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Introduction

The systematic appropriation of indigenous languages for missionary and pastoral uses was one of the most telling features of Spanish colonialism in the Americas. It is also one of the least understood today, a topic that tends to fall through the cracks between history, anthropology, and linguistics. In its everyday sense, the term “translation” does not convey the full dimensions of the process, which ranged from the selection and development of the appropriate language varieties for use in a given area to the imposition of performance systems for inculcating entire Christian literatures in these languages. Missionary translation in this broader sense was a key instrument of colonialism—interethnic relations were established and mediated by conversion, which in turn worked through, and was epitomized by, translation (Rafael 1993 [1988]). Translation itself can be understood as a way of establishing relations—often hierarchical ones—between languages, and thus between cultures and groups of people (Benjamin 1968 [1955]). The translation activities of the Spanish church in Latin America are a privileged window onto the divergent projects and ideologies vis-à-vis Indian Christianity that emerged within the colonial establishment. These activities are recorded in a mass of extant texts that make up the bulk, if not the totality, of the historical literature of many Amerindian languages. Such texts, which include liturgical and devotional genres as well as strictly catechetical ones, are particularly abundant in the languages of Mesoamerica and the Andes, the focal areas of the Spanish empire.

Quechua is no exception. A family of closely related languages and dialects, it is more widely spoken today than any other comparable Amerindian group—there are an estimated eight to ten million Quechua speakers, living mostly in Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru.¹ Quechua is also heavily
stigmatized, and most of these speakers are either subsistence farmers or rural immigrants in the cities who have little choice but to rapidly discard it for the dominant language, Spanish. Its role as a medium of written communication ranges from very limited to nil. The subjugated condition of Quechua is starkest in Peru, which of the three Andean nations concentrates the largest number of speakers and the greatest variety of forms of Quechua (cf. Mannheim 1991: 80–109). In short, Quechua is the language of the poor and marginal in a poor and marginal part of the world. In the aftermath of the conquest, however, it was of strategic importance for Spanish imperial interests, being widely spoken in an area characterized by immense mineral wealth (primarily silver) and a dense, sedentary native population that had been administratively unified under the Inca empire.

Accordingly, Quechua became the prime object of language study and translation in Spanish South America, particularly during the heyday of official interest in vernacular projects, which stretched from the mid-sixteenth to the mid-seventeenth century. About a dozen volumes featuring Quechua sermons, catechisms, prayers, hymns, and other genres are known to have survived from this period, all written by Spanish priests for use in Indian parishes. The church’s efforts did not, however, accommodate the internal diversity of the Quechua language family. The corpus comes in its entirety from what is now highland and coastal Peru, and is not fully representative of the diversity even of this area—instead, description, codification, and translation focused overwhelmingly on the Quechua of the southern highlands, particularly a written standard based on the variety of Cuzco, the Inca capital.

The Christian literature in Quechua is little known even among specialists in the colonial Andes. Scholars of Quechua have traditionally used Christian texts mostly as linguistic witnesses—it is only in the past decade or so that Quechuists such as Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino (1997), César Itier (1995a, 1995b), Bruce Mannheim (1998a, 2002), and Gerald Taylor (2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2003) have begun to approach them as objects of study in their own right. At the same time, historians of Christianity in the Andes, especially Juan Carlos Estenssoro Fuchs (2003) and Sabine MacCormack (1985, 1994), have been paying serious attention to the Quechua texts written by the Peruvian clergy. However, the two fields of research have remained separate, and the formal characteristics of the extant literature have not been explored systematically in relation to the historical con-
texts that produced them. Much the same could be said of research on other parts of the Spanish empire, not to mention early-modern missionary enterprises in general. Even the rich historical and anthropological literature on Christian conversion in Africa and South Asia in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries rarely places linguistic and textual practices at center stage.

This book seeks to help fill these gaps by telling the story of how the church in Peru developed and promoted what I call pastoral Quechua—the Christian "language" or register in Quechua. I prefer this label to more obvious ones such as "missionary Quechua" because the overwhelming bulk of the corpus was intended for use in fully organized parishes in areas that had been under Christian control for generations. I examine the extant texts as instances of systematic efforts to "incarnate" Christianity in Quechua, and explore how Spanish colonial ideologies and strategies are reflected in their ways of rendering Christian categories and terms, in their dialectology, and in their use of poetic resources. Conversely, I ask what these apparent minutiae contributed to the construction of an Andean Christianity and of certain types of relationships between Spaniards and Indians in Peru. While I speak of "pastoral Quechua" in the singular, much of my research has been directed at charting diversity and change at different levels—e.g., in the Christian terminology employed—and at tying them to splits and shifts within the church and the colonial regime as a whole. The tightness of the relation between even the most minute formal characteristics of a text and broad historical processes is most apparent when one focuses on variation and its motives. In particular, I examine variability in the pastoral Quechua corpus in relation to an orthodox standard established via a set of official catechetical texts published by the Third Lima Council (1582–83), which have left a lasting imprint on Christian discourse in Quechua up to the present day.

This book is based on the assumption, which I hope to demonstrate, that the pastoral Quechua literature carries implications that go far beyond the strictly linguistic or philological. Christian writing in Quechua was one of the front lines of Spanish colonialism in the Andes, an activity in which Spanish aims and intentions were confronted in very direct and precise ways with the language and culture of conquered peoples. Pastoral Quechua texts are strategic witnesses to colonial interactions and power relations because they enacted them—they are not post facto commentaries or rationalizations. Key issues in the study of colonialism, such as religious...
hybridity or syncretism, are analyzable with an empirical precision in these texts that is not often possible in other kinds of sources. I will attempt to show that the pastoral Quechua literature not only is illuminated by its historical contexts, but in turn illuminates them and even contributed towards their construction.

