstruction of P. Sixth, the Tabla reflects, through corrections inscribed by P2, the insertion of the "capítulo prohemial", and the renaming of chapter 1.

From the contributions made by P2, particularly the reconstructed quires 1a and 1b, we can put together an emergent picture of P2's authority. It seems that P2 took the responsibility for the difficult parts of quires 1a and 1b under construction, letting P5 copy its easier parts (8r, f15-22r). Chapter 16 (f23r)

\[99\] See above, section 2.6.1.
is particularly revealing with respect to P2's intellectual control of the project. The pasted-on folio, featuring the mutilated portrait of queen Chimpo, had on its back the original text of chapter 16. The mutilation had eliminated the end of every text line, and it would have been a waste of time to let a scribe (P5) conjecture about the missing parts; we can therefore suppose that P2 rewrote his own old text once more, easily filling out the gaps.

2.11. Elements of P in the S Manuscript

2.11.1. John Rowe's Theory

In the S manuscript, five folios were double-layered. Blank folios had been pasted onto the reverse of full-page illustrations, obscuring the inscribed texts. After the layers had been separated, John Rowe analyzed the revealed texts and identified one of them (S, fol. 19) as having been internally recycled within S. Rowe identified three of the four others as originating in P, the then-lost model of L, because they exactly filled out textual lacunae in Bayle's edition based on L. The fourth one contained textual elements with no direct context in P (L), but, by analogy, all four folios with pasted-on blank folios were assigned by Rowe to L's model (P), thus becoming the first known original drawings of the P manuscript (though migrated to S). All four of Rowe's identifications (Table 7, nos. 1-4) have been accepted by von Euw 1982, Adorno 2004, and Boserup 2004a. In addition to the fundamental observations made by Rowe, we can add, as mentioned above (section 2.9), that the hands P1, P2, and P4, are also found on these four folios.

Table 7: The Four Primary P-Folios Extant in the S Manuscript

Note: S, fol. 19, is not included in this table. Like the recycled folios originating in P, its text side was covered by a pasted-on blank folio, but, as pointed out by Rowe, it did not originate from P, before being obscured by a pasted blank folio, the text of S, f. 119, had been copied onto S, f. 118.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Original location</th>
<th>Content as primary P-folio, recto side</th>
<th>Content as primary P-folio, verso</th>
<th>Status in S: recto side (before degrading by J.H. Harris)</th>
<th>Function in S, verso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*For full details, based on Rowe 1979 and 1987, see Adorno 2004.*

*For details of the consecutive transpositions of folios within S, see Boserup 2004a.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Folio</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P. front matter</td>
<td>Letter of recommendation to / propositions on / title of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>P. fol 32</td>
<td>Part 1, chapter 25: &quot;De la Reina y señora Maria Orillo&quot; (1535)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P. fol 52</td>
<td>Part 3, title page: &quot;Libro 3, del gobernador des de Reyno del Piru&quot; (1538)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P. fol 61</td>
<td>Part 3, chapter 9: &quot;Del traje y vestido que trajan las ﬁustas&quot; (1538)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further observations can be made about the migration of folios from P to S. Just as no. 1 (coat of arms of Peru) served a different purpose after migration (P: frontispiece of the whole work → S: frontispiece of book 3), nos. 3 and 4 underwent a radical reinterpretation on their way from P to their new context in S. In P, they illustrated, respectively, the Inca king in procession, and his wife, the Inca queen, in procession, as frontispieces, respectively, of part 3’s chapter 1 ("De la manera que los Yugas eran y de sus costumbres [added by P2] y con la magestad que caminaban") and part 3’s chapter 10 ("Del majeastad que trayan las Coiais"). Simply put, these two drawings represented a generic Inca king and a generic Inca queen in procession. As such, they were correctly referenced in S by inscriptions (again, by P2) on facing blank folios where the P-folios were...
eventually inserted: “Modo de caminar de los reyes incas” (no. 3) and “Modo de
caminar de las reinas incas” (no. 4). At some point before or after migration
to S they were redefined (once more, by P2) as ruler portraits (“guascar ynga”
and “chuquillantu, muger de guascar ynga”). In S, they became frontispieces of
the chapters introducing the eleventh Inca king, Huascar Inca, and his queen,
Chuquillantu (S, book I, chapters 41 and 43, respectively).

The four S-folios corroborate the model proposed above, or vice versa, since
the above analysis is nothing but the application of Rowe’s findings to the
rediscovered and nearly complete P manuscript. Furthermore, when considered
in the immediate context of P, these S-folios supply us with crucial information
for understanding the history of Murúa’s Historia-cum-Historia general, as will
become evident below.

2.11.2. Juan Ossio’s Theory

Ossio challenges Rowe’s theory, suggesting that the 22 folios pasted into P
originate from a “parallel,” “analogous,” or “previous” manuscript or draft
(“borrador”), to which he also assigns two of the S-folios (no. 2, “Raba Oclo”
and no. 4, “Chuquillantu”). In Ossio’s view, Murúa intended to insert them in
P, but for some reason they were inserted into S. As for the two other S-folios
identified by Rowe, Ossio assigns them to “another draft” (“otro borrador”),
because he does not find space or confirming textual references for them in P;
and he considers these criteria to be decisive determinants. Ossio has been led
to this theory by Ballesteros’ speculations about drafts, which he has expanded
and developed. We review below Ossio’s assertions about the folios pasted into
S, in order to put forward our own assessment on the matter.

No. 1 (Coat of arms of Peru). According to Ossio, there is not allotted space
(a blank folio) in P for this S-folio. He believes that it originates from “another

---

102 Though brief, Murúa’s 1782 report of S had paid keen (and useful) attention to the topics
rendered pictorially, making note not only of the ruler portraits and coats of arms, but also of the
royal processions (“en modo de caminar en andas”). See his description above, in section 1.2.
103 “De los otros cuatro estos de acuerdo con Rowe que el de Raba Oclo y el de Chuquillantu [no. 2
y 4] podrían ser filiados con el manuscrito del propietario irlandés [P]? Sin embargo, en este
último no hay evidencias de cortes en las páginas. Por el contrario lo que se aprecia es que en los
lugares donde lluevan a ir los dibujos las páginas están en blanco ---. Por ejemplo en el caso de Raba
Oclo [no. 2] es claro que debía haber sido adherido en el lugar correspondiente en el manuscrito
Galvín [P]. Por determinadas circunstancias Murúa no hizo esta operación” (Ossio 2004, 21).
104 In reference to the illustration of the coat of arms of Peru, Ossio (2004, 21) remarks: “es el
único que no guarda mayor correspondencia ni con el contenido del manuscrito Galvín [P] ni con el
Wellington [S].”
draft," different from the one that, according to his theory, supplied the 22 pasted-on folios of P, and that it migrated directly to S from that "other" draft.

- There is no lack of space in P: a number of folios of quire 1 are lost, and this folio fits perfectly into P as a detached primary folio.

No. 2 (Raba Ocillo). Since there is in P a blank folio ready to host this folio, Osio conceives to Rowe that "it could be affiliated" ("podrían ser filiados") with P, but, contrary to Rowe, Osio chooses to let it originate in another manuscript or draft. According to Osio, it was Martín's intention to insert it into P, but for some reason it did not happen (and instead it was eventually inserted into S).

- Of all the extraneous S-folios, this is the one that most evidently originates directly from P.

No. 3 ("Huascar Inca"). Because there does not seem to have been allotted space (a blank folio) in P for this S-folio, Osio assigns its origin to the same "otro borrador" as no. 1, and he suggests that it migrated directly from that draft to S. However, he acknowledges that the text on the reverse of Huascar has some likeness to the text on fol. 51v of P, which alludes to the execution of Tupac Amaru. In fact, the two texts are not lookalikes, but supplement one another perfectly. As explained above (section 2.7), replacement fol. 52v was intended for the reinstatement of "Huascar Inca," but because this folio had migrated to S, the replacement folio was used instead as support for pasted-on fol. 53r.

No. 4 ("Chuquillantu"). This now-S-folio originally belonged in a location in P where two primary folios have been removed and only one replacement

---

80 We use quotation marks to signal this Inca's name as a secondary identification of a figure that was in P initially assigned an identity as a generic figure of an Inca.

81 "Aquel de Huascar Inca cargado en una letra es cierto que no encaja directamente con ninguno de los capítulos del manuscrito que se reproduce en este facsímil" (Osio 2004: 21).

82 "Asimismo, el texto que está en el anverso es semejante al que alude a la ejecución de Túpac Amaru en el capítulo 16, libro 2º" (Osio 2004: 21).

83 At the bottom of P, 54v, we read: "No se vio jamás este ciudat del Cuzco en sus guerras ni trabajos tan a pique de perderse como este día, pero que Dios que, sin escondíjlos ni guerras, acabése este príncipe y malogrado Amaro. En saliendo de su ..." This exposition continues without interruption on S, 107/8r (originally P, 52r): "... Preción todos los caciques, curacas y los demás ydios con algunos de los nuestros acompanaron-lorando. En llegando a la calle salían a los balcones y ventanas mayores y doncellas y ydios y ydias llorando ..." Reading smoothly from the folio in P to its original sequel in P, which has now migrated to S, we have: "This city of Cuzco never found itself in its wars and hardships so close to being lost as on this day. But God willed that, without wars or scandals, this prince and ill-fated Amaro should come to his end. In leaving his (P, 51v) prison, all the lords, chiefs, and the rest of the Indians, along with some of our own people, accompanied—weeping. In arriving on the street, women and maidens and male and female Indians went to their windows, weeping ..." (55r).
folio subsequently inserted to replace it. That is, there are extant only two pages numbered 61 and 62, not folios, which would have yielded four pages. Since the recto of the S-folio (“Capítulo noveno”) is obviously the missing chapter 9 of P’s part 3, the recto of the folio is to be identified with primary folio. This is also what Ossio entertains and accepts in the commentary to his transcription (Murúa 2004, vol. 2, page 142, note 109). In his Introducción, however, he takes the opposite approach to this case. Finding no blank page in P following “Capítulo 10, de la magestade que trayan las Coias” (replacement page 62) to which to assign the drawing of “Chuquillantu” on the verso of this S-folio (which had been the frontispiece of P’s chapter 10 in part 3, “De la magestade que trayan las Coias”), Ossio (2004, p. 21) assigns this drawing to chapter 27 of part 1 (f33v) where there is “space” for a ruler portrait of queen Chuquillantu. — Ossio presents this interpretation of the “Chuquillantu” folio as quite analogous to the Rabí Ocllo folio. However, he is dealing with a single folio whose recto and verso cannot be separated for insertion into two locations widely apart in P (f33v in part 1; “page” 61 in part 3, respectively), if this folio had originally belonged to another, but “parallel” or “analogous” manuscript.

It is not entirely clear how many drafts Ossio postulates, nor how he relates them to one another. Sometimes he mentions three, sometimes two. Possibly, he envisages that up to three drafts were aggregated into one single “manuscrito paralelo o previo,” and that, in the end, all pasted folios in P and S belong there. However, even when thus concretized and simplified, Ossio’s theory as propounded in the Introducción (2004, pp. 10, 17, 20-22) is at variance with annotations he makes to his transcription. They follow Rowe’s theory.160

2.11.3. Points of Method

Rowe’s primary concern was not the drawings but the texts. He had seen that the recto texts of these folios exactly filled out lacunae in Bayle’s edition of L, and he assumed that in L’s original, the then- lost P, there were 4 lacunae, each one consisting of 1 folio, corresponding to the 4 folios found in S. This, however, as we can see from the facsimile, is not what one encounters in P. In the places where Rowe envisioned lacunae (missing folios), P contains folios, some of them “empty”, others not, and it could seem to today’s observer of the facsimile that

160 See note 105. “Chuquillantu” is a secondary identification for a generic royal female figure.

Rove therefore was on the wrong track. However, the previous pages have shown that where Rowe thought that P had lacunae, we find instead *replacement* folios. They replace missing folios, that is, fill out lacunae. Rowe could not know that the lacunae had been prepared for the reinstallion of folios that earlier had been detached.

Ossio’s theory ignores the difference between primary folios and replacement folios. The only issue that matters is whether the S-folios, considered as primary P-folios, fit in among the remaining primary folios of P. Rowe argued long ago, on the basis of an analysis of the textual evidence, that this was the case, and the 2004 facsimile of P confirms that he was right.

This confrontation of Ossio and Rowe may seem inconsequential, but it is important for two reasons.

First, we must ask whether the S-folio with the *curatus*’ letter (Table 7, no. 1) is an ordinary element of the P manuscript itself or of some “other draft.” – The *curatus*’ letter is a document of paramount importance for the theory that Guaman Poma was Murúa’s main indigenous informant and a close collaborator during the genesis of his *Historia*. It is considered to document their close collaboration on the strength of the hypothesis that it is a “draft” penned by Guaman Poma in imitation of the fictitious letter of recommendation of his father Guaman Mallique de Ayala, which is found in Guaman Poma’s *Nueva corónica*. Conclusive arguments have never been adduced for the priority of the Guaman Mallique-text, nor indeed for Guaman Poma’s authorship of the *curatus*’ letter. Until the discovery of P, the *curatus*’ letter was considered as a “draft,” hypothesized as being jotted down in P by Guaman Poma. (His hand is on the reverse, which features the extensively commented Guaman Poma-drawing of the coat of arms of Peru.) Yet from the beginning it was patent that the letter had been inscribed by the same hand as the ordinary chapters of P [part 1, ch. 25; and part 3, ch. 9], discovered by Rowe. After the discovery of P, and insofar as its 22 inserted folios are interpreted as belonging to “other drafts,” rather than to P itself, the *curatus*’ letter, instead of becoming more tightly linked to P, can be dissociated totally from P, as if belonging to yet another “draft”. – By reverting to Rowe’s theory, the *curatus*’ letter becomes contextualized (in the newly discovered P) more strongly than before, and, indeed, far from being a

112 That there is a textual relation between this text and the fictitious letter of recommendation of Guaman Poma’s father is unquestionable, and well seen. But it does not follow that Guaman Poma drafted the letter of the *curatus*. More probable, on any count, is that Guaman Poma plagiarized and fictionalized the *curatus*’ letter, which he knew from having illustrated the manuscript in which it had been inscribed (see below, 4.5).
free-going "borrador de carta," it turns into an integrated part of a "copia en limpio," that is, a print-ready manuscript.

Second, we must ask whether it is true that Ballesteros was on the right track in 1962 and in 1987 when he suggested, as a mere hypothesis, that P (which he only knew through L, that is, Murúa 1946a) consisted of a plurality of drafts. It is this "historical lucidity" ("imaginando con gran lucidez histórica") of Ballesteros (Ossio 2004, 13), which has induced Ossio to suggest that there is evidence in P and S for the existence of one, two, or even three "drafts," and, consequently, to introduce the notion that Guaman Poma was the head of an artisanal production unit (taller artesanal) where members of his family were employed as scribes and illustrators. There is no evidence for such an atelier, neither in Guaman Poma’s own book (except for his own claim about instructing his legal-petition-writing "deciplinos" [Guaman Poma 1615, 499]), nor in his externally documented activities, nor in any other sources. To date, the only "evidence" has consisted of Ballesteros', and particularly Ossio's, visions of P as an aggregate of elements derived from earlier "drafts," rather than a tightly monitored manuscript evolving over time. In this context, one can hardly overestimate the importance of achieving a solid scholarly consensus on the question of whether Rowe’s theory of P was right or wrong.

2.12. The Integrity and State of Preservation of P

Our investigation has shown that neither P nor S offers evidence of material being interpolated into them from other drafts. P was fragmented, and P was reconstructed (with some, but not very extensive losses), and S was enriched with some elements of P. But there is no element in either P or S that comes from any other source. In fact, we have accounted for every single element in both manuscripts as originating in P or S.

P was not only carefully wrought in its various stages, but it is also well preserved. When we take into account that the twenty-two folios pasted into P are actually

---

113 Ossio (2004) correctly qualifies his notion about an artisans’ workshop as "hipotético" on p. 52, but elsewhere he presents it as an established fact. On p. 48, for example, Ossio writes of Murúa as being surrounded by "informantes, dibujantes y ananiures," which on p. 49 turn out to be "Guaman Poma y el personal de su taller artesanal," and on p. 54 a particular drawing is assigned to "Guaman Poma o sus familiares."

114 José Galdames-Ruiz (1998, 2001) has challenged the prevailing opinion since Pietschmann 1908 concerning the manuscript of the Nueva cabala y buen gobierno being autograph from beginning to end. The adduced evidence for dictation and a variety of scribes, as can be imagined in a taller, does not carry the point. On Guaman Poma as author and as his own artist and scribe, see most recently Adorno 2004.
primary folios from the same manuscript that have been cut out from it and then reinserted into it by pasting onto replacement sheets, and when we discover that Rowe was correct when he argued that all four extraneous S-folios had migrated there from P, we come to the conclusion that only 20 primary folios of P are missing. Four of them were blank on both sides. Hence, out of the 152 inscribed folios of P, only sixteen have been lost (the text on one of them, however, primary fol. 42, is extant in copy). In other words, a full ninety per cent of P has been preserved to this day. For the details of these counts, see Appendix 4.

The impression of disorder and incompleteness conveyed by the early editions of P (made, of course, on the basis of L) was enhanced, first, by Bayle’s insistence (“vo y declarar paladinamente”) that P had to be a “mala copia” of a lost “authentic original,” and, second, by the elevation of this impression into a theory of “uncleaned-up” drafts and notes (“un sucio”) by Ballesteros. The discovery of P in 1996 and the publication of its remarkable facsimile in 2004 could have been the occasion for a fundamental revision of unsubstantiated speculations, but these have come to represent, regrettably, the culmination of nearly a century of steadily accumulating misimpressions and misunderstandings about the nature of the P manuscript.

Manuscripts often reveal much, directly or indirectly, about the model from which they have been copied or about an earlier version of the same work on which they are based. This is also the case with P. The discovery that as much as 90% of P has been preserved intact, and that it is a manuscript that was rationally, not haphazardly, planned, constructed, and developed, provides a solid basis for the systematic investigation of its internal history, and, beyond that, of possible antecedent and subsequent versions of the same work. In this Part Two of our study we have presented the elements that constitute the manuscript, moving from the most basic levels of its construction to the more complex levels of its receipt of its contents. We have sought to identify the constitutive elements of P and the logic of their assembly, fragmentation, and near-complete reconstruction. We went from gathering simple and indisputable codicological facts, such as watermarks, to more complex notions, such as “replacement folios”. Our discussion culminated in the disentanglement of scholarly polemics over the complexities of migrated, recycled, and reinterpreted pictorial texts, that is, the water-colored drawings by Guaman Poma.

In the next part of our study, we will order chronologically the information that we have gathered and the analyses we have made. We do so in order to construct a plausible expression of the sequence of events that constitute the “early history” of the P manuscript from its earliest known antecedent version to its conservation and survival as a mutilated but still useful annex to the revised and expanded S manuscript that finally superseded it.
Part Three. The Early History of P

We now turn to a chronological consideration of the construction of P. The new interpretative context that the facsimile publication of P has created allows us to assess a critically important piece of the Murúa puzzle (the curacas' letter of 1596) and to discover that there had been an earlier completed version of Murúa's work, which we will call C (= Cuzco). We will explore in detail the phases of the fragmentation of P and the logic of its reconstruction. With regard to the last phases of the evolution of Murúa's life-work, we venture to explain P's survival in spite of its being rejected by Murúa as a satisfactory version of his Historia general del Perú.

3.1. Before P: The C Manuscript

P contains some information about the period of time over which it was produced, Bayle (1946, 31-34) discovered long ago that the date of 1590, which appears both on the title page and at the end of the Tabla, should not be taken at face value. Bayle (1946, 32-34) had identified two passages that refer to events of a decade later. First, on fol. 51v, Murúa refers to Martín García de Loyola as being the current governor of Chile. García de Loyola governed Chile from April 1592 until his violent death (at the hands of the Araucanians) on December 23, 1598. Second, on fol. 137v, Murúa mentions the volcanic eruption near Arequipa of February 18, 1600. Augmenting Bayle's discoveries, Ossio (2004, 50, 19, note 175) has added a third and even later documented date for Murúa's additions to P: on fol. 106r, Murúa relates that he punished three Indian "idolaters" in the province of Aymares, when he was serving there as comendador and cura. Ossio has determined that Murúa had this charge between 1604 and 1606. All three passages are additions by P2, and they clearly indicate that Murúa continued working on P after 1606.

There is a fourth post-1590 date to be considered, and it also appears in a passage inscribed by P2. It is found in the only prologue that is extant in P, which is the prologue to part 4 (126v). This text was written during the reign of Philip

115 The title page (replacement folio, inscribed by P2) carries the notice, "acabóse por el mes de marzo del año de 1590," and the Tabla (P1) is dated "año de 1590."

