PLACE IN RETURN BOX
to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
NOV 02		
[redacted]		
DEC 09		
092700 SEP 13		

1/98 c/CIRC/DateDue.p65-p.14

TRANSCULTURATIONS IN COLONIAL SPACE: COMPARATIVE CREOLE IDENTITIES AND THE ETHNOGRAPHIC IMAGINATION IN EARLY BRITISH AND SPANISH AMERICAN WRITING

VOLUME I

BY

RALPH R. BAUER

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

American Studies Program

1997

ABSTRACT

TRANSCULTURATIONS IN COLONIAL SPACE: COMPARATIVE CREOLE IDENTITIES AND THE ETHNOGRAPHIC IMAGINATION IN EARLY BRITISH AND SPANISH AMERICAN WRITING

BY

RALPH R. BAUER

Appropriating the conceptual and critical tools of postcolonial theory, this dissertation is a comparative study of the emergence and evolution of 'creole' American identities in the literatures of early British and Spanish America. It argues that American creoles, in British and Spanish America alike, had to 'inscribe' America into European languages of history, which had 'invented' America as a colonial space 'without' history in the ethnographic discourses of the discovery, exploration, and conquest. Writing at the colonial peripheries of transatlantic empires, early American creole authors such as the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega, Fransicsco Núñez de Pineda y Bascuñán, Mary Rowlandson, Carrió de la Vandera, Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, Joaquín de Olmedo, and Joel Barlow therefore transculturated European generic and discursive traditions and engaged in meta-historical critiques of imperial poetics of authorship, teleology, and division of labor.

Copyright by
Ralph R. Bauer
1997

Meinen Eltern, Erwin und Ingrid Bauer.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation director, Stephen Carl Arch (Department of English, Michigan State University), for his professional guidance, his generous support, and his perpetual encouragement; many thanks here also to the other members of my doctoral committee: Christine Daniels (Department of History, Michigan State University), Aníbal González Pérez (Department of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese, Pennsylvania State University), Earl Fitz (Department of Comparative Literature, Pennsylvania State University), Edward Watts (Department of American Thought and Language, Michigan State University), Alfred Goodson (Comparative Literature Program, Michigan State University); and thanks to the outside reader of this dissertation, Dean Rehberger (Department of American Thought and Language, Michigan State University).

The research for, and completion of, this dissertation has benefited from a number of fellowships, for which I would like to express my gratitude: the American Studies Program and the College of Arts and Letters have granted me research fellowships during the summer of 1995, thanks to which I was able to take off time which was then spent on this project. Many thanks especially to the staff of the John Carter Brown Library, who have generously granted me a four-month fellowship in residence at the Center for New World Comparative Studies at in Providence, RI, during the spring of 1997; the magnificent research opportunities and the stimulating intellectual life at the JCB have

greatly enhanced this project.

In completing this dissertation, I have benefited from the imput of readers who have commented on earlier versions of parts of the dissertation as panel commentors at conferences and as members of editorial boards of scholarly journals. Many thanks to James Levernier and Amy Turner Bushnell, who have commented on a part of Chapter II, and to Daniel Usner, who has commented on a part of Chapter I, during the First and Second Annual Conventions of the Institute for Early American History and Culture in 1996 and 1997 respectively; and to Michelle Burnham, who has commented on a part of Chapter II during the Conference of the Society for Early Americanists in 1996. Thanks also to Dana Nelson, who, as a reader for *Early American Literature*, has provided valuable commentary on a part of Chapter 4, and to the two anonymous readers of *American Literature*, who have commented on a part of chapter II.

Last but not least I would like to thank my fiancé Nicol Heather for her love, companionship, and support during the time in spend as a graduate student at Michigan State University. Meeting her has been the most important event in my life since I came to this country six years ago.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1
1. Comparative Cultures and Early American Studies 2
2. The Comparison of Early British and Spanish American Literature: Some Methodological Considerations... 17
3. The "Invention of America": Colonial/Post-colonial Discourse and Early American Literature 31
4. Creole Identities, Ethnography, and Colonial Space 34
5. Transculturations in Colonial Space: Creole Identities and theEthnographic Imagination in Early British and Spanish American Writing 48
Notes Introduction 54

CHAPTER I
EXODUS 56
1. The New World and the End of the World 56
2. Indian Utopias: Franciscans and Puritans in a Historical Perspective 61
3. Exodus: A People and a Land 83
4. The Millenarian Tradition 92
5. American Apocalypse 99
6. Babylonian Captivity 122
Notes Chapter I 141

CHAPTER II
CAPTIVITY 144
1. The Captivity Narrative in a Comparative Perspective 144
2. An American Genre? 149
3. The `Monstrous Birth': Imperial Historiography, Cultural Transfer, and the Invention of the `Creole' 155
4. Colonial `True Histories' and Ethnographic Authority 169
5. Primitive Speech 183
6. The European in the Looking Glass: Captivity and Identity in the Colonial Encounter 187
7. Identity Work in Colonial Space 193
8. Imperial Frontiers and Comparative Creole Identities 199

9. Creoles and Immigrants....207
10. The Colonial Captivity Narrative and National American Literary Histories....212
Notes Chapter II....218

CHAPTER III
HISTORY....223
1. 'Auto-Ethnography' and the Writing of History in (Post) Colonial Situations....223
2. Colonial Auto-Ethnographies and the Problem of Genre....228
3. 'Eye-Witnessing': The Hermeneutics and Epistemology of Letters from a New World....236
4. Carrió, Crèveceoeur, and the Baconian Project of History....256
5. The Fiction of Authenticity Defictionalized....274
6. Utopia and Counter-Utopia: Frontier, Identity, and 'Auto-Ethnography'....289
Notes Chapter III....309

CHAPTER IV
REVOLUTION....317
1. The Revolutionary Quest for a Postcolonial Literary History....317
2. William Robertson, the Rhetoric of History, and the Ethnographic Imagination....325
3. The Ercillesque Legacy....334
4. Joaquín de Olmedo's *Victoria de Junín*....343
5. Joel Barlow's *Vision of Columbus*....349
6. The Mestizo History of the Inca Garcilaso....354
7. The Inca Garcilaso and Joel Barlow's New World History....365
8. History, Creole Nationalism, and Postcolonialism....370
Notes Chapter IV....380

CONCLUSION....382

BIBLIOGRAPHY....387

INTRODUCTION

This study of the formation of "creole" (Euro-American) identities in early British and Spanish American literature aims to provide a larger perspective on the fields of early American and Latin American studies. Situated at the current postcolonial "intersection" of the various disciplines of literary studies, cultural anthropology, and history, this dissertation is intended to speak to a number of audiences. First, while it probes the relevances of postcolonial theory for the study of Early American Literature in both Anglo and Spanish America, it is has an interest in the evolution of postcolonial theory in its triangulated model of colonial hegemonic relationships in so-called white "settler" colonies, which are too often subsumed within the binary model of "Europe and its Others" in postcolonial theory. Second, while it explores the implications of the comparative approach for both (US) American and Latin American Studies in their quest for defining distinctly American identities, it has an interest in the field of comparative cultures, which has generally focused on New World transculturation processes in comparisons between

America and the "Old World," not between the various American cultures. And third, while it presents a literary critic's contribution to the `Atlantic' perspective called for by recent students of Early American history and culture (often dominated by social historians), it is of interest to a growing number of Inter- and Pan-American literary comparativists, who have thus far largely neglected the colonial periods.

1. COMPARATIVE CULTURES AND EARLY AMERICAN STUDIES

The question "Do the Americas have a Common History?" has inspired debate and controversy among historians for several decades now (see Hanke 1964). The question was first raised by Herbert Eugene Bolton in his inaugural address as president of the American Historical Society in 1932, "The Epic of Greater America," and in his book *Wider Horizons of American History* (1939). While Bolton's own work had investigated the Spanish borderlands in North America, he called upon historians to study North and South America together, in a "synthetic view," to discern the similarities in, as well as the distinctiveness of, the various New World experiences. In "The Epic of Greater America," he suggested that a "basic unity" underlay the historical development of the Americas in its progression in three major periods. The first period, from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century (he did not seem concerned with pre-Columbian history), encompassed the experiences of New World encounters between

indigenous American, European, and African peoples, as well as the new settlements and transplantations of cultures, imperial rivalries, and economic exploitation of peoples and resources; the second period spanned the time from approximately from 1776 to 1826, during which all of South America and two thirds of North America became politically independent from Europe and established modern nation states; and the third period of this hemispheric history covered the history of the new nation-states since their political separation from Europe.

Bolton's call for a comparative perspective was answered by prominent historians such as Silvio Zavala (1962), Max Savelle (1974), Antonello Gerbi (1973), and Germán Arciniegas (1986). Both British and Spanish America, these historians argued, shared the experiences of the encounter with, exploration, and conquest or invasion of a "new" continent, which Europeans often interpreted in comparably mythic ways. They shared the experience of settlement by Europeans and the displacement or subordination of native populations, as well as the search for new ways of exploiting resources. Colonists in both Spanish and British America experienced a clash between radically different cultures and races, across and within imagined frontiers, and the phenomenon of slavery in its distinctly American forms.[1] Despite the Europeans' general eagerness to replicate Old World cultural forms, both Spanish and British America saw the founding of new

communities and institutions upon imagined--or created--empty spaces of unfamiliar natural and human landscapes; both were closely tied into an emerging transatlantic economy heavily centered on the "other" side; both experienced the challenge to European social structures, the development of new colonial elites, the conflict of interests and perspectives with the metropolis, and finally the revolutionary rupture with the colonizing power.

Literary scholars, by contrast, more divided by institutional boundaries than historians, have only recently shown interest in the pan-American approach to American literature and in hemispheric comparisons. Even the interdisciplinary field of Comparative Literature has traditionally, with a few exceptions, been more concerned with the comparative study of the literatures of Europe than of the Americas. Gustavo Pérez-Firmat followed up on Lewis Hanke's question of 1964 and asked literary historians "Do the Americas have a Common Literature?" (1990). The comparatist approach to the literatures of the Americas has already cast new light on questions of distinct American national literary histories and cultural identities in the work of scholars such as José David Saldívar (1991), Gustavo Pérez Firmat (1990), Hortense Spillers (1991), Bell Gale Chevigny and Gari Laguardia (1986), Earl Fitz (1991), Lewis Parkinson Zamora (1989), José Ballón (1986), Renata Mautner Wasserman (1994), Myra Jehlen (1986), and Vera Kutzinski (1987).

No doubt, many of these works received their impetus, in part, from the cultural repercussions which have resulted from globalizations of national economies, inter-American migrations, and demographic and cultural shifts within the American nation states. These changes have shattered certainties about national identities and cultural history. However, unlike historians, whose interest in the colonial periods is deep and widespread, literary scholars interested in the hemispheric perspective have almost exclusively concerned themselves with the national periods and have generally neglected the colonial and Revolutionary periods. The notable exception here has been Alfred Owen Aldridge's *Early American Literature. A Comparativist Approach* (1982)--a precedent to which we will have to return. From this point of view, this study is conceived as an Early Americanist's contribution to a growing field of "inter-American literature."

Paradoxically, Early Americanists have, for the most part, ignored the current trend toward a wider perspective on American literature in American literary criticism on the national periods. In this context, I hope that this comparative study of the early literatures of British and Spanish America will therefore be of interest to students of Early American literature. Why, we may ask, have early Americanists in literary scholarship avoided the comparatist approach to Early American Literature? To answer this question, it is helpful briefly to reflect on the recent

"identity crisis" of the field and to outline the most influential arguments in the recent revisionary historiographic debates.

As William Spengemann has pointed out in his recent assault on the traditional identity of the field, the discipline has since the nineteenth century been invented in a proto-nationalist paradigm--to serve as a `precursor' to the subsequent national literary history. "This definition mocks history," Spengemann charged. "No one wrote in what has been called "the future United States," a future that did not exist until it was a past" (1994, ix). Even during the twentieth century, early American writing has, in the lingering "climate of literary presentism" that informed the rise of the American studies movement and the work of eminent literary historians such as Van Wyck Brooks (1915), Charles Feidelson (1953) , Harry Levin (1958), and Roy Harvey Pearce (1961), been studied to create a "usable past" for the "real" literature of the American Renaissance in the nineteenth century (Spengemann 1994, 17). Following the publication of the seminal works on American Puritanism of Perry Miller (1953), Samuel Eliot Morrison (1956), Kenneth Murdock (1949), and later Sacvan Bercovitch (1975), Puritan New England figured especially prominently as the progenitors of the nineteenth-century national classics of the "American Renaissance." Thus seventeenth-century New England letters became, in the proto-nationalist paradigm, the "Puritan Origins of the [US] American Self" (Bercovitch

1975).

However, while scholars such as Miller and Bercovitch could still conceive this national Self in terms of a (White, male, Protestant) "New England Mind," the social transformations in the United States since the 1960s have demanded a revision in conceptions of national identity and literary history. A first effect of this on the canon of early American literature was a significant expansion in terms of geographic origins along the Atlantic seaboard. Thus in 1972, Leo Lemay published his important study on the colonial literature of Catholic Maryland, which has been followed by the work of his students such as Robert Micklus (1990) and David Shields (1990).

The impact of the multiculturalist movement on the study of early American literature effected an inclusion into the canon not only of African American, Native American, and women writers but also of texts originating in geographical areas remote from the eastern seaboard, such as Florida, California, and New Mexico. Like their proto-nationalist predecessors, the multiculturalists also sought to identify the cultural origins of "what would become the United States" today. But what did all these remote places and disparate cultures still have in common? There was no longer an intellectual (or ideological) tradition which could provide the "origins" of an "American Self." The answer, the multiculturalists found, was not in tradition but in experience. Literary critics therefore turned to what

they perceived to be the distinctive feature of early American life--the frontier. Thus, the multiculturalists went out in search of a "new literary history of the American frontiers," as Annette Kolodny has called it in a programmatic essay (1992, 3). But, unlike the frontier historians working in the "old" school of Frederick Jackson Turner, they thereby did not imagine the frontier as an empty space in which American democratic values would germinate; rather, they relied on the school of the so-called "new frontier history" which conceived of the frontier as a place "where cultures come in contact," and where "friction and cross-fertilization transform local peoples [and] set them apart from their respective metropoli."[2] This "new literary history of the American frontiers" would thus chronicle the early New World cultural encounters, mixtures, and transculturations in "language - hybridized style, trope, story, or structure" (Kolodny 1992, 3). It was, in short, the literary history of a "mixed race" which would later, presumably, become the United States, thus "bringing dynamic enrichment, ... movement and newness to an otherwise [Old World] static, inbred group, bringing in effect originality to `our' ancestral origins."[3]

However, in these multiculturalist narratives it has often been forgotten that New World cultural encounters, *mestizaje,* and transculturation are hemispheric cultural phenomena *not* exclusively distinctive of the United States. Thus, while multiculturalist literary histories typically

included Spanish and Franco American texts into their canons, the "rest" of the hemisphere often receded into the background once Jamestown was founded, and it entirely evaporated--as though touched by a certain nineteenth-century spirit of history--after a few English colonies declared their independence in 1776.[4] Admittedly, then, from a hemispheric point of view, the multiculturalists' protonationalist historical narratives of "Early American literature" continued to suffer from a parochial "geopolitical anachronism" (D. Weber 1992, 8): What starts out as a spectacle of hemispheric discovery, conquest, and colonization, becomes the cultural "origin" of a (US) American (multiculturalist) national self. The possibility that such an American self may not be a distinctly national identity at all is all too easily forgotten as the `other' heirs of this past are made to represent special cases of Americanness (*Latin* Americans, Canadians, etc.).

While the multiculturalists' history of Early American Literature has thus responded to recent revisions in American national identity politics, it, too, has left the proto-nationalist paradigm firmly in place and remained subservient to the role in which early American Literature had first been invented: to provide a pre-history for a national literature. In an attempt to re-historicize the study of early American literature, a second major group of early Americanists has therefore taken advantage of recent developments in political and social history and redefined

Early American Literature from what we might call a neo-imperial or `Atlantic' perspective (Derounian-Stodola 1995, 188). On the one hand, there has been a notable influence of the work of historians of Republicanism such as Bernard Bailyn (1959; 1967), Gordon Wood (1967), and J. G. A. Pocock (1975) on early American literary scholarship. Partially in opposition to the "American exceptionalist" assumptions underlying the earlier historiography informed by Frederick Jackson Turner's "Frontier Thesis," these historians have described early, and especially Revolutionary, American culture as an outward extension, and replication of, metropolitan British culture. American culture was formed, to use the language of Bailyn's historiographic model, on a "huge, outwardly expanding peripheral arc," which connected the English rural provinces, Wales, and Scotland, as well as the American colonies, to the center of London. The cultural peripheries were linked to each other as though they shaped a "ring" around their common "central culture" and formed "a single overall system that might be designated `British'" (1982, 14). Following this model, literary historians have abandoned the earlier quests for a distinctly American literary tradition and begun to see early American literary culture as an extension of that of England. Thus, Michael Warner (1990) and Larzer Ziff (1991) investigated the formation of American literature in the context of a Republican "print culture," while William Dowling (1990) found the origins of American Revolutionary poetry in the

British Opposition poets and in an English "country ideology."

On the other hand, the drift away from a narrow focus on the thirteen original colonies and toward a wider perspective on early American literature has been re-enforced by the influence of a number of "Atlantic" historians such Jack Greene and J. R. Pole (1984), who have also criticized assumptions of American exceptionalism underlying the Turner school. However, whereas the imperial approach of the Bailyn school had resulted in a firmly Euro-centric perspective on the formation of American culture, the Atlantic' historians conceived of early American culture as an active and dynamic factor in an emerging trans-atlantic system of "British America." Culture, in this model, did not merely flow outward from England to the colonies, there translated into local forms, but was produced in a process of mutual intra-imperial cultural exchanges. Subsequently, literary historians such as William Spengemann (1989; 1994), Philip Gura (1988), and David Shields (1990), as well as Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse (1992), have called for a study of Early American Literature as "the literature of British America."[5]

William Spengemann, especially, in a provocative discussion of *Paradise Lost* as "Milton's American Poem," has recently redefined early American literature as writing, in all the Old World languages, that attempts to "make room in the language for the New World [and has] helped to create

the stylistic circumstances in which that writing is now received" (1994, 49). Thus defined, Spengemann claimed, "Early American Literature is a very different subject from the one bequeathed to us by the national literary historians." Now, early Americanists were able to study as well the "literarily important English writings of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment," from More's *Utopia* to Shakespeare's *The Tempest* to Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1994, 49-50).

However, early Americanists have been left wondering, will Spengemann's Early American Literature as a "New World of Words" remedy the common judgment that American colonial writing has "never been a subject to make the heart leap"--a judgment based on post-Romantic critical expectations that Spengemann critiques?[6] For, while Spengemann laments the anachronistic imposition of later standards of literariness upon early American writing, he seems to forget that the appreciation of sixteenth-, seventeenth-, and eighteenth-century (insular) English literature has rarely suffered from such anachronistic practices. It seems to me therefore that the lack of appreciation for Early American texts--the very failure which Spengemann is lamenting--is due less to an American nationalist bias toward a pre-national Early American writing than it is to a hardy tradition of Euro-centrism in the critical standards that have been applied in the study of colonial texts which were written under vastly different social and cultural circumstances from those in

Europe--they were produced by writers for whom the "idea of America" had become a reality.

Only very recently has the universal validity of the critical terms conceived to venerate the European `masterworks' of `literature' begun to be questioned when the postcolonial Western world suddenly `discovered' that colonial societies possessed literatures too--though often very different in nature. By juxtaposing the (post) colonial writings of early British and Spanish America, I hope to establish a point of reference for the critical study of each body of texts other than merely in their relationship to later periods or to their metropolitan counterparts. While both the multiculturalist as well as the neo-imperial or Atlantic approaches to early American literature have thus provided helpful insights in the general rethinking of early American literature, a pan-American comparativist approach has important advantages over both. Unlike the multiculturalist, the cultural comparativist can place early American texts in their distinctive historical traditions and trajectories without having ahistorically to appeal to later nationalist frameworks (... the `first' text written by a `Chicano' etc.) and having to end in an all-absorbing `e pluribus unum' of the United States. Unlike the neo-imperial approach, on the other hand, the comparative approach can illuminate both parallels and differences between the early literatures of the Americas and, when seen in the context of their respective imperial cultures,

provide insights also into what is distinctively colonial about theses early American cultures (in the hemispheric sense of the word). I would therefore, finally, like to urge the importance of a comparative perspective also to the field of `American Studies' which has traditionally been concerned with identifying the distinctiveness of US American culture. For, ultimately, it will only be from a comparative and hemispheric perspective that we will be able to decide whether, on the one hand, specific American cultural forms represent distinctly national or larger hemispheric phenomena, and, on the other, whether these forms represent distinctly New World phenomena that are separate from that of their various Old World traditions (on both sides of the Atlantic).

With regard to the latter, it is helpful to return, for a moment, to the historiographic model of an `Atlantic' history which, presumably, underlies Spengemann's "New World of Words." For, I do not wish to dismiss the need for a wider perspective on Early American literature through a contextualization in early Atlantic culture and in their respective imperial realms which literary historians such as Spengemann and also Armstrong and Tennenhouse have demanded. However, it seems to me that they have moved well beyond the paradigms set by the Atlantic historians of the "New History of the Early Modern Period" (Greene and Pole, 1984). While, surely, these historians had postulated a reevaluation of early American culture *in the context of* the formation of an

Atlantic world, they did not equate colonial (American) cultural production with metropolitan European cultural production, or even "early modern" culture, as Spengemann, in effect, has done in his discussions of Milton and Franklin under one and the same rubric of "early American literature." By contrast, the Atlantic historians saw colonial American cultural formations in a dialectical process of *replication* of Old World cultural forms and creative *adaptation* to the social and cultural conditions in the colonial environments of the New World.[7]

Some of these historians adopted, for this purpose, conceptual tools from cultural anthropology and have described this dialectical process in terms of a "transculturation." This term was coined by the Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz in his *Contrapunto cubano del tabaco y del azúcar* (1940), in which Ortiz set out to modify Bronislaw Malinowski's (earlier) paradigm of "acculturation." Whereas the latter concept had suggested a one-dimensional acquisition of a new culture, the term transculturation denoted, in Ortiz' coinage, the complex interrelated processes of acquisition of a new culture, the loss of a previous one, and the resulting creation of new cultural phenomena. This `paradigm shift' in American anthropology toward a model emphasizing New World culturation and creation processes had its repercussions also in the Anglo American world in the work of anthropologists such as Sidney Mintz and Richard Price, who,

in *An Anthropological Approach to the Afro-American Past* (1976), critiqued the earlier `continuity model' proposed by Melville J. Herskovits in order to overcome a hardy historiographic tradition which had centered on Old World standards and evaluated New World cultural difference with cultural decline.

The concept of transculturation has, I think, intrinsic merits also for the study of American literatures. And it has already been appropriated also by literary scholars such as Angel Rama, who has discussed twentieth-century Latin American literature in terms of "narrative transculturations" of European languages of history and "cosmovisión" (1988, 55), and Mary Louise Pratt, who has discussed eighteenth-century European travel writing in the colonial (American and African) "contact zones" in terms of a literary transculturation (1992, 5). It allows us to see both processes, of replication of Old World aesthetic traditions and creative adaptation to New World circumstances, without having to evaluate that difference in terms of a cultural `lag'. However, as a comparative model for the study of early British and Spanish American literature, it can help us only in conceptualizing the relationship between these New World literatures and Old World literature, not between the early American literatures. While we will bear this concept in mind in what follows, it is necessary to consider the methodologies practiced in Comparative Literature in order to define the

terms of an operative critical approach for the comparative study of early British and Spanish American literature.

2. THE COMPARISON OF EARLY BRITISH AND SPANISH AMERICAN LITERATURE: SOME METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

From the perspective of comparativist methodology, the neglect of the colonial periods by students concerned with the literatures of the Western hemisphere at large, as well as the neglect of hemispheric aspects by students of early American and early Latin American literature, is not entirely surprising. In most general terms, comparativist literary scholarship has commonly relied on one of three methodologies or a combination of these three. First, it has compared two or more texts from different languages and cultures unaware of each other on the common basis of larger European formal or aesthetic movements (i. e. `Renaissance', `Baroque', `Neoclassicism') and its generic vehicles (epic, novel, etc.). Second, it has traced cross-literary influences of specific texts from different languages illuminating the reception of texts in terms of distinct cultural or historical contexts. Third, it has compared the various literary responses to, and participations in, specific extra-literary events and historical developments.

With regard to the first alternative, the formalist comparison of early Anglo-American and Spanish American literature on the basis of European aesthetic movements raises a set of problems. A brief consideration of Chapter

II and III of Alfred Owen Aldridge's important book *Early American Literature* serves as a case in point. Strongly influenced by the formalist tradition that informed the study of Comparative Literature in his generation, Aldridge compared colonial writers in Spanish and British America by applying categories such as `Renaissance', `Baroque', or `Enlightenment'. For example, Aldridge juxtaposed the poetry of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, Anne Bradstreet, and Edward Taylor relying on the interpretative categories of Hans Galinsky's "*kolonialer Literaturbarock*" (1968; 1979) and Mariano Picon-Salas' "*barroco de Indias*" (1944).[8] His discussions are insightful and sensitive to the peculiar problematics involved in the comparison of these colonial literatures. Nevertheless, the results have often left Aldridge's readers wondering about the *comparability* of these poets. As Spengemann remarks in an implicit reference to Owen Aldridge, "the Pan-Americanists' insistence on lumping together the writers of New England and Mexico" ignores the sense of literary critics that "Edward Taylor speaks to them in a way that Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz ... simply does not" (Spengemann 1994, 216). For, while the formal traits of both colonial literatures grew out of European aesthetic traditions, comparability on the basis of formalist considerations poses a number of problems. Not only did European aesthetic traditions arrive in Spain and England, and thus also in their American dependencies, at very different times; *but also the nature* in which these

European aesthetic and cultural movements manifested themselves in the larger (Catholic) Spanish and (mostly Protestant) British worlds was vastly different. While--to stay with Owen Aldridge's example--the label `baroque' has often been applied in the study of seventeenth-century Spanish as well as seventeenth-century English literature, a direct comparison of their colonial manifestations becomes meaningless without endless footnotes about *culteranismo*, *conceptismo*, etc., on the one hand and the English metaphysical tradition, Protestantism, etc. on the other. A direct juxtaposition of colonial literary forms is therefore impossible without first comparing the (pen-) insular forms out of which they grew. If we therefore adopt a comparative methodology which cross-culturally compares the colonial formal manifestations of specific European aesthetic movements in America, as did Own Aldridge, we must maintain also a perspective that allows us to see how American colonials adopted, appropriated, and transculturated specific European formal traditions. It is only these *processes* of transculturation that can be cross-culturally compared, then, not individual American cultural *forms*. Finally, as I have already pointed out above, aesthetic categories such as Renaissance, Baroque, and Neoclassicism were critical conventions which have been devised (often retrospectively) in the comparative study of *European* literatures specifically and are therefore, in their Europo-centricity, problematic for an application to literatures

outside Europe. While surely Euro-American colonials strove to imitate--and even outdo--their European aesthetic models, their literary productions would appear--as indeed they have for generations of critics--imitative only and anachronistic at best when measured by European aesthetic standards. From a purely formalist point of view then, New World formal difference would inevitably appear as a cultural `lag'.

With regard to the second alternative--cross-literary influences--, Aldridge has also provided a pioneering example for the comparative study of early American literatures in a chapter on the influences of the writings of Thomas Paine in Spanish America.[9] But while such an approach is applicable (as we will see in Chapter IV) for periods when Anglo-Americans and Spanish Americans read each other's writings, it has limited value for the comparative study of the colonial writers of British and Spanish America, who were, for the most part, unaware of each other.

Beside the two approaches to cultural comparison discussed above--aesthetic literary movements and direct intertextual influences--there remains therefore the third methodological possibility, which is to compare early British and Spanish American literature from a historicist point of view. The literary historian may, in this regard, turn to the Bolton school of the "epic of greater America" as a hemispheric history. It is, therefore, helpful to return to the historiographic debate that Lewis Hanke's question in 1964--"Do the Americas have a common History?"--

has elicited. For, not all historians participating in this debate shared Bolton's view of what constituted the "basic unity" which supposedly underlay the history of the Americas.[10] The peoples of Anglo, Spanish, Franco, or Luso America, not only entirely lacked a common cultural memory, prominent historians such as Edmundo O'Gorman and others objected; but the Europeans colonizing the New World also originated from, encountered, and ultimately established profoundly dissimilar societies. They spoke different languages, subscribed to different religions, had distinct political traditions, and, finally arrived in the New World at very different moments in European history (1964).

As far as this debate has an interest for the literary historian, the difficulties pointed out by the critics of the Bolton thesis can be classed into two major categories: synchronic and diachronic. Within the first category, the literary historian encounters a number of variables. First, as the comparative work of Patricia Seed on "ceremonies of possession" has shown (1995), Spain's imperial enterprise was, from the very beginning, of an entirely different nature from that of England, and Spaniards and Englishmen were looking for very different things in the New World. While the Spaniards writing about the New World displayed an active interest in the mineral resources of the New World and in its peoples as an object of conquest--as new vassals of the crown and as tribute labor in their services--the English writers were looking primarily for land which could

be settled by their own people and considered the Natives hereby mainly as an obstacle. Second, besides these vast ideological and cultural differences separating the Spanish and the British empire, the two realms were also very different in the degrees in which they maintained their cultural and ideological homogeneities. While, paradoxically, the British colonies, some of which would later form the United States, were ideologically and socially extremely diverse from the very beginning (i. e. Catholic Maryland, Anglican Barbados or Virginia, Puritan New England), the colonial regions which would later form Latin America--sometimes called the "Disunited States"--were remarkably homogeneous in ideology, religion, and forms of social organization. Thus, the narrative of an Anglican in Virginia, William Byrd's *The History of the Dividing Line*, bears, in some ways, more resemblance to a text written by a Spanish American writer such as Carrio de la Vandera than it did to the works of William Hubbard or Increase Mather in New England. Third, some of the native societies that the Spaniards encountered in America, such as the Nahuas in New Spain or the Incas in Peru, were very different from any of the groups that the English would encounter. The Valley of Mexico, for example, had a population density before the Conquest that it would not regain again until the twentieth century (see Sanders et. al. 1979, 333; Wolf 1976). More importantly for the literary historian, however, not only were these native societies objectively very different but

they also represented, in European eyes, cultures of various degrees of validity. Thus, while Bernal Diaz del Castillo could, in a famous passage in his *Historia verdadera*, only refer his reader to fabulous romances of chivalry in order to convey his sense of marvel at his first glimpse of Tenochtitlan (1984, I:303), the colonial writers of British American usually had difficulty even recognizing a human landscape in America (see Jennings 1975; also Cronon 1983).

With regard to the diachronic problems involved in the historical approach to the study of the early British and Spanish American literature, we encounter yet again two distinct sets of variables. First, the internal development of distinct colonial regions (i.e. New Spain, New Granada, Chesapeake, South Carolina) happens at very different points in time within the respective chronologies of Spanish and British imperial development. Thus, we find the early seventeenth-century Mexican poet Bernardo de Balbuena, in his poem *Grandeza Mexicana* (1604), celebrating Mexico City as the new navel of the world, while his contemporary in New Granada, Juan Rodríguez Freyle, in his gossipy chronicle *El Carnero* (1638), was lamenting his provincial situation as a writer in and about what he considered to be the edge of the civilized world. The problem of chronology becomes more involved when we attempt to compare cross-culturally texts from different imperial realms in America from a historicist point of view. For, the development of the British and Spanish imperial domains happened at different times within

the larger trans-national context of Atlantic and European economic and cultural development. Thus, by the time of the first English settlements in America during the early seventeenth century, colonial Spanish America displayed complex societies, thriving cultures, and even a sense of local patriotism quite distinct from that of peninsular Spain. Without doubt--even if there ever was such a thing as *a* "colonial baroque"--it makes a difference whether literary activities are practised at the vice-regal court of New Spain, as did for example Sor Juana Ines de la Cruz, or in the backwoods of New England, as did her contemporary Edward Taylor. Moreover, it could be argued that the developments of the two imperial domains were largely antithetical, as the rise of British colonialism in America coincided with, capitalized from, and promoted the decline of Spain's imperial power in the Atlantic world during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Consequently, much of the colonial British American (and English) writing during the seventeenth century still displayed a sense of a Renaissance providentialist triumphism and historical optimism. By contrast, the literature of Spanish America (as well as of Spain) at the same time is profoundly informed by the aesthetics of the baroque, which is, as Jose Lezama Lima has written, an "art of counter-conquest" (1969, 34), and tends to represent the world in the ambiguous double image of youthful beauty mirrored by death and decay.

What to do about these historical diachronisms? It is,

in this context, helpful to consider Louis Hartz' classic comparatist model, proposed in his *The Founding of New Societies* (1946), which conceived of the European colonization of America in terms of an "ideological fragmentation of Europe." It is, in order to understand Hartz' "fragmentation" thesis, necessary to note Hartz' notion about European historical development, which he saw in a progression from a feudal to a bourgeois culture during the seventeenth century and to a "radical" culture in the nineteenth century. Whereas Spanish expansionism in the New World during the sixteenth century was therefore still entirely feudal, Hartz argued, the English colonization of America during the seventeenth century was informed by an inherently liberal ideology. Due to a cultural "conservatism," which Hartz discerned in the colonial "fragments," new colonial societies did not undergo the same development as did Europe but retained their original stages of cultural development.[11] Hence, the argument continued, the "liberal tradition" remained the prevailing ideology in British America, whereas Latin America has been dominated by the feudal tradition.

More recent scholarship has, however, called into question Hartz' description of Spanish America as feudal. Thus, as political historians such as Anthony Pagden (1990) and historians of "mentalities" such as Jose Antonio Maravall (1986) and Claudio Véliz (1994) have each pointed out, the Spanish Empire in the Americas can hardly be

considered as "feudal," for the autonomies of local lords had begun to crumble in Spain as early as the ascension of Ferdinand and Isabella and were eventually entirely crushed during the reign of Charles V, who turned Spain and its dependencies into a centralized modern state. Thus, the land in the Spanish American dependencies belonged to the Crown, not to local feudal lords, as it had in medieval Europe, or to private companies and individuals as it would in "liberal" British America. It appears, therefore, in light of this, more appropriate for the literary historian to follow Octavio Paz who has, in his study of Baroque culture and literature in New Spain (1990), applied the label "patrimonialism" in order to describe the hierarchical and centralized structure of Spanish society and state in the Americas.

Also the term "liberal," in Hartz' coinage, requires some re-consideration for its application in a historical comparison of British and Spanish America. For, the Marxist foundations implicit in Hartz' teleology of history--supposing the transformation from a feudal to bourgeois ideology during the seventeenth century--have been questioned in their applicability not only to the European countries from which British and Spanish American expansionism originated, but also to the new American societies which formed under cultural and social circumstances different from those of Europe. On the one hand, Alan Macfarlane, in his study of land ownership

practices (1978), has argued that England--which had of course been Marx's model when conceiving his historical teleology--had ceased to be "feudal" as early as the thirteenth century.

On the other hand, the Spanish philosopher of history Leopoldo Zea (1992) has denied that Spain has ever become a liberal society--that it even has, in effect, never become part of the "West." It had long been a characteristic of Spanish historiography, and of the Spanish sense of history in general, to think of Spain as a distinctive historical entity, one to which historical laws, as the German historians of the nineteenth century liked to call their generalizations, would not apply (see Godzich and Spadaccine 1986, xiv). Thus, eminent post-Civil War historians such as Claudio Sanchez-Albornoz (1956) stressed that Spain had been, in regard to these universalist laws, a "historical enigma" since the time of the *reconquista*, when an emergent Spanish messianism facilitated the early formation of a strongly centralized modern Catholic government that crushed local autonomies and the development of a liberal state. It is therefore helpful to consider the "baroque" as the defining feature of Spanish and Spanish American culture; "baroque," that is, not in the Hegelian sense as a historical stage in universalist narrative of European art history but rather as a "historical structure," as the historian Jose Antonio Maravall does (1986), encompassing social, economic, as well as cultural aspects.[12]

If "liberal" Hegelian or Marxist theories of history seem thus inadequate for a description of Spanish culture, they are inherently problematic also for an application to the Americas; for, in the Euro-centricity of their perspective, which inevitably obscures historical development in places outside the developmental patterns set by the history of Europe, "fragment" historical development must inevitably appear as static. While this problem has become visible in Anglo American historiography only occasionally, Spanish, and particularly Latin American, historians have been more sensitive in regard to what Robert Young has called "Marxism's universalizing narrative" (1990, 2). Incidentally, it was precisely this sensitivity which informed O'Gorman's attack of the Bolton thesis. But in order to illustrate this, it is necessary to return to O'Gorman's critique in more detail.

O'Gorman found "important point[s] of contact between Hegel's thought" about American history and that of the "contemporary Pan-Americanism" (106). Hegel, as well as Bolton," O'Gorman argued,

> see[s] the difference between the Americas in terms of degree, not of essence. Both speak of one America, establishing a principle of international differentiation: Hegel rates them according to their `primitivism'. Bolton according to their `importance'. Both have been influenced by a geographical hallucination... The two Americas progress and soon the one lagging behind (Hispanic America) will find itself on the same level as Saxon America.

The crux of O'Gorman's critique concerned thus the idea of "culture progress" which underlay Bolton's vision of a

hemispheric history: "from all sides are presented evidence of material prosperity," O'Gorman observed, "railroads, plantations, oil wells, investments, foreign capital, raw materials." "Progress," O'Gorman feared, referred in the Pan-Americanist narrative to a particular liberal Protestant notion of progress--that "culture follows material prosperity"--in precisely the way that Hegel had conceived of progress (1964, 109). Conversely, the absence of material prosperity implied the impossibility of progress. The teleologies conceptualized in historical reflections about bourgeois France (or capitalist England) would inevitably result in an image of cultural `backwardness' with regard to Latin America.

While Hegelian theory of history had therefore long been profoundly problematic from the perspective of Latin American history in general, O'Gorman was the more appalled when re-encountering it--in a kind of déjà vu--as a proposed model for a Pan American history. Too often had the history of Pan-Americanist interest in Anglo America been motivated by a Protestant liberal messianism that reached from Cotton Mather's and Samuel Sewell's plan to translate the (Protestant) Bible and distribute it into Mexico at the beginning of the eighteenth century to Calhoun's manifest destiny speeches in the nineteenth century (see H. Bernstein 1965; also Gandia 1964). From this point of view, it is not surprising that the "basic unity" underlying Bolton's "Epic of Greater America" appeared to the Mexican historian

O'Gorman in the 1950s--after his country had been invaded by the United States a dozen or so times since its independence from Spain--utterly "shocking" (109). Bolton had "not demonstrated the existence of this new American culture ... [and] the historical unity of America," O'Gorman insisted. "Had he done so," he remarked with subtle sarcasm in reference to the Protestant historian, he "would have performed a miracle--a thing which I am not sure that Professor Bolton would have liked" (1964, 109-110).

Here, we can see, then, the fundamental difference between Bolton's and O'Gorman's respective views of progress and history--a difference which is indicative of the profound chasm between their respective cultures. Whereas in Bolton's liberal Englightenment narrative of progress, material prosperity will lead to "culture progress," in O'Gorman's `baroque' vision of history, "a culture crisis" follows in the wake of "a dangerous material prosperity." Since the sixteenth century, O'Gorman believed, "the fate of the New World has been inextricably bound to that of western culture, at that time already in a painful stage of disintegration which has now become acute" (1964, 109-110). Apparently similar cultural forms of New World culture in British and Spanish America (New World progressivism, colonialism, individualism, indigenism) often resist adequate comparison by direct juxtaposition as they grew out of entirely different, often antithetical, cultural traditions.

As far as Bolton's call for a hemispheric perspective on American history was concerned, O'Gorman concluded that

> We may agree in our interpretation of the term "History of America" only insofar as we refer to the unity of the American continent as based on a spatial concept; but spiritual manifestations, one must insist, are the ones that are essential for the building of historical schemes. (1964, 106)

--the "unity of the American continent as based on a spatial concept." How far could the comparative study of the hemisphere be conceived to be based on the notion of America as a spatial concept? It is, in this regard, instructive to turn to O'Gorman's own model for a comparative study of the Americas.

3. THE "INVENTION OF AMERICA": COLONIAL/POST-COLONIAL DISCOURSE AND EARLY AMERICAN LITERATURE

In his seminal book, *The Invention of America* (1958), O'Gorman had argued that Europeans during the sixteenth century did not "discover" but rather (in making room for an extra-cosmic entity within their discursive practices) "invented" America. Indeed the very idea of a discovery of America, O'Gorman argued, was an integral part in the process of this invention. In his reading of historiography as narrative and as an instrumental tool for constructing history and inventing realities, O'Gorman anticipated then, by more than a decade, more current European and Anglo-American post-structuralist approaches which have operated from a similar perspective. Seen in this light, O'Gorman

could be said to have initiated a "postcolonial" tradition in Latin American historical scholarship which would deconstruct the ideological foundations that have shaped European historiography of America for five centuries. But O'Gorman's meta-historical critique of the "Invention of America" has had a profoundly transformative impact also on Americanist historical scholarship in the United States and Europe since the 1960s. Within the context of what Fernando Coronil has called the "politics of selfhood ... [in] post-colonial empires" such as the late twentieth-century United States (1989, 315), O'Gorman's work has become one of the most influential sources in the way in which historians would read early American texts.

Not surprisingly, O'Gorman's historiographic critique has been influential also in the wake of the cultural studies movement and in the study of early Spanish America from the perspective of Postcolonial theory. However, whereas O'Gorman had, in the positivist tradition, still subscribed to the belief in "a truth about an American reality from which we can differentiate inventing from discovering, and ultimately define `the historical structure of the being of America and the sense of American history'" (Rabasa 1993, 11), more recent cultural critics have appropriated the methodologies and analytical categories of Poststructuralism and Postcolonial Theory. The beginning of Postcolonial Theory is, of course, usually identified with the publication of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978), a

critique of European representations of the `Middle East' and the `Orient' since the end of the eighteenth century.[13] While both Said and O'Gorman were concerned with European productions of knowledge about the non-European world, Said stressed that these European discursive constructions were intimately linked to the systematic oppression of non-European peoples' own representations of themselves and that European representations of Otherness were intimately linked with a European ideology of imperialism and politics of oppression.[14]

Jose Rabasa has therefore modified O'Gorman's argument by substituting the noun "invention" for the gerund "inventing" on the basis that it "foregrounds the assumption that what we say about European expansionism, conquest, and colonization of the world in the early modern period implies a position on issues pertaining to neo-colonialism and Eurocentricism today" (1993, 12). The "invention" of America as Europe's Other in the language of colonialism and imperial control has been an ongoing process, Rabasa argued, even though the geo-cultural lines that once separated the colonial peripheries from the imperial centers have in part been re-drawn to include cultural regions once themselves Europe's `colonial space'. While O'Gorman has been the first among twentieth-century professional historians to deconstruct European languages of history about America, it is therefore important to contextualize his pathbraking critique within a larger cultural process of what José

Saldívar has called the "dialectics of Our America;" specifically, the intimate relationship between the writing of `History' and `colonial space'. For, it could be argued, as is suggested by O'Gorman's critique of the Bolton thesis, that O'Gorman became aware of the ideological structures that have informed European historical discourse since the sixteenth century precisely because in twentieth-century post-Hegelian discourse, Latin America has been defined as `colonial space'. Seen from this perspective, as I will argue in the following chapters about earlier American writers in colonial space, O'Gorman perpetuated (and institutionalized) a tradition that had been implicit in colonial American writing from the `periphery' of history all along. It is this body of writing which I will attempt to define as `American Literature': the meta-historical `un-official' rewriting of History from a constantly transforming colonial periphery. In this regard, O'Gorman's example represents an instance in a dialectical cultural process in Western culture in which writing in colonial space--from the sixteenth-century *relaciones* to the twentieth-century Latin American "New Narrative"--consistently transforms the official discursive practices in "The Writing of History" (de Certeau 1988).

4. CREOLE IDENTITIES, ETHNOGRAPHY, AND COLONIAL SPACE

The question that this study poses specifically with regard to Early American Literature is then how the constructions

of colonial `creole' identities in early British and Spanish America were affected by their location in Europe's `colonial space'; in particular, how colonials `inscribed' America--the `New' World--into a History which had invented America as `outside' History, not the subject of history but rather of `ethnography' or (as it was called before the nineteenth century `natural history'). In doing so, it asks inevitably what implications Postcolonial Theory can have for the study of early American literature in general and the construction of Early American identities in particular.

I should explain what is meant by `creole', `colonial', `identity', `ethnography' or `natural history'. Let us begin with `identity'. I rely in my use of this word on the terminology coined by the anthropologist Anthony Wallace (1967), who has defined "identity" as "any image, or set of images, conscious or unconscious" which an individual or culture has of itself. `Identity', as Wallace conceptualizes it, refers thus to a particular mode of self-perception which occurs on an imaginary spectrum reaching from an absolute "feared identity" (as the least desirable identity state) to an "ideal identity" (as the most desirable identity state). The actual state of self-perception within this spectrum, Wallace calls "real identity." By "identity work," Wallace means any "measurable physical or mental effort" expended on the part of individuals or cultures which are "designed to bring into perception evidence which will justify the cognitive resetting of real identity at the

more desirable state" (65-68). "Identity work," in Wallace's scheme, consists thus of an increase in what he calls "value distance" between an individual's or culture's "real identity" and "feared identity" on the one hand and by a decrease in "value distance" between this "real identity" and "ideal identity" on the other.

In order to theorize the connection between the construction of Early American identities in `colonial space' (America as an invention of the European ethnographic imagination), it is helpful to turn to Postcolonial criticism for a definition of `ethnography', or `natural history', and `colonial'. It is therefore necessary to trace, briefly and schematically, the position of Postcolonial theory on these terms to its poststructuralist roots, in particular to Michel Foucault's famous account of the connection between scientific knowledge and power. In *The Order of Things* (1966), Foucault had described natural history as a "regional" space within what he called the "classical episteme." By `episteme' Foucault meant a kind of conceptual grid that provides conceptions of order, sign, and language that allow a series of discursive practices to qualify as "knowledge." During the eighteenth century, Foucault believed, there happened a crucial shift in the European archeology of knowledge. Whereas the classical episteme had been structured by the principle of "resemblance," a way of thinking and being in the world in which there was no gap between "words" and "things," in the

"modern episteme," it yielded to a principle of "representation," in which "words" were dissociated from "things." Moreover, whereas "Man" had, in this classical episteme, stood outside this grid of knowledge, in the modern episteme Man was incorporated and became an object of scientific inquiry (221, 312, 386). The consequence of the first transformation, Foucault argued, was the breakup of knowledge into the mathematical sciences, the empirical sciences, and philosophical reflection. The consequence of the second transformation was, he argued in his *Discipline and Punish* (1975), the constitution of a new modality of power--which he called "disciplinary" power--as it subjectified and subjected human bodies to its grids.

If Postcolonial theoreticians have in essence adopted Foucault's Poststructuralist account of the human sciences, they have pointed out that he seemed largely "unaware of the extent to which [these] ideas of discourse ... are assertively European" and of how they were used to discursively produce, and then to occupy, rule, and exploit "almost the whole of the non-European world" (Said 1994, 222; see also 1978). For this reason, Edward Said argued, much of what Foucault had suggested "makes greatest sense not as an ethnocentric model of how power is exercised in modern society, but between Europe and the rest of the world." European man became the object of "philosophical reflection" (History), non-European became the object of "science" (natural history and ethnography).

Thus we have arrived at what I have initially called the current `postcolonial intersection' between the study of cultural anthropology and literature. On the one hand, cultural anthropologists such as Talal Asad (1973), Eric Wolf (1982), Renato Rosaldo (1986), or James Clifford (1986) have begun to investigate the role that the history of their field played in colonialism; and geographers, such as Derek Gregory in his study the European "Geographical Imaginations" (1994), have shown how "the incorporation of non-European `man' into the table, the taxonomy and the grid effectively prised non-European people away from the land which they inhabited" (30). He therefore called for a "way of remapping those spaces of power-knowledge or, better, of exploring the interconnections between power, knowledge, and spatiality" (33). On the other hand, literary critics such as Edward Said, Homi Bhabha (1994) and Mary Louise Pratt (1992) have explored eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scientific discourses from a literary point of view. Pratt, for example, has argued that the eighteenth-century European construction of the Other as a figure of "nonreason" was an essential moment in the self-construction of the European subject as a sovereign figure of reason and normality. And it was now time to reverse the direction of the Linnaean gaze, as Pratt suggests, "looking at Europe from the imperial frontier" and connecting the scientific appropriation of the non-European to the exercise of imperial power (1992, 34-36; 58-67).

A second consequence of the extrapolation of Foucault's Poststructuralist account of the connection between science and power onto the colonial encounter has been an implicit and explicit critique of the time frame initially proposed by Foucault, whose view had been limited to Europe. On the one hand, Anthony Pagden (1993) has suggested that the European encounter with the New World during the sixteenth century was a major impetus in the transformation of old forms of European knowledge. Thus, Wayne Franklin (1979), in his analysis of Columbus' letters, has observed that

> everything Columbus did ... was an education in language, in the relation of words to things in America. ... The contact with native groups was a form of cultural shock which was expressed most poignantly in the initial failure of even a verbal understanding between red and white. Likewise, the profusion of unknown natural objects in America placed an extra burden on the traveler's mind and language, as did the frequently tangled web of European events in this hemisphere of strange peoples and strange sights...Particularly in colonial settings, where the replication of old forms is the controlling impetus to new action, language develops a priority of its own. (2-4)

On the other hand, critics such as Michel de Certeau (1986; 1988), Tzvetan Todorov (1984), Peter Hulme (1987), Stephen Greenblatt (1991), Walter Mignolo (1995), and Jose Rabasa (1994) have linked this "shock" in European epistemologies and the "priority" of language in its drive toward "old forms" not only to the emergence of a new Euro-centric discursive system which would `produce' the non-European world in the spatialized scientific discourses of New World ethnography and natural history but also to the formation of a specifically colonialist kind of Foucaultian "disciplinary

power" during the sixteenth century. Thus, Stephen Greenblatt has argued that the rhetorical category of the "marvelous" in the Renaissance literature of the discovery served, like horses and gun-powder, as an act of power and appropriation, by evoking "a sense of the marvelous that in effect fills up the emptiness at the center of the mained rite of possession" (1991, 80). Similarly, Walter Mignolo, in his "essay on colonial semiosis as a field of study," has called for "a change in our understanding of the construction of a new World during the sixteenth century," a perspective in which what he calls "the darker side of the Renaissance" is brought into light and a change of voice in which "the European Renaissance is looked at from the colonial periphery" (Mignolo 1995, 8).

When we appropriate the terms `colonial' and `postcolonial' from Postcolonial theory for this study of early American Literature, a few words of explanation are needed. Indeed, the term `colonial' and `colonialism' in this regard may seem somewhat problematic.[15] Significantly, as Jorge Klor de Alva (1995) points out for the English case, the word "colonial" does not appear in any written source in the English language until the late 1700s (264). `Colonial' in the traditional coinage of Postcolonial theory refers, of course, to the non-European subjugated by European colonial power, not to European colonists outside Europe. Surely, the distinction is an important one to make. There are, indeed, a number of problems involved in

postulating a common `colonial situation' that links non-European colonized peoples (African, Indian, or even Native American) to (ex-) European colonials. First, there is an important difference with regard to language, cultural origins, and race--the very issues that play such an important role in the languages of the colonial encounters. Second, there are, presumably, important historical differences between (post) colonial consciousnesses that originated in the old empires of Spain and England from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century and those that emerged in the context of the `new' British Empire of the nineteenth century or of twentieth-century `neo-colonialism;" for, these imperial contexts have themselves evolved in the colonial encounters.

I order to distinguish the body of texts that I am concerned with here from those (post) colonial writings produced by the indigenous inhabitants and their descendants of European colonies, I use the term `creole.' I derive my use of this term from the Spanish *criollo*. A more detailed discussion of the `invention' of the *criollo* or creole in European imperial historiography will follow in Chapter II. In the context of postcolonial criticism, `creole' generally refers to "those who are the descendants of settlers yet who are indigenous to their land of settlement in the sense of being native-born (Boehmer 1995, 9, also 111-114). In including `creole' writing in the history of (post) colonial writing, I follow Ian Adam and Helen Tiffin (1991), who have

broadly defined post-colonial discourse as "writing ... grounded in those societies whose subjectivity has been constituted in part by the subordinating power of European colonialism ... and their forms and subjectificatory legacies" (vii). Thus defined, (post-) coloniality would allow for an inclusion also of early American creoles.

This study makes then no claim to "make a cultural and political intervention," as many scholars invested in this critical tradition would (Mignolo 1995, xi). My aim is not to `give voice' to the colonial subaltern but rather to provide new perspectives on, for the most part, rather well-known canonized texts in both Early American and early Latin American literary studies. Like (post-) colonial writers in India or Africa, early American creoles also had to confront the discourses of European writing of history in its historiographic conventions of authority, epistemology, and ideology when writing in and about Europe's colonial space. If, therefore, I nevertheless apply, for the purpose of this study, the terms "colonial" or "postcolonial" to refer not the indigenous colonized but rather to Europeans colonials (colonists or `planters'), I am talking about a distinct `settlement' colonialism rather than the nineteenth- and twentieth-century forms of colonial and neo-colonial dependency and exploitation of non-European peoples with which postcolonial theory has traditionally been concerned. I rely in my distinction between `settlement' colonies and `invaded' colonies on the coinage of D. E. S. Maxwell and on

its application by critics such as Ian Adam and Helen Tiffin (1991), Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Tiffin (1989), as well as on Stephen Slemon (1995), who has also, in this context, applied the term `Second World' colonialism.[16] These critics define "colonial" and "post-colonial" broadly as "all the cultures affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day" and have, I believe, provided a productive theoretical model for an application of post-colonial theory also to the literatures of American creoles (see especially Ashcroft, Griffith, and Tiffin 1989, 133-45).

Of course, we must not forget when applying the category "settler colonies" (vs. "invaded colonies") to the early Americas that this category refers to a particular group of writers (creoles) only, not to the inhabitants of the colonial Americas in general. To forget this would mean--as Francis Jennings (1975) would make a point to remind us--to perpetuate yet again a colonialist ideology. Clearly, from the perspective of social history, there were no "settler" colonies anywhere in America; all "settler" colonies were built on "invaded" territory. And to think of either Spanish or British America in terms of European settler colonies is, moreover, to forget the tremendous cultural heterogeneity, as well as the processes of mixtures and transculturations, which characterized the social environments of the colonial Americas and which often distinguished them from Europe. It is necessary to insist on

this point not merely as a token tribute to political correctness, but because the presence (or proximity) of cultural, racial, and linguistic alterities and mixtures in the social environments of the Americas had (as we shall see) profound effects on the constructions of distinctive creole identities in both Spanish and British America alike. Identification in colonial space, writes Homi Bhabha is always a "process visible in the exchange of looks between native and settler that structures their psychic relation in the paranoid fantasy of boundless possession ... It is always in relation to the place of the Other that colonial desire is articulated" (1994, 44).

In this context, I believe, a comparative study of creole colonial identities in the early Americas can also provide a contribution to Postcolonial criticism in general and particular to the study of settler colonialism. First, as Stephen Slemon has pointed out, the exclusionary focus in Postcolonial criticism on `third-world' colonialism at the expense of what world system theory calls "the field of `semi-periphery'" has led to a general "foreclosing ... on settler/colonial writing: the radical ambivalence of colonialism's middle ground." However, the inquiry into settler colonial writing in the context of Postcolonial theory has important implications for Postcolonial criticism itself as it has been practiced. For, in the writing of `settler' colonies, Slemon observes, the binary "centre/periphery model" with its roots in world-system

theory tends to "blur when it tries to focus upon ambiguously placed or ambivalent material." The inherent awareness in the colonial text of both `there' and `here', and the cultural ambiguity of these terms are, in this literature, "not so much the boundaries of its cultural matrix, nor tensions to be resolved, but a space *within* which the [settler colonial's] literary text may move while speaking" (1995, 107-9; see also Tiffin and Lawson 1994, 6). But it is this `space within', which Homi Bhabha calls "the disturbing distance in-between" the colonialist Self and the colonized Other, which also constitutes identity in the writing of `Third-World' (post) colonial intelligentsia, such as Frantz Fanon's *Black Skin, White Masks* (Bhabha 1994, 45). However, in settler writing, this "liminal problem of colonial identity" emerges not as "a white man's artifice inscribed on the black man's body" (as it does in Fanon), but rather as the `black man's degeneracy inscribed on the white man's body'. For both groups alike, however, "The question of identification is never," Bhabha writes,

> the affirmation of a pre-given identity, never a self-fulfilling prophecy--it is always the production of an image of identity and the transformation of the subject in assuming that image .... Identification ... is always the return of an image of identity that bears the mark of splitting in the Other place from which it comes (1995, 45)

As we shall see in the chapters that follow, American creoles also often ambiguously `split' and appropriate, rather than reject, the territorialized languages of the Invention of America. While individual colonial voices

frequently subvert imperial discourses within a specific historical context, they encounter these discourse in a dialogue which takes place in a `space' between `here' and `there', within the terms established by the metropolitan discursive landscapes.

However, even those critics who have concerned themselves with `settler' colonialism have entirely ignored the colonial Americas. Thus, while Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin discuss, though briefly, Charles Brockden Brown and James Fenimore Cooper, they do not mention a single American colonial author (1989, 133-45). Ultimately, they, too, fail to explore the relationship between the "postcolonial" writing after political independence and a tradition of writing in formally colonial settings for any given area. This points to a problem in positing "post-coloniality" as a distinct period in a culture's history without exploring how the "post-colonial" characteristics identified are specific to the literature of a "postcolonial" national period. The very concept "post"-colonial assumes stable temporal boundaries and characteristics which distinguish "colonial" from "post-colonial" and "national" discourses which, ironically, as Anne McClintock (1994) has pointed out, are based on Europo-centric concepts of history and which `post-colonial' writers in the twentieth century have labored hard to overcome. A dichotomy between colonial and postcolonial writing is furthermore problematic because it oversimplifies the historical complexity in which each text engaging in the

colonial encounter is immersed. This is true not only in the case of white `settler' colonials--themselves the heirs and beneficiaries of European colonial ideologies--but also for non-European colonials writing in a European language, as these languages themselves were profoundly shaped by the ideology and experiences of colonialism.

Finally, fixed boundaries separating colonial from postcolonial writing in any given historical context are problematic due to the changing impact that the colonial experience had on the European centers themselves. It can be argued--as I will--that European metropolitan discourses themselves evolved in the experience of colonialism and in their dialogues with peripheral voices. For, in the colonial encounter, as Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman (1994) have observed, the cultural movement is not only from the `center' to the `periphery' but also from the 'periphery' to the 'center'. Neither "colonial discourse" nor "post-" or "counter-colonial discourse" are therefore historical constants with formal, ideological, or epistemologic essences but products of ongoing dialogues and discursive struggles in specific historical contexts of the colonial experience. While the formal, ideological, and epistemologic attributes of peripheral "post-" or "counter-colonial" discourse always depend on the terms set by metropolitan power, metropolitan discourses are themselves constantly unsettled and transformed in the encounter with, and suppressions of, the textual representations of peripheral

experience. While "post-colonial theory" can therefore provide a larger conceptual framework for a comparison of specific Spanish and British American responses to European inventions of America, these responses must be discussed in their respective imperial and historical contexts while comparatively highlighting their rhetorical strategies in encountering metropolitan discourses.

5. TRANSCULTURATIONS IN COLONIAL SPACE: CREOLE IDENTITIES AND THE ETHNOGRAPHIC IMAGINATION IN EARLY BRITISH AND SPANISH AMERICAN WRITING

While I roughly follow, in accordance with convention, a chronological order in my arrangement of chapters (Exodus-Captivity-History-Revolution), I do so not to suggest a particular teleology in the formations of an `American identity'--the one which presumably culminates in an American independence movement--but rather to be able to locate better these formations within their specific historical contexts of imperial politics. The chronological arrangement is, from this point of view, a mere convenience, and each chapter, while focused on the comparison of British and Spanish American texts of the same `genre' and roughly of the same time, invariably harks back over several centuries to illustrate the transculturation of European discourses and genres in the Americas. Each chapter therefore represents not so much a `stage' in the development of an `American identity' but rather a perennial

topos in New World writing. Thus, the topos of `Exodus', for example, connects not only the texts of sixteenth-century Franciscan missionaries to their seventeenth-century Franciscan counterparts, but as well to eighteenth-century emigrants from New Spain to California and nineteenth-century slaves narrators, such as Frederick Douglass. Similarly, the topos of `History' (or the writing thereof) connects not only the narratives of Crèvecoeur and Carrio de la Vandera, but similarly the novels of Toni Morrison or Alejo Carpentier.

Each chapter thus explores the colonial transculturations of metropolitan languages of History about America within various contexts of European imperialism. By deliberately drawing from a chronologically and generically wide range of texts--reaching from sixteenth and seventeenth-century missionary and captivity narratives to eighteenth-century American "auto-ethnographies" and Revolutionary poetry--I will argue that each of these texts is engaged in a polemical meta-historical dialogue and critique of metropolitan languages of History with regard to their conventions of epistemology, teleology, authority, and division of labor.

Often, these colonial polemics are not overt critiques of imperial historiography but rather implicit and `hidden'--without explicit reference to the prior "speech act." In "hidden polemic," according to Michail Bakhtin, the author's discourse "brings a polemical attack to bear against another

speech act, another assertion on the same topic." The utterance focused on its referential object clashes with another utterance "on the grounds of the referential itself." Without being reproduced, the prior utterance nevertheless structures the discourse (see Bakhtin 1971, 203-210; also 1981). From this point of view, writing in colonial situations in European languages inevitably dramatizes what Bakhtin called the "semantic tension" of the text with the conventional and official discourses of the "social space" in which it originated (1971, 203). This dialogic tension originates in the singular enunciation of "the individual confronting his or her own norm" (Todorov 1984a, 70). However, for Bakhtin personal narrative is never merely an individual voice expressing a singular extralinguistic experience, but also a `bearer' of a political or ideological discourse concurring and competing with other discourses in social spaces. While, in the context of the colonial dialogues I am interested in, the discursive `norm' of the social space is that of the transatlantic `print cultures' in general and the centered language of history legitimating the transatlantic empires (i. e. the invention of America) in particular, colonial identities are constructed in the allegorization of the individual's enunciation as the voice of communal colonial experience (the reinvention of America). In the chapters that follow, I will illustrate the dialogism in the

compositional and authorial strategies that creole colonials employ in writing in colonial space.

In Chapter I, I compare the eschatological significations of the Indian neophyte in the American missionary accounts of sixteenth-century Franciscans in New Spain and seventeenth-century Puritans in New England and their `impact' upon European theories and practices of history. Djelal Kadir (1994) has studied the function that European "prophetic rhetoric" has had on the formation of an "ideology of conquest" in European expansionism. I partially build here on Kadir's comparative work but specifically trace the literary histories of the Indian convert in these colonial literatures in the context of changing imperial politics through the Franciscan chronicles of Fray "Motolinia" Toribio de Benavente, Bernardo de Sahagun, and Jeronimo de Mendieta as well as the New English Puritan texts of John Eliot, Edward Winslow, Cotton Mather and others. While the earlier New English chronicles of the Cromwellian era, as well as the pre-Tridentine Franciscan chronicles, had conceived of Redemption History as progressing in a geo-historically bilateral and `symmetrical' design on both sides of the Atlantic, the later chronicles entirely relocate the telos of history into the New World, deeming the Old World lost to Antichrist (i. e. Popery/the Reformation). However, due to the essentially divergent ideological foundations underlying British and Spanish colonialism in the New World, the New Spanish Indian

convert continues to inhabit the lost utopias of the Franciscan chronicles after 1570 whereas the New England `Praying Indian' is cast out of the Puritan social utopia as a symbol of a lost cause representing (white) New England's martyrdom after the Restoration in 1660s.

Chapter II contextualizes the two seventeenth-century colonial captivity narratives of Francisco Núñez de Pineda y Bascuñán and Mary Rowlandson in a tradition of European New World ethnography, especially the sixteenth-century narratives of travel, shipwreck, and captivity. Both colonial narratives appropriate the trope of pilgrimage and re-write earlier (European) narratives of `removal' that had legitimized the respective colonial projects in order to re-inscribe the Atlantic frontier from a colonial point of view. This re-inscription and `re-distribution of colonial space', I argue, is functional to the `identity work' of the seventeenth-century colonial cultures of Chile and New England and partially explains the perennial appeal of the captivity theme in the literatures of the Americas also in later periods.

Chapter III compares the `influence' of the Enlightenment discourse of natural history on Hector St. John de Crevecoeur's *Letters from an American Farmer* and Alonso Carrió de la Vandera's *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*. I contextualize both texts in a tradition of epistemologic and hermeneutical tension implicit in European writing about the New World and argue that these (post-)

colonial "auto-ethnographies" parody the European production of knowledge about America in its division of intellectual labor and constructions of historiographic authority.

Chapter IV discusses the creole appropriations of Ercilla's sixteenth-century New World epic *La Araucana* and the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega's *Comentarios reales* in the Revolutionary poetry of Joel Barlow and José Joaquín de Olmedo. I read both poets in a dialogue with European Enlightenment historiography, which denies an American historical depth, and argue that their poetry assimilates the American indigenous past to Enlightenment ideals of historical progress as in Gibbon's or Robertson's histories of Europe. By relocating the ideological axis separating European Selfs and Others from space into time, both creole poets reconceptualize imperialist ideologies of historical `progress' as not an outward expansion into Western spaces but rather as a universal evolutionary process leading from barbarity to civility in the Old World and the New.

NOTES INTRODUCTION

[1] For a historical comparative model developed in the study of Atlantic slavery, see Curtin (1990).

[2] D. Weber (1992, 13). See also Hennessy (1978); Covington (1990); Rausch and Weber (1994); Sullivan (1990); Amado (1990); and Turner-Bushnell (1994).

[3] Shuffelton (1993, 3); see also Kolodny (1984).

[4] See, for example, the latest edition of the *Heath Anthology of American Literature* (ed. Lauter, 1990).

[5] See also the recent anthology edited by Warner and Jehlen, *The English Literature of America* (1997).

[6] See, for example, the (perhaps too) critical review by E. Eliot (1995).

[7] See here Greene and Pole's introductory essay (1984); also Shammas (1979); Bushman (1984); Breen (1984); Canny and Pagden (1987); and Greene (1990; 1993)--all of whom explore the *relationship between*, rather than the *identity of*, cultural forms in metropolis and colony. For a sociological study of these transculturation processes in colonial Mexico, see Alberro (1992).

[8] Picon-Salas perceived a distinctly American form of baroque which incorporated Native American elements. Picon's idea of a *barroco de indias* has, however, been the subject of much debate. Some of his critics have denied that a distinct *barroco de indias* ever existed since the baroque, they have argued, was defined by the very principle of incorporating local forms and differences and did so in every part of America as well as Europe. We can therefore only speak, they continued, of various local American forms of baroque, not of an American baroque that is different from European baroque.

[9] Other examples of this approach can be found in the work of S. Williams (1968); also Sparks Stimpson (1952).

[10] See O'Gorman (1964); Arciniegas (1984); Whitaker (1984); Binkley (1984); de Gandia (1984).

[11] My representation of Hartz' model somewhat over-simplifies his thesis, but is adequate for my purposes here.

[12] Maravall argues that absolutist power, realizing Castilian hegemonic aspirations, began in the fifteenth century by controlling and disciplining the nobles; eventually, however, it turned into a defender of the nobility around 1600 as significant realignments took place in the body politic, especially as Castile brought within its sway areas in which other social groups had achieved significant power and autonomy. Maravall describes the Baroque therefore as a "culture of crisis" as it emerged in

Spain at around 1600 (Maravall 1979, 89; see also Maravall 1972).

[13] However, as Benita Parry has pointed out (1987, 29), the "post-colonial" critique of "colonial discourse" begins with Frantz Fanon's *Black Skin/White Masks* (1952), which has since the `emergence' of "post-colonial theory" been republished (1986) and enthusiastically reread.

[14] For an good overview of the impact that *Orientalism* has recently had on literary, anthropological, and historical scholarship, see Seed (1991).

[15] See Klor de Alva (1993). Adorno (1993) has also expressed concern that the overly enthusiastic embrace by scholars working in various fields of analytical categories devised in the study of a specific kind of colonialism (British imperialism in Asia) under specific historical circumstances (late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries) are inappropriate for the study of sixteenth-century empires, colonial regions, or historical circumstances.

[16] For a tentative--and perhaps problematic--attempt to read "American Renaissance" literature in the light of post-colonial theory see Buell (1992), as well as the response by Kutzinski (1992). An obvious problem with Buell's article is his notion of the "American Renaissance" as a period of "literary emergence" and his neglect of Revolutionary and Colonial writers.

I

EXODUS

> Yet their voice goes out through all the earth/and their words to the end of the world
> (Christopher Columbus, *Libro de las profesías*)
>
> we are a chapter in the history of the European utopias. ... Europe is the point, involuntary to a certain extent, of European history, while we are a premeditated creation.
> (Octavio Paz, *Literatura de fundación*, 13)

1. THE NEW WORLD AND THE END OF THE WORLD

On the morning of June 18, 1539, the city of Tlaxcala, New Spain, was something to see. The *plaza mayor* [main market place] had been transformed into a giant stage for the enactment of a pageant written and directed by the Franciscan missionaries and to be performed by their new Indian converts. The play, entitled "The Conquest of Jerusalem," would enact the final siege of the Holy City by the combined forces of Catholic Christendom. For this purpose, there were assembled hundreds of people, dressed up in European, Native American, and Turkish costome. On the west end of the *plaza*, the unfinished, flat-top building of the local *cabildo* had been adorned with five towers, flags, battlements, and walls, representing Jerusalem. Inside were

huddled the infidel forces of the Sultan, in whom the spectator would have recognized the Marqués de Valle, Hernando Cortés, dressed in oriental garb, his head wrapped in a turban. On the opposite end of the *plaza* was stationed Charles V, Lord over the Holy Catholic World Empire, played by a tlaxcaltecan cacique. The armies of Spain, Italy, and Germany took position in their fortified camps on the north end of the *plaza*, on the south end the armies of the Americas, dressed in traditional Mexican garb under the leadership of Antonio de Mendoza, viceroy of New Spain (also played by an Indian noble). Finally, the Blessed Sacrament--the pope, cardinals, and bishops--took their seats on an elevated platform, and the epic battle could begin.[1]

The cosmic significance and imminent suspense being lost on the modern reader, it would seem tedious today to recount the entire plot of the spectacle as it moved through several hours of advancements, retreats, unexpected reinforcement, and dispatches to emperor and pope before the final climax. After the Spanish army had almost been defeated, Santiago, Patron Saint of Spain, came charging onto the stage, "upon a horse as white as snow," and together with the Spanish soldiers drove back the Moors. The infidel then charges the Mexican forces, who turn, in great distress, to prayer. An angel appears and declares that

> Aunque sois tiernos en la fé os ha querido Dios probar, y quiso que fuésedes vencidos para que conozcáis que sin su ayuda valéis poco. Pero ya que os habéis humillado, Dios ha oído vuestra oración, y luego vendrá en vuestro favor el abogado y patrón de la Nueva España, San Hipólito, en

> cuyo día los Españoles con vosotros los Tlaxcaltecas ganásteis a México. (Motolinía 210)
> [Altough you are but young in the Faith, God has wished to prove you and willed that you should be vanquished so that you may realize that without His aid your efforts are of little avail. But now that you have humbled yourself God has heard your prayer, and shortly there will come to your assistance Saint Hypolitus, the advocate and patron of New Spain, upon whose day the Spaniards, with you Tlaxcaltecas, took Mexico. (116)]

Saint Hypolitus rides in, "mounted on a very dark horse." Finally, the Archangel Saint Michael appears, upon whose awesome sight the infidels surrender, recognize their errors, and repent. Thus, by the end of the spectacle, the stage had appropriately been set for the main event of the day--the baptism of several hundred new Indians converts that the Franciscans had planned to bring home into the City of God on that day.

I have related this remarkable event in the history of colonial New Spain because it vividly illustrates the apocalyptic significance that the Franciscan missionaries attributed to their apostolic errand in the Americas. Moreover, it serves to illustrate the similarities and differences between the Franciscans' visually oriented culture and another conspicuous group of New World millennialists: the English Puritans who would arrive in America over a century later and who would be the first to translate the Bible into an American vernacular. In Europe, the cataclysmic events of the discovery, conquest, and colonization of the New World had given new impetus to a long tradition of apocalyptic and prophetic fervor, which

would become one of the perennial elements in the constructions of identity of Europeans who had immigrated to this side of the Atlantic. The theme and stage geography of the tlaxcaltecan play was deeply symbolic of the role that the discovery of America played on the world stage of a cosmology and redemption history which had fused medieval millennialist eschatology with the northern Renaissance utopian quest for a universal rebirth. According to medieval apocalyptic prophesies, the emergence of a World Ruler combining the powers of state and church would coincide with the recapture of Jerusalem, and prepare the way for Christ's Second Coming. The location of infidel Jerusalem on the "west" end of the *plaza* thus signifies the recognition of a geo-historical telos long prophesied by medieval millennialists and finally `discovered' by Columbus' arrival in the New World: that Redemption History was to find its completion in the west, not in the east as centuries of luckless crusaders in the east had wrongly believed. Columbus had thus by default provided the explanation for the centuries of failed attempts to retake the Holy City in the Final Act of the Christian cosmic drama: there could be no Final Act because there was yet another, a `new' World to be converted in the penultimate act. It was only the discovery, conquest, and conversion of the New World which would initiate the End of the world.

