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Preface

Miranda: O brave new world
That has such people in’t!

Prospero: ’Tis new to thee.

These two volumes constitute the record of an international congress held at UCLA in February 1975 and devoted to the initial impact of the New World on the Old. They do not focus on the Discovery proper nor on Europe’s role in shaping America, but on the repercussions which modified the lives and thought of Europeans in the centuries to come: they steer eastwards to follow the waves of the returning shock. To the Amerindians, naturally, the New World did not need discovery. But many sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europeans strained every resource of mind, imagination, and money to grasp its significance. In this bicentennial year, interest naturally centers on the territories which became the United States. The studies here may redress the balance a little, enlarge the perspective; for, seen as a whole, they emphasize the primacy of Central and South America during the first century after Columbus and stress the centrality of the Latin role.

Unfortunately, it has proved impossible to include all the papers delivered at the congress, but the majority are present in a revised and annotated form. They take diverse approaches: some survey the state of knowledge on a topic, some concentrate briefly on points of detail, some venture into larger speculations. They range across the arts and letters, politics, economics, demography, technology and science, assaying the spectacular flow of bullion, the quieter advent of tomatoes and potatoes, the early contrasts between the “decadence” of Europe and New World “virtue”—ideas linked to powerful visions and to deeper levels of
Preface

myth which nourish literature—and the confrontation between native American religions and Christianity which soon polarized the debates over the proper treatment of the Indian.

Not all the explorers’ contemporaries reacted to the enlargement of their world: Machiavelli virtually ignored the Americas; Venice chose not to engage her immense mercantile and maritime strength; and the Fifth Lateran Council (1512) never mentioned the Discovery in its acts and legislation. Europocentric attitudes continued to preoccupy individuals and powers alike in dynastic, territorial, religious, and commercial arguments in the old framework, diverting them from the challenge of a new.

Apart from such areas where the New World failed to make an impact on Europe, there are recognizable gaps here. Topics which belong to the theme remain partially or entirely untreated not only because of limitations in time and space, but also because we did not always succeed in finding appropriate specialists—to treat, for instance, the ways in which the Discovery changed manners and modified the fabric of everyday life.

Though we regret these gaps and disproportions, we cannot regret the inevitable tensions which result from the authors’ differing emphases and interpretations; indeed, we were eventually impressed by the confluence of various disciplinary approaches and by a certain overall coherence. The points of contact as well as the multiple perspectives suggest that the response to the discovery, exploration, and settlement of the New World should be viewed as a discrete field of enquiry. The germ is here for numerous studies.

In designing the structure of the volumes, we tried to reflect the morphology of the problem itself and follow a logic or rhetoric of argument in the progression of topics. Thus we were led to place at the beginning the speculative and essentially literary papers on myth, symbol, and model, and then to turn toward the interaction of political theories and political realities. The idea of a norm at the intersection of politics, law, and theology connects the subsequent group. In the first volume, then, we see Europeans acting upon the New World (or upon each other) and perceiving it through inherited preconceptions, until, with the section on the arts, we reach the realm of the visible. In exploring the ways in which the New World acted concretely upon the Old, the second volume delineates Europe in the wake of the Discovery as a recipient of objects, words, new scientific data, new social conditions.

Certain papers were logically inseparable, such as those on the new geography and nautical science, or the New World flora and drugs. Others emerged as appropriate transitions in the sequence. In Parts I and II, for example, the connections between Renaissance and Discovery
carry the reader naturally to questions of folklore and legend, poem and play, and thence to the literary-philosophical issues broached by Professor White's paper which orients us towards the Enlightenment; this serves in turn to introduce Professor Slavin's analysis of American "primitivism" within the social theories of More, Hobbes, and Locke. Again, in Part IV, beginning with the relationship between the Discovery and the origins of international law, one moves through the legal and theological problems associated with conquest and colonization to an important long-term consequence, the impact of America on the juridical right to counsel. In short, avoiding a diachronic progression in the volumes' larger structure, we proceed from the mythic to the scientific, from the literary to the economic, and attempt to interlock the parts in a satisfying unity.

Such a variety of papers from different disciplines on different subjects, in different styles and conventions, demanded editorial choices. We have accepted both British and American spellings, but have regularized punctuation, references, and names; where possible we have adopted the most familiar (usually the Anglicized) form of a name: for instance, Pietro Martire or Pietro di Anghiera or Angleria appears throughout as Peter Martyr, similarly Borja as Borgia.

These volumes began with an occasion. When the conference itself has been forgotten, it will be all too easy to overlook the extent to which the contributions of the participants—many of whose names do not appear in the Table of Contents—enriched and enlivened the proceedings. Others helped not only with the conference but also in the long course of preparing these studies for publication. We wish to acknowledge the untiring cooperation of an outstanding staff:

Editorial Coordination: Dr. Carol D. Lanham
Copy Editing: Linda B. Miller
References and Bibliography: Mary B. Ross, John R. Johnson, A. Paige Morgenthal, Lori C. Stein
Indices: Deborah L. Crawford
Illustrations: Hana Hrabec
Administration: Marcia P. Uller

From the beginning, the event enjoyed the collaboration of several institutions: we wish to thank cordially the University of Southern California, the California Institute of Technology, the Henry E. Huntington Library, and the Claremont Colleges, all of which helped in the organization and funding. However, the enterprise would not have been possible without the generosity of the National Endowment for the
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Humanities, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Ahmanson Foundation, the British Council, the Commissione per gli scambi culturali fra l'Italia e gli Stati Uniti, the Ford Foundation, the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, the Council for International Exchange of Scholars, the Michael J. Connell Foundation, and of course the University of California.

We owe a special acknowledgment to the Program in the History of Discovery, William L. Clements Library (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor), whose unsolicited contribution to this publication greatly encouraged the editorial committee.
Part I

INTRODUCTION:
RENAISSANCE AND DISCOVERY
It is altogether fitting that, nearly 18 months before the two-hundredth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, one of the first acts commemorating our Bicentennial should be devoted to "First Images of America: The Impact of the New World on the Old." As students of the Age of Discoveries and of the Age of the Renaissance, we perhaps need no reminder that the American civilizations, blended sometimes more and sometimes less with native Indian and transported African cultures, have a dominantly European origin. As one of its tasks this conference will undoubtedly affirm that origin, as well as examine the transformations of Europe under the stimulus of the new experience and new knowledge flowing from the discoveries themselves.

The Renaissance, and specifically the Petrarchan-humanist Renaissance in Italy and its wider areas of influence, was itself an Age of Discoveries. Scarcely five years ago the late lamented Roberto Weiss brought out his Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity, a work devoted to charting the collection, analysis, and interpretation of the physical remains of that "Old World" which was just as much a new world to the men of the Renaissance as the geographical "New World"—which many considered the old world of Cathay, India, and

*Prefatory address prepared by Charles Trinkaus, President of the Renaissance Society of America.
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East Asia for nearly three decades after Columbus' first voyage. It is thus historically correct to speak of the Renaissance as also an age of re-discovery of worlds and cultures lost or dimmed through time. And in this expanding consciousness, perspective, and knowledge, one sees a parallel to the discovery (in space) of unknown worlds and their additional transformations of European culture.

Behind the search for inscriptions and sculpture, architectural remains and topographical evidence, were the more familiar efforts to discover manuscripts and reconstruct authentic texts—a story well told by Sabbadini, and enlarged, refined, and sharpened by such scholars as Ullman, Billanovich, and Kristeller. In this historical rediscovery and restoration of writings and artifacts from antiquity, we may observe two developments which have relevance for the geographical discoveries. First, from the time of Petrarch and Boccaccio, besides trying to reconstruct the more familiar Latin culture of ancient Rome, men turned toward the Hellenic and then toward the ancient oriental worlds. Italian mastery of Greek, which rapidly resulted from Boccaccio's and Salutati's efforts and from the teaching of Chrysoloras and of other Latinized Byzantines, led in stages to knowledge of literary, scientific, and philosophical works (previously known only partially, or by reputation, or not at all), and to a more accurate grasp of those Greek works translated in the Middle Ages either directly or from Arabic versions. A consciousness of a different and autonomous Greek history, culture, and world emerged alongside a deepening understanding of the Latin past, whose monuments and cultural vestiges lay around them. This historical and cultural experience of the Quattrocento and the Cinquecento preceded and then accompanied the experience of absorbing the knowledge—and implications of the knowledge—of America. Second, men began to sense the contrast between antiquity and the present (which, as Panofsky had argued, led to historical consciousness and the sense of historical distance) and along with this the difference between the Roman and Hellenic pasts. Out of this awareness of difference—past and present, Rome and Greece—came a conceptualization of culture, of cultural uniqueness, and even a nascent cultural relativism. Such was the state of mind with which European intellectuals could confront the new American and unfamiliar Asian cultures exposed by the great discoveries.

But if Renaissance mental patterns suggested openness and toleration of difference, Europeans of the Renaissance and Reformation epochs remained stoutly and fiercely Christian. They still could not easily place either the ancient or the newly discovered paganisms within their schema of sacred history. Were these cultures to be condemned and destroyed? Or had God granted them at least partial revelation of His truths so that there could be some basis for Christian accommoda-
Renaissance and Discovery

tion to their ways? For the ancient non-Christians, doctrines of the prisci poetae and the prisci theologi (each divinely inspired) proposed by humanists, Platonists, and Cabalists might help, as in the case of Petrarch and Pico della Mirandola. But what of contemporary Jews, Turks, Moors, Aztecs, and East Indians, whose living practice of false and alien religions might pose a more immediate and even demonic threat in Spain and Greece and the newly discovered worlds? The problem of the treatment of the natives of the New World and of how to win them for Christianity could not be separated, despite the cultural differences between Iberia and Italy, from Renaissance attitudes toward the ancient religions.

Questions such as these from the two overlapping modes of discovery, that of the past and that of the unknown continents, became involved with each other in European consciousness, and they offer a challenge for further study. Ficino’s doctrine of the prisca theologia, coming in his Theologia platonica from the more traditional humanistic conception of prisci poetae and theologia poetica, may have shaped attitudes toward the Indians of the New World as significantly as Aristotle’s Ethics and Politics. To mention another instance, Thomas More’s Platonic Utopia influenced Bishop Quiroga in his plans to reorganize Indian life.

What I chiefly have in mind for these opening remarks, however, is a more general and possibly more fundamental look at some of the attitudes toward travel, geographic knowledge, conquest and mastery of the natural and human worlds.

Surely Dante’s 26th canto of the Inferno (the cantica which fore­shadows the coming age so much more poignantly than the Purgatorio or the Paradiso) recounting the legend of Ulysses’ death, reveals much of the attitudes carried into the European consciousness by the voyages of discovery. “When I parted from Circe, . . . not fondness for a son, nor duty to an aged father, nor the love I owed Penelope which should have gladdened her, could conquer within me the passion I had to gain experience of the world and of the vices and worth of men; and I put forth upon the open deep with but one ship and with that little company which had not deserted me.” Sailing through the Pillars of Hercules and thence ever westward and southward toward the great isle of the Antipodes, the Mount of Purgatory, he addresses his men: “O brothers, who through a hundred thousand perils have reached the West, to this so brief vigil of our sense that remains to us choose not to deny experience (non vogliate negar esperienza) in the sun’s track of the unpeopled world. Take thought of the seed from which you spring. You were not born to live as brutes, but to follow virtue and knowledge” (fatti non foste a viver come bruti, ma per seguir virtute e canoscenza). The pursuit of experience, valor, knowledge: such false counsels misled
Ulysses’ men and doomed Ulysses to flame—to Dante’s horror and perhaps concealed admiration. The poetic imagination which was inspired by the discoveries also preceded them.

In Petrarch we find a different ambivalence. Not in the famous sortition on top of Mont Ventoux when Petrarch happened to open Augustine’s Confessions at “And men go forth to admire the high mountains, the vast floods of the sea, the huge streams of the rivers, the circumference of the ocean, and the revolutions of the stars—and they desert themselves,” where perhaps it is as much our pathos as his that has led us to dwell upon this episode, real or invented. Let us look rather at the letter addressed to Andrea Dandolo, Doge of Venice, on his love of travel. In Homer “and his great Latin follower, who are to be ranked among the first observers of human affairs,” Petrarch finds that they show the perfect man “as a world-wanderer, everywhere learning something new.” Although he modestly rejects this ideal as too lofty for himself, yet he confesses that it was my purpose in youth to follow Homer’s advice, to inspect ‘the manners of many men and their high cities,’ to gaze upon new lands, mountain peaks, famous seas, lauded lakes, secluded founts, mighty rivers, and all the world’s varied sites. I thought that thus I might become learned, most expeditiously and briefly, and not only at little expense of trouble but with great pleasure. To know more was always among the first of my desires and I seemed somehow to be overcoming ignorance by mere movement of mind and body. But far enough have I wandered now.

However, he does not stop his wandering because he can find no good place. Like a man tossing on a hard bed he keeps on vainly searching. “Thus I am tossed about, well aware that though there is no resting-place for me I must seek it out forever with pain and labor.” Thus he describes his famous restlessness, which more and more writers of the Renaissance and Reformation feel impelled to comment on as a necessary condition of man—the medieval viator is now modeled on the classical wanderers, Ulysses and Aeneas. But whatever the true explanation of the “changeableness of our souls,” they are created by God.

God’s throne is in heaven . . . the movement of the heavens is perpetual, as we see with our own eyes, so it is not strange that we have some relation of likeness with the home of our Creator. Whatever its origin, I know that in men’s minds, especially in superior minds, resides an innate longing to see new places, to keep changing one’s home. . . . Your own experience will lead you to agree with me that this taste for wandering about the world mingles pleasure with its pains, while those who sit forever in one spot experience a strange boredom in their repose.

This from the author of the De otio religioso and the De vita solitaria! Of course he was not the last to confess this itch to travel even when the experience failed to cure either his ignorance or his restlessness. Not for Petrarch the
identification with a specific civic community: whatever its causes, whatever its origins, this breaking free from local ties, or the capacity to break free from them, was an essential part of the new culture of wanderers.

Another humanist, Coluccio Salutati (we pass over the manifold Boccaccian vision of a world of constant adventure so expressive of a new consciousness of mobility), dwelt upon the hardiness of the men of his day, especially the sailors who took the galleys from Italy out into the Atlantic to northern ports and returned. Men were said to be no longer capable of the rigors of primitive life, nor could they devote themselves to God with the endurance of earlier saints, but these sailors, for mere worldly gain, daily embrace it.³

Curiosity, restlessness, endurance, all important qualities of the men who later sailed the seven seas, were seen by these Trecento writers in their moral ambiguity and problematical character as both admirable and spiritually dangerous: they grappled with the need to comprehend the world of historical experience within the frame of their deeply Christian faiths. This ambivalence of admiration and abhorrence was expressed among other ways in the theme of the dignity of man, which had developed around the various modes of interpreting Genesis 1:26, “Let us make man after our image in our likeness.”

Giannozzo Manetti’s treatise on this theme needs no special comment: he manages to combine theological traditionalism with extraordinary praise of the powers, talents, and accomplishments of man. Manetti was one of the first to allude to the early Quattrocento Portuguese voyages into the central Atlantic as evidence of intellectual power. Invention figures again in his third book as one of the five basic qualities placed in man by God—beauty, ingenuity, wisdom, opulence, and power. Man’s inventiveness has created all of human history and civilization. All things are the works of man except the original raw materials of nature; consequently man is a second creator or the maker of a second nature. In addition, God provided man with the possibility of pleasure in all his actions; thus both in this life and in the next, men “will be held always and in every time happy and blessed.” None of this is exceptional. In Manetti’s optimism, perhaps prophetic of the security with which the modern European world (until recently at least) has accepted the bounties of its history, there is also a recognition that these magnificences can be imperiled by overconfidence. Out of man’s great and sublime dignity came “envy, pride, indignation, lust for domination and ambition” as an almost inevitable consequence. Dominating nature and others, man will not tolerate any threat to his superiority. If man’s dignity is “spurned or neglected or despised, he is offended to such an extent that he will pursue his contemptors as . . . his capital and bitterest enemies and . . . violators and detractors of his excellences even unto death.” Man therefore must be seen not only as a creature of dignity but
as an "animal filled with indignation." If, as some of our contemporaries assert, the Renaissance conception of man was responsible for the arrogance, destruction, and waste with which European man overran the earth and caused our great crises of ecology, it is only fair to see that the Renaissance exponent of the dignity of man also grasped the dangers and thus provided us with the moral structure within which we can take a critical stand.4

Scholars often portrayed Marsilio Ficino as retreating from an active conception of human life, toward inwardness and contemplation. In man's striving to excel, to conquer, to explore, Ficino found evidence of man's deep drive to possess all of the manifest qualities of divinity, to become divine. In his aspiration to divinity, man seeks to conquer and to win:

In what pertains to the desire for victory, the immense magnificence of our soul may manifestly be seen from this: man will not be satisfied with the empire of this world, if, having conquered this one, he learns that there remains another world which he has not yet subjugated. . . . Thus man wishes no superior and no equal and will not permit anything to be left out and excluded from his rule. This status belongs to God alone. Therefore he seeks a divine condition. (Theologia platonica XIV. 4)5

But even more appropriate to the Age of Discoveries was man's desire to be everywhere:

God is everywhere. . . . Man desires to be everywhere. For he uses the four elements, as we have said. He measures the earth and the heavens, and he sounds the hidden depths of Tartarus. The heavens do not seem too high for him, as I borrow the words of Hermes, nor the center of the earth too deep. No intervals of time or place prevent him from running through all things wherever they are in whatever times and places. No wall dulls or weakens his glance. He is content with no frontier. He yearns to command everywhere and to be praised everywhere. And so he strives to be as God everywhere. (Ibid., XIV. 5)6

Like Manetti's, Ficino's vision of the grandeur of human ambition was aware of a built-in danger—insatiability, restlessness. While the human body could rest, man's soul drove him ever onward in pursuit of the infinite—which is the divine:

Anxiety of this sort is peculiar to man himself, since it arises from the characteristic powers of the human soul, not from corporeal elements, nor the animal powers which have been satisfied in us, as we said. That is why man alone in this present condition of life never relaxes, he alone is a wanderer in these regions, and in the journey itself he can find no rest, while he seeks the heavenly fatherland, which all of us seek, although because of the variety of opinions and choices we seek it by many roads. (Ibid., XIV. 7)7
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Manetti wrote his treatise in the early 1450's, Ficino his in the early 1470's, both before the major discoveries. Dante, Petrarch, and Salutati lived even earlier. We do not and cannot claim any causal relationship between their attitudes and the events of the Age of Discoveries. However, we can look at them as harbingers of a Christian Renaissance spiritual stance expressing some of the attitudes which the next generations would use to frame their responses to the discoveries—the assertiveness, first guilty but then seen as divinely inspired or God-like; the fatal excess of ambition that could make for spiritual ruin; and always the restlessness, the insatiable yearning for more wealth, more power, more knowledge—the Faustian readiness to gamble one's soul.

And so as we begin to trace the first consequences of the discoveries of the New World on the European mind and society, I offer these comments concerning the intellectual and moral attitudes of the Age of the Renaissance. The attitudes are all prior to the great events of the Age of Discoveries, but indicate in some way that the ensuing spiritual ferment had already started its working.

NOTES

2. Ibid., XV, 4 (3.139-143).
3. De secolo et religione, ed. B. L. Ullman (Florence 1957) 82-84.
5. Ibid., 2. 491 n. 61.
6. Ibid., 2. 491 and 789 n. 62.
7. Ibid., 2. 493 and 790 n. 67.
Five years ago, I maintained that the impact on the Old World of the discovery of the New was in many respects both disappointingly muted and slow in materializing. In reaching this conclusion I found that one of my greatest difficulties was that of measurement. How can we assess whether, relatively speaking, Renaissance Europe was quick or slow, receptive or unreceptive, in its cultural and intellectual response to the discovery of a new world and new peoples quite beyond the range of its expectations and experience? What criteria, if any, do we have for measuring the speed and effectiveness of a society's response to the presence of another with totally alien ways?

There exists, no doubt, an ideal response, which has been defined by the British philosopher Peter Winch: "What we may learn by studying other cultures are not merely possibilities of different ways of doing things, other techniques. More importantly we may learn different possibilities of making sense of human life, different ideas about the possible importance that the carrying out of certain activities may take on for a man, trying to contemplate the sense of his life as a whole."
first glance, one or two observers of the New World's indigenous societies in the sixteenth century may seem to come close to responding in this whole-hearted fashion. In a fascinating passage of his History of the Indies, for instance, Las Casas displays an apparent awareness of the Indian way of life as a viable alternative to that of the European conquerors. The Indians do as much work as is needed to sustain themselves, and the rest of their time they devote to hunting, fishing, fiestas, and dances. The contrast with the European work ethic—even in its Spanish manifestations—was striking to a sixteenth-century observer. But Las Casas is pointing to the contrast not as a means of presenting a novel alternative to his European readers, but as an argument in the continuing debate between two conflicting European traditions. Over against the acquisitive instinct, which had been sharply stimulated among Europeans by the sudden availability of silver and gold, this great medieval mendicant is setting the simple virtues of a society free from greed. In making his Amerindians honorary citizens of a New Jerusalem grounded on the age-old Christian doctrine of apostolic poverty, Las Casas inevitably misses the essentially ceremonial and ritualistic constituents of the Indian social order—constituents that remained too alien for easy comprehension.

I have chosen this example not only because it illustrates the difficulties confronting even the most sympathetic observers of societies other than their own, but also because it suggests how wide is the gulf separating Professor Winch's ideal response from the actual response of Europeans to sixteenth-century America. If we formulate our question in words that he has chosen, and ask whether Renaissance Europe did indeed learn from America "different possibilities of making sense of human life, different ideas about the possible importance that the carrying out of certain activities may take on for a man," I think we are bound to answer in the negative.

But may we not be pitching our expectations too high? It is asking a good deal of any society to take to heart the lessons which may be learnt from foreigners, especially when it has defeated and subjugated them. Perhaps cultural receptivity on any major scale can be expected only in a well-integrated society confident of its own identity (like medieval Islamic society when confronted with the learning of the Greeks) or else in a society which becomes forcibly aware of its own relative deficiencies, like nineteenth-century Japan. Renaissance Europe was neither so self-confident as to borrow from others on an extensive scale, nor so vulnerable and insecure as to require the mass importation of ideas and techniques. Instead, it approached the outer world with a combination of prejudice, curiosity, and caution. It was perhaps more genuinely interested in the workings of this alien world than it had shown itself to be when confronted by medieval Islam, but less inter-
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ested than its twentieth-century successor in the life-styles and achievements of non-European societies. There is, for instance, a striking contrast between the solitary labours of the fifteenth-century Spanish scholar Juan de Segovia, desperately scouring Europe for someone with a knowledge of Arabic to assist him in translating the Koran, and the activities of a whole group of sixteenth-century Spaniards dedicated to studying the language and customs of Amerindian societies. No doubt Western attitudes to Islam fluctuated over the centuries, with a greater readiness at some moments than at others to inquire into its ways. No doubt, too, the local situation in America—not least the opportunity and necessity for mass conversion of non-Christian peoples—goes a long way towards explaining the reasons for the contrast. But there are also indications of a greater willingness in the sixteenth century, if only in restricted circles, to come to terms intellectually with the realities of an alien world. However untypical, it is at least noteworthy that Bernardino de Sahagún, that great Franciscan ethnographer, should have committed himself to the statement that the allegedly barbarous peoples of Mexico were in some respects superior to other peoples with a greater presumption of civility.

Obviously, late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Christendom was unlikely to respond except by violently rejecting the strange native religions which were revealed to its startled gaze. But if we pitch our expectations rather lower, and attempt to identify those areas where some kind of positive response seems possible, the following would appear acceptable candidates: (1) geographical lore and learning; (2) Europe’s conception of mankind; (3) its views on the past and present organization of the family, the polity, and society in general; (4) aesthetic attitudes and the arts and crafts.

In attempting to measure the extent of the impact in all four fields, we find ourselves faced by problems of evidence and interpretation which are critical to the success of the enterprise. There is, for example, the fundamental question of the literary versus the oral tradition. In his Asia in the Making of Europe, Professor Donald Lach tells us that “oral reports . . . constituted a vital source of information and inspiration.” Presumably no less valid for the impact of America than of Asia, this kind of evidence is by its nature beyond recovery. How much animated discussion took place in the streets and convents of Valladolid before the Comunero rebels inserted into their 1520 manifesto the remarkable demand that Indians should not be treated as infidels and slaves?

But even if we make allowance for the spoken over the written word, we are still confronted with the standard problem of gauging the dissemination (and still more problematically the influence) of books, tracts, broadsheets, woodcuts, and engravings. To illustrate the problem’s complexity, let us take two pieces of information: Francanzano da
Montalboddo’s *Paesi novamente retrovati* (Vincenza 1507) went through 15 editions in four languages (Italian, Latin, German, and French) and is said to have been more instrumental than any other work in disseminating knowledge of America, Africa, and the Far East. Alongside this, let us set the following pronouncement by the distinguished humanist Cochlaeus, who was appointed head of a boys’ school in Nuremberg in 1510 with a commission to modernize its curriculum. In his introduction to the 1512 edition of Pomponius Mela’s *Cosmographia*, he writes:

In our lifetime, Amerigo Vespucci is said to have discovered that New World with ships belonging to the kings of Spain and Portugal; he sailed not only beyond the torrid zone but far beyond the Tropic of Capricorn. He says Africa stretches as far; and that this New World is quite distinct from it and bigger than our Europe. Whether this is true or a lie, it has nothing . . . to do with Cosmography and the knowledge of History. For the peoples and places of that continent are unknown and unnamed to us and sailings are only made there with the greatest dangers. Therefore it is of no interest to geographers at all.

So much for the modern education of the sons of the Nuremberg merchants.

Which of these two—the wide dissemination of Montalboddo or the unwillingness of humanist geographers to alter their textbooks—provides us with the more telling commentary on the discoveries’ impact on Renaissance Europe? This is among the most difficult problems which face us, and it is one to which I can see no clear answer. Some work has been done, and much more could be done, on the printing and translation of books relating to America in comparison with those on other parts of the globe. But unless we can find more about their readership, the printing statistics, however valuable in themselves, afford only an uncertain indicator of a highly complex phenomenon. Influence itself cannot be quantified; but it would still be helpful to have some regional breakdown of the popularity of *Americana*, as measured by the date and number of editions in different parts of Europe; and also, where the evidence permits, of relative popularity among different kinds of readership—scholars, merchants, ecclesiastics—as revealed by library inventories.

There are, too, what Professor Lach has called “the silent sources”—art objects, artifacts, flora, fauna, crafts. But, apart from the special difficulties arising from the random character of survival for the ephemeral and the fragile, there is also the major art-historical problem of whether similarity results from influence or chance. We know what an impact the treasures of Montezuma made on Albrecht Dürer. But does this allow us to go further and relate his ideal city of 1527 to the plan of Tenochtitlan which accompanied the 1524 Nuremberg edition of the
second and third letters of Hernando Cortés? The presumption is a fair one, but the evidence remains inconclusive.\textsuperscript{13}

The historical problems arising from the attempt to assess and measure influence are, of course, familiar enough, although familiarity does not deprive them of their baffling complexity. The temptation to assume an influence, and trace it back by convincing stages to its alleged original, has at one time or another afflicted us all. But another and more subtle temptation in the study of influences is less easily perceived. By its very nature a theme like the impact of discovery lends itself to a Whiggish interpretation of the historical process, on what seems the reasonable assumption that the gradual accumulation of knowledge will little by little dispel the mists of ignorance. Certainly one could postulate a linear progression from ignorance to understanding for geographical information. As each new verified geographical fact finds its way into general circulation, the contours of the maps become more accurate and the vast empty spaces begin to fill. But does the same process work where a wider range of human responses comes into play—for instance, in understanding Amerindian social organization or psychology, or in appreciating Amerindian art?

I would suggest that, instead of a linear advance, we find ourselves at the beginning of a winding road which twists back on itself, and involves retreats, advances, and more than one false start. In particular, some evidence seems to suggest that the humanist generation of the first half of the century was in certain important respects more responsive to the New World and what it had to offer, both culturally and intellectually, than was its successor—the generation of the Counter-Reformation. This is especially apparent in the respective attitudes of the two generations to the character of the Indian. The generation born between the 1480's and around 1510—men like Sahagún or Alonso de Zorita—seem to display a greater degree of sympathetic understanding for the Indian, and a deeper insight into his predicament, than the hard-faced clerics and officials of the later sixteenth century. We can trace more closely the decline of sympathy and the narrowing of vision by comparing the opinions expressed at meetings of the clergy of Mexico at different moments during the sixteenth century. While a meeting held in 1532 emphasizes the spiritual capacity of the Indians, the first Mexican Provincial Council of 1555 depicts them as feeble and inconstant creatures with a natural inclination to vice, and the picture that emerges from the third Mexican Provincial Council of 1585 is almost uniformly dismal.\textsuperscript{14}

This increasingly pessimistic vision of the Indian and his capabilities may well correspond to an actual change in his circumstances. The trauma of conquest, colonization, and exploitation undoubtedly created a shell-shocked and shiftless brood of Indians, more "degenerate" than
their ancestors in the eyes of Westerners. But may there not have been a radical change in the angle of vision as well? Man made in God's image and likeness was preeminently fifteenth-century man. The renewed emphasis of the sixteenth century on human sinfulness had an impact on the way in which Europeans assessed these strange peoples committed to their tutelage. The later sixteenth-century evaluation of the post-conquest Indian may have been closer to reality than the often absurdly simplistic attitudes of humanists who saw in the new-found peoples paragons of innocence such as inhabited Eden before the Fall. But the earlier humanist approach favoured closer inquiry and a greater receptivity to the traditions and values of Amerindian society than the closed, dismissive attitude of the later sixteenth century.

Something, then, was lost during the course of the century. I think it misleading to hypothesize a progressive degree of awareness, a deeper understanding, or a continually expanding capacity to incorporate aspects of the American experience into the European consciousness. Instead, we should look for changing angles of vision which, while bringing some pictures into clearer focus, will distort others that had earlier been caught by the European lens with reasonable fidelity.

This approach means that we must abandon the Ruskinian doctrine of the innocent eye—a doctrine which seems to inspire George Eliot's words in *Middlemarch*: “Perhaps that was a more cheerful time for observers and theorizers than the present; we are apt to think it the finest era of the world when America was beginning to be discovered, when a bold sailor, even if he were wrecked, might alight on a new kingdom.” Certainly newness was everywhere; and the intense excitement of new sights, new sounds, new kingdoms does give a freshness and an immediacy to the first eye-witness accounts of America and its peoples. If it ever existed, the innocent eye is more likely to be found among practical sea-faring men, trained to observe accurately and report succinctly, than among those whose images of the world were shaped by literature and learning; and one would like to know more about the background of a man like Captain Arthur Barlowe, whose account of the Roanoke voyage of 1584 has all the directness of untrammelled personal observation. But even Barlowe's account may seem too idyllic to carry full conviction, and as soon as we turn to a figure with the psychological complexity of Columbus, we see how easily direct personal observation becomes overlaid by a layer of preconceptions. Leonardo Olschki once showed in fascinating detail how Columbus—in common with other medieval and Renaissance voyagers—was far more precise and informative in his depiction of man than of nature, and how easily his landscapes merged into the idealized landscapes of the medieval paradise. Similarly, his descriptions of the Caribbean islanders, for all their sharpness of observation, still manage to convey classical and biblical
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overtones—overtones inevitably amplified further by armchair humanists in Europe.20

It was not the innocent, but the selective eye which first viewed America; and to assess the impact of America on Renaissance Europe we need to know the nature and criteria of Renaissance selectivity. More especially we need to know in precisely what ways the perception of America was affected by the Renaissance version of the two central European traditions—the Judeo-Christian and the classical.

Rather than pointing Europe in totally new directions, the discovery of America emphasized and strengthened certain elements in European civilization at the expense of others. This happened because the Judeo-Christian and classical traditions were themselves so rich and varied that they made it possible both to interpret and absorb a substantial part of what America had to offer without provoking a seismic shock in the European system.

The shock was perhaps greatest in the most specifically circumscribed area—Europe’s inherited geographical knowledge and experience. Although the classical geographical tradition, as interpreted by fifteenth-century cosmographers, provided an inspiration and a springboard for overseas voyages of exploration,21 this tradition was itself the first and most decisive casualty of the voyages. Personal inquiry and investigation confronted myths with facts. Again and again that wonderful chronicler of the Indies, Gonzalo Fernandez de Oviedo, insists, not without satisfaction, that traditional cosmography has been discredited: “What I have said cannot be learnt in Salamanca, Bologna, or Paris. . . .”22 The ancients had got it wrong: personal experience proved to have more authority than Authority itself; or, in the words of Sir Humphrey Gilbert: “These moderne experiences cannot be impugned.”23 But the emphasis on personal observation was no sixteenth-century novelty, and was itself justified by Authority—in this instance, the authority of Quintilian: “For there are no subjects in which, as a rule, practice is not more valuable than precept.”24 Even here, then, there was a kind of resilience within Europe’s cultural inheritance which helped to cushion the shock of what at first sight appeared a devastating refutation of long-cherished beliefs. If Authority weighed heavily on Renaissance Europe, experience also had its proper place.

The absence in the European tradition of complete exclusiveness, of a total commitment to one set of values at the expense of another, was equally important in enabling the inhabitants of Christendom to come to terms with the existence of new peoples as well as new lands. Trained to think in terms of global conversion to the Christian faith, Europeans naturally looked upon the inhabitants of the Indies primarily as souls to be saved. This global conception of conversion was fortified in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries by the apocalyptic and Joachimite
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tradition which subsumed into one single process the conversion of the world and its coming to an end. Consequently, although the very existence of the Amerindians came as a surprise, and posed difficult theological problems both about their origins and about their apparently total exclusion over many centuries from the blessings and benefits of the Christian revelation, they could nonetheless be incorporated into the inherited Christian conception of the nature of mankind. Given the fact that the Indians were indeed men, space had to be found for them within the accepted image of the family of man.

This image was naturally compounded of classical as well as Christian strains. The classical tradition, both as Christianized by the scholastics and revitalized by the humanists, played a decisive part in facilitating European acceptance of the peoples of America as members of viable and valid societies. Not Christianity alone, but rationality and civility too, furnished yardsticks with which to measure and test the unknown. No doubt rationality and civility were themselves vague and imprecise concepts in early sixteenth-century Europe, but this very vagueness ultimately proved to be a source of strength. For it enabled sympathetic observers like Las Casas to adduce criteria of civility derived from classical sources and to apply them to peoples unknown to the ancients. From such criteria it was obvious to Las Casas, if not to everyone else, that "although our Indians did not read the Philosopher, they lived—enlightened by natural reason—in conformity with the rules prevailing in a good polity, as he with his great philosophy had previously defined them."26

Even if others looked upon the Indians as closer to beasts than to men, Europeans still possessed within their own cultural tradition the mental equipment necessary for perceiving and recognizing alien societies. As trained by Renaissance humanism, it made them especially well suited to deal with the cultural consequences of overseas discovery. Here, after all, was a generation acutely conscious of a civilization that was not its own—that of Greek and Roman antiquity—and one which was now far removed in time. This newly acquired sense of temporal perspective must have helped it to come to terms also with civilizations far removed in space.

If classical antiquity provided Europeans with an alternative image—the existence of which alone makes it possible to develop some sense of perspective—it also gave them the basic tools of inquiry for the investigation of other lands and peoples. Fernández de Oviedo confessedly follows the model of Pliny in expounding the marvels and mysteries of the Indies.27 Even where the lack of written records threatened to impede an inquiry into the history and customs of alien populations, classical antiquity could again be brought to the rescue. Had not Herodotus, after all, grappled with just such problems? No
do not hallucinate.
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doubt in many instances the histories came first and the adducing of precedents followed, but in an age so deeply imbued with reverence for authority, the existence of Authority was itself a comforting vindication of pioneering enterprise. The Herodotean revival of the sixteenth century may have been, at least in part, a response from within the European tradition to the novel problems of historical method posed by the discoveries.28

Just as Christianity, therefore, enabled sixteenth-century Europeans to incorporate the peoples of America into their spiritual world-picture (as pure and innocent children or as deluded victims of the Devil), so also the classical tradition made possible their incorporation into an existing secular world-picture, where they could be suitably positioned both in space and in time. On the whole, spatial positioning came more easily than temporal. The encyclopaedic tradition, as represented in the sixteenth century by the figure of Boemus, had accustomed Europeans to accept the coexistence of wide varieties of human behaviour. By now they were well used to scanning the world and seeing a whole range of peoples, each with its own outlandish ways. But this same encyclopaedic tradition could also debase facts into mere curiosities to be collected, just as sixteenth-century collectors assembled odd bits and pieces for their curio cabinets.

Ethnographical curio-collecting undoubtedly represented a major impediment to ethnographical thought throughout the sixteenth century. It was much easier to marvel at diversity than attempt to explain it. But whenever the mere assembling of facts gave way to attempts at classification, and these in turn prompted a search for possible explanations, interesting conclusions began to emerge. When Fernández de Oviedo described a tribe of Colombian Indians whose only diet was ants as “the most wretched people to have been seen in the Indies,” clearly he conceived a scale of existence running from the civilized to the totally barbarous. By the end of the century Acosta was postulating three degrees of barbarism, and was talking about the need to teach those “who are scarcely men, or only half men, how to become men.”30 We have here the beginnings of a theory of progress and of social development—a theory which again had a respectable classical ancestry. For, as Louis Le Roy reminded his readers, Plato had suggested that the first men were naked forest dwellers.31

Once it was accepted that peoples passed through different stages of development, there was no valid reason for excluding Europeans from the same historical process. If, in Montaigne’s words, the New World was “so new and infantine, that he is yet to learne his A.B.C.,” presumably the Old World too had once been illiterate. The presence of primitive peoples in the newly-discovered lands made it easier to envisage what these untutored Europeans must have been like; and the
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fact that John White's drawings of North American Indians in 1585 were used as the basis for imaginative representation of ancient Picts and Britons\textsuperscript{33} shows that there were some who took the point.

As soon as the process of comparison got under way—and it began in a relatively unrefined form when Europeans first set eyes on the Caribbean islanders—Europe had the opportunity to see itself in new perspectives. It had already learnt, by the late fifteenth century, to see itself in relation to the old world of Greece and Rome. Now it could also look at itself in relation to the new world of America. For there was always something narcissistic in Europe's approach both to antiquity and to America. In observing America it was, in the first instance, observing itself—and observing itself in one of two mirrors, each of which distorted as it revealed. It could see in America its own ideal past—a world still uncontaminated by greed and vice, where men lived in felicity and prelapsarian innocence.\textsuperscript{34} Or, as occurred increasingly with the advance of the sixteenth century, it could see in America its actual past—a time when Europe's rude inhabitants were as yet untouched by civil manners or by Christianity.

Neither image may have borne much relationship to America past or present, but this was less important for European development than the fact that the images existed. They were images of what Europe had been or might be; and as such they provided a striking contrast to what in fact Europe was. Obviously such a contrast contained within itself exciting, and potentially subversive, possibilities of cultural relativism. Only the occasional bold spirit, like Léry or Montaigne, may have wandered down this path in the sixteenth century. But the path was now open and the first thickets had been cleared.

The unwillingness to exploit more than fleetingly the opportunities for relativism can, however, itself tell us something important about sixteenth-century attitudes. The limits of sympathy for the Amerindian world were tightly drawn—drawn by the very Christian and classical traditions which made possible Europe's initial opening to the new world of America. Take, for instance, Thevet's account of Les Singularitez de la France antarctique of 1558. "America," he tells us, "is today inhabited . . . by marvellously strange and savage peoples, without faith, law, religion, or the least civility, living like irrational beasts just as nature produced them. . . . We should offer up praise to the Creator who has enlightened us in these things, and has not left us in a brutish state like these poor Americans."\textsuperscript{35}

Thevet's words make it clear that sympathetic understanding came to an abrupt halt in the sixteenth century wherever Amerindian behaviour affronted Christian or "civilized" susceptibilities. Although Las Casas made a bold, if unconvincing, apology for the Aztec practice of human sacrifice,\textsuperscript{36} sacrificial murder and cannibalism filled Europeans
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with such intense repugnance that it was impossible for them to consider dispassionately what function these practices might fulfill in the life of indigenous societies. Similar barriers to comprehension arose in such sensitive areas for the sixteenth-century mentality as dress (or undress), the wearing of long hair, and systems of inheritance. But there are signs of greater flexibility when it came to family life and the education of children, where Sahagún, Las Casas, and Acosta describe Aztec practices with unconcealed admiration.  

The reaction to Indian art and artifacts was much the same. Like Dürer, Hernando Cortés was filled with wonder at the beauties of Mexican craftsmanship, and actually attempted to preserve the pre-Conquest temples which the friars were busily destroying. But such behaviour was too unconventional for contemporaries, and incurred the comments of hostile witnesses in the 1529 inquiry into Cortés' conduct. Clearly, Christianity took absolute precedence in any area of potential conflict between the religious and aesthetic. Where no such conflict arose, appreciation was easier, but it was naturally an appreciation inspired by contemporary European aesthetic attitudes. The rarity of the materials, the strangeness of the object, the cunning of the craftsmen—it was these which impressed sixteenth-century Europeans when they looked at Amerindian artifacts. When Bernal Diaz compared Indian craftsmen in Mexico City to Berruguete and Michelangelo, it was the skill and cunning of their workmanship that moved him. Verisimilitude to nature, technical skill, proportion, and perspective were the qualities which sixteenth-century Europeans looked for in works of art, and both pre-Conquest and post-Conquest native work was judged in accordance with these criteria.

I would suggest, therefore, that across the range of experience, from its vision of the world to its vision of art and aesthetics, Europe passed America through a selective screening process, which enabled it to reject images that were too far out of alignment with its own preconceptions. These preconceptions derived from the fusion of classical and Christian values and beliefs, and were now in many instances being filtered through the lens of Renaissance humanism. But the values and beliefs were themselves sufficiently rich, diversified, and sometimes self-contradictory to leave space for the partial and relatively painless incorporation of new facts and impressions into an image of the world and of mankind that was neither entirely rigid nor entirely exclusive. Moreover, the twin ideals of Christianity and classical antiquity—the desire to convert and the desire to know—happened to be unusually alive and potent in Europe at the moment of America's discovery, and their vitality helped to ensure that the immediate response of Christendom to the newly discovered lands and peoples was more generous than restrictive, more positive than negative.
Introduction: Renaissance and Discovery

Certain dangers to European values and attitudes were implicit in this initially positive response. But these dangers were reduced by the built-in screening mechanism to which I have referred—a mechanism which operated to limit the range and extent of cultural shock. In this respect—and leaving aside the sheer technical problems which attended the dissemination of information in Early Modern Europe—I believe that it is reasonable to talk about the blunted impact of the discovery of America on the sixteenth-century European consciousness. But the bluntness of the impact can itself be explained by the unique resilience and diversity of the society that received it. Whatever may have been true of America, Renaissance Europe was tailor-made for a soft landing. And, paradoxically, the softness of the landing was itself the necessary pre-condition for the slow, erratic but nevertheless persistent process by which the Old World adjusted itself to the forces released by its conquest of the New.

NOTES

4. See Dario Cabanelas Rodríguez, *Juan de Segovia y el problema islámico* (Madrid 1952), especially 153-155.
12. Lach (n. 7 above) 2. 6.
16. For the “innocent eye” and acute comments on it, see Ernst Hans Josef Gombrich, *Art and Illusion; A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation* (ed. 2 London 1962), especially 250-251.
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20. For the perceptions of Columbus and others, see Erwin Walter Palm, Los Monumentos arquitectónicos de la Española (2 vols. Ciudad Trujillo 1955) I. 8 ff.
27. Historia general (n. 22 above) 2. 56.
29. Historia general (n. 22 above) 3. 115.
34. On the general theme of primitivism and nostalgia in European thought, see Henri Baudet, Paradise on Earth: Some Thoughts on European Images of Non-European Man, trans. Elizabeth Wenthol (New Haven and London 1965).
35. André Thevet, Les singularitez de la France antarctique avurement nommée Americque (Antwerp 1558) 51.
36. Apologética historia (n. 26 above) 2. 251.
37. See my “Discovery of America” (n. 30 above) 114-116, for some of these sensitive areas.
38. Sahagún (n. 6 above) Historia general, 2. 327-329; Las Casas, Apologética historia (n. 26 above) 2. 421; José de Acosta, Historia natural y moral de las Indias, ed. Edmund O’Gorman (ed. 2 Mexico 1962) 315.
39. Hernando Cortés, Cartas y documentos de Hernan Cortés (México 1963) 70 (Second letter, 30 October 1520).
Part II

ANGLES OF PERCEPTION:
MYTH AND LITERATURE
Impulses of
Italian Renaissance Culture
behind the Age of Discoveries

by Thomas Goldstein

We want to know more about the inner affinities that may have existed between two fairly simultaneous developments. Are we entitled (as most of us, I believe, were taught) to think of the Age of Discoveries as an essential manifestation of Renaissance culture? Did contemporaries feel—without necessarily leaving us the documentary evidence—that the two events were really parallel expressions of the same impulse, or “spirit”? Assuming that this should turn out to be the case, would that mean that both developments might be traced to essentially common historic roots?

For Jacob Burckhardt’s beautifully unbroken vision, such essential affinities were still self-evident—and of course completely integral to his conception. (“My starting point has to be a vision,” he wrote to a friend: “Without that, I am unable to do anything at all.”) Part Four of his Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy bears the famous title “The Discovery of the World and of Man,” and includes a first chapter on the “Journeys of the Italians,” followed by one on “The Natural Sciences in Italy,” which is in turn followed by a chapter on the “Discovery of the Beauty of Landscape”: Burckhardt’s vision encompassed a feeling that this “discovery of the world” was related to the awakening interest in
scenic description, indeed to the emerging esthetic pleasure in the beauty of landscape; and an intuition that this syndrome had something to do with a new relationship between man and the natural world, which expressed itself in a rebirth of science (such as botany or zoology).¹

A century later, filled with doubts that partly stem from our greater command of factual detail but perhaps even more from our concern with methodological precision, we might find the mere fact of Burckhardt's advocacy sufficient cause to be skeptical. We might give credit to his intuition, but without the kind of substantiating evidence that would meet our exacting standards we would be unable to follow his lead. In our cool, late twentieth-century mood we are more likely to ask what is actually there to link the Age of Discoveries with the Renaissance besides a superficial chronological coincidence,² plus some vague impression that both events seemed to entail similar inner "dynamics." Can one reasonably expect to find more meaningful affinities than the apparent parallelism of two explosions of long pent-up energies, the one in the form of an outburst of artistic creativity, the other a spectacular practical venture aiming at the conquest of the world?

Let me suggest at once that, if there should indeed be any substantial kinship, it could only reveal itself in the motivating attitudes—and, conceivably, the conditions which brought these about—rather than in the results. To look for some meaningful connection between the lovely, explicit seascape that forms the background for Botticelli's Birth of Venus, and the expanding contemporary interest in maritime navigation (for example, on the part of Portugal) would constitute an obvious absurdity—and a dead-end for any serious investigation. The only worthwhile focus would have to center on the original impulses which are ultimately embodied in this painting (including its subject matter) and in the artistic movement to which it belongs, as well as in this kind of practical activity. But the question is whether such initial impulses could ever be convincingly identified.

Luckily, it seems to me, this emphasis on the original motivating forces and conditions is precisely what distinguishes the scholarly approach: it is the layman—or at any rate the non-specialist—who tends to think of both the geographic discoveries and the Renaissance largely in terms of their staggering results; while it is the scholar's tendency to reduce the end products (often by an inferential process) to the human, intellectual, emotional, indeed creative activity which brought them about, including, wherever possible, the constellation of historic circumstances that may have influenced them.

In the case of the Age of Discoveries, as soon as we try to enter into the minds of the participants we face a spectacular outburst of curiosity about the shape and nature of the earth, an outburst which people
realized with a remarkable degree of practical and intellectual effort—rather than the deliberate locating and unlocking of unfamiliar territories which the term "discovery" seems to imply. And it is highly appropriate to ask why this geographic curiosity should have seized so many people with such dramatic results at just that particular time. The whole meaning of the concept of discovery tends to reduce itself to this historical question—especially when one considers that some evidence of the existence of the American continent had reached Europe in mythic as well as tangible form prior to the fifteenth century; or that we have evidence of voyages to America before Columbus (in particular Norse); or that—after all—some of the major discoverers themselves, including Columbus, were only aware of attempting a new route to a centuries-old target of medieval commercial travel, rather than feeling themselves engaged in a purposeful venture of "discovery." The discovery of the New World presents itself more and more as the accidental byproduct of a particular cultural vogue or psychological attitude, concerned with expanding the familiar geographic horizons and, in its intellectual aspects, creating a realistic picture of the earth: people on the Continent were ready to open their imaginations to the outside world, and engage their intellectual and financial resources in its exploration.

There is not at this point anything like unanimity on, or indeed a complete understanding of, these questions among historians of the discoveries. But it is fair to say that our research has increasingly guided us away from a concept of geographic discovery as a unique and purposeful act of scientific significance (somewhat parallel to the role of invention on a technological level), and towards discovery as an act of perception, induced by an impulse to experience and to know, for which in turn the stage has been set by generally felt cultural developments.

If we therefore come to think of the Age of Discoveries as essentially the result of culturally induced and culturally shared attitudes, it should be more readily possible to ask what these attitudes might have had in common with the motivating impulses of the Renaissance. Certain random associations present themselves almost spontaneously: when the discoverers examined tropical flora on a West Indian island, their keen sense of observation, often coupled with esthetic pleasure, could not have differed much in motivation or quality from the fascinated attention lavished by Botticelli or Leonardo on a domestic flower. The esthetic pleasure in exotic scenery which speaks from Columbus' Journal has been justly likened to the awakening feeling for landscapes expressed in Renaissance literature and art.

The evolution of cartography can in some ways be considered an offshoot of Renaissance art: One thinks of painters who took up map-making as a profession, or else were intrigued by the problem of representing a vast area within the dimensions of a painting, like Leonardo.
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The vogue of city maps (and city descriptions), in particular towards the end of the fifteenth century, was paralleled by a vogue of "cityscapes," usually from the hand of minor painters, showing views of Florence, Venice, Naples, Genoa, which did not differ too much from the relief type of city map. The Ptolemaic method of map projection—diffused in Italy through the popularity of Ptolemy's freshly translated Geography— influenced artists and architects engaged in formulating the laws of perspective.

Here are apparent affinities of perception or concept: an absorption in the details of the human habitat which boldly disregards geographic distance and the boundaries of specialized approaches. This fascination with the details of the earthly environment did not rigidly distinguish botanical specimens growing nearby from those far away; the features of one's home town depicted in a painting or diagrammed on a map; or indeed the technique of representing three-dimensional space on two-dimensional planes for a pictorial or cartographic purpose. Our modern compartmentalizations—geography versus botany, painting versus cartography, science versus art—are peculiarly our own, while the Renaissance mind moved freely amongst these categories, impelled by whatever attracted its curiosity. It is no accident that at several turns in this context we had to think of Leonardo. Nor could it be irrelevant for our understanding of the Renaissance mind that we see him epitomizing a pervasive cultural trend, less and less as an altogether unique or isolated phenomenon (the scope of his mind and art notwithstanding).

Just as it is difficult to tell how one of Leonardo's anatomical sketches should be classified, we perceive a comparable flexibility of the Renaissance mind in its capacity for being intrigued by certain explicit aspects of reality—regardless of whether they appeared in a familiar environment or in some distant land. From the Franciscan missionaries of the thirteenth century, through Marco Polo and the traveling merchants and pilgrims of the fourteenth and fifteenth, to Columbus, travelers were gripped by the keyed-up alertness to foreign detail which always forms a part of the traveler's mentality. Characteristically for the Renaissance, the same passion for observation, also concentrated on the features of the domestic scene, was miraculously transferred to the sphere of daily experience: a cypress-studded Tuscan hillside edged by a rough-hewn wall; narrow-chested housefronts on a Florentine street; the faces of one's neighbors. Whatever the sequence of general circumstances, the sense of perception of even the most commonplace object had significantly increased.

Such a pervasive sense of discovery, tending to submerge distinctions between the "artistic" and the "scientific," the familiar and the far-away in sheer fascination with the object, derived in part from the foreign travel which Italians experienced extensively from the later
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Middle Ages on. The influence of travel awaits further study and substantiation. But it would seem logical that the new sense of space, expressed in the architecture, sculpture, and (above all) painting of the Renaissance, naturally reflected the expanded horizons of a merchant class accustomed to thinking in terms of far-flung international markets, far-roaming agents, and business dispositions on a generous scale. The merchants who built homes in the spacious style and proportions exemplified in the Florentine Palazzo Davanzati would be likely to choose exotic touches of interior decor which might in turn serve as a stimulus to new motifs in life-style and art. The same merchants again might act as patrons; their influence on the style and subject matter of painting is conceivably much greater than has been established so far.

The effects of expanding horizons due to sustained and extended travel occurred in some general as well as some highly specific ways: the drastic transition from an essentially two-dimensional concept of space in traditional medieval painting to the acute sense of three-dimensional space that pervaded Renaissance art after Giotto; the remarkable tendency of painters to evoke a definite locale, whether domestic or exotic, which seems to reflect a heightened geographic (or at any rate chorographic) consciousness; or the explicit “travel panoramas” presented on the subject of the Journey of the Magi throughout the fifteenth century, by Gentile da Fabriano, Benozzo Gozzoli, Ghirlandaio, or Leonardo, rich in exotic animals and costumes, figures with vaguely foreign features, or definitely black Africans.

In all this, the assumption is twofold: first, that Renaissance culture can be reduced to a basic new concept of space; and second, that this particular feature was inspired by a specific practical experience, the prolonged exposure of the Italian, and especially Florentine, merchant class to international travel and trade. It is necessary only to state these two assumptions in order to realize that both contain a degree of truth which might justify careful further study—and that they are at the same time palpably and simplistically inadequate.

First, the essence of Renaissance art cannot be exclusively reduced to a new sense of space, crucial though this element may have been. There is a host of other, often highly subtle features; one might say that, for instance, the element of acute time consciousness played an equally significant part. The awareness that something important is happening, either at this very moment or only a few instants before (as in Giotto’s Death of St. Francis), gives Renaissance art its unique dramatic value. Yet remarkably, it is this same combination of a bold thrust into three-dimensional space with an acute consciousness of the present moment that makes up the essence of geographic discovery.

Evidently, the attitude we describe as “discovery” is not defined by
mere spatial relationships. In the historic sense of the term we implicitly emphasize the time element: it is not the mere existence of unknown lands—timeless, from any human viewpoint—nor even the theoretical recognition of their existence, but the irresistible impulse to tear these lands from their obscurity at just that particular moment which defines the Age of Discoveries as a historic turning point.

The ultimate inner link between Renaissance and discoveries is implicit in this unique relationship towards space and time. The true Renaissance impulse behind the discoveries is the awakening to a world that had always been there, with a sudden keen urge to face and experience it. And manifestly the same relationship, denoting the same kind of awakening to the world—physical space contemplated in the light of a sudden awareness—is reflected in Renaissance art: Masaccio’s St. Peter healing the sick as he walks through a crowded Florentine street; the old church of Santa Trinita with its familiar surrounding houses looking down on the *Miracle of the Spini Child* in Ghirlandaio’s fresco; beauty in a woman rising from a familiar sea near a familiar Tyrrhenian shore in Botticelli’s *Birth of Venus*. It is merely the exotic aspect which dramatizes the perceptive experience in the discoveries, while the familiar setting often tends to minimize it in art.

Always assuming that these suggestions can be adequately substantiated (which is in fact the writer’s intent), we are entitled to draw a few, however tentative, conclusions. First, there apparently exist sufficient affinities between these two events to warrant a comparative study. It does seem possible to learn more about the motivating impulses of Renaissance culture by studying the geographic discoveries (and the reverse), and even to trace their common historic roots.

Next, while some important common aspects are of the substantial nature of social and economic facts—turning on the role of the Italian merchant class and its long-standing involvement in international travel and trade—the most telling affinities occur in the elusive area of cultural attitudes. What is more, the focus upon motivating impulses and attitudes compels us to view both developments under an unusually extended chronological perspective: Both the creative impulses of Renaissance culture and the urge to explore the world evidently have their origins somewhere within the texture of the later Middle Ages. The search for affinities and common roots—the comparative approach—makes short shrift of conventional notions implying a sudden burst of the modern age, as much as of conventional periodizations.

The basic attitude both phenomena ultimately have in common—the urge to experience (or indeed “discover”) the world, whether near or far, through art or science, through contemplation or artistic creativity, through the mind and the senses or through bold conquering deeds—implies the existence of a cultural tradition against which this attitude
found itself in a state of revolt. The very keenness of the experience, this sudden intense fascination with the earthly environment which unites geographic discoveries and Renaissance art across the most diverse manifestations, must indicate something about the nature of that tradition, as well as its sheer oppressive weight.

Lastly, the subtle, impulsive, ultimately psychological nature of the reaction suggests that it originated within that tenuous sphere where cultural mores tend to stifle the emotional life of the individual.

No doubt, we must seek these subtle origins in the tradition of enforced other-worldliness stemming from St. Augustine’s transcendental philosophy and its impact upon traditional medieval culture. A source of profound spiritual comfort and inspiration in an earlier age, it had frustrated a vast area of vital human need—man’s elementary need to relate to the world through the immediate perception of his senses. In turn, elementary human impulse had responded with the urge to escape from this restrictive cultural mold at every opportunity and in every conceivable manner. Our search for the common origins of an underlying attitude seems to lead us towards a chronologically extended and substantially broadened concept of the Renaissance (including the rise of an early geographic awareness), marked by the kind of inner continuity that has been suggested, for example, in the writings of Richard W. Southern.17

It is by no means incompatible with this long-range, evolutionary view to think that eminently tangible experiences had helped the gradual assertion of this attitude. Most significant among these was the thorough exposure to the outside world that was brought about by early capitalist trade; and—finally, most important of all—that unique combination of conditions which made Florence the ideal environment for the full realization of the new culture, from the early fourteenth century on.18

But although tangible material factors clearly played an important role—such as Florence’s involvement in international banking and trade—these seem only to have provided a favorable setting for the assertion of the new cultural energies. At the center of the difficult process by which Western man gradually broke away from the restrictions of an other-worldly mentality was the individual’s need to relate to this world through his senses or actions. Because the discovery of the world—through creative art or bold conquest—entailed the ultimate discovery of the human self in its full potential, the act of discovery became the quintessence of the Renaissance.

NOTES
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2. I think we are unconsciously inclined to place the Age of Discoveries substantially later than the flourishing Renaissance, while in fact they ran chronologically more or less parallel—if we think of the Franciscan travellers of the thirteenth century as corresponding, chronologically, to the forerunners of Giotto, Marco Polo as approximately Giotto's contemporary, a sequence of somewhat less distinguished travelers preserving continuity throughout the fourteenth century, and the concentration of great voyages beginning ca. 1415 under Prince Henry the Navigator, and of course climaxing during the period between Columbus and Magellan.

3. See Samuel Eliot Morison, Admiral of the Ocean Sea (Boston 1942) 60 ff. Morison also discusses the European awareness of the existence of unknown land formations in the Ocean Sea—a complex of myths and factual knowledge dating from Antiquity. I have tried to summarize and evaluate this complex in a paper, “Florentine Humanism and the Vision of the New World,” in Actas do Congresso internacional de história dos descobrimentos (Lisbon 1961) 4. 195 ff. On Columbus' conviction of finding himself in the island world of the Far East, the most searching analysis is in Leonardo Olschki, Storia letteraria delle scoperte geografiche (Florence 1936), including Columbus' insistence on projecting botanical and zoological features he had read about in Marco Polo onto the West Indian islands. My essay, “Geography in Fifteenth-Century Florence,” in Merchants and Scholars; Essays in the History of Exploration and Trade, ed. John Parker (Minneapolis 1965), attempts to trace some of the intense, systematic intellectual activity that went on behind the actual voyages.


5. The theme of fascinated observation of the island flora, especially the magnificent tropical trees, runs consistently through Columbus' journal of his first voyage: The Voyages of Christopher Columbus, ed. Cecil Jane (London 1930).

6. Olschki (n. 3 above) assigns the Journal its proper place among the scenic descriptions as an emerging literary category.


8. The mutual influences between the development of perspective and the Ptolemaic projection are discussed by Siegmund Günther, “Der Humanismus in seinem Einfluss auf die Entwicklung der Erdkunde,” Heffners Geographische Zeitschrift 6 (1900) 65 ff., esp. 86.


10. Crombie’s discussion (n. 9 above) implies that the fascination for the anatomy of the human body transcended distinctions in the approach—or, in other words, stimulated scientific study and artistic treatment often at the same time. (In a chapter on “Art and Science in the Renaissance” in a forthcoming book on medieval and Renaissance science, I am attempting to demonstrate that the same holds true for botanical, zoological, or geological studies).

11. See my paper, “The Role of the Italian Merchant Class in Renaissance and Geographic Discoveries,” William L. Clements Library (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor), Conference on “The New World and the Old,” 31 October 1974. As these statements are no more than interim reports on a continuing scholarly project, my views are inevitably subject to modifications.
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14. While the evidence of a new geographic—or chorographic—consciousness might be fruitfully traced through all of Renaissance art, I was most struck with the apparent significance of this theme (as a merely preliminary impression) by the famous series of Ghirlandaio frescoes in the Tornabuoni Chapel in Santa Maria Novella in Florence.

15. Though it is impossible to demonstrate that Florentine merchants traveled more frequently than others, a case can be made for the fact that Florence at the height of her commercial boom experienced a more intensive international involvement than cities which had enjoyed an earlier start. This would have been due partly to her later entrance into an already developed early capitalist scene; partly to the resulting necessity for Florence to refine its commercial and financial methods (which in turn meant a greater interdependence with foreign markets).

16. See n. 4 above. The space-time relationship in Renaissance art has been searchingly examined in the writings of Dagobert Frey, where it forms a central theme.


18. See n. 15 above.
The Earliest Accounts on the New World
by Antonello Gerbi

It would seem reasonable to suggest that the initial impact of the New World on the Old was due to those Europeans who first set foot in America. This impact would be imparted through reports such as Columbus’ writings, the tales of his fellow travelers, and the stories of those natives who were brought back to Europe.

It must be remembered, however, that America (apart from the fact that it was long believed to be a peninsula of Asia) exercised its perplexing impact well before its discovery. The momentous date 12 October 1492 has a prehistory. I do not refer to the prophecies of Seneca, nor to the possible incursion of some Viking who had gone off his course, but to the well-attested fact that, from the middle of the fourteenth century, Europe had been expecting a sensational oceanic discovery and was already somehow influenced by this expectation.

The awareness of an imminent and unknown reality was already somewhat analogous to the widening of the historical horizon that the rediscovery of classical antiquity had brought. The old questions about the existence of the Antipodes and the salvation of the infidels anticipated the doubts, anxieties, and theological puzzles which were soon to become topical and urgent realities with the discovery of America. The poet Pulci’s Astarotte\(^1\) anticipated the evangelical mission of the Europeans among the swarms of the heathens: “Be sure that the Cross brings salvation to \textit{all} men.”\(^2\) The discoverers themselves started rationalizing
as soon as they landed because they came from an environment that had in many ways prepared them for this discovery.

Without such devices as recorders, what remains for us to do is to turn to the registers of the first form of that impact—the documents left, the "incunabula" of American studies. Fortunately for us, these are neither too few nor insignificant. A glance at Harrisse's bulky Bibliotheca americana vetustissima is enough to convince us of that, although Harrisse unfortunately orders his editions in chronological succession, concealing the fact that their authors in no way form a homogeneous group or a sequence. We have Columbus' incomparable Diary (although somewhat altered), and the direct and indirect accounts of his companions on the second expedition: Doctor Chanca, Scillacio, Michele da Cuneo. We have Amerigo Vespucci's stories, both authentic and fake; the epistles diligently collected by Peter Martyr; Enciso's Suma de geographia; and the letters of Cortés. Shortly after the dateline of 1520, we have the accounts of the journeys of Pigafetta and Verrazano, and, far above them all, Oviedo's masterpiece: the Sumario de la natural y general historia de las Indias.

Clearly, then, original sources are not wanting. And yet, the detective work of the historian must expose differences among the sources not only in language and intent, but also in the enormously varying cultural contexts of each author. Their stock of preconceived ideas, their scales of values, and the very perspectives from which they scrutinize America are important references; they explain, for example, the difference between the latinizing humanist Peter Martyr and the rough and ribald Michele. While systematic description or analytic recordings are extremely rare, the prevalent feelings and motives of the authors are personal profit, rivalry with potentially exploitative emulators, flattery of powers, real or imagined, journalistic flair, display of erudition, mercantile speculation, indulgent tale-telling, and the ever-prevailing greed for gold.

To increase the difficulty involved in outlining a history of the separate, successive impacts of America on its explorers, the dozen or so most important authors do not form a chain of scholars who pass on information and explanations from one to another. In practice (with rare exceptions) they ignore each other. Only Oviedo shows a knowledge of the writings of many of his predecessors, from Columbus to Cortés. Each of them addresses a different audience, following his own whim and never feeling the urge to sustain his descriptions with precedents and witnesses—indeed, the fewer witnesses, the better! In short, there is no awareness of the "bibliography" of the subject. Four and a half centuries later, they appear like solitary scouts, sailing, galloping, or walking along diverging itineraries, with a few chance coincidences, towards the dark heart of the continent.
Yet with all these differences, the impact of the New World is clear in all of them: the corpus of their writings presents a rough formulation of many major physical and ethnographical questions which would be dealt with on a much higher scientific level by the naturalists of the eighteenth century.

To Columbus the face of America appears stupendous and shining like that of Asia, even more than the Asia of his dreams. The fauna in the islands which he first visited is emblematic: parrots and lizards, myriad canaries, and shoals of bright-hued fish. Flamboyant colors and agility characterize the terrestrial animals of America; an extraordinary, exuberant flora completes the picture. Europe had certainly never known anything of the sort.

Dr. Chanca, who accompanied Columbus on the second expedition, was also astounded by the luxuriant and incredibly varied American flora. But the savages with their bestial customs were laughable. Despite his distinction between natives and cannibals, and his jokes about the lasciviousness of the females of the Antilles, he does not manage to feel true human solidarity with primitive man. It cannot be said that he felt the impact which the discovery of the savages had on other Europeans: the motivation to look for their own origins as civilized men.

The almost forgotten Michele da Cuneo is distinctly different from Chanca in his attitude towards the natives, although he too treats them with that overbearing superiority that so many Europeans displayed for centuries. One does not easily forget that story of the beautiful female cannibal with whom he intended to amuse himself. She refused him and scratched his face, whereupon he whipped her with a rope until she screamed in pain and finally gave in to him. He reports that she then behaved as though "trained in a school of whores." The brutal story shows that if Michele did feel some common identity with the natives, it was on the level of its basest common denominator; the natives appear to him as feeble, lazy, sodomizing, even if he does describe an occasional cacique holding his own in an argument with Columbus. On the other hand, his cataloguing ability far exceeds that of Chanca, and he is the first to attempt an inventory of America's novelties in all the kingdoms of nature—animal, plant, and mineral. Methodical empiricism and pragmatic curiosity are as characteristic of Michele as his lack of benevolence for the natives.

The work of Amerigo Vespucci, for whom the continent is justifiably named, expresses a change in tone. The presence of America grows real in the hands of the Florentine who was so much better prepared to receive the message of the New World. Amerigo's pensive seriousness in the face of the unfamiliar—his questioning humility—are totally different from the noisy assertions and triumphal ecstasies of Columbus. Although the virgin forest reminds him of the Earthly Paradise of the
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*Divina Commedia*, there are no conventional idealizations in his work. His interest centers on the natives, but he does not indulge in coarse details about them, feeling that “it is better to say no more” about their well-known lack of modesty. There is no desire for gain: “We are a peaceful people, and are travelling round the world . . . we come in the name of discovery . . . with no idea of trying to make a profit.” Professing himself to be a follower of St. Thomas, he believes that experience is worth more than theory; in order to better study the natives, he partakes of their communal existence for 27 days, and leaves us with a seemingly objective record of their rites, languages, warlike tendencies, and way of life. The echo of Vespucci’s vision, accepted and deeply absorbed, was to make itself heard again and again in the controversies about the “savage” that are focal for more than a century.

Peter Martyr never actually traveled to the New World, but rather reports what the navigators told him. He stands, nevertheless, as a singular example of the impact of the New World on European historiography, as with him (and later with Oviedo) the novelties of America created a new sense of direction in the writing of history. The material not only renews the form, but impregnates it. The pen previously accustomed to writing about wars, dynasties, conspiracies, and alliances, turns to describing the pacific aspects of a boundless reality. The kingdoms of sovereigns give way to the kingdoms of nature. The historian’s plan expands, and history itself overflows into a world picture which stretches well beyond courts and battlefields. It reaches into unfamiliar realities—the native in the thick of the woods, the wild beast in an ambush, the balms of the berries and the lianas, the chasms of the sea, the glittering of gold in the rivers. The American experience has assigned a whole new reality to historiography.

Certainly Columbus, Vespucci, and Peter Martyr were Renaissance Italians but none of them was so totally rooted in the Italian Renaissance as the Spaniard Oviedo. He travelled through Italy for four years, 1498-1502, and despite his youth (in 1498 he was 20) he lived in the mainstream of the most illustrious courts and met the most famous artists and men of letters. He was in Genoa; in Milan at the court of Ludovico il Moro; in Mantua with the Gonzaga; in Cardinal Borgia’s suite. He witnessed the downfall of the Aragonese in Naples and escorted their last Lady, Giovanna, the “reina joven,” to exile in Sicily and then back again to Spain. Andrea Mantegna, Leonardo da Vinci, Pontano, Sannazzaro, Serafino dell’Aquila are among the creative artists whom he met in those years. He corresponded with such learned men of Venice as Bembo, Ramusio, and Fracastoro. In 1530 Oviedo was appointed official chronicler of the Indies. 3

How could the official historian of Charles V free himself from the fossilized schemes of the ancient Spanish chroniclers who preceded
him? Was it his mental training? I have tried to read between the lines in Oviedo to detect echoes of his time, his learning, his adventures, the quarrels in which he was involved, his political aspirations, the sources of his patriotism, the beginnings of ideas that were to be recognized and developed only after his death. And it appears certain that no one before him had approached America with such an open mind and such practiced intelligence. He determined the impact of America which was transmitted—although only a quarter of his opus was printed and disseminated—to subsequent historians of the discovery and renaissance of the New World. Nicolás Monardes, Father Acosta, and Father Cobo, as well as innumerable other writers and naturalists, would not have styled their treatises as they did if Oviedo had not distilled in his ever-open "scribbling books" all that his eyes saw, his ears heard, and his memory tirelessly recalled. Apart from his classical descriptions of plants with an immense future—like tobacco, rubber, cocoa, kapok—and fateful minerals like petroleum, one finds in his work novel intuitions that cover a scattered but fascinating range of topics: from bone conduction of sound to the division of the globe into hemispheres, from siege tactics to tropical equipment, from a foreshadowing of Gresham's law to glimmerings of Ranke's formula. These hunches have been hurriedly and unimaginatively dismissed, sometimes, as being devoid of lasting scientific value; but the fact remains that if properly studied, Oviedo inspires a multitude of insights into the confrontation of a Renaissance mind with an alien environment. 

Fernández de Enciso's vision of America, though Mexico and Peru were yet unknown, already distinguishes clearly between the Old and the New Worlds. There is a Western Hemisphere which completes the Eastern one and which in turn is divided into two—a Northern section, with Labrador and the Bacallaos, and a Southwestern section, with the Indies. To the copious written sources, antique and medieval, Enciso adds a deeply felt awareness of the "experience of present time." He shows a friendly understanding for the natives and for things of nature, a curiosity befitting the practical man of good sense. 

Pigafetta hardly qualifies among the first reporters on America. He followed Magellan's round-the-world trip, and wrote an account that was mostly concerned with East Asia and the islands from which aromatics and spices were imported. Nevertheless, Pigafetta is important to early American historiography for at least two reasons. He first told and gave wide currency to the story about Patagonian giants; and he was the first to try to study the native's languages, collecting vocabularies and drafting grammars. 

It was in March 1520, after a rest of two months in the port of San Julián, that Pigafetta saw "a man, tall as a giant, naked, dancing on the shore, singing and throwing dust upon his head." This grotesque
portrait remained a legend for several centuries—a cliché and a stimulus for the inquisitive European mind. No less a philosopher than Vico made the *Patacones* the prototypes of a barbaric and heroic humanity. Even if they did not really exist, the Patagonian giants filled a prominent role as exemplars of the indigenous peoples, and they were exploited by authors who defended America’s virgin and robust nature against slanders of weakness and degeneration.

Pigafetta’s philological and linguistic interests arise from his curiosity about the “savages” and their strange ways of living. He collected lists of words, among both the Brazilian tribes and the Patagonians, and later among the Filipinos and the Indonesians. Before posing as their teacher, he thus made himself the pupil of the natives. And his efforts were followed first by some missionaries (with quite different aims) and then by Thomas Jefferson, who prided himself on having managed to gather a “large collection” of Indian vocabularies.

Cortés is always the captain and *conquistador*, even when he reveals that he has been fascinated by the wonders of America. Mostly on the lookout for potential fortifications and strategic opportunities, he fights and wins in America; when he speaks of his exploits it seems as though he could have performed them equally well in any other part of the globe. And yet his contribution to the enrichment of historiography is fundamental, memorable. For the first time he gives a description of American lands radically different from the Antilles and Tierra Firme: lands whose climate is not tropical, whose flora and fauna, accordingly, are somewhat familiar, whose inhabitants are neither cowardly nor aggressive savages—unlike all those previously described. To Cortés the fighting aborigines display an intelligence and astuteness which easily rival the expert and cunning Spaniards. The seat of a highly developed civilization, Mexico is New Spain.

When Cortés, in the name of the all-powerful, all-just Catholic Emperor Charles V, looks for gold, and has to demean himself by asking Montezuma for some, he suffers in the best Spanish fashion from the fear that the sophisticated Aztecs will form a poor opinion of that great European sovereign who sends his soldier to ravage distant and peaceful lands. Within an apologetic euphemism, Cortés relates having told Montezuma that Charles V “needed gold for certain works he wanted to be carried out”!

When such a poor European excuse is offered to the first monarch of the New World, when the *conquistador* places himself on the same level as the man he has overcome and offers awkward justifications, then another small but important stride has been made toward an understanding and recognition of a common humanity.
The Earliest Accounts on the New World

NOTES

This paper is a brief anticipation of a 600-page volume on *The Nature of the Western Indies, from Christopher Columbus to Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo*, presently in press. The volume will contain an ample bibliography, which need not be summarized here.

1. Astarotte is a character in Luigi Pulci’s *Morgante maggiore*, completed before 1478. A fallen angel who has become a servant to a magician, he is depicted as intelligent and of strong convictions. He believed the earth was round and inhabited on the other side by people. To Astarotte, one was in heaven’s favor if one stood by his convictions, no matter what those convictions were.


3. This date is often disputed, and the year of his official title as Chronicler of the Indies is sometimes fixed at 1533.

4. His principal work, and one of the first and best of the histories of America, is *Historia natural y general de las Indias*, in 50 books: 19 of these were published in 1535, at Seville, and the twentieth at Valladolid in 1557; the remaining 30 books were first published by the Academia de la Historia (4 vols. Madrid 1851-55).

5. Treated with haughty contempt by contemporaries like Peter Martyr, Bartolomé de Las Casas, or Hernando Cortés, Oviedo has since been often neglected by historians of the discovery and rejected by historians of the natural sciences. Recent work has concentrated on biography; it is for the most part malevolent or outright denigratory. It would be a great thing, and long overdue, if Oviedo’s work, not his biography, were at last to be properly studied.
The Effect of the Discovery on Ethnological and Folklore Studies in Europe

by Wayland D. Hand

Folklore and ethnology did not exist as scientific disciplines at the time Columbus set sail for the New World. Even though there had been a healthy curiosity about far-off lands from the earliest times of navigation and overland travel, this interest revealed itself mainly in casual descriptions of land and people. Usually, cultural differences rather than similarities were stressed in accounts of explorers, as well as in those of travellers, merchants, pilgrims, and common wayfarers. Whereas geography had the status of a rudimentary science as early as the time of Strabo, folklore as a discipline did not begin to strike root until the eighteenth century. Almost another 50 years passed before the brothers Grimm and other German workers laid the founda-
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tions of the study as we know it today. The early development of ethnol­
ogy and anthropology came even later; the scientific formulation of these
fields was accomplished almost entirely during the nineteenth century.

In speaking of the impact of New World folkloric and ethnological
information on the scientific community in the Old World at the time of
Columbus and during the sixteenth century, we are speaking mainly of
the clergy, educated laymen, and the entrepreneurial classes who stood
to gain by commerce with the New World and its peoples. Happily for
the study of cultural history, almost every expedition had its dedicated
chroniclers and historians who set down not only the events of imme­
diate historical interest, but also descriptions of the land itself and the
animal and plant life which it sustained. These accounts were usually
highlighted by descriptions of the aboriginal peoples and often con­
tained glimpses of the tribal way of life. Many of the chroniclers, men of
the cloth in large part, were scholars; a few might be considered the
scientists of their day. It was not uncommon in the chronicles, for
example, that the compilers compared natural phenomena from the
New World with similar accounts from other parts of the world as found
in the writings of the ancients. As one would expect, Pliny the Elder is
cited more than anyone else.