116 Hemming 1970, 401. García de Loyola's wife was Doña Beatriz Cara Coya (1588-1609), the great-granddaughter of Huayna Capac and the niece of the last Inca prince, Tupac Amaru (c. 1554-1572), who was executed by the virrey Francisco de Toledo (Hemming 1970, 506-507). Commenting on the sixteen years of Murúa's rule in Chile by García de Loyola and Doña Beatriz, Hemming (1970, 401) notes that after the governor's assassination, "the Araucanians continued for many decades to use the skull of Governor García de Loyola [grand-nephew of St. Ignatius of Loyola] as a ceremonial drinking vessel."
III (1598-1621), as attested by the reference to the "cathólico Rey don Felipe, segundo Marte y tercer de este nombre," Muriña here reveals that P is a fair copy of parts 1-3 of his book, to which he adds a fourth part with the opportunity to make a clean copy of his book, he cannot but add to it an account of the riches and bounty of the kingdom of Peru and the excellence of its Spanish cities. Thus the earliest possible date of the main text of P, the fair copy inscribed by P1, is late 1598.

This prologue, which appears at the beginning of the text's part 4, comes in rather unexpectedly at this point because there is no other prologue in P. However, a cross-reference in part 3, chapter 25 (177v), "como queda dicho en el prólogo," confirms that there had been a prologue on one of the now-lost front matter folios in P. This is what one would have expected, but not that it was a prologue to parts 1-3 only, as revealed by the supplementary prologue to part 4. It can be concluded, therefore, that before P there existed a full-edged earlier version of the HISTORIA, consisting of a prologue and parts 1-3, and that P is a fair copy of it ("viendo la ocación ... para sacar en limpio el presente libro").

Additionally, the letter of recommendation of the Cusco, dated May 15, 1598, which we can conjecture was inscribed by P1 on a front matter folio of P (currently located in S, see above, section 2.11), describes the work submitted by Muriña (C) with precision and in some detail. Thus, it is not fortuitous that

117 "Viendo la ocación en las manos, prudente y discreto lector[e], para sacar en limpio [sic] el presente libro, no quise perdonar a mi trabajo ni contentarme con solo la historia y gobierno de los yngos, ser muy falló sino hacerlo enteramente completo, poniendo aquí las grandes y Riquezas deste reyno del Pirú y las excelencias de las ciudades y villas que en el ay de españoles" (R, 1126v; Muriña 2004, vol. 2, 221).

118 The cross-reference to the prologue is inserted in P2 into a long literal quotation about quipus, from the second edition (1585) of Jerónimo Ruíz and Zamora, "Refacciones del mundo. De la República de las Indias Occidentales" (1575), bk. 3, ch. 26 (1807, vol. 2, p. 68). "Tenían grandes montones de estas cuentas a manera de registros, como los tienen los escritanos, y allí tenían sus archivos... como queda dicho en el prólogo, y de tal manera, que el que quería algo, no tenía más que hacer de roce a los que tenían este oficio." The origin of this passage was identified by Párrasín (1908, 48) and acknowledged by Osorio Muriña 2004, vol. 2, 60).

119 The CUSCO'S letter reads: "El qual [Martín de Muriña] abrí cinco años que a escrito una historia de nuestros antepasados, los reyes yugos deste Reyno del pirú y de su gobierno, con otras muchas curiosidades por relación de ello como de los viejos antiguos deste dicho Reino y de nuestros. Y que el estilo es fácil, eloquente, grave y sustancial, y la historia [sic] muy verdadera como condicio al sujeto e personas de quien trata. Y que demás del servicio de V.Mag. que resultará de imprimirse la dicha historia comenzándose a celebrar e hacer inmortal la memoria e nombre de los grandes señores que fueron en sus fazas, deseando que todo esto se consaga" (S, 285v). Significant, "curiosidades" picks up a formula of the unabridged title of part 3, as evidenced by fol. 52 (in the manuscript S): "El gobierno que estos Reyes y Grandes señores Yngas tuvieron antes que los españoles viniesen a este Reyno del pirú, muy gustioso y con mucha curiosidad. Es como se sigue" (S, 167v).
the *curacas* do not mention Murúa’s description of cities (including Cuzco),
while his treatments of Inca history (parts 1 and 2) and of Inca civic and social
organization (part 3) are explicitly mentioned. The *curacas* further mention that
the recommended book had been completed by Murúa five years earlier (“abrá
cinco años que [Murúa] a escrito”). This fits well enough with the year, 1590,
found on the title page of P considered as a copy of the title page of C.

3.2. From C to P

Cross-references within the text inscribed by P1 reveal more about the genesis of
P. An important question is whether all four parts of the *Historia* were inscribed
by P1 at approximately the same time or possibly over an interval of many
years. If it could have stretched over many years, one could argue that only part
4 was inscribed after May 15, 1596, while the lost prologue and parts 1-3 were
inscribed long before that date and constitute the very manuscript submitted
by Murúa to the *curacas*. This possibility, however, can be ruled out because
there is a reference to part 4 in the running text of the P1 fair copy of parts
1-3. It is in part 2, chapter 13 (f. 48r), in which a long passage about the city of
Huamanga ends thus: “Es ciudad de buen templo y de mucho Regalo y de gente
muy yllustre y lúcido, como se dirá lo demás en la ystoria de la dicha ciudad.”
This cross-reference targets chapter 4 in part 4, and it proves that part 4 was
completed or in the making when P1 inscribed the fair copy of parts 1-3. Since
the main bulk of P was inscribed (P1) in one process, even if over a period of
several weeks or months, and since part 4 had been copied by P1 not earlier
than 1598, it is legitimate to assume that all the P1 fair copies of briefer texts
can be dated to the same period. These briefer texts are the *Fición*, the *Talla*,
the *Memoria*, and the letter of recommendation of the *curacas* of Cuzco.

The *curacas*’ letter is dated May 15, 1596, and since it is known through the
P1 fair copy of it, the P1 fair copy itself, to which the *Prólogo* of part 4 (inscribed
by P2) explicitly refers (“sacar en limpio el presente libro”), must have been
produced after May 15, 1596. Thus, it can be excluded that P (in any form)
was the very manuscript submitted to the *curacas*. Rather, we can suppose that
the enthusiastic declaration of the *curacas*, recommending to king Philip II the
publication of Murúa’s book, was an event that contributed to Murúa’s decision

---

210 Cuzco heads the 15 chapters, followed by Lima, Huánuco, Quito, Ica, Cañete, Chachapoyas,
Huamanga, Canapa, Arequipa, Arica, Chinchayco, Cochabamba, La Plata, and Potosí.
211 Osio (2004, 40) states that P was the manuscript submitted (or intended to be submitted), if it was
only a “draft of a letter,” cf. above, 2.11) to the *curacas*, and recommended by them for publication:
“aquella carta de 1596 ... donde un grupo de curacas suscitó decide respaldar la publicación del
manuscrito de Calvin [that is, P].”
to initiate the production of a new fair copy (P) of his book, that is, to take
decisive steps toward its eventual publication.

When P1 copied C, Murúa did more than just add part 4. This is evidenced
by the cross-reference to the fuller treatment of Huamanga, mentioned above.
Judging from P2's numerous later additions, it is probable that five years after
C was completed, Murúa was prompted to add a number of supplements,
corrections, and other enhancements to C before P1 started to make a fair copy
of it, whether in installments or as one single assignment. However, this point
should not be pressed. The text inscribed by P1 is not a new edition of C, as S is
a new edition of P. It is a fair copy, says Murúa (I126v), and the probable date of
completion of C, "por el mes de mayo del año de 1590" (P, title page) was not
changed in the P1 copy made sometime after May 15, 1596. Neither in C nor in P
was "1590" meant as an imprint date. It was the date of completion of the Historia
as an intellectual achievement materialized in a manuscript (C). The addition of
the 16 chapters of part 4 fulfilled a need in the work as conceptualized by
Murúa, but it did not turn the fair copy into a new work. Furthermore, the date
given as the date of composition had to comply with the information given in the
curiosa's letter, which was inscribed in proximity to the title page.

Apart from the addition of part 4, P came to differ from C in another very
important respect. The curiosa and Murúa's style ("el estilo es fácil, eloquente,
grave y sustancial"), but they do not mention the most salient characteristic of
the manuscript of its later copy P: the water-colored drawings. It seems fair to
infer that C was not illustrated. The drawings are explicitly mentioned in P's
prologue to part 4. Had they existed when C's prologue to parts 1-3 was written,
they would have been mentioned in that context, and there would have been
no need to repeat the information about the visual enticement of the work in
the prologue to part 4 written in 1598 or later. We can conjecture that the idea
of illustrating his book may have stimulated Murúa to have a new fair copy of C
produced, but it must remain a hypothesis.

Much must remain in the dark concerning peculiarities of C. Among errors
that may have been conveyed from C to P, because they were only lately detected
and corrected in P, is the faulty numbering of chapters in 57-73 of part 3, initially
numbered 56-72 (fols. 109-115). The Tabla in P has the correct chapter numbers
all along, and if C had no Tabla, the error in C may have been detected when
P's Tabla was composed.

122 This question is further discussed below, section 3.3.2.
123 Murúa expresses the hope that his work will be welcomed by the reader: "con amoroso espíritu
por las esmaltadas y barias pinturas y colores serán mejor recibido" (I126v).
3.3. The P Manuscript: A Professionally Produced Fair Copy

3.3.1. Overview of the Contents

P was laid out as 79 double folios, folded and arranged in 7 quires of 12, 9, 10, 14, and 3 times 11 double folios, or 158 single folios (see Appendix 2); the paper used was of "AM" type (see above, section 2.4).

The version of Murúa's Historia that was inscribed in P consisted of front matter and 132 chapters arranged in 4 unnumbered parts (see above, section 2.2). The front matter and first three parts were copied from a lost model, the manuscript C, to which were added part 4, the Ficción, a Tabla referencing all four parts plus the Ficción, and a short Memoria.

The front matter, up to the title page of part 1, consisted of 7 folios (9 + 14). The following contents are evidenced or can be conjectured, with each item occupying its own folio: the title page of the whole book, the camas' letter (recto) and the coat of arms of Peru (verso; extant in S), the coat of arms of the Inca kings, the Andean landscape (extant in P), the coat of arms of the Mercedarians (extant in P), and a prologue to parts 1-3 (including an exposition on quipus as historical sources). A blank folio may intentionally have preceded the title page, as is the case in the later S manuscript.

Table 8: Hypothetical Reconstruction of Quire 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First half of quire</th>
<th>Recto</th>
<th>Verso</th>
<th>Last half of quire</th>
<th>Recto (chap.)</th>
<th>Verso (frontispiece)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 0</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Fol. 25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Queen 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>Title page of work</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Fol. 22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Queen 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 2</td>
<td>Cimas' letter</td>
<td>Coat of arms of Peru (in S, f283)</td>
<td>Fol. 21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Principes yegos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 3</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>A version of the coat of arms of Inca kings, that is found in S, f13</td>
<td>Fol. 20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Inca king 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

124 S, fol. 13; in P (f28r), such a drawing is referenced as being "al principio de este libro."
125 P, 177v: “como queda dicho en el prólogo.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 4</th>
<th>(Obscured text)</th>
<th>Andean landscape (P, 1st unnumbered folio)</th>
<th>Fol. 19</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Inca king 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 5</td>
<td>(Obscured text)</td>
<td>Coat of arms of Mercedarios (P, 2nd unnumbered folio)</td>
<td>Fol. 18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Inca king 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 6</td>
<td>Prólogo</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Fol. 17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Inca king 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 7</td>
<td>Title page of part I</td>
<td>Frontispiece of part 1, chapter 1</td>
<td>Fol. 16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Inca king 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 8</td>
<td>Text of part 1, chapter 1</td>
<td>Frontispiece of part 1, chapter 2</td>
<td>Fol. 15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inca king 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 9</td>
<td>Text of part 1, chapter 2</td>
<td>Frontispiece of part 1, chapter 3 (Inca king 1)</td>
<td>Fol. 14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inca king 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 10</td>
<td>Text of part 1, chapter 3</td>
<td>Frontispiece of part 1, chapter 4 (Inca king 2)</td>
<td>Fol. 13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inca king 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol. 11</td>
<td>Text of part 1, chapter 4</td>
<td>Frontispiece of part 1, chapter 5 (Inca king 3)</td>
<td>Fol. 12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inca king 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three folios had on their rectos the title statements of the first three parts. Only the third is extant (f152r; currently S, I67r/I84r):

El gouierno. Que Estos, y grandes. señoría, yngas tuvieron antes que los españoles, viniesen, a este Reyno. del piri | mui gustosso, y con | mucha curiosidad | Es como, se sigue.

The entry in the Tabla is abbreviated: "Tabla del gouierno que los yngas y señoría tuvieron antes que los Español viniesen a este Reyno del piri" (f149r).

A whole folio was also assigned for the title page of part 4 (fol. 126) but it was left blank because the title page information in the model from which P1 copied part 4 was inscribed above the title of the first chapter. Fol. 127 recto therefore has two title boxes within the framing, the superior one containing the title of part 4: "Declaración del nombre deste reyno del piri con las ciudades que ai en el." It corresponds to the Tabla entry except for the addition of "de españoles": "Tabla de la declaración del nombre deste reyno del piri, con la declaración de las ciudades <de españoles> que ay en el" (f150r).127

125 At a later stage, the Prólogo to part 4 was added on f126 verso, facing chapter 1 of part 4, and still later (probably), Guaman Poma, by mistake, created a drawing on f126 recto, facing the last page of part 3 (see below, section 3.7.3).

127 The last two words, apparently inscribed by P1, pick up the expression "y las excelencia de las ciudades y villas que en el ay de españoles," which is found in the Prólogo to part 4 (f126c).
A whole folio (f143) was also left blank between the end of the Historia proper (f142v) and the beginning of the Ficición (f144r). The manuscript ended with 6 blank folios.

3.3.2. Single-Page Chapters

Each of the unnumbered parts of the Historia started with a "Capítulo primero." While the Ficición extended over 6 folios (including the initial blank separation folio) and had 4 pages set aside for illustrations, the chapters of the Historia proper were composed according to one simple scheme. They never exceeded a single page of text, and they included finely framed chapter titles of varying sizes, as determined by the length of the respective titles. Thus, every chapter had its own, single folio, invariably inscribed with the chapter's title and the single-page chapter text on its recto.

There is only one exception to this pattern, and it is found in the very last chapter (and page) of part 3, corresponding to the last page of the Historia in the C manuscript. The verso of f125 is inscribed by P1 in continuation of the recto. The tapered conical ending of P's part 3 probably reproduces the colophon that decorated the last page of C. This occurrence leads us to ask whether C was designed to have blank versos or whether its chapters were copied in such a way as to provide blank versos to accommodate further textual additions, or perhaps even illustrations/frontispieces which in that case, however, were never prepared. Thus, it is possible that C was designed to have frontispieces, as P (and, much later, S). However, as argued above (section 3.2), C was probably not illustrated, since neither the curacas' letter nor, apparently, the lost prologue to parts 1-3 makes any mention of drawings.

Before any text was copied, each of the recto pages of P was ruled with a thin lead-point. The number of ruled lines per page varies according to the amount of text to be inscribed. The maximum number of lines is 96 (Ficición, f145). All chapters of the Historia (and the first page of the Ficición) included a calligraphed title embedded in the framing of the whole page, leaving space for 28-32 lines of text. Thus, the amount of prose text per chapter varied substantially, but harmony and uniformity of layout were achieved by adjusting the distance between the ruled lines (i.e. the number of lines on the page), by conically

---

128 At a later stage, folio 143 was inscribed with a continuation of the text on folio 141 on its recto and the drawing of an adorning medal was created on its verso, as frontispiece to the Ficición. Still later, under the reconstruction of P, it was moved to the beginning of the manuscript, facing folio 8 recto, where it became the 3rd unnumbered folio with its text pasted onto a replacement folio and its adorning medal displayed as frontispiece to the "capítulo prohomial."
tapering the lines of script at the bottom of the page (the end of the chapter), and by skillfully adapting the size and heaviness of the letters to the amount of text of the current chapter (Compare f38r, which consists of thirty lines, a brief title, and a relatively short text, with f39r, which has thirty-two lines, a lengthy title, and a much longer text.)

3.3.3. The Framing of Recto Pages

With the exception of the front matter folios, as well as f126r (reserved as title page for part 4 but left blank at this stage of the evolution of P), and f147r (one of the three pages left blank at this stage between the end of the Ficicio and the beginning of the Tabula), all rectos carried text that was carefully inscribed by P1 within the boundaries of a double-lined frame. These frames, however, were not all of the same type. They vary in the way the chapter title is separated from the chapter text. The five variants, A–E in Table 9, do not occur haphazardly but in a sequential series with an increasing degree of complexity. The framing system evolves, step by step, and the framing of title and text becomes more and more integrated into one common structure.129

Table 9: Framing of Chapter Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Folios (total)</th>
<th>Part, chapters</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>884 (27)</td>
<td>1.1-27 (all of part 1)</td>
<td>1 line of separation between title and text; title in trapezoidal box within common 2-line frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>35-99 (35)</td>
<td>2.1-16 (all of part 2) and 3.1-17</td>
<td>2 lines of separation between title and text; title and text in separate rectangular boxes within common 4-line frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>70-109 (40)</td>
<td>3.18-57</td>
<td>4 lines of separation; title and text in separate 2-line frames; perspective126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>110-122 (with variants 116 and 117), 144 and 145b5 (15)</td>
<td>2.58-70 (with variants on 2.64 and 2.65) and the Ficicio</td>
<td>3 lines of separation; title and text in separate but contiguous double-line frames; perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

129 In the S manuscript, all chapter titles are calligraphed and all text pages are framed, as in P, but title and text are not separated by horizontal lines.

126 The illusion of a modest visual perspective is achieved by drawing lines that miter the corners of the frames.
| E | 123-125 and 127-142 (19) | 127-142 (all of part 4) | 2 lines of separation; title and text in integrated adjacent double-line frames; perspective (variations of this type due to long titles); fol. 124, 128, 137, 139 |

The frames were drawn after the body of the text was inscribed (see f52v and the rectos of fols. 58, 60, 66, 67, 93, 94, 112, 123, 125, where the frame is interrupted by or circumvents protruding letters), but was part of the making of a page. A thin, pencil-drawn line may have guided the scribe on the yet unframed page. A thin pen nib was used for inscribing the text of each chapter, while a thicker one was used for inscribing the chapter titles and for drawing the frames. Additionally, a thin pen nib was used to create the intricate, twisted decorative lines of frames of type A (fols. 8-34) and the elaborate cross-hatching and filigree-like variants of type D (see fols. 116 and 117). The ruling also guided the distance between the twin lines of the horizontal sides of the frames and the letter size of the calligraphic inscription of chapter titles (cf. e.g. fol. 53). Thus, frames and all text on recto pages are strictly monitored and modular throughout the manuscript.

3.3.4. The Foliation

As part of P1’s fair copy, a small, discrete foliation was added on the top right corner of the rectos. In many cases, this primary foliation was later partly or entirely cut away, but a later foliation, subsequent to the addition of replacement folios, was inscribed just above the frame; it coincided throughout with the primary foliation. In the facsimile, remains of the primary foliation can be seen from folio 26 onward, and it is still intact on fols. 59, 60, 86, 88, 89, 105, 113, 133, and 134. No primary foliation can be seen on the folios of the fiecio. The primary foliation was not introduced on one folio in the front matter, possibly the very first folio, and probably by design.

3.3.5. The Table of Contents

The Table, inscribed by P1 on three folios following a blank folio separating it from the Fiecio, includes references that correspond chapter by chapter to the primary foliation.

The Table's version of the titles of parts 3 and 4 can be compared with the title pages inscribed by P1 on f52r (currently S, S7v/S4r) and on f127r, respectively. In the first case, only the superfluous rhetoric (which goes back to C) is bypassed in

---

31 Exceptions occur where too few replacement folios had been added, see below, section 3.11. (For details, see above, section 2.7.)
the Tabla, while in the latter case the Tabla copy is slightly expanded. In contrast, the Tabla entries for the single chapters are very much abbreviated throughout. Only twice (part 1, chapter 8, and part 3, chapter 69) are they allowed to occupy more than one line.

The first reference in the Tabla is to fol. 8: chapter 1 of part 1. Thus, there are no references to the front matter (e.g. the prologue to parts 1-3). The last reference in the Tabla is to the Ficción (fol. 144).

On the verso of the last folio of the Tabla P1 inscribed a "Memoria" on the weaving pattern of a chumbi (see above, section 2.2). It is not referenced in the Tabla, and it may or may not go back to the 1590 C version of Murúa's book.

3.3.6. Conclusion

The fair copy produced by P1 was an exquisite and professional piece of craftsmanship, quite unlike the character of a draft (barrador) in which emphasis is placed on composition rather than presentation. Great care was exercised in the production of the "finished" fair copy. However, soon after its completion in 1596 or later, P2 began to make a number of additions to the prose text without apparent concern for the esthetic value of P1's work. Soon, the copia en limpio was transformed into a repository of textual and graphic materials which could be used in a subsequent new version of the Historia.