In this chapter, I will trace the literary histories of the Indian neophyte in the missionary literatures of the

Franciscans in New Spain and the Puritans in New England in the context of the first hundred years of European expansionism in the New World. Although colonial New England's original seal had imprinted on it "a poor Indian having a label going from his mouth, with a COME OVER AND HELP US," New England Puritans showed, by comparison with their Franciscan counterparts in New Spain, very little active interest during the first decade of colonization--a difference which illustrates the profound incongruities of the British American and Spanish American providentialist self-understanding in America. However, during the 1640s, in the wake of the English Civil War, the Praying Indian figured briefly but prominently in the emerging rhetoric of a New England identity in the millenarian writings of New England Puritans, which bear a striking resemblance to the New Spanish Franciscan chronicles of the sixteenth century. Owing to medieval eschatological traditions, both New World ethnographic literary histories integrate the Indian convert in a progressivist theory of history and are thus foundational in the creole inscription of the New World into Old World history. In both cases a distinctly utopian tone prevailed in these ethnographic writings during the early periods of colonization--a time when the imperial states exerted relatively little control over the American colonies. However, as in both Spanish and British America (with varying success) the imperial state became more assertive, the utopian rhetoric of the earlier tracts yields

to the rhetoric of the jeremiad in the later chronicles, which entirely relocate the telos of history into the New World, deeming the Old World lost to Antichrist (i. e. Popery/the Reformation).

2. INDIAN UTOPIAS: FRANCISCANS AND PURITANS IN A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

While, as the work of both Perry Miller (1956) and Sacvan Bercovitch (1975) has shown, Puritan providentialist ideology became one of the most conspicuous origins in Anglo-American literature, history, and sense of self-hood, the Franciscan conception of the world, while very evident in the writing of the conquest and in sixteenth-century Spanish American culture, failed to exert the same degree of lasting influence on the development of Spanish American culture. The prophetic and apocalyptic fervor which informed, as we shall see, both the Puritan and Franciscan sense of identity, would lose its cultural importance in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Spanish America, as well as during the periods of the early national eras, while it continues to be prevalent in US culture even to this day. While American Puritanism was, of course, also only one of the colonial sources of later US American identity, it attained, in seventeenth-century New England, a status of orthodoxy which Franciscan theology never had in colonial New Spain. There, Franciscans were, from the very beginning, only one (rather radical) group among a diverse array of

utopian impulses that shaped colonial Spanish American culture, a group which ultimately lost out to the more orthodox elements of ecclesiastical and state power. Before we can compare the colonial Indian utopias of New Spanish Franciscans and New English Puritans, it is therefore first necessary to see the historical distinctness of each in their respective imperial realms.

In New Spain, the spiritual conquest of America had been an integral part in Europe's New World utopia and in the rhetoric of a colonial identity from the very beginning. After the fall of Tenochtitlan, Cortés had personally requested from the Emperor that missionaries be sent to America. In 1524, a symbolic number of ten barefooted Franciscans arrived in Mexico--the "First Ten" apostles of the New World to be officially welcomed by a kneeling Cortés, who kissed their messianic hands in symbolic submission. Fifteen years later Fray Toribio de Benavente (1500?-1569), better known by his *nahuatl* name of Motolinía [the poor one] and one of the First Ten,[2] could report of "so many [Indians] to be baptized ... that it is a marvel" in his *Historia de los indios de la Nueva España* (227/132).[3] He estimated that in a matter of fifteen years "more than nine million Indians" had been converted and baptized, he himself often baptizing as many as forty thousand in less than a week.

For Franciscans in New Spain, their errand in the New World constituted an integral part in a global messianic

mission which had driven Iberian expansion since the 1440s and in which the Spanish nation had seen itself as divinely ordained. Motolinía marveled at the providential timing of the discovery when contemplating that New Spain's high mountains, visible from afar, "hayan estado encubiertos tanta multitud de años como ha que paso el gran diluvio general" ["should have been unknown for such a multitude of years as have passed since the great general deluge"]. Although ships had been scattered by "great storms and tempests" all across the world, he reflected,

> nunca con estas sierras toparon ni estos montes parecieron. La causa de esto debemos dejar para el que es causa de todas las causas; creyendo que pues El ha sido servido de que no se manifestasen ni decubriesen hasta nuestros tiempos, que esto ha sido son mejor y que mas conviene a la fé y religión cristiana. (312)
> [no one has ever come upon these ranges and the mountains have never been seen. The cause of this we must leave to Him who is the cause of all causes, believing that, since it has pleased Him that they should not be seen or discovered until our day, that has been best and most advantageous for the Christian and religion. (Motolinía 203)]

It was no coincidence, in other words, that Columbus' discovery had followed hard on the heels of the unification of the crowns of Castille and Aragon, and shortly after the infidel had been defeated on the Spanish peninsula. Still in the 1590s, Jerónimo de Mendieta (1525-1604) was "firmly convinced" that:

> mas antes, confiado en la misericorida del muy alto Señor, tengo por averiguado, que así como a estos católicos reyes fué concedido el comenzar a extirpar los tres diabólicos excuadrones arriba señalados, con el cuarto de los herejes, cuyos remedio y medicina es la santa Inquisición, así también se les concedió que los reyes, sus sucersores den fin a este negocio; de suerte que así como ellos

> limpiaron a España de estas malas sectas, así también la universal destrucción de ellas en el orbe y conversión final de todas las gentes al gremio de la Iglesia se haga por mano de los reyes sus descendientes. (I:14)
> [those Catholic Monarchs were granted the mission of beginning to extirpate those three diabolical squadrons perfidious Judaism, false Mohammedanism and blind idolatry along with the fourth squadron of the heretics whose remedy and medicine is the Holy Inquisition, in like manner the business of completing this task has been reserved for their royal successors; so that as Ferdinand and Isabella cleansed Spain of these wicked sects, in like manner their royal descendants will accomplish the universal destruction of these sects throughout the world and the final conversion of all the peoples of the earth to the bosom of the church.]

However, if Columbus' early letters from his New World journey had exemplified Spain's messianic sense of identity as a redeemer nation (see Milhou 1983, Kadir 1992, 30-32), the reports of his enslavement of the recalcitrant utopians and his return to Europe in disgrace and captivity had chronicled the beginning of the American experience. This is then what had distinguished the colonial American utopias from their European counterparts from the very beginning: whereas the latter were purely literary speculation, the former chronicle the tension between European utopian speculation and American experience in history.[4] Indeed, insofar as the colonial American New World utopists were inspired by European utopian textual traditions in setting up their social experiments, their attempts to read European utopias as blue-prints for social reform invariably represented a "misreading," as James Holstun has argued for the case of Vasco de Quiroga (1987, 7), whose Indian hospitals were inspired by the Renaissance humanist Thomas More.[5] For More, whose models were strictly literary

(Plato's *Republic*, Vespucci's *Mundus Novum*, etc.), utopia merely served the purpose of social criticism; his writing, like that of other European utopists, therefore always reveals an "ironic posture" toward his imaginary society (Tena Ramírez 1990, 37). Quiroga's reports on his `Indian Hospitals', by contrast, were the accounts of an experience, the success and shortcomings of an attempt to make real the literary utopia at Santa Fé de México, Santa Fé de la Laguna at the Lake of Pátzcuaro in Michoacan, Santa Fé del Río at Lake Lerma, and other places during the 1530s.

Inspired by this utopian zeal, the mendicant orders in America had also launched New World `social laboratories' as a blue-print for world reform. They had therefore started large-scale resettlement programs, removing the native populations of New Spain from their scattered hillside hamlets and concentrating them in towns situated on the plains, their streets laid out in the grid-like order of the baroque city, with its main square dominated by the parish church. The mendicants' chronicles detail life in these New World towns, in which they attempted to reshape native culture, preached the gospel, introduced Spanish arts and crafts, and taught new forms of government. Their New World ethnographic writings thus become literary projects in what James Holstun has called a "rational millennium," in which the native American world is rationalized and inscribed into European systems of knowledge. The "formal traits of utopian writing (literary and nonliterary) and its exercise of

power," Holstun writes, always "imply each other" (1987, 10; see also Tena Ramírez 1990, 56). However, the American chronicles, unlike their utopian literary models, always circumscribe the clash between Europe's imperial dream and American colonial reality. Typically, the tlaxcaltecan play, in its carnivalesque inversion of roles between the conqueror and the conquered, its plot of humiliation and final triumph, illustrates the intimate connection between the utopian dream and the exercise of power and control over real, and often unwilling, non-European peoples (see Caneque 1996; Curcio-Nagy 1996).

To be sure, it would be a grave oversimplification to assume that all Catholic New World utopists imposed the same rationalized `grid' on America in their attempt to rationalize the Native as an object of conversion, for their sources and epistemologies varied widely. In Spanish America the missionary literatures of the three mendicant orders--the Franciscans, the Dominicans, and the Augustinians--distinguish themselves here from those of the Jesuits on the one hand and from those of the lay clergy.[6] Vasco de Quiroga, for example, was not a mendicant but an *oidor* [judge] of the second *audiencia*, the high court of justice, of New Spain as well as bishop of Michoacán. As an agent of imperial civil authority as well as of the ecclesiastic church hierarchy, his ideas were indebted as much to Renaissance political philosophy as to Catholic Christian doctrine, and he is thus situated at a "point of

intersection," as Alfonso Reyes has written, "between the Christian tradition and the Renaissance renovation" of classical ideals (1960, 98). On the one hand, Quiroga could therefore model his Indian hospitals after the non-Christian society of More's Utopia when exclaiming that America was "called the New World, not because it is newly found, but because in its people and in almost everything it is like as was the first and golden age" (1940, 363). But on the other hand, he also saw in `his' Indian converts "the new primitive and reborn Church of this New World, a reflection and an outline of the Primitive Church in our known world in the Age of the Apostles" (1940, 482-495). His New World project must be seen in the context of an early sixteenth-century Spanish "enlightenment" tradition, a tradition which had grown out of the influence of Erasmus in Spain and the Spanish *alumbrados*, and called for an "interiorized Christianity ... [in which] knowledge of God was achieved by an intense love from a soul purified by moral virtues," and "perfected by the gifts of the Holy Spirit and the Grace of Christ" (Bataillon 1966, 168; see also Fernández and O'Gorman 1937). In terms of the conversion of the Indians, the most distinctive element of his missionary work was therefore, according to the Erasmian tradition, good example through virtuous living. "Words alone" were, in his view, insufficient for the goal of making new Christians (Dealy 1976, 40). Hence Quiroga's emphasis on the importance of "luring," "drawing," or "attracting" through good example

dominates his most important tract, *Información en derecho* (1540s).

The mendicants' intellectual world, their sources and methodologies, were, by contrast, entirely scholastic. For mendicants such as the Dominican "predicador" Bartolomé de Las Casas, the emphasis was precisely on words; their *vocatio* referred to a calling or "notification" and meant the winning of souls through preaching. Moreover, they did not conceive of their New World utopia as an expansion of the Old World ecclesiastic and civil structures, but rather, not unlike their Puritan counterparts in New England a century later, as the *renovatio* of the primitive church. However, unlike both the Protestants as well as Catholic lay clergy, who demanded a thorough cultural and linguistic `civilization' (i.e. Europeanization) of the Indian converts and a radical re-organization of indigenous society (see Zavala 1941, 22; Burrus 1961; Hernández 1993), the mendicants in general, and the Dominicans in particular, tolerated indigenous social structure and cultural practices as long as they did not overtly interfere with conversion. In fact, they even fiercely resisted the efforts to hispanize the Native Americans on the parts of the lay clergy and the civil authorities (see Ricard 1966, 39-60). Typically, therefore, "The Conquest of Jerusalem," like most other peagants staged by the Franciscans, was performed entirely in *nahuatl*, not in Spanish (Arróniz 1979, 22).

On the other hand, the mendicants' New World utopias

must be distinguished also from those of the Jesuits, who did not arrive in Spanish America until the 1570s and who would finally be expelled from all Spanish territories in the 1760s. The presence of this new "shocktroop of the Counter-reformation" (Brading 1991, 166), essentially a priestly association of university men with an acute sense for political influence and an emphasis on learning, was perceived as a serious challenge by the simple, barefooted mendicants. If there was anything, besides the importance of preaching, that had united the mendicants of the different orders, it was their espousal of the apostolic spirituality of `Our Lady Poverty'. Even the scholarly Dominican archbishop of Santo Domingo, Fray Augustín Dávila Padilla, had imagined the conversion process as a

> fuego de la caridad en la ceniza de la humildad y pobreza. Aqui se van encendiendo los carbones unos con otros, por la imitacion y buen exemplo: para que despues espazidos por el pueblo, inflamen los coraciones de los mortales [fire of charity in the ashes of humility and poverty. And so the coals inflame one another through imitation and good example: so that thereafter it spreads through the town and inflames the hearts of the mortals]. (Dávila Padilla 1596, 36)

Like their Protestant counterparts, the Jesuits, by contrast, openly despised outward poverty, flatly dismissing the mendicants' criticisms with the reminder that poverty was more characteristic of John the Baptist than of Jesus, who had preached the abnegation of the will, not of worldly possession. And if the Jesuits frequently clashed also with the bishops, it was because they matched them in political power and avoided or, as in the case of their assiduous

campaign against Juan de Palafox y Mendoza, bishop of Puebla, purposely undermined their authority (Israel 1975, 217-223; Brading 1991, 241-47).

Finally, the Franciscans were also, in many regards, quite distinct among the mendicant orders in regard to conversion theology and philosophy of life. The disagreements among the mendicants, though seemingly minor when juxtaposed to other groups, were perceived by them to be so fundamental that they resulted in lingering theological feuds and polemicisms against one another, the most famous perhaps being Motolinía's fierce enmity with the Dominican Las Casas. The Dominicans, who had arrived in New Spain two years after the Franciscans in 1526 (see Dávila Padilla 1596, 4), were scholars trained in Aristotelian logic and Roman and ecclesiastical jurisprudence, philosophical systems which had been closely linked with the Dominican Order since the time of St. Dominic himself. The leading figures of their order in the New World--Bartolomé de Las Casas, Antonio de Montesinos, and Agustín Dávila Padilla--concerned themselves therefore with the behavior of the Spanish laymen and rulers in learned discourses on jurisprudence and legalistic epistemology. They believed that the preservation of the natives' rights was as important as their eventual conversion (see Hanke 1974). Most important, the Dominicans disagreed with the Franciscans on the method and the degree of coercion to be used regarding the conversion of the New World's

recalcitrant utopians. Their position stated that the only method of conversion was that practiced by Christ himself, which was by peaceful and rational persuasion. Typical of this sentiment, the Dominican Dávila Padilla sharply criticized the Franciscan practice of relocating the indigenous population from their hillside villages and even blamed the sharp decline of the Indian population on this coercive practice (see Dávila Padilla 1596, 79-86; 91-2; 101-3). The Augustinian position, finally, was somewhere in between the Franciscans and the Dominicans, with an emphasis on a sense of obligation within the depiction of coercion and violence. While they endorsed military conquest, the role of the church was, for them, one of support and direction, not participation, following Augustine's prohibition against actual fighting (see Abel-Turby 1996, 12).

The Franciscans, by contrast, had distinguished themselves among the other missionaries from the very beginning by their messianic militancy, apocalyptic reformism, and medieval mysticism that had informed the ideology of Iberian expansionism since the fifteenth century (see Boxer 1978; Garrido Aranda 1980). While the Franciscans added a radical primitivism to this imperialist ideology not always in accordance with the interests of the imperial state, they, initially, entirely supported full military conquest and coercion for the purpose of conversion.[7] Thus Motolinía fully vindicates Cortés' "wise and valiant

behaviour in the whole conquest of New Spain" against Las Casas' accusations of having waged an unjust war. His achievements were enough, Motolinía thought, to "justify placing him on the tablet of Fame, and putting him in equal comparison with any of the captains, kings, and emperors of the ancients, for there is so much to say about his prowess and his invincible spirit that alone would suffice to make a big book" (216).

The Franciscans therefore gave much greater weight to the active intervention of the Devil in Indian religion than did the Dominicans. Their chronicles emphasize the cruelties of Aztec rites, dwelling on human sacrifice and ritual cannibalism--an aspect which lent their ethnographic representations to the appropriation by an ideology of conquest during the early sixteenth century and later by the conqueror's descendants, who sought to legitimize their quasi-feudal ascendancy based on the Indians' subjection. While the missionaries of other orders, such as the Dominican Diego Durán or the Jesuits José de Acosta and Juan de Tovar, also produced ethnographic chronicles of America's indigenous populations during the first century of colonization,[8] the Franciscans clearly dominated this genre during the sixteenth century: Andrés de Olmos, Motolinía, Martín de la Coruna, Francisco de Las Navas, Bernardino de Sahagún, Jerónimo de Mendieta, Agustín de Vetancurt, and Juan de Torquemada all wrote on New Spain, and Diego de Landa particularly on Yucatán.[9]

In part, this Franciscan predominance in early ethnography can be explained by the eschatological fervor by which many of the Franciscan chroniclers were inspired. Incidentally, it was Motolinía's very Franciscan millennial fervor which had driven him into a deep antagonism with Las Casas (see Ramírez 1944). Motolinía had undertaken such spectacular mass conversions precisely because he believed that time was running out before the arrival of the end time. In 1538, Las Casas, deeming this a travesty of the sacrament, had obtained an episcopal condemnation for the practice of mass conversion, which, not surprisingly, outraged Motolinía. When Las Casas' had, with the publication of his *Brevísima Relación*, launched his campaign of indictments against the conquerors' and creoles' violence, Motolinía wrote, in 1555, a letter to the Emperor, in which he angrily refuted Las Casas on the issues of Spanish colonization of the New World. While "there were instances when certain Spaniards had been greedy and badly disposed, there certainly were many other," he asserted, "who were good Christians, pious and charitable" (1949, 68). He disagreed entirely with Las Casas' unqualified condemnation of the Conquest. After all, he pointed out, "when the Marqués del Valle [Cortés] entered these lands, God was very offended and the people suffered many cruel deaths, and the Devil, our enemy, was served here with the worst idolatries and murders that ever were" with Montezuma sacrificing as many as 18,400 people in a space of three or

four days (52). To Motolinía, the Conquest therefore represented--despite some unavoidable bloodshed--one of the most important events ever in the fulfillment of Redemption History. He chastised Las Casas as a lunatic "enemy of the Spanish nation" who should be locked up in a monastery and whose book should be confiscated, lest, he warned, "tomorrow it will be read by the Indians and the other nations" (67, 69).

The disagreements over conquest and colonization, such as the dispute between these two friars, is significant for my purposes here not only because they illustrate that New World missionary utopias were far from being a uniform genre, but also because they provided an ideological justification on which the English colonization and missionary enterprise would rest. For, Motolinía's warning that Las Casas' book would be read by "other nations" proved a prophetic one. English colonizers, especially, were well aware of both the spectacular numbers of Indians that the Franciscan missionaries had converted during the sixteenth century as well as Las Casas' controversial book, which was published in England for the first time in 1583 under the title *The Spanish Colony*. Over a century later, the United Ministers of Boston would still claim that "What the Spaniards have done since the famous Columbus ... opened a passage for their colonies heither, has afforded but a very sad story, which a Bishop of their own has given us with a pen dipt in blood. Their boasted conversion of the pagans,

wherein one poor Friar has brag'd of his having baptized some hundreds of thousands, what will they be found when they are enquired into?"[10] Thus, the so-called "black legend" became one of the most important ideological foundations on which English colonization efforts in the New World were based:[11] the English colonizers would "salvage the savage," as Djelal Kadir has put it, and remove to the New World to protect the Indians against Spanish cruelty and in to compete with the Catholic Antichrist in the acquisition of souls (1992, 126). Thus, as early as 1596, Sir Walter Raleigh had proclaimed that the Inca empire empire would be restored to its rightful (Inca) heirs by the English. In his *The Discovery of the large and beautiful empire of Guiana*, he had reported finding a prophesy in an Inca temple "which foreshewed the loss of the said empire, that from Inglatierra those Ingas should be again in time to come restored, and delivered from the servitude of the said [Spanish] conquerors" (467). In 1626, Samuel Purchas claimed that the Spaniards had given to the Americans "*an Iron Age for a Golden*,"

> *imposing a heavy yoke of servitude which hath consumed worlds of people in this New World, and made the Name of Christ and Christians to stinke amongst them; yea they abhorre the Sea it selfe for bringing forth such monsters, as they thinke the Spaniards: whom for their execrable wickedness, they esteemed, not to come of humane generation, but of the froth of the Sea, and therefore call them Viracocha*, or Sea-froth. (795)

As Bernedette Bucher (1977) has shown in her analysis of Theodore De Bry's iconography, which ornamented a number of

editions of Benzoni's *The History of the New World*, the Protestant reinvention of America during the seventeenth century construed the invasion of America by the Catholic Spanish conquerors in terms of an American prelapsarian New World's belated Biblical Fall to Antichrist. The early English translators of the Spanish chronicles of the Discovery and the Conquest, from the Hakluyts to Samuel Purchas, therefore favored especially accounts featuring American `Noble savages' suffering under Spanish cruelty and greed. They found this Noble Savage in historians such as Peter Martir, Las Casas, and Benzoni, which were among the earliest Spanish books on America to be translated into English (see Cro 1990, 22; Pagden 1983). And in a process of inter-cultural transfer occurring in the translation (and selection) of these early Spanish New World texts, the early promoters of English colonization of America `invented' a New World of their own that would be produced and reproduced in countless English promotion tracts throughout the seventeenth century: an American `paradise' inhabited by docile American and African Calibans eager to be redeemed from their own and from Spanish savagery (see Prager 1993; also Hulme 1986).

The paintings of John White, for example, who was part of Sir Walter Raleigh's expedition to what is now coastal Carolina during the 1580s, displayed exotic American natives ready to adopt English culture, as signified in images of little naked Indian children holding dolls clothed in an

Elizabethan-style dress. Especially valuable, though rare, were in this context first-hand accounts of the Spanish American colonies corroborating the English translators of Spanish chroniclers. In 1649, Thomas Gage, formerly a Dominican fryer in Spain and Spanish America, who returned to England and forsake his Catholocism published his *The English American His Travail by Sea and Land: or, a New Survey of the West Indies*, which was republished numerous times until the late eighteenth century. "No question," he wrote there,

> the just right of title to those countries appertains to the Natives themselves; who, if they shall *willingly and freely invited the English to their protection*, what title soever they have in them, no doubt but they may legally transfer it or communicate it to others. And to say, that the inhumane butchery which the Indians did formerly commit in sacrificing of so many reasonable creatures to their wicked idols, was a sufficient warrant for the Spaniards to divest them of their country; the same argument may by much better reason be inforced against the Spaniards themselves, who have sacrificed so many millions of Indians to the Idol of their barbarous cruelty, that many populous Islands and large territories upon the main continent, are therey at this day uttely uninhabited, as Bartholomeo de las Casas, the Spanish bishop of Guaxaca in New Spain, hath by his writings in Print sufficiently testified. (Preface, n.p.)

Thus, Las Casas' grave indictments of the conquerors became the ideological building block for England's New World colonization project. From the time of its very foundation in 1606, the Virginia Company had attempted to sell America to investors by emphasizing England's evangelical mission to the American Indians as a rescue from American savagery and Spanish cruelty. The Company had therefore employed a host of Anglican ministers--among whom

John Donne was perhaps the most famous one--to deliver sermons before the shareholders, printing their sermons, and paying them with cash or stock (see Wright 1943; Parker 1979). The evangelical mission of the English people became anchored in Virginia's second colonial charter, which stated that "the principal effect which we can desire or expect of this action is the conversion and reduction of the people in those parts unto the true worship of God and christian religion" (in Kavenagh 1983, 1715). And even adventurers such as John Smith had agreed that the main importance of his colonizing enterprise was to erect "the true religion among Infidells, to the overthrow of superstition and idolatrie, to the winning of many thousands of wandering sheepe, unto Christs fold, who now, and till now, have strayed in the unknown paths of Paganism, Idolatrie, and superstition" (1986, I:25). English historians and promoters advertised that "gentle and tractable" American natives were "very ready to leave their old and blind idolatries and to learn of us the right service and worship of the true God" in gratitude to the English (Hakluyt 1935, 76-77; Eburne 1962, 46). Thus, Virginia's mission of rescuing the Noble Savage from Spanish cruelty "hinges the New England colonial conquest with the Spanish one to the south" (Kadir 1992, 126). It is in the context of this competition for souls with the Spaniards that King Charles I stipulated, when granting a group of Puritans a colonial charter in 1629, that the "principle end of the plantation" in New England

was to "win and incite the natives of that country to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God" (in C. Mather 1855, 572).

But despite this propaganda, most of the English settlers in general had removed to America, as Patricia Seed has pointed out, because of their interest in land, not, like the Spaniards, because of an active interest in the Indian. And the Puritans' idea of America was hereby particularly "antipathetic to evangelical endeavor" with regard to the Indians' salvation (Kellaway 1961, 5). While the literature of Virginia and Maryland had projected onto America images of edenic lushness and innocence prevailing in the Renaissance utopias of Elizabethan literature, the Puritans saw in their removal into the New World the fulfillment of a Scriptural prophesy, the reformation of `a people' returning to the primitive church. The southern myths of Virginia's "Beauties of naked Nature" and the "endless succession of Natural pleasures" of the southern colonies as the "rechon'd ... Gardens of the World" (Beverley 1947, 233; 296-98) provide thus a stark contrast to the Puritans' America as a "howling wilderness."

To be sure, Puritan theology had hardly been congenial ground on which an apostolic spirit might have flourished once transplanted to America. For the scholastically trained Catholic mendicants, who followed the redemption theology of Thomas Aquinas, it had been theoretically possible that the Indians observed natural law without the assistance of

Christian revelation since they, too, participated in the Divine intelligence of all creation (see Brading 1991, 264; Hanke 1974). By contrast, in Augustinian theology, which had played, as Perry Miller has shown (1954), an important part in the development of a Puritan "strain of piety," divine grace had destroyed rather than perfected nature. Thus, the Puritans perceived the Indians' seemingly uncivilized state of nature as a vivid outward illustration of human innate depravity. Moreover, if sainthood was `visible' in the process of `preparation' in the overcoming nature, a spectacular mass awakening of saving grace among the Indians was very unlikely since, in Augustinian theology, salvation was predestined and reserved only for the elect few (see Miller 1954, 1-54).

When, by 1640, the Puritan missionaries had remained embarrassingly unsuccessful in converting England's Noble Savages, they were repeatedly criticized by historians in England. In response, Thomas Shepard wrote in the 1640s that "Wee are oft upbraided by some of our Countrymen that so little good is done by our professing planters upon the hearts of these Natives." But he reminds his readers that "such men have surely more spleene then judgement, and know not the vast distance of Natives from common civility, almost humanity it selfe" (in Eliot 1834, 15). Still in 1727, Thomas Prince wrote his history of the Mayhew missions on Martha's Vinyard to answer "to the ungenerous and unworthy aspersions cast on this country by Mr. Oldmixon,

Moll, and some others." There have been "such zealous endeavours to christianize the aboriginal natives," he asserts,

> as have deserved a better regard and instead of flighting expressions, a very grateful and respectful mention: and with so much success, as has rather required their more becoming ascriptions of praise to God, than contempt of the works of his grace, in producing as evident instances of pure, sincere, and unaffected piety among that poor and unpolished people, as are to be seen in the politest nations. (in E. Mayhew 1727; 309)

Of course, the spectacular mass conversions that Franciscans such as Motolinía had performed during the sixteenth century were an antecedent not easily emulated. As a result, New England Puritans constantly invoked Bartolomé de Las Casas in order to define their own role as the Indians' protectors and to identify their own missionary errand to the Indians in contradistinction to the example of the Franciscans. When it came to the business of Indian conversion, they argued, quality was better than quantity. It was the progress in English civility, the Puritan missionary John Eliot argued in 1650, that they "leave their wild and scattered manner of life, and come under Civil Government and Order" (Preface, n.p.), which was the most distinguishing feature of his mission and which made them a model enterprise for subsequent efforts:

> I find it absolutely necessary to carry on civility with Religion: and that maketh me have many thoughts that the way to doe it to the purpose, is to live among them in a place distant from the English, for many reasons; and bring them to co-habitation, Government, Arts, and trades. (1834, 88)

Thomas Shepard, too, contrasted the Puritan missionaries with those of "Spanish ... about Cusco, Peru, and Mexico," who admitted their converts into the Christian communion after "having learnt them a short answer or two to some Popish questions;" thus the "Indian dialogues" included in many of the Puritan missionary tracts are supposed to convince the readers of the learnedness of the Puritan converts, which supposedly distinguished them from their Spanish American counterparts.

Indeed, this emphasis on learning did put Puritan missionary theology in direct opposition to the Franciscans, who had stressed human humility and simplicity. Moreover, the great material effort that had been invested in John Eliot's Praying Towns and the Puritan conversion enterprise was, admittedly, something quite new in missionary history, which seemed to prescribe apostolic poverty and a reliance upon the hand of God, not glass beads and iron pots, to touch the hearts of the pagans. Thus, Eliot had to concede that

> the comming of Jesus Christ into these parts of the world, is not as he formerly came amongst the Gentiles, a poore underling, and his servants poore, living upon the Gospel where it was accepted among the rich Gentiles: But Christ will come unto these, rich, potent, above them in learning, riches, and power. (1834, 83)

Unlike the Franciscans, then, the Protestant missionary utopia also promises to America material progress and prosperity. Protestantism had, as Max Weber once argued, profoundly modified Christian asceticism. Whereas asceticism

had previously fled from the daily life of the world into the monastery, it now "strode into the market-place of life, slammed the door of the monastery behind it, and undertook to penetrate just that daily routine of life with its methodicalness, to fashion it into a life in the world, but neither of nor for this world" (1958, 154).

3. EXODUS: A PEOPLE AND A LAND

But beside these perceptions of the Native American Other, the Puritans' apostolic errand suffered from their peculiar sense of Self in their New World enterprise. While Protestants had long identified the ecclesiastic hierarchy of the Papacy with Antichrist, the Puritans, in particular, regarded also the English episcopacy of the Laudian Church, as well as the court of the Stuarts, as infiltrated by the Kingdom of Evil (see Tuveson 1949, 23-70). Not entirely unlike the New World Franciscans, therefore, the Puritan New England off-spring also removed to America in order to reform and regenerate Christianity's primitive Church, to build a "City on a Hill," in John Winthrop's famous words, as a utopian model society for universal world reform. However, unlike the Franciscans, they saw themselves herein not as the emissaries of a messianic world ruler with an evangelical mission in America, but rather as `a people set aside' from the worldly domain of Anti-Christ. They were, in the words of Increase Mather,

> a people, even out of all parts of a Nation, which he hath

> also had a great favour towards, and hath bought them by a mighty hand, and an out-stretched arm, *over a greater then the Red Sea, and here hath he planted them* (1674, 27, italics mine)

They interpreted their removal into the New World through a typological exegesis of the Book of Exodus, as the new Israel removing into a new Canaan under the patriarchal guidance of a new type of Moses, such as John Winthrop, whom Cotton Mather would later call a "Hermes Christum."[12]

Thus the Puritans essentially "regarded the country as *theirs*," as Sacvan Bercovitch has written, "and its natives as an obstacle to *their* destiny as Americans" (1975, 141). John Cotton had quickly and conveniently found Scriptural evidence in order to justify the Puritans' indifference toward their Indian neighbors' spiritual salvation with whom they had been entrusted by the English monarch. According to the Book of Revelations, he pointed out, God would first convert the Jews and then the Gentiles before chaining Satan for a thousand years and then bring about His Kingdom on earth. As the American Indians were descendants of the Gentiles, Cotton continued, there was little point in pursuing the conversion of the Indians as long as the Jews had not been brought `home' (see Cogley 1987, 211). Still in 1647, Thomas Shepard explained the Puritans' meager missionary success by claiming that "it is not yet time for God to worke, 1. Because till the Jewes come in, there is a seale set upon the hearts of those people, as ... they think from some Apocalypticall places" (in Eliot 1834, 15). It was simply a matter of Christian obedience to God's Providential

design to be patient regarding Indian conversion.

To be sure, Cotton's rhetorical somersaults regarding apocalyptic time tables must primarily be seen as an attempt to assuage the Puritans' embarrassment regarding the issue of conversion. After all, they had plenty of reasons to be glad that Charles I--probably less out of millenarian expectancy than his desire to get rid of a bunch of obstinate non-conformists--had found a suitable pretext for granting a colonial charter to the dissenters. But they could hardly envision that a few heathen savages in the woods of an American wilderness would play a prominent role in the cosmic drama of the approaching apocalypse. In "God's Promise to His Plantations" (1630), Cotton had admitted of "three ways" in which the Indian Canaanites may conceivably still get a role in Redemption History: (1) "cast out" by "lawful war;" (2) "mak[ing] room ... by way of purchase" or simply "courtesy;" and (3) by acting as a "void."[13] The stunning devastation that European diseases--those "wonderful plague[s]"[14]--subsequently had among the Indians suggested to the Puritan observer that the Indians were indeed a type of Canaanites, the sons of the cursed Ham, who had, in the words of the United Ministers of Boston, been "so swept away ... as to make room for a better People" (in E. Mayhew 1727, xv).[15] Thus, John Winthrop plausibly argued that "if God were not pleased with our inheriting these parts, why did he drive out the natives before us?" (Winthrop 1947, III:149). What had been interpreted as

evidence of Spain's failure in her New World mission by critics of the conquest--the decline of the Indian population--was thus perceived as a sign of God's favor toward England in Puritan colonialist rhetoric.

`Land'--rather than `place'--was then, during the first fifteen years or so, the central concern for the emigrants.[16] During these years, Puritans considered their transplantation primarily as the temporary "refuge" of a `people' who would uphold the `true' church until the "storme" of God's judgment had destroyed England; they had therefore, as a number of historians have recently objected to scholars such as Perry Miller and Sacvan Bercovitch, no sense of an "American national mission," let alone of being on an "errand into the wilderness" (Bozeman 1988, 96, 119; see also Middlekauff 1971, 30-33). And while surely such a sense of mission did not yet entail a special role that the geographical place of America would play in God's providence, the refugees from the "Kingdom of Darkness" reigning in England thought that they, a people in Exodus, took the "Kingdom of Light" with them to New England - or, as Richard Mather said in a revealing phrase, "some like place" (in Middlekauff 1971, 33).

The New World Franciscans had also made extensive use of the Book of Exodus in investing their presence in the New World with cosmic meaning. Thus, Motolinía argues that God had brought the Spaniards "a esta tierra de Canaan para que le

edificasen nuevo altar entre esta gentilidad e infieles y para que multiplicasen y ensanchasen su santo nombre y fé" (296) ["to this land of Canaan that they might build Him a new altar amongst this gentile and heathen people, and propagate and spread abroad His holy Name and Faith" (189)]. However, there is an ambiguity in Motolinía's use of the Biblical image; for there is here implicit another exodus: at first, New Spain had been, he writes,

> un traslado del infierno; ver los moradores de ella de noche dar voces, unos llamando al demonio, otros borrachos, otros cantando y bailando; ... era cosa de grandisima lastima ver los hombres criados a la imagen de Dios vueltos peores que brutos animales; y lo que peor era, que no quedaban en aquel solo pecado, mas cometian otros muchos, y se herian y descalabraban unos a otros, y acontecia matarse, aunque fuesen muy amigos y muy propincous parientes. (125-126)
> [a copy of hell, its inhabitants shouting at night, some calling upon the devil, some drunk, some singing and dancing. ... It was pitiable to see men created in the image of God become worse than brute beasts; and worse still, they did not confine themselves to that one sin, but committed many others, striking, wounding, and even killing one another, though they might be friends and close relatives (45)]

But under the messianic guidance of the Franciscan missionaries, New Spain eluded the clutches of the Devil and progressed from infernal captivity into the Promised Land of salvation.

> asi como se iban haciendo las iglesias de los monasterios iban poniendo el Santisimo Sacramento y cesando las apariciones e ilusiones del demonio, que antes muchas veces aparecia, enganaba y espantaba a muchos, y los traia en mil maneras de errores, diciendo a los indios "que por que no le servian y adoraban como solian, pues era su Dios, y que los cristianos presto se habian de volver a su tierra"; ... [unas] veces les decia el demonio que no les habia de dar agua ni llover, porque le tenian enojado. (179)

> [As they gradually built the monastery churches, they put the Blessed Sacrament in them and the apparitions and illusions of the devil ceased. Formerly the devil had often appeared and deceived and frightened many and led them into all manner of errors, asking the Indians why they did not serve and worship him as they used to do, since he was their god, and saying that the Christians would soon go back to their own land. ... Sometimes the devil told them that he would give them no water or rain, because they had angered him. (90)]

"Y en esto se pareció mas claramente ser mentira y falsedad," Motolinía claims triumphantly," porque nunna tanto ha llovido ni tan buenos temporales han tenido como despues que se puso el Santisimo Sacramento en esta tierra" ["It was in this that his deceit and falsehood were most obvious, for it has never rained so much nor have they had such good rainstorms as since the Blessed Sacrament was brought to this land"].[17]

Whereas in first-generation New England Puritan mythology, the defining metaphor is that of the Exodus of a `people', in Motolinía it is then the Exodus of a geographical place, New Spain, from "otra Egipto en idolatrías" (333) [another Egypt in idolatry] to the Promised Land of a New Jerusalem. The image of the Indians' Exodus into the Promised Land is reinforced by their metaphorical passage through ten plagues, one of which was the gold mines in which innumerable Indians died. "Fue el oro de esta tierra," writes Motolinía, "como otro becerro por dios adorado, porque desde Castilla lo vienen a adorar pasando tantos trabajos y peligros" (120) ["The gold of this country was a second golden calf, worshipped as a god, for they come all they way from Castile through many dangers and

difficulties to adore it" (41)].

It is this new dual design in the geo-historical teleology of redemption history, which arises here for the first time in one of the earliest ethnographic histories about America, which will provide the perennial poles towards which later creole attempts at staking out historical depth for their New World identity will invariably gravitate. On the one hand, there is the perennial spatial Exodus of a European `people' into the Promised Land of America. On the other hand, there is the idea of the temporal progress of a land, here defined by the geo-cultural boundaries of New Spain. "!Oh Mexico," Motolinía exclaims,

> que tales montes te cercan y coronan! !Ahora con razon volara tu fama, porque en ti resplandece la fe y evangelio de Jesucristo! Tu que atnes eras maestra de pecados, ahora eres ensenadora de verdad; y tu que antes estabas en tinieblas y oscuridad, ahora das resplandor de doctrina y cristianidad. ...Eras entonces una Babilonia, llena de confusiones y maldades; ahora eres otra Jerusalen, madre de provincias y reinos. ... Otro tiempo con autoridad del principe de las tinieblas, anhelando amenzabas, prendias y sacrificabas, asi hombres como mujeres, y su sangre ofrecias al demonio en cartas y papeles; ahora con oraciones y sacrificios buenos y justos, adoras y confiesas al Senor de los Senores. !Oh Mexico! Si levantases los ojos a tus montes, de que estas cercada, verias que son en tu ayuda y defensa mas angeles buenos, que demonios fueron contra ti en otro tiempo, para te hacer caer en pecados y yerros. (314)
> [Oh Mexico, encircled and crowned by such mountains! Now your fame will rightly fly abroad, for in you there shines the faith and gospel of Christ! You who were once the mistress of sins are now a teacher of the truth, and you who once stood in darkness and shadows now glow with the light of Christian teaching! ... Then you were a Babylon, full of confusion and evil; now you are another Jerusalem, mother of provinces and kingdoms. ...Once, with the authority of the Prince of Darkness, you eagerly threatened, captured, and sacrificed both men and women

> and, on bits of card or paper offered their blood to the devil; now, with prayers and just and holy sacrifices you adore and confess the Lord of lords. O Mexico, if you would raise your eyes to the mountains which surround you, you would see that there are more good angles helping and defending you than there were devil in former days attacking you to make you fall into sin and error. (205)]

Now, even the physical appearance of the land transforms from an image of hell to that of a New Jerusalem. Thus, since the year 1528, the frequent smoke eruptions of the "Smoking Mountain" [Popocatépetl], one of central Mexico's two great volcanoes, miraculously ceased, "a fact much commented upon by both Spaniards and Indians," Motolinía adds, because "Some claimed that it was the mouth of hell" (316/207).

What used to be the domain of the Devil has now been transformed into a New Jerusalem, an ideal society of primitive and humble Christian utopians who will serve as the examples for world reform. "Son tan docibles y mansos," Motolinía marvels, "que mas ruido dan diez de España que mil Indios" (266) ["They are so gentle and docile that ten Spanish children make more noise than a thousand Indians" (162). The New World noble savage, reduced to obedience and submissiveness by the European conquest, becomes the virgin land of the Franciscan utopia, untouched by European riches, greed, and Protestant heresies. What had been promised in Old World prophesy was apparently coming to its fulfillment in New World history: The reformation of the world according to the ideals of Franciscan worldly abnegation, humility, and poverty. While the Old World Church was being corrupted

by the worldly wealth and ambition of the northern Protestant heretics--emblematized by the Jewish money-changers driven out of the temple by Jesus in El Greco's famous painting *Purification of the Temple* (c. 1600)--America was becoming a New Jerusalem of Franciscan piety.

Hand in hand with this conception of history implicit in the progress of a nation went the need to resynchronize New World history to Old World millenarian chronology. Thus, Jerónimo de Mendieta dwelt on the significance of the `fact' that Martin Luther, the progenitor of the Protestant heresy in the Old World, was born in 1484, the same year that Mendieta (wrongly) believed the great temple of Huitzilopochtili at Tenochtitlan to have been dedicated to the Devil amidst scenes of unparalleled sacrificial carnage. However, Luther, the Old World Anti-Christ, was also born in the same year as Cortés--

> aquel para turbar el mundo y meter debajo de la bandera del demonio a muchos de los fieles que de padres y abuelos y muchos tiempos atras eran catolicos, y este para traer al gremio de la iglesia infinita multitud de gentes que por anos sin cuento habian estado bajo el poder de Satanas (1973, II 12)
> [the former to upset the world and put under the banner the many faithful believers whose fathers and uncles had previously been Catholics, and the latter to win for the Church infinite multitudes of people who had for countless years been under the the dominion of Satan.]

This geo-historical parallel relationship between the Old World and the New, Mendieta went on to argue, manifested itself again in 1519, when Luther led the rich, proud nations of northern Europe into heresy and damnation at the same time that Cortés overthrew Satan's kingdom in Mexico

and led its poor, humble peoples into the fold of the Catholic Church (Mendieta 1973, II 15-17). Thus, as Europe was becoming the theater of the action of Antichrist, America was in a parallel development becoming the New Jerusalem preparing the world for the Second Coming.

4. THE MILLENARIAN TRADITION

There has been some debate among scholars regarding the origins of eschatological thought in the New World. While some scholars have seen it developing in a straight line from the millennialism of the Calabrian Abbot Joaquim de Fiore (ca. 1132-1202), others have cautioned against an uncritical acceptance of the assumption that apocalyptic ideas in the New World were directly inspired by Joachim's millennialism.[18] Whatever the case may be regarding the question of a direct and distinct influence of Joachimite ideas, there can be no doubt that the great popularity of Joachim's writings in Europe during the time of the American discoveries merely represents the culmination of a larger cultural tradition which predated the twelfth century and which had, ultimately, Scriptural foundations.

Based on I and II Thessalonians, I Corinthians, and, later, the Revelation of John the Divine, this tradition expected the arrival of a "Time of Rest" or "Millennium" during which would happen the Second coming of Christ, the defeat of Antichrist, the resurrection of the dead saints, and the transfiguration of the living saints. Christ's

thousand-year reign on Earth would be followed by the Last Judgment and the passage of the righteous into the other life. Originating in the second century, the timetable of this millenarian methodology in the Christian tradition was indebted to the typological reading of the week in Genesis in the Jewish tradition--in which six days of creation represent the time of this world and the seventh day the time of the next world--and partly to Hellenistic and Babylonian mathematics of the seven planets and corresponding seven cosmic eras, in which this typology of the week was extrapolated to represent the total time of the world. Thus, St. Augustine had divided history into six millennia, the last millennium (or the sixth day) being in its fourth century at the time of Augustine's writing. Nothing new would be revealed until the return of Christ, Augustine believed, which would initiate the seventh day and end earth and time (see R. Barnes 1988; Cohn 1957; McGinn 1979; Kadir 1992; Kemp 1991).

What was distinctive about Joachim's millennialism was merely his conflation of the traditional sequence of seven ages with another division of history into three distinct trinitarian stages governed respectively by God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. If the present epoch had opened with the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, the third and last epoch, animated by the Holy Spirit, was soon to begin. This third era of the Spirit--the sixth age in the traditional millenarian arithmetic--was to be consummated in

the millennium, the seventh and last age before the Coming of Christ and the Last Judgement. The advent of this third age would be announced by the emergence of two orders of `spiritual men'--a prophesy which many Franciscans had seen fulfilled with the foundation of the Franciscan and Dominican orders. In the thirteenth century, St. Bonaventure had identified St. Francis himself as the angel of the Apocalypse who was to unlock the seal of the sixth and penultimate age, an epoch to be characterized by an unprecedented preaching of the gospel throughout the world, though marred by the simultaneous appearance of Anti-Christ. Medieval Franciscan travelers such as William Rubruck and John of Pian Carpane had set out to hasten the conversion of Genghis Khan's Mongol's Asia to Christianity and to encircle the Muslims in the Mediterranean in order to carry out a final assault that would achieve the reconquest of the Holy Places, the founding of the New Jerusalem, and the universal triumph of Christ. The Catalan from Auvergne Johannis of Rupescissa had added the converted Jews to Christ's alliance against the infidel. Then a united world under the sole authority of Christ would live the End Time History.[19] A century and a half later, America would, in Spain, once more become the chosen territory for Old World eschatological hopes.

The reason why millenarian eschatology would be very popular with New World Puritans and Franciscans--but virtually absent from the ecclesiastic utopias of bishops

such as Vasco de Quiroga--was that it had dangerous revolutionary potential. While in Spain, it had inspired, in its more moderate forms, the Franciscan drive for Church reform in, for example, Cardinal Cisneros or Juan de Guadalupe (see Da Milano 1960), at other times, it had frequently spilled over into heresy, as in the case of the Franciscan "Spirituals," many of whom were burned at the stake. The precarious point in Joachimite interpretations of history was their claim that the era of the Spirit would be initiated by the destruction of the new Babylon of Anti-Christ. After the conversion of the Jews and the gentiles and the elimination of the infidels, the Millennium would begin with the establishment of a new Church of a saintly rule of perfect charity. The revolutionary implication of Joachimite eschatology was thus in its implicit opposition to the material Church of the second era, which had to be overcome before the arrival of the millennium. Whereas traditional millennial timetables had charted, as Anthony Kemp has observed, an "essential uniformity" leading up to "the present age [which] is the last before the end" (1991, 26), Joachimite apocalypticism initiated what Kemp has called the "continued principle of supersession" that would later inspire the progressivist histories of the Catholic and Protestant reformers in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (110).

England had, of course, had its own history in apocalyptic prophesy and reformism. And there, too,

Joachimite millennialism had been influential with Franciscans since the thirteenth century. Roger Bacon, for example, had been especially interested in Joachim's prophesy of a new messiah, which, in Bacon, still took the shape of an ideal Pope--an idea which would later became a commonplace in late medieval and Renaissance prophesies of a Last World Emperor, a kind of secular companion figure to the Angelic Pope (see Reeves 1954 and 1961; also Daniel 1972). Throughout the fourteenth century, there had been continued interest in England in Joachimite eschatology and historiographic method in treatises by Wyclif, Hus, and John Baconthorp. Joachim's Dialogi de Praescientia Dei et Praedestinatione Electorum became one of the cornerstones in the fifteenth-century quarrels over predestination by participants such as Thomas Bradwardine; and the Lollards was one of the earliest millennialists to see the apocalypse approaching by identifying the Pope with Antichrist (see Bloomfield 1980, 34-38; Hill 1988, 13-15).

As Marjorie Reeves and Morton Bloomfield have shown, the medieval millenarianism in Joachim's primitivist eschatology formed one of the most important antecedents of the Reformation in Northern Europe in general and in England in particular (see Reeves, 1969 and 1954; Bloomfield 1957). And while English Puritans rejected many of the medieval Franciscan authors, they, too, had inherited their reformist drive and re-energized their millenarian propheticism. When, in 1556, Heinrich Bullinger published his *Hundred Sermons*

upon the Apocalipse of Jesu Christ, he drew from a wide array of medieval sources that would become equally foundational in Puritan millennialism during the seventeenth century. Influential Puritan theologians such as Thomas Brightman, William Perkins, and Richard Hooker viewed the events of their present time as essentially discontinuous with everything that had preceded and believed that they were witnessing the last days before the end (Hill 1988, 15-18). Thus, while the differences between Protestant and medieval thought "appeared to men of that age completely revolutionary," as Perry Miller has observed, Puritans in Old and New England had essentially "retained with few alterations the cosmology of the Middle Ages ... Protestantism was a revolt against medieval thought, but only on a limited number of particulars; otherwise it was that same thought once more stabilized" (1954, 100-102).

One of those particulars with respect to the differences between Protestant and Catholic millennialism and conversion theology had to do with the apocalyptic time-table. While some Catholic millenarian time-tables maintained that Antichrist had not yet appeared, others saw the prophesy fulfilled in the rise of Protestantism. Protestant chronologies, by contrast, identified the Pope with Antichrist--a doctrine which was, however, rejected by many seventeenth-century conservative Anglicans such as Archbishop Laud (see Ball 1988, 107). The more radically Protestants insisted on the identification of the Pope with

Antichrist, the stronger was their expectancy of the imminence of the Second Coming. In particular, Protestant chronologers such as George Joye (1548) argued that, based on Matthew's Gospel, which holds that "as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be," Noah's Flood being *anno mundi* 1656, the last judgment will arrive in 1656 A. D. or soon thereafter (see Hill 1988, 14-15).

Nevertheless, both Puritan and Franciscan millennialists similarly saw themselves as the elect messianic instruments in carrying out God's work. Both did hereby not rule out the possibility that doing God's work might require them to forego the mediating role of human and ecclesiastical institutions. It is thus no coincidence that both Franciscans and Puritans would topologically interpret European removals into the New World in terms of a Biblical exodus under the guide of a Moses. In both Puritan and Franciscan millennialist interpretation of history, historical events and developments assumed an additional providential and messianic potential, promising renewal and reform. In Puritan as well as in Franciscan eschatology, "the arrival of chiliasm" had therefore the effect of taking away "the first step ... from the ideal of world-transcendence and toward that of world reform" (Tuveson 1949, 112). It was the promise for a new dispensation which made this prophetic method of reading history one of the most important medieval roots of the Renaissance and Reformation quests for a new messiah--a quest that equally

inspired early modern utopias as different as those of Campanella and Zwingli (Reeves 1969, 180-230).

5. AMERICAN APOCALYPSE

From the perspective of this messianic brand of millennialism, the sudden appearance of a "New World" on the western rim of Europe's known world seemed therefore to initiate a new era--perhaps even Joachim's third era of the spirit, which would turn upside down the established orders and bring about world reform. Of course, the `west' had long been associated with apocalyptic significances in European thought. As early as the twelfth century, the Parisian monk Hugo of St. Victor had expressed the suspicion that Europe's final destiny was not in the east but in the west when writing that

> The order of place and the order of time seem to agree almost completely in the course of events. Thus it appears to be established by divine providence that what was done at the beginning of the ages, at the outset of the world, took place in the East, and finally, as time runs along to its End, the completion of events should penetrate even as far as the West. Hence we may acknowledge that the End of the world approaches because the sequence of events has reached the geographical end of the world. The first man was placed in the East, in the Garden of Eden already prepared, so that from this source his posterity might spread throughout the world (quoted in McGinn 1979, 111).

It was in the context of this medieval millennialist speculation that Columbus, in his *Book of Prophesies* (1501), had written on the connections between "the recovery of the Holy City and God's Mt. Zion, and the discovery and conversion of the islands of the Indies and all peoples and

nations." Of course, thinking himself in Asia, he had little reason for concern over his calculation, extrapolated from Scriptural prophesies, that "there are but one-hundred and fifty-five years remaining" to the time at which, according to "the cited authorities, the world will have to come to an end" (quoted in Kadir 1992, 31, 34). In his "Letter on the Fourth Voyage" to the King and Queen of Spain, he had referred to a prophesy of Joachim that a Christian from Spain would rebuild Jerusalem and Mount Zion as in Psalm 141. He said that he was willing to bring to the east that man who "habitabit in Tabernaculo tuo, aut [qui] requiescet in monte sancto tuo" (quoted in Bloomfield 1980, 37). But when, several years later, Amerigo Vespucci announced that what had been found was a whole "New World," with millions of people speaking hundreds of languages, a hundred and fifty years suddenly seemed awfully little time for the conversion of "all peoples and nations" in sixteenth-century millenarian time tables.

It is then in the Old World tradition of this millenarian conflation of spatial and temporal ends of the world that Franciscan and Puritan missionaries could invest their apostolic errand in the New World with apocalyptic meaning. "Noten los que vivieren" ["Let those who shall come take note"], Motolinía writes,

> y veremos como la cristianidad ha venido desde Asia, quees en Oriente, a para en los fines de Europa, que es en nuestra España, y de alli se viene a mas andar a esta tierra, que es en lo mas ultimo de Occidente. ?Pues por ventura estorbarlo ha la mar? No por cierto, porque la mar

> no hace division ni apartamiento a la voluntad y querer del que la hizo. ?Pues no allegara el querer y gracia de Dios hasta adonde allegan las naos? Si, y muy mas adelante, pues en toda la redondez de la tierra ha de ser el nombre de Dios loado, y glorificado, y, ensalzado. Y como florecio en el principio la Iglesia en Oriente, que es el principio del mundo, bien asi ahora en el fin de los siglos tine florecer en Occidente, que es fin del mundo. (333-34)
> [and we shall see how Christianity has come from Asia, which is in the east, to reach the utmost limit of Europe, which is our Spain, and from there is coming with rapid strides to this land, which is the most remote part of the west. Does the ocean perchance present any obstacle to its passage? Certainly not, for to the will and desire of Him who created it, the sea can represent no division or separation. Shall not the will and grace of God go as far as ships can go? Yes, and much beyond, for in all the circumstance of the earth shall the name of God be praised and glorified and exalted; as in the beginning the Church flourished in the east, which is the beginning of the world, just so it shall flourish now, at the end of the centuries, in the west, which is the end of the world. (221)]

The Franciscan ethnographers were therefore constantly engaged in the task of re-synchronizing New World history with Old World prophesy. Christ and St. Francis had evangelized the Old World; the New World Franciscans, as a new types of St. Francis, such as Martin de Valencia, leader of the `First Ten', would evangelize the New World. They eagerly searched Old World history in order to find a prophetic space for the New World. "Por lo que he visto" ["From what I have seen"], Motolinía wrote,

> creo, que una d las cosas y secretos que en el serafico coloquio pasaron entre Cristo y San Francisco en el Monte Alverna, que mientras San Francisco vivio nunca lo dijo, fue esta rigueza que Dios aqui le tenia guardada, adonde se tiene de extender y ensanchar mucho su gracia religion. Y digo, que San Francisco, padre de muchas gentes, vio y supo de este dia. (277-78)
> [I suspect and even believe that one of the secret things that passed between Christ and Saint Francis in that seraphic conversation on Mount Averna--which Saint Francis never told as long as he lived--was the subject of these

> riches which God had in reserve for him here where His holy religion must spread and extend greatly. I maintain that Saint Francis, the father of many peoples, foresaw and knew about this day. (184)]

When St. Francis had received Christ's stigmata, he became the new messiah whose mission it would be to reform the church and spread the faith throughout the world. By analogy, Valencia had, after the discovery of the New World, received a vision before sailing for America--when he "rezaba ciertas profecías de la venida de los gentiles a la fe. le mostro Dios en espiritu muy gran muchedumbre de gentiles que venian a la fe, y fue tanto el gozo que su animo sintio que comenzo a dar grandes voces" (220) ["was reading certain prophesies about the coming of the gentiles to the Faith, and God showed him, in the spirit, a great multitude of people who were coming to the Faith, and so great was the joy that his soul felt that he began to cry aloud" (126)]. "!Oh! ?Y cuando sera esto?," he cried, "?Cuando se cumplira esta profecia? ?No seria yo digno de ver este convertimiento, pues, ya estamos en la tarde y fin de nuestros dias, y en la ultima edad del mundo?" (283) ["Oh, when shall this be? When shall this prophecy be fulfilled? Would I not be worthy to see this conversion, since we are now in the evening and end of our days and in the last age of the world?" (177)]. The lessons were from the prophet Isaiah and thus, Motolinía remarks, extremely appropriate to his purpose. From that time on, Valencia['s] "crecio en el mas el deseo que tenia de ir entre los infieles, y predicarlos y convertirlos a la fe de

Jesucristo. Esta vision quiso Nuestor Senor mostrar a su siervo complida en esta Nueva España" (284) ["desire increased to go among the heathen and preach to them and convert them to the Faith of Christ. This vision Our Lord willed that His servant should see fulfilled in this New Spain" (178)]. Valencia would thus become the New World's St. Francis, also receiving Christ's stigmata in the New World. Every year, at the time at which "Nuestro Senor fue puesto y enclavado en la cruz, fue tanto el sentimiento que tuvo, que saliendo de si fue arrobado y se quedo yerto como un palo" (291) ["Our Lord was nailed to the Cross, his suffering was so great that his spirit left him and he went into a trance and became as rigid as a stick" (184)].

Thus, Martín de Valencia becomes the St. Francis of the New World. The `First Ten' therefore carefully timed their landing at Veracruz on the eve of Pentecost in 1524 to begin their march upon Mexico. "Mas es de notar los que el profeta Daniel dice," Motolinía writes in his *Memorials*,

> que Dios muda los tiempos y edades, y pasa los reinos de un senorio en otro; y esto por los pecados, segun parece en el reino de los cananeos, que lo paso Dios en los hijos de Israel con grandisimos castigos; y el reino de Judea, por el pecado y muerte del Hijo de Dios, lo paso a los romanos; ... Lo que yo a vuestra majestad suplico es el quinto reino de Jesucristo, ... que ha de henchir y ocupar toda la tierra, del cual reino vuestra majestad es el caudillo y capitan, que mande vuestra majestad poner toda la diligencia que sea posible para que este reino se cumpla y ensache y se predique a estos infieles o a los mas ceranos, especialmente a los de la Florida, que estan aqui a la puerta. (1971, 412).
> [It is noteworthy what the prophet Daniel says, that God changes the times and the ages and that the dominions pass from one lord to another. And this is because of the sins, as it seems in the case of the kingdom of the Canaanites,

> which God bestowed upon the sons of Israel with great punishments; and the kingdom of Judea, which through the sin and death of the Son of God passed on to the Romans ... Your Majesty's is the fifth kingdom of Jesus Christ which will occupy the entire earth, over which your Majesty is lord and captain so that you order that as much effort as possible be put into the submission, preaching and conversion of these infidels and those farther removed especially those in Florida, which is right before our doors.]

The Franciscans thus saw themselves as the emissaries of the World Lord, Charles V, whose reign represented the fifth reign of Christ and whose triumph would initiate the final era of world history.

In colonial New England, during the years of the Puritan Revolution in England, a similar millennialist enthusiasm emerged and resulted in a new ethnological interest in the American Indian. There, by the second half of the 1640s, the social structures of the eastern Indian tribes had been substantially weakened by disease and warfare. It was therefore no coincidence that the Puritan missionary John Eliot of Roxbury, who had been engaged in missionary efforts since 1643, was gradually beginning to make some progress in attracting potential Indian converts.[20] But, more importantly, New England's Indian missions suddenly received significant attention also from the colonial elites during the second part of the 1640. As millenarian fervors were increasingly centering upon Old, not New, England, the New England ministers found themselves in need to redefine their colonial enterprise, and in particular what exactly it was that they were doing in the backwoods of an American

wilderness when they could be marching in Cromwell's New Model Army for the Second Coming of Christ. It was in the context of this new relationship with England that the New England divines recycled the Praying Indian.

In 1648, English Puritans in Old and in New England formed, according to Thomas Shepard, a nation of "saints on Earth"--his readership in Parliament being the "Representatives of this Nation" (in Eliot 1834, 27). The same Thomas Shepard who, in the quote above, had thought the progress of the Gospel among the Indians impossible only a year before now discerned a new historical design with a twofold role for New England in this transatlantic nation: First, what used to be an exile from the "malicious purpose ... to smother the light" of the royalists and the Episcopacy has, through God's marvelous providence, suddenly assumed a "farther end to their coming over" (28). It is New England's newly revealed "*farther Arrand*," Shepard proclaimed, which

> God requires of us ... to spread the Gospel, and in that, the fame and honor of this Nation, to the utmost ends of the earth ... [through] conquests of the Lord Jesus upon these poor outcasts. (28-31)

The completion of this "farther Arrand" would, Shepard hoped, have the effect "that you in England might bee stirred up, to be Rejoycers in, and Advancers of these promising beginnings" in converting the unregenerate on both sides of the ocean. But he also reminded his brethren and allies in England that "God hath no need of us" - in case

they failed to accomplish their part in reforming the Church, going through with the revolution, and keeping the cash for the American missions coming (33). Shepard explained: God's covenant by no means binds Him to the English people; and if they fail to fulfill His ordinances, He will find himself a different people:

> there can be no reason given why God should fence us, and suffer other places to lye waste, that we should bee his Garden, and other places a Wilderness, that he should feed us with the bread of Heaven, and suffer others to starve, men of the same mould, his offspring as well as we, and such (did he conquer to himselfe) were likely to doe him more service, bring him more glory then we have done. (33)

There is--not accidentally--an ambiguity in Shepard's rhetoric with regard to the definition of God's chosen nation. While on the one hand he evokes the vision of a transatlantic nation of English saints, all fighting together on their respective front on either side of the Atlantic, he also hints at the possibility that God will altogether abandon the English in favor of those in the "wilderness" in America. What is noteworthy about Shepards's use of the rhetoric of the jeremiad here is that, in speaking about this potential rival for God's favor, he is not referring to the New English in their American exile, but rather to the Indians, who, too, he discovers, are "men of the same mold" and whose allegedly rapid progress toward the Gospel poses a challenge to the English. Thus, in light of Sacvan Bercovitch's (1978) argument that the rhetoric of the jeremiad was instrumental in shaping a New England (and even an American) identity during the 1670s, it is

significant to note that it is here the image of the Praying Indian that makes for the transculturation of this rhetoric from an English into an American context. Shepard's discourse, which ultimately served the political purpose of driving forward the revolution in England, engendered a potentially new concept of an elect people no longer based on an opposition between the regenerate and unregenerate English people--a transatlantic "nation" of English saints--and not yet an identity based on an opposition between New Englanders and Old Englanders, but rather on a geo-cultural opposition between New World Americans (Indians) and Old World Europeans (English).

Sacred history provided ready evidence to back up Shepard's argument: Like "the Gentiles," who served as "a provocation to the Jews," these "poor Indians stand up incentives to us" (the English) to regenerate:

> God gave life to New England, to quicken Old, and hath warmed them, that they might heat us, raised them from the dead, that they might recover us from that consumption, and those sad decays which are come upon us. (in Eliot 1834, 34)

What was happening in the American "Tartarian tents" (62), Shepard predicted, will "make many Christians ashamed, who may easily see how farre they are exceeded by these naked men in so short a time" (64). Were these the first signs that God had--as he had done once before--already decided to transfer his favors? Again, Scriptural History did not lack precedents:

> The fall of whom christ knew not shall run onto him, *Isai.*

> *55.5.* The fall of the unbelieving Jewes was the rising of the Gentiles; my prayer to Europe is, that the fall of the Churches ... may not bee the rising of these *American* Gentiles, never pitied till now. I wish that ... prophesie herein may never prove true; but rather that the rising of these may be a provoking and raising up of them, especially of the English, to lament after that God whom they have forsaken (64).

Thus, while stressing the union of English saints on the one hand, Shepard, on the other hand, also implies the notion of a competition in which New and Old England stood in converting the unregenerate and the possibility that God will transfer his favors to another people altogether. What would previously have seemed an utter absurdity to Englishmen in Old and New England alike was apparently no longer inconceivable by the late 1640s: that God may ordain an American people--the Indians--as His new Jerusalem.

The question of where the Gospel would prevail first suddenly assumed cosmic significances. During the course of the Puritan Revolution, America, for the first time, became --at least potentially--a `*place*' in Redemption History. "I do beseech you to consider the times," John Eliot wrote in the Preface to his *Christian Commonwealth*, "and compare the Prophesies of Scripture, with the present providences; and see if you finde not all things to come to pass, according as it is written." For the first time, the New England Puritans' sense of mission entailed a specific relationship with the land they inhabited, and it was precisely the presence of the American Indian that had afforded them this avenue to a re-invention of New England as an extraordinary

and important place in History rather than merely a land of exile from History.

In New England, after King Charles was beheaded, the House of Lords abolished, and England declared a Commonwealth in 1649, John Eliot was quick to point out to Parliament the role that New England's missions would play in the new order as well as Parliament's obligations toward the American missions. England had been "first in that blessed work of setting up the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus" (1846, Preface, n.p.). Now, that "the Antichristian principle for man to be above God ... is thrown to ground" and space is cleared for the "bringing in and setting up the glorious kingdome of Christ," the "chief work of this nature ... is to follow this Indian work which sticks in the birth for the want of means" (1834, 120). Eliot argued that God's redemptive work follows a "Symmetricall" pattern (126-27): What had, as a first step, begun in New England with the gradual ousting of the devil there was now achieved also in Old England after the king was beheaded. Old England then preceded America with taking the second step--the making way for Christ's kingdom through the creation of the Commonwealth.

> Christ is the only right Heir of the Crown of England, and of all other Nations; and he has now come to take possession of His Kingdom, making England first in that blessed work of setting up the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus.[21]

In formulating this idea of a "symmetricall" and parallel geo-historical design of Providential progress in the Old

World and the New, Eliot, like other New World missionaries before him, arrived at a characteristically `creole' (Euro-American) theory of history emerging with the rise of comparative ethnology in the New World encounter.[22] This strategy of inscribing America (the `New World') into History was later adopted also by other, more prominent New England historians, such as Edward Johnson. In his *Wonder-Working Providence*, Johnson makes use of the recurrent imagery of a transatlantic "temple," with the numerous congregational churches on both sides of the Atlantic serving as its "pillars" and the individual saints as "living stones as outwardly appeare Saints by calling" (1974, 25-26; 65, 75, 207, 250; see also Tichi 1971, 150). Johnson hereby further develops a space of the New World within a centered ideology of history which denied history to any place but Europe. But it was John Eliot's ethnographic treatises which first laid the foundation on which a colonial identity could be built in New England, doing so by inventing historical depth for the New World.

Nevertheless, the Puritan missionaries speak of the Indians' progress in English civility with a peculiar ambiguity about Indian `nature': On the one hand, Eliot contrasts the governmental form of `his' Indians with those still under the "tyrannical rule" of the despotic Sachems--thus evoking an analogue to the `despot' in England. But on the other hand, the missionaries also point out the advantages that the Indians have over the Europeans, who are

burdened by history and a tradition of institutionalized errors. Europe, Eliot argues, due to its monarchical tradition and "humane wisdome" is likely to "be loth to yeeld to Christ," whereas the Indians, as a `blank slates', "have no principles of their own, nor yet wisdome of their own ... wherein to stick" (1834, 131).

While the Franciscans saw then the virtues and vices of the Indians in very different ways, for them, also, the new American converts are the ideal Christians to serve as an example of the reformation of the faith. "Estos indios cuasi no tienen estorbo que les impida para ganar el cielo, de los muchos que los espanoles tenemos y nos tienen sumidos," Motolinía writes,

> porque su vida se cententa con muy poco, y tan poco, que apenas tienen con que se vestir ni alimentar. Su comida es muy pauperrima, y lo mismo es el vestido. Para dormir, la mayor parte de ellos aun no alcanzan una estera sana. No se desvelan en adquerir ni guardar riguezas, ni se matan por alcanzar estados ni dignidades. Con su pobre manta se acuestan, y en despartando estan aparejados para servir a Dios, y si se quieren disciplinar, no tienen estorbo ni embarazo de vestirse y desnudarse. Son pacientes, sufridos sobre manera, mansos como ovejas. Nunca me acuerdo haberlos visto guardar injuria; humildes, a todos obedientes, ya de necesidad, ya de voluntad, no saben sino servir y trabajar. (188-89)
> [These Indians have almost none of those obstacles to prevent their achieving salvation which we Spaniards have and by which we are kept down, for their life is content with very little, so little, in fact, that they have scarcly enough to clothe and feed themselves. Their food is extremely poor and scanty, and their clothing the same; for sleeping most of them have not even a whole piece of matting. They do not stay away nights to acquire or preserve riches nor do they wear themselves out to achieve position or honors. They lie down wrapped in their poor blankets and as soon as they awake they have not the bother of dressing or undressing. They are extremely patient and long-suffering, as gentle as sheep. I do not remember ever having seen one of them bear a grudge. They

> are humble and obedient to all, either willingly or of necessity, and they know only how to serve and work. (98)

In both Franciscan New Spain and Puritan New England, the apocalyptic expectancy inspired the missionaries with a keen ethnological interest in native American cultural practices and origins. For, if it could be determined who this seemingly `new' people corresponded to in Biblical prophesies, it would be possible to project how close "the end of the centuries" actually was. Motolinía admits here of several possibilities: While, on the one hand, he evokes the possibility, based on Aristotle's *De Admirandis in Natura*, of Carthaginian origins, he finds it more likely that

> una tan gran tierra, y tan poblada por todas partes, mas parece traer origen de otras extranas partes; y aun en alugunos indicios parece ser del repartimiento y division de los nietos de Noe. Algunos espanoles, considerados ciertos ritos, costumbres y ceremonias de estos naturales, los juzgan ser de generacion de moros; otros, por algunas causas y condiciones que el ellos ven, dicen que son de generacion de judios; mas la mas comun opinion es, que todos ellos son gentiles, pues vemos que los usan y tienen por bueno. (113)
> [a land so great as this, and so thickly populated in all sections would seem rather to trace its origin from other foreign parts; and there are some indications that it comes from the division and dispersal of the sons of Noah. Some Spaniards, in view of the rites, customs, and ceremonies of these natives, judge them to be of the race of Moors. Others, because of some causes and conditions which they see in them, say that they are of the Jewish race; but the commonest opinion is that they are all gentiles, since we see that they practice it and consider it good. (34)]

The possibility of the Americans' Jewish origin hinted at here by Motolinía had already been a current subject of discussion in the ethnographic literature of the discovery and the conquest. The earliest manifestation of this idea seems to have been Pedro Martir de Angleria's *Decadas del*

Nuevo Mundo (1511) in which Martir reported that Columbus had thought Española to be Ophir. If this were true, Martir had gathered, Solomon's sailors might have left behind the progenitors of the Indians. In Spanish America, the possibility of Jewish origins was later asserted again in the Dominican Diego Duran's *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España y islas de Tierra Firme* (1580), the Jesuit Juan de Tovar's *Historia de la Benida de Los Yndios a Poblar a Mexico* [between 1582 and 1587] and in Juan Suarez de Peralta's *Tratado del descubrimiento de las Indias* (1580). In the rest of Europe, the theory gained currency during the 1560s with two publications of Joannes Fredericus Lumnius' *De Extremo Dei Iudicio et Indorum vocatione* (Antwerp, 1567 and 1594; also Venice, 1569) and with Gilbert Genebrad's *Chronographia* (Paris, 1567) in which the authors explained that the Americans were the descendants of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel referred to in the apocryphal fourth book of Esdras, IV Kings, and Isiah (see Huddleston 1967, 33-47).

The implications of this theory for the American missionaries' apocalyptic errand were significant. In 1596, Jerónimo de Mendieta wrote:

> Y quién sabe si estamos tan cerca del fin del mundo, que en estos se hayan verificado las profesías que rezan haberse de convertir los judíos en aquel tiempo? Porque en estos (si vienen de judíos) ya lo vemos cumplido. (1973, II:112)
> [Who knows whether we are not so close to the end of the world that the conversion of the Indians is fulfilling the prophecies for which we pray that the Jews may be converted in our time? Because if the Indians descend from the Jews, then the prophecy is already fulfilled.]

It the American Spaniards had been divinely ordained to convert the American Jews, the completion of their providential errand would bring about the apocalypse. It was thus in the American colonies, at the periphery of empire and on the edge of the world, not in metropolitan peninsular Spain, where Spain's messianic destiny as a redeemer nation would find its fulfillment. "Sabemos bien (si lo queremos considerar) [We know (if we wish to consider the matter)]," Mendieta wrote,

> que esta negociación y trato de buscar y llamar y procurar almas para el cielo es de tanta importancia, que nuestro poderosísimo Dios (con ser quien es y con tener todas las cosas en su beneplático cerca de todo lo criado) no se ocupa en otra cosa (hablando en nuestro mondo de decir), de casi sieta mil años a esta parte, que crió al primer hombre, si no es en llamar por sí con inspiraciones, avisos y castigos, y por medio de sus siervos los patriarcas y profetas, y por su propio Hijo en persona, y después por los apóstoles, márties y predicatores y otros y dispongan para entrar a gozar de aquel convite perdurable que no tendrá fin. La cual vocación no ha cesado ni cesará hasta que esté complido el número de los escogidos, que según la visión de S. Juan ha de ser de todas las naciones, lenguas y pueblos. (1973, I:17-18) [that this business and task of searching, calling and procuring souls for Heaven is of such importance that our Almighty God ... has done nothing else (in our way of speaking) during almost seven thousand years since He created the first man. By means of His illuminations, warnings and punishments, by means of His servants the patriarchs and prophets, by means of His own son in person and later by means of the apostles, the martyrs, the preachers and the saints, God has been calling all the peoples of the earth to hasten to prepare themselves to enter and to enjoy that everlasting feast that will be endless. This vocation of God shall not cease until the number of the predestined is reached, which according to the vision of St. John must include all nations, all languages and all peoples.]