Some comment on the terms “language” and “translation” may help to further explain my approach. Beyond the generic, deindividuated sense of “language” as the activity of verbal communication in general, two basic meanings are involved here: “language” in the ordinary sense of a linguistic variety, as when one speaks of Italian or Japanese as “languages” (the default meaning); and “language” in the sense of a register or mode of expression associated with a specific practice, profession, institution, discipline, ideology, etc., as when one speaks of “legal language” or the “language of scholasticism.” In Mikhail Bakhtin’s words, the first is “[language] in the sense of a system of elementary forms (linguistic symbols) guaranteeing a minimum level of comprehension in practical communication” and the second “[language] conceived as ideologically saturated, language as a world view, even as a concrete opinion, insuring a maximum of mutual understanding in all the spheres of ideological life” (Bakhtin 1981: 271). While in Spanish the two are conveniently distinguished as lengua and lenguaje, respectively, there is unfortunately no such lexical distinction in English.

A “language” in the second of the two senses is a heterogeneous “bundle” of different elements: styles, vocabularies, and tropes; textual genres and media; performance conventions and contexts; as well as a discursive and ideological order (sets of topics, modes of argumentation, etc.). Languages in the first sense are certainly more characterizable entities—their basic structural workings can be defined with some precision at levels such as grammar and phonology. However, identifying them and discerning their boundaries is not as straightforward as may appear. Languages tend to exist in a continuum of variation where it is hard to say where one begins and the other ends. The study of linguistic variation is one of the least developed branches of linguistics—that of synchronic (geographical or social) as opposed to historical variation is known as “dialectology,” a term that is something of a misnomer as it presumes clear boundaries between languages. In practice, the ways in which people distinguish, classify, and hierarchize linguistic varieties has little to do with their structural characteristics, and everything to do with the groups that speak them.
and how they in turn are perceived—a point expressed in the well-worn adage “a language is a dialect with an army and a navy” (cf. Irvine and Gal 2000).

Quechua provides an excellent example of the problems involved in identifying and discerning “languages” in the first of the two senses outlined above; even though there is very limited or no intelligibility between some varieties, it is popularly regarded as a single language—a fact reflected in the absence of names for different varieties other than the purely geographical designations used by linguists. This perception results from the fact that for over four hundred years Spanish has been the dominant language throughout the Andes, and from a lack of correspondence between important divisions within the Quechua language family and political units. On the other hand, these same facts have meant that homogeneous, clearly bounded varieties have not developed, as happened with many European languages due to nation-state formation. One of the central questions of this book is how the Spanish perceived and dealt with the diversity presented by “Quechua,” a question examined both through what they had to say on the subject and through the dialectology of the Quechua texts they wrote.

Only a small fraction of the pastoral Quechua corpus consists of direct translations of canonical texts. Rendering such texts into any vernacular language was a highly restricted activity in the Catholic church during the period of this study. More commonly, an ad-hoc Spanish text would be written specifically for translation—often fairly loose translation—into Quechua. Many texts were originally composed in Quechua. It might seem, then, that “translation” is not the best label for the activity studied here. However, if translation is approached as a program, practice, or set of norms rather than as a singular act of transference (cf. Hermans 2002), it makes little difference whether a given text is a direct translation or has more generic models. Even those texts that were originally composed in Quechua followed European genre conventions very closely, as well as striving to reproduce Christian discourses. A broader definition of translation that takes this issue into account can be formulated more or less as follows: translation is the process of recreating a “language” (in the second of the two senses) in a new linguistic variety (“language” in the first sense).5

This focus on translation as a process of transposing a “language” rather than a set of individual texts seems particularly appropriate to
pastoral Quechua. Since few canonical texts were translated, and a policy was soon established not to allow variant translations of key texts such as the basic prayers, questions concerning text-to-text relations, such as the literal-versus-free translation paradigm, never became very prominent. Instead, debate and disagreement focused on how to render key terms, on stylistic issues, and on the appropriateness of different varieties of Quechua as Christian media. Perhaps unexpectedly, the reader will not find in this book much in the way of one-to-one comparison of originals and translations, or, to use the translation studies terminology, “source” texts and “target” texts. Far more attention is paid to relations among translations (or target texts). As translation theorist Theo Hermans points out, “[a] ll translations bounce off existing translations.” In other words, translation “gestures not just to a given source text but just as much, obediently or defiantly, to prevailing norms and modes of translating” (2002: 15, 16), a principle that is amply illustrated in this book.

The purpose of my research has been to develop a holistic understanding of Christian translation into Quechua as a practice extending both before and beyond the establishment of a written text. This involves different levels of analysis. A first level concerns the identification of the appropriate linguistic variety to be used—as will be seen, the church required the use of a single, standard variety which had to be selected and, to some extent, created. A further level of translation practice involves the role or scope of Quechua as a Christian medium in relation to Latin and Spanish—the question of what particular texts, genres, and styles of religious speech were to be reproduced in Quechua. Such questions logically precede more obvious issues in translation practice, also studied here, such as the development of lexical forms to play the role of “untranslatable” Christian terms such as “God,” “church,” “baptism,” etc. Particular attention is paid to terminological disagreements, as they were tied to one of the key ideological rifts that developed within the church in Peru—the degree to which an author-translator was open to using existing religious vocabulary depended on his evaluation of pre-conquest religion as a whole and its relationship to Christianity. The role Andean religious terms and categories were given in pastoral Quechua is a central question for this book. Finally, the analysis extends to the issues of transmission and (intended) reception via liturgical and catechetical performances in the Indian parishes, the question being how various levels of context were supplied for texts that now reach us as isolated fragments. The issue of
contextualization—how the church sought to control perceptions of and interactions with the pastoral texts—was of particular importance because of the radical differences between source and target cultures.

