In 1527, about five years before the conquest of Peru began in earnest, a small band of Spaniards, sailing southward along the Pacific coast in the vicinity of the equator, captured an indigenous seagoing raft bearing trade goods that included, among other things, emeralds and fine textiles. Described in the Relación Samano-Xerez, a brief report of uncertain authorship, this event gave the Europeans a first glimpse of the riches that fueled the subsequent exploration and conquest of Peru. The account, however, also provides what may well be the earliest European description of Peru’s northernmost coastal settlements, first viewed by Francisco Pizarro and a small group of followers in 1528. Although this text portrays a moment of first encounter, it does not, as one might expect, convey a wonder-filled vision of exoticism and otherness. Instead, it projects an image of a landscape that is startlingly European in nature:

[T]here are many sheep and pigs and cats and dogs and other animals and geese, and there [in the coastal towns] the blankets of cotton and wool that I mentioned above are made, and [also] the needlework and the beads and objects of silver and gold, and the
people are very rational; they appear to have many tools made of copper and other metals with which they work their fields, and they mine gold and practice all kinds of farming; the streets of their settlements are very well laid out; they have many types of fortresses and they live in a state of order and justice; the women are white and well-dressed and almost all of them are embroiderers; there is an island in the sea near the settlements where they have a temple built in the style of a rustic shelter, hung with very fine embroidered cloth, and where they have an image of a woman with a child in her arms and who is called María Mexía.1

This account of Peru’s human geographies may be understood as an exceptionally vivid fantasy of familiarity and, by extension, of possession. Only by making the alien known and by forging connections where none existed, could the incommensurable be comprehended and described, and only by description could this new world be transported to Spain and laid at the monarch’s feet.2 By insisting on the familiarity of the yet-to-be-possessed, the account conveys to its royal recipient an ardent plea for his approval of the conquest of this territory: according to the text, this land and its inhabitants are already almost Spanish, for all the elements of a civilized Castilian existence—including even a foreshadowing of Christian knowledge—are identified.3

This excerpt, belonging to one of the earliest known European descriptions of what was to become Peru, reveals the powerful role that cultural preconceptions, ambitions, and desires played in shaping early Spanish interpretations and representations of the Americas. In terms of shared language, values, and beliefs, the author of the document was, to borrow a phrase from Mignolo, situated in the self-same “locus of enunciation” as his European audience—a cultural positioning that shaped his account at a profound level.4 Clearly, however, those early modern Europeans who ventured to Peru and other parts of the New World did not occupy merely linguistic and cultural spaces, exclusively shared with their companions and compatriots in distant Europe. Rather, they also traveled through real geographical spaces, traversed physical terrain, and interacted in diverse ways with indigenous peoples.

Just as the Spaniards’ perceptions and portrayals of New World landscapes were influenced by their membership in shared cultural com-
Communities and by individual interests, so too, their perceptions were shaped, in sometimes unpredictable ways, by the local contexts in which they found themselves, whether as conquistadors, travelers, or residents. In similar fashion, the construction of colonial geographical knowledge about the Americas depended as much on the local and ever-changing conditions in which it was produced as it did on shared cultural assumptions. The emphasis on change is significant, for the ways in which the New World’s colonial landscapes were perceived, the meanings that were attached to them, and the manner in which they were portrayed were never constant but were subject to ongoing transformation.

Scholarly interest in the geographical knowledge and writings that took shape in the wake of Spain’s conquest of the Americas is by no means a recent phenomenon. It can be traced back to the nineteenth century and earlier, especially in the Spanish-speaking world. Recent years, however, have witnessed a remarkable surge in the publication of studies on colonial Latin America that are concerned more broadly with issues of geography and space. The Columbian quincentenary brought with it a flurry of publications on European visions of the New World in the early years of encounter and exploration. Since then, increasing attention has been paid to the production, use, and representation of colonial (and especially urban) spaces in Spanish America and to the construction of colonial geographical knowledge. Within this growing literature, studies that focus on Peru are not absent. Extensive work exists on Andean concepts of space, territory, and landscape, both prior to and during the colonial era, and on changing post-conquest patterns of landholding and usage. Likewise, a number of scholars have explored the conflicts and differences that emerged between indigenous and Spanish concepts of space and territory, as well as cross-cultural negotiations over territorial control. Others have addressed practices of colonial domination and resistance associated with the creation and use of urban spaces. The geographical dimensions of numerous colonial chronicles, descriptions, and natural histories of Peru have also attracted growing, albeit still limited, scholarly attention.