We can calculate the time period of this transformation by taking into account the dates of contemporary events referred to in the manuscript (see above, section 3.1). Within approximately two years or less, from after the preparation of the curacas' letter of 1596 and prior to, or more or less contemporaneously with, the violent end of García de Loyola's governorship of Chile (December, 1598), P2 elaborated and augmented many expositions in the manuscript, and P was thoroughly and systematically expanded and transformed.

3.4. Additions to P: The Priority of Texts or Drawings

3.4.1. Filling out Blank Pages

When one pages through the facsimile, it seems evident that P was originally planned to include a complete set of frontispieces of its 132 chapters. However, the drawings are not mentioned on any of P's original title pages, neither the one copied from C (which is not surprising), nor the one that was later inscribed as a P2 addition below the copy of the 1596 letter of the curacas. With minor variants, the new title drafted in or after 1596 anticipates the title of Murúa's 1613 version (S). Both (see their transcription in our Introduction, above) refer to themselves as "general histories" that present a sweeping panorama spanning
the period from the origins of the Incas through the settlement of the Spanish and the establishment of their cities. Both versions include the part/book that describes the cities, but neither of them makes any mention of the graphic side of the work. Only in the prologue to part 4, which at a late moment, ca. 1600, looks back upon the whole of P, does Muriá refer to “las esmaltaudas y barias pinturas y colores.”

P was originally laid out and copied (P1) in such a way that every chapter started on a recto and the chapter never exceeded this single page of text. This simple scheme left a blank page between all chapters, which can be interpreted equally well as a blank page at the end of every chapter (available for later textual additions) or as a blank page facing every chapter (available for the addition of a frontispiece). In part I, every blank page was filled out with a frontispiece drawing (portraits of Inca kings and queens). In the remaining three parts, however, a number of blank pages were filled to the brim with additions pertaining to the chapter on the reverse, while others, starting at the top, were only partly filled with text. Later on, it can be inferred, the remaining blank space in parts 2-4 were filled out with drawings (frontispieces) in sizes varying from a full page to a half page, or even much smaller.

3.4.2. Additions Made After the Inclusion of Drawings

The great majority of additional texts (P2) were introduced before drawings were incorporated in parts 2-4, and the textual additions inscribed by P2 subsequent to the inclusion of drawings are few and normally brief, overwriting the bottom of frames on pages with text or inscribed in blank areas within drawings. In three instances Muriá succeeded in adding longer texts in locations where (in principle) a previously included drawing on the verso page prevented it. In these cases, the addition refers to a location in the manuscript beyond the boundary of the Historia proper:

1. At the bottom of f135r (a chapter on the virgins of the sun), a catch-word and “f°. 155” targets a folio that later was pasted onto replacement fol. 143 (see above, section 2.7). The reference was neither cancelled nor brought up to date, after it became obsolete through the migration of fol. “155” to the place previously occupied by fol. 143.

2. At the bottom of f126v (the prologue to part 4), a cancelled reference

---

135 The chapter on the cities can be seen as the logical conclusion to the story of Spanish conquest and settlement insofar as one can imagine Muriá presenting their establishment as the culmination and achievement of Western civilization and their illustration as the satisfying counterpart to the folio 1 verso drawing of the verdant and snow-peaked untamed Andean landscape.
targets “fo. 153” (?). The reference was later cancelled and is illegible in the facsimile.\footnote{Inspection of the original would probably make possible a positive identification of this cross-reference. The legible words “de V[nuestra] M[agstad]” and “deste V[nuestro] Reyno” make it probable that the target of the reference was an elaborate salutation formula.}

3. At the bottom of folio 141 recto (description of the city of La Plata), a reference reads: “lo demas está fo. 143”, and on the next line: “pagina 2.” If “pagina 2” can mean “page 2 of the present chapter” rather than “the verso of fol. 143,” the target can be identified as the obscured reverse (recto) of the primary folio that was reinstalled as a pasted-on folio on the third unnumbered folio facing 84r and serving (with its displayed verso: adorning adilla) as frontispiece to the chapter on the deeds of the Mercedarians. This reference was cancelled, possibly when primary fol. 143 was displaced because fol. “155” had occupied the original position of fol. 143 in the reconstructed quire 7.

These cases have in common Murúa’s solution to the need for more space: the use of blank folios at the end of the manuscript. He apparently did so, however, only on these three occasions.\footnote{Further textual additions that have been cancelled or are unreadable for other reasons are found in the margins (top or side) of f128r, f129r, and f135r.} From this we can infer that the drawings did not prevent Murúa from adding whatever supplements he wished until he definitively gave up P and concentrated all further work on the version of his book which was eventually to become the S manuscript. In consequence, it can also be inferred that the addition of drawings to parts 2-4 took place quite late during the process of expansion and transformation of P, that is, after P2 had introduced nearly all of the textual additions included in P.

3.4.3. Cross-Referencing Drawings

It is remarkable that the text of P, whether inscribed by P1 or subsequently augmented by P2, contains very few references to the drawings. The P1 fair copy contains more than twenty cross-references to the texts of other chapters, and more than ten are found in the additions of P2. One of the latter is inserted above the line in a P1 passage: “como queda ya dicho” (f54r, line 12). These cross-references are the result of Murúa’s repeated passes over his own text, and they reveal his endeavour to make his exposition more clear by tightening its structure and rendering its inevitable repetitions less irritating. In contrast, there are only two references to drawings embedded in the P1 fair copy, and one within the P2 additions:
1. In chapter 21 of part 1 (f28r), at the end of the detailed description of the iconographic elements in the coat of arms suspended above the entrance of the Incas’ palace in Cuzco, the P1 fair copy continues: “las cuales están pintadas al principio de este libro.” The folio that contained this drawing is not extant.\[135\]

2. In chapter 1 of part 2 (f36r), while recounting “fabulous” reports about “captain” Pachacuti Inca, the running text of P1 mentions the apparition of a man clad in crimson and refers to “this drawing”: “una persona vestida de colorado, como parece en esta pintura, con una trompeta en la una mano y un bordón en la otra.” The drawing would have been on the verso of the title page of part 2. Unfortunately, it is one of the folios that was removed but not later reinstalled.\[136\]

3. In chapter 16 of book 4 (on Potosí), the P2 addition (f142v) mentions, with a reference to “this drawing”, the silver with which the king of Spain sustains the Christian world: “... con lo cual nuestro católico Rey sustenta toda la cristianidad, como se ve por esta pintura, pues dice el Inga, ‘Ego fulcio columnas eius.’”\[137\]

These few references to the drawings over the course of the more than 100 extant chapters with frontispieces reveal their limited integration into the textual framework, and they stand as corroborative evidence of the lateness with which the hand-colored drawings supplemented the quasi-finallized text.

3.4.4 Working in Parallel, Partially Coordinated

Although few in number, the cross-references to drawings offer evidence to the effect that Murúa’s preparation of C, before its contents were copied by P1, ran parallel with the illustration project in a complex process that cannot

\[135\] Osio (in Murúa 2004, vol. 2, 96, note 46) takes for granted that a similar drawing among the front matter folios of S has migrated from P to S and is the very illustration to which Murúa refers in P. Inspection of the watermark found on S, f136, disproves this hypothesis, see above, section 4.14.2 and note 78.

\[136\] Osio (Murúa 2004, vol. 2, 103, note 51) asserts that the drawing does not match, apparently thinking that f146 is the frontispiece of f136; because it has a person clad in crimson, with the inscription (by P2) “Pachacuti Inca.” The drawing on f146 fills up the space that was left after the names of the ethnic groups subjected by Inca captains had been inscribed by P2, and the person clad in crimson is probably a generic representation of an Inca captain, rather than the portrait of a historical one. As mentioned in section 2.11.1, P2 has in more than one case made additional interpretative inscriptions on drawings with generic content.

\[137\] Instead of transcribing the perfectly legible text of the P manuscript, Osio (Murúa 2004, vol. 2, 236) repeats and further corrupts the inept rendering of Bayle’s copy of L. Osio thus reprints Bayle’s (in Murúa 1946a, 417) “columnas [sic],” while the manuscript, f142v, has “columnas.” In the same sentence, however, he departs from Bayle (L) when it comes to Latin (the motto of Potosí)
be elucidated in detail. It is imaginable that C can have included "al principio" a drawing of the coat of arms of the Inca kings without triggering an explicit mention in the letter of the "cuncas." Yet it is more probable that the reference to the coat of arms of the Incas and to the drawing of the "man in crimson," respectively, were added to the text of C shortly before P1 copied these chapters, thus providing information that would be useful to the prospective artist.

One more aspect of the drawings and their relation to the text in P indicates that the artist and the author did not collaborate closely. Osio (2004, 25, 49) has observed that text and drawings often have a very tenuous relation to one another. In the same vein, we have mentioned (section 2.11.1) that in some cases, P2 has reinterpreted or historicized drawings, such as "Guascar yunga" and "Chuquillantu mager de Guascar yunga." We suggested that this is the case with the P2 inscription "Pachacuti yunga" on the man clad in crimson of f34v, which for the artist represented a generic Inca captain or king rather than one particular, historical Inca ruler. Finally, some brief P2 additions to chapter titles can be explained as being triggered by the desire to link the prose exposition and the drawing, as in the addition to the title of chapter I of part 3: "y con la magestad que caminaban" (f52v). As often happens, author and artist were not closely coordinated. Yet after the inclusion of the illustrations, P2 did his best to relate text and drawing, repainting discrepancies that would confuse the reader and linking the visual to the verbal text wherever possible.

The idea of including illustrations in his work may have been a major incentive for Murúa to make a fair copy in which there would be space enough for a complete set of frontispieces. The illustration project was fulfilled in part 1, where nearly all of the frontispieces are ruler portraits. In parts 2-4, another artist came into the picture: Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala. By that time, many blank pages had been filled with additional textual material, but many others were still blank. Guaman Poma apparently was given carte blanche to fill out with illustrations all remaining gaps. Within the Historia proper, the drawings are all frontispieces, introducing the text that follows. The artist must have been instructed to create the alternating picture/prose pattern in this manner.

"Ego fulcio columnas cius" and prints "Juicio" instead of "Fulcio," which is found in P and in Barle (and surely in L). The error is evidently imputable to the scanning of Barle's text (see Osio 2004, 62-63); the applied program for automatic optical character recognition (OCR) was weak in Latin, and guessed at Spanish "Juicio" instead of Latin "Fulcio."

The drawings on f24v and f22v are not ruler portraits in the strict sense but have motifs of rulers' "everyday life," that is, the king's council and the queen's morning toilette, respectively.

The coats of arms found in the upper left-hand corners of the portraits of Inca queens in part 1 were drawn by Guaman Poma.

Concerning the drawings on f126r and f143r (primary "155"), see below, section 3.7.3.
3.5. Textual Additions that Antedate the Drawings

3.5.1. Additions on Rectos

Author and artist worked concurrently. It is not possible to distinguish in all cases between the textual additions inserted before, and those introduced after, the drawings were prepared. Nevertheless, it is possible to make such assessments in some instances. We begin by considering the great number of pre-drawing additions.

P2 additions are in some cases so brief that they are contained on the recto alone, normally below the P1 text, encroaching on the bottom of the frame. Like corrections and amendments in the text itself, these additions can equally well have been introduced before or after the creation of the drawings. For example, on f31r, the addition (in the margin) is a late note-to-self of P2 (probably while working on the S version) about information in the current chapter that should be moved to the chapter on the city of Cuzco. On f36r the addition consists of only two lines, and on f46r and f47r the additions are simple announcements about the contents of the following chapter: "como se dirá (como lo dirá) en el cap. siguiente."

Folio 106 recto was mentioned above (section 3.1). It contains a 3-line addition by P2 below the chapter inscribed by P1. The addition fits into the space available, with the third line overwriting the bottom part of the frame. This addition is datable to after the year 1606. It is possible, as suggested above, that the addition is on the recto because in 1606 (or later), the verso was already occupied by a drawing, and that the addition, which is partly autobiographical, would have been more detailed if there had still been more room available on the verso.

3.5.2. Additions on Versos

In contrast to the previously mentioned additions, those on verso pages can in general be considered as earlier than the addition of drawings. As mentioned, the versos were probably left blank by P1 because they were reserved for use as frontispieces. This program was carried out up to the end of part 1 (f33v), but from f34v onward, prose texts were sometimes inscribed before the artist was allowed to do his work. As detailed in Appendix 5, there are 17 cases in which the frontispieces are of much reduced size because the page was already occupied by a prose exposition, and there are 15 cases in which there is no frontispiece because P2 additions already filled the verso to the brim when Guaman Poma was involved as artist. In most cases, the additional verso text is initiated on the bottom of the preceding recto page.
The addition on f137v describing the volcanic eruption near Arequipa of February 18, 1600, is interpreted below (section 3.6) as the earliest time limit for the drawings of P (or in part 4 of P).

3.5.3. Embedded Quotations from Román y Zamora

Martti Pärsinnen (1989, 48-49) has identified three extensive literal quotations from Román y Zamora's *Repúblicas del mundo* (1575, 1595), nos. 1-3 in Table 10, below. Pärsinnen used Bayle's edition (Murúa 1916a), and in 1989 he could not know that in two cases (nos. 2 and 3) they are inscribed by P3. Studying the facsimile of P, we have discovered that P3 has inscribed two additional passages (nos. 4 and 5), which we have identified as also being literal quotations from Román y Zamora's *Repúblicas de las Indias Occidentales.*

Table 10: Quotations in P from Jerónimo Román y Zamora, *Repúblicas del mundo*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>P, folio</th>
<th>P, part and chapter</th>
<th>Hand</th>
<th>Román y Zamora (1575; 1595), book and chapter; 1897 edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>f77v</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>2, 16; 1897, v. 1, pp. 67-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>fol. &quot;155&quot; → f143r</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1, 8; 1897, v. 1, pp. 115-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>f122v</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1, 7; 1897, v. 1, pp. 108-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>f118v</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1, 9; 1897, v. 1, pp. 121-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>f122v</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1, 10; 1897, v. 1, pp. 127-128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quotation no. 1, inscribed by P2, includes a number of insertions by P2, and the transcription is relatively free. The quotations inscribed by P3 are all embedded in passages inscribed in P2 and render very faithfully the printed original's orthography, abbreviations, and punctuation. In a few cases, P2 has subsequently included small adjustments to the new context.

3.5.4. Other Characteristics of Verso Texts

The versos were not ruled, but the thin paper allowed the inscribed lines of text on the rectos to serve as guidelines for the inscription of textual additions.

Full-page textual additions up to f73 were not framed. From f77v onward, however, they are invariably framed, as are the drawings throughout the ma-

---

142 These adjustments include the interpolation of "como está dicho en el prólogo" (no. 1) and the alteration of "lo dejo para el capítulo siguiente" to "lo dejo para otro capítulo" (no. 3). Taking
rhyscript. The heavy framing on the rectos guided the verso framing.

In a number of cases, the P2 additions result in corresponding additions to the titles of the augmented chapters. The simplest such additions occur in part 1; they consist of an Arabic numeral referring to the sequential order of the Inca queens, added to the titles of some of those chapters and corresponding to the same numeral that appears on the respective portraits. The emendation of the chapter title serves to link the frontispiece drawing to its accompanying chapter (f25r, f26r, f27r, f28r, f29r), avoiding the reader’s potential confusion as to whether the pertinent portrait appears before or after the prose exposition of the chapter. The most notable instances of these late-added title references target the textual material that appears on the following (not the preceding) verso. These emendations are found in chapter title additions that call attention to the topics of the lengthy additions that P2 made to the chapters of part 3, on Inca civilization and society (chs. 28, 14, 15, 21, 44 [f54r–f60r, f66r, f67r, f73r, f96r, respectively]), and, in part 4, to those on the cities (chs. 2, 4, 8, 9 [f128r, f130r, f134r, f135r, respectively]). A different phenomenon is the addition of what seems to have been a long subtitle, perhaps amounting to a plot summary or a moral commentary that was written, and has been subsequently cancelled, within the title frame of the Ficción (f144r).

As mentioned in section 3.3.2, f125v is exceptional: in the Guaman manuscript, chapter 75 of part 3 was the last chapter of the Historia proper, and it was allowed to fill both recto and verso, since no more frontispieces would be needed at this point.

3.6. Guaman Poma’s Involvement in P: Between 1596 and 1600

When did Guaman Poma illustrate parts 2 through 4 of P? As already established (sections 3.5.1 and 3.5.2), it occurred after the overwhelming majority of textual additions had been incorporated. Apart from short phrases identifying the text no. 1 as a sample of the quality of Ossio’s transcription and annotation, we have found in the transcription of f177r (quotation no. 1) six misreadings of the perfectly legible P manuscript: por otra parte (Ossio’s transcription: parte), curioso (escuza), una manera de matar (pater noster), espantara (espantaba), cuentas (cuentas), pestilencia (pestilencias), que los antiguos (pues los antiguos). All six errors are repeated from Bade (in Martin 1946a) and represent misreadings of the copyist responsible for the L copy of 1899. As for the annotation, Ossio misinterprets Pasquetti (1988, 48) and limits the Romans quotation to 8 lines of text. Consultation of the source (Roman) reveals that the literal quotation extends over more than 20 lines.

Less frequently, a late addition to the chapter’s title simply refers to the initially redacted text in order to draw the reader’s attention to the material already there, as “de cómo en su tiempo conquistaron los españoles este reyno” supplements part 2, chapter 10’s title about Ahímalpa and his great deeds (f45v). See also f65r (part 3, ch. 13), where a late addition to the chapter title calls
pictorial subjects on drawings, there are only a few textual additions that were introduced after the inclusion of Guaman Poma’s drawings (see below, section 3.8). Insofar as these prose additions contain datable elements, they can help us locate, and limit, the timespan of Guaman Poma’s involvement as artist. There are three such pertinent additions:

1. On folio 51 verso, there is a P2 addition of 14 lines inscribed within the frame of the drawing. This emendation, mentioned above, refers to Martín García de Loyola as the current governor of Chile, which was a mission he fulfilled from April, 1592, until his death on December 23, 1598. Bayle had pointed out that this evidenced the fact that Murúa continued working on P beyond 1590, but we can deduce even more information from the facsimile. The addition is inscribed above the drawing of the execution of Tupac Amaru in such a way that the text does not interfere with the top of the hat of one of the executioners. This gives us a latest date for Guaman Poma’s participation: The drawing cannot be later than December 1598 (or sometime in early or mid-1599, if we allow for some time for information on events in Chile to reach Peru), but it need not in any way have been the last drawing that Guaman Poma executed for Murúa.

2. On folio 137 verso, a textual addition sets another lower limit for Guaman Poma’s involvement as artist. It is the account of the volcanic eruption at Arequipa of February 18, 1600, also noted by Bayle as indicative of Murúa’s continued work on P after 1590. Bayle was unable to make inferences regarding the time period of the illustration’s execution, since extremely few data on the graphic dimension of P were available to him (only P was known at that time). The evidence of the facsimile allows us to infer that the P2 addition on primary f137v (now P5 on a replacement folio) concerning the 1600 eruption made it impossible for Guaman Poma to create a frontispiece for the chapter starting on the recto of f138r, which describes the city of Arica. Had there been space left on f137v, Guaman Poma would no doubt have filled it with a frontispiece. So Guaman Poma must have been at work illustrating P, at least in part 4, after February 18,

attention to the sacrifices and ceremonies to be made to honor the honor and, more simply, in other cases, to recommend the chapter to the reader’s attention: “hacer cosas buenas” and “en capítulo muy curioso” (part 3, chapters 53, 60, 67 [f105r, f112r, f118r]).

131 See our Introduction, note 2, for a summary of the drawings that Bayle’s edition reproduced.

132 The original P2 addition about Arequipa, inscribed on primary f137v, is obscured, but it was previously copied onto replacement fol. 137v by P5. Had there been a drawing (featuring the city of Arica) on primary f137v, it would have been made visible instead of primary f118r. Additionally, because of its 14 lines of condensed text, there can be no doubt that primary f137v did not contain a drawing.

133 Regarding Guaman Poma’s occasional need to work in very cramped pictorial space, see the very small drawing of the city of Cochabamba (f136r).
1600. This implies that the frontispiece of the chapter on Arequipa (f136v), which depicts an ash-rain over the city, can refer specifically to the February 1600 eruption of the Huaynaputina volcano near Arequipa, or generically to this as well as earlier eruptions mentioned on f137r/v.  

3. On f106r there is an addition referring to Murúa's already-completed assignment as comendador ("commander," law-enforcement officer) and cura (priest) in the province of Ayacucho, which Ossio has discovered took place in 1604-1605 (see above, section 3.1). This dating is important for determining Murúa's latest additions to P, that is, sometime after 1606. Furthermore, one can argue that the P2 addition would have been inscribed on the verso instead of the recto (and been more detailed), if space had been available on the verso, and therefore that the verso was at that time already occupied by a full-page drawing by Guaman Poma, and that thus the addition was inscribed on whatever space was left at the bottom of f106r. However, the year 1606 as the latest point in time for Guaman Poma's involvement in P is too late to be significant; his collaboration with Murúa had probably ceased some years earlier.