The debate about the Indians' origin was soon expanded also into the Protestant world during the early seventeenth

century by Hugo Grotius, Jan De Laet, and Georg Horn. In 1644, a Portuguese Jew Antonio Montesinos arrived in Amsterdam from America proclaiming that the Americans were the descendants of the Jews. Subsequently, one of Montesinos' believers, the Rabbi Manasseh ben Israel, also a Portuguese Jew living in Amsterdam, published his famous *Spes Isrealis--The Hope of Israel (1650)*. The theory reached England by way of John Dury, an English clergyman and supporter of John Eliot's missionary work. Manasseh's version of Montesinos's account was republished in England by Thomas Thorowgood (1650), which again claimed that the American Indians were descendants of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel, who had been carried, according to the Bible, into captivity by the king of Syria (Huddleston 1967, 128-138; also Holstun 1987, 112).

Not surprisingly, New England Puritans associated with John Eliot's missionary enterprise eagerly seized, like the Franciscans had in New Spain a century before them, upon this ethnological re-invention of the Indian. It afforded colonial Europeans in America not only a venue to invent a *place* for the `New World'--by definition a world outside History--in Old World `Universal' (Biblical) History; but it also gave their own presence in this New World new cosmic significances at a time when events in England threatened to relegate New England's (first) errand of upholding the Light in their American exile to an insignificant ephemeral. Thus, in 1649--the year that Charles I was beheaded and the

English Civil War came to an end--Edward Winslow, in his *The Glorious Progress of the Gospel Amongst the Indians in New England*, eagerly provided first-hand evidence in favor of Manasseh's argument: the Indian habit of "purification of weomen" and circumcision of boys, their belief in the immortality of the soul, their stories about a loss of an ancient knowledge and of "one man only that ever saw God, ... which certainly I believe to be Moses" (in Eliot 1834, 73)-- all this, Winslow argued, was evidence that the Indians were indeed the descendants of the Hebrews.

Like their Franciscan counterparts during the sixteenth century, seventeenth-century Puritan missionaries marveled at the apocalyptic implications of this new ethnological perspective on the Indian. If the Indians were indeed the descendant of Abraham, John Eliot gathered, then America must be the place which, according to Scripture, God had ordained as the site for the final conversion of the Jews, which would mark the beginning of the end of History and the arrival of the millennium:

> ... and how often in the Scriptures doth the Lord use that blessed word of *Grace* and *Covenant, I am the God of the Hebrews*? besides there be sundry Prophesies in Scripture, *unto the goings down of the Sunne;* and let it be considered whether *America* be not be accounted among the places that are the goings down of the Sunne unto those places where those Promises were promulgated. (1834, 119)

Eliot explained the Indians' `degeneration' from their original knowledge of God with their lack of written language. However, he argued, they still retained a faint memory of the true God evidenced by their belief in one

supreme creator of the world. He thus concluded that the `lost tribes' were still entitled to the covenant promises that had been given to the Jewish people.

The new significance of the Puritan missions in New England was, as Joseph Caryl observed, no less than "to hope that the work of Christ among them, may be as a preparatory to his own appearing" (in Eliot 1834, 95). Eliot's belief in the connection between the Puritan missionary work and the arrival of the millennium was confirmed by John Cotton's contention that the Jews' conversion would begin in the 1650s--a theory which reaches back to Columbus, who had, in 1501, prophesied that there would be 150 years left before the arrival of the millennium. "These meditations," Caryl rejoiced, "do minister comfort & encouragement to my heart with others also" (120); for they reaffirmed that the missionaries' labors would soon be blessed with their divine rewards. Most importantly, they dispelled all doubts that New England's significance in Redemption History would be far greater than merely a transitory and forgotten colonial outpost at the edge of the world, overshadowed by the great events taking place in England.

Indeed, such apprehensions had not been unwarranted. New England Puritans had been returning to England to participate in the Civil War ever since the events there began "turning upside down the whole frame of things" in 1642 (in Eliot 1834, 61).[23] Thus, the tracts reporting on the missionary work in New England during the 1650s may be read

as the Puritans' version of the promotion literature more commonly associated with the advertisement of other parts of colonial America. While the nature of America's rewards here certainly differ from those advertised in, say, the promotion literature of Virginia, the language is strikingly similar. As John Eliot pointed out,

> there is a *golden mine* in every work of God; and the *foregoing Letters* to a gracious eye, are as a discovery of a far more precious *mine* in *America*, then those *Gold* and *Silver* ones of *India*: For they bring tidings of the *unsearchable riches of Christ* revealed unto pore soules in those parts. (1834, 93; my italics)

It is the mines of Indian souls that will afford the planters the riches with which to build their estates in the Hereafter. Thus, the work of the missionary "in America," Joseph Caryl claimed, is still worthwhile, "glorious, and to be admired by all those, who look after and rejoice in the appearance of our Lord Jesus" (in Eliot 1834, 95); it is what makes New England a place that still matters. Caryl marveled at God's wonderful Providence, which was, "as it now seems," gradually unfolding as He revealed to those who humbly believed themselves in a wilderness exile to be His new "*Ministers of the Dispertion*" that had been "intended in his carrying of them thither" all along (95).

Thus, the period immediately following the end of the English Civil War was, in Old and New England, a time of a great "coming-together of Puritan religious and political thought" (Holstun 1987, 136). For the New England colonial leadership, however, the success of the Puritan Revolution

in Old England necessitated a revision of their rhetoric of legitimacy and identity. They did so by `discovering' that their mission had not merely consisted in keeping the faith in their temporary American refuge, but that they had a "farther Arrand" in converting the American natives, a mission revealed to be indispensable to the universal progress of Redemption History. As Henry Whitfield concluded, America had at last become

> *a place of rest,* ... a place where many, very many have been brought home to Christ, even amongst themselves; so now apparently in the conversion of many of the Heathens, who sing and rejoice in the ways of the Lord. (in Eliot 1834, 145)

Thus, Robert Middlekauff may have been only partially right when arguing that the `first generation' Puritan emigrants "did not ever expect that the Congregational Church polity would serve as a model for others" (as Perry Miller had contended) and that they did "not even begin to think of what they were doing as an errand ... in fact, they did not ever use the word `errand' to describe their purpose; its first use came in the next generation (Middlekauff 1971, 32). For, the transformation of the idea of New England's special role in Redemption History during the late 1640s (Shepard's "Arrand") was not so much a matter of an organic generational succession but rather the varying results of a shifting Puritan rhetoric of identity in distinctive historical circumstances of imperial politics. The same generation that had previously dismissed their missionary calling after their migration into exile from Old

World persecution stressed the providential significance of their missionary work during the late 1640s and during the 1650s. Whereas formerly they had derived their arguments for `patience' regarding the missionary work from the tribal Old Testament story of an elect Israel's Exodus, they now appropriated, in their new missionary role, the universalist prophesies and promises of the New Testament. Second, while it is accurate that the first generation did not invariably conceive of their work and church as a `blueprint' for the reformation of others, which would, once achieved, bring about the millennium, New England Puritans during the 1650s did conceive of their work as being the preparatory and necessary work for God's initiation of the millennium. True, this sense of mission was not based on a "posing as the representative of a morally superior culture" (Middlekauff 1971, 32). But yet, in their reports back to England about the "Glorious Progress of the Gospel" among one of the last people to be converted before the Second Coming, they reveal their sense of a New England's extraordinary and unique mission in the world. And it is in their missionary role that American Puritans during late the 1640s first defined a uniquely American "errand."

In New Spain, the missionaries had also been engaged in redefining the role of America within the empire from what was increasingly becoming, in the course of the sixteenth century, a mere colony of exploitation, a space for temporary removal for the sake of attaining fame and fortune

for returning peninsular Spaniards. Instead, they asserted, New Spain was a permanent New Jerusalem, important in its own right in World History and in Spanish imperial mission. Motolinía especially chastises therefore those who come to America "too much absorbed and involved in acquiring the gold that they came to get, intending to return to Spain as soon as they have obtained it." And, the churchmen who come to America solely to complete their obligatory mission in order to be able to return to Spain are venom to his interest in retaining the myth of Spanish American Jerusalem. "Lo digo por todos en general," he writes, that "los frailes de todas ordenes que aca pasan ... que los que de ellos aca no trabajan fielmente, y los que se vuelven a Castilla, que los demandara Dios estrechisima cuenta de como emplearon el talento que se les encomendo" (295) ["I say in general of all friars of all orders who come here ... that those of them who do not work faithfully here and those who go back to Castile will be asked by God for a strict account of how they employed the talent that he entrusted to them" (188)]. He warningly refers to the example of Peru, which has, he believes, been transformed into a new Babylon by exploitation of greedy Spaniards returned to Spain. "!Oh, que río de Babilonia se abrió en la tierra del Perú!" he laments,

> !Y como el negro oro se vuelve en amargo lloro por cuya codicia muchos vendieron sus patrimonios, con que se pudieran sustenar tan bien como sus antepasados! Y enganados de sus vanas fantasias, de adonde pensaban llevar con que se gozar, vinieron a llorar, ... !Oh,

> tierra del Perú, río de Babilonia, montes de Gelboe, adonde tantos Españoles y tan noble gente ha perecido y muerto ... ?Adonde ha habido en tierra de infieles de tan pocos años aca tantas batallas como ha habido de cristianos contra cristianos, tan crueles como en el Peru, y adonde tantos muriesen? Bien senalado quedo el campo de la sangre que alli se derramo. ... Mas bastante fue la avaricia de nuestros Espanoles para destruir y despoblar esta tierra, que todos los sacrificios y guerras y homicidios que el ella hubo en tiempo de su infidelidad. (350-51)
> [Oh, what a river of Babylon flowed in the land of Peru! And into what bitter tears was converted the accursed black gold, for greed of which many sold their patrimonies, on which they could have lived as well as their ancestor! Deceived by their vain fancies they came to weep in the land from which they thought to get the means of enjoyment; ... O land of Peru, river of Babylon, mountains of Gilboa, where so many Spaniards and so noble a people have perished and died ... Where in heathen countries have there been so recently so many battles as there have been between Christians in Peru, and such cruel ones, where so many men died? The field was well marked with the blood that was shed there. ... More potent was the avarice of our Spaniards to destroy and depopulate this land than all the sacrifices and wars and assassinations that took place in its pagan days. (234-36)]

Like in Peru, greed, cruelty, and war would also bring down God's New Jerusalem in New Spain, he suggested, if Spaniards in America are not disciplined.

6. BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY

Motolinía's lamentation of Peru's degeneration into a New Babylon, was, of course, merely a warning for New Spain, a path be avoided by what he still deemed to be a New Jerusalem. After the 1570s, however, the optimistic triumphism which had been inspired by the idea of a New Isreal's exodus from the demonic captivity of Egyptian idolatry and which had prevailed in the earlier Franciscan ethnographies, gradually yielded to the lamenting rhetoric

of the jeremiad. In 1579, the missionary Bernadino de Sahagún once more evoked the westernizing theme so familiar from the apocalyptic writings of his Franciscan predecessors. "The Church militant started out from Palestine .... and crossing the Ocean has come to this western land of India, where there were many different peoples and tongues," he wrote. But instead of announcing the imminent millennium resulting from saving souls for God in America, he reflects that most Indians "have already died out and those that remain are on the road to extinction." Moreover, he finds that

> in the matter of the Catholic Faith its soil is sterile and very difficult to cultivate, and the Catholic Faith has very feeble roots and bears little fruit in return for excessive labor and very easily dries up and dies. It seems to me that the Catholic faith cannot last long in this land... It has merely come to the Islands and New Spain and Peru in passing, on the way to China .... where I believe that it will last for many years. (1956, III:302-3)

History's movement west had overtaken the Americas in its quest toward the new lands of imperial desire in the Philippines.

Moreover, since the opening decades of the reign of Philip II, the mendicants had increasingly seen their autonomies under assault by both the ecclesiastic establishment and the imperial state, both of whom were suspicious of the influence and power that the friars exercised over the Indian population. On the one hand the bishops had attempted to replace the friars in charge of the Indian missions with secular clergy who would have to answer

to the church hierarchy. The Mexican Church councils of 1555, 1565, and 1585, dominated by the bishops, had gradually enforced the decree of the Council of Trent that no cleric might have jurisdiction with care of souls over secular persons unless he was subject to episcopal authority. As the secular clergy was growing in numbers, training, and royal favor after the 1560s, the friars increasingly found themselves with but two alternatives--to retire peacefully to their monasteries or to apply their missionary zeal in the remote colonial frontiers among unconquered natives (see Phelan 1956, 54; also Ricard 1966, 239-263). While Motolinía could still marvel at the providential significance of the fact that hardly any Franciscan missionaries had perished either during the passage across the Atlantic or at the hands of the American natives, his Franciscan brethren Francesco Gonzaga, successively bishop of Cefalu, Pavia, and Mantua, and chronicler of the Franciscan order, found himself confronted, when writing his general history of the Franciscan missionary work throughout the world, with the task of writing the hagiographies of 26 missionaries who had been martyred by the Chichimecs in northern New Spain by the end of the 1570s (see Gonzaga 1587, 23-50).

On the other hand, the royal audiencia in New Spain had disputed the mendicants' practice to exercise jurisdiction over their Indian converts, a prerogative the imperial judges were eager to reserve for the state. As peninsular

Spain found itself more and more dependent on American bullion in order to finance Philip's European wars, the imperial officials had become increasingly unresponsive to the friars' pleas of protection against the social and demographic effects of economic exploitation institutionalized by the system of *repartimiento de labor*. Instead the officials of the Crown joined hands with the acting Inquisitor Bishop Montufar in the attempt to subject the Indians to paying tithes. This represented an attack on the separate constitutional status that the Indian missions held in colonial administration--based on the distinction between a *república de los indios* and a *república de los españoles*--and the gradual Hispanization of the Indians. But also, it implied a return to a Church based on the Old-World Spanish model, an idea the mendicants loathed (see Brading 1991, 114-115).

Mendieta therefore especially insists on the protection of the principle of the two republics. "It is manifest that this republic of New Spain should be considered as two nations, the Spanish and the Indian," he argues, "That of the Indians, who are in their own land, is natural [and] The nation of the Spaniards ...is foreign ...and it is unjust that one rules over the other and that the natural must serve the recent foreigners" (1973, III 188). The reduction of New Spain to the status of a mere overseas colony of the `foreigners' from Castile implicit in this development was then squarely opposed to the Franciscan vision of a new

Jerusalem in America. The missionary chronicles after the 1570s must therefore be seen primarily as the discursive attempts to preserve the New World utopias' autonomies and to protect the Indians from economic exploitation. "Lord God of Hosts," laments Mendieta, "how long wilt thou be angry against the prayer of this people?" (1973, III:556-63).

While both Motolinía and Mendieta, writing half a century apart, made ample use of millenarian prophesy, in Motolinía the Indians' ten plagues had merely been the temporary sufferings on their Exodus into the Promised Land; in Mendieta, by contrast, Motolinía's warnings turned into a historical jeremiad. The American New Jerusalem had fallen into permanent Babylonian captivity. Indeed, its condition was much the same, he pointed out, as that encountered by Judas Maccabaeus on Mount Zion under the degrading rule of the Seleucids. In despair, Mendieta turned to Psalm 79 of the Vulgate where the Lord is beseeched to rescue from destruction the vine he has brought out of Egypt. Mendieta evokes with his biblical allusions the hope for an earthly liberator who would rescue Israel from its new oppressors. While in the Joachimite interpretation of history, to which Mendieta owed most of his millennialist ideas (see Phelan 1956), this liberator would be a new messiah who would tear down the established orders, Mendieta (wisely) refrains from such a radical step but prays instead that the king of Castile, God's elect agent of earth, would take this role and liberate the Indians.

In the fifth and last book of his *Historia Eclesiástica*, Mendieta presents the biographies of his Franciscan antecedents in New Spain, which become, in a sense, the main event of his history and which define, in his view, the identity of New Spain. As the protectors of the Indians against their oppressors, the missionaries become the heroic martyrs, who worked and died for the utopian primitive church in New Spain. In his biography of Motolinía, who had died in 1569, he stresses that the missionary died on the "día del glorioso martir español S. Lorenzo, cuyo muy particular devoto era" (1973, IV, 68) [the day of the glorious Spanish martyr St. Lorenzo to whom he [Motolinía] had been particularly devoted"]. Mendieta evokes the "apostólico varón, gran defensor de Cristo, y hermoso por el ornato de toda virtud, amicísismo de la pobreza evangélica, celoso de la honra de Dios, muy observante de su regla y ferventísimo en la conversión de los naturales" (1973, IV 68) ["apostolic man, great defender of Christ, beautiful through the adornment of virtue, a great friend of evangelical poverty, zealous for the honor of God, and very observant of his principles and fervor in their conversion of the Indians"]. At a time when the Franciscan utopia in New Spain seemed to be vanishing, Mendieta appealed to the past, the heroic history of New Spain's missionaries, in his attempt to illustrate the injustices that he sees in Spanish imperial administration.

In New England, there is also a shift in tone in the

historiography about the Indian missions as the imperial state grew more assertive. By the end of the 1650s, after it had become evident to everyone that Cromwell would not reform the churches as Eliot and many New England Puritans, as well as English "conservative" Puritans had wished (Hill 1961, 166), there was gradually less emphasis on God's bilateral and "symmetricall" geo-historical design and the apocalyptical significance of the New England missions. As early as 1651, Henry Whitfield found it necessary to vindicate "the affections of New-England towards the Parliament and present state" against certain "false surmises and aspersions" implying that New Englanders had become critical of Parliament's way of running the Christian commonwealth. The last official report on the missions was published by the "Corporation" in 1655. By then, overt friction had arisen between the American missionaries and Parliament due to an order of the Commissioners of the United Colonies to Eliot to let the New England Company add dedications to his tracts (see Sehr 1984, 195)--probably to contextualize and counteract the subversive suggestiveness and implicit criticism now speaking out of the missionaries' accounts. Whereas America had played, in the millennialist schemes of the earlier tracts, mostly an experimental and preparatory significance in the coming of a transatlantic millenarian kingdom, it now became a place with its own end--as a "*wildernesse*" and "desert" that was being transformed by the New England Puritans into a "*spiritual garden*," where

the Indian "Rose ... blossemeth abundantly" (in Eliot 1834, 266, 67). Joseph Caryl--now without a word of homage to Parliament--praised the "laborers of the messengers of Sion in *New England*" and added an implicit warning to England:

> May we not now ... make mention of *Rahab and Babylon* to them that know Christ? *Behold Philistia and Tyre, with Ethiopia, this man was borne there; and of Sion* (in *New-England*) *it may be said, this and that man ... was borne there* (in Eliot 1834, 266).

When, in 1660, the Restoration made England once more the domain of Stuart `despotism', the New England clergy became increasingly vocal in expressing their opinion that England could no longer be reckoned with in bringing about the Lord's Kingdom. Thus, with England's apostasy in restoring the monarchy and, even earlier with Cromwell, who became, as Perry Miller once put it, a "dictator, in order to impose toleration by force," the New England errand "collapsed... There was nobody left at headquarters to whom reports could be sent" (Miller 1956, 14). The responsibility to fulfill the mission of the Israelites and early Christians thus rested on New England alone, without England; and as the new king's policy toward the colony became more assertive--with the enforcement of the Navigation Acts in 1660 and 1663 and the delegation of a Royal Commission to see after the colonials' compliance in 1664--some also thought that the Lord's work had now to be done against England (see Lovejoy 1972, 126-27).

New England's famous missionary John Eliot died in 1690. King Philip's War had left most of Eliot's Praying

Towns in shambles and what had remained was regarded with indifference, suspicion, and even hostility by most New Englanders. Thus, in 1695, Nathaniel Mather wrote that "Since that day" of the publication of the Eliot Tracts "there has been but little (that I know of) communicated to the Publick, concerning that Affair" (in M. Mayhew 1695, Preface, n.p.). And Eliot had lamented on his deathbed that "There is a cloud, a dark cloud, upon the work of the gospel among the poor Indians;" he prayed that "the Lord [may] revive and prosper that work, and grant it may live when I am dead" (E. Mayhew 1727, xvii).

Indeed, the Indian convert would once again become a symbol of New England identity politics--for Eliot's biographer Cotton Mather, perhaps the most prominent shaper of the New England myth. To be sure, it was a very different image from that of the ideal Christian utopian envisioned by the real Eliot fifty years earlier or that of Mendieta's New Jerusalem in Babylonian captivity. In the new politico-imperial context of British America in the 1690s, Cotton Mather, in his attempt to reconcile the various, and at times conflicting, ideas that his forefathers had harbored regarding the meaning of their colonial project, appropriated the image of the New England missionary, his work, and the Praying Indian in order to create a patriotic myth in the Whig rhetoric of the Glorious Revolution.

There is a certain irony in the fact that not until a decade after New England's original charter had been revoked

did an American Puritan, in 1691, actually cite the "principal end of the plantation," stipulated by King Charles I when first granting the charter to the Bay Colony in 1629.[24] Significantly, however, as Cotton Mather was evoking the image of the Praying Indian on the colony's seal, he turned to history, rather than to his contemporary missionary efforts, in his own attempt to define New England's identity. With a certain shamelessness, Mather celebrated New England's "*attainments* which with God's help we have carried up our Indians [and which] are the chief honour and glory of our labours with them" (C. Mather 1855, II:572). The biography of the missionary John Eliot presents for Mather the perfect site in his attempt to articulate New England's identity as a nation of martyrs. Thus, he dwells on the missionary's toils, hardships, and sufferings in his duty to complete the colonial errand. Here, as in Mendieta, the turn to the past--Mather's representations of John Eliot and the Praying Indians--must be seen in the specific context of cultural and political crisis in the colony's relationship with the imperial metropolis during the 1680s and 1690s. This crisis had been triggered by a general shift in the traditional grounds on which the authority of the colonial elites had been founded: the loss of the Massachusetts charter in 1684, which had returned the authority of appointing governors to the King and accordingly diminished the power of the colonial magistrates and the ministry; the failure of the new charter, which had

resulted from the Revolution, to restore New England's self-governorship--all this impelled Mather to look for other sources of authority and legitimacy than those of the present civil and ecclesiastical establishments, which could no longer take for granted the claim of representing the site of a New Jerusalem (see Arch 1994, 169; Smolenski 1992, 357-95; Haltunen 1977, 315; Middlekauff 1971, 212-217).

Mather therefore appeals to the authority of the mythic names of New England's past, the authority of the Puritan founding fathers, such as Winthrop and Eliot. Like the fifth book of Mendieta's *Historia*, the biographies constituting Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana* are not the stories of individual lives of New England's saints, but rather the communally owned history and the patriotic myth of a nation. This is the context in which *Mather's Eliot* becomes "*our Eliot*" in his history:

> The Atlantick Ocean, like a river of Lethe, may easily cause us to forget many of the things that happened on the other side. Indeed, the *nativity* of such a man were an honour worthy the contention of as many places as laid their claims unto the famous Homer's: but whatever places may challenge a share in the reputation of having enjoyed the *first breath* of our Eliot, it is New England that with most right can call him *her's*; his *best breath*, and afterwards his *last breath* was here; and here 'twas that God bestowed upon him sons and daughters. (1855, II:529)

Not surprisingly, when his *Life of John Eliot* was published in London, it was, according to Nathaniel Mather, "greatly maimed, according to the Direction and Pleasure of our English Index Expurgatorius" (in M. Mayhew 1695, Preface, n.p.). At a time of increasing political and ecclesiastical

factionalism, decreasing influence of the ministry, and the `injustices' of a far-away despot,[25] Mather had created a patriotic martyr who represents the mythic story of New England. Eliot's efforts, such as his translation of the Bible into Algonquian, are the achievements of all New Englanders:

> Behold, ye Americans, the greatest honour that ever you were partakers of! This Bible [the first one in an Indian language] was printed here at our Cambridge; and it is the only Bible that ever was printed in all America, from the very foundation of the world. (1855, II:564)

In Mather's biography of Eliot, the toils spent in the missionary effort are not the exclusive merits of the missionary, the ministry, or the saints but the pride of all (New English) "Americans"--regardless of class and status. As the old lines demarcating the exclusiveness of church polity and visible sainthood were gradually crumbling--even Presbyterians became acceptable--Puritan historians after the 1690 attempted to formulate a new consensus for defining New England's identity: hence Mather's support for a number of unifying tendencies during the 1680s and 1690s: "United Brethren," Toleration Act, secular magistrates, and United Colonies under the umbrella of a New England patriotism.

Mather's portrayal of Eliot--it would be as "unreasonable as unprofitable for posterity to bury" it--embodies all these compromising qualities of consensus: a "bravery" in all the "suffering" he endured in the Indian wilderness (542,43); "an inclination for peace [over contention which] made him almost sacrifice right itself"

(542); a "sort of temperament between rigid Presbyterianism and levelling Brownism" (552); but little patience for the "cruel hardship" of "prescription of other [English] Church state unto us," British despots and their governors (Randolph), and most of all Spanish, French, as well as English "Catholics" (such as King James).

Thus, the toils endured by Eliot in his missionary work bore the testimony against the ingratitude and wrongs done to New England by her "late oppressors" in England; after all, it had been an English king who had, with his charter, burdened them with their toilsome evangelical mission; and it had been an English king who had, after they had done the dirty job, revoked the charter, deprived them of their just rewards, and, instead, imposed his `tyranny' on them. It was, in fact, a broken contract between a government and its people. "I suppose it was in revenge upon us for this *conscientiousness*," Mather complains, "that the late oppressors of New England acknowledged no man to have any title at all unto one foot of land in all our colony" (573). It is the Whig language of the rights and privileges of Englishmen, not the special providential calling reserved for Americans, in which Mather grounds his new rhetoric of patriotic consensus and of the contractual meaning of the missionary work. While New Englanders were a people with a history in their own right, they also were Englishmen and entitled to the same rights and privileges as the English subjects.

Of course, "without" these rights of Englishmen were, in Mather's new rhetorical design, "our shiftless Indians" - regardless of the progress of the gospel among them. They remain without the "estates"--the property that is prerequisite to the privileges and rights--of Englishmen. It is therefore the mission of Mather's Eliot to bring them from their "contemptible and miserable" state (574) to that of respectability and property. Whereas John Eliot had applied the millennialist rhetoric of the Puritan Revolution, Cotton Mather, in the age of the Glorious Revolution, applied the Whig rhetoric of John Locke in order to define New England's mission to the Indians. And whereas it was the Indians' lack of the "church estate" which defined them as `Other' during the 1640s and 1650s, it is their lack of property that excludes them in the 1680s and 1690s and that defines the New England self.

The Red Puritan remains thus what Homi Bhabha has called a "mimic man," the "effect of a flawed colonial mimesis, in which to be Anglicized is *emphatically* not to be English" (Bhabha 1994, 87). In this regard, the Puritans' `mimic man' resembles that of the Franciscans, who is, though pious and converted, "not fit to command or govern, but rather to be commanded and governed" (Mendieta 1973, II:248). In a letter, Mendieta described the Indian as a grown child, the equivalent of a Spanish boy of twelve more in need of the protection of a father than of a governor (1971, II:9]. The image of childhood is, as Jo-Ann Wallace

has demonstrated, a necessary conceptual precursor of Empire, for it reconciles the "discursive contradiction between ... innate goodness and his [the child's] need of strict training and self-discipline" (J. A. Wallace 1994, 174).

However, there is also a significant difference here between Mather's New English and Mendieta's New Spanish ecclesiastical histories of their respective colonial *patrias*: Whereas both lamented the apparent demise of their New World utopias in the rhetoric of the jeremiad, for Mendieta, the New World utopia threatened by extinction was essentially the *Indian* church built by the Franciscans. His Indians, like Motolinía's, are the ideal material for the construction of the primitive church. They are

> de tanta simplicidad y pureza de alma, que no saben pecar; tanto, que los confesores con algunos de ellos se hallan más embarazados que con otros grandes pecadores, buscando alguna materia de pecado por donde les puedan dar el beneficio de la absolución. Y esto no por torpeza o igonrancia porque dan muy buena cuenta de la ley de Dios, y responden a todas las menudencias de que osn preguntados, sino que ayudado su simple y buen natural de la gracia, ni saben murmurar, ni quejarse de nadie, ni reñir aun a los muchachos traviesos, ni perder un punto de la obligación que la Iglesia les tiene impuesta. Y en este caso no hable de oídas, sino de lo que tengo sabido por experiencia. (1973, II: 61-62)
> [of such simplicity and purity of soul that they do not know how to sin. Confessors, who are more embarrassed by some of these Indians than they are by great sinners, search for some shred of sin by which they can grant them the benefit of absolution. And this is not because of stupidity or ignorance, for these Indians are well-versed in the law of God. They answer well all the questions, even the trifles, that they are asked. It is really because of their simple and good nature, they do not know how to hold a grudge, to say an unkind thing of anyone else, to complain even of mischievous boys, or to forget to fulfill one particle of the obligation that the Church

has imposed on them. And in this case I do not speak from hearsay but from my own experience.

Thus, in Mendieta, the Indians are incorporated, though at a lower level than Spaniards, into the hierarchical and inclusive "structure" of the Baroque state (see Maravall 1986). In Mather, by contrast, the Indians remain, despite the heroic efforts of New England's apostolic martyr John Eliot, outside the bounds of the New English nation, outside the American "City on a Hill." Notwithstanding the Praying Indians' admitted progress toward Christian piety, Cotton Mather, unlike Eliot, was deeply pessimistic regarding an inclusion of `our' Indians into the New English polity.[26] In a concluding address, he admonishes his Indian readers--in case one of them ever cared to read it--that, "To deal plainly with you, there are two vices which many of you are too prone onto, and which are utterly inconsistent with *true Christianity*." If had not been for the two vices of "idleness" and "drunkenness," he wonders, what else should have "hinder[ed] you from growing as considerable in your estates as many English neighbors? whereas, you are now poor, mean, ragged, starved, contemptible and miserable." As long as they remained in such a deplorable outward condition, Cotton Mather knows, "Satan still keeps possession of many souls among you, ... as much as if you were still in all your woful heathenism." Their preaching will remain unlike the "New-English way of preaching" (1855, II:570); and despite their attainments in matters of religion, the Praying Indians therefore remain, in Mather's

new Whig rhetoric of Lockean rationalism and property rights, "without" the privileges of their "English neighbors" (574/575).

Whereas the real Eliot knew why he was suffering the toils involved in the missionary work, the reader must then wonder why Mather's Eliot did. They are, according to Mather,

> the veriest *ruines of mankind* which are to be found any where upon the face of the earth. No such *estates* are to be expected among them, as have been the *baits* which the pretended converters in other countries have snapped at. One might see among them what an hard master the devil is to the most devoted of his vassals. (558)

In order to illustrate just how degenerate "our shiftless Indians" are, Mather reminds his readers that, despite the richness of their land in iron, copper, and wood, they were "never owners of so much as a knife till we come among them" (558). Not coincidentally, the spiritual `gold mines' in retrieving Indian souls for the Lord in the "Eliot Tracts" take on rather material and worldly forms in Mather's context. His profoundly pessimistic and contemptuous portrayal of the "miserable" Praying Indian has nothing of Eliot's enthusiasm for the "glorious progress" of the Gospel among the humble, naked, even apostle-like Americans, which prevailed in the tracts of the 1650s.

Having grown up during King Philip's War--Mather was twelve when it erupted--the portrayal of the Indian in the literature of the day--the Indian War Narratives and the Captivity Narratives--left a lasting impression on him. In

his *Magnalia Christi Americana*, the Indians figure most prominently as the agents of (the French Catholic) Satan inflicting suffering on the planters and tormenting female captives such as Hannah Swarton, whose narrative is reprinted there in Book Six. This image dominates also Mather's history of New England's missions in John Eliot's biography. For Cotton Mather, in the 1690s, the *history* of New England's mission to the Indians played a much greater part than his contemporary Indian converts ever could. It was New England's mythic suffering involved in the missionary effort, not the actual Indian convert, which defined New England's identity. New England had been sent on a mission--not only by God to endure the sufferings that marks the elect but also by the English King, who had granted them a charter in return for their attempt to bring to English civility an utterly degenerate and savage people. But despite their toils and sufferings, their Charter had been revoked; they had been betrayed. In order to make his point stick, Mather once more evokes Bartolomé de Las Casas' *leyenda negra* and contrasts Spanish cruelty to the Indians with New Englanders' "tenderness" in their treatment of the Indians. Unlike the Spanish (and English) despots, New Englanders let their "inferiours" (the Indians) have representation and sovereignty in government in accordance with contractual principles (564). Unlike the Spanish, "we did not think and we do not think, ... that the Indians had not by their Paganism so forfeited all right unto their

possession." And unlike the Spaniards, New Englanders did not "violently and yet honestly seize upon them." However, - if justice is not done to New England by the English king - Mather implies, they may well yet do so.

NOTES CHAPTER 1

[1] This description is based on the accounts by Motolinía (1985, 110-120), Bernal Diaz del Castillo (1984, II: 398-406), and Bartolomé de Las Casas (1951, 165). On the genre of these Franciscan spectacles in general see Curcio-Nagy (1996); Arroniz (1979); and Kobayashi (1974).

[2] Fray Toribio was given the name Motolinía by the Indians, which means `the poor one'. For an account of this story, see Ramirez (1944, 12).

[3] I give the page numbers of Baudot's Spanish edition (1985) first and then the page number of an English translation by Foster. All further references in the text indicate these editions. There had been a great deal of bibliographic dispute surrounding the authorship of the *Historia* and the *Memoriales*. For some of the main opinions in this dispute, see O'Gorman (1982), Gomez Canedo (1973), and Ricard (1933). Since the question has still not been resolved definitively, I will here accept the traditional assumption that Motolinía was the author of both the *Memoriales* and the *Historia*, the former having served as the raw material, as it were, for the *Historia*, composed for the Count of Benavente.

[4] Cro (1983, 3) has commented on the loss of the purely theoretical dimension in the utopia of Spain, citing also Quiroga, the Paraguay, and Las Casas. However, I would argue here that this combination of theoretical utopia with social experiment is a Spanish American phenomenon, rather than a Spanish, and can be similarly observed in other nations involved in the American colonial enterprise, as I will show here in my juxtaposition between Spanish American and British American utopias.

[5] On the Humanist foundations of, and More' influence on, Vasco de Quiroga see Zavala (1955); Dealy (1976); and Bataillon (1966).

[6] Some mendicants were, of course, also involved in the Church hierarchy, especially during the early decades after the Conquest. Thus, the first Archbishop of Mexico, Fray Juán de Zumárraga, was a Franciscan who also wrote utopian tracts about the indigenous population that were inspired by Renaissance ideals of "lo bello, lo verdadero y lo bueno" [the beautiful, the true, and the good]; see Leon-Portilla (1992, 41-66).

[7] In 1539, for example, they burnt at the stake Don Carlos Ometochtzin, Lord of Texcoco, for calling upon his subjects to return to their old religion (Brading 1991,

103). Similarly, they launched a regular campaign of terror against the natives of Yucatan when discovering that they had covertly continued to practice their native religion (often in Christian Churches and even in front of unknowing Spanish priests), imprisoning, torturing, and killing hundreds of people. See Clendinnen (1987, 72-93).

[8] Diego Duran, *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España y islas de Tierra Firme* (1580s); Juan de Tovar, *Historia de la Benida de Los Yndios a Poblar a Mexico* [between 1582 and 1587]; Jose de Acosta, *Historia natural y moral de las Indias* (1590).

[9] Andres de Olmos, *Gramatica de la lengua nahuatl in Mexico* (1547); Motolinía, *Historia de los indios de la Nueva España;* Martin de la Coruna and Francisco de Las Navas, *Relacion de Michoacan* (1540s); Bernardino de Sahagun, *Historia de las cosas de Nueva España* (1570s), Jerónimo de Mendieta, *Historia Eclesiastica Indiana* (1596); Juan de Torquemada, *Monarquia Yndiana* (Seville, 1615); Agustin de Vetancurt, *Teatro Mexicano* (1680s); Diego de Landa, *Relation de las cosas de Yucatan* (1570s).

[10] In E. Mayhew (1727, xv). These ministers were Cotton Mather, Benjamin Colman, Peter Thacher, Joseph Sewall, Thomas Prince, John Webb, William Cooper, Thomas Foxcroft, Samuel Checkley, William Waldron, and Joshua Gee.

[11] On the perpetuation of the *leyenda negra* [Black Legend], which originated in works such as Las Casas's *Brevíssima relación* (1552) and Girolomo Benzoni's *La historia del mondo nuovo* (1565), in the English, Dutch, and French empires, see Gibson (1971).

[12] Kadir (1992) has exhaustively studied these similarities and differences between the Franciscan and Puritan propheticism in the New World in its relationship to the justification of conquest.

[13] In Heimert and Delbanco (1985, 77). On the typological association of the Indians with the Canaanites see also Canup (1990, 79-87).

[14] E. Winslow (1621/1966, n. p.). Although Pilgrims Winslow and Cushman disagree with a typological justification of the taking of the land, their objections demonstrate the prevalence of the notions they are in dialogue with, and their interpretation of disease equally shows that their disagreement is only with regard to a particular issue in interpretation of Scripture ("is there a link between biblical and present time?") rather than a radical dissent from the dominant ideology.

[15] This notion was so widespread among Englishmen in America during the 1630s that even men as different as Thomas Morton, far from being a New England saint, could not

help but to conjecture that the "wondrous wisedome and love of God ... by sending to the place his Minister, to sweepe away by heapes the Savages" (1967, 120) "meanes there is as yet but a small number of Savages in New England, to that which hath beene in former time, and the place is made so much the more fitt for the English Nation to inhabit in, and erect in it Temples to the glory of God" (134).

[16] I derive my distinction between `place' and `space' from recent work done in cultural geography. Jonathan Sime (1986), for example, has argued that "place" is a term which implies "a strong emotional tie ... between a person and a particular physical location," while "space" is associated with an abstract or geometric vision of the environment (50). See also Yaeger (1996, 1-23).

[17] In fact, rains would fall so abundantly in colonial Mexico that the entire city was frequently flooded and, at times, as much as six feet under water--a fact that the missonaries would later intentify as God's punishment of the creoles' sins.

[18] For some examples of the former camp, see Phelan (1956); Baudot (1995); Bataillon (1954 and 1957); West (1989); Weckmann (1982); Maravall (1949); and Frost (1976). For a revisionary view see Frost's (unfortunately rather self-gratifying) review of (the first edition of) Baudot's book (1978).

[19] On Joachimite eschatology see Reeves (1961 and 1969); West (1980); and Bloomfield (1980).

[20] For details on the connection between the social decline of Indian communities and the success of missionary efforts, see Morrison (1974, 77-92).

[21] Eliot (1659/1846, 129). Although this tract was not published until 1659, Eliot wrote it as early as 1651 or 1552. See Holstun (1987, 142).

[22] On the connection between the rise of comparative ethnology and a progressive theory of history during the sixteenth century, see Pagden (1982, 119-200).

[23] For more on this issue, see also Greene (1988, 19-20); Stout (1975); and Delbanco (1986).

[24] C. Mather (1855, II:557). From now on referred to with page numbers in the text. The Triumphs of Reformed Religion, which was John Eliot's biography, was first published separately in 1691 and then included in the first publication of the Magnalia in 1702.

[25] Haltunen points out that many New Englanders cared little for Increase Mather's new charter as well as for his choice of Phips as governor (1977, 315).

[26] On Mather's pessimistic commentaries concerning Indian conversion, see also Post (1993).

II

CAPTIVITY

> Few speculative subjects have exercised the passions more or the judgment less, than the inquiry ... Whether in point of intellect we are equal to Europeans, or only a race of degenerate creoles (23).
> Fisher Ames

1. THE CAPTIVITY NARRATIVE IN A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

In 1634--about a century after the vice-regal capital of Lima was founded--"Los Conformes," a *limeño* theater company, announced a comedy based on a supposedly true story that had reached the now vibrant and wealthy colonial metropolis from the distant Chilean frontier. The comedy would recount the exotic adventures of a Spanish soldier who had been captured by Indians in one of the many engagements of the lingering Araucanian wars. The play apparently aroused lively interest, and the curtains were raised in the midst of enthusiastic applause by an approving audience.[1] The drama began with the battle and the capture of the soldier. During his subsequent captivity, he falls in love with the daughter of an Indian chief, and an interracial romance in the wilderness ensues. Eventually, however, the Spanish captive is redeemed, his Indian mistress herself is captured by Spaniards, but, happily, she taken in by her former lover

and finally converted to Christianity.

Several years later the Spanish soldier, Francisco Núñez de Pineda y Bascuñán (1607-80), a *criollo* born in Chile and formerly an officer of the Spanish army on the Araucanian frontier, wrote his own account of his captivity among the *mapuche* Indians of Araucania from May to November 1629.[2] He relates the fierce battle in which he was captured and the Indians' brutal blood-sacrifice of a fellow captive. Together with his Indian master and protector Maulicán, he embarks on a pilgrimage through Araucania, where he finds his spiritual and physical well-being under assault in the face of horrid Indian drinking orgies, the promiscuity of native women, and the revenge of blood-thirsty *caciques*, eager to put his head on a stick as a lesson to future Spanish intruders.

Like the metropolitan play, Pineda's first-person narrative also dwells in detail on the charms of native women; but, unlike the comedy, his narrative stresses his heroic and unfaltering resistance to Indian women, Indian dancing, and Indian *fiestas*. When, nevertheless, his diplomatic evasiveness fails him, and he finds himself particularly hard-pressed by the devil in the form of the daughter of a local chief, he commands her to be "off now, on your life, and don't come back, for I shall hide unless I see you come accompanied." Then he interrupts his narrative and turns to his reader:

> He significado este amoroso subceso con todas circunstancias, por haber sido los informas que hicieron en el Perú a quien hizo una comedia de las cosas de Chile, mui a la contra del hecho; porque representó estos amores mui a lo poético, estrechando los afectos a lo que las obras no se desmandaron. (B 149-150)
> [I have dwelt in detail on this half-amorous interlude because of the stories that later got as far as Peru, and there into a play on the affairs of Chile which romanticized them to the gross distortion of the facts and carried the relationship far beyond its true outcome. (A 77)][3]

Pineda's discursive resistance to metropolitan imputations of colonial *mestizaje* is significant, I believe, because it has a bearing on recent revisionary approaches to American literary history, where the captivity narrative has, as a textual site of New World interracial and intercultural encounters, occupied a central place. Thus, Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse have argued that Mary White Rowlandson's 1682 narrative of her captivity, by asking its readers to "imagine being English in America," performed important intellectual labor in the emergence of a British national identity defined by a common language and print culture (1992, 215). By arguing for the "American origins of the English novel," Armstrong and Tennenhouse have provided a valuable modification of Bennedict Anderson's (1983) earlier account of the connections between the rise of national "imagined communities" in the Americas and the domestication of the European novel. However, their historiographic model of a transatlantic nation has eclipsed, I believe, important differences between the identity work of the captivity narrative in metropolitan

imperial centers on the one hand and in the creole communities on the colonial peripheries on the other--differences which are attested to by a number of conspicuous incongruities in the early history of publication, promotion, and distribution of the Rowlandson narrative in Old and New England.[4]

By comparatively juxtaposing the many *colonial* voices of this hemisphere within the context of their respective imperial geo-cultural imaginations, we will better be able to understand the distinctiveness of America's various New World transculturations vis-à-vis the Old World, as well as inter-American national and regional differences. Here, I shall therefore compare the narratives of two colonial American `creoles' [*criollos*] about their captivity among different Native American cultures: The Puritan Mary White Rowlandson's *The Soveraignty and Goodness of God* (1682) about her captivity among the Algonquins in New England and the Chilean Francisco Núñez de Pineda y Bascuñán's *Cautiverio feliz* [The Happy Captivity] (1672) about his captivity among the *mapuche* Indians of Arauco.[5] There are, as we may expect, important differences between these two texts. First, of course, their narratives would have been shaped by their individual experiences among distinct Native American cultures. Second, they are set apart by gendered specificities of the frontier experience and the colonial encounter. Third, there are important cultural, ideological, and social differences between Rowlandson's Protestant,

British American and Pineda's Catholic, Spanish American colonial experiences. And finally, each text is shaped also by a number of regional factors specific to colonial New England and colonial Chile, each of which were, in various respects, not always representative in the overall experiences of their respective imperial realms (see Greene 1988; Korth 1968).

However, notwithstanding these differences, there are also important similarities between these two texts, both written by colonial creoles in America. I will argue that, in the context of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century `Occidentalist' inventions of America, both narratives represent discursive acts functional in the "identity work" of the seventeenth-century American creole (Euro-American) cultures of colonial New England and colonial Chile. As second-generation American creoles, both returned captives rewrite their immigrant ancestors' utopian narratives of New World exodus and counter-point the centrifugal cultural dynamics initiated by European New World expansion. Their historiographic re-configurations hereby appeal to the narrative situation of the `eye-witness/outcast' in order to assert a colonial authority of writing "true histories" ("historias verdaderas") in distinct but comparable historico-political contexts of colonial crisis. Finally, in their re-enactment of the narrative ritual of the pilgrimage, which structures the European New World travelogue, both creoles re-inscribe the European traveler's

`America' into the `frontier'. But as for both colonial captives the return is `incomplete'--to self-conscious creole cultures whose Americanized social realities render their `real identity' liminal--their narratives anxiously assert the captive's complete return to `Europe' through a semiotic exorcism of `America' in the identification of their creole Selfs. A comparison of their narratives will thus provide a wider perspective on the development and "significance" of what Richard VanDerBeets once called an "American genre."[6]

2. AN AMERICAN GENRE?

It was in the context of Chile's search for a national identity during the nineteenth century that Pineda's narrative of his captivity among the Araucanian Indians was re-discovered in an archive in Santiago and published for the first time by Diego Barras Arana after it had circulated widely in manuscript form in Chile during the colonial period. Immortalized already by Ercilla's *La Araucana*, the image of the legendary Araucanian warrior was the perfect symbol for the invention of a pre-national past for a Chilean national literary history. However, as literary critics soon found, Pineda's narrative left much to be desired as a `precursor' to a national literature both poetically and ideologically. Literary critics were exasperated over Pineda's lengthy digressions from his narrative about the Araucanians into history, philosophy and

religion, which account for eighty percent of his over six-hundred page work. Vicente Aguirre, for example, described Pineda's work as a "monster similar to a man with two heads." Instead of the "two separate books that he should have written," Vicente complained, "he wrote only one with two titles" (1873, 597). This notion persisted even still in the twentieth century, when the eminent Venezuelan critic Mariano Picón-Salas lamented that "the obligatory tedious moral reflections, quotations from the Gospels and from the lives of the saints; and stories of miracles aborted a potentially excellent novel" (1944, 83). The Chilean historian Amunategui y Solar had therefore suggested that "the grave defects" would disappear if an abbreviated edition were made, including only "the principle scenes and descriptions" about Pineda's experiences among the Indians. "No doubt," he continued, "the book would then read just as nicely as a novel, while yet preserving its great intrinsic merit" (1900, 14).

Finally, Pineda's work was abridged and re-published in various editions: as a biography by Alejandro Vicuña, who thought it advantageous to drop the "digresiones politicas, morales y religiosas" (1948, 9); as an approximately 150 page captivity narrative by the literary critic Angel González, who justified this abridgement by pointing out that Pineda "did not pretend to writing a work of art" (1948, 38) and as an English translation by William Atkinson (1977), which is also an abridged captivity narrative. At

the same time, historians such as Correa Bello have reclaimed the "*Cautiverio* as history" (1965, 26), reminding his readers that Pineda himself had deemed the historical discourses to be the main and most important part of his work.

While in British and Spanish America alike, nationalist literary critics have appropriated colonial captivity narratives for their invention of distinctly national American cultural histories, their appreciation of these texts has often been flawed not only by a lingering Eurocentricm in their own critical expectations but also by an historical anachronism with regard to colonial ethnographic representations. First, the preoccupation to establish a relationship between the colonial captivity narrative and the (belated) rise of the novel in the Americas is a conspicuous phenomenon in the reception history of both Pineda's and Rowlandson's narratives. Roy Harvey Pearce has even argued that the "significance" of the colonial captivity narrative consists in its role as a `precursor' of the novel in the national period.[7] At the same time, Americanists have been puzzled by the curious resistance of these colonial narratives to be neatly categorized as either "novels" or "histories" as they were being written in Europe. Whereas in Europe, the novel became the quintessential genre in the fermenting processes of national identities as a "national allegory" (Jameson 1986, 65-67; see also Anderson 1983; Bhabha 1990), the privileging

of this genre has proved inherently problematic in the Americas, where, as Jean Franco has put it, "literary genres and styles are inevitably hybridized and where the novel, in particular, has often `bled' into other genres" (1989, 204). Thus, American nationalist critics were frequently left to lament the apparent American cultural "lag" of their colonial ancestors who, unlike their European ones, seemed somehow incapable of simply writing a good story, especially a "real" novel.

However, for reasons that I shall explore here, the two discourses--personal narrative and historical narrative--cannot be separated from each other in both Pineda's and Rowlandson's creole hybrid discursive enterprises. Pineda could not have written the "two separate books" that later critics insist he should have. If the colonial captivity narrative was an "origin" of the European novel and--by asking its readers to `imagine being European in America'--instrumental in the construction of Europe's national Selfs, for American creoles the identification with America inevitably involved the problem of establishing a relationship with what an early modern print culture had been "inventing" as colonial space (see Rabasa 1993).

When writing about their creole selfs in America, colonial Americans throughout the hemisphere had therefore to construct what Walter Mignolo has called "alternative loci of enunciation in a colonial space."[8] The colonial voices in the Atlantic history of a "New World of words"

therefore often distinguish themselves by a narrative anxiety and self-consciousness that is strangely absent from their European counter-parts. Unlike the exotic European travelogue, which ends in the New World traveller's ritual return from the `Other' world of America to Europe--with, for example, Prospero's re-integration into `civilization' in *The Tempest*--the colonial's narrative plot is never quite redeeming by itself. The colonial never fully `returns' but remains in a semiotic terrain between the European Self and the American Other--in the transculturated social environments of the colonial Americas.

Typically, colonials therefore perceived New World transculturation and *mestizaje* in the American "contact zones" not as a sign of "enrichment" but rather of "creolian degeneracy."[9] Thus, Mary White Rowlandson, like Pineda, also struggles against unauthorized "other versions of what had happened in the wilderness" in her captivity narrative (Ebersole 1995, 16-17). As if she somehow had to dispel our suspicions that "I speak it for my own credit," she assures her reader that "not one of them [the Indians] ever offered me the least abuse of unchastity to me, in word or action. ... I speak it in the presence of God, and to His Glory."[10] And as she is anxiously laboring to convince us, her exculpatory discourse is, ironically, betrayed by the very printface of her narrative which bears the marks of creolization left by the idiosyncratic spelling of an Indian typesetter (see Derounian-Stodola 1988, 246).

It is thus, as Mignolo notes, a "mistaken assumption that a happy intermingling of different bloodlines and ways of life underlies America's unique identity." Instead we must understand *mestizaje* and transculturation as America's social "condition under which such a discourse of identification has been produced and reproduced" (1995a, 179). If the colonial captivity narrative is indeed one of the precursors of the novel, and thus a vehicle for the emergence of national imagined communities in America as well as in Europe, it is noteworthy that eighteenth-century English novelists often transformed, as Armstrong and Tennenhouse have shown, the colonial representations of racial, cultural, and linguistic otherness into representations of social alterity (1992, 202-213). In the *colonial* narratives, by contrast, social conflicts are continually codified in terms of racial and cultural alterity and the dangers of contamination in the American "contact zones" with "creolian degeneracy."[11] Colonial narratives about captives returned from `America' construct colonial identities in a demonstration that American creoles did not `go native' through transculturaton in the American environment, that creoles are, in fact, as `Spanish' or `English', as the Spaniards or English born in Europe. They are "getting ready to be `English'," as Benedict Anderson has recently written with regard to Rowlandson's narrative, precisely "because they are in Massachusetts, not in England" (1994, 315). In the terms of the anthropologist

Anthony Wallace (1967, 65-68), the "identity work" of the captivity narrative in colonial culture consists in its capacity to increase the "value distance" between creole "feared identities" and "real identities" through a semiotic `exorcism' of New World transculturation.

3. THE `MONSTROUS BIRTH': IMPERIAL HISTORIOGRAPHY, CULTURAL TRANSFER, AND THE INVENTION OF THE `CREOLE'

While Mary Rowlandson's story is too familiar to require summarizing here, a few general words are necessary about Pineda's narrative and about the comparative historical contexts in which each text was produced. The full title of Pineda's approximately six-hundred page account is *Cautiverio feliz y razón individual de las guerras dilatadas del reino de Chile* [The Happy Captivity and the reason for the protracted wars of the kingdom of Chile]. As the title already indicates, Pineda's stated purpose was two-fold: his narrative was to rectify "the gross distortion of the facts" about his personal "cautiverio" as well as about the "affairs of Chile" concerning the "reason of the .... wars." Although his "historia verdadera" is formally a personal narrative, Pineda repeatedly emphasizes that the lengthy historical "digressions I make and not the succinct story" are the "principal purpose of this book" (B 560). When, in 1656, Pineda announced that he would reveal the true "reasons for the protracted wars" in Chile, his subject already had a one-hundred-year old, extremely polemical

literary history.[12]

After the succession of Charles V to the Spanish throne in 1519 had united the largest territory under a Christian prince since the times of Charlemagne, his victory at Pavia in 1525 and the American conquests seemed to have made the long-awaited fulfillment of the Christian World Empire finally imminent. All of this pointed to, for contemporary observers, a revival of the imperial claims of the Holy Roman Empire. Charles V would be the new *dominus mundi*, the World Ruler, restoring the reign of Astraea, of universal peace and justice, in a wider sense ever conceived of before, even by the Romans, whose empire had been bounded by the pillars of Hercules.[13]

By the middle of the sixteenth century, however, the impact of publications such as Las *Casas' Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las indias,* Agustín de Zárate's *Historia del descubrimiento y conquista del Peru,* and Girolomo Benzoni's *La historia del mondo nuovo,* which had blamed the shocking decline of the Indian population on the colonials' cruelty, rebelliousness, and *codicia* [greed], had caused a deep `crack' in this Spanish providentialist ideology of history (see Hanke 1949). In the 1560s, the southward progress of the Universal Empire was suddenly and inexplicably put to a halt in Chile by the stubborn resistance of the Araucanian Indians, who had already kept the Incas at bay before the European arrival. By the middle of the seventeenth century, the Chilean frontier had become

notorious killing fields, transforming the Spanish Renaissance dream of the conquest of New Worlds into a baroque nightmare of death, destruction, and decay.

To the seventeenth-century historian, there could therefore hardly be a more dramatic illustration of Spain's tragic fall from the grace of divine Providence than the fate of Pedro de Valdivia - the would-be Cortés of Chile. In providentialist self-assurance, he had planted his capital of "La Imperial" on the utmost extremes of the Araucanian frontier, which would only be "the first step," he had written to the Emperor in 1545, "on which to raise the others, and by them to settle all this land for Your Majesty as far as the Strait of Magellan and the Northern Sea" (1953, 13). The Araucanians soon put an end to his imperial dreams by, as legend has it, quenching his proverbial greed by pouring a gallon of melted gold down his throat.[14]

While colonial New England is sometimes considered to be an extraordinarily stable and coherent society in comparison with other British American colonies,[15] colonial Chile was notorious for its continual social unrest in all of `pacified' Spanish America, where the institution of *encomienda* [royal grant of Indian tribute labor] had--despite its disastrous effects upon the Indian population--provided for a certain degree of social stability by uniting the interests of large sectors of the white population.[16] Just a year before Pineda began his narrative, yet another Indian uprising had erupted on the Araucanian frontier--the

so-called *rebelión de 1655*--which had plunged the colony into the severest crisis of its history yet. Not only had the new Indian offensive left thousands of people dead and hundreds of colonial settlements in ruins (Pineda's own *encomienda* among them); but also, a discontent white populace, who had long felt that the imperial officials in charge of Chile's provincial government had been provoking the Indian wars in order to cater to the powerful economic interests at stake in the slave trade with Peru, rose up in arms against the government and elected their own governor. Not surprisingly, the Count of Alba, viceroy of Peru, reacted swiftly to this unprecedented event in the history of the Spanish empire by having the democratically elected governor arrested and brought in chains to Lima while (illegally) appointing a replacement (see Correa Bello 1965, 110; Korth 1968, 162-187). Thus, while many New Englanders also harbored ill-articulated feelings of discontent about the colonial leadership's Indian policy during King Philip's War (see Webb Saunders 1984, 169-214), which brought that colony to the verge of annihilation in 1675, the *rebelión de 1655* split colonial society clear along social lines in Chile and pitted the locals against the imperial authorities. When reading Pineda's narrative, written in the middle of these turbulent affairs, we must therefore see it primarily as a discourse deeply invested in the social and political issues of the colonial crisis of the 1650s, not as the truthful account of his captivity among the *mapuche* in

1629.[17]

Then as now, historians have asked the same question: What went `wrong' in Chile? The typical answer given by the seventeenth-century *cronistas mayores*--the court historians of the Hapsburg (and later the Bourbon) monarchs--was to indict the degeneracy of the *criollos*, the Spaniards born in America: their proverbial *codicia* (greed) and cruelty, which had decimated the King's Indian subjects throughout the Americas; their insolent and individualistic social ambitions, which had already caused a number of serious insurrections against the crown, such as that of Gonzalo Pizarro during the Peruvian civil wars (1546) or the famous *conjuración* of Martín Cortés in New Spain (1565-1568); their seemingly unrestrained miscegenation with Indians and Africans, which had generated a society of countless racial mixtures of *mestizos*, *mulatos*, *zambos*, and *castas*.[18].

Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas, official historiographer of the Hapsburg crown, for example, discussed at great length the creoles' tendency to concern themselves with "nothing but how to enrich themselves at any Rate" (1973, IV, 415-416). He dwelled especially on the insolance of Gonzalo Pizarro, who not only had by an "*Indian* Woman three Sons and one Daughter" (291) but also was so given over to greed and cruelty that he "inhumanly caus'd several of those Wretches to be tormented to Death with Fire, and others to be torn in Pieces by the Dogs, the poor Creatures crying, that they dy'd innocent, and that neither

they, not their Parents had any way injured him" (244). As early as 1541, therefore, Madrid dispatched imperial officials in order to keep those creoles in check who had committed a "Breach of the most solemn Oaths and Contracts that could be made among Christians" (249). From now on, the crown would guarantee that the creoles would

> keep no fierce Dogs to terrify the *Indians* ... the Indians should not be permitted to work on Sunday and Holy Days, though they were not Christians .... Spaniards who went about marauding should be punish'd, and the Indians not oblig'd to work more than they were wont before ... Religious Men, who were not very regular should be banish'd ... no Person should under any Colour or Pretence whatsoever carry any Indian into *Spain* ... (287)

The colonials' inevitable failures in realizing the utopian myths that had justified the European imperial ventures became a commonplace in the geo-cultural taxonomies of New World ethnographers advancing theories of why `Americans' were the way they were. According to these theories, Europeans born in America assumed all the abominable qualities of the barbarous Indians while yet lacking the Noble Savage's innocence. Thus, the disenchanted Franciscan missionary and ethnographer Bernadino de Sahagún thought that "the temperature and abundant character of this land and the constellations which govern it greatly assist human nature to be vicious, indolent and given over to sensual vices" (1956, III:158-68). The inevitable processes of transculturation in the new social environments of the New World came thereby to be perceived as a `degeneration' from the allegedly superior standards of European culture.

The first *cronista mayor* López de Velasco--apparently also the first to use to term "criollo" in print (Arrom 1971, 54)--claimed in the 1570s that "los que nacen de ellos, que llaman criollos ... aunque ... no se hubiesen mezclado con los naturales volverían a ser como son ellos" [those born in those parts, who are called creoles ..., although they are not mixed with the naturals, will turn out to be like them] by simply "declinando a la dispocición de la tierra" [declining to the disposition of the land] (1894, 37-38).[19] The troublesome effects of this creolization in the American environment were that "el trato y conversación se ha depravado" [the general manners and conversation have declined] and that European "fuerza de virtud" [strength in virtue] had weakened to the effect of the prevalence of shiftlessness, greed, and lawlessness on the other. This theory would be echoed again and again by peninsular historians such as the madrileño Juan de la Puente when claiming that "the heavens of America induce inconstancy, lasciviousness and lies: vices characteristic of the Indians and ... of the Spaniards who are born and bred there" (1612, 263). Thus in peninsular Spanish eyes, creolization in America resulted, as Anthony Padgen has put it, in an essentialized "single, if varied, character" (1987, 57) that distinguished itself by a disdainful predilection for shiftlessness, corruption, and liberty, as well as a general lack of trustworthiness, civility, and cultivation.

However, the emergence of the stereotype of the

`creole' in imperial Spain after the sixteenth-century American conquests must be seen not only as the inevitable result of an unconscious ethnocentricism, shared by most cultures in their perception of cultural difference, but also as a deliberate discursive strategy in the centralizing metropolitan politics of the Hapsburg state and in the emergence of an imperialist culture during the late sixteenth and seventeenth century. After the monarchy had finally succeeded in subordinating the medieval feudal lords on the peninsula during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it was immediately wary of the regional powers of the conquerors, who had established themselves as the colonial elites in America and who looked too much like the reincarnations of the old European feudal lords. In order to keep the creoles in check, therefore, the crown launched a large-scale assault on the ascendancy of the colonial American elites and sent, in what has sometimes been called the `second conquest' of America, a flood of *letrados* (royal bureaucrats) representing the Catholic state in order to take over colonial administration despite the angry resistance of the creoles (see Véliz 1994, 66-114; Brading 1991, 213-252).

The `imperial synthesis' of *cronistas mayores* since the second half of the sixteenth century such as López de Velasco, Herrera, and Antonio de Solís, consisted therefore in a careful fusion of the polemical and contradictory discourses of the conquest during the first half of the

century. On the one hand, the *cronistas mayores* tended to fall in line with the early sixteenth century `pro-Conquest' historians (especially López de Gómara and Fernández de Oviedo) in their advocacy of the violent conquest and their providentialist interpretation of Spanish overseas expansionism (see Carbia 1940; Brading 1991, 203-227; Esteve Barba 1964, 112-136); but, on the other hand, they also were eager to justify Madrid's anti-Creole policies that had begun in 1542 with the famous "New Laws," which gradually replaced the *encomienda* with the *repartimiento* and thus took the allocation of Indian labor away from the local colonial elites and put it into the hands of the Crown's officials (the *corregidores*), who were now responsible for administering the compulsory recruitment of native labor, increasingly in short supply with the demographic collapse.[20] The *cronistas mayores* made therefore implicit and explicit use of the early `pro-Indian' chronicles of the Conquest among which were some of the most widely read histories of America during the early modern period such as the works of Las Casas, Benzoni, and Zárate, who had made the `cruelty' and `degeneracy' of the Spanish American creoles toward innocent American natives proverbial in the Atlantic world (see Burke 1995; also Gibson 1971).

Neither was this imposition of `Occidentalist' discourses upon American creole culture confined to a few elite historiographers commissioned by the crown; rather, it was part of a larger formation of a Spanish imperial

culture. It found its perhaps most refined expression in the Baroque stage of the *siglo de oro*, which showed a lively interest especially in the Araucanian Indian, who personified the Noble Savage in all his manly valor, love of justice and everything else that the Spaniard seemed to have lost in the process of creolization in America (see M. Lucia 1993). Thus, despite the inherent contradictions in the conflicting metropolitan representations of America, the image of the `creole' in the *leyenda negra* and the myth of the `Noble Savage' came to imply each other in the polemical debates surrounding the conquest during the latter part of the sixteenth century (see Cro 1990).

However, while the early `pro-Indian' chronicles of the historians of the Conquest such as Las Casas and Benzoni had served the Catholic state's interests well in legitimizing its initiative to centralize the administration of the "Indies," the Catholic state began to suppress the publication of these works once they began being translated and appropriated by Spain's imperial rivals during the seventeenth century, mainly the English and the Dutch. As we have seen in Chapter I, the Protestant reinvention of America hinged to a large degree on these histories, which provided a convenient pre-text for English colonization. But, as in Spanish America during the sixteenth century, in British America, too, the period of metropolitan reliance on individual initiative for colonial expansion was, during the second half of the seventeenth century, followed by an

attempt to consolidate the authority over England's imperial possessions. Surely, in comparison with what Claudio Véliz has metaphorically called the "baroque hedgehog" of Counter-Reformation Spain, the English "gothic fox" was never very successful in subordinating the aristocratic and baronical power of the colonial elites under the central monarchical and imperial regime (see Véliz 1994, 66-114). Nevertheless, not unlike the Spanish *Consejo de Indias* (Council of the Indies), the English Privy Council also grew increasingly determined during the seventeenth century to end or curtail what Stephen Saunders Webb has called an earlier "American Independence" of the colonial elites in Virginia and New England (1984, 169-244).

London's attempt to centralize colonial administration had begun as early as the time of the Puritan Revolution and the establishment of the Commonwealth. New Englanders were therefore, as we have seen, increasingly sensitive to metropolitan charges that they had somehow failed in their colonial mission, especially regarding the pacification and conversion of the Indians. As early as the 1640s, the English Puritan historian William Castell, in his *A Short Discovery of the Coasts and Continent of America*, had suggested that New Englanders, since they had not achieved anything of consequence in New England, remove to Barbados, where they could be of more service to the Commonwealth (1644, 20-30; 41). Not surprisingly, non-Puritan historians were hardly more generous toward the New England saints.

Peter Heylyn in his popular *Cosmographie in four Bookes*, wrote: "I finde not any great increase of Christianity amongs the Natives ... our English Undertakers think it sufficient if they and their houses served the Lord without yearning what became of the souls of the wretched People; which hither have sate in darknesse and the shadow of death, notwithstanding those New Lights which have shined amongst them" (1652, 109). Another historian, George Gardyner, even indicted the New Englanders' cruelty in their treatment of the Indians when he sarcastically remarked that "They punish sin as severely as Jews did in old time, but not with so good a warrant. And they have brought Indians into great awe, but not to any Gospell knowledge" (1651, 92).

The New England elites, in particular, were targeted after the Restoration (1660), when New England's colonial charter, which had guaranteed a remarkably large degree of colonial autonomy, came under severe attack and was finally revoked completely. By the time of King Philip's War, English historians had already been engaged in forging a "new cultural identity" of the nation as a British empire and were intent to justify metropolitan efforts at centralizing imperial administration by curtailing the power of the colonial elites.[21] English imperial historians such as John Ogilby charged that New Englanders had "made themselves Masters of their own opinion" against the imperial interest of the crown (1675, 142). Shortly after the outbreak of King Philip's War, Samuel Groom blasted the Puritan oligarchy for

their constant "quarrels which you have brought upon yourselves, through your pride and unequal dealing with dissenters in matters of religion, and by your treacherous practices toward the Indians, all which crieth very loud for vengeance." Like the Spanish critics of creole character a century before, he argued that Colonial Americans had degenerated into greed, barbarity and cruelty from their original English virtues and wondered whether New Englanders, "since ye fled out of Old England into the Wilderness of New England, ... have not brought forth many monstrous births, like bruit beasts, like dragons, like Cockatrices, like roaring lyons and Devouring Wolves?" (1676, 16).

As in the inception of the so-called "leyenda negra" [black legend] in imperial Spain a century earlier, the utopian `Noble Savage' thus came to play a crucial role in the demonstration of creolian degeneracies. Joseph Mede claimed that the English colonists "themselves are become exceeding rude, more likely to turne Heathen, then to turne others to the Christian faith" (1664, 800). The colonials' inability to convert, and tendency to destroy, the Indian subjects of the imperial crown were, according to Morgan Godwin, a "crime of such degenerate English, who with that air [of America], have imbibed the Barbarity and Heathenism of the countries they live in" (1680, Preface n.p.).

Already, official, more authoritative and `scientific' English geographers of America, such as Nathaniel Carpenter,

had begun to theorize that English people who lived remote from Europe "by little and little ... decline and suffer alteration" from the original virtues of superior European culture (1625, 276). The causes of this "alteration" had become increasingly associated with the American natural environment, with what Europeans believed to be the "disintegrating forces which the liberty of a wild country unleashed" (Wright 12). Thus, the "debate over creole culture," Karen Ordahl Kupperman has written, "reveals a powerful continuity in European response [to America] by interpreting difference from utopia as degeneracy and by treating America as "a screen on which to project their own fears and fantasies" (20). Imperial historians, in metropolitan Spain and England alike, suggested that the American creoles had succumbed to the `American' disorder and immorality which they had been sent to redeem; they had, in effect, succumbed to the very `America' invented in the discourses of the Conquest as a place where the Devil's unrestrained force had turned up-side down God's natural order (see Cervantes 1994).[22]

There was therefore more at stake in Mary Rowlandson's colonial account of King Philip's war than mere religious edification. Her narrative, whose composition and promotion were assisted by Increase Mather, later one of the colony's shrewdest political lobbyists in London, had distinct implications for colonial political relations with the imperial metropolis and debates about "creole" character in

America. Specifically, the different title of the London edition--*The True History of...*-- put her narrative in dialogue with the historiography of what Cotton Mather called the "late oppressors of New England" in White Hall who were targeting the colonial charter on which the political ascendancy of the Puritan oligarchy was founded and who finally succeeded in forcing its revocation in 1684 (1855, II:573). Rowlandson's 1682 narrative--of an *English* woman's extraordinary suffering at the hand of cruel American savages--was to counter such metropolitan notions about creole character and the Noble Savage at the colonial periphery. "Little do many think," she cries, "what is the savageness and brutishness of this barbarous enemy, aye even those that seem to profess more than others among them, when the English have fallen into their hands" (326). But in order to illustrate the special role that the captivity narrative could play in authorizing the colonial voice in the debates surrounding creole culture in these imperial politics, it is necessary to examine, in more detail, its rhetorical strategies.

4. COLONIAL `TRUE HISTORIES' AND ETHNOGRAPHIC AUTHORITY

Francisco Núñez de Pineda y Bascuñán, when writing his *Cautiverio feliz* in 1655, was also keenly aware of this unflattering stereotype of the creole. The frontier uprising, the war, and the ruin of the settlements, he argues, were the "azote con que Dios, nuestro Señor, nos ha

castigado" (B113) [the whip with which God, our Lord, has chastized us]. However, it soon becomes clear that when he writes "nos" [us; i.e., the Spaniards], he does not at all mean all the Spaniards in Chile. Not only is he careful to portray himself (and his personal ancestors) as the Indians' best friend when emphasizing how much he was loved and respected by the people of his captor and master Maulicán and other friendly tribes; but he also takes care to point out that the never-ending wars in Chile were not the result of the alleged deficiencies of `American' character--either Indian or *criollo*. Rather, he argues, the Indian uprising was God's punishment for the abuses of "los que gobiernan" [those that govern] (B 132)--the Spanish governors and `foreign' imperial administrators, who had provoked the wars with their perpetual slave raids. There arises thus a distinction in his narrative between two kinds of Spaniards: the Chilean locals and the Spanish `foreigners': "...algunas alborotos y alzamientos que ha habido en las fronteras," he complains to the King, "se han originado todos por malos ministros y governadores cudiciosos, sin temor de Dios ni respeto a la justicia ni a los mandatos del Rei N: S" [Some disturbances and uprisings on the frontier have originated entirely because of bad ministers and greedy governors who have neither fear of God nor respect for the mandates and justice of Your majesty] (B 162-63). The narrative of his "cautiverio feliz" among Chile's Indians was thus to provide the first-hand testimony of his argument. His "historia

verdadera" was, in effect, the loyal subject's appeal to his King that Chile should be governed by native Chileans, not by corrupt strangers to the province.[23]

The peninsular Spaniards who come to his country now--who would later be referred to by the *criollos* as `gachupines'--"siguen los pasos de aquellos primeros conquistadores" [follow in the path of those first conquerors] of Chile, such as Pedro de Valdivia and Hurtado de Mendoza, whose corruption had stood implicated by the historiographic literature of the *cronistas mayores*, the clerical chroniclers, and in the early modern belletristic literature, such as Ercilla's *La Araucana*. The Spanish governors imitate

> sus acciones y aun aventajándose en ellas, con insaciable cudicia y con extraordinarios modos de ejecutarlos, atropellando la justicia y desquiciando la razon de su conocido asiento ... vivan los malos y los vicios prevalezcan, con que la paz se sepulta, presa la razon, los buenos oprimidos y finalmente destruidas las virtudes. (B 54-55)
> [their actions and even surpass them in their insatiable greed and extraordinary modes of executing them, trampling on justice and turn upside down the reason with which they were brought up ... with which peace is buried, reason is spoiled, righteousness is oppressed and virtues are finally destroyed]

In his absolution of the Araucanian Indians in demonstrating the causes of the war, his narrative thus provides a striking contrast to Rowlandson's narrative--and, in fact, also to many texts written by Spanish American colonials at the time. If the Indians were cruel, he argues, it was only in defense against the injustices they have experienced at the hands of the imperial governors.