Colonial negotiations over Peru’s landscapes still remain to be explored more fully, especially where the diversity of Spanish experiences
and portrayals of those landscapes is concerned. It is striking that studies of Spanish visions of Peru, even in the early years of conquest and colonization, are relatively few and far between compared with those that focus on Mexico and the Caribbean—a phenomenon that may be related in part to the lack of wonder that, as Graubart suggests, characterizes many early European accounts of Peru. This book, however, is less concerned with dwelling on expressions of wonder in the fetishized moments of first encounter than it is with drawing attention to the frequently mundane and everyday circumstances that shaped ongoing negotiations over landscape and geographical knowledge in Peru, and that may be traced in documentation that goes well beyond explicitly geographical accounts and descriptions.

In placing landscape and geographical knowledge at the center of the study of early colonial Peru, this book explores some of the ways in which the viceroyalty’s human and physical landscapes and its Amazon frontiers were experienced, portrayed, and negotiated—both physically and discursively—over the course of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, predominantly from within Peru itself, but also from the geographical location of Spain. In particular, it questions the notion of a unified and homogeneous “Spanish geographical imagination” that was straightforwardly opposed to Amerindian understandings and perceptions of landscape. In doing so, it demonstrates how Peru’s landscapes and territories were imbued with meaning by Spaniards and Spanish Americans in diverse, improvisatory, and frequently conflicting ways, and were shaped within shifting networks of power, agency, and interest.

My predominant (but by no means exclusive) emphasis on Spanish and Spanish American experiences and portrayals may appear to go against the grain of much recent scholarship that challenges the marginalization of Amerindian, mestizo, and other groups in colonial society. As Elliott observes, however, our contemporary discovery of the presumed “otherness” of others has embraced the non-European world to the exclusion of the conquerors, colonists, and chroniclers of the sixteenth century; the observers have been accorded a privileged status that has been denied their observers, whose individual voices, reduced to
an unattractive unison, are dismissed as “the hegemonic voices of
the West.” But in reality there are many voices, among the con-
querrors and conquered alike.\textsuperscript{16}

In citing Elliott’s comments, my intentions are emphatically not to
suggest that “the colonizers” should be returned to a privileged location
in historical analysis. On the contrary, this study is propelled by a con-
viction that the adoption of nuanced approaches to the Spaniards’ expe-
riences of landscape and their imaginative geographies can contribute
to dismantling narratives that aggrandize the coherence and power of
European imperialism and perpetuate its binaries. Rather than focus ex-
clusively on dramatic conflicts between Spanish and indigenous groups,
this book explores how knowledge of landscape and geography was ne-
gotiated within colonial networks that frequently confounded clear-cut
oppositions between colonizers and colonized.

Within these networks, as I hope to show, Amerindian groups did
not merely resist the imposition of alien geographical notions but played
an active role in shaping Peru’s colonial geographies, as well as Spanish
experiences and perceptions of its landscapes. As historians have re-
peatedly recognized, Spanish colonialism in the New World was heavily
dependent on the presence of colonial subjects, in practical as well as
ideological terms.\textsuperscript{17} Taking account of how Spanish engagements with
Peruvian landscapes were molded by native agency is therefore crucial:
as the viceroyalty took shape, the beliefs of indigenous people, their
settlement patterns and mobility, and their sheer physical presence and
absence were all reflected in the diverse ways in which Peru’s landscapes
mattered for Hispanic populations.

\textit{Landscape, Territory, and Colonialism}

As Sluyter observes, no significant attempts have yet been made to con-
struct a “comprehensive geographic theory of colonialism and land-
scape,”\textsuperscript{18} despite the dramatic and far-reaching transformations that
landscapes have so often undergone as a result of European overseas ex-
pansion and colonization. Central to his proposals for developing such a
theory is the contention that reciprocal interactions between indigenous
populations, Europeans, and material landscape resulted in that landscape’s transformation. In outlining his approach, Sluyter decisively rejects the notion that European colonizers were the “ultimate determinant” in the process of transformation—a deeply rooted belief that finds expression in Elliott’s suggestion that “America had given Europe space, in the widest sense of that word—space to dominate, space in which to experiment, and space to transform according to its wishes.”

Although the central purpose of my study is not to contribute to the development of Sluyter’s theory, significant common ground exists between his objectives and my own. In exploring colonial negotiations over Peru’s landscapes, I seek to convey, like Sluyter, that they were never the product of European agency alone, but emerged from ongoing interactions between the material landscape, its indigenous inhabitants, and Hispanic populations.