The available evidence suggests that P was produced as a fair copy and then transformed into a repository of supplementary textual and graphic materials used over a long period of time, perhaps ten years, that is, from sometime after May 15, 1596, through sometime after 1606. As for Guaman Poma's involvement in P, the earliest and latest time limits are 1596 (sometime after May 15) and 1600 (sometime after February 18), respectively.

3.7. The Inclusion of Drawings

3.7.1 General Remarks

Excepting the drawings on front matter folios and the four full-page illustrations added to the text of the Ficció, all extant drawings are frontispieces in the sense that they do not refer to the current (preceding) chapter, but to the chapter immediately following the drawing. Exceptions to this rule are folios 126 recto.

---

137 Ossio's discussion of this issue seems confused (2004, 54-55). He thus believes, in contrast to what we have shown (above, section 3.1), that drawings were included before P2 additions on verso pages, and he confuses the P2 addition on f136v (about the city of Camaná) with that about the city of Arequipa, which is on f137v: "Ésto es sugerido por el añadido [f137v] donde Murúa describe esta erupcion [of 1600] en el manuscrito Galvin[P], que, como se puede apreciar, ha sido superpuesto al dibujo [which is on f136v]." We are in agreement with Ossio as to the date of the drawing of the ash-rain over Arequipa (after 18 February 1600), but while this date complies with our theory of the relationship between P and Guaman Poma's Nueva cosnica (P. NC), it represents, as conceded by Ossio (2004, 54), an exception to his (NC-P), see below, section 4.5.
and "155" (see below, section 3.7.3). If it is correct that the verso pages were initially planned to carry such frontispieces, the original plan was carried out through part 1. In part 2, we find a solitary full-page addition on f18v: Through the 89 chapters of parts 3 and 4, numerous versos had been used for inscribing more or less extensive textual additions, and the illustrator had to make do with the space that was left. Extant in these two parts (in P and in S) are 52 partial or full-page frontispieces; in 13 cases, the textual additions left no space at all, not even for a mini-frontispiece; in 24 cases, no evidence is available.148

The drawings fall into two groups: (a) those that were probably not made by Guaman Poma (unnumbered fols. 1 and 2, and all of part 1), and (b) those that apparently were, bearing as they do the constellation of his familiar iconographic traits. These drawings include the coats of arms next to the portraits of Inca queens in part 1,149 and all the drawings in parts 2 through 4 as well as those in the Ficción. Since there are no P2 additions on versos in part 1, the portraits of Inca kings and queens may have been added here at any point in time. If it is correct, as suggested, that the coats of arms next to the portraits of the Inca queens were drawn by Guaman Poma, the portraits of the Inca queens themselves (fols. 24-33; 8 extant in P, 1 in S) must predate his involvement in the comprehensive illustration project.

The case for Guaman Poma’s role as illustrator is a strong one, and it dates from the studies of Mendizábal Losack (1961, 1963), who worked with the few illustrations from L. (as copy of P) reproduced by Bayle, along with the 1936 Paris facsimile edition of Guaman Poma’s work, and (from 1962) Ballesteros’ edition of the S version of Murúa’s Historia. These inquiries into the shared artistic style of drawings in Murúa’s manuscripts and Guaman Poma’s are part of a fourfold constellation of positive evidence for their relationship. Fundamental is the subject matter of the drawings, which runs in series: the Inca kings, their queens, the officers of political and societal organization, and the cities of the kingdom. Osío (2004, 29-38) has most recently reviewed these points of common pursuit with regard to the chapters’ contents and, therefore, by default, with the pictorial texts in the works of both authors. Two particularly revealing elements are the coats of arms created by Guaman Poma in both the P manuscript and the Nueva corónica manuscript, and the captions and annotations in his handwriting that

148 Frontispieces in parts 3 and 4 of P are found on the versos of fols. 63-66, 69-72, 74-76, 78-80, 88-91, 113, 114, 117, 117, 120, 121, and 141. The count of three P4 frontispieces in S excludes the folio with the coat of arms of Peru, since it was not a chapter frontispiece in P.

149 These shields are found in P on the versos of fols. 22, 25, 26, 28, 29, and 31, and in S on f63r/73v (formerly P, f22v) and f283/307v (formerly within the front matter of P). The compositional and interpretative identity is especially evident upon comparing P, f22v, with the Nueva corónica’s title page, and S, f283/307, and P, s4v, with the Nueva corónica’s p. 83.
are occasionally found on the drawings (see Appendix 6). In short, with regard to (1) representations of heraldry, (2) captions inscribed within the pictorial field, (3) the subject matter of the paintings, and (4) their artistic style, Guaman Poma’s creation of Murúa’s drawings is beyond question.130

As mentioned above (section 3.4.3), the text of the Historia contains two cross-references to drawings that appeared earlier in the text, in the front matter and on the verso of the title page to part 2, respectively (f128r, f136r). The former is now in S and the latter has disappeared. There is a third such cross-reference, appearing not in the P1 fair copy but in a P2 addition. It is the reference in the written account of Potosí, “como se be por esta pintura” (f142v), which refers back to that chapter’s frontispiece (f141v). Likewise, in one single instance (f145r), the prose text of the Ficciones refers (”la figura lo muestra”) to a drawing that follows it on the next page.

The drawings of P were framed; there is only one extant exception (f126r; see below, section 3.7.3).131 When a verso includes both a P2 textual addition and a drawing, the frame integrates matter pertaining to one chapter with a frontispiece of the next. The frame was drawn by following the lines of the frame on the recto, which was easily visible through the thin paper. While the recto frames start by being concentric boxes, the verso frames from f23 onward have “perspective” oblique lines in the corners to create the illusion of mitering (see above, note 130).

As Osio has observed, the drawings do not always correspond very well to the chapter contents. It is indicative of a rather loose connection between author and artist. Furthermore, as mentioned above (section 2.11.1), Murúa (P2) apparently redefined or historicized certain drawings (Pachacuti Inca, Huascar Inca, Chuquillanu).

At least fourteen chapters of P were without frontispieces because of previous textual additions that took up the available space,132 and as many as thirteen frontispieces may be lost among the 20 removed and missing folios.133 Within the front matter, the loss of a drawing of the coat of arms of the Inca kings is documented (see above, section 1.14.2). The small-size “frontispieces” may seem

---

130 We will not discuss these matters in detail, but they will be entertained briefly below, in Part Four.

131 Although the pasted-on primary “155”, currently occupying folio 143v, seems to be unframed, some lines of its original frame are still visible.

132 These fourteen chapters lacking frontispieces are as follows: Part 2, chapter 14 (f136v); Part 3, chapter 4 (f55v); 3.5 (f56v); 3.7 (f56v); 3.9 (f60v); 3.10 (f65v); 3.22 (f73v); 3.25 (f77v); 3.71 (f129v); Part 4, chapter 1 (f126v); 4.2 (f127v); 4.3 (f128v); 4.9 (f134v); 4.12 (f137v).

133 These thirteen frontispieces would be found as follows: Part 1, chapter 1 (f5v); 1.2 (f8v); 1.5 (f11v); 1.6 (f12v); 1.7 (f11v); 1.24 (f90v); 1.27 (f33b); Part 2, chapter 1 (f35v); 2.8 (f12v); 2.9 (f33v); Part 3, chapter 11 (f62v); 3.17 (f68v); 3.36 (f87v).
meaningless compared to the full-page frontispieces, but Murúa may have been aware that the drawings would in any case be resized as woodcuts or engravings when his book was printed. His goal may have been to collect as many "original" motifs as possible in order to provide abundant material on which an artist in Spain eventually could elaborate.

3.7.2. Versos Without Facing Chapters

Because each part of the book was initiated by a separate title page, the end of each of the four parts was irregular insofar as there was no facing chapter. Remarkably, this problem was "solved" differently in all four cases. We mentioned above (section 3.3.2) that in one exceptional case, that is, the last chapter of part 3 (f125v), the P1 fair copy continued onto and filled up the verso page. It was the ultimate page of the Historia as copied from C, and no frontispiece would follow. Similarly, the verso of the last chapter of part 4 (f142v) was filled by a P2 addition.

The problem of finding an appropriate way of ending the series of facing frontispiece-plus-prose chapter was solved differently in the two remaining cases. It was done in part 1 by referring forward to part 2, and in part 2 by referring back to the last chapter of part 1, as follows:

The last page of part 1: On f34v, the last page of part 1, there was a textual addition: a list of 34 ethnic groups conquered by the Incas. A drawing of an Inca clad in crimson, was added alongside the list. He is shown slaying a foe, while above, coming down from the sky, a male figure clad in blue blows a trumpet. It is a frontispiece to part 2: "De los principes y capitanes del gran reyno del Pirú." On the crimson man, P2 has added the notation "Pachacuti yunga" in reference to the ninth Inca, who greatly increased the territorial extent of the empire.154

The last page of part 2: On f51v, the last page of part 2, a drawing of the execution of Tupac Amaru refers back to the final chapter (16) of that part: "Del noble yunfante [sic] y capitan Amaro y de como los españoles le degollaron". Chapter 16 of part 2 thus stands out as the only chapter in P that has both a frontispiece and a following illustration. The frontispiece (f50v) shows Tupac Amaru being led forward with a golden rope or chain by his captor, Martín García de Loyola. In this way, the graphic rendering of the end of the Inca dynasty could be stretched over two drawings depicting first the capture and then the execution of Tupac Amaru, the last male offspring of the Inca dynasty. Apparently, this in turn invited further textual additions; one extending from f51r to f52r (the

---

154 Osio (in Murúa 2004, vol. 2, p. 105, note 54) interprets this drawing to be the frontispiece of the first chapter of part 2. This chapter, however, must have had its own frontispiece (now lost) on primary fol. 35v.
latter, now is 8), and one contained on P's f51v. Both were inscribed after the introduction of the drawings (see below, section 3.8).

3.7.3. Two Exceptional Cases

While all other pages with drawings are framed, f126r is not. According to the book's characteristic formatting of its division into parts (later: books), there should not have been a drawing on this page. Instead, it should have been occupied by the title page of part 4. However, the title of part 4, "Decreación del nombre deste reino del Pirú con las ciudades que ay en el," had been inscribed in a rectangular frame poised above the frame featuring the title of chapter 1 ("Capítulo primero del nombre deste reyno, de el Pirú y sus riquezas"), which occupies that page (f127r). This layout probably reflects quite accurately the layout of the small manuscript by Murúa that must have served as model for the P1 fair copy of part 4 in addition to C (see Appendix 8). Exceptionally, therefore, f126r was blank when P was handed over to the artist. The manuscript was not sewn and bound, and the artist (Guaman Poma) probably took out every double folio from the stack of quires when doing his artwork in the spaces left empty at that time by P2.

Referring to Appendix 2, we know that f126r belonged to the second half of the double folio 123 plus 126. Under normal circumstances, the facing pages constituted by f123v plus f126r would appear as blank and inscribed, respectively, and the blank page would have to be made into a frontispiece for the chapter on f124r (Part 3, chap. 72: "De los nombres de los otros seis meses y de las fiestas que acostumbran los yndios en todo el año"). Here, however, Guaman Poma was confronted with two facing blank pages. Apparently, he chose to make a frontispiece for chapter 72 on both blank pages. The former now carries what became the "real" frontispiece of chapter 72 in part 3, representing a public feast hosted by the Inca ("Fiesta del ynga"), with the Inca king and his queen, a female musician and other women, probably aditas, in attendance (f123v). The latter, which was separated from its chapter when the double folio was reinserted into the quire structure, features a male Inca court dancer and a female musician. When Guaman Poma realized his error, f126r was abandoned; although hand colored, it was left unframed.

The drawing of the morning toilette of an adita (virgin of the sun) on the often-mentioned fol. 155, later pasted onto replacement fol. 143, is also irregular: it had never been, and is not now, a frontispiece. When it was still primary fol. 155, it bore the written text at the top of the folio and the drawing at the bottom. The order was reversed when the two pieces, now cut apart, were re-installed on replacement fol. 143. Originally, therefore, this drawing referred backwards, illustrating the text above itself, but as re-installed it refers,
likethe regular frontispieces, to the text that follows it. However, as part of folio “155,” this drawing of an aërea, like the other three drawings in the Ficción that originally preceded it (f146v, f147r, f147v), was an illustration of current text on the same page, not a frontispiece. The artist, hence, had not realized that folio “155” in reality was a continuation of folio 95 (part 3, chapter 43, “De las casas que aua de yndias de recogimiento dedicadas al sol”) in the Historia proper, where he was supposed to make only frontispieces, not illustrations embedded in the prose text.

3.8. Textual Additions Made After the Introduction of Drawings

Just as the size of drawings had to be adapted to the space left by previously inscribed textual additions, subsequent textual additions had to be adapted to previously included drawings. A particularly complex instance, showing that author and artist to some extent worked concurrently, is the just-mentioned addition to f95r on fol. “155.” Because of the existence of a drawing on f95v, the addition to the chapter on “yndias de recogimiento” (aërea) (f95r) was referred to fol. “155” (f143r). There, in turn, it was adorned with an additional drawing. The textual addition contains a long literal quotation (by P3) from Ramón y Zamora (see above, section 3.5.3, with Table 10, no. 2). The complex sequencing of the elements of chapter 43 of part 3 (twice alternating textual and pictorial phases) thus reveals a glimpse of Murúa and Guaman Poma working simultaneously on the enhancement of P.

The vast majority of textual additions preceded the drawings, but the following instances can be considered as certain or, in a few cases, probable post-drawing additions. They either carefully avoid encroaching on any part of the drawing, or do so minimally.

Table 11: Textual Additions Inscribed after the Inclusion of Drawings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>37v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>51v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Addition no. 4 was interpreted above (section 3.6) as setting a latest limit (December 23, 1598, that is, beginning of 1599) for the inclusion of the drawing of the 1572 execution of Tupac Amaru.

Apart from the P2 additions listed above, the hand P2 is also found in hundreds of captions added to drawings. They include longer texts on the drawings of Lucas in part I, names and dynastic numbers of kings and queens, and (on drawings by Guaman Poma) supplements to the mostly very short captions (identifications or explanations) inscribed previously by P1, that is, Guaman Poma himself. This small corpus of autograph Guaman Poma texts of P (including the relevant S-folios) has been assembled in Appendix 6.155

3.9. From Parts (C) to Books (S)

In the Tabla, P2 has modified the main structure of the Historia from the original fourfold division into unnumbered parts to a division into books numbered 1 through 4. This division by books seems to have been partly implemented in running heads before the fragmentation of P. There are no running heads on the P-folios that migrated to S, but this seems to be due to the fact that running heads were at first only inscribed at the beginning of books. Significantly, on the second folio of book 3 (replacement fol. 53r) P5 has reproduced from primary

155 No other Guaman Poma autographs are known, apart from the 1195 pages of the Copenhagen manuscript of the Nueva corónica y buen gobierno, and his signature in AGI (Seville), Audiencia de Lima 115.
53v (before the folio was cropped and pasted-on) what would eventually become the standard running head of verses in book 3: "Libro tercero del gobierno." The first three running heads of book 2 and the first six of book 4 differ from the running heads that follow and that seem to have been mechanically inscribed, probably after the reconstruction of P. We can conclude that the book structure was implemented as part of a renewed editing of P in connection with the addition of supplementary textual and graphic material, but that it was not carried out through the full body of the work (from f3r through f14r) until after the phases of fragmentation and reconstruction were completed, or, rather, that the books' running heads were only introduced systematically as part of the latest phase of the reconstruction process.

3.10. The Partial Fragmentation of P

At some point in time, after P had thus been filled with prose text, textual additions and water-colored drawings, Murúa began to produce a new version of his Historia, which eventually developed into the version known through the manuscript S. P was immediately (or gradually) given low priority or simply abandoned. However, the superseded P contained valuable elements that could not be copied easily into the next, expanded manuscript. A number of folios (double folios, as P was still unbound) were removed, in all likelihood because of their frontispieces. Most of these double folios included full-page drawings, but some of them contained smaller drawings, such as the depiction of the ashenain over Arequipa, and of the n xia's morning toilett (f136v, f145r). If removed as double folios, these were subsequently cut into single folios which could not simply be reinserted into a quire-structure. Eventually, four such single folios were inserted into the manuscript S, as detailed above (section 2.11.1).

3.11. Replacement Folios

Soon after this partial fragmentation, or after some time, P was reconstructed. A number of single folios (22) were at hand, but they could not just be inserted or pasted into the manuscript from which they originated. Instead, new blank double folios (watermark "PD," see above, section 2.4) were inserted within or on the outside of the remaining blocks of intact primary double folios. The replacement folios functioned as dummies of the previously removed primary

---

150 There seems to be no running head on f128r because a previous addition takes up all the space. Hence, the running head on the facing verso (f127v) apparently contains the text of both halves of the full running head: "Libro quarto de las riquezas y excelencias deste reyno del Pirú, de las ciudadas;"
double folios and as supports for the reinsertion of those twenty-two single folios that were at hand. Twenty-four folios were never reinserted (see above, sections 2.4 through 2.6, summarized in Appendix 4); one was at hand but could not be re-inserted because “its” replacement folio was missing (primary fol. 42), four had probably already been assigned to the S manuscript, and 19 apparently never turned up.

Excellent guidance, consisting of the early foliation on primary folios, and the folio-by-folio references of the Tabla, was available during this process of replacing removed primary double folios. In quire 2, two double folios were missing, one of them its center (see Appendix 2); in quire 3, three double folios were missing (two outer leaves of the quire, and one in its center); in quire 4, only one double folio had to be replaced; quires 5 and 6 were intact; in quire 7, three double folios had to be replaced.157

In spite of the simplicity of the replacement procedure, an error seems to have occurred in quire 3; instead of the three double folios needed, only two were added to the quire. This led to a double irregularity in the foliation. Fols. 42 and 43, and fols. 61 and 62, became pages 42 and 43, and 61 and 62, respectively, when the whole manuscript, subsequent to the reconstruction, was foliated/paginated once more (see section 2.2). Because the following page 43 was reserved for fol. 43, this irregularity prevented the then-extant primary fol. 42 from being pasted into P, with the drawing face-up, after the chapter on the recto had been copied onto page 42. It is the only instance in which a folio (containing a drawing) that was extant at this stage has disappeared because it could not be hosted in the reconstructed manuscript.

3.12. Copying and Pasting

The detached single primary folios of P that were available after the fragmentation process were to be pasted onto the newly installed blank replacement folios. This technique had one obvious drawback: only one side of the pasted-on folio would be displayed. Quite logically the side that would be the most difficult to reproduce was the one chosen for display. These were the versos containing a water-colored drawing or, if there was no drawing, the rectos with their fancy framing of the chapter titles. The text on that side of the detached folio which was to be sacrificed when pasted onto the replacement folio was first copied onto that side of the replacement folio that had been selected for this purpose (normally the recto; f137v is the single exception158). The side to be sacrificed was covered

157 For a detailed discussion of quires 1 and 7, see section 2.6.
158 Although the primary folio is not extant, the text on f13v (F5) appears to be copied from a detached
with paste and secured to the still blank side of the replacement folio. At some stage during this process, each folio was carefully trimmed along the exterior borders of the frame of the drawing or of the chapter text, respectively. In the S manuscript, where another method for fastening loose folios was applied, the folios removed from P were not subjected to such trimming.

This procedure of copying and pasting can be observed in a regular fashion on the following eighteen of the total of twenty-two reinstalled folios: 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 44, 53, 63, and 136, 137, and 149. Three of them (53, 137 and 149) only carry text. The recto of fols. 53 and 137, with the finely framed and inscribed chapter titles, were displayed as reinstalled, while the text on the verso was copied onto the following page; both sides of folio 149 (part of the Tabula) contained plain text, so the verso was copied onto the replacement verso and the recto was displayed on the replacement recto.

With four exceptions, all chapters copied from the sacrificed reverse of primary folios pasted onto replacement folios were inscribed by P5, a hand found only on replacement folios. The exceptions, all within the remains of quire 1 (1a and 1b), were inscribed by P2, either because Murria in these cases was not satisfied with the C version of these chapters (part 1, chapters 2, 5, 7, and 16) or because the reconstruction of quire 1 was significantly more complicated than the occasional repairs needed in the following quires (see section 2.6.1).

3.13. Quire 1 (1a and 1b)

No intact primary double folio remained in quire 1. We have not been able to determine with certainty the original sequence of available folios up to fol. 8 because the foliation and Table references only start at fol. 8. Instead of one huge quire of 12 double folios, two small replacement quires (1a and 1b) were made, consisting of 4 and 5 double folios, respectively. Quire 1b was easy enough to prepare; chapters 7 through 16 were assigned to fols. 14 through 23. Chapters 7 and 16, which were to be copied on the outer double folio (13r plus 13v) of the replacement quire, were inscribed by P2, and the remaining 8 chapters (8-15) were inscribed by P5.