It is difficult to assess the immediate impact of discovering America
on Europeans concerned with primitive man. This scholarly community
could not have been great, nor could it have been privy to the archival
materials constituting the only complete and reliable accounts of the
various voyages and explorations. Few of these chronicles were pub­
lished before 1550. By the end of the century, however, scholars in Spain
and Italy, at least, could either consult published chronicles or gain
access to those in royal archives or in the depositories of religious
houses. For scholars elsewhere in Europe matters were more compli­
cated. The De orbe novo of Peter Martyr, for example, was published in
1530, but the first English translation did not appear until 1597 (London),
the first Spanish translation until 1892 (Madrid), and the first French
translation until our own day (Paris 1907).1

Since we are speaking of folklore and oral tradition in general, I
would suggest that for the few years before 1500 and well into the
sixteenth century, most of the common information about the Discovery
itself and about conditions in the New World was passed on by word of
mouth. It was certainly not limited to discourse at court, nor to the
deliberations of secular and religious councils, nor to people connected
with mercantile houses and other more or less public agencies. The
Discovery was no doubt a topic of general conversation among all
segments of society, including people of humble station, and sailors—
always good storytellers—could be expected to have played a prominent
part, along with soldiers and the whole working force of any retinue
bent on exploration and adventure. In the account of the relentless search for El Dorado, for example, we shall see that information often passed from expedition to expedition without benefit of official reports. In these person-to-person exchanges during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, whether on the wharves in Italian, Spanish, or Portuguese seaports, in the harbors or on the staging grounds in various parts of the New World, or at inland communication points, two kinds of information were exchanged: first and foremost was the practical information needed by contingents of soldiery bent on trekking into unknown or little-known regions—namely, facts about routes, trails, watercourses, sources of food and shelter, friendly or hostile natives, and the like. Beyond this, anything that struck the fancy would be passed on in casual conversation, with strange and unusual matters claiming more attention than things more commonly known.

In both cases, we are dealing with a wondrous, far-off land, which was both real and fabled. The folklore of the New World accrues naturally from the land itself, with its tropical forests, its marshes and savannas, its rolling hills and majestic mountains, its coral strands, its mighty lakes, its lowland reaches and mountain fastnesses, its lazy tropical streams and rushing rivers. For the land itself provides an almost fairy-tale setting, familiar to all in the folk stories current throughout Europe at the time Columbus and other explorers set out for the New World. In the earliest period of exploration, the voyages of Spanish, Portuguese, and French navigators were directed to lands within the equatorial and torrid zones, where the aroma could be detected far out at sea. The lush vegetation was a source of wonder to the Europeans, astonished by the eternal growing season and trees bearing fruit and blooming at the same time. The heavy rainfall in certain areas was entirely new to the invading Europeans, as were the rainbows around the moon resulting from heavy night mists. More awe-inspiring than the flora of the new land was the fauna that sought shelter within it. The caymans and other aquatic and amphibious creatures in the tropical streams and lagoons were a special source of wonderment—and horror. Folklore about the snakes constitutes the largest single body of animal lore to lay hold on the European imagination. The Aztec corpus itself is sizable, perhaps because the serpent was a central figure in the native mythology, but reptiles are mentioned in most chronicles dealing with other parts of New Spain. Father Sahagún provides an ample catalogue of serpents found in Mexico and adjacent regions in his day, invariably noting whether the species in question is venomous or not, and often adding the strange habits of the creatures and other herpetological lore. The *tecutlacocauhqui*, with an Aztec name too difficult to pronounce, has yellow and black spots and a bifurcated tongue, and though it has teeth, ingests small creatures whole. The male
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and female of the species travel together, keeping in touch by hissing or whistling. If one is killed, the other is believed to pursue the killer to avenge the death of its mate, a conceit widely held even today. The fat of this snake is used to combat gout, and its skin is powdered and mixed with a drink to reduce fever. The ictaccoatl spits venom, but when it attacks humans it wraps itself around their necks and strangles them, a predatory habit shared by the tetzmolocoatl. The most fantastic of all these creatures is the maquizcoatl, a two-headed serpent with one head in its natural place and the other at the tail. It was said to move in either direction, depending on which head chose to lead. The famous plumed serpent, quetzalcoatl, a prefiguration of the powerful Aztec god of the same name, was described as a small, bright green serpent, with a red breast and blue plumes, with which it was said to fly. The most deadly of all snakes, the tleua, meaning, 'it carries flames with it,' was reputed to rise to full length supported only by its tail, and then shoot flames, dragon-like, as it struck.

Father Sahagún has given an orderly listing of these creatures, familiar and unfamiliar, for Mexico and adjacent lands, and most other early chroniclers have done likewise for the specific areas treated. Notable, I think, is Father de Acosta's account of the woolbearing mammals of Peru, namely, vicuñas, tarugas, llamas, and various kinds of sheep and goats. His detailed description of the bezoar stone found in several of these creatures is perhaps the earliest to come from the New World, and is certainly among the best treatises on the subject to appear anywhere.

I have already alluded to the lush vegetation of the tropical regions, and to the wonderment which struck the first white men when they saw trees bearing fruit throughout the year. For Mexico, Father Sahagún gives a fairly complete listing of edible plants as well as of trees and plants treasured for medicinal properties. Other chroniclers also discuss botanicals used in the treatment of the sick. Among the many curative vegetable products used by the native peoples of Latin America at the time of the discoveries which are now part of the pharmacopoeia are balsam, cassia, and tobacco. The use of various animal products—especially from snakes—as curative agents was widespread, as was the use of so-called medicinal stones, las piedras medicinales, whether for their absorptive, thermal, or amuletic properties.

As in other primitive cultures, the care of the sick fell to the priestly caste, particularly in the case of diseases which could not be readily diagnosed. The theory that disease was sent by evil powers as a punishment for transgression required someone who was especially qualified to intercede with the gods. In his De orbe novo of 1530, Peter Martyr, Secretary of the Council of the Indies, gives perhaps the earliest description of a rudimentary kind of shamanism to come from the New World:
Their priestes and diuines (whom they call Boitios) instructe them in these superstitions. These priestes are also phisitions, deuising a thousand craftes and subtilies howe to deceiue the simple people which haue them in great reuerence: for they persuade them that the Zemes vse to speak with them familiarly, and tel them of thinges to come. And if any haue ben sicke and are recouered they make them beleuee that they obtained their health of the Zemes. These Boitii bind themselues to much fasting, and outward cleanlinesse, and purginges, especially when they take vpon them the cure of any prince, for then they drinke the powder of a certaine herbe by whose qualitie they are driuen into a fury, at which time (as they say) they learne many things by reuellation of the Zemes. Then putting secretely into their mouthes eyther a stone, or a bone, or a peece of fleshe, they come unto the sicke person commaunding al to depart out of that place except one or two whom it shal please the sicke man to appoynt: this done, they goe about him three or foure times, greatly deforming their faces, lipps, and nosthrils with sundry filthy gestures, blowing, breathing, and sucking the forhead, temples, and necke of the patient, whereby (they say) they drawe the euil ayre from him, and sucke the disease out of his vaynes: then rubbing him, about the shoulders, thighs and legges, and drawing downe their handes close by his feete, holding them yet faste, they runne together to the doore being open, where they vnclose and shake their hands, affirming that they haue driuen away the disease, and that the patient shall shortly be perfectly restored to health. After this comming behinde him, hee conveigheth a peece of fleshe out of his owne mouth like a juggeler, and sheweth it to the sicke man, saying, Behold, you haue eaten to much, you shall nowe bee whole, because I haue taken this from you. But if he entend yet further to deceiue the patient, hee perswadeth him that his Zemes is angry, eyther because he hath not builded him a chappell, or not honoured him religiously, or not dedicated vnto him a groue or garden.18

The amuletic power of the stones and bones which the Boitii carried were highly valued by pregnant women who tried to secure them to ease the pangs of childbirth and bring forth the child without mishap.19

To the natural prodigies of Latin America must be added the volcanic and seismic activity in many parts of the South American land mass. Friederici has given an excellent summary of earthquakes and volcanoes after 1530, and broadened it to include other areas such as the Philippines where Spanish colonization took place. Many superstitious people of the time believed that these spectacular natural prodigies were visitations of the wrath of God and punishments for the rape of the new land.20 The terrible tropical hurricanes, particularly those of 1508 and 1509, were viewed in the same light.21 This widespread fear and veneration of nature account for the apprehension of the natives themselves in the face of storms and natural disasters.22 Thermal waters, including hot pools of tar, were encountered in many areas where vulcanism was present.23 Various kinds of springs and fountains are described, includ-
ing springs producing water of various colors. Medicinal waters are also mentioned in Acosta's chronicle, particularly a spring at Guayaquil in vice-regal Peru (now in Ecuador) almost at the equinoctial line, which was held to be beneficial in the treatment of the French disease. The particular virtue of the waters, according to Acosta, stemmed from the fact that they contained the medicinally active roots of sarsaparilla.

Mention must also be made of the mineral wealth which was to play such an important part in the history of the Conquest. Inca lands were bountifully endowed, and Acosta gives a good survey not only of minerals, but also of precious stones, and early mining and metallurgy in general. Prodigious though the natural wealth in minerals was, it was to be far outrun in the mad quest for gold and other precious metals. Part of the story belongs to history, but much of it belongs to legend. One of the classic accounts concerns Francisco Pizarro's demand for a roomful of gold, and his subsequent perfidious murder of the Inca chieftain Atahualpa. But the most famous legend connected with the quest for gold in the New World was the legend of El Dorado ('the gilded man').

Even before the Spaniards had explored the islands of the West Indies they began to hear rumors of mysterious countries and peoples on the southern mainland. They heard of the land of the Amazons, of the rich wild cinnamon forests of Canela, of the Casa del Sol, the Temple of the Sun, somewhere east of the Andes in the Valley of the Meta, a tributary of the upper Orinoco, and of Manoa, the golden city. They heard also of the fabulous White King, and of the Copper-Crowned King, but it was the legend of El Dorado, the gilded king, that fired their imagination most. Collectively these fabled lands and peoples constituted the so-called "Southern Mysteries," which for a full century or more were to lure the Spanish conquistadores ever southward from their beachhead in the New World in search of wealth and glory. Before the search for El Dorado had run its course in the early seventeenth century both German and English explorers had joined in the adventure. The legend had also expanded from the notion of a gilded man to include his place of habitation, and lakes and cities of gold.

The story of El Dorado fits the classic formula of legend. It dealt with a subject of consuming interest. To search for El Dorado was to pass through tropical jungles and mountainous areas where the feet of white men had never trod, and where each day brought new hazards. The remoteness of the areas traversed, the poor communication, and the passage of time all conspired to invest El Dorado with the indistinct outlines and mystery that are the hallmarks of a legend. Finally, the story of El Dorado existed in different versions, even though the account remained essentially the same wherever the story was told. Stripped of local details, it concerned a chieftain of a realm so rich in gold that he
could, without profligacy, cover his body daily with a golden film. This he removed at night, letting flakes fall where they might, only to follow the procedure day by day throughout the year.\textsuperscript{33}

The earliest account of El Dorado, according to the chronicler Juan Rodriguez Fresle, son of one of the \textit{conquistadores} of New Granada, dates from 1535 when an Indian told the story of the Gilded Chieftain to the Spaniards.\textsuperscript{34} Added interest attached to a ceremony preceding the investiture of the new \textit{cacique}, or chieftain, in which a huge balsa raft laden with gold and emeralds was rowed to the center of Lake Guatavita, a small body of water situated a short distance northeast of Bogotá. As spectators beheld the sacred ritual from the shores, the precious cargo was jettisoned to propitiate the spirit of the lake, a devil-like creature that was a prefiguration, it would seem, of the new religion.\textsuperscript{35} The \textit{cacique} had been stripped of all clothing, covered with viscous earth, and then dusted with gold before being rafted out onto the lake.\textsuperscript{36} A half century later the home of the Gilded Chieftain had been transferred from the elevated plateau of Cundinamarca to the lowlands of southeastern Guiana, from Lake Guatavita to Lake Manoa, as Manso remarks, “from one end of the continent to the other.”\textsuperscript{37} The blowing of gold dust onto a body besmeared with resin is shown in old drawings.\textsuperscript{38}

Following the ill-fated expedition of Sebastian Belalcazar in the 1530’s, and those of Gonzalo Pizarro, Francisco Orellana, Fernán Pérez de Quesada, and Philip von Hutten in the 1540’s,\textsuperscript{39} interest in the fabled El Dorado revived during the 1560’s, with further searches to the north and east. These expeditions were undertaken by Pedro de Ursua, Martín de Proveda, and Gonzalo Jiménez de Quesada, brother of Fernán.\textsuperscript{40} Approaches from the Orinoco made by Pedro de Ursua 20 years earlier were followed by Antonio de Berrio and other explorers in the 1580’s.\textsuperscript{41} Sir Walter Raleigh, having learned what he could from existing accounts and from people familiar with previous attempts to locate El Dorado, also pursued a course up the Orinoco in 1595-96. His second expedition in 1617 was the last of the great organized attempts to locate the fabled land.\textsuperscript{42}

In the persistent searches for El Dorado over a period of 80 years, from a folkloristic point of view it is interesting to note that about all the \textit{conquistadores} had to go by were verbal accounts, either from Indians or from survivors of previous expeditions, for written accounts of several of the expeditions were not available until a century or two later. The chronicles of the expeditions of Jiménez de Quesada, Ursua, and Gonzalo Pizarro were not edited until the eighties and nineties of the last century,\textsuperscript{43} and some of the contemporary records were still gathering dust in the archives of Spain and Peru when Manso made his pioneering study in 1912.\textsuperscript{44}

The religion and mythology of the aborigines, treated so fully for
Mexico by Father Sahagún, and less thoroughly for other peoples of Latin America, featured many customs and rituals that shocked Europeans. Among these were sacrifice, including the sacrifice of humans, cannibalism, and ancestor worship, which I cannot deal with here.

More in the realm of folklore are a few curious notions about unusual breeds of *homo sapiens*. Mention is made of giants in some areas, principally on the basis of skeletons of unusually large humans; and there are accounts of people with long tails who were supposed to have survived from the time when humans and apes mated. Humans without heads, popular in the early fictions, were supposed to have had eyes, nose, mouth, and other features in their upper chests. Sir Walter Raleigh refers to them as the Ewaipanomas.

Folk tales and etiological fictions must have been common when the first settlers arrived, but they apparently were not collected as much or remembered as easily as the shorter accounts that fall under the rubrics of folk beliefs, customs, and legends. Peter Martyr, however, relished such fictions, and gave currency to a few in conversation and in letters to friends. In a letter written from Medina del Campo 27 July 1497 to the cardinal of Santa Cruz, for example, he related an etiological myth dealing with the creation of the world from a gourd.

The exploration of the North American mainland, though exciting and adventurous, never produced a body of legend with the same epic sweep and grandeur as the search for El Dorado. Still, the conditions for creating a folklore to mirror the heroic undertaking were by no means lacking. The quest for the lost Seven Cities of Cibola in the plateau country of northern Arizona and New Mexico, and of Quivira on what would now be the plains of Kansas, certainly do not possess the same grand epic proportions as the fruitless search for El Dorado with its famine, pestilence, and unremitting hardship. Cibola and Quivira, however, do linger as legends and form part of a larger body of romantic lore and legend referred to as the “Northern Mysteries.”

The most celebrated of all is the search for the Fountain of Youth by Juan Ponce de León between 1512 and 1521. There are apparently no extant records of his resolve to find the Fountain, but legends concerning the miraculous waters circulated among the Lucayan Indians of the Bahamas and native tribes in Cuba. Early chroniclers and historians knew of these legends, and almost unanimously state that they were one of the main reasons for Ponce de León’s voyages in search of the fabled Bimini Islands. Belief in the power of water to cleanse and to renew is old and widespread, and is still found in folk tales from different parts of the world. In the many early legends concerning the Fountain of Youth, there were reports from Africa by the mythic Prester John in the twelfth century and from Asia by Sir John Mandeville over a century later. It was against this historical background, and with the impetus of reports from natives in Cuba and the Bahamas, that the exploratory voyages of Ponce de
León were conceived, whatever other motivations prompted the voyages from Puerto Rico to the islands of Bimini. Oviedo and Peter Martyr, contemporary of Ponce de León, and Herrera, writing 35 or 40 years after Ponce’s death, all agree. Herrera’s account is worth quoting in part:

It is a certain thing, that beside the principal purpose of Juan Ponce de León, for the voyage that he made . . . which was to discover new lands . . . he went to seek the fountain of Bimini, and in Florida a river, giving credence in this to the Indians of Cuba, and others of Española, who said that bathing one’s self in it, or in the fountain, old men would be turned into youths . . .

The search for the Fountain of Youth tell us something about human communication. First of all came the tradition represented by the earlier reports of Prester John and Sir John Mandeville; then came the local legends and traditions of the Indian tribes of the northern Caribbean; then, finally, the transmission of details by Spanish chroniclers of the sixteenth century. The same process characterizes much of the early knowledge about the New World.
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The New World
from Within: The Inca Garcilaso
by Juan Marichal

There is a striking passage in Chapter cxiv of the History of the Indies by Las Casas: narrating the preparations for the 1519 expedition from Cuba to Mexico, the fiery Dominican comes to the choice—most unfortunate in his view—by the island's governor, Diego Velázquez, of Hernando Cortés as fleet commander. Las Casas recalls that he had repeatedly warned Velázquez about Cortés' close relationship with the royal accountant, a Castilian named Amador de Lares. And Las Casas quotes in graphic terms his own cautionary advice to Diego Velázquez: "¡Señor, guardaos de veintidós años de Italia!" ("Sir, beware of twenty-two years in Italy!"). Thus Las Casas' insight into the political heart of the Renaissance: Amador de Lares had served in Italy for many years as the chief-butler ("maestresala") of the so-called "Great Captain" ("Gran Capitán") Gonzalo Fernández de Córdoba. It would not be arbitrary to assume (as Las Casas did) that the royal accountant provided Cortés with useful lessons of statecraft learned in Machiavelli's own country and times. But Las Casas' recollection of his warning to Velázquez—leaving aside, of course, the question of its veracity—points out a central fact in the history of the Spanish Conquest of the New World: that the Conquista was truly a vast Renaissance enterprise and not simply a prolongation of medieval activities.
This inner connection—of the Renaissance and an emergent New World—is clearly visible in the first American author to achieve wide European recognition: the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega, born at Cuzco in 1539, died at Córdoba in 1616. Peruvian scholars have often called Garcilaso their first national author, or more precisely, the first criollo ("creole," that is, American-born son of a Spaniard) in the literature of the Spanish-speaking peoples. But Garcilaso's historical originality is much more than a sort of New World pioneering in the Spaniards' literary domains. Garcilaso is actually the first Latin American: because he is the first to be consciously so, the first to want to be deliberately a Latin American.

His pride in being a mestizo, the offspring of two elites—his father was a Spaniard whose aristocratic ancestry included three great Castilian poets and his mother was the Inca princess Chimpu Ocllo—is the first affirmation of his Latin American consciousness: "me lo llamo yo [mestizo] a boca llena y me honro con él" ("I gladly call myself a mestizo and feel honored by it"). Let us keep in mind here that "mestizo" was normally a derogatory term never used by those to whom it was applied. But Garcilaso always places in the foreground his New World ethnic origin. Thus, when he published in 1590 his translation of Leone Ebreo's Dialoghi d'amore, the title of the work ostentatiously began with the following attribution: La traducción del Indio ("The Indian's translation"). Fifteen years later—in 1605, the date of Don Quixote's publication—Garcilaso's book on Hernando de Soto appeared with a no less personally resounding title: La Florida del Ynca ("The Florida of the Inca").

Garcilaso obviously wanted the reader to know from the title page that his books are, first of all, the works—or even, one might say, the exploits—of a recent newcomer into European civilization, though Garcilaso's reader realizes simultaneously that the author's literary pride derives primarily from his Inca ancestry. One sees this particularly in the preface to the posthumous edition of the Historia general del Peru (Córdoba 1617) in which Garcilaso claims that his Peruvian ancestors compared favorably with the great rulers and warriors of antiquity. They were—and I again quote Garcilaso's lapidary Spanish—"Césares en felicidad y fortaleza" ("Caesars by their strength and just government"). We should not enter into the question of whether Garcilaso legitimately used the Inca royal title for himself. What really matters here is Garcilaso's aim in writing his Royal Commentaries: he wanted to endow the Incas' past with the dignity of a classicism. Garcilaso strongly believed that the Peruvians—and, in a sense, all "Indians, mestizos, and creoles," to whom he principally addresses his book—could proudly claim two classical heritages, represented symbolically by the European Rome and by "that other Rome," Cuzco, the old Inca capital.
only because of the imperial power of the Incas: for Garcilaso—a complete Renaissance man—the Incas’ political and social structure had been one of the rare fulfillments in world history of the classical principle of orden y concierto (“order and harmony”).

It is true that in this view of the world of his maternal ancestors Garcilaso seems today to be more a retrospective Utopian than a historian; but Garcilaso felt that he was following—in his reconstruction of the Incas’ past—the sound historiographical principles of one of his Córdoba friends, the great antiquarian Ambrosio de Morales (1513-91). History demanded an artistic prose, that compostura (“neat composition”) that Las Casas found so objectionable in Gómara and other authors on New World matters. And thanks to his Renaissance articulateness (with its emphasis on orden y concierto) Garcilaso achieved what could be called “the American historiographical conquest of the Old World.”

Other Americans—for instance, Hernando Alvarado Tezozómoc and Fernando de Alva Ixtlixóchitl—wrote, in their respective native languages or in Spanish, more factual accounts of their ancestors’ past, but most of their manuscripts remained unpublished until the last century. Yet even if they had been printed and known, they could not have matched Garcilaso’s Royal Commentaries in the breadth and continuity of its circulation. It was not enough for the voices of the conquered to be authentic: in order to be heard, they had to manifest one of the conquistadores’ instruments of power, the Renaissance’s rhetorical polish. Precisely this was Garcilaso’s most precious possession: the art of language made him the most effective representative of the New World in the culture of the Old. His well-ordered Inca Empire became actually a significant part of European intellectual history, became indeed history.

Garcilaso’s retrospective Utopia—despite the critical outcries of some contemporary archaeologists—continues to stand out as an artistic monument of the Renaissance.

It is well-known that the designation “Latin America” was invented by the French a little over a century ago, in the course of a dual diplomatic offensive against the United States and Spain. Since then many Spaniards and Latin Americans have resented its use, pointing out that the Spanish-speaking countries of this hemisphere are not “Latin” but “Hispanic.” None of them seems to realize that leading intellectuals in Spanish-speaking America from Garcilaso to Alfonso Reyes have wanted to be true Latinos; the discipline of European classical culture was for them part of the search for their own national characteristics. That is why it is also historically accurate to insist that Garcilaso was the first true Latin American: the first to achieve universality and classical stature—a classic of the Euro-American Renaissance.
Renaissance world-view in the early Latin Americans' intellectual general del indeed of a reprint. Jolas' unacceptable translation, pre-Columbian past. As often happens, a poet, (“We, Spanish-speaking Americans, were born in olmo Durand center on the Inca’s Renaissance filiation: a first volume of medieval, sino la renacentista” (“We were discovered by Renaissance Spain, not by the Spain of the Middle Ages”). On Garcilaso as a Renaissance man, Luis A. Árocena’s El Inca Garcilaso y el humanismo renacentista (Buenos Aires 1949) is still indispensable, and worthy indeed of a reprint. Several studies by the distinguished Peruvian garcilasista José C. Durand center on the Inca’s Renaissance filiation: a first volume of Estudios sobre el Inca Garcilaso is coming out in Mexico (Colección SEP-Setenta). New documentation on Garcilaso’s intellectual biography may be found in Raúl Porras Barrenechea, El Inca Garcilaso en Montilla (1561-1614) . . . (Lima 1955), and in Aurelio Miró Quesada, El Inca Garcilaso y otros estudios garcilasistas, Ediciones Cultura Hispánica (Madrid 1971). Frances G. Crowley’s Garcilaso de la Vega, el Inca and his sources . . . (The Hague 1971), and Donald G. Castanien’s El Inca Garcilaso de la Vega (New York 1969) offer useful information, though both fall into scholarly naiveté (Garcilaso “wrote with obvious bias,” etc.). Harold V. Livermore’s translation of the Royal Commentaries of the Incas and the General History of Peru (2 vols. Austin, Tex. and London 1966) has a good foreword by Arnold J. Toynbee and two introductions by the translator. It has the obvious merit of being a direct version from Garcilaso’s own Castilian prose and not from the French as in María Jolas’ unacceptable translation, The Incas: the Royal Commentaries of the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega (New York 1961). The edition of Garcilaso’s Obras completas by P. Carmelo Sáenz de Santa María, S.J. (Madrid 1960; 4 vols. of the Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, 132-135), does not meet the textual requirements demanded by Garcilaso’s artistic eminence. Aurelio Miró Quesada’s editions of the Comentarios reales de los Incas and the Historia general del Perú (Lima 1959) are a considerable improvement but not yet what the Inca deserves. Two well-chosen selections are: Augusto Cortina’s Comentarios reales (Buenos Aires 1942), often reprinted but unfortunately with a vast number of misprints; and Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce’s El Inca Garcilaso en sus “Comentarios”: antología vivida (Madrid 1964). A study with political implications is Carlos Manuel Cox (a prominent “Aprista” leader), Utopía y realidad en el Inca Garcilaso (Lima 1965); the Inca is seen as a fundamental source in Peru for “any realistic project of social justice” (p. 235). For an interpretation of Garcilaso from a viewpoint almost entirely opposed to mine, see Luis E. Valcárcel’s Garcilaso el Inca visto desde el ángulo indio (Lima 1939). There is now a good selection in English of Las Casas’ History of the Indies, ed. and trans. Andrée Collard (New York 1971). But Professor Collard’s translation of the particular Las Casas passage loses its original vividness: “I used to warn Diego Velázquez to beware of a man who had spent twenty-two years in Italy” (p. 225). The Historia de las Indias has been edited in an exemplary manner by Agustín Millares Carlo, with a long prefatory study by Lewis Hanke (3 vols. Mexico 1951; ed. 2 1965).

1. The main purpose of this brief essay is to accentuate the role played by the Renaissance world-view in the early Latin Americans’ intellectual “recovery” of their pre-Columbian past. As often happens, a poet, Octavio Paz, had defined with greater precision than any historian the relation between the Renaissance and the New World: “Los americanos de habla española nacimos en un momento universal de España” (“We, Spanish-speaking Americans, were born in Spain’s universal hour”), Las peras del olmo (Mexico 1957; ed. 2 1965) 3-4. And he added: “la España que nos descubre no es la medieval, sino la renacentista” (“We were discovered by Renaissance Spain, not by the Spain of the Middle Ages”). On Garcilaso as a Renaissance man, Luis A. Árocena’s El Inca Garcilaso y el humanismo renacentista (Buenos Aires 1949) is still indispensable, and worthy indeed of a reprint. Several studies by the distinguished Peruvian garcilasista José C. Durand center on the Inca’s Renaissance filiation: a first volume of Estudios sobre el Inca Garcilaso is coming out in Mexico (Colección SEP-Setenta). New documentation on Garcilaso’s intellectual biography may be found in Raúl Porras Barrenechea, El Inca Garcilaso en Montilla (1561-1614) . . . (Lima 1955), and in Aurelio Miró Quesada, El Inca Garcilaso y otros estudios garcilasistas, Ediciones Cultura Hispánica (Madrid 1971). Frances G. Crowley’s Garcilaso de la Vega, el Inca and his sources . . . (The Hague 1971), and Donald G. Castanien’s El Inca Garcilaso de la Vega (New York 1969) offer useful information, though both fall into scholarly naiveté (Garcilaso “wrote with obvious bias,” etc.). Harold V. Livermore’s translation of the Royal Commentaries of the Incas and the General History of Peru (2 vols. Austin, Tex. and London 1966) has a good foreword by Arnold J. Toynbee and two introductions by the translator. It has the obvious merit of being a direct version from Garcilaso’s own Castilian prose and not from the French as in María Jolas’ unacceptable translation, The Incas: the Royal Commentaries of the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega (New York 1961). The edition of Garcilaso’s Obras completas by P. Carmelo Sáenz de Santa María, S.J. (Madrid 1960; 4 vols. of the Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, 132-135), does not meet the textual requirements demanded by Garcilaso’s artistic eminence. Aurelio Miró Quesada’s editions of the Comentarios reales de los Incas and the Historia general del Perú (Lima 1959) are a considerable improvement but not yet what the Inca deserves. Two well-chosen selections are: Augusto Cortina’s Comentarios reales (Buenos Aires 1942), often reprinted but unfortunately with a vast number of misprints; and Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce’s El Inca Garcilaso en sus “Comentarios”: antología vivida (Madrid 1964). A study with political implications is Carlos Manuel Cox (a prominent “Aprista” leader), Utopía y realidad en el Inca Garcilaso (Lima 1965); the Inca is seen as a fundamental source in Peru for “any realistic project of social justice” (p. 235). For an interpretation of Garcilaso from a viewpoint almost entirely opposed to mine, see Luis E. Valcárcel’s Garcilaso el Inca visto desde el ángulo indio (Lima 1939). There is now a good selection in English of Las Casas’ History of the Indies, ed. and trans. Andrée Collard (New York 1971). But Professor Collard’s translation of the particular Las Casas passage loses its original vividness: “I used to warn Diego Velázquez to beware of a man who had spent twenty-two years in Italy” (p. 225). The Historia de las Indias has been edited in an exemplary manner by Agustín Millares Carlo, with a long prefatory study by Lewis Hanke (3 vols. Mexico 1951; ed. 2 1965).

2. Royal Commentaries, Book IX, Ch. xxxi (Livermore, 1.607).

3. Professor Livermore did not include in his translation of the Historia general del Perú the very revealing prologue, reproduced by A. Miró Quesada (words quoted, p. 9).


5. In Chapter xvii of Book I (Royal Commentaries) on “some fabulous accounts of the origins of the Incas,” Garcilaso implicitly contrasts his narrative style and that of “los indios” (“Indians”), “tan sin orden ni concierto.” Professor Livermore translates this as “disjointed and confused style” (1. 48) but “order and harmony” are here key Renaissance terms. In Las Casas’ repeated derogatory references and allusions to Cortés’ own cronista Francisco López de Gómara, “mentiras” (lies) are coupled with “compostura“:
see, for instance, Ch. cxix of Historia de las Indias (ed. Millares, 3) 237. Professor Collard renders "compostura" as "fabrication" (p. 234), but in sixteenth-century Spanish it meant as well "neatness" and "elegance."


A Note on Montaigne's Des Cannibales and the Humanist Tradition

by Aldo Scaglione

Throughout his history European man has displayed an implicit conviction that Europe is the center of the world and that only European values are worthy and meaningful. The cultural pluralism of the modern American viewpoint, a position logically demanded by the predicament of the present world, is largely un-European. The discovery of America was a first testing ground for the superiority and ultimate validity of the European way of life. The opening of new horizons was a mental fact, but the perspective with which the newly discovered realities were evaluated remained Europe-oriented. America was seen as a means to be used for European ends; and if the concept of person implies an end rather than a means, American natives were not usually regarded as true persons. As for a genuinely objective, "scientific" interest in American landscape and life, the travellers could have used as their motto the sign in a chemist's shop in Piccadilly Circus: "We dispense with accuracy." Even the new myth of the Noble Savage, which saw the Indian as an ideal man of nature
Angles of Perception: Myth and Literature

putting to shame the artificiality and corruption of European civilization, was essentially a metamorphosis of the myth of the Golden Age in the context of Platonic utopias. It did not stem from an active concern with understanding the reality of American life, nor did it generally bear any close resemblance to it.

The irresistible urge to analyze the Indians from a European vantage point is exemplified early: compare the authentic “Bartolozzi” letter of Amerigo Vespucci and the Mundus novus, with its clearly prejudiced and subjective insertions and additions. The Indians “vivunt secundum naturam, et epcuri potius dici possunt quam stoici”; “ipsi admirantur cur nos non comedimus inimicos nostros, et eorum carne non utimur in cibis, quam dicunt esse saporosissimam.” The reference to the ancient Epicureans as archetypal heretics or atheists is, with its medieval and Dantesque flavor, an interesting paraphrase of the original’s non conoscono l’immortalità d’anima.

Even though much of the early literature and information on the discoveries first became available in Italy, the Italians showed little interest in their import—for sufficient, if not good, reasons. The famous passage in Ariosto’s Orlando furioso (XV, esp. 19-27), which together with the whole XV. 18-36 was composed between 1529 and 1532, and added in the third edition (Ferrara, 1 October 1532), and contains Andronica’s geography lesson to Astolfo. It tells the story of the great explorations in the context of Charles V’s gloriously expanding empire, the theme of the digression. It is not disinterested, since the Convention of Bologna of November 1529 had confirmed the good relations between Ferrara and Charles V. The poet expected recognition from the emperor; it came after he personally presented Charles with a copy of his poem at the Gonzaga court in 1532, and received in return a diploma appointing him poet laureate. But apart from this, the passage is striking because of the apparent unawareness, even at this late date, of the true nature of Columbus’ and Vespucci’s discoveries. In saying that the navigators del sole initando il camin tondo,/ ritrovare nuove terre e nuovo mondo (following the sun’s circular course they [managed] to find new lands and a new world, XV.22.7-8), the poet refers to the “yet unknown way,” la strada ignota, 21.6, ascosa strada, 24.1-2, toward a new region in the neighborhood of India (di là da l’India, 23.4), or the Orient (regn in Oriente, 27.7). This confusion should not be too surprising: even such an experienced author as Bartolome de Las Casas, beginning his Historia de las Indias in 1527, looked upon the American lands as part of the Orient. Still, the lines in the Furioso reflect typical Italian attitudes of the time: practical concerns had overridden mental and theoretical questions. The Venetians and the Florentines had remained largely untouched by the new Atlantic discoveries, absorbed as they were in the commercial advantages that would accrue from the possibility of reaching India by circumnavigating Africa, thereby disproving the mythical prejudice that the
African land separated the waters of the Atlantic from those of the Indian Ocean, which did not communicate anywhere. Ariosto echoes this Venetian and Florentine absorption in stanzas 19 and 20, stressing the point that it is now apparent how d'ogn'intorno il mar la terra abbraccia . . . (19.2), so that ships can move from India to Europe and vice versa. In other words, the Italians tended to view the now achieved circumnavigation of Africa as more important and promising than whatever had been going on toward the West.

In Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata* XV. 24-32, while Carlo and Ubaldo are being carried to Armida's Gardens in Fortuna's ship, they hear from their guide that the Atlantic Ocean, over which they are sailing and which had been previously crossed only by Ulysses (according to Dante's fiction), contains fertile islands and lands inhabited by barbarians and godless peoples, some of them even cannibals (ognun . . . barbaro è di costume, empio di fede, 28.8). But they will receive the Christian faith from Western man once the great captain from Liguria, Christopher Columbus, has conquered the seas by following the route which will circumnavigate the globe. Tasso's religious preoccupations left him no time to dwell, as Montaigne did, upon the enfranchisement of the savage and upon the state of nature; these only meant something to him in terms of the myth of the Age of Gold, as so splendidly evoked in his previous *Aminta*, and its psychological implications for the courtiers of his own time and place, not in distant lands.

The best testimony for Italian acceptance of widening mental and geographical horizons can perhaps be found in Giovanni Botero's statement, that "we Italians are too fond of ourselves and too interested admirers of our things, when we prefer Italy and its cities to all the rest of the world."

Predictably, Giordano Bruno offered perhaps the broadest-minded insight from a theological standpoint into the anthropological implications. For him the American discoveries could not be reconciled with biblical chronology and the postulates of a universal flood and unique creation. Campanella displayed similar breadth when he inserted the Indians into his demographic plans for a Spanish universal empire by proposing that they be treated as equal citizens and employed to colonize Africa, Asia, and Spain itself, even as administrators and barons. In the literature on America one would have to search far and wide for such an unrealistic lack of prejudice.

In the contradictory and confused situation of the travellers' reports at the very beginning of literature on America, one finds a central underlying question: what is human nature? The Christian notion of original sin postulates an abstract idea of nature: good as given by God (the Earthly Paradise, the Golden Age), bad in historical terms for its post-lapsarian corruption. A savage, primitive people living in a Golden Age could be envisaged only literarily, poetically, and when Christopher
Columbus wrote in such terms to a pope about the Indians of Hispaniola, his imaginative lapse could well be regarded as dangerously heterodox nonsense. Chinard showed many years ago that the “American” view deriving from such reports was, indeed, historically anti-social and the forerunner of Rousseau’s revolt. The only intelligible reality in nature was *homo homini lupus*. The image of savages being good, without being compelled to be so by force of law, and living in orderly conditions was insulting to the Christian conscience of Western man unless he was espousing that image out of a conscious need for escape and revolt.³

Yet this fundamentally anti-social, even potentially anarchistic view that Chinard regarded as central to the European tradition of Americanism applies typically to France from Montaigne to Rousseau. It does not apply to Italy, where the prevailing interpretation of the same experiences remained essentially orthodox. A special study by Rosario Romeo explains this difference between the two countries.⁴ The Italians remained more interested in the “civilizations” of America (which they tended to compare with the Greek and Roman and even with the Chinese) than in the “savages,” happy or not. Typical in this respect is the frequent treatment of the Incas, who found enthusiastic apologists in such authors as Girolamo Giglio in the middle of the sixteenth century (relying on Cieza de León and López de Gómara)⁵ and, early in the eighteenth century, Francesco Algarotti. It is customary to view Algarotti’s 1753 *Essay on the Incas* (*Saggio sopra l’imperio degl’Incas*) within the context of the American literature of the Enlightenment, which includes a relatively small crop of such disparate authors as Gian Rinaldo Carli, Voltaire, van Pauw, and Marmontel, but in another respect the essay is a conclusive statement of a long Italian tradition. The topos of the Golden Age is little more than a point of reference, since the author’s thesis consists precisely in freeing the Incas from any association with the savage and the primitive in order to place them on a plane with Rome, the supreme human civilization. Rather than primitivism, the author gives us a more or less paradoxical example of ideal government.⁶

I have been stressing that the myth of the Happy Savage, characteristic of French Americanist literature, is largely missing from such literature in Italy. The myth in question, combined with a relativistic way of looking at such matters, was essentially inherited from Montaigne. Romeo has offered a shrewd contrastive analysis of the original work performed by Montaigne and his Italian contemporaries on their sources. Noting that Montaigne constructed almost full-blown the myth of the Happy Savage from a typically anti-Indian source, López de Gómara, he goes on to point out that the same sources available to the French were also (with the notable exception of Las Casas) available to the Italians, who used them, however, in a typically Counter-Reformist
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mood—which prevails from roughly 1550 to the middle of the eighteenth century—to condemn the natural state and to praise the civilized, urban societies, ideally stable and orderly. Aside from travel accounts, the literature on America was also substantially affected by Renaissance doctrines about the possibility of salvation outside the Church, much debated by Reformers as well as Catholic theologians. The latter were compelled by their traditional positions to combat on the one hand the Protestant thesis of human nature’s corruption, since it would have supported predestination and justification by faith alone, and on the other hand the unchecked defense of the fundamental goodness of human nature, which would arouse charges of Pelagianism from the Protestant side and, as Romeo puts it, “played into the hands of those who espoused relativistic tendencies already creeping through the culture of the time, to the extent of maintaining the equivalence of all religions in different countries.”

What Romeo refers to implicitly is the current of conciliation and harmonization between pagan and Christian cultures and especially Platonism and Christianity, as represented by Ficino and Pico.

To recall Montaigne’s Italian humanist background is specifically relevant in our context because of a curious paradox: the myth of the Happy Savage remained largely inoperative in Italy, but its first components came from Italy. And it is only fitting that Petrarch, the Prince of Humanism, should provide an exemplary parallel text for our consideration.

But first, reculons un peu pour mieux sauter. Although the direct reaction to the discoveries was shaped by practical considerations of material interest, as was the case with Columbus, even then the preconceptions suggested by classical education, with its myths of happy islands and monsters, remain an important element. The fervent expectation of millenaristic palingenesis, nourished by astrology and prophetic literature, leaned on such key texts as Pierre d’Ailly’s, but also on the elusive, subterranean, yet powerful moods spread by the inspired preaching of Gioachino da Fiore. Columbus could still hear echoes of the Argonaut myth and see himself at the helm of the ship as a new Tiphys. Generally the travellers sought in the new lands a confirmation of what the ancient texts had mentioned, fictionally or mythically. Only later in the century, and in Elizabethan England rather than in southern Europe, was the brave new world adduced to chide the ignorance and limitation of the ancients.

But a mind like Montaigne’s may legitimately be placed with more sophisticated and out-of-the-way texts than those of ordinary contemporaries. The points of contact between Montaigne and Petrarch are more than one. They begin with that splendid egocentrism, that self-conscious autobiographism which invests their entire careers. As to their
respective methods of composition, even a cursory look at the copy of the Bordeaux edition of his *Essays* (1588), which Montaigne spent the last four years of his life emending, annotating, glossing until the wide margins became almost fully covered with his handwriting, recalls its great antecedent, Petrarch's Vatican Latin codex 3196, which contains the successive variants and revisions of the *Canzoniere* in the poet's own hand covering a period of several years.

The principal theme of Montaigne's most explicit and extended comment on the discovery of America, namely his essay "On cannibals" (*Essays*, I. xxxi), is the infinite variety of customs and beliefs. The resulting relativism is all but total: both the objects and our varying, subjective experiences of them are without fixed boundaries, so that "il n'y a aucune constante existence, ny de nostre estre, ny de celuy des objets."

Two main topics run through "Des cannibales": a) the myth of the Golden Age, metamorphosed into that of the Happy Savage; b) the relativity of customs and mores based on human opinion and prejudice (see, also, the *Umwertung aller Werte* in "De la coustume," I. xxiii). The main thrust of the essay is, however, stoico-heroic, even referring to ancient models such as that of Ischolas the Spartan. Montaigne exaggerates the bravery of the prisoners of war, who provoke their captors to torment them, in order to enhance both their difference from Western man and the myth of Western decadence after the Romans. Thus he remains essentially the humanist who uses the theme of the Indian—happy, good, and especially brave—to confirm the humanists' myth of modern man as a moral and psychological pigmy. He is thus, once again, in line with Petrarch, who admitted no modern heroes in his "biographies."

Let us now turn to Petrarch's *Familiarium rerum* II, 2. A *consolatoria*, it proposes to comfort the recipient for the death of a dear friend. Since the grief is reported to linger most bitterly on the circumstance of an unburied death in the waters of the Egyptian sea, Petrarch proceeds to dispel this prejudice, as he sees it, by a critique of our veneration for one burial rite over another. It is wrong and unphilosophical, he asserts, to judge situations by the force of popular custom rather than by reason. Let us think of Artemisia, queen of Caria, who expressed her extreme love for her dead husband by giving him no other tomb than her own body: she did so by dissolving his ashes in her beverages little by little. Some tribes are wont to feed their dead to animals, especially dogs. Even if we remain within the boundaries of Italy, our own land, we will do well to remember that the ancients first practiced inhumation, then cremation. The Christians restored the former, but who is to say which is better? (§19). Such practices are nothing but customs and make no objective difference. Remember "Lambas de Auria," captain of the Genoese
fleet in the first battle with Venice, who congratulated his son, dead in that battle, for having the best possible burial, and threw him into the sea with his own hands. Briefly, plus usum posse quam rationem is a fact of life, but it is the wrong criterion for our judgement (§11, p. 64, citing Cicero). Nimium decursu temporis mutati mores opiniones hominum alternant (§18, p. 66). Then, in terms reminiscent of the logical thrust of the previous letter, the magnificent consolatoria to the bishop Philippe de Cavaillon for the death of his brother: “Quicquid in hac vita patimur molesti, non tam ex ipsa rerum natura, quam ex nostre mentis imbecillitate sive, ut eorum [i.e., illustrium philosophorum] etiam verbis utar, ex opinionum perversitate procedere” (§6, p. 63).

Petrarch’s deep and obsessive sense of the ephemeral nature of things makes him, rather than a skeptic, a sort of relativist and subjectivist avant-la-lettre. Yet the need for objectivism reappears when the author concludes with the admonition: “veritatem rerum non vulgi rumoribus, sed insita ratione quesieris . . .” (§20, p. 66). We can thus say that Petrarch’s world remains objective in a transcendental sense. There is a firm, stable truth, but it is above the phenomena of this world and our history. It is in God.

Moreover, between Petrarch’s subjectivism and that of Montaigne the focus moves away from the collective toward the individual. For the former it is not so much the mental image produced by individual conditions that matters, but rather the impact of popular opinions on us. Petrarch manages to display his “mentalism” even further in the following letter, where he resumes the subject and adds: “As a matter of fact, even in all other kinds of fears and apprehensions you will find that no one is unhappy except him who has made himself so; thus it is greed, not scarcity of things, which makes the poor; thus in death, which is most like exile, what harms us is more our apprehension and distortion of opinion than the true hardship of the thing itself.”

If humanism affected early reactions to the discoveries, and shaped and to some extent distorted those reactions, the new discoveries wreaked a kind of revenge. On the intellectual plane, this chief impact lay in contributing to the decay of the myth of Antiquity as an absolute model together with the notion of the modern age as an age of progress.

NOTES


Angles of Perception: Myth and Literature


4. Romeo (n. 1 above).


6. A. Scaglione, “Il pensiero dell’Algarotti: I Saggi sul Cartesio, sul Triumvirato e sugli Incas,” *Convivium*, n.s. 4 (1956) 404-426. In his recent *La leggenda dei secoli d’oro nella letteratura italiana* (Bari 1972) Gustavo Costa is led to stress the presence of the Golden Age topos as characteristic of the works he surveys, and misses the fact that with Algarotti, as with the whole seventeenth-century speculation on America that precedes him, the primitivist “instance” is essentially absent, and the attention of the Italians is attracted toward real or imaginary examples of civic values and stable social order.

7. Romeo (n. 1 above) 75-76.

8. Romeo (n. 1 above) 37 and Ch. 3 *passim.*


12. Sayce (n. 10 above) 194.


Primitivism
and the Process of Civility
in Spenser’s Faerie Queene
by A. Bartlett Giamatti

The Other World of folklore had suddenly become the New World of fact. The medieval locale of enchantment and perfect satisfaction found itself realized, so it seemed, in the Novus Mundus of Columbus. While the Spanish would call the new place “otro mundo” or Indies long after other names had been found, the English begin referring to it as America as early as 1519. However, something of the older sense of medieval dreams underlying Renaissance realities still occurs in England in 1651 when, in a derisive medical treatise, Noah Biggs can refer to “The New-found-Land of Americall or Prestor-John humours.” I will look at precisely this mix of attitudes, this engagement of something new-found that recalls older dreams, in The Faerie Queene. Through Spenser’s poem I want to suggest some approaches to the question of what the Renaissance did with new-found things, and how in the process of shaping the new in the image of the old, the very nature of recreation and re-naissance is explored.

Spenser is aware of the “other world” as well as the “new world.” He incorporates the Spanish view by referring twice to “Indian Peru” (II. proem. 2; III.iii.6) and to various savages or savage im-
pulses, like Maleger or Fanny in Cupid’s Masque, as Indians (II.xi.21-22; III.xii.8)—Indians that have to be tamed. But the man who wrote the Letter to Raleigh also knew about “fruitfullest Virginia” (II. proem 2). named for the Virgin Queene in 1587, and he knew the name America. Mercilla, another version of Elizabeth, is said to have “enlarged” her rule.

From th’ utmost brinke of the Americke shore
Unto the margent of the Molucas. (V.x.3)

Earlier, in Book II, in the Antiquitee of Faery Lond that Guyon read at the top of Alma’s Castle, we had heard how the first offspring of Elfe and Fay, Elfin, had first ruled all:

him all India obayd,
And all that now America men call. (II.x.72)

Thus, from the beginning, myth has asserted what recent history proves: that the other world, now called the New World, was an original possession of the British imagination, and that that possession or mode of existence, Faery Land, is now called America. The ancient dream which must be revived in time is also the new-found place that must be refashioned in accordance with antique standards. In this double view of America, as once and future ideal, as original actuality and new potentiality, we have an emblem of how the poet’s very act of retrospection, of looking back, is the act of restoration, of making up. For Spenser, as for so many others, to probe the past was to make the future, and America is a term for defining that process as well as an element in the process.

In viewing the New World as a potential revision of the antique world, Spenser also distinguishes the primitive, figured by the Indies or the Indians, from the antique, now new-found, figured by America. And he distinguishes between the primitive and the potential, because while the new may be primitive in some respect, the primitive is not necessarily new. He had to separate the New World from what had always been unshaped or unregenerate. Otherwise a sentimental equation between what was primitive and what was good would result, and in various ways the great Renaissance writers—all of whom worried this problem—resisted that widely-held and much too easy conclusion.

So Spenser distinguishes between wild men and foundlings, between two orders of being—those who at best are susceptible of being tamed, and those who can be reformed. The distinction is crucial and wide-ranging, for it is between suppression and expression, domestication and education, between beings who inhabit nature and beings who build cities. A wild man cannot change; the most one can hope to do is make him useful. A foundling, however, is precisely the image of
potential change; at best, the process of civility is explicit in the
education of the child. In wild men, Spenser located what I have
subsumed under the term "Indian," the primitive as fecund, energetic,
but finally resistant; in the foundling, the new-found, he located what
we have figured by "America," the ancient shape of man now new
begun, the image of the past ready for rebirth. The distinction, which
points to self-consciousness, is about self-consciousness; it is a Renais-
sance distinction that, in its very assertion, reveals some of the Renais-
sance's deepest preoccupations.

By Spenser's wild men, I mean all the satyrs who receive Una at
I.vi.7f. and who are received by Hellenore at III.x.36f; the "salvage"
nations at VI.viii.35f; the grim forester who would rape Amoret at
IV.vii.5; and the appealing wild man who rescues Calepine at VI.iv.2f.
Obviously there are different kinds of satyrs and different levels of
savagery. Amoret's pursuer and Serena's tormentors are far removed
from Una's adoring host, and none of these approaches the decency of
Calepine's rescuer who, when he knights himself by donning Calepine's
abandoned armor (VI.v.8), seemingly completes or complements a series
of affirmations in chivalry that began when Calidore re-affirmed Crudor
(VI.i.42-43) and then dubbed Tristram as his squire (VI.ii.35). Indeed,
this "salvage" man, as the poet says (VI.v.1), must have gentle blood;
and in "salvage" the potential for salvation exists or seems to exist. But if
Spenser recognizes the potential for improvement in the primitive order,
he also recognizes that the potential is limited, limited because the
primitive world has no self-consciousness, no self-reflexive vision. It has
no art. It only has instinct. And good though instinct may be—it can be
far better than what is misshapen by art, for instance—it is in itself not
enough for true civility. All of Spenser's wild men finally derive from
that very old tradition, superbly traced by Penelope Doob, of the sinful
or bestial dweller in the wood. They exist in Spenser's poem as images
of fixed identity, beings who, much as their kind of energy is necessary
to other orders on the chain of being, are still frozen at the bottom of that
chain. Because they do not possess the capacity for self-transformation
past certain limits, they will never pass from the woods to the city. These
creatures inhabit the landscapes of Renaissance works as the final
recalcitrant remnants of the medieval past, the last remnants of the
romance and folklore world out of which so much Renaissance literature
grew. They are remnants that refused transformation because they were
so radically bound to that earlier world where all was meant to remain as
it came from the Creator's hand. They are the primitive ancestors whom
self-transforming Renaissance man has left behind, though—as Ariosto's Orlando so clearly shows in Orlando furioso XXIII—they are what,
when the process of civility defeats itself, the new man may instantly
revert to. Wild men are what we have been and can be again if, as Spenser would say, we are "carelesse" (see Redcross, "carelesse of his health, and of his fame," I.vii.7).

Broadly defined, however, foundlings represent the future; they project the material the process of civility works on, and the artifacts that result. Where wild men were medieval elements, man ready-made, foundlings figure Renaissance hopes, man as he will be remade. The very terms foundling and changeling imply transformation and renovation: like America, they are terms for rebirth, a new start, a protean capacity to adapt the best of the past to the demands of the future. But because foundling and changeling can mean transformation as re-formation, they can also figure de-formation, something worse than wild because it could have been better. Spenser will treat foundlings from the benign or affirmative perspective, but we should remark that what is true of Renaissance men is always true of language: in the sixteenth century, both "foundling" and "changeling" had meanings that referred to shiftiness and deceit, particularly the deceitfulness of words. Thus, only when a foundling is properly shaped, when the aesthetic fashioning is ethically or morally inspired, does the process of civility occur.

Who are the foundlings? In The Faerie Queene, there are two kinds: those who were foundlings, and those who are. The former list is very impressive, and includes Satyrane, Prince Arthur, Redcross, Belpheobe, and Amoret, Artegall, Tristram, and Pastorella—an extraordinary group that touches all the main concerns of the poem. Then there are the two infants: Ruddymane found by Guyon in Book II and the baby found by Calepine in Book VI. In fact, all books but the fourth present us with foundlings, and a brief review of their origins and educations will show how and why Spenser stresses the status.

First is Satyrane, who as his name implies is closest to the order of primitives. He is introduced to the reader at the same moment as Una's satyrs to allow us to distinguish between the two types. The bastard son of a "lady myld" and a satyr, he was abandoned by his mother for his father to raise in the wild. Satyrane learned to subdue savage beasts, in effect overcoming the primitive part of himself (I.vi.21-6). And because he always considered his oppression of the beasts as "sportes and cruell pastime" (27), "bloody game" (29), and not as his only mode of survival—because in short his sense of play made him flexible and not, like the satyrs, fixed—he developed into the new man his father was not. He became the "noble warlike knight . . . Plaine, faithfull, true, and enimy of shame" (20) who rescues Una. Satyrane is the emergent potential from (not of) the primitive past, and yet he only finds Una because he has returned to the wild "To seeke his kindred, and the lignage right, / From whence he tooke his weldeserved name" (20). As he does everywhere in his poem, Spenser here emphasizes genealogy,
for the old energy cannot be re-shaped in new forms unless it is first recovered. Spenser knows what his culture knows: that without exploring origins, we have no originals from which to fashion ourselves the new and true copies; that, for individuals as for institutions, unless one first returns to one's sources, \textit{ad fontes}, there is no genuine rebirth. Satyrane is just over the line between primitive and civilized, a Janus who shows us in a shadowy way what the new man will be like, and where he has come from.

Once Satyrane establishes the paradigm for self-transformation in the foundling, Arthur and Redcross reveal the type's full potential. Both Arthur and Redcross were stolen and raised by others: Arthur, stolen from his mother, is brought up by Timon, an old retired knight, and by Merlin (I.ix.3-5) (here all the models of action, contemplation, and flexible, benign magic are impressed upon him) for a great destiny which is only revealed (at least to us) in II.x when he reads \textit{Briton Moniments}; Redcross, a proper changeling left in a furrow, is reared by a ploughman under the name Georgos—the georgic one—for an epic future that is finally revealed by Hevenly Contemplation (I.x.64-66). Stolen too were Belphoebe and Amoret, twin daughters of Chrysogone, taken from their sleeping mother by Diana and Venus just after their birth. Belphoebe was then raised in the wild in "perfect maydenhed"; Amoret in the Garden of Venus and Adonis in "goodly womanhed" (III.vi.26-28). Renaissance eclecticism, taking what you need wherever you find it, is imaged in kidnapping.

Even Astraea had no qualms, evidently, about alluring "with gifts and speaches milde" the child Artegall and then raising him, like Satyrane, among the beasts where he learned "to weigh both right and wrong / In equall ballance with due recompence" (V.i.5-11). As we look back on the first time we saw Artegall, at IV.iv.39, in armor "like salvage weed, / With woody mossed bedight," and a motto \textit{Salvagesse sans finesse}, we realize that he appeared so close to the primitive order, so very like the wild man in Book vi, because the poet was telling us how Justice, based on primitive principles—the law of nature—is shaped for civic purposes with the most difficulty. And we also realize that the foundling who was so bound to the wild, so rough as a knight, signifies that Justice, the power that shapes others for civil ends, must itself incorporate primitive energies in order to be effective. In Book v, the image of that sense of force is Talus, the polished wild man.

In Book vi we meet the last two former foundlings. At VI.ii.27-33, Tristram recounts his upbringing. Like Arthur and Redcross, he was British born and raised in Faery Land; like Satyrane and Artegall, he was trained in manhood by tests in nature over beasts. The strands are beginning to come together. And finally, complement to Belphoebe and Amoret, there is Pastorella, abandoned by noble parents, found by the
shepherd Meliboee (VI.ix.14; xii.3-22). She is the perfect heroine of old romance, at once aristocratic and rustic, ultimately restored to her parents at the end of Book vi—as Una had been at the end of Book I. Through the lost children of the poem, we are led to see that, for Spenser, civility is a process of passing through the primitive in order to engage it and thus consciously to overcome it. The primitive order does not give rise to civility; it only provides the backdrop against which civility defines itself.

This process of self-definition through self-transformation can only occur in a condition of displacement. The children were translated in order to be trained, removed in order that they could rediscover themselves or be reborn, because only by distance could they acquire the flexibility necessary for identity. Exile is the precondition for self-consciousness, culturally or individually. For instance, both Satyrane and Artegall are said, as lost children, to be exiled: Satyrane “from lawes of men exilde” (I.vi.23), Artegall, “from companie exilde” (V.i.6). In fact, all foundlings are exiles, and thus the process of civility involves both going out and coming back, displacement and homecoming, a removal from and return to the parents or shape one first had, return to the America that was Faery Land, return to the ethical norms and cultural forms of the classical world that, for the Renaissance, is the original model, the home new-found man has lost.¹⁰

Regardless of how this movement is viewed, whether in terms of an individual (foundling) or a culture (humanism), the sense of being exiled to achieve freedom and perspective—in order to transform yourself—means that the ethical process of civility is also a radically aesthetic process. The foundling is disciplined or nourished or shaped by antique mentors and ideals for a purpose, and the result is a different creation than would have occurred had the child (or culture) been left to grow naturally in a primitive state. All the foundlings noted above are examples of the process as it was long since begun or even completed. But in the two babies who are actually found in The Faerie Queene, we can see the dynamics, not simply the results, of the process.

The first baby, Ruddymane, child of the dead Mordant and the dying Amavia, is rescued by Guyon at II.ii.1-10. He tries to cleanse the child of its parents’ gore, but the stains remain. The child is all of us, entering “Into this life with woe” (2), bearing the marks of our parents’ sin. Even foundlings, the very images of potential change, are fixed in the ineradicable first condition of being fallen. Ruddymane is therefore the new-found in its harshest light, lost in the primitive wild, stained by sin, emergent, vulnerable. A canto later, leaving the hectic household of the mild Medina, Guyon gives her this child, conjuring her:

In vertuous lore to traine his tender youth,
And all that gentle noriture ensueth. (II.iii.2)
Ruddymane will be trained to remember the infamy of his parents and to avenge their deaths. He has a future, but it is determined by his origins, and, unlike the second baby's, Ruddymane's future is bleak.

Late in the poem, Spenser returns to the image of the baby, giving us (at VI. iv. 17-38), in a passage little noticed by commentators, the poem's most concentrated model for the ethical-aesthetic process of civility. After being rescued by the gentle wild man, Calepine, alone, sees a bear with a screaming baby in its mouth. Again, as with Satyrane and the satyrs in Book 1, the two orders of primitive and new-found are contrasted in a single canto. But in Book 1 we saw the foundling grown up and the primitive unregenerate, while in Book VI the foundling is new-born and the primitive as developed as it can be. In these parallel but reversed sets of images, we see the least and most in each order of being: the wild man is the most the satyrs will ever be, Satyrane is the least the foundling can become.

Calepine chases the bear, which turns in rage, dropping the child, and the knight rams a large rock down the bear's throat, choking it. In using nature (the rock) to overcome nature (the bear), Calepine does what certain foundlings (Satyrane, Artegall, Tristram) did. But even more, Calepine has used art. That is, he has turned the primitive world back on itself in a way the primitive order could never do itself. The result is that the nameless baby is freed from brute nature and taken up by Calepine, who finds him, despite all, "whole" (23). This baby is whole—or holy—that is, innocent still; he offers a different view of new-found things from that projected by the stained Ruddymane. Calepine, with his charge, now encounters a lamenting woman, Matilde, who tells how she and her husband Sir Bruin can have no children and how, without heirs, their hard-won land will revert to the giant from whom they first wrested it. Without a new future, all we have won from time threatens to collapse back into the primitive order. A prophecy, she says, promised they would have a son—*Be gotten, not begotten*—but age is beginning to overtake them. Renaissance is a constant imperative.

Calepine, perhaps the most nervous single parent in epic literature, says it all—fast:

*If that the cause of this your languishment
Be lacke of children to supply your place,
Lo! how good fortune doth to you present
This little babe, of sweete and lovely face,
And spotlesse spirit, in which ye may enchace
What ever formes ye list thereto apply,
Being now soft and fit them to embrace;
Whether ye list him traine in chevalry,
Or noursle up in lore of learn'd philosophy.*
And certes it hath oftentimes bene seene, 
That of the like, whose linage was unknowne, 
More brave and noble knights have raysed beene, 
As their victorious deedes have often shownen, 
Being with fame through many nations blowen, 
Then those which have bene dandled in the lap. 
Therefore some thought that those brave imps were sowen 
Here by the gods, and fed with heavenly sap, 
That made them grow so high t'all honorable hap. (35-36)

In the second stanza above, Calepine tells Matilde that many “of the like, whose linage was unknowne,” have become greater knights than those raised at home, and Satyrane, Arthur, Redcross and Artegall come to mind. Specifically, Calepine’s notion that foundlings are seeds sown by the gods and fed with “heavenly sap,” with the thick, viscous light of divine ideals, recalls Redcross, left “in an heaped furrow” (I.x.66). Here in the middle of Book vi, the central Christian virtue of Book i is recalled, as Courtesy fulfills Holiness, as—in Spenser’s typology of foundlings—this nameless child completes and projects the pattern of Christian chivalry and civility first foreshadowed in Redcross. Finally, the imagery of divine seedlings reveals the organic basis of spiritual concerns and the way the art of civility is the process of mediation between natural energies and transcendent forms.

Art is what the process of civility is about, and art is what the first stanza cited speaks to: take this child,

in which ye may enchace
What ever formes ye list thereto apply, 
Being now soft and fit them to embrace. You may transform the baby by applying whatever form you want, either chivalry or philosophy; you can shape him for the active or the contemplative life, says Calepine. The key word in the passage, and in Spenser’s view of civility, is “enchase”; that word tells how you apply form to a baby or a culture, how you create reformation or renaissance. To “enchase” is the word that tells what an artist does.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, enchase meant to ornament; to set a jewel, to set gold with gems, to inlay or variegate metal with jewels, to adorn with figures in relief; to enshrine, to engrave. And it was a word Spenser exploited throughout his career. In *The Shepheardes Calender*, enchased refers to a literal work of art, the traditional pastoral price, “A mazer . . . / Wherein is enchased many a fayre sight” (“August,” 26-27). In *The Faerie Queene*, the poet refers to his own art: first, concerning Una’s face:

My ragged rimes are all too rude and bace, 
Her heavenly lineaments for to enchace. (I.xii.23)
then, concerning many lovely faces:

All which who so dare thinke for to enchace,
Him needeth sure a golden pen, I weene. (IV.v.12)

And what the poet does was done to Alma's Castle, whose porch is "Enchaced with a wanton yvie twine" (II.ix.24); was done, says Scudamour, to the Shield of Love "With golden letters goodly well enchaced" (IV.x.8); was done, presumably by God's art, to "heavens bright-shining baudricke" which the twelve signs of the Zodiac do "enchace" (V.i.11). What Calepine recommends to Matilde, that she enchase the child with whatever form she wishes, carries powerful and specific associations with the poet's view of the aesthetic process.

All the various kinds of artistic shaping implied by the word come home in the last use of enchase in the poem. Calidore has his vision on Mount Acidale; Colin Clout has conjured a hundred naked maidens around three ladies:

And in the middest of those same three was placed
Another damzell, as a precious gemme
Amidst a ring most richly well enchaced,
That with her goodly presence all the rest much graced. (VI.x.12)

"Enchaced"—"graced": what Calepine implied, Calidore, the Knight of Courtesy, sees in Colin's creation—the way the artist's power to make anew, rooted in nature, reveals divinity. Gloriously, if briefly, man is given insight into the way the process of civility redeems nature and therefore restores our heavenly origins. All men, all of us foundlings or exiles in the fallen world, are enchased, elevated, and humbled (chastened) by our vision through art of the paradisial home we lost in the race's infancy.

Calepine's foundling, recalling all the earlier foundlings in the poem and projecting the vision on Mount Acidale, figures the process of civility: the radical alliance of aesthetic and ethical concerns that is the individual and cultural movement we call renaissance. The poet's last words on the baby are that Matilde and Sir Bruin raised him so well

That it became a famous knight well knowne,
And did right noble deede, the which elsewhere are showne. (VI.iv.38)

A past tense reveals a future condition (precisely at the smallest syntactic level the movement of recollection for replication that we have been claiming occurs on the largest cultural level of the Renaissance). We never learn who the baby will be or what unwritten book he was meant to grace, but we are given to understand that the baby will also come home later in The Faerie Queene, that his future will be part of the constant process of redeeming and restoring the past. The once and future foundling, like the once and future America with which we
began, projects the process of civility, at whose center is the artist who, by his morally informed power of mediation, recreates.

NOTES


2. OED, s.v. "Americall" and "American." Noah Biggs, Mataeotechnia Medicinae Praxeos. The Vanity of the Craft of Physick, or, A New Dispensatory . . . With an humble Motion for the Reformation of the UNIVERSITIES and the whole Landscap of PHYSICK, and discovering the Terra Incognita of CHYMISTRIE (London 1651). In speaking of the inefficacy of laxatives and purges, Biggs says: "neither do any diseases respond or goe a pilgrimage to lodge in the New-found-Land of Americall or Prestor-John humours." Para. 124, p. 78.


4. By foundling, I intend any child lost, abandoned, or stolen, thus expanding on the OED: any "deserted infant whose parents are unknown, a child whom there is no one to claim," and including changeling, specifically as it occurs in Midsummer-Night’s Dream II.i.23:120—the stolen child for whom another is substituted. For Wild Men, and bibliography about them, see the fine study of Penelope Doob, Nebuchadnezzar’s Children: Conventions of Madness in Middle English Literature (New Haven and London 1974), Chapter iv, “The Unholy and the Holy Wild Man,” especially 135-137; for Wild Men in Spenser, see Donald Cheney, Spenser’s Image of Nature: Wild Man and Shepherd in “The Faerie Queene” (New Haven 1966) passim; of particular relevance here is Chapter v, “Wild Man and Shepherd,” especially 196-214. Also see John Erskine Hankins, Source and Meaning in Spenser’s Allegory: A Study of The Faerie Queene (Oxford 1971) 179-185. These views of Wild Men and their role in Spenser are very different from mine though not incompatible, save that I emphasize the limited potential of the Wild or Salvage Man. See also Robert H. Goldsmith, "The Wild Man on the English Stage," Modern Language
Primitivism and the Process of Civility in Spenser’s Faerie Queene


5. I regret not having seen Barbara Estrin, “The Lost Child in Spenser’s The Faerie Queene, Sidney’s Old Arcadia, and Shakespeare’s The Winter’s Tale,” Diss. Brown University 1972, which, I gather from the abstract I have seen, has an outlook similar to mine on foundlings. See Nelson (n. 11 below).

6. See n. 4 above.

7. OED s.v. foundling cites Arthur Golding, De Mornay, Pref. 8 (1587): “As for lying or vntruth, it is a foundling, and not a thing bred”; s.v. changeling, George Puttenham, The Arte of English Poesie (1589): “Hipallage or the Changeling . . . as, he that should say, for tell me troth and lie not, lie me troth and tell not.” Here Puttenham uses the figure and, in using it, refers to the shiftiness in language it figures. When the foundling (or changeling), either as infant or as language, is misused, it becomes monstrous (if a child) or makes us monstrous (if it is language). This is another way of saying that the possibility always remains that the foundling may re-engage the primitive if care is not exercised.

8. In Book iv, there is Agape, the Fay, who, after being “oppressed” by a “noble youthly knight” in the “salvage wood” (V.i.45), had three sons Priamond, Diamond, and Triamond, “. . . in one happie mold./Borne at one burden in one happie morne” (41). The episode recalls that of Chrysogone (III.vi.26-27) and the birth of Belphoebe and Amoret. Agape’s sons grow up in a manner parallel to most of the foundlings in the poem.

9. His mother’s influence is at issue: at one point she sees him with lion cubs and urges him: “leave off this dreadfull play; . . . Go find some other play-fellowes, mine own sweet boy” (28).

10. I have touched on exile in epic in Play of Double Senses: Spenser’s “Faerie Queene” (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1975), Chapter ii, “The Forms of Epic.” For a study of exile and the development of the Renaissance, see Margaret Williams Ferguson, “The Rhetoric of Exile in Du Bellay and His Classical Precursors” Diss. Yale University 1974—Ferguson’s study of exile, and its insights into Renaissance theories of culture and language, is the most impressive examination of the subject I have seen.

11. Cheney (n. 4 above) 208 and Hankins (no. 4 above) 181 only mention the baby in passing; William Nelson, The Poetry of Edmund Spenser (New York 1963) 288 does say: “The use of education is most clearly defined in the episode of the bear baby,” and Nelson cites VI.iv.35 and notes that the child “may be molded into the form of a knight or learned man—or a learned poet.” But the baby is then abandoned again. Kathleen Williams, Spenser’s World of Glass: A Reading of “The Faerie Queene” (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1966) 208, mentions the episode as an instance of “Fortune’s long and witty foresight.” Rosemary Freeman, The Faerie Queene: A Companion for Readers (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1970) 322-323, notes that the episode is part of the pastoral setting and based on Irish folklore—which is what the Variorum edition tells us (The Works of Edmund Spenser, ed. Edwin Greenlaw et al. [9 vols. Baltimore 1932-1949] Books vi and vii, 204-205). The baby in Irish lore is referred to in passing by Arnold Williams, Flower on a Lowly Stalk; The Sixth Book of The Faerie Queene (East Lansing, Mich. 1967) 71. Tonkin (n. 4 above) discusses Matilde and the baby “as a product of Spenser’s own fancy, a texture of half-remembered associations and vaguely recollected reading” (p. 67); see the discussion, 65-69, and, on the baby, 219-225. Tonkin anticipates my comments on the baby as being formed for the active or contemplative life (222, n. 29).

12. Enchase, from OF enchasser, to enshrine, set (a gem), encase; from en and chasse, shrine, casket, case; from Lat. capsae. S.v. enchase, OED and Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology.
13. Gerioneo’s knights will “enchace” Arthur’s shield in an ironic parallel at V.x.34.
14. The rhyme of “enchaced” and “graced” is also used in Amoretti lxxxii. There
the usage is wry and self-deprecatory: had only God graced her, as he had in other
things, with a poet proper to enchase her.
Much futile controversy could have been avoided if we had chosen, instead of "Renaissance," Shakespeare's ambiguous expression "brave new world" to designate the period following the imperfectly dead Middle Ages. The period discovered a New World that had already existed. Hence the sagacity of Prospero's words to the wondering Miranda, "'Tis new to thee" (V.i.184). There had been other "new worlds" that influenced Elizabethan literature more than did America: Platonism and the whole Mediterranean culture, Ovid, Pliny, Seneca, and the English Bible; and stimuli more contemporary, such as Machiavelli, the pastoral, and the sonnet.

The overwhelming criterion is how new—that is, how fresh, evocative, and disturbing—the new land, physical and intellectual, truly was to the age and especially to individual authors. With many later writers, like Donne, it had become familiar enough to serve the cold, designing intellect rather than the excited emotions directly. With an earlier author, quite different in nature, for whom the strange and the nightmarish were a part of his poetic genius, the New World became a less reflective and controlled vehicle for expressing the undiscovered countries of his imagination. Edmund Spenser, explaining to the queen
That all this famous antique history,
Of some th' aboundance of an idle braine
Will judged be, and painted forgery,
reminds her

That of the world least part to us is red:
And dayly how through hardy enterprize,
Many great Regions are discovered,
Which to late age were never mentioned.
Who ever heard of th' Indian Peru?
Or who in venturous vessell measured
The Amazons huge river now found trew?
Or fruitfullest Virginia who did ever vew?

"Yet," he adds significantly, "all these were, when no man did them
know." The artistic problem of the age was to recognize and exploit
these lands so as to make them intellectually new. This was imperfectly
achieved by hortatory writers, like Raleigh and Drayton, who wrote with
a propagandistic purpose and for whom the recognition took the form of
colonization, search for gold, or manic patriotism.

A more serious limitation upon the newness of the experience was
the tendency of the age to interpret what was new in an established
context. As George H. T. Kimble has said, geographical discoveries were
greeted "paradoxically enough, more by a deepening of interest in the
classical than in the contemporary world." This was a salubrious
enough tendency in literature if it led to archetype and myth, for
example, to age-old concepts of the West as a land of the future, as in
Marlowe's Tamburlaine. The Scythian conqueror tells his sons:

Look here, my boys; see what a world of ground
Lies westward from the midst of Cancer's line
Unto the rising of this earthly globe,
Whereas the sun, declining from our sight,
Begins the day with our Antipodes.
And shall I die, and this unconquered?

And, as Harry Levin has shown, the New World led to a stimulating
chapter in the myth of the Golden Age.

But myth and stereotype are never far apart. Most of us can accept
the new only in terms of what we already know or intuit; and poets, as
did Sidney in Arcadia and Shakespeare in As You Like It and The Tempest,
read new locales in the spirit of the pastoral, and new adventures as
chivalric romance. As Howard Mumford Jones has written, "History is a
fable agreed on. The chivalric dream was too potent to be overthrown by
reality. Europeans read what they wanted to read, and the New World
belonged to Roland, El Cid, and King Arthur." In popular literature,
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the Elizabethans could usually understand Machiavelli only as a stereotyped Machiavel; the moral wisdom of Seneca was overshadowed by his sensationalism. Shakespeare is the least vulnerable to a stereotyped view of new people, yet there is a disturbing suspicion that the freedom-proclaiming, rebellious Caliban, who turns promptly from one god to another, is patterned upon the mobs in Julius Caesar (and of course England) and not freshly upon the latest knowledge of the American Indian. Nevertheless, myth and stereotype have perhaps been more influential in literature, possibly because of the reassuring pleasure of recognition, than have the enigmatic and the topical. C. S. Lewis has observed that “the existence of America was one of the greatest disappointments in the history of Europe.” He was referring, of course, to the frustration in not achieving a direct westward route to the Orient; but an equal disappointment may be attributed to the damage that the fact always wreaks upon the dream, the dust and rocks upon the gentle legends of the moon.

Despite the influence of travel writings and the graphic Bermuda pamphlets, the legendary and the stereotyped maintained a firm hold on literature, even that of the travellers, for the whole sixteenth century. The age, with its concepts of the primitive, the savage, and the demonic, did not need factually diminishing accounts of the marvelous, or fair, or tumultuous regions. Lyly, with the help of Pliny and his own imperturbable dishonesty, created his fantastic marvels; and the age as a whole had “Sir John Mandeville.” Greene, a superb realist for London life, created a mixture of the incredible and the factual in his romances. Only Bacon seems to have studied the New World with scientific curiosity, seeking empirical evidence for his favorite topics—the winds and tides, longevity, and the difference between the Peruvians and the Mexicans.

It is with the major creative writers, however, that we find the most thoughtful departure from stereotypes in that they reacted neither fancifully nor realistically to America. Of these More, Marlowe, and Shakespeare are the most interesting. More was not only acquainted with Vespucci’s voyages, but was interested by his brother-in-law John Rastell in the colonizing of the northern American continent. Like the Utopians, the natives of America, according to Vespucci, were Epicureans and held everything in common—again, obviously, a “new” idea that had not been seriously explored since Plato. The Utopians, moreover, considered it “a most just cause for war when a people which does not use its soil but keeps it idle and waste nevertheless forbids the use and possession of it to others who by the rule of nature ought to be maintained by it.” Above all, however, More benefited from the New World as, in a different way, Bacon did in his New Atlantis; it supplied the stimulus that his intellectual creed sorely wanted: an unspoiled
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country, capable of education and reasonable religion—a country, in other words, amenable to the ideals of humanism.