Before I turn my attention to these negotiations, however, it seems appropriate to explain how I use and understand the term “landscape” in this study of colonial Peru, not least because the historical origins of the term are European. If the term is understood in a narrowly genealogical fashion, centered on particular, elite “ways of seeing” that first emerged in Renaissance Italy with the discovery of perspective, then its use, as Bender suggests, is distinctly limited outside very specific cultural and geographical contexts. Instead of restricting the term to a reduced set of historical, cultural, and geographical associations, I use it, like Bender, in a manner that is intentionally expansive and that has room for diverse ways of experiencing, relating, and giving meaning to places and environments:

If . . . we broaden the idea of landscape and understand it to be the way in which people—all people—understand and engage with the material world around them, and if we recognize that people’s being-in-the-world is always historically and spatially contingent, it becomes clear that landscapes are always in process, potentially conflicted, untidy and uneasy.

By speaking of “landscape” in the context of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Peru, then, my intention is not to impose on its inhabitants (Eu-
European or otherwise) a set of alien concepts that they did not possess, but instead to gain insight into an array of experiences, meanings, and embodied relationships that were constantly being reshaped. Indeed, the very value of the term “landscape” may be seen to lie in what one cultural geographer has described as landscape’s “duplicity”—its perennial refusal to be pinned to any fixed or unitary meaning.

My explorations of landscape and colonialism in Peru are informed by ongoing endeavors in cultural geography and anthropology to conceptualize landscape as animated rather than static, as process rather than as product, and as embodied experience rather than as disembodied vision. As Rose suggests, landscape does not possess inherent or predetermined qualities, but instead is made to “matter”—to take on diverse meanings and to have effects on people’s lives by means of “the everyday practices and activities that surround it.” By conceptualizing Peru’s colonial landscapes in these ways, emphasis may be shifted away from the analysis of selected representations and toward an exploration of the varied spatial, material, and discursive practices that continuously shaped those landscapes and the meanings with which they were imbued. At the same time, the dynamism of landscape may be brought to the fore by treating colonial texts not simply as sources of “finished” landscape representations that are open to critical analysis, but as resources that allow valuable insights into ongoing colonial negotiations.

Peru’s colonial landscapes were not merely represented in text and image, but were also experienced in corporeal and spatial ways by all those who traveled through, inhabited, and sought to control them. These aspects have not been ignored in work on colonial Latin America: recent studies that highlight the impact of frequently harsh New World environments on explorers’ and conquistadors’ bodies—and, indeed, on their very ambitions and objectives—provide a clear example of this. Frequently, however, the profound physicality of the Spaniards’ experiences has been sidelined by concerns for the cultural (and hence metaphorical) locations from which they perceived and wrote about the Americas, as well as by a tendency to focus on their role as agents who appropriated and transformed America’s spaces, while paying scant attention to how they were affected by those spaces. “Negotiations over landscape,” therefore, certainly refers to verbal and textual exchanges...
but also, and no less significantly, to the ways in which landscape was experienced, struggled over, shaped, and used in physical and corporeal ways.

I have also chosen to speak of “negotiation” because it calls forth conditions of contingency, compromise, and modification. Although this choice of terminology may appear to trivialize or sideline the violence and conflict that was ever-present in the colonial world of Peru, this is not my intention: as Bolaños writes, the study of colonialism in Latin America brings with it a responsibility to remember that it was founded on cultures of violence and exploitation. Instead, my use of this term is intended to reflect the ways in which landscape experiences, perceptions, and portrayals were contextualized and subject to change, instead of being rigidly predetermined by cultural origins or the existence of an unbridgeable colonial divide.

This study, although focusing in part on the ways in which colonial negotiations over landscape unfolded within particular localities or regions, is equally concerned with tracing their development at the viceregal and transatlantic level. Locally focused negotiations over landscape and those that extended beyond the local sphere were inextricably connected: the discursive and embodied practices that surrounded particular landscapes were never restricted to the local, but always formed part of broader networks of practice and communication that connected them with other, more distant, landscapes and spaces.