The fact that this study combines close analysis of a corpus of texts with an examination of their broad historical contexts has made it difficult to organize into a neat series of thematically or chronologically defined chapters. Instead, I have chosen to divide it into two qualitatively distinct parts preceded by a background chapter. Part I (chapters 2–5) provides a narrative history of the pastoral literature in Quechua and, more broadly, of the pastoral regime in the Andes. Discussion of the language of the texts is kept to a minimum in these chapters, which focus on presenting the literature in its broad outlines and institutional and ideological contexts, while also detailing the particular histories of texts and authors. Part II consists of four chapters dealing directly with the pastoral literature in its linguistic, textual, and performative aspects. This structure results in some overlap and repetition, but I have found it to be the most effective way of combining the historical and linguistic/textual themes and information.

Chapter 1 sets the background for the rest of the book, discussing the development of the colonial system in Peru and of Spanish colonial linguistic ideologies and policies, and drawing the outlines of the linguistic landscape of the Andes at the time of the conquest. The next two chapters survey the development of pastoral Quechua and of the pastoral regime in general during a phase of diversity and experimentation in the 1550s and 1560s (chapter 2) and a period of reform and consolidation in the 1570s and 1580s that culminated in the Third Lima Council (chapter 3). Chapter 4 deals with the politics of linguistic selection (i.e., the question of what language[s] to use in missionary and pastoral contexts) and clerical language training from the 1570s up to the middle of the seventeenth century. Chapter 5 doubles back to the 1590s to survey the general development of pastoral Quechua writing in the wake of the Third Lima Council, continuing until a sudden drop around 1650.

The first two chapters of part II provide a synchronic survey of the pastoral Quechua literature in its formal characteristics: chapter 6 deals with grammar, dialectology, and Christian terminology, while chapter 7 discusses the kinds of texts and genres that are present in the corpus and their poetic resources (tropes and textual figures). Chapter 8 focuses on the use of Andean religious categories, images, and motifs in the creation of a deliberately syncretic Catholic-Andean iconography surrounding the
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figures of God, Christ, and Mary that is in evidence in the work of specific author-translators. This chapter examines the types of dialogue between Christian and Andean religious traditions that these author-translators sought to establish. Chapter 9 deals with the issue of contextualization. First, it provides an overall description of the organization of catechesis and liturgy in the Indian parishes in order to determine how and for what purposes specific texts were performed. Second, it discusses the mechanisms that were intended to orient and control the ways in which Indians engaged the texts, focusing on the implicit metalanguages present in performance practices, in the formal organization of the texts, and in certain aspects of Quechua grammar.

The only portions of the book that may be difficult to read without some knowledge of Quechua and/or descriptive linguistics are parts of chapter 6 and the final section of chapter 9. Readers interested in following the details of the arguments made there can consult Bruce Mannheim’s *The Language of the Inka Since the European Invasion* (1991)—which apart from its other contributions has very useful appendices clarifying technical issues—and the sections on Quechua in Willem Adelaar and Pieter Muysken’s *The Languages of the Andes* (2004). The standard reference work in Spanish is Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino’s exhaustive *Lingüística quechua* (1987). These books provide in-depth treatment of topics in Quechua grammar, phonology, dialectology, and historical linguistics that are only mentioned here in passing.

**Themes**

This book draws on a variety of distinct traditions of scholarship without fitting squarely into any particular one. Although it is, most obviously, a piece of historical research, it began as a dissertation in sociocultural anthropology and is especially indebted to themes and concepts from linguistic anthropology. My hope is that it will appeal to all those interested in colonialism, religious conversion, and the language-society relation in historical perspective. As a way of situating the book in broader frames of reference, I highlight three interdisciplinary areas of research that are of special relevance to it: (1) the social history of language, (2) translation studies, and (3) the history/anthropology of religious accommodation and syncretism.
The Social History of Language

The “new cultural history”—the historiography focused on the production of meaning as the basis of social life that developed in the 1980s—is often identified with a “linguistic turn” (cf. Eley 2005). However, the expression is a misleading one in that this historiography has paid very limited attention to language in the first of the two senses outlined above. Hence the importance of the calls by Peter Burke (1993, 2004), a cultural historian of early modern Europe, for a “social history of language” drawing on linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics to study the relations between historical processes and the development, distribution, and use of languages.

As the orientation of Burke’s surveys suggests, a (or perhaps the) central task for a social history of language is the study of linguistic perceptions and policies and their relation to actual language use. The most prominent examples of this sort of research concern the relation between nationalism and processes of linguistic standardization, unification, and purification in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (e.g., Anderson 1991 [1983]). However, all societies are linguistically diverse, and no society is indifferent to this diversity: all interpret and manage it in particular ways. There may be disagreement regarding when one can speak of outright language planning, but it is clear that explicit linguistic debates and policies can be found much earlier than the nineteenth century—in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe and its overseas colonies, for instance. They are not necessarily located in the state or based on political programs—all sorts of historical processes and institutions involve the question della lingua in some form (see Bloomer ed. 2004). In the early modern context, religious schism and reform come to mind immediately. Not only is the management of linguistic diversity an important historical practice in its own right, it also reflects and mediates a variety of other domains.