Marlowe, though a suggestible student of maps and one who savored exotic names, found in the New World his own kind of newness, and not a humanistic one like More's. He can descend to the lowest of stereotypes in Doctor Faustus, with the imagery of:

And from America the golden fleece
That yearly stuffs old Philip's treasury. (I.i.132-133)

though the learned doctor is more an astronaut than a geographer. And it is more characteristic of Marlowe that his vision in Tamburlaine should be a spatial one of unprecedented grandeur and brutality. It is, in one sense, the obverse of the New World story: primitivism overcomes sophistication by its native virtù, even while assuming (unlike Caliban) the verbal power of sophistication. It is, however, essentially not the horizontal but the vertical spatial thrust of Marlowe that counts, the "lift upwards and divine" (1 Tamburlaine II.i.8); and he links himself with Hamlet's undiscovered country from whose bourn no traveller returns when he has the dying Mortimer think of voyaging to other, possibly loftier lands:

Farewell, fair queen; weep not for Mortimer,
That scorns the world, and, as a traveler,
Goes to discover countries yet unknown. (Edward II V.vi.64-66)

Shakespeare's new geography in The Tempest is closer to More's than to Marlowe's in that it moves him to explore ideas rather than envision wide expanses of territory. The island is a limited one, as is the structural range of the play. Even in terms of ideas, there is a truth in Kermode's claim that "there is nothing in The Tempest fundamental to its structure of ideas which could not have existed had America remained undiscovered, and the Bermuda voyage never taken place" (p. xxv). Hallett Smith has not only demonstrated how Shakespeare could have gotten facts about Caliban and Setebos from Richard Eden's History of Trauayle (1577) and general ideas from the accounts of Magellan in it, but has also tied together Shakespeare's last romance with his earlier experiment in the kind, notably A Midsummer-Night's Dream. Shipwrecks and reunions, moreover, the staple of the Greek romance, had appeared in Shakespeare as early as The Comedy of Errors; primitivism versus the sophisticated court, fundamentally a pastoral theme, had benefited from specific thought in As You Like It and from the most powerful investigation in King Lear; there had been spirits in plays as early as A Midsummer-Night's Dream; and in Hamlet and Macbeth Shakespeare had given considerable thought to demonology. All can be traced to conventions, literary and philosophical, independent of the new
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gography. As to the remarkable people in Miranda’s brave new world, they are mainly rather weakened, tired versions of the Mediterranean sophisticates, scoundrels, young lovers, clowns, and rebels of his early plays. Shakespeare might seem to have brought them all together for a stage reprise and not a new experience. But in that lies the biographical heresy.

Nevertheless, Gayley14 and others have demonstrated Shakespeare’s sharing the keen interest of his friends in the Virginia colonization; and Cawley’s article ("Shakespere’s Use of the Voyagers in The Tempest") catalogues with persuasive detail the parallels between the Bermuda pamphlets and even the vocabulary of the play. Nor can one overlook the special closeness between the problems of Caliban and those of the Indian. Above all, there is an interest, sometimes explicit, in plantation that was only partially stimulated by Montaigne.

Like More, but with the whole of humanity within his imaginative range, Shakespeare was a humanist. Though not didactic like early humanists, his dramas always point toward what might have been if men had known more about others and about themselves. His tragedies leave one with the impression of a great loss suffered by noble creatures who could have been saved. The New World may have given Shakespeare a suggestion for a more rigorous testing of the humanist’s potential. It placed beauteous mankind in a setting that provided a controlled test for education, for the age-old humanistic dream of nurture modifying and rescuing nature. Youthful innocents, a savage man, and Italian sophisticates are subjected to a world that places no artificial limitation on human virtue. Everything, Shakespeare seems to have discovered (and I would underline that word, for I do not think that Shakespeare usually knew in advance, and certainly not in this play), turns out on the control island as it had in his early tragic worlds, except that the humanist dreamer Prospero, who had depended like the earlier humanists excessively on books, learns that the rarer action is in virtue than in vengeance. Prospero and Shakespeare end the play with only a bittersweet tranquility, without radically solving any human or political problems. The facts of history and geography have proved Shakespeare now, as they did then, to be right in this benevolent pessimism.
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NOTES

1. Entire books and large sections of books have been devoted to the influence of the explorers and new lands on Elizabethan literature, but there has been little sustained concentration on the New World. The most useful of the students tend to do little more than cite and, if one is lucky, organize allusions. Such, generally, are the works by Robert Ralston Cawley, which dominate the field. *The Voyagers and Elizabethan Drama* (Boston and London 1938) manages to be at the same time factually enlightening and fragmentary reading. The same is true of his article "Shakespeare's Use of the Voyagers in *The Tempest*," PMLA 41 (1926) 688-726. His more popular book, *Unpathed Waters: Studies in the Influence of the Voyagers on Elizabethan Literature* (Princeton 1940), is superior in style and in development of theme. Another informative work is Gustav H. Blanke, *Amerika im Englischen Schrifttum des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts* (Bochum-Langendreer 1962). And another, especially useful for the earlier part of the century, is Franklin T. McCann, *English Discovery of America to 1585* (New York 1952), which has, as its final chapter, "The Reappearance of America in Imaginative English Literature." The scholarship of Louis B. Wright is, as always, illuminating if sometimes bibliographical in presentation. Especially pertinent here are *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England* (Chapel Hill 1935), especially Chapter xiv and his *Religion and Empire: The Alliance between Piety and Commerce in English Expansion, 1558-1625* (Chapel Hill 1943), which takes up an important aspect of the subject with which I have not leisure to deal. A derivative, but wieldy and readable, survey of the facts is Alfred Leslie Rowse, *The Elizabethans and America* (London and New York 1959). On *The Tempest*, specifically, there is an irritably keen chapter (iv) in Leslie A. Fiedler, *The Stranger in Shakespeare* (New York 1972), which benefits from placing Caliban as the New World man in a context of other "strangers." Also stimulating, and perhaps sounder in its thesis, is Leo Marx's chapter, "Shakespeare's American Fable," in *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (New York 1964), which studies the effect of the pastoral convention upon the Elizabethan reactions to America as shown in *The Tempest*. "It is impossible," writes Marx (p. 38), "to separate the taste for pastoral and the excitement, felt throughout Europe, about the New World." Dominique O. Mannoni, *Psychologie de la colonisation* (Paris 1950), though not concerned with the Renaissance New World, is valuable for its use of Prospero, Ariel, and Caliban as symbols of the enduring problems of the colonizer as seen by a professional student of the sociological and psychological phenomenon. According to Mannoni, Prospero's punishment of Caliban is irrational; he is justifying hatred on the grounds of sexual guilt, a motivation at the root of colonial racism.

2. All *Tempest* references are to the new Arden edition, ed. Frank Kermode (London and Cambridge, Mass. 1954). Kermode's introduction offers a compendious guide to the influence of the New World on the play. He also includes excerpts from the Bermuda tracts.


7. *O Strange New World; American Culture: The Formative Years* (New York 1964) 27.
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Images of America in the German Renaissance

by Harold Jantz

Our main concern will be those special imaginative contributions of the German Renaissance that may be considered outstanding or even unique, and that were taken over into the total Renaissance image of America, helping to determine its contours and distinguishing features. There were at least three: the encompassing visionary symbolism of the Habsburg, the intricate humanistic process of determining the name of the newly-found continent, and the iconographic wedding of word and picture into the standard composite image of the primordial New World. First of all, however, there is some prehistory to report.

As early as the 1230's a brilliant German monarch wrote a book in which one New World product is prominently mentioned: Emperor Frederick II's treatise on falconry and its mention of the Greenland falcon. A generation earlier, shortly after 1200, Wolfram von Eschenbach included three allusions to a fabulous Greenland in his chivalric romance, Parzival, and later, in his Willehalm, another allusion that clearly designates Greenland as Scandinavian. Yet the tale goes back even farther, to the Vinland voyages, where the reports mention German participants, among them Tyrkir who, coming from wine country, was
understandably the first to discover the wild grapes of the New World. More important than such isolated or accidental factors was the close relationship of the Hanseatic merchants to the whole Scandinavian world, including Iceland, though what still remains to be explained is the peculiar prominence that Bremen enjoyed. Why was it that Adam of Bremen, in his chronicle of about 1070-75, left us the earliest written notice of Vinland, the new land far away in the West? The reason for Bremen’s prominence was spiritual rather than mercantile. Though Hamburg was originally the seat of the great northern archdiocese, after its destruction by the Normans in 848 the see was transferred to Bremen and the archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen continued to reside there. In the service of the archbishop, Adam travelled in Scandinavia and gathered the information on the Western territories. Thus when Greenland was settled and the lands farther to the West explored, they fell under the ecclesiastical supervision of the archbishop in Bremen until the time when an archepiscopal see was established at Nidaros (Trondheim) in Norway.

The subsequent participation of the Germans in the great era of discovery farther to the south rested, for one, upon their technological eminence. It provided Europe not only with its printing presses but also with various of its improved astronomical, horological, and navigational instruments and, what is equally important, with some of the scientists who developed these new instrumentalities, together with improved ephemerides, and applied them to the rational founding of the new geography. Witness the long succession from Regiomontanus and Martin Behaim in the fifteenth century through Martin Waldseemüller and his successors in the sixteenth century and later. Two generalizations can be made at this point. The first is that many of these men, from Behaim onward, travelled to other lands to do their work, though Behaim did return to his native Nuremberg to construct his famous globe of 1492, and several of the most famous early maps of America do continue to reside in German lands. The second generalization is more important, though just as subject to exceptions. The German participation in the opening of the western world to European cognizance was to a large extent an intellectual one. Here lies its main achievement, while the actual physical participation of Renaissance Germans in New World activities is perhaps more romantically interesting than materially fruitful.

One German physical, indeed somatic, achievement did prove to have decisive consequences. Simultaneously and paradoxically, here is also where the strange factor of the prophetic anticipation of American discovery enters into the historical picture. It all started on a highly spiritual, airily intangible level with Emperor Frederick III (1415-93), a dreamy, impractical man with artistic and intellectual interests, whose
main achievement, so far as American consequences are concerned, was to invent, about mid-century, a motto for his Habsburg family that fitted into the vocalic acronym A E I O U—in Latin, “Austria Est Imperare Orbi Universo”; in German, “Alles Erdrrecht Ist Österreich Unterthan”; in English, “Austria’s Empire is Ordained Universal” (the English version is not Frederick’s). He took the first practical step toward that end in arranging for his son Maximilian I (1459-1519) to marry the heiress of Burgundy and the Netherlands. Mary of Burgundy brought another prophetic symbol to the Habsburg when her husband, in succession to her father, Charles the Bold, became Grand Master of the Order of the Golden Fleece. Here was the classic anticipatory image in the Argonaut expedition, the perilous voyage to a distant land of gold and menace. Maximilian in his turn brought the A E I O U closer to dynastic reality by marrying his son to the heiress of Aragon and Castile. And so it was that Maximilian of the Empire, Mary of Burgundy, Ferdinand of Aragon, and Isabella of Castile, four mighty monarchs, bestowed all their worldly goods upon their grandson, Charles V, Carlos Primero (1500–58). These possessions included Asiatic and American territories as well as much of the western and central European continent, so that a Spanish poet was able to proclaim that Charles reigned over an empire on which the sun never set. Charles Habsburg was the right man in the right place at the right time. With his family attraction toward symbolic signification it is not surprising that he achieved yet a further extension in the emblem and motto he chose for his own. Emblem and motto were in direct defiance of Antiquity and its conviction that, for all practical purposes, the navigable world ended not far beyond Gibraltar, the Pillars of Hercules: “Non Plus Ultra,” there is no more beyond. On the emblem stand two pillars with the motto “Plus Ultra,” meaning not only “There is more beyond,” but also implying the “Onward and upward” of the transcendent spirit. The ultimate boundary set by Hercules is surpassed; the other worlds concealed from Alexander are discovered and conquered—so the panegyric poets and artists of the Renaissance proclaimed. This “Plus Ultra” is thus as good an expression as any of the “Faustian” urge of the Renaissance, which could just as well be called a “Carolinian” or a “Columbian” urge.

When Cortés landed on the shores of Mexico, the first diplomatic gesture of Emperor Montezuma, about Easter tide 1519, was to send ambassadors to him with an array of gifts of such magnificence and value as to make Cortés and his men all the more eager to pursue their conquest of this part of the New World. Cortés sent the gifts on to Emperor Charles; they were first exhibited in Seville and Valladolid, and when Charles returned to the Netherlands in May 1520, he took them along and had them exhibited in Brussels. There it was that the Nuremberg artist Albrecht Dürer saw them later that summer during his
journey in the Netherlands. His description of the Mexican treasure is imbued with the sense of wonder that is one of the most attractive traits of the Renaissance:

I have also seen the things brought to the king from the new golden land: a sun all of gold a whole fathom broad, also a moon all of silver and just as large; also two chambers full of instruments of these [people], likewise of all kinds of weapons, armor, catapults, wonderful shields, strange garments, bed hangings, and all kinds of wonderful things for many uses, more beautiful to behold than prodigies. These things were all so precious that they are valued at a hundred thousand gulden. All the days of my life I have not seen anything that gladdened my heart as these things did. For I saw among them wonderful works of art and marvelled at the subtle ingenuity of people in strange lands. I do not know how to express all that I experienced there. 7

It is remarkable how Dürer, thus suddenly confronted by an art that was totally strange, totally divergent from European practice and standards of taste, could take such an immediately positive attitude toward it instead of lapsing into the conventional clichés of “barbaric,” “grotesque,” and the like.

What happened to these treasures from Montezuma? 8 Works of art made of gold are most vulnerable to being reduced to their metallic content, and so the large golden sun disk of Montezuma soon disappeared, it would seem without further trace or record. The silver moon (together with various featherworks) Charles with symbolic appropriateness gave to his aunt Margarete, regent of the Netherlands, and it can be traced for a few years longer. The feather cloak in the Brussels museum and a mask in the British Museum purchased in Bruges are probably Montezuman, and several other mosaic masks in Italian collections apparently trace back to Charles’ gift to Pope Clement VII. Well recorded, by contrast, is that part of the treasure, ten pieces, that came to Nuremberg in early January 1524 for Charles’ brother Ferdinand, and a part of this in turn went over into the large collection that Charles’ nephew, Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol, assembled at Ambras Castle. This Ambras collection, one of the great ones of the Renaissance, was preserved through the centuries, and much of it is now on display in the various museums in Vienna; several Montezuman pieces are in the Ethnological Museum. Ferdinand’s most precious treasure was his beautiful wife, Philippina, a commoner who was able to charm her imperial father-in-law into acquiescing in their secret marriage. He was persuaded no doubt by her lovely personality, possibly also by the fact that she was the offspring of one of the two wealthiest families in the Empire, the Welser of Augsburg.

Since there were further shipments of Mexican treasure to Ambras, we cannot be entirely sure which of the preserved pieces were originally
Montezuman. The feather headdress and the turquoise mosaic shield almost certainly are, possibly also the gold bird’s beak and the feather fan, though certainly not the feather shield with the blue coyote and the obsidian mirror. Interestingly enough, American artifacts were not only in the hands of Austrian nobility and royalty but also in the hands of the common man, as I noticed to my surprise years ago at an exhibition of folk art at Krems on the Danube; there among the native products was a ceramic pot from a farmhouse in Lower Austria that (to my eyes, if not to the curator’s) was clearly of Mexican origin. Considering the many missionaries and soldierly adventurers that came to America from the German regions, such an artifact in a humble home is no great surprise.

Among the German adventurers who left records of their American careers, such as Nicolaus Federmann and Ulrich Schmiedel, Hans Staden is perhaps the most interesting. Though no university man, he had enjoyed a good basic education and furthermore was endowed with a fine native intelligence, artistic talent, and remarkable powers of observation. For the book on his travels and his captivity among the cannibals of Brazil, completed in 1556, published early in 1557, he prepared not only the text but also the design for the more than 50 remarkable woodcuts that, as he observes, the xylographer carried out not quite to his satisfaction. This is the first large series of published illustrations realistically depicting life among the Indians of America, as well as details of their artifacts and articles of adornment, several of prime ethnological value.9

In San Vincente, Brazil, Hans Staden met Heliodorus Hessus, the son of the great, free-spirited Renaissance poet Eobanus Hessus. Among the other representatives of the German humanist families was Philipp von Hutten, who went along on the tragic German expedition to the Welser colony of Venezuela. His touching letters of 1535-41 to his brother Moritz, later bishop of Eichstatt, have been preserved at least in part. He had had forewarning enough: before leaving Germany he had, in true Renaissance fashion, equipped himself with astrological predictions for the ensuing years. The gloomy forecast of the future had been made by none other than Dr. Johann Faustus, and Philipp von Hutten perished by treachery near the end of his expedition into unknown regions.10

Considering the important place of German printers and publishers in Spain and Portugal, it is not surprising that the first printer in Mexico was also a German, Hans Kromberger, who furthermore acquired the silver mines of Zultepeque. From the famous instance of cooperation between Erasmus and Froben at Basel and from other comparable instances, we know how important the relation was between the humanists and the printer-publishers of the day, and on how high a cultural level the latter often stood. Thus it was that the semiannual
book fairs at Frankfort provided a meeting place not only for the publishers of Europe to exchange their wares, but also for the men of letters. In effect, Frankfort became the first international conference center. Probably the most delightful account of these semiannual assemblies was written by the great French humanist Henricus Stephanus (Henri Estienne) and published in 1574: the *Francofordiense Emporium*. In it he tells us that "here very often right in the shops of the booksellers you can hear them discussing philosophy . . ." and that the universities "of Louvain, of Padua, of Oxford, of Cambridge . . . and many others . . . send to the Fair not only their philosophers, but also poets, representatives of oratory, of history, of the mathematical sciences. . . ." The semiannual catalogues became the standard bibliographies of Europe, and Governor John Winthrop the Younger continued to receive them after he came to America in 1631. If an author desired rapid international circulation for his book, he would be inclined to publish it in Frankfort as William Harvey did in 1628 with his work on the circulation of the blood.\textsuperscript{11}

All this helps explain why so much of the early publication about America took place in the German lands and why most of what was published elsewhere found quick circulation there.\textsuperscript{12} The Columbus letter appeared at Basel in 1493, in German translation possibly at Ulm that same year, certainly at Strasbourg in 1497; Sebastian Brant in his *Ship of Fools* of 1494 makes poetic reference to the new "gold islands and naked people"; the Vespucci letters, in Latin and German, were printed in at least seven German cities during the first five years of the new century; and in 1524 the account of Cortés’ conquest of Mexico appeared at Nuremberg, accompanied by a large map of the capital—the first American city map to be published anywhere. It is to be remembered that Nuremberg in 1524 was the very place and time in which part of Montezuma’s treasure was transferred to Archduke Ferdinand, and that Martin Behaim’s globe of the world had reposed there since 1492. This and Hieronymus Müntzer’s letter from Nuremberg to the king of Portugal on behalf of Behaim show how similar Behaim’s and Columbus’ notions were, so much so that some direct connection seems likely.\textsuperscript{13}

Before we turn to the great illustrated travel series issued in Frankfort by Theodor de Bry, his sons, and Matthias Merian from 1590 onward, it might be well to give some consideration to the Vespucci letters, observe what they did to a pair of German humanists, and what these two did in turn to affix a name to the New World that it retains to the present day. In fact, both the Vespucci letters and their sequel require careful philological examination, yet neither has received it. Samuel Eliot Morison has shown how shockingly unreliable the modern printed Vespucci texts are in comparison with the preserved manu-
scripts—early copies, not autographs. This would mean that a good critical edition does not yet exist and that the whole Vespuccian dispute continues to be based on unreliable texts. To be sure, Morison, after a careful examination of both manuscript and printed texts, delivers a devastating blow against Vespucci by demonstrating that his display of navigational erudition is mere pretense, impressive only to a historian who knows nothing about navigation. That much would seem to be proven. Nevertheless, doubts remain about the relation of the various published versions and manuscript copies to the lost originals. That the prints were tampered with to some extent is evident from the discrepancies among the various editions; that they were tampered with to a very grave extent by whoever prepared them for the press is the conviction of a number of able scholars, though others see no just cause for such doubts. To the outside critic, it would seem clear that some of the nonsense in the texts could not have originated with Vespucci: his genuine American experiences would have enabled him to lie more plausibly, whereas a Florentine landlubber forger would have been likely to perpetrate the stupidities; the clever lies may well be Vespucci’s, but the more ignorant ones can hardly be his. Only a careful philological and stylistic examination on the basis of reliable texts will bring clearer light to the problem.

For present purposes all this is of less importance than another matter of grave doubt, a matter of origins that has hardly been raised in recent years, even though it was a few times in the past, only to be buried again or dismissed with a few curt words. Just as with the questioned authenticity of the Vespucci letters, so here in the matter of origins, the historical and geographical approaches are not quite adequate, and the literary-philological approaches have not been adequately employed. Then there is also the “either-orish” tendency of mankind which, in the one case, insists that the Vespucci letters must be genuine or must be forgeries, and cannot conceive of a third possibility. In the other instance, which we are about to examine, there is this same “either-orishness,” and there is also another factor that has been left out of consideration, namely the specifically literary factor involved. What a literary scholar can perhaps contribute to a discussion that hitherto has been mainly in the hands of the historians and geographers is some wider perspectives and closer understanding of the very central matter of etymologies and of the way the Renaissance humanists traditionally manipulated them. Since the founding of the more scientific comparative philology, some hundred and fifty years ago, the favorite humanist game of etymologies has (justly) fallen into deep disrepute and has been (often unjustly) dismissed as fantastic nonsense, to the extent that one tends to forget that it did exist as a serious (though also playful) scholarly pursuit during the Renaissance and that it did leave its indelible mark
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on the history of that time and thus on the history of the New World. Modern philologists often mention with amusement such folk etymologies as Rotten Row for route de roi or dash hound for Dachshund. The absurdity of these has not prevented them from leaving their very real stamp on language and history; and the same is true of the learned, the humanistic etymologies of the past that have been more indebted to sound than to sense.

The external facts are well known. In 1506 the young humanist poet Matthias Ringmann (Philesius) translated Vespucci’s “New World” letter into German and wrote a Latin poem in tribute to its author and his discovery of a land unknown to Ptolemy. In late April of the following year he and his associates in Saint-Dié, particularly the artist and cartographer Martin Waldseemüller (Ilacomilus) issued the Cosmographiae introductio, dedicated to Emperor Maximilian. It contained a revised version of Ringmann’s poem, this time mentioning Vespucci by the Latin form of his baptismal name (in the genitive: “Americi”), and also a Latin translation of the “Four Voyages.” The famous passage occurs in Chapter 9 of the Cosmographia proper. In the recent literature on the subject, I have not found a truly accurate and complete translation of this crucial onomastic passage. There is even a tendency to abridge it to the bare “facts,” and omit the rest as so much vexatious literary flourish. The Greek pun has only been half seen and thus entirely missed—this a manifest triviality, until its connotative implications for the whole text are understood. Here then is the crucial statement in plain translation, followed by a brief explanation of its connotative implications:

Now truly these parts [Europe, Africa, Asia] have been more widely explored, and another, fourth part has been discovered by Americus Vespuitus (as will be heard in what follows), and I do not see why anyone should rightly forbid naming it Amerige, land ofAmericus as it were, after its discoverer Americus, a man of acute genius, or America, inasmuch as both Europe and Asia have received their names from women. Its position and the customs of its people may be clearly learned from the twice two voyages of Americus that follow.¹⁵

At first sight, the intermediate onomastic form, Amerige, leading to the final form, America, appears to be mere word play between the Italian form Amerigo and the Greek γῆ, a play that had to be explained in the very next words. But the very next words are “quasi Americi terram,” (the land of Americus so to speak, as it were). This means that a fiction looms on the horizon, and we are being warned that all this is not to be taken with unsmiling gravity. But is the Greek pun confined to the last syllable or does it extend over the whole word? If so, we have a true piece of humanistic ingenuity. A humanist acquainted with the inflectional variants of ἀμέργος, ἀμέρδω (not to mention ἀμάραντος) combined
with γῆ, might by quick association arrive at such meanings as “clear, pure, bright, dazzling land,” or “ever-young, ever-fair land,” and thence by easy association to “new world” and “golden continent.” No purist Hellenist would of course tolerate such poetic freewheeling with the sacred Greek language, but a high-spirited young humanist such as Ringmann would be delighted to do so. And he goes right on to have a bit of feminine fun at the expense of old Europe and Asia in alluding to their flightier youth. It is amusing to observe how the serious-minded historians and geographers took pains in their translations and explanations to eradicate all the humanist humor, as though it were a bit indecent on the solemn occasion of naming a continent—forgetting the divine indecency that accompanied the naming of Europe. To fail to observe the Greek pun means missing the significant overtones of the passage and thus the author’s intent. Here we have the pretty broad hint that, however much these young men revered Amerigo and were taken in by his claims, they were under no illusion that the continent was really being named after him. They were simply delighted at the splendid pun, which, on closer scrutiny, turns out to be a triple word play in that the one etymological coincidence they concocted pointed to another one, namely that the name of the discoverer corresponds so closely to the most prevalent continuity of place names along the newly explored continental shore.

In modern studies the phenomena have been misrepresented, as though there were only an isolated Indian place name or two in Central or South America that was analogous in sound to America. As a matter of fact, the name occurs in many variants as a series of aboriginal place names along great stretches of the coasts of Brazil, the Guianas, and Venezuela—precisely that part of the continental coast that was first extensively explored. It also occurs in other parts of northern South America. Among the dozens of variants that could be mentioned are such striking ones as Amaracao, Maraca, Marica, Maracaibo, Marahuaca. On Juan de la Cosa’s map (ca. 1500-05) the name “El Macareo” occurs just north of the estuary of the Amazon. The great island in the estuary is still known as Marajo; a smaller one to the north is Maraca. Hans Staden mentions an Indian tribe named Markaya and has several other variants as designations of things and people. In the treaty of 27 March 1528, the eastern limit of the Welser territory is designated as Cape Maracapana, and later Sir Walter Raleigh in his Guiana explorations recorded such place names as Emeria and Amaricocapana. There is a tribe of Amarizanos Indians in eastern Colombia near Brazil; and the ancient Incas honored the Aymaras as their ancestral tribe. Thus it is clear that the place name, in numerous variants, had continental spread from aboriginal times, and some such form as “Amaraca” is no doubt a truly appropriate name, for the southern continent at any rate.

The error we must avoid is to consider the indigenous and the Ves-
puccian origins as mutually exclusive. The course of events in the naming of the new continent may have been somewhat like this: since the name was so common along the coast line first explored during the late 1490’s and early 1500’s, it may have been in current use among the returning sailors and navigators; information about it may have come to Ringmann and Waldseemüller at about the same time that the Vespuccian reports reached them, together with new, more accurate cartographic information. They would then only have been indulging in the humanistic sport of etymology by accidental similarity (nomen est omen) when they enthusiastically linked the place names to Vespucci’s baptismal name. A learned pun was the humanists’ greatest delight, and it was their special triumph when they made it a triple pun. What should long since have alerted the reader is the light playful tone of this famous onomastic passage.

With this as background, it is easier to explain why the proposal to name the new continent “America” was so readily accepted by so many and contested so ineffectively by so few. If it had burst on the world as a total novelty without precedent, the reception would probably have been quite different. Symptomatic of the lack of true philological and literary consideration of the whole matter is the fact that no one seems to have wondered why it was that Amerigo Vespucci’s baptismal name and not his family name was proposed, whereas in the case of Christopher Columbus the opposite is true. Aesthetics and analogy were decisive: America was just right, Columbia might have done, but Vespuccia or Christophoria would have been sad absurdities. In the end it is the poetic principle that is determining, and the influence of the Florentine’s name (descended from the royal Gothic “Amalrich”) helped remove the one bit of awkwardness from the native “Amaraca” or “Amarica” and achieve the present A E I vocalic modulation of “America” in a perfect union of Old World Gothic and New World primordial.

Omitting so much else of interest about the sixteenth-century impact of America on the German lands and the reciprocal impact of the Germans on the European image of America, in the fields of botany, medicine, mining engineering (to mention only the most obvious), let us turn in conclusion to one area where the Germans held preeminence throughout the Renaissance, namely, to the illustrated book that coordinated word and picture to tell Europe what America and things American were actually like. From the earliest, sometimes crude, sometimes remarkably fine woodcuts depicting every kind of Americana (as for instance Hans Burgkmair’s elegant depiction of Brazilian Indians in the “Triumph of Maximilian,” begun 1 April 1516), the course of development continues to the folio series of the Great Voyages of the de Bry family that began to appear at Frankfort in 1590. If all the German illustrations were somehow to disappear from the corpus of early Americana, we should be left with a desperately scanty and impov-
erished image of the primordial New World. Most of the original drawings of John White depicting Indian life in Virginia, and one of the drawings of Jacques Le Moyne depicting Indian life in Florida, have indeed been preserved, but in their own time these came to the eyes of only a few people and would have had little influence if Theodor de Bry had not taken them from London to Frankfort, engraved them on copper (often in greatly modified composition), and distributed the prints world-wide in the first two parts of his collection of voyages. After the sixth part the project was continued by his widow and sons, especially by the talented Johann Theodor de Bry. When the American series, the so-called Great Voyages, was completed in 1634 by the latter’s son-in-law, Matthias Merian, it had reached 13 parts in Latin, 14 in German, and therewith early American iconography was basically established. Many of the illustrations were copied and recopied in succeeding series through the eighteenth century, and hardly one illustrated volume of our century dealing with Renaissance America fails to reproduce at least a few of them.

What has occasionally though not generally been observed is that these illustrations of de Bry and Merian also contributed centrally to developing the Christian and humanist poetic image of the Noble Savage, unfolding as they did a picture of primordial life that (despite some brutal undertones) could sustain the European in his dream of a Golden Age still extant in America. The earlier Hans Staden illustrations had no such intent and effect. Even though the White and Le Moyne illustrations were also ethnologically fairly correct, often reliable down to small details, the Indians in them have assumed the anatomy and pose of classical and Renaissance representations of gods and heroes, this even more in the engravings than in the original drawings. The dream of the Golden Age colored the artist’s vision of America. There was enough truth about it to make it probable: members of some North American tribes, at any rate, had magnificently developed bodies, of Hellenic tone and tension; certain tribes cultivated the art of oratory to such a degree that some of the Indian treaties, notably those known through the English versions of Conrad Weiser (who was also a fine German poet), are literary masterpieces; some of the Indian social and ceremonial forms were noble: all in all, at a distance, where certain other details remained unknown, the European could reasonably believe that the Golden Age with its noble primitive had been recovered. There were skeptical voices, of course, and one of the most delectable bits of mockery at Europe’s dream of a Golden Age in America was Christoph Martin Wieland’s story, “Kokkox and Kikequetzal, a Mexican Tale.”

In the perennial debate about golden-age primitivism and the relation of European vision to American reality, one crucial piece of evidence has been neglected. From the de Bry and elsewhere we have seen how the classically trained Renaissance artist transmuted the
American native into a Greek athlete or god, and the debate since then has concerned the resulting proportion of truth to fiction. What would happen if we could find an opposite instance, namely that of a young person of great artistic talent who had grown up on the frontier in the neighborhood of one of the nobler Indian tribes, only later to be suddenly confronted by one of the great masterpieces of Greek sculpture? This actually did happen, and we have a fine record of it.

The early biographer of Benjamin West, John Galt, gave an account in 1816 of what happened to the artist at the beginning of his Roman sojourn in 1760:

... the Italians concluding that, as he was an American, he must, of course, have received the education of a savage, became curious to witness the effect which the works of art in the Belvidere and Vatican would produce on him. . . .

... It was agreed that the Apollo should be first submitted to his view, because it was the most perfect work among all the ornaments of Rome; and, consequently, the best calculated to produce that effect which the company were anxious to witness. The statue then stood in a case, enclosed with doors, which could be so opened as to disclose it at once to full view. West was placed in the situation where it was seen to the most advantage, and the spectators arranged themselves on each side. When the keeper threw open the doors, the artist felt himself surprised with a sudden recollection altogether different from the gratification which he had expected; and without being aware of the force of what he said, exclaimed, "My God, how like it is to a young Mohawk warrior!" The Italians, observing his surprise, and hearing the exclamation, requested Mr. Robinson to translate to them what he said; and they were excessively mortified to find that the god of their idolatry was compared to a savage. Mr. Robinson mentioned to West their chagrin, and asked him to give some more distinct explanation, by informing him what sort of people the Mohawk Indians were. He described to him their education; their dexterity with the bow and arrow; the admirable elasticity of their limbs; and how much their active life expands the chest, while the quick breathing of their speed in the chase, dilates the nostrils with that apparent consciousness of vigour which is so nobly depicted in the Apollo. "I have seen them often," added he, "standing in that very attitude, and pursuing, with an intense eye, the arrow which they had just discharged from the bow." This descriptive explanation did not lose by Mr. Robinson's translation. The Italians were delighted, and allowed that a better criticism had rarely been pronounced on the merits of the statue.

The varied German relations to America—scholarly, scientific, technological, artistic—continued far beyond the Renaissance to the magnificent achievement of Alexander von Humboldt, and further to our day. Worth anyone's perusal is the work of a monk of the Benedictine abbey of Seidenstetten in Lower Austria who, under the pseudonym Honorius Philoponos, issued his *Nova typis transacta navigatio* at Linz in 1621.
The text goes far beyond an account of the Benedictine missions in the New World and includes many an unexpected delight. The illustrations of American products, scenes, and personalities are also fascinating. Perhaps most unusual about the volume is an Indian song, both words and music, that accompanied a Caribbean dance. Reports by German Jesuits had started in the previous century and culminated in Šepp’s and Böhm’s account of the remarkable Indian utopia in Paraguay. On the Protestant side, the German scientists and poets who accompanied Johann Moritz of Nassau-Siegen, the governor of Dutch Brazil, produced some of the most interesting as well as influential accounts. During the seventeenth century, speculations about American origins became particularly intense.

As for the specifically literary works in the German lands concerned with the New World, there are already a few in the first decades of discovery, as we have seen, and about a dozen or so of importance during the rest of the sixteenth century, including an episode in a popular novel, a few short tales, satires, and parodies, several humanist poems, and some of the essays of Philipp Camerarius, which were also translated into French and English. In the seventeenth century the number of literary works of American relevance increases to well over 200 and in the eighteenth century to well over 1,000, and there are probably more of which I am not yet aware. The first German poem written in South America dates from 1641; there were further such poems in the 1650’s, with Pernambuco as the literary center. From North America I know of none before the 1680’s. Probably the finest Baroque novel devoted to America was Johann Bisselius’ Argonauticon Americanorum of 1647; five years later came the first successful drama, Heinrich Heinrich’s Ferdinandina; and seven years after that the Columbus epic of young Vincentius Placcius. Fascinating in its paraphrastic literary technique is the 12-page section on America in Lohenstein’s Arminius novel of 1689, with its subtle interplay of ancient and modern story about the distant lands to the West. A Connecticut governor visited a German poet in 1642, and both John Winthrop the Younger and Johann Rist wrote accounts of the meeting. The first German translation of a New England work appeared in 1662, others soon followed. At the turn of the century a German began his literary career in Newport and Boston and continued it in Leipzig; in Pennsylvania and New York there were at least three German poets of some quality whose works were in part published in Germany. After Winthrop’s correspondence with 15 or more learned Germans (one of them, John Lederer, an early explorer of western Virginia), the most important correspondence of early date was Cotton Mather’s with August Hermann Francke and Anthony William Boehm, followed by James Logan’s with Johann Albert Fabricius. Early in the eighteenth century the novels and poems about America were more
significant than the dramas, though in the last quarter the dramas had
the greatest success, with Kotzebue’s Peruvian tragedies, for instance,
sensational hits from St. Petersburg and London to New York, Philadel-
phia, and points south. Nearly every one of the great writers of the Age
of Goethe had something to say about America, in several instances in a
memorable way.

All this was in the continuation of a tradition early established and
carried on in the nineteenth century and our own. The German
successes in America were never in the field of conquest and coloniza-
tion. From the time of the Welser in Venezuela and the Fugger in Chile,
to the duke of Curland’s sovereignty over the island of Tobago, on to
the various schemes and projects of later centuries, the political results
have been ephemeral, even though certain material results have turned
out to be more permanent. By contrast, the intellectual and spiritual
reception of everything American has always been open-hearted and
open-minded, and Albrecht Dürer near the beginning can stand as a
symbol for this. Likewise in the assimilation of all things American and
their re-presentation for the benefit of the rest of Europe, the Germans
have also played a vital part. For instance, Christoph Besold’s Conjectures
on the New World of 1619 and another work of his four years later are
among the searching early analyses of the larger implications and conse-
quences of the European settlement of America. Schiller put the accent
on the intellectual and spiritual role of the Germans in his poem “The
Apportionment of the Earth.” And Goethe with his broad human per-
spective made perhaps an ultimate statement when he remarked: “The
history of human understanding is like a great fugue in which the voices
of the nations one by one come to the fore.”

NOTES

1. I consulted the facsimile edition of the Vatican Ms. (Pal. Lat. 1071) of Frederick II’s
ed. and trans. Casey A. Wood and F. Marjorie Fyfe, was published in 1943 by the Stan-
2. Wolfram von Eschenbach, Parzival, Book i (48.29), Book ii (87.20), Book xvi (806.14); Willehalm, Book vii (348.25).
3. English translations of the texts of the Greenland and Vinland voyages can con-
veniently be found in The Norse Discovery of America, ed. Rasmus B. Anderson, Nor-
roena Society (London 1906). Facsimiles, texts, and English translations of original
medieval documents are published in his The Flatey Book and Recently Discovered Vatican
Manuscripts Concerning America as Early as the Tenth Century (same publisher, place, and
date). The whole extensive literature on the Vinland problem, including the lamentable
story of the so-called Vinland map, is irrelevant to this study.
4. See most conveniently Adam of Bremen: History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen,
5. A useful survey and summary of the German participation in the voyages of
discovery of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, with extensive documenta-
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tion, is to be found in Karl H. Panhorst’s Deutschland und Amerika. Ein Rückblick auf das Zeitalter der Entdeckungen . . . (Munich 1928). See also Vol. 2 (1936) of Georg Friederici, Der Charakter der Entdeckung und Eroberung Amerikas durch die Europäer . . . (3 vols. Stuttgart 1925-36; rpt. Osnabrück 1969). Documentation for later details in this study not separately annotated can usually be found in these two works.

6. See, for example, Sigmund von Birken, Ostländischer Lorbeerhüten . . . (Nuremberg 1657) 184-186, with its verbal description of an “Ehrenseule” depicting these symbolic connotations.


8. A comprehensively documented summary of the whole matter, together with new contributions, is to be found in Karl Anton Nowotny’s “Die Gastgeschenke des Mote­cuñoma an Cortés,” Archiv für Völkervunde 2 (1947) 210-221. See also his Mexikanische Kostbarkeiten aus Kunstkammern der Renaissance . . . (Vienna 1960).


10. Philipp von Hutten’s letters were first published by Johann George Meusel in his Historisch-litterarisches Magazin (Bayreuth and Leipzig 1785) 51-117.


12. For the details of early German publication on America see Joseph Sabin, A Dictionary of Books Relating to America, From Its Discovery to the Present Time (29 vols. New York 1868-1936); Paul Ben Baginsky, German Works Relating to America, 1493-1800 (New York Public Library 1942); Philip Motley Palmer, German Works on America, 1492-1800 (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1952). All these together record far less than half of the pertinent early German material.


15. A somewhat free translation, following a facsimile of the original text, is to be found on p. 70 in Charles George Herbermann’s edition, The Cosmographiae Introductio of Martin Waldseemüller . . . , with an introduction by Joseph Fischer and Franz von Wieser, United States Catholic Historical Society, Monograph V (New York 1907).

16. The founder of the family, Theodor, a Fleming (1528-98) had in 1570 (not 1590) moved to his wife’s native city, Frankfort, and established a publishing firm that was carried on by his two sons, particularly by Johann Theodor (1561-1623) and by the latter’s son-in-law, Matthias Merian (1593-1650), who for a brief transitional period had as his partner another son-in-law, Wilhelm Fitzner from England (ca. 1600-71). Even though nearly all of the renown of Theodor de Bry comes from the work of his German period, historians insist on referring to him as a Flemish artist. And this is perfectly all right, provided one is willing to refer to Peter Paul Rubens as a German artist because he was born in Westphalia. Indeed, what is one to do about Andreas Vesalius (1514-64), who was born of a German family in Brussels and became an Italian professor of anatomy? Or about Orlandus Lassus (ca. 1532-94), who was born a Fleming, reared an Italian, returned briefly to his homeland, but at age 24 settled permanently in Munich where he became so German that he even wrote some of the German lyrics for his songs, though without giving up his fame as a composer of French and Italian songs, not to mention the Latin? Later, in turn, Georg Friedrich Händel (1685-1759) was a German composer who at 27 settled permanently in England and chose to become an English composer. The main point is not to introduce anachronistic nineteenth- and twentieth-century nationalistic prejudices into the less chauvinistically inclined earlier centuries. Regional differences there were, some of them intrinsically important in the artistic and intellectual life of the
time, and we must take care to interpret them properly, a task for which we in our century are ill prepared.

17. In his Beyträge zur Geheimen Geschichte des menschlichen Verstandes und Herzens (Leipzig 1770).
19. Two variant copies at the John Carter Brown Library.
The Vision of
America in the Writings of
Urbain Chauveton

by Benjamin Keen

Urbain Chauveton is known as the translator whose Latin and French versions of Girolamo Benzoni's *Historia del mondo nuovo* widely diffused in Europe the Black Legend about the Spanish Conquest. Scholars have generally ignored the solid learning underlying many of the notes, the critical spirit with which Chauveton approached Benzoni's text and its Spanish sources, and his effort to interpret the Spanish Conquest and the Indian in the light of Calvinist thought.

My paper attempts to derive Chauveton's vision of America from the prefaces and notes to his Latin and French versions of Benzoni's *Historia*, supplemented by the introductory chapters that Chauveton wrote for Nicolas Le Challeux's brief relation of the Huguenot effort to plant a colony in Florida—a relation which Chauveton inserted as an appendix to his translations of Benzoni.

Girolamo Benzoni was born in Milan in 1519. Leaving his Spanish-dominated native city as a youth, he sailed from Seville in 1541 for the Indies. During his 14 years in America—including the West Indies, Terra Firma, Peru, and Central America—he probably practiced his trade of silversmith and took part in many expeditions. He returned home to write a book about "the strange and rare things" he had seen in the New
World. Illustrated with the author's own artless line drawings, it was published in Venice in 1565 and reprinted there in 1572.

Numerous editions of Benzoni's *Historia*, usually based on Chauveton's Latin translation, were issued in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The first German translation, by Nicolas Hoeniger, appeared in 1579; the first Dutch edition appeared the same year. Benzoni's book secured even wider diffusion through its inclusion in the *Grands voyages*, a series of handsomely made, profusely illustrated travel accounts published by the Walloon engraver Theodor de Bry and his sons Jean Theodor and Jean Israel in Frankfort between 1590 and 1634. In this series de Bry included two editions of Benzoni's book: first Chauveton's Latin translation, issued in three parts between 1594 and 1596, and then Hoeniger's German version in 1597. Along with Las Casas' *Brevissima relación de la destrucción de las Indias*, the *Historia* is considered one of the two foundation stones of the so-called Black Legend of Spanish cruelty to the Indian.

The Franciscan chronicler André Thevet, correctly noting Benzoni's wholesale borrowings from Gómara, was the first to question the authenticity of the work. He described Benzoni's and Las Casas' works as "little tracts of falsehood used by men who would not dare to say these things for fear of losing their skins, and so pass off their impostures under the names of men who supposedly travelled in those countries in order to give weight, color, and authority to their own ridiculous fooleries."

Thevet's skepticism persisted among later critics, most of whom charged Benzoni with borrowing from other chroniclers and a strong anti-Spanish prejudice. In 1939 Augusto Fraccacreta complained that of the 380 pages of the *Historia*’s text, 117 were devoted to descriptions of Spanish cruelty. The Mexican historian Carlos Pereyra joined the chorus in 1945, affirming that "perhaps those writers who follow Thevet in asserting that Benzoni’s voyages were a literary fiction utilized by Spain’s enemies to reinforce their cause before European public opinion with the authority of an eyewitness are not very far from the truth."

But Benzoni has also received vindicatory discussion. The Chilean bibliographer and historian José Toribio Medina, who discovered one of the few known documents about Benzoni—a colonial document stating that Benzoni, "a silversmith of Milan and a vecino of Honduras," had been pronounced a Lutheran heretic and reconciled by the Mexican Inquisition in 1555—wrote that he had left an account of "interesting historical incidents and very curious details about the lives and adventures of the Conquerors of the New World, whom he knew intimately, giving a picture of them and their treatment of the Indians that is severe yet basically truthful." Rómulo Carbia, a passionate defender of Spain’s work in America, compared Benzoni's balanced view of the Spanish
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Conquest favorably with that of Las Casas. Another champion of Spain increasingly favored Benzoni, concluding that Benzoni contains valuable data for Peruvian ethnology and the history of the conquest of Peru. Modern scholarship, while recognizing the historical questions raised by the Historia, confirms Chauveton’s judgment in selecting Benzoni’s work for his indictment of Spanish colonialism.

Chauveton, himself a pamphleteer of the first order, must have recognized its popular qualities: its simple, almost naive, style; its moving descriptions of Spanish cruelty to the Indians; the numerous anecdotal details; and the general effect of candor and compassion. In the “Praefatio” of the 1578 edition, however, he stresses its superiority to Spanish chronicles and its greater impartiality. The preface opens with a conventional Renaissance theme: disillusionment with European civilization. Weary of Europe’s wars and crimes, he has flown in spirit to the new India, called there by reports of its wealth, its temperate skies, the rude and antique simplicity of its people, and above all by the hope of relief from Europe’s oppressive strife and corruption. Even as he contemplates that marvelous New World, however, its aspect darkens. He beholds natives driven from their homes, the enslavement of barbarian peoples whose very names are unknown to their conquerors. The barbarians wage atrocious wars against the Europeans, bringing on fresh calamities.

Wishing to learn the causes of these tragic events, Chauveton has turned to the Spanish histories of the Conquest, but finds there only tales of famous Spanish victories that would make one believe that every Spanish commander was another Scipio Africanus or Alexander the Great. The Spanish sources say little about the Spanish atrocities and treat the Indians’ calamities with the utmost scorn.

Why, asks Chauveton, could not the Spaniards have made a peaceful entrance into those lands? Why should the Indians, who were free from the causes of Europe’s fearful struggles—ambition and greed—have chosen war instead of peace with men who could be expected to bring them both a purer faith and many useful implements, even writing, an art rare among barbarians? At first Chauveton attributed these wars to the wild, untamable nature of the Indians. Then a copy of Benzoni’s book fell into his hands. Comparing Benzoni’s book with the Spanish histories, he finds these differences: Benzoni plainly sets forth the causes of the Indian wars, concerning which the Spanish writers are silent; he does not report what he has heard from others (a jibe at Gómara), but tells what he himself has seen and experienced; and he proves his impartiality by exposing Indian as well as Spanish vices.

Chauveton praises Benzoni’s admirable brevity, but feels a need to fill gaps in Benzoni’s information with his own notes. For the convenience of readers Chauveton divides Benzoni’s continuous text into chapters, followed by his own “Discours” or notes.
Chauveton’s notes and prefaces are our principal sources for his views of the Spanish Conquest and the Indian. They reveal that he was familiar with most of the published works dealing with America. His sources include the writings of Oviedo, Gómez, Peter Martyr, Cabeza de Vaca, Cieza de León, the Anonymous Conqueror, Agustín de Zárate, Nuño de Guzmán, Hernando de Alarcón, Nicolás Monardes, Jacques Cartier, and Jean de Léry. Chauveton’s use of the relations of the Anonymous Conqueror, Guzmán, and Alarcón, then available only in the third volume (Venice 1556) of Giovanni Battista Ramusio’s compilation *Delle navigationi et viaggi*, makes clear that he had access to that treasure-house of travel accounts and chronicles.

Chauveton uses annotation for several purposes. Aware of Benzon’s large borrowings from Gómez and other Spanish sources, he subjects Benzon’s text to close scrutiny, calling attention to discrepancies. The famous supposed oath on the sacramental host by which Pizarro and Almagro sealed their compact, assigned by Benzon to Panama before the third expedition to Peru, Chauveton notes, was actually made (according to Gómez) in Cuzco in 1535. Benzon doubts the Spanish story that Atahualpa was put to death because the false Indian interpreter Felipillo had accused him of planning to attack the Spaniards, for he heard it said that Pizarro intended to kill Atahualpa from the time he was made prisoner. In the corresponding note, Chauveton gives Gómez’s version that Felipillo made the charge against Atahualpa because he wished to marry one of his wives, but adds: “If we may believe Benzon, the whole story was trumped up by the Spaniards to shift the responsibility for Atahualpa’s death from themselves on to someone else.”

Many notes elaborate points or topics which Benzon has treated too sketchily or which have a special interest for Chauveton, such as the economic resources of the Spanish colonies. His notes deal at length with the history of exploration, diplomatic history, Spain’s Indian policy, and Indian culture.

Other notes attempting to compare and evaluate Spanish chroniclers of America may properly be called historiographic. Thus, Chauveton compares Gómez’s and Oviedo’s handling of the story of the unknown pilot who allegedly revealed to Columbus the existence of new lands to the west:

Oviedo, the Emperor Charles’ chronicler, also tells this fine tale, but he gives it as hearsay and does not confirm it as does the cleric Gómez, who wrote after him. Instead, Oviedo modestly offers his opinion in these words: “None can say whether this happened or not; for my part, I hold it to be false.” Gómez, on the other hand, tells this story as confidently as if he had been there, although he cannot give the pilot’s name, nationality, or
any other important circumstance, as if the affair had taken place two thousand years ago. (Histoire 39-40)

Chauveton distrusts Gómara because the greater part of his Historia general de las Indias was based on hearsay, and because he was excessively prejudiced against the Indians. By contrast, he regards Oviedo—whose indictments of Spanish cruelty to the Indians he cites with relish—as one of the best, least prejudiced Spanish historians (Histoire 177, 181, 326).

Chauveton thus makes a serious effort to discover and correct Benzoni's errors, enhancing the value of the text by adding notes which reflect a careful reading of Benzoni's sources. Chauveton's historiographic comments suggest his own partialities, but also reveal a shrewd common sense and a grasp of the elementary rules of historical evidence.

Chauveton's background as a Huguenot militant and pastor gives his writings a strong religious stamp. Suffused with Calvinist doctrine, they breathe a combative, self-righteous air. But they also had a practical political purpose. Chauveton's editions of Benzoni in 1578-79 appear to have been specifically designed to fan French anti-Spanish sentiment, and thus revive French interest in colonial expansion at a time when the dream of Coligny—the dream of uniting Frenchmen, Huguenots and Catholics, in a patriotic war against Spain—seemed likely to become a reality. They appeared at a turning point in the French religious wars. The St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre of 1572 shocked many moderate Catholics (Politiques), driving them into alliance with the Huguenots. The balance of political and military power shifted against the fanatically Catholic Henry III and the Queen Mother, Catherine de' Medici; in 1576 they decided that the Huguenots could not be beaten. The resulting Treaty of Monsieur conceded the Huguenots nearly complete religious liberty. Despite intermittent renewals of fighting, despite immense pressure on Henry from the reactionary duke of Guise and his Catholic League, Henry and Catherine seriously tried between 1576 and 1584 to achieve a unity based on religious toleration, loyalty to the crown, and a consistent anti-Spanish policy. In response, the Huguenots gave up the right to rebel against a king who broke his contractual obligations to his subjects, a right which they had claimed after St. Bartholomew's Day, and again professed complete obedience to the crown. 14

The new political climate inspired a series of French anti-Spanish projects in Europe and America. While the king's brother, the duke of Alençon, intervened in the Netherlands in behalf of the rebels there, Henry III and Catherine de' Medici revived dreams of a French colonial
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empire. In 1578 Henry III, ignoring Spanish claims to a monopoly over the New World, granted commissions to the marquis de la Roche to continue the work of Cartier and Roberval in Canada. The following year Catherine sent her cousin and favorite Philip Strozzi on a secret voyage of reconnaissance to the coasts of Brazil. This was the first stage of an ambitious plan which called for an expedition to seize the Azores, the resting stations of the Spanish treasure fleets on the voyages from America, to be followed by an expedition against Brazil.15

The colonial theme in Chauveton’s writings links him most closely to French political life in the period 1576-84. An important element in the Huguenot-Politique strategy for reuniting France, the colonial question fused the interests of diverse groups, laying the basis for a broad anti-Spanish coalition.16 It appealed to the Norman and Breton commercial bourgeoisie, as eager to exploit American fisheries, furs, and dye woods as they were to seize Spanish treasure ships17; to the crown it promised increased revenue and power; to political leaders it suggested a safety valve for the discontents produced by many years of civil war.

I find little evidence of an ardent interest in converting the Indians in the Huguenot pastor Chauveton. The missionary motive appears at best secondary, used in a clearly opportunistic manner to reproach the Spaniards for their missionary failure. Much more substantial are Chauveton’s notes on the economic resources of the Spanish colonies. A single note on the pearl fisheries is 13 pages long. A four-page note on the sugar industry of Hispaniola discusses capital, slave labor requirements, and technical processes. Other notes deal with such topics as cattle raising, vines, olives, wheat, maize, and cassava.18

Like other Huguenot writers on colonial themes in this period,19 Chauveton deplored the failure of French monarchs to pursue colonial expansion aggressively. He cites an unnamed French captain who declared that the Portuguese could be grateful to the French king. Had he given the least sign of approval to the French merchants who wished to trade with Brazil, they could have made more progress in conquering Brazil in five years than the Portuguese in 70.

In his Brief discours, Chauveton champions “the traditional French theses of freedom of the seas and France’s right to possess colonies.”20 The Brief discours introduces Nicolas Le Challeux’s account of the Huguenot effort to plant a colony in Florida and its destruction in 1565 by a Spanish expedition under Menéndez de Avilés.21 Chauveton justifies his addition of this petite histoire to Benzoni’s work by noting that it deals with almost the same subject; moreover, it will effectively silence the Spaniards, tearing off “the fine mask of zeal and religion with which they have covered all their barbarous acts in the Indies.” When reproached for their actions, Chauveton says, the Spaniards replied, “What would you have us do? It was a matter of choosing between that
and letting ourselves be eaten by savages whose only resemblance to men was their facial appearance." What pretext, asks Chauveton, can the Spaniards offer for their massacre of French settlers in Florida? They are dealing not with cannibals who roasted Spaniards alive, but with Frenchmen, "formerly reputed to be one of the most humane nations on earth" (the "formerly" evokes memories of St. Bartholomew's Day). The French have always treated their defeated Spanish foes humanely. In the interests of fairness, however, Chauveton allows an imaginary Spanish spokesman to defend his countrymen’s conduct.

The French (begins the Spanish argument) are usurpers in Florida and all those parts of the Indies where they have planted the arms of France. It belongs to us: first, we were the first to discover and occupy it; second, His Holiness the Pope made a perpetual and irrevocable donation of it to the Catholic sovereigns and their successors, in proof whereof we have bulls, signed and sealed; and, third, we had the trouble of settling and pacifying that land after we had conquered it at the expense of our blood.

Moreover (continues the Spanish argument), we know very well what the French corsairs have done to us, how they daily affront us, prowling as far as Hispaniola, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and even to the coasts of the Indies. After having toiled to get gold out of our Peruvian mines, we dream of returning to our homeland to enjoy the fruits of our labor, but must settle accounts on the way with those accursed corsairs, who need only go out to sea and quietly wait for us. Without a twinge of conscience they take all the gold and silver in our ships, showing no more respect for our Catholic king, for whom that treasure is bound, than if he were a scarecrow.

Besides, our people who performed those executions in Florida knew that the majority of the Frenchmen who had come there were Lutherans and Huguenots who had come to set up their conventicles and thumb their noses at all the kings and princes of the earth, as did some others 22 or 23 years ago on the coast of Brazil. Would you not think us very stupid if we allowed heresies to swarm in the lands where we have planted the Christian faith with pike and halberd? Why, do you suppose, does our king bear the title "Catholic"?

The Castilians, as good Catholics as can be found, will not leave a single Huguenot in Florida, or in that New France of yours, if they can. They will certainly receive absolution from His Holiness, who would gladly see every Huguenot in the world exterminated, for they trouble his repose, and to the great cares and griefs that drive him out of his mind.

Chauveton, having not unfairly stated the Spanish case, proceeds to answer it, point by point.

The papal donation of the New World, he argues, gave no valid
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title, for the pope could not give away what was not his to give; the Indians were the true owners of America. Besides, assuming that the papal donation was Spain’s best title to America, that title lapsed if the condition attached to the grant were not fulfilled. Now, the papal donation stipulated that the Spanish king must cause the gospel to be preached to the Indians and reduce them to obedience to Christ. But one would vainly search the Indies for an Indian who truly knew Christ or a Spaniard who had properly announced His name.

Chauveton also challenges the Spanish claim based on discovery and occupation. The discoverers of America were not Spaniards but Italians—Columbus, Amerigo Vespucci, John Cabot, Giovanni Verrazano. Chauveton conceded that vacant lands belonged to the firstcomer who occupied them. But this was not the case with America. What natural or international law, asked Chauveton, allowed the Spaniards to exterminate or reduce to servitude the native inhabitants of a country so that they might become its owners?

One last Spanish title remains: the right of conquest. But Chauveton reminds the Spaniards that if a war is unjust the violence and conquest that accompany it are equally unjust. To be sure, the Spaniards claim the Indians were brute beasts without rights. Yet these Indians, who have never studied dialectic or philosophy, proved in dispute with the Spaniards that they possessed very quick minds, more than once putting to rout the missionaries who dared to dispute with them.

Since the Spaniards have no other title to the Indies than the right of conquest and occupation, asked Chauveton, why have they attacked the French in Florida so barbarously? The French have as much right as the Spaniards to settle Florida and other parts of the continent which the Spaniards have not effectively occupied. (If the Indies belonged to the Indians, as Chauveton argued, the French had as little right to settle there as the Spaniards, but the inconsistency does not trouble him).

The Indians recede into the distant background; their unhappy fate and their rights become weapons against Spain in defense of the French title to a place in the colonial sun. Although Chauveton defends the rights of Huguenots as Christians to fair treatment, he is careful not to make the Florida affair a sectarian issue; he seeks to fuse Huguenot and national interests by appealing to French patriotism.

Gilbert Chinard sees in the *Brief discours* an anticipation of the trenchant, ironic pamphleteering style of Pascal and Voltaire:

Chauveton is one of those rare Protestant writers who know how to restrain and govern their writing. We cannot ask him to have taste and measure, negative qualities, so to speak, which cannot stand the heat of battle. However violent his pleasantry, they are short, they have quality and clarity. Chauveton knows how to dramatize his argument, to vary it with dialogues, to make his opponents mount the stage and condemn themselves;
in a word, to inject life and passion into his indictment. There is no monotony or pomposity, but a kind of eloquent and ironic preaching. . . . These qualities make the *Brief Discours* little less than a small masterpiece of pamphleteering style.24

Since Chauveton’s writings are a *machine de guerre* against Spain, he makes the Spanish conquerors the principal actors in the New World drama; the Indians are the assisting cast, clouds of witness to Spanish cruelty and perfidy. Alternately portrayed as “poor savages” and noble savages, the Indians remain shadowy creatures. One suspects that despite his sympathy for the Indians, Chauveton is not greatly concerned about their fate; his denunciations attain an eloquent ring and passion only when he condemns the Spanish massacre of his own countrymen in Florida.

Chauveton saw a providential meaning in the discovery and progressive revelation of America to Europe. God wished to show Europeans the variety and grandeur of His terrestrial riches in a new setting, because they had become too familiar with their own. He also wished to show Europeans, in the persons of the American savages, what a poor thing was corrupt human nature without God: “What they are, so were we when deprived of the light of God: poor, blind, naked idolaters, lacking all virtue and filled with all the vices.” Chauveton’s categorical assertion of Indian depravity and inferiority suggests the Spanish anti-Indian school of Sepúlveda, Oviedo, and Gómara; it also suggests an inability, despite his access to the descriptions of the Aztec splendor in Cortés’ Second Letter and the *Decades* of Peter Martyr, to recognize the vast cultural differences among Indian groups. In this respect Chauveton falls far short of the achievement of his Spanish contemporary, José de Acosta, who classified Indian societies according to their cultural level.25

His discussion of the problem of Indian origins, however—a problem which preoccupied writers on America—reveals a probing mind influenced by the new rationalist and critical currents of the late sixteenth century. In this, Chauveton anticipated Acosta.

Chauveton conjectured that most of the Indians had come to the New World over a land bridge between Asia and America; if the continents were separated, they were divided by a very narrow strait that could easily be navigated. He based his theory on two main grounds: proximity and the great similarity of manners and customs, both in government and religion, between Indians and Asiatics. Chauveton further conjectured that those portions of America toward the Northwest—including Cibola, Quivira, New Spain, and Florida—had been peopled by Tartars coming from eastern Asia; while those regions which faced the North—such as Canada, Newfoundland, and Labrador—had
been peopled by men from those northern lands separated from the American continent only by the narrow strait which the English had recently discovered. 26

Chauveton’s judgments on the Indian—judgments influenced by Calvinist doctrine, the contradictory reports of travelers and chroniclers, and the requirements of the propaganda struggle against Spain—are understandably inconsistent. Calvinist dogma and travelers’ accounts of Indian cannibalism and other “crimes against nature” dictated an accent on Indian depravity and savagery. Other, more favorable travelers’ reports and the need to heap coals of fire on Spanish heads dictated an emphasis on Indian innocence, simplicity, peacefulness, and intelligence. Chauveton’s tendency to regard the Indians as an undifferentiated mass of “poor Savages” only compounds the confusion.

Chauveton strongly dissented, however, from Gómara’s suggestion that the servitude and sufferings of the Indians were divine punishment for their sins, with the Spaniards acting as instruments of God’s vengeance. Chauveton’s argument blends relativist and primitivist ideas with the Calvinist doctrine of original sin and corrupt human nature. The Indians no more deserve God’s special wrath than did the pagan ancestors of present European Christians. Their nudity and lack of shame merely prove their innocence and simplicity. Indians worship the Devil, true, but so do all others who prostrate themselves before images. They practice human sacrifice, but so did the ancient Germans and Franks. The Indian’s only curse, then, is original sin and the sins which men have added to it (Histoire, “Preface”).

Indian religion strongly interested Chauveton; one of his notes on the subject runs to 16 pages. For Chauveton, as for many Spanish mendicant chroniclers, America before the Conquest was a true realm of Satan. But Spanish cruelties only made the name of Christ hateful to the Indians and strengthened Satan’s hold over them (Histoire, “Preface”). Whatever names the Indians gave their gods, they were but multiple forms of Satan, who borrowed God’s name and made the poor Indians fear him. Satan had gradually stifled the little natural reason that the Indians retained, depriving them of their sense of right and wrong, wickedly suggesting to them all manner of bestial appetites. The devil also tried to counterfeit many of the Christian ceremonies: an example was the offering of bread made to their idols by the Indians of Hispaniola in imitation of the bread offering asked of his people by God in Exodus (Histoire, 293-294, 208-309).

Chauveton found vestiges of natural reason in the Indian way of life. The Indians abstained from marriage within certain degrees of kinship, not because they had laws against such unions, but “from a natural instinct, and because they hold it for certain that one who cohabits with his mother, sister, or daughter must end badly, either because experi-
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ence has so taught them, or for some other reason." Equally remarkable, Chauveton found:

although Satan has marvelously led astray the natures and customs of these savage peoples, he has not been able to efface from their minds that natural law which declares that men and women must not mate together promiscuously, in the manner of brute beasts, but that such unions must be sanctioned by marriage (despite the abuse of polygamy); or that other law which forbids adultery, punishable by death among most of the Indian peoples. (Histoire, 323)

Chauveton found much to praise in Indian society, with its good order, cooperative spirit, and indifference to material wealth. The primitivist strain in Chauveton's thought undoubtedly reflected humanist memories of an antique Golden Age, but it also reveals the strong impression made upon him by his reading of Jean de Léry's account of his stay in Brazil, which Chauveton cites frequently and copiously. 27

Aside from his important contribution to the problem of Indian origins, Chauveton's discussion about the Indian marks no advance over the prevailing low level of European thought on the subject. In humanistic and intellectual quality it ranks far below the consistently secular, rationalist approach of his great contemporary, Michel de Montaigne. Montaigne saw the Indians as products and parts of nature. Their culture and their customs, good or bad, obey the laws of their natural environment, for "the air, the climate, and the soil where we are born" determine "not only the complexion, the stature, the constitution and countenance, but also the faculties of the soul." 28 Imprisoned in his Calvinist framework, Chauveton is incapable of reaching these intellectual heights.

NOTES

1. Urbain Chauveton was born about 1540 in the town of La Châtre, in the province of Berry, France, into one of the first Huguenot families of the region. His father destined Urbain for a medical career and sent him to Paris to study; later, "placing piety above all else," he removed his son from the French capital and sent him (1559) to enroll in the new Academy or University of Geneva. There he studied under Theodore Beza and Jean Tagaut. After completing his studies he held pastoral posts in and near Geneva, but in 1571 was deposed as a result of the support he gave a relative in a squabble over the interest rates of Geneva's public bank. In 1575 he appears as proofreader in the printing shop of Henri Estienne. In 1578 he published his Latin edition of Benzoni's Historia del mondo nuovo, and was also admitted to membership in the city's bourgeoisie without payment of fee—an exemption usually granted only for special services in teaching or preaching. In 1579, while working on the notes to his French translation of Benzoni, Chauveton was called as pastor to the important town of Issoudun. He was later pastor at Bergerac for some years, but was dismissed along with a colleague, Paul Baduel. The affair evidently did not involve serious doctrinal deviations, for the two men were
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promptly given new churches, Chauveton going to the town of Limeuil, where he still lived ca. 1614. My account of Chauveton is based principally on scattered information in


The two translations are Novae Novi orbis historiae, id est, rerum ab Hispanis in India Occidentali hactenus gestarum, & acerto illorum in eas gentes dominatris, libri tres, Vrbani Calvetonis opera industriaque ex italicis Hieronymi Benzonis Mediolanensis, qui eas terras xiii annorum peregrinatione obijt, commentarjjs descripti, latini facti, ac perpetuis notis, argumentis & locupleti memorabilium rerum accessione, illustrati. His ab eodem adiuncta est, De Gallorum in Floridam expeditione, & insigni Hispanorum in eos saevitiae exemplo, brevivs historia (Geneva 1578) (hereafter cited as Historiae); and Histoire nouvelle du Nouveau Monde, contenant en somme ce que les Hespagnols ont fait jusqu’a present aux Indes occidentales, & le rude traitement qu’ils font à ces povres peuples-la: . . . enrichie de plusieurs discours & choses dignes de memoire. Par M. Urbain Chauveton. Ensemble, une petite histoire d’un massacre commis par les Hespagnols sur quelques Français en la Florida. Avec un indice des choses les plus remarquables (Geneva 1579) (hereafter cited as Histoire).

2. For trial lists of editions of Benzoni’s work, see Carlos Radicati di Primeglio’s introduction, “Azarosa vida y obra de Jerónimo Benzoni,” to La Historia del mundo nuevo de M. Jerónimo Benzoni Milanes (Lima 1967) p. xxxiv; and Leon Croizat’s “Estudio preliminar” to M. Girolamo Benzoni, La Historia del mundo nuevo, translation and notes by Marisa Vannini de Gerulewicz (Caracas 1967) 7-3.


5. Augusto Fraccarreta, Alcune osservazioni su l’Historia del mondo nuovo di Girolamo Benzoni (Rome 1939), discussed by Alfredo Vig in his “Prefazione” to La Historia del mondo nuovo di Girolamo Benzoni Milanese (Milan 1965).


8. Carbia (n. 3 above) 54.


10. Since 1960 editions of Benzoni’s book have multiplied. In the 1962 facsimile of the 1572 edition (Graz 1962), Ferdinand Anders declared in the preface that the book, with all its defects, constituted an important link in the chain of American historiography because it contained many facts not to be found elsewhere (pp. xii-xiii). Three years later the first Italian edition since 1572 appeared, with a thoughtful preface by Alfredo Vig, whose discussion of Benzoni’s Milanese background shed new light on the political and economic causes of his anti-Spanish attitudes; Vig also called attention to the controversial nature of the testimony on which some of the charges of Benzoni’s anachronisms and errors were based (n. 5 above, pp. xvi ff). In 1967 the Academia Nacional de la Historia de Venezuela published the first complete Spanish version of Benzoni’s work (n. 2 above). In the “Estudio preliminar,” Leon Croizat concludes that as a reporter of what he himself had seen and done, Benzoni is worthy of faith. “I have been unable to find significant errors in the dates that he assigns for his adventures between 1541 and 1558, and there is no reason to doubt that the great majority of the events he relates actually happened.” Croizat admits that Benzoni was not a first-rate historian, but argues that his work raised a whole series of historical problems that await solution (pp. lxxviii-lxxxviii). Also, in 1967, the University of San Marcos in Lima published a Spanish translation of Book III of Benzoni’s Historia by Carlos Radicati di Primeglio, whose introduction made a major contribution to Benzoni’s rehabilitation (n. 2 above), pp. v-vi, xxxii.
11. There are substantial differences between the annotation of the Latin and French editions. The notes to the Latin edition as a rule are short and are distributed quite evenly throughout the book. The notes to the French edition, on the other hand, tend to be much longer, and there is a heavy concentration of notes in the first book, only three in the second, and none in the third. Chauveton's call to the pastorate at Issoudun (1579) explains this disparity.

12. Historiae 277. For the history of the legend surrounding this oath—a legend to whose making Gómara, Benzoni, Chauveton, and others contributed—see Marcel E. Bataillon, Le lien religieux des conquérants du Pérou (London 1956).


14. The principal architect of the new Huguenot policy was Philippe du Plessis-Mornay, chief adviser to Henry of Navarre. "Our sole aim," he declared to Henry III's minister Villéry, "is to show to His Majesty that to be a good Huguenot and a good subject at the same time are not incompatible things." Raoul Patry, Philippe du Plessis-Mornay, Un Huguenot Homme d'État (1549-1623) (Paris 1933) 85. On the development of a "Protestant Patriotism" in this period, see the interesting work of Myriam Yardeni, La conscience nationale en France pendant les guerres de religion, 1559-1598 (Paris 1971), especially Chapters v-vi.


16. Mornay, the Huguenot "pope," was the principal architect of his party's foreign program as he was of its domestic policy. In his Discours au Roy Henry III sur les moyens de diminuer l'Espagnol (1584), he developed a program of struggle against Spain with "arguments both military and political, European and colonial, economic and commercial." The Discours specifically discussed the possibility of "an attack against the West Indies and Peru." Patry (n. 14 above) 83.

17. On French interest in Canadian fish and furs, see Lanctôt (n. 15 above) 77 ff; on the French dye wood trade with Brazil and efforts to colonize there, see Ch.-A. Julien, Les voyages de découverte et les premiers établissements (XVe-XVIe siècles) (Paris 1948) 177-221. The rivalry of the French ports with Spain and Portugal, and the failure of the Valois kings to give adequate support to French commercial and colonial interests, undoubtedly contributed to the rapid growth of the Reformed religion in regions like Normandy. By 1560, such towns as Dieppe, Rouen, Caen, and Saint-Lo "could count their Protestants by the thousands, including lawyers, merchants, clergy, royal officials, sailors, and artisans": Henri Hauser, La prépondérance espagnole (1559-1660) (Paris 1933; ed. 2 rev. Paris 1940, rpt. 1948) 44. Calvinist leaders in turn accommodated their strict moral code to the needs of the Huguenot commercial bourgeoisie. At the Parisian synod of 1559, a "brother" from Marennes (near La Rochelle), where piracy flourished, asked whether former corsairs could be admitted to the Lord's Table. The reply was that they should make restitution of their ill-gotten wealth, "if they be able," to the rightful owners; if not, they could be admitted if found properly penitent. Even more ambiguous was the reply to the question: "Whether goods sold by Pirates, might be bought?" The answer was yes, if the goods were sold publicly with the approval of the town magistrates. In the case of Huguenot cities like La Rochelle this meant effective permission to deal in goods robbed from Spanish and Portuguese ships, secrecy being necessary only for the sale of merchandise stolen from French owners. Synodicon in Gallia Reformata: or, the Acts, Decisions, Decrees and Canons of . . . the Reformed Churches in France, ed. John Quick (2 vols. London 1692) 1. 9. We observe that Chauveton has not a word of censure for French piratical activities against Spain and Portugal, described by Benzoni in some detail. For an assessment of Huguenot colonial policy, see Stanislaw Grzybowski, "Hugonoci wobec francuskiej ekspansji Kolonialnej (The Huguenot Attitude toward French Colonial Expansion)," Odrodzenie i reformacja w Polsce 8 (1963) 77-89.

18. The following page references are to the Histoire: pearls, 160-173; tobacco, 309-310; maize, cassava, manioc, 338-354; wheat, olives, and vines, 370-374; sugar, 375-379.
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19. Jean de Léry, a Huguenot pastor who took part in the abortive French effort to colonize Brazil in the 1550’s, sounded the theme of lost colonial opportunities in his account of the expedition (first edition, Geneva and La Rochelle 1578): “Had the affair been pursued as well as it was begun, the spiritual and temporal reign would have been so solidly established that more than 10,000 Frenchmen would have as complete and secure possession of that land for our king as the Spaniards and Portuguese now have there for theirs.” Jean de Léry, *Histoire d’un voyage fait en la terre du Brésil*, ed. Paul Gaffarel (2 vols. Paris 1880) 1. 2.

The Huguenot historian Henri Lancelot du Voisin de la Popelinière wrote *Les trois mondes* (Paris 1582) to promote the neglected cause of colonization. Rejecting the Spanish claim to a monopoly over the New World, “as if God had thought them alone worthy of that great favor,” he urged Frenchmen to emulate the gallantry the Italians, Portuguese, and Spaniards had shown in the work of exploration. The book takes its title from La Popelinière’s belief that there remained to be discovered a “third world” whose discovery and occupation could compensate France for the mistake made by one of her kings in rejecting Columbus’ offer and abandoning America to the Spaniards. This “third world,” of immense extent, lay some thirty degrees south of the Equator; because of its vast extent it must possess, like America, a diversity of climates; and, again like America, it must possess treasures incalculable. La Popelinière also saw in colonization a means of ridding France of its idle and rebellious elements and applying their *inutile puis­sance* to useful ends. On La Popelinière, see Corrado Vivanti, “Alle origini dell’idea di civiltà. Le scoperte geografiche e gli scritti di Henri de la Popelinière,” *Rivista storica italiana* 74 (1962) 225-249.

21. First published with the title: *Discours de l’histoire de la Floride, contenant La trahison des Espagnols, contre les subiets du Roy, en l’an mil cinq cens soixante cinq* (Dieppe 1566). Chauveton attached this relation as an appendix, paginated separately, to his French translation of Benzoni, added three introductory chapters, and gave the whole this title: *Brief discours et histoire d’un voyage de quelques François en la Floride: & du massacre autant intustement que barbarement executé sur eux, par les Hespagnols, l’an mil cinq cens soixante cinq* ([Geneva] 1579).
22. The above summary is based on pp. 3-14 of the *Brief discours* (n. 21 above).
25. For Acosta’s view of the Indian, see my *Aztec Image in Western Thought* (New Brunswick, N.J. 1971) 121-124.
26. *Histoire*, “Preface.” Frobisher’s Strait (modern Frobisher Bay) was in reality a cul-de-sac.
27. Léry’s anti-Italian bias reflects the French political climate after the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre, which many Huguenots regarded as an application of Machia­velli’s ideas by his disciple Catherine de Medici. “Some went so far as to condemn en masse all Italians, considered perfidious by nature.” C. Edward Rathé in his introduction to Innocent Gentillet, *Anti-Machiavel* (Geneva 1968) 4.
28. For Montaigne’s views on the Indian, see my book (n. 25 above) 147-152.
The theme of the Noble Savage may be one of the few historical topics about which there is nothing more to say. Few of the topoi of eighteenth-century thought have been more thoroughly studied. The functions of the Noble Savage theme in the ideological debates of the age are well-known, its remote origins have been plausibly identified, and what John G. Burke calls its “pedigree” has been precisely established by historians of ideas.¹ Archival research will no doubt turn up new instances of the use of the theme in the imaginative and political literature from the Renaissance to the Romantic period and beyond, but the chances of adding to our understanding of the concept, in any historically significant way, would seem remote. In future studies of eighteenth-century cultural history, the “Noble Savage theme” is likely to be consigned to those footnotes reserved for subjects about which scholars no longer disagree.

Yet in looking over the literature on the Noble Savage theme, one might gain a relatively new insight into its function in eighteenth-century thought by stressing its fetishistic nature. For like the concept of the Wild Man, from which it derives and against which it was ostensibly raised up in opposition, the concept of the Noble Savage has all the attributes of a fetish. And if this is the case, then the Noble Savage idea might be significantly illuminated by being conceived as a moment in the
general history of fetishism in which civilized man, no less than primitive man, has participated since the beginning of human time.