Literary historians have long wondered at the curiously "abiding friendship instead of violent repulsion," in Pineda's apologetic portrayal of the Indians, "not sufficiently explainable by the Ercillesque myth." It is, as Hernán Díaz Arrieta has put it, the "small mystery" of *Cautiverio Feliz* (1954, 86). That Pineda had not suddenly been converted to a `pro-Indian' stance by his actual experiences during his captivity in 1629 but only fashioned himself so after 1655 in clear from the fact that he had just before the rebellion joined the governor's generals in the *entrada* [slave raid] which, in part, triggered it (see Korth 1968, 181). Moreover, José Anadón, when comparing *Cautiverio feliz* with Pineda's letters written shortly after his captivity, found it especially curious that "early on [i. e., in the letters], there appeared no sign of this change, patent later in *Cautiverio*, where the pro-Indian attitude overtakes the resolved combativeness" of the earlier accounts (1974, 35). While Anadón went on to speculate that the "impressions about Maulicán and his friends did not mature in his conscience" until a later time, I would suggest that the confusion over Pineda's "change" points to the limitations of a biographical approach and toward the need for a reading of *Cautiverio* as a historical discourse in the context of seventeenth-century *criollo* identity politics.

It is partly the centralized structure of Spanish imperial administration, partly the lack of social stability

in colonial Chile, and partly Pineda's personal ill fortune in losing his *encomienda* during the rebellion which combine here to produce this rather singular creole voice couched in a critique of both the metropolitan encroachments on colonial affairs and the status quo of the colonial regime through an absolution of Native American character. Having been cast among the losers of the perennial Indian wars, Pineda's narrative was the apologia of the Chilean locals who felt they had defied corrupt imperial officials on behalf of the superior justice of the monarch. A careful calibration of creole identity in the 1650s, Pineda's narrative of his captivity among the *mapuche* is thus fashioned as a *relación de méritos* [account of merits] and as proof of a colonial's impeccable conduct among the Indians as a faithful royal subject.

Both Pineda's and Rowlandson's narratives were thus produced in the context of political friction between a colonial frontier society and the centers of imperial administration; both interpret the Indian wars in providentialist terms as God's punishment for colonial `declensions'; and both make a case for certain political autonomies from the centers of imperial administration. However, as Pineda's narrative was written in the patrimonialist context of the Spanish imperial state, it blames the colonial government and absolves the populace; and as Rowlandson's text was written in the `liberal' context of British colonialist expansion, it blames the

populace and absolves the leadership. While Pineda thereby argues for political change, Rowlandson argues for the old political status quo (as anchored in the first colonial charter); and while Rowlandson's narrative thereby portrays the Amerindians in extremely unflattering terms, Pineda's ethnographic account `discovers' the noble qualities of the Araucanians, who supposedly turned `savage' only in response to Spanish injustices and corruptions. Whereas Rowlandson's account thus evokes the image of the colonial pilgrim, suffering at the hands of irredeemably cruel American savages on one side and wronged by imperial England on the other, Pineda fashions himself as the King's loyal soldier appealing to his lord for requital of his unrewarded sufferings, loyalty, and merits.

Of course, neither Pineda nor Rowlandson--one a colonial soldier and the other a colonial woman--were naturally in a position of authority to speak on matters of history and politics. Their identity as captives, however, lent their voices an authority which could bear considerable weight in their respective Christian cultures. Christianity is, as Anthony Pagden has noted, a "religion of observance." The Martyr (as Pagden notes, a word whose original Greek root means simply `witness') is a Christian hero who has `seen' but failed to persuade others of the unique authenticity of his or her vision, a pilgrim who has not returned (1993, 67). While our two colonials did return, both exploit their experiences as the suffering

castaway/captive, which realizes, as Mary Louise Pratt has put it (1986, 38), the "ideal of the participant-observer" and represents a rhetorical figure frequently employed in the construction of ethnographic authorship from Hans Staden's sixteenth-century captivity narrative to Bronislaw Malinowski's *Argonauts* (1922). Thus Gonzalo de Fernández Oviedo y Valdes stressed that European captives among the Indians are "more trustworthy" than those who have "never known anyone but their neighbors." He moaned that the chronicler of "these things over here" lives

> with much thirst and hunger, with exhaustion, in warfare with his enemies, and in both war and peace, he struggles with hostile elements and great needs and dangers. Here he is wounded without a surgeon, sick without a doctor or medicines, hungry without food, thirsty without water, tired without being able to sleep, needy with nothing in which to dress himself, and with no shoes for his feet. He who should ride on horseback walks on foot, and he who cannot swim has to cross many great rivers. (1959, I:55)

It is precisely this experience of the captive's suffering which authorizes our two lowly New World authors to speak. "Mas de cuarenta anos" [For more than forty years"], he laments, he has

> continuado esta guerra ... padecido en un cautiverio muchos trabajos, incomodidades y desdichas, que aunque fue feliz en el tratmiento y agasiajo, no por eso me excuse de andar descalzo de pie y pierna, con una manta o camiseta a raiz de las carnes, lleno de pulgas y otros animalejos que me daban fatidio; que para quien estaba criado en buenos panales y en regalo, el que tenia entre ellos no lo era: y con todo esto me tuviera por premiado si llegase a alcanzar un pan seguro con que poder sustentarme y remediar en algo la necesidad de mis hijos. (B467) [continued this war, suffered in captivity much hardship, inconvenience and misfortune, for although I was happy in the treatment and gracious regalement that I received, I was not on that account exempt from going about bare of

> foot and leg, with a blanket or under-shirt next to my skin, full of fleas and other little animals that pestered me. For one who was reared in good swaddling clothes and in dainty comfort, the life I led amongst them was far from convenient.

Both Rowlandson and Núñez de Pineda, while lacking in institutionalized historiographic authority conferred traditionally by the state or the church, thus enlist their identity as captives in order to authorize their histories.

The appeal of both colonial narratives to the rhetorical figure of the New World ethnographer/captive in order to authorize their colonial counter-histories must, however, be seen in the context of important historiographic transformations during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For the New World encounter had fundamentally decentralized European poetics of authorship. As Roberto González-Echevarria has shown, the Spanish *crónica de Indias*--the narratives about the conquest and colonization of the New World--derived from a discursive spectrum which had fused a number of older discursive practices ranging "from the *relación* to the *historia* but also included the letter, the memorial, the commentary and the *visitatión*" (1983, 16). Whereas the traditional *historia* had derived its authority from a display of historioraphic rhetoric, the *relación* was primarily a forensic textual genre, whose author related his/her own individual and subjective experience and resorted to the use of notarial rhetoric in an appeal to the situation as eye witness. While this authority had traditionally been regarded as somewhat

suspect, the remoteness of the subject matters in the writing about America rendered the authority of the eye witness account more important relative to that of historiographic rhetoric (see also Graetzer 1994).

The imperial historians of the New World, such as Antonio de Herrera and Samuel Purchas, therefore eagerly collected, edited, and reprinted the accounts and letters by first-hand witnesses in their histories. Pineda also uses the Indians' relations as "*casos* ejemplares o emblemas" in order to lend authority to his historical discourses (Correa Bello 1965, 26). However, Pineda distinguishes himself from the European historians in two important regards. First, most of the *relaciones* he provides as evidence are based on his own first-hand experiences; he is historian *and* witness at the same time. He invokes his "ability to bear witness ...to mark off those who had `been there' from those who had not, as Anthony Pagden has written in regard to another New World author, "to sharpen the boundary which divided the Old World from the New, and the `them' from the `us'" (1993, 52). Second, Pineda's "historia verdadera" differs from the imperial histories in its inversion of the usual structural subordination of the *relación* to historiographic rhetoric. In the imperial historical discourses (natural history, geography, etc.), the *relación* is contextualized, edited, and commentated on by the historian. In Pineda's history, by contrast, while formally structured into five historical "discursos," each of which is itself divided into twenty-six

"capítulos," neither the content of the different discourses nor the chapters in themselves are topically distinct from each other as they are in Renaissance historiographic rhetoric (i.e. geography, climate, ethnographic descriptions). The content is rather entirely structured by the narrative of his experiences in captivity, into which are inserted his lengthy historiographic "digresiones."

As American colonials thus often lacked the rhetorical eloquence and courtly authority of their peninsular counterparts, first-hand experience became in their chronicles an important, even prevalent, rhetorical tool and literary device in giving voice to their colonial interests. `Writing back' to the center of imperial authority in this fashion, American colonials could appropriate, manipulate, and transform European conventions of historiographic rhetoric and notions of `truth' as in the instance of Bernal Díaz, who boldly called his account *Historia verdadera de la Conquista de la Nueva Espana.*

However, since pure experience continued to be considered somewhat "unstable because of its novelty" during the seventeenth century (Pagden 1993, 53), Old World doctrinal foundations had to be found to establish its legitimate authority. Pineda therefore seems compelled to provide never-ending Scriptural and Classical precedents and analogues for every page of narrative. He begins, for example, by emphasizing the validity of empirical knowledge with an invocation of the first chapter of Genesis where God

created light and dark and "vió" [saw] that it was good. It was one of the first "príncipes cristianos," he argues, "no juzgar sin haber visto, ni rejirse por el primer informe, ... (B56) ["Christian principles ... not to judge without having seen, nor to rule with informing oneself first"]. The narrative of his captivity serves as testimony that he--unlike those who write "sin haber asistido en las fronteras de guerra cuatro dias" (B132) [without having served in the frontiers of war for even four days]--has seen.

Like Pineda, Rowlandson, too, exploits this authority reserved to the New World experience. She thus "wondered at [her son's] speech" when he told her that he "was as much grieved for his father as for himself" because "I had enough upon my spirit in reference to myself, to make me mindless of my husband and everyone else" (344). Her husband (like England) has not `been there' and experienced what she has. "Now is the dreadful hour come, that I have often *heard of* (in time of war, as it was the case of others)," she writes, "but now *mine eyes see* it" (323; my italics).

But, as in Pineda, the depiction of her suffering is primarily an authorial strategy, a means not an end of her self-representation as a witness in the imperial frontier. If she uses the language of Christian martyrdom in order to authorize her narrative as eye-witness testimony, her suffering serves as a reminder of English colonists' ill reward for all the abuse endured on their colonial errand. `Only if you have known the Indians first-hand, as I have,

the captive, and we, the colonials', Rowlandson seems to remind the metropolitan readers, `will you see the true nature of the Indians'. In order to counterpoint metropolitan images of the noble savage, Rowlandson stresses her role as a witness of the unredeemable nature of the Indians and reports, with gory vividness, the "cruelty of the heathen," as, for example, in her account of the murder of Goodwife Joslin:

> [They] stripped her naked, and set her in the midst of them: and when they had sung and danced about her (in their hellish manner) as long as they pleased, they knocked her on the head, and the child in her arms with her: when they had done that, they made a fire and put them both into it. (332)

However, the "significance" of this sensationalist description is, as Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola has pointed out, that Rowlandson did not actually witness this scene at all but wrote it based on the accounts of other captives eyewitnesses (Derounian-Stodola and Levernier 1993, 107). Although Rowlandson appeals to her status as an eye-witness, she herself admits that she knows of this incident only second-hand, from "some of the company ... in my travel" (331). Her appeal to the status of eye-witness experience serves therefore primarily as a rhetorical strategy for the construction of authorship. Although she mentions that "twenty-four of us" were taken "alive and carried captive" (325), her authority depends on an erasure of twenty-three potential narratives. Thus, she asserts ("with Job") that "*I only am escaped alone to tell the news*"

(325).

What makes her narrative extraordinary among most histories of warfare is therefore not the extraordinary amount of violence she *actually* experienced in frontier warfare, as Richard Slotkin has suggested (1974, 110-115); but rather the preservation of the realities of frontier warfare in the records of history written by American eye-witnesses. It is less a difference in the external reality of American violence that makes the American captivity writings distinct rather than the circumstance that they were produced in an extra- or pre-textual (and thus extra- and pre-historical) `New World' frontier. At the geo-cultural margins of empire, history, and writing, individual experience in view of the "newness" of the Americas could become a ground of textual authority.

As in Pineda's narrative, there are two opposing historiographic authorial rhetorics in Rowlandson's narrative: the rhetorical appeal to "eye-witness experience" on the one hand and the rhetorical appeal to discursive "form" on the other. When Rowlandson relates the death of her eldest sister during the raid, she interrupts her narrative in order to insert a brief account of her sister's conversion experience, which likens her seemingly senseless death to her "reaping the fruit of her good labors" (324). Whereas in European histories of the New World, then, narrative is contextualized by historiographic rhetoric, its meaning explicated and controlled by the editor/historian's

discourse, in colonial `true Histories' interpretative discourse "punctuates" narratives of personal experience (Breitwieser 1990, 74). Both colonial `true histories' therefore subvert the borderline that constitutes the institutionalized "dichotomy between the voice telling the plot details and the voice interpreting them (Derounian-Stodola and Levernier 1993, 101). And both colonial narratives hereby de-center conventions of historiographic authorship.

For this purpose, Rowlandson's narrative employs the rhetorical figure of the Bible, which, she claims, was given to her during her captivity by an Indian. Whether or not this is factually accurate is impossible to establish; but it is also, in a sense, irrelevant. What is relevant, however, is the significance she attributes to the Bible and the rhetorical uses she makes of it, when writing her narrative. There, she claims that she randomly opened her Bible whenever the event left her at a loss for meaning during her captivity, and, miraculously, Providence directed her to just the right passage giving meaning to her experience. Meaning and truth can not be dissociated from her experience, historiographic rhetoric can not be dissociated from her narrative. While her own narrative, written by a woman and a colonial, is still, in a sense, contextualized by the author of the "Prologue," it speaks for itself, and her narrative clearly remains the main event.

5. PRIMITIVE SPEECH

Besides appealing to the authority of the eye-witness, of `having *seen*', both American captives also make use of what Michel de Certeau (1988) has called the authority of primitive or unconscious `savage babble'. It is the truth of the savage voice as God's unconscious vehicle of revelation, but a voice that is itself unaware of the implications of its testimony for `civilized' society. This rhetorical tool is appropriated in both colonial `True Histories' which transfers the revelation of meaning and truth from the centers to the peripheries of historiographic authority. For example, although the Indians in Rowlandson's narrative are given over to "him who was a liar at the beginning" when speaking intentionally, truths about New England history, and the causes of the Indian wars, are revealed, with a bitter irony, in the speech of the unintentional Indian speakers. Thus Rowlandson is struck with the Indians' blunt reply that they would "break my face" (333) at her announcement that she would rest on the Sabbath day. She interprets her captivity as God's just punishment for violating, in her inward wilderness, the Sabbath. Her subsequent captivity is His lesson by casting her into the corresponding outward wilderness, in which she is, ironically, excluded from the Sabbath. Behind the Indians `primitive babble' is hidden God's awful justice, truth, and Providence--but also, of course, her personal election. The

Indian's words become pregnant with meaning, and it is this instance that causes the author to reflect upon "the strange providence in preserving the heathen" (334). Her entire captivity--and by extension--the entire war is staged by God for her personal (and New England's) chastisement and correction. Thus, Indian language acquires the "double function of being the way by which a substance (the effectivity of primitive life) happens to uphold the discourse of a European knowledge," as Michel de Certeau has written; it is

> a fable, a speech which is unaware of what it expresses before decipherment can provide it with meaning and practical usage. The being which authenticates the discourse is no longer directly received from God; it is made to come from the foreign place itself, where it is the gold mine hidden under an exotic exteriority, the truth to be discerned beneath primitive babble. (de Certeau 1988, 223-24)

Rowlandson often accentuates the effect of this rhetorical tool of primitive speech by pitting it against `civilized' readers' expectations. The unorthodoxy of Indian behavior, the encounter of two alien discourses, and the disruption of European cultural expectations often result in what Michelle Burnham has called the "dialogism" of her narrative (1997, 33-40) and often render her narrative, as other readers have also remarked, almost grimly comical. When, for example, she appeals, as an English woman, to the comforting masculine sensitivities of her male captors, to lighten the burden of her pack because "the skin was off my back," she "had no other comforting answer from them than

this, "That it would be no matter if my head were off too" (342).

But the dialogism of Rowlandson's narrative consists not only in the upsetting of cultural expectations; rather it is often raised to another plane of complexity in the cross-cultural `mimicry' of discourses about the Other. Thus, the Indians even frequently parody European colonial discourses of cross-cultural representation by acting out colonialist stereotypes in jest. When, for example, Rowlandson asks an Indian about the whereabouts of her son, he answered that "such a time his master roasted him, and that himself did eat a piece of him, as big as his two fingers, and that he was very good meat" (342). Not only is the Indian clearly making fun of European anxieties and cross-cultural representations, but his `primitive' language is also mimicked by Rowlandson and colors her own discourse ("he was very good meat").

For Pineda, too, the authority of `primitive speech'--the unintentional and disinterested speech of the Savage--authorizes his historiographic reflections on the reasons of the war. However, Pineda's Indians lack the gothically grotesque and horribly surprising caprices of Rowlandson's Indians. The Indian's voice does not derive from the perverted tongue of the devil but from a natural language, yet uncorrupted in an innocent golden age. His is a Catholic, rational, and inclusive, a symmetrically baroque universe, which even the Indian savage inhabits. Pineda's

savages are not natural creatures of the devil but turned to evil either as a result of the devil's seduction and perversion or as a result of Spanish cruelty, abuses, and injustice. They are stylizations of Montaigne's cannibals, whose fictive voice he mobilized for his social critique of European society.

In order to authorize his corrective history about the Spanish conquerors and governors, he presents as his superior "evidencia" the personal *relaciones* (accounts) of those old Indians who were actually alive to witness those events as a kind of legal testimony--to show, he says, that

> lo que digo y escribo en este volúmen, es por ciertas relaciones adquiridas de los propios antiguos naturales, he fundádolos en historia de mi captiverio dichoso y feliz, por referir experimentado lo que adquirí cuidadoso entre los indios mas ancianos, criados y nacidos en aquellos tiempos de los primeros conquistadores. (B246)
> [that what I say and write in this book is based on the authentic relations of the old Indians themselves, I have included them in the history of my blessed and happy captivity, in order to provide experienced reference of what I carefully acquired among the oldest Indians, who were born and brought up in those times of the first conquerors.]

Typically, these accounts are presented in the form of a confession, in which a notorious Indian enemy of the Spaniards relates how he was transformed from a friend into an enemy. After relating all the injustices suffered at the hands of the Spaniards, the Indian enemy typically concludes:

> "Esta fué la causa, capitan y amigo, de mi tranformación y mudanza de amigo vuestro a enemigo declarado. Mirad, por vuestra vida, ahora si tuve razon o no." (52)
> ["And that, captain and friend, is why I changed sides

and, from being the Spaniards' friend, became their enemy. Say, on your life, if I had cause." (34)]

Thus, while both Rowlandson and Pineda put the Indian's voice to vastly different uses, the representation of the savage voice serves in both colonial narratives the purpose of lending the texts superior experiential authority. Both colonial captives employ the rhetorical figure of the New World ethnographer/captive in order to authorize their colonial counter-histories in the historiographic polemicism of empire. But in order to illustrate the larger significance that this ethnographic discourse had in the identity work *within* both colonial cultures, it is first necessary to sketch some of the structural and formal properties of this New World genre.

6. THE EUROPEAN IN THE LOOKING GLASS: CAPTIVITY AND IDENTITY IN THE COLONIAL ENCOUNTER

In the nineteenth "Remove" of Mary Rowlandson's narrative, her Indian master "asked me, When I washed me? I told him not this month, then he fetched me some water himself, and bid me wash, and gave me the glass to see how I looked" (351). Rowlandson's look in the mirror occurs one stage before her final and, according to the structure of the narrative, farthest removal from the Christian community, the city, and human civilization itself, from which she will finally be removed `twenty times' before returning. By the second half of the seventeenth century, the image of Rowlandson looking into the mirror while in the American

frontier had already become a recurrent trope in the literary history of the New World. While she herself refrains from a detailed description of "how I looked," we may therefore speculate how her early modern readers' imagination would have filled her descriptive gap.

On the one hand, surely, the imaginations of her seventeenth-century readers would still have been colored by medieval popular legend, in particular the tradition of the "Wild Man." According to this legend, the Wild Man is a semi-human creature who lives outside the medieval human community of the `City'. As Hayden White has explained, the Wild Man/Woman in these legends represented a threat to civilized society and the `civilized' individual, "both as nemesis and as a possible destiny, both as enemy and as representative of a condition into which an individual man, having fallen out of grace or having been driven from his city, might degenerate." Black and disfigured in appearance, sexually promiscuous, the wild men/women live in the forest or the desert outside the city, occasionally carrying off civilized women and children.[24]

On the other hand, however, Rowlandson's contemporary readers would have recalled images of Europeans living beyond the edges of the civilized world from the many New World narratives reproduced by early modern print technology (see Hall 1979). Unlike in medieval oral tradition, where the wild man had lived "just out of sight, over the horizon,"[25] New World ethnographies displaced the realm of

the savage altogether from Europe and projected it onto the geographic periphery, thus inventing the "idea" of Europe as a distinct geo-cultural entity during the sixteenth century.

Hans Staden's narrative of his captivity among the Tupinimbá in Brazil in 1554 is paradigmatic. His captivity narrative went through a total of sixteen editions, including its original 1557 edition in German and all its translations into six European languages. Entitled "The True History and Description of a country of wild, naked, and furious man-eating people of the New World of America," it tells an outrageous tale of American cannibalism and other `unnatural' cultural practices. In one particularly grotesque scene Staden relates, for example, how the Indians "tied my legs on top of each other and made me hop through the cabins, while they were shouting: `There comes jumping our dinner'" (1921, 242).[26]

Of particular interest and appeal in this literary history of the New World, however, were images of Europeans being themselves `Indianized' into "wild men" while living on the western edges of the known world. Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca's *Naufragios*, for example, was translated into Italian by Ramusio in his *Navigationi et Viaggi* (1556) and made known in England by Samuel Purchas, who paraphrased it in *Purchas His Pilgrimes* (see part IV, book vii, chapter 1). While Alvar emphasizes his heroic steadfastness in Christian martyrdom and suffering, his narrative chronicles also his gradual transformation into American nakedness and cultural

practices after the shipwreck of the Pánfilo de Narváez' expedition off the coast of northwestern Florida in 1528. Toward the end of his narrative, he describes the bewilderment on the faces of the first Spaniards that he encountered after his eight-year odyssey along the southern coast of North America:

> ... otro dia de mañana alcance quatro christianos de cavallo que rescibieron gran alteracion de verme tan estrañamente vestido y en compañia de indios. Estuvieronme mirando mucho espacio de tiempo, tan atonitos que ni me hablavan ni acertavan a preguntarme nada. (1986, 127) [The day after I overtook four of them on horseback, who were astonished at the sight of me, so strangely habited as I was, and in company with Indians. They stood staring at me a length of time, so confounded that they neither hailed me nor drew near to make an inquiry. (1993, 112)][27]

Ten years later, the soldiers of Hernando de Soto found another shipwrecked Spaniard captured during the Narváez ten years before--Juan Ortiz, who was tattooed, unable to speak (Spanish), and "like the natives with nothing but some loin clothes on his body, a bow and arrows in his hand, and for ornament, plumage half a fathom in height upon his head." The narrative of Juan Ortiz' encounter with the Spanish soldiers was republished in England four times during the seventeenth century.[28] Similarly, the Spanish `redeemed captive' Jerónimo de Aguilar, found in Yucatán, was, according to Bernal Diaz,

> por indio propio, porque de suyo era moreno e tresquilado a manera de indio esclavo, e traia un remo al hombro e una cotara vieja calzada y la otra en la cinta, e una manta vieja muy ruin e un braguero peor, con que cubria sus verguenzas, e traia atado en la manta un bolto, que eran Horas muy viejas. (1984, I:135)

> [not in his appearance to be distinguished from a native, ... his colour was dark as a native, and he was marked like them; he had a few rags about his shoulders and waist, an oar in his hand, and the remnant of an old book of prayers tied in a bundle on his shoulder. (1966, 38)]

Finally, in the famous story of Pedro Serrano related by the Inca Garcilaso--also reprinted also four times in England alone during the seventeenth century--the shipwrecked protagonist caught crabs, shrimps, and turtles, "ate them raw," and "drank [their] blood instead of water." Within "two months or less," he was "as naked as when he was born, for the great rain, the heat, and the humidity of the region rotted the few clothes he had".[29] Because of the "harshness" of the American climate his "hair grew all over his body till it was like an animal's pelt, and not just any animal's, but a wild boar's. His hair and beard fell below his waist." When another European is shipwrecked on his island and

> ... se vieron ambos, no se puede certificar cuál quedó más asombrado de cuál. Serrano imaginó que era el demonio que venía en figura de hombre para tentarle en alguna desesperación. El huésped entendió que Serrano era del demonio en su propia figura, según lo vió cubierto de cabellos, barbas, y pelaje. Cada uno huyó del otro, y Pedro Serrano fué diciendo: "Jesús, Jesús, líbrame Señor del demonio. (1960, 18)
> [...they saw one another, it would be hard to say which was the more surprised. Serrano thought it was the Devil come in human form to tempt him to some desperate act. His guest thought Serrano was the Devil in his true form, he was so coated with hair, beard, and hide. Each fled from the other, and Pedro Serrano went off crying: "Jesus! Jesus! Oh Lord, deliver me from the demon!" (1688, 29)]

When they were found years later, neither one of them any "longer looked like human beings" (29).

Within the context of what has been called the

"specular" literature of European colonialist expansion, which dwells on descriptions of native alterity "as a mirror that reflects the colonialist's self-image" (JanMohamed 1985, 19), these moments in the literary history of the New World--of Europeans transformed into `savages' at the edges of the earth--are of particular interest because they underline the geo-cultural `Occidentalism' or Euro-centrism (rather than `racism') of this early modern ethnographic imagination. Early modern ethnography thus projects what Michel de Certeau has called the "split that divides the universe" in the medieval mental world of ordinary experience and the world of fable onto the Atlantic as a "breakage of space into two worlds." A "rift between the Old and the New World," the Atlantic becomes an ideological axis in the European geo-cultural imagination that separates "over here" from "over there" and that re-affirms `Europe' as geo-cultural center in countless reenactments in travel narratives, novels, and histories during the early modern period. Ethnography functions in these New World narratives as "a form of exegesis" that articulates Europe's identity through a relation with its past and future, with foreign lands and nature, its fears and desires. The return to `Europe', the re-integration into the *civitas* of the human community, asserts identity in a movement "from the self to the self, through the mediation of the other" (de Certeau 1988, 221).[30]

7. IDENTITY WORK IN COLONIAL SPACE

Both of these colonial captivity narratives appropriate the narrative structure in the European New World narrative--of removal to `over there' and return to `over here'. However, engaged in the continual semiotic process of re-inscribing `America' from `Europe', the colonial narratives re-locate the cosmic divide in the European geo-cultural imagination from the Atlantic into the American landscape--the `frontier'. Both captives' treacherous journeys thus begin with a providentially guided `removal' by crossing a vast spatial divide--through a "vast and desolate wilderness," in Rowlandson's case (335). As if symbolically to reenact the European traveler's crossing of the Atlantic divide, both colonial captivity narrators attribute special significance to their crossings of bodies of water.[31] Pineda's capture is immediately followed by the crossing of the Bío-Bío River, which marks the Araucanian frontier and his entry into the conceptual space of `America'. Echoing the many exotic accounts of hurricanes during the Atlantic crossing in the European New World narratives, Pineda dwells on the ferocious might of the "swirling waters of the Bío-Bío, by when a tempest had been unleashed so fierce that it seemed the elements were in league against us" (A17).

Once they have entered the frontier--the re-inscribed conceptual space of `America'--both narrators appear in the role of the eye-witness ethnographer describing America with journalistic sensationalism in the idioms of

`Occidentalism'--ritual cannibalism, blood-sacrifice, devil worship, Amazonianism, tobacco-smoking, and so on. Shortly after having crossed the Bío-Bío River, Pineda witnesses, for example, the brutal sacrifice of his fellow captive, who

> le dió en el celebro un tan gran golpe, que le echó los sesos fuera con la macana o porra claveteada, que sirvió de la insignia que llaman toque. Al instante los acólitos que estaban con los cuchillos en las manos, le abrieron el pecho y le sacaron el corazon palpitando, y se lo entregaron a mi amo, que despues de haberle chupado la sangre, le trajeron una quita de tabaco, y cojiendo humo en la boca, lo fué echando a una y otras partes, como incensando al demonio a quien habian ofrecido aquel sacrificio. ... Acabado este bárbaro y mal rito, volvió el corazon a manos de mi amo, y haciendo de él unos pequeños pedazos, entre todos se lo fueron comiendo con gran presteza. (43)
> [was dealt such a blow on the head with the studded club he dashed his brains out. Straightway the other two with the knives cut open his breast, ripped out his still quivering heart and handed it to Maulicán. He sucked its blood, was handed a pipe of tobacco and drew in a mouthful of smoke which he then blew in every direction, as though wafting incense to the devil in whose honour the youth had been sacrificed. .... The barbarous rite ended at last when the heart was given back to my master, who cut it into pieces which the others devoured." (A27-28)]

`America' is a place snatched by, and abandoned to, the Devil, a land where God's order has been perverted and where chaos reigns (see Cervantes 1994). Pineda's narrative encodes this perversion of order, for example, in images of homosexuality and transvestism in his ethnographic descriptions of native religious rites. The inversion or de-stabilization of European gender roles in colonial space is, of course, one of the oldest tropes in European colonial discourse, reaching from Herodotus's placement of the Amazons at the eastern rim of the World to Hernán Cortés's famous act of naming an `island' reportedly off the

northwestern extremity of Mexico "California" (after Califia, the legendary Amazon queen). Thus, Pineda's medicine man "wore a blanket wrapped round his waist and a long blouse to indicate that he was a pervert and played the woman's role" (A83/B159).[32]

The perversion of sexual order in colonial space is paralleled by the perversion of economic order. Like the European traveler, both captivity narrators represent primitive man as what de Certeau has called a "character from a spectacle" that practices "an economy other than work" (1988, 228). Rowlandson dwells especially on the Indians' un-Protestant economy during their feasting, when animals are consumed in an outrageous "waste" that "made the place a lively resemblance of hell" (326). Pineda, too, initially promises the reader accounts of "dance and drinking spree, a not too reputable kind of entertainment of which the reader will hear more" (A55). And, indeed, whenever arriving at a new village on his pilgrimage through the Araucanian wilderness, he and his Indian master Maulicán are greeted "with chicha ... drinking, singing and dancing." It is "hard to think of a more perverse custom," he complains,

> ... porque al llegar un pasajero a la jornada mojado, molido y hecho pedazos de caminar a pié todo un dia por pantanos, quebradas y riscos, muerto de hambre y sin aliento, darle luego por descanso no dormir y estarse parados, bailando y quebrándose las cabezas con gritos y voces desmedidas, no sé que pueda haber peor entretenimiento ni costumbre mas mal usada. (B80)
> [a traveler turns up at the end of the day, soaked through, battered and bruised after foot-slogging it from

> dawn over swamps, crags and ravines, dying of hunger and desperately in need of rest. Instead he is denied all possibility of sleep, dragged into the dance and deafened with outrageous cries and shouting. What kind of hospitality is that? And yet such is their invariable usage. (A45)]

As a captive at the mercy of his Indian hosts, he finds himself in constant danger of being dragged into the infernal vortex of tribal culture. When shown signs of hospitality by a "una mocetona, no de mal arte" [not unattractive girl], the Indian chief wispered to him that

> como suelta y libre podia arrimarse a quien le diese gusto; que la pagase el amor que me mostraba, con igual correspondencia, haciendo oficio de tercero él y los demas, diciendo a la moza que tenia buen gusto. (B202) [that she was single and unattached, and free accordingly to approach anyone she liked. He suggested I should admit her attentions and make return in kind for the favour she was clearly ready to show. (A91)]

If he has to compromise his European identity by putting on the girl's headdress, and by even dancing with her, he describes it as a "*venérea* insignia" [*venereal* insignia] evoking colonial anxieties surrounding syphilis as the contact-zone disease in order to purify his identity from the suspicions of *mestizaje* that had rested on his identity since his return resulting from the *limeño* play.

For the writers in colonial space, the description of exotic Otherness becomes thus less important in their narratives than the identification of the (auctorial) selfs *against* the otherness of the American environment. While there remains a certain degree of "Stockholm syndrome" or "survivor syndrom" in both captivity narratives that resist subordination to orthodox form and rhetoric (see Anadón

1988, 148; Derounian-Stodola, 1987), it results in a narrative anxiety that seems to dominate them, as Mitchell Breitwieser notes for the case of Rowlandson even "*in the moment that she writes*" (1990, 74). It is the very awareness of her own acculturation, which breaks down Old World rhetoric, Michelle Burnham has observed, that Rowlandson feels she must repress" in her narrative (1997, 38).

Thus, in what might have been the climax in the plot of the novel that Rowlandson didn't write--her meeting with the savage king (Philip)--she declines his invitation to smoke. In the rhetorical move typical of the writer in colonial space, she switches focus from her exotic description of `America' to an identification of a Self purified from Americanization.

> For though I had formerly used tobacco, yet I had left it ever since I was first taken. It seems to be a bait, the devil lays to make men lose their precious time: I remember with shame, how formerly, when I had taken two or three pipes, I was presently ready for another, such a bewitching thing it is: but I thank God, he has now given me power over it; surely there are many who may be better employed than to lie sucking a stinking tobacco pipe. (337)

At a time when a "New World of words" emerged along with modern Western civilization and the rise of a transatlantic economy based on the capitalist exploitation of exotic consumer goods,[33] the colonial Rowlandson displaces the principle commodity--tobacco--of this exotic New World from her Self. Equally, Pineda displaces the exotic tobacco pipe by associating it with Indian devil worship:

> ... sobre un banco grande a modo de mesa una quita de tabaco encendida, de la cual a ratos sacaba él humo de ella, y esparcia por entre las ramas y por adonde el doliente y la música asistia. ... le hizo descubrir el pecho y estómago, ... y sacó el corazon vivo, y palpitando le clavó en medio del canelo en una ramita, que para el propósito habia poco ántes ahuzado, y luego cojió la quita y empezó a sahumar el corazon, que aun vivo se mostraba, y a ratos le chupaba con la boca la sangre que despedia. ... vimos de repente levantarse de entre las ramas una neblina obscura a modo de humareda, que las cubrió de suerte que nos las quitó de la vista por un rato, y al instante cayó el encantador en el suelo como muerto, dando saltos el el cuerpo para arriba, como si fuese una pelota ... que me causó grande horror y encojimiento a encomendar a Dios. (B159-161)
> [A lit tobacco pipe lay on a long bench that served as table, and from it the quack drew smoke from time to time and blew it into the foliage and towards the bed, the women singing mournfully the while... The witch-doctor ... took a knife, slit the sheep down the middle and, cutting out its heart, pinned it still palpitating on the sharpened twig. Picking up the pipe, he blew tobacco smoke over it, then sucked the dripping blood. Finally, [after he had] wafted more smoke throughout the hut, ... we saw smoke cloud issue from the foliage, hiding it from view for a moment, and the quack on the instant fell to the ground in a stupor, his body contorting and bouncing about like a ball. ... I, who had seen the devil in all he did, was horrified and drew back, muttering a prayer to God. (A83-86)]

Having "seen the devil in all he did" in America, he "drew back, muttering a prayer to God" (A83) in order to expose the Devil's beginnings in creole culture after his return. Both captivity narrators thus fashion themselves as colonial pilgrims returned from the frontier to call for purification and regeneration of creole America in the space-in-between. Pineda, who was forced to participate in sinful *fiestas* during his captivity, returns with revelations about the despicable Indianizations among Spaniards who engage in "dishonest dances like the Indians, excessive parties and

banquets, and other things" (B205). Having `seen' the end of the road in its full extent of Indian horrors, the captives return as prophets with a vision of the teleology of degeneration into American `savagery'. Both narratives thus position instances of New World transculturation on a linear semiotic continuum in the discursive spectrum of Occidentalism. In Rowlandson, spiritual "declension" of colonial society lies on a continuous scale with Indian devil worship; colonial transculturation with an American demographic environment (community `dispersal') will end in Indian `nomadism', in America's `emptiness'. In Pineda, modification of European dress leads to America's nakedness; racial *mestizaje* to Indian sodomy, polygamy, and homosexuality. The colonial texts therefore engage in a compulsive "identification of the self-same" which sets them apart from the focus on "otherness" in the accounts of European travelers to the New World (Mignolo, 1995a 174). The narrative anxiety that critics have sensed in many colonial texts may therefore provide an insight into the cultural identity processes of those `in-between' who, though returned from the frontiers to become authors, are still, as it were, running when writing.

8. IMPERIAL FRONTIERS AND COMPARATIVE CREOLE IDENTITIES

Both colonial captivity narrators anxiously compensate for the physical absence of the Atlantic divide from the

American Other through an intense focus on racial distinctions. They openly debunk, for example, their missionary predecessors in colonial ethnography, such as the Jesuit Luis de Valdivia (in Pineda's case) or John Eliot (in Rowlandson's case), who had dreamed of all-inclusive Christian Commonwealths and utopias unifying all of humanity. Rowlandson, especially, de-emphasizes Christianity as a unifying force and emphasizes racial difference for an identification of their colonial Selfs by exposing the `true' nature of the `Praying Indians' who seem to undermine the imaginary "hedges" and "walls" that a Puritan frontier ideology built around (white) New England.

> Those seven that were killed at Lancaster the summer before upon a Sabbath day, and the one that was afterward killed upon a week day, were slain and mangled in a barbarous manner, by One-eyed John, and Marlborough's praying Indians, which Captain Mosely brought to Boston, as the Indians told me. (326)

At a time when Indians were becoming `Red Puritans' and when some creoles were becoming `White Indians', the racial difference remained the only objective bastion that kept New Englanders apart from `Americans'. Racial difference thus "fabricated," as Michael Zuckerman has argued, New England's colonial identity by compensating for the anxieties involved in the colonials' sense of their own transculturation.[34]

Pineda, too, would insist on the institutionalized social division in colonial society--between a *república de los indios* and a *república de los españoles*. On the one hand, he is appalled by the `degeneracy' of those

(unreturned) Spaniards who voluntarily live with the Indians and whom he finds during his captivity:

> reparé con cuidado que en algunas habia españoles antiquísimos entre ellos, y no los solicitaban para este sacramento; y inquiriendo la causa, me sacó de esta duda un indio antiguo y en nuestro lenguaje ladino, que me mostraba amor y buena voluntad, y este me dijo, que los españoles que habian quedado entre ellos, no eran captivos, sino eran de los que por su gusto entre ellos estaban viviendo a su usanza, y no como cristianos, gozando del vicio y del ocio que los demas infieles; (219)
> [I discovered that in some [districts] there were Spaniards who had been living there for many years but had never sought to lead anyone to baptism. I asked the reason, and was given it by one old Indian who spoke my language [...] [and] showed himself particularly friendly and well-disposed towards me. These Spaniards, he said, were not captives but lived among the Indians by choice, following their ways and abandoning themselves to the same vices and sloth, to the forgetting of their Christian upbringing. (98)]

But on the other hand, he also debunks the inclusive utopias of the Jesuit missionaries, who attempt to turn the Indians into Spaniards

> dádivas y regalos de chaquiras, agujas, listones, añil y otras menudencias que para ellos eran de alguna estimacion, por cuyo interes se baptizaban muchos dos y tres veces; y ocasion hubo que un cacique principal hizo que se baptizasen todos los de su casa, por el interes de lo que a cada uno se le daba, y no teniendo otra persona que pudiese baptizarse, llevó un gato o perro al padre que los cristiniaba, y le dijo que le baptizase tambien aquel perro, y le daria unas chaquiras. (B218)
> [with gifts of beads, ribbons and the like baubles, so that many would come for baptism two or three times. ... there was even a cacique who had his entire household baptized just to collect what he could get, and when there was nobody left he took a dog to the priest and asked him, for the sake of a few more beads to baptize it too. (A97)]

However, there are also a number of important differences between the (male) Spanish American Pineda's and the (female) New England Puritan Rowlandson's

representations of Otherness, the colonials' relationships to the Indians, their attitudes toward transculturation and *mestizaje*, as well as between their constructions of creole identities in the imperial periphery. Most notably, Pineda's narrative allows for a certain degree of erotic attraction to the American tribals. His description of the "venereal insignia" (the headdress), for example, is an ambivalent composite of American exotic eroticism and savage wildness: it was

> un hocico de zorra desollado, *abierta la boca* manifestando los dientes y colmillos, y las orejas mui tiesas y *levantadas para arriba*, cubierta a trechos de muchas llancas y chaquiras de diferentes colores mui bien adornadas. (B202)
>
> [a skinned vixen's skull, its jaws *gaping open* to show its teeth and fangs, its ears *very stiff and erect* and draped in beads of different colors" (A91-92; my italics)].

On the one hand, Pineda's language here illustrates an important gendered difference between his and Rowlandson's narrative. The different degrees of narrative anxiety about biological *mestizaje* manifest in each of Rowlandson's and Pineda's narratives originates, in part, in the gendered nature of the poetics and politics of colonial discourse, which typically silenced European women's biological *mestizaje* with male Amerindians. Shortly after the Chilean rebellion of 1655, Pedro de Córdoba y Figuera, for example, wrote that

> many persons of both sexes were taken prisoner by the rebels, including some of distinguished birth whose names I could mention; but since there is no reason to recall their

> shame, suffice it to say that the illegitimate progeny living among us today is a product of that disgrace. (quoted in Korth 1969, 182)

The specifications that the captives were of "both sexes" and that the "illegitimate progeny" lives among the whites "today" suggest, of course, that some of the mothers of the "illegitimate progeny" were white. Unlike a woman writing about her captivity after her return, Pineda can appeal to his reader for absolution regarding his inability to resist the gaze at his "desirable object" with the cavalier reference to the fact that she was, after all, exceptionally "white" and that he, too, is "just a human being" (B296/A113). The eroticism of Pineda's description of the *mapuche* women is within the poetics of colonial discourse, where *mestizaje* with Indian females is sanctioned if it promotes the objective of conquest--as, for instance, in the narratives about Indian women in White society, such as Bernal Díaz del Castillo's account of `La Malinche'/Dona Mariña or John Smith's account of Pocahontas. Pineda, in his narrative, once even confesses that his resistance broke down, that he was taken in by the exotic object of his descriptions when he found several girls

> desnudas en el agua, sin rebozo, y entre ellas la mestiza, hermana de mi compañero (que tambien por su parte me insistia y solicitaba para que la comunicase a lo estrecho), entre las demas muchachas se señalaba y sobresalia por blanca, por discreta y por hermosa. ... no me ví jamas con major aprieto tentado y perseguido del comun adversario; porque aunque quise de aquel venéro objeto apartar la vista, no pude. (B 296)
> swimming naked: among them the one in question stood out from the whiteness of her skin, her beauty and her obvious air of discernment ... never had I known myself in greater danger or temptation from the evil one. And when I would

have averted my gaze from that so desirable object I could not. (A113)]

When a local cacique presents his daughter to Pineda as a wife, he informs him that "no podíamos ofender a Dios N. S. tan a las claras, y mas con mujeres infieles y ajenas de nuestra profesion, porque era pecado doble y de mayor marca" (B137) [It was impossible for a Christian to offend God in this manner, especially with an infidel, which would make it doubly sinful" (A 70)].

But besides gender, there are here other differences at work between Pineda's and Rowlandson's narratives. Pineda's `double' resistance to biological *mestizaje* here appears as a rational reservation originating in his sense of obligation to God, *patria*, and civility. Rowlandson's account, by contrast, displays a Protestant excremental disgust for humanity's innate depravity in the state of nature. When invited by an Indian--"What, will you love English men still?"--she recoils into a description of the fiendish "roaring, and singing and dancing, and yelling of those black creatures in the night" (333). For Rowlandson, the influences of the American frontier and the Indians are unequivocally demonic, whereas Pineda's portrayal of the frontier is ambivalently "dualistic" (Clevenger 1974, 95).

The cultural differences between Pineda's and Rowlandson's conceptions of the frontier are moreover evident in their respective notions regarding the Indian's role in the social, cultural, and religious body politic. For Pineda, the converted Indian is an integral subject in

the heavenly City of God. Unlike Rowlandson's Augustinian redemption theology, which equates the state of nature with a state of sin, Pineda, educated in a Counter-Reformation Jesuit school, believes, with Thomas Aquinas, that the dispensation of divine grace perfected, rather than destroyed, nature.[35] Human corruptions are not evidence of a Calvinist innate depravity but evidence that "con nuestros delitos y maldades borrábamos la perfeccion con que fuimos criados" ["by our offences we blotted out the perfection that was ours at birth" (B107/A58). For Pineda, therefore, Indian `devil worship' is not the natural state of the savage but rather the devil's (reversible) perversion of God's natural order. Unlike the Puritan Rowlandson, Pineda portrays himself as a lay apostle who "will teach you the prayers in your own language so you will understand" (A82). In Pineda's Counter-Reformation fusion of a classical with a Book-of-Genesis philosophy of history, which stresses humanity's oneness as Adam descendants, Indian "gentile" cultural practice operates, like Rome had in Europe, as a preparatory step to the final triumph of Christ in the redemption of humanity. Rowlandson's Puritan incorporation of America into Old World History, by contrast, is based on a Book-of-Exodus theology of history, where is no room for the American `Canaanites'.

These distinct attitudes toward Indian cultural difference suggest, finally, important differences in the notion of the `creole' in Spanish and Anglo America. Pineda

finds space for praise of certain aspects of Araucanian culture, such as their humility, valor, bravery, and love of freedom, which birth in Chile's vastness and wild beauty supposedly furthered and from which the creoles also benefitted. The Spanish idea of empire, which largely derived from the Roman model, rested on the medieval theory that existing regional cultures could be incorporated within the baroque structure of absolutist state (see Pagden 1995). There was, therefore, in the Spanish empire, a certain `positive space' for regional cultural diversity into which a Spanish American creole patriotism could be inscribed. The creoles' resistance to the inferior colonial status of the Americas in relation to the *peninsulares*, as it had emerged in the administration of a modern transatlantic economy, could therefore be grounded in an assertion of the equality of the Americas among the kingdoms comprising the empire (i.e. the Spains, the Netherlands, Italy, etc.) (see Brading 1991, 255-272, 293-313). By contrast, the Anglo American empire was built on the idea of the `plantation', which would exactly replicate Old World social and cultural models. Colonial settlements which did not resemble England were therefore, by definition, un-English and thus `American'. Whereas Pineda's captivity narrative shows thus a creole returning from America's Otherness in order to assert a distinct creole identity *equal* to the metropolitan Self, Rowlandson's narrative constructs colonial identity by asserting the preservation of her pure English body.

9. CREOLES AND IMMIGRANTS

Rowlandson's narrative was in part also directed towards an increasing number of local critics of the Puritan oligarchy within an increasingly diversified colonial society. The narrative therefore interprets the Indian war in the rhetoric of the jeremiad, as God's punishment for certain late `declensions' among His New English Israel. It was, like Increase Mather's *A Brief History of the War with the Indians* (1676), the Puritan oligarchy's call upon the colonial populace to "regenerate" an allegedly declining piety in order to reassert the authority of the theocratic state, which was increasingly being undermined by the demographic, social, economic, and ideological processes of early modern New World transculturations.[36] A comparison of Rowlandson's and Pineda's captivity narrative illuminates finally the identity work of a distinct generation of creoles vis-a-vis their immigrant ancestors, whose narratives of New World Exodus (without return) they rewrite in the attempt of defining a new place of center in a colonial space.[37]

Like the sixteenth-century Franciscans, Pineda also imagines his entry into the Araucanian frontier as an exodus from History. He hereby resembles Columbus, who associated the geographical entity that he encountered (`over there') with the Earthly Paradise, where History had been suspended. In Pineda's constant analogies between "these naturals" of

America and "the ancients" of Europe, he also implies that History has been suspended in the America frontier, that `America' could provide the individual with first-hand access to a primitive past preserved, in Europe, only in written documents. However, unlike in the Franciscans' historical imagination, in Pineda's baroque vision this past is not primitive Christianity, but rather pre-Christian paganism of Classical Antiquity. For example, in their habit of "consultar al demonio" they imitate "a los antiguos, que usaban de adivinos que por arte májica resucitaban los muertos para que respondiesen a sus dificultades y preguntas" [the ancients who used fortune tellers who through magic resucitated the dead so that they should assist them in their difficulties and problems] as the textual authorities of "Horacio, Virjilio, Bible, Tertuliano, San Agustin" testify (B135). In their cultural customs Americans are therefore not inherently *different* from Europeans. Pineda's Americans do inhabit the same world as Europeans do, but as Redemption History has been suspended in America, Americans have merely not risen beyond ancient paganism. It is in this `baroque' vision of reality of an inclusively universal struggle against sin and decay that Pineda's narrative perhaps differs most from Rowlandson's gothically horrible narrative.

Moreover, there is another significant difference between the creole Pineda's exodus into the American frontier and that of his European conqueror ancestors. In

his colonial seventeenth-century narrative reenactment of New World removal he significantly appropriates the theme of `shipwreck' rather than that of *translatio imperii* governing the Spanish chronicles of conquest of the sixteenth century. When he arrives on the `other' side, he does not stand in the proud and imperial poise of a Virgil or as a *Christum ferrens* (a "Christ-Bearer") of the Catholic World empire--as had a Columbus, a Cortés, or a Pedro de Valdivia. Pineda is not the harbinger of empire but the castaway, who stands humbled, naked, and `Indianized' in America. When exchanging his Spanish for Indian clothes, Pineda "dándome vueltas y mirándome por una y otra parte vestido como uno de los mas desdichados indios, descalzo de pié y pierna, representándoseme la poca estabilidad de las cosas humanas (B104-105) ["gave vent to tears, and ... preoccupied as I turned this way and that, looking at myself transformed into a down-and-out Indian, barefoot, barelegged, eloquent testimony to the instability of all things human" (A 57)]. The captive Pineda is the American version of the Cervantesque seventeenth-century "lonely individual" (Promís 118), not the confident Renaissance man building a terrestrial City of the Sun.

Rowlandson's narrative also presents interesting variations upon the narratives of removal prevailing in her cultural tradition. However, as we have seen in the previous chapter, first-generation New Englanders had interpreted their New World removal not in terms of the expansion of the

Holy earthly Empire but in terms of the Biblical Exodus, as `a people set apart' from the worldly empire of Anti-Christ and as a restoration of the primitive church in their American `exile' (see also Wiget 1991, 220). As in these narratives of Exodus, Rowlandson's crossing-over from "New England" (`Europe') into the conceptual space of `America' (the "wilderness") is also accompanied by an apocalyptic exit from History. When one day, the frontier suddenly moves in on her, it seems as though historical time stops, and her narrative begins, like Michael Wigglesworth's *The Day of Doom*, with an apocalyptic vision. It is a moment in which every-day life and History are suspended:

> We had six stout dogs belonging to tour garrison, but none of them would stir, though *another time*, if any Indian had come to the door, they were ready to fly upon him and tear him down. (324; my emphasis)

For Rowlandson, the exit from History does in fact not begin with the Indian raid on the community of Lancaster (the first paragraph in her narrative), which she reports in the strangely impartial manner of the onlooker-observer -

> another there was who running along was shot and wounded, and fell down; he begged of them his life, promising them money (as *they* told me) but they would not hearken to him but knocked him in the head, and stripped him naked, and split open his bowels. (323)

Rather, she becomes the `participant-observer'--"standing amazed" (324)--only when her own house comes under attack (in the second paragraph). Unlike in Wigglesworth, in Rowlandson the suspension of History coincides with the beginning of the experience of an individual outside History

(rather than collective cultural memory). The author of the "Preface to the Reader"--most likely Increase Mather (see Minter 1973, 336-37; Hambrick-Stowe 1982, 259)--tries to resynchronize the individual with communal experience, or, as Breitwieser has put it, her "private time" with "public time" (4). Mather thus contextualizes Rowlandson's narrative in public memory: "It was on Tuesday, Feb. 1, 1675" (318), not "On the tenth of February 1675" (323), when the story began for the community. However, when writing her own narrative, Rowlandson does not structure her `history' in chronologically arranged narrative segments but in her twenty `removes', which are measured, in effect, in her spatial distance from `over here', from `home' and from History.

Unlike in William Bradford's *Of Plymouth Plantation* or John Winthrop's *Journal,* then, in Rowlandson's narrative the `Atlantic' removal is not the experience of a community "closely knit together," but rather the experience of the modern lonely individual out in the wilderness of the world, all by herself (see also Fitzpatrick 1991). "All was gone," she laments, "my husband gone ... my children gone my relations and friends gone, our house and home and all our comforts" (324). And if the eyes of the world were to turn upon her in her state of removal, they would find her not in a "City on a Hill" but degenerated into a "wilderness condition," when "like a swine, [she] must lie down on the ground" (346), and when even the Indians' food--"their

filthy trash"--gradually becomes "sweet and savory to my taste" (333).

Rowlandson's narrative of Exodus moreover counterpoints the Biblical subtext, which would put Egyptians in pursuit of Israelites. In her narrative, the Egyptian pursuers become the English redeemers, and she is taken across the water not by a Moses leading his people into the Promised Land but by savage heathens, who would drag her into an American wilderness in order to strip her of her English identity. Her version of `removal' thus resembles not Bradford's story of a people's providentially guided Exodus into the American exile but rather the untold story of his wife--who supposedly `fell' off the boat when catching her first glimpse of the New England wilderness shore. At a time when creole New England divines called out against community `dispersal' (spatial, but also ideological and social), Rowlandson's `gendered' narrative of removal operates as a metaphor of defining `place' *against* the centrifugal cultural dynamics of a people moving out into the "Promised Land" under the patriarchal guidance of perennially proliferating types of Moses.[38]

10. THE COLONIAL CAPTIVITY NARRATIVE AND NATIONAL AMERICAN LITERARY HISTORIES

In British and Spanish America alike, the novel is conspicuously absent from colonial literary production. But if we must speak of the "significance" of the American

captivity narrative in terms of its continuous role as a literary template for the novel and the rise of national identities, it should be pointed out, in conclusion, that for nineteenth-century Spanish American novelists, the colonial *Indian* captivity motif lacked the tremendous appeal that Roy Harvey Pearce has claimed for it in the novels of Brockden Brown, Cooper, and other Anglo American novelists (Pearce 1948). More typically, nineteenth-century Spanish American writers of historical novels, such as Soledad Acosta de Samper, Vicente Fidel López, and Justo Sierra, imagined instead their national communities in an appropriation of the language of Self and Other in colonial narratives about Pirate captivity (see Gerassi-Navarro 1993).[39] While a full discussion of this cultural difference would lead beyond the scope of this study of the Indian captivity narrative in British and Spanish America, a few final words of explanation are in place here.

As we have seen, narratives of captivity served to articulate colonial identities in the encounters with the American frontier as well as with the European metropolis. However, they also emphasized the distinctly national characters of the various colonization projects in the context of inter-imperial rivalry. John Hortop's *The Travailes of an Englishman* (1591), for example, recounts his captivity in New Spain, during which he repeatedly becomes the victim of `Spanish' cruelty at the hands of the Inquisition, while also providing useful geographical and

military information about the Spanish American possessions. In the late seventeenth century, and during the eighteenth century, Anglo-Americans produced a host of narratives about captives taken by a Catholic alliance of `French' Indians, such as John Williams' *Redeemed Captive* (1702), which recounts the experiences of the Puritan minister and his community of Deerfield on their journey to Quebec after their capture by French-allied Indians.

By contrast, colonial Spanish Americans often negotiated their representations of alterity and identity in Pirate Captivity narratives about the English `northern barbarian'. If, in nineteenth-century Spanish American literature, the English pirate could became a stock figure in the context of Anglo-American aggression, he had his origins already in colonial times. In the 1570s, a group of English and French Protestant pirates, shipwrecked on the coasts of Yucatán, were the first to be tried before the newly arrived Inquisition in New Spain and their sentencing and punishment turned into a tremendous spectacle. As an emblem of the European Protestant renegade, the pirate could play an important role in late sixteenth and in seventeenth-century Counterreformation ideology (Jiménez Rueda 1945, xvi).[40] Thus, when Alexander Olivier Esquemeling first published his famous *Píratas de la América* (1681) in Amsterdam, in which he portrayed the English pirates such as Captain Morgan in an extremely unflattering light, it was eagerly translated and republished in Spanish (while

outraging contemporary English publicists).

This Counterreformation ideology also inspired the Mexican literary imagination of the seventeenth century. In Carlos de SigÜenza y Góngora's popular 1690 narrative *Los infortunios de Alonso Ramírez* [The Misfortunes of Alonso Ramírez], for example, Alonso, the returned captive (whose plain oral narrative SigÜenza claims to transcribe), depicts the English pirate in the language of savagery and cannibalism so familiar in European representations of American Indians since the sixteenth century. In one instance, Alonso even relates how the English pirates offered him a "human arm from one of their victims ... From this each one cut a small slice and praising the quality and flavor amid repeated toasts they finished it off (1962, 55). SigÜenza's pirate narrative defined the New Spanish creole Self in a representation of ethnic alterity similar to the construction of the `French Indian' in later New England captivity narratives. And like the Indian captivity narratives of Rowlandson and Pineda, Alonso Ramírez' account of his captivity among English Pirates re-fashions the European narratives of New World exodus from a colonial creole point of view: the son of a poor ship-carpenter, Alonso sets out from his native town in the Caribbean (Puerto Rico), and, like Bernal Díaz and other famous sixteenth-century conquerors, moves west in search of fame and fortune. But unlike the Renaissance chronicles, Alonso does not tell of the epic conquests of New Worlds but only

relates the long series of "misfortunes" that brought the protagonist lower and lower into misery and suffering.[41] Like the Indian captivity narrative in other parts of America, then, this narrative demonstrates the regional particularities in the "emergence of a creole discourse" in central Mexico (K. López 1996), where the English pirate became a powerful codification of cultural alterity on the one hand but where, on the other, the return from pirate captivity during intra-imperial "pilgrimage" also illustrated the breakdown of the idea of imperial patronage and revealed instead the reality of the creoles' exclusion from vertical and horizontal mobility as imperial citizens.[42]

Of course, the archives of early British America are not devoid of accounts of piracy.[43] But from the perspective of a cultural continuity in Spanish America, the piracy motif lacks the literary significance it has had in Spanish American literary and cultural history. Conversely, the motif of Indian captivity is curiously absent from most of the national literatures of Latin America during the nineteenth century. Esteban Echevarría's narrative poem *La cautiva* (The [Woman] Captive) (1837), a sentimental melodrama about the death of an Argentinian general and his wife at the hand of (drunken) pampa Indians, is the lone exception here. It is, however, perhaps no coincidence that this work originated in Argentina, which had displayed, in various regards, a similar frontier ideology as Anglo Americans.[44]

The "frontier" had, then, very different meanings in different parts of the colonial Americas. To be sure, in general, early Spanish expansion was driven, as Patricia Seed has recently pointed out, by ideas about empire and frontier that were distinct from those of the English--specifically by a quest not so much for land to be settled by Europeans (as in British America), but rather for new vassals for the Castilian crown (see Seed 1995). While we generally find, therefore, a "frontier of inclusion" in Spanish America, with the Church, Crown, and settlers all having active and different interests in the Indian population, in British America we find a racially and culturally defined "frontier of exclusion."[45] However, neither Mary Rowlandson's nor Pineda's frontier narratives were, in all respects, representative for the overall experiences of the British and Spanish empire in America respectively. When comparatively juxtaposing colonial Spanish American and British America texts, we must therefore remember that the colonial Americas were, as historians are increasingly coming to recognize, richly heterogeneous cultural "archipélagos" which often defy our attempts to see them as neat `precursors' of later national cultures (R. M. Morse 1965, 30).

NOTES CHAPTER 2

[1] For a historical reconstruction of the drama (which has not been preserved), as well as for the circumstances of its performance, see Lohmann Villena (1945, 213-16); For the role that the Araucanian wars (and the Araucanian "Noble Savage" warriors) played on the baroque stage of the *siglo de oro* in peninsular Spain, which created its own, distinctly European, "idea" of America, see M. Lee (1993).

[2] The most comprehensive discussion of Pineda's narrative is Anadón (1974).

[3] I have used the edition by Barros Arana (referred to in the text as "B"). I have also used, whenever possible and adequate, the translated abridgement by William Atkinson, *The Happy Captive* (referred to as "A").

[4] The colonial editions of Rowlandson's narrative were published under the title *The Soveraignty and Goodness of God,* whereas the London edition was published under the title *The True History of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson, a Minister's Wife in New England: wherein is set forth the cruel and inhumane usage she underwent amongst the heathens for eleven weeks time, and her deliverance from them.* Also, Rowlandson's narrative sold, during the seventeenth century, so poorly in England that the left-over copies of the only seventeenth-century London edition were still being imported into the colonies after it had already gone through two editions there. See Katherine Zabelle Derounian Stodola (1988).

[5] Although Mary White Rowlandson (1637?-1711) was born in Somerset, England, and therefore not, strictly speaking, a "creole" (born in America), I nevertheless include her in this category because she emigrated with her parents to Massachusetts during her early childhood. For a biographic note on Rowlandson, see Harris (1996, 217).

[6] VanDerBeets (1984); Pearce (1947-48); and Derounian-Stodola and Levernier (1993).

[7] See Pearce (1948); also Burnham (1997); and Minter (1973). For the novelistic potential of *Cautiverio feliz,* see Soriano.

[8] Mignolo (1995a, 188). For a more comprehensive articulation of the concept of "colonial semiosis," see Mignolo (1995).

[9] Pratt (1992, 6); Shuffelton (1993, 3); on `creolian degeneracy', see Canup (1990); on colonial identity in British America, see Zuckerman (1987, 115-157) and (1977,

183-214); in Spanish America, see Pagden (1987, 115-157); Brading (1991); and Promís (1991).

[10] The edition of Rowlandson's narrative used here is that of Slotkin and Folsom (1978). Further references to this edition appear in the text.

[11] Pratt (1992) 6; Canup (1990); see also Zuckerman (1987) and Pagden (1987).

[12] The most important texts contained in this literary history are three epics, Ercilla's *La Araucana*, Pedro de Oña's *Arauco Domado* [Arauco Tamed], and Alvarez de Toledo's *Purén Indomito* [Puren Untamed], as well as Pedro de Valdivia's *Cartas*, Alonso de Gongora Marmolejo's *Historia de Chile*, Pedro Marino de Lobera's *Crónica del Reino de Chile*, Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa's *Hechos de Don García Hurtado de Mendoza*, and Alonso de Ovalle's *Histórica relación del reino de Chile*.

[13] On the imperial idea during the sixteenth century, see Yates, especially (1975, 1-28).

[14] The origins of this legend are not entirely clear but seem to reach back to the seventeenth century.

[15] See on the issue of social cohesion in colonial New England the `town studies' of Demos (1970); Lockridge (1970); and Greven (1970); for an opposing view, see Martin (1991).

[16] Compare here Korth's portrayal of colonial Chile (1968, 162-187) and Gibson's discussion of colonial Mexico (1964).

[17] For some discursive readings of this narrative, see Invernizzi (1993); Chang-Rodríguez (1975); and Pollard (1986).

[18] For a social and anthropological discussion of colonial Spanish American *mestizaje*, see Mörner (1967); also Lipschutz (1963). For the negative metropolitan stereotypes imposed on New World *mestizos*, see Marshall (1963).

[19] For earlier occurances, as well as for a more comprehensive discussion of the genesis and evolution of the idea of the creole, see also Lavallé (1993)

[20] For a now classic (but still authoritative) account of this, see Gibson (1964).

[21] Hinderacker (1996, 489). Although Hinderacker dates the emergence of a British imperial culture only after the Glorious Revolution, I believe that he has somewhat overaccentuated the significance of the year 1688 in the transformation of the image of the Indian from a brutish savage to a "new" image as noble "Indian King." Rather than a radical change in metropolitan England, this bi-polarity must rather be explained, I would argue, as a result of different identity politics in metropolitan England and colonial New England. My argument is also supported by the

fact that most of the earlier texts that Hinderacker cites as evidence of this apparent cultural change were written by colonials (Hubbard, Increase Mather, etc.), not imperial historians. See also Saunders Webb (1984, 169-214).

[22] Interestingly, in light of postcolonial extrapolations of Foucault in order to shed light on the `Darker Side of the Renaissance' on the colonial peripheries, Cervantes shows that the idea of `witchcraft' undergoes a fundamental transformation during the fifteenth century from a `social crime' to a crime against `humanity' and `God' at large. It would lead to far here to explore the connections between the invention of America and the growing obsession with witchcraft in Europe.

[23] It should be pointed out, however, that Pineda's appeal for certain local autonomies is not radical or revolutionary but rather deeply rooted in Spanish legal and constitutional traditions, especially the *fueras*, which regulated the interaction between the local Spanish aristocracies and the king.

[24] The wild woman of this medieval legend was known to be "surpassingly ugly, covered with hair except for her gross pendant breasts which she threw over her shoulders when she ran." Like the wild man, who lusted for civilized women, she, too, was obsessed by a "desire for ordinary men" and therefore appeared as the most enticing of women, revealing her ugliness only during sexual intercourse (White 1973, 20-21)

[25] See White (1973, 3-38, 21); on the perception of Native Americans in terms of "wild men," see especially Barta (1994).

[26] Staden's narrative was translated into Dutch, Latin, French, English, Portuguese, and Spanish; see the introduction to Staden's narrative (Staden 1921, 189-190).

[27] The *Relación* was widely disseminated throughout Europe after its first two publications at Zamora (1542) and Valladolid (1555). Since the eighteenth century, it has also been republished many times, in different editions and languages, to the present.

[28] This is from *La Florida del Inca* by the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega (1951, 78). Other accounts of Juan Ortiz's captivity include the Hidalgo of Elvas' *True Relation of the Vicissitudes that Attended the Governor Don Hernando de Soto* ([1557] in Gaylord 1904, I:27-34); Luis Hernández de Biedma's *Relation of the Conquest of Florida* ([1544] in Gaylord 1904, II: 3-4; and the diary of Rodrigo Ranjel (in Gaylord 1904, II:56-57). The account of the Hidalgo of Elvas appeared in English four times during the seventeenth century: by Richard Hakluyt in two editions of *Virginia richly valued* in 1609 and 1611; by Samuel Purchas

in *Purchas his Pilgrimes* (1625, 1532-1556); and again in 1686 as *A relation of the invasion and conquest of Florida* (London, 1686). For a twentieth-century, romantically fictionalized, version of Juan Ortiz's captivity, see Steele (1972).

[29] Garcilaso, *Comentarios* (1688, 28). In Peru, the word "Serrano" is to this day virtually synonymous with `Indian'. The story of Serrano was first included in Garcilaso de la Vega's original *Comentarios reales*, then translated into English by Samuel Purchas and included in his *Purchas his Pilgrimes* (1925, 1454-89). A part of this translation was then republished by Samuel Clarke in his *A Geographical Description* (1657), and in John Ogilby's popular history entitled *America* (1675); finally, it appeared a fourth time in Sir Paul Rycault's new translation of Garcilaso's entire text (1688), which is my source. In light of Armstrong's and Tennenhouse's thesis of the "American origins" of the English novel, it is instructive to note that narratives of Atlantic shipwrecks, such as William Strachey's *The True Reportory of the Wracke*, Cabeza de Vaca's *Naufragios*, or the story of Pedro Serrano, were much more popular in England than Rowlandson's colonial narrative ever was there.

[30] For an excellent discussion of the American discoveries in the context of the ancient and medieval European geographical imagination, see Romm (1992); for the rise of History as a Western "invention" in the context of Europe's encounter with America, see Zea (1992 ,3-28); and Burke (1995, 33-51).

[31] On Rowlandson, see here Seelye (1977, 281).

[32] See Hartog (1988, 212-259). For more on the connection between gender and ethnicity on frontiers, see Namias (1993, 29-36); Pratt (1992, 22-23); and Castiglia (1996). On Native American trans-gender cultures, see Roscoe (1991).

[33] Spengemann (1994). On the emergence of a `European-World economy' see also Wallerstein (1974, 335-345).

[34] Zuckermann (1977, 183-214). On "Red Puritans," see Axtell (1981, 39-86, 272-316).

[35] See Brading (1991, 264). For the Thomist revival during the Spanish Counter-Reformation, see Véliz (1994, 45-65).

[36] The lamentation that American Puritans `declined' in piety was, as Sacvan Bercovitch has shown (1978), a rhetorical strategy of the "American jeremiad" and instrumental, during the seventeenth century, in the ministry's attempt to resist an erosion of their power during processes of increasing decentralization of political power, economic diversification, and demographic expansion.

[37] See, for example, the later parts of William Bradford's *Of Plymouth Plantation*, where his historiographic providentialist model breaks down in his attempt to make sense of post-Exodus history.

[38] Logan (1993). Still in 1775, the famous missionary of the Colegio de la Santa Cruz de Querétaro Pedro de Font would evoke, in his *Diario*, his role as a Moses on the colonists' journey across the Rio Grande to California (1775, 12).

[39] The image of the northern barbarian has been a persistent one in Spanish American culture and was perhaps best articulated in José Enrique Rodó's famous essay *Ariel* ([1900] 1926), in which he used the famous Shakespearean character to distinguish the Latin American "Arielesque" cultural spirit of idealism from the Anglo American utilitarian culture of "Caliban".

[40] The proceedings of these trials have been edited and published by the National Archives of Mexico (see Archivo Nacional 1945).

[41] On the metahistorical properties of this narrative, see Ross (1995). There has much debate over the generic status of the narrative and its historical factuality. Some critics classify it as a historical narrative (Anadón 1988), others have seen it as an early novel (Cummings 1978; Arrom 1990-91; Lagmanovich 1974) or a picaresque (Castagnino 1970; Johnson 1981; Quinonez Gauggel 1980) or something in-between (González-Pérez 1983; Sacido Romero 1992; Lopez Arias 1994).

[42] Anderson (1983); see also Brennan (1990, 44-70)

[43] The Virginia History Chronology provides a host of accounts of piracy. The perhaps most famous ones is a (rarely anthologized) passage in John Smith's *History*, in which he is captured by pirates on his way back to England from Virginia. For a discussion of New England piracy accounts, especially the Barbary captivity accounts, see Baepler.

[44] On captivities on the Argentine frontier during the colonial period, see Migden Socolow (1992). On nineteenth-century Argentinan captivity literature, see Lagmanovich (1979). See also the famous Argentinian Domingo Faustino Sarmiento's novel *Civilización y barbarie: Vida de Juan Facundo Quiroga* ([1845] 1938), which, in some respects, displays a similar frontier ideology as the North American authors.

[45] Hennessy (1978, 19); see also D. Weber (1992); Covington (1990); Rausch and D. Weber (1994).

PLACE IN RETURN BOX
to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
NOV 0 2		

1/98 c:/CIRC/DateDue.p65-p.14

TRANSCULTURATIONS IN COLONIAL SPACE: COMPARATIVE CREOLE IDENTITIES AND THE ETHNOGRAPHIC IMAGINATION IN EARLY BRITISH AND SPANISH AMERICAN WRITING

VOLUME II

BY

RALPH R. BAUER

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

American Studies Program

1997

III

HISTORY

> When Hermes took the post of messenger of the gods, he promised Zeus not to lie. He did not promise to tell the whole truth. Zeus understood. The ethnographer has not. (Vincent Crapanzano, 53)

> ... history, that Medusa of the New World (Dereck Walcott, 370).