The social history of language has much in common with the study of language ideologies, a growing field in linguistic anthropology (cf. Kroskrity ed. 2000; Schieffelin, Woolard, and Kroskrity eds. 1998). The concept of language ideology refers to largely implicit, socially held understandings of the nature and appropriate use of language in general, and, differentially, of particular languages. It involves the ways in which
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languages are classified, hierarchized, and related to social groups. The notion that there is, or should be, a correspondence or isomorphism between nation-state and language is an example of a particularly pervasive modern linguistic ideology. A related but much older linguistic-ideological notion holds that the essential characteristics of groups of people (e.g., civility, barbarism) are reflected in the languages they speak; in this sense, Judith Irvine and Susan Gal speak of “iconicity” as one of a set of widespread cognitive or semiotic procedures in the classification and valorization of languages (Irvine and Gal 2000).

The agenda of a social history of language is especially relevant to colonial contexts, where linguistic differences are unusually prominent and laden with inequalities. Translation practice would also seem to be a particularly fruitful field for its application, especially for the opportunities it presents to combine the study of linguistic policies and ideologies with that of actual language use. As a form of language use necessarily involving at least two different languages, translation is a uniquely deliberate and pregnant one. This is particularly the case with large-scale translation programs between previously separate cultural traditions. The many choices translators must make in such cases, starting with which particular linguistic variety to use and what texts or genres to translate, are determined by often tacit understandings and policies regarding the relative status and potentials of the languages and cultures involved. Once enshrined in actual texts and performances, these choices in turn serve to consolidate, reproduce, and naturalize such understandings and policies.

Translation

The historical study of translation has been going on independently for some time within translation studies, a discipline that has grown under the aegis of modern language departments. Translation studies is distinguished from the vast, primarily applied literature on translation by its concern for the contexts and effects of historical translation activities. One prominent line that developed in the early stages of translation studies during the 1970s and 1980s sought to monitor the roles that translated literatures assume in the “literary systems” of target languages and cultures, and to establish fixed correlations between variations in the organization of such literary systems and translation practices (e.g., Toury 1995; cf. Gentzler
This literature made an important break with a previous reductionist focus on the relation between source text and target text, and emphasized the need to study translation in terms of broad programs involving entire literatures rather than isolated texts. The earlier concern with fidelity and appropriateness was tempered in light of evidence that the norms that define what is faithful and what is appropriate vary historically and culturally. At the same time, however, much of this literature was marred by an excessively typological and rule-bound focus.

Under the influence of poststructuralism and postcolonialism in the 1980s and 1990s, translation studies developed a heightened sensitivity to the political implications of translation activity. In particular, postcolonial translation studies has dealt with the issues involved in translation between Third World/colonized languages and First World/colonialist languages. Very much in line with the postmodern critique in anthropology, postcolonial translation scholars have essentially been concerned with understanding and counteracting the power effects underlying translation from colonized into colonialist languages. Translation is understood as an instrument of cultural representation and control that reaffirms colonial preconceptions and stereotypes of the Other, and neutralizes and domesticates foreign cultures (cf. Basnett and Trivedi eds. 1999; Simon and St-Pierre eds. 2000; and Tymoczko and Gentzler eds. 2002).

The reader will quickly notice, however, that the translation studies literature does not figure prominently in this book. With some exceptions, I have not found translation studies theory particularly applicable to the issues surrounding pastoral Quechua. First of all, translation studies has focused on literary translation, with very limited attention to religious languages, whose translation presents unique problems. Religious traditions of the dogmatic, revealed type tend to impose strict limits on the translation of canonical texts in order to guarantee the role of ritual specialists as well as the distinctive, sacral character of the texts themselves. Similar limitations apply at the level of religious terminology, such as terms for deities and institutions; translators often prefer to leave them untouched by introducing them as loan words instead of searching for a risky equivalent in the target language and culture. Religious translation programs usually involve a tension between the need to translate in order to fulfill missionary or pastoral mandates and the fear that translation will lead to corruption and betrayal, and such tensions have not been dealt with systematically in translation studies.
A second problem is that translation studies has focused overwhelmingly on translations carried out by members of the target culture—i.e., translators who translate foreign works into their native language, as is usually the case in literary translation. This could be called “endogenous translation” in opposition to “exogenous translation,” where the translators are members of the source culture and seek to introduce their own texts and textual traditions into a foreign language and culture. There are, of course, many instances where the distinction does not apply—e.g., if the translator is bi- or multicultural, or if the source and target languages share a common sociocultural context. Often enough, however, translation activities are quite clearly classifiable as either endogenous or exogenous, particularly in the increasingly monolingual modern world and, historically, in colonial contexts. It could be suggested that “internal” translators have a tendency to produce translations that maximize continuity with the traditions of the target language, whereas “external” ones are more likely to emphasize fidelity to the source language and produce translations that involve greater transformations of target norms. This may not always be the case—indeed, the opposite could occur—but whenever the endogenous-exogenous distinction is applicable, it would seem to have major consequences for what is translated and how.

Even though it is clear that a substantial portion of all historical translation activity has been of the exogenous variety, translation studies have focused so overwhelmingly on endogenous translation that the terms “source text” and “foreign text” have become virtually synonymous. A similar slant is apparent in anthropology: when anthropologists deal with translation, they tend to do so in the reflexive mode—it is their own endogenous acts of translation with which they are concerned. Little if any attention is given to the exogenous acts of translation carried out by anthropologists, as when they have to explain themselves and their research projects to their hosts. As a product of translation that is both religious and exogenous, pastoral Quechua belongs to a class of less-studied translation programs and it is a very large and historically important class. It thus has the potential to modify or broaden understandings of how translation works, and to what effect.