In my discussion of the Noble Savage theme as fetish, I shall use the term *fetish* in three senses.² A fetish is any natural object believed to possess magical or spiritual power. This is the traditional ethnological meaning of the term, and from it derives the conventional figurative use of it to designate any material object regarded with superstitious or extravagant trust or reverence. From this figurative usage, in turn, derives the psychological sense, as indicating any object or part of the body obsessively seized upon (cathected) as an exclusive source of libidinal gratification. From these three usages we derive the three senses of the term *fetishism* which I use here: belief in magical fetishes, extravagant or irrational devotion, and pathological displacement of libidinal interest and satisfaction to a fetish.

As thus envisaged, fetishism is, at one and the same time, a kind of belief, a kind of devotion, and a kind of psychological set or posture. By considering the Noble Savage theme as a fetish, I hope to show that the very notion of a Noble Savage was, given the historical context in which it was elaborated as a putative description of a type of humanity, fetishistic in nature. That is to say, belief in the idea of a Noble Savage was magical in nature, extravagant and irrational in the kind of devotion it was meant to inspire, and, in the end, displayed the kind of pathological displacement of libidinal interest that we normally associate with the forms of racism that depend on the idea of a “wild humanity” for their justification.

To be sure, expressions such as “Wild Man” and “Noble Savage” are metaphors, and insofar as they were once taken literally, they can be regarded simply as errors, mistakes, or fallacies.³ But the fact is that human culture cannot do without such metaphors, and when we have to identify things that resist conventional systems of classification, they are not only functionally useful but necessary for the well-being of social groups. Metaphors are crucially necessary when a culture or social group encounters phenomena that either elude or run afoul of normal expectations or quotidian experiences.

This is why we must conclude with the anthropologist and the psychologist that there is really nothing inherently “absurd” about either of these types of fetishism. From a scientific point of view, the ascription of spiritual powers to inanimate objects or of the qualities of a whole to its parts may be a mistake, a fallacy of logic or a failure of reason, but both kinds of fetishism are too widespread to be regarded as in themselves pathological and too congenial to commonsense modes of thought to be regarded as inherently vicious or harmful. The social scientist is much more interested in how a given fetishistic practice functions in a given culture, individual, or group, whether it is oppres-
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sive or therapeutically efficacious, than in exposing the error of logic or rationality that underlies it. Cultural practice or belief can be adjudged absurd only from within the horizon of expectations marked out by those practices and beliefs that would make it either “unthinkable” or, if thinkable, “unconscionable.” From the standpoint of a truly objective social science, no belief is inherently absurd if it provides the basis for an adequate functioning of the practices based on it within the total economy of the culture in which it is held. And it is here that the very notion of “absurdity” must be linked up with the concept of taboo. For although many cultural practices may be wrong, fallacious, harmful, inefficient, repressive, dehumanizing, and so on, they can be viewed as “absurd” only insofar as they violate some taboo on what is either “thinkable” or “feasible” within a given frame of moral reference.

For example, Marx calls the “money form of value” which takes the form of a “fetishism of gold” absurd because it is based, first, on a mistake (the confusion of the “means” of exchange [money] with the things to be exchanged [commodities with a certain use-value]), and, secondly, on a confusion of a “form” of exchange (commodities) with the “content” of the things exchanged (their labor-value, which gives them their use-value). The “fetishism of gold” is absurd because it leads to the pursuit without end of the most “worthless of commodities” and the denial of the “value” inherent in man’s noblest faculty, his capacity to produce by his own labor commodities with specific use-values. But Marx was less interested in castigating the “fetishism of gold” (which, after all, had been done as a matter of course by moralists since the time of Hesiod and the Prophets) than in explicating the logic of this “absurd” belief and the “vicious” practices which it engendered or justified. In the process of this explication, Marx applied nothing less than a logic which he called “dialectical” but which I would call a logic of metaphor, which he took to be the key to the understanding of all forms of fetishism and to that process of alienation by which men psychologically distanced themselves from those things that were ontologically closest to them and turned into idols those that were most removed from their own natures as men. Prior to his analysis of the logic of commodity exchange, Marx set forth a logic of men’s thought about commodities, so as to demonstrate how what had started out as a perfectly understandable and commonsensical equation of one thing with another ended up in the fetishism of gold that was characteristic of the most highly advanced system of exchange, capitalism.

I propose to attempt much the same sort of thing with the idea of the Noble Savage theme as it developed between the late fifteenth and early eighteenth century. I want to stress, however, that this is not a specifically Marxist exercise, but is generally dialectical; and that it owes as much to Vico, Hegel, Nietzsche, Freud, and Lévi-Strauss as it does to Marx. Marx was only the most persistent
Applicator of the logic of metaphor to the material structures of society. And whether or not we accept his characterization of the money theory of value as "absurd" (in fact, his characterization presupposes the absolute validity of the labor theory of value), we can still see in his explication of the fetishism of gold a particularly apt model for our own explication of the notion of the Wild Man as it developed in the Baroque age.

Application of this model requires only that we recognize the elements of paradox present in the use of the concept, the alienation implicit within the structure of this usage, and the hidden, or repressed, identification of the natives of the New World with natural objects (that is to say, their dehumanization) to be used (consumed, transformed, or destroyed) as their conquerors (or owners) desired. Nor should we be surprised by the idolization of the natives implied in the notion of the Noble Savage. This notion represents merely the late return of the humanity repressed in the original oxymoronic characterization of the native as a Wild Man. It is significant, I think, that this idolization of the natives of the New World occurs only after the conflict between the Europeans and the natives had already been decided and when, therefore, it could no longer hamper the exploitation of the latter by the former. As thus envisaged, the fetishization of the Wild Man, the ascription to him of super-human (that is, noble) powers, is only the ultimate stage in the elaboration of the paradox implicit in the notion of a "humanity" which is also "wild."

This fetishization of the Wild Man was inevitable because, first of all, the concept of a specifically human nature is only negatively definable. Man is what the animal and the divine are not. Such at least is the sum and substance of the Aristotelian, Thomist, and Neoplatonic notions of man as occupant of the middle rungs of the ladder, or chain, of being. Christianity had reinforced this idea of the "middling" nature of man with the doctrine of the possibility of men becoming gods (or at least god-like), even though it restricted the realization of this possibility to the next world. At the same time, Christianity had provided the basis of belief in the possibility of a humanity "gone wild" by suggesting that men might degenerate into an animal state in this world through sin. Even though it held out the prospect of redemption to any such degenerate humanity, through the operation of divine grace upon a species-specific "soul," supposedly present even in the most depraved of human beings, Christianity nonetheless did little to encourage the idea that a true humanity was realizable outside the confines either of the Church or of a "civilization" generally defined as Christian.

It was the vagueness of the definition of "humanity," I suggest, that promoted the ambiguity in the original assessment of the "nature" of the inhabitants of the Americas. The first descriptions of American natives
are characteristically anomalous. For example, John of Holywood's *Sphera mundi* (1498) describes the natives of America as "blue in colour and with square heads." So too the caption of an engraving of 1505 describes the natives in what Hanke calls "fantastic" terms:

They go naked, both men and women . . . They have no personal property, but all things are in common. They all live together without a king and without a government, and every one is his own master. They take for wives whom they first meet, and in all this they have no rule. And they eat one another . . . They live to be a hundred and fifty years old, and are seldom sick.

Now, this description of native Americans might be seen as a distortion caused by the projection of a dream of Edenic innocence onto the fragmentary knowledge of the New World available at the time. But if this description of native Americans is on the manifest level a dream, on the latent or figurative level it has all the elements of a nightmare. For the description contains no less than five references to violations of taboos regarded as inviolable by Europeans of that age: nakedness, community of property, lawlessness, sexual promiscuity, and cannibalism. This may be, in the European commentators, a projection of repressed desires onto the lives of the natives (as the references to the health and longevity of the natives suggest), but if it is such, it is a desire tainted by horror and viewed with disgust. Within this original metaphorical characterization of the natives, we have the two moments necessary for the projection of the negative and positive poles of the dialectic of fetishism which will fall apart into contending ideals over the years to follow: Wild Man and Noble Savage respectively. This dialectic is describable, I maintain, in the terms of the logic of metaphor itself. This logic, in turn, elaborates the relationship between desire and the availability of the objects desired, which itself requires a calculus for the determination of its meaning.

Gold, land, incest, sexual promiscuity, cannibalism, longevity, health, violence, passivity, disease—all mixed in with a compulsive concern for the "souls" of the natives: these are the themes of those discussions of the Wild Man which interact with actual treatment of the natives to produce the fetish of the Noble Savage. We need not recapitulate the saga of the European's depredations of the natives of America (and elsewhere) in this essay. It is known well enough. We are concerned, rather, with the ideological dialectics which generated the idealized Noble Savage out of the myth of the Wild Man, which precedes it both in time and in the logic of the dialectic.

We have noted the anomalies contained in the early accounts of the natives and the paradoxes implicit in early descriptions of their lives: while violating all of the taboos that should have rendered them "unclean" and degenerate, the natives apparently enjoy the attributes
formerly believed to have been possessed only by the Patriarchs of the Old Testament: robust health and longevity of life. The combination here is between moral depravity and a kind of physical super-humanity. What was required first of all, if theory was to follow practice and belief, was the explosion of the myth of a physical superhumanity. To this end one could argue one or another of two possibilities: savages were either a breed of super animals (similar to dogs, bears, or monkeys), which would account for their violation of human taboos and their presumed physical superiority to men; or they were a breed of degenerate men (descendants of the lost tribes of Israel or a race of men rendered destitute of reason and moral sense by the effects of a harsh climate).  

Whichever way the argument went, its effect was to draw a distinction, in the nature of an opposition, between a normal humanity (gentle, intelligent, decorous, and white) and an abnormal one (obstinate, gay, free, and red). This opposition is sufficient to transform the native from the merely “exotic” being depicted in the earliest characterizations into an “object”—an ontological “other” or “opposite” to “normal” men—and, consequently into a “thing” to be done with as need, conscience, or desire required. Las Casas perceived as much when, in criticizing Spanish imperial policy in 1519, he charged that the natives were being treated:

just as if . . . [they] were pieces of wood that could be cut off trees and transported for building purposes, or like flocks of sheep or any other kind of animals that could be moved around indiscriminately, and if some of them should die on the road little would be lost.  

The invocation of the authority of Aristotle by Las Casas’ opponent, Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, to justify the Indian’s status as a “natural slave” was recognized from the beginning as an ideological justification for the terrorist practices deemed necessary for the pacification of the New World. Sepúlveda’s views were denied official support by the Spanish crown after the debate of Valladolid of 1550-51; but the evidence adduced by Sepúlveda in defense of his ideas is instructive. First, and most important, was the “gravity of the sins which the Indians had committed, especially their idolatries and their sins against nature,” among which cannibalism and incest were foremost. That certain tribes of the New World were organized along matrilineal, rather than patrilineal, lines only exacerbated the manifestly sexual anxieties of the Europeans, exhibited most immediately in their horror of (or fantasies about) the practices of incest and cannibalism. Such fantasies, we may surmise, are sublimations of an idyll of unrestricted consumption: oral and genital; and its alternative: the need to destroy that which cannot be consumed.  

Consumption and destruction, in turn, are twin aspects of the idyll
of unrestricted possession (whether of persons or of property) and presuppose the desirability of the thing to be possessed, that is to say, the assumption of the adequacy of the thing desired to the gratification of the person desiring it. And this assumption of the desirability of the thing desired is the basis of that dialectical relation between master and slave that permeates the psycho-social pathology of all oppressive systems. The return of the repressed suspicion that the natives being brutalized shared in fact a humanity with their brutalizers is the motivation behind the long debates over whether the natives possess, beneath their putatively animal aspects and behavior, a recognizable human soul.

First of all, it should be noted that the issue being debated is over essences or qualities, rather than attributes or behavior; and that these essences or qualities are considered to be spiritual in nature (hence capable of being present behind or within appearances); and that they are not, therefore, determinable by what might be called "empirical" evidence alone. The debate is therefore much more illuminative of the confusion present in Europeans' minds over the nature of their own humanity than it is either of the nature of the natives (which goes without saying, of course) or of the attitudes toward and the beliefs about natives held by Europeans.

The "natural slave" argument turns upon the issue of the native's talents, abilities, or presumed capacities to act autonomously in the world without disrupting or threatening the existence of "civilized" men. Here the implicit distinction is between "barbarians" and "city dwellers," a distinction which simply juxtaposes two ways of life found universally, positions the individual in a situation of choice between these two ways of life, and accepts force as the ultimate form of mediation in cases where two ways of life come into conflict. Such a distinction is, one might say, a vertical one, since it differentiates between "insiders" and "outsiders" on a lateral plane of being (city and forest, sown and steppe lands, fixed and nomadic zones). But the distinction drawn between "human soul" and "animal soul" is a horizontal one, hierarchical inasmuch as it differentiates, not between two ways of life that might exist contiguously with one another, but two states of being which occupy superior and inferior positions on a vertical ladder or chain of being. The image of a vertically-ordered scale or hierarchy is inherently ambiguous, however, inasmuch as it presupposes a common stuff or essence shared by the various creatures dispersed across its ranks or some common source from which all of the creatures so dispersed derive, a common goal toward which they all tend, or a single cause of which they are all effects. The metaphysics of the chain-of-being idea renders unstable any attempt to draw, on its basis, a definitive distinction between natives and "normal" men. Every attempt to draw such a distinction is, in fact, if carried out
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rigorously, driven ultimately to the apprehension of the common qualities shared, not only by natives and Europeans, but also by animal and human nature in general. This conceptual instability is the other side of the pantheism implicit in all such Neoplatonic doctrines. If all creatures derive from God and aspire to return to Him, then they must all "participate" in some way in the divine essence. This means that all creatures are governed and protected by the law adequate to the full realization of their species-specific attributes—and can be used by other creatures, even man, only for purposes consonant with the law governing both the whole and its parts. The ambiguity of the concept of a spiritual essence and the instability of any effort to draw definitive distinctions on the basis of a chain-of-being notion of reality may account for the continued popularity of the more purely physicalist "degeneracy" thesis, long after the Aristotelian theory of the "natural slave" and the Neoplatonic theory of "ontological inferiority" had run their courses.

The degeneracy thesis received its most benign—and authoritative—statement in Buffon's work, which argued from the presupposition of the deleterious effects of the New World's environment on its inhabitants, both animal and human. The "monster" theory which this thesis generated received its most ardent defense in Cornelius de Pauw. Both the degeneracy and the monster theses appeal to a physical, and specifically quantitative, criterion for differentiating among the types of humanity which are to be classified. For Buffon, species are generated by cross-fertilization of genetic strains, which means that genetic combinations can be ranked according to capacities for survival in resultant breeds. Buffon has no doubt that all of the species of America, including the human, are congenitally inferior to their Old World counterparts. On the basis of size, strength, configuration, and so on, he assigns all of them to the category of "degenerates." The transition from the notion of "degeneracy" to that of "monstrosity," the idea that a given species' attributes are products of an "unnatural" mixture of strains, a mixture that is associated with the incestuous form, can follow as a matter of course. The degenerate is, however, only an inferior species-type; the monster, by contrast, is the product of a mixture of different species-types, the parts of which remain species-distinguishable and the whole of which is an anomaly. Buffon limits himself to the characterization of the natives of America as degenerate; De Pauw transforms degeneracy into monstrosity.

What should be stressed here, of course, is not the validity or invalidity of these various theories or the manner in which they might anticipate later scientific opinions, but the modes of the relationships which they posit between the normal and the abnormal. Both the Aristotelian and the Neoplatonic conceptions of the relation between the
animal and human worlds are conceived in the mode of continuity. The physicalist theories of Sepúlveda, Buffon, De Pauw, and even Linnaeus conceive this relationship in the mode of contiguity. Now, whereas things can be associated in both of these modalities of relationship, that of continuity is certainly more productive of tolerance and mediation by degree than that of contiguity. Of course, neither mode is conceivable without the other, so that in any given system of imagined relationships it is necessary to determine which mode is to be regarded as structural and which as functional. In general this determination will be dictated by the interests of the classifier: that is to say, whether he will wish to construct a system in which either differences or similarities are to be highlighted and whether his desire is to stress the conflictual or mediative possibilities of the situation he is describing. The two modes of relationship, continuous and contiguous, also engender different possibilities for praxis: missionary activity and conversion on the one side, war and extermination on the other.

The use of the term pacification to name genocidal policies and practices is important, because it signifies the advent of a fourth moment in the history of race relations in the period between the Renaissance and the late eighteenth century. This new moment is signalled by the currency of the idea of the Noble Savage. As Boas and others have shown, the Noble Savage idea was present in both classical and Christian thought, and was revived during the Renaissance, though never with the enthusiasm that characterized its use during the second half of the eighteenth century—and especially after Rousseau. How are we to account for the popularity of this idea in Europe, especially in the light of the fact that the time of its popularity postdates the resolution of the struggle against the natives and comes at a time when the issue between the Europeans and the natives has already been decided to the advantage of the former? This popularity might be put down to guilt feelings, to be sure; but I want to suggest another possibility. It is this: the idea of the Noble Savage is used, not to dignify the native, but rather to undermine the idea of nobility itself. As thus envisaged, the notion of the Noble Savage represents the ironic stage in the evolution of the Wild Man motif in European thought. It is an “absurd” idea, the fetishistic nature of which is obvious; for its true referent is not the savages of the new or any other world, but humanity in general, in relation to which the very notion of “nobility” is a contradiction.

That is to say, the concept of Noble Savage stands over against, and undercuts, the notion, not of the Wild Man, but rather of “noble man.” This is consistent with the logic of the conception of a Wild Man which, on the basis of the beliefs of the time, was on the face of it a contradictio in adiectis. The very notion of “man” is comprehensible only as it stands in opposition to “wild” and that term’s various synonyms and cognates.
There is no contradiction in "wild savage" since these are in fact the same words; so that "wild savage" is a pleonasm. But given the theory of the classes prevailing at the time, Noble Savage is an anomaly, since the idea of nobility (or aristocracy) stands opposed to the presumed wildness and savagery of other social orders as "civility" stands to "barbarism." As thus envisaged, the Noble Savage idea represents not so much an elevation of the idea of the native as a demotion of the idea of nobility. That this is so can be seen by its usage on the one side and its effects on the other. It appears everywhere that nobility is under attack; it has no effect whatsoever on the treatment of the natives or on the way the natives are viewed by their oppressors. Moreover, the idea of the Noble Savage brings to the fore (or calls up) its opposite: that is to say, the notion of the "ignoble savage," which has as much currency in literate circles in Europe as its opposite. 17

Diderot and Rousseau both use the Noble Savage idea to attack the European social system of privilege, inherited power, and political oppression. The "ignoble savage" idea is used to justify the slave trade. To be sure, not all opponents of the Noble Savage idea were racists, as the examples of Goldsmith, Johnson, and Voltaire attest; but they were all political conservatives, which tells us something about the essentially domestic interests of their more radical opponents, the defenders of the idea of the Noble Savage, such as Diderot and Rousseau. The Noble Savage was a concept with which to belabor "nobility," not to redeem the "savage."

However, it is the suppressed function of the Noble Savage idea in the social debates of the eighteenth century that gives it its fetishistic character, both to those who espouse it as an ideal and those who reject it as a fiction. The anomaly of the concept is contained in the ambiguity of its referent. On the literal level, the concept asserts the "nobility" of the "savage." This nobility is affirmed in the face of increasingly precise information about the natives of the New World (such as that provided not only by the colonists in America but also by explorers such as Cook), which suggests, if not their backwardness, then at least their essential differentness from European peoples. If the aim of those espousing the idea of the "nobility" of the "savages" had been to gain better treatment for native peoples, then they would have done better to stress those attributes which they shared with their European counterparts and to insist on the native's rights to "life, liberty, and property," which were claimed for the European middle classes of the time. But the amelioration of the natives' treatment was not a primary consideration of those who promoted the idea of their nobility. The principal aim of the social radicals of the time was to undermine the very concept of "nobility"—or at least the idea of nobility tied to the notion of genetic inheritance. Yet,
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the idea of genetic inheritance is implicit in the concept of a "race" of "noble savages." How are we to account for this contradiction?

Obviously, the idea of a race of savages who are noble had to be conceived as having the effect, given the documentation of the backwardness of native peoples, of demeaning the idea of nobility itself. The hidden or suppressed referent of the Noble Savage idea is, in short, that of "nobility" itself.18 This concept of "nobility" is implicitly characterized as "savage" on the figurative level of the phrase.

And was any concept more problematical, more subject to feelings of ambivalence, by aristocrat and bourgeois, conservative and radical, in the late eighteenth century, than that of "nobility"? However much the middle classes of Europe resented the aristocracy, they wished more to share their privileges than to destroy the distinction between the "better" and "worse" parts of the human race. However much they resented the inherited prerogatives of the nobles, they still in general honored the idea of a social hierarchy. Such a hierarchy might be conceived to be based on talent and wealth, rather than on birth, but it still presupposed a humanity divided into "haves" and "have-nots." And it is such presuppositions that made the concept of the Noble Savage absurd and its use in social debate fetishistic.

It could only be thus, for at the basis of the idea of the Noble Savage was the assumption, shared by both sides of the social debates of the time, of the divisibility of mankind into qualitatively different parts. That such was in fact the case has been amply documented by Louis Chevalier in his ground-breaking Laboring Classes and Dangerous Classes in Paris During the First Half of the Nineteenth Century. Chevalier shows that efforts of European upper classes (aristocratic and bourgeois) to classify, comprehend, and control the urban masses created by industrialization are beset by the same sense of anomaly and the same tendency towards fetishism as earlier efforts to make sense of the natives of the New World. On the one hand, there was a general tendency to deny to these new classes of urban poor the status of humanity; they are viewed as animals, wild, savage, and are turned into grotesque objects of fear and anxiety. On the other hand, there is a tendency on the part of those who would view them as the type of the humanity of the future to endow them with the attributes of deity, a tendency which reaches its apogee in Marx's designation of the proletariat as the very type of humanity come into its kingdom at the end of history.19 At the basis of the discussion of the nature of the new "dangerous classes" of mass society stands a deep and abiding anxiety over the very concept of humanity itself, a concept which, in turn, has its origin in an identification of true humanity with membership in a specific social class. That part of the urban masses which Hegel called the "rabble of paupers"20 plays the same role in
European thought of the nineteenth century that the natives of the New World played in its counterpart in the eighteenth century. Like the "wild men" of the New World, the "dangerous classes" of the Old World define the limitations of the general notion of "humanity" which informed and justified the Europeans' spoliation of any human group standing in the way of their expansion, and their need to destroy that which they could not consume.

Let me summarize: I have argued, first, that the very notion of a "wild humanity" constituted a contradiction in terms and that, in turn, this contradiction reflected an ambiguity about the nature of that "humanity" on which Europeans of the early modern age prided themselves. The proximity of whole peoples who differed in external aspect and way of life from those which characterized the European settlers in the New World was enough to bring this ambiguity to the fore of consciousness. The original anomaly of the first characterizations of the natives of the New World thus gave way to two opposed, and ultimately contradictory, ways of conceiving the relationship between the Europeans and the natives. On the one hand, the natives were conceived to be continuous with that humanity on which Europeans prided themselves; and it was this mode of relationship that underlay the policy of proselytization and conversion. On the other hand, the natives could be conceived as simply existing contiguously to the Europeans, as representing either an inferior breed of humanity or a superior breed, but in any case as being essentially different from the European breed; and it was this mode of relationship which underlay and justified the policies of war and extermination which the Europeans followed throughout the seventeenth and most of the eighteenth century. But whether the natives were conceived to be continuous with or simply contiguous to the humanity to which the Europeans laid claim as a unique possession, the mere differentness of the natives' modes of life was enough to exacerbate the feelings of anxiety which the ambiguity of the concept of humanity engendered.

An ambiguity similar to that underlying settler-native relationships was also present in European discussions of social class relationships, with the concept of "nobility" playing the same role in these discussions that the concept of "humanity" did in discussions of settler-native relationships. What the bourgeoisie and its spokesmen were attacking, in their criticism of the nobility, was the nobility's claim to represent the highest type of humanity. But the attitude of the rising classes of eighteenth-century Europe with respect to the noble classes was a mixture of love and hate, envy and resentment. They wanted for themselves what the aristocracy claimed as its "natural" due. Within the context of a situation such as this, the spokesmen for the rising classes needed a concept to express their simultaneous rejection of the nobility's
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claims to privilege and desire for similar privileges for themselves. The concept of the Noble Savage served their ideological needs perfectly, for it at once undermined the nobility's claim to a special human status and extended that status to the whole of humanity. But this extension was done only in principle. In fact, the claim to nobility was meant to extend, neither to the natives of the New World nor to the lowest classes of Europe, but only to the bourgeoisie. That this was so is seen in the fact that, once the middle classes had established their right to a claim to the same humanity as that formerly claimed only by the nobility, they immediately turned to the task of dehumanizing those classes below them in the same way that, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Europeans in general had done to the natives of the New World.

Fetishism, I have said, is a mistaking of the form of a thing for its content or the taking of a part of a thing for the whole, and the elevation either of the form or the part to the status of a content or an essence of the whole. From the Renaissance to the end of the eighteenth century, Europeans tended to fetishize the native peoples with whom they came into contact by viewing them simultaneously as monstrous forms of humanity and as quintessential objects of desire. Whence the alternative impulses to exterminate and to redeem the native peoples. But even more basic in the European consciousness of this time was the tendency to fetishize the European type of humanity as the sole possible form that humanity in general could take. This race fetishism was soon transformed, however, into another, and more virulent form: the fetishism of class, which has provided the bases of most of the social conflicts of Europe since the French Revolution.

NOTES


2. Three non-technical senses, I should add. I am treating fetishism here as a fixation on the form of a thing as against its content or on the part of a thing as against the whole. One of the points I try to make is that such reductionism is inevitable in the use of certain concepts, such as "humanity" or "civilization," since these concepts are inherently unstable, having no non-contestable referent. When a given part of humanity compulsively defines itself as the pure type of mankind in general and defines all other parts of the human species as inferior, flawed, degenerate, or "savage," I call this an instance of fetishism. In such a situation the tendency is to endow those parts of humanity which are, in effect, being denied any claim to the title of human with magical, even supernatural, powers, as happened in the myths of the Wild Man of the Middle Ages. If these magical or supernatural powers are fixed upon as desiderata for all men, including Europeans, then there will be a tendency to fetishize the imagined possessors of such powers, for example, the Noble Savage.

3. Philosophers spend a good deal of time exposing the metaphorical expressions taken literally and hypostatized as bases of metaphysical systems. See for example Colin M.
Angles of Perception: Myth and Literature

Turbayne, *The Myth of Metaphor* (New Haven and London 1962; rev. ed. Columbia, S.C. 1970), which is concerned, among other things, to expose the metaphor which lies at the heart of mechanistic metaphysics as both crucial “mistake” and generator of a set of “myths.”

4. See the famous opening chapter, entitled “Commodities,” of *Capital*, trans. from the 4th German ed. by Eden and Cedar Paul (New York 1929). Marx writes: “Thus the mystery of the commodity form is simply this, that it mirrors for men the social character of their own labour, mirrors it as an objective character attaching to the labour products themselves, mirrors it as a social natural property of these things. Consequently the social relation of the producers to the sum total of their own labour, presents itself to them as a social relation, not between themselves, but between the products of their labour. Thanks to this transference of qualities, the labour products become commodities, transcendental or social things which are at the same time perceptible by our senses. . . . We are concerned only with a definite social relation between human beings, which, in their eyes, has here assumed the semblance of a relation between things. To find an analogy, we must enter the nebulous world of religion. In that world, the products of the human mind become independent shapes, endowed with lives of their own, and able to enter into relations with men and women. The products of the human hand do the same thing in the world of commodities. I speak of this as the fetishistic character which attaches to the products of labour . . .” (Ibid., 45-46).


6. Ibid., 4-5.


8. See John G. Burke, “The Wild Man’s Pedigree: Scientific Method and Racial Anthropology,” in Dudley and Novak (n. 1 above) 266-267. According to Linnaeus, the Asiatic is “austere, arrogant, greedy” and of course “yellow,” while the African is “crafty, slothful, careless” and of course “black.” The four races thus differentiated are, however, accorded the title of “men” in Linnaeus’ system and distinguished from “wild” men on the one side and “monsters” on the other.

9. Quoted in Hanke (n. 5 above) 17.

10. Ibid., 41.

11. Ibid., 46-47.

12. The apprehension of a common essence is not a threat to laterally dispersive systems of thought inasmuch as it is presupposed as the basis of the differentiation given in the mode of contiguous relationships. In vertical systems, however, the apprehension of similarities is a problem, since what is given in any hierarchical arrangement is differentness.

13. See Gerbi (n. 7 above) Ch. v.


15. The other three “moments” I take to be the moment of the originally “anomalous” characterizations of the natives, the moment of their elevation by Las Casas and others as childlike and hypersensitive, species of men, and the moment of their degradation as “degenerates” and “monsters.” The advent of the Noble Savage concept and its elevation into an ideal for the whole of humanity during the second half of the eighteenth century is the fourth moment in the debate, “ironic,” I would maintain, since it refers not to the natives, but to the presumed “nobility” of human beings, especially in Europe, to whom the title of a full humanity had been denied by the defenders of the aristocracy as exemplars of a “full” humanity.

The Noble Savage Theme as Fetish

The problematical nature of the terms “nobility” and “aristocracy” on the eve of the French Revolution.

17. Gerbi (n. 7 above) 66 ff.

18. It should be noted that the French “le bon sauvage” has the same ideological implications as the English “noble savage” analyzed in this paper. In both cases, the effect of the usage is to draw a distinction between presumed types of humanity on manifestly qualitative grounds, rather than such superficial bases as skin color, physiognomy, or social status. The appeal to such qualitative criteria as “goodness” and “nobility” must be construed ironically, of course, and is comprehensible only within the context of a social system in which a class that has claimed aristocratic privilege has ceased to display the qualities of leadership and rule which had originally justified its claim to noble status.


Part III

THE POLITICS OF CONFLICT
The American Principle
from More to Locke

by Arthur J. Slavin

The discovery of America was revolutionary for political thought because it rendered unacceptable the habitual linear patterning of events derived by way of St. Augustine from Paul's letters and also undermined the alternative way of making sense of events, the classical notion of the cyclic nature of history. The Discovery did this by presenting a free space, apparently one with neither a history nor any political forms at all. It is simple to make a long list of treatises on politics written after the Discovery which show no trace of American influence. For every century from the sixteenth to the nineteenth, the main bulk of political thought continued to employ the principles inherited from Athens and Jerusalem, at least until Hegel. But the most startling and fruitful work in England took America into account from the outset.

The linear character of Christian thought not only had the stamp of orthodoxy on it; it was also empirically useful in explaining reality in the long centuries during which the closure of the western political horizon obscured from view other patterns of politics. The Church endured. The World grew old. Then the impact of Arabic and Jewish learning in the eleventh century, and the growing awareness of Europeans of non-Western societies, introduced elements of tension. So, too, did the internal crises bracketed on one side by the Investiture struggle and on the other by the claims of Boniface VIII. But it required no break in form
for Gratian to write the Infidels into various *causae*, for Dante to challenge the papacy, or for Marsiglio to work out a theory of popular sovereignty.

Each thinker could incorporate what was novel in his own thought into the traditional framework of political theory, which rested on three assumptions: that right religion was revealed religion; that the philosophical categories necessary to understand right order were in the Greek corpus; and that it was necessary to bring into harmony with civil ideas of right order the life of communities rooted in divine law. The harmony achieved might extend from scholastic Aristotelianism on the one side to the extremes of Joachite chiliasm on the other, but it did not require a lifting of the political horizon nor decisively enlarge the range of basic political ideas. Even humanists like Poggio, weary of corruption in Church and Empire, and feeling the pressure for new instruments of analysis, fell back on the theory of cycles in order to include in their treatises the contemporary Old World and the events of the classical past.  

In its form, therefore, political theory was either secular and cyclical or secular and linear, if it was a theory of what we would call experience. Breaks with a politics of experience were prophetic and eschatological or metaphysical and wholly speculative, either millenarian or based on the doctrine of the absolute power of God. When a medieval theorist wished to know what possibilities of order there might be other than the created order of the world as he knew it, he posited a new world *ex mero motu voluntatis dei*. God’s *fiat* constituted nature.  

The discovery of America opened the door on a new range of political ideas. In America there were wholly natural and empty spaces more fruitful for thought than divine *fiat*. Or there were human societies in the New World innocent of revelation, Greek categories, and the tension between what was reasonable and what was revealed. Although Europeans in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries had achieved an extensive knowledge of the Orient, there was nothing in the civilized and filled space of the East to prepare them for the world revealed in Vespucci’s letters, not even familiarity with the notion of God’s power to ordain new worlds.  

Francisco López de Gómara expressed this sense of a revolution in human life in 1552:

> The Discovery of the Indies, what we call the New World, is, excepting only the Incarnation and Death of Our Lord, the most important event since the creation of the world.

Gómara’s was not a new idea, when he published his *General History of the Indies*. The exiled humanist Juan Luis Vives had proclaimed the tremendous significance of opening the whole globe to the human race.
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two decades earlier. Much later Louis Le Roy paired the Discovery and the invention of the printing press as the causes of a new age in history. In 1614 Lope de Vega's play *El nuevo mundo* presented Columbus as a romantic hero and human benefactor of Promethean importance. Ferdinand the Catholic is the Admiral's foil, a man unable to believe there might be an undiscovered part of the world because to do so would be to contradict the human geography established in the biblical account of the peopling of the earth by Noah's three sons.⁸

Yet Professor Elliott has recently cautioned us against exaggerating the immediate impact of the Discovery, despite its admittedly enormous importance for the context of European political life.⁹ It is the immediate and revolutionary impact I wish to assert, however, in the realm of political thought as well as in that of practical politics. By shattering the biblical mold of human cosmography and human geography, the Discovery did more than merely widen the sources of power available to European states and thus extend the range of their competitions into a struggle for world dominion. To say that "America hardly commands at all," immediately after the brilliant sentence of Braudel, because the major European developments in theory and practice "are entirely conceivable in a Europe which remained in total ignorance of the existence of America" is to speak contrary to fact and in an unhistorical way.¹⁰

Ideas about politics are possible to the extent that a pattern of politics is real. Hence changes in political geography necessarily produce changes in history and thus in thought about the meaning of that history. To the extent that the environmental changes in which ideas grow are not merely incremental but are truly fundamental, changes *in posse* for ideas are also fundamental. We may, of course, say that the history of political ideas bears no structural relationship to the history of politics. But this is a position difficult to sustain, if we consider even briefly on what materials makers of political ideas actually work. They place at the heart of their work some philosophic view of the State or other form of communal association. For they begin with the assumption that some such framework is necessary to human development in a condition of freedom.¹¹

On Elliott's own showing the Discovery also radically altered the framework of the European states, by transforming the bases of their power. If the structure of political thought is subordinate to the actual structure of political life, it is irrelevant at best to argue, as Elliott does, that the changes we see taking place in European politics and thinking about politics could have occurred without any awareness of America's existence.¹² Before the Discovery, European political thought devoted itself either to compact associations on the city-state model or to the theory of universal communities under the heading of *imperium*. ¹³
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Whether the writers were systematic or merely creators of scraps, they sought to explain the origins and nature of political arrangements rooted in submission to authority. There were republicans, but they looked back to Rome and Athens for their raw material, not to the contemporary world. After the Discovery there was a rapid development of the idea of voluntary association, and even the meaning of *imperium* changed. The opening of the Atlantic ushered in new modes of thinking about politics.

I do not follow Sabine in supposing that the chief novelty was the theory of the sovereign state. Nor can one say that America pressured out of circulation all theories of compact associations and theories of empire of the sort Wycliffe understood. Long after the Discovery it was possible for Grotius to "prove" the subordination of sovereign states to the community of nations, relying on the old idiom of the law of nature. Also, the New World gave a new lease on life to Joachite chiliasm, as Professor Phelan has shown in his important book on the Franciscan millenarian Geronimo de Mendieta. Moreover, the Spanish Empire in America provided a huge field for Aristotelianism, as the Dominicans and Franciscans struggled to control the missionary work among the Indians.

The chief novelty in European theory was the awareness of nature in America. Grotius himself reflected this when he helped to change the meaning of the law of nature, which he called "unchangeable even in the sense that it cannot be changed by God." Like Montaigne and others who integrated the new reality into their political writings, Grotius no longer needed the hypothesis of God's creation of new worlds by *fiat*. A new nature actually existed. And in it one could observe the "natural" condition of people or even experiment with them. Where the space was void it was open to consider what wholly voluntary arrangements of society might be settled in it, under the influence of natural-law assumptions about the rule of reason. It was also possible to do this imaginatively, in the settled space of Europe, as Thomas Starkey's work illustrates.

More's *Utopia* is, however, the *locus classicus* for the impact of the Discovery. This is so for a variety of reasons. We know, for example, that More had enthusiasm for America and reports of it. He knew Waldseemüller's *Cosmographiae introductio* and also Peter Martyr's *De orbe novo*. He also had direct access to the well-stocked mind of John Rastell, his brother-in-law, and a visitor to North America in 1517, only a year after the first edition of *Utopia*. More important is the fact that the narrator who describes the Utopians and their institutions, Raphael Hythlodaeus, identifies himself as a sailor who has made three voyages with Vespucci. For More sets *Utopia* somewhere in the New World, in the South Atlantic waters plied by Vespucci, and, as I will argue, borrows a crucial idea from the printed versions of what were alleged to be letters about America by Vespucci.
More thus took immediate advantage of the opportunity presented by America, an opportunity unprecedented in Christian time. The discovery of lands with massive uninhabited stretches or at best sparsely settled by uncivilized peoples produced a stimulus to political thinking analogous to that produced among the Greeks by the long period of colonizing activity from about 750 B.C. to about 500 B.C. A space open for experimentation was one of the boundary stones of the Greek tradition, and the closing of that space, first by Alexander and then by the Romans, closed the tradition of Greek speculations about politics. It would be an exaggeration to say that there ceased to be any politically free space from the time Rome came to dominate the Mediterranean until the discovery of America. There were the imaginary spaces of scholastic hypotheses, governed by divine necessity. And there were the colonial adventures familiar to historians of Europe: Carolingian, Ottonian, Norman, the Hanse, and especially the barons of the Crusades. But it would be wide of the mark to identify the many treatises De regimine with either Plato’s Republic or More’s Utopia, with regard to the stimulus provided by the real existence of free political space. Quantitative differences do become qualitative.

More’s revival of an ancient genre was fuller than that attempted or achieved by earlier humanists because of the difference in historical setting. He thus became responsible for adding to our language the adjective utopian and the common noun utopia. Conceptually, these words convey the idea of a fictional polity which is ideal because free from external constraints. Utopia is able to achieve and maintain the best commonwealth possible for men because it can experiment wholesale with fundamental social institutions. Histories of utopian thought have thereby become possible, from More to Orwell, and by anachronism these may be made to embrace even Plato. So thorough has been the degree to which More’s invention has pervaded the modern tradition. The warm, southern seas were soon filled with ideal polities and with travellers happy to escape the less than ideal European ones.

By Locke’s time the idea of America had lost some of its original meaning, although it was still far from exhausted. Colonizing and empire-building as well as wars for empire had drained the powerful image of America of most of its content, which was basically freedom from European conventions. America was by European standards an incredibly free space, even in Locke’s time. But for reasons I will make clear, Locke refused to see in America either a pure state of nature, as Montaigne had, or a social state more desirable than that in Europe. The actual establishment of patriarchies in the New World and also true polities had altered it from what it might once have been.

The central feature of More’s work is an opening up of the idea of freedom, politically, ethically, and economically, for people in Utopia.
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The commonwealth there is not a paradigm set up in heaven nor a myth of the projection of the well-ordered soul in political terms, of the sort we find in Plato's Republic and Timaeus. It is a true and genuine state in that it is no longer suspended between thought and reality. Although embedded in a traveller's report in exactly the same manner as the reports given by Socrates and Critias in the Platonic dialogues, the tale of Utopia differs from its antique models. Its verisimilitude hinges on the fact that the traveller is actually able to go to the place he describes. We no longer confront the myth of a world released in perfect form from the hand of the gods or a demiurge. We confront instead the report of a wholly human piece of engineering. And it is this difference in the ontological status of Utopia that is so important.

Why? Because the Utopians live by virtue of reason, on utilitarian principles which seem attainable, without private property, and with guarantees of religious liberty. Spiritual life is a personal thing, and the magistrates in Utopia do not cut windows into people's souls. But a citizen is subject to banishment, if he or she stirs up people with Christian doctrines in an evangelical way. The temporal order depends for its durability on the principles of reasonable argument and also on the absence of private property. Pride (superbia) is indulged in human affairs chiefly though acquisitiveness, for property is the mark of power and social superiority. The Utopians embrace communism as the only way to avoid that "conspiracy of the rich" which in other places masquerades as a commonwealth. Community of goods removes the spur to aggression. And without this policy there can be neither the rule of reason nor any form of government by consent. What Hobbes achieved in Leviathan by an external power great enough to repress the proud by force, More achieves in Utopia by the abolition of private property. Communism becomes for him the necessary condition of freedom.

More had a wide variety of sources available to him, from which he could have drawn the radical doctrine of communism. And he also had a wide variety of sources available on the notion that government by consent is the only true commonwealth. But Professor Hexter has convincingly shown how radical was More's departure from traditions available to him, with respect to communism and also with respect to popular government. There is nothing in Utopia like Plato's communism or the various modes of Christian poverty advocated in sources ranging in time from Paul to late medieval radical Franciscan preaching. Nor does More stand in the Stoic tradition on the point of property. All turns on the dictum that where nothing is private, everything is public. The political radicalism of Utopia is in the all-embracing character of public life, which includes even the election of priests. But every political innovation has its basis in the nature of the utopian economy.
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Though More’s ideas are in essence novel within the European tradition, one might be tempted to think of them in terms of imagination and fantasy, seeking in More’s inward mind the spring of his doctrines. But this is a temptation to resist. For it was in America that More found the model for his Utopia. He was not the only humanist to grasp how different the New World was from the Old. The Spaniard Hernán Pérez de Oliva imputed to Columbus not only a recognition of novelty but also a desire to “give to those strange lands the form of our own.” He thus implied a sense of deficiency in the New World. More, on the other hand, whatever the exact sources of his knowledge were, did not consider exporting European institutions to America. On the contrary, he condemned the social patterns of the Old World in Book I of Utopia; and he proposed setting up true commonwealths on the pattern of the strange society found in the New World. In fact, a conventional condemnation of community of property, put into More’s mouth near the end of Book I, provides the occasion for Hythlodaeus to enlarge upon the institutions of Utopia, and especially utopian communism.

Did More intend us to take seriously his attack on European institutions and also the remedy proposed? If so, we must deal with the problem that in the earlier dialogue of Book I it is More who provides the main argument against communism—that by abolishing incentive it leads to poverty and public disorder. Professor Hexter has shown that in the Utopia of More’s first intention there was no attack on the doctrine of community of property and its alleged consequences. The onslaught was an afterthought, placed in the work for reasons having nothing at all to do with More’s intense commitment to recommend utopian practices to Europe.

At this point I must be more definite on the matter of More’s sources. There is in Vespucci’s Second Letter a passage worth quoting at length:

Having no laws and no religious doctrine, they live according to nature. They understand nothing of the immortality of the soul. There is no possession of private property among them, for everything is in common. They have no king, nor do they obey anyone. Each is his own master. There is no administration of justice, which is unnecessary to them. . . .

The consequences of being without private property struck Vespucci with great force, and he returned to the matter again and again. There was no administration of justice, for justice was giving to each what was his own; and in America the concept of one’s own had no meaning. For example, there was no litigation among heirs: “They do not have heirs, because they do not have private property.” Nor was there among the Americans any just cause for war:

considering that they held no private property or sovereignty of empires.
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and kingdoms and did not know any such thing as lust for possession, that is, pillaging or a desire to rule, which appear to me to be the cause of war and every disorderly act. . . . 37

Professor Hexter depicts More’s “methodical annihilation” of property and the money economy as a “true masterpiece of constructive imagination.” 38 I do not see it in that way at all. Rather, I see More rising to a real challenge in political theory. Beginning from a postulate about human behavior—that mankind seeks to annex the goods of this world because these are thought to be good—More had made an analysis of the error in such thinking and hence of the natural sinfulness of mankind. America provided new hope, because there people lived in little commonwealths without private property. What had always appeared natural might therefore be merely conventional. Armed with this new observation of reality, More made a coherent explanation of politics on what I would call the “American Principle.” He did not make a flight of fancy or construct the new arrangements out of his imagination entirely. Rather he developed a theory to fit the new facts, a theory in which some traditional ideas about the rule of reason were no longer defeated by the lust for gain. Theory must not be confused with baseless speculation. For theory is an effort to explain what is real. And More, under Vespucci’s spell, was able to base his new politics in the solid reality of the reports of communism in America. It is much more important to grasp this point than to place More in the line of socialist thinkers. To grasp this point is to understand the contrast between fantasy and theory and hence to understand the ground on which More stood. For he found the tools for a critique of the emerging order of European capitalism not in his mind but in the less familiar territory of America.

In Tudor England, More’s Utopia quickly became politically a dangerous book to read and in economic terms one repugnant to the temper of those who were most concerned about America. Even John Rastell, the first Englishman to describe America, saw in it little beyond an avenue to riches and national glory. 39 The merchants quickly came to dominate within the image of the New World. The poets sometimes depict America in idyllic terms, but more often we find in Sidney, Spenser, and Marlowe a place to hit the enemy and advance private fortune. 40 Chapman contributed a scene to Eastward Ho! which has in it a fitting symbol of English attitudes. Seagull, the aptly named sharper who profits from public innocence, urges townsfolk to go to Virginia “to share the rest of her maidenhead.” The mood of exploitation is not More’s, but we recognize this passage below as lifted from Utopia:

I tell thee, Gold is more plentiful there than Copper is with us. . . . Why man, all there dripping pans and their chamber pots are pure Gold; and
all the chains with which they chain up their streets are massy Gold; all
the prisoners they take are fettered in Gold. . . . 41

More’s message from *Utopia* quickly found translation into a clean
contrary language. Virtue was no longer the result of foreswearing
private property. Instead, it waited on wealth from America. 42 Raleigh
proclaimed the message in a single sentence, as he announced his
intention to sail to America “to see new worlds for gold, for praise, for
glory.” 43 This poetic vision found confirmation in the plays of Jonson,
Marston, Massinger, Mayne, and Middleton, in whose works America
was the place to make a fortune or escape the consequences of folly,
avoiding the penalties of crime and leaving creditors in the suds. 44

Shakespeare provides a link back to More’s principle, however.
Whether or not he took his cue from Strachey’s account of Gates’ and
Somers’ wreck at Bermuda, in *The Tempest* he plumbs the depths of the
meaning of America, by bringing Caliban face to face with the meaning
of civilization, and providing a scene in which Gonzalo, an “honest old
councillor,” becomes the poet of the state of nature. Gonzalo recalls
*Utopia* in a double sense. The so-called “dialogue on counsel” in Book I
presented the perversity of European institutions in the context of the
obligations of a counselor to give wise advice to his sovereign. There is
no easy answer to that question, although the obligation of an honest
counselor is to show how to set the best commonwealth. 45 Hythlodaeus
presents his own answer to the question of good counsel in his discourse
on *Utopia*. Surrounded by Sebastian and others intent on private gain
by any means, Gonzalo is thus the perfect man to pick up the theme of
freedom first set out by Prospero. Enjoining his companions to thankful­
ness for their preservation in the wreck, he enlarges on their good
fortune. Their island has on it everything advantageous to life. Gonzalo
spies in its bounty the means to create a perfect commonwealth. And he
addresses himself to men with murder in their minds:

> I’ th’ commonwealth I would by contraries
> Execute all things; for no kind of traffick
> Would I admit; no name of magistrates;
> Letters should not be known; riches, poverty,
> And use of service, none; contract, succession,
> Bourn, bound of land, tilth, vineyard, none;
> No use of metal, corn, or wine, or oil;
> No occupation—all men idle, all;
> And women too, but innocent and pure;
> No sovereignty.  46

Sebastian and Antonio ridicule Gonzalo, as he says “All things in
Common nature should produce” (II.i.163-164). The scene ends on a
comic note, before the plotters return to the heavy business of arranging
to murder Gonzalo, “that can prate amply and unnecessarily” (II.i.268-269).

What are we to think of Gonzalo’s utopian speech? Prospero praised his old counselor, suggesting to us that Shakespeare’s concern with social justice (and the opportunity in the New World) was a serious one (V.i.61-71). I am not deterred in this line of arguing by the fact that most critics consider the scene a playful one. Shakespeare borrowed very little from other authors for The Tempest. But he did borrow the speech provided Gonzalo from Montaigne, by way of John Florio’s translation. And in Montaigne’s essay “Of Cannibals” we cannot doubt the seriousness of the author. He addressed himself to American society in that essay because the discovery of a boundless country was worthy of consideration (150). In what sense? At first to disprove any connection between America and the lost worlds reported in Plato and Aristotle. But that disproof was a diversion from the main topic, which was to show that in the New World we can see “what Nature has produced by herself and in her normal course” (152).

Of course there is a difficulty in adducing Montaigne in this way. He plainly contrasts the virtues of barbarian America and the corruption and decadence of civilized Europe. But that does not tell against his seriousness of purpose, when he writes that Europeans suppose their own country’s religion, government and manners to be perfect, while at the same time praising the wild and barbarian Americans who have not been “led astray from the common order of nature” (152). Despite the coming of the Europeans, the Americans are admirable because

The laws of nature still rule them, very little corrupted by ours; and they are in such a state of purity that I am sometimes vexed that they were unknown earlier, in the days when there were men better able to judge them better than we. I am sorry that Lycurgus and Plato did not know of them; for it seems to me that what we actually see in these nations surpasses not only all the pictures in which poets have idealized the golden age and all their inventions in imagining a happy state of man, but also the conceptions and the very desire of philosophy. They could not imagine a naturalness so pure and simple as we see by experience; nor could they believe that any society could be maintained with so little artifice and human solder. This is a nation, I should say to Plato, in which there is no sort of traffic, no knowledge of letters, no science of numbers, no names for a magistrate or for political superiority, no custom of servitude, no riches or poverty, no contracts, no successions, no partitions, no occupations but leisure ones, no care for any but common kinship, no clothes, no agriculture, no metal, no use of wine or wheat. The very words that signify lying, treachery, dissimulation, avarice, envy . . . [are] unheard of. How far from this perfection would he find the republic that he imagined (153; italics added).
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I have argued that in More the experience of America was more important than his powers of imagination. On this point, Montaigne is clear beyond a reasonable doubt. Not only did he say it was impossible for philosophers to imagine a better society than that actually existing among Americans, "with so little artifice and human solder," but he also understood that Europeans would resist honest reports of travellers in the New World, even those "wedded to no theory" (152). This is the mood of Utopia: hearers of Hythlodaeus' account will be skeptical, although More like Montaigne knows that his society is skeptical. The Frenchman makes the point about skepticism ironically. He has met three American Indians at the court of Charles IX, at Rouen in 1562. They had been asked what they found most interesting or hard to understand in Europe. Montaigne can remember that the Indians made three replies, but he recalls the substance of only two of the answers some 16 or 18 years later. The Americans were amazed by the superior power held among the people by unworthy persons (Charles IX). And they were even more uncomprehending that property was not held in common, there being in Europe some men "full and gorged with all sorts of good things" while there were others "emaciated with hunger and poverty" (159).

Yet Montaigne stood on ground quite dissimilar to that occupied by either More or Shakespeare, if we consider the reality of America and the "American Principle." Shakespeare's island scene has the qualities of a fairy-tale. Gonzalo's words already have about them the "utopian" quality of unreality (and fantasy) we meet in modern usage of the adjective. The old counselor's yearning is speculative: "Had I plantation of this isle, my lord. . . ." It is a condition contrary to fact. But there is a point of contact between More and Shakespeare, of course, in the image of a bounteous, politically unformed space. And between Montaigne and Shakespeare there is an even closer contact. For Montaigne had already begun to shape the American experience philosophically into a doctrine of the state of nature, a state in which people lived in harmony with laws of nature accessible to mankind through reason. Shakespeare's Caliban is a powerful symbol of the natural state. Gonzalo's commonwealth is another. These ideas, or rather the sorts of men who represented them, were utterly foreign to More's train of thought, however.

The alchemy of time has worked a profound transformation on More's original understanding of the meaning of America. More's commonwealth did not exist by "nature," but by a deliberate human act overthrowing the old laws and the basis of the old society. The people in More's world were not naturally good, but by nature corrupted and so in need of institutions to restrain their unbridled acquisitiveness. The
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world interpreted by Montaigne and Shakespeare was filled with people who were good by nature but likely to be corrupted by civilization. We have entered the world of Hobbes and Locke, by the main door.

Hobbes was as harsh in his judgment of human nature as ever More was. Recall his terrible dictum:

I put for a general inclination of all mankind, a restless and continual desire of power, that ceaseth only in death.50

Also like More, Hobbes thought in great extended metaphors—what else is Leviathan?—and was, as a philosopher, eager to ground a knowledge of politics in more fundamental sciences. Where More created puffs of the spirit, Hobbes created a great determinist system. Hobbes took account of reality only long enough to find a behavioral truth on which to build his epistemology, his ethics, and his politics. He thus stood in the classical tradition of abstract thinkers at the same time as he dealt that tradition a terrible blow.

The classical tradition from which later political thinkers took their bearing held that man cannot reach the perfection of his nature except in civil society. This doctrine led the ancients to say that civil society was prior to the individual and superior to him. More was in the grip of this idea, for in Utopia what is observable about the nature of man is very much a function of the social situation there. Human rights, or natural ones, had no meaning in Utopia apart from the context of the polity. More was thus a classicist in the matter of refusing to speak of human nature apart from social life or in ascribing inalienable rights to man. Rigorous Christian thinkers had always had trouble with such ideas, starting as they did with the Augustinian doctrine of human nature or less pessimistic versions of it.

Hobbes turned the whole idea upside down. He came to believe in a state of nature anterior to social life and also prior to civil society. The condition of life anterior to social life he called the state of nature. In it there were no duties, only rights; and the individual was prior to ordered life of any sort, fixed in his nature, and sovereign. Ruthless acquisitiveness reigned, not Gonzalo's communism.51 Hobbes was thus directly at odds with Montaigne and other revisionists of the classical tradition who also supposed life according to nature predated social life but was in essence superior to it.52

It is necessary to summarize Hobbes' famous argument here, in order to show how he accounts for property and also to say something about his indifference to America.

Hobbes' basic postulate is psychological. Men seek to obtain the things they find desirable or good. They avoid what they find noxious or evil. Each desires his own good, but men differ in reckoning what that
is. Power is the means to get and to avoid. Hence men ceaselessly pursue power. But by nature men are substantially equal with respect to power. What distinguishes them is what they are able to acquire. The habit of acquisition is dangerous, however, for in the state of nature there is no governor to restrain the impulses of essentially equal contestants. Hence the state of nature is a state of war. In it, no man is secure in the enjoyment of his goods or life. Thus the first law of nature discovered by mankind is the necessity of civil peace. For civil peace is the condition of self-preservation, which is the greatest good of all. But civil peace requires some neutral power to curb the aggression of self-help and keep men out of each other's way. It is therefore good in reason and a natural law that men submit to civil laws and the rule of magistrates appointed to oversee human affairs. This can be done only by covenant, out of mutual self-interest. For without such a covenant in which each agrees to forego the right to exercise the ultimate power, the power to kill, life offers only the prospect of perpetual fear and violent death. 53

My summary points up the relentless consequences of having property as the basis of society. 54 Between goods and what is good there is nothing to choose in Hobbes. And it is on this point that an abyss divides him from More. The assumptions in More's work are socialist: he is the theorist of communal interests. The assumptions in Hobbes are those of possessive individualism. If they are not yet bourgeois, they are at least assumptions necessary to bourgeois morality. What is lacking in Hobbes is the idea that possessive individualism is naturally harmonious. Hobbes is still too close to More in at least one respect. He sees pride of possession as an ugly, deforming thing. Leviathan, he says, "is the king of the proud." And society exists only for gain and glory. Thus, no matter how far apart they are in providing means to relieve the ills they analyze, More and Hobbes have abstracted from European life a quite similar understanding of human character. The difference lies in this: Hobbes supposes that what he sees in Europe is the universal character of man; More, under the influence of America, says this is not the case. Hobbes is not the theorist of commodity fetishism, but his view of property moved him to suppose mankind in the state of nature is free of social ties and by nature anarchical. 55

But Hobbes put limits on the role of property in society. He did not provide a guarantee for it under all circumstances. Hobbes upheld the right to life above the right to possess goods. He said it was no crime to steal in order to live, thereby echoing the common law tradition which waived penalties for petty theft in times of famine. 56 He also supported reform of the poor law, an attitude utterly foreign to sterner men of property like Sir Matthew Hales. 57

Hobbes' thought seems to be utterly unaffected by America. At least there is in Leviathan no argument addressed to the society found
in America, despite our expectation that he would follow Montaigne and others in comparing the state of things there and the state of nature. Indeed, Hobbes makes only three references to America in *Leviathan*; and of these only one is of consequence. He comments on the lack of heraldry (I.x.61). He scoffs at the pretentions of the kings of Peru to be children of the sun (I.xii.76). The third reference occurs in the important chapter “On the Naturall Condition of Mankind, as Concerning their Felicity and Misery.” Here we find Hobbes’s discourse on the state of nature, and the famous description of life as “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short . . . .” Hobbes has acknowledged the unhistorical character of his doctrine of a universal, perfect state of nature. Yet he takes comfort from the American example:

For the savage people in many places of America, except the government of small families, that concord whereof dependeth on naturall lust, have no government at all; and live at this day in that brutish manner, as I said before. (I.xiii.83).

This is the one passage in which Hobbes shores up his doctrine with an explicit example drawn from the New World. And it is most notable for its variance from the reports others make and the conclusions they draw from the available literature. Where others report an absence of property and war, Hobbes finds a general insecurity of property among men in a state of war.

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that Hobbes simply made his data conform to his model.

Compare this dark and limited reading of the American record with what we find in Locke, chiefly in his *Two Treatises of Government*. Locke was as much a theorist of natural law and a rationalist as Hobbes, but his most basic commitment was to devise a theory to fit the known facts about nature and human behavior. Reason by itself failed men, he taught, if they tried to make out the law of nature by its light. He chose as his guide what he called the light of common sense. Unlike Hobbes, who claimed to have found certain arithmetic and geometric rules “for making and maintaining commonwealths,” and for whom America hardly mattered, Locke found the basis for his doctrines in his direct experience of European politics and his study of America.\(^{58}\) Where Locke absorbed what he could about the continents and islands of the New World, Hobbes wished to discover an island exempt from causation, an artificial place, the creation of his own science, in order to understand the basis of politics. Leo Strauss grasped this fully: “It was Machiavelli, that greater Columbus, who had discovered the new continent on which Hobbes would erect his structure.”\(^{59}\)

Locke was a “politician” on the lines advocated by Harrington, who
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said “No man can be a politician [that is, a student of politics] except he be first a historian or a traveller.” Locke was certainly well-travelled, and he had in his library a large number of books about America, almost all of them acquired before he wrote his Two Treatises. He was also a man of vast practical experience in American affairs, as Secretary to the Associated Proprietors of the Colony of Carolina, an office in the gift of his patron Anthony Ashley Cooper, the future Earl of Shaftesbury. But what impact did his knowledge of America and the people there have on his political thought?

Mr. Laslett has established that Locke wrote the Two Treatises to refute Sir Robert Filmer’s Patriarcha, rather than Hobbes’ Leviathan. But Locke did not altogether “escape the shadow of Leviathan,” as Laslett said, particularly with regard to the relationship between property and justice. Hobbes had written the striking sentence “Where there is no own, that is no Propriety, there is no Injustice; and where there is no coercive Power erected, that is, where there is no Commonwealth, there is no Propriety; all men having right to all things....” It follows from this that property could not exist apart from government, which is another way of saying that any prepolitical state must be a communal state.

The implications of Hobbes’ sentence ought to have forced him to reexamine his own doctrine of the state of nature, perhaps in the light of his own reference to American life. But Hobbes avoided the task. Locke could not. His own knowledge of colonizing adventures told in favor of the hypothesis that communism rather than anarchy was the true state of men in nature, or in that facsimile of nature, the plantations of America. In the actual settlement of Virginia, Bermuda, and Old Providence, the Company had in each case provided a period of communism to safeguard the interests of both planters and colonists. The establishment of private property in chattel and land took place only after the common stock had grown sufficiently large to secure the profits of the joint stock holders.

These were facts known to Locke, just as he knew from his own reading of Utopia and travel literature about America that communism existed there, not as a deduction from principles but as a matter of common observation.

We shall understand the Two Treatises better if we consider them as the focal point of Locke’s vehement rejection of what I have called the “American Principle.” There can be no doubt that Locke understood the point Hobbes had made. For he returned to it after completing the Two Treatises, in his celebrated Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690). There he declared, “Where there is no property there is no injustice is a proposition as certain as any in Euclid.” Now no philosopher would openly prefer a regime in which injustice existed to a regime in which injustice was impossible. Locke therefore faced a critical choice: he could either abandon his defense of private property, or he could try to show...
that others had radically misunderstood the American situation, particularly the so-called state of nature. For Locke had no meaningful idea of liberty apart from property.68

Locke had demonstrated his concern for private property as early as 1669, when he wrote (together with Lord Ashley) The Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina. The colony had been set up by Charles II to benefit Locke’s patron and some partners, partly as a reward for service and partly to rescue Lord Ashley from poverty. The Charter of 1663 was a “liberal” one in that it tolerated religious dissent among those who were quiet in their dissent, while also providing that all freemen must consent to laws passed in the colony. Early attempts to establish the colony failed, however. Lord Ashley then asked Locke to provide a set of constitutions for Carolina, a request that moved Locke to produce what Professor Morison calls “the longest, most fantastic and reactionary of all colonial regimes in America.”69 In the frame of government Locke provided a nobility of manorial lords arranged on a ladder: barons with 3,000 acres; cassiques with 12,000 acres; landgraves with 20,000 acres. He gave the lords a veto over any bill passed in the House of Commons.

The raw conditions of pioneer life told against Locke’s scheme. The Commons ignored the stipulations about legislative process and also prevented the upper nobility from attending the governor’s council. Small farmers, timber shippers, and barrel makers made the plantation profitable and had the chief voice in politics, until Huguenots in the tidewater developed huge rice plantations on the basis of slave labor in accord with Locke’s own preference.70

We cannot set down The Fundamental Constitutions to youthful excess, however. The mature statesman of the 1680’s wrote into the second Treatise what he thought were true principles of government. It is therefore significant that he incorporated into it anti-democratic and anti-majoritarian ideas already familiar in the work of 1669—for example, the forfeit of the will of the majority to the rule of reason.71 He also made a spirited defense of the lawfulness of Negro slavery, on the basis of the rights conquerors have over captives taken in a war, rights he assigned to the Carolina freemen.72

Still, the right to possess slaves is only a peculiar right of property in Locke. Hence it is necessary to look more closely at the general development of his treatment of property in the Two Treatises.

For the most part, the first ten chapters of Book I (the first Treatise) are taken up with biblical exegesis in order to refute Filmer on aspects of patriarchy. At one point Locke adverts to property in relationship to sovereignty, in contending against Filmer’s assertion that fatherhood and property are the dual foundations of dominion (I.vii.73). But he does not reach the question of property fully until the eleventh chapter of Book I, “Who Heir?” To that point he had argued that in patriarchal
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societies no political question arose, much less that of sovereign dominion. In “Who Heir?” he shifts his argument: “the great Question which in all ages has disturbed mankind...[is] not whether there be Power in the World, nor whence it came, but Who should have it?” (I.xi.106). The cat is out of the bag.

The most important question in politics is not either the origin or nature of power, but rather the enjoyment of property. A “Reformer of Politics,” Locke said, “should lay this sure, and be very clear in it” (I.xi.106). The right to possess a thing gives an edge to ambition. If the right is left disputable, men will stumble into contention and disorder instead of living in peace and tranquility. To provide peace and tranquility is the business of government and the end of human society. On this point More and Locke agree. But More had solved the problem in Utopia by setting society on a foundation in which no question of inheritance could arise because there was no property to devise to heirs. Vespucci had reported the absence of the custom of inheritance among Americans. Shakespeare, following Montaigne, had abolished “successions.”

I take it as no accident, therefore, that in the eleventh chapter Locke for the first time makes significant use of what he knows of America. In the first ten chapters there are plentiful references to Bodin, Grotius, Filmer, and the Bible. There are some references to English statutes. But I am able to find only one indirect reference to the New World before Locke raises the problem of inheritance (I.vi.58).

In the eleventh chapter, Locke is at pains to refute Filmer’s strange doctrine that kings are heir to Adam’s power. To do so he makes no more important argument than the one based on the experience of planters in the rude societies of the West Indies. It is a matter of fact that the planters there have a sort of dominion. But it does not stand by inheritance from anybody. The planters acquire their power with their possessions, by the use of money or some means of trade. Their case is one suitable to test a theory of patriarchy as a political state. For the style of life among the planters is indeed patriarchal. They not only buy and sell; they make war, which Filmer takes for a mark of sovereignty in “politick societies” (I.xi.130). But Filmer would not say that every planter is a king. Hence Locke concludes that the state in which planters live in America is not a political state at all. Nor is it a state of nature in Hobbes’ sense. For it is clearly a social state, if a prepolitical one: the planters live in a voluntary state of society in which there is no common superior to arbitrate disputes. There is no civil society, but there is clearly private property, which cannot therefore ever be said to exist only where there is government (I.xi.131).

The Bible was not a good ground for understanding politics. Consider America again. There were whole continents in which the
people “think little of Noah, his sons and nephews,” living without any sense of deriving their rights from the patriarchs of the Old Testament (I.xi.141). America had been “left to be His that could catch it,” peopled by little bands, as in the peopling of Carolina by the English, French, Scots, and Welsh:

[They] plant themselves together and by them the Country is divided in their Lands after their Tongues, after their Families, after their Nations. . . .

(I.xi.142,144)

Europeans in America brought Locke face to face with a powerful image of how society arose in hitherto vacant spaces, created by people who congregated together on certain elementary bases of affinity. Their condition was prepolitical but social and proprietary. He insists on the division of the lands and extrapolates from this general idea his own image of what primitive America must have been like:

Or because in many Parts of America, every little Tribe was a distinct People, with a different Language. . . though we know not Who were their Governors, nor what their form of Government, but only that they were divided into little Independent Societies, speaking different Languages.

(I.xi.144)

The state of the Americans was a real one, but it was not a state of nature, any more than the state of the planters could be thus described. Knowledge of it provided no ground for a politician to “make out what Model of an Eutopia will best suit his Fancy or Interests” (I.xi.147). Yet it was a common trick for authors to work up “confused Accounts” out of sources having to do with the West Indies or the “Northern America” (I.xi.153). All that could be said about such societies was that they had a certain resemblance to patriarchies but not to civil governments. There was nothing in their experience to make us suppose that political power existed among them or that we could gain any understanding from them of the power magistrates have over a people in civil society (II.i.2-3). For political power had to do with a common superior set up to make laws with penalties of death and also lesser penalties, for the better “Regulating and Preserving of Property” (II.i.3). The primitives in America, like the planters, had property, but they knew nothing of employing the force of the community against foreign and domestic enemies for the common good.

Locke had not yet satisfied the demands made on him by the troublesome myth of the state of nature, however. From the point of view of common sense, the state of nature was simply “that State all Men are naturally in,” that is, according to Locke, a condition of perfect freedom “to act in order to dispose of their Possessions and Persons as they see fit,” limited only by the Law of Nature (II.i.4). Locke meant by the law of Nature nothing more than that man is reasonable and therefore
able to conclude from experience the necessity of self-restraint. "We are born Free as we are born Rational" is Locke's best formulation of the problem (II.vi.61). Human freedom to act without external restraint is a function of reason, which causes us to restrain ourselves from acts abridging the freedom of other persons (II.vi.63). Children are thus born into a condition of freedom but are not free until they reach the age of reason. In early life we do willful injury to others and are likely to be injured or destroyed because of it (II.vi.55 and vx.172).

On rational principles, then, the state of nature may be said to exist, but that this was the original condition of humanity is an inference not susceptible to proof. Wherever there are people they are either in a civil state or at least in a social state. If they are in a civil society we must conclude that they at some time established a common superior according to the rule of reason, in the interest of life and property. We cannot observe this agreement, because government is everywhere antecedent to records (II.viii.101). But we can observe the modern parallel in that heads of state at war with one another reach agreements from self-interest for the common good. Nothing more clearly establishes that the state of nature is not in essence a state of war. War is rather an accidental disturbance of the rule of reason, which is natural (II.iii.16-19).

Again, the American experience is useful. The planters and the primitive peoples there are wholly private parties, treating with one another on reasonable grounds, even with interlopers. Peace is fragile there because there is no sovereign to protect it (II.ii.14 and x.136). Hence in America men eager to enjoy life, liberty, and property give up independence (II.ii.9 and 19) by "putting themselves in Society" (II.iii.21). Their purpose in so doing is not merely self-preservation, which is their natural right (II.v.25). It is to secure the property which is also natural, despite assertions to the contrary. Locke accepts the necessity of showing

How Men might come to have a property in several parts of that which God gave to Mankind in Common, and that without any express Compact of all the Commoners. (II.v.25)

It is a measure of Locke's integrity that we find this sentence in his work at all. For Locke has just finished asserting the naturalness of property. Yet he recognizes the force of the argument that the earth was given by God to "Mankind in Common." Locke could not say that the act of Creation was unnatural. Nor could he deny what he took to be the evidence of his senses, which had taught him that in all human societies private property existed, even in those American societies supposed by some to preserve the original community of property. What in the natural order of things allowed the establishment of private property without the express consent of the commoners? For without consent
there was no obligation, and Locke had no interest in overthrowing the doctrine of consent.

I cannot provide an examination of the way Locke chose to solve the problem of private property. To do so would require going over the path by which he moved from the assertion that we have a property in our own person to the assertion of the labor theory of value (II.v.27-45). The view that we have a property in our own person is an axiom. We have the right to our bodies. And it is the use of our bodies that appropriates “out of the state of nature” a thing to our own use. An Indian slaying a deer, a horse chewing a piece of turf, labors at a thing and thereby creates a new right in it (II.v.28-30). Work fixes one’s property in a thing, by extending the natural function of our body into it (II.v.28). Moreover, in laboring, we fulfill God’s commandment to subdue the earth (II.v.32). Hence property is godly, despite the fact that we enclose a piece of the common. Locke is the theorist of the view that to grow prosperous is to do God’s will.

He that in Obedience to this Command of God, subdued, tilled and sowed any part of it thereby annexed to him something that was his Property, which another has no title to, nor could without injury take from him. (II.v.32)

Nor was this Appropriation of any parcel of Land, by improving it, any prejudice to any other Man, since there was still enough, and as good, left. . . . (II.v.33)

God gave the World to Men in Common; but since He gave it to them for their benefit . . . it cannot be supposed he meant it should always remain Common and uncultivated. He gave it to the use of the Industrious and Rational (and Labor was to be his Title to it) not to the Fancy and Covetousness of the Quarrelsome and Contentious. (II.v.34)

These passages strongly suggest a preoccupation with the fanaticism of the Diggers and other communists of the era of the Civil War as well as the debate over Enclosure in England. But the contest for land in England was not the only thing in Locke’s mind, as he tried to solve the problem he had set for himself. He referred to the Spanish custom of allowing peasant squatters to appropriate fully waste lands they had reduced to tillage (II.v.36). And he closed the circle by looking to America once again for proof that the “rule of propriety” was natural. Colonists had seized land in America and were justified in doing so, on the grounds that what they made their own was not much, or likely to be of harm or prejudice to the rest of mankind (II.v.36). Also, the beneficial argument was central. How could America be of benefit to the human race, if it were allowed to lie fallow?

For I ask whether in the wild woods and uncultivated wastes of America
left to Nature, without any improvement, tillage or husbandry, a thousand acres will yield the needy and wretched inhabitants as many conveniences of Life as ten acres of fertile Land doe in Devonshire where they are well cultivated? (II. v. 37)

Locke does not so much meet head-on More's American Principle, that community of property is the key to a good commonwealth, as he goes around it. Locke asserts that the natural thing is to maximize production and hence profit, a principle consistent with his behavioral postulate, which is that men desire to annex goods for their own use, the more the better, in the name of happiness. Thus for Locke the "Property of Labor" overbalances the "Community of Land" or any other idea about natural resources (II. v. 40). For Labor alone "putts the difference of value" on a thing:

There cannot be a clearer demonstration of any thing, than several Nations of the Americas are of this, who are rich in Lands, and poor in all the comforts of Life; whom Nature having furnished as liberally as any other People, with the materials of Plenty... yet for want of improving it by labor, have not one hundredth part of the Conveniences we enjoy: And a King there feeds, lodges, and is clad worse than a day Laborer in England. (II. v. 41)

The whole tendency of Locke's thought was to bury from view that other vision of the New World, the vision of More and Vespucci, of a place that was good because it lacked the institution of property. Locke casually admitted that in America there were native "Commoners," ignorant of money until introduced to it by Europeans (II. v. 46). But this ignorance hindered their enlargement as a people, because in a bounteous land men soon passed the limits of immediate consumption and hence of useful property:

For I ask, what would a Man value Ten Thousand Acres of excellent Land, ready cultivated, and well stocked too with Cattle, in the middle of America, where he had no hope of Commerce with the other parts of the World, to draw Money to him by the Sale of his Product? It would not be worth the Enclosing, and we should see him give it up again to the wild Commons of Nature, whatever may more than would supply the Conveniences of Life... (II. v. 48)

Locke is often said to be the first European fully to appreciate the new science of anthropology and to use it for advancing his doctrines. That may well be true. But More had a better grasp of the essence of traditional life there, even though he knew less about it. He seemed better able to appreciate the situation of Commoners in nature: working with her rather than confronting or exploiting her. More did not see nature—everything made by God's fiat—only in economic terms. He
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created no myth of the state of nature, but he was stimulated to think creatively about politics by the discovery of societies where there was community of property.

English thinkers after More grappled with the image of America on quite different principles. The net result was to transform America from a symbol of radical freedom into a symbol of opportunity for appropriation. Locke completed this transformation, creating in the course of his work the fullest expression of what later came to be the ideology of the American Revolution. Of course, there were some in England who held to More's vision, like the anonymous radical pamphleteer who in Tyrannipocris Discovered (1649) attacked Cromwell's Commonwealth in More's words, calling it a conspiracy of "rich thieves." And there is an irony in knowing that when Cornwallis surrendered to the Americans at Yorktown in 1781 some Americans played the tune "The World Turned Upside Down." For that was an echo of a radical ballad popular in Digger and Leveller circles in 1646, as well as the title of a tract later written by an American communist, early in the nineteenth century. But not even the flowering of the utopian movement in America in the nineteenth century, when Emerson said everyone went about with a scheme for Utopia in his pocket, compensates fully for Locke's melancholy truth:

Thus in the beginning all the World was America, and more than that is now; for no such thing as Money was ever known. Find out anything that has the Use and Value of Money ... you will see Man presently begin to enlarge his Possessions. (II.v.49)
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Some 20 years ago I maintained that the transition from the classical idea of the Golden Age to the polemical myth of the Noble Savage (which one can already observe in the work of Montaigne) did not take place in sixteenth-century Italy. Since then the publication of the Jesuit documents on the New World missions has provided abundant new material about the sources of information available in Italy in the second half of the century.

A certain number of Letters from the Indies (Eastern as well as Western) had been translated into Italian and published when the General of the Order, Acquaviva, promoted in 1581 the regular publication of the Annuae litterae in Latin which continued in Italy until 1607; at that point the letters for the years 1581-97 had been completed. The materials contained in the Monumenta missionum, in the three-part series...
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of the *Monumenta mexicana*, edited by Father Félix Zubillaga, the *Monumenta peruana*, edited by Father Antonio de Egaña, and the *Monumenta Brasiliae*, edited by Father Serafim Leite, now permit a critical evaluation of these *Litterae*—their genesis and their relationship to the original information sent by the missionaries. Moreover, they help to identify the specific contribution of the Italian missionaries who had previously been indistinguishable in the reports contained in the *Annuae*. In light of these new sources, the problem of the influence of the American experiences on utopian thought and on Italian political thought in general during the first decades of the Counter-Reformation can therefore be taken up once again and placed in a wider context.

The importance which missionary activity had from the very beginning among the aims of the Society of Jesus is well known. On 1 December 1558 the recently-elected Father General Lainez sent the missionaries in the Indies a first letter "as proof," he said, "that I keep all of you inscribed in my soul." In 1576 his successor, Saint Francis Borgia, instructed the missionaries of Spanish America to ascertain, in their contacts with the Indians, "which errors and pagan sects they follow," and to immediately approach their chiefs; he added to this advice a number of missionary criteria. These were inevitably marred by European prejudices; still, they show a humanistic and Christian inspiration, to which the enterprise of evangelism would owe its genuine success: "Always consider carefully," wrote the Father General, "the softness of those souls and the primitive state of those minds. They will not be able to shoulder the load that can be borne here by perfectly rational people, who have greater knowledge of God Our Lord."