---

159 For the trimming of f23r, see above, section 2.10.
160 See Basedow 2004a, 83-84.
161 The four other pasted-on folios are the three unnumbered front matter folios, and fol. "155" aixes fol. 143.
162 On this folio, see above, section 2.1.
163 In some copies of the facsimile fol. 136 is by error one-layered, see above, note 81.
Quire 1a, however, was miscalculated, and in the end there was no replacement folio in this quaternion (4 double folios) for fol. 10. Its chapter text was copied onto a single replacement folio, the drawing was trimmed, and the text side pasted onto the replacement folio. This minimal, reconstructed element then was loosely tucked between folios 9 and 11. In this small quire of 8+1 folios, all texts are inscribed by P2, except f8r (chapter 1), which is by P5 and therefore probably copied from a primary folio that was extant but has not been preserved. This chapter bears another name (“Del nombre de los Reyes del Pirú”), but its content corresponds to the title of chapter 1 in the Tabla: “Del origen y principio de los yngas” (overwritten by: “De el nombre de los reyes del Pirú”), as well as to the content of chapter 1 in the S version of the Historia, which at last came to carry a name that fits: “De cómo antiguamente no uyo en este Reino Rey ni señor univercal hasta los yngas.”

Because the first two chapters in P (and in C, we must surmise) had nearly identical titles, Murúa seems to have planned to reduce the number of chapters, assigning number 1 to the chapter that had been numbered 2 in C and in P, before fragmentation. This renumbering, done in connection with the copying of chapters that were going to be obscured, was abandoned after chapter 7, that is, P’s chapter 1 was copied (by P5), and the original numbering of chapters 1-7 was corrected into 2-8.

Murúa furthermore composed or rewrote a “capítulo prohemial” on the achievements of the Mercedarian order (f3r). No such chapter is referenced in the Tabla, and it is improbable that C and/or P had such a chapter among the front matter folios. However, P had a full-page drawing of the coat of arms of the Mercedarians, with a Latin epigram inscribed by P2. There is no similar “capítulo prohemial” in S, but the Mercedarian coat of arms is included in its grand title-page device, below the respective coats of arms of Castille and León, Peru, and the Inca kings. A chapter on the order’s history in Peru was later added to hook 3 in the S manuscript.

Among the primary front matter folios of P, two are extant in P (Andean landscape and Mercedarian coat of arms), while a folio with the coat of arms of Peru is lost (its later counterpart in S is extant) (see above, section 1.14.2). A folio with a drawing of an adoring adula, including as-yet unidentified textual additions on its pasted-down reverse, was recycled as the frontispiece to the new...

164 “Dum fluunt maris curruque per ethera Febo / Vict mercedis candidius ordo mili.” (To me, the white order of grace [the Mercedarians] will live as long as water flows in the sea and Phoebus hurries across the sky). P2 made a number of mistakes while calligraphing these few words (eterna for ethera, Febo for Febo, Vict for Vicet), which were subsequently corrected in another ink. Osio (in Murúa 2004, vol. 2, 75) has the following readings, which give no meaning: “perchera” (for: per ethera) and “ordonsi” (for: ordo mili).
chapter on the Mercedarians because it had lost its original site after fol. “155” had taken its place as fol. 143.

3.14. Running Heads and Filiation

The folios that migrated from P to S have no running heads. After reconstruction, running heads were supplemented throughout P where they were missing, probably first only on the folios at the beginning of parts/books, then as part of the conversion of “parts” to “books” over all the subsequent folios of the respective “books” (see above, section 3.9). The introduction of this feature subsequent to the insertion of the replacement folios and to the pasting onto them of detached primary folios is especially evident, for example, on 115v, 116v, and 144v, where “Libro primero” or “Libro segundo” occurs partially or completely on the trimmed primary folio pasted onto the replacement folio. This new series of running heads also completed the process of renaming Murúa’s whole work as Historia general.163

An extra foliation, running from 8 to 143 and following the early foliation, was introduced after the reconstruction of P. The replacement folios needed foliation because the pasted-on folios had been trimmed, and the early foliation had disappeared. Hence all folios were foliated anew. The error that led to the pagination of fols. 42/43 and 61/62, whereby the numerical series was maintained in spite of a missing double folio, has been discussed above.

3.15. Title Pages

It so happened that the title pages of the whole work and of parts/books 1-3 had been removed, and that part/book 4 had no title page of its own. The primary title page of P’s part 3 is extant (52r), but it had been moved to the S manuscript [S, 67r/68r], so this part also has a title page inscribed on a replacement folio. Apparently, the wording of the reconstructed title-page statement of book 3 was not taken from the Tabla, but rather from the first complete and intact set of pre-fragmentation running heads (primary 53v + primary 54r): “Libro 3º del gobierno deste Reyno de el Pirú.”

Similarly, the reconstructed title page of book 2 (replacement fol. 35r) does not reflect the Tabla information, but rather, with a small addition, the running head of the nearest primary folios: “Libro segundo de los principes y capitanes del [added: gran Reyno de el] Pirú.”

163The running heads can be summarized thus: (1) “Libro primero de la historia general del Pirú,” (2) “Libro segundo de la historia general del Pirú,” (3) “Libro tercero del gobierno del Pirú” (this was the pre-fragmentation formula, repeated 49 times post-reconstruction), or “Libro tercero de la historia general del Pirú” (30 times), and (4) “Libro quarto de la historia general del Pirú.”
Again, the reconstructed title page of book 1 (recto of third unnumbered replacement folio) reflects not so much the Tabla as the title (with an addition) of the nearest chapter (replacement fol. 9r): “Libro primero del origen y principio de los reyes Ygas del [added; gran reyno del] Piru.”

As for P’s title of the whole work, it appears to be quite outdated when compared to the new running heads, not to mention the new title of P inscribed below the curacas’ letter (Ystoria general e libro del origen y descendencia de los yucas señores... etc, la entrada de los españoles, con su modo de guarnecer, condición y trato, y la descripción [sic] de las mas principales ciudades y villas... see above, our Introduction). The title on unnumbered replacement fol. 1r: Historia del origen, y genealogia Real de los Reyes ingas del Piru. De sus lechos, costumbres, trajes, y manera de guarnecer, takes no account of the added part 4 and fits better to the hypothesized C manuscript than to P, which is already a Historia general. The outdated title is also picked up by the Tabla, which combines into one syntagm the titles of the work and of part/book 1: “Tabla de los capítulos que ay en este presente libro de la famosa ystoria y relacion del origen principio y genealogia de los grandes Reyes y señores que fueron deste Reyno del Piru.” It thus seems certain that the primary folio that was the model for P’s current title page was a copy of C’s title page; the primary folio is not extant, unless it is to be found on the obscured reverse of the first pasted-on folio in P, which on its current verso contains a colorful depiction of a forested Andean landscape with the cordillera in the background.

3.16. Sewing and Binding

At some point in time after reconstruction, P was sewn and bound. Fol. 10 had been loosely tucked in between folios 9 and 11. The running head and chapter number gave unambiguous information on the folio’s intended placement. Furthermore, a catch-word had been added on f10r (“Cap° 4°”) referring to its verso. However, this well-meaning signal was misunderstood as referring to the “empty” chapter page f11r, not to the frontispiece of chapter 4 on the verso, and fol. 10 was ultimately reversed and wrongly fastened to the adjacent folios so that its verso came to face f9v and its recto, f11r. This late and banal rebinding error is confusing insofar as it gives a false impression of disorderliness in a manuscript that was constructed, developed, and reconstructed with the greatest care and consequence.

3.17. Why was the P Manuscript Reconstructed?

Our contention is that P was reconstructed because Murúa realized that the drawings would be more useful if they were kept intact within P than if they were removed, cut apart, trimmed, and kept as a stack of separate and suddenly
decontextualized drawings. We do not see the reconstructed P as a manuscript being completed in view of publication. P was fragmented because the S version had emerged, and the text of the P version could be discarded as outdated, while the drawings still represented an important asset. Murúa started to recycle drawings in S, but he soon must have realized that it was better to keep them in their original context, as an album. As models for an engraver illustrating a printed version of his book, there were definite advantages in having the more than one hundred drawings secured in one single volume, together with the explanations (chapters) pertaining to each of them.

The structure of P is very regular, and in one respect very peculiar. The text on the recto of a folio never refers to the drawing on the reverse. If a folio is separated from the manuscript, both the removed drawing and a drawing left behind in the manuscript will be deprived of the prose texts that they were supposed to illustrate, and that to some extent explain what they represent. Removal of drawings from P thus entails a substantial loss of information. This information can be dispensed with if all the drawings are simultaneously assigned to new locations, but the P and S versions of the Historia are so different in their structuring of the material that this would be a highly complicated operation. We have seen above (sections 2.11) that while the recycling in S of the frontispiece representing queen Raba Oclo went smoothly, that of the “Huascar Inca” and “Chaquillante” frontispieces were self-contradictory and resulted in unresolved ambiguities within S.

Another case that illustrates what we believe was Murúa’s dilemma, and which made him suspend the operation of fragmenting P, is constituted by P’s “folio” 42, actually page 42. As we have seen, the primary folio must have been available, since P5 has copied the chapter text on the replacement folio’s recto. The drawing, however, could not be accommodated, because page 43 was reserved for primary fol. 43 (which, however, is lost). Unless we choose to interpret this anomaly as a singular error from Murúa’s side (which is possible), it is remarkable that if Murúa had chosen to display the drawing of fol. 42, he would have had two adjacent drawings without their respective chapter texts, while by choosing to have the removed chapter text copied, he “saved” the context of the drawing on 41v. One can only speculate about what Murúa then did with primary fol. 42; even if primary fol. 43 turned up (or actually was at hand), fols. 42 and 43 could not be hosted in a satisfactory way in P because of the missing double replacement folio.166

166 Only one of the 22 pasted-on folios has lost its prose context; it is the chapter-less frontispiece of the adoring ador, originally primary 41r, currently facing 42r (the chapter on the Mercedarian) and occupying the third unnumbered folio.
Only in their original textual setting of P could the more than one hundred drawings be of any use when, some day, the Historia general would be printed. P had to be reconstructed with texts, if the work invested in the drawings was not to be lost. The fragmentation operation was put to an end when this was realized. In theory, if rectos and versos had been related to one another, that is, if in pairs they had pertained to the same topics, there would have been no need to stop the extraction of drawings and no reason to reconstruct P. But since they did not, that is, since the versos and its rectos throughout the Historia pertained to different chapters (and therefore to different topics), P had to be as intact as possible if its drawings were to be reused in connection with a printed publication of the Historia.

This also explains the fundamental paradox of P and the origin of Ballesteros’ and Ossio’s erroneous conceptions of P as a collection of pieces of various (undocumented) drafts. The paradox is as follows: why was Murúa so keen to preserve or copy some chapter texts, while sometimes leaving whole chapters blank? In others words, why is P partly reconstructed, partly dumped? The answer we offer is that the reconstructed P was never meant to be a book read consecutively. After the S version emerged, the prose texts (chapters) of P served only as annexes to the drawings. That is, P was only to provide an album with drawings.

Yet at the same time, as we have analyzed them, many of the careful efforts at reconstruction have no bearing on such a purpose as that hypothesized above: Would it be necessary to reconceptualize the work as numbered “books” instead of unnumbered “parts”? Why bother to draw a frame for the mutilated drawing of the queen Chimbo? Would running heads really be needed, if this were a mere “album,” juxtaposing pictorial texts with prose expositions? Perhaps the answer lies in the fact that the decision (or the transition to the decision) to move away from P and create S was not so clear cut, or definitive, at the time when it was taken. The difficulty of creating, and then choosing between, two options, neither of which is altogether or at least immediately and obviously satisfactory, is not only Murúa’s but any author’s dilemma. On the horns of it, Murúa may have chosen to keep both options open, that is, restoring P and forging ahead with the already begun S, for as long as he was able to do so. This model gives us no definitive answer, but it does corroborate the vagaries of an author’s experience: weighing against one another many non-compatible factors and keeping them afloat until even that strategy can no longer be sustained.

3.18. After P: The S Manuscript

P’s 1598 (or later) prologue to part 4, and the completion date of “May 1590” inscribed (retained) on P’s title page, demonstrate that C and P were fundamentally the same work, in spite of the inclusion of the 16 chapters of part 4 as
well as many other additions (including the prologue to part 4), and in spite of
the addition of more than one hundred drawings. By 1606 (or later), however,
Muría had gathered more textual material, and he was ready to take the next
step. P could not accommodate more information without a multiplication
of the number of cross-references to additions at the end of the manuscript.
Furthermore, Muría was dissatisfied with the structure of P, in which the history
of Inca kings, queens, and captains ran in parallel instead of progressing in a
single, integrated chronological sequence. P had already for some time been
renamed Historia general (del Pípí), as attested by the P2 addition of the new and
expanded title below the curacas’ letter and by the lately added running heads
(see above, sections 3.14 and 3.15). The new title of the work (quoted above, in
our Introduction and in section 3.15) explicitly took account of part 4 on the
cities of Peru.

The new work, which would eventually become the S manuscript as we know
it, was very much expanded, and again it was designed as a work in three parts
(or rather “books,” as already introduced in P, at a late stage). Their content
was, in short: Book 1: Inca history; book 2: Inca government; book 3: cities of
local tradition as well as those established by the Spanish. S was dated 1613 on
its title page, and again the date was not changed, although further changes
and enhancements were carried out over the following years. The book P, S had
been laid out with blank pages separating all 163 chapters, and, as had been the
case with P, Muría succeeded in finding an artist for the earliest period of the
historical part of book 1: portraits of Inca kings and queens.

However, the decoration program was discontinued before it was completed.
There was no Guaman Poma available to carry on the project, but the finely
water-colored drawings could be moved from one manuscript to the other.
Three ruler portraits were missing in S in the twin sequence of 12 Inca kings
and queens: Raba Oello (11th queen), Huascar Inca (12th Inca), and Chuquipantu
(12th queen). Three drawings were removed from P and inserted into S, so that
the ruler series would be complete. The drawing chosen for Raba Oello was

---

66 See Boserup 2004a, 84-87, 92-94, on the reshuffling of the initial chapters of S.
667 The S manuscript has a total of 38 drawings. From chapter 3 onward, S contained 20 “portraits”
of Inca kings and 10 of Inca queens, to which were added one king portrait and two queen portraits
from P. The unequal number of kings and queens is due to the fact that some Inca kings are treated
in more than one chapter (in contrast to what is the case in P), and because the illustration project
was discontinued after chapter 32 and before reaching the end of the dynasty. Appendix 4 shows
how the 9 times added instruction, “No se a de pintar,” or simply “No”, plus the three P drawings
introduced into S, correspond to a reconceptualization of the illustration program of S: the 299+1
king portraits become 12, just as did the 10 + 2 queen portraits, that is, the minimum required to
display the complete Inca dynasty as canonized under viceroy Toledo ca. 1570.
appropriate enough, being a real ruler-type portrait, but for Huascar and his wife, drawings that had been made for quite different purposes were reinterpreted as ruler portraits. One folio with a coat of arms was detached from among the front matter folios of P and inserted into S. The coat of arms of Peru was inserted as frontispiece to book 3 (cities). Eventually, these four extraneous folios were fastened securely into S by pasting at the gutter, and blank folios were pasted onto them, so that the text passages on the rectos disappeared completely from sight and would not disturb the flow of chapters in S.

3.19. The Illustration Project of S

The reason adduced above for reconstructing P may help to understand why only four folios were transferred from P to S. Although extremely damaging to P, the four recylcings did not (with one exception) spoil other drawings insofar as no important information pertaining to them was removed and sacrificed. Except for the folio with the drawing of Rapa Oclo, none of the migrated P-folios had text on the reverse that belonged to (and therefore explained the meaning of) another frontispiece: (1) the cunaos’ letter on the reverse of the coat of arms of Peru obviously had no frontispiece; (2) the reverse of “Huascar Inca” was a title page without relation to the facing drawing of the execution of Tupac Amaru; (3) the reverse of “Chuquipac” contained one of the chapters (part 3, chapter 9; fol. 60) that never had a frontispiece because the facing page had been filled with textual additions to the previous chapter before Guaman Poma began to illustrate P; (4) only in the case of Rapa Oclo (11th queen) would the migration from P to S entail a loss of information regarding the significance of another drawing; that of Mama Oclo (10th queen, f31v). However, one can object that the ruler portraits, in contrast to the drawings illustrating Andean antiquities, are self-explanatory and that the loss of the accompanying texts would not reduce the usefulness of these drawings as models for an illustrator of a printed version of Martia’s Historia.

Although building on scant evidence, these remarks are pertinent. After having implemented a minimal repair of the series of ruler portraits in S, Martia discontinued the fragmentation of P. Instead of merging more P-drawings into

---

169 One can ask why the real ruler portraits in P of Huascar Inca (20v: extant in P) and Chuquipac (33v: lost) were not chosen instead, unless the reason is, precisely, that fol. 33 had disappeared. The choice seems to pertain to that period when maintaining (or reconstructing) P intact, and pursuing at the same time the prospect of S, were both entertained. Removing from P the “modo de caminar” processional paintings did not destruct one of P’s fundamental aspects; the series of rulers, male and female, civil and military, that represented the ordering of Andean (and Inca) society. Additionally, the reverses of “Huascar” and “Chuquipac” had no frontispieces, so no other drawing was “destructed”, cf. above, section 3.17, and below, section 3.19.
S with the risk of creating havoc in both P and S, Murúa changed his mind and made P into an annex to S, an album of illustrations, which would eventually provide models or be used as inspiration for an engraver when the work was to be printed. According to this model, P and S must be considered as having arrived to Spain together.

During 1615-1616, Murúa had acquired all the necessary recommendations and permissions to print his work, and when the author could no longer pursue his project because of incapacitation or death or other reasons, S was still in a number of respects a work “in progress.” When Murúa disappeared, so did the key to understanding fully the relationship between S and P.

We have now arrived at that point in the history of the manuscripts of Murúa where we began our account of their “modern” history in Part One of this study. As mentioned there, S was included in the library of the main house of the Mercedarian order in Madrid. What happened to P before it was included in the library of the exiled Spanish Jesuits in Poyanne, France, is still unknown.

3.20. Conclusion

Substantial information has been gained by allowing the four P-folios of S to contribute fully to the elucidation of the complicated internal history of P, and, on this basis, the history of Murúa’s grand historical, ethnographical, literary, and artistic project has also come into focus. Some points are fairly clear, corroborated in multiple ways. Other points are hypothetical, waiting for corroboration or better explanations based on more decisive evidence, stronger arguments, or technical investigations.

Beyond our tight focus on P and the evolution of Murúa’s Historia, we believe that the results achieved thus far have new and far-reaching implications for the much-debated issue of the working relationship between Murúa and Guaman Poma: its chronology, the question of priority, and the assessment of the impact on Guaman Poma of his collaboration with Murúa (and vice versa). We will take up these issues in Part Four of our study.

Part Four. Guaman Poma and Martín de Murúa

In this concluding portion of our study, and based on the cumulative weight of the evidence adduced and interpreted above, we seek to untangle the many assertions that have become commonplaces regarding the Murúa/Guaman Poma relationship, to reassess the similarities and differences between their works, and to show where Guaman Poma “parts company” with his one-time employer. We put forward the reverse of the model offered by Juan Ossío, whereby Guaman Poma began first but finished last, that is, that Murúa followed Guaman Poma’s lead.
but then surpassed him. By coordinating the evidence of the dating of Murúa's P manuscript with the documented activities of Guaman Poma's biography, we demonstrate that Guaman Poma underwent a significant artistic and literary apprenticeship with Murúa but that, breaking away from it in 1600, went on to write his own magnum opus. As for Guaman Poma's leadership of, or participation in, an artisanal workshop, there is simply no evidence for it.

4.1. *The Theory of Murúa’s Multiple Lost Drafts*

In Part One of this study, after having disentangled a number of confused reports about the two Murúa manuscripts P and S, we have shown that the theory of Murúa's multiple drafts was a hypothesis fostered in response to the confusing evidence offered since 1909 by the Loyola copy (L) of the vanished manuscript P, which was compounded by the rediscovery of S in the early 1950s.

Within the framework of an investigation of a textual tradition, undocumented lost drafts should only be introduced as a last resort, when all other possibilities have been examined and eliminated. Anything can be imagined to have happened within the vague notion of a “draft,” and the introduction of hypothetical lost drafts into a textual tradition usually does not solve problems but rather obscures them. They often become a euphemistic way of treating the extant hard evidence that does not behave according to the scholar's initial expectations.

Applied to the transmission of Murúa’s *Historia general*, the “idea” of explaining contradictory manuscript evidence by referring to lost drafts was initiated four decades ago by Ballesteros. Over the last two decades it has been vigorously repeated and expanded by Osio. The theory has not been critically reassessed in the light of the important new evidence that has surfaced since it was conceived: Rowe’s discovery in 1979 of a number of original P-folios within S, and Osio’s own discovery in 1996 of the manuscript P.