**Accommodation and Syncretism**

Whether the author-translators wanted it or not, the story of pastoral Quechua is one of contact and interaction between religious and cultural
Christian conversion strategies have historically involved forms of religious adaptation or accommodation whose modern expression (post–Second Vatican Council) is inculturation theology, which proclaims the need for Christianity to be expressed through the values, ideologies, and symbols of particular cultures. Accommodation is a two-way street: Christianity is adapted to a specific cultural context, but local categories and forms are themselves radically transformed through contact with Christianity. Translation is, of course, a key aspect of accommodation, but should not be identified with it too closely—accommodation does not necessarily involve translation, and, as will be seen, translation is not necessarily accommodationist.

How far the give-and-take of accommodation can be allowed to go before essential elements of Christianity are lost or corrupted has been a highly controversial issue for the Catholic Church up to the present day. The forms, extent, and purposes of accommodation have varied widely. The main canonical locus is in Gregory the Great’s instructions for Augustine of Canterbury in 601, advising that the pagan temples of Anglo-Saxon England be adapted for use as churches and that the practice of slaughtering cattle in their festivities be allowed to continue on Christian feastdays. Accommodation appears here as an expediency to make the transition to Christianity less abrupt—certain aspects of the local religion are assimilated into Christianity not because they are judged to have any intrinsic value, but because they are judged harmless or regarded as lesser evils. Modern inculturation theology contemplates more profound and radical forms of adaptation grounded in a valorization of cultural diversity and a belief that all cultures are in essence compatible with Christianity (e.g., Shorter 1988). Even in the absence of modern ideologies of multiculturalism or cultural relativism, accommodation programs in the past have also been inspired, and justified, by a belief in the presence of the “seeds of the faith” in the culture being evangelized.

On the broad stage of early modern Catholic expansion overseas, the Spanish church in Peru does not stand out for the boldness of its accommodationist practices. In the contemporary mission fields of India and China, accommodation was taken to lengths that caused open conflict within the church. During the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Jesuit missionaries carried out systematic modifications of the liturgy in order to accommodate native social norms and sensibilities, resulting in
the prolonged Chinese and Malabar (Tamil) Rites controversies, which were eventually resolved in favor of orthodoxy by papal commissions (Catholic Encyclopedia, “Malabar rites” and “Matteo Ricci,” cf. Županov 1999). Jesuits throughout South and East Asia dressed, acted, and to some extent lived like natives, something which would have been inconceivable in the Andes. In Peru, as elsewhere in the Americas, the need for accommodation was obviated by full military conquest and the destruction of native political and religious institutions. The viability of accommodation was compromised by the fact that the most influential Spanish commentators, such as the Jesuit José de Acosta, saw major shortcomings and deficiencies in Andean society and culture. For all their achievements, the Incas were thought to be very far from attaining the same level of civility and rationality as the Chinese and Japanese, which meant that their customs were less compatible with natural and divine law (cf. Pagden 1986).

Missionary and pastoral practices in the Americas were thus characterized more by a tabula rasa or “clean slate” approach than by accommodation, and this is very much apparent in the development of pastoral Quechua. One might object that translation is itself an act of accommodation, but it can be carried out in ways that minimize interaction between Christianity and the religious traditions associated with the target language. A recent (2001) post-inculturationist Vatican instruction on liturgical translation advises that key terms be “translated” with loan words and neologisms instead of the native categories that most seem to approximate them, even if the result is initially unfamiliar (not to say unintelligible) for the target audience. This approach is apparent even in the way Latin was adopted as the language of Western Christianity in the fourth century—the translators of the liturgy made heavy use of Greek loan words and Latin neologisms that became a permanent part of the Latin of the Catholic Church, while existing Latin terms which were fairly close equivalents of the Greek terms were often excluded precisely because they were religious terms and thus carried the danger of “contamination” from pagan associations (Mohrmann 1957: 54–55).

Similar principles were applied in the development of the standard or canonical forms of pastoral Quechua, especially as represented in the catechetical volumes of the Third Lima Council. However, the scholarship on the early church in Peru has shown that there were ongoing debates regarding the compatibility of Andean religious traditions with Christianity that
had direct consequences for missionary and pastoral practices, including translation (Estenssoro Fuchs 2003; MacCormack 1985, 1991, 1994). A few author-translators engaged in often daring accommodationist practices, deliberately, if implicitly, provoking identifications between Christian and Andean religious entities and categories through the use of key terms and motifs. A central concern of this book is thus to distinguish the more from the less accommodationist translation programs, and to work out their contrasting motivations and implications.

The topic of missionary accommodation can be considered a subset of the study of syncretism, even if the term is a controversial one. From a missiological point of view, syncretism is accommodation or inculturation run amok—religious traditions are merged to the point where essential features of the Christian message are lost. The term is also unpopular in academic discourse, particularly in anthropology, where it is felt that it presumes the existence of pure, uncontaminated cultural traditions and forms that can be distinguished from syncretic ones. Notwithstanding these reservations, there have been calls for an anthropology of syncretism that would be “concerned with competing discourses over mixture,” or “metasyncretic” discourses—in other words, “the commentary, and registered perceptions of actors as to whether almagamation has occurred and whether this is good or bad” (Stewart 1999: 58, cf. Stewart and Shaw 1994). One thus avoids the problem of determining whether a specific form is syncretic or not (just about anything can be considered syncretic from one perspective or another), to focus instead on syncretism as a category guiding the production and interpretation of texts (broadly understood), even if the term itself is not employed and there is no explicit discussion of the subject.