1. `AUTO-ETHNOGRAPHY' AND THE WRITING OF HISTORY IN (POST) COLONIAL SITUATIONS

In 1783, the English index maker of the British Museum, Samuel Ayscough, published a polemical pamphlet entitled *Remarks on the Letters from an American Farmer; or a Detection of the Errors of Mr. Hector St. John; Pointing to the Pernicious Tendency of these Letters to Great Britain.* In his tract, he debunked a book that had been published in London a year before by a "J. Hector St. John" and which was rapidly becoming popular throughout Europe. *Letters from an American Farmer*, Ayscough charged, was the latest example of a "new species of forgery imported from the Continent of

America" (Ayscough 1783, 3). Its author had not only promoted pernicious "romantic schemes" of emigration and liberty in English heads through gross exaggeration of the virtues of American life; but - apparently more damaging to the credibility of the book for contemporary readers - he was not at all, as the book had claimed, an American farmer, but rather "a French man born in Normandy [who had] his residence ... chiefly at New York;" and - to make the fraud complete - the author had, Ayscough showed, plagiarized large parts of *Letters* from "old stories" in other books (Ayscough 1783, 7-8).[1]

However, the fact that Crèvecoeur's *Letters* had ended on a rather bleak note which would hardly have persuaded any European to emigrate to America suggests that Crèvecoeur had not, as Ayscough claimed, designed his book "for the purpose of encouraging foreigners to emigrate and settle in America." And while Ayscough accused Crèvecoeur of exaggeration, the factual accuracy of Crèvecoeur's descriptions of America seems to be only of secondary importance next to his questioning of the `authenticity' of Crèvecoeur's American identity and experience (not a real American, not first-hand experience). What was primarily at issue in Ayscough's attack, I want to suggest, was rather the question of Crèvecoeur's authority as a voice in the eighteenth-century academic debates about America and the implications of his book for the institutionalized authority of the professionalized discourse of eighteenth century

Enlightenment historiography.[2]

Indeed, Ayscough's complaint about a "new species of forgery imported from the Continent of America" was as old as `America' itself. But the criticisms hurled against the authority of *Letters from an American Farmer* echo not only the old charges brought against books of travel that had gradually begun to enter into the domain of history since the discovery of America, but foreshadow also the reactions of twentieth-century professional anthropologists to the discourses of "mere travelers" and "casual observers" that trespass into the terrain of the `science of the exotic' and threaten to `de-center' the authority of the "serious scientist" by undermining his or her delicate disciplinary boundaries.[3]

If, during the twentieth century, the certitude of ethnographic authority has nevertheless begun to crumble, it was, in part, due to a "breakup and redistribution of colonial power in the decades after 1950" as postcolonial voices began to infiltrate the literary canon as well as academic discourses.[4] This breakup of ethnographic authority has radically altered, as Clifford Geertz has observed, "the nature of the social relationship between those who ask and look and those who are asked and looked at" (1988, 131), as anthropologists now began to explore (and expose) the connections between the formation of a professionalized ethnographic authority and the establishment of European colonialism.[5] And as the ethnographic gaze was turning upon

its own history, it began to uncover the changing poetics and politics governing the writing and professionalization of cross-cultural representation not only during the twentieth century but also in the various genres of "pre-anthropology"--travel writing, "ethnographic history," and natural history--governing, for example, the `production' of the Americas during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries.[6] Finally, the break-up of this ethnographic authority has also been reflected by new impulses in literature--always, as Michel de Certeau has reminded us, "the theoretic discourse of the historical process" (1986, 18)--in a distinctly postcolonial American literary tradition of meta-ethnographic `magic realism' in much of Latin American, African American, and Native American fiction.[7]

The meta-ethnographical perspective of this literature, as well as the vocabulary provided by post-modern cultural anthropology, I want to suggest here, provide useful conceptual tools also for the study of eighteenth-century Euro-American writing at a time of the disintegration of the European colonial empires in the Americas. These writers were engaged, I argue, in a "dispersion" of professionalized historiographic authority similar to that which has driven the ethnographic meta-narratives in postmodern anthropology and literature (Clifford 1983, 120). In their attempt at self-representation, these writers had to enter into the domain of the professional European historian; and in

producing what Mary Louise Pratt has coined `auto-ethnography,"[8] they had to become a subject, rather than an object, in the Euro-centrically territorialized idioms and hierarchical divisions of labor that governed Enlightenment writing about America.

Here, I want to read two (post-) colonial creole dialogues with European writing of history about America during the second half of the eighteenth century. Both Crèvecoeur's *Letters from an American Farmer* (1782) and Carrió de la Vandera's *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes* [A guide for blind travelers] (1775), I argue, are meta-historical critiques of Enlightenment poetics of history and in particular the institutionalized division of labor underlying its professionalization during the eighteenth century. After some introductory remarks on these two texts and the critical debate about genre surrounding their reception (Part Two), I will position them in a distinctly colonial narrative and hermeneutic tradition which continuously translates American realities by collapsing the authority of eye-witness experience and the authority of history, which metropolitan ideologies would separate (Part Three). Then, I will read these two colonial narratives specifically in the context of the poetics of history that govern the European `production' of America during the eighteenth century and argue that both texts represent and parody the institutionalized processes of the Baconian Enlightenment project of natural history by exposing the

assumptions that construct its authority (Part IV). Each author first assumes, therefore, a narrative mask of authenticity in order to afford himself an entry into the disciplinary terrain of Enlightenment historiography only to deconstruct this mask to the effect of subverting Enlightenment assumption of what constitutes `authentic' observation and authoritative knowledge (Part V). As both colonial writers authorize themselves as voices in the eighteenth-century debate about America, they counterpoint European representational strategies of `otherness' by presenting distinctly colonial counter-utopian interpretations of American realities (Part VI).

2. COLONIAL AUTO-ETHNOGRAPHIES AND THE PROBLEM OF GENRE

To be sure, neither Carrió de la Vandera nor J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur were, strictly speaking, `creoles' (of European descent and born in America) but first generation immigrants to the American colonies. Nevertheless, both had spent a substantial part of their lives there and had permanently settled in the New World by the time they began their narratives. J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur came to America from France as a soldier in the French colonial army before settling in the British colonies and marrying the daughter of a well-to-do family; Alonso Carrió de la Vandera came to America as a government official, spent ten years in Mexico and worked as an inspector of the postal system in La Plata and Peru, where he finally settled down and married a

socially prominent woman of Lima.

The drafts of the individual sketches which would later be molded into and published as *Letters from an American Farmer* were probably written during Crèvecoeur's stay at his farm in New York. However, they were not published until Crèvecoeur temporarily returned to Europe for the settlement of a family inheritance and after a period of severe personal distress at seeing his family and farm ruined by Revolutionary factionalism. While Crèvecoeur's drafts might very well have initially been conceived as the authentic source materials produced by a `participant-observer' (to borrow an apt term from ethnography) in the Enlightenment New World experiment, the published version of *Letters* is the literary chronicle of the failure of this experiment.[9]

The composition of *El lazarillo* began as Carrió de la Vandera's field notes taken during an inspection tour of the royal postal system of viceregal Peru, which was part of a grand project launched by the conservatively Enlightened Bourbon dynasty in their large-scale attempt to reform a notoriously decrepit and corrupt system of colonial administration in the Americas - an effort which was, in many ways, Spain's last-ditch effort to salvage her imperial American dream. However, Carrió, after having spent nearly a year in the field, returned only to find that postal administrators had, without ever seeing his report, already made some perfunctory changes which satisfied imperial officials but generally left things as they were. The

published version of *El lazarillo* is Carrió's literary response to learning that his efforts had been in vain and that they would not be rewarded with the hoped-for career in Spanish colonial officialdom.[10]

Formally, Crèvecoeur's text consists of a collection of twelve letters supposedly written by a simple colonial American farmer named James to his English acquaintance, the educated "great European man" Mr. F. B., whom James has met during F. B.'s earlier stay in America and who has now assigned the farmer to provide first-hand information about America on specific subjects ranging from colonial character and society to information on specific communities and the natural environment. The final letter deals with imperial politics and the effects of the American Revolution on the American farmer.

El lazarillo is an itinerary of a journey of two men from Buenos Aires to Lima; a "*gachupín*" (European Spanish) inspector of the colonial postal system named Don Alonso and his "half-breed" (or *mestizo*) guide named Calixto Bustamente Carlos Inca or `Concolorcorvo', who supposedly is the author of the itinerary.[11] The narrative consists of travel anecdotes, observations on the postal system, statistical tables and ethnographic descriptions of local populations, information on geography and commerce, as well as what seems to be long digressions on literature and history, often presented in form of dialogues between Concolorcorvo and Don Alonso.

While the narratives of both immigrant authors thus present one respectively archetypal European character (traveler/collector, traveler/imperial inspector), formal authorship is in both cases attributed to an archetypal American character (American Farmer; *mestizo*), although *Letters* contains an unsigned "Advertisement" and a dedication "To the Abbé Raynal, F. R. S." (the French *philosophe* historian of America) signed by a "J. Hector St. John." (The author of the "Prologue" in *Lazarillo* is supposedly the same as in the subsequent itinerary - the *mestizo* Concolorcorvo). What is curiously absent from the surface of both texts is the `transatlantic' voice of the (post-) colonial American intelligentsia living in America and educated in or by the European metropolis. It is precisely the group to which both authors belonged and which represents, as Enrique Pupo Walker has pointed out, the creole voice upon which a "new context of values" would be founded in America (1982, 178).

A constant problem in the critical reception of these narratives has been how to categorize them generically. Because of the separation of the narrator from the author and the fiction of `American' authorship, both texts have recently been read as early examples of the American novel.[12] However, in both texts, this fiction is disguised rather thinly. In Crèvecoeur's *Letters*, James, the semi-literate American farmer, is gradually transformed from the simple and submissive American `informant' to the creator of

meaning in the course of *Letters*. While critics often considered this to be a conceptual flaw and a narrative inconsistency that show that Crèvecoeur "loses control of the initial contrast between the farmer and his learned friend" (Marx 1964, 109), more recent readers have recognized James's transformation as a deliberate fictional device on the part of the author in order to dramatize James's "progression toward self-knowledge" (Arch 1990, 154).

Equally, readers of *El lazarillo* have noted that the fiction of Concolorcorvo's *mestizo* authorship is often disrupted, frequently revealing Carrió's satirical creole voice beneath the *mestizo*'s word.[13] While some have dismissed the transparency of this fiction as the result of Carrió's "often carelessly applied paintjob," which supposedly illustrated the author's lack of the "artistic refinement of a Marivaux" (Wentzlaff-Eggebert 1992, 17), more sympathetic readers have shown it to be an intricate narrative technique effecting an ambivalent interplay of voices characteristic of creole writing (see Pupo Walker 1982, 171; Johnson 1993, 114). In both cases, then, recent criticism has illustrated the artistic value and the literary creativeness of two colonial texts that had, since their publication in the eighteenth century, primarily been read as humble compilations of first-hand historical source material on colonial American life and society.

The question of genre, however, has continued to be a

problem in the critical discussions of these colonial texts. A second group of readers has therefore considered them to be `travel narratives' of sorts. However, their personification of the European traveler as a character in the text and the imposition of the narrative "I" upon the American `native' opposes such a categorization. In both cases, travel writing seems to be more accurately the subject rather than the genre of the narrative. And they might therefore better be described as `meta-travel narratives' rather than travel narratives.[14]

Finally, a third group of critics has read these texts as history. Pamela Regis, for example, has shown that the "framework for Crèvecoeur's representation of America" is that of the Enlightenment rhetoric of natural history in the tradition of Linnaeus and Raynal (1992, 108). And, to be sure, both colonial writers explicitly or implicitly respond to the French *philosophe* and historian of America Abbé Raynal and thus engage in the subject of America as the object of natural history and ethnography. However, if Crèvecoeur appropriates some of the European historians' taxonomic idioms in his descriptions of America, the fiction of the transatlantic exchange of letters, the narrative "I" of an American farmer, and the infusion of narrative into description itself make plain that Crèvecoeur, in the end, did not intend to write a natural history in emulation of Linnaeus or Raynal. Rather, in his literary fiction of the exchange of letters, he portrayed an integral part in the

production of the discourse of natural history. "History" (the writing thereof) is therefore again the subject rather than the genre of Crèvecoeur's *Letters from an American Farmer*.

In *El lazarillo*, the writing of history is also one of the main concerns of the text. As Enrique Pupo Walker has shown, Carrió de la Vandera sets out, for example, to refute the sources used by Raynal, specifically Juan and Ulloa's *Voyage to South America* (1747), which was translated into English by John Adams and went through five edition (which are also mentioned in the text several times). Moreover, the title of *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes* establishes a dialogue with a series of contemporary official geographical descriptions written about Peru in the tradition of natural history - the *Lazarillo de ciegos* of the viceregal "Cosmógrafo Mayor" Cosme Bueno.[15] If Carrió de la Vandera's *Lararillo* makes hereby plain his concern with the writing of history about America, the narrative is not a "direct defense of historiographic method" as Enrique Rodrigo has argued (1993, 265),[16] but rather a "historiographic parody" not only of the sixteenth-century "polemical discourses [of] the historians of the Indies" (Pupo-Walker 1982, 164-65) but also of the contemporary Enlightenment discourses of natural history governing European representations of America.[17]

Faced with these divergent generic categorizations by contemporary critics, it is helpful to recall Francois Charlevoix's topography of the eighteenth-century discursive

landscape in his *Histoire et description générale de la Nouvelle France* (1774). An eighteenth-century author, Charlevoix said there, may write, one of "two kinds of history:" first, "a serious, dignified, factual kind" when dealing with the ancient civilizations of the European homeland; and second a "lighter, more entertaining kind" when treating the remote and new countries (Adams 1962, 9). Both of these colonial authors - treating `remote' countries that are also `home' - positioned their narratives between these extremes defining Charlevoix's eighteenth-century discursive spectrum. Crèvecoeur, for example, has James compare himself as an author to the European historian, but humbly assumes a subordinate position in reference to the European historians when he has James compare them to "eagles [which] soar high," whereas the colonial author like himself is like "a feebler bird, [who] cheerfully content myself with skipping from bush to bush and living on insignificant insects."[18] He resembles Concolorcorvo, the narrator of *El lazarillo*, who refers to the historian as "el Plomo" [Mr. Lead] on the one hand and to the traveler as "el Corcho" [Mr. Cork] on the other. The *mestizo* says ambiguously of himself as an author, he is like a "peje entre dos aguas" ["fish between two waters"], neither "tan pesado" ["as ponderous"] as the historian nor "tan liviano" ["of as little weight"] as the traveler.[19] *Letters from an American Farmer* and *El lazarillo* are colonial `auto-ethnographies' whose authors constantly confront, in their

endeavor to write American history, the writing of history about America.

3. `EYE-WITNESSING': THE HERMENEUTICS AND EPISTEMOLOGY OF LETTERS FROM A NEW WORLD

In 1772, the Prussian historian of America Cornelius de Pauw declared, in his *Recherches philosophiques sur les Américains,* that when travelers embark overseas, "their prejudices travel with them and acquire a sort of authority on crossing the Equinoctial line or the Tropics" (1768, I:10). De Pauw himself, of course, belonged to what his contemporary Louis-Antoine de Bougainville contemptuously referred to as "that class of slothful and arrogant writers, who speculates the livelong day about the world and its inhabitants in the penumbra of their study, thus imperiously submitting nature to their imaginations" while denouncing the traveler, the only real harbinger of truth and knowledge, as "a liar and imbecile" (quoted in Stafford 1984, 48-49).

The conflict underlying the confrontation of these two late eighteenth-century points of view regarding the authority of the traveler is, of course, nothing new or particular to the eighteenth century. The traveler faces not only a hermeneutic problem of how to communicate exotic experience through language; but also, his or her audience confronts, faced with the exotic travel account, the epistemological issue of what constitutes legitimate

knowledge. These two issues involved in the traveler's problematic claim to authority are at the heart of the dialogue between James and Mr. F. B. in *Letters* as well as the dialogues between the narrator Concolorcorvo and the inspector, Don Alonso, in *Lazarillo*.

When, in his (possibly plagiarized) passage on American snakes, the narrator of *Letters from an American Farmer* had ironically remarked that their "formidable length and appearance often get the better of the philosophy of some people, particularly Europeans" (180), the snake assumes both a metaphorical and a hermeneutic significance as a topos in the New World encounter. First, Crèvecoeur referred, of course, to the century-old debate about the `newness' of America and the recentness of its Biblical Fall. And he addresses here particularly Raynal, who had marveled in his *Histoire* at "How nature seems to have neglected the New World" (1776, IV:174). America had a

> frozen and severe climate under the same parallel as our temperate climates, ... a difference of ten or twelve degrees, in the temperature of the old and new hemispheres, ... are so many tokens of a world that is still in its infancy ... a rude and unpeopled hemisphere denotes a recent world; ... The sun well scorching, more plentiful rains, and thicker and more stagnating vapours, betray either the decay or the infancy of nature. (IV:172)

The indigenous inhabitants of America were still the "wretched remains" who had not yet recovered from the "great devastation" of the Biblical Flood. "Degraded and degenerated in their natural constitution, in their stature, in their ways of life, and in their understandings, which

have made so little progress in all the arts of civilization," the American Indians still had the "ruin of that world imprinted" on them (IV:176).

This strategy of simply likening the `other' to previous stages of the `self' is, as Anthony Pagden has shown, a common epistemological device of achieving "commensurability" with the unfamiliar and the incomprehensible in the European encounter with the New World (1993, 89-116). However, the reference to the extraordinary size of the snake also evokes the persistent hermeneutic controversies that accompanied the reception of "giantism" in the hundreds of New World exploration reports - a controversy which had re-ignited in the trans-Atlantic world during the 1760s with the renewed debate over the factuality of Pigafetta's Patagonian giants.[20]

As early as Vespucci's *Letters* to Lorenzo de Medici, the European New World traveler had found in American reality "the most marvelous things I encountered." The non-European natives Vespucci encountered, for example, were "taller kneeling than I am standing: in sum, they were of the stature of giants" (1944, 13). Similarly, Pedro de Castañeda Njera, in his narrative of the Coronado expedition, wrote:

> Were it not for the fables of enchantments with which they are laden, there are events that have happened recently in these parts to our Spaniards in conquests and clashes with the natives that surpass, as deeds of amazement, not only the aforesaid books [of the romances of chivalry but even the ones written about the twelve peers of France (in Hammond 1940, 276)

As Hans Galinski (1977) has shown in his analysis of Castañeda's narrative, New World explorers confronted with the exotic otherness of American reality often sought semantic recourse in the European world of popular legend in order to truthfully translate their exotic experiences. However, the difference between popular legend and the New World travelogue is in their respective representations of reality. The popular legend is characterized, as Max LÜthi has explained, by a "bidimensionality" (1961, 28), where two distinct and coherent codes of reality coexist but where the super- or extra-natural is recognized as disturbing, problematic, and unreal. The fabulous in the New World travelogue, by contrast, figures as a hermeneutic strategy for conveying exotic (extra-linguistic), subjectively true, experience. While the popular legend therefore maintains a clear distinction between the two different codes of reality, in the New World travelogue the `other' reality of America fuses with conventional reality into the category of the marvelous while its author insists on the `truth' of the exotic experience.

The travel and exploration account was therefore (and because of the proliferation of proven literary hoaxes) consistently subject to an epistemological tension that had been at work in European writing about America since the sixteenth century--a tension involving questions of the real and the possible. While Crèvecoeur's *Letters from an American Farmer* was, as Robert Lawson Peebles has observed,

"an opportune and essential contribution to the debate on the significance of the New World" (1988, 101), Crèvecoeur's self-conscious dialogue with Raynal suggests that he saw the significance of his contribution primarily in the light of a debate over historiographic authority and the role of the traveler in the production of history that had preoccupied Europe since the American discoveries.

As early as Martin Waldseemuller's proclamation, in his *Novus Mundi*, that there was a land in the middle of the Sea of Darkness where none was supposed to be, the `New World' had challenged European epistemologies. Thus, the Jesuit José de Acosta wrote in a famous passage of his *Historia natural y moral de las indias*:

> When I passed to the Indies, I will tell what chanced unto mee: having read what poets and philosophers write of the burning [*torrida*] Zone, I perwsaded my self that comming to the Equinoctiall [equator], I should not endure the violente heate, but it fell out otherwise; for when I passed [the Equator], which was when the sun was there for Zenith there, being entered into Aries, in the moneth of March, I felt so great cold, as I was forced to go into the sun to warme me; what could I else do then, but laugh at Aristotle's Meteors and his Philosophie, seeing that in that place and at that season, whenas all should be scorched with heat, according to his rules, I, and my companions were a colde. (1889, 90)

It was the first-hand sensational experience of the traveler that Father Acosta enlisted against two thousand years of learning. The so-called `dispute of the New World', in which de Pauw and the French *philosophes* became later so notoriously involved (see Gerbi 1973, 52-156)), was therefore from its very beginning in the sixteenth century

not only a disagreement about the nature of the American Indian and the American environment, but also a conflict about what constitutes historiographic authority, a conflict between the authority of the traveler - based on a claim for first-hand sensational experience and testimony - and the authority of the historian - based on the received knowledge and ancient learning and books. The early New World texts therefore already contained the seeds of the "Qurelle des anciens et des modernes" which erupted during the Renaissance and would explode two centuries later in Enlightenment France, where the discovery of America invariably became the first argument employed by the `moderns' as proof not only of the superiority of one scientific procedure over another but also of the superiority of the modern age over the ancient.[21]

To be sure, as Anthony Grafton has illustrated, the "revolution in the forms of knowledge" taking place in early modern Europe resulted as much from "contradictions between and tensions within" the received ancient canon as from its "confrontation with external novelties" (1992, 6). The canon never formed "a single grid that imposed a uniform order on all new information," he objects in response to recent postcolonial re-visitations of Foucault, "but with a complex set of overlapping stencils, a rich and delicate set of patterns and contrivances" (Grafton 1992, 58). And the measurable "impact" of the New World on European epistemologies therefore remains rather "uncertain" before

the eighteenth century (Elliott 1970, 15). However, it was due to Europe's encounter with the external novelty of America that the New World chroniclers could appeal to eye-witness experience *as a rhetorical strategy* in creating their status as historians and their authority for participating in textual (canonical, political, or historical) disputes. Gonzalo Oviedo, for example, who explicitly named his *magnus opum* on America *Historia general y natural de las indias*, opened it by declaring that "I do not write with the authority of any historian or poet, but as an eye witness" (1959, I:113). And even a staunch scholastic like Las Casas appealed (in trying to refute Oviedo's unflattering depiction of Native American culture) to his "many years that I have been there and in which I have seen with my eyes, I have not read histories which could be lies, but instead I have experienced" (1959, III:342).

Not surprisingly, this literary strategy resulted in an unprecedented social expansion of historiographic authorship. Previously, only professional scholars, licensed by the possession of formal degrees and trained in the Latinate seclusion of the universities, were credited with access to understanding and authority to interpret, annotate, and (sometimes) manipulate the texts of canonical knowledge (see Grafton 1992, 3). But in an outwardly expanding world, anyone with eyes and ears could suddenly claim that "I have seen." While Las Casas had still been a

respected Dominican cleric - his appeals to eye-witness experience only form the portals of an elaborate edifice of forensic rhetoric - and Oviedo a royal official commissioned by the Castillian crown to provide an accurate geographical description of the `Indies', now even common foot soldiers and colonials could dispute authoritative history on the basis of eye-witness experience. Thus, Bernal Diaz del Castillo even boasted that his *Historia verdadera* [True history] was devoid of the "ornaments of rhetoric" and contained only "the truth, word for word as it happened" (1966, 235). "This is no history of distant nations, nor vain reveries," he asserted, "I relate that of which I was an eye witness" (1966, v). And occasionally claimed that "I cannot recollect" (1966, 236).

It is the authority of "eye-witnessing" that both *Letters* and *El lazarillo* exploit as their main rhetorical device for authority. The appeal to the first-hand experience and subjectivity of the witness/martyr was also, as we have seen in the previous chapter, an important authorial strategy in the seventeenth century colonial "true histories" of captivity, in which American colonials evoked their situation as castaways to authorize their refutations of imperial historians. In the American first-hand accounts, the observer's voice is ever formally fused with that of the historian, the natural scientist, or the ethnologist; `subjective' narrative is fused with `objective' description. And like the early American chroniclers,

Crèvecoeur, too, uses his authority as an eye-witness to authorize himself, a land surveyor in the French colonial army and a `British' American farmer, as a participant in the Enlightenment academic debates about America. He therefore constructs his narrative persona James as a `martyr/witness' to lend his voice the authority of experience whenever it would contradict European authorities. In the tradition of Rowlandson and Pineda, he makes therefore use of the trope of pilgrimage - of having `been there' - when he has James most famously declare that Americans are the "western pilgrimes," distinct from those who have stayed at home. "Securely placed as you are," he instructs the European Mr. F. B., "you can have no idea of our agitations, but by hearsay; no relation can be equal to what we suffer and to what we feel" (203). Second-hand knowledge (by "relation") cannot compare to the experience (suffering and feeling) of the witness. And while James's Letters ostensibly begin as his `observations' on subjects given by Mr. F. B., they invariably turn out to be about James's journey to the authority and knowledge of the historian.

Similarly, Carrió uses the voice of his narrator/character, the *mestizo* Concolorcorvo, to critique the European stay-at-home historian of America. Like Crèvecoeur, Carrió begins his narrative with an ironical "Prologue" and a satirical dedication to the European philosopher/historian. "No porque mi principal fin se dirija

a los señores caminantes" ["Although my principal purpose is to address travelers"], he has Concolorcorvo say, "dejaré de hablar una u otra vez con los poltrones de ejercicio sedentario, y en particular con los de allende el mar" ["I shall not refrain from speaking occasionally to the lazy persons of sendentary exercise, and particularly to those from across the sea"] (5/27). Like the supposedly humble farmer James (who will write "although" he is an American), the *mestizo* also professes a submissive posture toward the European historian: "Eslo también en él, que los cholos respetamos a los españoles, como a hijos del Sol" ["It is well-known here that we half-breeds respect the Spaniards as sons of the Sun"]. But immediately, his irony becomes apparent when he remarks that "no tengo valor (aunque descendiente de sangre real, por línea tan recta como la del Arco Iris) a tratar mis lectores con la llaneza que acostumbran los más desprecialbes escribientes" ["I have not the courage (although I am descended from royal blood in a line as straight as a rainbow) to threaten my readers with the lack of respect customarily shown by more contemptible writers"] (5/27).

Like James, Concolorcorvo establishes his narrative authority by his appeal to first-hand experience. And he specifically defends this authority against the charges brought against it by stay-at-home historians such as de Pauw. "Si fuera cierta la opinión común vulgar" ["If the

common, or shall we call it popular, opinion were true"], he says

> que viajero y embustero son sinónimos, se debía preferir la lectura de la Fábula a la de la Historia. No se puede dudar, con razón, que la general extrató su principal fondo de los viajeros, y que algunas particulares se han escrito sobre la fe de sus relaciones.
> [... that the words traveler and liar are synonymous, then the reading of fables should be preferred to that of history. It cannot be doubted, and with justification, that history in general drew its principal source from travelers, and that certain historical works have been written which accept the accounts of travelers as authoritative.] (17/47)

However, the eighteenth-century charges against the traveler were only a part of a metropolitan reaction to the epistemological challenges, the de-centering of knowledge, and the dispersion of historiographic authority that the American narratives had effected since the sixteenth century.

Even Vespucci, in his original letters to the Medici, had more than once remarked: "I whisper this" for fear of his truth turning into heresy when describing his discovery of "a new land" which, based on his experience of two voyages, was apparently of continental proportions but never mentioned by Ptolemy. Significantly, he never used the words "New World" in these letters. And, if he later announced in *Mundus Novus* that "these regions which we found and explored ... may rightly be called a New World" (1504, n.p.), his book - in its early editions of *Mundus Novus* were published without dates and without the printer's name - pointed to the precariousness of its authority. Its authority was

precarious precisely because of his insistence that "our ancestors had no knowledge of them [the `new' lands]" and that

> this transcends the view held by our ancients... that there was no continent beyond the equator, but only the sea which they named the Atlantic ... In those southern parts I have found a continent more densely peopled and abounding in animals than our Europe, Asia or Africa ... Part of this new continent lies in the torrid zone beyond the equator toward the antarctic pole. (151).

Still in 1512, when the Nuremberg humanist Joannes Cochlaeus wrote his Preface to yet another edition of Pomponius Mela's authoritative *Cosmographia*, he declared that "Whether it is true or fabricated," the discovery of America "matters not at all or very little to the knowledge of Cosmography and History" (quoted by Burke 1995, 35).

Cochlaeus could make this assertion because, before the eighteenth century, history belonged to that enterprise of textual scrutiny to which humanists like himself were as dedicated as the scholastics. Intellectuals lived, as Anthony Pagden has written, in a mental world without the possibility for immediate and authoritative knowledge outside a fixed "structure of norms" provided by the canon. When "experience directly contradicted the text, it was the experience, which was unstable because of its very novelty, which was likely to be denied or at least obscured" (Pagden 1993, 52). Understanding the world was therefore dependent upon the interpretation of a determined canon of texts: the Bible, the Church Fathers, and the Ancients.

Europe's persistently reactionary reception of the genre of `letters from a new world,' circulating in Europe since the beginning of the sixteenth century, is not surprising, of course. Especially before the seventeenth century, the traveler's decentering "claim to autopsy" was, as Anthony Pagden has observed, a matter of contention because the

> proven unreliability of any particular `I' [and] the fact that before the emergence of the idea of the autonomous self ..., reliance on `I' as a source of *authority* could only ever be tenuous ... For all those whose intellectual habits had been formed by the canon, the self had little existence beyond the plurality of the text. (1993, 83)

But also, the explorers' letters from America had fundamentally troubling implications for the existing social orders. If anyone with eyes and ears could now argue with the order established by the canonical texts about geography, Erasmus asked in 1517, in what other unpredictable ways might they be questioned? Especially, what might the implications of the discovery of a `New World' be for Scriptural truth, wondered the Italian historian Francesco Guicciardini? Did not Psalm 18.5 explicitly state that the "Their sound has been spread throughout the wold and that the Word had reached to the ends of the earth?" (quoted by Pagden 1993, 89). Indeed, historians concerned with the implications of the New World frequently confronted the problem of reconciling the

contradiction between experience and text. "A new World it may bee ... called," gathered Samual Purchas in 1626,

> for that World of new and unkowne Creatures, which the old World never heard of, and here only are produced: the conceit whereof moved *Mercator* to thinke (which I dare not thinke with him) that the great Deluge in the dayes of Noah, drowned not these parts because men had not here inhabited, who with a deluge of sinne, might procure that deluge of waters. (1626, 791)

The authority of first hand experience governing the travel account was therefore regarded as especially problematic when its contents were in contradiction to received knowledge. The mentality of this "Bound World" (as Grafton has called it) opposing the authority of travel is exemplified in the earliest literary reactions to the Columbian discoveries. In *Das Narrenschiff* [*The shyppe of fooles*] (1509) by Sebastian Brandt, a great admirer of Desiderius Erasmus, the traveler becomes the personification of the humanist notion of `folly', of seeking knowledge outside the soul (see Spengemann 1994, 146). And the book about sailing and traveling knaves is thus an outrageous satire against the claims of other realities besides those contained in the canon.

Vespucci's letters themselves, in which he had portrayed the `new land' natives in a quasi-edenic state, had inspired Thomas More's *Utopia*, which was (like *Das Narrenschiff*) an exercise in European social criticism, surely, but also a satire in the tradition of Lucian's *True History*, which had been prefaced by the statement that "I am

writing about things entirely outside my own experience or anyone else's, things that have no reality whatever" (quoted in More 1965, 4). Like the *True History*, *Utopia* was an epistemological attack on the claim for the `new' and the authority of the traveler. While the narrator in *Utopia* was able to recall in every detail what the traveler Raphael Hytholodaeus had supposedly told him about the island of Utopia's civic and political structures, he had "forgot" (he mockingly claimed) where exactly Hythlodaeus had told him Utopia was located, except that it was somewhere near the Americas. In *Utopia*, of course, Vespucci's `new world' turned out to be nothing new at all but rather an ancient republic modelled after the age-old civic ideals of Plato. If, finally, "Utopia" turns out to be altogether "Nowhere," it is a bitter satire not only on the character of Hytholodaeus - the `dispenser of nonesense' who travelled not as your average "seaman," the narrator declares tongue-in-cheek, "but as a traveler, or rather a philosopher" (More 1965, 55) - but also on the claim made by "Americus Vesputius" that there existed something new under the sun `over there'.

The theme of New World travel satire forms a thread through early modern European literary history from Rabelais to Swift and Raspe - what Percy Adams has called the "extraordinary" voyage in his anatomy of the genre of the travel narrative (1962, 1). These satires were, of course, deeply rooted in the `progressive' Humanist projects of

social criticism and reform. But, despite their `modern' opposition to scholastic doctrines, the humanists were equally `conservative' in their epistemological project of recovering truth from scholastic perversions through a (re-) reading of texts, not through experience. By definition, therefore, as Adams (1962) notes, these travel satires deceived no one. They were written not to deceive but rather to expose. Whereas both the faithful travel narratives of incredible realities and the `travel lies' strove for verisimilitude and authority, the travel satires deliberately debunked the credibility of the travel account through the introduction of conspicuously incredible elements, which effected a clash between two opposing codes in their representation of reality - the credible `over here' vs. the incredible `over there'.

Thus, in David Lloyd's *Legend of Captain Jones* (1671), prefaces, and thus contextualizes, "The Wonderful and Surprizing Voyagesof Captain Jones to Patagonia" with a mock poem in which he discredits the authority of traveler-authors such as Captain Jones:

> When I do read thy Travels, Jones, and see
> Thy Fights, thy victories,thy all and thee,
> I stand engag'd 'twixt wonder and delight,
> That i can neither think, nor speak, nor write.
> My faith thou puzzl'st, and invention too,
> `Tis monstrous strange! but these things though did'st
> Alcides, Hector, are out-done by thee,
> Thy History has soil'd all poetry.
> Poor Hector! he by his own valour's lost,
> But though surviv'st, and dost thy triumphs boast.
> Herc'les, we know, hath his Non ultra found,
> But to thee, Jones, nor earth, nor sea's a bound;
> The world from east to west, form north to south,

> To eccho forth thy fame's but one wide mouth. (1671, 12-13)

Similarly, in *Gulliver's Travels*, Jonathan Swift also parodies the epistemological issues at stake in the New World travelogue. As we have seen, the truthful New World travelogue had fused, in its hermeneutic endeavor truthfully to render exotic experience, the bidimensional representation of reality in the popular legend into a unidimensional representation in what might be called the `exotic realism' of the marvelous. Swift's parody of the New World travelogue, by contrast, splits this unidimensionality in the truthful travelogue into the bidimensional representation of reality of the fantastic by exaggerating the giantism in the New World travelogue into the clearly incredible.

As Amaryl Beatrice Chanady explains, the fantastic resembles the popular legend in the bidimensionality of its representation of reality, but is distinct from it not only because the popular legend is an oral genre, whereas the fantastic is a literary genre, but also because in the popular legend the extra-natural, though considered disturbing, "is not questioned on the grounds of reason and logic."

> The listener does not reject the irrational events, because they do not contradict his total view of reality, even if they belong to an order that differs from that of his world. ... In the fantastic, on the contrary, the supernatural is seen as problematical because it cannot be integrated within the implicit ideological code conveyed by the text. The irrational event or being is described as

> strange and disconcerting, and thus *problematized*. (1985, 8)

Epistemologically, the fantastic travel satire is thus an inherently conservative literary "mode," because it re-establishes an "unresolved antimony" between the natural and the extra-natural fused in the exotic travelogue while hierarchically privileging the truth value of the conventional reality over that of exotic reality.

Swift parodies the epistemological challenges posed by the New World travelogue by confronting Gulliver with a Lilliputian's claim that

> there are other kingdoms and states in the world, inhabited by human creatures as large as yourself, our philosophers are in much doubt, and would rather conjecture that you dropped from the moon, or one of the stars; ... Besides, our histories of six thousand moons make no mention of nay other regions, than the two great empires of Lilliput and Blefuscu. (1977, 84)

While evoking the epistemological debate sparked by the discovery of the New World, Swift, by naming his New World traveler/narrator "Gulliver" (gullible), evokes the travel lie and satirizes the traveler's challenge that experience is more valid than the canon and "practice is of greater worth than theory" (Vespucci 1944, 8).

The travel satire thus represents an epistemologically conservative endeavor to counteract the dispersal of historiographic authority through the appeal to authorial first-hand experience in the European encounter with the New World. The `historian', always in a culturally privileged

position, is "around power," as Michel de Certeau has put it (1986, 56). And the cultural center has therefore a vested interest in keeping a monopoly over the rules of historiographic discourse and its constructions of authority. `Truth' is therefore always produced in the center, and, in the Western tradition, the center is the metropolitan *civitas*. The nature of the traveler's authority is suspect precisely because he/she has left the settled community, the source of all civility, and, having become nomadic, is in a state of savagery. The only sanctioned form of travel in that culture is that of pilgrimage. But the objective of pilgrimage is, of course, the (purified) return, not the journey (see de Certeau 1988, 72; Pagden 1993, 157). It is precisely his unwillingness to return that makes travelers suspect. Thus, More's Hytholodaeus "was more fond of traveling than of returning home, to be buried in his own country" (More 1965, 55).

Only the metropolis can define, then, the individual's identity. Still, in the middle of the eighteenth century, the Earl of Chesterfield reportedly advised his son: "Had I seen anything so very extraordinary as to be almost incredible I would keep it to myself, rather than by telling it give anybody room to doubt, for one minute, of my veracity" (quoted in Adams 1962, 203). And for the Enlightenment *philosophes*, too, the authority of the traveler remained fundamentally suspect. There is "no state more immoral," said Diderot in the Abbe Raynal's *Histoire*

philosophique et politique de deux Indes, "than that of the continual traveler"

> The greater the distance from the capital, the further the mask of the traveler's identity slips from his face. On the frontier it falls away altogether ... From one hemisphere to another ... what has he, the traveler, become? Nothing! Once past the equator a man is neither English, nor Dutch, nor French, nor Spanish nor Portuguese. All that he preserves of his homeland are the principles and prejudices which authorize or excuse his conduct. (1776, V:3)

It is significant, in light of this debate over the authority of eye-witness experience, that both Crèvecoeur and Carrió - part of the European colonial intelligentsia - defend, in accordance with a creole rhetorical tradition, the authority of eye-witness observation against the charges made by the European heartland historian. However, both colonial authors do not - despite Crevevcoeur's reference to pilgrimage - assume the role of the European traveler or even, like Pineda or Rowlandson, the European castaway/captive. Instead, both construct (and de-construct) the narrative masks of the `native' (the farmer and the *mestizo*). But in order to fully illustrate the significance of this half-disguised fiction, it is necessary to place both narratives in the context of contemporary poetics of history governing the division of intellectual labor at the time they wrote.

4. CARRIÓ, CRèVECOEUR, AND THE BACONIAN PROJECT OF HISTORY

Many readers have noted that, in the later parts of *Letters*, Crèvecoeur overtly debunks the utopian portrayal of British America by *philosophes* such as Raynal, who had "viewed these provinces," the dedication of *Letters* to the French historian still claimed, "in their true light as the cradle of future nations and the refuge of distressed Europeans" (37).[22] Nevertheless, no one has questioned Crèvecoeur's "sincerity of the motives which urge me" to profess his love and respect for the "man whose writings I so much admire" (37). Crèvecoeur's *Letters* are not, I argue, "the purest tribute of reverence and affection" to the French historian. In reading *Letters*, we must heed the advice of James's wife about Mr. F. B.'s motives in asking James to write to him: "thee must read this letter over again, paragraph by paragraph, and warily observe whether thee canst perceive some words of jesting, something that has more than one meaning" (41).

While "Hector St. John" is addressing the abbé Raynal in the "Dedication," the character James--the supposedly simple American farmer--is addressing "Mr. F. B.", who has asked him to provide first-hand information about America. And if Crèvecoeur explores, through the fictional exchange of letters, the relationship between James and Mr. F. B., he is commenting also on his own relationship to Raynal. I believe that Crevecour's dialogue between James and Mr. F. B. is a critique of the historiographic method proposed by

Sir Francis Bacon and of Raynal's *Histoire* as the eighteenth-century culmination of the Baconian project in modern `scientific' historiography.

There have been numerous interpretations of the role of "Mr. F. B." in Crèvecoeur's *Letters*.[23] Specifically, recent readers have wondered about the "`enlightened' European's rather implausible attitude" in needing James as his informant on things American when, obviously, he had himself traveled to America (Chevignard 1984, 184). And while James and his wife are also puzzled by the European's request for letters containing information about America, James's minister, educated at Yale and better familiar with the poetics of Enlightenment historical discourse, finds nothing strange about this request at all. As the minister knows, the refined European could not simply write down his own observations, made during his stay in America, and subsequently call them "History." Unfortunately, things were not that simple in the world of the historian, as the minister was very likely to know from reading Francis Bacon's *The Advancement of Learning* (1605), which had laid down the poetics of the modern Enlightenment historiographic project.

An announcement of nothing less than a thoroughly new method for unlocking the secrets of nature, Bacon's manifesto had established a strict grid of "rules" circumscribing the production of Enlightenment historical discourse. The "first that ever joyned," the author of the

dedication to James I pointed out, "Rationall & Experimental Philosophy in a regular correspondence" (1987, 2), Bacon had called for a "natural history" of mankind departing from the prevailing scholastic, humanist, and oculist models of historiographic discourse. The new historian would no longer survey only the "Records of Antiquity, ... the volumes of men," but also "the volumne of the world" (1987, 2).

Knowledge of these "volumnes of the world" would be attained by means of "objective observation" and a mechanical routine of eliminative "induction," making a gradual ascent from the level of the observably particular to the ever more general level of theory. "We must march," he said, "by line and levell, and all the way, even from the first perception of Senses, ... by a certain Rule, and constant Method of proceeding" (1987, 14). The objective of this method was to "circumvent" man's (potentially erroneous) "Judgements" and to penetrate to the "things themselves, and to the league and confederacy of Things" (1987, 16).

However, the problem with observation was, as Bacon knew, that the "sense either destitutes or deceives us ... for the testimony and information of sense, is ever from the Analogy of Man, and not from the Analogy of the World; and it is an error of dangerous consequence to assert, that sense is the measure of things" (1987, 27-28). And this was precisely the downfall of the European eye-witness accounts in the "woods of Experience" of the Americas. Their

translation of sensual experience into language was distorted by their learning. The `histories' of the prejudiced clerics, untrustworthy creoles, as well as the European travelers' "current fictions and lies, which ... have for many ages bin countenaced and are become inveterate" (1987, 34), were corrupt, their authors' perception clouded by medieval prejudice. While they might have appealed to eye-witness experience in order to lend their never-ending polemicisms authority, they had produced, as Bacon called it, "Experiments of use and not Experiments of Light and Discovery" (1987, 12). It is "no marvaile," he lamented, "if nature hath not disclosed hir selfe." All the natural historian/philosopher had to rely on were "negligent, inequall, and as it were casuall observation" by men who claimed to have `seen'. It was a "vain Tradition and from idle report; ... ignorant, dull, wild, and broken" (1987, 31).

Fundamental to the Baconian historical project was therefore the strict division of intellectual labor. We must "divide," he wrote, "[natural] Philosophy into two parts; the Mine and the Fornace; and make two professions, or occupations of Natural Philosophers; Pyoners or workers in the mine; and Smythes, or refiners" (1987, 140). Whereas the "worker" was to confine him/herself to "the Production of Effects" by "search[ing] the bowels of Nature," the erudite "refiner" would conduct an "Inquisition of Causes" and thus "fashions Nature, as it were, upon the Anvile." These "two

parts, Speculative and Operative," as he called them, must "be separate, both in the intention of the writer, and the body of the Treatise" (1987, 140).

It was, then, the task of the `observer' merely to provide the raw material of data through first-hand eye-witness experience. Not unlike his humanist predecessors, who had called for reform by returning to the "original" text (without the "perversions" of the scholastics), Bacon called for a return to "original" experience, to "pure" experience (without the traveler's "prejudice"). The best observer, therefore, was the observer whose senses were unrefined and unadulterated by book learning, whose language was entirely transparent. No longer would the authority of the historiographic text be guaranteed by the "I" who had seen (the status of the observer, as, for example, in the clerical chroniclers of the Americas). Rather, as in the modern ethnographic professional text, where "authority resides in the absolute effacement of the speaking and experiencing subject' (Pratt 1986, 32), the scientific status of natural history would be guaranteed by the observer's transparency on the one hand and by the scientific `detachment' of a *collector*'s "choice of Reports and Experiments" on the other (1986, 33).

It was this Baconian division of intellectual labor which became the governing method in the primary landmarks of the European production of knowledge about America, such as Samuel Purchas *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas his*

pilgrimes (1625). The American eye-witness accounts collected, abridged, and reprinted there were to serve, Purchas said, as the "material" for the "universal speculators" (i.e. `philosophical' and `natural' historians)

> as David provided material for Solomon's Temple or (if that be too arrogant) as Alexander furnished *Aristotle* with Huntsmen and Observers of Creatures to acquaint him with these diversified kinds and natures; or (if that also seems to ambitious) as Sense by industry of particular yeeldeth the Premises to reason's Syllogistical arguing ... so here *Purchas* and his Pilgrimes minister individual and sensible materials (as it were with Stones, Birches and Mortars) to the universal Speculators for their theoretical structures. (1625, 2)

The testimony of the prejudiced and self-interested Euro-American eye-witnesses would now only be permitted to provide the eye in the collection of raw material for the `scientifically' detached historian's theoretical structures. The eye-witness's judgments, on the other hand, would be effaced, his arguments juxtaposed to that of others, his authority assessed and contextualized by that of the collector. The `speculator' would then interpret, synthesize the sources from the `detached' vantage point of his desk at home and integrate them into theoretical and conjectural models derived from historiographic rhetoric and `truth'. It was this authority of the detached philosopher/historian that the abbé Raynal was constructing when he prefaced his *Histoire philosophique et politique de deux Indes* with the assertion of being entirely "raised above all human concerns" and "disengaged from all passions

and prejudices." From the scientific detachment of his armchair, he had assessed the American eye-witness accounts, "interrogated the living and the dead, ... I have weighed their authority. I have contrasted their testimonies. I have clarified their facts" (1776, 3).

Significantly for our purposes here, Bacon had elaborated the division of labor governing the production of knowledge in metaphors derived from the distinct idioms of agriculture. The report of the eye-witness resembled, he said, "the first milke to the nourishing up of Philosophy" whereas the work of the philosopher/historian was like "the due season of Harvest." Any short-cuts in this division of labor would equal "reap[ing] the green hearb or the blade" (1987, 32). When "J. Hector St. John" addresses the abbé Raynal as a "humble American planter, a simple cultivator of the earth," he therefore ostensibly assumes the role that the Baconian poetics of history have assigned to him: he will be the observer, not the speculator. Both *Letters from an American Farmer* and *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes* thus signify their meta-historical objective by their very title. While the `farmer' is a trope for a specific task in the Baconian division of labor, the trope of the European `blind traveler' in need of a native `guide' refers to the alleged corruption of the Europeans' (and Euro-American's) perception in the apprehension of nature.

However, in the Dedication to Raynal, J. Hector St. John immediately undermines the foundation of this division

of labor in his subsequent reflection on the "secret communion" of all men espoused by Enlightenment doctrine and the "mental affinity connecting them by a similitude of sentiments": "Why," he asks, "though an American, should not I be permitted to share in that extensive intellectual consanguinity? Yes, I do," he asserts, because, despite the fact that he "possesses neither titles nor places," or "rose above the humble rank of a farmer," he is still "a man" (38).

It is very well possible that Crèvecoeur began the notes taken during his life as an American Farmer with the sincere commitment to providing the `raw material' for the European historians whose great works he admired. However, at the time he wrote the dedication and published *Letters from an American Farmer* - after his own first-hand experience of America had contradicted the philosophical speculators - the "sincerity" of his submission to which he professes in the Dedication turned into irony. The letters following the Dedication to Raynal dramatize Crèvecoeur's rebellion against his subordinate position. In the course of *Letters*, he recreates a discursive space for his creole voice which had been effaced by European poetics of history.

Crèvecoeur's satirical voice rings, for example, behind the exclamation of James's wife:

> What! ... James, would'st thee pretend to send epistles to a great European man who hath lived abundance of time in that big house called Cambridge, where, they say, that

> worldly learning is so abundant that people get it only by breathing the air of the place?

Similarly, Crèvecoeur parodies the institutionalized practices governing this division of labor in James's astonished remark "that in the course of your [past] American travels you should not have found out persons more enlightened and better educated than I am" (38). Of course, Mr. F. B. never desired to find an "educated" man while traveling through America. It was precisely James's lack of refinement that made him useful to Mr. F. B. as a cultural informant with (in the words of the minister) a "mind ... what we called at Yale college a *tabula rasa*, where spontaneous and strong impressions are delineated with facility" (46). The minister dispels the farmer's self-consciousness as a worthy correspondent of the "great European man" by reminding him that the rudimentary appearance of his letters, which will seem "like one of our wild American plants," will be "no detriment to them, take my word for it" (he knowingly adds).

James learns his lesson in the Enlightenment poetics of history swiftly. He understands (and immediately assumes) the only role which lends him, a colonial farmer, a voice in the metropolitan poetics of Enlightenment historiography: His supposedly `authentic' (because `unadulterated' by book learning) and transparent language. He thus dramatizes his new authorial self by asserting that he will record only "the spontaneous impressions which each subject may inspire"

(49). He has neither the capacity nor the ambition to become historian but confines himself to his role as the American informant producing nature's `effects': He is "so habituated to draw all my food and pleasure from the surface of the earth," (rather than the depth of `causes'), "which I till that I cannot, nor indeed am I able to, quit it" (90). In compliance to his role as a transparent observer, he vows to report "nothing ... but what lies within the reach of my experience and knowledge" (51). His transparent language will therefore disclose the `volumes of the world' (as Bacon had called it), not the `volumes of man'.

If Crèvecoeur constructs James "as an aspiring New World author, a would-be-man of letters," as Grantland Rice has argued (1993, 97), he begins his career as a sign of transparency and authenticity, as a `self-othering' narrative mask which yields him, "J. Hector St. John," a voice in the discourse of history within the rules of historiographic authorship. James's voice is to resemble that of Montaigne's "Caniballe," whose testimony is to be much preferred to that of the "subtile" travelers. The "Caniballe," Montaigne had written, is

> a simple and rough-hewen fellow: a condition fit to yield a true testimony. For subtile people may indeed marke more curiously, and observe things more exactly, but they amplifie and glose them: and the better to perswade, and make their interpretations of more validitie, they cannot chuse but somewhat alter the storie. They never represent things purely, but fashion and make them according to the visage they saw them in; and to purchase credit to their judgment, and draw you on to beleeve them, they commonly adorn, enlarge, yea, and Hyperbolize the matter. Wherein

> is required either a most sincere Reporter, or a man so simple, that he may have no invention to build upon, and to give a true liklihood unto false devices, and be not wedded to his owne will. (1958, 162-63)

It is the Cannibal's "naked eloquence," as Eric Cheyfitz has observed (1991, 157), which makes him a credible witness for Montaigne. His speech is still "transparent," his words have not yet lost their immediate relationship to things, a relationship which has been perverted in the European by his medieval legacies.

James's unconscious words, then, do not derive, in their primitive eloquence, from a literate mind trained by books; rather their `authenticity' is guaranteed by their orality. They are language merely transcribed on paper and have thus retained the direct and primeval "reference to things," as Bacon had put it, "that the Letters of the Alphabet have to speech and words" (33). "What he requires of you is but simple," the minister therefore instructs James, "what we speak out among ourselves we call conversation, and a letter is only conversation put down in black and white" (44). And the fiction of James's early letters as transcribed oral language is intensified by James's short sentences, broken up by semi-colons, and his paratactical style, which Barabara Stafford has identified as the "preferred mode for achieving an impression of directness ... of description or `demonstration'" in the eighteenth-century "factual travel narrative," which was based on the "ideal of linguistic or representational

transparency and primitive terseness" (1984, 148). His voice, unlike the voices of "several histories" Mr. F. B. may have "read," is the only authentic voice retaining its direct relationship to things. In their transcribed orality, James's letters become the documents of ethnography and natural history - in short, of `science' in Bacon's division of the disciplines.

The (Euro-) American farmer James, then, appropriates the voice not of the Enlightened traveler or the educated creole but of Montaigne's savage cannibals, the `naked eloquence' of the "simple and rough-hewen fellow" which alone authorizes to "yield a true testimony." It is therefore not so much that Crèvecoeur (the author) "wanted to be an *intellectual* savage," as D. H. Lawrence once put it (1961, 38). Rather, Crèvecoeur used the uneducated farmer as "an innocent mouthpiece" which sets up the "ironic interplay between naive actor and knowing narrator that ... is characteristic of many American novels and autobiographies" (Stone 1981, 18-19). Crèvecoeur, however, exploits the possibilities of this narrative mask in order to create a space for himself in the historiographic production of America and, ultimately, as Mary Rucker has noted, to critique Enlightenment theories of man, nature, and America from the vantage point of the colonial's experience (1978, 194).

In accordance with the European literary tradition of the noble savage reaching from Peter Martir to Crèvecoeur's

contemporary Rousseau, James appropriates the cannibal's role as social critic of Europe by invoking the customary contrast between the realities of Europe's corruption and the utopia of the American Golden Age (see Cro, 1990).[24]

However, James transforms the role fashioned for him by the historiographic division of labor rapidly from the cultural informant to the ethnographer himself. In the course of doing so, he breaks, as has been illustrated (see Arch 1990, 145-159), through the various levels of historiographic authorship involved in writing about America, thus deliberately violating the division of labor that constructs its authority. He moves from his role as local cultural informant in the early letters to that of the biographer in his narrative about the immigrant Andrew, and appears as the colonial traveler in his descriptions of John Bartrams' farm. And while in the first letter dealing with Nantucket, "Description of Nantucket," he still establishes authority by referring to the observing "I" (106-107), this "I" recedes into the background in the subsequent letters and he gradually becomes natural historian and ethnographer of Nantucket (see Regis 1992, 114). As the observing `I', as well as the dialogue with the European correspondent, vanishes, the `speculating' historian-philosopher giving shape to his materials takes over. In his descriptions of the Nantucketeers, the act of hunting and killing whales becomes likened, as many critics have observed, not to the violent and primitive `chase' but to the pastoral

occupations of the farmer (see Gilmore 1971, ix; Carew-Miller 1993, 243). And, if he, in Letter XII, applies the *philosophes'* oppositional rhetoric in his social critique of colonial society through his (somewhat uneasy) utopian representation of the Oneida, his narrative becomes thoroughly autobiographical and confessional. Writing in a distinctly `American' tradition, he re-unites the roles of the observer and the speculator in the role of the auto-ethnographer, personified also by the figure of the `colonial scientist' William Bartram, whom he finds, upon his arrival at his farm, returning from his manual work in the field before sitting down at his desk to write, classify, and theorize.

As James emancipates himself as an author in the poetics of eighteenth-century historical discourse, the European authorial voice of Mr. F. B. is gradually displaced in *Letters* and recedes into the background. On the plane of the text's meta-historical commentary, then, the plot of *Letters* is the story of the gradual displacement of Mr. F. B., of "James" becoming the "Hector St. John" who displaces the Abbe Raynal in the "Dedication." For example, like the natural historian questing for the authentic American voice, the transforming fictional author imposes, in his descriptions of Nantucket, all these qualities on the Nantucketeers:

> They have all, from the highest to the lowest, a singular *keenness of judgement, unassisted by any academical light;*

> they all possess a large share of *good sense*, improved upon the *experience* of their father; and this is the surest and best guide to lead us through the path of life, because it approaches *nearest* to the *infallibility* of *instinct* ... university knowledge would ... pervert their plain judgment, it would lead them out of that useful path which is so well adapted to their situation. (142; my italics)

However, Crèvecoeur's metahistorical irony in James's subsequent reflection on "that useful path which is so well adapted to their situation") becomes again apparent in James's discovery of

> several copies of Hudibras and Josephus, but no one knows who first imported them. It is something extraordinary to see this people, professedly so grave and strangers to every branch of literature, reading with pleasure the former work, which should seem to require some degree of taste and antecedent historical knowledge. (165)

Of course, their `professed' lack of refinement was only a wishful fiction that the natural historian had imposed on the American primitives. Perhaps it does not require breathing the air of London after all, the text implies here, to be able to share in the intellectual consanguinity of Europeans. Surely, travelers, "returning from seeing the paintings and antiquities of Rome and Italy," would hardly have imagined that "so contemptible a spot" (which cannot even show for an "ancient amphitheatre") would produce people capable of understanding literature, let alone historical satires such as *Hudibras*.

Thus, the American observer James begins to speculate. He openly debunks the territorialized and determinist theories of Raynal, who had claimed that the American

natural environment and climate are averse to the development of culture. "Famine, disease, elementary convulsions, human feuds, dissensions, etc.," he declares, "are the produce of every climate." And he counters Raynal with the theory that it is the distance from the equator, rather than the proximity to Europe, which determines the nature of human "vices and miseries" (a theory which James also supports with his comparison between Charleston and Lima):

> each climate produces, besides, vices and miseries peculiar to its latitude. Few of the frigid sterility of the north ... the parched lands of the torrid zone, replete with sulphureous exhalations ... the poisonous soil of the equator, at those putrid slimy tracks, teeming with horrid monsters, the enemies of the human race. (175)

The new *philosophe* James employs here the geo-cultural theory proposed by Jean Bodin's *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognintionem* (1566), which had conceptualized the world in different zones from north to south. This division had put the New World and the Old world in an exact parallelism, not in the essential opposition that Raynal and other *philosophes* had drawn between the western and eastern hemisphere (see Gerbi 1973, 35-51).

It is a rhetorical strategy of redeeming the American environment from its supposedly degenerative influences that is frequently used by other colonials, such as William Byrd, in his *History of the Dividing Line*, and also by Carrió de

la Vandera, in his contrast between Peru and Mexico. "Lo cierto es," he has the inspector say in *El lazarillo*,

> que hay países en que se conserva más que en otras partes la robustez del celebro, y asi entre Lima y México hay una gran diferencia. En México, la sequedad y stilidad de los aires y otros influjos, destemplan el celebro y [c]ausan inso[m]nios. Al contrario sucede en Lima, porque sus aires espesos y húmedos fortalecen los celebros, conciliando el sueño, con que dejan las potencias agiles para continuar las tareas de meditación. (219)
>
> [It is a fact that there are countries in which the strength of the brain is preserved longer than in others, and in this matter there is a great difference between Lima and Mexico. In Mexico the lightness and dryness of the air, and other influences, dull the brain and cause insomnia. The opposite is true in Lima, because its heavy and damp air strengthens the brain and induces sleep, thus leaving mental powers nimble for pursuing the tasks of cogitation (292).]

The rhetorical structure of these arguments fulfils an important function in the fabrication of colonial character and identity within the contrastive and comparative hermeneutics of ethnological discourse in European representations of America. (We will return to this issue again in Section Six). However, like James, Concolorcorvo, too, engages not only in the debate surrounding the authority of the travel account vis-a-vis history, but also ironically comments on Enlightenment poetics of history and, in particular, the division of intellectual labor in the production of knowledge about America. In fact, he reverses the hierarchical relationship which relegates the traveler to the subordinate position that both he and James, as colonials, initially profess to accept. The historian, he claims, is utterly dependent on the traveler. "Los viajeros

(aquí entro yo)" ["Travelers (and here I come in)"], he announces,

> respecto de los historiadores, son lo mismo que los lazarillos, en comparación de los ciegos. Estos solicitan siempre unos hábiles zagales para que dirijan sus pasos y les den aquellas noticias precisas para componer sus canciones, con que deleitan al público y aseguran su substancia. Aquéllos, como de superior orden, recogen las memorias de los viajeros más distinguidos en la veracidad y talento. No pretendo yo colocarme en la clase de éstos, porque mis observaciones sólo se han reducido a dar una idea a los caminantes bisoños del Camino Real, desde Buenos Aires a esta capital de Lima.
> [... are, with respect to historians, just as guide boys are to the blind. The latter always solicit skillful youths to direct their steps and to supply them with necessary tidbits for composing the songs with which they entertain the public and assure themselves a living. Historians, of a higher order, collect the memories of travelers most distinguished for their talent and veracity. I make no pretext of placing myself among these because my observations have been reduced to giving to inexperienced travelers an idea of the royal road from Buenos Aires to this capital, Lima.] (19/50)

The parallelism of traveler/guide and historian/blind is a rhetorical strategy distinctive of `creole' (post) colonial writing, for the native guide generally inhabits, of course, a curiously ambivalent space in the European `discovery' narrative. As Chris Tiffin and Alan Lawson have observed in their analysis of English representations of the first climbing of Chomolungma (Mt. Everest), the European can discovery a place only if it is not already known, so the native guide must "know and yet not know." This paradox is resolved in "textualizing the event by rendering the guide's knowledge pragmatic rather than conceptual and strategic. The guide has the practical knowledge ... but not he

conceptual knowledge to see its `true' significance" (Tiffin and Lawson 1994, 3). The `settler' colonial Carrió, like Crèvecoeur, satirizes here the effacement of the observing "I" from the production of the European historiographic text about America by claiming primary importance for the observer, who is at once native guide and European traveler.

Thus, whereas the European encounter with the New World of America had challenged the ruling epistemologies through the emergence of the authority of the American eye-witness account, the Baconian project of history had formalised the silencing of this authority as part of a general attempt to prevent the dispersion of historiographic authority. Whereas the Baconian poetics of history had centralized historiographic authority in the metropolis during the period of consolidation of the European empires in America, both (post-) colonial American writers parody, and break through, the conventions of the Enlightenment poetics of natural history in order to authorize themselves as a voice in the debates about America.

5. THE FICTION OF AUTHENTICITY DEFICTIONALIZED

In both narratives, meta-historical satire is thus channeled through the dialogue between the personification of the principal agents involved in the production of Enlightened historical discourse - the observer and the speculator. The American narrators serve as authentic `informants' (as "guides") substituting for the European traveler's

experience, whose eyes have been rendered "blind" by Enlightenment poetics of history. Their role is confined to that of the colonial oral `informant' for the European literate historian. In the course of their works, however, both Carrió and Crèvecoeur disrupt the fiction of authenticity by hybridizing the voice of the oral informant with the voice of the creole intelligentsia.

Initially, Concolorcorvo, like James, fills his slot as an allegedly `authentic' observer in the division of labor governing the production of Enlightenment history. Not only is the writing of the history of America, which lacks Europe's "roídos pergaminos, carcomidos papeles, inscripciones sepulcrales, pirámides, estatuas, medallas y monedas" ["worn parchments and moth-eaten papers, sepulchral inscriptions, pyramids, statues, medals and coins"], especially dependent on the travel account providing observation (17/47). But even more importantly, the *mestizo* Concolorcorvo appeals to his identity as an "indio neto" ["Indian pure and proud"] not only in order to highlight his supposedly superior perceptive abilities as they were (13/41), in James's words, "much more closely connected with Nature than we are" (215). And, like the Inca Humanist Garcilaso de la Vega (to whom there are several references in the text), Concolorcorvo appeals to his (presumed) advantage both over the European historian and the European traveler because of his linguistic access to indigenous `texts', such as the Peruvian "quipus, o nudos de varios

colores, los jeroglíficos o pinturas de los mexicanos, la tradición de unos y otros, vertida en cuentos y cantares y otros monumentos" ["*quipus*, or multicolored knots, the Mexican hieroglyphics or paintings, and the oral traditions of one or another peoples, translated into stories, songs, and other memorials"] (17/47). The European documents of history, he argues, "no merecen más crédito" [are not any more "worthy of merit"] because of their greater age than the American ones (as some had argued) for "así como no estorban las barbas para llorar, no impiden las canas para mentir" ["just as a beard does not prevent one from weeping, neither do white hairs keep him from lying"] (17/47).

Of course, the degree of historio-poetical awareness apparent throughout the self-dramatizations of the "Indian" Concolorcorvo as well as the farmer James as an "authentic" voice belie their very credibility and suggest the interference of another voice. When James, for example, asserts his complete ignorance of "scientific rules" and says that the "only line I am able to follow [is] the line which Nature has herself traced for me" (49), his very use of the idioms of historical poetics contradict his professed ignorance of their "scientific rules." In both narratives, this interference of another voice works to the effect of undermining the authenticity of the narrator's `naked eloquence' altogether and makes the ironical creole voice of both authors audible.

In *Letters*, it often seems that James is either

parroting what he has been told by the book-learned minister, as Stephen Arch has suggested (1990, 147), or that the transcription of his voice was manipulated by an editor, perhaps the anonymous author of the "Advertisements to the First Edition, 1782," who claims that the letters were "the actual result of a private correspondence" and contain "authentic information" about America recorded by an "eye-witness." The claim of James's authenticity is, then, as Robert Lawson-Pebbles has observed, a "complex fiction" of authorship, which "manipulates personae and carefully arranges the individual letters" (1988, 103).[25] However, this fiction, unlike supposedly more `refined' European novels, is always apparent as such in both (post-) colonial texts. While employing the authentic voice of the simple American farmer on the one hand, Crèvecoeur ridicules the European's historian's quest for the authentic transparent American voice when he undermines the reliability of James as the narrator in his Rousseauean day-dreams. When, for example, he feels compelled, in his letter to F. B., to enumerate the reasons why exactly he "prefer[s] that [Indian] life for which we entertain such dreadful opinions" James confesses, after being able to list only two, that "I have forgot" the many other reasons for arguing as he does (214). This suggests that his voice is a text, too, and that the authentic American voice does not exist exept in the European historian's imagination.

Equally, Carrió de la Vandera undermines the

authenticity and credibility of his narrative persona Concolorcorvo. The mestizo's appeal to his identity as an authentic "Indian" is, of course, suspect from the beginning. And the experienced inspector, too, does not buy it: "Dejomos lo neto para que lo declare la madre que lo parió" ["Let's leave off this pure business until the mother who gave birth to you declares it"], he tells him (167/237). Carrió warns the reader about his narrative persona's sincerity when he has Concolorcorvo, the *mestizo* himself, say: "Cuidado con mestizos de leche, que son peores que los gitanos aunque por distinto rumbo. Yo soy indo neto, salvo las trampas de mi madre, de que no salgo por fiador" ["Be careful of tricky mestizos, for they are worse than gypsies, although in a different way. I am an Indian pure and proud, except for the malpractices of my mother, for which I do not stand security"] (13/40-41). And, he often infuses a racialized color symbolism in his association of mixture with deceit, when he says, for example, "En todo hay trampa menos en la leche, que le echan agua, y alguna veces se halla un bagrecillo que la manifiesta" ["There is something deceitful in everything except milk, and even into that water may be poured; and sometimes a fish is found to prove it"] (158/225).

Concolorcorvo's authenticity is also ridiculed by an ostensibly false bibliographic information identifying the published text of *El lazarillo*: the place of publication is supposedly Gijón (the real author Carrió de la Vandera's

birthplace in Spain), the publishing house is called "Imprenta de la Rovada" [Press of her that was robbed] - both referring to the "Indian" Concolorcorvo's usurpation of the creole's textual offspring. Moreover, Concolorcorvo obviously parrots what he had read in other historical books, such as that of the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega's *Comentarios reales*.[26] When, for example, Concolorcorvo, upon reaching the old Inca metropolis of Cuzco, finds that "all the streets built by my forefathers were probably similar to these, just as were those of all the other nations of the ancient world," he echoes the Renaissance universalist descriptions of the city by the Inca humanist. Equally, in his remark that the "criollos naturales decimos Cozco. Ignoro si la corruptela será nuestra o de los españoles" ["we creoles who are natives of this city call it Cozco. I do not know whether the variation in this word is a thing of our own doing or the work of the Spaniards"] he echoes the Inca's etymological discourse on the origin of the word "Peru," which was, the Inca argues, a Spanish corruption of a *Quechua* word (143/203).

Of course, these references to the Inca Garcilaso must not be mistaken as an early manifestion of creole *indigenism* (as would later emerge during the Independence movements). Carrió, who wrote his narrative in the context of the Indian uprising of Tupac Amaru against the colonial regime, frequently uses Concolorcorvo precisely in order to parody European images of the noble savage, as well as indigenous

attempts to cultivate an Inca mystique fashioned after Garcilaso's portrayals of Peru's past in order to arouse political sympathies at the Bourbon court and on the international scene. The fact that the references to Garcilaso are put into Concolorcorvo's mouth illustrates therefore that *El lazarillo* is not only a "parody of this distinguished mestizo writer's work," as Julie Greer Johnson has observed (1993, 119), but also a parody of contemporary appropriations of Garcilaso in the idealizations of the Inca image by Indian rebels as well as by Las Casas's Enlightenment children, such as Jean Francois Marmontel in his popular *Les Incas, ou La destruction de l'empire du Perou* (1777).

The reader gradually learns that Concolorcorvo's voice is not entirely transparent after all, that his discourses are indebted to the `volumes of men', and that they are even driven by pecuniary interests. Like the "Dos primas mías collas [quien] conservan la virginidad a su pesar en un convento del Cuzco, en donde las mantiene el rey nuestro señor" ["Two cousins of mine [who] are preserving their virginity, to their sorrow, in a convent in Cuzco, where the King our lord supports them"], Concolorcorvo informs the inspector, "me hallo en ánimo de pretender la plaza de perrero de la catedral del Cuzco, para gozar inmunidad eclesiástica, y para lo que me servirá de mucho mérito el haber escrito este itinerario" [I have in mind to try for the post of beadle of the Cuzco cathedral in order to enjoy

ecclesiastical immunity and my having written this itinerary will serve me well in this"] (13/41). Like Pineda's Indian convert, who brought his dog to be baptized in order to get some more trinkets from the missionary, Concolorcorvo is simply a *mestizo* con-man playing his assigned role in the poetics of colonialism in order to gain material favors in return.[27]

The text therefore constantly disrupts the fiction of Concolorcorvo's authorship and thus draws attention to the distinction between the (rather foolish) narrator/character of Concolorcorvo and the (satirical) author Carrió de la Vandera. The half-audible presence of Carrió's satirical voice beneath the *mestizo*'s word renders the final interpretation of American history in *El lazarillo* "purely colonial" and represents, as Marcel Bataillon has pointed out, the very "antipodes of indigenism" (1960, 211). Like Crèvecoeur, who adopts the narrative mask of Farmer James, Carrió adopts the mask of Concolorcorvo as a "trap," as Evaristo Penha has noted, into which more than one critic has fallen (1986, 18).

Not only does Concolorcorvo's supposedly authentic voice turn out to be motivated like that of `prejudiced' Europeans, but also, like the farmer James's observations, his testimonies turn out to be nothing more than parroted phrases, instilled in him by Europeans who had a distinct interest for having the voice of nature prove their theories. Although he supposedly wrote his itinerary "en

Dios y en conciencia" ["in the eyes of God and of my conscience"], he admits that

> lo formé con ayuda de vecinos que a ratos ociosos me soplaban a la oreja, y cierto fraile de San Juan de Dios, que me encajó la introducción y latines, tengo a lo menos mucha parte en haber perifraseado lo que me decía el visitador en pocas palabras. Imitando el estilo de éste, mezclé algunas jocosidades para entretenimiento de los caminantes, para quines particularmente escribí.
> [I wrote it with the help of the neighbors who whispered in my ear in idle moments, and of a certain friar of San Juan de dios who inserted the introductory remarks and the Latin phrases, at least I had a large part in having paraphrased what the inspector said to me in a few words. Imitating his style, I included some jocularity for the diversion of the travelers for whom I wrote it in particular.] (13/40)

His supposedly `authentic' observations thus turn out to be parroted phrases borrowed from prejudiced priests. In order to satirize the claim to authenticity in Concolorcorvo's Indian voice, Carrió also has him frequently make ridiculous mistakes when repeating commonly known historical facts. When for example, Concolorcorvo instructs the reader that "que luego que los españoles saltaron en las tierras del Virú, supieron que se hallaba en Cajamarca ... Cápac" ["as soon as the Spaniards set foot in the lands of Virú, they learned that there was in Caxamarca Manco Capac"], he does not only mean to say Atahualpa, but seems to be unaware of the damaging implications to his own identity politics when continuing that this man was a "un ascendiente mío bastardo, que se había levantado con la mitad del Perú, y que pretendía destronar a su hermano, legítimo emperador" ["bastard ancestor of mine, who had revolted with half of

Peru at his side, in an effort to dethrone his brother, the rightful emperor"] (148/211). In Concolorcorvo's version of Inca history, then, Manco Capac, Garcilaso's Incan hero, becomes a "hombre de mala fe(e)" ["man of bad faith"] and a "traidor y aleve" ["perfidious traitor"] (148/212).

Furthermore, his itinerary was, the reader learns, edited and cut by the inspector - the representative of the metropolitan imperial order in America. "Me hago cargo" ["I realize"], he says,

> de que lo substancial de mi itinerario se podía reducir a cien hojas de octavo. En menos de la cuarta parte le extractó el visitador, como se puede ver de mi letra en el borrador que para en su poder, pero este género de relaciones sucintas no instruyen el público, que no ha visto aquellos dilatados países, en que es preciso darse por entendido de lo que en si contienen, sin faltar a la verdad. (13-14)
> [that the essence of my itinerary could be reduced to 100 pages in octavo. The inspector cut it to less than one quarter of the present length, as can be seen from my writing in the rough draft, which I have in my possession, but this kind of short narrative does not instruct the public who have not seen these vast countries, and it is necessary to give attention to what is contained therein, without violating the truth. (40-41)]

The inspector acts, like the *philososphe* historian or the collector Samuel Purchas, as the ultimate source for authorizing the text, while using the `authentic' voice of the primitive observer. And while Norman Grabo has suggested that *Letters* initiates an "American tradition of book as Anthology and authorship as editing" of an authentic American voice (1991, 167), this could also be said of *El lazarillo*, which equally draws attention to the process of

editing that has shaped the final publication. The `noble savage' says, Carrió implies with this meta-narratological irony, what you want him to say - as long as you pay him. But in fact, he is just a foolish parrot, imagined by the philosophes to reveal truth and the secrets of nature when speaking. "Hágame Vm. el gusto" ["Do me the pleasure"], he has Concolorcorvo ask the inspector, "de decirme alguna cosa sobre las virtudes, calidades y circunstancias de los indios" ["of telling me something of the virtue, character, and circumstances of the Indians"]. But the inspector only sarcastically responds: "Eso mejor lo puede Vm. saber, señor Inca, retratando su interior e inclinaciones; pero porque no se ponga Vm. pálido, ya que no puede rubicundo" ["You could divulge this better, Señor Inca, depicting your inner state and inclinations, but not in a way that would cause you to turn pale (since you cannot blush!)"] (164/232).