In Part Two of this investigation, we conducted a codicological analysis of P on the basis of the remarkable facsimile published by Osio and the available reports about the P-folios contained in S. This led to the conclusion that the theory of Murúa’s multiple drafts cannot be sustained. We have shown that P is not a conglomerate of elements from earlier drafts, that is, that it does not contain any material trace of other “previous,” “parallel,” or “analogous” manuscripts. On the contrary, P is (and was) a unitary, coherent and self-contained manuscript. Superficially examined, it may look like an aggregate of elements from various sources, but the history of its calamities is a different one.

At some point in time, P was fragmented (25% of it was, literally, cut to pieces), but soon after it was reconstructed from the quires and fragments that were still at hand. However, some parts of P had already been recycled and installed in the manuscript S, and others were apparently lost. Although the lost
parts amounted only to 10 to 12% of the manuscript, the replacement folios, the pasted-on folios, and the lacunae together created the impression of a very disorderly and unfinished manuscript, particularly because P since ca. 1900 was known only through a copy (L) that gave no clear clues as to how its model could have deteriorated into the condition it was in at that time (1890). In contrast to the theory of multiple drafts, our theory of fragmentation and reconstruction allows for all the elements of P to find their original placement in one single and well-documented manuscript, the structure of which is corroborated by compelling codicological evidence. This evidence is sufficiently manifest for us to have been able to glean it in the published facsimile, without recourse to the inaccessible original.

In our Part Three, taking now as a given the status of P as an unitary and self-contained entity, we outlined the sequential stages of its creation and development, right from its immediate model (C), which was dated 1590 and documented in 1596 by the recommendation letter of the curacas of Cuzco, and by Murúa’s reference to it in his prologue (to part 4) of 1598 or later. These stages include the addition of substantial amounts of prose exposition to the initial fair copy of C that constituted the main bulk of P, and the inclusion of more than one hundred illustrations, followed by an experiment which seems to have been quickly abandoned: the recycling of P’s drawings in S, the successor manuscript of P, which was in fact a new edition of the Historia general. We suggested that P was reconstructed because it was the only way to save the drawings in a way that would allow them eventually to serve as models for illustrations of a published version of Murúa’s ultimate version (S) of his life-work.

4.2. The Theory of Guaman Poma’s taller artesanal

Closely connected to the theory of multiple lost drafts, and following it like a shadow, is Osio’s theory of multiple amanuenses and artists, linking to a theory of an artisanal production unit, a taller (atelier) where the drafts and fair copies were made of both written texts and drawings. Beside the supposed evidence for hypothesized drafts of P, which has turned out to be nothing but folios cut out of, and reinserted into, the P manuscript itself, there exists no concrete evidence for such a taller. Yet Osio insists that Guaman Poma’s family and associates worked in such an artisanal atelier, under Guaman Poma’s leadership.120 From Guaman

120 Osio (2004, 40) hypothesizes about the existence of such artisanal arrangements on the basis of contemporary artisans’ workshops: “muchos otros [dibujos] debieron proceder de su autoría o de un taller, como sucede con los artesanos peruanos contemporáneos, que pudo estar bajo su liderazgo.” He (Osio 2004, 48, 49) also refers to Murúa’s reliance on “Guaman Poma y el personal de su taller artesanal,” consisting of “informantes, dibujantes y amanuenses.”
Poma as hypothetical head of a literary and artistic atelier there is only a short step to the idea—soon presented as though it were an established historical fact—that he became Murúa’s main informant and close collaborator. It followed, in turn, that much of Murúa’s book imitated the model of Guaman Poma’s own chronicle while it was in the making. As far as P is concerned, the evidence for Osio’s workshop theory rests on the presupposition that the curarers’ letter (inscribed on one of the front matter folios currently contained in S), which Osio since 1985 has called “a draft of a letter” (“un borrador de carta”), was penned by Guaman Poma (or by someone very close to him). It was thus viewed as merely an adaptation to the context of Murúa’s work of the fictitious letter of recommendation of Guaman Poma’s father (dated 1587), which the son had invented and included in his Nueva corónica. However, we have shown in the structural and historical analysis of P carried out here that when all the elements of this manuscript are considered together, the evidence supports the argument that the curarers’ letter is a copy of an original document, of May 15, 1596, which was inscribed as an integral

172 Osio’s conclusions about the working relationship of Murúa and Guaman Poma are seen in the following statements: “Lo más probable es que este sacerdote contrató los servicios del indígena, cuyas habilidades en el manejo del castellano, de la escritura y, posiblemente, del arte pictórico no le pasaron desapercibidas. Este contacto inicial debió haber tenido lugar en la década de 1580 posiblemente en el Casco” (Osio 2004, 50); “Ahora simplemente podemos conjeturar que, si la obra está fechada en 1596 y presenta tantos paralelos con la Nueva corónica, alguna relación debió de tener, lo que podría traducirse en una de colaboración y aprendizaje” (Osio 2004, 69). Osio moves between the models of the individual Guaman Poma as artist and chronicler and Guaman Poma working with associates: “Tan al unísono marchan [Guaman Poma y Murúa] que por momentos parece que el mercedario cede a la tentación de organizar su material en los esquemas organizadores del cronista indígena” (Osio 33); “Una vez más los dibujos que [Murúa] asocia con esta parte son casi exactos a los de Guaman Poma” (Osio 36); “En realidad, la narración de Murúa coincide con la que dan otros cronistas, pero para mostrarse más exhaustivo y original usa los nombres que da Guaman Poma y parte de su tradición” (Osio 40); “La única explicación que se me ocurre para esta situación es que el sacerdote copió dibujos, quizá por su valor decorativo y estético, pero, al igual que las tradiciones orales que circulaban, sin entender su significado. Lo dicho hasta el momento sugiere que, así como saqueó a otros cronistas de origen europeo, Murúa no tuvo el más mínimo inconveniente de hacer lo mismo con Guaman Poma y el personal de su taller artesanal” (Osio 49); “Guaman Poma y sus posibles allegados le habían sido útiles como un primer paso. Además le proveían de materiales no deseados que estaba seguro permanecerían en el anonimato por ser de indígenas. Ellos le habían proporcionado la estructura y los dibujos que decoraban su obra” (Osio 2004, 6041).

part of the front matter of P as conceived by Murúa shortly after that date. The curacas' letter is inscribed on the reverse of a folio that eventually came to be adorned with a drawing of the coat of arms of Peru, which was executed and extensively commented upon by Guaman Poma himself. However, the curacas' letter itself is not inscribed by the hand of Guaman Poma. It is inscribed by P1, the hand responsible for the main text of P. Hence the curacas' letter offers no evidence of either a close collaboration between Murúa and Guaman Poma before 1596, or the existence of any literary and artistic workshop under the latter's leadership.

4.3. The Theory of Literary Evolution from “Indigenous” to “European”

According to Ossio's often repeated model of the relationships among the three extant "illustrated chronicles", that is, Guaman Poma's Nueva corónica (NG), and the two versions of Murúa's Historia attested in P and S, respectively, each one of them represents a separate stage in a monodimensional evolution from the "indigenous" to the "European": NG (indigenous) → P ("in between") → S (European). As we understand Ossio, the relations here symbolized by a simple arrow synthesize three criteria, a linguistic, an artistic, and what we could call a mediatic criterion:

Table 12: Ossio's Criteria of Evolution From “Indigenous” to “European”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Linguistic criterion</th>
<th>Artistic criterion</th>
<th>Mediatic criterion</th>
<th>Stage in-evolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guaman Poma: Nueva corónica manuscript</td>
<td>Quechua-inflected Castilian</td>
<td>indigenous style</td>
<td>publication not envisaged</td>
<td>mostly indigenous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murúa: P manuscript</td>
<td>Castilian with Quechua words</td>
<td>&quot;in between&quot;</td>
<td>aggregate of drafts</td>
<td>&quot;in between&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murúa: S manuscript</td>
<td>native Castilian</td>
<td>European style</td>
<td>made ready to print and publication</td>
<td>mostly European</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

de otro indigena que fue cercano al cronista indio." Later, Ossio (2004, 40) mentions only Guaman Poma as the letter's author: "aquella carta de 1596 ... que supongos fue redactada por el mismo Guaman Poma." He defines the letter as a draft: "En realidad se trata de un borrador de carta modelado de acuerdo a otra que aparece en la Nueva corónica como escrita por el padre del cronista indio" (Ossio 2004, 18-19).

17) About Murúa's P manuscript: Ossio (2004, 60) writes: "No debía extrañarse que lo que escribió primero estaba muy contaminado de un tomo indigena que sería criticado." In Ossio's theory, this concept led Murúa to the conceptualization of S.
The linguistic criterion applied by OSSIO consists of assessing the pervasiveness of Quechua words in Guaman Poma’s work and the influence of Quechua in the structure of his written Spanish. These are actually two different criteria, lexical and grammatical/syntactic, and they are questionable when used as an evolutionary framework for assessing a particular relative chronology of literary works within a span of twenty to thirty years. The embedding of Quechua words in P cannot be reduced to “faulty Castilian,” and so the postulated dichotomy, and ensuing “evolution,” become a question of the authors’ mother tongues and nothing more.

Likewise, Guaman Poma’s general dependence on European motifs and iconographic style is a well-known fact, and the thematic repertory of the illustrations in the three examined works varies greatly. In reality, a stylistic comparison can be established only with regard to the ruler portraits, which, as motifs, relate to their own, complex iconographic tradition. It is far from obvious that the stylistic differences displayed by the three series of ruler portraits represent stages in a common evolution, rather than individual reactions to common standards, such as the famous paintings commissioned by the viceroy Francisco de Toledo.

Finally, Guaman Poma clearly expressed the hope to have his book published. Thus, in precise and recognizably conventional ways, he made it print-ready to the best of his abilities. Furthermore, we can now appreciate that P, correctly interpreted, was not a collection of drafts but also a print-ready manuscript before

---

175 Assuming the persona of his father, and under his own name also, Guaman Poma (1615, 7, 11) twice requests that the king publish his work and show favor to its author: “Y que demés del servicio de vuestra Majestad que requerirá imprimirse la dicha historia..., suplico a vuestra Majestad se sirva de favorecer y hacer merced al dicho mi hijo don Felipe de Ayala.” “Y la dicha merced pida y suplico para cumplir de la dicha impresion a su Majestad, del dicho libro compuesto por el dicho autor, don Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala... pues que lo merese de la dicha amabilidad y trato.” He also foresaw his book taking its place in Rome and in Spain: “Lo tendrá en el archivo del mundo como del cielo, en el catedral de Roma para memoria y en la causa de nuestra cristianidad de nuestra España, adonde recibió Sacra Católica Real Majestad, que Dios le guarde en España.” In his “dialogue” with Philip III, he asks that his book be placed in the archive in the service of justice: “Que se ponga en el archivo para que la justicia.” These references to the archives are not metaphorical, but legal: Guaman Poma (1615, 751, 391) foresaw his work as the basis for a code of laws (see also Adorno 2000, 89). OSSIO’S assertion (2004, 61) that Guaman Poma had no further aspirations for his work than that it reach the monarch’s hands (“am poco aparece Guaman Poma solo se contentaba con que su manuscrito llegase a manos del Rey”) requires him to ignore the explicit and repeated declarations by Guaman Poma himself, one of which OSSIO (2004, 20), in fact, transcribes.

it was expanded and ultimately superseded by S. Thus, the three examined works are on a par insofar as awareness of European media is concerned.

Ossio's model of a mono-dimensional organic evolution from "indigenous" to "European," as applied to the three "illustrated chronicles," is inconsistent and does not further the understanding of the specific characteristics of each work. In the end, it boils down to a reiteration of two sets of facts, set up in a simplifying grid: first, that Guaman Poma was a native-born Andean, while Murúa was born, grew up, and was educated in Spain; second, that Guaman Poma declared in 1615 to have worked on his book since ca. 1585, while P carries the date of 1590, and S is dated 1613.

4.4. Murúa's P Manuscript and Guaman Poma's Nueva corónica: Similarities and Contrasts

With regard to the content of the works, the series of portraits of the ancient Inka kings, their queens, and captains, the representations of the Incas' reigns and wars, as well as their political and social institutions, and the offices, customs, and practices of Inka society, are common to both the P manuscript and the Nueva corónica of Guaman Poma. Ossio (2004, 29-50) examines these many coordinates, and notes how the two authors "march in unison" (p. 33) on many topics. The study of the commonalities between Murúa's work (as known through Bayle's and other editions of the L copy of P) and Guaman Poma's Nueva corónica began as early as 1958, as pointed out by John Murra (1992, 63), when John Rowe published his study of the similarities between Murúa's [P] and Guaman Poma's works with regard to the age-grades of Andean society. In 1967 Ramiro Condarco Morales (1967, 302-305) also noted the striking similarities and juxtaposed the texts of Murúa and Guaman Poma to demonstrate them. He (1967, 303), and later Murra (1992, 64), were struck by their common, unusual treatment of the acla, "the women kept in Inka administrative centers who performed primarily weaving duties for the state." Although the names and duties assigned to them by Murúa and Guaman Poma differ, as Murra (1992, 64) notes, he perceives the very close literary relationship between the two by observing that "Murúa and Guaman Poma are the only ones among the many sources for pre-Columbian Andean life to refer to six kinds of acla." Ossio (2004, 32) examines these similarities in his comprehensive review of the thematic convergences and differences between the two authors, including the chapters on the colonial cities.

One of the most specific and revealing instances of the similarity in content of Murúa's and Guaman Poma's works is, on one hand, the letter of presentation from the native lords of Cuzco, which is one of the P texts inserted into the S manuscript, and, on the other, the letter of presentation from "don Martín Guaman Malleque de Ayala" in Guaman Poma's Nueva corónica y buen gobierno. In
1985, Ossio suggested that Guaman Poma was the author of both letters.\textsuperscript{177} We will return to the consideration of the \textit{curias} and Guaman Mallq\'e's letters below.

The discovery of P and its publication in facsimile allow us to add to the list of the similarities of content between P and the \textit{Nueva corónica} a number of formal elements that both have in common.

The original compositional pattern and book layout of P displays remarkable similarities to the \textit{Nueva corónica}. Murúa's practice of placing a frontispiece before nearly every chapter's prose text is a principle that we see applied consistently throughout Guaman Poma's \textit{Nueva corónica y buen gobierno}. If it were an ideal sought but not quite achieved in P, it was realized by Guaman Poma's \textit{Nueva corónica} manuscript.

With regard to the ordering of the segments of the work, the early version of P, divided into unnumbered groups of chapters rather than their later identification as numbered "books," is echoed in Guaman Poma's organization of his work into sequences of elements consisting of frontispiece + text, introduced by "capítulo primero" (but never followed up by a "capítulo segundo," etc.). Guaman Poma uses the "capítulo primero" designation for the announcement of his expositions and as the principal means for dividing all the segments of his work. While Murúa's P manuscript uses the "capítulo primero" convention for the first chapters of its parts (f1r, f136r, f152v, f127v), Guaman Poma uses it to organize his work at the level of the parts ("Primer corónica," "primer conquista," and "El primero buen gobierno," respectively (GP 1615, 1, 370, 438), as well as its chapters, whether it be "primer comienzo" (GP 1615, 15, 33), "primera generación" (GP 1615, pp. 13, 23, 85), "capítulo primero" or "primer capítulo" (GP 1615, 49, 79, 145, 196, 237, 300, 305, 317, 330, 520, 575, 689, 752, 806, 884, 923, 1005, 1092, 1140), or "primera historia" (GP 1615, 120, 491, 675, 717), "primera reina" (175), "primer milagro," or (93) "primer becita general" (155). The two "systems" are not identical, but while Guaman Poma's can be understood as a partial imitation of Murúa's system in the P manuscript, the latter cannot be conceived as being an imitation of Guaman Poma's.

This leads us to consider some points of contrast between P and the \textit{Nueva Corónica} in their treatment of specific themes and particularly in the use of the graphic medium.

\textsuperscript{177} Ossio (2004, 1929, 46, note 33) transcribes both texts, and he remarks that the similarities he has long observed (since 1985) have been more recently expanded by Tom Cammins, referring to rhetorical formulas in the \textit{prologo} part 1 of the \textit{Historia} and to Guaman Poma's \textit{prologo al lector} at the beginning of the \textit{Nueva corónica y buen gobierno}. The detection of such similarities, however, has no bearing on the question of priority, and it does not imply dependency except in a most attenuated and general manner.
With regard to the illustrations, Guaman Poma expands the idea of a chapter’s frontispiece to include, within his “capítulos primeros,” several subchapters, each introduced by a pictorial text. He has expanded, in other words, the notion of an introductory frontispiece and turned it into the principal and, in fact, primary exposition of his prose text. As Adorno (1979, 29, 31) confirmed on the basis of her 1977 examination of the Nueva corónica manuscript and her observations of the variations in the tones of its ink as one after another page was filled out, the compositional priority of pictorial to prose text in the preparation of Guaman Poma’s manuscript, as well as the rhetorical effect of the drawings, constitute “the foregrounded text of which the written one is a subsequent elaboration or complement.” This contrasts with the clear evidence that we have seen in P of Murúa’s illustrations having been added after the prose texts were set in place, with the result that the drawings are not uniform but varied in size, and their content is often independent of the text they accompany.

Ossio (2004, 25, 49) has noted this written/pictorial divergence with regard to the treatment of the Inca kings and queens in Murúa’s P manuscript, and he takes as examples the cases of Inca Roca and Pachacuti Inca (P, f14v, f17v); Guaman Poma’s drawings of these figures (1615, 102, 108) are related to the respective written texts which describe their stance, accouterments, and the colors of the garments they wear. In Murúa’s case, as Ossio sees it, that is, starting from the picture, the written text does not allude in any minimal way to what has been represented in the drawings. The two cases he has adduced are drawings on pasted-on folios, and Ossio would see this non-correspondence as another indication of their emanating from outside the P manuscript. However, we have seen that the distinction between primary folios and pasted-on folios is irrelevant, since all pasted-on folios are also primary P-folios, so, on the contrary, the examples adduced by Ossio corroborate our notion that text and illustrations are loosely connected in P, as opposed to Guaman Poma’s Nueva corónica, where they are intimately related. Ossio himself has observed that (also primary) frontispieces exhibit varying degrees of independence from the prose texts they are supposed to introduce.

The character of the drawings that can be clearly attributed to Guaman Poma stands out from those which cannot be so readily identified as the work of his pen (or brush). Adorno (1979, 29, 31) argued long ago that “Guaman Poma’s graphic representations do not merely illuminate or illustrate the written text, in the European manuscript tradition, nor are they as unimaginative and arbitrarily placed as the conventional wood-cut or copper engraving decorations found in

178 Ossio (2004, 49): “En cambio en el manuscrito Galván [P], que repite estas escenas, no encierra en su texto ni la más mínima alusión a lo representado en los dibujos.”
early printed books. These full-page drawings visually narrate hundreds of events in Guaman Poma’s chronicle.” Even longer ago, in 1953, Ballesteros appreciated the narrative quality of Guaman Poma’s drawings in the comparative context of Murúa’s work. Shortly after his discovery of the S manuscript, Ballesteros (1953a, 214) observed that while the pictures in Murúa’s work (he refers, of course, exclusively to S) serve as illustrations, they serve in Guaman Poma as narration: “En el indio, muy a tono con su cultura y con su mundo intelectual, la ilustración es un complemento casi indispensable, con valor narrativo, al tiempo que para el fraile es solamente un aditamiento, no consubstancial con la obra, y elaborado posteriormente.” Although Ballesteros’s explanation of Guaman Poma’s capacity for visual narrative on the basis of his indigenous culture is dubious at best,179 he captures the outstanding aesthetic quality of dynamism in Guaman Poma’s art in contrast to the dignified but decidedly stiff figures that decorate Murúa’s S manuscript.180

With regard to content, Guaman Poma’s Nueu coroneu and Murúa’s P manuscripts differ in the amount of detailed information they offer in their treatment of similar themes. Condurco Morales’s 1967 (302-305) textual comparisons revealed that Guaman Poma often elaborates the content of the material that he takes from Murúa so that, for example, he specifies the flora and fauna referred to by Murúa simply as “los frutos de la tierra,” or he gives Quechua terms for phenomena mentioned more generically by Murúa. While Guaman Poma has the same ethnographic and geographic repertory as the P manuscript, he greatly expands Murúa’s treatment of the already mentioned age-grades of Andean society as well as his survey of Andean and coastal cities. With regard to the age-grades, Guaman Poma’s treatment is not only more extensive, it is, as John Murra (1992, 63-64) observed, a more “finished,” that is, a corrected version:

In 1958 Rowe compared in detail both authors’ versions of the age-grades; there was no doubt then, nor is there today, that both texts have a single origin. While Murúa is not very interested in the welfare features, both men list the blind, the crippled, and others not fit for active service on row four; both have three rows of able-bodied and six rows for the young. Both feature men and women in the same order. But who was first? The internal evidence points to Murúa. His Quechua texts are full of mistakes; Guaman Poma’s have been corrected. I have the impression that Murúa compiled the list, while Guaman Poma saw, revised, and added the welfare dimension.