The cultural background of the Society of Jesus included, in fact, the idea of the American Indian as endowed with the autonomous ability to raise himself from a primitive, uncivilized, and abject state to the level of civilized societies. As decisive proof of such ability the Jesuits repeatedly asserted the Indians' aptitude for fully absorbing Christian teaching. This vision confirmed the superiority of Europe against every temptation to apply relativistic theories: the aborigines appeared potentially capable of all Christian virtues only after overcoming their state of obvious inferiority. The germinal problems about the nature and meaning of the hasty mass conversions, which were inherent in such a vision, developed so far beyond those relating to the missions themselves that they exposed the whole question of the relations between Christianity and pre-Conquest religions—indeed of the condition of pagan Indians before Christian victors.

Various factors, on the other hand, enhanced the missionary ideal: the religious ferment of the Counter-Reformation in the circles close to the Society; the risks involved in the voyage; the prospect of martyrdom. The ideal exerted a considerable influence on the movement that we are
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about to describe. Its force is eloquently documented in the writings (partly studied by Miguel Batllori) of the applicants for overseas missions (the so-called indipeti). One of them, Vespasiano Bonamici, on 25 October 1598 wrote, in an imaginary letter to his parents, that “even though you must have thought me dead for a long time, now I am so indeed, since I have to go to the Indies. Consider me dead, without further hope”; and he added, “Am I to end my life in bed, and Christ on the Cross? Not I, if that is in my power, if I go to the Indies. I might die, but I might not: and at least I will have performed this generous deed for God.” Though in less excited tones and moods, “the desire to go . . . where one could more easily shed blood for God” returns with such frequency in the requests of the aspiring missionaries that their superiors were seriously concerned about preventing unnecessary risks and casualties.

Since 1549 Jesuit missionaries had been established in Brazil under the direction of Father Manuel de Nóbrega, and already on 6 January 1550 there were two Italian Franciscans at Porto Seguro who “made very good examples of themselves and won great fame for their virtue.” We have no record of their names, however, and we have no documented evidence of Jesuit missionaries in Brazil until the arrival of the coadjutor Scipione Comitoli (1561) from the diocese of La Spezia. Father Giuseppe Morinelli followed in 1575 at the head of an entire expedition. He stayed briefly, and had with him a Neapolitan, Father Leonardo Armini, who was then the superior of Tucumán, and Father Giam-battista Giacopuzzi, also from Spezia. In the following years, other Italians arrived: Adriano Giovanni; Father Ventidio Baiardi of Ascoli; the coadjutor Agostino Cifarello, a Neapolitan who died in 1583; Ascanio Bonaiuto, of Lauro (Nola), a tailor.

While no Italians participated in the unfortunate Florida mission (1566-72), they are conspicuous in the missions in Peru (started in 1568) and in New Spain, where the first group of Jesuits arrived four years after (1572). It should be mentioned that not only Castilian and Aragonese missionaries, but all other subjects of His Catholic Majesty were admitted into the New World territories subject to Spain: Neapolitans, Sicilians, Milanese, Sardinians, Belgians. In all, there were about 50 Italians among the 350 Jesuits who left for Spanish America up to the death of Philip II (1598).

The relations between the Italian Jesuits and the far more numerous Spanish brothers were generally good, but not completely so. Teofilo Ciotti, who arrived in Mexico in 1584 and remained there until his death on 31 March 1594, was tormented by a grave illness which he endured with a stalwartness that made him the object of general sympathy. On 15 March 1589 he wrote to General Acquaviva that various professed fathers criticized his work and intended to ask the pope for the nomination of “an independent Vicar General, who should have jurisdiction
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over all of the Indians." Some of them reproached the General for "being . . . Italian, young, and inexperienced"; others charged that he "does not love the Spanish nation as much as he does the provinces of France, Germany, England, Poland, and Japan," and that "he quickly removes the good subjects of Spain and sends them to honor the said provinces, and Spain remains without its good workers. . . ." They requested that the Spaniards have "a general or a vicar of their own, not subject to the Italians or to any other nation." 22

The national pride of the good Ciotti was awakened by these discriminations. He was driven to recall the glories of the "Italian nation which gave laws to the entire world: everything that is good and beautiful, both spiritual and temporal, arose from her, like the rivers and fountains rise from the waters of the sea to fertilize the earth." He requested the shipment of "orationes and other works of rhetoric" in Italian, "it being an honor for all of Italy and for our fathers and brothers, scholars and colleagues, that all nations want to improve themselves by using Italian works and holy Italian labours." 23 Nationalistic conflicts were not limited to the colonies: Bishop Ascanio Cesarini, for example, complained that in the Society "the Spaniards alone are those who rule everything in their own way, excluding from this all the other nations . . . ." 24

But apparently General Acquaviva was not very upset by Ciotti's charges, nor was Ciotti's popularity in the Jesuit community noticeably diminished. In general, Jesuits of Italian origin seem to have enjoyed popularity and esteem: on 12 December 1576 Fathers Juan de la Plata, José de Ácosta, and Baltasar Piñas wrote from Cuzco to the Father General Evrard Mercurian requesting 24 additional missionaries for Peru; they advised him to include in the number some Italians "especially for the contacts with the aborigines, which is the most necessary thing, because they pick up the local language well, and, being able and suave, can have very good results." 25 Those who came from the College of Rome enjoyed a particular renown: "They appear well brought up on the good milk of the Society," wrote Juan de Atienza, Provincial of Peru, on 7 August 1585, "the Society which observes so purely the discipline of our Institution; and those who came from there succeed very well here." 26 Such were Ludovico Bertonio, G. B. Ruffo, Agostino da Pietrasanta, and Roberto d'Arnoni.

In his accusations to Father Acquaviva, Teofilo Ciotti had complained that in Mexico "one does not give attention to oratory or to spiritual men, but only to learning": thus of the 180 Jesuits only about 15 at the most devoted themselves to the Indians. Ciotti seemed to see this as a confirmation of the fears already expressed by the General himself that the Society did nothing "but teach so many of our enemies how they can make war on us, and persecute us their entire life." 27 Neverthe-
less, several Italians persistently asked to dedicate themselves exclusively to missionary work, rather than to instruction in the schools. This trend was much encouraged by Acquaviva.28

One should mention first Giovanni Ferro, apostle of the Tarascans, who arrived in New Spain in 1579 and carried on missionary work among the Mexican populations for 32 years. He was well-known and highly praised for his extraordinary mastery of the indigenous languages—he wrote a catechism in Tarascan, knew and utilized also Mexican (Nahuatl), Cuitlatecan, Contalpan and Matlatzincan in his missionary work.29 In Peru, Roberto d’Arnoni of Cosenza deserves mention; he arrived in 1584, and during 1588-89 he repeatedly asked General Acquaviva to be relieved of the office of minister or vice-superior in order to deal with the Indians. His request was well received and granted, since it seemed to the General a just and pious one.30 Arnoni then learned the Aymara and Quechua languages, which in 1591 he was already using in confession and in sermons; he earned the praises of the General for “his devotion in helping these poor souls.”31 Arnoni acquired such excellent command of Aymara that he was able to teach it at the college of Potosí, where he had the particular task of supervising the proficiency of the parish priests who sought to assume the care of the souls of the Indians.32

Nicolas Mastrilli, of Nola, achieved an eminent position in the organization of the Society in southern America. The Annuae litterae of 1596 say that he was “nobili loco natus.”33 He then assumed the name of Durán (and in Spanish-American literature he is called Durán Mastrilli). He left Cadiz in 159234; in October 1595 he accompanied one of the most enterprising missionaries of Peru, Juan Font of Valencia, in an exploration of the Jauja Andes, near the Pilcozuni, where the two missionaries and their escort, Joan Beles, arrived alone and without any protection. Finding the region almost a complete desert (“nulla plane forma Civitatis”) they moved to the more populous and civilized region of Huamanga (today Ayacucho), where they knew of still another people, the Iscaisinga; but they had to limit themselves to the zone this side of Marañón.35 Font’s further attempts to resume the expedition—resorting even to support from the mother country—never materialized, owing to the resistance of the political and religious authorities of Peru.36 But Mastrilli’s missionary career was anything but finished: he later assumed positions of noteworthy responsibility in the Society as the Provincial of Paraguay and of Tucumán.37

The Neapolitan Leonardo Armini played a part in proselytizing the Santa Fe district, where he was the first representative of the Society for a brief period before returning to Brazil.38 Actually, Armini belonged rather to the other missionary current—the scholars, artists, and teachers—that contributed considerably to the diffusion of European culture, par-
particularly Italian, in the American environment. He taught grammar, theology, and casuistics in the colleges of Pernambuco, Bahía, and Tucumán; this was hardly an adventurous activity, but it did not prevent him from being captured while on a journey in 1587 and threatened with death by the English pirate Withrington. Armini came to be characterized as a man "of outstanding intelligence, but of mediocre judgment, prudence, and experience; with good knowledge of letters; choleric; talented for confession, as well as for teaching theology and casuistics." Later, Bernardo Bitti of Camerino, who was assigned to Peru in 1573 and arrived in Lima in 1575, played an important part in the diffusion of Italian art, particularly of post-Michelangelo Mannerism. Already in 1576 it was said that he had "great talent as a painter." As a matter of fact, his works are preserved in the principal Jesuit church of Saint Peter in Lima; at Juli, on the shores of Lake Titicaca; in the Jesuit churches in Cuzco; in Chuquisaca, capital of the Audiencia of Charcas (modern Bolivia); and in Ayacucho. Lacking in any great intrinsic value, his art nevertheless had a certain influence on the subsequent development of Spanish-American painting.

The Sicilian Vincenzo Le Noci is undoubtedly the most unusual figure among the Jesuit missionaries of Italian origin. Born probably in Syracuse in 1543, he joined the Society in Messina as early as 1559. From 1561-64, he taught in Catania, and then in Messina. He was 24 when in 1567, he asked "to be removed from Sicily to some remote country, like Spain." He managed, for the moment, to be transferred to the diocese of Genoa, where we find him in 1573; from there he persistently asked to be sent to the Indies. But his request was met with determined resistance on the part of Father Alessandro Valignano, who, at the beginning of the following year, drew the following picture of him for General Evrard Mercurian:

Father Vincenzo Le Noci has always been considered by us to be very dangerous and troublesome. If he should go to the Indies, his nature is such that, arriving in a city, he will tum it all upside-down, leaving nothing in sight alone. He immediately takes up diverse friendships and visits from men and women, embracing every sort of business without discretion and he is not very scrupulous in his obedience; but interpreting it in his own manner, he usually does what pleases him in the end and, in short, he displays nothing but vanity and strangeness: thus, in regard to his coming, everyone, i.e., the above-mentioned fathers of Portugal and Father Alessandro [Valla] and Father Francesco Vipera, has decided that in no way should he be sent to the Indies since he has qualities which are contrary to those necessary in that place.

A few months later, however, Le Noci managed to leave for Vera-
cruz as superior of a group of six other Jesuits; he wrote that he was going with the greatest feeling of happiness he had had in his whole life.
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After a troublesome journey, during which many crew members perished and others were stricken by grave illness, he arrived at his destination (1 September 1574) and was assigned to the College of San Pedro y San Pablo in Mexico, as instructor of rhetoric, Greek, and Hebrew. He was a good humanist and an elegant Latinist, judging from the annual letters he wrote from Mexico, dated 31 December 1574 and 1 January 1577. He taught the students in the more advanced courses, and introduced the “Roman curriculum” into Mexican teaching. The students had to learn their lessons by heart, doing exercises in grammar and rhetoric, translating from Greek to Latin and vice versa, reciting poetry, and holding performances, public orations, and debates both in and out of class. Thus, according to a contemporary reporter, it was easy “to see that they had a great instructor.” Together with Juan Sánchez Baquero, Le Noci was probably the author of a tragedy, the Triunfo de los Santos, performed by the students of the various colleges of the Society during the great feast days of 1579. As vice-rector he headed the College of San Pedro y San Pablo for two years (1578-79). But in 1576 Le Noci’s restlessness was already urging him to request a transfer to Japan or China. General Mercurian told him on 3 March 1576 that he should not worry about going to Japan or China, since he had so much to do in that vast domain and since he was doing it so well. He tried again in January 1579, expressing his desire to return to Europe, and objecting to the teaching of pagan classical authors: out of religious scruples he requested authorization to stop reading them in the schools. Mercurian rejected the request, since it clashed with the custom adopted universally by the colleges of the Society. Le Noci then declared (he appealed to the viceroy of Sicily, Marcantonio Colonna, as well) that he wanted to return to defend his position personally before his superiors, and to become a Carthusian. He obtained permission to do so from the Provincial Father, and succeeded in leaving before the General could prohibit it. Deeply affected by the scandal, Mercurian ordered the fugitive to be restrained in Seville, where his baggage was secretly searched (nothing suspicious was discovered).

In fact, Le Noci displayed an extreme submissiveness in Seville, declaring that he had never really considered becoming a Carthusian; he had taken that pretext because he wanted to leave and report to the General, and “he feared being prevented to do so.” Mercurian, on the other hand, was greatly worried because “of the example; weak or suffering missionaries are not rare . . . : we absolutely cannot permit their return here”; and he obtained from Gregory XIII the apostolic letter Decet Romanum Pontificem of 1 November 1579, prohibiting members of the Society of Jesus from transferring to other orders. The bull eliminated the pretext of the Carthusian vocation, which many members of the overseas missions employed when seeking authorization to return.
Le Noci had to go back to his native Sicily; he died a Jesuit in Messina on 19 October 1592.50

We have already alluded to the serious problems which hindered the activity and challenged the culture of the missionaries in their proselytism of the new lands. The existing relationship between the pre-Conquest religions of Mexico (centered around the preservation of the cosmic order) and a religion like Christianity (totally oriented toward individual salvation) posed immediate problems which sixteenth-century European culture was totally unprepared to deal with. Acts which in the eyes of Christians were quite sinful, like adultery or drunkenness, were unlikely to appear sinful in the eyes of the natives, unless they assumed forms which threatened the social order. On the other hand, some affinities existed between certain Christian rites and the Mexican religion: a sort of baptism, a confession of sins, a type of communion, abstinence among the priests who inspired great reverence; and also some similarities in the feast days and ethical norms.51

The shattering crisis in the religious consciousness of the Indians came as a result of the attempts to convert them: the new religion often appeared connected with the most brutal forms of violence and abuse, and its clergy were often greedy and coarse. In many Indians, the collapse of the old beliefs caused the loss of their inner equilibrium, total passivity, drunkenness. Consequently, there were diverse reactions to the religion of Christ: as the God of the conquerors, He could either be accepted and immediately added to the old idols, or simply be rejected by those who tried to escape from the new rulers by seeking shelter in remote and as yet unexplored regions.52 At the time of the arrival of the Jesuit missionaries in Mexico and Peru, however, the main thrust of the Conquest in the most developed regions was already about two generations old. Therefore such problems concerned mainly the vast territories not yet evangelized.

The missionaries could rely on two mental categories for an understanding of the native world: the innocence and simplicity of primitive man, still free of the vices and decadence which followed the Golden Age, and the dignity and nobility of Christian man, universally capable of faith and reason. It is not our task to trace the importance that these categories had for the New World missionaries involved in defending the native American: we will limit ourselves to identifying their use in the interpretation of the American world, as it appears in the information that the missionaries sent to the Italian circles during the second half of the sixteenth century. From the Curia of the General of the Society in Rome, to which reports from the various provinces of the New World poured in, the Jesuit documents did indeed bring into the Italian milieu a
number of firsthand observations and news regarding the most varied aspects of American regions and societies. It is often impossible to identify the sources of the individual notices and dispatches which were later assembled in the *Annuae litterae*. Italian Jesuits contributed only part of the material. We must consider exceptional Le Noci's annual letters from New Spain for the years 1574 and 1577. The annual compilations brought to the cultivated Italian public, in translation, far more abundant material which originated with the Spanish and Portuguese missionaries. We know that even before 1581 the hand-written *Annuae* were translated, re-copied, and sent to various provinces of the Society to be read in the homes of the Jesuits, and passed on to outsiders and to other religious orders.

The form in which such information became public needs some clarification. The information gathered by the missionaries was subject to a double screening, first by the Provincials of the Society, and then by the Curia of the General in Rome. On 30 August 1575 the procurator of the Society at the court of Madrid, Father Francisco de Porres, pointed out to General Mercurian that some of the *Annuae* contained information which might provoke hostility toward the Society, and might also furnish pretexts to those who accused it of interfering in political affairs. He suggested that these *Annuae* not be sent, "or, if they must be sent, all inappropriate details should be suppressed." 55

We have significant examples of actions aimed at impeding the diffusion of damaging information. On 16 August 1578 Father Antonio López and the Italian Brother Marco Antonio, 56 tried to open a church of the Society in Arequipa, disregarding the jurisdiction of the bishop of Cuzco, but the two were expelled by order of the viceroy, Francisco de Toledo. 57 A report of the event was contained in the *Annuae* from Peru, sent on 11 April 1579 by the Provincial Acosta to General Mercurian, 58 who replied on 25 February 1580: 59 "In the *Annuae* sent by Your Reverence about 1578 it is absolutely necessary to suppress the story of Messrs. Virey, Potosí, Arequipa and Lima, because this kind of thing is not edifying for our people and for the others; it was enough to report it to me privately"; at the same time, the General warned Father Baltasar Piñas in Madrid "to suppress it from the texts which may reach your hands, as we have done here." 60

Other cuts and censures reflected specifically religious reasons: as in the case of the well-known murder of Father Gonzal de Tapia in Sinaloa on 11 July 1594 by the Indian Nacaveva. This Indian had been baptized, but had lapsed back to his former state, and kept ridiculing the evangelizing work of the priest. The Jesuit referred him to the *alcalde mayor* of the province, under whose orders the Indian was whipped and subjected to a haircut: a grave offense, for which Nacaveva took vengeance upon the missionary, and then took refuge in the mountains.
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The event was narrated in detail in a letter of Father Martin Pelaez, rector of the college of Sant’Idelfonso, to the Provincial of Mexico, Father Antonio de Mendoza. But the essential data had already disappeared in the *Annuae* sent from Mexico to Rome on 1 November 1595, in which it was maintained that Nacaveva had killed “for having been exhorted by the priest to give up his idolatry and vices, or because he had been instigated by the devil.” The same watered-down version was reported in a letter of the Italian Brother Angelo Armano to General Acquaviva; and in this form it became known to the public by way of the *Annuae litterae* of 1594-95, in which the “barbarus” Nacaveva appears, without plausible motive, “offended by the Father’s solicitude towards him,” and is induced to vengeance, together with his four accomplices, “because they are inconstant and impulsive.” The concern with keeping information about the more realistic aspects of proselytism from the public is obvious here.

Perhaps still more significant is the censorship of information such as Father Francisco Ramirez gave in 1585 in his report from Michoacán: he talks of the existence of a population which “apparently had some notion of the true beginning of the world, of the creation of man, and of the Flood.” This was due to the earlier preaching of a local priest, who “led them so far in the things of our faith that they did not find much novelty listening to us.” It was information that could open the way to ideas of natural religion or deism, but it could also further complicate the heated dispute over the relationship between the preaching of the Apostles and the American populations. Anyway, one reads nothing about it in the summary of the report which appeared in the *Annuae litterae*.

In short, even in the area of the Jesuit reports, information from the New World was heavily censored. The unsuccessful Italian translation of Las Casas’ *Historia de las Indias* (*Istoria o brevissima relatione della distruttione dell’Indie occidentali*) appeared for the first time in Venice in 1626; and (in an area still more directly related to our topic) important cuts were made in the Italian edition (1596) of Acosta’s *Historia natural y moral de las Indias*. Here, the translator, Giampaolo Galucci, warned that “many things are missing . . . which are in the Spanish original, because this is the superiors’ decision . . . ; we are not only forced to obey them, but we must obey willingly.” The Italian translation eliminated Acosta’s references to some of the trinitarian beliefs of the Peruvians; for example, in the title of Chapter xxvii of Book v, one finds only: “The feast days used by those (of) Cuzco”; the rest of the Spanish title, which was suppressed, read: “and how the devil tried to imitate the mystery of the Holy Trinity.” In the text of the chapter the details regarding that subject and the tentative explanations offered by the Spanish Jesuit are also omitted; curiously, they had escaped the notice of the censor in the re-elaboration of Acosta which had been done the year before by Botero.
in Part IV of the *Relationi universali.* All of Chapter xxx of the same Book v of Acosta's *Historia* was abolished, where the author had pointed out advantages of being informed about the aborigines' superstitions: the ability to unmask the simulations of false converts, to recognize the pride, envy, and tricks of the devil in his captives, and finally to obtain gratitude from converts for having been delivered from idolatry.

Sebastiano Berettari, who was entrusted for a few years with the compilation of at least a part of those volumes, provides information of some interest on the methods followed in preparing the *Annuae.* Berettari declared he had not availed himself, at the beginning, of the free hand awarded to the editors of provincial letters, in spite of the monotony that could result from it. However, as he sent off (1 December 1603) the part relative to 1597, he remarked that while he was writing, the censor of the Fathers was still pondering over three years of texts, and that it was not clear yet whether they would be published or eliminated. And he concluded with wry wisdom: "Those who are unaware of the scruples of almighty Rome will perhaps be surprised."

On his arrival in Mexico in 1573 as head of the first Jesuit expedition, the Provincial Father Pedro Sánchez sent General Mercurian the first Jesuit report from New Spain. It was immediately translated into Italian in Rome, to be read "in the residence of Saint Andrew." It established a pattern of description:

The Indians in their customs and humble way of acting are a marvelous thing, because they go dressed only in a cloth; in a cloak and shoes they seem descendants of the ancient Hebrews. Their eating is so moderate that probably no one in Spain could sustain himself in that way of life. Their bed is ordinarily on the ground, with a mat that they use here. The houses are like those of the saints in hermitage. They don't resist anyone who uses force on them; they are ingenious in copying what they see; they have great painters and artisans of all the mechanical arts. These are servants of the Spanish and thus upon them falls the burden, the load, and the labor of everyone. They are devoted people, and they favor foreign ceremonies and faith. Their language is very copious and elegant, and even though there are many languages in these realms, this Mexican language is the universal one which is understood everywhere.

This same pattern would be repeated later with infinite variations every time the missionaries encountered a population that showed gentle habits and a willingness to receive baptism. Le Noci, in his yearly letter from Mexico dated 1 January 1577, affirmed that "it is impossible to say how much the Indians love us; they come on foot from far-away villages to listen to our sermons, and share all they have with us." This seemed to be of particular note to the lively and sensitive Sicilian humanist, since in that year (1576) the Indians had been hit by one of the
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plagues that punctuated the demographic history of the Conquest—a plague of which Le Noci gave a colorful and careful description. 77

Precisely because of its a priori character, the model of the natural goodness and gentleness of the natives was destined to give way under the impact of more accurate experience of the actual conditions. This was the case with the population of the Sinaloa region, which the Annuae of 1590-91 (on the basis of Father Martin Pérez' report) described as "people of outstanding intelligence and kindness . . . who even at night will hardly leave our company." 78 But the compiler of the 1594-95 letters had to admit that "what was written about them four years ago—at the beginning of our dealings with them—is quite different from what is reported in 1596." 79 He tried to explain the discrepancy by attributing to different regions the mild people of the early reports and the "cruel and intractable ones" of the later reports. He had to conclude, however, that the "instability and promptness belonged to both sorts: to those who were born in rugged mountains as well as to those who were born in mild regions, under a benign sky"; he suggests that the bad characters did not appear immediately, but after some time. 80

An equally schematic view of barbarism superseded the primitive characterization. Thus often-repeated descriptions of the Chichimecas speak of "barbarians, ferocious mountaineers . . . lazy . . . nomads . . . led by greed, not by reason." 81 They were the most difficult to convert; and yet, even among these "some have a human mind" 82 which one could see in objections made to the preachers. Such was the Zacateca woman "who, being taught that everything had been created by one God, asked why He had created vipers and obnoxious animals. A question most similar to those asked by our own peasants." 83 This firm faith of the Jesuit missionaries in the common element of humanity in all men was the best and ultimate guarantee of the validity of the message that they brought to the American populations. 84

Between the extremes of the two schematizations—of primitive innocence and of extreme barbarity—there was room for an entire spectrum of concepts, some inherited from the classical-humanist tradition, others dictated by new and often disquieting anthropological experiences. The theory of the climates still remained the most generally adopted conceptual instrument in the explanation of the diversities in attitudes and customs, so much so that one is astonished by the rare cases in which the theory seems to be refuted: certain populations of Michoacán, for example, inhabitants of a region with a horrible and torrid climate who nevertheless were mild and hospitable. 85

In the eyes of the missionaries the nature of America kept the well-known character of amazing greatness: large dimensions and extraordinary force. The Marañón is described as "the biggest of all rivers. . . . It surrounds many and huge islands . . . but particularly one of three
hundred leagues, the biggest of them all, bigger than any we have in our seas; looking at the size and course of the waves one cannot speak any more on those rivers admired by antiquity, the Nile, the Indus, the Ganges. . . ." No less grandiose was the Andean landscape where "just at the Equator it was so cold, that human bodies would freeze; the snow-fall exceeds that of the Italian Alps." Opposite results were derived from the comparison of the two types of societies, of the New and the Old World. The revival of Golden Age themes lasts until the last decades of the century, and includes the community of goods, the absence of theft and venality ("if somebody needs a dress, those who have plenty just give them one"), extraordinary longevity in the Santa Cruz de la Sierra province, where "the inhabitants often reach 100 or even 110 years of age." 

If nothing of the Tarascan beliefs was left in the Annuæ, the imitation of Christian rites discovered among the Ciriguans of Paraguay was reported in great detail: "Although they do not venerate Christ, they worship greatly the Cross: they perceive a divine force in the symbol. . . ." But such practice was considered a corruption of the Faith, "an inept and ridiculous imitation." They went as far as electing a "cenopapa" with his own cardinals, who distributed indulgences and assigned penances, "as if everything was in the idols." This silly herd was justly punished a few years later by the Spanish governor, who "for the dignity . . . of the religion . . . hanged the false pope and all the false cardinals." References to the transient nature of the conversions and to the difficulty of preventing new converts from lapsing back into their old superstitions (especially in areas lacking adequate religious assistance) were frequent. But such recidivism was usually attributed to the peculiar mobility and instability of the populations; or, in more serious cases, like that of the indomitable inhabitants of Sinaloa, it was explained by the innate hardness, stolidity, and perfidy developed since childhood: so that even those who had received baptism "are not easily led away from superstition."

Later we find frequent mentions of commerce between the Indians and the devil. Those of Paraguay were so intimate with the devil that, "not wanting children or adults to be scared by the aspect of demons, they evoke them by whistling, and see them in various sizes emerge from the earth. . . ." This information was, in the end, less disquieting than that concerning some Mexican Indians who rejected the images of divinity, because "they hold that God is indifferent to humans, that Paradise does not exist, and that all souls, good and bad, are thrown down to the dark grottos of Hell." This doctrine was capable of shaking the principles of Christian teaching to their very foundations, and it was based on its own ethics: "They consider, according to these principles, that everybody lives justly; if an action is possible, they accomplish it if they want to, and they
The Politics of Conflict

think that they acted justly by simply accomplishing it" ("quicquid facere possunt, hoc si lubet faciunt, si fecerint recte factum existimant"). Still more dangerous were the beliefs found among the Auracani, who "had no religion whatsoever," and who did not believe in immortality.

Other beliefs and practices were more easily explained as attributes of inferior civilization. The Chichimecas, for example, lacked civil codes entirely, lived in a state of perpetual nomadism, and elected chieftains only in time of war. The letters point out indications of barbarism in Sinaloa: "They hate laws, they hate rights, they don't respect authority." Especially barbaric were the inhabitants of the Guadiana lagoon area (Lagoon of St. Peter, Mayrán), who "are so far from humanity... that they don't even gather in families or in any organization, and have no form of society." On the other hand, the first sign of progress toward a more advanced humanity appeared in the disposition toward communal living among those who "enjoy socializing with other men, and living together." The first effort of the missionaries was directed to leading the nomads to congregate in communities "in order to attract them to humanity, and civilized commerce." It was an aspect of that theory of the stages of civilization which Botero had developed with noteworthy originality during those same years.

These concepts—which culminated in the exaltation of civil society—are reflected in the admiration for the great civilization of the Incas, scattered traces of which were still to be seen, for example in the moral prestige that Cuzco still retained for the Indians of Peru as the former see of the kings and of the empire. The monumental remains of that civilization were also admired. A letter describes a temple built by an Inca king in the interior of Titicaca, northeast of the peninsula of Copacabana: "The ruins show how grandiose it had been. It was dedicated to the Sun, which they thanked when things went well, whose help they asked when things went badly, to whom they sacrificed the most beautiful children...."

There is no sign of any elaboration of an idea of the primitive life and of the Noble Savage theme: the cultural environment of the Society of Jesus was certainly not favorable to it. New and reinforcing material for the ideal of the rationally ordered "city" (which characterized the Counter-Reformation culture) could have come out of the American experiences, particularly out of the missionaries' insistent comparison between a superior civilized society and a nomadic and primitive life. But in the field of political utopia this does not seem to have occurred in any appreciable measure. An examination of Italian utopian literature of the second half of the century convinces me that the American experiences were only a secondary influence. The old thesis that utopian thought would have influenced the political experiments attempted in the new continent has been abandoned; one tends now to stress the influence that the new experiences had on the development of the political
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thinking of the Old World. This view is certainly valid for European culture in general, but not for Italy. Some time ago Rodolfo De Mattei supported it in regard to Campanella, and later Curcio expanded and generalized it; recently Tenenti has taken it up again. One can recall Anton Francesco Doni’s sporadic allusion to the discovery of the “way to go to the Antipodes” and to “other worlds outside of our Asia, Europe and Africa, other people and habitations,” whose existence “leaves Aristotle a goose, for he did not believe that all of the zone under the zodiac was inhabited”; but, in reality, the geographic horizon, even in this case, remains the ancient one of the Mediterranean and Europe. Furthermore, it has been impossible to find any reference to the American elements in the political-utopian writings of Francesco Patrizi, Mambro Roseo, Bartolomeo Cavalcanti, Ortensio Lando, Francesco Sansovino, Francesco Piccolomini, Ludovico Agostini, and in the utopian literature already examined.

Naturally, American influences can be present even where explicit references are lacking; but if one assumes the explicit reference as an objective indication, it is easy to perceive how the influence of the eastern world, from China to Japan, to India, even to the Turks, is much deeper and more extensive than that of America. Italian political thinking in the second half of the century aims at exalting the state and the civilized city: thus it found in the East a much richer harvest of significant observations. For the most part, the great pre-Columbian empires were already only a memory.

There remains the problem of the City of the Sun. Implicit and explicit references to American things are not lacking in that famous work: the title of “helmsman of Columbus” attributed to one of the two interlocutors, the description of the streets of the City of the Sun which was perhaps derived from the Mexican temple of Vitzilpuitzli, the public confession that recalled the Peruvian custom of the Incan epoch, the astrological meanings attributed to the discovery of the New World and to the conquest of Mexico. But as to the fundamental question of Campanella’s communistic conceptions, the presumed derivation from the institutes of Incan Peru is unsustainable. The text does not mention its sources for this matter; the later Philosophia realis, however, refers to the theme of the community of goods as it appears in Genesis, “when God distributed nothing, but gave everything in common to men, so that they would grow, multiply, and fill the earth,” and identifies its models in Plato, in the original community of Christians, in the life of the clerics up until Urban I, and finally in the monastic orders. The juridical basis of the community of goods and women is upheld by a wealth of quotations from the Church Fathers, with obviously justificative aims; these, however, fit into Campanella’s deeper adherence to Christianity in the years of the compilation and revision of the celebrated work. The Philosophia realis recalls instead the themes of the lost Monarchia de’ Cristiani and of the
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Monarchia de Spagna by insisting upon the providential nature of the Spanish conquest of the New World as part of the predicted return to the innocence of the Golden Age: “Hence one sees that the Spanish Crown is prompted by God in unifying the world.”

In much larger measure, the information transmitted by the Jesuits at the close of the century could have nourished the belief in the innocence of the primitives—which was bound to evolve into the Enlightenment myth of the Noble Savage. The more advanced cultures of Europe would soon take this direction; but Italian intellectuals in those decades were withdrawing into themselves, and for centuries thereafter would be alienated from this sort of cultural experience.
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The Discovery
of America and Reform Thought at the Papal Court
in the Early Cinquecento

by John W. O'Malley

The official documents concerning the New World which issued from the Roman Curia from 1493 through the first several decades of the sixteenth century are well known and important. They deal with practical political and ecclesiastical questions, however, and they do this in the abstract juridical terminology appropriate to curial documents. In themselves they reveal little about the cultural and religious context of Rome where the news of the voyages of discovery was received. The fact is that we are not very well or very surely informed about this larger context, and we can well afford to turn our attention to other Roman documents, literary and theological, which might somehow throw light on it.

Unfortunately, the search for such documents has not yielded an abundant harvest of obviously pertinent texts. Berchet's collection of Fonti italiane contains only very few citations, and these are brief and not particularly informative about attitudes towards the discoveries at the papal court. Since recent scholarship seems based on the documents
The Politics of Conflict

Berchet provides, it has nothing specific to say about Rome's reception of the news. My own research during the past several years, however, has led me to large quantities of Roman documentation which historians have tended to neglect. Though only a small portion of this documentation deals directly with America, much of it can be utilized to illuminate the context with which we are concerned.

The documentation can be divided into four reasonably distinct categories. First, there is the extensive body of Roman literature, especially orations and sermons, which has no explicit relationship to America but which, taken as a whole, reveals the hopes, fears, religious aspirations, and theological assumptions of high-placed Romans, or of persons temporarily associated with Rome, in the first decades of the sixteenth century.

The second category consists of four Roman documents which deal with the discoveries, conquests, and victories of Manuel of Portugal and Ferdinand of Aragon without dealing specifically with America. My justification for using them is that the events they describe were viewed as part of the same expansion of Christianity as the discovery of America. The events, therefore, are susceptible of the same interpretation. The documents consist of two orations at the papal court in the name of Manuel of Portugal by the Portuguese jurist, Diogo Pacheco, the lengthy discourse by Giles of Viterbo on the Golden Age, and Giles' "Historia xx saeculorum" written during the pontificate of Leo X and dedicated to him.

The two pieces by Pacheco are brief, standard "pro obedientia" orations offered in the name of Christian princes and states upon the accession of a new pontiff. The discourse on the Golden Age, unknown until recently, is a unique, important, and relatively lengthy document by the influential prior general of the Augustinian order who would be created a cardinal in 1517 by Leo X. It was originally delivered as an oration in St. Peter's basilica in 1507, before Pope Julius II and at his command, in honor of Manuel of Portugal and to celebrate the Portuguese landing in Ceylon, the defeat on 18 March 1506 of the Zamorin of Calicut, and the discovery of Madagascar. Giles' "Historia," another extremely important and even longer document, still awaits editing and publication. The "Historia" resembles medieval world chronicles but is primarily a history of the papacy down to the very days of Leo X himself. Historians have long known of it, but never directed their attention to its four interesting folios dealing with the achievements of Manuel and Ferdinand. Giles again discusses those successes of Manuel which he celebrated in the discourse on the Golden Age. As regards Ferdinand, he shows special interest in his victories over the Muslims in Spain and especially North Africa, but he also mentions the Spaniards' circumnavigation of the globe and their discovery of the "islands" in the West.
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takes pains to emphasize that now, for the first time in history, the whole world is known.

The third category consists of two documents which deal directly with America and which have been known before: the first is a brief response in 1532 by Cajetan (Tommaso de Vio), cardinal and former master general of the Dominican order, to six pastoral questions sent him by Dominican missionaries to the New World. 10 Cajetan’s response shows his concern for an intelligent administration of the sacraments and his insistence on good instruction and good preaching for the Indians. The second document is the long “Libellus” on the reform of the Church which the two Venetian noblemen turned Camaldolese hermits, Paolo Giustiniani and Pietro Quirini, addressed to Pope Leo X in 1513. 11 This treatise on reform has in recent years attracted considerable interest. But the section on America, which reminds the pope in no uncertain terms of his duty to send learned and holy preachers to the New World and makes some very practical suggestions as to how the language barrier can eventually be overcome, has not received much attention, nor has its integral relationship with the basic direction and intent of the “Libellus” as a whole been clearly exposed. 12

Finally, along with documents which have long been known to make explicit and significant mention of America, I am able to adduce three which, to my knowledge, have not been noticed. The first two are the letters, dealing with the Turkish threat, from the humanist Giovanni Antonio Flaminio to Pope Adrian VI in 1523 and to Pope Clement VII in 1524. 13 Flaminio’s interest in the New World was clearly indicated, of course, in his De quibusdam memorabillis novi orbis. 14 The third document, where the mention of America is briefer than in Flaminio’s letters, is the oration of the humanist Tommaso Fedra Inghirami before Julius II in honor of Ferdinand’s capture of Bugia in North Africa in 1510. 15

Though there are possibly other references to America like Flaminio’s and Inghirami’s still buried in the literary remains of Rome in the early Cinquecento, it is unlikely that there are major documents still undiscovered. The last three documents, therefore, are poignant reminders of how sparse the immediate documentation really is and how relatively little account was taken at the time of events fraught with incalculable importance. Even Rome, conscious of its universal mission, does not seem to have sustained a high level of excitement over the prospect of the New World and the new peoples offered to its pastoral care. It is significant that, although representatives of the missions in the New World were present at the Fifth Lateran Council which met in Rome from 1512 until 1517, there is not a single mention of the New World in its acts and orations which have survived. 16

To put this disinterest into perspective, we must recall several facts. The American enterprise, after all, was not a papal enterprise, though
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Orators often presented the voyages and discoveries of their sovereigns to the popes in terms of expanding the papal spiritual "empire." Nor can we expect the Romans of the Renaissance to be gifted with any more effective clairvoyance than their contemporaries elsewhere in Europe, especially outside of Spain and Portugal, concerning the ultimate impact of the discovery of America. Most important of all, Rome was preoccupied with other more immediate and more urgently pressing concerns. These concerns are familiar to us: the political disorder in the States of the Church, the Spanish and French aggressions in Italy, the architectural and artistic restoration of the city of Rome, the threat of the Turk. The attention which Pastor and other historians direct to these issues is well deserved and is reflected in the poetry, diaries, treatises, and orations of the period.

However, what is not so generally realized is that the Romans of the Renaissance were also preoccupied with the most universal preoccupation of their age—reform. Contrary to what we have sometimes been led to believe, reform of society and the Church, by no means conceived as perfectly distinct from one another, was an insistent and persistent theme in Renaissance Rome. Indeed, reform might well be the best general rubric under which to subsume all Rome's other great concerns. The discoveries themselves best reflect the Roman mentality when they are viewed in the context of Roman reform thought. That, at least, is my thesis.

There is certainly no doubt that reform was a fashionable rhetorical commonplace of early sixteenth-century Rome; and I would be reluctant to dismiss it as any less sincere or any more ridden by convention than most of the reform talk which was heard throughout Europe during the period. Moreover, from the documents of the period it is possible to generalize about an ideal of reform which in its basic vision was broadly shared in Rome. A strong case can be made, too, for a certain inner consistency in this reform ideal. At least, certain goals are repeatedly proposed as constitutive of a restored or reformed condition of human society: (1) the moral and disciplinary restoration of the city of Rome; (2) the securing of worldwide peace, which implies the eventual conversion or defeat of the Turk; (3) the fraternal union of all men in the love of one God and gathered into the Roman Church. These goals may or may not have been very efficaciously pursued, or had any impact upon the popes, to whom they were often addressed; and they certainly were susceptible of ugly distortions. Nevertheless, they deserve to be looked at on their own merits.

One general aspect of the Roman reform ideal is obvious: it is a this-worldly reform which strives to accomplish certain societal goals. Though often concerned with a renewed interiority, it is not content with a private life of piety detached from this world's problems, nor is it
hostile to human achievement. It would be easy to characterize, or even stigmatize, this reform ideal as secular and unrelated to traditional religion. I do not believe this was the case. It seems to have been based, in its best representatives, on what I can only describe as an "incarnational theology," which in turn was dependent upon the Fathers of the Church for much of its inspiration. I use the term "incarnational" for several reasons: (1) the mystery of the Incarnation received considerable attention in Roman theological documents, and it was conceived as a mystery in itself redemptive; (2) the Incarnation was interpreted as signifying not only the Word's becoming flesh but also the investment of all humanity and all creaturedom with a new dignity and importance: "God became man that man might become God"; (3) more specifically, as divinity's wedding with humanity, it implicitly called for closer bonds of affection among men; (4) and, finally, it is clearly distinguished from an "eschato­logical" theology, which would withdraw from the transitory goods of this world in order to expect fulfillment only in the world to come. Time and again elements of this "incarnational" theology appear in documents composed, circulated, or presented at the papal court, and they logically relate to the Roman reform ideal. 17

We can now examine that ideal in its particulars and try to set the news of the discovery of the New World in context. Most, if not all, reform programs of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries placed considerable emphasis on the restoration of good discipline in the Church and on the reform of the morals and education of the clergy. Roman reforms were no exception, and the pages dedicated to these questions in Part v of the "Libellus" of Quirini and Giustiniani are illustrative of a concern which was widespread. This aspect is important, but it is distinctive in only one regard: the ideal of a holy and moral life, the ideal of bene beateque vivere, was especially incumbent upon the Romans because of the peculiar and exalted mission of their city. We must not believe that an awareness of the discrepancy between reality and ideal in Rome was reserved to foreigners. Through a rhetoric of congratulation as well as a rhetoric of reproach, the Romans tried to demonstrate their awareness of the need for Roman spiritual leadership and their awareness of the city's deficiencies in that regard. 18 In any case, one aspect of the city's mystique received repeated celebration: its character as the patria communis of all humanity and its mission to unify mankind. 19

Thus we arrive at the most insistently explicit theme of the orators, preachers, and theologians at the papal court: the Roman mission to bring peace to the world. The pax et concordia message, which we associate with Erasmus, was anticipated in Rome long before Erasmus took it up, and it continued there after he adopted it as his central Christian teaching. One of the fundamental themes of the sermons at the Renaissance papal court was that the universe was or ought to be a
universe of unity, concord, and harmony. The theme had ancient roots in the rhetorical tradition of the West, but the sermons gave a theological base to a practical task whose urgency in the light of schisms and threats of schisms, wars and threats of wars, was all too apparent. The harmony of the universe, impaired by the Fall, was inchoately re-established by the Incarnation-Redemption: Christ would “draw all things” and all men to himself (John 12.32).

If the frequency with which a particular verse from Scripture is repeated is any indication of theological orientation, then Jesus’ promise of peace to his disciples is significant. The promise was his “last will and testament.” Reform is to restore or create, therefore, the ideal condition of peace proper to Christianity. Hence, Quirini and Giustiniani are on target when, in their “Libellus” on reform, they indicate to the pope his responsibilities to establish peace. With certain writers and orators *pax et concordia* was probably a safe and conventional theme, but not with Quirini, Giustiniani, Cajetan, Giles of Viterbo, and others whose lives and writings show ample evidence of originality and conviction.

Paradoxically the eloquent Roman pleas for the establishment of *pax et concordia* in the universe were frequently coupled with a rousing call for a war against the Turks. Among the goods which such a war would secure was, most immediately, the diversion of arms from the inter-necine campaigns of the Christian princes to a common enemy. Perhaps the only way to understand this is to interpret the Turkish war as a war for peace or a war to end war, an interpretation which sometimes occurs in the documents themselves. The logic of somebody like Giles of Viterbo on this issue is, however, involved and not very clearly thought through.

At any rate, the Roman documents show a deep and persistent fear of Turkish advances. Sometimes this fear borders on paranoidal obsession, but the reality of the threat to Europe cannot be denied. The documents betray an awareness of the history of continuing losses to the Turks, and some of them suggest a feeling of claustrophobia as Christians find themselves confined to an ever smaller “corner” of Europe. A sense of shrinkage, confinement, failure, and danger characterized the Roman reaction to what was happening; and the conversion or defeat of the Turks was conceived as part of the edification of “our collapsed religion,” thus, implicitly or explicitly, part of the Roman program of reform. The desideratum was a restoration of lost peoples and lost territories and, further, of the territorial universality which was the ideal condition of the Christian religion.

Here the voyages, conquests, and discoveries of the Portuguese and Spaniards become particularly pertinent to the interests of the Romans. Instead of shrinkage of Christian territories and influence, they were evidence of expansion and *incrementum*. The new territories (some of which were taken from the Mohammedan infidel) compensated for the losses
to the Turks. Giles of Viterbo, Inghirami, and others make this clear to Julius II. More important, the accomplishments of the Portuguese and Spaniards were interpreted as signs that the tide was turning and that the moment had come for a successful expedition against the Turks. Flaminio's discussion of the discovery of America in his letters to Adrian VI and to Clement VII makes precisely this point, as does Giles of Viterbo in his discussion of Manuel and Ferdinand in the "Historia." Inghirami interprets the America successes of Ferdinand in the same way. There was, therefore, cause for hope and optimism. The solemn public celebrations in Rome during the pontificates of Julius II and Leo X to honor the great deeds of the kings of Spain and Portugal were in part expressions of this hope and optimism.

A new and better age was dawning—a Golden Age in which Christian universality would be realized. The term "Golden Age" came naturally to the lips of poets, orators, and theologians of the Renaissance papal court; it signified the union of all men in a bond of charity and common faith. The specific theological doctrine most often adduced in favor of such union was that of the Mystical Body of Christ; the papal court was frequently instructed in the doctrine and reminded of it. It related easily to the theme of the dignity and even the divinization of man which derived largely from scriptural and patriotic sources, and also to the basic assumptions about the harmony of the universe which were operative at the court. This harmony, only inchoate as yet, would be perfectly accomplished in the new age by the gathering of all men into effective union with God and with one another. Harmony and union, peace and concord, were thus the goals of reform and the touchstones for its authenticity.

In this Roman reform ideal a philosophy of history was at least implicit, and a generally optimistic outlook on the future prevailed whenever the discoveries were taken into account. Our authors sometimes explicitly state that now the Christian "empire" exceeds the limits and accomplishments of anything previously known, and Giles of Viterbo sees in the successes of Manuel and Ferdinand clear signs that a new age is dawning. Later in life he will characterize that age in terms of two "new worlds": the "new world" of territories revealed for the first time by the voyages of discovery, and the "new world" of a more perfect understanding of Scripture revealed for the first time by the study of Hebrew and the Cabala, a study where Giles himself was taking the lead.

But it would be unhistorical to expect the sixteenth century to conceive of ameliorating society without restoring it to a previous state or condition. The territorial limitations of the ancient Roman empire were now more keenly recognized than ever, and Julius Caesar's expeditions and conquests were disadvantageously compared with those of Ferdinand of Aragon. Nonetheless, the hope for the establishment of one
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world of faith and love was often expressed in terms deliberately reminiscent of the political universality and military imperialism of the ancient empire. To speak of the Church as imperium (as was frequent) and to speak of the pope as Caesar (as was occasional) offends our sense of propriety. The Roman empire offered, however, a model of universality which could now be imagined on the point of fulfillment again in a more sublime, as well as a territorially more comprehensive, way.

But did not the early Church provide a more fully actualized model of universality than the empire? In response to this question Roman commentators hastened to modify earlier assumptions in the light of the discoveries. By several decades they anticipated Guicciardini’s view that during the apostolic age the “word” of the Apostles did not go “out to the ends of the earth” (Ps. 18[19].5); and despite Quirini’s, Giustiniani’s, and the humanist Raffaele Maffei’s qualifications, Giles of Viterbo was adamant in his conviction that only in his own day was the prophecy of the psalm being fulfilled.

If the early Church did not provide a model of universal evangelization, at least it extended the promise to the present generation. No verse from Scripture is quoted more frequently here than the Johannine assurance that someday there will be “one flock and one shepherd” (John 10.16). No verse, indeed, summarizes the aspirations of the Roman reform ideal so perfectly.

The methods and motivations for achieving full union, however, often fell considerably short. Giles of Viterbo complacently praises Manuel of Portugal for “forcing conquered peoples to submit to the yoke of the Christians,” and he is by no means unaware of the economic advantage to Portugal through the spice trade that Manuel’s voyages and victories have effected. Even the gentle Quirini and Giustiniani recommend expulsion of the Jews from Christian lands, if all the methods for their conversion which the “Libellus” urges eventually fail. Moreover, as I have already indicated, the conviction was widespread in Rome that war was, perhaps regrettably, the only way to handle the Turkish threat. Occasionally an author betrays a crass interest in the bona temporalia to be gained from such a war.

These questionable or deplorable methods and motivations, on the other hand, were by no means universal. In most of the documents we have been considering, the role of the pope tends to be seen in terms of the mediator of human unity rather than the lord of the world. Giustiniani sincerely recognizes that in the practice of Christianity some of the schismatic Christians make their European counterparts look like “semipagans.” Assumptions about the character and destiny of the newly discovered peoples in America are generous and positive: that is, these people were considered receptive to the message of Christianity.
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The persuasion that God "wills all men to be saved" (1 Tim. 2.4) animated much reform thought in Rome. Men could be saved, however, only in a way in keeping with their dignity and humanity; conversions could not be forced; they could be effected through good preaching and good instruction alone. Cajetan is passionately eloquent and firm on this point: holy words and holy lives, not armies, are the instruments of conversion, and he unequivocally denounces as unjust and immoral the wars of conquest and subjugation the Europeans were waging against the newly discovered peoples.

Quirini and Giustiniani are also convinced that instruction and preaching is the basis for conversion. They would train missionaries to make them effective preachers of God's word by having them learn the languages of the natives. Their "Libellus" contains an astonishingly forthright demystification of the traditional role of the Latin language in the Western Church. Latin is no more sacred than any other language, and its use in the Church should be regulated by the pragmatic norm of the facility with which it is understood. Quirini and Giustiniani leave little doubt as to how impractical they felt Latin had become even in their own day, and they go so far as to propose the introduction of the vernacular languages into the liturgy.

Their program for the effective preaching of the Gospel deserves some elaboration. It is based on the premise that the pope's great duty is to see that "Christ is announced" to the newly discovered peoples. Throughout the "Libellus" there is considerably more emphasis on preaching than on the administering of the sacraments. The program for training preachers consisted of two parts. First of all, the pope should send to the new peoples some older religious from every order who, through interpreters or through their "life and example," would instruct them in the Christian way of life; he should also send some younger religious, whose age would make it easier for them to learn the languages. Secondly, the two reformers strongly urged that the study of the languages of all nations, and especially the study of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Arabic, be instituted in all studia. In this plea there is an appeal to the provisions for language learning of the Council of Vienne (1311-12; decree 4), though the Council is not mentioned by name. The purpose of language learning is not to satisfy a vain curiosity but to prepare good preachers. The pope should see to it that some of the new peoples were brought to Europe to teach their languages to future preachers, as they themselves simultaneously learned the Christian faith. Thus the pope would provide suitable preachers to send to "all peoples." In the spirit behind these recommendations, Quirini and Giustiniani terminate the discussion: "But these works, most Holy Father, are the works of peace."
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divided into six parts, it deals in turn with: (1) the nature of the papal office; (2) the call of Jews and idolaters (American Indians) to the faith; (3) the conversion or conquest of the Muslims; (4) union with the separated (schismatic) Christian churches; (5) measures for the reformation of Christians now subject to the Roman pontiff; (6) the increase of the Christian “empire” in the lands of the infidel. By clear determination of the authors themselves, it is not Part v but the whole document which deals with reform. Moreover, the theme which makes it a consistent whole is the establishment of human solidarity in faith and affection. For the authors of the “Libellus” unity was reform.

This position was not unique to Quirini and Giustiniani. Giles of Viterbo’s “Historia” is a history of the papacy written expressly to indicate to the pope his duties and responsibilities in the present crucial moment of history. The pope must restore the Church to a condition of health and holiness. Giles foresees that restoration as issuing in the union of all men in truth and charity. The promise of the past, so obscured in the present, will be fulfilled in the near future. This vision of reform contrasts with other visions which were almost contemporaneous. The personal reform of the Devotio moderna, for instance, proposed an ideal which ratified withdrawal from the concerns of the world. Luther’s reform campaigned for the restoration of a lost doctrinal orthodoxy. It came early to the conviction that the truth of the Gospel would perforce bring division and disruption in its wake, and it did not expect the reconciliation of man with man in this world. Like most theologians of the Reformation, “tended to restrict rather than enlarge the scope of salvation,” and his interests were confined to the peoples and problems of western Europe. The Tridentine reform, as expressed in the actual documents of the Council of Trent, focused on “in-house” problems of definition of doctrine and the more purposeful functioning of ecclesiastical structures. By implication at least, combating the errors of heresy was elevated to a distinguished reform task.

The reform desired by some of the missionaries to the New World was the restoration of the radical Franciscan poverty of the pre-Constantinian era. The Roman vision in the early Cinquecento was different from these, and more easily related to the discoveries than they. The Savior’s Incarnation and Redemption had inchoately accomplished peace and solidarity among men, and it had destined them to be united to one another and to him in his Mystical Body. The best Roman reform thought had to consider the newly discovered peoples precisely in terms of that destiny. They had to be evangelized, and the style of their evangelization had to correspond to their destiny and consequent dignity. We should not marvel, then, at the stark reminder Quirini and
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Giustiniani delivered to Pope Leo X about the American Indians: "Most Holy Pontiff . . . they are our brothers." 65
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26. See Pacis encomium (n. 19 above) fols. 5v, 6v, and esp. Flores (n. 23 above) fols. 6v-7r. On Leo X’s rather ineffectual efforts to provide leadership against the Turks, see Kenneth M. Setton, “Pope Leo X and the Turkish Peril,” Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 113 (1969) 367-424.

27. I have tried to expose the elements of Giles’ thought on this issue and to indicate some coherence among them, Giles of Viterbo (n. 4 above) 127-130.
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29. See “Golden Age” (n. 6 above) 338; “Libellus” (n. 11 above) cols. 630-654; Flaminio, Ad Adrianum (n. 13 above) fol. 5v; Mansi (n. 4 above) col. 857 (Giovanni Battista Garghi); Brandolini (n. 18 above) fol. 48v.

30. See “Golden Age” (n. 6 above) 310-311, 315, 326; Inghirami (n. 15 above) 10. See also Mansi (n. 4 above) col. 822 (Baltassar del Rio); Pacheco, In praestanda obedientia (n. 5 above) fol. 5v; and the dedicatory letter to Julius II in Francesco Albertini’s Opusculum de mirabilibus novae et veteris urbis Romae (Rome 1515) fol. 4. Albertini puts the discoveries and conquests of the kings of Spain and Portugal into the context of war against the Turks but without explicitly interpreting them as either compensation for lost territories or portents of future victories. Though Fumagalli notes Albertini’s brief mention (fol. 103v, ed.) of Vespucci and his discoveries, he does not call attention to this letter to the pope, in which there is possibly an allusion to America, fol. 4; see Fumagalli (n. 2 above) #575 (p. 89) and #584 (p. 92).

31. Ad Adrianum (n. 13 above) fols. 8r-9r; Epistola ad Clementem VII (n. 13 above) fols. 4v-5r; “Historia” (n. 7 above) fols. 176v-177v.

32. Inghirami (n. 15 above) 34-37. See also “Golden Age” (n. 6 above) 325.

33. See “Golden Age (n. 6 above) 267, n. 6, for some references to sources describing these occasions.

34. Rosario Romeo (n. 3 above) limits his discussion of the term to two instances when Peter Martyr and Pietro Bembo specifically applied it to the life-style of the peoples of the New World, esp. pp. 17, 20. It is important to note how often the term is applied to hopes for the papacy during this period. The most extensive treatise on the theme is Giles of Viterbo’s “Golden Age” (n. 6 above). For a very general treatment for the whole Renaissance period, see Harry Levin, The Myth of the Golden Age in the Renaissance (Bloomington, Ind. 1969). See also Ernst H. Gombrich, “Renaissance and Golden Age,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 24 (1961) 306-309.

35. See, e.g., “Golden Age” (n. 6 above) 290, 305; Flaminio, Ad Adrianum (n. 13 above) fol. 4r; Pacis encomion (n. 19 above) fol. 9t; Mansi (n. 4 above) cols. 762 (Cristoforo Marcello), 854 (Giovanni Battista Garghi).

36. See “Preaching for the Popes” (n. 4 above) 420; Cajetan, Opuscula (n. 17 above) 185; Giles of Viterbo, “Historia” (n. 7 above) fol. 1r; Mansi (n. 4 above) cols. 702-703 (Bernardo Zanni), 721 and 726 (Cajetan), 737-738 (Alexius Celadonius [Celadini, Celadoni, Celidonio]).

37. See “Libellus” (n. 11 above) cols. 614-616; Mansi (n. 4 above) cols. 720 (Cajetan), 762 (Cristoforo Marcello), 779-780 (Giovanni Maria del Monte), 804 (Simun Kožić-Begna).

38. See Inghirami (n. 15 above) 34-37. See also, e.g., Cristoforo Marcello, Oratio ad Iulium II pontificem maximum in die omnium sanctorum in capella habita [Rome c. 1510] fol. 2r. Though the Roman documents occasionally suggest or insist that the end of time is nigh, they do not particularly dwell on the idea. See, however, Minnich (n. 4 above) 234-235 and my Giles of Viterbo (n. 4 above) 114-117.

39. “Historia” (n. 7 above) fols. 176v-177v, 191r-193r.


41. See Inghirami (n. 15 above) 34-37.

42. Examples of such terminology could be multiplied. See Inghirami (n. 15 above) 26, 38, 41; Marcello (n. 38 above) fols. 2r, 6; Flores (n. 23 above) fols. 5v, 9r; Massimo Corvino, Oratio Maximini Cordini Parthenopeti episcopi Eserniensis sanctissimo Iullo II pontifici maximo dicta [Rome 1513] fols. 2r-3v; Giovanni Antonio Flaminio, “Ad Iulium II pontificem maximum,” in Delitiae canninum italorum poetarum huius superriorisque aevi (Frankfort 1608) 972-976. On the roots for this identification, see Robert Folz, L’idée d’empire en occident du Ve au XIVe siècle (Paris 1953) 15-21, 87-101, and J. B. Sägmüller, "Die Idee von der Kirche als Imperium Romanum im kanonischen Recht," Theologische Quartalschrift 80 (1898) 50-80. The appropriateness of this terminology was explicitly dis-
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cussed in the early sixteenth century. See Isidoro Isolani, *De imperio militantis ecclesiae libri quattuor* (Milan 1517) Liber I, Titulus I, Quaestio I: “Utrum nomen imperii conveniat ecclesiae.”

43. The meaning of the verse was seriously discussed, as Romeo indicates (n. 3 above) 34-36, in our period and into the Counter-Reformation. Raffaele Maffei (Volaterrano) thought the verse was best interpreted as a prophecy fulfilled in his own day by the efforts of the kings of Spain and Portugal: *Commentariorum urbanorum octo et triginta libri* (Basel 1530) fol. 140r. Quirini and Giustiniani deny Christianity was ever preached in the New World before the recent voyages of discovery, but they do not absolutely exclude the possibility of its having been preached and forgotten: “Libellus” (n. 11 above) col. 622. Giles of Viterbo without scruple or backtracking affirms that it is only now that the prophecy of the psalm is fulfilled, “Historia” (n. 7 above) fols. 191r-193r, 266; see also his *Sechina* (n. 40 above) 1. 183. For Guicciardini’s view, which is practically identical with Giles’, see *Storia d’Italia*, ed. Costantino Panigada (5 vols. Bari 1929) 2. 132.

44. See Mansi (n. 4 above) cols. 761 (Cristofaro Marcello), 780 (Giovanni Maria del Monte), 827 (Baltassar del Rio), 856 (Giovanni Battista Garghi), 893 (Stefano Tagliacci); Giles of Viterbo (n. 40 above) 1. 160-161; ibid., 2. 149; Pacheco, *In praestanda obedientia* (n. 5 above) fol. 5r; Petrus Galatinus, “Commentaria in Apocalypsim,” Vat. MS Vat. lat. 5567, fols. 1v, 169r. On the Florentine employment of the verse and theme, see Eugenio Garin, *La cultura filosofica del Rinascimento italiano* (Florence 1961) 167. 180-181, 225; Donald Weinstein, *Savonarola and Florence* (Princeton 1970) 174, and by the same author, “The Apocalypse in Sixteenth-Century Florence: The Vision of Albert of Trent,” *Studies in Honor of Hans Baron*, ed. Anthony Molho and John A. Tedeschi (Florence 1970) 324. See also Schwoebel, *Shadow of the Crescent* (n. 28 above) 22-23, on the fifteenth century’s stress on “the pope as the one true source of Christian unity.”

45. “Historia” (n. 7 above) fol. 192v: “... et gentes victas Christianorum subire iugum cogit.”

46. See, e.g., “Golden Age” (n. 6 above) 280, 314, 317, 331, 335-337; “Historia” (n. 7 above) fol. 192v.

47. See “Libellus” (n. 11 above) 624-625.

48. For an example of a brief, but forthright, presentation of *bona temporalia* to be gained from the Turkish war, see Albertini (n. 30 above) fol. 4v.

49. See “Libellus” (n. 11 above) cols. 614-619, 633, 635-637, 657; Donato (n. 19 above) fol. 4r; Giles of Viterbo (n. 40 above) 1. 41; Girolamo Porcio, *Commentarius de creatione, coronatione, etc. Alexandri VI ad Ferdinandum et Helisabeth Hispaniae reges* (Rome 1493, Hain no. 13295) fols. 26r-33v, listed by Fumagalli (n. 2 above) #550 (p. 84), as containing “due allusioni alla recente conquista delle Indie Occidentali”: Cajetan (n. 10 above) II-II. 66. 8, ad 2am. See Minnich (n. 4 above) 229-230 and my “Preaching for the Popes” (n. 4 above) 421-422.

50. See “Libellus” (n. 11 above) col. 662.

51. *Ibid.*., col. 626; Flaminio, *De quibusdam*, in Berchet (n. 2 above) 2. 413-418; Flaminio, *Ad Adrianum* (n. 13 above) fols. 8f-9f. See also Romeo (n. 3 above) 10-21, on the early positive evaluation of the new peoples. I have found in the Roman documents no suggestion that the Indians were “natural slaves,” a position which would be a lively issue a little later in the century and which appeared as early as 1510 in the work of John Major, the Scots theologian at the University of Paris. For a discussion and the pertinent text, see Pedro Leturia, “Maior y Vitoria ante la conquista de America,” *Estudios eclesiasticos* 11 (1932) 44-82, esp. 81.

52. See “Libellus” (n. 11 above) cols. 618, 644-645; Giles of Viterbo (n. 40 above) 2. 51, 57; “Golden Age” (n. 6 above) 334; “Historia” (n. 7 above) fol. 238v; Augustus Philippus Florentinus, *Oratio die Epiphaniae MDXX* [before Leo X] [Rome 1520] fols. 5v-6f; Mansi (n. 4 above) cols. 825 (Baltassar del Rio), 888 (Antonio Pucci); etc. For a general historical context for the opinions of the Roman authors, see Louis Capéran, *Le problème du salut des infidèles* (2 vols. Toulouse 1934) esp. 1. 216-220; 2. 49-61. See also George H.
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53. See Cajetan (n. 10 above) II-II. 66. 8, ad 2am. See also Pollet, "Ad sex quaesita" (n. 10 above) 549-553.

54. See "Libellus" (n. 11 above) cols. 626-628. On the preeminent importance of preaching, see ibid., cols. 643, 663-664.

55. See ibid., cols. 682-683.

56. See ibid., cols. 628-630.

57. See ibid., col. 627.

58. Ibid., col. 629: "Sed haec, sanctissime pater, pacis sunt opera."

59. See ibid., cols. 614-616; also cols. 708-709.

60. See my Giles of Viterbo (n. 4 above) esp. 16, 189-191.

61. See De imitatione Christi, 1.20.5. The best treatment of this movement is now Regnerus R. Post, The Modern Devotion (Leiden 1968).

62. See Williams (n. 52 above) 368 and passim, as well as my "Erasmus and Luther" (n. 20 above).


65. "Libellus" (n. 11 above) col. 626: "... Beatissime Pontifex, ... fratres illos nostros esse non te latet. . . ."

I wish to thank the American Philosophical Society for a grant-in-aid which made possible the research upon which this article is based.
The Alexandrine Bulls of 1493: Pseudo-Asiatic Documents

by Luis Weckmann-Muñoz

It has long been a popular misconception—and unfortunately it still appears in many textbooks of Latin American or Iberian history—that in 1493, after Columbus' return from his first voyage, Pope Alexander VI (1492-1503) “with a simple stroke of the pen” divided the new-found lands of the whole American continent between His Most Faithful Majesty the Portuguese king and the Catholic monarchs of Spain, his beloved subjects.

This “papal division of the New World” was invoked time and again down to the nineteenth century, first in a futile attempt to exclude other nations from settling in what we now call the Western Hemisphere, and later (as modified by the Treaty of Tordesillas) to settle border claims between the Spanish and Portuguese territories or among the Latin American Republics. Once the universal scope of the original papal concession was curtailed by the Protestant Revolution, however, the Iberian claims to exclusivity were more and more grounded on the simple argument of prior discovery. And modern historiography tends to admit that in the last resort there was no other basis for Spain’s and Portugal’s sovereignty over their American possessions than the bare fact of conquest.
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Still, the controversy surrounding the true meaning of the Alexandrine bulls has not fully died down. To my mind, it can be settled easily if we take a fresh look at those documents not from a modern American but from a medieval European point of view, and thus place the bulls in their proper historical perspective. After all, in the early months of 1493, nobody was aware that a new continent had been reached, least of all the Discoverer himself.

As is well known, there are two Inter cetera bulls of Alexander VI dealing with the Discovery, officially dated the 3rd and 4th of May 1493 respectively. The drafting of the first bull did not fully satisfy Spain; and the second Inter cetera, which was really issued on 28 June and pre-dated (a not unusual practice in the papal chancery at that time), introduced the so-called Alexandrine Line. In both bulls, the pope appears not as an arbiter settling differences between Spain and Portugal, but very clearly as the fons iuris: it was his prerogative to grant the newly found lands to Spain on certain conditions, chiefly that the natives be converted to Christianity. 1

In May or June 1493, exactly what did Europeans know about these newly found lands, and what in particular did the Roman pontiff know? The dates the bulls were issued rule out any possibility that they had entailed a continent’s enfeoffment. Since infallibility has never embraced the realm of geography (the dogma had not been proclaimed in 1493, in any case), the only possible source of knowledge about the nature and location of the new lands had to come (especially in view of his secretive nature) from Columbus himself, who is credited with having drafted Inter cetera-B anyway. 2

According to one of his best biographers, Columbus remained convinced till the last that he had only discovered a new route to Asia. 3 But in summing up his discoveries, he numbered the islands he had found at 1,400. 4 He had set out in 1492 to find a westward route to the Indies, in quest of both real and mythical islands fabulously rich, such as Antilia, Cipango, St. Brendan’s Isle, the Isle of the Seven Cities, the Islands of the Spices, 5 all placed somewhere off the coast of Asia by either medieval cartography or the narrations (real or imaginary) of medieval travellers like Marco Polo and Sir John Mandeville. The Admiral believed he had found some of them. In his geographical ideas Columbus was the last of the great medieval travellers rather than the first of the modern explorers of America. 6

Throughout his wanderings, he believed he was skirting the Asian coastline. For him, Hispaniola was Cipango or Ophaz or Tarsis; Cuba was an island near southern Cathay; the Caribbean Sea was the Sea of China; and Veragua, which was going to give him and his descendants their ducal title, was either the Golden Chersonese (identified with the Malay Peninsula in some medieval maps) or Ophir, the legendary site of
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King Solomon’s mines. The Admiral mistook the Orinoco for the rivers of Paradise and believed himself at one point within sailing distance of the Ganges River and of the kingdom of Ciguare and Ciamba (Indonesia or perhaps Sumatra). Columbus would not have been surprised to encounter Prester John (for whom he was actually looking) and was disappointed at being unable to deliver to the Great Khan the letter of salutation which the Catholic kings had entrusted to his care.

This quest for the islands was not exclusive to Columbus. At the end of the fifteenth century legends and pseudo-scientific geographical knowledge were full of references to them, and by making long voyages, the Portuguese had actually found some, like the Azores and the Cape Verde Islands, “on the route to the Indies” and on the outer limits of the known world. A succession of papal bulls from 1454 to 1481 had invested the Portuguese crown with those islands on the same grounds which Alexander VI used twelve years later for the Columbian islands. A number of the Admiral’s contemporaries went out in search of Asia and the islands, and some of his precursors as well, among them Ferdinand van Olmen, who may have sighted Newfoundland in 1486-87 while in the service of the Lusitanian king. The secret dispatches of the Catholic kings’ London ambassador bear testimony that another Genoese, John Cabot, had followed the wake of earlier Bristol navigators and merchants in the pursuit of the Island of the Seven Cities and of Brazil, and that in August of 1497, after returning from his North American journey, he was confident that he had reached the northeastern projection of Asia not far from Cipango. In 1524 Verrazano sailed similarly towards Cathay and the Oriental confines of Asia, and Jacques Cartier, reaching New France ten years later, at first also believed he was on the fringes of the Asiatic continent.

It must be pointed out that since contemporary scientific circles in the maritime powers shared an advanced but as yet untested belief in the sphericity of the earth, there was nothing, hypothetically, that should stand between Europe and Asia, if a westward route was followed, except the Sea of Darkness and its fascinating and mysterious islands. Columbus was certainly an exponent of such a belief, and his uncritical geographical ideas concerning the size of the globe (which were closer to those of Pierre d’Ailly and the classical authors than to the calculations of Albertus Magnus) did not allow much room for a huge land mass between Europe and the easternmost reaches of Asia.

If the Discoverer died convinced of having visited only Asia and totally unaware of a New World, and if the notion of America’s existence came gradually into men’s minds decades afterwards, how can Alexander VI have “divided” a continent whose existence was not even suspected? We are confronting a latter-day and erroneous interpretation of the scope of the pope’s donation. His decision
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becomes clearer and quite understandable if we examine it for what it was, namely, a grant of the islands found by Columbus to the Spanish crown. In the papal archives the Alexandrine bulls were incorporated in the Leonicus collection under the title *De insulis novi orbis*; furthermore, all the news about the Discovery which circulated in Europe in 1493 mentions islands exclusively. Alexander VI in the second *Inter cetera* drew a line 100 leagues west of the Azores to avoid jurisdictional conflicts between Lisbon and Valladolid over the islands, ports, and littorals his immediate predecessors had already conferred on Portugal, and over those he himself was granting to the kings of Castile and Aragon.

He had a legal right to do so. The popes may have shared the shaky geographical notions of their time, but ever since the days of Alexander III and Innocent III, they were excellent jurists (perhaps even more so than theologians). In the Middle Ages there was hardly any case settled at the papal Curia for which a prodigious array of precedents could not be mustered in full accordance with the prevailing traditions based on customary, Roman, and canon law. As I have established elsewhere, the Alexandrine bulls of 1493 constituted the last application of a centuries-old and fascinating theory (I have baptized it the omili-insular doctrine), which had tried since the late eleventh century to incorporate all islands in Saint Peter’s Patrimony and had been largely successful in doing so. Relying mainly on the spurious Donation of Constantine, the papacy first claimed in 1091 the right to possess and dispose of islands lying in Western Europe— islands falling within the limits of Constantine’s supposed fourth-century donation to the successors of Saint Peter. In his bull *Cum universae insulae* of that year, Pope Urban II recalled the Constantinian Privilege, particularly the emperor’s expressed donation to the popes “of islands” or “of (the) various islands” (vel diversis insulis)—an alleged gift couched in ambiguous terms, and set forth a claim to the Lipari Islands, which had just been reconquered from the Moslems, vesting the abbot of Saint Bartholomew of Lipari with their possession.

Later in 1091, in the bull *Cum omnes insulae*, the same pope broadened what I have called the omni-insular doctrine to encompass every island, and granted Corsica to the bishop of Pisa in exchange for a tribute. Sixty-four years later the doctrine was again applied when Hadrian IV’s bull *Laudabiliter* (1155) gave Ireland, “which, like all the islands over which Christ, the Sun of Justice, has shone, . . . belongs . . . to the Holy Roman Church,” to Henry II of England on condition that he pay Peter’s Pence to Rome.

Peter’s Pence, which originated in pre-Norman days as an ecclesiastical tithe among the Anglo-Saxons, had assumed by the twelfth century all the outward characteristics of a feudal tribute although the
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English monarchs successfully resisted this interpretation, at least until the surrender of King John to Pope Innocent III in 1213.\textsuperscript{19} A few years before his issuance of \textit{Laudabiliter} Hadrian IV had visited the Scandinavian countries as papal legate (in 1152-1153), and there introduced Peter’s Pence as a feudal tribute on the basis of the then prevailing notion that Scandinavia was an island. This vassalage of the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian kings to the Apostolic See was interrupted only by the Reformation, and subsequent to Hadrian’s visit, Peter’s Pence spread from the peninsula—the tribute always duly recorded in the Book of Tributes (\textit{Liber censuum}) of the Holy See—to Gotland, Iceland, the Faroes, the Orkneys, and the Shetland Islands, the Isle of Man, and even to Greenland, the last recorded in 1328.\textsuperscript{20}

Urban II’s \textit{Cum universae insulae} in 1091 first enunciated the doctrine of papal lordship over islands. In a subsequent paragraph, it states that this “is particularly true of those near the shores of Italy” (\textit{maxime quae circa Italiae oram habentur}). Although papal suzerainty over the kingdom of Sicily and over Corsica antedates the pontificate of Urban II, it was reaffirmed in Corsica’s case on the basis of the omni-insular doctrine. And tacitly or explicitly the doctrine which gathers all islands \textit{sub iure sancti Petri} was applied during the Middle Ages (and in some cases well into the nineteenth century) to no less than 28 Italian islands and archipelagos including Sardinia, Capri, Malta, Elba, and Capraia. Practically all monasteries built on Italian isles were sooner or later made directly dependent on the Roman pontiff.\textsuperscript{21}

Between 1114 and 1450 the omni-insular doctrine was applied in many corners of the Mediterranean. Thus, papal feudal supremacy was claimed (and accepted) in the Balearic Islands, Rhodes, Djerba and Kerkennah, and Castelrosso, as well as in Cyprus, the island where this paper was written.\textsuperscript{22}

With the beginning of the era of great geographical discoveries, the omni-insular doctrine reached the Atlantic Ocean. In 1344, Clement VI personally invested Don Luis de la Cerda, a descendant of the royal house of Castile, with the Canary Islands and Galicia,\textsuperscript{23} giving him the title of Prince of the Fortunate Islands. And as mentioned before, Nicholas V’s bull \textit{Romanus Pontifex} (1455) granted to the Portuguese crown the islands recently discovered by its sailors, principally Madeira, Cape Verde, and the Azores. This donation was confirmed in 1456 by the bull \textit{Inter cetera} of Calixtus III; in 1481 by Sixtus IV in the bull \textit{Aeterni Regis clementia}; again by Innocent VIII in 1484; and, finally, in the bull \textit{Precelse devotionis} of Leo X in 1514.\textsuperscript{24}

From 1091 to 1493 the formulae the papal chancery employed in all the bulls or diplomas awarding islands to secular rulers or ecclesiastical dignitaries were remarkably uniform even if the precise terminology varied; variations were always evolutionary. Until 1450, when the bull
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Inter innumeras of Nicholas V conferred upon Alfonso of Aragon the as yet unconquered island of Castelrosso in the eastern Mediterranean, all the islands are mentioned by the specific name which identifies them in existing maps, but after 1454, as the omni-insular doctrine was applied to seas hitherto unmapped, the references were to "solitary" or "remote" or "unpossessed" islands "having been found." At this point the doctrine was further broadened on the basis of successively reported discoveries to benefit Portugal first, then Spain, and included in addition to the grant of islands, although in a perfunctory and haphazard manner, the donation of seas (maria), ports (porti), provinces (provinciae), or in a generic sense, lands (terrae).25

The so-called Alexandrine bulls of 1493 had a very brief legal span. In October of the same year, Alexander VI embarked on an altogether new policy, trying to sweep Portuguese claims out of existence in his bull Dudum siquidem. The Lusitanian reaction was understandably violent, and in 1494 the two Iberian nations signed the purely secular Treaty of Tordesillas which stipulated that the popes should have nothing to say about its interpretation. Still, they accepted the Alexandrine Line (although they moved it westward 370 leagues from the Azores) as the division between their respective nascent maritime empires in the Ocean Sea. The Treaty of Tordesillas describes the lands newly discovered only as islands. When in 1506 Julius II confirmed this contractual arrangement in the bull Ea quae, he referred only to islands and ports, and he specifically mentioned only the Antilles.26

On the basis of Columbus' first fragmentary discoveries, Alexander VI also thought in terms of islands, and in awarding them to Spain he believed himself in line with his predecessors. The New World, as it came to be known afterwards, does not come into the picture at all. The pope and Columbus had their minds set on the mysterious islands which medieval legends and traditions placed near the shores of Asia.