Furthermore the *gachupín* (European) inspector's influence on Concolorcorvo's voice is often blatantly visible in the *mestizo*'s discourse. Without seeming to notice the ramifications for his own (indian) identity politics, Concolorcorvo obviously attempts to please the inspector when criticizing European promoters of the legendary noble savage and of the *leyenda negra*. European historians produce their authoritative "historias generales" ["General Histories"] of America, frequently based on false travel accounts written by anti-Spanish Frenchmen and ignoring the American writers. "Así como los monsiures se

jactan del honor de us idioma, por ser el que más se extendió en este siglo en toda la Europa, y se escribieron en él tantas obras excelentes" ["Just as the *monsieurs* boast of the honor of their language, since it is the one of most extensive use in this century in all Europe with so many excellent works being written in it"]. He refers here, of course, specifically to the French *philosophes* such as Raynal, who had disparaged the Spanish empire in America at length and whose *Histoire* was received with outrage in Spanish America (see Ventura 1991). These historians, he argues, should be aware of the

> agravio que hacen a los españoles los viajeros que, en su idioma, pretenden denigrar a unos vecinos tan inmediatos como los españoles, ... pero estos monsiures, o sean milords o ilustrísimos, a la francesa, inglesa o italiana, sólo piensan en abatir a los españoles, publicando primeramente en sus brochuras, que pasan después a sus historias generales, ignorancias y defectos que cuasi hacen creer a los españoles poco advertidos, y dar motivo a los sabios a un concepto injusto por falta de práctica de los ingenios americanos, que generalmente están reducidos a sus libros y particulares meditaciones. (155) [wrong done to Spaniards by travelers who try, in their language, to defame such immediate neighbors as the Spaniards ... but these *monsieurs*, milords or illustrious Frenchmen, Englishmen, and Italians think only of debasing the Spaniards, publishing from in their pamphlets (which afterward become general history) follies and faults which are almost convincing to Spaniards of little intelligence, and give wise men an unjust concept, due to the lack of acquaintance with creative Americans who are usually occupied with their books and private meditations. (220)]

The conquerors, he asserts, were "injustamente ... perseguidos de propios y extraños" ["unjustly persecuted by strangers as well as by their confreres"]. And with a reference to Las Casas he continues, "A los primeros no

quiero llamralos envidiosos, sino imprudentes, en haber declamado tanto contra unas tiranías que, en la realidad eran imaginarias, dando lugar a los envidiosos extranjeros para que todo el mudno se horrorice de su crueldad" ["I do not wish to call the latter envious, but rather indiscreet for having declaimed so loudly against tyranny which was really only imagined, giving rise to the stories of begrudging outsiders who soon caused the whole world to be horrified at the cruelty of the Spaniards" (145/206)]. And with a reference to one particular of these "estranjeros," namely Rousseau, he writes: "quisiera preguntar yo a este crítico naturalista por qué influjo se convirtieron estos hombres feroces en tan humanos" ["I would like to inquire of this nature-loving critic by what influence were these ferocious men converted into the humble creatures such as those he describes"] (146/208).

Thus, Carrió de la Vandera's own creole satirical voice often breaks through the narrative mask of Concolorcorvo's discourse. Some of Carrió's readers have argued that he adopts this mask in order to engage in controversial subjects while yet evading possible repercussions to the publication of the text.[28] And surely, these sensitive matters are put into the mouth of Concolorcorvo to render the entire historical debate ambivalent and more ridiculous than serious. "Iba a insertar ... en compendio, todo lo sustencial sobre las conquistas de los españoles en las Américas" ["I was going to insert here, in summary form, all

the essential facts about the Spanish conquest of the Americas"], announces a self-confident Concolorcorvo aspiring to the grandeur of the famous American chronicles such as Oviedo's *Sumario de la natural historia de las Indias* or Las Casas's *Apologética historia sumaria*,

> pero el visitador que tenía ya conocido mi genio difuso me atajó más de setecientos pliegos que había escrito en defensa de los españoles y honor de los indios cuzqueños, por parecer asunto impertinente a un diarista. (146) [but the inspector, who knew my inclination to be profuse, cut out more than 700 pages which I had written defending the Spaniards and honoring the Indians of Cuzco since he deemed these matters inappropriate for a journalist. (209)]

The playful dialogue between the European inspector and the American mestizo creates, as Ivette Malverde Disselkoen has argued, a "heterogeneous discourse," a "hybridism which generates a liberating and restraining discourse at the same time" (1992, 127-28). However, the narrative hardly produces "a hierarchical inversion" which "gives voice to marginalized perspectives" of the Indian and "makes room for his [the Indian's] discourse" (1992, 128). In fact, Carrió's satire, which always contextualizes Concolorcorvo's voice, renders his narrative less agreeable to our political and cultural sensibilities. But Carrió's foremost interest in writing his narrative was not political, as Evaristo Penha and others have argued,[29] but rather meta-historical and literary. In the fashion of a Mennippean satire (see Johnson 1993, 120), the narrative leaves, in the end, no clear authoritative historical voice at all and parodies the

production of history at all levels.

Similarly, by ostensibly accepting, behind the narrative mask of James, the role of an informant assigned to him by historians such as Raynal, Crèvecoeur creates for himself an entry into historiographic discourse. It is, of course, indicative of the differences between the Spanish American and the British American colonial social realities, as well as imperial ideologies, that Crèvecoeur--despite his Indians being supposedly `closer to nature'--does not choose an Indian character for his narrative `native' mask, like Carrió's `Con-color-corvo', who, as a *mestizo,* is at or near the bottom of the rigidly defined caste system of Spanish American colonial society but nevertheless an integral part of it. Also, Carrió was, of course, not an Indian or even a *mestizo* and rather openly ridicules the perceptive powers attributed to the `other'; Crèvecoeur was indeed "an American Farmer" although he also parodies, somewhat more subtly, European primitivist assumptions about him. However, both (post) colonial texts similarly speak with a ventriloquist voice that hybridizes the unconscious `native's' naked eloquence with the conscious voice of the Euro-American colonial intelligentsia. But by gradually breaking through the fiction, he subsequently subverts the rules of historiographic authorship and the confines of prescribed divisions of labor and thus creates for himself an authorial space which closes the schisms between the observer and the historian that Enlightenment poetics of

history would separate. In this regard, both Euro-American (post-) colonial writers Crèvecoeur and Carrió thus resemble the twentieth-century postcolonial `native intelligentsias' who turned to a deconstruction of ethnographic authority after their ancestors had been displaced as a subjectivity from the ethnographic text by the professional anthropologist, contemptuous of the "privileged informant" (Clifford 1983, 144).[30]

6. UTOPIA AND COUNTER-UTOPIA: FRONTIER, IDENTITY, AND `AUTO-ETHNOGRAPHY

A comparison of *El lazarillo* and *Letters from an American Farmer* would not be complete without a discussion of that aspect which has made both texts (somewhat anachronistically) most famous in their respective American literary histories: the portrayal of an `American character' and its relation to the frontier. More than in any other aspect of Crèvecoeur's and Carrió de la Vandera's texts, the vast differences between the agrarian values of British American culture and the urban values of Spanish American culture are apparent in their respective portrayal of the frontier. Similarly for both colonial writers, however, the frontier represents a threat to the order of the values they idealize. Moreover, both create, in their invocations of images of frontier disorder, a distinctly counter-utopian vision of America which sharply counterpoints the European projection of Golden Age utopias unto American realities

and, thus, parody European hermeneutic strategies of translating the American experience in terms of Europe's Self and Other.

In British and Spanish America alike, the frontier was conceived in terms of colonialist dualisims and essentialisms. At times, frontier life was imagined to be an Edenic existence, subject to the benevolent powers of nature. But, still during the eighteenth century, it was also perceived to be subject to the allegedly degenerative influences prevailing on the imperial margins--the reversion to a semi-barbaric life in the "wilderness."[31] The wilderness and paradise themes often merge into a picture of a frontier life part European, part Indian, independent, indolent, and plentiful. Thus, the frontier character--the *gaucho* (or "gauderio") in *El lazarillo* and the `backwood settler' in *Letters from an American Farmer*--is not at all the ideal personification of a national character that he will come to represent in the later (post) Romantic literary re-inventions of the frontier during the nineteenth century. The European "generalized allusions to the contrast between country and town" became, as one critic has observed, transposed on the "difference between American and European culture, a complex variation of the grand Nature-Art antithesis" (Marx 1964, 114).

Colonial character was, in the eighteenth-century imagination, determined by the tensions of its geo-cultural location between the extreme semiotic spaces of "European"

order and "American" disorder. It is precisely into the space in-between "Europe" and "America," between `culture' and `nature', that the Enlightenment historians, disillusioned with established European orders, had projected their social utopias. Crèvecoeur's ideal America, too, is neither a transplanted Europe nor an absolute `America' but a space that fuses the characteristics of both. His ideal society is adjacent, on one side, to `Europe' with its old world orders and moral values but also with its corruptions, its overpopulation, social inequalities, and poverty; on the other side, it is adjacent to `America', with its vast emptiness and promises of freedom and renewal but also with its specters of barbaric nakedness and threatening disorder.[32]

It is, as Robert Lawson-Peebles has observed, an uneasy balance that defines this "middle landscape" (1988, 103), and colonials were self-conscious of its ill-defined limits. In *Letters from an American Farmer*, colonial society's proximity to the absolute state of nature leads, on the one hand, to the highest degree of individual virtue in European immigrants like Andrew the Hebridean (and James himself, of course). On the other hand, colonials are also strangely self-conscious about the proximity of an anarchic American wilderness, associated with images of Native Americans and other peoples that have degenerated into `unnatural' sins and violations against Natural Law. When the new free-holder Andrew, for example, purchases his first horse, James

marvels at the significance of this event which seems to be demonstrating the success of the American experiment in private property, self-sufficiency, and freedom. But then James suddenly swallows his words when pondering whether Andrew had ever "before mounted such a beast"--"I did not choose to ask him that question," he curiously remarks "for fear it might suggest some mortifying ideas" (98)--evoking the specter of bestiality that had haunted colonial identity since William Bradford's famous account of the execution of that most unfortunate cow in *Of Plymouth Plantation*.

The fluidity of the border defining Crèvecoeur's ideal landscape against these dangers is epitomized by the possibility of transcending it both physically and biologically. Thus, in both narratives, there is little enthusiasm for Diderot's utopian fantasies that the problems of slavery and oppression plaguing the European colonies in the Americas could be solved by a mixture of the races. Men and women, Diderot had announced in Raynal's *Histoire*, should be sent to America, and "through consanguinity the foreigners and the natives of the place would have made a single and common family." Only then, he continued, America would need "no weapons, no soldiers, only large numbers of many your women for the men, and many young men for the women" (1776, V:4-5). In Letter XII, James initially echoes the *philosophe's* primitivist utopian dream in his portrayal of the Native Americans as living "Without laws" which makes them "in many instances superior to us; ... They most

certainly are much more closely connected with Nature than we are; they are her immediate children" (215). He devises the narration of his plans to live with the Indians as a confessional apologia in the tradition of the Rousseauean individual driven to `go native' by the corruptions of civilized society.

Unlike Rousseau, however, who fantasized about primitive life while sitting in his woods outside Versailles, Crèvecoeur's James cannot help but feel - despite all his "respect [for] the simple, the inoffensive society of these people" - the "strongest prejudices [which] would make me abhor any alliance with them in blood, disagreeable, no doubt to Nature's intentions, which have strongly divided us by so many indelible characters" (221). During his planned stay with the Indians, James will not go native, but build a bulwark against "the danger of Indian education" threatening his children--by "redoubl[ing] my attention" for religious orthodoxy and an insistence on an agricultural mode of living. "As long as we keep ourselves busy in tilling the earth," he believes, "there is no fear of any of us becoming wild" (219-223).

Similarly, Carrió not only ridicules European images of utopias inhabited by noble savages - in his descriptions of the pampa Indians, for example, who are "sumamente inclinados al execrable pecado nefando" ["highly inclined to the execrable natural sin"] (32/67) - but also frowns upon the realities of *mestizaje* in colonial society - about

"estos, que por tales [españoles] se tienen, aunque con más mezclas que el chololate" ["these settlers, who consider themselves Spaniards, although they have a mixture greater than chocolate"] (114/172). Both texts thus display, as Karen Stolley has observed for *El lazarillo*, a "great preoccupation with the hues of *mestizaje*" and herein resemble many other texts written by creole colonials (1992, 2). But even worse for Carrió than the darkening of skincolor in colonial society is the corruption of the purity of the Castilian language through Indianization. Since the *mestizo* offspring of the colonial encounter was "al cuidado de las madres o amas indias, salieron los mesticillos hablando el idioma de ellas" ["always in the care of their Indian mothers or maids the *mestizo* children grew up speaking their language"], the inspector laments. And "como a Vm.," he scolds Concolorcorvo, "a quien no pude sacar de los cascos el que deje de pronunciar y escribir *llovia* y *lluver*, con otros infinitos" ["this is the case with your into whose skull I have not been able to drive the idea that you should stop pronouncing and writing *llovía* and *lluver*, and an infinite number of other errors"]. "No es mucho esto," Concolorcorvo protests, "porque yo soy indio neto" ["This is nothing, because I am a pure Indian"] - implying that this pronunciation is due to his `natural' innocence and ignorance. But the scornful inspector counters:

> Vm. tuvo la misma crianza fuera de casa que el resto de los españoles comunes serranos, y siempre sirvío a europeos y no lee otros libros que los que están escritos en castellano, y aunque ve con sus ojos escritos *lluvia* y *llover* siempre lo dice al contrario. (167)
> [you had the same upbringing outside the home as the rest of the common Spanish highlanders, and you always served Europe and read only books written in Castilian; yet even though with your eyes you see it written *lluvía* and *llover*, you always say just the opposite. (237)][33]

Again, the difference between *Letters* and *El lazarillo* with regard to attitudes toward the infiltration of colonial society by American `primitive' elements reflect the vast difference in social realities between British and Spanish America.[34] Whereas for Crèvecoeur, *mestizaje* is a troubling specter which has to be avoided by `re-doubling' one's commitment to purity, for Carrió it is a sign that the chaos has arrived and that the world has permanently been turned upside-down. Both Crèvecoeur and Carrió, however, find equally little romanticism in cultural or racial *mestizaje.* For both, `America' was too close to home. If you "recede still farther from the sea," James tells Mr. F. B., "you will arrive "near the great woods." Society there "does not afford a very pleasing spectacle," James finds, as it seems to have been thoroughly `Americanized' by "the unlimited freedom of the woods" (77). Many Europeans, who have immigrated to escape oppression, live there, "remote from the power of example and check of shame" (75), in "discord, want of unity and friendship, ... drunkenness or idleness prevail in such remote districts, contention, inactivity,

and wretchedness" (72). In short, it is a Hobbesian chaos where a "mongrel breed, half civilized, half savage," lives (77)

> in a perfect state of war; that of man against man, sometimes decided by blows, sometimes by means of the law; that of man against every wild inhabitant of these venerable woods, of which they are come to dispossess them. There men appear to be no better than carnivorous animals of a superior rank, living on the flesh of wild animals when they can catch them, and when they are not able, they subsist on grain. (72)

Similarly, Carrió's portrayal of the white or, more typically, *mestizo* "gauderios" inhabiting the region is tinted by the idioms of `Americanism'. Like Pineda's *mapuche* Indians, the gauderios, who are typically "nacidos en Montevideo y en los vecinos pagos" ["born in Montevideo and the neighboring districts"] before heading for the frontier (22/54), are prone to a `Indian-style' nomadic lifestyle. Dressed in "mala camisa y peor vestido procuran encubrir con uno o dos ponchos, de que hacen cama con los sudaderos del caballo, sirviéndoles de almohada la silla" ["ragged underclothes and worse outer garments, they try to cover themselves with one or two ponchos, from which, along with the saddlecloth of their horses, they make a bed, with the saddle serving as a pillow"] (22/54). Like the Indians, the frontier *gauderios* are known for their excessively wasteful and disorderly *fiestas*. During these excesses, they

> hacen de una guitarrita, que aprenden a tocar muy mal y a cantar desentonadamente varias coplas, que estropean, y muchas que sacan de su cabeza, que regularmente ruedan sobre amores. Se pasean a su arbritrio por toda la campaña y, con notable complacencia de aquellos semibárbaros colonos, comen a su costa y pasan las semanas enteras

> tendidos sobre un cuero, cantando y tocando. (22)
> [sing, out of tune to the accompaniment of a guitar, which they learn to play very badly, ... many ballads which they ruin, and many which they get out of their own heads, usually treating of love. They wonder over the countryside at their will, and to the great pleasure of the semi-civilized settlers, they eat at the latter's expense and spend entire weeks stretched out on a hide, singing and playing. (54)]

Some critics have read Carrió's *Lazarillo* as a precursor of "a kind of manifesto of the nineteenth-century nation state" (Soons 1979, 93) and even as an early example of the romanticist *gaucho* novel. Similarly, North American critics have read Crèvecoeur's *Letters* as a precursor of nineteenth-century romantizations of the frontier, culminating in Frederick Jackson's `frontier thesis'. But, while surely many of the topoi are present in both writers, they evaluated the characteristics that would later define nationalist myths with great ambivalence. In Crèvecoeur's case, it is thus not, as more recent critics have argued, "Nature" which is idealized; rather Crèvecoeur "admires improved nature, a landscape that is a made thing, a fusion of work and spontaneous process" (Marx 1964, 112).[35] While both Carrió de la Vandera and Crèvecoeur "anticipate ... the characteristic themes of creole narrative" (Pupo Walker 1982, 186) - the gaucho and the frontiersman respectively - both still portray what would become the romantic (however always ambivalent) heroes of the nineteenth century through the lenses of eighteenth-century `policed'--as the French had it aptly—Enlightenment world view.[36]

Carrió's descriptions of the American frontier, for

example, oscillate between images of cannibalistic monstrosities, horrific laziness and waste on the one hand and the spontaneous carelessness and delightfulness of life in the land of plenty on the other. "Muchas veces," he reports,

> se juntan de éstos, cuatro o cinco y a veces más, con pretexto de ir al campo a divertirse, no llevando más prevención para su mantenimiento que el lazo, bolas y un cuchillo. Se convienen un día para comer la picana de una vaca o un novillo: le lazan, derriban, y, bien trincado de pies y manos, le sacan cuasi vivo toda la rabadilla con su cuero, y, haciéndole unas picaduras por el lado de la carne, la asan mal, y medio cruda se la comen, sin más aderezo que un poco de sal, si la llevan por contingencia. Otras veces matan sólo una vaca o novillo por comer el matahambre, que es la carne que tiene la res entre las costillas y el pellejo. Otras veces matan solamente por comer una lengua, que asan en el rescoldo. Otras se les antojan carcúes, que son los huesos que tienen tuétano, los descarnan bien, y los ponen punta arriba en el fuego, hasta que den un hervorcillos y se liquide bien el tuétano que revuelven con un palito, y se alimentan de aquella admirable sustancia; pero lo más prodigioso es verlos matar una vaca, sacarle el mondongo y todo el sebo, que juntan en el vientre, y con una sola brasa de fuego o un trozo de estiércol seco de las vacas prenden fuego a aquel sebo y, luego que empieza a arder y comunicarse a la carne gorda y huesos, forma una extraordinaria ilumincación, y así vuelven a unir el vientre de la vaca, dejando que respire el fuego por la bocca y orificio ... (22-23)
> [Frequently four or five, ... taking no provisions for their sustenance other than a lasso, bolas, and a knife ... agree to eat the rump of a cow or a calf; they lasso it, throw it down, and with its four feet securely tied, they pull from it, almost alive, the entire rear quarter with its hide, and making a few punctures in the side of the meat, they roast it badly and devour it half raw .... Other times they kill a cow or a calf merely to eat the *matambre* the meat between the ribs and the skin. Sometimes they kill only to eat the tongue which they roast in embers. Another time they may take a fancy to the *caracuces*, the bones containing the marrow, which they turn over an over with a small stick, and they feast upon that delightful substance; but the greatest monstrosity is to see them kill a cow, extract the tripe and all the fat which they pile together in the belly, and the merely alive coal or a piece of dry cow dung they set fire to that fat; as soon as it begins to burn and the fire

> spreads to the fat meat and bones, it produces an extraordinary illumination, and then they close up their belly again, allowing the animal to breathe fire through its mouth and nostrils. (55-57)]

Unlike *Letters*, however, in which Crèvecoeur had idealized the pastoral farm community as the breeding ground for his famous "new race of men" of American rural free-holders (69), there is no such a `middle landscape' or `garden' in *El lazarillo*. For Carrió, firmly entrenched a strong tradition of urban values so distinct of Hispanic culture,[37] the ideal social order can only exist in a quasi-European city. There is, in *El lazarillo*, only the city and the wilderness.

Carrió therefore parodies European representational strategies in depicting America in terms of lost pastorals. "Muy poco sabía Virgilio" ["Vergil knew very little"], he has Concolorcorvo say in reference to one of the most frequently evoked ancient writers in European writing about America,

> de problemas cuando propuso ...[que] no habrá quebradas honas y estrechas, que son tan comunes en toda la América; pero supongamos que no las hay, o que fuese una sola de que tuvo noticia. Es posible que no había elevadas chimeneas? A fe que si yo fuera su pastorcillo me reiría bastante de su pregunta, aunque le consta a V [m.] muy bien que los indios apenas nos reímos tres veces en la vida. (193-94)
> about problems when he proposed ... that there were no deep and narrow ravines such as are common in all of America. But let us suppose that there are none, or that there was just one from which he got his information. Is it possible that there are no high chimneys? If I were his little shepherd, I would certainly laugh considerably at his question, although you should know very well that we Indians laugh scarcely three times in our lives. (269)]

In Concolorcorvo's reference to Virgil's pastoral as well as to the alleged `stoicism' of the Indians, Carrió again satirizes European ethnographic representations of the American realities in terms of its European self-image of a lost past. Like the modern ethnographer,[38] the stay-at-home European natural historian, uninitiated to personal experience of other realities, is bound ever to strive for `commensurability' with the other world of America by assimilating the realities of other places in terms of stable knowledge and "without placing their own reality in jeopardy" (Clifford 1983, 133).

Moreover, Carrió's ethnographic descriptions of the rural settlers occupying the vast territories of the La Plata region outside Buenos Aires are pervaded by the same language of disorder and chaos that characterize his descriptions of the *gauderios*, foreshadowing modern ethnographic descriptions of exoticism, such as for example Clifford Geertz's famous description of the Balinese cockfight.[39] Their diversions, he writes,

> se reducen a jugar la chueca bárbaramente y sin orden, porque aunque es un género de malla, es solamente una bola entre muchos sujetos, que a porfía la golpean. Algunos se abrazan para cogerla, y como la bola, por el desorden, no lleva siempre el movimiento recto, hay cabezas rotas, y muchas veces pies y piernas lastimadas. (100-101)
> consist of playing the game of *chueca* in a wild fashion and without order, inasmuch as, although they have a kind of net, there is only one ball which the numerous players hit in competition. Some players rush forward to lay hold of it, and since the ball, due to the disorder, does not always go in a straight line, there result cracked heads and, very often, injured legs and arms. (153)

While the inhabitants of the country are all a degenerate lot given over to vice, indolence, and stupidity, Carrió is eager to defend the urban colonials of Spanish America against European charges of degeneracy. Even the (traveling European) inspector in *El lazarillo* is ready to concede that in Lima there are "tantos sabios a proporción, y cualquiera ciudad de las de España comparable a ésta la igualaba en ingenios, juicio y literatura" (214) ["as many learned men as on the peninsula and that any city in Spain comparable to this one would be matched in creative talent, good judgment and literary production" (284)]; and the "mujeres en esta ciudad ... son las más pulidas de todas las americanas españoles, y comparables a las sevillanas" (26) ["ladies of this city are the most refined of all the Spanish American women, comparable to those from Seville" (59)]. Thus, after having `seen' for himself, the inspector finds European theories to be false. "Protesto a Vm.," ["I protest to you"], he asserts,

> que ha cerca de cuarenta años que estoy observando en ambas Américas las particulares de los ingenios de los criollos y no encuentro diferencia, comparados en general, con los de la península. El cotejo que hasta el presente se hizo de los criollos de Lima con los que se avecindan aquí de España es injusto. (213-14)
> [that for 40 years I have been observing the peculiarities of the talented Creoles in both Americas [Peru and Mexico], and comparing them in general, I find them no different from the peninsulares. The comparison which has been made up to the present between the Creoles from Lima and those from Spain who take up residence here is unjust. (284)]

Thus both writers define a `positive space' for the setting of colonial identity by re-drawing the conceptual frontier separating the semiotic spaces between `Europe' and `America' in terms of its binary dualisms. However, while for Crèvecoeur this ideal landscape is that of a rural pasture, for Carrió it is located in the colonial city.

If both colonial narrators seem, by merely re-drawing the frontier lines, in part to corroborate theories of the degenerative forces prevailing in the world's margins, they insist that colonial degeneration is due strictly to social (or racial), not environmental or natural, circumstances. While European natural historians had, for example, claimed that the American Indians' reproductive organs were smaller than those of Europeans, James counters, "Let us say what we will of them, of their inferior organs, of their want of bread, etc., they are as stout and well made as the Europeans" (215).

Carrió also argues that if Americans on the frontier degenerate, it is not due to America's humidity of climate or peculiarities of soil, as European historians had claimed; rather, "este abandono y desidia" ["this abandon and indolence"] arise from "la escasez de poblaciones grandes para consumir estas especies y otras infinitas produc[c]iones" ["the scarcity of large cities whose inhabitants would consume these and other infinite products"] (91/141). By contrast, he redeems the American environment by his report of seeing a "viejo" ["old man"] in

the country who "parecía de sesenta años y gozaba de vida 104" ["appeared to be 60 years old, but in reality enjoyed 104"] (91/143) in order to disprove European theories that creoles age quicker into senility.[40] On the contrary, "con solo ir a tomar sus aires" ["by merely breathing the air"] of Peru, the people he encounters assure him, "sanan y convalecen hombres y mujeres, en poco tiempo, de todo tipo de enfermedades" ["men and women regain their health and recover in a short time from all sorts of illness"].

> Nos aseguro un español muy robusto, de ochenta años, que había conocido a don Simón de Herrera, de 145 años y a doña Tomasa Aballón, de 137, aunque Herrera la acusaba de cercenarse a lo menos ocho años, y que apostaban a quién corría más. (140)
> A very robust Spaniard of 80 years assured us that he had known Don Simón de Herrera, who was 145 years old, and Doña Tomasa Aballón, of 137 years, although Herrera accused her of trimming her age by at least 8 years; and they used to bet about which one could run the fastest. (200)

And if European historians may be right that at times Americans appear more mature than European, he argues, "los americanos saben tanto a la edad de cincuenta años como los europeos a la de sesenta, y fueron tan útiles por su doctrina y escritos, deben ser más aplaudidos, así como aquel operario que con igual perfección hace una estatua en un día, como otro en dos" ["Americans know as much at the age of 50 as Europeans do at 70, and are as useful because of their teaching and writing, [and therefore] should be more applauded, just as that worker who produces in one day a statue of a perfection equal to that of another who

executes it in two"] (219/292).

The ironical tone in which the conflicted European ideas about America are turned on their head and played against each other (fountain of youth/recent ruin of the world, etc.), however, illustrate that this entire debate surrounding colonial character in *El lazarillo* is less about proving or disproving particular theories than it is about ridiculing European attempts to theorize about America. This irony, as well as the language of disorder pervading the descriptions of American realities in *El lazarillo,* as well as *Letters,* introduces a distinctly counter-utopian irony through which Crèvecoeur and Carrió de la Vandera counterpoint European representations of America as Europe's idealized counter-image.

This counter-utopian theme is initiated in both texts by an invocation of one of the most famous utopian texts written during the eighteenth century, namely Bernard Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* (1714), which had expressed the Enlightenment's optimism in the essential benevolence of human nature by defining the virtuous society in analogy to the natural society of industrious bees. Carrió, however, after pointing out that the American bees "no defienden la miel y cera con el rigor que en la Europa" ["do not defend their honey and wax with the vehemence of those from Europe"] (90/141), goes on to observe that instead of cultivating bee-hives, the indolent frontiersmen, unlike the bees, only "[se] mant[ienen] de un trozo de vaca y bebiendo

sus al(h)ojas" ["sustain[] themselves with a piece of meat and drinking their *alojo*"] during their "bacchanals" (91/142). As Allen Soons has pointed out, the invocation of the topic of the economic man and the useful bee amplifies the realities of colonials' indolence and produces an ironic contrast parodying Enlightenment expectations of the restoration of ideal and natural society in America (1979, 94).

In *Letters*, too, nature's ideal order supposedly realized in America is portrayed by the invocation of bee society only to be contradicted by James's later description of the fierce struggle of the snakes, which demonstrates the cruelty and injustice of nature. Moreover, in *Letters*, this counter-utopian vision initiated by the invocations of frontier disorder gains momentum especially during the latter parts when James increasingly abandons his effort to define America as an exceptional place essentially different from Europe and Americans as essentially different from Europeans. And it culminates when his earlier question, "What is an American?" turns into a dim reflection on mankind in general: "What, then, is man, this being who boasts so much of the excellence and dignity of his nature among that variety of inscrutable mysteries, of unsolvable problems, with which he is surrounded?" (170). Somehow the docile and virtuous `Andrews' that America has supposedly created have turned out to be "ravenous beasts" killing each other during the Revolution. Frontier disorder seems to have

invaded the pastoral landscape.

Thus, both Crèvecoeur and Carrió rewrite American history in order to counterpoint the imposition of European utopias onto America. Carrió rewrites the vainglorious Spanish literary history of the chronicles of the conquest of New Worlds in South America - typically beginning in Lima and moving south - through a demonstrative geographical inversion by traveling in the opposite direction from Buenos Aires to Lima. It is a world gone astray - a "world turned up-side down" (Johnson 1993, 115). After "more than 20 years in these provinces," Carrió de la Vandera's inspector has learned that the "folly" of mankind is universal and unchanging. Faced with Spain's apparent failure to realize the Renaissance imperial dream of Tomasso Campanella's *City of the Sun* in America, Concolorcorvo asks the inspector "que de hombres suaves y de apacible trato se conviertan en ásperos y soberbios?" ["What makes docile men of gentle manner become harsh and arrogant?"] - apparently expecting a rational explanation in the peculiarities of the American environment. The inspector, however, sullenly reflects:

> No hay tal mudanza ... La mayor parte de los hombres es una tropa de locos. Los unos son furiosos, y se huye de ellos. Los otros son graciosos, y se divierte con ellos; y el resto son disimulados y contienen su furia por cobardes y de recelo de encontrar con mayores fuerzas y perder un par de costillas a garrotazos, y así estos, cuando se ven autorizados, son peores que los locos furiosos, porque a éstos culaquiera los contiene con la fuerza o con el arte, y para aquéllos sólo sirve una determinación criminal o un tolerancia insufrible, porque no siempre se proporciona la fuga. (127)
> There is no such change ... Most men are a herd of madmen.

> Some are violent and one flees from them; others are funny and one amuses himself with them. And the rest are cunning and restrain their fury out of cowardice or fear of meeting greater strength and losing a couple of ribs from some blow; this group, when they find themselves in authority, are worse than raging lunatics, because the latter may be restrained either with force or with art, while for the others only a criminal decision or an insufferable tolerance serves, because refuge is not always afforded. (187-88)

The inspector's gloomy view of mankind encapsulates, as Julie Greer Johnson has written, Carrió de la Vandera's Spanish American creole vision of disillusionment - the voice of people who "had witnessed Spain's ambitious plans and good intentions come to naught in the New World" (1993, 125). The creole's fall from the naive acceptance of European utopian expectations is also chronicled by *Letters* in James's gradual transformation from the cosmic optimism in America's redeemer role prevailing in the early parts toward the counter-utopian stance of experience prevailing in the latter parts. It is a transformation which re-enacts, within the body of each single work, an entire literary history of the New World from the utopian expectations of the early chronicles of the discovery as well as in the American Christian utopias of Protestants and Catholics accounts alike, to the dystopian vision prevailing in many American settlement narratives. These narratives typically display, as Wayne Franklin has written, "shifts of tone, infusions of light irony" in their tales of "ruin of wonder and hope, the wreck of enthusiastic attempts." The settler narrative rewrites the European accounts of "Old World presumption of American abundance" into a "catalogue of

colonial `lacks', failures within the structure of European design" (1979, 126-133). There are no new beginnings nor rebirths, they illustrate speaking with the voice of experience, of man's `ancient dignity' after all, even in America.

NOTES CHAPTER III

[1] See also the marginalia left in a first edition of the English *Letters* in possession of the Houghton Library and reproduced by G. Rice in his essay (1993, 111). Rice has argued that Crèvecoeur's *Letters* was a problematic book for English "critics of republican print ideology" not only because of its sociologically subversive potentials for English society, but also because of its "cultural consequences" as a "public text which .... blurred or broke conventional distinctions in genre" and made unintelligible "the line between fact and fiction" (1993, 110). For more on this episode, see also Allen and Asselineau (1987, 71).

[2] Significantly, Ayscough never challenges the accuracy of James's descriptions of snakes in Letter X but rather attacks the account on the ground that it does not derive from authentic experience but rather from reading books. This suggests that Ayscough's main concern in his criticism was not the question of factual accuracy in *Letters*, or even the intelligibility of fact from fiction.

[3] I am thinking here particularly of M. Pratt's account of the reception of Florinda Donner's *Shabono* (1982) by the anthropological community in which she illustrated that the text, which entered into the domain of ethnography but without adhering to the conventions of its divisions of labor, had to be "killed by science" because it implicitly raised issues of ethnographic authority, personal experience, scientism, and originality of expression (1986, 28-35). My discussion is also informed by the discussions of the issue of ethnographic authority by Clifford (1983 and 1986); and Marcus and Fischer (1986).

[4] Clifford mentions specifically the writings of an ethnographically aware group of black intellectuals and poets of the *négritude* movement, such as Aimé Césaire, Léopold Senghor, René Ménil Léon Damas, and we could add, of course, Frantz Fanon for the francophone world. In other countries, such voices include Talal Asad and others (1986, 9)

[5] See, especially, the collection edited by Talal Asad; also the works of de Certeau (1986 and 1988); Pratt (1986 and 1992); Pagden (1993); Boon (1982); and Fabian (1983).

[6] See Pratt (1992, 7); Stocking (1991, 4); Rosaldo (1986, 77). While earlier historical accounts of ethnographic discourse, such as M. Hodgen's (1969) clung to the belief that objectivity in ethnography is, if not attainable, at least approachable, these more recent accounts have increasingly abandoned this notion.

[7] See here especially, R. González Echevarría (1990) on Alejo Carpendier's novels, J. D. Saldívar (1991) on Gabriel

García Márquez, A. B. Chanady (1985) on Miguel Angel Asturias, and D. Brumble (1983) on N. Scott Momaday.

[8] In her recent analysis of how "travel and exploration writing *produced* `the rest of the world' for European readerships" in the wake of a rising "planetary consciousness" in the eighteenth century European imperial world (1990, 5), M. L. Pratt has illustrated that the literary topoi that had evolved in the ethnographic literature of the colonial encounter provided the discursive framework also for the self-representational practices for indigenous counter-colonial "auto-ethnographies" as well as for the postcolonial "creole self-fashioning" discourses of Euro-American revolutionaries during and after the Spanish American independence movements in the nineteenth century. These "auto-ethnographic texts ... are not," Pratt argues, "`authentic or autochthonous forms of self-expression" but rather self-conscious colonial responses to or dialogues with metropolitan representation. While they therefore always entail a "partial collaboration with and appropriation" of metropolitan discourses, they also engage in a critique of the poetics governing Europe's representations of America (7-11). For a comparative account of this phenomenon in terms of appropriations of the signs of the "exotic" in the `postcolonial' cultures of the nineteenth-century United States and Brazil, see also Mautner-Wassermann (1994).

[9] For biographical accounts on Crèvecoeur, see Allen and Asselineau (1987); Stone (1981); and T. Philbrick (1970).

[10] The best accounts of Carrió's life are to be found in Carilla (1976); also Penha (1986). For background on Carrió's involvement in postal reform, see Bose (1941).

[11] Although both characters are loosely based on historical figures, it is important to separate them from the literary characters in the text. Concolorcorvo is based on a historical person of racially mixed background who actually accompanied Carrió on his inspection tour of the postal system, although the duration of their common voyage does not correspond with that in the narrative (see Vargas Ugarte 1929, 105; Carilla 1976, 27). The inspector Don Alonso matches, as W. Bose and others have shown, in some ways the biographical profile of Carrió; but the narrative preserves a crucial distance, as J. G. Johnson has noted, between the author and the literary figure he creates. In fact, the latter is in some ways a satirical portrait of himself in his role as a failing agent of Spanish imperial officialdom (see Bose 1941, 219-240; Johnson 1993, 111).

[12] Despite D. Eisermann's reprimand that "especially younger critics [have] often forgotten the *Farmer* is a

compilation" of essays (1985, 52), there has been a strong tendency to read *Letters* as a novel. T. Philbrick was among the first to call for a reading of *Letters* "as a work of imagination" and argued it was as a "novel in embryo (1970, 74, 88); Allen and Asselineau concur that *Letters* is "closer to an epistolary novel in the tradition of Richardson or Smollett - or rather, of Rousseau" (1987, 74). I concur with these and other recent critics such as Chevignard (1984, 176), Arch (1990, 157) and Rice (1993, 104), all of whom have stressed the importance of reading *Letters* as an artistic whole rather than as a disjointed series of sketches. With respect to *Lazarillo,* critics have also been at odds how to classify the narrative. R. Mazzara has illustrated some characteristic themes of the picaresque in *Lazarillo de ciegos caminantes* (hunger, vagabondage, anti-clericalism). Others, have, however, disagreed with Mazzara, arguing that *Lazarillo* is closer to the novel. E. Carilla has even compared it to the adventure novels of Jules Verne (1957, 54-55). Most recently, Karen Stolley (1992) has very persuasively argued that the main theme of *Lazarillo* is language itself and that the work is a a specimen of the eighteenth-century genre of (linguistic) "criticism."

[13] It should be noted, though, that Carrió's narrative `trap' was apparently much more successful than Crèvecoeur's, which was exposed as a literary hoax by Samuel Ayscough only a few years after its publication. While contemporary readers have accepted the authorship of Carrió de la Vandera since the incontrovertible documentary evidence has been presented by the eminent French Hispanist Marcel Bataillon (1960), still in the nineteenth and even in the early twentieth century, readers as famous as Ricardo Palma, in his *Tradiciones Peruanas* (1923), have mistaken *El lazarillo* as a specimen of indigenous expression.

[14] On forms and conventions of this genre in general during the eighteenth century, see Batten (1978), Adams (1983 and 1962), Gove (1941), and Stafford (1984). Although both colonials incorporate many of the features of its eighteenth-century forms as described by these literary historians, I disagree with A. Lorente Medina's assessment that "in its general features *El lazarillo* is primarily a book of travel" (1985, 18). Various other critics of each work have commented on the complex use that these colonial narratives make of the trope of travel. P. Regis, for example, remarks that Crèvecoeur is "careful to distinguish his text from the standard European travel narrative" (1992, 112) but explores neither what role this genre actually plays in the production of the rhetoric natural history which she discusses, nor the implications of her observation for the relationship between *Letters* and natural history. In

his discussion of Carrió's narrative, E. Rodrigo argues that Carrió defends both the discourse of history as well as books of travel (1993, 260-264). However, this does not, therefore, as K. Stolley has observed, make it merely a travel book (1992, 26). Rather, I would agree with J. G. Johnson's argument that Carrió was "drawing upon both the tradition and popularity of the genre" but uses the travelogue mainly as "a vehicle as well as a target of his satire" (1993, 111), although I see `satire' functioning not as an end in itself in *Lazarillo* but as a vehicle to critique the production of Enlightenment historical discourse. Although I would disagree with a reading of Concolorcorvo as historian, my own reading of these colonial narratives therefore comes closest to that of M. Meléndez, who has argued that *Lazarillo* is at bottom a meta-travel narrative (although she does not use this term), the concern of which is the "most significant aspect of the voyage," which is "its epistemological character" and distinct "structure of knowing" (1993, 69).

[15] There has been considerable disagreement in how to read Carrió's title. Mazzara and others have seen in it a reference to *Lazarillo de Tormes* and the Spanish picaresque tradition. Woyski, however, has pointed out that the word "lazarillo" is here employed in a metaphorical sense with the signification of a guide for travellers not introduced to the realities of America. In what follows, I will agree with Carilla (1957, 45) and E. Penha in their argument that the title referred to the natural history of Cosmo Bueno but disagree with Penha's suggestion that Carrió "imitated" the rhetoric of natural history applied by the viceregal cosmographer (see Penha 1986, 22).

[16] While, surely, as Rodrigo (1993) shows, Carrió sympathizes with Feijoo's defense of the American creoles, and also asserts the value of travel books for the writing of history, he, in my opinion, not only critiques the subordinate position of the traveller vis-a-vis the historian, but also parodies the Enlightenment historiographic division of labor and the historian's attempt to eliminate and by-pass the traveller's subjectivity by grounding authority not in the experience of travel but in the theory of history.

[17] To be sure, Crèvecoeur was in a somewhat different position from Carrió with regard to Raynal's Enlightenment history of America, whose damaging portrayal of Spanish America was anathema to Spanish Americans (see Ventura) but echoed by North Americans, such as Crèvecoeur himself in his essay "Sketch of a Contrast between the Spanish and the English Colonies." In many ways, this "contrast" perceived by the eighteenth-century Enlightenment community is

portentous of modern liberalism's invention of itself by means of marginalizing the `catholic', `Spanish', `tyrannical' medievalism' and brings Crèvecoeur much closer to Raynal than to Carrió. However, like Carrió a colonial, Crèvecoeur, too, found himself in a precarious position with regard to historiographic authority as a voice about America when faced with European professional historians.

[18] Crèvecoeur ([1782] 1981, 90). All further references to this edition will appear as page numbers in the text.

[19] Carrió de la Vandera ([1773] 1985, 5) and in the English edition (1965, 27)). All further references to these edition will appear in the text as page number with the reference to the Spanish edition preceding the reference to the English edition (5/27).

[20] The controversy over Pigafetta's Patagonians began during the 1520s (with the publication of Pigafetta's account of Magellan's voyage), continued in Samuel Purchas's inclusion of Richard Eden's translation in the seventeenth century, and finally climaxed during the debate over John Byron's famous 1765 letter to Lord Egmont, which described the Patagonian giants. This debate involved the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, The Royal Society Club, the president of the French Académie de Sciences, and the French naturalist M. de la Condamine. See Boon (1982, 37-43).

[21] For a discussion the *querrelle*, see Maravall (1964, 1966) on the sixteenth century and Levine (1991) on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

[22] See here, for example, Kolodny (1975, 57); Rucker (1978, 198); and N. Philbrick (1991 and 1993), all of whom have read *Letters* as an "unfolding tale of disillusionment" about America (Philbrick 1991, 415); also E. Rapping, who has illustrated that *Letters* moves gradually toward an ironic vision of the rational order in the natural state of man in general (1967, 713); and S. Arch, who has observed that James gradually "defictionalize[s] his world, to dismantle the many claims colonial and revolutionary America made on behalf of rational, `objective' truth" (1990, 154).

[23] Beranger remarks that Mr. F. B. resembles Dr. Fothergill, the European patron of John Bartram (1977, 74). Chevignard speculates that Mr. F. B. "was so full of his own importance that he paid but little attention to the promising newness of the New World" and that, perhaps, the dialogue between the two represents the "acting out of an inner dialogue between its author's two selves" - Mr. F. B. as " Crèvecoeur's present self, now stranded far away from his Pine Hill haven, speechless with shock" and James as his "former self, now contained in St. John's selectively magnifying memory" (1984, 53).

[24] The themes of the utopian Golden Age and pastoral freedom that pervade his descriptions of America's colonial society in the early parts of *Letters* do not need further elaboration here. For only some of the many elaborations on these themes, see Marx (1964, 109-114) and Kolodny (1975, 54-66). Unlike other critics, Kolodny sees the collapse of this utopia taking place as early as the Letter III, with James's portrayal of the back-wood settlers.

[25] A number of critics have commented on the significance of `masking' in Crèvecoeur's life and work. Chevignard, for example, points out the three dates of birth and many signatures that Crèvecoeur used. Plumstead called Crèvecoeur a "man of many masks" (1977, 220) and Cunliffe called him a man of "multiple identities" (1978, 176).

[26] In 1723, a second edition of this book had been published in Madrid - probably in part to assist the Bourbon monarchy's attempt at undermining the power of the American creoles. Significantly, this new edition contained a prologue, which mentioned a passage in Sir Walter Raleigh's *Relation of His Voyage to Guiana*, in which he prophesied that the empire of the Incas would be reinstated by the English (see Penha 1986, 40).

[27] The name itself is Carrió's rather insidious play on color. "Con-color-corvo" [or "cuervo"] literally means "of the color of a raven." E. Carilla, in his study of the influence of the Spanish Baroque poet Quevedo on Carrió, has also pointed out that the name "Concolorcorvo" moreover evokes a satirical *romance* by Quevedo entitled *Boda de negros* ["The Wedding of the Negroes"] (1957, 109). K. Stolley also suggested that the name might be inspired by the "Cuento del Cuervo" [the Tale of the Raven], which appears in Book II of Ovid's *Metamorphosis* and which relates a series of abuses of language (1992, 3-4).

[28] J. G. Johnson, for example, notes that controversial and sensitive statements are most frequently delivered by Concolorcorvo, which provides a safe outlet for Carrió's personal anger and frustration with imperial administration (1993, 114).

[29] W. Bose saw Carrió's narrative mainly as an individual's "medium of revindication" against his personal enemies in the postal system, particularly his superior José Antonio de Pando (1941, 282); and J. G. Johnson, also arguing biographically, has proposed that his work was inspired mainly by his personal frustration over the being slighted by his superiors in the postal system (1993, 110). E. Penha, by contrast, argues that there was a larger "ideological significance" to Carrió's satire, which was to give voice to the interests of the merchant class in colonial Peru in opposing the attempts to centralize and

monopolize colonial commerce and administration, which were part of a larger reform program implemented by the "Enlightened Despots" of the Bourbon dynasty, which came to power in Spain in 1700 (1986, 46).

[30] Some of the limitations in applicability of the vocabulary provided by postmodern anthropology for a description of creole deconstructions of historiographic authority should also be pointed out, however. Whereas the creole subjectivity was displaced from the historiographic production of America by the separation of the tasks of observation and speculation (theorizing), the colonial `privileged informant' was replaced by a fusion of the task of fieldworker and the theorizer in the same person of the professional ethnographer.

[31] For a good comparative discussion of the role of the frontier in Spanish and British American literature, see Clevenger, who has compared *El lazarillo* with William Byrd's *History of the Dividing Line* (1733).

[32] The construction of Crèvecoeur's `middle landscape' (between culture and nature) is a theme which has been amply illustrated by critics; see Mohr (1970), Beranger (1977), Rucker (1978), T. Philbrick (1970), and Winston (1984).

[33] As Johnson has observed, Concolorcorvo's characteristics do not seem to be based upon the historical personage of Calixto Bustamente Carlos Inca but "purposely reflect a commonly held Spanish view of racially mixed people" (1993, 115).

[34] M. Savelle estimates by 1820, the *mestizo*'s (4 million) had numerically surpassed the white population (3.4 million) in Spanish America while the mulattoes made up almost half the number of the whites (1.5 million). The greatest share, however was still made up by the Indian population (8 million). Savelle does not give an estimate with regard to the *mestizo* population in British America, but there is not reason to assume that it drastically increased in its proportion from 1700, which was only one for every thirty whites. In British America, the white population was by far the numerically dominant one by 1820, about 85% of the total population (see Savelle 1974, 104).

[35] There is, nevertheless, a continuing tendency to read Crèvecoeur as the "first American ecologist" (Allen and Asselineau 1987, 45) because of his occasional lamentations of the destruction that European colonization has triggered. These lamentations are not, however, Crèvecoeur's plea for preservation but rather his archaic nostalgia for things past.

[36] In Spanish America, especially, the frontier character remains an ambivalent figure despite the belated arrival of Romanticism in, for example, Sarmiento's

Civilizacion y barbarie: Vida de Juan Facundo Quiroga (1845), in which the *caudillo* Quiroga is driven by the forces of barbarism and wildness of the frontier.

[37] For a good comparative discussion of Latin America and British America in this regard, see Véliz (1994).

[38] J. Clifford points out that while the insistence on personal field work became generally accepted in cultural anthropology after the 1920, in America the "fieldworker-theorist" emerged, with Boas and Morgan, earlier than elsewhere (see Clifford 1983, 121).

[39] For the function that the language of disorder plays in the ethnographic descriptions of George Catlin's account of the Mandan Indians' O-Kee-Pa ceremony, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's description of the Roman carnival in his *Italienische Reise* and Clifford Geertz's description of the Balinese cockfight, see Crapanzano (1986).

[40] For a discussion of this debate, particularly the role that the Spanish intellectual Benito Jerónimo Feijoo played in his defense of the creoles, see Rodrigo (1993); also Brading (1991, 393-4).

IV

REVOLUTION

> the person over on this part of the world is an American, whether he be a Latin American, an Afro-American, or a West Indian American. Even the white American had the same problem of identification. In fact, I think this - identity - has been the obsession of any race in this part of the world. (Derek Walcott)

1. THE REVOLUTIONARY QUEST FOR A POSTCOLONIAL LITERARY HISTORY

On October 26, 1786, about a month after the Constitutional Convention had been announced to be held at Philadelphia the following year, the *New Haven Gazette* published the first "book" of a heroic mock epic entitled "American Antiquities." The editor of the piece, who identified himself as a member of the American "society of critics and antiquarians," alleged to have found an ancient manuscript in the newly discovered Indian ruins of the Ohio territory. In the fashion of the humanist scholar, he translated the ancient text and now presented it to the "republic of letters" in order to "demonstrate that this delightful region had once been occupied by a civilized people." During

the course of the next year, the actual authors of "American Antiquities"--the "Connecticut Wits" Joel Barlow, Lemuel Hopkins, David Humphreys, and John Trumbull - published eleven additional installments in the pages of the *New Haven Gazette* and the *Connecticut Magazine*. The concluding installment appeared on September 13, 1787--four days before the final session in Philadelphia.

"American Antiquities" is a peculiar piece of epic poetry indeed. In the eleventh and twelfth installments (the only two parts which were actually published during the Constitutional Convention), the "ancient American bard"--supposedly the original author who has until then remained outside of his own epos - becomes himself the protagonist of the epic plot as he descends into the underworld. The editor reflects upon the special significance of this moment in the epic, whose bard, he insists, has hitherto

> closely [...] been followed (as indeed, might naturally be expected) by Homer, Virgil, and their successors in modern ages. The philosophical cause which has led all poets into those regions, we shall not attempt to investigate. (Barlow et. al. 1967, 65)

This passage concludes the Wits' satirical occupation with unruly `mobs' during the months preceding the Constitutional Convention; instead, the poem now turns against the lettered enemies of Federalist ideology on the domestic front and against the European denouncers and belittlers of America on the international front. These Europeans include some of the most renowned and authoritative historians of the eighteenth

century: the Frenchmen Guillaume l'Abbé Raynal and the Comte de Buffon, the German Cornelius de Pauw, and the Scotsman William Robertson.

Also, this moment in the epic plot--the descent into the underworld--gives occasion not only for a satirical inversion of the common criticism of plagiarism and dullness in modern (and especially American) poetry, but also for a "philosophical" departure from all the Old World models of epic poetry: No old world bard has ever sung of his own time, his own first-hand experience, and let alone of his own deeds. Instead, the Connecticut Wits borrowed here the epic "machinery" of the only epos that had been written in America and about America known to them theretofore - an epic whose author had done exactly this. This New World epic is Alonso de Ercilla y Zúñiga's (1533-94) *La Araucana* - a sixteenth-century Renaissance epic about the heroic resistance of the Araucan Indians against the Spanish efforts to conquer the province of Arauca, which is in present-day Chile.[1] Although there were several announcements in the literary journals of the new American Republic that a translation from the Spanish was in progress, *La Araucana* was never actually translated in full into English until the twentieth century (see Lancaster and Manchester 1945, 7-25). However, it received considerable attention in Voltaire's *Essay on Epic Poetry*, with which the Connecticut Wits were very familiar (Howard 1967, 140).

"American Antiquities" is, for my purposes, significant

because it exemplifies four interconnected and distinctly `post-colonial' cultural currents of the Revolutionary period while also revealing the historical and cultural distinctiveness of the American creole movements for independence in the global history of cultural decolonializations. First, *American Antiquities* illustrates an awareness of, and overt opposition to, the imperial bias firmly entrenched in European historiography about America and a pre-occupation with writing into being a usable American past for the new Republic distinct from that of its `parent' nation. Second, in its fictionalization of the epic author, its play with traditional genres (the epic and the history), as well as in its fusion of hero and poet, "American Antiquities" illustrates a postcolonial problem of authorship:[2] In their attempt to re-write the American past, American Revolutionaries had to confront the officially authorized discourses of American history as sanctioned by the old imperial centers; and the re-making of the American past could therefore occur only in a relocation of textual authority from established grounds of historiographic authorship.

Third, like the lettered elites in later post-colonial societies, American Revolutionaries flirted with an identification with indigenous culture in their quest to express cultural difference from England. This manifested itself, for example, in the new roles that the Indian now played (besides the traditional children-roasting and

maiden-raping captor) in the literature and culture of the early Republic--as a mask for Revolutionary creoles resisting metropolitan mercantilist policies at the famous `Boston Tea Party'; as a token guest to the new nation in Jefferson's generous invitation to the Indians to "mix your blood with ours;" and as a linguistic model in considerations by creole nationalists to use an indigenous tongue as the new, "uncorrupted," national American language for the new republic (Haberly 1974, 90).[3]

However, the obviously fictitious nature of the "ancient American bard" illustrates a problem inherent in this identification as it was faced specifically by writers in former `settler' colonies. For, unlike the native intelligentsias in former `invaded' colonies, American creoles in British and Spanish America alike could identify with indigenous culture only very ambivalently; and their appropriations of a pre-colonial indigenous past remained, for the most part, mythic and elusive.

Finally, in response to the conflict between their post-colonial desire for indigenous roots in America on the one hand and their ambivalence in identifying with their Indian neighbors on the other, Anglo American Revolutionaries for the first time looked beyond the old borders of the British Empire for the establishment of an independent American literary history. In their search for a cultural identity, they initiated a tradition of inter-American interest which has ever since surged and waned in

the United States corresponding to declining and improving US-European relations respectively. And while Spanish American creoles dressing up as Indians in order to resist imperial authority never had to look beyond the boundaries of the Spanish empire in America,[4] liberal Revolutionary intellectuals, such as José Joaquín Olmedo, Simón Bolívar, Francisco de Miranda, Félix Varela, Andrés Bello, and Fray Servando Teresa de Mier also looked, though with a certain ambivalence, to the Anglo American precedent as a political model which might be imitated also by a future independent Spanish America.[5]

The "Connecticut Wit" Joel Barlow, in particular, was interested in what has been called a "pan-American pan shot" (McWilliams 1989, 57): a concern with the global meaning of America for human history at large and an anti-imperialist (and anti-European) hemispheric vision which the Cuban Revolutionary José Martí would later call "Nuestra América."[6] Barlow had read widely in the voluminous literature about the New World written by European historians, particularly William Robertson's *History of America* (1777). But he had also read many of the chronicles and "accounts" written by American eye-witnesses who wrote from personal, first-hand experience as far as they were available to him in English translation. Thus, he was, of course, familiar with Las Casas's *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias* (1552). More importantly, however, he had avidly read in the Yale library a 1688 translation of

one of the most important Spanish American classics: The Inca Garcilaso de la Vega's *Comentarios reales de los incas* (1607).[7] Due to his interest in the history and literature of the hemisphere, Barlow has been referred to "one of the earliest scholars of Inter-American literature" (Fitz 1991, 53).

To be sure, Barlow, as William Dowling has shown, owed much to the British literary heritage of Augustan poetry. However, Barlow's extended treatment of the American indigenous past is far from being a "long narrative digression" from the main plot of his poem (Dowling 1990, 114); rather it is central to his epic enterprise. We cannot understand the significance of Barlow's literary projects by only seeing them as replications of their Old World traditions. Doing so would mean concluding with the all-too common critical judgment that his works are "dinosaur[s] in the clay pots of literary history" because he "was no Pope" (Woodress 1958, 246; Ford 1971, 64).

While Joel Barlow's role in the development of a epic creole voice in North America has often been underestimated by twentieth-century literary critics,[8] one of his most prominent South American contemporaries, the Revolutionary Ecuadorian epic poet José Joaquín Olmedo, has generally been acknowledged to be one of the major literary founding fathers of early nineteenth-century Spanish America--among Andrés Bello, José Maria Heredia, and the `Liberador' himself, Simón Bolívar, who was a soldier as well as a poet.

Born in Guayaquil, José Joaquín Olmedo has been claimed by both Peruvian and Ecuadorian nationalists since the city was still part of the Vice-royalty of Peru at the time when Olmedo was born but later became part of Ecuador. His tombstone today bears the inscription "Father of His Country" (see Hills 1920, 9).

However, like Barlow's North American epics, Olmedo's epics, too, have been regarded as seriously flawed when judged according to the literary standards of the early nineteenth century. They were Neoclassical in form but Romantic in content--a strange anachronism, which manifested, according to twentieth-century literary critics, an American provincialist `cultural lag' in comparison with the cultural production of Europe at the time.[9] But, it is precisely in their blending of elements from both periods, I will argue here, as well as their fusion of Old World and New World literary models, that both poets were significant for the development of their respective literary traditions. Rather than treating them as exceptions to the "continuity" of American literature, I suggest reading them as the key figures that they are in their respective traditions.

However, in order to do so it is essential to read each creole poet in the context of a pan-Atlantic literary history of colonial and counter-colonial discourses about America. Here I will therefore compare the use of these discourses of conquest and colonialism by these two Revolutionary poets in their epic enterprise to construct a

postcolonial literary history for their newly independent American republics. Both Barlow and Olmedo appropriated, and reconfigured, discursive practices for their own counter-colonial discourse from other New World writers. I will argue that, first, as did the poet Ercilla during the sixteenth century, they authorize themselves as writers by celebrating their own roles as New World bards in the political and cultural transformations of their times and, in the process, transform European conventions of authorship. The cultural liberators of America from European historiographic traditions, they sing a song to themselves as the rediscoverers of the hitherto obscured universal meanings of "the subject of America at large ... for the improvement of mankind" (Barlow quoted in Todd 1886, 15). Second, like the *mestizo* historian Inca Garcilaso before them, they reshape European models of `universal' history in their `re-invention' of an American Indian past and de-center the telos of European providential history, thus offering a linear and progressive concept of time for a New World man and age.

2. WILLIAM ROBERTSON, THE RHETORIC OF HISTORY, AND THE ETHNOGRAPHIC IMAGINATION

Critics have generally presumed that Joel Barlow had simply relied on the "histories of the conquest" for information and "facts" which he then incorporated into his poem (Ford 1971, 64). However, as I have illustrated in the previous

chapters, writing about the European discovery, conquest, and colonization of the New World has always been contested territory in the realm of imperial politics, and there has never been a single tradition of historical writing on which Barlow could have relied. Surely, as both Leon Howard (1943, 140) and Theodore Zunder (1934, 87) have observed, the outline and structure of the first four books of *Vision of Columbus* (1787) are almost identical to William Robertson's *History of America*, who, in turn, had followed the conventions of the Spanish chroniclers in structuring their histories in discussions of American geography, ethnographic descriptions of the indigenous populations and the history of creole society, etc.. Barlow, in his introduction, even explicitly refers to Robertson's history--"which," he says, "as is usual in the works of that judicious writer, contains all that is valuable on the subject, [but] is not yet reprinted in America, and therefore cannot be supposed to be in the hands of American readers in general."[10]

However, that Barlow is speaking ironically here is evident not only because Robertson's work was denounced in "American Antiquities" as apparently having "for its especial mission the disparagement of the country, [as it] abounded in deprecatory allusions to the American people" (1967, 73); but also because Barlow could almost certainly suppose that his American reader knew Robertson's *History*, which was one of the most popular histories of America written in the eighteenth century and was widely known also

in America. In fact, it sold so well that it had gone through five editions already by 1788 and went through a total of thirteen editions by 1817 (see S. Bernstein 1985, 215).

Ideologically, Robertson's historical work lay squarely within a tradition of European imperial history about America reaching back to the early chronicles of the conquerors and to the Spanish court historians of the Hapsburg monarchy in the second part of the sixteenth century. His *History* represents, in many ways, the culmination of the European imperial tradition. Robertson's debt to this tradition is evident in his references and notes, as well as in his bibliographic discussions in which he critically assessed the reliability of his sources. Thus he accredits the early `proconquest' chroniclers such as Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo and Francisco López de Gómara who had revived the Aristotelian concept of "natural servitude" for a convenient incorporation of the indigenous Americans into the natural Chain of Being (Pagden 1982, 27-56), as well as the royal geographers such as Antonio de Herrera. Within a legalistic framework based on scholastic philosophy, the early chroniclers had defined the Conquest as a holy and just war against infidel American `barbarians' who had violated universal `natural law' and resisted the march of civilization and the cross--thereby establishing the perennial topoi on which a tradition of European colonial discourse about the Americas would rest. Pre-

Conquest Americans had been creatures of such subhuman status, so fabulously different from Europeans that even their heads, wrote Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo y Valdes, were not like the heads of "other men." They were not, in fact, heads at all, he continued,

> but rather hard and thick helmets, so that the most important piece of advice the Christians gave when fighting in hand to hand combat with them was not to strike them on the head, because that broke the swords. And just as their heads were hard, so their understanding was bestial and evilly inclined. (1959, I:111)

Only as a result of the European Conquest had Americans become human. In the words of Cortés's chronicler López de Gómara, the Conquest represented therefore "the redemption of the most primitive people on earth" (1991, 162).

As pessimistically as the early Spanish conquerors had viewed the American Other, so confident was their self-image as a redeemer nation. As we have seen in the first chapter, these narratives of the Conquest, in their static conceptions of time, in their sense of universal harmony and cosmic perfection, as well as in their confidence in civilized rationality, owed much the medieval scholasticism that had also inspired the early Franciscan missonaries in the New World. "Historical existence," writes José Promis, "was conceived as the object of stylized and immutable nature ... a rational, harmonious, and unalterable cosmogony" (1991, 28; see also White 1987, 23-67). However, unlike in the apocalyptic histories of the Franciscan ethnographers, the fulfillment of history was, in the

Renaissance chronicles of the conquerors, less conceived as a temporal movement of redemption history forward in time than as a movement through space. In his work on *translatio*, Karlheinz Stierle has described the transformation from medieval to Renaissance historiography in Western Europe in terms of an "axis" that shifted in orientation: "One might say that the dominance of the axis of vertical translation is basic to the medieval conception... The transition from a medieval to a postmedieval model of culture can be understood as a shift from vertical to horizontal dominance" (1996, 56). In the context of this new spatial dimension in the European geo-historical imagination, the Conquest of America became the glorious story of a gradual fulfillment of a providential design of history leading up to the formation of a Holy World Empire, gradually but inevitably expanding into the domains of the Devil.

As we have seen in the second chapter, the rhetoric that had rationalized the conquest came back to haunt the creole descendants of the conquerors in the imperial narratives of the Hapsburg court historians since the late sixteenth-century. For, while the Hapsburg historians had retained the "sense of fatal schism" informing the early chronicles of the conquest (White 1973, 59), spatial divisions would become more and more prominent in the increasingly "territorialized" discourses of imperial geography during the seventeenth century in Spanish and British America alike (Boon 1982, 35; see also Gregory

1994).

To be sure, eighteenth century Enlightenment historians generally viewed historical events in more skeptical terms, fiercely rejecting the scholastic epistemologies that had informed the discourses of the Conquest. Moreover, unlike the sixteenth-century chroniclers of the Conquest, they were firmly convinced that civilization had radically progressed since the `dark ages'--partially, as we have seen in the third chapter, as a result of the New World encounter (see also Arciniegas 1986; and Maravall 1966). However, they, too, retained the divisive schemes that had informed European attempts to achieve "commensurability" with the seemingly incommensurable fact of the New World since the sixteenth century (Pagden 1993). Particularly with the emergence of a `scientific' ethnographic imagination during the eighteenth century, a curious connection between time and space was established in which the movement out of the European center was conceived to equal a movement back in time--an emplotment strategy that Johannes Fabian has called the "denial of coevalness" in modern ethnography (see Fabian 1983, 1-31). Thus, in 1724 Joseph Francois Lafitau campared, in his *Moeurs des sauvages amériquains comparées aux moeurs des premiers temps* [Customs of the Savage Americans Compared with the Customs of the Earliest Times], the eighteenth-century Huron with the ancient European Spartan. If the stability of an unconscious Euro-centric view of the world had been challenged in the sixteenth-century New World

encounter, it was salvaged by the erasure of a pre- or non-European history in America. In 1800, Joseph-Marie Degerando could thus claim that

> The traveler-philosopher who sails to the farthest corners of the Globe, travels, in fact, along the road of time. He travels in the past. Every step he takes is a century passed. The Islands he reaches are for him the cradle of human society. (1978, 131-132)

Progress, in this "History invented by the West," happened in Europe, but nowhere else (Zea 1992, 47; also 29-50). Within the context of this Euro-centric theory of historical progress, the perceived `backwardness' of the Americans in historical development inevitably appeared to equal either a superior Golden Age or a cultural `deficiency'. The evaluation of the American Other thus depended on how one viewed the development of the European Self. And while exotic travelers such as Degerando and Lafitau compared the "people whom our ignorant vanity despises" favorably to a corrupted European civilization (Lafitau 1974-77, 62), most of the imperial historians during the eighteenth century such as Robertson hardly shared this Rousseauean primitivism.

When confronted with the question of why historical development had been suspended in America, `scientific' explanations were readily at hand. Already during the Renaissance, the `natural law' theorist Jean Bodin had made a claim for a connection between the natural environment and the development of human culture. In the eighteenth century, Montesquieu had added the thesis that the American climates

and soils made people in general lazy, servile, and degenerate (see 1966, 269-291). Also, in 1749, Le Comte de Buffon had published his influential *Histoire naturelle*, in which he had claimed that the American environment specifically was averse to the development of human civilization. Other influential natural historians such as de Pauw, Peter Kalm, and Guillaume l'Abbe Raynal were soon to follow (see Gerbi 1973; also Lawson-Peebles 1988, 29-43).

Working within this European rhetorical tradition about the negative influences of America's size, climate, and environment upon the development of culture, William Robertson, who had never been to America, arrived in his historical masterpiece at the conclusions that Americans were "destined to remain uncivilized" (1829, 123) and that whatever civilization was transplanted to the American soil would inevitably regress and degenerate into barbarity (1829, 128). His discussion of Native American culture would serve as a case in point. After his *History* had been first published, one of Robertson's readers, the Jesuit Juan Nuix in his Italian exile, ironically remarked that the "wretched Americans" could be thankful to their Spanish conquerors that they had not "viewed you as Robertson and other philosophers did" (1782, 303). Not surprisingly, the publication of his *History* had created an outrage also among British and Spanish American creoles, such as Thomas Jefferson, who denounced Robertson in his *Notes on the Present State of Virginia*, and the Mexican historian Javier

Clavigero, who wrote his *Historia Antigua de México* in order to "detect some of the many misrepresentations which occur in the history" of Robertson, "which we might swell into large volumes" (1979, I:xxvii). For the American post-colonial writers, Robertson's historical discourse about America represented thus a giant obstacle in their desire to assert a usable pre-colonial past.

This problem proved the more sizable as Robertson's authority was firmly grounded in Christian Humanist learning and the neoclassical rhetorical conventions of Enlightenment historiographic form and eloquence. As a contemporary commentator put it:

> His delight was to trace and elucidate moral and religious truths, to apply the process of reasoning to subjects more immediately connected with the every-day business of existence, to search into the causes and effects of historical events, to expatiate amidst the perennial beauties of classic lore, and, by meditating on the great models of oratorical art, to render himself master of all the powerful resources of a ready and persuasive eloquence.[11]

As Nancy Struever (1970) and Roberto González Echevarría (1990, 44) have each shown, the persuasive power of humanist historical discourse rested less on empirical "facts" than it did on an assimilation of textual source-materials to historiographic rhetoric. The Enlightenment historians modeled their art of persuasion after their Renaissance predecessors and the rhetors of classical antiquity. According to this tradition, the validity of certain ideas about truth and history consisted more in conveying to an

audience the "phenomenal reality" of an idea rather than the "pure" idea itself (Struever 1970, 72, 77). It was the illusion created through form, not fact, which lead to historical and moral truth. Working within this tradition, Robertson had written the most authoritative work of American history to date.

American post-colonial writers had thus to equal and to overcome this tradition from which they, too, had sprung. When Joel Barlow undertook the one major revision in the 1779 draft of an epic poem about the American Revolution, he did so under the influence of his reading in Robertson: He extended the history of indigenous Peru from a short reference to the story of the first Inca Manco Capac at the end of his Book II (in which he discussed the natives of America) to a long account of Inca civilization filling almost two out of the total of nine books. Also, he added his polemical "Dissertation on the GENIUS and INSTITUTIONS of MANCO CAPAC," which he inserted between Book II and Book III (see Ford 1971, 47).

3. THE ERCILLESQUE LEGACY

A frequent criticism of Barlow's *Vision of Columbus* and the *Columbiad*, on the other hand, has been that they have "no hero" (Pearce 1961, 61). John Seelye, consequently, concluded that Barlow's poem "is not an epic, at least not in the classical mode," but rather must be read within the tradition of "the Vision [poem] as an Anglo-American epic

genre [which] dates back as far as Langland's *Piers Plowman*" (1988, 192-94). This is, however, not what Barlow suggests. He specifically refers to Camoes's *Lusiad* and Ercilla's *La Araucana* in his notes (167-168)--a poem which was, as we shall see, also an important model for Olmedo. Barlow's epic "machinery" of the vision was also used in the *Lusiad*--an epic, as Barlow had read in Voltaire, about an entirely "new Subject, manag'd by an uncommon Genius, [which] could not but produce a Sort of *Epick* Poetry unheard of before" (Voltaire 1970, 72): the explorations of previously unknown lands undertaken by Vasco da Gama. The heroism involved in exploration and the gain of experimental knowledge, fit, as John McWilliams has pointed out, republican values much better than did the martial heroism of Aenas or Achilles (1989, 22). Unlike many of his contemporaries, though, who revered Milton as their model, Barlow begins his *Columbiad* by explicitly putting himself in the tradition of this New World epic on the one hand, while also acknowledging the classical discursive tradition: "I sing the Mariner ..." (rather than Virgil: "I sing of warfare and a man at war"). In *Vision of Columbus*, Barlow lamented his insufficient, second-hand knowledge of Ercilla's *La Araucana* in the context of his own attempt to make use of an indigenous past in his New World epic:

> The account given of that work by Voltaire excited my curiosity at an early day; as I conceived the manners and characters of the mountain savages of Chile, as described by that heroic Spaniard, must have opened a new field of Poetry, rich with uncommon ornaments. (168)

Barlow's search for this "new field of poetry" is indicative of his quest to find a post-colonial literary voice about America. In many respects, Barlow followed what he knew about Ercilla's poem through Voltaire. For example, when he spent a book and a half on the indigenous cultures of America in order to refute Robertson, he found the poetic license to do so in Ercilla. Thus, Ercilla's description of the Araucan Indians as "a Race of Men, stronger and more fierce, than all the Nations of the new World" (Voltaire 1970, 93) certainly inspired Barlow in his own depiction of the American.

But while Camoes's *Lusiad* did have a conspicuous hero, who *is* the hero in Barlow's epics? Is it Columbus? Surely not. His role within the action of the poems is confined to that of a passive spectator who is either tortured or elated by the show which is put on for him by the Seraph/Hesper. The closest he gets to acting is to bewail the destructions which his discovery has triggered. Rather, I suggest, the hero in Barlow's epic is the poet himself in his role of re-educating his audience about America. Barlow, like Ercilla in his epic poem, sings a song to himself about his epic struggle to liberate America from the colonialist bias of the European literary tradition and from the authority of the conventions of historiographic rhetoric and eloquence on which it rests. It is in this context that the influence of Ercilla is significant.

The most important parallel between Barlow and Ercilla

is that in both epic poems the present appears as epic time. Indeed--despite Barlow's rhetorical somersaults in re-writing the American past--it is the present which becomes the ultimate point of reference in his poem. Unlike in Milton's epic (or any of the Old World epics) the past is, in Barlow's poem, merely a pre-text which glorifies the present. In this he also differs from the tradition of the British Opposition poets, for whom the present was not the stuff for epic poetry but only for satire. In Barlow's epic, many of his contemporaries become heroic figures, such as the Promethean Franklin, who, unimpressed with "Heaven's awful thunders ... curbs the fierce blaze and holds the imprison'd fire" (307). And while Barlow does not explicitly refer to himself as a poet, his personal poet-friends Trumbull and Dwight do appear as heroic figures in his poem (310-12). In Barlow's epic, it is the poet's own real-life experience which qualifies as the stuff for epic poetry. And Barlow uses as the basis for his account of the Revolutionary War his own experience and his authority as an eye witness. His poem is epic and historic, but also journalistic at the same time.

