

*Dialogue with Europe, Dialogue with the Past: Colonial Nahua and Quechua Elites in Their Own Words.*

Edited by JUSTYNA OLKO, JOHN SULLIVAN, and JAN SZEMIŃSKI. Louisville: University Press of Colorado, 2018. Maps. Figures. Notes. Glossary. Bibliography. Index. xii, 363 pp. Paper, \$41.95.

*Dialogue with Europe, Dialogue with the Past* offers a collection of 35 Hapsburg-era Nahuatl, Spanish, and Quechua documents with English translations and analysis, with the goal of bridging the divide between colonial Mexican and Andean ethnohistory. A lengthy introduction provides a general comparison of colonial Mexican and Andean indigenous elites, of social stratification within the *república de indios* in both viceroyalties, and of indigenous-language writing and contact-induced change. Emphasis is given to native agency both in the composition of the texts and in the social conflicts and attempts to control resources that these texts articulate. Both indigenous elites and colonial Nahuatl and Quechua have been the object of wide study in the past two decades, and specialists in the field will find little new in this introductory survey.

The real value of such a collection lies in making available relatively mundane manuscript documents to a broad audience. Divided into four sections, of legal proceedings, petitions, wills, and ecclesiastical writings, *Dialogue with Europe, Dialogue with the Past* broadly seeks to reflect the colonial archives of indigenous society, with documents concerned with property and relations between indigenous petitioners and secular and religious government. At the same time, the collection raises concerns about selection and representation. With two exceptions, all documents come from the Hapsburg period (1520–1700), thus ignoring the significant changes in both Spanish colonial and indigenous society in the eighteenth century. While limiting the collection to the earlier period is not an unreasonable choice, the failure to address the exclusion of later works implies that the colonial era was static and limits opportunity for cross-temporal, as well as cross-cultural, comparison.

The choice to focus solely on Nahua and Quechua elites similarly receives no justification. In particular, the exclusion of Mixtec, Yucatec, and other Mexican-language notarial and legal documents, of which well-known troves exist, has the unfortunate effect of reproducing the colonial equation of Nahua and Mexican and erasing the ethnolinguistic complexity of early modern Mesoamerica. More confusingly, the labeling of central Andean elites as “Quechua” yields an anachronistic conflation of language and cultural identity, with the exclusion of Aymara-speaking elites reproducing a colonial Spanish understanding of Andean imperial language politics. But more striking is the inclusion only of Spanish-language texts to represent the colonial Andean notarial and legal archive. Certainly colonial Quechua documents are far scarcer than those in Mesoamerican languages, but caches studied by scholars such as Alan Durston could provide Quechua-language documents to allow for comparisons between Mexico and the Andes across all four of the collection’s categories; instead, the collection implies that Andean elites entered the written record only in Spanish. Finally, by the work’s own criterion of facilitating comparisons between Mexico and the Andes, the selection of

documents is unbalanced. Just 7 of the 35 selections are from the Andes, and these include no legal proceedings or petitions: aside from four Spanish-language wills, three examples of “accounts and ecclesiastical writing” are drawn from Juan Santa Cruz Pachacuti Yamqui Salcamayhua’s Spanish-language *Relación de antigüedades deste Reyno del Piru* and Juan Pérez Bocanegra’s bilingual (Spanish-Quechua) *Ritual formulario e institución de curas*. Both are well-studied works, and as the only example of colonial Quechua, the latter is an odd choice to represent indigenous Andean elites “in their own words.”

A collaborative effort by more than a half dozen scholars, this book offers varied approaches to scholarly commentary on each document. Some commentaries are little more than English-language summaries of the contents, while others provide useful and specific historical information about the communities and relations recorded in the documents, particularly concerning sixteenth-century central Mexican politics. Finally, a number of the commentaries focus on contact-induced language change, with careful attention to neologisms, typological and structural innovations, and the effects of Nahua and Quechua phonology on written Mexican and Andean Spanish. Overall, the result is a somewhat eclectic collection of documents and commentaries that are of interest to Mexican and Andean ethnohistorians and ethnolinguists and useful as a source of primary texts for students.

DAVID T. GARRETT, Reed College

DOI 10.1215/00182168-8178402

*The Directory for Confessors, 1585: Implementing the Catholic Reformation in New Spain*. Edited and translated by STAFFORD POOLE. With contributions by JOHN F. SCHWALLER. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2018. Notes. Glossary. Bibliography. Index. ix, 358 pp. Cloth, \$65.00.

The Third Mexican Provincial Council of 1585 sought to restructure the local church in order to implement the policies and positions of the Catholic Reformation and the Council of Trent. Bishops of the Third Mexican Provincial Council identified confession as an effective means of influencing their parishioners’ religious attitudes and practices. In order to advance their objectives, the bishops supported the writing of a text, or directory, that described the educational and personal qualifications of confessors and provided priests who would work with Spanish parishioners in Mexican parishes with “a compendium of moral and sacramental theology, canon law, and pastoral practice” (p. 5).

Stafford Poole’s *The Directory for Confessors, 1585: Implementing the Catholic Reformation in New Spain* makes available a scholarly and erudite English translation of this manual for priests. The original source was written in Spanish and then translated to Latin. Today there are only five extant copies of the directory. Poole’s excellent and approachable translation offers a rare and critically important text of the sixteenth-century Mexican church. Abundant footnotes provide useful explanations of theological