The curious theory that the Roman pontiffs were the lords or overlords of all islands is not only specifically mentioned in three papal documents dating from the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but allusions to it were made by at least two medieval chroniclers, John of Salisbury and Gerald of Wales. Fifteenth-century Roman jurists affirmed the right of the popes to delegate to third parties the occupation of newly found lands, "especially islands."27 The American world was seen by European eyes only as a group of islands neighbouring the huge Asiatic land mass.28 This belief remained a half century later, not only in Europe but even among the conquerors and missionaries already treading the paths of the New World.

Writing after the death of Isabella but while Ferdinand of Aragon was still alive—between 1504 and 1516—the crown jurist Palacios Rubios eruditely discusses in his treatise "On the Islands of the Ocean
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Sea" (the title itself is conclusive) the basis of the rights which the Spanish sovereigns held over their new possessions and specifically over their new subjects, the "islanders." 29 The Italian-Spanish chronicler of the Discovery, Peter Martyr of Anghiera, confirmed that Columbus' discoveries were all islands.30 In 1523 the first Latin translation of Cortés' Second Letter to Charles V, published by Pietro Savorgnano with a dedication to Pope Clement VII, bore the inscription De rebus et insulis noviter repertis.31

Juan de Grijalva believed he had discovered yet another island in 1518 while skirting the coasts of Yucatán, and the information was so recorded in Spain.32 Yucatán's peninsular character began to appear in 1527, and maps as late as 1553 still depict it as an island.33 Ponce de León reports in 1513 and again in 1521 his discovery of the "island" of Florida, an error which was repeated in 1526 by his successor Ayllón; Florida's peninsular character was probably not established until Narváez in 1528.34 In the fourth decade of the sixteenth century most of the missionaries in New Spain still believed themselves to be baptizing the "Indians" of Asia,35 and Cortés was convinced that in Lower California he had located the mythical Island of the Amazons. Amerigo Vespucci was the "discoverer" of the continent qua continent: it is just that it should bear his name.

NOTES

1. The strongest case for regarding the charters of 1493 as instruments of feudal investiture has been made by E. Staedler, "Die Urkunden Alexanders VI. zur westindischen Investitur der Krone Spaniens von 1493," Archiv für Urkundenforschung 15 (1938) 145-158, and "Die Cruciata Martins V. vom 4. April 1418," ibid., 17 (1941) 304-318. The bull Inter cetera was also, significantly, registered in the Leonicus Collection, compiled by the order of Pope Paul V (1605-21) exclusively for documents beginning with the pontificate of Gregory VII (1073-85), which referred to the Holy See's secular lordship over various countries.


4. Columbus describes his first discoveries as islands in a letter, copies of which he sent to both the major-domo and the treasurer of Ferdinand of Aragon. The letter reached Rome before 18 April 1493, that is, before the first Inter cetera was prepared. See Francis G. Davenport, European Treaties bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies (4 vols. Washington, D.C. 1917-37) 1. 58 n. 8. Before his departure for Europe after his last voyage, Columbus wrote to the pope that he had gained "1400 islands and 333 leagues of the continent of Asia, besides many other great and famous islands." Madariaga calls him a "fisher of islands" (Christopher Columbus [ed. 2 London 1949] 300), and discusses the 1492 landfalls under the title "The discovery of Cipango" (ibid., Ch. xviii).

The Politics of Conflict

ed. 2, 1973) 1. 11-13 and "The Middle Ages in the Conquest of America," Speculum 26 (1951) 130-132. For Enrique de Gandia the chief incentive of Columbus' 1492 expedition was the discovery of "Antilia," "(Historia critica de los mitos de la conquista americana [Madrid 1929] 14, 16).

6. See Travel and Travellers of the Middle Ages, ed. Arthur P. Newton (London 1949) 16, 17, 18, where Columbus' geographical ideas and concepts are discussed.


8. The bulls Romannus Pontifex by Nicholas V (1454), Inter cetera by Calixtus III (1456), and Aeterni Regis clementia by Sixtus IV (1481). The popes awarded those islands as well as "ports" and "littorals," etc., in recognition of the zeal the Portuguese displayed in spreading the Gospel among the indigenous population.
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The Papal
Division of the World and Its Consequences
by Miguel Batllori, S.J.

Despite the general title of this essay, I shall limit myself to a central aspect of the problem, from which essential consequences derived, both for the two kingdoms directly interested in the question—Castile and Portugal—and for the remaining states which were soon to take part in the discovery, conquest, and colonization of the New World. The problem, I believe, is the degree of importance which the two Iberian kingdoms attributed to the many interventions by Alexander VI with respect to the new lands. The documents related to the Tordesillas treaty, some well known and others new, indicate that Isabel I of Castile and Ferdinand II of Aragon considered the Alexandrine bulls politically helpful but not essential to their goals. In my opinion, this idea of requesting a supplementary but not indispensable title helps to explain facts and attitudes which appear anachronistically medieval in the midst of the Renaissance.

A few days after Columbus returned to Lisbon on 4 March 1493 from the first American voyage, he arranged an interview with King John II of Portugal "in the valley of Paradise," only a few leagues away from the capital. The monarch received him "very honorably" on 9 March, but, he added, "he understood that in the agreement which existed between
the kings [of Castile and Aragon] and himself, this conquest belonged to him," undoubtedly referring to the Alcáçovas treaty of 1479. When Columbus replied "that the Kings had told him not to go to the Mine nor to all of Guinea," John II "answered that he was sure there would be no third parties in this."1 In such a case, the intermediary could only have been the pope.

Above all, what is reflected here is the attitude of the king of Portugal: the question of the discovery and conquest of the new lands depended solely on the already existing treaties between Portugal and Castile. At least, this was the attitude brought forth by John II in his conversation with Christopher Columbus. Obviously, according to a long-standing Portuguese tradition, John II would have tried to obtain new papal bulls in order to curtail Castilian expansion.

For this very reason, the kings of Castile and Aragon thought it appropriate to hasten their homage to Pope Alexander VI, which had been delayed for more than six months. So, on 3 April 1493—before Columbus could reach Barcelona, where the Court was then located2—Don Diego López de Haro was named ambassador, and on the following day he was given lengthy instructions about purely ecclesiastical matters.3 The most important problem, that of the islands and lands discovered by Columbus, was apparently the object of secret deliberations. As no trace of them has been found in the archives of Barcelona or of Simancas, they probably resulted in oral instructions.

According to the historian Antonio de Herrera, Isabel and Ferdinand intended, upon greeting the new pope, to obtain papal reconfirmation of the political rights already guaranteed by the treaty of Alcáçovas, and confirmation of the new right acquired by the discovery and partial occupation of certain islands:

Because of the possession of those new lands which Columbus had taken and for many other reasons, certain great men of letters held the opinion that neither the confirmation nor the papal donation was necessary to possess the New World justly. However, the Catholic Kings, pious princes and most obedient to the Holy See, sent the same ambassador, who should entreat His Holiness graciously to grant to the Crown of Castile and Leon the discovered and still-to-be-discovered lands, and to issue bulls concerning this.4

Since Herrera did not document the opinions of these great scholars, his assertions might correspond, at first glance, better to the political conceptions at the time of the first edition of his Historia general (1601) than to those of 1493, especially since the idea of dependency does not exist in Chapter lxxix of the Historia de las Indias by Fray Bartolomé de Las Casas,5 which was Herrera’s main source for that passage. But long before Herrera, Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo had explained the
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concept of subsidiarity in his Historia general y natural de las Indias, islas y tierra firme del mar Oceano, published in Seville in 1535:

And so those holy princes [Isabel and Ferdinand] first received the gracious concession of these Indies from the Supreme Pontiff, so that their holy purpose—which was, as God’s servants, to spread the Christian religion—could be carried out by a more just title, and although this was not necessary, they accepted permission and title from the Vicar of Christ, to whom they had always been obedient with faithful heart, just as also these seas and this empire were conquered by the Crown of Castile and belong to it.6

Around 1510 Ferdinand II of Aragon was preparing his expedition against Algiers.7 Algiers is located east of the river Muluya; therefore, according to the treaties of Monteagudo and Soria signed in 1291 between James II of Aragon and Sancho IV of Castile, the town lay in the area of African expansion assigned to the kings of Catalonia and Aragon.8 On 28 April 1510, Ferdinand the Catholic wrote to his ambassador in Rome, Jeroni Vich:

Some would like to say that for a better justification of the said war [against Algiers] it would be appropriate for His Holiness to declare war... against all infidels, and to give us the right of conquest over all lands we would acquire from them, because it is said that it is not lawfully permissible for Christian princes to make war in any of the lands of the infidels, except in the kingdom of Jerusalem, unless these infidels start a war against Christians, or unless war is declared against them by the Supreme Pontiff.9

The parallel is only partial: the North African conquests were precisely divided between Aragon and Castile in 1291; the comparable division of the islands and lands of the Atlantic by the treaty of Alcáçovas in 1479 between Castile and Portugal was less precise. But the treaties of Monteagudo and Soria had not had specific papal confirmation, whereas the agreement of Alcáçovas had passed into the bull Aeterni Patris, issued by Sixtus IV on 21 June 1481 at the request of King Alfonso V of Portugal. Moreover, what was requested in 1493 was not the same thing that would be asked in 1510, when Ferdinand II of Aragon wanted Pope Julius II to issue a bull declaring war against all Moslems as allies of the Turks. Still, the king thought fit to bring also this kind of petition (1510) to the pope’s attention.

As seen in the later texts of Oviedo and Herrera, Ferdinand of Aragon’s attitude toward the New World seems clearer in the conquest of the kingdom of Naples. Of course this kingdom was feudally subject to the pope; moreover, in the Chambord-Granada treaty of 1500, Ferdinand the Catholic and Louis XII of France divided the territory of
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Naples without consulting the Roman pontiff, who simply had to accept their decision. And when he took over the kingdom in the war of 1503-04, Ferdinand II completely excluded Alexander VI and Julius II. Only much later did Julius invest Ferdinand feudally with Naples.\textsuperscript{10}

If John II of Portugal thought that, even without the intervention of third parties and despite the bull \textit{Aeterni Patris}, the problems arising from Columbus’ discoveries could be resolved, Isabel and Ferdinand—especially the latter—probably shared the same political opinion. But because of the bull and many other pontifical documents obtained by the kings of Portugal,\textsuperscript{11} as well as the fear that John II would continue to call on Rome to secure his discoveries, conquests, and privileges, Isabel and Ferdinand could not remain content with the traditional political right of conquering and occupying lands belonging to no one.

Even though the two \textit{Inter cetera} bulls are well known to all Americanists, I must stress some of their features.\textsuperscript{12} In the first bull, Alexander VI praises Ferdinand and Isabel for the exaltation of the Catholic faith in the reconquest of Granada. Further, he mentions his own earlier desire to find “\textit{aliquas terras et insulas remotas et incognitas}” and to bring the Catholic faith to its inhabitants, the commission given to Christopher Columbus and to others “that they should seek remote and unknown lands” (\textit{ut terras remotas et incognitas huiusmodi... inquierent}), the fact that Columbus had found “certain very remote islands as well as mainland which had not previously been discovered by others” (\textit{in mare Oceano navigantes, certas insulas remotissimas et etiam terras firmas} [which was not exact\textsuperscript{13}], \textit{quae per alios hactenus repertae non fuerant}), and the hope that those who lived “in the aforementioned lands and islands” (\textit{in terris et insulis prae­dictas}) would convert to the Christian faith. Finally, the bull adds: “Hence, all things considered and especially the exaltation and expansion of the Catholic faith, you are to subject these lands and islands and their inhabitants and, with the help of God’s mercy, bring them to the Catholic faith” (\textit{Unde, omnibus diligenter et prae­sertim fidei catholicae exaltatione et dilatatione... consideratis, terras et insulas praedictas illarumque incolas et habitatores vobis, divina favente clementia, subiceret et ad fidem catholicam reducere}).

In the bull \textit{Inter cetera} of 3 May, everything that precedes the \textit{Nosigitur} formula of juridically constitutive disposition justifies, \textit{de facto} and \textit{de iure}, the concessions that are soon to be made. The pope then orders the kings to induce the “\textit{populos in huiusmodi insulis degentes}” to embrace the Christian faith, and “by the authority of Almighty God granted to us through St. Peter and of Christ’s Vicarship which we exercise on earth” (\textit{auctoritate omnipotentis Dei nobis in beato Petro concessa ac vicariatus Christi quo fungimur in terris}), the Pope granted (\textit{donamus, concedimus et assignamus}) “all lands and islands” (\textit{omnes et singulas terras et insulas}) discovered or still to be discovered, that were not already subject
to some Christian king prior to 25 December 1492, to them and to the succeeding kings of Castile and Leon (vosque ac heredes . . . praefatos de illis investimus).

Even though the verb investimus was deleted—both here and in parallel places—in the shorter homonymous bull predated to 4 May, the notion of investiture would reappear in the bull Dudum quidem, dated 25 September. That this was not an infeudation in the strict sense of the word is verified by the fact that the popes did not ask the kings of Castile for vassalage in return for their American dominions, though of course they demanded it of King Ferdinand II of Aragon for the kingdom of Naples. 14

The first Inter cetera document (3 May 1493) still mentions insulas and terras at several points. But only once, in the passage already quoted, 15 does it refer to terra firma. The less specific form, insulas et terras, was repeatedly transformed in the homonymous bull to insulas et terras firmas. Even though in fact Columbus had discovered no mainland on his first voyage, the term terra firma had appeared in the first Alexandrine document, and had been constantly repeated in the second Inter cetera. Nonetheless the use of this term does not prove exclusive reliance on the medieval papal doctrine (since Urban II) that assigned all islands to the dominion of the Holy See. 16 Rather, Alexander VI relied on the medieval theocratic doctrine developed by canonists attached to the Roman Curia, and reinforced by the formula papa vicarius Christi. 17

Many scholars have noticed the tension between the theocracy—a passionate defense of the papa dominus orbis both in spiritual and temporal spheres—and the more moderate position of many theologians who, beginning with Saint Thomas, delineated the differences between the pope’s universal jurisdiction in spiritualibus and his limited, indirect jurisdiction in temporalibus. 18

The Alexandrine bulls follow that canonistic tradition which, since the later Middle Ages, could be alleged only after a petition by princes interested in particular cases. It seems very unlikely that Isabel of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon would recognize these papal theocratic rights as the principal juridical title for their dominion over the new lands and islands. On the other hand, certainly they saw in these bulls an additional bulwark against pontifical privileges granted to the kings of Portugal.

Incidentally, the curial claim to power over islands found late, though not explicit, echoes in Bonifacius VIII’s donation of Corsica and Sardinia to James II of Aragon in 1295, 19 and in Clement VI’s investiture of the Infante Luis de la Cerda with the Fortunate Isles in 1344. 20

On the other hand, Ferdinand II of Aragon could not ignore the case of his predecessor Peter the Great (III of Aragon and II of Catalonia): advised by the bishop of Valencia, Jaspert de Botonac, Peter considered
invalid—till moments before his death—his own deposition, decreed by
Martin IV for having accepted the kingdom of Sicily against the pope’s
will. And Ferdinand II should have known that his own uncle
Alfonso, the Magnanimous, had commissioned Lorenzo Valla to pre-
pare the famous attack upon the historicity of the Donation of Con-
stantine. In accepting the all-embracing power of the pope, Ferdinand
was essentially pursuing political opportunity.

Thus in the minds of Isabel and Ferdinand the Alexandrine bulls
had only subsidiary value in claims to dominion over the new lands, but
essential value in whatever concerned the evangelization of the Indians.
For one can scarcely doubt the genuinely religious intent of Alexander VI
and of the Spanish rulers, and the fusion of political and missionary
elements in the papal documents.

Not only the text of the Tordesillas treaty (7 June 1494) but also the
historical circumstances of its writing and signing confirm this interper-
tation.

The donation in the second bull Inter cetera delimited the boundaries
(vague in the first bull) 100 leagues west of the Azores and the Cape
Verde Islands. At Tordesillas, Castile and Portugal agreed to move the
dividing line 270 leagues further west, and they decided to request a
bull confirming this agreement. But neither party hurried to get the bull.
Manuel I of Portugal finally asked for it in 1506.

Furthermore, at Tordesillas neither the Portuguese ambassadors Rui
and João de Sousa and Aires de Almada nor the kings turned to the
nuncio Francesc Desprats, who was present. On 27 May, the nuncio
wrote Alexander VI: “The ambassador of Portugal is present here at
court, and from what I understand, matters between those lords . . . are
going very well, and I believe there will be agreement.” Since Desprats
always reported fully on any royal audience which he had attended, this
text indicates that he was excluded from any direct knowledge of the
negotiations. During those same days, in contrast, Desprats was
informed of discussions between the Spanish rulers and the ambas-
dors of France and Naples, and he communicated them in detail to
Alexander VI.

The delegates of Isabel and Ferdinand for the discussions with the
ambassadors of John II of Portugal were Don Enrique Enríquez, the
king’s butler and uncle; Don Gutierre de Cárdenas, commander-in-chief
of León; and Doctor Rodrigo Maldonado. Don Enrique once had close
ties with the nuncio because of the recent marriage of his daughter,
María Enríquez, to the duke of Gandia, Don Joan de Borgia, son of
Alexander VI. Even so, Desprats learned nothing about the treaty,
neither during his and the Spanish rulers’ stay in Tordesillas, nor after
the signing on 7 June, nor during its ratification at Arévalo on 2 July. He
was not even told about the clauses in which both parties agreed not to
ask the Holy See for absolution or dispensation, and agreed to solicit a papal bull confirming the treaty.

Also in Columbus' mind, the popes' political interventions in American matters seemed subsidiary. In the Santa Fe agreement of 1492, the monarchs were explicitly termed "lords...of said oceans," and they name Columbus "Viceroy and governor-general of all the islands and lands which he shall discover or conquer."\(^{26}\) And Columbus' explanation to John II of Portugal on his return from the first voyage indicates that the Admiral perceived the rights of Castile over the newly discovered lands as founded upon the treaty of Alcâçoas.\(^ {27}\) This attitude is significant in a man like Columbus, normally deferential toward the Holy See, and convinced—perhaps already at that moment, perhaps only much later—that he was fulfilling a prophetic religious mission with his explorations.\(^ {28}\)

Yet Columbus' initial attitude seems to have changed when the privileges granted to him in Santa Fe were confirmed and expanded by the monarchs in Barcelona on 28 May 1493, after the first Inter cetera bull had reached Catalonia. In the memorial of La Mejorada of 1497, Columbus speaks expressly, citing a letter from the Spanish rulers to John II of Portugal, about "the donation of the Holy Father, both of the discoveries and of all other islands and mainlands that were to be discovered in the West"; and a little later Columbus states that "the Supreme Pontiff gave and conceded to the said king and queen, in the year 1493, all the islands and mainlands that lie to the west of a line that he had traced across the islands of the Azores and of Cape Verde."\(^ {29}\) But both texts were composed as part of polemics against the Portuguese King John II, in which an argument based on papal bulls could have a decisive value.

Nonetheless, both the kings and their officials, in Spain as well as in the Indies, in documents and also on occasions not directly related to Portuguese claims, frequently alleged the Alexandrine bulls as the only—or at least the principal—title of their temporal sovereignty in the Indies. For many, the bulls were the most compelling title. But such juristic allegations did not preclude other titles of public law being utilized before Columbus' first voyage and before the first Inter cetera. Undoubtedly, in rectifying the second Inter cetera by the Treaty of Tordesillas, Ferdinand and Isabel had in mind these other claims deriving from ius publicum and ius gentium.

Finally, two questions:

First, did the Alexandrine bulls truly constitute a division of the world? On the strictly juridical level, the bull Inter cetera, predated to 4 May 1493, traced a demarcation line in a sphere where the pope—with no actual authority to do so—signed and donated lands exclusively to the crown of Castile. The donation imposed spiritual obligations regard-
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ing the evangelization of the natives. Even though it was later ratified by Julius II, the agreement of Tordesillas, correcting the demarcation parallel, was a purely political treaty by which Castile and Portugal themselves delimited their own colonizing spheres. A true division of the world would have required a thorough knowledge of the world and its continents, which did not occur until America began to be considered distinct from Asia, after Sebastián Elcano had circumnavigated the world in 1519-22.30

Second, in contrast to the more theocratic canonists, almost all contemporary theologians, particularly Cajetan and Mayr, interpreted the bulls of Alexander VI according to Saint Thomas' thought, as only a concession of privileges concerned with the evangelization of the lands.

The problem soon passed from the theoretical terrain to a concrete and practical one when Las Casas and his followers denounced not only the personal enslavement of the Indians—even if under other labels—but also their enforced political submission to the kings of Castile, denying to the pope and the emperor direct jurisdiction over the infidels simply because they were infidels. And Francisco de Vitoria, enumerating eight titles that could make the conquest of the Indies legitimate, excluded the Alexandrine "donation."31

The consequences of the supposed world division between Castile and Portugal, though based on papal bulls and privileges, did not differ for predominantly Catholic states and for those which separated from the Roman Church. France's attitude resembled that adopted by England and Holland.32 All considered themselves equal in their right to explore and occupy areas not controlled by the rulers of Castile and Portugal.

NOTES

2. Antonio Rumeu de Armas, "Colón en Barcelona," Anuario de estudios americanos 1 (1944) 431-524; and see p. 78 of the work quoted below, n. 29.
4. Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas, Historia general de los hechos de los castellanos en las Islas y Tierrafirme del mar Oceano (17 vols. Madrid 1934-57) 2 (ed. A. de Altolaguirre y Duval) 138 (in Década I, Libro 2, Cap. 4): "Aunque por la posesión que de aquellas nuevas tierras"—Herrera says—"había tomado el Almirante [Colón], y por otras muchas causas, hubo grandes letrados, que tuvieron opinión, que no era necesaria la confirmación ni donación del Pontifíce, para poseer justamente aquel nuevo orbe, todavía los Reyes Católicos, como obedientísimos de la Santa Sede, y piadosos Principes, mandaron
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al mismo Embajador, que suplicase a su Santidad fuese servido de mandar hacer gracia a la Corona de Castilla y de León, de aquellas tierras descubiertas, y que se descubriesen en adelante, y expedir sus bulas acerca de ello.”


6. Edition prepared by Juan Pérez de Tudela Bueso (5 vols. Madrid 1959) 1.33 (Libro 1, Cap. 8): “He hablado primero aquellos santos príncipes [Isabel y Fernando] la merced y concesión destas Indias por el Summo Pontifice, así porque con más justo título su sancto propósito se efectuase (que era ampliar la religion cristiana, como siervos de Dios, y aunque para esto no tuviesen necesidad, tomaron licencia e título del vicario de Cristo, a quien ellos siempre con fiel corazón tuvieron obediencia), como por ser estas mares e imperio de la corona e conquista de Castilla.” García Gallo did not assign much objective value to this paragraph by Fernández de Oviedo: Alfonso García Gallo, “Las bulas de Alejandro VI y el ordenamiento jurídico de la expansión portuguesa y castellana en África e Indias,” Anuario de historia del derecho español 27-28 (1957-58) 461-829 (esp. 514-515 n. 94); however, Father León Lópezegui believed that this concept of subsidiarity corresponded to Ferdinand’s political thought, and he considered this confirmed in a text by Ferdinand from the year 1510 (“Introducción general a la historia de la Iglesia en la América Española,” Historia de la Iglesia en la América Española desde el descubrimiento hasta comienzos del siglo XIX, by León Lópezegui and Félix Zubillaga [2 vols. Madrid 1965-66] 1.58). This idea was first set forth by E. Sarrablo Aguarelas, “Una correspondencia diplomática interesante: Las cartas de Fernando el Católico a Jerónimo de Vich,” in V Congreso de historia de la corona de Aragón, Estudios, 2 (Saragossa 1956) 177-194. The diplomatic correspondence has been studied and published in its entirety by the Baron de Terrateig: Política en Italia del Rey Católico, 1507-1516 (2 vols. Madrid 1963).

7. See J. M. Doussinague, La política internacional de Fernando el Católico (Madrid 1944).


9. Baron de Terrateig (n. 6 above) 2. 94-95, doc. 34: “algunos quieren dezir que para mayor justificacion de las dicha guerra [contra Argel] conuernfa que su Santidad por su bulla apostólica declarasse guerra contra todos los infieles y nos diesse la conqista de todo lo que adquiríésemos de las tierras de los infieles, porque disen que de derecho no es permitido a los príncipes xristianos fazer guerra en todas las tierras de los infieles, salvo en el reyno de Hierusalén, sino en caso que los dichos infieles faigan la guerra a Xristianos, o que la guerra sea declarada contra ellos por el Sumo Pontific.”


12. About the Alexandrine bulls and their dates, see principally H. Vander Linden, “Alexander VI and the demarcation of the maritime and colonial domains of Spain and Portugal, 1493-1494,” American Historical Review 22 (1916-17) 1-20; Paul Gottschalk, The Earliest Diplomatic Documents on America: The Papal Bulls and Treaty of Tordesillas (Berlin 1927); Manuel Giménez Fernández, “Nuevas consideraciones sobre . . . las bulas alejandrinas de 1493, referentes a las Indias,” Anuario de estudios americanos 1 (1944) 173-259; and the work of García Gallo (n. 6 above) that we follow for the text of the Pope’s documents reported in this paper. The bull Inter cetera was issued toward the end of April 1493, after the arrival of López de Haro in Rome, was correctly dated 3 May, sent to Barcelona on 17 May, and delivered into the kings’ hands on 28 May; the small bul with the same title Inter cetera was prepared in Barcelona after the arrival of Columbus in this city, corrected in Rome around 28 June, even though it was pre-dated to 4 May 1493, and arrived in Barcelona between 18 July and 4 August of the same year.


15. Page 214 above.
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20. Weckmann-Muñoz, Las bulas (n. 16 above), 229-239.


24. Archivio Segreto Vaticano, AA, arm. I-XVIII, 5023, fol. 43r. “En esta cort ha hau el present embaxador de Portugal, e, en lo que comprench, les coses de aquests senyors rey e reyna ab lo rey de Portugal se van molt metigant, e se creu ne exirà alguna bona concòrdia.”

25. M. Batllori, Alejandro VI y la casa real de Aragón 1492-1498, lecture in the Royal Academy of History, Madrid, with a response by G. Marañón (Madrid 1958); Idem, Vuit segles de cultura catalana a Europa, with a preface by J. Rubió i Balaguer (ed. 2 Barcelona 1959) 51-83.


27. This implication is evident from the references to the Mine and the Guinea; see p. 212.


A viceroy is an official who represents in his person the reigning sovereign and exerts authority in his name. He administers territory subject to his monarch but geographically distinct from the ruler’s residence. He is more than the king’s locum tenens; he is his alter ego. When he is present, the ruler is present in theory, and this distinguishes him from governors-general or governors, who are a rung or two down the hierarchical ladder.

What has been thought of as the world’s last viceroyalty quietly expired at midnight 15 August 1947, when Lord Louis Mountbatten handed over control of British India to Pandit Nehru. But the succession of rulers of India beginning with Lord Canning in 1858 and ending with Lord Louis was not viceregal in the correct, older sense; the title had no recognition in British government. While it was used in everyday speech and sometimes in official parlance, Canning and his successors during those 89 years were really governors-general.

The last Spanish viceroyalty ended 9 December 1824 on the battlefield of Ayacucho, where Peruvian viceroy José de la Serna and his French-born general, José de Canterac, surrendered with their entire army to the Colombian liberating force under Antonio de Sucre. But La
Serna and his predecessors in the New World had enjoyed full status as kings' personal representatives for 289 years. It is the origins of this system that I wish to investigate.

To an unappreciated extent the history of Portuguese-Spanish maritime expansion has Italian roots. By this I mean more than the fact that Cadamosto, Columbus, and Vespucci were Italian-born. They and their countrymen served the Iberian kingdoms during the formation of their empires, but, more importantly, Italy offered ready-made examples of overseas dominions, though smaller and nearer home than the Iberian ones. Venice, Genoa, Pisa, and to some extent the earlier Amalfi, built what today would be called colonial empires in possessing and governing distant dependencies. These were all based on trade, and the long rivalries over them are interesting, but I shall confine myself to a few remarks about Venice.

Venice called itself "The Most Serene Republic," yet it always had a titular head. The doges, from the election of Paolo Anafesto in 697 to the abdication of Ludovico Manin before General Bonaparte's threat in 1797, had ups and downs of power but were always in name the first citizens of the state. Regardless of what a doge was—prince, duke, president, or primus inter pares—at times he exercised dominant power, as the last strong one, Francesco Morosini, did as late as 1694.

An earlier doge, Enrico Dandolo, laid most of the foundation of his city's imperial structure in 1204: in the Fourth Crusade, when Dandolo, reportedly a nonagenarian, diverted French armies from their original destination—the Holy Land—to the sacking of Constantinople and the virtual elimination, for the time being, of the Byzantine empire. At one stroke he both removed the suzerainty theoretically held by Byzantium over Venice and rid his city of its main commercial rival. In the partition of spoils after the conquest Dandolo was named lord of "a quarter and a half of a quarter" (3/8) of the temporarily defunct Greek state, and his successors bore that title for 150 years. Originally, the dogal share included part of Constantinople and soon embraced many islands and strips of mainland coast.

There was no doubt about who first represented Venetian central authority, because Dandolo remained in the Greek capital until his death, aged 98, in 1205. After that a podestà was set up in the city with jurisdiction over Venetians there and in their other Aegean possessions. These viceregents held office for a limited time, in the name and commission of the doge, who was still a powerful person in the thirteenth century—before the establishment of the Council of Ten after 1310. They also reported to a Venetian commercial body, the Consoli dei Mercanti, which resembled the later Consejo de Indias and even more the Casa de Contratación, to which Spanish viceroys in America were later responsible. A rump Byzantine empire retook Constantinople in 1261,
but Venice went on ruling Levantine possessions and even acquired more. Its great imperial age closed with the loss of Cyprus, which it held from 1489 to 1571, employing a complicated system of administration on the island. In case of war all officials were subordinated to a provveditore generale, a military commander, and though the dogal power had grown largely honorary by then, the provveditore functioned in the incumbent’s ostensible behalf. Coins stamped for Cyprus bore the doge’s name but not his profile. 4

Turning to Spain, we begin not with Castile and León, in whose rulers’ names the New World was so largely conquered, but with the Mediterranean part. Catalonia, originally the Frankish county of Barcelona, had become a maritime power by the early twelfth century, and in 1114 undertook a naval expedition against the Balearic Islands, then in Muslim hands. In 1137 a royal betrothal, later a marriage, linked Count Ramón Berenguer of Barcelona and Petronila, baby heiress to the small new kingdom of Aragon. This personal union and the efforts of the immediate descendants of Ramón and Petronila extinguished neither the constitutional differences nor the divergence of interests between Aragon and Catalonia. The languages, the laws, and above all the aims, were different. For generations provincial, land-locked Aragon, centering in Saragossa, struggled with the more cosmopolitan Catalonia, with maritime Barcelona as its capital. The landlubber Aragonese nobles thought mainly of protecting their local, parochial interests and of tearing down the king’s power. The commercial magnates of Catalonia, with less objection to an absolutism which could serve their interests, looked eastward across the Mediterranean for trade and ultimately for empire. The one common idea the two had was expansion southward against the Muslims, lest Castile’s growth confine them to a small northeastern corner of Spain. Aragon’s aim was largely accomplished by King Jaime I the Conqueror (1213-76), whose capture of Valencia in 1238 ended the independent Muslim kingdom governed from there. Jaime did not incorporate Valencia into either of his older dominions but ruled it as a separate entity. The word viceroy had apparently not yet been coined, or if it had, was not employed in this case. The king appointed a royal lieutenant of Valencia, Simon Pérez of Tarazona, who was already high steward for Aragon. 5 Owing to the secular Aragonese nobles, and especially the military-religious orders, who swarmed into Valencia from Aragon, both king and lieutenant were hard put to exert their authority.

A few years earlier Jaime had successfully subjugated the Balearic Islands with the naval strength of Catalonia; in fact he had undertaken this largely to please the Catalans, who considered it necessary to safeguard their Mediterranean trade. In the case of Majorca he left a lieutenant to govern in his name, and later appointed a second deputy to
assist the first. At his death, Jaime followed the medieval Spanish practice of dividing his realms, so Majorca and the other Balearics passed to a son who became an independent ruler. But in 1349 Majorca was permanently annexed to Aragon, and now the king’s authority was represented by a viceroy. The importance of the office dropped, however, as that of the Balearics declined, because, owing to Barcelona’s wish to kill off commercial competition, the islands were discriminated against in legislation. By the fifteenth century they played a minor role in Spanish history.

The Catalan duchy of Athens, though mainly the creation of a trading company in the early fourteenth century, developed what resembled a viceregal office. The company found it advantageous to hold Athens and Thebes through an Aragonese duke—a member of the royal family—residing in Sicily. The duke appointed a vicar general (vicarius generalis, viceregens), who swore fealty to him before leaving Sicily and became chief executive officer upon reaching his post. The title appears to have lasted 60 years, from 1312 to 1372.

Although Pope Boniface VIII conceded Sardinia to the crown of Aragon in 1297 as part of a complicated diplomatic maneuver, 26 years passed before King Jaime II attempted to take possession. His forces captured Cagliari, the most important town, but the representatives of Genoa and Pisa, both of whom claimed the island, had to be dislodged. Establishment of Aragonese rule proved difficult also because Sardinia had ancient governing customs of its own, especially a territorial arrangement dividing it into four independent judgeships. From the start, the Aragonese kings appointed viceroys to represent them and their authority, but rebellions continued for generations, making viceregal functions largely military. Incumbents of the office were sometimes distrusted by their kings, and to counteract any tendencies they might have toward independence, they were limited to three years in office and barred from handling most revenues. Rather early in Aragonese administration, a procurador real (royal proctor) was named to manage the king’s Sardinian finances, and the viceroy had strict orders to keep hands off this department of government. The three-year rule for the latter’s administration was not strictly observed, but investigation shows that this was about the average tenure. Except for limitations imposed from above and problems encountered in trying to govern the stiff-necked Sardinians, the authority of the viceroys was nearly absolute. The separation between political-military power and financial responsibility resembled a development in the later history of the Spanish-American viceroyalties.

Shortly after the death of Jaime the Conqueror, Aragon intervened in Sicily. The gory episode in 1282 known as the “Sicilian Vespers,” in which the Sicilian populace massacred the French forces of Charles of
Anjou, brought intervention by Pedro III of Aragon, who had a claim by marriage to the Sicilian throne. Events then and for the next hundred years are too complicated for even the briefest narration, but not until the fifteenth century did the Aragonese crown gain full possession of the island. The first viceroy—or rather vicereine—Blanche of Navarre, widow of Martin of Aragon, maintained Spanish authority through six troubled years (1409-15), during which time Sicily was torn between local factions aiming at complete independence. Her exact title appears to have been vicaria (deputy), but she behaved as a full ruler, and when replaced, married her successor and ultimately inherited the throne of her native Navarre. After her departure, the royal representatives were viceroys, residing in state at the royal palace in Palermo. Few of them were Sicilians, none at all after the first 50 years. After the situation settled down, they tended to have three-year terms, but more by custom than by law, which was not always observed.

When Alfonso V of Aragon acquired Naples in 1443, the city and kingdom needed no viceroy because the ruler preferred Italy to Spain and resided there himself. A curious reversal of the usual situation resulted: his wife, Doña Maria, not accompanying him to Naples, had to be his vicereine for Aragon, although her official title was, of course, queen. When Alfonso died in 1458, his illegitimate son, Ferrante, became king of Naples, which ceased to be part of the Aragonese empire. Not until the time of Ferdinand the Catholic, a few years after the discovery of America, did Naples return permanently to Aragonese rule (1504). Thereafter, until the end of the Spanish Habsburg, it was a viceroyalty, with most of the viceroys being Spaniards and often Castilians. A conspicuous example is the first, the famous Castilian General Gonzalo de Córdoba, who had conquered Naples for Ferdinand. The king felt uneasy about the arrangement after his wife’s (Isabella’s) death, when he was unsure about his own future in Castile, and threw Gonzalo and other Castilians out of office in Italy. Still, the union of crowns allowed Castilians an increasing share in Italian matters, while Aragonese subjects, at first legally disqualified from going to Castilian America, found it easy to evade the prohibition until it was finally repealed.

Following the discovery of America and the opening of the sea route to India, Portugal preceded Castile by a decade in building an overseas empire. At first the subjects of King Manuel I sought only to dominate Indian Ocean trade and to avoid war when possible, refraining from territorial conquest. They sent annual fleets around the Cape of Good Hope to such Indian ports as Calicut, Cochin, and Cananore to trade for Asiatic products, principally spice. But within eight years of Vasco da Gama’s first voyage, it was evident that this policy did not work. The Portuguese needed to control points on shore, where their merchants
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could carry on business securely between the departure of one Lisbon fleet and the arrival of the next in the following season. Furthermore, the Portuguese had not altogether stopped the supply of spice shipped in Arab vessels via Aden and the Red Sea to Alexandria, where Venetian—or mostly Venetian—vessels picked it up for distribution to Europe. And the Arabs (a word used loosely for Muslim shippers in the Indian Ocean) having previously held a monopoly of this trade, were prepared to fight for it. To obtain a permanent upper hand, the Portuguese needed both strenuous military measures and reliable bases. So when Francisco de Almeida went out in command of the annual fleet in 1505, he had orders to occupy and fortify points both in East Africa and the Indian peninsula. He also bore the title viceroy, and, according to the sixteenth-century historian João de Barros, “this was the first title of this quality that in these realms was ever given.” He was being sent to cope with an economic situation that had turned military. Many persons of distinction accompanied him, and Barros explains that the viceregal title was given to increase his authority over them and to magnify his standing in the eyes of Oriental friends and foes. Almeida achieved most of what was expected of him, climaxing his career with a stunning victory over a Muslim coalition in 1509. Strangely, Alfonso de Albuquerque, who succeeded Almeida and certainly surpassed him as a conqueror, did not hold the viceregal title, though it was awarded him posthumously. He is sometimes called viceroy by historians, but one does not find, either in Portuguese documents or Portuguese sixteenth-century historians, any mention bestowing the title. After him governors of the Portuguese Orient were viceroys or lesser officials, depending on their social standing or the nature of the work they had to perform. The last appearance of the title that I am able to find occurs in 1896, when Dom Afonso, brother of the reigning king, Carlos, received it briefly.

Castile was settled in the “Indies” for 43 years before installing a real viceroy. By the Capitulations of Santa Fé before his first voyage, Columbus was named “viceroy and governor-general” of the lands he would presumably discover for the Crown. But after a brief and unsuccessful attempt to govern Hispaniola, his authority was superseded. His son Diego later held the governorship of Hispaniola for a few years, but in the elaborate set of orders naming him admiral and governor, the word viceroy was purposely omitted.

The Indies were considered the property of the Castilian crown, and the sovereign owned them solely in her or his Castilian capacity. The many other titles possessed by the Spanish monarchs had no application to the New World. Although Castile had a representative body, the cortes, resembling the three estates of France and of other European monarchies, it had nothing to do with the Americas. Years before the installation of the first viceroy in Mexico City, the Castilian monarchs
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established two bodies to care for the detailed work of governing the Indies. In 1503, before Isabella’s death, when Castilian authority had not yet spread from the Antilles to the mainland, they created the Casa de Contratación (House of Commerce) at Seville, the port of contact with the Americas. Initially it had various functions promoting further discovery, such as cartography and the licensing of pilots, but it finally concentrated on controlling trade. Then the Consejo de las Indias grew until in 1524 it became the official lawmaking body for the new possessions. Like the Council of Castile at home, this Council of the Indies was directly responsible to the ruler, and as Castile then had no fixed capital, moved with the court from place to place, but never went to the Indies. It issued laws for the Americas and acted as a court of appellate jurisdiction for colonial cases.

By now, Castilian adventurers operating loosely in the name of the crown were conquering the American mainland, starting with the Isthmus and following with the Cortesian overthrow of the Nahua-Aztec confederation in 1521. During the next 14 years, the conquistadores and others who soon came from Spain expanded Spanish jurisdiction in all directions from Tenochtitlán, rebuilt as Mexico City. Cortes retained the major authority, but since his administrative talents did not equal his military ability, the land fell into confusion. For a time, government by audiencia, a Castilian institution dating sketchily back to the thirteenth century and in more developed form to the fourteenth, was tried. An audiencia, or chancery, was originally a body of several members administering justice in the king’s name. Both a civil and criminal court, it eventually came to have administrative powers.

Two successive audiencias tried to manage Mexican governmental affairs, while Cortes continued to have military jurisdiction. The experiment failed because the audiencias could not consistently please anyone. They antagonized the Church and outraged the old conquistador element naturally attached to Cortes, many of whose members were now major landholders and exploiters of Indian labor. The audiencia judges were accused of high living, neglect of duty, and licensing Indian slavery. Changing audiencia personnel did not help much; Cortes was still there, constantly showing his contempt for lawyers and bureaucrats. The judges were conscious of being only temporary appointees, and some were aging and anxious to be relieved of office to return to Spain.

What was needed was a strong leader: a soldier who would put Cortes in his place, a man of high birth and standing whose family name would impress everyone, an experienced administrator who would set affairs in order, and above all a man of brains and statesmanship—in short, a viceroy. Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor and lord of a miscellany of European dominions, had little time for the Indies. His
wife, Isabella of Portugal, therefore played the primary role in selecting Antonio de Mendoza. Of the three men who seemed qualified, the Count of Oropeso begged off on account of health, the mariscal de Fromesta wanted too high a salary and preferment, but Mendoza’s general attitude and willingness pleased the queen-empress. He accepted the viceregal post in 1529 but needed nearly six years to put his affairs in order and move to Mexico, which became the viceroyalty of New Spain.

Mendoza’s situation differed from that confronting the Portuguese Almeida in 1505. The latter had been given a title and told to win his viceroyalty with the sword; Mendoza’s realm was ready-made and awaiting him. But his task, while not primarily military, was difficult; he had contending factions of Spaniards to reconcile, Indian problems to remedy, a frontier to expand, fresh explorations to organize, and a Church to manage. Handling Church matters, Mendoza undertook a task which Aragonese viceroys in Europe did not have to face. Popes Alexander VI and Julius II, by bulls of 1501 and 1508 amounting to treaties with the Castilian crown, had granted the régio patronato (royal patronage), which gave the government authority over the Church in the New World in all but doctrine and religious discipline.

The concrete application in Mendoza’s case and those of his successors was that the viceroy managed the Church in worldly matters, chose its priests—subject to investiture by ecclesiastical authority—arranged for converting the Indians, collected tithes, and paid the bills. He did this in the capacity of vice-patron, a companion title to his viceregal one. There had to be some deviation from this arrangement, as in the management of remote frontier missions, and most especially in the case of Paraguay, but the twin functions and titles of a viceroy remained virtually to the end of the empire.

Mendoza acquitted himself well, and the viceregal institution, having proved itself useful, ultimately expanded. Peru became a viceroyalty nine years after New Spain; New Granada—meaning principally Colombia—in 1739; and Rio de la Plata in 1776. The other agencies of Castilian government continued, the House of Commerce until nearly the end of the colonial era and the Council of the Indies until it had only Cuba and Puerto Rico for which to legislate.

The three-year limit for a viceregal term of office was ultimately applied, as in the old Sardinian and Sicilian cases. Mendoza and those who followed in Mexico and Peru governed as long as they continued useful, or until they died or asked to be relieved. In the seventeenth century the three-year term became accepted in theory, though not rigorously maintained in practice. With the coming of the French Bourbon dynasty to Spain in the eighteenth century, there was growing realization that three years hardly sufficed for mastering the problems of
American administration, and five years became more the standard period. Then came another change: instead of being chosen for birth and illustrious family, later viceroys were apt to be experienced army or navy men who had previously served elsewhere in the Indies.

Near the end of the Spanish administration—we shall no longer call it exclusively Castilian—an effort was made, as in Sardinia, to separate viceroys from their financial functions. Officers called intendants (from the French intendant) took, or were meant to take, jurisdiction over royal finances. They increased efficiency and monetary gain to the Crown because of their greater economic effectiveness. But most of this change came in the time of Charles III, whose 29-year reign ended in 1788. Charles IV, his successor, was exceptionally stupid and soon overwhelmed by European problems with which he had no chance to cope. Whatever efficiency and reinvigoration his father’s ministers had given the empire were soon dissipated.

NOTES

3. The council was installed after the conspiratorial attempt by Baiamonte Tiepolo to overthrow the government in 1310.
8. Raimundo Carta Raspi, Storia della Sardegna (Milan 1971) 304. The judgeships were Arborea, Cagliari, Torres, and Olbia.
9. Merriman (n. 6 above) 1. 507.
12. José M. Doussinague makes the immediate cause a quarrel, threatening violence, between Gonzalo and the king: La politica internacional de Fernando el Católico (Madrid 1944) 149. But John Lynch is doubtless right in saying that Ferdinand wished to safeguard Aragonese interests: Spain under the Habsburgs (2 vols. Oxford 1964-69) 1. 32. Mary Purcell says the king enticed Gonzalo from Naples with the offer of the mastership of Santiago: The Great Captain (London 1963) 205.
14. Asia de Joam de Barros, primeira década, ed. António Baião (ed. 4 Coimbra 1932) 295. Author’s translation. This is a facsimile of the original edition published in 1552.
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18. Merriman (n. 6 above) 1. 229-230.
20. The bulls of 1501 and 1508 are in Matías Gómez Zamora, Régio patronato español e indiano (Madrid 1897).
21. This trend is observable in Cayetano Alcázar Molina, Los virreinatos en el siglo xviii (Barcelona and Buenos Aires 1945).
The New World

as a Factor in
International Relations,
1492-1739

by Charles H. Carter

In considering the New World as a factor in the international relations of the Old, I should like to give special attention to the question of timing, to some ways and circumstances in which it played either no role at all or only a limited one, and, in due course, to the nature of the influence it did have.

For reasons that will become obvious, I should like to discuss the matter within the chronological framework of three broad periods: a beginning stage of some six or seven decades from the discovery of America to the mid-sixteenth century, during which the New World had not yet become a serious factor in European affairs; the hundred years or so between a mid-sixteenth century watershed (ca. 1555-68) and a mid-seventeenth century watershed (1648 or 1659), during a part of which time it was a factor, but in limited and particular ways; and, as epilogue, the eighty-year stretch from 1659 to the War of Jenkins' Ear (1739), when entirely different conditions prevailed. Given the subject—and the thesis to be argued here—one must inevitably speak mostly of non-American matters.
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THE EUROPEAN WORLD VIEW

In the matter of timing it is no surprise that there are strong parallels with the picture John H. Elliott describes in his Wiles Lectures, published as The Old World and the New, 1492-1650.¹ As Professor Elliott shows, the European mind needed more than a century—perhaps until 1650—to see the New World at it was. Similarly, the New World only slowly became an important factor in European international relations.

Professor Elliott shows that the intellectual lag was caused by Europeans’ insistence upon integrating the observed phenomena of the New World into the European world view, on European terms. There is something of a parallel here as well, though in the present case it is more practical than conceptual: the New World did not become a factor in European affairs until it fitted into the European framework of concerns, needs, and capabilities—and it did so only gradually and after substantial delay.

It is not surprising that a Euro-American world, as distinct from a merely Ibero-Iberoamerican one, did not spring quickly into being. Men naturally see, think, and act in the context of their own time and their own past. The question at hand can hardly be discussed apart from that context, most especially the geographical shape that it had.

It was, of course, not an exclusively European world. With the Crusades, Marco Polo, and numerous travelers and traders to the East, it had long since become a Eurasian world, and with continual extension of trade and discovery down the West African coast since the twelfth century by Genoese, Castilians, and especially Portuguese, it embraced a constantly increasing region of new lands, peoples, wealth, and wonders in that direction too.

One cannot reconstruct here the European perception of what lay beyond Europe during the first generations to which one may apply that evocative phrase, “Europe and a Wider World,”² but one may note in passing that even Prince Henry the Navigator, himself a latecomer to the business of exploration,³ had come on the scene seventy-odd years before the first Columbus voyage; that, after a lull, a new surge of Portuguese expansion down the West African coast had come twenty-odd years before; and that the discovery of America was bracketed by Bartholomeu Dias’ rounding of the Cape of Good Hope (1487-88) and Vasco da Gama’s extending that route all the way to India (1497-98)—the beginning of direct European penetration of the Far East. As every schoolboy knows, it was these Indies that Columbus was looking for; and that of course was where Cabral was heading when he bumped into Brazil (1500): Portuguese America.⁴ The momentum in that direction was building rapidly: the third Portuguese fleet to the East, again under Vasco da Gama, “a powerful and well-armed force”⁵ that established Portuguese domination, sailed in 1502—the year of Columbus’ last voyage.

Thus Europeans had been accustomed for generations to living in
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an established European-African-Asian world, with an established, increasingly dynamic thrust to the East—by the Portuguese, the Italians overland, soon even the North European maritime powers. In 1497 John Cabot rediscovered the North American mainland (the first since the Vikings), but his commission from Henry VII of England had "objects similar to those of Columbus," that is, to find a route to the East. As late as the 1550's the main English effort was a quest for a Northeast Passage to the Orient; the Willoughby-Chancellor expedition (1553) got only as far as Archangel, but it gave England access not only to the Muscovy trade but to the north-south river route to South Asia. Sixty years later—and beyond—English explorers were still probing for a Northwest Passage, the fourth and last theoretical alternative route to the traditional and continuing magnet for European overseas expansion. It was over a century after Columbus and da Gama that the English and Dutch were strong enough to sail to the East Indies by the Portuguese route, founding East India Companies in 1600 and 1602 respectively; but it was another 55 years before the English made their first major acquisition in the far handier Caribbean (Jamaica 1655), and even the Dutch did not establish a West Indian Company until 1621.

Thus the New World was a long time in gaining Europe's attention, and then had to share it with other non-European areas. That naturally delayed America's becoming a factor in international relations. It started out otherwise. First, the succession war between Isabella and her Portuguese-backed rival claimant ended in the Treaty of Alcaçovas in 1479, which gave Isabella the Castilian throne but stripped Castile of all holdings in the West African sphere except the Canaries—shutting her out of the southward competition while leaving her, by odd navigational coincidence, with an ideal jumping-off place for voyaging westward. 7

Then, after the later discoveries, the limits of the respective spheres for overseas penetration were agreed to in the Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494. But that settlement (and the related papal bulls) served to take the New World out of Spanish-Portuguese relations, not inject it into them.

Without Spanish-Portuguese conflict (and those crowns were of course united from 1580 to 1640), the Americas could have two kinds of effect on European relations. On the one hand, incursions by raiders, interloping merchants, and would-be settlers could affect relations between Spain or Portugal and the non-Iberian states involved. On the other hand, relations among those non-Iberian states could be affected by rivalries that developed in the course of those incursions. In practice, both occurred but not for a long while.

THE TRADITIONAL INWARD FOCUS

Why so long? One side of the answer is simply that it required considerable time for Spain to develop the area to the point where it would be attractive to raiders and traders. 8 The other side is that the non-
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Iberians—and Spain as well, for that matter—were preoccupied with traditional native European concerns. As a temptation the New World had first to get the attention of monarchs, governments, and ruling elites distracted by long-established rivalries, goals, fears (the Turk), values (the influence of religion on politics and warfare), and means (land armies, and Mediterranean sea power unsuitable for the ocean).

It is both symbolic and illustrative of this traditional internal focus of European affairs that in 1494, when the Treaty of Tordesillas in effect clarified the national framework for overseas rivalry, the king of France took his armies across the Alps and began the "Great Italian Wars"—a 65-year struggle (1494-1559) for domination of that peninsula. It was a full quarter-century after Tordesillas before Spanish force in the Indies was finally capable of the Cortés expedition (1519). Yet the intervening period of weakness passed without interference; Spain's European rivals were busy with other things.

The next decade, between Cortés' assault on Mexico and Pizarro's on Peru (1530), is usefully illustrative of these. In 1519, the year Cortés landed in Yucatán, Charles I became Charles V and added the imperial and Austrian entanglements to those of Spain. He was immediately hampered by the Comunero rising in Spain (1520-21). The Turks attacked both westward in the Mediterranean and northward through the Balkans: Rhodes fell in 1523, and the annihilation of the Christian forces at Mohacs in 1526 brought Turkish control almost to the Austrian frontier. One might expect at least France to take advantage of the situation by attacking Spain overseas, but she was for a time prevented from doing so by the latest twist in traditional dynastic competition: at the battle of Pavia in 1525 Francis I was captured and taken to Spain (and released in 1526 after signing the Treaty of Madrid). The ultimate response was purely European, the shift from a series of "grand alliances" among Spain and various lesser powers against France, to the first (League of Cognac 1526) of a long series among France and lesser powers directed against Spain.

Meanwhile, hatreds were at least partly rechanneled to religious matters—an important watershed was reached with the Diet of Worms (1521) and the excommunication of Martin Luther—and His Most Christian Majesty had not yet sorted out his position on such things vis-à-vis His Catholic Majesty; in all events, the growing religious turmoil held much of Europe's attention. Of the two northern maritime powers that were later the greatest threats to the Indies, the "Dutch Republic" was still of course merely part of Charles' Burgundian dominions, with the revolt still 40 years in the future, while England was caught up in the controversy over Henry VIII's divorce and the increasing turmoil of reformation. For Europeans of the time, possibly the most impressive single event of the decade was the sacking of Rome (1527) by mutinying Spanish (imperial) troops; it profoundly affected Italian society, in-
creased Spanish control of the peninsula, decided Henry VIII's divorce
(and to a large extent England's religious future and her future foreign
alignments)—and was completely unrelated to the New World.

Thus the problem must be viewed in the context of two fundamental
and enduring situations. The East, having gained Europeans' attention
half a millennium before and having become entrenched in their world
view through centuries of trade, travel, and occasional conflict, as the
other pole in an East-West world, provided formidable attractions that in
practice were never displaced as the overseas area of greatest interest for
Europeans (except, of course, for the Spanish), and in fact had a firm
enough hold on men's minds that it was only slowly that room was
made in that world for the newly discovered Americas even at a level
below that of number one attraction. And secondly, international rela-
tions not only continued to focus upon traditional European goals, but
the New World did not for a long while enter into the pursuit of those
European goals, much less provide alternative American goals for
European states.

For example, during the Great Italian Wars, it was expectable that
France would do whatever seemed likely to damage Habsburg power.
And French corsairs did in fact attack Spain's Atlantic sea-lanes in the
1520's and raid in the Caribbean in the 1530's. But that effort was not
sustained. In the 1540's France's main strategy was not a major assault on
the Indies but a rather unusual alliance with the Turk (1542).

THE MID-SIXTEENTH CENTURY SHIFT

It is not until around the middle of the sixteenth century that one
finds a substantial change in the situation. There is in fact a quite
remarkable constellation of events within a few years of each other—
mainly from the mid-1550's to the middle or late 1560's—that alter condi-
tions in various ways, and collectively radically so. In 1555-56 Charles
V abdicated his various thrones and was succeeded by his son Philip II—
excluding the Austrian domains and the imperial throne but fateful-
ly including the Netherlands. The "Religious Peace" of Augsburg in 1555
settled the Catholic-Lutheran dispute in Germany and so, by dis-
engaging the Austrian Habsburg from religious strife, disengaged the
Spanish branch from Central European conflicts for some 65 years;
while the Calvinists, excluded from that settlement and more mili-
tant than the Lutherans, became the cutting edge of Protestant expan-
sion as the scene of religious conflict shifted to France and to Philip II's
domains in the Netherlands. Meanwhile, the Council of Trent (1545-47,
1551-52, 1562-63) put Catholicism on a much firmer footing while—a
crucial though usually unnoticed matter—that contentious assembly's
dissolution removed a peaceful arena, much used while it lasted, for the
Habsburg-Valois competition.

In 1559 the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis ended the Franco-Spanish
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war that had raged sporadically since 1494. This should have freed Spanish resources for the better defense of the Indies; ended French wartime attacks there; allowed France a period of "peacetime" expansion overseas (which might bring her again into conflict with Spain); or allowed Spain to move against England (once again Protestant), which, even if done for purely religious reasons, might have pre-empted the age of Hawkins and Drake and its consequences in Anglo-Spanish relations. But all of these possibilities either never came to pass, or did so for other reasons or in a form altered by unrelated circumstances. Though Spain would not acknowledge, nor France abandon, the right of French merchants to trade to the Indies, both sides were ready for peace (both had been ready three years earlier, and peace would surely have come then, had the pope not interfered), so both sides waffled and allowed the matter to remain unresolved. That omission set a vital non-precedent that would be cited and interpreted to suit non-Iberians' self-interest in future treaty negotiations and diplomatic debates.

Two other royal accessions entailed even more important changes than Philip's had brought. In 1558 Philip's wife, Mary Tudor, was succeeded on the English throne by the Protestant Elizabeth. In 1559, while celebrating the Spanish peace treaty (and a royal marriage), Henry II of France was killed in the jousting (alongside the role of chance in history, one must make room for the role of stupidity). He was succeeded by a series of three young sons who ranged from mediocre to psychotic, and the Queen Mother was markedly unfit to govern during the crisis ahead.

The onset of that crisis was also a part of the watershed in question: the French "Wars of Religion" that began in the 1560's (and lasted to 1598) served to deflect French efforts from the Indies. The attempt to plant a French colony in Florida in the 1560's illustrates this well: what is significant is not the attempt but the failure. The same decade saw the beginning of the revolt of the Netherlands, ultimately to create a new state and a new threat to both the Spanish and Portuguese overseas, though one much delayed by the internal struggle itself. In marked contrast to these two was the Elizabethan settlement, completed in 1563, accompanied by John Hawkins' first voyage (1562) that began the long history of English incursions into the Indies. Events during these watershed years, or beginning with them, thus took one overseas threat out of the picture, began the creation of a later one, and brought in a new one not previously involved.

On the American side, this watershed marks the opening of the great Potosí silver lode and the adoption of the mercury amalgamation process, both vastly increasing silver production and transatlantic shipment, and the establishment of a full-blown convoy system: that is, a
quantum increase in the attractions of the Indies and of the cost of their defense.

THE PLAYERS

The involvement in America (and of America in their foreign affairs) of such transient "powers" as Denmark and Sweden was not only much later but slight, and is not considered here. But one must give brief individual attention to the major non-Iberian states—France, England, and the United Provinces—potentially or actually involved, and to the conditions of that involvement.

As Spain's principal opponent and the only other European state of comparable power, France might be expected to be her principal rival in the New World, or at least her principal tormentor. She was not, for the direction of French expansionist policy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was in fact so consistently landward as to make the Canadian venture almost an aberration: continued involvement in Italy; steady penetration of the Swiss Alps, the upper Rhineland, and eventually the southern Netherlands; recurrent struggles for disputed lands along the Pyrenees; interference in Central, Eastern, and Northern Europe; and other such purely European preoccupations.

Spain, of course, responded with her own intervention in Italy and regained the large kingdom of Naples in the South, acquired control of the strategically crucial duchy of Milan in the North, and began a centuries-long domination of the peninsula, all without seriously distracting her from her simultaneous American penetration. Indeed, the two Spanish thrusts dovetailed rather nicely: the Italian wars served as a useful training ground for conquistadores, while the booty from their conquests helped finance those wars. Thus, to explain the vast difference in the two powers' involvement overseas by saying that "France was a land power" is not by itself very helpful. The problem is not that that is not true, for indeed she was, but that comparing France to "Spain" is to compare her with something that did not exist: France was a reasonably coherent entity, while Spain was not. "Spanish" penetration of Italy was in pursuit of traditional Aragonese goals (though using mainly Castilian resources to do so). At the same time, the discovery of America was simply one more step—though a giant one—in a long maritime and colonial Castilian tradition that embraced both medieval domination of shipping in the Bay of Biscay and the conquest and settlement of the Canary Islands. The king of "Spain" had both an Aragon and a Castile while, metaphorically, the king of France ruled only an Aragon.

England, on the other hand, besides the maritime tendencies appropriate to an island, began with an "Aragonese" bent as well, but gradually lost it. Henry VIII, like a parody-in-miniature of his Plantagenet
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forerunners, sent forth his armies to conquer a couple of cross-channel bishoprics, and Mary Tudor died bemoaning the loss of Calais, but only four years later came Hawkins’ first voyage, and a new age began. From then on, no serious efforts were made to secure a foothold on the Continent. By the late seventeenth century England was once more sending sizeable armies to the Continent, but to fight a new preponderant power that as yet could not be hurt overseas. When that circumstance changed, the English again attacked in the New World (and the Orient) to “restore the balance of the Old.”

But all this does not necessarily explain the relatively small part played by overseas attacks in France’s long struggle with Spain. The answer is again geographical. When at war and wanting to cause damage to Spain (and when internal disruptions did not prevent it), France had merely to take advantage of the so-called “Habsburg encirclement”—intervening in the Low Countries during the Eighty Years’ War and in the Catalan Revolt 1640-56, grabbing at “disputed” lands (Roussillon, Cerdagne) on the Franco-Spanish frontier, and closing off key Alpine passes and other overland lines of communication. It was an advantage England, for example, conspicuously lacked; it is hardly surprising that the French availed themselves of it instead of going all the way to the Indies for more doubtful results.

WAR AS A SPECIAL CONDITION

Which brings the discussion to another limitation on the New World’s impact on international relations: the distinction between a wartime and a peacetime context. During wartime, the Indies’ attractiveness to raiders, armed interloping merchants and such might incline Spain to peace and her opponents against it, and in a general war that effect could be generalized. In the late sixteenth century the prospect of ending such raids, as well as the cost of land war and domestic economic disruption, especially in the “obedient provinces” of the Netherlands, was a strong argument in favor of Spain’s making peace with the English and the Dutch, but it involved complications. The argument favoring peace with the French was less strong, because the greatest damage was being done by the English and Dutch, but the complications were comparably less inhibiting; consistent with this, the French peace was made first (Vervins 1598). But if Spain made peace with either of the other two, its raiders (and interloping merchants and slave traders) would simply mix in indistinguishably with those of the remaining combatant. Without this consideration a case could be made for peace with one even if peace with both was not possible; but because of this special problem a strong argument could be made that peace should be made with both or neither. Peace was finally made with England (Treaty of London 1604), with the Dutch truce still five years away, but it was done in the
fervent hope of “completing the peace with this third and last treaty” soon, and in fact a formal cease-fire was obtained in 1607.

New World considerations did not cause Spain’s desire for peace: military stalemate and sheer exhaustion demanded it in any case, and would have done so had the New World not even existed. Indeed, without American treasure, even allowing for the cost of raids and of defending against them, Spain would surely have reached that point far sooner. But these New World considerations affected Spain’s approach to peace-making, and may well have delayed the decision; they also delayed the negotiation of all three treaties, and thus the coming of formal peace. Conversely, they may have accelerated Spain’s desire for peace, for an end not only to the European war but its American adjunct. But they were not necessary as a motive for peace.

But this special effect has to do with the end of a war, not its course. And an obvious fact must be emphasized here: normal diplomatic relations between opponents cannot be damaged in wartime since they do not exist. There are of course degrees of hostility, but except for some particularly odious outrage (real or imagined), the privateering, illicit trade, and territorial encroachment in the New World were not apt to worsen relations between Spain and an enemy she was already at war with on other fronts. Thus, with the end-game exception already noted, America was not a factor in international relations between Iberian and non-Iberian states whenever those states were at war. And that drastically reduces the time when it was such a factor.

THE DUTCH: MID-SIXTEENTH TO MID-SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

To take the simplest case first, the Dutch were at war with Spain from the mid-1560’s until the Treaty of Münster in 1648, with the exception of the Twelve Years’ Truce (1609-21), with open hostilities thus comprising 85 percent of the period of the Eighty Years’ War. And since it was a civil war, with Spanish recognition of the United Provinces as an independent sovereign state coming only in 1648, there was no establishment of “normal diplomatic relations” during the remaining 15 percent, the 1609-21 interim. Thus during the whole hundred years, from the mid-sixteenth to the mid-seventeenth century, there were no formal diplomatic relations to be harmed or helped by the American factor. There was, of course, a period of formal peace, and one, even though under a truce and not a permanent settlement, which in the eyes of contemporaries had as good a chance for longevity as those with France or England. Dutch policy cannot be traced in detail here, but one may note that the West Indies Company (1621) and its accelerated aggression in Portuguese West Africa and intrusion into Brazil (1624) came after the resumption of war—indeed, as C. R. Boxer notes, “this Company was from the first intended as an offensive weapon for strik-
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ing against the roots of Iberian power in the New World”—and that the Brazilian venture lasted only about as long as the war did, though its end was caused by its unprofitability, local rebellions, and other factors besides the return of Spanish-Dutch peace. (With the beginning of the Portuguese revolt in 1640, of course, the West African and Brazilian incursions were, in effect, against a newly separate Portugal; for a few years the Dutch managed to be fighting against both sides of that Spanish-Portuguese war.)

There continued to be some Dutch raiding in the Caribbean during the truce, of course, and other types of interloping as well. Dutch attempts to control the valuable salt pans at Araya, for example, begun before 1609, continued thereafter. But other things far overbalanced America in the relations between Spain and the Dutch. The United Provinces, already off on their rapid rise to the status of the world’s greatest maritime power, were thus potentially Spain’s greatest threat and rival in the New World, but that region played a relatively small part in their maritime activities.

As Professor Boxer notes, “As early as 1588 there were reportedly over 2,000 sizeable Dutch merchantmen suitable for service as warships” and in 1644 “over 1,000 vessels [suitable] as warships, and another 1,000 topsail merchant-ships on the high seas.” In 1608, just before the truce, the Dutch claimed to have 100 ships in the West Indies; this would be less than 5 percent of “over 2,000,” counting only these types. But these were not all: “Another factor in the accelerated expansion of Dutch seaborne trade in the 1590s was the evolution of a cheaper and more efficient cargo-ship, the fluit. [It was] manned by relatively few hands, carried a bulky cargo, mounted few or no guns, and could be built cheaply and in large numbers. In some ways it may be considered the counter-part of the Liberty ships of World War II.” Counting these in the total Dutch fleet makes the American effort an even smaller part of the whole. Dutch maritime interests and enterprise simply lay elsewhere.

To quote Professor Boxer again:

For contemporaries and for posterity, one of the most spectacular manifestations of Dutch commercial enterprise was . . . the rise of their East and West India Companies, [but their] economic importance . . . was in reality less than that of the more humdrum carrying-trade of Western Europe and the North Sea Fisheries. The grain-trade with the Baltic was, as De Witt observed in 1671, the “source and root of the most notable commerce and navigation of these lands.” At the beginning of the 17th century some 1,200 vessels [a dozen times the number in the West Indies] were engaged in this trade, and during the first half of the same century the total of Dutch ships passing the Sound outnumbered the English by roughly thirteen to one.

By their peak at mid-century the Dutch were hauling three-fourths of the Baltic grain exports, half to three-fourths of the timber, and a third...
to a half of the Swedish metals exported. In exchange they carried into
the Baltic three-fourths of the salt from France and Portugal and half the
cloth (which had also been made or finished in Holland), and were the
largest haulers of other Baltic imports as well. 31

Domination of Baltic grain exports gave the Dutch very advanta-
geous entree elsewhere, especially in the late sixteenth century:

Five successive years of bad harvests in southern Europe (1586-90) gave
them the chance to seize and retain new markets beyond the Straits of Gi-
braltar. Whereas their ships had been only occasional visitors to Medi-
terranean and Levant ports before 1585, twenty years later [1605] their trade
thither was second only in importance to that with the Baltic. 32

Nor was this all. The numbers of Dutch vessels already mentioned
for 1608 were "apart from 6,000 herring-busses and vessels used on the
inland waterways." 33

The North Sea Fisheries for herring, haddock, cod, and ling were also
termed the "chiefest trade and principal gold-mine" of the United Provinces
in 1580-1639. Some forty years later, De la Court claimed that these fisheries
were estimated to employ over 1,000 busses or fishing-smacks of 48-60 tons
burden [and] with its ancillary trades then employed about 450,000 persons,
compared with about 200,000 . . . in agriculture and about 650,000 . . . in
other industries. 34

To this one must add the Dutch domination of the Greenland and Spitz-
bergen whaling grounds, "organized as a monopoly of the Northern
Company in 1614-42." 35

Thus "the number of ships and men in European waters greatly ex-
ceeded those employed in the colonial trades." 36 "As late as 1666 it was
estimated that three-fourths of the capital active on the Amsterdam
bourse was engaged in the Baltic trade." 37 Whether that trade or the
fisheries constituted the United Provinces' "gold mine," both candidates
for that title are European. Compared to these two, the overseas areas
were distinctly minor attractions.

This mattered particularly on the Dutch side. Though they were
ready to harrass Spain in America in wartime (and carried on a certain
amount of piracy and interloping in the brief period of peace in these
hundred years), they were much more interested in regaining com-
mmercial access to the Hispanic peninsula. In practice the matter was
"settled" in the truce not by their giving up any right to be in the Indies
but by the tacit assumption, already customary in such negotiations, that
peace treaties (in this case a truce) between European powers applied
only to European waters: there was "no peace beyond the line."

This was naturally unpalatable to the Spanish, since it was their
colonies that were "beyond the line," which raises the question of why
they accepted it. The simplest answer is that they could not have got the
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truce without it, and they needed the truce more than the Dutch did. But this applies mainly to the East, not to the New World. There may have been “no peace beyond the line,” but in that direction, as it involved the Dutch, there was not much war either, especially in Spanish America even during wartime. To quote Professor Boxer:

Although Spain was the . . . arch-enemy in neighbouring Flanders, where the war became increasingly bogged down in minor sieges and inconclusive manoeuvering, the Dutch attack on the Iberian colonial world was directed far more against Portuguese possessions than against those of Spain. From the time when the . . . [East India Company] passed to the offensive with the capture of Amboina in 1605, they concentrated on Portuguese strongholds and settlements in the tropics . . .

[In the New World the West India Company], though founded largely with an eye on Spanish America and the silver of Mexico and Peru, actually concentrated [ultimately unsuccessfully] on the sugar of Portuguese Brazil, and on the gold, ivory, and slaves of Portuguese West Africa. Piet Heyn’s spectacular capture of the Mexican silver-fleet in the Cuban harbour of Matanzas (1628) has tended to overshadow the fact that his contemporaries and successors in the service of the [West India Company] had relatively few other major successes against the Spaniards. Their renown, their victories, and their prizes were mostly achieved at the expense of the Portuguese in the South Atlantic. 38

Thus the New World was a minor consideration for both sides in Spanish-Dutch relations. On the Spanish side, in the Netherlands wars (to 1648) the king was primarily trying to put down rebels in his own domains and to regain the lost provinces. On the Dutch side there was, for example, much opposition to concluding the Treaty of Münster; Professor Boxer, who cannot be accused of ignoring “the Dutch seaborne empire,” manages to give a comprehensive list of the reasons for that opposition without even mentioning America. 39

FRANCE: MID-SIXTEENTH TO MID-SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The beginning of this hundred-year span is marked for France by the Franco-Spanish peace, the death of Henry II ushering in a series of weak kings, 40 and the beginning of nearly four decades of recurring civil war, both religious and political in nature, which was periodically intermingled with the simultaneous Netherlands revolt—both Crown and Huguenots supporting the rebels, depending on the occasion, and with Spanish invasion of France. There was of course some involvement in the Indies, both private and government ventures, and strong French resentment of their ouster from Florida, 41 but both private and government attention and energies were soon absorbed by these local, more pressing domestic conflicts. Calvinists in the Atlantic ports who otherwise might have engaged in piracy or interloping trade, for example,
were fighting for survival at home; their principal enemy was not Spain
but the French Catholic League, and, until the accession of the Prote-
tant Henry IV in 1589, sometimes the French king himself.

In 1598 the religious issue was settled for a time (Edict of Nantes),
the Franco-Spanish war was ended (Treaty of Vervins), and Philip II
died—a combination of events that created a quite different situation.
Thus began an unusual 37 years of at least nominal peace (1598-1635), to
be followed by another 24 years of war (1635-59).

There were in those 37 years of "peace" as many changes in Franco-
Spanish relations—or, more precisely, their respective stances toward
each other—as one might normally expect in a century or two. The
Treaty of Vervins was accompanied by a parallel Franco-Dutch treaty
guaranteeing continued French support of the rebel provinces (and by a
similar English guarantee), and the French government was mainly con-
cerned for the next several years with bringing about a Spanish-Dutch
peace, preferably as advantageous to the Dutch as possible. France's
Spanish diplomacy was bent mainly to persuading the Spanish to make
the desired concessions, particularly the continued closure of the
Scheldt estuary, an effort (joined in by the English) that ultimately led to
the truce of 1609. But—consistent with the traditional French preoccupa-
tion with European broils—another controversy arose that same year to
capture Henry IV's attention: the Cleves-Jülich succession dispute. He
was in fact about to lead French forces to the disputed area when he was
assassinated in 1610.

Henry was succeeded by his nine-year-old son Louis XIII, with the
regency falling to the Queen Mother Marie de' Medici, her government
soon run by another Italian import, Concino Concini, maréchal d'Ancre.
Since many of the great nobles opposed Marie's regency and despised
Concini, the government was in no position to take a strong line in
foreign affairs. The regency first cancelled the planned armed interven-
tion in Cleves-Jülich and then shifted to an unaccustomed pro-Spanish
policy, or at least a conciliatory policy of cultivating Spanish friendship,
that culminated in the double marriage, finally formalized in 1615, in
which the future Philip IV and Louis XIII each wed the other's sister, and
which the Spanish wanted as much as the French. This conciliatory
French approach lasted until 1617, when Concini was assassinated with
the young king's approval.

Freed of the regency as well as Concini, Louis gave the government
to the duke of Luynes. The next seven years (1617-24) saw a drift back to
the customary anti-Habsburg stance. The principal anti-Spanish thrust
was continued penetration of the Alps and attempts to control the Valte-
line, the Achilles' heel of Spanish communications. With the coming of
the Bohemian crisis in 1618 a related but distinct foreign policy thrust
was added against the Austrian Habsburg, France supporting the Prot-
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estant German princes. With the Spanish invasion of the Lower Palatinate in the Rhineland and the crushing defeat of the Count Palatine—an usurper of the emperor's Bohemian throne from the Habsburg viewpoint—in Bohemia (1620), France sought to mount an allied attack against the Valteline, but failed for lack of allies.\textsuperscript{48}

At the beginning of his long ministry (1624-42), Richelieu's first preoccupation was with the Huguenots, whose final defeat came with the successful siege of La Rochelle (1628). In 1630 Richelieu began subsidizing the Swedish entry into the German war; both France and Spain recalled their ambassadors, leaving only chargés d'affaires, and both sides knew that it was only a matter of time before Franco-Spanish war was renewed. France formally entered the war in 1635.\textsuperscript{49}

Renewal of the long Franco-Spanish conflict was unrelated to either goals or \textit{casus belli} in the New World. Nor did America shape their 37 years of peacetime relations. Although France was indeed becoming increasingly active in the Indies,\textsuperscript{50} attempts at friendship and acceptance of war were motivated on both sides by quite other factors. When in 1640 France chose to launch a major attack against Spain on a new front, that front was not American but Catalan. France still was an "Aragon," not a "Castile."

ENGLAND: MID-SIXTEENTH TO MID-SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

The English case is much different. Unlike the French there were no serious internal distractions until the 1640's. Unlike the Dutch their European commerce was not sufficient to distract them from overseas activities—indeed, Dutch domination of the European carrying trade must have acted substantially to compel the English to seek overseas markets and other occasion for profit—and with the Dutch increasingly strong in the Orient and relatively inactive in Spanish America, the latter was their best available target.

Unlike both, the English were at war with Spain only briefly in these hundred years: 1585-1604, and in brief spurts later, about the same low proportion of time that the Dutch were at \textit{peace} with Spain. And unlike both, they were not really entangled in the war on the Continent: they could dabble in it or back away whenever they chose. They were thus free to commit their resources as they chose, and since their naval strength, actual and potential, was much greater than their strength in land warfare, the high seas provided the obvious arena. And these wars were fought in the Netherlands, France, and Germany, not in England.

The lack of English analogues to the 1590 siege of Paris (Pigafetta reported 13,000 deaths from starvation and 30,000 from disease\textsuperscript{51}), the 1576 "Spanish Fury" at Antwerp, or the 1631 sack of Magdeburg (at least 20,000 slaughtered, over half the population), as well as the more routine devas-
tations of war, gave England a substantial offset for her comparative lack of national resources for commercial expansion, colonial settlement, naval warfare, or even mere piracy.

One cannot detail English activities in the Caribbean, but one may note that serious English presence there begins with John Hawkins' first slave-trading voyage in 1562; that this interloping entailed no violence until the Ulloa incident of 1567, with systematic English reprisals beginning around 1570; that "merchants," armed to defend themselves and often running in packs, typically became both traders and raiders; that while neither trading nor piracy was consistently profitable, enough impressive killings were made (and exaggerated in the telling) to attract increasing numbers of venturesome Englishmen; that sinking of captured ships, damage to raided towns, etc., ran Spain's losses far higher than raiders' gains; that the cost of maintaining permanent defenses on land and the convoy system at sea made Spain's "losses" from this still higher; but that, despite all this, no treasure fleet was taken until 1628—and then not by the English.