Accommodation can be considered a key “metasyncretic discourse,” one that deliberately produces syncretism instead of merely commenting on it. It is not a fruitless exercise to distinguish “the native” from “the Christian” in, say, the imagery of a Quechua hymn when it is apparent that it was written (and perhaps meant to be interpreted) in precisely these terms. The author-translators certainly worked with such oppositions in mind, and some attempted to bridge them in very precise and deliberate ways. Exactly how and why they did so is an issue of some importance from the perspective both of the cultural politics of colonialism and of Andean cultural history in general (see especially chapter 8).
Scope

This is a book about Spanish colonial uses of Quechua. The issue of native response is not dealt with directly—it is addressed only from the perspective of the clerical authors, whose translation practices were naturally oriented by their understandings of audience response. My decision to limit the book's scope in this respect stems both from the belief that native response is a distinct (though not separate) topic requiring full treatment in its own right, and from the fragmentary nature of the relevant sources. A first place to look for native reactions to, or reinterpretations of, Christian discourse would be in Christian texts of native authorship. However, pastoral Quechua is the product of an overwhelmingly exogenous translation program: the extant texts are almost all, as far as one can tell, the work of priests, and Indians were excluded from the priesthood. Most of these priests were criollos, Spaniards born in Peru who were often native speakers of Quechua. We know a few of them to have been mestizos, but mestizos who were raised and educated in Spanish contexts. It is possible that some of the author-translators worked closely with native collaborators, but there are almost no references to such collaboration. In general, very few Quechua texts of native authorship have survived, in contrast to the wealth of sources available to Mesoamericanists. Nor is there much in the way of archival sources that might bear testimony to indigenous responses. Although there are abundant references to indigenous appropriations of Christian images, sacraments, and institutions in the “extirpation of idolatries” trials, which were directed at eradicating the clandestine practice of native cults (see Mills 1997), the appropriation of Christian language is not so well documented.

Similarly, the broader question of how pastoral Quechua impacted Andean culture and society in the short and long term is only dealt with tangentially. Frank Salomon has pointed to issues such as the effects of the introduction of a standardized, written form of Quechua on the development of indigenous discourses and forms of historical memory (1994: 231). The literature on colonial indigenous writing has often made note of the very prominent influence of pastoral language (e.g., Adorno 1986; Duviois 1995; Itier 1993 and 2005; Salomon 1991), although it has sometimes been hampered by the lack of a more precise understanding of the characteristics and development of the pastoral literature in Quechua. One of the purposes of this book is to aid future research in these directions.
The chronological and geographical limits of this study are fairly clear-cut. I use 1550 as a symbolic date for the period when a missionary/pastoral regime first began to develop in a more or less centralized and systematic way after the upheaval that followed on the conquest in 1532. Furthermore, the oldest extant pastoral Quechua texts date to around 1550 (see chapter 2). For reasons which will be discussed in chapter 5, the colonial regime all but abandoned its vernacular project around the middle of the seventeenth century, when there was a dramatic decline in the production of new pastoral Quechua texts. The 1550–1650 period can be considered both formative and classical in relation to the late colonial and republican production. The standard established by the Third Lima Council for basic Christian terms and expressions has remained stable, as have its translations of the basic prayers, which are still used universally, if with the appropriate dialectal modifications. Later authors of Christian texts come nowhere near Luis Jerónimo de Oré, Juan Pérez Bocanegra, Francisco de Avila, and other writers of this period in the extent and sophistication of their writings. Above all, their texts stand out because they were the product of a large-scale translation program that for a time involved the entire colonial establishment. By comparison, subsequent efforts have been limited and derivative.

Defining my geographical area of research as “Peru” is, of course, an anachronism, but the southern and northern frontiers of the modern nation-state (the Peru-Chile frontier at Tacna excepted) roughly approximate important colonial jurisdictions within the Viceroyalty of Peru (i.e., Spanish South America)—in particular the audiencia of Lima. I concentrate on the coastal and highland areas of what is now central and southern Peru—the archdiocese of Lima and the dioceses of Cuzco, Huamanga (modern Ayacucho), and (to a lesser degree) Arequipa as they existed in the seventeenth century. Of the thirteen individuals we know to have authored or translated important extant works, only two were from Spain, and they spent their careers in Peru. The rest were all natives of Spanish towns in Peru, with the exception of Pablo de Prado, a Jesuit from La Paz, and he seems to have spent all of his adult life in Peru. Most of the published works were printed in Lima, and all seem to have been written in Peru.

I have not dealt systematically with the colonial diocese of Trujillo (now northern Peru), which was subject to the archdiocese of Lima and contained Quechua-speaking populations. This is because no pastoral Quechua texts can be linked to this area, which was characterized by a
significant presence of non-Quechua languages such as Mochica and Culli. Similarly, my decision not to deal at all with Bolivia (colonial Charcas) and Ecuador (colonial Quito) reflects the absence of relevant texts from these areas. They were also distinct jurisdictionally from what is now Peru—in the seventeenth century Charcas was a separate archdiocese and audiencia, while Quito, the seat of a separate audiencia, was subject ecclesiastically to an archdiocese based in Bogotá. There can be little doubt that many of the Quechua texts studied here were also employed in the parishes of Bolivia and Ecuador, but I have not researched this topic myself and there is not much in the way of a relevant secondary literature to work from. It should be a priority of future historical research on Quechua language and culture to work across the modern and colonial boundaries.

Sources

The pastoral Quechua corpus is modest in size compared to equivalent literatures in some of the other major vernacular languages of the Spanish empire—the corpus of pastoral texts in Nahuatl, for instance, is several times larger. For precisely this reason, the Quechua material is susceptible to study within the frame of a single research project. I am not, of course, claiming to have dealt thoroughly with the entire corpus—in particular, I have paid much closer attention to texts intended for public or private performance by Indians, such as prayers and hymns, than to sermons, which quantitatively make up the bulk of the corpus. However, addressing the questions outlined above to all of the known extant works has been essential both for contextualizing individual translation programs and for discerning the full range of variation in the literature.

