

about Spain and Portugal. From the vast literature on the subject, he has had (perforce) to rely on a relatively small selection of books, all or nearly all in English translation, and some of them are now a little old-fashioned. Arthur Helps and Salvador de Madariaga, for example, are cited as authorities on Cortés, Oliveira Martins on Prince Henry of Portugal, Prestage on the Portuguese explorers in general. The recent and admirable works of Magalhães Godinho are not mentioned. John Hemming's excellent account of the conquest of Peru presumably appeared too late to be consulted, as did Lawrence Wroth's book on Verrazzano, whose important voyage is not mentioned at all. Where original sources are cited, the editions used are not always the best; the 1896 Hakluyt Society edition of Azurara's *Chronicle of Guinea*, for example, has been superseded by M. Bourdon's much better version of 1960; the Gheerbrand edition of Garcilaso's *Commentaries*, by that of Harold Livermore. Inevitably, in a brief general book on a big and complex subject, there are some outright mistakes. Columbus did not become a "grandee of Spain" (p. 78); he sailed on his fourth voyage in 1502, not 1505 (p. 80), and died in 1506 (p. 81). Pigafetta did not publish his account of the Magellan voyage (p. 138). An encomienda was not an "apportionment of land" (p. 168). There are some odd phrases relating to nautical matters, as where Dias (p. 58) is made to "run close-hauled before the wind." But these are relatively minor matters, in a book clearly not intended for specialists. In capturing the general spirit of his topic, Mr. Wright has a sure touch. The book is smoothly written and handsomely produced. It is an elegant introduction to an exciting story.

Harvard University

J. H. PARRY

The Chronicles of Michoacán. Translated and edited by EUGENE R. CRAINE and REGINALD C. REINDORP. Norman, Oklahoma, 1970. University of Oklahoma Press. Illustrations. Suggested Readings. Index. Pp. xxiii, 259. Cloth. \$7.95.

The *Relación de Michoacán* is our most important single source for the pre-conquest Tarascans. It was compiled about 1540, probably by the Franciscan missionary Fray Martín de Jesús de la Coruña, from information provided by Indian informants. The surviving text, which lacks the first part, begins with an account of Tarascan government in the period just prior to the Spaniards' arrival and proceeds systematically to deal with religion, warfare, marriage, and other political and social topics. The text then becomes one of narrative history, and we have the Spaniards' arrival and events of the conquest. "Part II" then

deals with an earlier history of migration and settlement, the foundation of the Tarascan state by Tariacuri, and relations with the Aztecs. In all, the amount of information is considerable and its value high, especially given the dearth of alternative and supplementary material. The text is accompanied by forty-four very interesting illustrations depicting the events described and presumably contemporary with the original.

The English edition is attractively presented in a straightforward translation with illustrations, a map of the Michoacán area, and glossaries of terms, deities, and festivals. The translators provide occasional explanatory notes, but for the most part they confine their task to that of rendering the 16th-century Spanish into readable English. A foreword introduces the reader to the materials and presents some related data on Tarascan society and the history of the Escorial manuscript and its copies.

The title, *The Chronicles of Michoacán*, might at first suggest that additional documents are included in the publication, as in Federico Gómez de Orozco's anthology of 1940, *Crónicas de Michoacán*. The publication however is of the *Relación de Michoacán* alone, and the term *Chronicles*, while not inappropriate to the content, might be criticized as somewhat misleading. The translators do not seem to be aware of Gómez de Orozco's work, nor of Félix C. Ramírez' study of the manuscript published in 1956. These are perhaps explainable omissions in an edition that is not intended to incorporate all past research. But what I find inexplicable is that no reference is made to the 1956 facsimile by José Tudela, which was the subject of a special review in the *HAHR* by John Glass and which received the usual publicity accorded to important scholarly publications. That translators in 1970 should revert to the Morelia edition of 1903 and refer to this as "probably the best edition" strains one's credulity. It means of course that the commentary and other useful materials of the Tudela edition are not used. What we have instead is a translation of Martínez Solórzano's Introduction to the 1903 edition, which incidentally suggests that his source was not the 1869 publication but the "fraudulent" work of 1875. The translators follow Donald Brand in the belief that the 1869 edition was the basis for the 1903 edition, as well as in statements on the supposed "three other manuscript copies." I know that Brand made a very valuable contribution, but that was in 1943. In any event much more has now been done by way of commentary on the manuscript, identification of other copies, and discussion of relevant problems.

University of Michigan

CHARLES GIBSON