179 See Teresa Gosbert (1992) and Maarten van de Gucht (1992) for the evidence of Guaman Poma’s appropriation of European artistic styles and models.
180 The one exception is a drawing that depicts the adoration of Manco Capac Inca (S. 177).
This concrete, specific instance of the discussion of the Andean age-grade system suggests, as Murúa read it, that Murúa’s P manuscript was created before Guaman Poma’s.

4.5. The Curacas’ Letter and the Question of Priority

There is no evidence of contact between Murúa and Guaman Poma before 1596. By that time, Murúa had completed C (around 1590), and after having received the recommendation of the curacas of Cuzco, he further expanded and edited his work (P) with the aim of publication in mind. He had P illustrated, and he was still making additions to P as late as 1606. A third and final version of his work (S), anticipated in P by the new title for the work written beneath the curacas’ letter, was completed by 1613.

While the evidence of Murúa’s activities suggests that he enjoyed an unbroken and successful ecclesiastical career, archival documents (Prado Tello and Prado Prado eds. 1991), known since the 1950s and published in full in 1991, have shown that Guaman Poma’s life fell into two distinct periods. The year 1600 was the turning point. In 1599 he had been successful in his petitions to the Real Audiencia in Lima in defense of his family’s and kinmen’s rights to lands in the valley of Chupas in the jurisdiction of Huamanga (Adorno 1993, 74). The defeated plaintiffs in these land litigations, the Chachapoyas, subsequently made successful accusations of imposture against him, and he was convicted on those charges and exiled from Huamanga on December 18, 1600.181

Adorno (1993, 80-84) has suggested that this series of events led Guaman Poma to take the steps to become a writer in his own right, when all avenues of social participation were closed to him. Although elaborated a decade before the publication of the facsimile of P, this theory is now supported by the evidence offered there and in S. It allows for a model according to which Guaman Poma collaborated with Murúa up to the time of his conviction and exile from Huamanga at the end of 1600. After that date, when the Spanish colonial justice system on which he had relied betrayed him, Guaman Poma undertook his own, independent literary project. Looking with new eyes upon the administration of colonial society as a site of corruption and injustice, he found new aims and a new focus (his “nueva corónica”) for his intellectual and artistic talents.

In Ossio’s view, Guaman Poma’s life is “mysterious.”182 Although he (Ossio 2004, 60) mentions Guaman Poma’s legal troubles (Ossio 2004, 60), he puts

181 For the documents of these decade-long proceedings, see Prado Tello and Prado Prado, eds., 1991; for the analysis and interpretation of these documents, in relation to other pertinent texts, see Adorno 1993.
them in the context of a work already begun, taking at his word Guaman Poma’s assertion about the 1560s commencement of his project. As we have seen, Osio suggests that Guaman Poma’s manuscript preceded Murúa’s “1590.” According to his model, the manuscripts were developed along a single track, going from a more indigenous style and perspective to a more European one, with Guaman Poma’s manuscript as the point of departure (Nueva corónica → P → S). Yet the evidence adduced for this theory is neither strong nor specific.

We propose a different model. We take P as the “origin” (remembering that it came from G) and suggest that from P both the Nueva corónica and S emanated simultaneously and independently (Nueva corónica ← P → S). We base our conclusion on the evidence provided, first, by the letter of the curacas of Cuzco (found in P) and that of “don Martín de Ayala” (in the Nueva corónica) and, second, by the related yet different contents of the P and Nueva corónica manuscripts, especially in light of Guaman Poma’s views on Murúa’s work.

The analysis of P has shown that the curacas’ letter was originally inscribed there, on one of the unnumbered front matter folios, where it could provide the model for Guaman Poma’s own letter of presentation in the Nueva corónica, which he carefully devised according to Murúa’s ordered formula of elements and which he antedated to a year that preceded Murúa’s presentation letter by reference to a certain “document” whose content he rejects (that Blas Valera wrote the Nueva corónica) but whose “authenticity” he nevertheless entertains. Although such recent “discoveries” have not been accepted by the international scholarly community on the basis of the lack of positive, authenticating evidence, the shadowy prospect that such materials provide of other actors and relationships in Guaman Poma’s life fits well with Osio’s speculative theories. The unknown portions of Guaman Poma’s biography would be better served by pursuing further documentation about his relationship with historical figures whom he mentions, such as the church inspector Cristóbal de Albornoz, the Franciscan brothers of the Ore family in Huamanga, and members of the Dominican order in the same community and in Lima.  

[13] “Para aquel entonces [‘hacia el año de 1580’] Murúa ya debía tener una decisión firme de escribir su obra, mientras que en el caso de Guaman Poma se encontraba en un estado muy incipiente” (Osio 2001, 60).  

[14] Osio (2001, 59-50) has carefully laid out the points of comparison and contrast of the P and NG manuscripts. With regard to the differences between P and S, Rowe (1979, 2) remarked on S’s expanded treatment of Inca history which, in relation to P, offers “a more coherent and detailed account of events before the Spanish invasion and a circumstantial account of Inca resistance to the Spanish.” He added that the material from P on Inca institutions was reorganized and condensed in S. For example, Murúa devoted some eighteen chapters in P (part 3, chapters 41-62) to ritual Andean beliefs and religious practices. He devoted fewer chapters, about thirteen, to these subjects in S (part 2, chapters 24-37). Departing from P, Murúa further elaborated in S the description of colonial Peru and added late chapters on the activities of the Mercedarian order.
almost a decade. Insofar as the *cumacas’s* letter’s reference to the year 1596 can be taken as an authentic dating, and given the evidence of events narrated in P that stretch into the year 1600 (the Arequipa earthquake), this presentation letter aptly provided a model for Guaman Poma’s own, later one. Furthermore, Guaman Poma antedated his letter to 1587 in an effort to provide a plausible letter of presentation from one of the only authorities the *indio ladino* writer could plausibly call upon, that is, one of his own forebears.

Pietschmann (1908; idem in Tello, 1939, 83) long ago pointed out the implausibility of the letter of “don Martín Guaman Mallque de Ayala” as being of such a personage’s authorship, and he ascribed the letter to Guaman Poma himself. Yet Guaman Mallque’s letter is still to this day occasionally cited as evidence that Guaman Poma *did* spend thirty years, as he claims (1615, 916, 976, 991), serving the king, that is, writing his chronicle.185 But the arithmetic doesn’t work. These thirty years, dating backward from 1615, bring us to 1585. Indeed, Guaman Poma backdates the letter of presentation that he attributes to don Martín Guaman Mallque de Ayala almost to that year, 1587. However, he then forgetfully has “don Martín Guaman Mallque” claim that his son had already spent two decades writing his (now concluded) work: “el cual abrá como veinte años poco a más o menos que a escrito unas historias de nuestros antepasados agüeños” (Guaman Poma 1615, 6). This would place Guaman Poma’s conclusion of his literary project in the 1580s and its impossible inauguration in the 1560s, as Conduero Morales (1967, 291) pointed out.

Alternatively, as Pietschmann remarked (1939, 83), if counting from the 1613 date affixed to the letter that follows Guaman Mallque’s and bears Guaman Poma’s name, it would mean that Guaman Poma started writing his work at least forty-six years earlier. It is clear, on balance, that if “Guaman Mallque”’s letter can be used as a proof of anything, it is of Guaman Poma having followed the model of the *cumacas’s* letter in P in crafting his own presentation letter in the *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno*. Together with a number of other aspects of P, the *cumacas’s* letter corresponds to the generic elements of P that Guaman Poma had made note of, or remembered, when planning and composing his own work.

185 On one occasion Guaman Poma states clearly that he spent thirty years writing his work: “Con tanto trabajo de cín escrito cosa alguna el trabajo a costado treinta años, anadiendo muy pobre desnudo” (Guaman Poma 1615, 1091). On another, he claims to have spent thirty, or possibly twenty, years writing: “El autor don Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala, digo que el cristiano lector estará maravillado y espantado de leer este libro y corónica y capitulos y dirán que quien me enseñó, que como la puede asemejar. Yos yo te digo que me a costado treinta años de trabajo ci y no me engano, pero a la buena razón beynie años de trabajo y pobresa” (Guaman Poma 1615, 715).
4.6. The Originality of the Nueva corónica

Finally, Guaman Poma’s more famous criticisms of Murúa’s chronicle also speak to the corrective that he sought to achieve by his own work. As Guaman Poma (1615, 1090) remarked, Murúa “does not declare where the Inca came from nor how nor in what manner nor from whence” or whether the Incas were legitimate rulers. Murúa had expressly taken as his own the version of Andean history as "researched" and elaborated by the viceroy Francisco de Toledo’s historians, and thus he briefly states that there were only local lords in ancient times, who managed “their miserable settlements and houses without order” (“tenían sus pueblecillos y casa sin orden”) (P, 88v [part I, chapter I]). In response and smartly taking an anti-Toledo stance (lessons learned from Murúa), Guaman Poma elaborates the long tradition of pre-Incaic rulers and stages of Andean civilization, thus postulating a non-idolatrous incipient Inca era that prevailed and died out before the appearance of Manco Capac. It is implausible that Guaman Poma’s chronicle antedated Murúa’s on this ground, for if Murúa had had Guaman Poma’s work at his disposal, he likely would have taken from Guaman Poma some of the substance (such as the four ages of pre-Incaic Andean humanity) of his pre-Inca history, even if he wished to present it as primitive and barbarous, without virtue.

When Guaman Poma (1615, 15) lamented that Murúa did not declare, regarding the Incas, “how their line came to an end,” he implied the absence or inadequacy of accounts of the Spanish invasion and conquest on the heels of the civil war between the princes Huascar Inca and Atahualpa Inca. Murúa’s P manuscript devotes only a half dozen chapters to these events (part 2, chapters 10-16), and the figure of Francisco Pizarro himself is mentioned only as the superior of Lorenzo de Aldana in the account of the latter’s founding of Quito and of Pizarro’s being queried by the Inca captain Quisquis about Spanish currency (P, 1131r, 1133r [part 4, chapters 5, 7]). For his own part, Guaman Poma highlights graphically and at great length the Spanish conquest of Peru, devoting to those events a long transitional section, “Conquista,” between his “new chronicle” and his treatise “on good government.” He narrates at great length the pretensions of the Pizarros and the Almagros, the murderous conflicts that

---

196 The S manuscript makes the same assertion, but augments it at greater length by emphasizing as liberating the “right rule” of the viceroy Toledo (Murúa 1962-64, I:29 [lib. I, cap. 11]).
197 The S manuscript goes into much greater length on these topics, with some twelve chapters devoted to the civil wars between Huascar and Atahualpa, and some twenty-seven to the Spanish conquest of Peru (Murúa 1962-64, I:131-171; 171-274 [lib. 1, caps. 45-57; lib. 1, caps. 58-85]). Once more we see the expansion, from the P to S manuscript, on the topic of Inca and Spanish colonial political history.
arose between them, the rebellions of subsequent Spanish caudillos against the Castilian king, and, finally, the viceroy Toledo’s culpability in the capture and execution of the last Inca prince, Tupac Amaru.

All these events are portrayed in great detail in drawings and prose texts in the Nueva corónica y buen gobierno. We take as an example Guaman Poma’s treatment of the viceroy Toledo, which was surely motivated by Guaman Poma’s criticism of the versions of Andean history’s usurpation that the viceroy authorized, as well as Toledo’s historic role in bringing the Incas to their end. In Murúa’s P manuscript, the viceroy does not appear anywhere in the account of the capture and execution of Tupac Amaru. Guaman Poma, in responsive contrast, narrates this sequence of events at considerable length, creating more complex versions of the drawings on the same topics that he had created in Murúa’s manuscript. 188 Guaman Poma completes this “Buen gobierno” sequence by portraying the viceroy Toledo, overcome by his own arrogance and the despair of having been refused an audience with King Philip, slumped dead in his chair: “Y acabó su vida sentiéndose del dolor de no poder la cara de su rey y señor... Y así la soberbia le mató a don Francisco de Toledo” (Guaman Poma 1615, 460, 461). 189

In brief, Murúa was an historian and ethnographer, Guaman Poma was an artist-and-illustrator-turned-author by virtue of what he had learned from Murúa about the genre and subgenres of historical writing in the book of Murúa to which he had contributed. At the same time, the lessons Guaman Poma learned included his own assessment of the adequacy, and inadequacies, of the historiographic treatment carried out by his one-time “mentor.”

Guaman Poma illustrated Murúa’s P manuscript, but he was not involved in its composition. As we pointed out, the identification of Guaman Poma as Murúa’s sole or main informant rests on the presupposition that text and image are intimately connected in P, as they are in Guaman Poma’s Nueva corónica. As we have seen, this is a presupposition that does not stand up under scrutiny.

Nevertheless, by creating most of the paintings of P, Guaman Poma became intimately acquainted with the kind of book that Murúa had created and the kind of ‘chronicle’ that he had composed. When Guaman Poma determined to make his vocation that of reformer, satirist, and counsellor to the king of Spain, he had Murúa’s P manuscript in mind. He wrote and illustrated his own ‘new chronicle’ in emulation of, and opposition to, P as a physical artifact, and to Murúa, as its conceptualizing creator.

188 Compare P, 150v, 151v, and Guaman Poma 1615, 431, 433.
189 Guaman Poma is inconsistent in citing the place of Toledo’s death: In his prose text, Guaman Poma (1615, 461, 460) suggests that it occurred at Toledo’s home; the caption under the picture, however, states “en Castilla, en la corona.”
Transgressing the simple emulation of Murúa, Guaman Poma’s originality as an author and as his own illustrator lies in his implementation, into the Murúaian scheme, of a ‘beginning’ (pre-incas) and an ‘end’: the Spanish conquest and the contemporary (corrupt) colonial society. In terms of literary history, Guaman Poma is thus deeply indebted to Murúa, but in terms of literary and artistic achievement, his work vigorously sets up an alternative to that propounded by Murúa. In this respect, as a political thinker and author, he is deeply original, and his work should be considered, in the best sense of the term, an “anti-Murúa,” making use of a diversity of genres and techniques in order to further his own program of political colonial reform. Thus, Martín de Murúa’s 1596 version of his Historia (V) is at the origin of two different developments. On one hand, it is the basis for Murúa’s expanded and recomposed 1613 version (S) of Inca history. On the other, for Guaman Poma, it is not only the text that served as his apprenticeship as illustrator, but also and more importantly, it was the point of departure for Guaman Poma’s negation of the adequacy of Murúa’s description of Andean civilization and the postulation (“nueva corónica”) of his own alternative to the Spanish colonial chronicle tradition. The felicitous publication of the Códice Murúa has made it possible for us to illuminate a few crucial years (1596-1600) along the path trodden by Guaman Poma on his way to becoming “el autor Ayala.”

Works Cited

—. 2002. A Witness unto Itself: The Integrity of the Autograph Manuscript


Alcedo y Herrera, Antonio de. 1964. *Bibliotheca Americana: catálogo de los autores que han escrito de la América en diferentes idiomas y noticias de su vida y patria, años en que vivieron, y obras que escribieron* 1807. 2 vols. 1. Consejo, Quito, Ecuador.


4. n.d. [1954] *La Historia General del Perú del mercedario [sic] Fray Martín de Murúa. Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Americanists, held at Cambridge, 18-23 August 1952*, Royal Anthropological Institute, London. 239-242. [The one-volume Proceedings was published after 1954, but when it appeared it was undated, according to Juan Comas]
1954, lxxxi; idem 1964, 11, 40.

—. 1953-54. La crónica de Murúa y la crítica del Inkario. Ruma (Buenos Aires) 6:97-117.


—. 1975. La “Historia general del Perú” de Fr. Martín de Murúa: hallazgo y estudio de su original. In Miscellanea offerita a Charles Verlinden à l'occasion de ses trente ans de professorat = Miscellanea aangeboden aan Charles Verlinden ter gelegenheid van zijn dertig jaar professoraat. Ghent. 61-85.


—. 2003b. Codicological Survey of Copenhagen, Royal Library, GKS 2232


Comas, Juan. 1954. Los Congresos Internacionales de Americanistas: Síntesis histórica e índice bibliográfico general, 1875-1952. Instituto Indigenista Interamericano, México, D.F.


Guaman Poma de Ayala, Felipe. 1615. *El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno*. The Royal Library, Copenhagen, Gks 2232, 4to.


León Pinelo, Antonio Rodríguez de. 1629. Epitome de la biblioteca oriental y occidental, náutica y geográfica, Juan González, Madrid.

—. 1787-88. Epitome de la biblioteca oriental y occidental, náutica y geográfica de don Antonio de León Pinelo. Añadido y enmendado nuevamente. 3 vols. Francisco Martínez Abad, Madrid.


Murúa, see Murúa.


Murúa, Fray Martín de. 1590. Historia del origen, y genealogía Real de los Reyes ingas del Perú. De sus hechos, costumbres, trages, y manera de gobierno. Private Collection.


—. 1922-1925. Historia de los Incas Reyes del Perú por el R.P. Fr. Martín de


- 1985. Los retratos de los Incas en la crónica de Fray Martín de Murúa. Introducción por Juan M. Osío A. Lima: COFIDE.


Pastor Fusté, Justo. 1827-1830. Biblioteca valenciana de los escritores que florecieron hasta nuestros días y de los que aún viven, con adiciones y emmendas a la de D. Vicente Ximeno. 2 vols. Imprenta y Librería Ildefonso Mompié, Valencia.


—. 1979. Martín de Murúa’s Manuscripts on Inca History and Culture. Berkeley, California. [mimeographed study.]


Spain, Junta directiva del cuarto centenario del descubrimiento de América. 1892. El Centenario, revista ilustrada. 3 vols. Madrid.


**Appendix I**

Extant Drawings in the Two Murúa Manuscripts. (See the Introduction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Still extant in “Murúa 1500” (P)</th>
<th>Moved from “Murúa 1500” (P) to Murúa 1615 (S)</th>
<th>Extant in Murúa 1615 (S)</th>
<th>Total of extant drawings</th>
<th>Total of extant drawings by Guaman Poma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Murúa 1500&quot; (P)</td>
<td>Front matter</td>
<td>Andean landscape; coat of arms of Mercedarians (1st and 2nd unnumbered folios)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat of arms of Peru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Index of P-folios Reproduced on Plates I-VIII

Front matter, unlocated fol.  
(S, f.233/307) - Figs. 25 & 26

Front matter, verso of 3rd unnumbered fol. - Fig. 24

Fol. 9v - Fig. 9
Fol. 10v - Fig. 21
Fol. 21r - Fig. 22
Fol. 24r - Fig. 1
Fol. 25r - Fig. 10
Fol. 32 (S, f.63/79) - Figs. 27 & 28
Fol. 34v - Fig. 17
Fol. 36r - Fig. 2
Fol. 37v - Fig. 18
Fol. 48v - Fig. 11
Fol. 50v - Fig. 12

Fol. 51v - Fig. 19
Fol. 52 (S, f.167/84) - Figs. 29 & 30
Fol. 54v - Fig. 13
Fol. 61 (S, f.171/89) - Figs. 31 & 32
Fol. 66v - Fig. 20
Fol. 70r - Fig. 3
Fol. 85v - Fig. 14
Fol. 110r - Fig. 4
Fol. 112v - Fig. 15
Fol. 116r - Fig. 5
Fol. 123r - Fig. 6
Fol. 125v - Fig. 7
Fol. 127r - Fig. 8
Fol. 136v - Fig. 16
Fol. 143r "155" - Fig. 23

SUMMARY

ROLINA ADORNO AND IVAN BOSERUP: Guaman Poma and the Manuscripts of Fray Martín de Murúa.

The 1984 publication of the facsimile edition of Fray Martín de Murúa’s Historia del reyno y gobernación Real de los Incas ingal del Perú, dated 1590 on its frontispiece and referred to here as “Murúa 1590,” is an important event in Andean and Spanish colonial studies. This is so for two reasons. First, the facsimile’s publication makes possible the thorough study of the “Murúa 1590” manuscript, which has to date been known only indirectly through brief reports and editions based on a copy of it made in 1890 and is currently inaccessible in a private collection. Second, the facsimile makes possible the evaluation of the relationships of “Murúa 1590” to the other known Murúa manuscripts (The J. Paul Getty Museum, Ms. Ludwig XIII 16), dated 1613, and to the Nueva corónica y buen gobierno (1615: Copenhagen, Royal Library, GKS 2232 Ito), whose author-artist, Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala, produced some ninety drawings for the richly illustrated “Murúa 1590.” Because the “clone” facsimile reproduces a significant number of the physical characteristics of “Murúa 1590,” it lends itself to a systematic codicological analysis and thus provides the opportunity to re-examine the commonplaces about its relationship to the manuscripts with which it has long been associated.

Our aim in this four-part study is to discover the compositional process of “Murúa 1590” and to assess its relationship to “Murúa 1613” and Guaman Poma’s 1615 chronicle. In Part One we trace the history of scholarship on Murúa’s manuscripts from the seventeenth century to the present day. We undertake this
task in order to show how canonized views of the Murúa textual tradition have emerged and therefore how they have affected recent and current thinking about the relationships between Murúa’s works (and with that of Guaman Poma). In Parts Two and Three, we analyze the “Murúa 1590” manuscript from structural and historical viewpoints, respectively. We show that what first seems to be an extremely complicated hybrid codex (Juan Osío’s theory of multiple drafts) turns out to be the result of procedures undergone by one single manuscript, ninety percent of which has been preserved more or less intact. We demonstrate, furthermore, that “Murúa 1590” is an expanded copy, produced starting in 1590 or later, of a version that was briefer, lacked illustrations, and had been completed in and/or dated 1590.