A broad distinction between catechetical and liturgical genres may be useful to introduce the reader to the types of texts I address. While catechesis is a pedagogical activity, the liturgy brings participants directly into relation with God and the saints (see Stapper 1935 [1931] for a survey of the Catholic liturgy and its history). In its strict sense, the term “liturgy” refers to the official public services of the mass, canonical hours, and sacraments, but I will be using it somewhat more broadly to include formal and regular acts of public worship in general. The liturgy is usually distinguished from the private devotions (such as the rosary, which is performed on an individual basis), which can be considered a third category of texts,
although they are patterned on the liturgy. One of the key differences between catechetical and liturgical texts is that the former by definition tend to be translatable, whereas the translation of liturgical texts (in particular those that are specific to the mass, canonical hours, and sacraments) is problematic. The catechesis/liturgy distinction is not a hard-and-fast one, however—individual texts can serve both catechetical and liturgical purposes depending on the performance context.

Catechetical and liturgical genres and practices were not entirely stable throughout the period of this study, the early part of which straddles the transformations of the Counter-Reformation or Catholic Reformation. Nonetheless, certain generalizations can be made about Spanish colonial practice. The fundamentals for catechetical instruction were provided by brief compilations of basic canonical texts that were intended for memorization and generally included the basic prayers (the Pater Noster, Credo, Ave Maria, and Salve Regina), the Articles of the Faith, and the Ten Commandments. These compilations were known as cartillas and often doubled as basic literacy primers. The cartillas, also called doctrinas cristianas, were complemented by catechisms—concise and systematic expositions of basic doctrines and texts in question-answer format. Like the cartillas, catechisms were intended for memorization, or in any case for repetitive recitation. The book genre commonly referred to as the “catechism” typically contained a cartilla and one or more catechisms proper. Another key catechetical text was the sermon, to which the laity were intended to have a primarily passive relation. Sermons were often published in book-length compilations or sermonarios, of which there were two main types: the thematic sermonario, which was organized on a doctrinal basis, and the liturgical sermonario, in which each sermon was intended to be read on a specific date of the liturgical calendar and contained a paraphrase of, and commentary on, the Gospel passage read in that day’s mass. While the Quechua cartillas consisted of translations of canonical texts, most Quechua catechisms and sermons were translations of Spanish texts composed in Peru for Indian audiences.

The formal Catholic liturgy is contained in three main books: the missal (for the mass), the ritual (for the administration of the sacraments), and the breviary (for the canonical hours). All three books were undergoing a process of standardization in the aftermath of the Council of Trent, but there was still a considerable amount of variability in their content and organization. The archdioceses of Toledo and Seville, for instance, each
had their own rituals, which were also used throughout Spanish America and were only gradually superseded by the Tridentine Roman Ritual. Neither the mass nor the canonical hours were translated into Quechua systematically, and although there were Peruvian rituals, they only provided Quechua versions of some of the sacramental texts. Rituals often contained a confesionario, a list of questions to be asked by the priest in confession. Peruvian confesionarios often went into extraordinary detail in their typification of the sins most commonly committed by native Andeans. In addition to translating fragments of the official liturgy, the author-translators also wrote a variety of new Quechua texts of a liturgical or devotional character, in particular hymns, litanies, and prayers. Pastoral Quechua books often combined liturgical and sacramental texts—for instance, Juan Pérez Bocanegra's well-known Ritual formulario (Brief Ritual) of 1631 contains catechisms and a collection of prayers and hymns as well as a ritual proper. The proportion of Quechua text in these books ranges from under 10 percent to slightly under half. The preliminary texts, headings, indexes, and the like are always in Spanish, and the Quechua texts are usually accompanied by Spanish versions.

The Quechua grammars and dictionaries, while not an object of study in themselves, have been taken into account as supplements to the main source base of pastoral texts. Apart from the short pastoral texts that many of them contain, these linguistic works are important because they were written as aids for priests who would be using Quechua in pastoral contexts, and they directly complement the pastoral literature per se. While no linguistic work can be regarded as a neutral description of a language, these grammars and dictionaries are perhaps more clearly programmatic than is usually the case, in that they were instruments for defining the “correct” Quechua for pastoral use at dialectal, orthographic, and terminological levels. Some of the most important author-translators also wrote grammars and dictionaries (which unfortunately have been lost), and it is clear that the extant grammars and dictionaries are part and parcel of specific translation programs.

I have not studied the five extant colonial Quechua plays as examples of pastoral Quechua, although four of them, El hijo pródigo, El robo de Proserpina y sueño de Endimión, El pobre más rico, and Usca Pucar, are examples of a tradition of vernacular religious drama that developed in Cuzco during the seventeenth century (the first two plays are autos sacramentales that were probably performed as part of the Corpus Christi celebrations).
sion is partly for chronological reasons, since the earliest of these four plays date to the very end of the period of this study, if at all. Moreover, these plays are, strictly speaking, neither catechetical nor liturgical in nature. César Itier has argued that religious plays such as El pobre más rico and Usca Paucar are not instances of a teatro de evangelización and should be seen instead as moral exhortations directed at audiences that were considered to already have a solid Christian background (Itier 1995c). It has also been suggested that the intended audience was not “Indian” at all, and that the plays were composed by and for the bilingual criollo elite of Cuzco, which would have cultivated Quechua literature as part of an identity politics (Mannheim 1991: 70–74).