Open war did indeed break out—not formally but de facto, and in the Indies. As Parry notes, Drake

was back in the Spanish Indies in 1585, when war with Spain was already certain. This expedition was no mere raid, but a full-scale naval operation by a fleet of more than twenty sail, mounted with the objects of taking and holding Cartagena and Havana and so paralysing the trans-Atlantic trade system of Spain; denying to Spain the silver which provided the means of making war in Europe; and throwing the Indies open to English exploitation. The operation achieved a partial success.

But English warlike acts against Spain were various, and not all in the New World: harboring the Sea Beggars in an English port, seizing a Spanish pay ship in clear violation of the laws of the sea, supporting the Dutch rebels diplomatically and with money and even a few thousand troops. The only solution, if there was to be one, to this interference in Spain's internal crisis in the most valuable of her European dominions was a direct attack on England. Although the Indies raiding was a part of this equation, non-American factors were sufficient for making the decision to invade, just as they were for invading France shortly thereafter.

A successful invasion of England would of course have solved the Indies side of the English problem as well, but that does not mean that Spain would have sought that solution had that been the only side of the problem: it could and surely would have been sought in the Caribbean, with a far greater prospect of success. Though both types of English activity elicited a military response from Spain, the stimuli were very different in kind: Anglo-Spanish war was in fact already going on in the
Indies, but that factor was superfluous as a motive for sending the Armada against England.

Still, the same does not apply to the English. "Forced" into the Caribbean by Dutch domination of European markets and not yet capable of penetrating the East in force, they continually escalated the violence of their activities there until it had reached the stage of "war," whether formally declared or not. At the same time the Netherlands broils, center ring for Spain, were, compared to the Indies, no more than a sideshow for England. Spain did not "go to war" over the Indies, but England did.

But that meant no "relations" beyond war between the two powers for nearly two decades, except for England's involvement in the Vervins negotiations (mostly with the Dutch), an attempt at a peace settlement in Elizabeth's last years, and the later negotiations for the Treaty of London. As regards the Indies, those negotiations followed the same pattern as those for Vervins before and for the truce afterward: demands for access to the Caribbean trade, refusal by Spain, and "solution" of the problem by ignoring it in the treaty. From the Spanish point of view the problem embraced piracy also, but that also proved intractable. When Robert Cecil, negotiating for the English, proposed a clause giving English merchants the right to trade freely in the Indies and it was refused by Senator Rovida, chief Spanish negotiator in the absence of the Count of Villa-Mediana, "Cecil suggested that if this commerce were permitted the pirate attacks . . . would be terminated." But Rovida replied that "one could hardly expect the king of Spain to reward men who robbed the Spanish fleet, giving them a commerce from which the family of Philip himself was excluded." As regards the Indies, those negotiations followed the same pattern as those for Vervins before and for the truce afterward: demands for access to the Caribbean trade, refusal by Spain, and "solution" of the problem by ignoring it in the treaty. From the Spanish point of view the problem embraced piracy also, but that also proved intractable. When Robert Cecil, negotiating for the English, proposed a clause giving English merchants the right to trade freely in the Indies and it was refused by Senator Rovida, chief Spanish negotiator in the absence of the Count of Villa-Mediana, "Cecil suggested that if this commerce were permitted the pirate attacks . . . would be terminated." But Rovida replied that "one could hardly expect the king of Spain to reward men who robbed the Spanish fleet, giving them a commerce from which the family of Philip himself was excluded." 58

Spain was thus unwilling to make England an exception to the Spanish monopoly on trade, but one should not take Rovida's rhetoric too seriously. Besides the emotional matter of rewarding the wicked there was the practical aspect of the proposal itself: swapping commercial privileges for an end to piracy. On the face of it the "tradeoff" was at least worth weighing, except for two considerations: Spain, with peace, would be freer to cope with piracy herself, and the Spanish as yet had only Elizabeth's track record by which to gauge what the English crown was apt to do regarding piracy—and she had been in the business herself. But for the English, acquiring privileged access to the Seville end of the Indies trade monopoly was in any case a significant gain. 59

Five years after the treaty there came simultaneously the "third and last peace" (the Spanish-Dutch truce) and the beginning of the Cleves-Jülich crisis; before the latter was well over came the Bohemian and Palatinate wars (James' son-in-law Frederick V lost both), during which the truce expired (1621) and the old war resumed; by 1625 England herself was again at war with Spain. One need not trace their uneven relation-
ship from then to mid-century, for the period of greatest interest here is
the 21 years of uncertain peace (1604-25) between the Treaty of London
and England’s comic-opera attack on Cadiz. In those years the role of the
New World was not that of providing either potential casus belli or war-
time theaters of action, but rather something that receives little attention
from historians: not potentially war-causing crises and issues but simple
sources of friction between two powers.

These were usually not single events with an isolated impact, but a
recurrence of some type of event or the continued existence of some situ-
ation that wears away at amicable relations and has its impact in its
cumulative effect, and in that of all such matters collectively. Even when
individual matters of this sort were either resolved or deliberately over-
looked by the “offended” party they had a serious psychological effect,
each time casting one more doubt on the possibility of continued peace-
ful relations at a time when peace was preferred by both states.

NEW WORLD SOURCES OF FRICTION: ENGLAND AND SPAIN, 1604-25

Such sources of friction were numerous, and of course not confined
to New World matters. Some were specific events or matters of limited
duration, such as the Jesuit scholar Francisco Suárez’ De defensione fidei, a
multi-volume response to James’ Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance. The
Defense of the Faith took the form of an exhaustive discussion of whether
the pope had the power of excommunication over the English king, and
if so whether his subjects had a right to depose and murder him, once
excommunicated. Suárez answered both questions resoundingly in the
affirmative, and went even further: any Catholic who took the oath was
participating in heresy (since it entailed denying the pope’s temporal
power); every Catholic was obliged to deny obedience to the heretic
king; a foreign army could be invited to invade England to aid in depos-
ing the heretic. And Suárez demonstrated that the present situation in
England, even without excommunication, justified deposing the king
and if necessary killing him, on simple grounds of self-defense and pro-
motion of the public good.60

James was understandably beside himself. Many such works had
appeared on the Continent of late; what made this one specifically an
Anglo-Spanish matter, and particularly galling to James, was that it had
been published in Portugal with the approval of Philip III, who had been
pretending to be his friend.61 As successive volumes came from the
press the English ambassador to Spain procured copies and forwarded
them to James,62 repeatedly refueling James’ resentment, as did other
such works being published in the Spanish Netherlands.63

Others were continuing matters, such as the problems arising from
English merchants’ access to Spain. Article 12 of the treaty granted ex-
emption from the 30 percent import duty to English goods, not to non-
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English goods carried in English bottoms, which led to continual wrangles with customs officers over what was eligible and what was, under that article, contraband, and to extended and expensive litigation by English merchants to recover seized goods, embittering the merchants (who had a large anti-Spanish constituency at home) and causing Spanish authorities no end of annoyance. The English solution of smuggling the contraband in rather than trying to slip it past customs under pretense of English origin angered the Spanish further, as did the illegal export of silver. When smuggling came to include the import of counterfeit “Spanish coins, the Spanish had their own occasion to be beside themselves.64

Other non-American sources of friction were Spain’s resentment of English mistreatment of Catholics (much exaggerated by the Spanish) and England’s of Spain’s harboring English Catholic exiles, including some (in the Spanish Netherlands) involved in the Gunpowder Plot. Another non-American issue was English incursions into the Portuguese East Indies, but that was a minor matter. But the New World also provided its share of problems, and on this lower level of intensity as well, not merely the big potentially war-threatening crises that one is normally inclined to look for in that contested area.

A few years into the peace these things began to crystalize to a point where one can examine them as sources of friction under something approaching normal peacetime relations. The peace officially began after the treaty was signed by Philip III in a splendid ceremony, to which James sent a large delegation headed by the earl of Nottingham, the Lord High Admiral who had commanded the English forces against the Armada and still held that post. It is perhaps a measure of the Spanish mood that this arch-enemy of ’88 made a great hit at the Spanish court. But the Spanish did not do so well with their first appointment of a permanent ambassador to London, Don Pedro de Zúñiga (1605-07), who was preoccupied with relieving the plight of English Catholics and with helping them organize as a political force capable of demanding and obtaining freedom of religion, backed by the king of Spain as their patron. For improving Anglo-Spanish relations, or even for maintaining the peace, Zúñiga had the wrong goal and the wrong methods: instead of working through the king, to whom he was accredited, he sought his goals through direct contact with James’ Catholic subjects—much to James’ displeasure. So Zúñiga was replaced by Don Alonso de Velasco (1607-13), who shifted to the right approach but proved not sufficiently effective at it. So he in turn was replaced by Don Diego Sarmiento de Acuña (1613-18, 1620-22), better known by his later title (1617) as Count of Gondomar.

Sarmiento soon found that several of the sources of friction whose elimination formed part of his mission had already resolved themselves
or could be easily settled or safely ignored, while others required continual attention. The planting of English settlers in North America and voyages of exploration in that direction were of the former type, the problem of piracy or privateering of the latter.

The matter of English settlement was a theoretical as well as a practical issue. As Professor Parry notes:

In the negotiations for [the Treaty of London] a new and important principle was put forward. James announced that he was willing to respect Spanish monopolistic claims in all territories effectively occupied by Spain, but that he recognized no Spanish rights in unoccupied parts of America. The claim that "prescription without possession availeth nothing" of course contradicted the basic assumption of Spanish imperialism in the Indies, and it was only after considerable haggling that the Spaniards agreed to a silence which their enemies might interpret as consent. In the truce of Antwerp of 1609... between the Netherlands and Spain... the same principle was embodied in a formal, if ambiguous, clause.65

This theory of "effective occupation" subsequently caused Spain trouble elsewhere as the legal justification for English intrusions, but it was somewhat irrelevant in cases such as the settlement planted in Virginia in 1607, since it did not involve encroachment in an area that Spain had any interest in settling or otherwise exploiting. She did object, which kept intact the long-standing Spanish claim to all the non-Portuguese New World, but her chief concern was that an English colony in that region would be used as a base for raids in the Caribbean.

But after Velasco's encouraging reports, those fears were waning even before Sarmiento began his London embassy in 1613. He nevertheless gave a high priority to learning all he could about the project, and quickly concluded that the Virginia colony, six years after its founding, was more a fiasco than a threat to Spain. Barely two months after his arrival he reported that the colonists were dying almost as fast as they were sent out, and a few months later that there was serious talk of abandoning the project entirely.66

The case of Bermuda was somewhat different. This collection of some 300 coral islands about 700 miles ESE of Virginia, discovered in 1515 by Juan de Bermúdez, had remained uninhabited until a shipload of English colonists under Sir George Somers was wrecked there in 1609. Four years later the population was still small but growing, and there was talk of transferring the surviving Virginia colonists there. Some shipments were being made of pearls and ambergris, and the company behind the project seemed well capitalized. But the financial possibilities did not look exceptional and, more important, there was no good harbor to serve as a base for raids on the West Indies shipping—a sensible Spanish concern because of its nearness to the passages into the Indies and to the sea lanes leaving them: England was about a dozen
times farther away. In 1614 some Spanish ships sailed in close to investigate the colony and found nothing alarming. Both Sarmiento and his government ceased to consider it a source of concern.

One rather minor matter was not quite so simple as it seemed. In their early period of concern the Spanish had sent a small party north to reconnoitre the Virginia settlement, and a few men had been captured by the colonists. Velasco had petitioned the English crown for their release. In 1612, by which time it involved only the lone survivor, Diego de Molina, James had ordered him exchanged for an English pilot supposedly imprisoned somewhere in Spain, but the pilot could not be found and Molina had not been released. Philip instructed Sarmiento to procure Molina’s release without the exchange, and he was able to get James to agree to this. But the matter was not this straightforward. The problem had not been that the Spanish could not find the pilot but that he had been captured in the Indies, had had a chance to observe the fortifications, garrison strength, and other military matters in Havana, and the Spanish simply did not want to let him return to England with that information. The Spanish failure to make a simple exchange delayed Molina’s release and entailed a minor but additional source of friction between the two crowns.

The possibility that English explorers might find a Northwest Passage to the East (the Spice Islands, the Manila galleons’ route to Mexico) was another source of Spanish concern. Ever since Sebastian Cabot, the English had entertained a theory that the northern and southern hemispheres were symmetrical, with the land masses tapering at the northern tips just as they did in the south. A Northeast Passage had been found (though only as far as Archangel), and there was great confidence that the fourth and last passage only awaited discovery. Verrazano had explored the mouth of the Hudson (1524) and Cartier the coast northward to the St. Lawrence (1534) and that river itself (1535-41), sponsored by the French crown. English efforts, with the impressive theoretical backing of Sir Humphrey Gilbert’s Discourse on the subject (published in 1576), began with the three voyages of Martin Frobisher (1576, 1577, 1578) and of John Davis (1585, 1586, 1587); Davis concentrated on the waters between Greenland and the North American islands, made much progress, and wrote an influential book on the Northwest Passage, The Worldes Hydrographical Description. As J. H. Parry notes:

Next in time was Henry Hudson. . . . On his last voyage in 1610 he . . . was the first to sail through [the Hudson Strait] and into the great bay beyond. He was spared the disappointment of learning later that this was not the South Sea, because his company, after suffering great hardships through wintering on the shore of the bay, mutinied and set Hudson adrift in a small boat to die of exposure. The mutineers, with difficulty, made their way back to
England, and spread an edited version of their adventures from which the conclusion was generally drawn that Hudson had succeeded in his search. In 1612 the men who had financed his voyage secured incorporation as the "Company of the Merchants of London Discoverers of the North-West Passage"; and in this capacity sent out a series of expeditions to complete Hudson's work and open trade across the South Sea. For the next twenty years captains [Bylot, Baffin, Button, Foxe, James] employed by the company engaged in fruitless—or apparently fruitless—exploration of the shores of Hudson's Bay and Baffin Bay. 71

The northwest route was of course not traversed until the twentieth century, but the possibility of doing so at the time seemed real enough. Davis "had the distinction of seeking the passage in the direction where, but for the ice, it might have been found," and for his successors the task was simply that of finding the opening. "Most sixteenth-century maps show the Arctic as open sea, with large but widely separated islands. Little was then known of the vast extent of the northern ice cap." 72

Sarmiento, with instructions to investigate the matter, learned that in 1611 an English ship had returned with high hopes that discovery was near, and two more ships were outfitted for the search. Two months after Sarmiento got to England the smaller of the two ships returned, in very bad shape. The larger ship had been crushed by ice and had gone down with all hands. The second ship had made a landfall and lost 40 men out of a crew of 60 in an attack by the natives. The survivors had made their way back through the icy sea, and were now loudly proclaiming that even if there was a passage, they had no intention of looking for it in those waters. Sarmiento sent the good news to Madrid and ceased to worry about the matter. He had the good luck to be right, and the matter did not trouble Anglo-Spanish relations again. 73

But the most serious source of friction was English piracy. This involved three conceptual matters: the conceptual framework in which piracy of any kind was discussed and dealt with, and two legal concepts over which England and Spain differed sharply. The first provides the basic terminology as well as the basic framework for the problem. Everyone agreed that there were both buenas presas, "good prizes," legitimately taken, and malas presas, illegally taken. All would agree, for example, that any seizure of a ship or cargo or both by Turkish raiders was mala presa, while if the intended victim managed to capture the attacking ship that would clearly be a "good prize." But among Christians—more precisely, between the colonial powers and outside intruders—there was a constant dispute over definition which paralleled their opposing interests in the matter.

Second, there were what are often incorrectly referred to indiscriminately as "letters of marque and reprisal" but which were in fact two distinct types of document, both of which purported to legalize the ac-
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tions of sea raiders and thus exempt them, if caught, from treatment as common pirates; they were, instead, "privateers." A letter of marque in effect commissioned a vessel as a legitimate warship, entitling its captain and crew to treatment as prisoners of war. Comparable to modern-day commissioning of private vessels into the navy, its use was routine in an age when requisitioning armed merchantmen for fighting service was standard procedure, so the Spanish could hardly object to it as a form, though they of course would to its abuse.

But a letter of reprisal was a very different matter. It purported to legitimize just what its title implies: personal reprisal. If a person (in practice a merchant or shipowner) suffered a loss at the hands of a foreigner (mainly by piracy or illegal customs seizure) and could not obtain restoration or compensation in the courts of the culprit's sovereign, a letter of reprisal obtained from the authorities of his own country would "legalize" his taking his compensation by force from any of that sovereign's subjects. The Spanish could object to this on ethical grounds—a notion of national responsibility that would justify robbing individuals who were personally innocent of the original offense—and on practical grounds, since their empire made them vulnerable to the kind of raids that the letters envisioned. In addition, this practice, unacceptable to the Spanish at best, was subject to two sorts of gross abuse. A complainant who could not obtain such a letter in his own country sometimes sought and obtained one from some other government (which entailed the converse abuse of that government's issuing letters of reprisal to foreigners). And the letters, granted for the recovery of a specific loss, continued to be used after that amount had been recovered; the letter was, in practice, a permanent license to plunder.

In the Treaty of London the only article on piracy (6) deals with this specific aspect, the parties pledging that they will see to it that their subjects abstain from all force and injury, revoke whatever commissions or letters, either of reprisal or of marque, that give authority to rob, of whatever type or condition they may be, in prejudice of the subjects of the other Prince, given and conceded to his own subjects, or to inhabitants or foreigners, and declare them to be null and of no value; and whoever contravenes [this nullification] shall be punished, and besides the criminal penalty, will compel them to repay those damages that they shall have done to the [victims].

Third, there was the theory—held by France, England, and the Dutch, and denied by Spain—that there was "no peace beyond the line," that treaties between European powers applied only to Europe and European waters, and that attacks elsewhere did not violate the treaty or the state of peaceful relations between the two states involved. References to that line (which had two segments, a north-south one in
The Atlantic and one running from the southern end of that eastward to the West African coast) and to incidents involving it are frequent in the diplomatic documents of the time, though its exact location is often left unspecified. Perhaps the earliest statement of the theory with any precision is one made by Marie de' Medici in 1613, which gains added relevance from its having been made during the pro-Spanish Concini ministry and at a time when the much-wanted marriage alliance with Spain appeared to be in jeopardy:

I consider that there is no manner of peace between the vassals of these two crowns [of France and Spain], as bear witness all the treaties that have passed between them since King Francis the First, nor that [at any time when commissioners of the two crowns have negotiated] has any resolution been arrived at except that verbally . . . it has been determined and concluded between the said commissioners that such acts of hostility and enmity as may be committed beyond the meridian of the Azores [in that direction] and the Tropic of Cancer on the south will [not constitute grounds for complaint or for reparation demands], and that whoever [is strongest] in those parts will pass for [legitimate] master. 75

Again, Sarmiento’s embassy provides some useful examples of the role piracy or privateering played in Anglo-Spanish relations. Shortly after his arrival he began a concerted campaign against the practice, starting when a ship belonging to John Davis, a London merchant with a grudge against Spain, a number of ships, and a penchant for piracy, sailed into Portsmouth with a prize taken in the West Indies, a Portuguese caravel with a cargo of sugar. 76 As soon as Sarmiento heard of it, he claimed Spain’s rights in the matter, putting up a bond for the ship and cargo so they could not be disposed of by the pirates while he sought to have them restored to their owners. 77 When the anti-Spanish members of the Privy Council learned what he had done, they immediately ordered the prize turned over to Davis.

Sarmiento obtained an audience with the king on 8 November 1613 and argued the Spanish position forcefully (a risky approach because of James’ current anger over the Suárez book and other non-American sources of friction). He recounted the whole story of the captured caravel and the order in Council which had countenanced Davis’ piracy, and then added:

Your Majesty must tell me what I should write my soverign about this, because if Your Majesty does not remedy what the Council has done—if the king does not only order the ship and cargo turned over to me but punish Davis as an example—it will encourage others here to become pirates, and in Spain those who suffer from it will take their revenge and recover their losses from the English wherever they can, which would be small injustice.
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He went on in great detail about the ways the English with vulnerable interests in Spain would be made to pay for losses to English pirates. James, caught in the middle, did not point out that Sarmiento’s threat, only slightly veiled as a prediction, was based on the very principle of reprisal (“which would be small injustice”) that the Spanish normally so hotly condemned:

I don’t know what to do. It seems to me you are right. But my Council tells me the claims and complaints of my subjects are not being taken care of in the Spanish courts, though I know your king has ordered that they be given speedy hearings. And my Council has informed me that Davis’ experience with the Spanish courts was very sad. He used to be a wealthy merchant, but he and his partner were ruined by a Spanish judge who had him arrested for passing counterfeit money. Investigation showed it had been passed by a Frenchman and that Davis was innocent, and the Council set him free, but the judge kept the money. Davis did not even get his own money back, much less any damages.

Sarmiento replied:

The only notice I have had of the case is in my copy of a list of claims Your Majesty’s ambassador gave my king. But there is no John Davis on the list, though there is a Nigel Davis, and the amount involved is only £250, so that should be proof that the story of his having been ruined is false. But even if it were true that he has damages coming, that has nothing to do with his robbing someone else not even connected with the case, in a wicked and insolent act of piracy that breaks his king’s royal word.

Sarmiento thus managed to use both sides of the argument. They spoke further of the matter, and James later sent word that he would cancel his plans to leave town that afternoon and convene the Council instead, to discuss the matter with them. In that meeting James spoke out strongly against Davis. The order in Council was revoked and a decision given in Sarmiento’s favor. The prize was turned over to him, and Davis, in spite of his powerful friends, was sent to prison.

Sarmiento followed this victory up with a vigorous campaign to get pirates arrested, prizes restored, and in general to make piracy too unprofitable to be attractive as an enterprise or—more important in the ambassador’s mind—as a motive for “seducing” James into a war with Spain. Within three weeks after the November 8th audience six prominent raiders had been condemned to hang, and—more unusual—only one of the six managed to escape the gallows through influence.

Sarmiento found that the greatest difficulty in keeping James in this course was the embarrassingly plausible argument of the English merchants. Though Philip had repeatedly issued orders that their cases were to be handled with dispatch, it was simply not being done. The English
argued convincingly that if their money, goods, and ships, ensnared in the Spanish judicial system, and the exorbitant cost of delays could not be recovered in Spain then full compensation should be collected from the Spanish on the high seas\textsuperscript{79}—convincingly because the Spanish government itself agreed that it was not a case of guilty convicted persons claiming injustice. The problem was widespread corruption in the lower courts, stimulated by the judge's getting a share of all goods declared contraband; almost without exception this was corrected by the higher courts, which were famous for their honesty, but a merchant's goods and funds could be tied up for years in the process. Sarmiento wrote often to Madrid, urging that his needless source of bitterness be eliminated; the Council of State gave a very high priority to giving all possible satisfaction to all sorts of complaints by English merchants (though many were far less reasonable), and during those times when the courts complied Sarmiento's task was made easier thereby.

Perhaps his most important success against piracy was in the case of the \textit{Pearl}—important because he won his case based on Portugal's exclusive rights in the East Indies, because the case involved not just an individual like Davis but the East India Company, and because he was granted an unusually large part in the handling of the booty.\textsuperscript{80} By the time that case was satisfactorily settled there were three other armed ships in port ready to leave for a raid in the Indies; these were disarmed and sold. Pirated goods continued to be restored to their owners, sometimes from cases dating well into the past, and the pirates continued to be executed. By the middle of January 1614 James had ordered all pirates to be caught and hanged.\textsuperscript{81}

Sarmiento was convinced that James was sincerely opposed to piracy, if only because it was a form of lawlessness, which he disliked. But the king's diligence in the matter lasted only a few months. During an audience in April 1614 in which the ambassador was registering another strong protest against continued English raiding in the Indies, James cited in support of English actions the interpretation of the legalities he had received in two letters from the Queen Regent of France (apparently the same two letters mentioned in footnote 75). Though he put that interpretation forward as a widely-held justification for such raids, he apparently brought it up mostly for the sake of argument, and Sarmiento responded accordingly:

\begin{quote}
I have never heard of such a thing. It is unlawful to rob another's house, and I refuse to accept their argument as an excuse for robbery. How can it be lawful for the English even to enter the Spanish king's overseas domain when his own subjects cannot go there without a royal licence? There are evil men both in England and in Spain who are trying to bring on a war [here he told of many proposals in Spain for war similar to those heard in
\end{quote}
England]. But the greatest wickedness of all is this talk about “this side of the line” and “that side of the line” [daca linea y toma linea], when it is all robbery no matter where it is done.82

With allowance for Sarmiento’s rhetorical excess (probably staged) this is a succinct statement of the Spanish government’s consistent position on the matter. And in sticking to that position Sarmiento managed to keep James’ cooperation most of the time and had numerous successes in specific cases, most conspicuously in that of Walter Raleigh, who lost his head in 1618 for raiding a Spanish town during his Orinoco expedition, thus violating James’ own principle of effective settlement, and that of Roger North, imprisoned for also violating territorial rights during his 1620 expedition to the Amazon.

But these were successes for James as well. Spain wanted piracy at least held in check, and James managed this to a far greater degree than ever before. James wanted Spanish friendship for his own long-term reasons, and was willing to manipulate the piracy matter for those ends. He was also willing to manipulate the ambassador in the process: Sarmiento (Count of Gondomar by then) was actually flim-flammed quite neatly in both the Raleigh and Roger North cases.83

James succeeded in maintaining Anglo-Spanish amity during the unusual period of Franco-Spanish rapprochement after the death of Henry IV, and through the early stages—Bohemian and Palatinate—of the Thirty Years’ War, working throughout for an Anglo-Spanish marriage alliance as the key to achieving his aims. But by the early 1620’s those aims included the restoration of the Palatinate, which Spain found unacceptable. For 20 years the two crowns had found in the problem of English piracy in the New World a basis, though a very prickly one, for cooperation with the end of preserving the peaceful relations they both wanted. It is possible that it was not so much the results as the process that mattered most. But there was a limit to what Spain would concede in Europe to continue that amity, and to what James could forego.

And James’ insistence on the restoration of the Palatinate was a crippling factor in another way. After the Count Palatine’s defeat James had to deal from some kind of strength, and so he called Parliament to seek funds for armed intervention. But James’ policy of conciliation toward Spain had, over the years, increasingly antagonized, to the point of alienation, an important part of his constituency—the merchant interest and the pirate interest—that was heavily represented in Commons; they refused to give any aid that was not specifically earmarked for attacks on the West Indies.84 There was one last try at the Spanish marriage, a humiliating rebuff, and then a return to war. The two decades in which American sources of friction had an influence on Anglo-Spanish relations were ended.
The New World as a Factor in International Relations, 1492-1739

THE COMPLICATING FACTOR OF MUTUAL INTERESTS: A PARENTHESIS

The thrust of this essay, of course, has been that all is not as simple in this matter as one would initially suppose. One reason, avoided until now, is that the presumably natural antagonists, those with colonial empires and those invading them, often had common interests and thus common positions. The Dutch and the English presented the greatest piracy threat in the Caribbean, so one might suppose that they approved of the practice. But both were also emerging commercial and carrying nations, so it was as natural for them as for the Spanish to disapprove of piracy when directed against themselves. And in fact the English and Dutch in the early seventeenth century both offered to join Spain in combined naval operations against the pirates of the Mediterranean.85 The English attempt to lift the siege of La Rochelle found a Spanish naval force sent to help against a momentary common enemy. And, with the Dutch in the Far East attacking and seizing English ships as well as Portuguese, the English interlopers began banding together with the Portuguese to fight off their closest European ally and fellow anti-Spanish paladin. Thus anything smacking of simplification in the foregoing essay should be liberally seasoned with complications of these types.

MID-SEVENTEENTH CENTURY TO 1739: EPILOGUE

For the Spanish the mid-seventeenth century watershed was very different from the one a century earlier: the widespread revolts of the 1640’s, the Rocroi defeat, and the later strains of the Thirty Years’ War, the formal concession in the Treaty of Münster that the Dutch provinces were lost, the continuing war with France finally ending in the 1559 Treaty of the Pyrenees.86 After this Spain was one of those lesser states in Europe, banding together against the new Leviathan, France, submitting for decades while her allies repeatedly bought off Louis XIV with still further chunks of the Spanish Netherlands. In the Indies an epoch was marked when an English force, failing to take Santo Domingo, tried Jamaica instead and succeeded, giving England her first major foothold in the Caribbean; more footholds were to follow, for the English and others, and elsewhere in the hemisphere. The role of the New World in European international relations had shifted again, in ways that cannot be traced here.87 Which is just as well: for an historian of Spain’s age of greatness, the period from Jamaica to Jenkins’ Ear is too much to contemplate.
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NOTES


2. Used as the original title for John H. Parry's excellent little volume Europe and a Wider World, 1415-1715 (London 1959), which in paperback was strangely given the rather forbidding title The Establishment of the European Hegemony, 1415-1715: Trade and Exploration in the Age of the Renaissance (New York 1961); the change is usually in the other direction.

3. See Bailey W. Diffie, Prelude to Empire: Portugal Overseas before Henry the Navigator ([Lincoln, Neb.] 1960), a brief but very valuable treatment of a subject vital to understanding what came after.

4. He lost four of his ten ships, including one commanded by Dias.


7. The prevailing winds in sailing season dictate sailing westward by a southerly route, eastward by a more northerly route.

8. As Portuguese America developed even more slowly it is omitted from this phase of the discussion.

9. For the treaty in general see, for example, Baron Alphonse de Ruble, Le traité de Cateau-Cambrésis (2 et 3 avril 1559) (Paris 1889); Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris (hereafter cited as BNP), Anciens Petits Fonds Français 23632-5, Nouvelles Acquisitions Françaises 18062; etc. As the negotiations (as well as the terms) were heavily used by both sides as models during the 1596-98 negotiations for the Treaty of Vervins, large quantities of the Cateau-Cambrésis documentation at both the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Archivo general de Simancas are to be found with the Vervins documentation.

10. Francis II (1559-60), age 15 at accession, accentuated the expectable rivalry for control of the crown (vs. the Queen Mother) through his connection by marriage (to Mary Queen of Scots) to the Guise faction; Charles IX (1560-74), age 10 at accession, crowned his reign with the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre; Henry III (1574-89), age 23 at accession, was mainly preoccupied with survival while war raged between rival religious-political factions for the succession to his throne. He had Henry of Guise assassinated, then was himself assassinated in retaliation, removing two thirds of the principals from the "War of the Three Henrys," leaving Henry of Navarre to accede as Henry IV.

11. This is not the place to consider the effect of military technology and custom and other technical factors (including agricultural productivity, which could support only a limited number of troops in an area and thus put a maximum limit on field army size) that allowed petty states such as Denmark to play, for a time, the role of a major military power, or at least have the impact of one, rather like the prospect now of a small state with a few nuclear missiles.

12. This is of course a comparative matter; one naturally does not mean to say that they did no damage. But the more fundamental comparison being made here is not between French and other attacks on the Indies but between that and other available areas for attack; see below, notes 13-16. The still more fundamental comparison between American and non-American considerations as factors (on either the Spanish or non-Spanish side) in international relations is considered further on in this essay.

13. The contemporary literature on both sides of the subject, including the polemical, is substantial: for example, Les combats des François contre les Espagnols en Flandres (Lyon 1581); Francisco Gomez de Quevedo Villegas, Relación en que se declaran las trazas con que Francia ha pretendido inquietar los animos de los fidelissimos Flamencos, a que se rebelassen contra su Rey, y señor natural (Málaga 1637). A modern work unjustly neglected of late is Albert Waddington, La République des Provinces-Unies, la France, et les Pays-Bas espagnols, de 1630 à 1650 (2 vols. Paris 1895-97).
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15. See, for example, Auguste Galland, Mémoires pour l'histoire de Navarre et de Flandre contenans le droit du roy [de France] au royaume de Navarre, et aux duchez de Pegnafiel, de Gandie et de Montblanc, à la comté de Ribagorce, à la vicomte de Castelbon, à la ville de Beluguer et à la seigneurie de Castillon de Farfagna, en Castille, Arragon et Catalogne, usurpees et detenues par les roys d'Espagne avec le royaume de Navarre, depuis l'an 1512 (Paris 1648), two folio volumes that push these claims at least to the limit of credibility. Both French and Spanish documentation on the subject is voluminous. Random samples: BNP, Anciens Petits Fonds Français 23418, re: Franco-Spanish relations over frontier lands at the western end of the Pyrenees 1510-1618; Anciens Fonds Français 4032-33, on the frontier limits supposedly settled at Vervins; Ancien Saint-Germain 16138 (1608-09) and 18565, re: "rights and pretentions" of the French crown "sur divers pays". On the war with France in Catalonia, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid (hereafter cited as BNM) MS 2388 includes eleven legajos that pertain just to Perpignan (including the governing of it).


18. Some typical arguments of Spanish Habsburg advisors on both sides of this question (as well as others) are described in Charles H. Carter, The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598-1625 (New York 1964) 53-64.


20. [Antoine Brun], Pierre de touche des véritables intéresses des Provinces Unies du Pays-Bas et des intentions des deux couronnes sur les traitées de paix [Dordrecht 1647] and Pierre de touche des véritables interesses des Provinces Unies du Pays-Bas, et des intentions des deux couronnes de France et d'Espagne sur les traitez de paiz à Munster. Avec la responce à l'auteur de la Pierre de touche, en forme d'avis à Messieurs les Estats Généraux des Provinces unies touchant les interesses de la France (n.p. 1650); August Leman, Richelieu et Olivares: leurs negociations secretes de 1636 à 1642 pour le rétablissement de la paix (Lille 1938); Correspondencia diplomatica de los plenipotenciarios españoles en el Congresso de Munster, 1643 à 1648, in Coleccion de documentos inéditos para la historia de España, Vols. 82-84 (Madrid 1883-85) to p. 507.

21. The importance of this truce for all the powers involved directly or indirectly may be seen in the enormous amount of related documentation in their various archives, including many duplicates for use by contemporary policymakers as well as by later chroniclers: BNP must have between a dozen and two dozen sets of the correspondence of the French ambassador Jeannin (which is also published) and his colleagues. Among published material, see Copie de l'instruction donné par leur Altesses [the archdukes Albert and Isabella] au Marquis Ambrosio Spinola, le president Richardot, etc., deputez . . . au Traicté de paiz entre le roy d'Espaigne . . . et les Estatz Généraux des Prov. Unies (n.p. 1608); Con-
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sidérations d’Estat sur le Traicte de la paix avec les serénissimes Archiducz d’Austriche. Manuscript of 1607, with intro. and notes by Charles Rahlenbeck, Collection de mémoires relatifs à l’histoire de Belgique 32 (Brussels 1869). For the expiration of the Truce, see Jan Joseph Poelhekke, ‘t Uytgaen van den Treves: Spanje en de Nederlanden in 1621 (Groningen 1960); Peter Brightwell, “The Spanish System and the Twelve Years’ Truce,” English Historical Review 89 (1974) 270-292; Carter (n. 18 above) 192-265.

22. “De tachtigjarige oorlog” is long since established as the Dutch name for that war (making the traditional beginning date 1568, slightly arbitrarily) and the conventional title for works on it: for example, the volume by G. J. Presser, J. Romein, A. C. J. de Vrankrijker, R. E. J. Webber, J. W. Wijn (Amsterdam 1948); Jan Cornelius Hendrik De Pater (2 vols. Amsterdam 1936); J. A. Stamkart (4 vols. Amsterdam 1865-67); Otto von Corvin-Wierbisky (6 vols. Amsterdam 1842-48; translated from German).

23. Charles R. Boxer, The Dutch Seaborne Empire: 1600-1800 (New York 1965) 49. “The formation of a West India Company was suggested much earlier in the 17th century, but was delayed by the conclusion of the twelve-year truce . . . . The truce was ill observed in the colonial world, and the official renewal of the war in 1621 . . . gave both the VOC [that is, the East India Company] and the WIC great scope for offensive action” (25). No one familiar with the subject will be surprised by the following frequent citation of Professor Boxer, the leading scholar in the field.


25. For both Dutch and English involvement with Araya in these years see, for example, British Museum, Additional MS 36319, fols. 54, 61, 78, 85, 88, 107. This is vol. 6 of the 40 vol. “Venezuela Papers” (Add. MSS 36314-53) covering 1530-1824 (vol. 1 is 1530-84) which the British government assembled during the Venezuela-British Guiana boundary dispute, with some of the contents published in the bluebook British Guiana Boundary: Appendix to the case in behalf of the Government of her Britannic Majesty (1898-99).

The relevant volumes contain much useful material on this and related subjects: 36317 (1596-1600) includes a letter from Pedro de Salazar, governor of Margarita, to Philip II, Margarita, on 25 March 1596, dealing inter alia with the fate of two Englishmen Raleigh left as hostages for his son (fols. 16-25; English trans. 26-35); Roque de Montes to Philip II, Cumana, on 18 April 1596, includes the capture of the Englishman Francis “Espari” (83-95); 36318 (1601-04) has much interesting material on English and Dutch incursions into the area, including Araya. 36319 (1605-11) is fairly typical in its variety, dealing with the English tobacco trade with the West Indies (66, 277), the same for both Dutch and English (268, 273), and a Spanish decree against cultivating tobacco in Caracas and Venezuela because it attracted the Dutch (141, 155); it also discusses English ships in the Indies (133, 254), Spanish successes against them (96, 124, 129), English designs against the West Indies (281), defense against the English, Dutch, and French (284), an English prisoner Captain Thomas “Curri” (294), and the hanging of Dutch captives (188), the problem of trade with the enemy in general (255), and a Spanish expedition to El Dorado (15, 155, 161, 175). 36320 (1612-18) includes in its 373 folios news of a 1614 Dutch and English descent on Nicaragua and of a Dutch fleet fitting out under an English Captain “Harbey” for Nicaragua (142-45), and a 1618 discourse on the advantages of peace or war with the Dutch when the truce ends (300; Eng. trans. 304; treatises on that subject were a Spanish staple in those years). 36321 (1619-25) embraces the expiration of that truce; the period to the Treaty of Münster and the end of the long Spanish-Dutch war goes to 36329 (1637-53) fol. 363.

26. “In many respects the Treaty of Münster forms the highwater mark of the United Provinces’ golden age. By 1648 the Dutch were indisputably the greatest trading nation in the world, with commercial outposts and fortified ‘factories’ scattered from Archangel to Recife and from New Amsterdam to Nagasaki.” Boxer (n. 23 above) 27.

27. Actually what follows is a two-part argument: overseas areas played a small part in the total maritime activity, and the New World played a small part in the overseas activity.

28. Boxer (n. 23 above) 69; also 40 in West Africa and 20 in the Orient.

29. Ibid., 20. For a fuller description (“little more than floating holds”) see Parry (n. 5
above) 67. Parry correctly states that "the possession of large numbers of these very economical freighters allowed the Dutch to secure a major share of the carrying trade of the Atlantic, both in Europe and in the Americas" (67-68); it is the radical imbalance between the two that I wish to emphasize.


32. Boxer (n. 23 above) 20.

33. Ibid., 69.

34. Ibid., 43-44.

35. Ibid., 44.

36. Ibid., 69. (Contemporaries often referred to Spitzbergen as "Greenland," an unfortunate source of confusion for the historian.)

37. Ibid., 43.


40. See n. 10 above for the extreme youth of the first two.


42. A sketch of the crisis is in Carter (n. 18 above) 16-22.

43. A multiplicity of internal problems are reflected in the calling of the Estates General of 1614-15 and the proceedings themselves.

44. An "army" was still sent to the scene, but much reduced in size, a face-saving maneuver with which the Spanish Habsburg gladly cooperated.

45. As the contemporary Spanish Council of State *consultas* make clear. See also François T. Perrens, *Les mariages espagnols sous le règne de Henri IV et la régence de Marie de Médicis*, 1602-1615 (Paris 1869); Pedro Mantuano, *Casamientos de España y Francia, y viaje del Duque de Lerma, llevando la reyna Christianissima Doña Ana de Austria al passo de Beobia, y trayendo la Princessa de Austrias nuestra señora* (Madrid 1618).

46. There is an excellent narrative account of the dramatic events surrounding the assassination in Louis Batiffol, *Le Roi Louis XIII a vingt ans* (Paris 1910) Ch. 1.

47. For this penetration see the numerous works of Edouard Rott; see also n. 16 above.

48. The excuse for the attack would have been the recent massacre of Protestants under French "protection"; for the failure to recruit England see Carter (n. 18 above) 182-212.

49. For the Franco-Spanish propaganda war that raged during the 1630-35 interim, see Carter (n. 14 above) 212-214. See also José María Jover Zamora, 1635: *Historia de una polémica y semblanza de una generación* (Madrid 1949).


51. Filippo Pigafetta, *Relazione dell'assedio di Parigi* (Bologna 1591). Another edition was published in Rome (also in 1591) under the title *Relazione dell'assedio di Parigi col dissegno di quella città e de'luoghi circconvicini*.


53. Rayner Unwin, *The Defeat of John Hawkins: A Biography of his Third Slaving Voyage*
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54. "Open war did not break out until 1585. Nevertheless, from 1570 the Caribbean was the scene of an intermittent privateering war of which Drake was the central figure." Parry (n. 5 above) 184. See also James A. Williamson, The Age of Drake (London 1938), and Sir Francis Drake (London 1951).

55. Parry (n. 5 above) 185.
58. Salyer (n. 19 above) 375-376. The "family" reference is presumably to the Archdukes Albert and Isabel.
59. Salyer (n. 19 above) says at 380 that inclusion of Article 12, allowing English merchandise to enter Spain without paying the 30 percent duty, was a "clara victoria" for Cecil, and at 382 that "Spain needed English goods to complete her cargoes for the West Indies colonies," which seem contradictory. His strong assertion (379) that access to Seville "in reality meant trade with the West Indies since the merchandise was re-exported" seems badly exaggerated.
60. The Classics of International Law, Selections from Three Works of Francisco Suárez, ed. James Brown Scott (2 vols. Oxford 1944) has Latin (1) and English (2) texts; see esp. 2. 649-725. For James's reaction see Documentos inéditos para la historia de España, Vols. 1-4: Correspondencia oficial de Don Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, conde de Gondomar (Madrid 1936-45), ed. Antonio Ballesteros y Beretta: Sarmiento to Philip III, London, 16 November 1613, 3. 145. (This series is referred to hereafter as DIE.)
61. The book was published at Coimbra, the licence to publish issued by the Court at Lisbon. The licence Philip granted was just for import into and sale in Castile, no doubt signed for him, but there seems no reason to doubt he read it. The three bishop-censors who praised and approved it were all members of his Council.
62. Mention of which occurs at the pertinent intervals in John Digby's reports even before the June 1613 beginning of publication; see Public Record Office, State Papers Spain (SP94), Vols. 19 ff.
63. Sarmiento to Philip (n. 60 above). All Sarmiento letters cited are from London.
64. For English merchants' complaints see Samuel Rawson Gardiner, History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642 (10 vols. London 1883-84) 2. 134-135, 149-150, 163. The English ambassador's reports are replete with them, including complaints about imprisonment for other reasons and about other sources of discontent.
65. Parry (n. 5 above) 186.
66. Sarmiento to Philip, 5 October 1613, DIE (n. 60 above) 3. 119-121, and 17 March 1614, DIE 4. 16.
67. Sarmiento to Philip, 5 October 1613, DIE (n. 60 above) 3. 120, and 17 March 1614, DIE 4. 16-19.
69. Sarmiento to Philip, 5 October 1613, DIE (n. 60 above) 3. 118, 172; account, ibid., 277.
71. Parry (n. 5 above) 204.
72. Ibid., 203-204, 203.
73. Sarmiento to Philip, 5 October 1613, DIE (n. 60 above) 3. 121-122. Discovery of the entry did, however, give England access to a rich source of fur.
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74. The treaty is of course in the standard treaty collections; the above is translated from the Spanish translation published in Spain at the time, Capitulaciones de la Paz, hecha entre el Rey nuestro Señor los serenissimos Archiduques, Duques de Borgoña, sus hermanos, y el serenissimo Rey de la gran Bretaña: . . . las quales se concluyeron por los disputados, que abaxo y ran nombrados, en Londres, a 18 de Agosto, de 1604 (Valladolid 1605).

75. Marie stated this position in two letters to James in late 1613, which are in Spanish translation in DIE (n. 60 above) 3. 179-183: quotation is from 181-182.

76. Sarmiento refers to him as "a merchant of this city, a great corsair, and the head of a large company of them": Sarmiento to Philip, 3 July 1614. DIE (n. 60 above) 4. 183. He is of course not to be confused with John Davis, the navigator who, after discovering the Falkland Islands and traveling to the Orient, was killed in a fight with Japanese pirates in 1605.

77. Except where otherwise indicated, this incident and audience are from Sarmiento to Philip, 24 November 1613, and same date, DIE (n. 60 above) 3. 187-192, 193-195. Sarmiento gives detailed accounts of his conversations with James, usually beginning in indirect discourse but soon shifting into virtual or actual direct discourse; the direct quotations given in this essay are from such accounts.

78. Though necessarily written as self-justification, John Digby, The Earl of Bristol's Defense of His Negotiations in Spain, ed. S. R. Gardiner, Camden Society 104, #2 (Westminster 1871) provides an easily-accessible picture of his dependability and thoroughness that is fully borne out by the body of documents related to his resident embassy in Spain. This particular memorial has not come to hand, but it seems reasonably certain that Davis' maximum claim would have been recorded there since Digby's memorials were consistently detailed and reliable.

79. Sarmiento to Lerma, 6 December 1613, DIE (n. 60 above) 3. 206-207.

80. Foscarini to the Doge and Senate, 25 October 1613, Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, XIII. no. 126; Calendar of State Papers, Colonial, II. no. 680; Acts of the Privy Council, Vol. 33 (1613-14) 324, 337-338 (11 and 13 January 1614), 371 (6 March 1614); C.S.P. Col., II. no. 682 (Court minutes of the East India Company, 13 January 1614).

81. Sarmiento to Lerma, 25 January 1614, DIE (n. 60 above) 3. 244; same to Philip, 12 February 1614, ibid., 281.

82. Sarmiento to Philip, 9 May 1614, DIE (n. 60 above) 4. 52-58; much further documentation on the subject in its various aspects may be seen in DIE, Vols. 1-4, passim.

83. Carter (n. 18 above) 131-132.


85. Bartolome Garcés Ferra, "Propuesta de armada contra los piratas berberiscos entre Holanda y España a mediados del siglo XVII. Noticias de Mallorca y de Argel," Hispania 8 (1948) 403-433. With England there was, for example, the Richard Gifford project.

86. Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin où l'on voit le secret de la négociation de la paix des Pyrénées, et la relation des conférences qu'il a eues pour ce sujet avec D. Louis de Haro, ministre d'Espagne (Amsterdam 1960).

87. See Charles Jenkins [not the Ear man], England's Triumph; or, Spanish Cowardice expos'd. Being a compleat history of the many signal victories gain'd by the Royal Navy and Merchants Ships of Great Britain, for the term of 400 years past, over the insulting and haughty Spaniards (London 1739).
The Battle
of the Atlantic, 1500-1700

by Geoffrey W. Symcox

In the two long centuries between Columbus and the peace of Utrecht, conflict over the Atlantic sea-lanes became an issue of constantly growing importance in the relations between the European states. The first impact of the New World was faint and distant; the magnetic pull of the Americas was initially too weak and remote to cause more than a ripple in the existing fields of force that comprised the European state system. But the commercial and strategic value of the Atlantic was growing, as were the maritime capabilities of the states that bordered it, so that by about 1580 the struggle for Atlantic hegemony had begun to loom large in the calculations of European statesmen. From this time the Spanish and Portuguese “monopoly” over the Atlantic gradually broke down, as other powers—notably the Dutch—seized footholds in the New World and captured a growing share of oceanic trade. By the mid-seventeenth century a new period was opening in the struggle for commercial and military control over the Atlantic. Iberian sea power was a thing of the past, and the Dutch in turn were losing their bid for dominance; a climactic struggle now followed between the emergent maritime powers of England and France, reaching a first peak in the later wars of Louis XIV’s reign and continuing through the next century.

In the course of these two centuries of unbroken warfare, the Atlantic gradually became a unified sphere of diplomatic and military
activity, but this was a slow process that had to await the forging of strong, permanent commercial links between the Old World and the New. Unification through trade was the necessary condition upon which diplomatic and political unity could be established. Consequently for much of the period the Atlantic and the New World were considered a region apart, where European treaty settlements and international law did not really apply. Distance, the uncertainty and delay inherent in communication, and the Iberian states’ insistence that the New World was a separate region closed to other powers, all helped to maintain the division enshrined in the dictum “no peace beyond the line.”

This arrangement had its convenient side: overzealous colonial authorities, embarrassing interlopers, or dangerous privateers could be disavowed if the need arose, and undeclared wars could be allowed to smoulder at a safe distance so long as they seemed to offer some chance of ultimate profit.

But by the 1680’s the widening rivalries of the European powers, the greater efficiency of their fleets, and the growing web of commercial ties across the Atlantic put an end to the dichotomy. The major European states had both the means and the incentive to treat their Atlantic rivalries as part of the struggle closer to home. Carlos II’s death in 1700, and the opening of the Spanish Succession question, demonstrated conclusively that the Atlantic world had become an undivided whole, and that its fate was inextricably linked to the balance of power within Europe. The peace of Utrecht thus opened a new era in the struggle for control of the Atlantic; first, it showed that colonial and maritime rivalries were no longer peripheral to the general scheme of European power-politics, and second, it signalled the rise of England to dominance—but not unchallenged hegemony—over the Atlantic sea-lanes once ruled by Spain.

As the Atlantic moved slowly to centre stage in European international relations, certain changes necessarily took place in the way that policy was conducted. For a long time, wars in the New World or on the high seas were fought mainly by unofficial or semi-official forces. Governments at that time customarily contracted out many of the activities that we regard today as the prerogative of a sovereign state: taxes were farmed by private capital, armies were recruited by military enterprisers, overseas colonies were managed by trading companies, and most of the fighting at sea was done by privateers, freebooters, or outright pirates. Most states lacked both the will and the capacity to control the interlopers who flew their flags or the privateers who carried their commisions; they accepted no responsibility for what these unofficial agents might do outside European waters and left them to their own devices. State policy in the wider world of the Atlantic thus operated at two levels, official and unofficial; often the unofficial policy...
pursued by commercial interests would be at cross-purposes with the political aims of the government that supposedly controlled them. Governments seeking alliance with Spain were continually embarrassed by the buccaneers and interlopers who flew their flag; conversely, expanding mercantile interests obtained only the most niggardly support from their governments, whose priorities lay elsewhere. Maritime and colonial policy was thus not really made by governments; to a far greater degree it was decided by individual merchants and skippers, operating in the broad legal penumbra between trade and piracy, and impelled by self-interest rather than patriotism. They set the direction of a policy that their governments would eventually follow, willy-nilly and half-heartedly. It is not surprising, therefore, that if we examine the impact of the New World on state policy solely in the light of diplomatic correspondence and official papers our conclusion is largely negative: policy was still oriented towards the traditional battlefields of Flanders and Italy, rather than to the widening lure of the Atlantic. But this is an error of perspective. To form a full true picture of the impact of the New World on the relations among the European states, we need to look elsewhere, to the actions of the unofficial policy-makers who carried trade and the flag across the oceans.

The only exception to the pattern of policy-making on two levels, with the unofficial predominating, was provided by the Iberian powers. In the sixteenth century, only Spain—and to a lesser degree Portugal—possessed a navy strong enough to direct the conduct of war and commerce across the Atlantic, but by 1600 Madrid's grip on its empire was slackening, and the Spanish crown was forced to adopt the more haphazard policies of the other powers. By the end of the seventeenth century, in most European states, the two tiers of policy were merging. The volume of commercial traffic across the Atlantic grew ever larger, and governments began to take a close interest in maritime and colonial expansion. The mercantilist outlook that lay behind much of state policy reflected the rising importance of the Atlantic and its trade; mercantile interests were directly concerned in the formulation of policy. The leading European sea powers—England and France—developed colonial administrations and regular navies that permitted them to prosecute their policies with greater force and consistency than even Spain in its heyday. Privateers were brought to heel, trade was carefully regulated, and the buccaneers were driven from their lairs in the Antilles, now that they had served their turn. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, direct state intervention was clearly replacing private initiative as the decisive factor shaping maritime policy, and another essential condition had been created for the political integration of the Atlantic world.

This political and military unification of the Old World and the New rested ultimately on the steady increase in transatlantic trade. Spain
and Portugal developed their navies in the sixteenth century because of their extensive overseas empires: the profits of empire helped finance naval development, while the need to protect a privileged commercial position made powerful fleets absolutely essential. During the sixteenth century the overwhelming majority of the tonnage sailing the Atlantic routes was Iberian. The other maritime powers did not reach this stage of commercial development until much later, and consequently did not feel the need to build great fleets after the Iberian pattern. Expanding and protecting their smaller shares of the Atlantic trade could safely be left to auxiliary forces, up to a certain point. But the need to seize a greater share of Atlantic trade required the creation of regular navies, first by the Dutch, later by the English and French. The commercial pull of the New World, and the urge to dominate the Atlantic sea-routes, thus formed a potent factor in stimulating the development of the European navies that in the end were to tighten the links between the Old World and the New, and transform the entire Atlantic into a single, unified political arena.

What were the principal sea-routes that formed the foci of conflict in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? The location of harbours, accessible resources, and fishing-grounds, together with the prevailing wind systems, divided the vast oceanic space of the Atlantic into three main theatres. First of these great zones in strategic and commercial importance was the axis running from Seville and its satellite harbours via the Atlantic islands to Havana and the Caribbean; here the economic attraction of the New World made itself felt earliest and with the greatest force. This was the lifeline that brought annual convoys of Mexican and Peruvian silver to keep the Spanish army going and secure the credit of the Spanish crown. The Seville trade was the greatest oceanic traffic by far, easily outstripping even the Portuguese commerce with the East Indies. This route therefore formed the prime focus of Atlantic rivalry, especially after about 1580, when the growing dependence of the Spanish war-machine on American bullion made the treasure-fleets sailing to Seville the natural target for opponents of Spain's military dominance in Western Europe. For a century, however, Spain kept firm control over this vital route, despite determined French, English, and Dutch attacks. Trade plying to and from the Americas was managed by the Casa de Contratación at Seville, which exercised a commercial monopoly and in return was charged with organising defensive measures. At first the Spaniards responded to foreign attacks by building bigger, more powerfully armed vessels; then, under growing pressure in the 1540’s, they adopted a convoy system with warships as escorts. From the 1560’s, guided by the strategic genius of Pedro Menendez de Avilés, they established a network of defences in the Caribbean, fortifying the chief bases and sending out cruiser patrols to hunt down foreign priva-
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teers and interlopers. These measures enabled the Spanish crown to maintain its Atlantic hegemony for a century, and even after 1600, when its maritime power was obviously failing, it still succeeded in protecting the lifeline to the Indies and securing the key ports in the Caribbean.

Second of the oceanic zones in order of military and commercial importance was the triangular trade that developed after 1500 between Portugal, Africa, and Brazil, embracing the rich Atlantic archipelagoes of Madeira, the Azores, and the Cape Verde islands. From the middle of the sixteenth century a profitable sugar economy began to develop in Brazil, necessitating the import of slaves from Elmina and São Thomé in West Africa, and soon from Angola as well. Sugar from the Brazilian plantations was then shipped to Lisbon for distribution to the rest of Europe. Until the early seventeenth century this South Atlantic trade was overshadowed by the more valuable Portuguese empire in the Indian Ocean; the chain of bases along the African coast had originally grown up before 1500 as stations on the way to the East Indies, and through the sixteenth century they were regarded primarily as a means of controlling the vital Portuguese route to the Cape of Good Hope. During the first half of the seventeenth century the Dutch sought to wrest the South Atlantic from the Portuguese, and the region became for a time the real storm-centre of Atlantic rivalries. But the Dutch attack failed, and the Portuguese empire, though badly battered, survived largely intact. The great network of trade and bases was less tightly managed than the Spanish trade to the Caribbean, even though it was a form of state monopoly. The nature of the trade and its geographical dispersion militated against the kind of control that the Spaniards could impose on the corridor between Seville and Havana, and in any case the Portuguese never matched the naval strength of Spain, so that escorts and patrols were far fewer and regular convoys were not adopted.

The third great maritime zone, and until the later seventeenth century the one in which the commercial and political attraction of the New World was weakest, lay in the North Atlantic. Here, as with the Portuguese in the south, European maritime expansion before Columbus laid the foundations of later commercial routes. The chief source of wealth in the northern region was, until the foundation of the English and French colonies, the rich fisheries of Newfoundland, discovered at the very beginning of the sixteenth century by mariners moving on from the overcrowded fishing-grounds off Iceland. From about 1560 English and French fisherman started a triangular traffic based on the North Atlantic fisheries. They sailed first to Newfoundland to catch cod, which they salted or dried, and loaded aboard their vessels; then they headed for the Mediterranean to exchange their catch for wine, salt, alum, or some other southern commodity; with this as cargo they would return home after an absence of up to a year. Profits from this trade were
less spectacular than those to be made from African slaves, Brazilian sugar, or Mexican silver, but the northern fisheries offered one advantage that the other zones lacked: they were a training-ground second to none for sailors. This was to prove of great importance for the future development of French and English naval power. And with the establishment of settlements in North America after 1600 the commercial and strategic importance of the area began to develop, slowly but steadily, drawing it into the mainstream of Atlantic rivalries.

In the conflict for Atlantic hegemony, the Iberian powers started well ahead of any potential rivals: they held the best bases, founded the first settlements in the New World, and having mastered the techniques of oceanic navigation long before their competitors, they were at pains to keep these precious secrets to themselves. The early phases of the struggle for control of the Atlantic therefore consisted of a series of efforts by the other powers to dislodge the Spanish and Portuguese from their commanding position. The first challenge came from the French; interlopers from the Channel ports soon turned up in Brazil and the Caribbean, drawing strength from their kings' refusal to recognise the Treaty of Tordesillas. After the outbreak of the long wars between Francis I and Charles V in 1521, the French intensified their assault on Spain's Atlantic shipping and continued their efforts to break into the Portuguese trade with Brazil, but the struggle naturally centred on the route from Seville to the Indies. In 1523 a flotilla of privateers armed by Jean Ango of Dieppe ambushed the fleet bringing Montezuma's treasure to Spain. Within a decade or so French corsairs were raiding as far as the Caribbean, and in the last, most bitter phase of the conflict they made a determined effort to break Spanish sea power there. In 1555 they sacked Havana, and for several years their ravages helped to reduce the flow of bullion to Charles V's overburdened treasury. By now the French had come to realise the need for permanent bases of their own across the Atlantic. In 1555 they founded a short-lived colony on the site of Rio de Janeiro (even though they were not at war with Portugal), and in the 1560's they made an abortive attempt to plant a colony in Florida.

France's bid for Atlantic hegemony—though it can hardly be called this—was a failure. The French corsairs never really worked together and never were properly supported by their government, whose interests centred on the land war. After the 1560's, as France sank into civil war, it ceased to pose a serious threat to the Iberian powers. The Huguenot privateers of La Rochelle might inflict heavy losses on Spanish merchant shipping, but they operated in waters close to home and did not really endanger the traffic between Seville and the Indies. English interlopers (who often had close ties to the Rochelais) now came to the fore, trying to force their way into the Portuguese slave trade—as
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John Hawkins attempted to do in the 1560's—or molesting Spanish shipping and settlements in the Caribbean. After Hawkins' ventures ended in defeat at San Juan de Ulloa in 1567, relations between Spain and England steadily deteriorated, and even though Philip II and Elizabeth remained nominally at peace until 1585, their subjects had actually been engaged in a fierce unofficial maritime war for close to a generation before that.

Fernand Braudel has suggested that from about 1580 Spanish policy became oriented irreversibly towards the Atlantic and away from the Mediterranean. Viewed from the perspective of the Atlantic, this judgment seems correct: the 1580's are a decisive decade opening a new era of conflict, more intense than ever before, and focused on the Spanish treasure-route to the Indies. Supported by an unprecedented flow of bullion from the New World, Philip II now made a final herculean effort to suppress the Netherlands rebels and settle accounts with England. The rapidly expanding sea power of Philip's enemies meant that the struggle would be long-drawn and far-ranging. Here, for the first time, was an effective challenge to Spanish naval power. The scope of the conflict was further widened by Philip's accession to the Portuguese throne in 1580, which completely changed the balance of forces in the Atlantic: the two great Iberian empires were now united for 60 years, and the Portuguese domains, hitherto a secondary target, were drawn into the struggle with the rising northern sea powers.

Philip II's acquisition of Portugal caused profound alarm. A French expedition to seize the strategic base of the Azores before the Spaniards could consolidate their hold on it was defeated in 1582, despite some half-hearted assistance from the English, and Spanish control of the sea-route to the Americas became firmer than ever. Philip II now assumed the offensive. In 1585, spurred on by the progress of Spanish arms in the Netherlands and the deepening crisis in the Atlantic, Elizabeth launched an all-out maritime war against Philip II. On the English side the brunt of the fighting was borne by privateers and was a direct continuation of the unofficial war that had been going on for decades. As a result, the English offensive suffered from the drawbacks common to privateering warfare: overall strategic direction was impossible, the forces available were dispersed into too many different ventures, and there was no sense of long-term objectives. The English never managed to secure a foothold in the Caribbean or to cut the artery from Seville to the Indies, even though they captured large numbers of Spanish and Portuguese merchantmen off the main convoy routes. Nor was Spanish sea power prostrated by the defeat of the Armada in 1588. Within a few years the Spanish navy was as formidable as ever and could mount a counter-attack close to the English bases: for a time in the
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1590's the Spaniards tried to seize Brest, they held Kinsale for a few years, and even seem to have contemplated establishing a base in the Scilly Isles.19

By the time England and Spain came to terms in 1604, Spain's Atlantic hegemony was seriously shaken, but not destroyed. The Spaniards had been forced onto the defensive and had sacrificed the outlying, less valuable parts of their empire in order to concentrate their forces to protect the vital Caribbean ports and the route to Seville. The safety of their treasure-fleets was bought at the cost of abandoning the outer West Indian islands, leaving much of their merchant shipping unprotected, and giving up any attempt to maintain a naval presence in the North Atlantic. After the 1580's Iberian fishermen were driven from northern waters, and the fisheries became the preserve of the English and French.20 With Spanish forces effectively confined to the Caribbean and the treasure route, there was no longer any obstacle to prevent other powers from founding colonies in North America, as there had been in the days when Spain had forts and patrols to deter would-be settlers. The English and French now found it possible to colonise the coastal regions from Virginia to Canada. A new epoch opened in the history of the North Atlantic.

The ruin of Iberian sea power, begun by the English, was completed by the Dutch.21 At first they had set their sights on Portugal's eastern empire, and by 1609 they were well on the way to conquering it. In the meantime they were pushing into the Caribbean and encroaching on the carrying trade between Portugal and Brazil. As Portugal's eastern empire crumbled away, its Brazilian and African colonies became correspondingly more important: in fact the rise of a "second Portuguese empire" in the South Atlantic more than compensated for losses in the Indian Ocean.22 Despite the Twelve Years Truce (1609-21) the Dutch kept up their attacks on Spanish and Portuguese shipping and colonies "beyond the line," and after the resumption of declared hostilities their main target became the new Portuguese Atlantic empire. The locus of Atlantic rivalry now shifted southwards for a time, and the weaker partner in the Iberian union seemed singled out for destruction.

The spearhead of the Dutch assault was the West India Company, formed under the aegis of the States General in 1621 for the specific purpose of attacking the Spanish crown's possessions in the Americas.23 The Company offers a new variation on the theme of unofficial warfare. It owed no direct legal obligation to the States General and behaved very much as an independent power, pursuing its own commercial and military aims in defiance of the wider interests of the state. This did not prevent it, however, from asking the States General for ships and troops whenever things were going badly and its shareholders' dividends were threatened. After an abortive attack on Bahía in 1624-25, the Company
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pulled off the unique feat of capturing a Spanish treasure fleet at Matanzas in 1628. Financially reinvigorated, it returned to the attack in Brazil and by 1635 had occupied most of the northern littoral with its important sugar plantations. The next step, logically, was to seize the Portuguese slave depots in Africa, for without control of the slave trade the plantations could not long function; Elmina was captured in 1637, Luanda in 1641. The Company had virtually secured a stranglehold on Portugal's Atlantic empire, and Portuguese control over its remaining territory in southern Brazil looked precarious indeed.

Hoping to save what they could, the Portuguese threw off their allegiance to Philip IV of Spain in 1640 and sought a separate peace with the States General; a truce was declared in the following year. Undeterred, the Company pursued its private war in Brazil and Africa, ignoring remonstrances from the States General, until in 1645 a rebellion of Brazilian settlers under Dutch rule gave the Portuguese government a chance to retaliate in kind by aiding the settlers surreptitiously but remaining technically within the terms of the truce. The undeclared war dragged on until the Company was finally expelled from Brazil in 1654. Throughout the period, Portugal and the United Provinces were at peace in Europe and actually in alliance against their common enemy, Spain.

The Dutch failure in Brazil proved to be a major strategic defeat; it deprived the Dutch of a firm transatlantic base on which to erect a lasting thalassocracy. Thereafter their fortunes declined. But they had delivered the coup de grâce to Iberian maritime hegemony. They had opened up the West Indies and established outposts there; at the battle of the Downs in 1639 they won a victory that sounded the knell of Spanish naval power. By mid-century the Spanish navy had sunk into irreversible decline, and Madrid's claim to sole domination in the Caribbean was no more than a stubborn sham maintained in defiance of reality. Foreign penetration of the heartlands of the Spanish maritime empire could be prevented no longer, and here the Dutch led the way. But their ascendancy was to prove short-lived. From about 1650 they had to contend with the rising naval and commercial power, first of England, then of France. Following in the wake of the Dutch, the English and French thrust their way into the Caribbean, and at the same time steadily developed the trade with their colonies in North America. The Anglo-Dutch war of 1652-54 marked the first stage by which the United Provinces' hard-won Atlantic supremacy was undermined. This war was a factor in their defeat in Brazil, for they were forced to concentrate their fleets in European waters to meet the threat from the English and so had to leave the West India Company's Brazilian settlements unprotected. The war was followed by an Anglo-Portuguese entente—anticipating the Methuen treaty half a century later—which frustrated subsequent Dutch attempts to bully the Portuguese into making further concessions and,
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while helping to ensure the survival of what was left of Portugal's Atlantic empire, facilitated commercial penetration of it by English interests. The loss of New Amsterdam in 1667, during the second Anglo-Dutch naval war, gave further evidence of the growth of English sea power at the expense of the Dutch and was a major step towards consolidating England's colonial position in North America. Hard on the heels of the English came the French: from the 1660's, building on progress already achieved, Colbert laboured tirelessly to turn his country into a colonial and commercial power. Between 1672 and 1678 the new French navy, aided for part of the time by the English, fought a devastating war against the Dutch, further eroding their maritime and commercial ascendancy. In the long run, the Dutch lacked the resources to compete with their bigger rivals: henceforth, the struggle for Atlantic hegemony would be fought out between England and France.

The collapse of Spanish hegemony, the eclipse of Portuguese power, the decline of the Dutch, and the emergence of England and France established a new framework of Atlantic rivalries in the second half of the seventeenth century. Competition still focused on the Caribbean, but was shifting north as well, as the settlements in Canada and North America grew in commercial and political significance. These were the two theatres in which the Anglo-French rivalry was to be played out. Both powers had already established small colonies in the Outer Antilles earlier in the century, and in 1655 an English force occupied Jamaica, while French colonists began to settle the deserted regions of Santo Domingo. As yet neither power was willing—or really able—to control its new colonies in the Caribbean. The settlers freely engaged in piracy with the connivance or open support of the local authorities, who viewed them as useful tools for completing the ruin of Spanish power. This was the epic age of English buccaneers and French _filibustiers_, and a time of long-drawn martyrdom for the ill-protected Spanish colonies. Gradually, however, the English and French islands developed thriving plantation economies, and the demands of peaceful trade began to take precedence over the urge for booty. The West Indian sugar islands were drawn into a commercial system that covered the entire northern and central Atlantic. Food and timber were sent to the islands from the North American colonies; certain manufactures were imported from the mother countries; slaves were brought in from Africa. In return the islands, both English and French, exported a growing quantity of sugar. The whole system of trade was oriented towards the mother countries, in accordance with the precepts of mercantilist economics, as the profits of colonial trade aroused increasing interest on the part of the home governments. Commerce was regulated with great care, privateering was brought under closer control, and the local governors were finally prevailed upon to expel or domesticate the bucca-
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neers. Often this could only be accomplished with the aid of regular naval forces sent from home. In 1680 a French squadron appeared in the West Indies to curb piracy; from about 1685 an English flotilla was stationed there for the same purpose, and in 1687 James II despatched a fleet to put down the buccaneers. England and France now possessed the means to police their Atlantic colonies and to fight their colonial and maritime wars without the help of dangerous and unruly auxiliaries; state policy, executed by regular forces under central government control, was replacing private initiative. The sack of Cartagena in 1697 was the flibustiers' last great feat of arms—and even here, the backbone of the force involved had come from home. Most of the English buccaneers had been suppressed a decade or more before. A new era of Atlantic rivalry was beginning.

By 1700, therefore, the nature and conditions of maritime warfare in the Atlantic had radically changed. Operations were now linked closely to the conduct of policy and the balance of forces within Europe. Mercantilism, with its emphasis on the wealth to be derived from colonies and trade, accurately reflected the increasing importance that these factors had attained in the formulation of state policy. The New World and the Old had become a unified, mutually dependent political and commercial whole. Treaties between European states thus bound the colonies as well; for the maxim "no peace beyond the line" had come to hinder the development of overseas trade. Another barrier to the integration of the Atlantic world had fallen when Spain finally abandoned its claim to sole possession of the New World; the treaty of Madrid in 1670, recognising the English seizure of Jamaica, marks the de iure end of the Spanish "monopoly" which had ended for practical purposes long before. As the Spanish Succession was to demonstrate, the New World was now a factor of prime importance, and control of the Atlantic sea-lanes was a prize to which states were willing to dedicate a great part of their warlike energies.

NOTES

1. For the concept of the Iberian "monopoly" in the Atlantic, see Pierre Chaunu, Conquete et exploitation des nouveaux mondes (XVIe siecle) (Paris 1969) 247 ff.

2. The origin and exact meaning of this time-hallowed maxim are shrouded in mystery. In the most general terms, the "line" seems to have run west of the Azores and south of the Equator; in practice the definition could be stretched to cover anywhere outside European waters.


4. The most recent general work is Ralph Davis, The Rise of the Atlantic Economies
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(London 1973); on English trade, the same author’s *Rise of the English Shipping Industry in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London 1962) is excellent.


6. Chaunu (n. 5 above) 1.11-14.

7. Even during its period of greatest abundance (ca. 1580-1610) American bullion never formed more than about one-fifth of the Spanish crown’s total revenue, but since it provided lump sums of ready cash (as opposed to the uneven trickle of taxation) it played a far more prominent role in Spanish finances than its size alone would suggest. On the government credit mechanisms keyed to the bullion shipments, see Fernand Braudel, *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l’époque de Philippe II* (ed. 2, 2 vols. Paris 1966) 1.433-468.


12. The figures in Chaunu (n. 5 above) 6.335-341 show a decline in traffic from about 1552-53 for roughly a decade; although this was partially due to production difficulties at the mines, it must also be attributed to the threat of corsairs in the Atlantic, at least until 1559.


15. Braudel (n. 7 above) 2.23-26, 451-468.


17. The Elizabethan privateering war is analysed in the excellent work of K. Andrews (n. 3 above); see especially his comments on English strategy, at 10, 19-21.

18. *Ibid.*, 224-225, where Andrews shows that H. and P. Chaunu in *Seville et l’Atlantique* (n. 5 above) 6.335-341 considerably underestimate the losses caused to Spanish shipping. English privateering was consequently more effective than the authors believed.

19. Menendez de Aviles proposed capturing the Scillies as early as the 1570’s; Parry and Sherlock (n. 8 above) 37.
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24. For an account of the Dutch-Portuguese war, see Charles R. Boxer, The Dutch in Brazil, 1624-1654 (Oxford 1957) and his Salvador de Sá and the Struggle for Brazil and Angola, 1602-1686 (London 1952).

25. Parry and Sherlock (n. 8 above) 81-94; a new translation of Alexandre Exquemelin's classic The Buccaneers of America, by Alexis Brown, has recently appeared (Harmondsworth and Baltimore 1969).

26. Symcox (n. 3 above) 218. On the suppression of the buccaneers, see Arthur P. Newton, The European Nations in the West Indies, 1493-1688 (London 1933) 320-333.
Echoes of the New World in the International Rivalries of East Central Europe

by Paul W. Knoll

The growing awareness in late medieval Europe of western lands ultra mare received decisive confirmation by the voyages of discovery during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries as Europeans overflowed their old continent. Driven by reasons as varied as the languages and cultures of their homelands, these priests and profiteers, explorers and exploiters, often took with them the same rivalries and conflicts which were convulsing Old World Christendom. In addition, true to the creative and innovative ability which Europeans had been showing for a millennium, they also developed on the seas and in the Americas new rivalries and conflicts. The interplay between these old and new frictions is our particular concern in this essay. More precisely, this study will deal briefly with the faint echoes of the New World as they affected developments in East Central Europe, particularly Poland, in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The disputes and conflicting ambitions of the reconnaissant powers in the New World played at most a minor role there, but politicians, and even segments of
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the broader population, were to an extent aware of the impact of the New World.

This limited impact is not surprising, for the interests of the area were generally focussed elsewhere. The territorial expansion and continual threat of the Ottoman Turks, the regional struggle for the dominium maris Baltici, the Muscovite gathering of the Russian lands with its concomitant impact upon Poland-Lithuania, and the dynastic struggles of Jagiellonians, Vasas, Hohenzollerns, and Habsburgs: all these concerns and more drew attention away from the routes and results of the great geographical discoveries. Only the European dominance of the Habsburg indirectly involved East Central Europe in the international rivalries spawned by the expansion of Europe into the New World. The immediate interest of the Spanish Habsburg involved both Western Europe and the Americas, while the Austrian branch was bound to its cousins “in every generation by a strong feeling of family solidarity”\(^2\) that reinforced East Central Europe’s share in the impact of the western hemisphere.

One of the best examples of this process is the way in which Spain’s vision of empire, both in Europe and in the world, influenced the judgement of its rulers and leaders in the later 1620’s and brought about an extension and continuation of the Thirty Years’ War. After the virtual triumph of Wallenstein over Protestant forces in northern Germany, it was the Madrid Habsburg, rather than the Viennese, who understood the significance of his territorial control and envisioned the possibility of an imperial fleet in the Baltic.\(^3\) Such an instrument would ensure Habsburg control of the Empire, while at the same time it would be used to strike at the United Netherlands on their commercial flank, wresting a crucial economic support from the Dutch. This would facilitate Spain’s efforts to reestablish its control in the Lowlands and would even free them from Dutch attacks in the Caribbean and the West Indies.

The prospect of controlling the Baltic overrode the more limited tactical aims of Emperor Ferdinand II. But the possibility of another rival in the area also confirmed Sweden in its growing conviction of the necessity of extending its control over the southern coast of the Baltic. Such a step would widen Vasa conflict there to encompass not only such previous rivals as Poland and Denmark but also the other powers of Central Europe, particularly the Habsburg. The entry of Gustavus Adolphus into the early seventeenth-century conflict for European hegemony led eventually to the triumph of anti-Habsburg forces in Europe. This was signaled by the capture of Breisach and blocking of the Spanish Road (1638) and by Dutch victories in the Downs (1639) and at Bahia (1640) and confirmed by the treaties of Westphalia and the Pyrenees.

In the mid-seventeenth century, therefore, one can clearly see the
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The interrelatedness of the European powers and the way in which both colonial and European rivalries impinged upon East Central Europe. But it was not only in the arena of diplomacy and war that the New World had an impact. For example, the fields of art and literature provided elements which, by the mid-seventeenth century, shaped in Poland a growing awareness of the Americas. There is extant today in the Museum Treasury of the Jagiellonian University in Cracow a beautiful golden globe of the earth. Surrounded by an armillary sphere, this small globe (13 cm. in diameter) is in reality a precise clock. Made in Western Europe sometime about 1510, it came into the possession of the ruling Jagiellonian dynasty in Poland shortly thereafter. A wonder of craftsmanship, the globe is important also because it is one of the earliest known artifacts reflecting the discovery of the New World. Among other inscriptions on the landforms depicted on its surface are two relevant notations. One, in the same hemisphere which shows Europe and Africa, is placed 80 degrees west of the Line of Demarcation at 10 degrees south latitude and says Terra de Brasil. The other, located less accurately on a smallish island at 40 degrees south latitude east of Madagascar and west of India, reads America noviter reperta. The misplaced impact of the New World may thus have been misleading; but in another area, that of literature, it was more significant.