The following chapters attempt to convey how Peruvian landscapes and territories were negotiated not just within Peru itself but also from across the Atlantic in Spain. As this study illustrates, particularly in chapters 5 and 6, these negotiations not only focused on clearly demarcated localities or regions but also unfolded around vast and often vaguely defined geographical spaces that extended across and beyond the vice-royalty. By speaking of both “landscape” and “territory,” I seek to convey a clear sense of this multiscalar perspective. In using these two terms, I also distinguish between negotiations that revolved, on the one hand, around particular places and regions that were experienced directly by the Spanish, and, on the other, around the representation of frequently extensive geographical spaces that largely lay beyond the realm of the colonizers’ experience.
Cartography, Text, and Landscape

Material and discursive struggles over landscape, territory, and space have always been central to the implementation of colonial and imperial ventures. The production of diverse maps and cartographies in and of Spanish America, as in other parts of the world, played a highly significant role in the process of conquest and colonization. Besides facilitating America’s emergence within an increasingly dominant Western geographical worldview, mapmaking reflected and reinforced the material transformation of New World landscapes and the creation of new, colonial spaces. The intense scholarly interest that has emerged around colonial Spanish mapping practices represents a welcome move away from the once widely held view that imperial Spain contributed little to the development of modern European cartography or geography.

It may be argued, however, that Spain’s nascent modern cartography has come to represent an “overdetermined signifier” of Spanish imperialism in the New World. Despite the undeniable role that cartography played in the service of imperialism, it was by no means representative of all Spanish geographical ideas. Indeed, it appears to have been of limited relevance for a majority of the Spaniards and Spanish Americans who experienced, inhabited, and portrayed the New World and its landscapes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. As such, it is important, as some scholars have done, to take account of other, “popular” forms of mapmaking and visual representation that were practiced alongside formal cartography in early modern Spain as well as in the Americas.

The significance of cartography and mapmaking should not be allowed to overshadow the value of written text as a source of insights into colonial negotiations over landscape and geographical knowledge in the New World. As a result of their great scarcity for many areas of early colonial Spanish America, including the Viceroyalty of Peru, extant colonial maps must frequently be considered a supplementary rather than a principal historical source. Overwhelmingly, Peru’s landscapes were portrayed and contested through the production of written texts rather than of maps, and it is in written records that the most detailed accounts of everyday, nonrepresentational negotiations over those landscapes may be found. The scarcity of cartographic records for early Spanish
Peru may therefore be regarded not as a disadvantage but as an invitation to explore negotiations over its landscapes and territories in a diverse range of administrative, ecclesiastical, and other documents that fill the colonial archives.

In drawing on these written records, the chapters that follow do not attempt to focus on a comprehensive spectrum of colonial identities. Most notably, perhaps, they do not address the ways in which Peru’s landscapes were experienced and perceived by women, for all the texts that I draw on, without exception, were written by men. Neither “colonizing women” nor those women who experienced colonialism ever constituted unitary groups: as recent scholarship shows, however, their spatial practices, perceptions of landscape, and geographical imaginings often differed significantly from those of their male counterparts. Given my concern for bringing to light difference and diversity among “the colonizers,” such an omission may strike some readers as puzzling, even inexcusable.

In focusing primarily on the writings of those whose voices are heard more insistently in the colonial archive, however, I believe that these complex entanglements can be most effectively explored. The abundant writings produced by administrators, conquistadors, and ecclesiastics not only shed light on their own engagements with landscape, perceptions, and experiences, but also provide a window onto an array of other practices—indigenous as well as Hispanic—that were central to negotiations over landscape. Indigenous-authored sources are not ignored by this study, for they too shed valuable light on how native agency played a key role in shaping Spanish engagements with landscape. Accounts of merits and services, geographical descriptions, and other documents produced by Andean subjects reveal, moreover, that indigenous experiences and portrayals of landscape were no less diverse, improvisatory, or open to change than those of Spaniards or Spanish Americans.

Spatial, Temporal, and Thematic Limits

This study cannot claim, of course, to include every area of the Viceroyalty of Peru or to chart the continuous unfolding of colonial negotiations.
over landscape throughout a period of more than one hundred years. Inevitably, the study is geographically selective; although commencing on the northern fringes of the Inca empire, it is predominantly oriented toward the central highlands of the Audiencia of Lima and the tropical frontiers of the Audiencia of Charcas (see figs. 1 and 2). The existence of rich textual records that relate to the colonial provinces of Huarochirí, Jauja, and Huamanga has placed these areas in a particularly prominent position. Materials relating to these provinces have already been extensively studied by Andeanist historians. Rather than seek out new or little-known sources, however, I am more concerned with revisiting those that are familiar and exploring the ways in which they can provide fresh insights into colonial negotiations over landscape and geographical knowledge.