The dozen volumes of pastoral works that have been analyzed are the remains of a much larger literature. I have had access to all of the known printed books from this period, but there are references to numerous works that were never published and of which no manuscript copies are known to have survived. In fact, only two pastoral Quechua manuscripts from the period of this study are known to scholars today (D. Molina [1649] and Castromonte [ca. 1650]; for the latter, see also Durston 2002). The loss of a significant portion of the original literature creates obstacles for defining change and variability and interpreting the features of specific texts. It seems likely that the lost manuscript literature was more diverse than the printed literature because it was not subject to the approval process necessary for publishing a book. Furthermore, among the missing manuscripts are important early works, without which it is difficult to get a clear picture of the initial development of pastoral Quechua. Equally problematic is the uneven chronological distribution of the different genres. For instance, most of the liturgical literature dates from what I call the postcouncil period (ca. 1590–1640), but none of the sermonarios written during this time have survived. This makes charting chronological changes in translation practices more difficult, because genre-for-genre comparisons across different periods cannot always be made. I have attempted to navigate these gaps in different ways. To begin with, they are often significant in themselves. The unequal distribution of genres reflects changing understandings of what needed to be available in Quechua. Even when we know that a specific gap is due to problems of conservation, some significance can still be attributed to it—conservation is very much a function of printing, and which texts made it to the presses was not a matter
of chance. Most importantly, my analysis of what the extant texts tell us in terms of general tendencies and changes in translation practices is always correlated with political, ideological, and institutional developments that are documented elsewhere.

Four main types of Spanish-language texts have provided information on the broader contexts of pastoral Quechua, on performance practices, and on the individual histories of texts and authors: (1) chronicles and treatises, (2) letters and reports, (3) legislation, and (4) administrative documents. The chronicles of the Incas and the Spanish conquest, as well as those of the religious orders, contain scattered but often valuable information on missionary and pastoral practices, though it is extremely rare for them to discuss specific texts. Treatises such as José de Acosta’s *De procuranda indorum salute* (On obtaining the salvation of the Indians, 1577), a theoretical work on the conversion of the Indians of Peru, are essential for understanding the ideological currents and interpretations of native languages and cultures that guided translation.

Letters and reports were written by pastoral agents, ranging from parish priests to archbishops, to their superiors. Perhaps the best-known example of this type of document is the missionary letter, a peculiarly Jesuit genre that was produced in great abundance and detail during this period. These reports were collected and anthologized in the *cartas anuales*, which were sent to the Jesuit leadership in Rome on a yearly basis. While the secular and mendicant clergy did not write regular pastoral reports, their superiors (bishops and provincials) did correspond with each other and with the crown. Legislation relevant to the development of pastoral Quechua is concentrated in the Peruvian councils and synods. However, as a result of the *patronato real* arrangement that gave the crown control over the secular church in the Indies, royal legislation is also of relevance, as are the letters and reports sent by viceroys and other royal officials to Spain.

The administrative category comprises documents produced in the day-to-day running of the parishes, including the parish priests’ titles and certificates of language competence, various sorts of litigation (often initiated by Indian parishioners against their priests), and administrative inspections (*visitas*) carried out on behalf of the bishop. A particularly important administrative genre is the *información de oficio* (also known as *probanza de méritos*), an extensive biographical file that accompanied petitions for promotion sent to the crown. These files go into great detail and often include transcriptions of earlier texts related to the priest’s activities in
Indian parishes. Administrative documents illuminate the general institutional milieu in which the author-translators, most of whom were parish priests, were trained and worked, as well as the workings of the parishes themselves. They also provide key biographical information on many individual author-translators.

There are major gaps in the serial documentation (letters/reports and administrative documents)—only some periods, areas, and institutions are well represented in the archives. As regards the secular church, the archive of the archdiocese of Lima (AAL) has fairly complete series starting around 1600, and is complemented by the archive of the Lima cathedral chapter (ACML), which contains important sixteenth-century records. However, there are no equivalent series for the dioceses of Cuzco, Huamanga, and Arequipa—important records have been lost, especially in Cuzco, and others remain off-limits to most researchers. Most mendicant archives remain closed, and those that are accessible contain only a tiny fraction of the documentation that the orders must have produced in running their parishes. As for the Jesuit order, few early records remain in Peru as a result of the expulsion in 1767, but an important collection of reports and letters held in different archives, including the famous cartas annuas, has been published in the eight Peruvian volumes of the *Monumenta Missionum* series. Fortunately, the Archivo General de Indias in Seville (AGI), the central archive of the Spanish empire, holds a mass of letters and informaciones de oficio by both secular and regular clergy from every area and period that do much to fill these gaps.

A final methodological issue concerns the paucity and opacity of explicit statements concerning linguistic and translation policies, which often went unremarked or were glossed over in terms of “correct” or “proper” usage. There is a sharp contrast here with the sources available to students of nineteenth- and twentieth-century missionization, both Catholic and Protestant, in Asia and Africa. In the writings of the later missionary translators one often finds an explicit recognition of the fact that they were creating new languages through dialectal standardization and the semantic transformation of the lexicon, as well as discussions that explicitly weigh alternative translation practices and their implications. The contrast can be attributed to basic changes in the perception of language that occurred between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries. Since purely conventional understandings of language had not yet prevailed, the agents studied here seem to have regarded the activity of creating pastoral Quechua
as one of purification and “reduction” to order rather than engineering—Anthony Pagden has remarked on the prevalence among sixteenth-century linguists of Amerindian languages of the belief that they were “restoring” them to a more pristine state (1986: 181). There was also a sense that translation was divinely guaranteed through the authoritative mediation of the church (Rafael 1993 [1988]). Because of these naturalizing assumptions, the concrete strategies and perceptions that guided translation practice have to be teased out through the examination of the Quechua texts themselves and the archival reconstruction of their historical contexts. Both records are incomplete and ambiguous, but they reinforce each other on key points.