In this he resembles the soldier/poet Ercilla, who had "made use of the Intervals of the War to sing it, and as he wanted Paper, he wrote the first Part of his Poem upon little Pieces of Leather which afterwards he had much ado to set right, and to bring together ... he was at once the Conqueror and the Poet" (Voltaire 1970, 94). New World

Soldier/writers such as Bernal Díaz and Ercilla, writing of their own actions at the very periphery of empire, took a bold step in pretentiously calling their texts *historia* or *epopeya*, thereby emancipating themselves, like the authors of the American `true histories' and captivity narratives, from the *cronistas mayores*, the professional writers licensed by the imperial center. While both Ercilla and Bernal have been criticized for the unorthodoxies of their texts ever since by conservative literary censors, they also began to transform the discursive landscapes in which these institutionalized forms occurred in their appeal to authority of subjective knowledge and the writing subject of the `I'. Ercilla is narrator, eyewitness, and warrior all at the same time:

> Pues que en autoridad de lo que digo / vemos que ahy tanta sangre derramada, / prosiguiendo adelante, ye me obligo / que irá la historia más autorizada: / podré ya disucurrir como testigo / que fui presente a toda la jornada. [Moreover to bear out what I say, we can see that so much blood was shed / continuing from here on, I swear that / the tale will proceed with more authority / for I can speak as a witness / since I was present through all events].[12]

After the European has experienced American reality, he re-writes history from the perspective of his own subjective New World experience. This is nowhere so evident as it was in the peninsular Spaniard Ercilla, who had left Europe for Chile in order to partake in the glory of Spain and the progress of the Holy Cross in redeeming the American infidel:

> Gente es sin Dios, ni ley, aunque respeta / A aquel que fue del cielo derribado / Que como a poderoso y gran profeta / Es siempre en sus cantares celebrado / Invocan su furor con falsa seta / Ya a todos sus negocios es llamado / Teniendo quanto dice por seguro / Del prospero suceso o mal futuro. (I:44)
> [Godless, lawless, naught respecting / Save the One flung down from heaven / Who in songs oft celebrated / Is their great and thunderous prophet / They invoke His false-famed fury / Chant to Him in every action / Holding all He says as certain / Words of dire portent and promise. (37)]

But while Ercilla's epic journal begins with an unambivalent celebration of the Conquest, it gradually turns into a condemnation of Spanish actions.

> Pero luego nosotros destuyendo / Todo lo que tocamos de pasada, / Con la usada insolencia el paso abriendo / Les dimos lugar ancho y ancha entrada; / Y la antigua costumbre corrompiendo, / De los nuevos insultos estragada, / Plantó aquí la cudicia su estandarte / Con más seguridad que en otra parte. (II:170))
> [We, however, bent on pillage / Disrespectful, with our wonted / Base destruction, / brewed the poison / Which contaminated all things. / By corruptng ancient usage / Vitiated with our insults, / Here, as nowhere else, we planted / Envy's banner, greed's labarum. (315)]

Instead, he praises the humanity, valor, civility, and wisdom of the Araucans.

> Note dellos las cosas senaladas, / Los ritos, ceremonias y costumbres, / El trato y ejercicio que tenian, / Y la ley y obediencia en que vivian. (II:172)
> [Carefully I scanned their customs / Most outstanding rites and rituals / Social usage, rules of conduct / and the laws whereby they flourished. (316)]

As a whole the epic represents thus a huge paradox and in its "mannerist Weltanschauung" provides a glimpse into the "Awakening of [a] Modern Awareness" during the later Renaissance (Promis 1991, 56). What we watch unfolding while reading Ercilla's epic journal is the disintegration of Renaissance historiographic and linguistic codes in the face

of the individual's subjective American experience. Consequently, Ercilla becomes, as Beatriz Pastor has pointed out, the first European writing about the Conquest who represents the "American man as a superior and free being" (as opposed to a *perro* [dog]) (1983, 367).

However, despite these incursions of subjectivity, Ercilla's concern was not, of course, to give an ethnographically more accurate account of the Araucan Indians. Despite the mannerist skepticism in his poem, he elevated his accounts in the stylized rhetorical conventions of the Renaissance epic. Thus, the ancient cacique Colocolo (rather than the Spanish conqueror) surpasses, as Voltaire observed, even Homer's Nestor in eloquence (1970, 98). While Ercilla deconstructs the Renaissance ideology of conquest which had provided the discursive foundations of the early Spanish chronicles on the one hand, he manipulates and assimilates these discourses in order to celebrate his own subjective experience and his role as an epic soldier/poet on the other.

> En el silencio de la noche escura / En medio del reposo de la gente / Queriendo proseguir en mi escritura / Me sobrevino un subito accidente: / Cortome un hielo cada coyuntura / Turboseme la vista de repente / Y procurando de esforzarme en vano / Se me cayo la pluma de la mano. (I:283)
> [In the drear, dark, brooding silence / Whilst my tent-mates were reposing / Whilst I coaxed my muse to music / Sudden mishap fell upon me / All my joints with ice were frozen / And my sight was blurred and blinded / Vainly did I try to rally / From my quivering hand the pen dropped. (171)]

In his own poem, he has the native Amazon-like Bellona sing to himself:

> "Que viendote a escribir yo aficionado / Como se muestra bien por el indicio / Pues nunca te han la pluma destemplado / Las fieras armas y aspero exercicio, / Tu trabajo tan fiel considerado / Solo movida de mi mismo oficio / Te quiero yo llevar en una parte / Dondo podras sin limite ensancharte. (I:284)
> ["You enthusiastic scribbler / All too clearly show that never Savage arms and trained endurance / Broke your pen or clogged its motion. / I, impressed by loyal labor / Moved alone by my profession / Wish to lead you to a region / Where the bard has scope unfathomed". (172)]

However, the appeal to `eye-witness' experience is in Ercilla, as in other New World writers, less an epistemological foundation of his historical account than it is a rhetorical tool and literary device which is supposed to lend his new historiographic model credibility. Indeed, as José Promis has pointed out, Ercilla frequently `cheated' in his claim of writing with the authority of an eye-witness when he presented accounts of battles during which he was not present. But in his idealized portrayal of the indigenous American as well as in his stylized appeal to his own subjective experience, Ercilla provided a first model of writing about America, which would later be followed by other New World writers such as Garcilaso, who had read *La Araucana* in the 1590s (Miró Quesada y Sosa 1971, 197-210; Bernal 1982, 550-562), as well as by the creole poets Joel Barlow and Joaquim de Olmedo during the time of the American independence movements.

Ironically, however, Ercilla had not been a *criollo* but rather a peninsular Spaniard, who had come to America in

order to participate in the punitive expedition of Hurtado de Mendoza against the Araucan Indians and who ultimately wrote his poem for the glorification of the Spanish monarch. In the political context of the 1590s, his historical narrative must therefore be read *not* as an assertion of a *criollo* identity but rather as the poetical flowering of a peninsular Spanish imperialist culture which had also informed what I have called, in Chapter II, the "imperial synthesis" of the Hapsburg court historians. And because of the sympathetic picture he painted of the Araucans and the cruelties he exposed in the conquerors of Chile, his poem was anathema for his creole contemporaries, who saw their self-image once more tainted by *leyenda negra* and their claims to Indian tribute labor and `personal services' [*servicio personal*] challenged. Subsequent to the publication of *La Araucana*, therefore, the Peruvian creole poet Pedro de Oña `corrected' Ercilla's version of the conquest in his own poem *Arauco domado* [*Arauco Tamed*] (1590s), in which he stressed the barbarity of the Indians, the braveness of the conquerors, and the justness of the conquest.

But in the specific historical context of the American independence movements, the peninsular Ercilla's idealized portrayal of Native American culture proved suddenly much more useful to Revolutionary creoles than did the creole epic tradition of Pedro de Oña. And it was in this context also that Garcilaso's *Comentarios*, which had recently been

republished in Spain, gained suddenly in popularity with Spanish American creoles.[13] The fact that creoles now appropriated Ercilla's *La Araucana* illustrates, therefore, that Revolutionary Americans had, in their strive for legitimacy, re-invented their relationship with the American indigenous populations.

4. JOAQUíN DE OLMEDO'S *VICTORIA DE JUNíN*

Olmedo's most important poem is *Victoria de Junín*,[14] an ode about one of the major battles of the Spanish American struggle for independence, in which Simón Bolívar led the Revolutionary forces to victory over the peninsular Spanish army in 1824. Olmedo wrote the poem immediately after he had learned of the victory, and published it in 1825--still before he had news of General Sucre's final victory at Ayacucho, the battle that sealed Spanish American independence. Unlike Barlow's poem, *Victoria de Junín* does have an ostensible hero, who is, of course, Bolívar; and the other military generals of the American armies are also being celebrated. Indeed, Olmedo lifted them to such heroic heights he was later reprimanded by Bolívar, who wrote in a letter:

> Ud. se hace dueño de todos los personajes: de mí forma un Júpiter; de Sucre un Marte; de La Mar un Agamenón y un Menelao; de Córdova un Aquiles; de Necochea un Patroclo y un Ayax; de Miller un Diómedes, y de Lara un Ulises ... Ud., pues, nos ha sublimado tanto, que nos ha precipitado al abismo de la nada" (quoted in Guevara 1958, 276)
> [you have turned me into Jupiter, Sucre into Mars, La Mar into Agamemnon, Necochea into a Patroclus and Ajax, Miller into a Diomedes, and Lara into a Ulysses ... You have

> elevated us to such heights that you have flung us headlong into the abyss of nothingness.]

Like Barlow, however, Olmedo, too, celebrates his own role as the "cantor de la gran epopeya del Nuevo Mundo"--[the singer of the great epic of the New World] (Guevara 1958, 10), who not only chronicles history but, with his pen, participates in and shapes the historical process. Olmedo had therefore written, in a letter to Bolívar, while at work on his poem: "y es que si me llega el momento de la inspiración y puedo llenar el magnífico y atrevido plan que he concebido, los dos, los dos hemos de estar en la inmortalidad" ["If inspiration comes to me and I can fulfill the magnificent and daring plan I have conceived, the two of us will be immortal together"] (quoted in Guevara 1958, 253).

As the military general leads to political independence, the New World poet is indispensable in the struggle for cultural independence. Thus, the heroic epic author becomes more and more the central subject of Olmedo's own poem. ?"Quien me dara templar el voraz fuego / en que ardo todo yo?" he asks,

> Tremula, incierta, torpe la mano va sobre la lira / dando discorde son. Quien me libera del dios que me fatiga ...? / Siento unas veces la rebelde Musa, / cual bacante en furor, vargar incierta / por medio de las plazas bulliciosas, o sola por las selvas silenciosas, / o las risuenas playas que manso lame el caudaloso Gyuayas. [Who will help me to assuage the voracious fire that consumes my whole being? Tremulous, uncertain and heavy, my hand runs over the lyre giving a discordant sound. Who will free me from the God that exhausts me ...? Sometimes I hear the rebellious Muse wandering uncertainly, like a bacchante in a frenzy, throught he noisy squares, or alone

> through the silent forests or the charming shores lapped gently by the mighty Guayas.[15]

His poetic genius and "rebelde Musa" ["rebellious Muse"] join, "en cristado morrion y peto armada / cual amazona fiera" [armed in crested morion and breastplate like a fierce Amazon], with the soldiers' ranks and march forward into battle against the armies of peninsular soldiers and European historians. He evokes those "siglos de virtud y gloria, / donde el guerrero sólo y el poeta / eran dignos de honor y de memoria" (105) ["those centuries of virtue and glory, where only the warrior and the poet were worthy of honour and of memory" (228)]. Just as important a subject as the generals in his historical poem is, therefore, the poetic "Yo" that sings ever more daring epic songs (110). Thus, Olmedo, like Barlow, celebrates the role of the poetic "Muses" in leading America to cultural independence from the European imperialist ideologies.

For this purpose, Olmedo's *Victoria,* like Barlow's *Vision of Columbus,* also makes use of the device of the vision. In the middle of Olmedo's description of the battle of Junín there appears in the sky the spirit of Huayna Capac, who was the last legitimate Inca ruler, in order to watch over the American forces on their road to victory. Like a guardian angel, Huayna Capca prophesies a bright future of the American republic after the victory at Ayacucho.

> Miró a Junín, y plácida sonrisa / vagó sobre su faz.
> "Hijos - decía - generación del sol afortundada, / que con

> placer yo puedo llamar mía, yo soy Huayna-Capac, soy el postrero / del vástago sagrado; / dichoso rey, mas padre desgraciado. / De esta mansión de paz y luz he visto correr las tres centurias / de maldición, de sangre y servidumbre / y el imperio regido por las Furias. (113) [He looked down at the battle site of Junín, and a calm smile spreads over his face. "Children," he spoke, "fortunate descenants of the Sun that with delight I can call my own, I am Huayna-Capac; I am the last sacred offspring; blessed king, but wretched father. From this sanctuary of piece and light I have watched three centuries pass by - centuries of damnation, of bloodshed and slavery, and of the empire ruled by the furies.]

Huayna, rather than, say, the first Inca Manco, as the father of creole Revolutionaries is a significant choice here with subtle implications. It had been Huayna who had adulterated the royal Inca blood by marrying the princess of Quito and whose `bastard' son with her, Atahualpa, subsequently usurped the Inca throne, thus throwing the Inca state into the civil war in which the Spanish conquerors found it. Huayna had therefore become something of a pariah for sixteenth-century Inca historians, such as the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega, who had interpreted the subsequent Spanish conquest as God's punishment for Huayna's sin against ancient Inca law, according to which the Incas were allowed to marry only pure-blooded Inca relatives, often sisters and cousins. By contrast, Huayna becomes, in Olmedo's Revolutionary epic, the father of creole America.

Thus, the American Revolution represents, in Olmedo's poem, the return of the land to its `rightful' owners--the creole "children" of the (dead) Inca ruler--after it had been usurped by the `European' conquerors. The creole insurgency represents, moreover, the fulfillment not only of

Inca history but also of the history of the Aztecs, whose conquest had preceded that of the Incas. Thus Huayna exclaims: "oh dolor! ni el solo, ni el primero: que mis caros hermanos / el gran Guatimozin y Motezuma / conmigo el caso acerbo lamentaron" (114). [Oh pain, but I was not the only one nor the first one; my dear brothers / the great Guatimozin and Motezuma / lamented with me the bitter event (of the Conquest)].

Even the creole elites' old arch-enemy--the Indians' *defensor* Bartolome de Las Casas--is now mobilized in Olmedo's historical synthesis for the cause of the creole insurgency--as "el martir del amor americano / de paz, de caridad apostol santo" (115) [the martyr of American love / of peace / of apostolic and holy charity]. Of course, the real Las Casas had, during the colonial period in the sixteenth century, been much more closely allied with Spanish metropolitan rather than creole interests. But in Olmedo's postcolonial creole reinvention of American history, the sixteenth-century historiographic polemicisms about the European conquest are (anachronistically) re-configured in order to construct the legitimacy of the creole Revolution against the `European' usurpation.

Besides appealing to the Inca past, Olmedo finds the origins of American strength and love of liberty in the "sublime" of the American landscape. In his poem, the Andes become a symbol for American love of freedom and strength:

Mas los sublimes montes, cuya frente / a la region eterea

> se levanta, / que ven las tempestades a su planta / brillar, rugir, romperse, disiparse, / los Andes, las enormes, estupendas / moles sentadas sobre bases de oro, / la tierra con su peso equilibrando, / jamas se moveran. Ellos, burlando / de ajeno envidia y del protervo tiemp / la furia y el poder, seran eternosde libertad y de victoria heraldos ....(104)
> [The sublime mountains, however, their faces raised in the ethereal regions, watching the storms flare up, roar, shatter, and vanish at their feet, the huge and marvelous blocks on foundations of gold that balance the earth with their weight, the Andes will never move. Scorning the fury and the strength of foreign envy and peevish time, they will be the eternal heralds of freedom and victory .... (226)]

The Araucans--like the modern Ecuadorians--were invincible because they were under the invigorating influence and protection of the Andes. In his environmental argument, Olmedo is followed by many other Spanish American Revolutionary poets, who also appealed to the American landscape as an origin for their love of libery (see Cussen 1992, 74). However, like Olmedo, they hereby merely entered into the polemical disputes with European environmentalist theorists that civilization could not flourish in America. Andrés Bello, for example, wrote his poem *La agricultura de la zona tórrida* (1826) precisely in order to contradict these determinist theories. Not only is the torrid zone equal, Bello claimed there, but even superior for the nurturing of civilization. Rather than rejecting the authority of ancient European rhetorical traditions reaching back as far as Pliny, American creoles therefore merely inverted its arguments, a strategy foundational in the "intellectual construction of America" which resulted, as Jack Greene (1993) has argued for the case of British

Americans, in an anxious, though hardy, tradition of American exceptionalism.

5. JOEL BARLOW'S *VISION OF COLUMBUS*

Like Olmedo, the North America Revolutionary creole poet Joel Barlow also did not lack a creole epic tradition in his native New England. Analogously, however, he did not choose what has been called the "First American Epic Poem" (Slotkin and Folsom 1978)--Benjamin Tompson's New England poem about King Philip's War *New Englands Crisis* (1676)--as a discursive model, as had his contemporary, the Federalist Timothy Dwight, in an epic poem about New England which he entitled *The Conquest of Canaan* (1788). Rather, Barlow chose Ercilla's sixteenth-century (European) epic about Chilean Noble Savages, who bravely resisted the `European' invader.

Barlow's *Vision of Columbus*, like Ercilla's *Araucaniad* and Olmedo's *Victoria*, also celebrates the New World warrior/poet's subjective experience. And Barlow perceives his role in writing his historical poem about the American Revolution as being similar to that of Ercilla. After the battles are fought and won, and experience contradicts a whole historiographic tradition which claimed that degenerate "Americans have never succeeded in defense of their liberty rights" (Robertson 1829, 347), it is the eye-witness/poet's task to re-write history from his own, more advanced perspective:

> And lo, descending from the seats of art,

> The growing throngs for active scenes depart;
> In various garbs they thread the welcome land
> Swords at their side or sceptres in their hand,
> With healing powers bid dire disease cease (304).

But, as in Ercilla, the appeal to progress in historical knowledge through eye-witnessing the action is not an appeal to a more factually accurate social reality; but rather it is a progress toward a more perfect historical ideal leading to a higher stage in the knowledge of truth. Appealing to his subjective experience, the American poet/historian creates a new, more perfect image of America, like a painter paints a more ideal landscape in order to reveal a yet broader glimpse of truth.

> Thro' nature's range their ardent soul aspire,
> Or wake to life the canvass and the lyre.
> Fixt in sublimest thought, behold them rise,
> Superior worlds unfolding to their eyes;
> Heaven in their view unveils the eternal plan,
> And gives new guidance to the paths of man (307).

Barlow's idea of poetry reflects hereby the idea of government in the heroic Inca emperor in the second book of *Vision*, who grounded his authority for his benevolent government by creating the illusion of being the child of the sun. This illusion created by the heroic emperor Manco (the "Guardian" of America) prefigures the rhetorical illusion of the "Vision" created by the Seraph and the poet Barlow himself. The rhetorical counter-illusion is, like sun-worship, the benign means to the "mighty plan design'd, To bless the nations and reform mankind" (166).

The Seraph/poet's rediscovery of America is thus more precisely a creole reinvention of America. The poet and re-

creator of history becomes in Barlow what Cynthia Jordan has called the "new patriarchy" of the learned authority figure of the Republic (506). In singing about the moderate and benevolent despotism of Manco, which "encouraged the advancement of knowledge, without being endangered by success" (186), Barlow sings about himself as he is trying to re-negotiate the progresses and dangers that the Revolutionary zeal brought with them by creating a new, more perfect historical illusion. Like the heroic Wadsworth, whose revolutionary zeal led to political independence through military warfare, Barlow, the New World poet, fashions himself as the revolutionary man of letters who leads to cultural independence.

Thus, both Olmedo and Barlow carry on an American (post-) colonial literary tradition in which the "primary concern of ... literature has been itself" and where "the subject of the writer's work became its own process" (Ashcroft, Griffith, and Tiffin 1989, 137). Both Revolutionary authors hereby appropriate the first New World epic, Ercilla's *La Araucana*, as a model for a postcolonial literary history and re-configure--as polemically as anachronistically--colonial creole and imperial European representational practices in the discourses about the conquest.

It is in the context of the debate about America that the dialogues between Columbus and the "Seraph" in Barlow's

Vision of Columbus must be read. Thus, Columbus asks with regard to the American man:

> Tell then, my Seer, from what dire sons of earth
> The brutal people drew their ancient birth?
> Whether in realms, the western heavens that close,
> A tribe distinct from other nations rose,
> Born to subjection; when, in happier time,
> A nobler race should hail their fruitful clime
> ... Why various powers of soul and tints of face
> In different climes diversify the race. (152)

While Barlow, in this passage (like Olmedo in his poem), accepts the ideological premise of the determinant influences of the environment on human civilization, he goes on to invert its negative conclusions. For Europeans living in the extremities of the American environment, culture and "institutions" have the greatest potential to flourish. The Indians, by contrast,--coming from Asia, where "Tartar hosts for countless years, have fail'd" (156)--degenerate in the colds of the North American continent. Europeans transplanted to America become, in this narrative, not weaker, smaller, and less civilized--as European natural historians had argued--but rather stronger, bigger, and more virtuous. As evidence, Barlow observes that Europeans transplanted to America have a "ruddier hue" than those remaining in Europe (155). Barlow thus manipulates European imperial discourse by inverting spatial determinations on the one hand and by emphasizing racial determinations on the other.

This is, as Robert Lawson-Peebles has pointed out, a common (however fateful) rhetorical strategy in American

Revolutionary writing (1988, 44-57). In his discussions of Crevecoeur, Freneau, Brackenridge, and Lewis and Clark's journal, Lawson-Peebles shows how these North American creole writers often failed to accommodate the American landscape in their Revolutionary quest for cultural independence by recoiling into European concepts about America. Similarly, Myra Jehlen (1986) has illustrated the more or less successful attempts by Thomas Jefferson and the Argentinean writer Domingo Faustino Sarmiento to escape the patriarchy of the European literary traditions in their representations of the American landscape. In this regard, both Barlow's and Olmedo's American Republics also become an indigenous "American Incarnation."

However, unlike the writers discussed by Lawson-Peebles and Jehlen, Olmedo and Barlow did not leave the post-colonial problem of a historical continuity in a distinctly native American past unsolved. More accurately, in both Barlow's and Olmedo's case, the American Republic is less legitimized by *incarnating* a timeless natural landscape than by *re-incarnating* previous stages of an American historical past. For this purpose, Barlow resorts to a significant rhetorical `trick': He claims that the founders of the great ancient American civilizations had sprung not from Asian but rather from European origins:

> When first thy roving race, the Power reply'd
> Learned by the stars the devious sail to guide,
> From stormy Hellespond explored the way
> ... Driven from those rocky straits, a hapless train
> Roll'd on the waves that sweep the western main. (156)

It was these descendants from classical Greek antiquity, he claims, who built the great empires of Mexico and Peru and who are the real ancestors of Revolutionary Americans.

Barlow may have borrowed this device from Thomas More's *Utopia*, in which More had written that a native Utopian "chronicle" mentioned a

> shipwreck that was made on their coast 1,200 years ago; and that some Romans and Egyptians that were in the ship, getting safe ashore, spent the rest of their days amongst them; and such was their ingenuity, that from this single opportunity they drew the advantage of learning from those unlooked-for guests, and acquired all the useful arts that were then among the Romans, and which were known to these shipwrecked men .... (1965, 88-89)

However, in their search for a post-colonial historiographic tradition about American, both Barlow and Olmedo found a more immediate model in another New World writer: the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega, who had also read More and had been influenced by *Utopia* in the representation of Inca culture in his *Comentarios reales* (see Duran Luzio 1976).

6. THE MESTIZO HISTORY OF THE INCA GARCILASO

Independence had, of course, been far from the Inca's agenda when he wrote his *Comentarios reales* during the 1590s. As the *mestizo* offspring of creole and the Inca elites, he had rather attempted to re-define Peru's status within the Spanish empire--from that of a colony to a that of a kingdom equal to, say, León or Aragon. In its *mestizo* vision of Peruvian history, Garcilaso's narrative was therefore quite distinct from the chronicles written by Peruvian provincial

Indians, such as Garcilaso's contemporary Felipe Guamán Poma de Ayala, who, in his *La primera nueva crónica y buen gobierno* (1615), suggested to the Spanish emperor that the Indians had now been converted and that the Spaniards (creole as well as peninsulares) should now go home. And while Guamán's Indian voice disappeared into oblivion until the twentieth century--when it was suddenly `discovered' in an archive in Copenhague and has attracted scholarly attention only recently in Latin American postcolonial criticism--Garcilaso's work became the perhaps most influential historical source for nineteenth-century creole nationalists such as the Revolutionary Francisco de Miranda, who cited the *Comentarios* extensively in his influential revolutionary pamphlet *Proclamación a los pueblos Columbianos*. And while Garcilaso himself was not, in colonial society, a creole, he has nevertheless been claimed by nationalist literary critics as the "primer criollo" chronicler of America (see Sanchez 1945).

It is no coincidence that Garcilaso's sixteenth-century history of Peru has become a long-time Spanish American `classic' in a creole nationalist ideology. Not only could an identification with his *mestizo* heritage signify a creole postcolonial difference from imperial Spain, but it also conveniently legitimized the creoles' presence in America, which was still, after all, being contested by native resistance to creoles and `gachupines' (peninsulars) alike. It is in the context of this nationalist celebration of

mestizaje as a creole postcolonial phenomenon that the Inca Garcilaso was appropriated as a literary model in Spanish America and by the North American poet Joel Barlow.

The sixteenth-century *mestizo* Garcilaso was in his historiographic project of writing about the New World in a similar position as the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century creoles Barlow and Olmedo. Prefiguring Barlow's struggle with Robertson, Garcilaso, too, had to re-write American history--indigenous history and the history of the Conquest--as constructed by the Renaissance court historians of the Spanish empire. And as much as Garcilaso was discredited by Robertson, he was praised by Barlow. For example, Robertson had written about Garcilaso's history of Inca civilization that, "As for composition, arrangement, or a capacity of distinguishing between what is fabulous, what is probable, and what is true, one searches for them in vain in the commentaries of the Inca" (1828, 494). Barlow, on the other hand, praises the "honest zeal of Garcilaso de la Vega in collecting these traditions into one body of history, as a probable series of facts, [which] is to be applauded; since he has there presented us with one of the most striking examples of the *beau ideal* in political character, that can be found in the whole range of literature" (797-98).

Like Olmedo and Barlow, Garcilaso had also appealed to first-hand experience in order to lend his revisionary historical account authority. Nevertheless, the Inca

expressed a great deal of self-consciousness in relation to the historiographic authority of his European counterparts. In a typically apologetic gesture, Garcilaso writes: "I for my part have done what I could, though not all I desired. I beg the discreet reader to accept my will to give him pleasure and satisfaction, though the strength and skill of an Indian, born among Indians and brought up amidst horses and arms, may be insufficient for the attempt" (1688, 51-52). And Barlow, in a similar vein, laments the "disadvantages that an Author, in a new country, and in moderate circumstances, must have to encounter" (168).

Thus, if, as Leon Howard complains, Barlow's poetry is "original in intent but imitative in effect, romantic in substance yet neoclassic in form" (1967, 53), his use of neoclassical language was a "recoil" from the anxiety about being a provincial (Buell 1986, 90). In the light of myths that (in the words of a commentator for the *Edinburgh Review*) "polished literature is not to be expected from America" (quoted in Todd 1886, 221), the American authors appealed to European conventional rhetorical traditions in order to lend their historiographic revisionist models authority. Like Barlow and Olmedo, Garcilaso therefore attempted to match and surpass the Europeans' rhetorical persuasiveness and eloquence of verisimilitude in his somewhat anachronistic use of a Renaissance language of history.[16]

Margarita Zamora has located Garcilaso's authorial

strategy within a humanist tradition of linguistic exegesis and return to textual originals. Like Lorenzo Valla, who had disproved the legitimacy of Pope Sylvester's donation of certain Italian territories to the church by exposing the document as a corruption, and like Fray Luis de León, who returned to the Hebrew version of the Bible suspecting the Latin version to be corrupt, Garcilaso retrieves `true' Inca history from Spanish corruption by way of a return to the original Quechua sources (see Zamora 1988, 18-30). In this fashion, the Inca historian constructed a historiographic model which would exert tremendous appeal for later creole Revolutionaries. But in order to understand the reasons for this appeal in the Inca's chronicle, it is necessary to illustrate in detail his vision of American and universal history.

"No hay más que un mundo," Garcilaso had declared at the beginning of his *Comentarios*, "y aunque llamamos Mundo Viejo y Mundo Nuevo, es por haberse descubierto éste nuevamente para nosotros, y no porque sean dos, sino todo uno" (1960, 7) [There is only one world; and although we speak of the Old World and the New, this is because the latter was lately discovered by us, and not because there are two" (1688, 9)]. Garcilaso's entire subsequent historiographic enterprise revolves around this one thesis. Like Barlow and Olmedo, Garcilaso attempts to re-configure the divisive foundations on which Spanish Imperial history rested and to persuade his audience that his colonial *patria*

has a legitimate history. Although the *mestizo* Garcilaso did not, as would the creole Barlow, claim European origins for the Incas, he also assimilated the representation his own native elite ancestors to the image of the European Self in order to redeem Inca culture from European colonial discourse of Otherness. He therefore carefully distinguishes between the ruling class of the Incas on the one hand and the provincial Indians on the other, stressing that the Incas never practiced violations of natural law but were, indeed, a race with a superior civilization. In this, they differ from the provincial Indians, who, in their "primitive heathendom ... were little better than tame beasts and others much worse than wild beasts" (1688, 30).

Here Garcilaso's version of Peruivan history is, again, distinct from those of provincial Indian chroniclers such as Guaman Poma, whose ethnic group, the Yarovilca, had been subjugated by the Incas in the thirteenth century. Thus, Guaman argued, in his *Nueva Coronica y Buen Gobierno* (1615), that the pre-Incan Indians were Christians, monotheists by nature who were confirmed in their intuitive faith by the visit of Saint Bartholomew. However, it was Incan idolatry, Guaman argues, which had made the first Andeans abandon monotheism for the cult of the sun and of the huacas, or earthly deities. Guaman Poma's version of the myth of the origin of Cuzco therefore also differs from that of Garcilaso de la Vega: whereas for Guaman Poma the first Inca Manco Capac descended from the sun and a sorceress, for

Garcilaso, he descended fro the sun and the moon, civilizing the original inhabitants of Peru.

But what is of particular interest is the rhetorical strategy the Inca used in order to create this distinction: he divides pre-Conquest American history into two distinct temporal stages in an upward movement toward civility:

> Para que se entienda mejor la idolatría, vida y costumbres de los indios del Perú, será necesario dividamos aquellos siglos en dos edades: diremos cómo vivían antes de los Incas, y luego diremos cómo gobernaron aquellos reyes, para que no se confunda lo uno con lo otro. (1960, 19) [For the better understanding of the idolatry, way of life, and customs of the Indians of Peru, it will be necessary for us to divide those times into two periods. First we shall say how they lived before the Incas, and then how the Inca kings governed, so as not to confuse the one thing with the other, and so that the customs and gods of one period are not attributed to the other. (1688, 30)]

In order to emphasize the contrast between the two periods, Garcilaso discusses in detail the barbarity of the pre-Inca Indians in precisely the idioms of European colonialist languages. Then he continues by relating how the first Inca Manco Capac, the child of the sun, ascends from Lake Titicaca and civilizes those who would become subjects under his imperial authority. The two periods are neatly separated from each other by a great flood (supposedly a punishment of the first Indians' barbarism), which is associated with the Biblical Flood.

Garcilaso hereby initiates a narrative strategy which pervades his entire work: He inscribes Western history into the American hemisphere, thereby creating not *real* Inca history but rather a *rhetorically persuasive model* that is

supposed to bring his audience to acknowledge that America had a valid pre-colonial history at all. Garcilaso therefore stylizes his accounts of Inca history in the language of the urban patriots of the Italian Renaissance such as Leonardo Bruni and Francesco Guicciardini.[17] Throughout his history of the Inca empire--for example in his descriptions of the imperial city of Cuzco or in Manco's Ciceronian speeches--he evokes explicit and implicit comparisons with ancient Rome. Like Aenas, who gave the barbarous Italic tribes Greek civilization, the Inca Capac, in his "greatness, piety, clemency, liberality, justice, and magnanimity" teaches the Indians the "rules of civility, ... friendship and brotherhood, as the laws of nature and reason dictated" (1688, 46). True, he concedes, during this first period of Inca history man adored idols "with as much veneration as the ancient Gentiles, such as the Greeks and Romans, did their Jupiter, Mars, and Venus" (1688, 47). However, as in Western history, his period came to an end, and the Christian period began.

> ... los reyes Incas, y sus amautas, que eran los filósofos, rastrearon *con lumbre natural* al veradero sumo Dios y Señor Nuestro que crió el cielo y la tierra, como adelante veremos en los argumentos y sentencias que algunos de ellos dijeron de la divina Majestad. (1960, 43; emphasis mine)
> [... the Incas, who were kings, and the Amautas, who were philosophers, proceeded *by the mere light of nature*, to the knowledge of the True Almighty God our Lord, maker of heaven and earth, as we shall hereafter prove by their own words and testimonies which some of them gave of the Divine Majesty. (1688, 70; emphasis mine)]

The Inca Capac, like Moses, is a lawgiver and messenger of God, whom the Indians called "Pachacámac" (1688, 42). In order to refute Spanish historians who had accused the Incas of devil worship and in order to prove that a Christian tradition had indeed existed in pre-Conquest America, Garcilaso re-asserts an old argument claiming that the Inca god (Pachacámac) and the Catholic god were one and the same thing. Before Garcilaso, the Spanish historian Pedro Cieza de León had countered this argument by claiming that the Incas' god was actually the Devil, who had only told them that he was the god of the Spaniards. Carrying the argument one step further, Garcilaso responds to Cieza with the typical irony of the American writer:

> El cual en decir que el Dios de los cristianos y el Pachacamac era todo uno, dijo verdad [el demonio]; porque la intención de aquellos indios fué dar esté nombre Dios que da vida y ser al universo, como lo significa el mismo nombre; y en decir que él era el Pachacamac mintió, porque la intención de los indios nunca fué dar este nombre al demonio, que no le llamaron sino Cupay, que quire decir diablo. (1960, 44)
> [The Devil was right in saying that the God of the Christians and the Pachacámac were one and the same, for the intention of the Indians was to give the name to the Most High God who gives life and being to the universe, as the very name implies. But the Devil lied in saying that he was the Pachacámac, for the Indians never intended this name for the Devil, whom they called Cupay, meaning `devil'. (1688, 71)]

In a distinctly American fashion, Garcilaso combines humanist rhetorical strategy and his experiential knowledge about America in order to construct his historical counter-model, which rests on the authority of his superior linguistic competency. Moreover, by creating a pre-Conquest

Christian tradition in America, Garcilaso offers a rhetorically persuasive alternative for including America in the Western concept of providential history other than through conquest.

In fact, in his account of the arrival of the Spaniards, he denies that the Conquest ever happened: the Incas never resisted, he claims, but welcomed the original Spaniards and were eager to join their own empire with theirs in order to bring about the providential fulfillment of one universal Christian empire and--by implication--the millennium. Garcilaso builds here his rhetorical "edificio" on the foundation of the scholastic legal arguments of Las Casas (49). During the `Great Debate' of Valladolid in 1553 between Las Casas and the conquerors' `lawyer', Juan Gines de Sepúlveda, Las Casas had argued that there could be no just war against an infidel people who did not actively resist Christianization (see Hanke 1970). Garcilaso appropriates Las Casas' argument in order to absolve the Inca elite. The hostilities that had ensued at Cajamarca between Pizarro and Atahualpa, he argues, were the consequence of a series of linguistic misunderstandings between Atahualpa, his interpreter Filipillo, and the Spanish priest Valverde, not because the Inca's resisted the Holy Cross.

In his tragic vision of history, Garcilaso hereby links the fatal mistake of the Conquest with the biblical Babel, where men ceased to understand God and one another. His

jeremiad here resembles the mannerist voice of Ercilla, who had also lamented that Spain, in its greed and cruelty, had fallen from its providential role in the fulfillment of history ("losing in one hour the honor / Won through centuries of striving" [1945, 41]). The erroneous assumptions governing European historiography become, in the Inca Garcilaso, the historical analogue of this linguistic fall.

In his rhetorical construction of a new historical model, Garcilaso asserted then that the America of the Incas was not a timeless Other but had a history in the mirror-image of Europe. He thereby subverted European assumptions about the "newness" and Otherness of America: the fulfillment of providential history was not to be achieved by means of a spatial expansion of the `Old' World into the `New' as in the court historians (who had portrayed the conquest as a mythic, inevitable movement of the frontier of the Catholic empire from Spain to the Caribbean to *Tierra Firme*). This spatial opposition between the European Self and the American Other was, however, precisely the foundation on which their colonialist narratives had rested: an ideological axis which separated civility from barbarity, drawn into space. Garcilaso, by contrast, implied that the millennium could only be achieved in a temporal, parallel, and universal progress on both sides of the Atlantic. However, in Garcilaso, this progressive temporal scheme remained only implicit as he couched it in his mannerist

jeremiad--the nostalgia for the past grandeur of the Inca empire destroyed by the conquest.

In his rhetorical counter-model of a progression in time from barbarity to civility of "One World," Garcilaso relocates the divisive axis in European colonial discourse from space into time and hereby opens up a distinctly modern dimension in the "bipolar" structure inherent in Western historiography (see de Certeau 1988, 135; also 118-125). In light of an application of post-colonial theory to the American independence movements, then, it is significant that the narrative that the creole Revolutionaries would appropriate was less interested in an "abrogation" of European colonial discourse (Ashcroft, Griffith, and Tiffin 1989, 38) than it was in a *manipulation* and re-configuration of this tradition: Garcilaso attempted to assimilate *a part of* American history to the European Self while re-asserting another part of American history as Europe's Other. It is this model that would later result, in Barlow's creole appropriation of the *mestizo*'s text, in the distinction between *two* indigenous races in America: the `real' (Asian) Indians (as they still exist[ed]) and the (white) mythic and noble Indians of the past whose heirs, of course, are the creoles themselves.

7. THE INCA GARCILASO AND JOEL BARLOW'S NEW WORLD HISTORY

While there are still some religious overtones in *Vision*, Barlow generally divests Garcilaso's model of Christian

mythology. However, Barlow borrows the Inca's rhetorical device of assimilating America to Western historiographic models of Selfhood and cultural evolution. And he, too, uses this strategy in a dialogue of his own with the imperial historian Robertson: Why, Columbus asks the Seraph, have the Americans - "These tribes [which] have stray'd beneath the fruitful zone / Their souls unpolished and their name unknown" - not produced any great civilizations like the Western world - where "Since that unletter'd, distant tract of time / What arts have shone! / what empires found their place!"? (157-58). As an answer, the Seraph shows Columbus the great civilizations of America.

First, he gives a description of Mexico, which becomes America's Egypt. Tenochtitlán is built in "Memphian style" (160); its temples - in "eastern" and "equal pomp" - are "magnificently great;" and Moctezuma (like the Pharaohs), is "robed in state, high on a golden throne, [a] Mid suppliant king[]" (158-59). While Robertson (and the imperial Spanish court historians) had praised Cortés for his valor and had described him as a benevolent "leader of great abilities" who treated the Indians with much clemency (Robertson 1829, 230-235), Barlow - following Garcilaso's gradual de-mythologizing of Pizarro and Almagro - depicts a "murderous Cortés" as the epitome of Spanish cruelty (162).

In Barlow's account of the second period of the American history, the Inca past becomes America's Classical Antiquity. Barlow's descriptions of the Inca empire abound

in allusions to ancient Greece and Rome. The imperial city of Cuzco, for example, is a place where the "arts and peace" flourish (Pax Augusta) and where processions of "white-robed ... virgins" can be watched (166). Peace, civic and public virtue prevail throughout. Capac's political system (as we learn in Barlow's "Dissertation") was "at least equal to those of the most celebrated ancient or modern lawgivers" (187), and his leadership promoted "the advancement of knowledge." Although Capac's government was--like that of Augustus--despotic, it was "beyond all comparison" in his "artfully contrived" pretensions to divine authority, which linked religion and the state for the sake of his benevolent ends as well as for the benefit of his imperial subjects. In this, Barlow claims, Capac equals the "most enlightened periods of antiquity, [when] only a very few of the wisest Philosophers, a Socrates, a Tully, or a Confucius, ever formed a just idea on the subject or described the Deity as a God of purity, justice and benevolence" (189).

Barlow responds here directly to Robertson, who had denounced Capac for having "arrogated a ... jurisdiction over the new subjects which they acquired; the despotism of Asia was not more complete" (1829, 268-69). Robertson had hereby repeated an old theme in imperial history which reaches, once more, back to the Las Casas/Sepúlvada debate at Valladolid. Among other things, Sepúlvada had been intent on proving that the American empires were 'tyrannical' in nature, which would have qualified the Americans, according

to Aristotelian philosophy, as barbarians and thus legitimate objects of conquest. This theme was later perpetuated by Herrera and de Pauw. Las Casas, by contrast, tried to demonstrate that the Inca and Aztec societies met the Aristotelian definition of a city, which required agriculture, artisans, warriors, rich men, organized religion, and lawful government (see Brading 1991, 94-101).

Likewise, in Barlow, Capac is the incarnation of Republican virtues. Like Cincinnatus, who was not naturally a warrior, he left his fields in order to defend his *patria* against the barbarous intruders of the tribe of Zamor. He returns to his wife Oella after having subdued his enemies by gentle persuasion and promises of extending his benevolent imperial protection to them (170-71). In the "Dissertation," Barlow emphasizes that in the Inca empire the cultivation of the soil was considered a "divine art" (185). He evokes, in short, the pastoral imagery that William Dowling has called "Connecticut Georgic"--however projected onto the Native American past as an `Inca Georgic'.

Revolutionary Americans thus become the direct descendants of the Incas. The British, by contrast, are linked to the barbarous tribe of Zamor, which has invaded the Inca empire and takes Rocha, Manco's son, captive. Echoing Garcilaso's distinction between waning barbarous and prevailing civilized American nations, the barbarous tribe (like wild "tygers") are about to offer Rocha to their "Gods

of gore" in an outrageous blood sacrifice, when Manco appears and engages in an epic battle with Zamor: "The strife is fierce, your sanes and fields the prize, The warrior conquers or the infant dies" (216). The benevolent Manco, who "knows to conquer, but .. loves to spare" rescues his son, who in turn, fathers twelve subsequent generations of benevolent government and American civic values.

Analogously, the British--"another wolfe" (272)--during the Revolutionary War, take America captive, thereby linking the mythic Rocha to America: "And, with increasing vollies, give the fight ... smear'd with clouds of dust, and bath'd in gore ... your children butcher'd and your villas burn'd" (266-67). But then a new Manco, the heroic Wadsworth, comes to rescue and engages in the epic battle with the British foe: "Reverse the fate, avenge the insulted sky; Move to the strife, we conquer or we die" (271). Barlow thus responds to Garcilaso's mannerist nostalgia for the lost Inca Golden Age and asserts that the progress of American civilization begun by the Incas was fulfilled by, and culminated in, the American Republic.

Thus, Manco has a prophetic vision of "future empires from its labours rise" (169). When Tenochtitlán falls, Columbus laments ever having discovered America for the Europeans; however, he is consoled by the Seraph that "future years thy rising fame extend," and future "fires of nations" will follow Mexico in America (161). In turn, Pizarro is the re-incarnation of Cortés ("another Cortez"

[165]). Equally, when the empire of the "arts of Peace" in Peru is destroyed, the Seraph evokes the prospect of another empire to follow (173).

By linking the Mexican and Peruvian past with the Republican present, Barlow creates an American genealogy of Republican values. And in order to create this post-colonial version of American history, he must inevitably appropriate, like the writers Lawson-Peebles discussed, European languages of history about America. However, far from merely imitating the Christian Humanist discursive tradition, which negated an American past, he reconfigures its various discourses and "becomes its master" as Gari Laguardia has put it in regard to another New World writer (1986, 272).

8. HISTORY, CREOLE NATIONALISM, AND POSTCOLONIALISM

Both Barlow's and Olmedo's historical thoughts were thus shaped by their reinvention of America and the global significances it held "for the improvement of mankind." As in Garcilaso's *Comentarios*, in Barlow's *Vision* and Olmedo's *Victoria* providential history is not Europe's inevitable expansion into an empty American landscape, but rather the progression of one American stage of history after another. Providential history comes to its fulfillment through a parallel and symmetrical progress through distinct stages in the New World and in the Old. In neither creole epic is the American Republic then the "ricorso" to the Old World classical past; nor is it, as William Dowling has argued for

Barlow's case, an "England in exile" (1990, 23). Significantly, Barlow--unlike some of his contemporaries but like many of his nineteenth-century literary descendants--refuses to attribute great literary importance to the Puritan exodus.

By dismissing the first three books of Barlow's poem, Dowling has therefore misread Barlow's concept of *translatio imperii* and *translatio studii*. Surely, Barlow, by claiming an Ancient Greek origin for the American empires, also makes use of the concept of *translatio studii*. But it is not the cyclical design of the rise and fall of empires which is on a gradual and providential westward course through space, thereby extending the "real" old England into the "New World" at the arrival of the first English colonists. Nor does Barlow, by claiming European origins for the great empires of America, merely pre-date Europe's providential expansion into America through *translatio imperii* in order to assert his post-colonial desire for cultural independence from England. After all, the poem is dedicated to Louis XVI, who, like Manco, is acknowledged as the "Guardian" of America in the Old World (104) and who is associated with Manco also in the metaphor of the sun (Louis's dynasty referred to themselves as the "Sun Kings").

In Barlow's epic, as in Garcilaso's *Comentarios*, American history is the hemispheric variant of a unilinear and temporal teleology determining the progress of "One World." Barlow fashioned himself as the New World poet not

so much in a spatial sense (America vs. Europe) as in a universal and temporal sense as the bard of the American age, who reveals the meaning of history ever more perfectly by participation in the historical process. However, Barlow's historical thought was hereby not so much "proto-Hegelian," as Dowling has argued; Hegel was entirely unaware of the influences of the Americas upon European historical thought and treated the Americas as an exception to his theory of historical dialectics. In *The Philosophy of History*, Hegel, who had conceived of the idea of a progressive historical development in his contemplation of the meanings of the French Revolution, even dismissed the idea of an American history:

> We have news of America and its culture, particularly of Mexico and Peru, but all they tell us is that it was *entirely* natural and that it had to go under as soon as the spirit came near it. America has shown itself physically and spiritually impotent and still does so ... all that happens in America has its origins in Europe. (107-108, 1944)

From an epistemological perspective outside Europe, therefore, Hegelian (and later Marxist) historical dialectics, in its universalizing narrative of the unfolding of a rational system of world history modeled on the experience of Europe, presents itself, as Robert Young has noted, as "simply a negative form of the history of European imperialism" (1990, 2). Barlow, by contrast, conceptualized his history emphatically *not* as a Euro-centric and outwardly expansionist spirit as would later Hegel or Marx. As I have aimed to show, he arrived at his progressivist historical

narrative as a result of his creole `postcolonial' attempt to inscribe a place into `History' which had been invented as `without' history--as a `New World'.

Significantly, Barlow's own first-hand experience of the French Revolution does not seem to have affected his historical thought. Thus, he does not write a new poem about the French Revolution but returns to his epic about America, revises it from his now more advanced perspective, and later publishes it as *The Columbiad* (1807). After experience had taught him that benevolent despotism was bound to fail, he quietly dropped Louis XVI (to whom *Vision* had been dedicated) and now pointed to certain flaws of Manco's despotic government in his revisionary account of Inca history. Whereas in *Vision*, Capac's rule is "what arts unknown" (167) in the *Columbiad* "what pious fraud" (61); what then was Capac's "virtue" (168) now is only a "charm of glory"(474); the "sacred rites" (229) of sun-worship-like government become mere "religion .. [which] still deludes the race" (527).

But to Barlow, the French Revolution merely reconfirmed what America had already taught him--that history is an essentially linear and progressive movement, the meaning of which is knowable only through subjective experience in the present. In the *Columbiad*, he therefore further sharpens his critique of the European rhetoric of newness, division, and expansionism with regard to America. For example, whereas in the introduction to *Vision* he still had talked about the

"discovery of a new world" (116), in the introduction to the *Columbiad* it is the "discovery of what *they called* a new world" (403; emphasis mine).

Also, in the *Columbiad,* Barlow reenforces the linear concept of history which had already informed *Vision.* Whereas in the first edition, the rise of Mexico initiates "*circling* years the destined course have run, The realms are peopled and their arts begun" (158; emphasis mine), in the revision Barlow writes that "at last the destined course is run, The realms are peopled and their arts begun" (463). In the American age, the present gives meaning to the past, not vice versa. History becomes, as Voltaire once put it somewhat cynically, "a pack of tricks .. that the present plays upon the past" (quoted in Jordan 1988, 494). But while Voltaire still found reason for cynicism in the waning authority of the past for giving meaning to the present, Barlow embraced his task as the New World poet who continually revises his poems and rewrites history for the welfare and progress of mankind.

The awareness of the "progressive character" of history that Dowling observed in both Barlow and Hegel, as well as the tendency to secularize the telos of history, conceiving it as "an inner imperative driving events at the objective level to a higher and higher realization of rational freedom," were then original neither to Barlow nor to Hegel (1990, 109-110). Rather they had been elements explicitly or implicitly present in the new historical models germinating

in the Europe's New World encounter and in the rise of comparative ethnology during the sixteenth century. While López de Gómara, when hailing "the discovery of America [as] the greatest event since the creation of the world," still cautiously excluded "the Incarnation and death of He who created it" (1991, 57), it had increasingly become human curiosity, not divine providence, which drove the *telos* of history. Since the American discoveries, "the self-confirmation of human curiosity," as Hans Blumenberg has written, "had become the form of its legitimization." A new *telos* became possible, one expressed in terms of progress and of the constant, if unsteady, process of the fulfillment of purely human objectivity. "History had become an authority to which to appeal against metaphysics" (Blumenberg 1983, 339-40; see also Elliott 1972; Maravall 1966).

Both creole Revolutionary poets thus appealed to the Indian past in order to assert their postcolonial difference. Interestingly, however, Olmedo has sometimes been criticized by creole nationlists for his glorification of Huayna-Capac,[18] since it dangerously conjured up memories not only of Francisco de Toledo's execution of Tupac Amaru in 1572, but also the more recent specters of the great Indian rebellions in Peru during the eighteenth century of Juan Santos Atahualpa and Tupac Amaru II. Jose Gabriel Condorcanqui Tupac Amaru II, who had styled himself as the true Inca descendant, and thus as the only rightful heir to

the land, had for that purpose also mobilized Garcilaso's *Comentarios*, which was later ordered to be withdrawn from circulation. But unlike the creole insurgency, this rebellion, taking place in the 1780s, would have expelled from America not only peninsular Spanish imperialists but also *criollo* oppressors, had it not been subdued in an extremely bloody and long-lasting war by a coalition of *gachupín* and creole forces. And while the Connecticut Wit Joel Barlow could evoke the distant Peruvian Incas more safely for his "historical poem," his creole postcolonial historiographic synthesis stood on no less ambivalent grounds, considering that not long before Barlow first conceptualized his poem, Chief Pontiac had mobilized an alliance against the European settlers that included Indian tribes from Lake Superior to the Gulf of Mexico.

But despite this ambivalence, the creole appropriation of the Native American past in both Barlow's and Olmedo's Revolutionary epics became an ideological foundation that created the new nations' historical legitimacy by inventing a distinctly American and anti-imperialist historical depth and continuity. Other prominent creole Revolutionaries in Spanish America such as the Venezuelan Francisco de Miranda and the Argentine Manuel Belgrano, therefore also eagerly exploited Native American symbols for their cause of insurgency. In the 1820s, Bolívar even had the ancient Inca temple of Pachacamac reconstructed, which had lay in ruins since the European conquest. Similarly, San Martín,

addressing the Araunanians of Argentinia in 1816, told them that "I am an Indian too" in order to mobilize them for his campaign of independence (see Henriquez Ureña 1946, 104). And while Revolutionary creole intellectuals in the new centers of postcolonial culture adopted the fictional `Noble Savage' that had adorned European writing about the New World since Peter Martyr in the early sixteenth century, their compatriots on the national and social frontiers continued to exterminate or oppress the real native populations in British and Spanish America alike. The creole writers, or what Stephen Slemon has called the "Second-World writers," have thus

> always been complicit in colonialism's territorial appropriation of land, and voice, and agency, and this has been their inescapable condition even at those moments when they have promulgated their most strident and most spectacular figures of post-colonial resistance. (Slemon 1990, 110)

American creoles forged postcolonial identities vexed by contradictions and anxieties that could only be resolved by a continuous nostaligia for and glorification of the Indian that has passed on the one hand and by the suppression of the Indian still alive on the other. It is an identity that is compulsively enacted and reenacted, as Vine Deloria has written, by the "dead Indian falling off the back of a horse" (1969, 47). And if therefore the notion of historical progress is a Western ideology at large, it is a particular foundational necessity in the construction of creole national identities in the Americas.

The Spanish American independence movements (and to a lesser degree also their British American counter-parts) were mainly carried on by creoles who formed an uneasy alliance with the various subordinated peoples of colonial America (*indios, mestizos, negros, mulattos, zambos, castas,* etc.). Only after independence, in the course of more or less violent revolutions (some of which are continuing to this day), were Latin American national identities transformed in what might be called America's `second' decolonization. Thus, as Jorge Klor de Alva reminds us, the American `revolutionary' wars, which brought about the separation from the European colonizing powers, present themselves not so much de-colonizing efforts (like the struggles for decolonization in Africa and South Asia), but rather as civil wars between different interest groups of Englishmen or Spaniards mostly over economic, and perhaps political, issues; but not over ideological or cultural ones (1995).

The difference between Olmedo and Barlow, of course, is that, whereas the latter mobilized the image of the Indian solely for the purpose of postcolonial identity politics, the former actually had to appeal to the Indian populations for their support in the war and therefore fostered the expectation among them that independence would also bring about their personal freedom, which was still curtailed by a number of legally disguised colonial practices. Like many other Spanish American Revolutionaries, Olmedo therefore

actively lobbied for the rights of (living) Indians, when, for instance, speaking out against the *mita* (the Peruvian equivalent of the *encomienda*) before the *Cortes* of Cadiz (see Guevara 1958, 121-130). The failure to make these promises a reality have haunted the Spanish American creole states ever since.

NOTES CHAPTER IV

[1] For the special significance of the epic genre (as opposed to the ethnographic history) in the writing about America in the context of Spanish imperial politics of literary production and censorship, see Adorno (1986).

[2] For a discussion of the problem of authorship in other Anglophone post-colonial societies, see Ashcroft Griffith, and Tiffin (1989, 7-9).

[3] For a discussion of this rediscovery of the Indian as a post-colonial phenomenon, see Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (1989, 143).

[4] In the 1540s, for example, a group of *criollos* in New Spain appeared, dressed up as Indians, in front of the house of Martin Cortes and symbolically re-enacted the surrender of Tenochtitlan to the son of the Conqueror in order to demonstrate against imperial policy in passing of the New Laws; see Padgen (1987).

[5] There was an entire colony of Spanish American Revolutionaries in Philadelphia during the early nineteenth century who served as conduits for the exchange of ideas. See here especially the writings of Félix Varela, José Servando Teresa de Mier, and Francisco de Miranda, who travelled in and wrote extensively about the United States. While many of these liberals, such as Miranda, viewed the United States with admiration, they also felt that Spanish Americans lacked the liberal values that had made the American Republic possible. For some scholarship, see Owen Aldridge (1971 and 1982), Miguel Luis Amunátegui (1888), Lanning (1956), and Rodriguez de Alonso (1982).

[6] For a discussion of Martí's hemispheric vision from a postcolonial perspective, see Saldívar (1991).

[7] This translation was titled *The Royal Commentaries of Peru* (1688), which is my source here.

[8] Thus, when George Dekker (1987)observed the epic qualities of the American "Historical Romance" and saw that Cooper had "reincarnate[d] the heroes of Homer, Milton, and the Bible in the New York Wilderness" (i.e. in the struggle between Uncas and Magua in *The Last of the Mohicans*), he did not have to go back to Homer in order to find Cooper's models. He could have found them more immediately in Barlow's epics.

[9] For some criticism of Olmedo's poetry, see Guevara (1958) Hills (1920); and Caracciolo-Trejo (1971).

[10] Barlow (1970, II:107). All further references to this edition and volume will appear as page numbers in the text.

[11] This is quoted from the unidentified author of the "The Life of Dr. Wm. Robertson" in a 1829 edition of his *History*.

[12] The Spanish version is from Ercilla (1861, I:244) and the English translation from Ercilla (1945, 147). All further references to these edition will appear as page numbers in the text.

[13] On Revolutionary creole appropriations of the `noble savage' of the French Enlightenment and especially of the Chilean Araucans, as well as on the popularity of Ercilla's poem during the Chilean Revolution, see also Collier (1967, 40-41).

[14] Olmedo was also politically active. Besides representing the district of Guayaquil, he presided over the *Junta* that declared the province of Quito free from Spanish rule in 1820, and was a member of the assembly that gave a constitution to Peru in 1823. Always in the forefront of public life, he was once vice president, once president, and once a defeated candidate for president after Ecuador had detached itself from Colombia and had become an independent republic in 1830. He was a prototype of the Spanish American writer/politician to be followed by such famous writers as Mario Vargas Llosa.

[15] Olmedo (1960, 104-105). I am giving the (abridged) translation of Caraciollo-Trejo where ever possible (1971, 227). Otherwise I have translated from the Quito edition of Olmedo's poetry (1960). Further references to these editions will appear as page numbers in the text.

[16] On the anachronism of Garcilaso's Renaissance language at the beginning of the seventeenth century, see González Echevarría's (1990).

[17] For the best discussion of the influences of the Italian Renaissance on Garcilaso, see Pupo-Walker (1982a).

[18] Perhaps the most famous later critic of Olmedo's invocation of the Inca apparition has been the eminent literary historian and critic Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, who, in his classic *Historia de la poesía hispanoamericana*, chastized Olmedo from a positivist point of view for his historical distortion (1893-95, 376).

CONCLUSION

In his Nobel lecture of 1982, Gabriel García Márquez evoked Antonio Pigafetta's sixteenth-century account of his journey around the world on board of Magellan's ship. Pigafetta had written, García Márquez said, "a strictly accurate account that nonetheless resembles a venture into fantasy." This book, García Márquez argued, "even then contained the seeds of our present-day novels." By `our' novels, García Márquez did not, however, refer to the Western generic tradition at large, but rather to those texts that give expression to (Latin) America's "solitude," whose "crucial problem has been a lack of conventional means to render our lives believable." For, it is America's "outsized reality, and not just its literary expression," he believes, that defines `our' writing--a "reality not of paper, but one that lives within us and ... that nourishes a source of insatiable creativity" (1983, 17). The preceding pages have been an extended reflection on García Márquez's vision and its relevance to recent attempts to (re-) define Early American Literature.

William Spengemann recently proposed a radical re-definition of Early American Literature as all those writings in the different European languages of the New

World which "discover to modern readers the origins of their modernity" by making room in the languages for the idea of America (1994, 209). There are "many Early American Literatures, each in its own language," he has argued, and therefore we need a "comparative study of American literary histories." In the foregoing chapters, I have aimed, in part, to answer Spengemann's call for such a comparative study; but I have also proposed to reconsider the concept of "colonial" for the study of Early American Literature; "colonial," that is, *not* in reference to a later (national) American literature, but rather in the context of the various European languages of imperialism about the New World. Adopting a cultural studies approach in a comparison of Early British and Spanish American texts, I have inquired into the role that spatiality played in the writing of these colonial literatures and have offered a comparative study of the history of creole identities in the literatures of early British and Spanish America. It has been my argument that the construction of creole identities in the colonial spaces of the `New World' has continually involved the reinvention of America from the colonial periphery and the transculturation of European discourses of `History' and `literature' since the sixteenth century.

If I have thus been concerned with the implications that Postcolonial criticism can have for the study of Early American Literature, I have also been interested in the implications that a study of Early American literature has

for Postcolonial criticism. I have, in this regard, suggested that early American creole writing resembled, in a number of ways, the (post-) colonial literatures in other colonial regions, affected by European imperialism at different times. Early American creoles, I have argued, were also engaged in a deliberate attempt "to disrupt European notions of `history' and the ordering of time ... Received history is tampered with, rewritten, and realigned from the point of view of the victims of its destructive progress," as Ashcroft, Griffith, Tiffin have observed for other (post) colonial writing (1989, 34).

However, I have also attempted to illustrate the historical and cultural specificity which distinguishes these creole literatures in the history of (post-) colonial writing. While early American creole writing `disrupted' Old World epistemologies in an insistence on a radical experimentalism and by constructing unilinearly progressive historical teleologies based on European self-images of its past, non-European (post-) colonial writers have rejected Western rationalist epistemologies and a unilinear teleologies based on Western models (see McClintock 1994). Both literatures have, however, transformed--and are still transforming--Western culture in the process of these epistemological disruptions at the colonial peripheries.

Thus, we have seen to what degree many of the Western Enlightenment narratives such as modern ethnography--the epistemologies of which are now being demolished by post-

colonial magic realists such as Gabriel García Márquez, Miguel Angel Asturias, or Toni Morrison--may themselves represent New World transculturations, engendered, in part, in a process that Walter Mignolo has called "colonial semiosis" (1994). If twentieth-century post-colonial discourse has "privilege[d] space over time as the most important ordering concept of reality" (Ashcroft, Griffith, Tiffin 1989, 37), time had itself only become an important concept of ordering reality with the emergence of the early New World texts, which had to acknowledge, reluctantly but gradually, not only that the world had changed but that the "other" world of America was not new, but had a history of its own. "By the end of the sixteenth century," the historian John Elliott writes,

> the experience of America had provided Europe with at least the faint outlines of a theory of social development. But this theory was set into a general framework of historical thought which was European in its points of reference, and Christian and providentialist in its interpretation of the historical process. The criterion for assessing the development of non-European peoples remained firmly Europocentric. (1970, 50)

The emergence of a Western linear and progressivist ordering of time represents thus an example of how the cultural movement in the colonial encounter was as much from "`periphery' to `centre' as from `centre' to `periphery'" (Williams and Chrisman 1994, 16).

Colonial American creole writing was thus at the forefront in the fermenting processes of modern Western culture, of what Spengemann has called the "Americanization

of European languages," which "reveals to its readers the origins of their modernity." However, it was the colonial's subjective experience in the colonial periphery which relativized Old World discursive constructions of reality in the New World text. Whereas the European `Americanized' text strove (and strives) to conserve metropolitan discursive constructions of reality--in its "scientific" discourses or by carnivalizing a textual experience of New World relativity in the realm of the fantastic--it is precisely its polemical (magico-) realism and its meta-historical obsession, which has driven the evolution of the colonial and postcolonial American literatures. It is the writing at the colonial periphery, which first initiated--and has continued to be the driving force of--the evolution of this literature as the "colonial imagination is driven to recreate, again and again, the experience of writing in colonial space" (Lee 1974, 162-63).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acosta, José. [1590] 1880. *Natural and Moral History of the Indies*. London: The Hakluyt Society.

Abel-Turby, Mickey. 1996. New New World Augustinians and Franciscans in Philosophical Opposition: The Visual Statement. *Colonial Latin American Review* 5.1: 7-24.

Adam, Ian and Helen Tiffin, eds. 1991. *Past the last post: theorizing post-colonialism and post-modernism*. Harvester Wheatsheaf: Hemel Hempstead.

Adams, Percy. 1962. *Travelers and Travel Liars, 1660-1800*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

---. 1976. The Discovery of America and European Renaissance Literature. *Comparative Literature Studies* 13: 100-115.

---. 1983. *Travel Literature and the Evolution of the Novel*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Adorno, Rolena. 1986. Literary Production and Suppression: Reading and Writing about Amerindians in Colonial Spanish America. *Dispositio* XI, nos 28-29: 1-25.

---. 1988. Discourses on Colonialism: Bernal Díaz, Las Casas, and the Twentieth-Century Reader. *MLN* 103: 239-58.

---. 1993. Reconsidering Colonial Discourse for Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Spanish America. *Latin American Research Review* 28: 135-145.

Aguirre, Vicente. 1873. *El cautiverio feliz de Bascuñán*. Santiago de Chile: La Estrella de Chile.

Alberro, Solange. 1992. *Del Gachupín al Criollo: o de como los españoles de México dejaron de serlo*. México, D. F.: Colegio de México.

Allen, Gay Wilson, and Roger Asselineau. 1987. *St. John de Crèvecoeur*. New York: Viking.

Alvarez-Brun, Félix. 1966. Noticias sobre Carrió de la Vandera (autor del *Lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*)

Caravelle 7: 179-188.

Amado, Janaina, ed. 1990. *The Frontier in Comparative Perspectives: The United States and Brazil.* Washington D.C.: The Woodrow Wilson Center.

Ames, Fisher. 1983. *The Works of Fisher Ames.* Ed. E. B. Allen. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics.

Amunategui, Miguel Luis. 1888. *Las primeras representaciones dramáticas en Chile.* Santiago de Chile: Imprenta Nacional.

Amunategui y Solar, Domingo. 1900. *Bosquejo histórico de la literatura chilena. Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía 15.* Santiago de Chile: Barcells.

Anadón, José. 1988. *Historiografía Literaria de América Hispánica.* Santiago de Chile: Ediciones Universidad Católica de Chile.

---. 1974. Vida y Autobiografía de Pineda y Bascuñán. Ph.D. Dissertation. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso.

---. 1994. Exodus. *Critical Inquiry* 21 (Winter): 314-327.

Andrews, K. R., N. P. Canny, and P. E. H. Hair, eds. 1979. *Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and America, 1480-1650.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Arch, Stephen Carl. 1990. The `Progressive Steps' of the Narrator in Crèvecoeur's `Letters from an American Farmer'. *Studies in American Fiction* 18:2: 145-159.

---. 1994. *Authorizing the Past: The Rhetoric of History in Seventeenth-Century New England.* DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

Archivo General de la Nación. 1945. *Corsarios Franceses e Ingleses en la Inquisición de la Nueva España.* Siglo XVI. Introducción de Julio Jiménez Rueda. México. D. F.: Imprenta Universitaria.

Arciniegas, Germán. 1964. The Four Americas. In *Do the Americas Have a Common History? A Critique of the Bolton Theory.* Ed. Lewis Hanke, 235-249. New York: Knopf.

---. 1986. *America in Europe. A History of the New World in Reverse.* San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Armstrong, Nancy and Leonard Tennenhouse. 1992. *The Imaginary Puritan: Literature, Intellectual Labor, and the Origins of Personal Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Arrom, José Juan. 1971. *Certidumbre de América. Estudios de Letras, Folklore y Cultura*. Segunda edición ampliada. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.

---. 1990-91. Carlos de SigÜenza y Góngora: Relectura criollo de los *Infortunios de Alonso Ramírez*. *Revista de Estudios Hispanicos* 17-18: 131-47.

Arroniz, Othon. 1979. *Teatro de evangelización en Nueva España*. México, D. F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Asad, Talal, ed. 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. London: Ithaca Press.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, eds. 1989. *The Empire Writes Back. Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London and New York: Routledge.

---. 1995. *The Post-Colonial Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Axtell, James. 1981. *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

----. 1985. *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ayscough, Samuel. 1783. *Remarks on the Letters from an American Farmer, or a Detection of the Errors of Mr. J. Hector St. John*. London: Printed for John Fielding.

Bacon, Francis. [1605] 1987. *The Advancement of Learning*. (A Reproduction of the Copy in the British Library, owned by Charles I.) Alburgh: Archical Facsimiles Limited.

Baepler, Paul. 1995. The Barbary Captivity Narrative in Early America. *Early American Literature* 30. 2 (Summer): 95-120.

Bailyn, Bernard and Philip Morgan. 1991. *Strangers within the Realm. Cultural Margins of the First British Empire*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Bailyn, Bernard. 1959. Politics and Social Structure in Virginia. In *Seventeenth-Century America: Essays in Colonial History*. Ed. James Morton Smith. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 90-115.

---. 1967. *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

---. 1982. The Challenge of Modern Historiography. *American Historical Review* 87: 2-25.

Bakhtin, Michael. 1971. *Probleme der Poetik Dostoevskijs*. Uebersetzt von A. Schramm. Muenchen: Carl Hanser Verlag.

---. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. M. Holquist, trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Balbuena, Bernardo de. [1604] 1954. *Grandeza mexicana: Y Fragmentos de Siglo de Oro y El Barnardo*. México: Ediciones de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma.

Ball, B. W.. 1988. *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism*. Leiden: E. G. Brill.

Ballón, José. 1986. *Autonomía cultural Americana: Emerson y Martí*. Madrid: Editorial Pliegos.

Barker, Francis, Peter Hulme, and Margaret Iversen, eds. *1994. Colonial Discourse/Postcolonial Theory*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

Barnes, Robin. 1988. *Prophecy and Gnosis: Apocalypticism in the Wake of the Lutheran Reformation*. Stanford: Standford University Press.

Barlow, Joel. 1970. *The Works of Joel Barlow*. Two Volumes. Ed. William Bottorff and Arthur Ford. Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints. Volume II.

Barlow, Joel, Lemuel Hopkins, David Humphreys, and John Trumbull. 1967. *The Anarchiad. A New England Poem, 1786-87*. E. Luther Riggs. Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimile and Reprints.

Barta, Roger. 1994. *Wild Men in the Looking Glass. The Mythic Origins of European Otherness*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Bataillon, Marcel. 1954. Novo Mundo e fim do mundo. *Revista de Historia* (Sao Paolo) 18: 1-23.

---. 1957. Evangelisme et millenarisme au nouveau monde. *Courants religieux et humanisme a la fin du xve et au debut du xvie siecle*. Colloque de Strasbourg: 25-36.

---. 1960. Introducción a Concolorcorvo y a su intinerario de Buenos Aires a Lima. *Cuadernos Americanos* 19:192-216.

---. 1966. *Erasmo y España*. México, D. F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Batten, Charles. 1978. *Pleasurable Instruction: Form and Convention in Eighteenth-Century Travel Literature*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Baudot, Georges. [1979] 1995. *Utopia and History in Mexico. The First Chroniclers of Mexican Civilization*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.

Baym, Nina, Wayne Franklin, Ronald Gottesman, Laurence Holland, David Kalstone, Arnold Krupat, Francis Murphy, Hershel Parker, William Pritchard, Patricia Wallace, eds. 1994. *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. Fourth Edition, vol. I. New York: Norton & Company.

Bello, Andres. [1826] 1954. *A Georgic of the Tropics/ Silva, a la agricultura de la zona tórrida*. Charlottesville: King Lindsay Print Corp..

Benzoni, Girolomo. 1572. *La historia del mondo nuovo*. Venetia: Pietro and Francesco Tini, fratelli.

Beranger, Jean F. 1977. The Desire for Communication: Narrator and Narratee in Letters from and American Farmer. *Early American Literature* 12: 73-85.

Bercovitch, Sacvan. 1975. *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

---. 1978. *The American Jeremiad*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Berkhofer, Robert. 1978. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. New York: Knopf.

Bernal, Alfredo Alexandro. 1982. *La Araucana* de Alonso de Ercilla y Zuñiga y *Comentarios Reales de los Incas* del Inca Garcilaso de la Vega. *Revista Iberoamericana* 48: 549-562.

Bernstein, Harry. 1965. *Origins of Inter-American Interest, 1700-1812*. New York: Russel and Russel.

Bernstein, Samuel. 1985. *Joel Barlow: A Connecticut Yankee in an Age of Revolution*. Cliff Island, Maine: The Ultima Thule Press.

Beverley, Robert. 1947. *History of Virginia*. Ed. Louis B. Wright. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Bhabha, Homi, ed. 1990. *Nation and Narration*. London/New York: Routledge.

---. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London/New York: Routledge.

Binkley, William. 1964. Have the Americas a Common History? A United States View. In *Do the Americas Have a Common History? A Critique of the Bolton Theory*. Ed. Lewis Hanke. New York: Knopf. 112-128.

Bloomfield, Morton. 1980. Recent Scholarship on Joachim of Fiore and his Influence. In *Prophesy and Millenarianism. Essays in Honour of Marjorie Reeves*. Ed. Ann Williams. Harlow: Longman. 21-54.

--- and Margaret Reeves. 1954. The Penetration of Joachism into Northern Europe. *Speculum* 29: 772-793.

Blumenberg, Hans. 1983. *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*. Trans. Robert M. Wallace. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Boehmer, Elleke. 1995. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature. Migrant Metaphors*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bolton, Herbert E. 1939. *Wider Horizons of American History*. New York: D. Appleton.

Boon, James. 1982. *Other tribes, other scribes. Symbolic anthropology in the comparative study of cultures, histories, religions, and texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bose, Walter. 1941. *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes y su problema histórico*. La Plata: Publicación de la Universidad Nacional de La Plata.

Bost, David. 1985. From confict to mediation: humanization of the Indian in *Cautivio feliz*. *SECOLAS Annals Southeastern Conference on Latin American Literature* 29: 2/3: 8-15.

Boxer, C. 1978. *The Church militant and Iberian expansion 1440-1770*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bozeman, Theodore Dwight. 1988. *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Bradford, William. [1856; wr. 1630-55] 1981. *Of Plymouth Plantation, 1620-1647*. Introduction by Francis Murphy. New York: Random House.

Brading, David. 1991. *The First America. The Spanish Monarchy, Creole Patriots, and the Liberal State 1492-1867*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.

Brandt, Sebastian. [1494] 1913. *Das Narrenschiff*. Strassburg: K. J. Trubner.

Breen, Timothy. 1984. American High-Style and Vernacular Cultures. In *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era*. Ed. Jack Greene and J.R. Pole. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 200-213..

Brennan, Timothy. 1990. The National Longing for Form. In *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi Bhabha. London/New York: Routledge. 44-70.