Chapters 5 and 6 also focus on the Amazon frontier regions of present-day Bolivia and southern Peru: above all, the inclusion of these areas is intended to further scholarly efforts to challenge the frequently encountered segregation of the Andes and Amazon in historical studies. Although the Spanish conquest undoubtedly brought about the widespread disruption of cultural and political linkages and networks of exchange between Andes and Amazon—thereby continuing a process that had already been set in motion by the Incas—these linkages did not disappear altogether. Large-scale military expeditions of conquest into the Amazon had largely ceased by the beginning of the seventeenth century, yet Spanish interest in the region did not disappear; indeed, sporadic exchanges and encounters between the highlands and tropical lowlands continued throughout the colonial period. If the Amazon regions are persistently portrayed in colonial texts as spaces that were detached from and in many ways the antithesis of the Andean highlands (whether in a positive or negative sense), many writings also confound this stark dualism. As this book endeavors to illustrate, fascinating textual sources exist that allow the negotiations that took place over Peru’s Amazon frontiers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to be explored in considerable depth.

Focusing on petitions and accounts produced by Peru’s first conquistadors, chapter 2 traces changes in the Spaniards’ experiences and perceptions of landscape as they passed from the exploration of the Pacific coastline to the conquest of the Inca empire. By comparing these
Fig. 2. The Audiencia of Charcas.
texts with native testimonies of conquest produced in Jauja, I argue that the conquistadors’ physical engagements with landscape, and consequently their portrayals of it, were strongly shaped by the agency of indigenous groups and by their physical presence or absence. A final section examines how, in the wake of conquest, Peru’s indigenous populations continued to play a crucial role in shaping the material landscapes of the new viceroyalty and the ways in which Europeans experienced and portrayed them.

Chapter 3 shifts the discussion from the era of conquest to the 1580s. By examining the production of geographical accounts in response to the questionnaires prepared by the Council of the Indies, it questions the notion that indigenous and Spanish geographical representations were always straightforwardly opposed or defined by clear-cut relations of domination and resistance. As well as questioning the suitability of “resistance” as a concept for understanding indigenous participation in this process, this chapter illustrates the point that Spanish portrayals of landscape produced in Peru were far from homogeneous and were often at odds with the “official” geographical notions embedded within the questionnaire.

Whereas chapter 3 focuses predominantly on the colonial provinces of Jauja and Huamanga, chapter 4 traces Spanish negotiations over the landscapes of Huarochirí between the 1570s and the 1630s. Beginning with a dispute over jurisdictions that took place between two parish priests, it goes on to explore the ways in which the landscapes of the province were experienced and represented by Jesuit missionaries, a crown official, and seventeenth-century extirpators of idolatry. In doing so, it draws attention to the significance of travel in shaping these diverse individuals’ experiences of Huarochirí, but also foregrounds how their portrayals of travel in the province were influenced by the nature and extent of their involvement in local affairs, as well as by their personal and professional objectives.

In chapter 5, the focus shifts from descriptions of Huarochirí produced in Peru to portrayals of the viceroyalty’s Amazon frontiers produced in early-seventeenth-century Madrid by a Spanish officer, a maestre de campo named Juan Recio de León. By tracing the ways in which his portrayals of Amazonia and of his proposed colonizing venture were
continually revised, I demonstrate that Recio, far from merely succumbing to “contagious” tales about Paititi, El Dorado, and other mythical locations, opportunistically tailored his reports and petitions to suit the ever-changing context of prominent royal interests and concerns. In addition, then, to questioning the homogeneity of colonial Spanish portrayals of Amazonia, this chapter examines how the material and social spaces of the royal court played a crucial role in influencing the ways in which Recio chose to represent the tropical lowlands to the east of the Andes.

The subtropical frontier regions of Charcas that connected the Andean highlands to Amazonia are central to chapter 6. Here, I aim to call into question the notion that clear-cut divisions between Andes and Amazon were common to all Spanish and Spanish-American geographical portrayals in the early colonial era. By examining texts produced by conquistadors, missionaries, and royal officials between approximately 1550 and 1650, I show that stark binary divisions were frequently moderated by the perceived existence and functions of an “in-between space” that connected or separated the Andes and Amazon. Once again, this chapter conveys how colonial negotiations over landscape unfolded through the unpredictable interactions of discursive and embodied practices that were performed at local, regional, viceregal, and transatlantic scales. In a brief concluding section I draw together the themes outlined above and reflect on the insights that they collectively provide on the entanglements between landscape and colonialism in early Spanish Peru.