In Part Four, we consider the relationship of Murúa’s and Guaman Poma’s works on the basis of this new understanding of the “Murúa 1590” manuscript. Thus, we challenge the model offered by Juan Osío, whereby Guaman Poma’s work in its incipient stages became the model for Murúa’s works in a multidimensional evolution that proceeded from the “indigenous” (Guaman Poma’s manuscript) to the “European” (“Murúa 1590,” followed by “Murúa 1613”), based on our accumulated evidence, we show that the 1590 and 1596 versions of Murúa’s works represented in the “Murúa 1590” manuscript were the first manuscripts to be written, that Guaman Poma then illustrated the 1596 version, and that subsequently Murúa went on to create “Murúa 1613” without Guaman Poma at his side. Meanwhile Guaman Poma, independently and after 1600, created his “new” chronicle, in juxtaposition and opposition to the one which he had illustrated for Murúa. As for Guaman Poma’s involvement in “Murúa 1590” we set the earliest and latest time limits as 1590 (sometime after May 15) and 1600 (some time after February 18), respectively, and we find no evidence of an artisanal workshop in which Guaman Poma served as participant or head.

**Resumen**

**Roleña Adorno and Ivan Boserup:** Guaman Poma y los manuscritos de Fray Martín de Murúa.

La publicación hacia finales del año 2004 de la edición facsimilar de la Historia del origen y genealogía Real de los Reyes ingles del Perú, del cronista mercedario Martín de Murúa que lleva en el frontispicio la fecha de 1590 y que está referida aquí como “Murúa 1590,” constituye un acontecimiento significativo en los estudios coloniales hispanoandinos por dos razones fundamentales. Primero, la publicación del facsimilar permite el estudio detallado del manuscrito “Murúa 1590,” que hasta la fecha se conocía sólo indirectamente a través de breves reportes y ediciones basadas en una copia de éste realizada en 1890 y que actualmente se encuentra en una colección privada. Segundo, el facsimilar hace posible la evaluación de las relaciones de “Murúa 1590” con el otro manuscrito conocido de Murúa (The J. Paul Getty Museum, Ms. Ludwig XIII 16), cuyo folio primero data el año de 1613, y con la Nueva cosmica y buen gobierno (1615; Copenhague, Biblioteca Real, GKS 2232 4to), cuyo autor y artista, Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala, mudará a su cargo noventa de los dibujos preparados para el ricamente ilustrado “Murúa 1590.” Dado que el facsimilar “clon” reproduce un número significativo de las características físicas de “Murúa 1590,” se pretende para un análisis codicológico sistemático y nos
proporciona, por tanto, la oportunidad de reexaminar los lugares comunes acerca de su relación con los manuscritos con los que ha sido asociado por mucho tiempo.

Nuestro objetivo en este estudio cuantitativo es descubrir el proceso de composición de “Murúa 1590” y evaluar su relación con “Murúa 1613” y con la crónica de Guaman Poma de 1615. En la primera parte, tratamos la historia de los estudios dedicados a los manuscritos de Murúa desde el siglo XVII hasta el presente. Asumimos esta tarea con la finalidad de mostrar cómo surgieron las opiniones consagradas sobre la tradición textual de Murúa y, en consecuencia, cómo han afectado las concepciones actuales sobre las relaciones entre las obras de Murúa (y también con relación a las de Guaman Poma). En la segunda y tercera partes, analizamos el manuscrito “Murúa 1590” desde puntos de vista estructural e histórico, respectivamente. Mostramos que lo que a primera vista parece ser un código trabado de extrema complejidad (la teoría de los múltiples borradores de Juan Osio), es, en realidad, el producto de procesos a los que se sometió un solo manuscrito del cual se ha conservado intacto un memento por cierto. Demostramos, a mayor confirmación, que “Murúa 1590” es una copia expandida, comenzada en 1596 o poco después, de una versión más breve, carente de ilustraciones, que había sido terminada y/o fechada en 1599.

En la parte final, evaluamos la relación entre las obras de Murúa y Guaman Poma sobre la base de este nuevo examen del manuscrito “Murúa 1590”. Así, cuestionamos el modelo propuesto por Juan Osio, según el cual la obra de Guaman Poma en su estado más temprano habría fungido como modelo para las obras de Murúa en una evolución multidimensional que procedería de lo indígena —representado por el manuscrito de Guaman Poma— a lo europeo —encarnado en el manuscrito “Murúa 1590” seguido por “Murúa 1613”. Basándonos en la evidencia acumulada, mostramos que las versiones de la obra de Murúa de 1590 y 1596 representadas por el manuscrito “Murúa 1590” fueron los primeros manuscritos que se escribieron, que Guaman Poma entonces ilustró la versión de 1596, y que posteriormente Murúa comprendió la creación del manuscrito “Murúa 1613” sin la colaboración de Guaman Poma. Mientras tanto Guaman Poma, independientemente y después de 1610, creó una nueva crítica en yuxtaposición y oposición a aquella que había ilustrado para Murúa. Para la intervención de Guaman Poma en “Murúa 1590” establecemos como límites temporales más temprano y más tardío, respectivamente, los años de 1596 (en algún momento posterior al 15 de mayo) y 1600 (después del 18 de febrero), y no encontramos evidencia alguna de un taller artesanal en el cual Guaman Poma haya servido como aprendiz o maestro.

SAMMENFAATTING

ROLENA ADORNO OG IVAN BOSTRIEX: Guaman Poma og Fray Martín de Murúa hændskrifterne.

Dette er et grundlæggende til et udgivelser af 2004 af en faksimile af Fray Martín de Muruas Historia del origen y genealogía Real de los Reyes Inca de l'Virú, der på titelbladet hører årstallet 1590, og som her omfattes som “Murúa 1590,” er en betydelig fuld begivenhed for udkomsten af Andesområdets kultur og historie i den spanske kolonialtid. For det første gør faksimilen det muligt at studere i detaljer


**Appendix I**

Extant Drawings in the Two Murúa Manuscripts. (See the Introduction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Still extant in <em>Murúa 1500</em> (P)</th>
<th>Moved from <em>Murúa 1500</em> (P) to Murúa 1613 (S)</th>
<th>Extant in Murúa 1613 (S)</th>
<th>Total of extant drawings</th>
<th>Total of extant drawings by Guaman Poma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Murúa 1500&quot; (P)</td>
<td>Front matter</td>
<td>Andean landscape; coat of arms of Mercedarians (1st and 2nd unnumbered folios)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coat of arms of Peru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Survey of the Structure of the P Manuscript (Before and After Fragmentation and Reconstruction). (See sections 2.2 through 2.6).

Note 1: The foliation, here extended so as to encompass also the blank folios at the end of the manuscript, runs only to "156", because one folio at the beginning of quire 1 was missed in the count up to folio 8 (possibly the very first folio, on purpose), and one was missed (by error) in quire 7 ("115b6").

Note 2: The difference of 11 between the 46 detached primary folios and the 35 extant replacement folios is accounted for by a "loss" of 5 folios in quire 1, of 2 in quire 3, and of 4 in quire 7.

Note 3: Two primary folios were displaced under the reconstruction of P: primary "155" was pasted onto replacement fol. 148, and primary fol. 143 was pasted onto folio facing 18.

Note 4: The six ultimate primary folios, "151-156", were originally blank, except fol. "155", which carried an addition to the text of fol. 95 verso.

Note 5: This Table includes the 8 single primary folios which are extant in the manuscript 8 and which are discussed in section 2.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quire</th>
<th>Folios as foliated in P (C)</th>
<th>Original number of primary folios</th>
<th>Primary folios still in place</th>
<th>Number of replacement folios</th>
<th>Primary folios pasted onto replacement folios in the manuscript</th>
<th>Primary folios pasted into the S manuscript</th>
<th>Primary folios missing from original quire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (21 folios)</td>
<td>61-141</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 (Coat of arms of Peru, became S, fol. 283/307)</td>
<td>9 (5 unnumbered) (344,462); 8,11, 12, 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (18 folios)</td>
<td>141-158</td>
<td>8+1</td>
<td>8+1</td>
<td>5 (14 and 2nd numb., 3rd numb., 1440); 15, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (10 folios)</td>
<td>168-178</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 (1925)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (18 folios)</td>
<td>242-269</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (3 folios)</td>
<td>270-272</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Changes within the Tabla and the Replacement Folios of Quire 1 (1a and 1b). (See section 2.10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tabla, original state</th>
<th>Replacement folios before addition of new chapter 1</th>
<th>Replacement folios after addition of new chapter 1</th>
<th>Tabla, current state, taking account of final state of replacement folios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sr Cap. proheminal</td>
<td>Sr Cap. proheminal</td>
<td>Sr Cap. proheminal – fol. 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap. 1: Del origen y principio de los yogas – fol. 8</td>
<td>Sr Cap. 1: Del nombre de los Reyes del Pintu</td>
<td>Cap. 1: Del nombre etc. – fol. 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap. 2: Del principio de los yogas – fol. 9</td>
<td>Sr Cap. 1: Del origen y principio de los Reyes ingas del Pintu</td>
<td>Sr Cap. 2: Del origen etc.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap. 3: Mango Capac - fol. 10</td>
<td>10r</td>
<td>Cap. 2: Mango Capac</td>
<td>10r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap. 4: Sinche Roca - fol. 11</td>
<td>11r</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>11r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap. 5: Uloque Yupampiti - fol. 12</td>
<td>12r</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>12r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap. 6: Maya Capac - fol. 13</td>
<td>13r</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>13r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap. 7: Capac Yupampiti - fol. 14</td>
<td>14r</td>
<td>Cap. 6: Capac Yupampiti</td>
<td>14r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap. 8: Yungo Roca - fol. 15</td>
<td>15r</td>
<td>Cap. 7: Yungo Roca</td>
<td>15r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap. 9: Yungo Guacac - fol. 16</td>
<td>16r</td>
<td>Cap. 8: Yungo Guacac</td>
<td>16r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix 4**

State of Preservation of the P Manuscript. (See section 2.12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Up to &quot;9&quot;</th>
<th>Actual foliation</th>
<th>Original number of primary folios</th>
<th>Primary folios extant in P</th>
<th>Primary folios extant in S</th>
<th>Total number extant</th>
<th>Total number lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 + (1)  + 3</td>
<td>9 (1 blank)</td>
<td>2 (Ancestral landscape, coat of arms of Mercedarios)</td>
<td>1 (coat of arms of Peru)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 (1 blank)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk. 1</td>
<td>924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk. 2</td>
<td>35-51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5 (11, 12, 13, 30, 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk. 3</td>
<td>52-125</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 (02: Huscaral; 61: Choquipallana)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5 (62, 68, 87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk. 4</td>
<td>126-1/2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finials, Field, Memorias</td>
<td>143-145, 146b, 146-150</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 (incl. 143</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final folios</td>
<td>[151-155]</td>
<td>6 (5 blank)</td>
<td>3 (154, 152, 153, 94, 95)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (153, 154, 150, all blank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158 (6 blank)</td>
<td>134 (2 blank)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>138 (4 blank)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5

Reduced or Missing Frontispiece Drawings due to Textual Additions (See section 3.5.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio no.</th>
<th>Chapter on recto</th>
<th>Verse Text</th>
<th>Notes on content of text addition</th>
<th>Verse Drawing</th>
<th>Function of drawing</th>
<th>Catch-word of verso text on bottom of recto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,27</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>List of 34 conquests (other lists added after drawing)</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Frontispiece of part 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2,13</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>este tercer hijo ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2,15</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Lexical texts (some added after drawing)</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Frontispiece (Quispic Amaru)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 (now 52r)</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>otras cosas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Frontispiece (toral letter)</td>
<td>la manera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>y como</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>a los que</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Frontispiece (Inca's Family)</td>
<td>ablo en el</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>y es cosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Frontispiece (Puchacari)</td>
<td>en este mismo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Intrareadable pues no son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>3,15</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>tenían sus oratorios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>3,21</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>dizen que</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3,25</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>lo cual era una inhumanidad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>3,14</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Frontispiece (incomplete)</td>
<td>no se a pedido</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>3,66</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Frontispiece (tributo)</td>
<td>en este Reino del</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>3,67</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>List of provinces</td>
<td>Reduced</td>
<td>Frontispiece (crops)</td>
<td>en este Reino del</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>3,70</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>otras muchas fiestas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>3,73 (Book end)</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>llaman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>4, Prologo</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>4,1</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>y así mismo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>Full page</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Guaman Poma and the Manuscripts of Fray Martín de Murúa

### Appendix B

Explanatory Texts Inscribed by Guaman Poma on Drawings of the P Manuscript. (See section 3.8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In P</th>
<th>In S</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Front matter]</td>
<td>283/307r</td>
<td>Around and below the coat of arms of Peru</td>
<td>la primera, las armas de chinchaysuyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54v</td>
<td>On image</td>
<td>las andas del yunga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57v</td>
<td>On lower frame</td>
<td>el yunga y la coya y dos hijos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[61v]</td>
<td>71/89r</td>
<td>Beside figures</td>
<td>coya y Reyna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63v</td>
<td>Beside edifices</td>
<td>ande suyo</td>
<td>colla suyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65v</td>
<td>Above edifice</td>
<td>dos casas de piedra, papa de cantería del yunga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7

Drawings in the S Manuscript (See sections 3.18 and 3.19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawing no.</th>
<th>Fol. in S</th>
<th>Fol. in P</th>
<th>Chapter in S</th>
<th>Subject matter of drawing and/or chapter</th>
<th>Inscribed instruction</th>
<th>Kings/queens in revised plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22r</td>
<td>Book 1</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Title page device</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2r / 13r</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coat of arms of Inca kings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3r &gt; 7r / 10r</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Manco Capac (adoration of)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5r &gt; 9r / 21r</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cuychiroca (coronation of)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5r &gt; 9r / 21r</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Manco Capac</td>
<td></td>
<td>King no. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7r / 23r</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mama Huaco</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen no. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8v / 24v</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cuychiroca</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen no. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9v / 25v</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chimuco Coca</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen no. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10v / 26v</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yupa Lloque</td>
<td></td>
<td>King no. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11v / 27v</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mama Coya</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen no. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12v / 28v</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mama Capac</td>
<td></td>
<td>King no. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13v / 29v</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Inca</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen no. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14v / 30v</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Capac Yupanqui</td>
<td></td>
<td>King no. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15v / 31v</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chimpo Odlo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen no. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16v / 32v</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yupa Roca</td>
<td></td>
<td>King no. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17v / 33v</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cusi Chimpo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen no. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18v / 34v</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yahuar Huaco</td>
<td></td>
<td>King no. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19v / 35v</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ypa Huaco</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen no. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20v / 36v</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Viracochi Inca</td>
<td></td>
<td>King no. 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21v / 37v</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mama Yunto</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen no. 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22v / 38v</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>[Yupanqui / Pachacuti]</td>
<td></td>
<td>King no. 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>24v / 40v</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No se a de pintar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Verso / Ròleo</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Verso / Ròleo</td>
<td>Nota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>26v / 42v</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>No se a de pintar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>28v / 44v</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30v / 46v</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>[Mama Anahecurque]</td>
<td>Queen no. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>31v / 47v</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>[Tupa Inga Yupanqui]</td>
<td>King no. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>33v / 49v</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>35v / 51v</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>38v / 54v</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>[Mama Oello]</td>
<td>Queen no. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>40v / 56v</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>[Huaina Capac]</td>
<td>King no. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>41v / 57v</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>44v / 60v</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>46v / 62v</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>No se a de pintar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>48v / 64v</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>No se a de pintar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>63r / 70r</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(id.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>67r / 81r</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(id.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>71r / 89r</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(id.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>28v / 30v</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(id.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>61v</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(id.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>P. front</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Book A, front</td>
<td>Coat of arms of Peru (by Guaman Poma)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No se a de pintar* significa 'no se puede pintar'.
Appendix 8

Relationships among Manuscripts of Guaman Poma and Martín de Murúa (C, P, S, L). (See sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.18, 3.19, and 4.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guaman Poma</th>
<th>Martín de Murúa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>C(uzco), parts 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textual additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P(oyanne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Nueva corónica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 folios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P(folios detached)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P(reconstructed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S(alamanea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>L(oyola) copy of P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plate I. P's Calligraphed Text and Framing Systems (1).

Courtesy of Mr. Sean Galvin, County Meath, Ireland, and Testimonio Compañía Editorial, Madrid.

Fig 1. Type A frame, 1-line separator.
P. 12r (1:17). Hand Pl.

Fig 2. Type B frame, 2-lines separator.
P. 60r (2:1). Hand Pl.

Fig 3. Type C frame, 4-lines separator.
P. 170r (3:18). Hand Pl.

Fig 4. Type D frame, 3-lines separator.
P. 1110r (356). Hand Pl.
Plate II. P's Calligraphed Text and Framing Systems (2).
Courtesy of Mr. Sean Gabin, County Meath, Ireland, and Testimonio Compañía Editorial, Madrid.

Fig 5. Variant of type D frame.

Fig 6. Type E frame, 20 lines separator.

Fig 7. End of part 3, verso inscribed by P1.
P, f125v (373). Recent owner's mark.

Fig 8. Variant of type E frame.

Fig. 9. King Marco Capac. Unknown artist. P, 89v (frontispiece of 1:3). Hand P2.

Fig. 10. Queen Chimpa Urma. Unknown artist. P, 125v (facing 1:19). Armas by Guaman Poma.

Fig. 11. Full page textual addition. P, 158v (addition to 2:13). Hand P2.

Plate IV. P's Verso Pages (2): Frontispieces by G. Poma in Remaining Blank Areas. Courtesy of Mr. Sean Galvin, County Meath, Ireland, and Testimonio Compañía Editorial, Madrid.

**Fig 13.** Frontispiece (3/3) below textual addition. P. 154v (add. to 322). Hand P2.

**Fig 14.** Full-page frontispiece (3/34). P. 85v. Captions by G. Poma (hand P4).

**Fig 15.** Frontispiece (3/61) below textual addition. P. 112v (add. to 360). Hands P2 and P3.

**Fig 16.** Frontispiece (4/11) below textual addition. P. 136v (add. to 410). Hand P2.
Plate V. P’s Verso Pages (3): Texts Added after the Drawings of Guaman Poma.
Courtesy of Mr. Sean Gabin, County Meath, Ireland, and Testimonio Compañía Editorial, Madrid.

Fig 17. List extended around drawing.
P. 134v (facing title page of part 2). Hand P2.

Fig 18. Textual addition around top of drawing.
P. 137v (facing 2:3). Hand P2.

Fig 19. Texts in blank spaces around drawing.

Fig 20. Texts in blank spaces around drawing.
Plate VI: Fragmentation and Reconstruction of P.

Courtesy of Mr. Sean Galvin, County Meath, Ireland, and Testimonio Compañía Editorial, Madrid.

Fig 21. Copy of obscured text on replacement folio, P, f10r (1:3). Hand P2.

Fig 22. Copy of obscured text on replacement folio, P, f12r (1:4). Hand P5.

Fig 23. Reinstalled text and ill. (cella's toilette). P, f14r (was f155r). Hand P3. Ill. by G. Poma.

Fig 24. Reinstalled frontisp. (adoring cella). P, verso of 3rd fol. (was f143r). Ill. by G. Poma.
Plate VII. P-Folios Migrated to S (1).

Courtesy of The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles.

Fig. 25. Curacas' letter and book title.

Fig. 26. Armas of Peru.
S, 1283/307r [P, Fr]. Ill and texts by G. Poma.

Fig. 27. Chapter crossed out and obscured.

Fig. 28. Queen Raha Oello. Unknown artist. S.
165/79r [P, 132r (facing 1225)]. Armas by G. Poma.
Plate VIII. P-Folios Migrated to S (2).

Courtesy of The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles.

Fig. 29. Title page crossed out and obscured. S, 107/84v [P, B2r (port. 3)]. Hands P1 and P2.

Fig. 30. Inca king in procession "Huascar Incas." S, 107/84r [P, 152v (facing of 3:1)]. III. by G. Poma.

Fig. 31. Chapter crossed out and obscured. S, 171/89v [P, 56r (8:9)]. Hand P1.

Fig. 32. Inca queen in procession "Chuquiullana." S, 171/89r [P, 56fr (facing, 3:10)]. III. by G. Poma.
Appendix 8

Relationships among Manuscripts of Guaman Poma and Martín de Murúa (C, P, S, L). (See sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.18, 3.19, and 4.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guaman Poma</th>
<th>Martín de Murúa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>C(uzco), parts 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textual additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P(oyanne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Nueva corónica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P-folios detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P reconstructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S(almanea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>L(oyola) copy of P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>