Breitweiser, Mitchell Robert. 1990. *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning. Religion, Grief, and Ethnology in Mary White Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Brooks, Van Wyck. [1915] 1975. *America's Coming-of-Age*. New York: Octagon Books.

Brumble, H. David. 1983. Indian Sacred Materials: Kroeber, Kroeber, Waters, and Momaday. In *Smoothing the Ground. Essays on Native American Oral Literature*. Ed. Brian Swann. Berkeley: University of California Press. 283-300.

Bucher, Bernedette. 1977. *La sauvage aux seins pendants*. Paris: Herman.

Budick, Sanford, and Wolfgang Iser, eds. 1996. *The Translatability of Cultures. Figurations of the Space Between*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Buell, Lawrence. 1986. *New England Literary Culture, from Revolution Through Renaissance*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

---. 1992. American Literary Emergence as a Postcolonial Phenomenon. *American Literary History* 4: 411-442.

Burke, Peter. 1995. America and the Rewriting of World History. *In America in European Consciousness, 1493-1750*. Ed. Karen Ordahl Kupperman. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 33-51.

Burnham, Michelle. 1997. *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682-1861*. Hanover and London: University Press of New England.

Burrus, Ernest. 1961. Cristóbal Cabrera on the Missionary Methods of Vasco de Quiroga. *Manuscripta* 5: 17-27.

Busaniche, José Juis. 1942. La incógnita de *El lazarillo*. Introduction to *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*. Ed. J. L. Busaniche. Buenos Aires.

Bushman, Richard. 1984. American High-Style and Vernacular Cultures. In *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era*. Ed. Jack Greene and J.R. Pole. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 345-83.

Byrd, William. [1841; wr. 1726-33] 1967. *Histories of the Dividing Line betwixt Virginia and North Carolina*. New York: Dover Publications.

Campbell, Mary. 1988. *The Witness and the Other World. Exotic European Travel Writing, 400-1600*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Caneque, Alejandro. 1996. Theater of Power: Writing and Representing the Auto de Fé in Colonial Mexico. *The Americas* 52.3: 321-343.

Canny, Nicholas and Anthony Pagden, eds. 1987. *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Canup, John. 1990. *Out of the Wilderness: The Emergence of an American Identity in Colonial New England*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

Caracciolo-Trejo. E., ed. 1971. *The Penguin Book of Latin American Verse*. Baltimore: Penguin.

Carbia, Rómulo D. 1940. *La Crónica oficial de las Indias occidentales*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Buenos Aires.

Carew-Miller, Anna. 1993. The Language of Domesticity in Crèvecoeur's *Letters from an American Farmer*. *Early American Literature* 28: 243-254.

Carilla, Emilio. 1976. *El libro de los `misterios'*. Madrid: Gredos.

Carpenter, Nathaniel. 1625. *Geography Delineated Forth in Two Books*. Oxford.

Carrió de la Vandera, Alonso. [1773] 1985. *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*. Introducción de Antonio Lorente Medina. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho.

---. 1965. *Concolorcorvo: El lazarillo. A Guide for*

Inexperienced Travelers between Buenos Aires and Lima. Trans. Walter D. Kline. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Carroll, Peter. 1969. *Puritanism and the Wilderness: The Intellectual Significance of the New England Frontier, 1629-1700*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Carter, Paul. 1987. *The Road to Botany Bay. An Exploration of Landscape and History*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Casas de Faunce, María. 1977. *La novela picaresca latinoamericana*. Madrid: Cupsa Editorial.

Castagnino, Raúl H.. 1970. *Escritores Hispanoamericanos. Desde otros ángulos de simpatía*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Nova.

Castell, William. 1644. *A Short Discovery of the Coasts and Continent of America*. London.

Castiglia, Christopher. 1996. *Bound and Determined: Captivity, Culture-Crossing, and White Womanhood from Mary Rowlandson to Patty Hearst*. Chicago: The Univ of Chicago Press.

Certeau, Michel de. 1986. *Heterologies: Disourse on the Other*. Trans. by Brian Massumi. Foreword by Wlad Godzich. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

---. 1988. *The Writing of History*. Trans. Tom Conley. New York: Columbia University Press.

Cervantes, Fernando. 1994. *The Devil in the New World: The Impact of Diabolism in New Spain*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Cevallos-Canau, Francisco Javier, Jeffrey A. Cole, Nina M. Scott, and Nicomedes Suárez-Araúz, eds. 1994. *Coded Encounters. Writing, Gender, and Ethnicity in Colonial Latin America*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Chanady, Amaryll Beatrice. 1985. *Magic Realism and the Fantastic. Resolved Versus Unresolved Antimony*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc..

Chang-Rodríguez, Raquel. 1975. El propósito del *Cautiverio feliz* y la crítica. *Cuadernos Hispánoamericanos* 297 (March): 657-663.

Chaplin, Joyce. 1993. *An Anxious Pursuit. Agricultural Innovation and Modernity in the Lower South, 1730-1815*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Chevignard, Bernard. 1984. St. John de Crèvecoeur in the Looking Glass. *Letters from an American Farmer* and the Making of the Man of Letters. *Early American Literature* 19: 173-190.

Cheyfitz, Eric. 1991. *The Poetics of Imperialism. Translation and Colonization from* The Tempest *to* Tarzan. New York: Oxford University Press.

Clark, Harry. 1967. *Transitions in American Literary History.* New York: Octagon Books.

Clarke, Samuel. 1657. *A Geographical Description of all Countries in the Known World.* London: Thomas Newberry.

Clavigero, Francisco Javier. [1780] 1979. *The History of Mexico.* New York: Garland Publishing. 2 Volumes.

Clendinnen, Inga. 1987. *Ambivalent Conquests. Maya and Spaniards in Yucatan.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clevenger, Darnell Haines. 1974. A Comparative Study of the Frontier in the Literatures of Spanish America and the United States. Ph. D. dissertation. Bloomington: University of Indiana.

Clifford, James. 1983. On Ethnographic Authority. *Representations* 1, no. 2: 118-46.

---. 1986. Introduction. *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography.* Ed. James Clifford and George

Marcus. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1-23.

Clifford, James and George Marcus, eds. 1986. *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cogley, Richard W.. 1987. John Eliot and the Origins of The American Indians. *Early American Literature* 21: 211-225.

----. 1990. John Eliot in Recent Scholarship. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 14: 77-92.

Cohn, Norman. 1957. *The Pursuit of the Millennium.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Collier, Simon. 1967. *Ideas and Politics of Chilean Independence, 1808-1833.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Copans, Jean and Jean Jamin, eds. 1978. *Aux origines de l'anthropologie francaise. Les Mémoires de la Société des Obervateurs de l'Homme*. Paris.

Coronil, Fernando. 1989. Discovering America Again: The Politics of Selfhood in the Age of Post-Colonial Empires. *Dispositio* XIX, no. 36-38: 315-331.

Corréa Bello, Sergio. 1965. *El* Cautiverio Feliz *en la vida política chilena del siglo xvii*. Santiago de Chile: Editorial Andrés Bello.

Covington, Paula H., ed. 1990. *Latin American Frontiers, Borders and Hinterlands*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Crapanzano, Vincent. 1986. Hermes' Dilemma: The Masking of Subversion in Ethnographic Description. In *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Ed. James Clifford and George Marcus. Berkeley: University of California Press. 53-75.

Crèvecoeur, J. Hector St. John de. 1981. *Letters from an American Farmer and Sketches of Eighteenth-Century America*. Ed. Albert E. Stone. London: Penguin Books.

Cro, Stelio. 1983. *Realidad y utopía en el descubrimiento y conquista de la América Hispana, 1492-1682*. Troy, Michigan: International Book Publishers; Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Espanola.

---. 1990. *The Noble Savage. Allegory of Freedom*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilffrid Laurier University Press.

---. 1994. *The American Foundations of the Hispanic Utopia*. Tallahassee: The DeSoto Press.

Cronon, William. 1983. *Changes in the Land. Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Crosby, Alfred. 1992. *Ecological Imperialism. The Biological Expansion of Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummings, J. S. 1978. The Philippines Glimpsed in the First Latin American Novel. *Philippine Studies* XXVI: 91-101.

Cunliffe, Marcus. 1978. Introduction to Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur. In *The Divided Loyalist: Crèvecoeur's America*. London: The Folio Society. 7-18.

Curcio-Nagy, Linda. 1996. Introduction: Spectacle in Colonial Mexico. *The Americas* 52.3: 275-281.

Curran, Stuart, ed. 1970. *Le Bossu and Voltaire on the Epic*. Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints.

Curtin, Phillip. 1990. *The Rise and Fall of the Plantation Complex. Essays in Atlantic History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cussen, Antonio. 1992. *Bello and Bolívar. Poetry and Politics in the Spanish American Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daniel, E. Randolph. 1972. Roger Bacon and the De Seminibus Scripturarum. *MS* 34: 462-7.

Davila Padilla, Fray Augustín. 1596. *Historia de la fundación y discurso de la Provincia de Santiago de México de la Orden de Predicadores, por las vidas de sus varones insignes y cosas notables de Nueva España*. Madrid: Casa de Pedro Mardrigal.

Da Milano, Ilarino. 1960. L'incentivo escatologico nel reformismo dell' ordine francescano. *L'attesa dell' eta nuorva nella spiritualita della fine del medioevo.* Convegno del Centro di Studi sulla Spiritualita medievale III: Todi. 283-337.

Davis, Lennard. 1983. *Factual Fictions: The Origins of the English Novel*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dealy, Ross. 1976. *The Politics of an Erasmian Lawyer, Vasco de Quiroga*. Malibu: Undena Publications.

Degerando, Joseph-Marie. [1804] 1978. Considérations sur les divers méthodes a suivre dans l'observation des peuples sauvages. In Jean Copans and Jean Jamin, eds. *Aux origines de l'anthropologie francaise. Les Mémoires de la Société des Obervateurs de l'Homme*. Paris. 129-69.

Dekker, George. 1987. *The American Historical Romance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Delbanco, Andrew. 1986. Looking Homeward, Going Home: The Lure of England for the Founders of New England. *New England Quarterly* 59: 358-86.

Deloria, Vine. 1969. *Custer died for your Sins; an Indian Manifesto*. New York: Macmillan.

Demos, John. 1970. *Little Commonwealth*. New York: Oxford University Press.

---. 1994. *The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story From Early America*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Derounian-Stodola, Kathryn Zabelle and James Arthur Levernier. 1993. *The Indian Captivity Narrative, 1550-1900*. New York: Twayne Publishers.

Derounian-Stodola, Kathryn Zabelle. 1987. Puritan Orthodoxy and the `Survivor Syndrome' in Mary Rowlandson's Indian Captivity Narrative. *Early American Literature* 22: 82-92.

---. 1988. The Publication, Promotion, and Distribution of Mary Rowlandson's Indian Captivity Narrative in the Seventeenth Century. *Early American Literature* 23 (Winter): 239-61.

---. 1995. Review of William Spengemann's *A New World of Words*. *Early American Literature* 30: 2: 188-89.

Díaz Arrieta, Hernán. 1954. *Historia personal de la literatura chilena*. Santiago de Chile: Zig-Zag.

Díaz del Castillo, Bernal. [1632] 1984. *Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España*. Ed. Miguel Leon-Portilla. Madrid: Historia 16. 2 vols.

---. 1966. *The True History of the Conquest of Mexico*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, Inc..

Dowling, William. 1990. *Poetry and Ideology in Revolutionary Connecticut*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Dudley, Edward, and Maximillian Novak, eds. 1973. *The Wild Man Within: An Image in Western Thought from the Renaissance to Romanticism*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Duran Luzio, Juan. 1976. Sobre Tomás Moro en el Inca Garcilaso. *Revista Iberoamericana* 42: 349-361.

During, Simon. 1994. Rousseau's Patrimony: Primitivism, Romance, and Becoming Other. In *Colonial Discourse/Postcolonial Theory*. Ed. Francis Barker, Peter Hulme, and Margaret Iversen. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press. 47-71.

Ebersole, Gary. 1995. *Captured by Texts. Puritan to Post-Modern Images of Indian Captivity*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Eburne, Richard. [1609] 1962. *A Plain Pathway to Plantations* Ed. Louis B. Wright. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Eisermann, David. 1985. *Creveceur, oder, Die Erfindung Amerikas: ein literarischer Grundvater der Vereinigten Staaten*. Rheinbach-Merzbach: CMZ-Verlag.

---. 1991. La `Raynalisation' de l' *American farmer:* la réception de l'*Histoire des deux Indes* par Crèvecoeur. *Lectures de Raynal. L'* Histoire des deux Indes *en Europe et en Amérique au XVIII siecle*. Ed. Hans-JÜrgen LÜsebring and Manfred Tietz. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation at the Taylor Institution.

Elliott, Emory. 1995. Review of W. Spengemann's *A New World of Words*. *The William and Mary Quarterly* 52 (April): 327-331.

Eliot, John. 1834 *Tracts Relating to the Attempts to Convert To Christianity the Indians of New England Society. The Collections of the Massachusetss Historical Society,* 3rd series. Vol 4. Cambridge.

---. [1659] 1846. *The Christian Commonwealth: Or, The Civil Policy of the Rising Kingdom of Jesus Christ*. Written Before the Interruption of the Government [1659]. In *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 3rd series. Vol 9. 127-64.

---. [1673] 1809. An Account of Indian Churches in New England, in a Letter Written A. D. 1673, by Rev. John Eliot, of Roxbury. *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. First Series. Boston. Vol. 10.

---. [1657] 1809. A Letter from Rev. John Eliot to Major Atherton. In *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. First Series. Boston. Vol 2.

Elliott, J. H. 1970. *The Old World and the New, 1492-1650*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

---. 1972. The Discovery of America and the Discovery of Man. *Proceedings of the British Academy* LVIII.

Ercilla y Zúñiga, Alonso. [1569] 1861. *La Araucana*. Barcelona: Imp. de Narioso Ramirez. 2 Vols.

---. 1945. *The Araucaniad. A Version in English Poetry of Alonso de Ercilla y Zuniga's La Araucana*. Ed. and trans. Charles Lancaster and Paul Manchester. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press.

Esquemeling, Alexander Olivier. 1681. *Píratas de la América, y luz a la defensa de las costas de Indias Occidentales*. Amsterdam.

Esteve Barba, Francisco. 1964. *Historiografía Indiana*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.

----, ed. 1960. *Crónicas del reino de Chile*. Biblioteca de

Autores de Españoles. Madrid: Atlas. T. 131

Fabian, Johannes.1983. *Time and Other: How Anthropology makes its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fanon, Frantz.1952. *Peau Noire, Masques Blacs*. Paris: Editions de Seuil.

Feidelson, Charles. 1953. *Symbolism and American Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fernández de Oviedo y Valdes, Gonzalo. [1535] 1959. *Historia general y natural de las Indians*. Ed. Juan Pérez de Tudela Bueso. Biblioteca de autores españoles, t. CXVII-CXXI. Madrid: Real Academia.

Fernández Herrro, Beatriz. 1992. *La Utopía de América. Teoría. Leyes. Experimentos*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Fernández Insuela, Antonio. 1990. Un dato sobre un enigma de *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*. *Bulletin Hispanique* 92: 847-56.

Fernández, Justino y Edmundo o'Gorman. 1937. *Santo Tomas More y "La Utopia de Tomas Moro en la Nueva España"*. México, D. F.: Alcancia.

Fernández Retamar, Roberto.1989. *Caliban and other essays*. Trans. Edward Baker. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fiedler, Leslie. 1975. *Love and Death in the American Novel*. New York: Stein and Day.

Fitz, Earl.1991. *Rediscovering the New World. Inter-American Literature in a Comparative Context*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Fitzpatrick, Tara. 1991. The Figure of Captivity: The Cultural Work of the Puritan Captivity Narrative. *American Literary History* 3 (Spring): 1-20.

Font, Pedro de. 1775. Diario que formó el P. P dor. Ap co Fr. Pedro Font. Providence: John Carter Brown Library Codex Sp 66.

Ford, Arthur. 1971. *Joel Barlow*. New York: Twayne Publishers.

Foucault, Michel. [1966] 1970. *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the human Sciences* [1966]. London: Tavistock.

---. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*.

London: Penguin.

Franco, Jean. 1989. The Nation as Imagined Community. In *The New Historicism*. Ed. H. Aram Veeser. New York: Routledge. 204-212.

Franklin, Wayne. 1979. *Discoverers, Explorers, Settlers: The Diligent Writers of Early America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Frantz, R. W. [1934] 1967. *The English Traveller and the Movement of Ideas, 1660-1732*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Frost, Elsa Cecilia. 1976. El milenarianismo franciscano en México y el profeta Daniel. *Historia Mexicana* 26.1: 3-28.

---. 1980. A New Millenarian: George Baudot. *The Americas* 36: 515-526.

Funkenstein, Amos. 1988. The Body of God in the 17th Century Theology and Science. In *Millarianism and Messianism in English Literature and Thought, 1650-1800*. Ed. Richard Popkin. Leiden/New York: E. J. Brill. 149-175.

Gage, Thomas. 1648. *The English American His Travail by Sea and Land: or, a New Survey of the West Indies. Containing a Journall of Three thousand and Three hundred miles within the main land of America*. London: Printed by R. Cotes.

Gale Chevigny, Bell and Gari Laguardia, eds. 1986. *Reinventing America. Comparative Studies of the Literature of the United States and Spanish America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Galinski, Hans. 1968. Kolonialer Literaturbarock in Virginia: Eine Interpretation von `Bacon's Epitaph' auf der Grundlage eines Forschungsberichtes. In *Amerika und Europa. Sprachliche und SprachkÜnstlerische Wechselbeziehungen in amerikanistischer Sicht*. Ed. Hans Galinski. Berlin: Langenscheidt.

---. 1977. Exploring the `Exploration Report' and its Image of the Overseas World: Spanish, French, and English Variants of Common Form Type in Early American Literature. *Early American Literature* 12: 5-24.

---. 1979.`Colonial Baroque': A Concept Illustrating Dependence, Germinal Independence and New World Interdependence of Early American Literatures. In *Proceedings of the 7th Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association*. Ed. Milan V. Dimíc and Eva Kusher. Stuttgart. 43-51.

Gandia, Enrique de. 1964. Pan Americanism in History. In *Do the Americas Have a Common History? A Critique of the Bolton Theory*. Ed. Lewis Hanke. New York: Knopf. 128-133.

García Calderón, Ventura. 1938. Introduction. In Concolorcorvo, *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*. Ed. V. García Calderón. Paris.

García Márquez, Gabriel. 1983. The Solitude of Latin America. *New York Times*. Section iv, February 6: 17.

Garcilaso de la Vega, el Inca. 1960. *Obras Completas del Inca Garcilaso de la Vega*. Edición y estudio preliminar de P. Carmelo Saenz de Santa Maria. Biblioteca de Autores Españoles desde la formación del lenguaje hasta nuestros días, t. 133. Madrid: Real Academia Española.

---. [1605] 1951. *The Florida of the Inca*. Trans. and ed. John Grier Varner and Jeannette Johnson Varner. Austin: University of Texas Press.

---. [1609] 1688. *The Royal Commentaries*. Trans. Sir Paul Rycault. London: Printed by M. Flesher for C. Wilkinson.

Gardyner, George. 1651. *A Description of the New world or America, Islands and Continent as they were all in the Year 1649*. London.

Garido Aranda, Antonio.1980. *Moriscos e indios. Precedentes Hispánicos de la evangelización en México*. México. D. F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Gates, Henry Louis, ed. 1985. *"Race," Writing and Difference*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gaylord Bourne, Edward, ed. 1904. *Narratives of the Career of Hernando de Soto*. 2 vols. New York: Allterton.

Geertz, Clifford. 1988. *Works and Lives. The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gerassi-Navarro, Nina. 1993.Pirate novels: Metaphors of a Developing Identity. Ph.D. dissertation. New York, Columbia University.

Gerbi, Antonello. 1973. *The Dispute of the New World. The History of a Polemic, 1750-1900*. Trans. Jeremy Moyle. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Giamatti, A. Barlett. 1966. *The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gibson, Charles.1964. *The Aztecs under Spanish Rule*.

Stanford: Stanford University Press.

---. 1971. *The Black Legend. Anti-Spanish Attitudes in the Old World and the New*. New York: Knopf.

Gilmore, Michael. 1971. Introduction. *Letters of An American Farmer*. London: Dent.

Glissant, Edouard. 1989. *Caribbean Discourse: Selected Essays*. Trans. and introd. J. Michael Dash. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Gómez Canedo, Lino. 1973. Toribio Motolinía and his Historical Writings. *The Americas* 29.3: 277-307.

Gómez de la Serna, Gaspar. 1973. *Los viajeros de la Ilustración*. Madrid: Alianza.

Gómez-Tabanera, José M. 1983. En el bicentenario de Alonso Carrió de Lavandera, *Concolorcorvo*, autor de *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*. *Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Asturianos* 108: 3-36.

---. 1984. Nueva luz sobre el gijonés don Alonso Carrió de Lavandera, *Concolorcorvo*: Su estirpe, hidalguía, nacimiento y relaciones. *Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Asturianos*: 227-236.

Gonzaga, Francesco. 1587. *De Origine Seraphicae Religionis Franciscanae*. Rome.

González, Angel Custodio, ed. 1948. *El cautiverio feliz de Pineda y Bascuñán*. Santiago de Chile: Zig-Zag.

González Echevarría, Roberto. 1983. Humanismo, Retórica y las Crónicas de la Conquista. In *Isla a su Vuelo Fugitiva. Ensayos Criticos sobre Literatura Hispanoamericana*. Madrid: José Porrúa Turanzas, S. A. 9-26.

--. 1990. *Myth and Archive. A theory of Latin American narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

González-Pérez, Aníbal. 1983. Los *Infortunios de Alonso Ramírez:* Picaresca y Historia. *Hispanic Review* 2: 189-204.

Godwin, Morgan. 1680. *The Negro's and Indians Advocate, Suing for their Admission into the Church*. London.

Godzich, Wlad and Nicholas Spadaccini. 1986. Foreword. In Jose Antonio Maravall, *Culture of the Baroque: Analysis of a Historical Structure*. Trans. Terry Cochran. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gove, Philip. 1941. *The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction: A History of its Criticism and Guide for its Study with an Annotated Check LIst of 215 Imaginary Voyages from 1700-1800*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Graetzer, Margarita. 1994. `Crónica de Indias' y narrativa hispánoamericana: Espacio de encuentros. Ph.D. dissertation. Austin: The University of Texas.

Grabo, Norman. 1991. Crèvecoeur's American: beginning the world anew. *The William and Mary Quarterly* 48 (April): 159-173.

Grafton, Anthony. 1992. *New Worlds, Ancient Texts. The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Greenblatt, Stephen. 1991. *Marvelous Possessions: the Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

---. ed. 1993. *New World Encounters*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Greene, Jack. 1988. *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

---. 1990. *Peripheries and Center. Constitutional Development in the Extended Polities of the British Empire and the United States, 1607-1788*. New York/London: Norton.

---. 1992. *Imperatives, Behaviors, and Identities. Essays in Early American Cultural History*. Charlottesville: University Virginia Press.

---. 1993. *The Intellectual Construction of America: Exceptionalism and Identity from 1492-1800*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Greene, Jack and J. R. Pole. 1984. *Colonial British America. Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Period*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gregory, Derek. 1994. *Geographical Imaginations*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Greven, Philip. 1970. *Four Generations*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Groom, Samuel. 1676. *A Glass for the People of New England in which they may see themselves*. London.

Guamán Poma de Ayala, Felipe. [1615] 1980. *Primer Corónica y buen Gobierno.* Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho.

Guevara, Darío. 1958. *Olmedo. Actor y cantor de la grán epopeya libertadora de América.* Quito: Editorial Casa de la Cultura.

Gura, Philip. 1977. Cotton Mather's *Life of Phips*: `A Vice with the Vizard of Vertue upon it'. *The New England Quarterly* 50: 430-450.

---. 1988. The Study of Colonial American Literature, 1976-1987: A Vade Mecum. *The William and Mary Quarterly* 45: 305-42.

Haberly, David T. 1974. The Search for a National Language: A Problem in the Comparative History of Postcolonial Literature. *Comparative Literature Studies* 11: 85- 97.

Hakluyt, Richard II. 1935. *The Original Writings and Correspodence of the Two Richard Hakluyts.* Ed. E. G. R. Taylor. London: Hakluyt Society Publications, 2d ser..

Hall, David. 1979. The World of Print and Collective Mentality in Seventeenth-Century New England. In *New Directions in American Intellectual History.* Ed. John Higham and Paul K. Conkin. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 166-80.

Haltunen, Karen. 1977. Cotton Mather and the Meaning of Suffering in the *Magnalia Christi Americana. Journal of American Studies* 12: 311-329.

Hambrick-Stowe, Charles. 1982. *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Hammond, George P. and Agapito Rey, eds. 1940. *Narratives of the Coronado Expedition, 1540-42.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Hanke, Lewis. 1949. *The Spanish Struggle for Justice in the Conquest of America.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

---, ed. 1964. *Do the Americas Have a Common History? A Critique of the Bolton Theory.* New York: Knopf.

---. 1970. *Aristotle and the American Indians.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

---. 1974. *All Mankind is One.* DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

Harris, Sharon, ed. 1996. *American Women Writers to 1800.* New York: Oxford University Press).

Hartog, Francois. 1988. *The Mirror of Herodotus. The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hartz, Louis, ed.. 1946. *The Founding of New Societies. Studies in the History of the United States, Latin America, South Africa, Canada, and Australia.* New York: Brace & World.

Heimert, Alan and Andrew Delbanco. 1985. *The Puritans in America. A Narrative Anthology.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Heimert, Alan. 1953. Puritanism, the Wilderness, and the Frontier. *New England Quarterly* 26: 361-382.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm. [1827] 1944. *The Philosophy of History.* Trans. J. Sibree. New York: Willey Book Co.

Henderson, Harry B. 1974. *Versions of the Past. The Historical Imagination in American Fiction.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hennessy, Alistair. 1978. *The Frontier in Latin American History.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Henríquez Ureña, Pedro. 1946. *Literary Currents in Hispanic America.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hernández, Francisco Martín. 1993. *Don Vasco de Quiroga (Protector de los Indios).* Salamanca: Publicaciones Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca.

Herrera y Tordesillas, Antonio de. [1601-1615] 1973. *The General History of the Vast Continent and Islands of America.* Trans. John Stevens. 2nd ed. London, 1740. Reprinted New York: AMS Press. 6 Vols.

Heylyn, Peter. 1677. *Cosmography in Four Books. Containing the chorography and history of the whole World.* London: A. C for P. Chetwind, and A. Seile.

Higham, John and Paul K. Conkin, eds. 1979. *New Directions in American Intellectual History.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hill, Christopher. 1966. *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714.* New York: Norton.

---. 1972. *The World Turned Upside Down. Radical Ideas*

During the English Revolution. New York: Viking Press.

---. 1988. `Till the Conversion of the Jews'. In *Millarianism and Messianism in English Literature and Thought, 1650-1800*. Ed. Richard Popkin. Leiden/New York: E. J. Brill. 12-36

Hills, Elijah Clarence. 1920. Introduction. *The Odes of Bello, Olmedo, and Heredia*. New York: Putnam's Sons.

Hinderaker, Eric. 1996. The `Four Indian Kings' and the Imaginative Construction of the First British Empire. *William and Mary Quarterly* 53 (July): 487-526.

Hodgen, Margaret. 1969. *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Holstun, James. 1987. *A Rational Millennium. Puritan Utopias of Seventeenth-Century England and America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hortop, John. 1591. *The Travailes of an Englishman*. London.

Howard, Leon. 1943. *The Connecticut Wits*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

----. 1967. The Late Eighteenth Century: An Age of Contradictions. In *Transitions in American Literary History*. Ed. Harry Clark. New York: Octagon Books. 49-90.

Huddleston, Lee Eldridge. 1967. *Origins of the American Indians, European Concepts, 1492-1729*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Hulme, Peter. 1986. *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean*. New York: Methuen.

Invernizzi, Lucía S. C.. 1993. Recursos de la argumentación judicial-deliberativa en el *Cautiverio Feliz* de Pineda y Bascuñán. *Revista Chilena de Literatura* 43 (Spring): 5-30.

Israel, Jonathan. 1975. *Race, Class, and Politics in Colonial Mexico, 1610-1670*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jameson, Frederick. 1986. Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism. *Social Text* 15: 65-88.

JanMohamed, Abdul R. 1985. The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature. *Critical Inquiry* 12. 1.(Autumn): 2-25.

Jara, Alvaro. 1954. Pineda y Bascuñán, hombre y su tiempo.

Boletín de la Academia Chilena de la Historia (Santiago de Chile) XXI, no. 51: 77-85.

Jehlen, Myra. 1986. *American Incarnation. The Individual, the Nation, and the Continent*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Jennings, Francis. 1975. *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Jiménez Rueda, Julio. 1945. Introducción. In Archivo General de la Nación, *Corsarios Franceses e Ingleses en la Inquisición de la Nueva España*. Siglo XVI. México. D. F.: Imprenta Universitaria.

Johnson, Edward. [1654] 1974. *Wonder-working Providence of Sions Saviour in New-England* [1654]. Delmar, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints.

Johnson, Julie Greer. 1993. *Satire in Colonial Spanish America. Turning the New World Upside Down*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

---. 1981. Picaresque Elements in Carlos Siguenza y Gongora's *Los Infortunios de Alonso Ramirez*. *Hispana* 64.1: 60-67.

Jordan, Cynthia. 1988. `Old Worlds in New Circumstances': Language and Leadership in Post-Revolutionary America. *American Quarterly* 40: 491-523.

Kadir, Djelal. 1992. *Columbus and the Ends of the Earth. Europe's Prophetic Rhetoric as Conquering Ideology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

---. 1993. *The Other Writing: Postcolonial Essays in Latin America's Writing Culture*. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press.

Kavenagh, W. Keith. ed. 1983. *Foundations of Colonial America: A Documentary History*. New York: Chelsea House. 4 vols.

Kellaway, William. 1961. *The New England Company, 1649-1776. Missionary Society to the American Indians*. London: Longmans.

Kemp, Anthony. 1991. *The Estrangement of the Past. A Study in the Origins of Modern Historical Consciousness*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Klor de Alva, Jorge. 1995. The Postcolonization of the (Latin) American Experience: A Reconsideration of

`Colonialism', `Postcolonialism', and `Mestizaje'. In *After Colonialism. Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacement*. Ed. Gyan Prakash. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 241-278.

Kobayashi, José María. 1974. *La educacción como conquista*. México, D. F.: El Colegio de México.

Kolodny, Annette. 1975. *The Lay of the Land: metaphor as experience and history in American life and letters*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

---. 1984. *The Land Before Her: Fantasy and Experience of the American Frontiers, 1630-1860*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

---. 1992. Letting go of our grand obsessions. A note toward a new literary history of the American frontiers. *American Literature* 64: 1-18.

Korth, Eugene. 1968. *Spanish Policy in Colonial Chile. The Struggle for Social Justice, 1535-1700*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Kutzinski, Vera. 1987. *Against the American Grain: Myth and History in William Carlos Williams, Jay Wright, and Nicolás Guillén*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

---. 1992. Commentary: American Literary History as Spatial Practice. *American Literary History* 4: 550-557.

Lafitau, Joseph Francois. [1724] 1974-77. *Costumes of the American Indians compared with the custums of Primitive Times*. Ed. and trans. William Fenton and Elizabeth Moore. Toronto: The Champlain Society.

Lagmanovitch, David. 1974. Para una Caracterización de Infortunios de Alonso Ramírez. *Sin Nombre* 5.2: 7-14.

---. 1979. Tres Cautivas: Echevarría, Ascasubi, Hernández. *Chasqui: Revista de Literatura Latinoamericana*. 8.3: 24-33.

Laguardia, Gary. 1986. Perspectives on Literary Criticism: Introduction. In *Reinventing the Americas. Comparative Studies of Literature of the United States and Spanish America*. Ed. Bell Gale Chevigny and Gari Laguardia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 271-277.

---. 1986. Marvellous Realism/Marvellous Criticism. In *Reinventing the Americas. Comparative Studies of Literature of the United States and Spanish America*. Ed. Bell Gale Chevigny and Gari Laguardia. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Lancaster, Maxwell. 1951. The Happy Captivity of Francisco Núñez de Pineda y Bascunán. *Vanderbilt Studies in the Humanities* I: 161-173.

Lancaster, Charles and Paul Manchester. 1945. Introduction. *The Araucaniad. A Version in English Poetry of Alonso de Ercilla y Zuniga's* La Araucana. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press.

Lanning, John Tate. 1956. *The Eighteenth-Century Enlightenment in the University of San Carlos of Guatemala*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Las Casas, Bartolomé de. [1550] 1909. *Apologética Historia Sumaria*. In Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, *Historiadores de Indias*. Madrid: Por M. Serrano y Sanz.

---. [1551] 1951. *Historia de las Indias*. Ed. Agustín Millares Carlo y estudio preliminar de Lewis Hanke. México, D. F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

---. 1552. *Brevíssima relación de la destrucción de las Indias*. Sevilla: Casa de Sebastián Trugillo.

Lauter, Paul, ed. 1990. *The Heath Anthology of American Literature*. 2nd ed. Lexington: D. C. Heath. Vol 1.

Lavallé, Bernard. 1993. *Las Promesas Ambiguas. Ensayos Sobre el Criollismo Colonial en los Andes*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Peru.

Lawrence, D. H. [1923] 1961. *Studies in Classic American Literature*. New York: Penguin Books.

Lawson-Peebles, Robert. 1988. *Landscape and Written Expression in Revolutionary America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, Dennis. 1974. Cadence, Country, Silence: Writing in Colonial Space. *Boundary* 2. 155-170.

Lee, Monica Lucia. 1993. De la crónica a la escena: Arauco en el teatro del Siglo de oro. Ph.D. dissertation. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Lemay, Leo. 1972. *Men of Letters in colonial Maryland*. Knoxville: University of Kentucky Press.

Leon-Portilla, Miguel. 1992. Fray Juan de Zumárraga y las lenguas indígenas de México. *La Utopía Mexicana del Siglo XVI. Lo bello, lo verdadero y lo bueno*. Ed. Octavio Paz.

México, D. F.: Arte Novohispano.

Leonard, Irving. 1949. *The Books of the Brave*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lerner, Isaías. 1971. The *Diccionario* of Antonio de Alcedo as a Source of Enlightenment Ideas. In *The Ibero-American Enlightenment*. Ed. Alfred Owen Aldridge. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 71-98

Levin, Harry. 1958. *The Power of Blackness: Hawthorne, Poe, Melville*. New York: Knopf.

Levine, Joseph. 1991. *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Lezama Lima, José. 1969. *La Expression Americana*. Santiago de Chile: Editorial Universitaria.

Lipschütz, Alejandro. 1963. *El problema racial en la conquista de América y el mestizaje*. Santiago de Chile: Editorial Austral.

Literary Magazine and American Register. Philadelphia: John Conrad & Co. (1804). Vol I.

Lloyd, David. [1671] 1766. *The Wonderful, Surprizing and Uncommon Voyages and Adventures of Captain Jones to Patagonia*. London: John Lever.

Lockridge, Kenneth. 1970. *New England Town*. New York: Norton.

Loewith, Karl. 1949. *Meaning in History*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Logan, Lisa. 1993. Mary Rowlandson's Captivity and the `Place' of the Woman Subject. *Early American Literature* 28 (Fall): 255-277.

Lohmann, Villena. 1945. *El arte dramático en Lima durante el virreinato*. Madrid: Estades, artes gráficas.

López, Kimberly. 1996. Identity and Alterity in the Emergence of a creole Discourse: Sigüenza y Góngora's Los infortunios de Alonso Ramírez. *Colonial Latin American Review* 5.2 (December): 253-276.

López Arias, Julio. 1994. El genero de *Los Infortunios de Alonso Ramirez*. *Hispanic Journal* 15.1: 185-201.

López de Gómara, Francisco. [1552] 1991. *Historia general de las Indias y vida de Hernán Cortés*. Caracas: Biblioteca

Ayacucho.

López de Velasco, Juan. [1574] 1894. *Geografía y descripción universal de las Indias recopiladas por el cosmógrafo-cronista Juan López de Velasco desde el año de 1571 al de 1574*. Madrid: Establ. tip. de Fortanet.

Lorente Medina, Antonio. 1985. Introducción. *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes* de Carrió de la Vandera. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho.

Lovejoy, David. 1972. *The Glorious Revolution in America*. New York: Harper and Row.

LÜsebring, Hans-JÜrgen and Manfred Tietz, eds. 1991. *Lectures de Raynal. L'* Histoire des deux Indes *en Europe et en Amérique au XVIII siecle*. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation at the Taylor Institution.

LÜthi, Max. 1961. *Volksmärchen und Volkssage: Zwei Grundformen erzählender Dichtung*. MÜnchen: Francke Verlag.

Macfarlane, Alan. 1978. *The Origins of English Individualism: the family, property, and social transition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Maclear, J.F.. 1975. New England and the Fifth Monarchy: The Quest for the Millennium in Early American Puritanism. *The William and Mary Quarterly* 32: 223-260.

Malverde Disselkoen, N. Ivette. 1992. La palabra mestiza en *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*. *Acta Literaria* 17: 127-135.

Mannheim, Karl. 1949. *Ideology and Utopia*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Manuel, Frank and Fritzie Manuel. 1979. *Utopian Thought in the Western World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Marcus, George and Michael Fischer, eds. 1986. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Maravall, José Antonio. 1949. La Utopía político-religiosa de los franciscanos en Nueva España. *Estudios Americanos* 2: 199-227.

---. 1966. *Antiguos y Modernos. La Idea de Progreso en el Desarrollo inicial de una Sociedad*. Madrid: Sociedad de Estudios y Publicaciones.

---. 1972. *Teatro y literatura en la sociedad barroca*. Madrid: Editorial Ariel.

---. 1979. La cultura de crisis barroca. *Historia* 16 extra 12 (Dec): 80-90.

---. 1986. *Culture of the Baroque. Analysis of a Historical Structure*. Trans. Terry Cochran. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

---. 1991. *Utopia and Counterutopia in the "Quixote"*. Trans. Robert Felkel. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Marx, Leo. 1964. *The Machine in the Garden; technology and the pastoral ideal in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, C. E. 1963. The Birth of the mestizo in New Spain. *Hispanic American Historical Review* 43: 161-84.

Martin, John. 1991. *Profits in the Wilderness*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Mather, Cotton. [1702] 1855. *Magnalia Christi Americana; or, the Ecclesiastical History of New England*. Hartford: Silas Andrus. 2 Vols.

Mather, Increase. [1673] 1674. *The Day of Trouble is Near*. Boston.

Mautner-Wasserman, Renata. 1994. *Exotic Nations: literature and cultural identity in the United States and Brazil, 1830-1930*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Mayhew, Experience. 1727. *Indian Converts: or some Account of the Lives and Dying Speeches of a considerable number of the Christianized Indians of Martha's Vineyard, in New England*. London.

Mayhew Matthew. 1695. *The Conquests and Triumphs of Grace. Being A Brief Narrative of the Success which the Gospel hath had among the Indians of Martha's Vineyard (and the Places adjacent) in New England*. London.

Mazzara, Richard. 1957. Some Picaresque Elements in Concolorcorvo's *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*. *Hispania* 40. 2: 323-327.

McGinn, Bernard. 1979. *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages*. New York: Columbia University Press.

McClintock, Anne. 1994. The Angel of Progress: pitfalls of the term `postcolonialism'. In *Colonial Discourse/ Postcolonial Theory*. Ed. Francis Barker, Peter Hulme, and Margaret Iversen. Manchester and New York: Manchester

University Press.

McCormick, John. 1968. Notes on a Comparative American Literary History. *Comparative Literature Studies* 5: 167-179.

McWilliams, John. 1989. *The American Epic. Transforming a Genre*, 1770-1860. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mede, Joseph. 1663-64. *Works. Corrected and Enlarged according to the Author's Manuscript*. London: Flesher for R. Royston.

Meléndez, Mariselle. 1993. *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes* y la metáfora del viage como vehículo de transgresión historiográfica, literaria y cultural. Ph. D. Dissertation. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

---. 1993. Entre historia y creación: El viaje como creación de espacios discursivos en *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*. *SECOLASA* (March 24): 69-76.

Mendieta, Gerónimo. [1596] 1973. *Historia Eclesiastica Indiana*. Biblioteca de Autores Españoles. Madrid: Atlas.

---. [1892] 1971. *Códice Mendieta: Documentos fransciscanos siglo XVI y XVII*. México, D. F.: Facsimile. 2 Vols.

Menéndez Pelayo, Marcelino. 1893-1895. *Historia de la poesía hispanoamericana*. Madrid: Academia Española.

Micklus, Robert. 1990. *The Comic Genius of Dr. Alexander Hamilton*. Knowville: University of Tennessee Press.

Middlekauff, Robert. 1971. *The Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals, 1596-1728*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mier Noriega y Guerra, José Servando Teresa de. [1821] 1974 *Memoria politico-instructiva, enviada desde Filadelfia en agosto de 1821, a los gefes independientes del Anahuac, llamado por los Españoles Nueva-España*. Monterrey: R. Aynatamiento de Monterrey.

Migden Socolow, Susan. 1992. Spanish Captive in Indian Societies: Cultural Contact Along the Argentine Frontier, 1600-1835. *Hispanic American Historical Review* 72.1 (February): 72-99.

Mignolo, Walter. 1981. El Métatexto Historiográfico y la Historiografía Indiana. *MLN* 96, no 2: 358-402.

---. 1989. Colonial Situations, Geographical Discourses, and Territorial Representations: Toward a Diatopical

Understanding of Colonial Semiosis. *Dispositio* 36-38: 93-140.

---. 1989a. From Colonial Discourse to Colonial Semiosis. *Dispositio* 36-38: 333-37.

---. 1994. The Movable Center: Geographical Discourse and Territoriality During the Expansion of the Spanish Empire. In *Coded Encounters. Writing, Gender, and Ethnicity in Colonial Latin America*. Ed. Francisco Javier Cevallos-Canau, Jeffrey A. Cole, Nina M. Scott, and Nicomedes Suárez-Araúz. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

---. 1995. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance. Literacy, Territoriality, and Colonization*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

---. 1995a. Afterword: Human Understanding and (Latin) American Interests - The Politics and Sensibilities of Geocultural Locations. *Poetics Today* 16: 1: 171-214.

Milhou, Alain. 1983. *Colón y su mentalidad mesiánica en el ambiente franciscanista español*. Cuadernos Colombinos XI. Valladolid: Museo de Colón y Seminario Americanista de la Universidad de Valladolid.

Miller, Perry. 1949. *The New England Mind. The Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

---. 1953. *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

---. 1956. Errand into the Wilderness. In *Errand into the Wilderness*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1-15.

Minter, David. 1973. By Dens of Lions: Notes on Stylization in Early Puritan Captivity Narratives. *American Literature* 45: 335-47.

Mintz, Sidney. 1992. *The Birth of African American Culture. An Anthropological Approach*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Miranda, Francisco de. 1963. *The New democracy in America; travels of Francisco de Miranda in the United States, 1783-84*. Trans. Judson P. Wood. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

---. 1928. *The Diary of Francisco de Miranda, tour of the United States, 1783-1784*. New York: The Hispanic Society of America.

---. 1978. *Proclamación a los pueblos Columbianos*. México, D. F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Miró Quesada y Sosa, Aurelio. 1971. *El Inca Garcilaso y otros estudios garcilasistas*. Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica.

Mohr, James. 1970. Calculated Disillusionment: Crèvecoeur's Letters Reconsidered. *South Atlantic Quarterly* 69: 354-363.

Monguió, Luis. 1971. `Las Luces' and the Enlightenment in Spanish America. In *The Ibero-American Enlightenment*. Ed. Alfred Owen Aldridge. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 211-233.

Montesquieu, Charles De Secondat, Baron de. [1749] 1966. *The Spirit of the Laws*. Trans. Thomas Nugent. New York: Hafner Publishing Company.

Monthly Magazine and American Review. 1799. New York: T. & J. Swords. Vol I.

Mood, Fulmer. 1944. The English Geographers and the Anglo-American Frontier in the seventeenth century. *University of California Publications in Geography* 6, no 9.

More, Thomas. [1516] 1965. *Utopia*. Trans. and ed. by Paul Turner. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Morgan, Edmund. 1975. *American Slavery, American Freedom. The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia*. New York: Norton.

Morrison, Kenneth M. 1974. `That Art of Coyning Christians:' John Eliot and the Praying Indians of Massachusetts. *Ethnohistory* 21: 77-92.

Morison, Samuel Eliot.1956. *The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England*. New York: New York University Press.

Morse, Jarvis M. 1952. *American Beginnings. Highlights and Sidelights of the Birth of the New World*. Washington DC: Public Affairs Press.

Morse, R. M..1965. *The Bandeirantes*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Morton, Thomas. [1637] 1967. *New English Canaan*. Ed. Charles Francis Adams, Jr. New York: Burt Franklin.

Motolinía, Fray Toribio de. [1555] 1949. *Carta al Emperador. Refutación a Las Casas sobre la Colonización Española*. Ed. José Bravo Ugarte. México, D. F.: Editorial Jus.

---.[1541] 1985. *Historia de los Indios de la Nueva España*. Ed. Georges Baudot. Madrid: Clásicos Castilia.

---.[1541] 1950. *History of the Indians of New Spain.* Trans. and ed. by Elizabeth Andras Foster. Berkeley: Cortés Society.

---.1971. *Memoriales, o libro de las cosas de la Nueva España y de los naturales de ella.* Ed. Edmundo O'Gorman. México, D. F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Mörner, Magnus. 1967. *Race Mixture in the History of Latin America.* Boston: Little Brown.

Murdock, Kenneth. 1949. *Literature and Theology in Colonial New England.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Namias, June. 1993. *White Captives. Gender and Ethnicity on the American Frontier.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Nuix, Juan. 1782. *Reflexiones imparciales sobre la humanidad de los Españoles en las Indias contra las pretendidos filósofos y políticos para ilustrar las historias de MM. Raynal y Robertson; escritas en italiano por el abate Don Juan Nuix; y traducidas con algunos notas por D. Pedro Varela y Ulloa.* Madrid: J. Ibarra.

Núñez, Alvar/Cabeza de Vaca. [1542] 1986. *La Relación o Naufragios.* Edición de Martin A. Favata y José B. Fernández. Potomac, MD: Scripta Humanistica.

---. [1542] 1993. *The Account: Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca's Relación.* Trans. M. Favata and J. Fernández. Houston: Arte Público.

Núñez de Pineda y Bascuñnán. [1655] 1863. *Cautiverio Feliz, y razón de las guerras dilatadas de Chile.* Ed. Diego Barros Arana. Santiago de Chile: Imprenta del Ferrocarril.

---. [1655] 1977. *The Happy Captive.* Trans. and abridged William Atkinson. London: Folio Society.

Ogilby, John. 1675. *America.* London: Printed by the Author.

Olmedo, Josí Joaquín. 1960. *Poesía - Prosa.* Biblioteca Ecuadoriana Mínima. La Colonía y la República. Quito: Publicación auspiciada por la Secretaria General de la undecima conferencia interamericana. T. 12.

Oña, Pedro de. [1596] 1917. *Arauco Domado.* Santiago de Chile: Imprenta Universitaria.

Ordahl Kupperman, Karen, ed. 1995. *America in European Consciousness, 1493-1750.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Ortiz, Fernando. 1987. *Contrapunto cubano del tabaco y del azúcar*. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayachucho.

Owen Aldridge, Alfred, ed. 1971. *The Ibero-American Enlightenment*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

---. 1982. *Early American Literature. A Comparativist Approach*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

O'Gorman, Edmundo. [1958] 1972. *The Invention of America*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

---. 1964. Do the Americas Have a Common History. In *Do the Americas Have a Common History? A Critique of the Bolton Theory*. Ed. Lewis Hanke. New York: Knopf. 103-111.

---. 1982. *La Incognita de la llamada "Historia de los Indios de La Nueva España" attributida a Fray Toribio Motolinía*. México, D. F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Pagden, Anthony. 1982. *The Fall of Natural Man: The American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

--- 1987. Identity Formation in Spanish America. In *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800*. Ed. Nicholas Canny and Anthony Pagden. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 51-94.

---. 1990. *Spanish Imperialism and the Political Imagination: Studies in European and Spanish American Social and Political Theory, 1513-1830*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

---. 1993. *European Encounters with the New World. From Renaissance to Romanticism*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

---. 1995. *Lords of all the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain, and France, 1500-1800*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Palma, Ricardo. 1923. *Tradiciones Peruanas*. Madrid: Calpe.

Parker, John. 1979. Religion and the Virginia Colony 1609-10. In *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and America, 1480-1650*. Ed. K. R. Andrews et al. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Parkinson Zamora, Luis. 1989. *Writing the Apocalypse Historical Vision in Contemporary U.S. and Latin American Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. 1990. The Usable Past: The Idea of History in Modern US and Latin American Fiction. In *Do the Americas have a Common Literature.* Ed. Gustavo Pérez Firmat. Durham: Duke University Press.

Parry, Benita. 1987. Problems in current theories of colonial discourse. *The Oxford Literary Review* 9: 27-58.

Pastor, Beatriz. 1983. *Discursos narrativos de la conquista: mitificación y emergencia*. Hanover, NH: Ediciones del Norte.

Pauw, Corneille de. 1768-69. *Recherches philosophiques sur les Americains*. Berlin: G. J. Decker. 2 Vols.

Paz, Octavio. 1966. *Literatura de fundación, Puertas al campo*. México, D. F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

---. 1988. *Sor Juana: or the traps of faith*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---, ed. 1992. *La Utopía Mexicana del Siglo XVI. Lo bello, lo verdadero y lo bueno*. México, D. F.: Arte Novohispano.

Pearce, Roy Harvey. 1948. The Significances of the Captivity Narrative. *American Literature* 19: 1-20.

---. 1961. *The Continuity of American Poetry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

---. 1968. *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind*. Rev. ed. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Penha, Evaristo de Souza. 1986. *La función ideológica de la ironía en "El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes."* Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, no. 7820762.

Pérez-Firmat, Gustavo, ed. 1990. *Do the Americas have a Common Literature?* Durham: Duke University Press.

Phelan, John. 1956. *The Millennial Kingdom of the Franciscans in the New World*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Philbrick, Nathaniel. 1991. The Nantucket Sequence in Crèvecoeur's *Letters from an American Farmer*. *The New England Quarterly* 64:3: 414-433.

---. 1993. `Every Wave is a fortune': Nantucket Island and the making of an American icon. *The New England Quarterly* 66:3: 434-448.

Philbrick, Thomas. 1970. *St. John de Crèvecoeur.* New York: Twayne Publishers.

Picón Salas, Mariano. 1944. *De la conquista a la independencia.* México, D. F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Plumstead, A. W. 1977. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur. *American Literature 1764-1789: The Revolutionary Years.* Ed. Everett Emerson. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 213-31.

Pocock, J. G. A. 1975. *The Machiavellian Moment.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pollard, Dennis. 1986. The King's Justice in Pineda y Bascuñán's *Cautiverio feliz. Dispositio* XI (Fall): 113-135.

Popkin, Richard, ed. 1988. *Millarianism and Messianism in English Literature and Thought, 1650-1800.* Leiden/New York: E. J. Brill.

Post, Constance. 1993. Old World Order in the New: John Eliot and `Praying Indians' in Cotton Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana. New England Quarterly* 66: 416-33.

Powell, Philip Wayne. 1981. North America's First Frontier. In *Essays on Frontiers in World History.* Ed. George Wolfskill and Stanley Palmer. Austin: University of Texas Press. 3-29.

Prager, Carolyn. 1993. Early English Transfer and Invention of the Black in New Spain. In *Early Images of the Americas. Transfer and Invention.* Ed. Jerry M. Williams and Robert E. Lewis. Tucson: University of Arizona Press. 93-110.

Prakash, Gyan, ed. 1995. *After Colonialism. Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacement.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 1986. Fieldwork in Common Places. In *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography.* Ed. James Clifford and George Marcus. Berkeley: University of California Press. 27-50.

---. 1992. *Imperial Eyes. Travel Writing and Transculturation.* New York: Routledge.

Promís, José. 1991. *The Identity of Hispanoamerica. An Interpretation of Colonial Literature.* Trans. Alita Kelley and Alec E. Kelly. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press.

Puente, Juan de la. 1612. *Conveniencia de las dos monarquías*

Católicas, la de la Iglesia Romana y la del Imperio Español. Madrid.

Pupo-Walker, Enrique. 1982. *La vocación literaria de pensamiento histórico en América: desarollo de la prosa de ficción, siglos XVI, VII, VIII y XIX*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.

---. 1982a. *Historia, Creación y Profesía en los Textos del Inca Garcilaso de la Vega*. Madrid: Ediciones José Porrúa Turanzas, S. A..

Purchas, Samuel. [1625] 1905-1907. *Hakluytus Posthumus, or Purchas his pilgrimes*. Glasgow: James MacLehose & Sons.

---. 1624. *Relations of the World. And the Religions observed in all Ages and Places. Discovered, from the Creation unto this Presnt. Contayning a Theological and Geographical Historie of Asia, Africa, and America.* Fourth Edition. London: Printed by William Stansby. Vol. V.

Quiñónez-Gauggel, Maria. 1980. Dos Picaros: Guzman de Alfarache y Alonso Ramirez. *Romance Notes* 21: 92-96.

Quint, David. 1993. Voices of Resistance: The Epic Curse and Camoes's Adamastor. In *New World Encounters*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Berkeley: University of California Press. 241-271.

Quiroga, Vasco de. 1992. *La utopía en América*. Edición de Paz Serrano Gassent. Madrid: Historia.

---. 1940. *Documentos Inéditos referentes al ilustrísimo Señor Don Vasco de Quiroga*. Recopilados por Nicolas León. México, D. F.: Antigua Librería Robredo, de José Porrúa e Hijos.

---. [1542] 1985. *Información en derecho del licenciado Quiroga sobre algunas provisiones del real Consejo de Indias*. México, D. F.: Consejo Nacional de Fomento Educativo.

Rabasa, José. 1993. *Inventing America: Spanish Historiography and the Formation of Eurocentrism.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Raleigh, Sir Walter. [1590] n.d. *The Discovery of Guiana*. In *Works*, Oldys and Birch. New York: Burt Franklin. Vol 8. 391-476.

Rama, Angel. 1982. *Transculturación Narrativa en América Latina*. México, D. F.: Siglo veintiuno editores.

Ramírez, J. F. 1944. *Vida de Motolinía*. México, D. F.:

Edición Porrúa.

Rapping, Elayne. 1967. Theory and Experience in Crévecoeur's America. *American Quarterly* 19: 702-715.

Rausch, Jane M., and David Weber, eds. 1994. *Where Cultures Meet Frontiers in Latin American History*. Wilmington: University of Delaware Press.

Raynal, Guillaume Thomas Francois. 1776. *A Philosophical and Political History of the Settlements and Trade of the Europeans in the East and West Indies*. Trans. J. Justamond. London: Printed for T. Cadell. 6 Vols.

Real Díaz, José. 1956. Don Alonso Carrió de la Vandera, autor del *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*. *Anuario de Estudios Americanos* XIII (Sevilla): 387-416.

Reeves, Marjorie. 1961. Joachimist Influence on the Idea of the Last World Emperor. *Traditio* 17: 323-70.

---. 1969. *The Influence of Prophesy in the later Middle Ages. A Study in Joachimism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Regis, Pamela. 1992. *Describing Early America: Bartram, Jefferson, Crèvecoeur, and the Rhetoric of Natural History*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

Reyes, Alfonso. 1960. *Utopías americanas*. In *Obras Completas*. México, D. F.: Fondo de Cultura Económica. T. X.

Ricard, Robert. 1933. Remarques bibliographiques, sur les ouvrages de Fr. Toribio Motolinía. *Journal de la Societe des Americanistes* nouvelle serie XXV: 139-151.

---. 1966. *The Spiritual Conquest of Mexico*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rice, Grantland. 1993. Crevercoeur and the Politics of Authorship in Republican America. *Early American Literature* 28:2: 91-120.

Robertson, William. [1777] 1829 *The History of the Discovery and Settlement of America*. New York: Harper.

Rodríguez Freyle, Juan. [1638] 1986. *Conquista y Descubrimiento del Nuevo Reino de Granada* [*El Carnero*]. Ed. Jaime Delgado. Madrid: Historia.

Rodrigo, Enrique. 1993. Carrió de la Vandera y Feijoo: El papelde la historia en el exordio de *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*. *Boletín del Real Instituto de Estudios Asturianos* 47: 259-68.

Rodó, José Enrique. 1926. *Ariel*. Barcelona: Editorial Cervantes.

Rodríguez de Alonso, Josefina. 1982. *Miranda y sus circunstancias*. Caracas: Academia Nacional de la Historia.

Romm, James. 1992. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought. Geography, Exploration, and Fiction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rosaldo, Renato. 1986. From the Door of his Tent: The Fieldworker and the Inquisitor. In *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Ed. James Clifford and George Marcus. Berkeley: University of California Press.
77-97.

Roscoe, Will. 1991. *The Zuni man-woman*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Ross, Kathleen. 1995. Cuestiones de género en *Infortunios de Alonso Ramírez*. *Revista Iberoamericana* 61: 172-73, 591-603.

Rucker, Mary. 1978. Crèvecoeur's *Letters* and Enlightenment Doctrine. *Early American Literature* 13: 193-212.

Sacido Romero, Alberto. 1992. La Ambiguedad generica de los *Infortunios de Alonso Ramirez como producto de la dialectica entre discurso oral y discurso escrito*. *Bulletin Hispanique* 94.1: 119-39.

Sahagún, Bernadino. [1579] 1956. *Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España*. Ed. Angel María Garibay K. México, D. F.. 4 vols.

Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.

---. 1984. *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. London: Faber.

Saldívar. José David. 1991. *The Dialectics of Our America: Genealogy, Cultural Critique, and Literary History*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Salisbury, Neal. 1974. Red Puritans, The `Praying Indians' of Massachusetts Bay and John Eliot. *The William and Mary Quarterly* 31: 27-54.

Sánchez, Luis Alberto. 1945. *Garcilaso de la Vega, primer criollo*. Santiago de Chile: Ediciones Ercilla.

Sanders, Williams, Jeffrey R. Parsons, Robert S. Santley.

1979. *The Basin of Mexico. Ecological Processes in the Evolution of a Civilization.* New York: Academic Press.

Sarmiento, Domingo Faustino. [1845] 1938. *Facundo.* Edición Crítica y Documentada. La Plata: Universidad Nacional de La Plata.

Savelle, Max. 1974. *From Empires to Nations. Expansion in America, 1713-1824.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Seed, Patricia. 1991. Colonial and postcolonial discourse. *Latin American Research Review* 26 (3): 181-200.

---. 1993. More Colonial and Postcolonial Discourses. *Latin American Research Review* 28: 146-152.

---. 1995. *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seelye, John. 1977. *Prophetic Waters. The River in Early American Life and Literature.* New York: Oxford University Press.

---. 1988. Flashing Eyes and Floating Hair: The Visionary Mode in Early American Poetry. *Virginia Quarterly Review* 65: 191-214.

Sehr, Timothy J. 1983/84. John Eliot, Millennialist and Missionary. *The Historian* 46: 187-203.

Shammas, Carole. 1979. English-Born and Creole Elites in Turn-of-the-Century Virginia. In *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century. Essays on Anglo-American Society.* Ed. Thad W. Tate and David Ammerman. New York/London: Norton. 274-296.

Shields, David. 1990. *Oracles of Empire: Poetry, Politics, and Commerce in British America, 1690-1750.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Shuffelton, Frank, ed. 1993. *A Mixed Race. Ethnicity in Early America.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Sigüenza y Góngora, Carlos. [1690] 1962. *The Misadventures of Alonso Ramírez.* Trans. Edwin H. Peasants. México, D. F.: Imprenta Mexicana.

Sime, Jonathan. 1986. Creating Places or Designating Spaces? *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 6: 35-60.

Slemon, Stephen. 1990. Unsettling the Empire: Resistance Theory for the Second World. *World Literature in English*

30.2.: 3-28.

Slotkin, Richard. 1974. *Regeneration through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860*. Middletown: Wesleyan Press.

Slotkin, Richard and James Folsom, ed. 1978. *So Dreadful a Judgment. Puritan Responses to King Philip's War, 1676-1677*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press. 301-370.

Smith, John. 1986. *The Complete Works of Captain John Smith (1580-1631)*. E. Philip L. Barbour. 3 vols. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Smolenski, Reiner Erwin. 1992. *Israel Redivius*: The Eschatological Limits of Puritan Typology in New England. *New England Quarterly* 63: 357-95.

Soons, Alan. 1979. An Idearium and its literary presentation in *El Lazarillo de Ciegos Caminantes*. *Romanische Forschungen* 91: 92-95.

Soriano, Ramón. 1987. *El Cautiverio Feliz* de Francisco Núñez de Pineda y Bascuñán: Cuadro de costumbres, ficción novelesca, y crítica de la guerra de Arauco y de los funcionarios del Reino de Chile. *Anuario de Estudios Americanos* 44: 3-21.

Southern, R. W. 1972. Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing: History as Prophesy. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th S. 23: 159-80.

Sparks Stimson, Frederick. 1952. Spanish Themes in Early American Literature. In Novels, Drama, and Verse, 1770-1830. Ph. D. Dissertation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Spengemann, William. 1989. *A Mirror for Americanists: Reflections on the Idea of American Literature*. Hannover: University Press of New England.

---. 1994. *A New World of Words. Redefining Early American Literature*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Spillers, Hortense, ed. 1991. *Comparative American Identities*. New York: Routledge.

---. 1991. Introduction: who cuts the border? Some readings on `America'. In *Comparative American Identities*. Ed. Hortense Spillers. New York: Routledge.

Staden, Hans. [1554] 1921. *Wahrhaftige Historia und Beschreibung einer Landschaft der wilden, nacketen, grimmigen Menschenfresser Leute in der neuen Welt Amerika*

gelegen. Ed. Robert Lehmann Nitsche. Buenos Aires.

Stafford, Barbara. 1984. *Voyage into Substance. Art, Science, and the Illustrated Travel Account, 1760-1840*. Cambridge, MIT Press.

Steele, William. 1972. *The Wilderness Tattoo*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Stierle, Karlheinz. 1996. Translatio Studii and Renaissance: From Vertical to Horizontal Translation. In *The Translatability of Cultures. Figurations of the Space Between*. Ed. Sanford Budick and Wolfgang Iser. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Stocking, George, ed. 1991. *Colonial Situations. Essays o the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Stolley, Karen. 1992. *"El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes": Un itinerario crítico*. Hanover: Ediciones del Norte.

---. 1994. `Concolorcorvo': Guide for Travelers in Eighteenth-Century Spanish America. In *Coded Encounters. Writing, Gender, and Ethnicity in Colonial Latin America*. Ed. Francisco Javier Cevallos-Canau, Jeffrey A. Cole, Nina M. Scott, and Nicomedes Suárez-Araúz. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press. 298-301.

Stone, Albert E. Introduction. 1981. *Letters from an America Farmer and Sketches of Eighteenth-Century America*. Ed. Albert E. Stone. London: Penguin Books.

Stout, Harry. 1975. The Morphology of Re-Migration: New England University Men and Their Return to England, 1640-1660. *Journal of American Studies* 10: 151-172.

Struever, Nancy. 1970. *The Language of History in the Renaissance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sullivan, Tom R. 1990. *Cowboys and Caudillos: Frontier Ideology of the Americas*. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press.

Swift, Jonathan. [1726] 1977. *Gulliver's Travels*. Franklin Center, PA: Franklin Library.

Tate, Thad W., and David Ammerman, eds. 1979. *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century. Essays on Anglo-American Society*. Ed. New York/London: Norton.

Tena Ramírez, Felipe. 1990. *Vasco de Quiroga y sus Pueblos de Santa Fé en los siglos XVIII y XIX*. México, D. F.: Editorial Porrúa.

Thomas, Nicholas. 1994. *Colonialism's Culture. Anthropology, Travel, and Government*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Thorowgood, Thomas. 1660. *Jews in America, or, the Probabilities, that those Indians are Judaical, made more probable by some additionals to the former conjectures*. London.

Tichi, Cecilia. 1971. The Puritan Historians and their New Jerusalem. *Early American Literature* 6:2: 143-155.

---. 1979. *New World, New Earth: Environmental Reform in American Literature from the Puritans through Whitman*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Tiffin Chris, and Alan Lawson. 1994. *De-Scribing Empire. Post-Colonialism and Textuality*. London/New York: Routledge.

Todd, Charles Burr. 1886. *Life and Letters of Joel Barlow. Poet, Statesman, Philosopher*. New York: The Knickerbocker Press.

Todorov, Tzvetan. [1982] 1984. *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*. New York: Harper and Row,.

---. 1984a. *Bakhtin--The Dialogic Principle*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.

Tognetti, Giampaolo. 1970. Note sul prefetismo nel Rinascimento e la letteratura relativa. *Bullettino dell' Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo* 82: 129-57.

Tompkins, Jane. 1985. `Indians': Textualism, Morality, and the Problem of History. In *"Race," Writing and Difference*. Ed. Henry Louis Gates. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Turner Bushnell, Amy, ed. 1995. *Establishing Exceptionalism: Historiography and the Colonial Americas*. Brookfield, VT: Variorum.

Tuveson, Ernst. 1949. *Millennium and Utopia: A Study in the Background of the Idea of Progress*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ulrich, Laurel Thatcher. 1980. *Good Wives. Image and Reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England, 1650-1750*. New York: Vintage Books.

Valdivia, Pedro de. 1953. *Cartas de Don Pedro de Valdivia que tratan del descubrimiento y conquista de Chile*. Ed.

José Toribio Medina. Santiago de Chile: Fondo Histórico y Bibliográfico José Toribio Medina.

VanDerBeets, Richard. 1984. *The Indian Captivity Narrative. An Ameican Genre*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Varela, Félix. 1977. *Escritos Politicos*. La Habana: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales.

Vargas Ugarte, P. Rubén. 1929. Quién fue el autor del *Lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*? *Mercurio Peruano* XX: 137-138.

Vaughan, Alden. 1965. *New England Frontier: Puritans and Indians, 1620-1675*. Boston: Little Brown.

Véliz, Claudio. 1994. *The New World of the Gothic Fox. Culture and Economy in English and Spanish America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ventura, Roberto. 1991. Lectures de Raynal en Amérique latine aux XVIIIe et XIXe siecle. In *Lectures de Raynal. L'* Histoire des deux Indes *en Europe et en Amérique au XVIII siecle*. Ed. Hans-JÜrgen LÜsebring and Manfred Tietz. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation at the Taylor Institution.

Vespucci, Amérigo. [1503] 1944. *Letters from a New World*. Trans. Pohl Frederick. New York: Doubleday.

---. 1504. *Mundus Novus*. Augsburg: Magister Johannes Otmar.

Vicuña, Alejandro. 1948. *Bascuñán, el cautivo*. Santiago de Chile: Nascimiento.

Voltaire, Francois-Marie Arouet. [1727] 1970. *Essay on Epic Poetry*. In *Le Bossu and Voltaire on the Epic*. Ed. Stuart Curran. Gainesville, Fl: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints.

Walcott, Derek. 1995. The Muse of History. In *The Post-Colonial Reader*. Ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. New York: Routledge. 370-374

Wallace, F. C. 1967. Identity Processes in Personality and Culture. In *Cognition, Personality, and Clinical Psychology*. Ed. Richard Jessor and Seymour Feshback. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Wallace, Jo-Ann. 1994. Describing *The Water Babies*: `the Child' in post-colonial theory. In *De-Scribing Empire. Post-Colonialism and textuality*. Ed. Chris Tiffin and Alan Lawson. London and New York: Routledge. 171-184.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The Modern World System:*

Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European-World Economy in the Sixteenth Century. New York: Knopf.

Warner, Michael and Myra Jehlen. 1997. *The English Literatures of America, 1500-1800*. New York: Routledge.

Warner, Michael. 1990. *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in eighteenth-century America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Warren, Austin. 1940/41. Edward Taylor's Poetry: Colonial Baroque. *Kenyon Review* III: 355-371.

Webb Saunders, Stephen. 1984. *1676: The End of American Independence*. New York: Knopf.

Webb Prescott, Walter. 1964. *The Great Frontier*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Weber, David. 1992. *The Spanish Frontier in North America*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Weber, Max. 1958. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans. Talcott Parsons. New York: Scribner.

Weckmann, L. 1982. Las esperanzas milenaristas de los franciscanos de la Nueva España. *Historia Mexicana* 32: 89-105.

Wentzlaff-Eggerbert, Christian. 1992. Alonso Carrió de la Vandera: *El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes*. In *Der Hispanoamerikanische Roman I: Von den Anfängen bis Carpendier*. Ed. Volker Rolof and Harald Wentzlaff Eggerbert. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. 375-394.

West, Delno. 1980. The Education of Fra. Salimbene of Parma: The Joachite Influence. In *Prophesy and Millenarianism. Essays in Honour of Marjorie Reeves*. Ed. Ann Williams. Harlow: Longmann. 191-216.

---. 1989. Medieval Ideas of Apocalyptic Mission and the Early Franciscans in Mexico. *The Americas* 45 (1989): 293-313.

Whitaker, Arthur. 1964. The Americas in the Atlantic Triangle. In *Do the Americas Have a Common History? A Critique of the Bolton Theory*. Ed. Lewis Hanke. New York: Knopf. 141-164.

White, Hayden. 1973. The Forms of Wildness: Archaeology of an Idea. In *The Wild Man Within: An Image in Western Thought from the Renaissance to Romanticism*. Ed. Edward Dudley and Maximillian Novak. Pittsburgh: University of

Pittsburgh Press. 3-38.

---. 1973. *Metahistory*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

---. 1987. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wiget, Andrew. 1991. Reading against the Grain: Origin Stories and American literary History. *American Literary History* 3 (Summer): 210-231.

Williams, Ann, ed. 1980. *Prophesy and Millenarianism. Essays in Honour of Marjorie Reeves*. Harlow: Longman.

Williams, Jerry M. and Robert E. Lewis, eds. 1993. *Early Images of the Americas. Transfer and Invention*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Williams, John. [1701] 1908. *The Redeemed Captive, or the Captivity of the Rev. of John Williams* [1701]. Springfield, H. R.: Huntting.

Williams, Patrick and Laura Chrisman, eds. 1994. *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Williams, Stanley. 1968. *The Spanish Background of American Literature*. Hamden: Archon Books.

Winslow, Edward. [1621] 1966. A letter dated, December 11, 1621. In *Journal of the English Plantation at Plimoth*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms Inc.

Winston, Robert. 1984. `Strange Order of Things!': the journey to chaos in Letters from an American Farmer. *Early American Literature* 19: 249-167.

Winthrop, John. 1947. *Winthrop Papers*. Boston: The Massachusetts Historical Society. 5 vols. Vol. 3.

Wolf, Eric, ed. 1976. *The Valley of Mexico. Studies in Pre-Historic Ecology and Society*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Woodress, James. 1958. *A Yankee's Odyssey: The Life of Joel Barlow*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Wolf, Eric. 1982. *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wolfskill, George and Stanley Palmer, ed. 1981. *Essays on Frontiers in World History*. Austin: University of Texas

Press.

Wood, Gordon. 1967. *The Creation of the American Republic*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Woyski, Segismundo. 1979. El léxico americano en `El lazarillo de ciegos caminantes' de Concolorcorvo. In *La Picaresca. Orígenes, textos y estructuras*. Ed. Manuel Criado de Val. Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española. 1013-1030.

Wright, Louis B. 1943. *Religion and Empire: The Alliance between Piety and Commerce in English Expansion 1558-1625*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

---. 1955. *Culture on the Moving Frontier*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.

Yaeger, Patricia, ed. 1996. *The Geography of Identity*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

---. 1996. Introduction. In *The Geography of Identity*. Ed. Patricia Yaeger. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Yates, Frances. 1975. A. *Astraea. The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*. London: Routledge.

Young, Robert. 1990. *White Mythologies. Writing History and the West*. London/New York: Routledge.

---. 1995. *Colonial Desire. Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race*. London/New York: Routledge.

Zamora, Margarita. 1988. *Language, Authority, and Indigenous History in the* Comentarios reales de los incas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zavala, Silvio. 1941. *Ideario de Vasco de Quiroga*. México, D. F.: El Colegio de México.

---. 1947. The American Utopia of the Sixteenth Century. *The Huntington Library Quarterly* 4: 337-347.

---. 1955. *Sir Thomas More in New Spain. A Utopian Adventure of the Renaissance*. México, D. F.: Colegio Nacional de México.

---. 1962. *The Colonial Period in the History of the New World*. México, D. F.: Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia.

---. 1969. En torno de tratado *De Debellanis Indis* de Vasco de Quiroga. *Historia mexicana* 18: 623-626.

---. 1992. *Por la Senda Hispana de la libertad.* Madrid: Editoiral MAPFRE.

Zea, Leopoldo. 1992. *The Role of the Americas in History.* Ed. Amy Oliver. Trans. Sonja Karsen. Savage, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Ziff, Larzer. 1991. *Writing in the New Nation: Prose, Print, and Politics in the Early United States.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Zuckerman, Michael. 1977. The Fabrication of of Identity in Early America. *William and Mary Quarterly* 34 (April): 183-214.

---. 1987. Identity in British America: Unease in Eden. In *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800.* Ed. Nicholas Canny and Anthony Pagden.Princeton: Princeton University Press. 115-157.

Zunder, Theodore Albert. 1934. *The Early Days of Joel Barlow.* New Haven: Yale University Press.