During the lifetime of Columbus, the news reached Poland of the “recent discovery of Ganges India,” as the Admiral put it in a letter to Raphael de Santis on 29 April 1493. A Latin copy of the letter was available in northern Poland in the late 1490’s, although it was probably little read, while a German translation of 1497 circulated more widely at the same time in Royal Prussia (the part of Prussia held directly by Poland). Of more importance in the following century were two western books, whose contents were widely known, directly or indirectly, in Poland.

The first was the Novus orbis regionum ac insularum of the German humanist Simon Grynaeus, the chief source utilized by the Polish chronicler Marcin Bielski for the treatment of the New World in his Kronika wszystkiego świata (Chronicle of the World). The picture which emerges from it is one of a great Genoese explorer overcoming great difficulties, both in his voyages and in the Spanish intrigues at home. Bielski also included in his narrative numerous strange and wondrous incidents and oddities from Columbus’ voyages. This understanding of the popular taste accounts in part for the popularity of his work and for the relatively wide dissemination which news of the New World received in sixteenth-century Poland.

In other respects, however, Bielski’s work did not fare so well. The author himself was sympathetic to Protestants in Poland and was eventually accused informally of heresy. As a result, Catholic circles dis-
trusted his work, and with the victory of the Counter-Reformation, it is not surprising that his chronicle was soon superseded by other sources on the New World. The most important of these was the Polish translation of Giovanni Botero's *Relationi universali*. This well known chronicle, which was printed three times in seventeenth-century Poland (1609, 1613, and 1659), contains in its description of the discovery of the New World a detailed account of the preliminary obstacles which faced Columbus, of the expedition itself, and of the perversive machinations against the explorer at the Spanish court. Here again, as we have noted with Bielski, there is an implicit hostility toward the Spanish. As a result, the Polish public was learning not only to praise Columbus but also to believe the worst of those who had sent him. Their attitude, with its eventual implications for Poland's share in the continental rivalries of its day, was reinforced by the popularity in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Poland of the works of Bartolomé de Las Casas.

The figure of Las Casas—churchman, administrator, politician, and humanitarian—dominated the sixteenth-century debate over Indian policy among colonists, particularly the Spanish. The social experiments which he fostered are well known, as are his disputations with the humanist lawyer Sepúlveda. His views on the status of Indians and on Spanish colonial policy were, of course, widely known in Western Europe and eventually gave rise to the "Black Legend." Poland did not remain untouched by the debate over which Las Casas presided. Although there were no Polish editions of his work until the twentieth century, copies of the 1552 Spanish edition of his *Brevisíma relación de la destrucción de las Indias* were found in Polish libraries by the end of the sixteenth century, though because of the language it is probable that they were discussed more than read. The 1598 Latin edition of the same book found more currency, however, as did an anonymous polemical German tract of 1618, *Wessen man sich gegen Spanien versehen sol*, which was based upon Las Casas' work. By the early seventeenth century there were several copies of these works in Poland. The views of Las Casas spread in Poland also through the works of German Protestants which circulated among their Polish co-religionists. For example, the Lutheran jurist Bartholomew Keckermann delivered a course at the Gymnasium in Gdańsk (Danzig) in 1606 which attacked the Spanish, their Catholicism, and their colonial policy. Here and in his lectures published the following year, the worst elements of the Black Legend were freely combined with more reliable data about the impact of the conquistadores upon the Indians. Finally, an indirect presentation of Las Casas' views was provided for Poles in the early seventeenth century by the popularity of the aforementioned chronicle of Giovanni Botero. In his description of colonial practices in the New World, he mentions Las Casas directly as bishop of Chiapas and relies heavily upon
the Brevissima relación for other details. As with the narrative of Columbus' fortunes, there are in this section elements hostile to Spain and its empire.

The thrust of the preceding paragraphs has been to make the double suggestion that Poland was not untouched by the discovery and colonization of the New World and that Poles were generally hostile to the Spanish, but I want to conclude with three qualifications.

First, Polish hostility toward Spain derived from many factors besides knowledge of Spanish colonial practices. Two possible considerations are Spain's militant Catholicism in the sixteenth century, at a time when Poland was a religious mosaic which tolerated many forms of Christianity, and Iberian ties to the Austrian Habsburg, whom many Poles saw—despite marriage ties in the first half of the seventeenth century—as uncertain and potentially dangerous allies.

Second, Polish hostility toward Spain appeared almost exclusively in the only socially conscious groups of the time: the nobility, particularly that part of it known as the Szlachta (the gentry), and the urban aristocracy. Still the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Polish history are the times when the Szlachta in particular exercised inordinate influence in Polish political life. Thus their hostility to Spain and its world empire may have played a role in their attitudes to other questions closer to home.

Third, the impact of the New World, no matter in what detail it may be traced, was far less in Poland—and the rest of East Central Europe for that matter—than anywhere in Western Europe. Neither in literature, politics, nor economics does the New World impinge upon Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary as it does elsewhere. Thus, whatever is said about Eastern Europe is most appropriately couched in terms of distant echoes.

NOTES

1. In the present discussion, the term East Central Europe is used in the sense developed by Oskar Halecki, The Limits and Divisions of European History (New York 1950), except that it is limited rather specifically to the states of Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary.
3. The relation between Spain and the Empire is the subject of an excellent study by Bohdan Chudoba, Spain and the Empire 1519-1643 (Chicago 1952) 229-258 especially. The comments of Konigsberger, The Habsburgs and Europe 1516-1600 (Ithaca, N.Y. and London 1971) 239-241 are particularly stimulating. On the specific problem of the Baltic, the study by Anton Gindely, Die maritimen Pläne der Habsburger (Vienna 1891), is most valuable.
4. A copy of this globe was commissioned in 1936/37 and is now housed in the "Polish Room" of the University of Pittsburgh.
5. The most thorough study of this globe is by Tadeusz Estreicher, "Globus Jagielloński," Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności, wydział filologiczny 32 (1900). A brief description is
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provided in Karol Estreicher, *Collegium Maius of the Jagiellonian University in Cracow, History, Customs, Collections* (Warsaw 1973) 152.

6. Copies of this letter are now included in the collections of the Theological Seminary in Włocławek and the Library of the University of Wrocław, neither of which I have seen personally. I have used the printed version in *Przegląd Katolicki* 48 and 49 (1892) 753-757, 769-772.

7. This popular work went through three editions, each time becoming more accurate. For example, in the first edition, Bielski had described Columbus as a Venetian sent by King Emmanuel I of Portugal (Cracow 1551; further editions in 1554 and 1564).

8. The Italian monk Hannibal Rosselli, who lived in Cracow from 1581 until his death, also utilized Grynaeus' work in his own book *De elementis et descriptione totius orbis* (Cracow 1586). This proved to be popular in local ecclesiastical circles.


11. Ironically, no copies of Las Casas' *Historia de las Indias* were ever known in Poland. See the comments of Tazbir, "Connaissance des Oeuvres de Las Casas en Pologne," *Acta Poloniae Historica* 28 (1973) 25-27.


13. B. Keckermann, *Systema disciplinarum politicarum praesentationibus anno 1606 propositorum in Gymnasio Dantiscano* (Hanover 1607), copy in the Jagiellonian Library in Cracow. See also the recent study by Bruno Nadolski, *Życie i działalność naukowa uczonego gdanskiego Bartłomieja Keckermann* (Torun 1961).


15. The hostility of the Szlachta was particularly deep-seated and therefore, because of the importance of this group in Polish society and politics, potentially a powerful factor in shaping Polish policy. See the stimulating study by Tazbir, Szlachta a konkwistadorzy, *Opinia staropolska wobec podboju Ameryki przez Hiszpanów* (Warsaw 1969). This book was my original stimulus for the subject of this paper and should be regarded as a point of departure for any further study.

16. A desirable future investigation would be an analysis of the opposition which the Szlachta showed to the Habsburg policy of King Sigismund III Vasa. Their rhetoric and motivation reflects the way in which abstract hostility toward Spain was translated into specific opposition against the Austrian policy of the king. Bishop Goslicki of Poznań and Mikolaj Zebrzydowski are particularly crucial figures. Despite the absence of adequate studies of Sigismund's reign in recent Polish scholarship, a good introduction in English may be found in F. Dvornik, *The Slavs in European History and Civilization* (New Brunswick, N.J. 1962) 435-488.

17. Before the Second World War, Bolesław Olszewicz began to prepare an exhaustive study on this theme. A first attempt was presented in outline in *Poland and the Discovery of America* (Poznań 1931). During the war, however, the notes and materials of a lifetime were lost in the 1944 Warsaw uprising. See his comments in "La Pologne et la découverte de l’Amérique," *Comptes rendus de la Société des sciences et des lettres de Wrocław* 2 (1947) 28. Janusz Tazbir has now begun the task of completing the work Olszewicz began for Poland. In the other countries of East Central Europe (Czechoslovakia and Hungary) the opportunities for research on this topic are particularly rich.
Part IV

GOVERNING THE NEW WORLD:
MORAL, LEGAL, AND THEOLOGICAL ASPECTS
"It is the sinfullest Thing in the world, to forsake or destitute a Plantation, once in Forwardnesse: For besides the Dishonour, it is the Guiltiness of Bloud, of many Commiserable Persons." So Bacon, reflecting on the colonizing enterprises of his own day. His stricture was aimed at Raleigh, whom he had disliked and whom he accused of having neglected the early Roanoke settlements and allowing settlers to perish. The accusation was somewhat unfair; in fact, Elizabeth’s government sealed the fate of the 1587 Roanoke settlers by commandeering—admittedly in a moment of acute national danger—the ships which were to have taken them urgently needed supplies. When the crisis passed and an expedition sailed for Roanoke, it arrived too late; the colony had disappeared. It was not revived because Raleigh had insufficient personal resources. He could do nothing without the royal favour, and that he lost in 1592. This sorry story suggested a general lesson, and Bacon, in alluding to it, was reminding his contemporaries—some of whom needed reminding—that anyone who became involved in the business of oversea colonization necessarily assumed responsibilities. A network of mutual responsibility, not only legal, administrative, and financial, but social and moral also, bound together all the people immediately concerned: the settlers, the promoters of settlement, and the metropolitan government.
Settlers, it was generally considered, had a responsibility towards the promoters (who had adventured their money) to ensure, by their diligence, that the investment should in due course earn its reward. The promoters, even more clearly, had a responsibility towards the settlers (who had adventured their lives), not only to transport them to the place of settlement, but to see that they were adequately equipped; to provide food and reinforcement at appropriately spaced intervals, during the critical early years; and to wait patiently for profits until the colony was sufficiently established to produce marketable commodities without neglecting its own immediate needs. According to Bacon—generalizing from a hundred years of Spanish experience as well as from the few English experiments of his own day—"... the Principall Thing, that hath beene the Destruction of most Plantations, hath beene the Base, and Hastie drawing of Profit, in the first Yeeres."²

The role of the metropolitan government was primarily to authorize, to consent. It might itself be the promoter of settlement and assume all the promoter's responsibilities, but this was unusual. Even when a government initiated a colonizing project, execution was nearly always entrusted to private contractors. Most projects were undertaken on private initiative; but whoever initiated them, they all needed to be authorized by government. The issue of a formal document—licence, charter, capitulación—conferred on the administrators of a colony a delegated power to govern, and delimited, usually very roughly, the area to be governed. Without such a document, the authority of a governor might be challenged by any malcontent in the colony, and the settlers' claim to the territory they occupied might be disputed by any rival group.

The responsibility of the metropolitan government towards its colonies did not end, however, with the mere authorization of their existence. No sixteenth-century government relinquished the allegiance of those of its subjects who settled overseas; and allegiance entitled the subjects to demand the services traditionally rendered by governments. The least they could reasonably expect included diplomatic and military support against foreign Europeans—they were usually left to defend themselves against the local natives—and arrangements for the adjudication of disputes. This last was a matter of major importance. The men who settled overseas in the sixteenth century were litigious as well as adventurous, often involved in disputes not only among themselves, but with the commanders who led them and the promoters who sent them out. The Crown, acting through its judicial representatives, was the only acceptable umpire. All European colonizing governments, from the sixteenth century onwards, recognized this responsibility and endeavored to discharge it, though with widely varying degrees of assiduity. The Spanish government, in the first two generations of American
settlement, created a very elaborate judicial system, drawing large num­bers of trained people from the metropolis; for though the system was supported out of colonial revenues, it was organized and staffed from Spain. A familiar sentence, often repeated in the consultas of the Council of the Indies, admonished the king: “The most serious obligation which Your Majesty owns in the government of the new lands of the Indies is to provide an abundance of justice.”

Where, in this network of commonly accepted obligations, could a place be found for the natives of the territory to be planted? This was the thorniest question confronting the theorists of colonization. Bacon’s ideal was to settle uninhabited lands: “I like a Plantation in a Pure Soile,” he wrote, “... where People are not Displanted, to the end, to Plant in Others. For else, it is rather an Extirpation, then a Plantation.” 3 Bacon may have been thinking here of the horror stories, drawn mostly from Las Casas, which circulated in Europe in his day and were used in England as anti-Spanish propaganda. The famous Frankfort edition of his Breuissima relaci6n de la destrucci6n de las Indias, with de Bry’s ghoulish engravings, was published in the same year as Bacon’s first Essays. “Pure soil,” in Bacon’s sense, however, hardly existed. Totally uninhabited places usually turned out to be uninhabitable; wherever Europeans seriously tried to settle, there were some native inhabitants, and the nature of the early relations between natives and newcomers was an important factor in determining the character of the settlement. The American Indians were not initially hostile to Europeans, as a rule. They might be shy, apprehensive, suspicious; they were usually, and understandably, curious, but courteous and respectful. They often—and to all appearance willingly—provided food, without which some of the early settlers might have starved when their own attempts to grow crops failed and supplies from Europe were delayed. Sometimes Indians displayed generous, even lavish hospitality. Some Europeans maintained more or less civil relations with them over considerable periods. Balboa seems to have had the knack of it. The English settlers in New England succeeded in avoiding major Indian hostilities for more than fifty years. Usually, however, the period of peace and puzzled accep­tance was brief. The immediate reasons for its termination varied from place to place. Slave raiding, indiscriminate foraging, the slighting of shrines, competition for natural resources, such as water, in places such as Yucatán where it was scarce—all these were causes of fighting, but in many places there was no obvious and overt cause. The Indians simply discovered that the newcomers were digging themselves in, apparently with the intention of staying, and they resisted. Here and there, resistance was successful: the Araucanians in Chile, the Chichimecas in northern New Spain, and various Carib groups in the West Indies maintained their remote independence for many years; but these were
scattered peoples, intractable, wild, and few in number. In most areas, particularly in the areas of dense, settled populations and sophisticated culture, the centres of organized resistance were quickly captured, resistance itself—though never completely extinguished—paralyzed and subdued. The conquerors found themselves at once in possession of substantial quantities of valuable loot, and responsible for governing a large and—at least outwardly—remarkably docile subject population.

The conquered areas of the Americas were not deliberately “displanted.” The “extermination” against which Bacon inveighed was caused by epidemic disease rather than by expulsion or massacre. “Displanting” was the last thing the Spanish conquerors wanted. The men who led and organized the conquests—at least the more thoughtful and responsible among them—from the first intended permanent settlements. They were not mere casual predators; they knew that the initial plunder of conquest, and the occasional unpredictable yield of tomb-robbing, represented the accumulation of years and could not quickly be replenished. They looked for a steady income for themselves and their backers and indirectly, through taxation and duties on expanding trade, for the home government. Such income could come only from a systematic exploitation of all the available resources—agricultural, pastoral, mineral—and for this they needed Indians. Europeans could, if they saw no alternative, develop pioneer settlements by their own efforts, as Valdivia’s people did in Chile and as the settlers of New England were to do a century later; but the process was painful and slow. The rapid and remunerative development which took place in, for example, central Mexico depended at every turn upon the Indians: for food, fuel, and fodder; for information about a host of matters—water supply, fish and game, wild or cultivated edible plants, silver mines and gold-bearing streams; above all for labour. Amerindians were unfamiliar, however, with European notions of wage-earning employment; they would perform regular organized work, initially at least, only under some form of compulsion. One of the first duties of the metropolitan government, therefore, was to decide what forms of compulsion were legally acceptable.

There was no question of general enslavement. So drastic a measure would have been repugnant even to the most convinced apologists of conquest. The Spanish government steadily refused to contemplate it. The Indians—by virtue of papal decree or of conquest or of their own acts of submission, real or fictitious—were deemed in law to be the subjects of the Crown of Castile; enslavement might be, and often was, used as a punishment for serious crime, in particular for rebellion, but no self-respecting prince could permit the enslavement of his subjects for economic gain by private persons. Decree after decree insisted that the Indians were free men. Nor, even from the settlers’ point of view, was
there need for general enslavement. It was not difficult to devise less drastic forms of compulsion, which might be deemed compatible with personal freedom. Compulsory labour of one kind or another was common in Europe, and those of whom it was required were not confused with slaves. In the Americas, at least in the areas of dense settlement and relatively sophisticated culture—in general, the area of Spanish conquest—the natives had long been accustomed to a tight social discipline, to the communal performance of the major tasks of the agricultural year, in accordance with an elaborate ritual calendar, and to the rendering of tribute in kind and in labour. The Spanish settlers, therefore, inherited a tradition of compulsion, and adapted it to their own purposes.

Any system of forced labour lends itself to abuse. The various devices employed by the Spaniards to recruit Indian labour in the sixteenth century all provoked indignant criticism on this ground from time to time by judges and administrators as well as missionaries. Compulsion in itself, however, was not generally thought unreasonable. On the contrary, most Spaniards who thought about such matters at all regarded the goods and services demanded from the natives of the colonies as a fair return for benefits conferred. Of course, religious conversion, the opportunity of salvation, was formally placed first among these benefits in most writing on the subject, but there were also benefits of a secular nature. The Spanish Conquest was the means of rescuing the Indians—so the argument ran—not only from pagan idolatry, with its accompaniments of human sacrifice and ritual cannibalism, but also from degrading subjection to arbitrary tyrants, from a life made excessively laborious by technical ignorance, and from frequent wasting war. The conquerors put down the tyrants and substituted the rule of just and pious princes; they stopped the wars and brought hundreds of mutually hostile tribes under a common government; they introduced domestic animals, many useful plants, metal tools and a wide range of technical devices, including the use of money.

There was some substance in the claims, especially those that had to do with material conditions. It might be true that smallpox claimed more victims than had ever died on sacrificial altars; but that was an act of God, which Spaniards lamented and for which they accepted no blame. In many ways the Conquest made life more comfortable for the survivors. In the Mexican and Central American highlands, where the weather can be cold and wet at some times of the year, the introduction of sheep, and so of woollen blankets, made a considerable difference to people whose only cloth had been cotton, to say nothing of the new availability of meat to people whose food had traditionally been maize, beans, and squash. Beasts of burden were obviously important in countries where all carriage hitherto had been on men’s backs. Spanish
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officials new to the Indies were often shocked by the spectacle of tamemes trotting along, bowed by their immense shoulder loads, much as later Europeans in the East were shocked by coolies pulling rickshaws. They thought it an affront to human dignity, and they knew the remedy: just as rickshaws today can be towed by bicycles, so the burdens could be loaded onto mules, those indomitable beasts which, economically speaking, conquered the vast distances of the Americas for Spain. Conscientious administrators even had ground for hope that forced labour, which under Aztecs and Incas had been a permanent feature of Indian life, might prove under Spanish rule to be a temporary measure. They hoped that the need for it would disappear as the Indians acquired European tastes and habits and learned to appreciate the merits of a money economy and the attractions of wage-earning employment. 

The sixteenth century produced a considerable body of serious writing on the rights and wrongs of conquest and empire and the proper treatment of conquered and subject peoples. Most of the writers were Spaniards, though not all. The sententious Bacon had his views on this:

If you Plant, where Sauages are, doe not onely entertaine them with Tri­fles, and Gingles; But vse them iustly, and gratiously, with sufficient Guard neuerthelesse: And doe not winne their fauour, by helping them to invade their Enemies, but for their Defence it is not amisse: And send oft of them, ouer to the Country, that Plants, that they may see a better Condition then their owne, and commend it when they returne.7

Bacon characteristically treated the matter from the standpoint of politic wisdom rather than of moral duty. He could afford to be detached; when he wrote there were few English colonies among "savages," unless (as some Englishmen did) one included the Irish under that head. The Spanish writers, on the other hand, dealt with existing practical situations and urgent moral dilemmas. They agreed almost without exception that their countrymen, as conquerors, in addition to the basic duty of Christian proselytizing, must accept responsibilities in secular matters. Thus Vitoria—no great enthusiast for colonies in general—wrote:

Those people [the Indians] are not unintelligent, but primitive; they seem incapable of maintaining a civilized State according to the requirements of humanity and law . . . their government, therefore, should be entrusted to people of intelligence and experience, as though they were children. . . . But this interference must be for their welfare and in their interests, not merely for the profit of the Spaniards.8

Some writers, most notably Las Casas, thought that the only way to enforce this last proviso was to confine secular responsibility to the Crown and its officials, to deny to private lay Spaniards all duties and rights in connection with Indians and indeed all contact with them. He did not intend by this to hand the Indians over to an irresponsible absolutism. He had strong
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and conservative views on the limits which divine law and human custom placed upon the powers of kings. In his thought, those limits operated as well in the Indies as in Spain. A trained and royally appointed judiciary, besides being disinterested (as the settlers obviously could not be) would be accountable to an authority which was itself bound by law and accountable to God.

Spanish conquerors and settlers, however, were firmly installed in the Indies before the officials arrived, and could not be dislodged; and some theorists—Sepúlveda the most distinguished—insisted that they had a part to play in the civilizing, Hispanicizing process. The Indians, according to Sepúlveda, needed "... by their own nature and in their own interests, to be placed under the authority of civilized and virtuous princes or nations; so that they may learn from the might, wisdom and law of their conquerors, to practise better morals, worthier customs and a more civilized way of life." Sepúlveda's colonizing ideal was to divide the Indians of the cities and the fields among honourable, just, and prudent Spaniards, especially among those who helped to bring the Indians under Spanish rule, so that these may train the Indians in virtuous and humane customs, and teach them the Christian religion. . . . In return for this, the Spaniards may employ the labour of the Indians in performing those tasks necessary for civilized life. Sepúlveda, therefore, not only thought that the Crown should delegate to the leading settlers its secular responsibility for the Indians; he explicitly linked the settlers' right to employ Indian forced labour and to receive Indian tribute with their discharge of the duties thus delegated.

Discussion of these matters in academic circles naturally raised other more fundamental questions. Were the Indians human? Were they rational beings, that is, capable of understanding Christian doctrine? Affirmative answers were enjoined on the faithful by no less an authority than a papal bull, Sublimis Deus of 1537; but Sublimis Deus was denied the pase regio and never circulated officially in the Indies. Many settlers and even some missionaries expressed a contrary opinion. If the Indians were human and rational, had they, before their conquest by the Spaniards, legitimate rulers? or were their former chiefs to be adjudged usurpers or tyrants? If legitimate, what justification could be found for the wars of conquest launched against them? Not all Spaniards accepted the bulls of Alexander VI as an adequate answer to this question; yet those theorists who sought independent justification soon found themselves on contentious ground. Vitoria, for example, expressed grave doubts about the justice of the wars of conquest; it would have been better, in his opinion, if the Spaniards had followed the example set by the Portuguese in the East and contented themselves with peaceful trade. In so arguing, Vitoria revealed his own ignorance of what the Portuguese were actually doing in the East. He assumed that peaceful
and profitable trade—unlike dominion, which involved fighting—could always be had for the asking. This was a very dubious assumption, as the Portuguese had long ago discovered. In proclaiming the injustice of past conquests and seeking a prohibition of future ones, Las Casas made an equally implausible assumption that by persuasion alone, the Indians could have been converted to Christianity and induced to submit to the Spanish crown. Sepúlveda, the apologist of conquest, propounded, on the other hand, a theory of natural aristocracy and natural servitude based on his reading of Aristotle, which to many theologians was both implausible and repugnant. According to the great Suárez, “Hactenus . . . tam barbarae gentes inventae non sunt.”

Disputation on all these theoretical questions in the middle decades of the sixteenth century was both vigorous and vituperative; yet none of the disputants even carried their arguments to logical extremes. However hard to justify in theory, the Spanish presence in the New World was a fact and had to be accepted. In denouncing the Conquest as unjust no friend of Indian liberty—not even Las Casas—suggested that it should be reversed, that Spain should withdraw from America leaving the Indians to manage their own affairs in secular matters; still less, of course, in matters spiritual. Nor, on the other hand, did the apologists of conquest and the advocates of settlers’ rights seriously suggest that the conquistadores should be left to themselves to establish personal, virtually independent fiefs without metropolitan interference. It is true that one of the emperor’s confidants, Fray Nicholas de Witte, thought America too distant to be administered effectively from Spain, and recommended the appointment of a prince of the blood to govern the Indies independently; but de Witte was a Dutchman, and no one in Spain attended to him. In general, the whole debate was conducted within limits imposed by the assumption of royal authority over the Indies. Theoretical arguments were advanced not only as matters of intellectual and spiritual conviction, but also in order to influence decisions on practical questions: who was to exercise authority from day to day? Who was to profit by it? These decisions would have to be made by the crown, as judge and legislator. The disputants knew perfectly well that the crown would not admit the injustice of conquest, and so allow doubts to be cast on its right to rule; nor, on the other hand, would it declare the Indians slaves by nature, for that would be to hand its subjects and its revenues over to a class of rapacious feudatories, besides disowning fifty years of solemn declarations. Between these extremes, however, was a wide area of uncertainty, in which policy could be influenced—was in fact influenced many times—by arguments addressed to the royal conscience and the royal sense of responsibility. All the disputants shared this common assumption: that the crown was legally and morally responsible for the
good government of the Indies and that it must and would discharge its responsibilities.

The controversies over the status of the Indians caused a considerable stir at the time, in official as well as academic circles, and have aroused considerable interest among historians since. Most writers on the subject have concentrated their attention on the differences of opinion, however, and have tended to take for granted the common assumption of a royal sense of responsibility. This is the result of applying twentieth-century political principles to a sixteenth-century situation. We have been accustomed for years to the notion that in all colonial situations the metropolitan power has a responsibility towards both colonists and natives; that it has services to render as well as revenues to receive; that the power which a metropolis exercises over its dependencies is justifiable only if exercised in the interests of the dependent population. This metropolitan responsibility is assumed to be didactic, as well as administrative and judicial. The terms used to describe it—the supremely arrogant phrase *mission civilisatrice*, the more neutral term "trusteeship"—are, or were until recently, commonplaces of political discourse. In sixteenth-century Europe, however, the idea of metropolitan responsibility—at least in secular matters—was far from commonplace. It was certainly not inherent in the colonial relationship. There had been many historical examples of purely predatory empires, in which the metropolitan rulers rendered no services at all, beyond the provision of enough armed force to suppress internal rebellion and to keep other predators out. Why should even a conscientious Christian ruler worry about the situation in a distant territory, which his subjects had conquered on their own initiative and at their own expense, so long as formal homage was rendered, due revenue received, and the evangelizing work of the Church encouraged and protected? Even for these minimal provisos, there were no firm, long-standing precedents. The secular sense of responsibility for colonies, so familiar in later times, was in the sixteenth century new and striking. It was provoked and fostered by the special conditions of settlement in the New World.

Western Europe had had considerable experience of conquest and colonization before the New World was discovered. Some of the conquered lands—in the Slavonic and Baltic areas, for example, and in the southern part of the Iberian peninsula—were contiguous to the homeland of the conquerors, or else near it, as Sicily was. These conquests could be spaced over generations; there was a permanent hinterland, which allowed a free flow of immigrants into the frontier areas. Where former inhabitants were driven away or massacred, new settlers took over; where land became desolate, newcomers reclaimed it; where conquered populations survived under Christian, European rule,
their social cohesion was loosened or broken, and they became accessible to religious conversion, and to political and social integration. The colonies thus ceased to be colonies and became integrated into the kingdoms from which the conquerors had come.

A totally different set of conditions governed conquest and settlement in places far distant from the conquerors' homeland and communicating with it wholly or mainly by sea: in the Norse colonies in the North Atlantic, the Crusader establishments in Syria and Palestine, the Italian colonies in the Aegean and the Levant, and the Iberian settlements in the Atlantic islands. Most of these colonies were established and maintained without much support from a metropolitan country. Metropolitan governments accepted no responsibility whatever for the well-being of natives and very little for that of the colonists; in most instances, the colonists were on their own.

In the Norse colonies, the settlers suffered great initial hardships, but the settlements were too remote to be effectively assisted by their home government and too small and poor to arouse royal cupidity. There were no natives except for a few nomads in Greenland. The colonies were virtually independent from the beginning, and no one felt any particular responsibility for them. They had in any event no importance as exemplars, since virtually nothing was known about them outside Scandinavia.

The Crusader establishments, more powerful, more prosperous and much better known, also developed independently, though in very different circumstances. The First Crusade was a mass movement, undertaken impulsively, with virtually no preparation, for motives in which material considerations played a relatively insignificant part. These characteristics distinguished it sharply from almost every other recorded movement of colonial expansion. The participating armies were informal and international. They did not operate under the auspices of any particular European government except—in a very loose and general sense—the papacy. The Crusaders thought of themselves as representing Christendom as a whole. Entering the Levant at a time of Muslim disunity and disarray, they achieved rapid victories. With experience of easy success, the leaders shifted their aims. From a single-minded preoccupation with the Holy Places, they turned to a more general interest in plunder and territorial conquest. They established principalities based on major cities, among which the kingdom of Jerusalem soon became recognized as suzerain, in a loose sense, over the others. Possession of the Holy City not only conferred prestige, it entitled the kingdom to military support from the rest of Christendom. European princes felt a moral obligation—of which the papacy from time to time reminded them—to go to the aid of the kingdom when it got into
difficulties. The kingdom was in constant need of reinforcement; on the other hand, it was from its beginning an independent state whose ruler was no man's vassal. Its baronage resented any suggestion of outside interference and always suspected the motives of its allies. When the Emperor Frederick II married the heiress of the kingdom, his attempts to apply imperial law there were stubbornly and successfully resisted. The kingdom, in short, though a colony, rejected the standing of a dependency. It developed without control or guidance from Europe, and no one in Europe was responsible for its administration or welfare.

The absence of responsibility in Europe for the conduct of the Crusader colonies was reflected in an absence of responsibility among the Crusader settlers for their Muslim subjects. The Crusaders settled as alien conquerors, parasitic upon the conquered; and alien parasites they remained throughout the life of the Latin states. Contacts between the two cultures were confined to the material level. There was no serious attempt at religious proselytizing, either because it was thought a hopeless task, Muslims being irretrievably the devil's, or because of indifference and a desire to avoid trouble. There was no sense of a mission civilatrice, nor would such a sense have produced much result in a society which regarded the Franks as illiterate barbarians. On the other hand, the Crusaders made few serious attempts to absorb or to understand the culture of their subjects, except to the extent that they adopted some of the material comforts of local daily life. They lived in their own quarters in the cities, their own strongholds in the country. The immense castles they built, whose ruins still frown upon the Syrian countryside, are the aptest symbol of an unsympathetic rule. As a cultivated Muslim put it, "The Franks . . . are an accursed race, the members of which do not assimilate except with their own kin." 13

The loose feudal organization of the Crusader principalities allowed room in Crusader territory for organized European communities who recognized no allegiance to Crusader rulers. The military Orders, for example, though they played an essential part in the defence of the kingdom, were not its subjects and had no institutionally defined standing within it. In Antioch and Tripoli, even more, they operated quite independently of the local authorities. The position of the Italian merchant groups was somewhat different, being legally defined by treaties between the European mother-cities and the Crusader rulers; but they too constituted autonomous (though not autarchic) communes within Crusader territory. 14 The development of these communes was a superimposed process of colonization. Its object was not the conquest of Muslim territory nor the domination and economic exploitation of a native populace, but the use of an existing colony as a commercial base. While the Crusaders ruled and exploited the country, the Italians
pursued their non-feudal aims, which included, besides ordinary trade, contracts for the transport of pilgrims and fighting men and the hiring-out of fighting fleets with, naturally, a share in any resulting loot.

The capture of Constantinople by a crusading army in 1204 offered the Venetians—who shared the spoil with the Franks—the opportunity of establishing colonies in Byzantine territory. They acquired an extensive quarter in Constantinople itself, a number of harbours and naval bases round the shores of the Aegean, and the island of Crete. Later in the century the Genoese in their turn acquired colonies outside the old Crusader territories, partly as the result of commercial enterprise, partly as rewards for supporting the Byzantine emperor against the Venetians. The maritime empires so created long outlived the Crusader states. They were formidable, profitable, and very diverse. Every type of settlement which Portuguese and other Europeans were to establish in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century East had precedents between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries in Italian settlements in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. The *fondachi* in the major Muslim centres were warehouse compounds where organized groups of merchants lived and traded by permission of the local rulers. The establishments—mostly Genoese—in the Crimea and elsewhere around the shores of the Black Sea were, in most instances, autonomous, extra-territorial merchant communes, some of them comprising entire cities. The harbours and islands acquired in the Aegean in the thirteenth century were outright territorial possessions, colonies in a modern sense; Venetian Crete and Genoese Chios, indeed, might almost be termed plantations—not only naval bases, guarding frequented trade routes, but fertile islands which yielded revenue to the metropolis from their own products and in which many Italians acquired valuable fiefs. In these colonies the territorial administration was provided by the metropolis. Sometimes it was farmed, as in Chios after 1346, for example, to the celebrated *maona* of the Giustiniani. Much more commonly—in Venetian colonies almost invariably—the principal administrative officials were sent out by the metropolitan government, were paid, and were removable. This was not quite a colonial civil service (a tour as *baiulo* at one of the overseas centres formed part of the Venetian *cursus honorum*), but it was the nearest approach to such a service in any empire governed by Western Europeans in the thousand years between the collapse of Rome and the settlement of the New World. Italian interest in colonies, however, remained almost wholly commercial. There was no hint, in occasional contemporary allusions or in the very detailed instructions issued to the *baiuli* and other high officers, that the metropolis enjoyed privileges in its colonies and drew revenue from them by virtue of services rendered to the peoples who lived there. The Italian maritime empires
set many precedents for the future, but a secular sense of responsibility was not among them.

The Castilians and the Portuguese, who were to be the initial explorers and settlers of the New World, served their apprenticeship in overseas government not in the Mediterranean but in the Atlantic islands. There too, though for very different reasons, there was little scope for the development of a sense of responsibility. Except for the larger islands of the Canaries group, the islands were uninhabited when the Europeans arrived. In the Madeira group and the Azores, settlement presented little physical difficulty. Soil was fertile, climate was pleasant, European crops and domestic animals flourished from the beginning. Pioneering in these conditions was relatively painless. The islands lay on trade routes which were beginning to be frequented, and the passage to and from Portugal or Spain was not dauntingly difficult. Similar conditions existed in the Canaries, except that there the natives, the Guanches, resisted Castilian settlement in some of the larger islands for many years. Tenerife—whose towering cone was to be, for thousands of emigrants, their last sight of the Old World—was still unconquered when Columbus passed it on his way to Hispaniola in 1492. When, eventually, the Guanches had been hunted down and subdued, they were distributed in encomienda, like the Moors in contemporary Granada and the Arawaks in contemporary Hispaniola; but they proved un receptive to Christian teaching and intractable as a labour force.15 Today, as a separate race, they are extinct. No one in Spain at the time seems to have expended much sympathy on them. As for the settlers, they were doing well in a modest way and seemed in no need of sympathy. There was no lack of willing emigrants. All the island groups were settled under contracts of a feudal nature, with "captains" who subcontracted with the actual settlers, the metropolitan government collecting dues but otherwise taking little direct interest. They came only slowly under direct metropolitan administration, when their importance as ports of call for trans-Atlantic shipping made tighter control desirable.

The anxious sense of responsibility, then, which developed in the sixteenth century among some thoughtful Europeans concerned with colonial affairs, was connected almost exclusively with the New World. There were no obvious precedents for it. Even in the sixteenth century it had no parallel among Europeans concerned with Africa or Asia, except to a limited extent in connection with missionary activity. What were the peculiar circumstances of New World settlement which favoured this trend of thought and even allowed it, to a limited extent, to influence policy?

Promoters of settlement soon grasped that settlers in the New World ran unprecedented risks. They were much further from home
than any European settlers had ever been before. Distance, it is true, did not make the Indies inaccessible, for sixteenth-century shipping was efficient enough to make the Atlantic crossing regularly with a reasonable expectation of safe arrival. The daunting factor was time. Whenever the settlers got into difficulties—the disappearance of Columbus’ first settlement was a warning not lost on contemporaries—it would take a year at least for news of their plight to reach Europe and for succour to arrive. The difficulty was compounded by unfamiliarity. Europeans had never before tried to settle in the tropics. The West Indies looked inviting—Columbus’ descriptions were idyllic—but none of the familiar basic food crops of Europe would grow there; the settlers did not know how to cultivate the local food crops and—even if they were willing to make the attempt—needed time to learn. The natives might support them, if their numbers were small, but small numbers involved risk of another kind: the natives, weary of constant demands, might—usually did—turn on the intruders. Even while they supplied food, it was unfamiliar, often unpalatable, and probably indigestible to unaccustomed stomachs. At the outset of New World settlement, some promoters thought it enough to send out their settlers with six months’ or a year’s supply of salt beef and biscuit, assuming that by the end of that time they would have become self-supporting, either by growing their own crops or by organizing native tribute or labour. It soon became apparent that in many parts of the New World new settlements might have to be supported for years by shipments from home, especially if the settlers were expected to search for precious metals or pearls. It is not without interest that the Guerra brothers, who exploited the Venezuela pearl fishery so ruthlessly and successfully, were bizcocheros in Triana, and had their first contacts with the New World through a contract to supply ships’ bread to the Hispaniola colony in 1498.

Unusual risks included not only starvation and native hostility, but disease. We are accustomed to the notion of Europeans taking their diseases to America with them and infecting the hapless Indians. So they did, but they also encountered unfamiliar diseases. The hideous verrugas, for example, which afflicted Pizarro’s people on the coast of Ecuador, were (and still are) caused by a local parasite, unknown elsewhere. The modorra, the fatal lethargy which thinned Pedrarias Dávila’s great expedition in 1515, may have been a deficiency disease, afflicting men who had been cooped up on board ship with inadequate food for weeks and then landed at a settlement which, though modestly flourishing, was too small to feed so great a force. Such distempers, like contagious diseases, were a constant accompaniment of New World settlement. Disease was one of the most potent factors affecting life in the Americas throughout the sixteenth century. Though contemporary medical science could do little, no one could accuse the Spanish govern-
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Unprecedented risks incurred by the settlers imposed unprecedented responsibilities on the promoters in the early stages of many New World settlements. Subsequent success, particularly success in the conquest of formidable native populations, imposed a different kind of responsibility, also unprecedented; a responsibility which only government could shoulder effectively. The peoples of the major Amerindian cultures presented to the European mind a series of puzzling contradictions. They were the first significant body of pagans—people, that is, who were neither Christian nor Jew nor Muslim—to fall under European rule. They were ignorant of true religion—so ran the argument—because it had not been revealed to them. Or—since God could not be supposed to be so unjust as deliberately to leave a whole race in darkness—it had been revealed in some ancient time, but in their wanderings in the New World they had forgotten it. They could not be accused, as Jews and Muslims could, of knowing true religion and wilfully rejecting it: their ignorance arose from geographical circumstance, not from contumacy. If they were wicked, as in many ways they clearly were, it was because the devil took advantage of this ignorance. They were not irretrievably committed to the devil; preaching to Indians should prove—did, in fact, prove—an easier and more rewarding task than attempts to convert Muslims. With such high hopes of success, proselytizing was for conscientious Christians an urgent duty.

Similarly with their material well-being. Many of the Indian peoples encountered by Spaniards were at least superficially civilized. They lived in well-organized, orderly communities, with social and moral conventions which, apart from those connected with false religion, commanded the respect of percipient Europeans; yet they made a cult of war—in Mexico at least—and often picked quarrels merely in order to collect captives for sacrifice. When fighting to defend their homeland, they were brave, disciplined, and determined; yet their weapons were so primitive that they were no match for a handful of armed and armoured Spaniards. They were ingenious and assiduous in public works—witness the aqueducts which brought water to Tenochtitlán and the cyclopean masonry of Sacsahuamán; yet they were strikingly deficient in technical devices and lacked many material possessions which to Europeans were familiar and essential: ploughs, wheeled vehicles, domestic animals, seagoing ships. They had gold and silver and were skilled in working them; yet they had no iron, and even bronze was rare among them. They possessed jewellery—pearls, most admired of all jewels in sixteenth-century Europe, were found in plenty on the Main coast, often adorning women who wore nothing else. More sophisti-
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cated peoples, the Mexicans especially, employed highly skilled jewel­
ers; yet none of these peoples were familiar with simple glass. Every­where the impressive social and artistic achievement contrasted dramat­ically with technical backwardness and helplessness. While the combi­nation of wealth and weakness appealed to Spanish cupidity, the combina­tion of native ingenuity and technical ignorance made a cor­responding appeal to the Spanish sense of didactic responsibility. Technical ignorance, like ignorance of true religion, could be attributed to isolation, rather than to stupidity. The Indians appeared to be capable of learning; it was the duty of their new masters to teach them.

Instructions to Spanish colonial officials repeatedly ordered them to press for better—or supposedly better—methods of agriculture, to orga­nize work on roads and bridges, to distribute seed, stock, tools, clothing, even hats—almost everything which Europeans found essential to productive livelihood (firearms and horses always excepted for obvious reasons of security). Indians were to be taught craft skills; were to be encouraged to keep sheep, to spin and weave wool, and so on. They were to be pressed to live in "properly" organized towns, not in scattered hamlets. Determined efforts were made to introduce municipal government of Spanish type in Indian communities. Portuguese policy in Brazil, it is true, was less insistent on these aspects of the duty of government, though there, too, government made dutiful noises. En­glish government in eastern North America, initially at least, was less insistent still—the eastern woodland peoples were unpromising pupils, but even there a sense of didactic responsibility emerged from time to time. Often enough it arose simply from the commercial hope that savages could be persuaded to wear broadcloth, but sometimes it went further. John Archdale advocated an extensive scheme of Indian educa­tion in Carolina. He was one of those who believed that "the Hand of God was eminently seen in thining the Indians, to make room for the English," but on the other hand, he thought the survivors were teach­able and should be taught. In particular, they should be taught that the English "were once such as themselves, but were by a Noble Her­ock Nation reduc’d into a Civiliz’d State."16

The difference between Spaniards and all other Europeans in the rapid growth of a sense of didactic responsibility in the New World is a matter of degree rather than of kind; yet it is striking enough. To some extent it can be attributed to the fact that Spaniards encountered—at least on the mainland, for the islands were a different matter—more sophisticated and more teachable people than other Europeans did; to some extent to the fact that Spaniards before 1492 had had very little experience of overseas colonization. They had played very little part,
for example, in the Levantine Crusades; they had their own crusade at home. To some extent, they applied in America the experience they had gained in continental—one might almost say domestic—colonization in Andalusia and particularly in Granada, where the task of Hispanicizing and Christianizing the Moors appeared, to Isabella and her advisers, a matter of urgency. They soon discovered that the actual methods employed in Granada were inappropriate in America, but a similar didactic urge inspired them in both continents. To some extent, this explains why the Spanish authorities tried to turn Indians into Spaniards, but the English never seriously contemplated trying to turn Indians into Englishmen. A perhaps more powerful consideration is that for more than a hundred years the Spaniards had America virtually to themselves. Early Portuguese settlement in Brazil was sparse and unenthusiastic, and after 1580 Spanish kings ruled Portugal. The Spaniards, once their conquests were completed, were never seriously threatened; they had no real competitors. They were not fighting to maintain a precarious toe-hold, as the Crusaders had done in Palestine, or the Portuguese in Morocco. They were not struggling to keep themselves alive in a threatening wilderness, as the early settlers did in New England. They could afford to argue about whether their policies were right, not merely whether they were expedient. Whether by papal grant, or prior discovery, or conquest, or mere conviction of the fitness of things, the Indies belonged to the crown of Castile. Like any conscientious proprietor, the king of Spain must cherish and develop his estate, must keep a firm hold on his bailiffs and stewards, and must look after his dependents so long as they cultivated their plots efficiently, responded to suggestions intended for their own good, and paid their rent. Rent moreover, must be reasonable and just. In varying degrees, this sense of proprietary responsibility was shared by all who served the king in the Indies. Explicitly or implicitly, it is characteristic of all colonial administration which takes the interest of “natives” into serious account. Anyone who was familiar with the colonial scene in, say, West Africa 20 or 30 years ago must have listened to conversations in which a District Officer boasted that “his” natives were more responsive to suggestion, more anxious to learn and improve their lot, perhaps even (in their primitive fashion) more lovable than the natives of the neighbouring districts. This proprietary, quasi-paternal attitude towards relatively primitive people was common among the more conscientious Spanish officials—though much commoner among those sent from Spain than among those brought up in the Indies—in the sixteenth century. It was almost wholly unknown before the settlement of the New World.
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The Beginnings
of International Law and
General Public Law Doctrine:
Francisco de Vitoria's
De Indiis prior

by Etienne Grisel

Around 1500, two complex developments led to the revival of
an international and, to a lesser degree, general public law
discipline.¹ One was the consolidation of a number of powerful,
independent states in Europe. True, the Continent had seen republics
and kingdoms since the tenth century or even earlier, and many of them
were able to resist subordination to the empire. Yet it was only at the
end of the fifteenth century that they achieved a degree of centralization
which made them almost modern states. The other development was, of
course, the discovery and settlement of the New World.

Both raised legal questions which, at least in crucial respects, were
new. The Greeks and, even more, the Romans had conceived their
relations with foreign nations on an unequal basis. To them, the *jus
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gentium was not so much an international law created by all parties as a branch of internal Roman law governing the relationship between the republic—later the empire—and other peoples. During the Middle Ages, jurists addressed themselves to the question whether the Holy Roman Empire (or the Holy See) had a universal jurisdiction. Many of them affirmed it and concluded that the adoption of an actual law of nations would not only be contrary to the emperor's (or the pope's) rights but would also destroy the unity of the Christian world. Until the end of the fifteenth century, only relatively timid attempts were made to frame a body of international rules, and these almost exclusively concerned war.\(^2\) But as mighty and coequal states were increasingly competitive in the political, economic, and military spheres, their relations had to be subjected to fresh legal principles. Moreover, the discovery of an entirely new continent demanded the solution of many problems concerning the treatment of barbarians, the seizure of their lands, and the law applicable to them.

That evolution was bound to affect especially the Spaniards. On the one hand, they had only recently completed the Reconquista and had, through the marriage of Ferdinand II of Aragon and Isabel of Castile in 1469, unified much of the Iberian peninsula. On the other, they were chiefly responsible for the conquest of America. Most remarkably, however, Spain had an intellectual elite which proved equal to the great material achievements of the time and to the difficulties created by the conquest of the New World, particularly in the law of nations. Indeed, the birth of a modern doctrine of international law is due mainly to the Spaniards.

 Obviously, the discovery of America did not immediately create the need for, and consequently lead directly to, the formation of modern international law. The question here is unusually complex, for it concerns a whole body of law. Further, one must resist the natural temptation to exaggerate and to attribute to the discovery of the New World the sixteenth century's major innovations in all areas of human thought. Still, it is clear that one direct effect of the discovery on the elaboration of international law was the work written by Francisco de Vitoria on the lawfulness of the war waged by the Spaniards against the Indians. This masterpiece, called De Indiis prior, is regarded as one of the first theoretical contributions to the law of nations.

Francisco was born at an unknown date (probably around 1480), and his family name is also unknown.\(^3\) According to the custom of his religious order, he later took the name of his birthplace, Vitoria, capital of the province of Avala. His parents brought him as a child to Burgos, where he was received by the Dominican order, which had been, since
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its foundation in the early thirteenth century, devoted to preaching and hence to the study of theology. He spent several years at the convent of St. Paul in Burgos and in 1507, after his novitiate, was sent to Paris. He stayed there for 15 years, first as a student, then as a teacher at the College of Santiago, which was attached to the Sorbonne. Although the quality of this school is disputed, Vitoria did acquire wide knowledge and became acquainted with a number of humanists, which later enabled him to win the admiration and affection of Erasmus. In 1522, he became the first regent of St. Gregory, another college of the Preachers, in Valladolid. Because of his experience and his reputation as a professor, in 1526 the students unanimously elected him to the foremost chair of theology at the University of Salamanca, a position traditionally held by famous theologians. He taught there until his death in 1546. One of his students at Salamanca was Domingo de Soto, who was later to take an active part in the great controversy on the lawfulness of the conquest of America.

His lectures have reached posterity only in part. First published at Lyon in 1557, 12 Relectiones theologicae were public dissertations, given outside the framework of ordinary classes and collected by his students. As their title shows, they bear chiefly on theological questions. However, they also treat more earthly matters, for two relectiones treat the legal implications of the action taken by the Spaniards in the New World: the fourth, called De Indiis prior, studies the titles by which America could have come under Spanish rule. The fifth, known as De Indiis posterior, elaborates the principles pertaining to the law of war, in particular the just causes for war, the measures which may be taken during the fighting, and the legal consequences of military conflict.

The First Lecture on the Indians was delivered in 1539. At the time, Vitoria was already a renowned scholar, often consulted by Emperor Charles V on problems of conscience. But the debate over the propriety of the American conquest gave him an occasion to develop a largely new theory on the law of nations.

DE INDIIS PRIOR

The First Relectio on the Indians Lately Discovered expressly purports to discuss the question "whether the children of unbelievers may be baptized against the wishes of their parents" (116), but it goes far beyond that purely theological matter. It is divided into three well-balanced parts. In the first section, Vitoria asks whether there were true princes among the Indians and whether they were true owners of their lands before the Spaniards arrived. The second section bears on seven
alleged titles gained from the Spanish conquest which Vitoria deems illegitimate. The third section is devoted to the study of eight possibly "lawful titles whereby the aborigines of America could have come into the power of Spain" (150).

THE INDIANS' DOMINION OVER THEIR LANDS

At the outset, Vitoria acknowledges that it might seem "useless and futile" to inquire by what right the Indians came under Spanish sway, since the kings who occupied the Indies were just and scrupulous, and since they knew what their rights were. Debates over matters either impossible or necessary or obvious would not be Christian.

When, however, some project is on foot concerning which there is a genuine doubt whether it be good or bad, just or unjust, it is then advantageous to take advice and to deliberate and to abstain from premature action before finding out and determining how far it is or is not lawful. . . . Accordingly, when, in a doubtful case, the doer omits to take the advice of the wise, he is without excuse . . . because he is acting contrary to the conscience which he ought to have. (117)

In fields which concern his salvation, "a man is bound to yield credence to the teachers appointed by the Church, and in a doubtful matter their ruling is law" (117), as the Old and New Testaments say. Cardinal Cajetan is wrong in sustaining a somewhat different view. Accordingly, Vitoria establishes three propositions: first, in dubious matters, a man must seek the advice of the wise; second, if they say the project is unlawful, he is to follow their opinion, or otherwise be without excuse; third, if the wise accept the thing as lawful, the man is safe, "even if it be otherwise unlawful" (119). Vitoria firmly believes that the question of the Indies is indeed doubtful, for "we hear of so many massacres, so many plunderings of otherwise innocent men, so many princes evicted from their possessions and stripped of their rule" (119). Further, he thinks that this problem must not be solved only by jurists, for since the barbarians "were not in subjection by human law [see page 316], it is not by human, but by divine law that questions concerning them are to be determined" (119). Consequently, the discussion is "well worth the trouble," concerns human conscience, and must be led by the Church.

Quite logically, Vitoria asks whether the Indians were true owners in both private and public law and whether they had true princes before the arrival of the Spaniards. On the one side, "the people in question were in peaceable possession of their goods" (120) and must therefore be treated as legitimate owners, unless the contrary is shown. On the other side, he maintains that the aborigines could be regarded as mere
slaves before the conquest for two different reasons, either because they were nonbelievers, or because they were "witless or irrational." He studies these two possible arguments separately.

Some—including Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun, authors of the *Defensor pacis*, John Wycliffe, and Armachanus—have written that grace is the sole title to dominion and those in mortal sin have no ownership over anything. Although Vitoria admits that their opinion is founded on citations of the Bible, he advances the proposition that in accordance with a decision by the Council of Constance, mortal sin does not hinder true dominion, and he develops eight proofs drawn from the Bible and from the Doctors of the Church. The last proof seems decisive: "In the same way that God makes His sun to rise on the good and on the bad and sends His rain on the just and on the unjust, so also He has given temporal goods alike to good and to bad" (122). Citing St. Thomas Aquinas and Holy Scripture, Vitoria further denies that under divine law ownership may be lost by reason of nonbelief. As for human law, he recalls that "a heretic incurs confiscation of his property from the day of the commission of his offense" (124). Still, even if the crime is evident, the fisc cannot seize the property before condemnation; otherwise it would offend divine law and natural law. Since a "heretic continues to be owner in the forum of conscience until he is condemned . . . it follows as a corollary that a heretic may lawfully live of his own property" (124-125). By way of conclusion, the barbarians "can not be barred from being true owners, alike in public and in private law, by reason of the sin of unbelief or any other mortal sin, nor does such sin entitle Christians to seize their goods and lands . . . ." (125).

Then Vitoria asks "whether the Indians lacked ownership because of want of reason or unsoundness of mind" (125). Vitoria admits that irrational creatures, slaves or wild beasts, cannot have dominion either over themselves or over other things because they have no right and therefore suffer no wrong. However, children, who already possess the image of God, can have dominion even before they have the use of reason, since they may be heirs and suffer wrong. The same is true of those afflicted with a perpetual unsoundness of mind. Besides, the Indians "have, according to their kind, the use of reason. This is clear, because there is a certain method in their affairs, for they have polities which are orderly arranged and they have definite marriage and magistrates, overlords, laws, and workshops, and a system of exchange, all of which call for the use of reason; they also have a kind of religion" (127). It is not their fault that they have been born in sin and "void of baptism." Perhaps they are stupid because of bad and barbarous upbringing, but "even among ourselves we find many peasants who differ little from brutes" (128). Vitoria concludes that before the
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Spaniards came, the aborigines had true dominion in public and private law, and that private persons and princes could not be deprived of their lands on the ground that they were not true owners.

SPAIN'S ILLEGITIMATE TITLES OVER AMERICA

The second section deals with seven illegitimate titles which attempt to deliver the aborigines of the New World into the power of the Spaniards.

The emperor as lord of the world. The king of Spain is also "our present, most Christian emperor," who would have jurisdiction over the whole world, including the barbarians. Those favoring such a claim refer to the Old and the New Testament, and they reason that things outside nature should imitate natural things; therefore, the world ought to have one governor, just as there is one God. Vitoria notes that dominion can be founded only on natural, divine, or human law. But as Aquinas said, no one had dominion over the world by natural law. In regard to divine law, it is not established that emperors ever were lords over the entire earth. Rather, Genesis shows that the world has always been divided into different kingdoms. Further, Vitoria denies that Christ granted all temporal powers to the emperor, as He vested the spiritual power in the pope. Even if Christ was temporal lord of the world (which indeed He was not, since He said: "My kingdom is not of this world"), there is no mention in the Bible that He bequeathed His power to the emperor. Finally, Vitoria recalls that the Roman empire itself was at one time separated into Eastern and Western, and that both emperors were recognized by the Church as lawful lords. "Also, the kingdom of Spain is not subject to the emperor, nor is France" (133). Now, in point of human law, the emperor is not master of the world, since "either this would be by the sole authority of some law, and there is none such; or, if there were, it would be void of effect, inasmuch as law presupposes jurisdiction. If, then, the emperor had no jurisdiction over the world before the law, the law could not bind one who was not previously subject to it" (134). Nor has the emperor received such power by exchange, by purchase, by just war, by election, or by any other title. Therefore, his alleged dominion over the entire world is no ground to justify the seizure of the Indies.

The pope as temporal monarch of the whole world. Some claim that the pope could make the kings of Spain sovereign over the Indians, and that, even if he could not do that, "at any rate if these aborigines refused to recognize the temporal power of the pope over them, this would warrant him in making war on them and in putting rulers over them" (135). Vitoria rejects the idea that the pope is civil or temporal lord of the entire earth in the proper sense of the words "lordship" and "civil power," either by natural, human, or divine law. Citing Torquemada,
St. Bernard, and his own Relectio de potestate ecclesiastica, he thinks the proof is insufficient. He further reminds his opponents that even they admit that the pope has no spiritual jurisdiction over nonbelievers. How, then, could the pope have temporal dominion over them? And even if he had it, he could not give it to secular princes, because he would thus unlawfully sever it from the office of the supreme pontiff and deprive his successors of their power. Truly enough, the pope has temporal powers “so far as is necessary for the government of things spiritual” (137). When princes are in conflict, he may act as a judge and deliver an opinion which they are bound to respect. As St. Thomas and earlier Doctors held, “on this principle the pope can sometimes depose kings and even set up new kings, as at times has been done” (137). But such is the limit of his power, which is not temporal, over the whole world. Therefore, if the barbarians refuse to recognize his lordship, it is no ground to make war upon them and to seize their property. The same principle is valid if they reject the Christian faith, for nonbelievers may not be compelled by arms to convert.

The Spaniards’ right of discovery. Under the law of nations and natural law, deserted regions become the property of the first occupant, and by virtue of this title, “Columbus the Genoan first set sail” (139). Vitoria rapidly disposes of this argument. Since the rule applies only when lands belong to nobody, it is irrelevant where the barbarians were true owners.

The barbarians’ refusal of the faith of Christ. Some contended that, after being entreated to accept the Christian faith, the aborigines were obliged by the Bible to do so (139), or otherwise could be coerced and have their lands occupied. In support of this assertion, it is said that a prince can force foreign subjects to obey their king and a fortiori can constrain them to obey God. Moreover, if the Indians publicly blasphemed Christ, they could be compelled by war to cease such impious speaking. Vitoria replies to this reasoning with six carefully framed propositions. First, “before the barbarians heard anything about Christianity, they did not commit the sin of unbelief...” (140). This has been denied by William of Paris and Gerson, among others. However, St. Thomas has demonstrated that ignorance cannot be sin, unless there is negligence. Second, when the Christian faith is announced to them, the barbarians are not put under any fresh obligation to believe it by that simple announcement “without miracle or any other proof or persuasion” (143). Where there are no particular signs or other reasons to believe, the Indians commit no sin by not doing so, and it follows that the Spaniards cannot make it a cause to wage war against them. Third, “if the Indians, after being asked and admonished to hear the peaceful preachers of religion, refused, they would not be excused of mortal sin,” for they are bound “at least to hear and to enter into consultation” (144). Fourth, if the Christian faith is demonstrated to the aborigines
with reasonable argument and is accompanied by orderly life, they are obliged to receive that faith under penalty of mortal sin. Fifth, it is not clear to Vitoria that Christianity has been so announced to the aborigines that they are bound to believe it or otherwise commit fresh sin. It rather seems that, instead of being confronted with miracles, they were shown "many scandals and cruel crimes and acts of impiety" (144). Sixth, even if in fact it were not so, there would still be no cause to make war on the Indians, because St. Thomas and other Doctors hold that nonbelievers may not in any way be compelled to receive the faith. Vitoria mentions two convincing reasons to that effect: on the one hand, "belief is an operation of the will"; on the other, "war is no argument for the truth of the Christian faith" (145).

The Indians' commission of sins against nature. Allegedly the aborigines have engaged in cannibalism and "promiscuous intercourse with mother or sisters and with males" (145). Some authors contend that they may be coerced by war to obey the law of nature. Vitoria answers that "Christian princes can not, even by the authorization of the pope, restrain the Indians from sins against the law of nature or punish them because of these sins" (146). Since he is not their lord, the pope may not make law for nonbelievers, nor sit in judgment over them. Even the Old Testament demonstrates that the people of Israel never seized arms against idolaters on the pretext of other mortal sins. Further, the Indians do not know all the laws of nature. Therefore, they cannot be forced to respect them.

The Indians' voluntary acceptance of the king of Spain as their lord. This title is deemed inadequate by Vitoria for two main reasons. First, the aborigines did not know what they were doing, and a decision made from fear or ignorance is not sufficient ground for the seizure of their property. Second, the Indians had lords, whom they could not depose without a reasonable cause; nor had their princes the right to impose a new master without the consent of the populace.

God's grant of the Indians to the Spaniards. Vitoria refrains from discussing this point at any length, "for it would be hazardous to give credence to one who asserts a prophecy against the common law and against the rules of Scripture, unless his doctrine were confirmed by miracles" (148). Besides, the Bible shows that even if God had so decided, it would not necessarily mean that the Spaniards were blameless in conquering the Indies.

Spanish lawful titles over America.

The third section of the De Indiis prior pertains to eight lawful titles whereby the aborigines of America could have come into the power of Spain.
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Natural society and fellowship. First, Vitoria holds that the Spaniards have a right to travel into the Indies, as into any other land, provided they do not harm the natives. That claim arises from the law of nations, which itself derives from natural law. Peaceful journey has always been permissible. It would be unlawful to banish strangers who have committed no fault. To expel them forcefully would even be an act of war. For friendship among peoples and amicable reception of foreigners exist by natural and divine law. If human law contradicted these, "it would be inhumane and unreasonable and consequently would not have the force of law" (152). Further, the sea and running water are public, belonging to all, and the Spaniards may not be kept from them. Finally, the Indians welcome other barbarians and must therefore admit the Spaniards. Second, Vitoria asserts that by the same divine and natural law, neither the Spanish princes nor the Indian lords may hinder the Spaniards from trading among the natives, so long as they do no harm to their country. If, without cause, the aborigines kept the Spaniards from making their profit, they would violate the proverb: "Thou shalt not do to another what thou wouldst not wish done to thyself" (153). Vitoria adds that the Spaniards could not prevent the French from carrying on trade with them. His third proposition, derived from the first two, reads: "If there are among the Indians anything which are treated as common both to citizens and to strangers, the Indians may not prevent the Spaniards from a communication and participation in them" (153). As examples, he mentions digging for gold in land, or fishing for pearls in the sea or a river. Also, things that belong to nobody are acquired by the first occupant according to the law of nations, which originates in natural law or in the consensus of the greater part of the world. Fourth, if children of Spaniards are born in the Indies and their parents have domicile there and they wish to acquire citizenship, they are entitled to it and may not be barred from the advantages enjoyed by other citizens. Under the law of nations, one is a citizen of the state where he is born and of no other state. Further, since refusal to receive strangers is wrong, when a person wishes to acquire a domicile in an Indian state, he must be allowed to do so and have the same rights and obligations as the citizens. Fifth, if the barbarians want to keep the Spanish from enjoying their rights, the Spaniards should first attempt to persuade them and to show them that they did not come to hurt them, but only to travel and sojourn as peaceful guests. If the aborigines still refuse, the Spaniards may defend themselves, build fortresses, and even make war, but only "within the limits of permissible self-protection" and "so far as possible with the least damage to the natives," for those are "timid by nature . . . dull and stupid . . . [and] excusably . . . afraid" (154-155). Besides, Vitoria remarks that "there is no inconsistency, indeed, in holding the war to be a just war on both
sides, seeing that on one side there is right and on the other side there is invincible ignorance” (155). Sixth, if the Spaniards cannot obtain safety after recourse to all other measures, they may seize the Indians’ cities and reduce them to subjection. Seventh, if the Indians persist in their hostility despite the Spaniards’ scrupulosity in deed and in word, they may be treated as enemies, deprived of their goods, and made slaves. In short, provided they have a just cause to wage war against the Indians, the Spaniards can exercise all the rights of war according to the law of nations.

Propagation of Christianity. Vitoria advances four propositions in this regard. First, as a consequence of their right to travel and to do business, Christians are entitled to preach in barbarian lands. This is also necessary for the salvation of the Indians. Second, the pope may entrust such a task to the Spaniards and forbid it to all others. He may even forbid them to trade there, if it would thereby help the propagation of the Christian faith, for “he has power in matters temporal when this would subserve matters spiritual” (156). In the present case, a rush of all Christians into the Indies would create quarrels. Therefore, it is just to reserve for the Spaniards alone the fruits of their investment and discovery. Third, if the Indians allow the Spaniards to preach the Gospel, there is no cause for war whether they receive the Faith or not. But fourth, if they prevent such preaching, the Spaniards, after trying to convince them, may make war, because of the injury done. A second title is thus established for seizing the barbarians’ lands and setting up new lords there. Vitoria personally has no doubt that the use of force was necessary under the given circumstances. Yet he fears that “measures were adopted in excess of what is allowed by human and divine law” (158), and he warns that massacres and spoliations will hinder rather than help the conversion of the Indians.

Friendship of converted natives. If Indian princes attempt to force converted natives to return to idolatry, this justifies the Spaniards, should other methods fail, in making war against these rulers and in deposing them. That title is based upon religion as well as upon human friendship, inasmuch as converted aborigines have become allies of the Christians.

The authority of the pope over Christians. Assuming a large part of the Indians were converted, whether lawfully or not, the pope could, even without a request from them, depose their nonbelieving princes and give them a Christian sovereign, if he had a reasonable cause to fear that under heathen rulers, converts might apostasize or otherwise be harrassed. For St. Thomas teaches that the Church may free Christian slaves from barbarian lords.

Tyranny of the Indian lords. If the native princes adopt tyrannical laws, such as imposing human sacrifice, the Spaniards may stop this practice in order to rescue innocent people from an unjust death. This
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title is derived from the Bible, and it is immaterial whether Indians assent to the oppressive laws and refuse the help of the Spaniards.

True and voluntary choice of the Spanish rule by both the rulers and the ruled. Unanimous consent is not necessary. A majority suffices: “Otherwise naught could be done for the welfare of the State, it being difficult to bring all to the same way of thinking” (160).

War among the Indians. As the Indians themselves wage lawful wars, the side which suffered a wrong may summon the Spaniards to help and share the rewards of victory with them. To expand their empire, the Romans used that method, which is approved by St. Augustine and St. Thomas. Protection of friends and allies is a just cause of war and thus a title “whereby the Indians and their lands could have come or might have come into the possession and the lordship of Spain” (160).

The inability of the Indians to found or administer a lawful state. Vitoria brings to discussion this doubtful title, without affirming it but without entirely condemning it. He recalls that the aborigines have no liberal or mechanical arts, no proper laws or magistrates of the standard required by human and civil claims. He thus finds some strength in the contention that the Spaniards might undertake the administration of the Indians’ country and give them governors for their own benefit.

In conclusion, Vitoria asks whether travel to and trade with the Indies should be stopped, if none of the titles put forward are valid—for instance, because the natives give no cause for a just war. He gives a negative answer for three reasons: first, there would be no need to stop trade, since the Indians regard many of their commodities as superfluous, as ownerless, or as common to all. Second, there would probably be no diminution in the amount of the royalties, since the king of Spain could continue levying taxes on the gold brought away from the Indians. Third, the Spanish sovereign may not wash his hands of the fate of these lands, now that there are already so many converts.

QUESTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AND GENERAL PUBLIC LAW

We must attempt to throw some light on the main innovations in Vitoria’s thought, and to inquire into the possible influence which the discovery of America had on him and therefore on the beginnings of an international law doctrine. Interestingly enough, the most important problems not only relate to the law of nations, but concern constitutional law in the wider sense, as well.

INTERNATIONAL LAW

The applicable law. In conformity with the tradition of the Church, Vitoria declares three different kinds of laws applicable to the various titles alleged by the Spaniards to support their claims over the Indies.
Those are: divine law, natural law, and human law. Though he does not always clearly separate the three, he seems to regard them as distinguishable. Still, he refrains from defining them, despite the fact that their characterization is by no means obvious. Roughly, he might have said that divine law consists of rules laid down by God’s will, that is to say, by the Bible as interpreted by the Church; natural law comprises fundamental principles of human nature derived either from God’s commands or from reasoning; human law encompasses statutes, contracts, and customs adopted by men living in community.  

Since Vitoria’s study bears on a conflict between two formerly unrelated peoples, human law can play no important role in his argumentation. Indeed, it remains continually in the background, if not altogether absent from the debate. One probable effect of America’s early settlement on the beginnings of the international law doctrine may well have been to reduce the part of human law in the writers’ minds. If the first main works on the law of nations had been devoted to questions exclusively pertaining to the relations between European countries, strictly human law—notably treaties concluded and customs observed by coequal princes—might have been taken more significantly into account.

The same circumstance could have had another important effect, namely, a greater emphasis on natural law as an independent, rationally constructed body of rules, to the detriment of divine law. Considering that the Indians were heathen, Vitoria could have concluded that divine law was not, as such, applicable to them, and that only new principles would be relevant, merely on the ground that they were reasonable and in accordance with human nature at large. However, this evolution did not take place. As it had previously been, natural law remained with Vitoria and afterward an undetermined concept, strongly dependent upon divine law. Some 70 years later, Suárez still frequently confused “eternal” law and “natural” law. Only Grotius, and especially his followers Pufendorf and Thomasius, developed a law of nature which was completely autonomous, relying neither on theology, reduced to a pure science of religious matters, nor on morals, regarded as ethics meant solely for the individual. To Vitoria, divine law, moral philosophy, and natural law are still interconnected.

Moreover, at the outset of his First Lecture on the Indians, he stresses that the lawfulness of the Spanish enterprise in America, being a doubtful question of conscience, must be ascertained by the Church in accordance with divine law (119). He even cites that body of law to sustain the first five rightful titles for the seizure of the Indies: the right of communication between the natives and the Spaniards, as well as the latter’s right to preach the Gospel and the former’s obligation to listen, are explicitly based upon divine and natural law, both having the same
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origin and content. The third and fourth just titles, relating to the help which Christian princes and the pope himself may grant to converted aborigines, are also grounded solely upon "religion" and the teaching of the Church. Finally, under the fifth title, the Spaniards are justified directly by the Bible in stopping the Indian princes from enforcing tyrannical laws.

Still, the application of divine law does not necessarily run counter to the barbarians' interests. While having recourse to religious principles, Vitoria displays towards heathen people a remarkable degree of tolerance, which he probably would not show to Protestants, and which thus may well be labeled an important impact of the discovery of the New World. Not only does Vitoria firmly refuse to believe that the Indians were easily delivered into Spain's hands by God, he also holds that nonbelief by ignorance is no sin, that a heretic may have true ownership over his lands, that barbarians are not bound to adopt the Christian faith unless they are presented with miracles or other proofs, and that they may not be forced to convert. Vitoria undoubtedly understood, at least partially, the position of the Indians and, as a result, he laid down rules which were astonishingly liberal for the time. Therefore, they can accurately be described as nearly immediate consequences of the conquest of America.

As to the choice of the rules of law applicable to the questions he discusses, Vitoria demonstrates two contrasting tendencies. On the one hand, he treats the problem as one of theology and refers essentially to divine law for its solution; he even goes back to the use of the rather deductive scholastic method, established in the thirteenth century, and relies heavily on the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, so much so that the Thomistic revival is chiefly attributed to the Master of Salamanca. Yet he is not merely a traditionalist faithful to earlier Doctors of the Church, for he tried to adjust their doctrine to the particular needs of the situation he faced. Considering the Conquest of America, Vitoria resisted the temptation simply to approve a Christian victory over heathen people, thus implicitly rejecting the "politics of power," as advocated—for example—in Machiavelli's Prince, which was certainly unknown to him. In agreement with Erasmus and Vives, Vitoria developed a theory of divine and natural law applicable to international relations which was not only compatible with the mystical trends in Christopher Columbus and many of his followers, but also appeared as reasonable to Charles V's ideals of chivalry and his declared intention to have the Gospel peacefully preached in barbarian lands, and heathen people well treated and quietly converted to the Christian faith.

The Indians' de facto and legal status. By the conquest of America the Spaniards became acquainted with people who were previously unknown to them. Thus Europeans had to examine afresh their relations
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with natives of other continents. Until the end of the fifteenth century, their experience in this respect (apart from invasions) had been twofold. With Asians, they had had commercial ties which had remained too loose to become truly political. With Turks and Saracens, they had had wars which were of an entirely different nature than those Spain waged against the Indians: either they were Crusades in the Holy Land, or defensive actions against invading Arabs. Of course, the Spaniards, their lands long occupied by the Moors, had played a major role in the latter sort of conflict and had only recently reconquered their own land. Their situation being quite the opposite in America, they were bound to get a new perception of "barbarians."

As Professor Elliott points out, Europeans had a mixed inheritance which encouraged a dual classification of mankind. According to the Judeo-Christian tradition, "the fundamental division along religious lines was between Christian and heathen." But the Renaissance also revived the thought of ancient philosophers, who had distinguished between Greeks and barbarians. As to the former distinction, the criterion used was religion, or receptivity to grace; as to the latter, it was civilization, or rationality.

Vitoria addresses himself with an open mind to these long-debated questions. As has been seen, he does not give excessive weight to the fact that Indians are heathen. He denies that their born nonbelief is sin and that they are obliged to accept the Christian faith without further proof. He also rejects the idea of an essential superiority of Christians and their right to punish idolatry.

On the rationality of the Indians, he has nuanced, if not altogether uncertain, views. On the one hand, he describes them as having the use of reason. He recognizes that they have a kind of religion, orderly political institutions, a system of marriage, and a system of exchange. On the other hand, he labels them "dull and stupid" and finds some strength in the assertion that they are unable to administer themselves adequately, since they have no liberal or mechanical arts, no proper laws and magistrates. In short, although probably well-informed about the facts by his former pupils established on the American continent, Vitoria feels unsure in his conclusion and abstains from definite judgment, which of itself shows a remarkable respect for different peoples' intelligence and customs.

His tolerance towards alleged Indian crimes is even more noticeable and, since it influenced his followers, it may be regarded as an important, though perhaps paradoxical, impact of the discovery of the New World on European thinking. He considers the aborigines' cannibalism and incest serious crimes, but admits that the law of nature is relative and sometimes difficult to prove: "We certainly possess clearer proofs whereby to demonstrate that the law of Christ is from God and is
true than to demonstrate that fornication is wrong or that other things which are also forbidden by natural law are to be shunned” (117). However, he also maintains that the Spaniards are entitled to prevent the Indian lords from enforcing tyrannical laws, such as those which impose human sacrifices. When statutes or customs in a country violate universal moral principles, Vitoria holds that foreign princes may exercise a right of intervention in order to restore the lawful order.

It would be wrong to think that this idea was new at the time or to see it as the result of the conquest of America. On the contrary, such theory had been accepted throughout the Middle Ages, was abandoned by later writers of the school of natural law, especially by Vattel, and was finally revived in the nineteenth century. But behind it lay an important thought, also inherited from St. Thomas: the community of mankind, to which all human peoples belong, is composed of rational individuals. Enhanced—if not brought about—by the discovery of the Indies, this notion was developed by Suárez and his successors.

During the bitter, complex controversy between defenders of the Indians (especially Las Casas, who found them equal to the Christians and unobliged to convert) and apologists of the colonization (Sepúlveda in particular, who deemed the barbarians inferior and considered their lack of faith a just cause of war), Vitoria was able to advance well-balanced propositions. Indeed, he made a compromise between the conflicting claims. On the one hand, he admitted that the natives were not irrational beings and, as a significant consequence, that they were true owners of their land before the Spaniards arrived. On the other, he stressed a community of all nations, as well as a body of divine and natural law which can be enforced through the intervention of one state against another, if the latter has violated the universally applicable rules and if there is no other way to restore the rightful order.

The right of communication and its consequences. Machiavelli saw the state as the principal, in fact exclusive, political community; to him, individuals are and should be heavily dependent on their Prince, whose power need not have constitutional limits. On the contrary, Vitoria conceived a world where men were treated as largely autonomous social, political, even economic creatures free to communicate among themselves without hindrance from their respective lords. While the latter views obviously affected internal public law, they also had effects on the rules governing international relations.

Vitoria believed that the first (and chief) lawful title for the seizure of America was that of “natural society and fellowship.” By divine and natural law, humans must be friendly to each other, love their neighbours as themselves, receive strangers, visitors, and pilgrims. Solidarity between men is not only commanded by God, but also essential to their nature and often necessary for their survival. Any human statute
violating these principles would be unreasonable and unenforceable. From the premise of the community of mankind, an idea which was largely influenced by the discovery of America, Vitoria thus derived the right of communication. In turn, the latter title had numerous consequences, many of which are direct and indirect results of the same event.

First, individuals have a right to travel and to sojourn abroad. That idea, which was not really new at the time, entails both a claim to emigrate and to establish a domicile in any country. Second, children born in a foreign state are entitled to its citizenship if they wish to acquire it; it must be noted that Vitoria is unfaithful here to the classical tradition of the *jus sanguinis* and lays down the foundation for the *jus soli* maxim, which in the future would have a much greater impact on America itself than on continental Europe. Third, foreigners must have the same rights and obligations of citizens; this formula of equal protection strikes a modern note. Fourth, men have a natural right to trade, which princes may not deny either to their own subjects or to strangers; the idea that such reciprocal rights rest on the law of nature and do not depend on any formal treaty later was eventually abandoned by the doctrine and practice of international law. Fifth, the sea and running water, including the ports, are public, therefore available to everybody. Against the claim of various powers, among which were Venice, Sweden, England, and Spain itself, Vitoria affirms the principle of the freedom of the seas; the ultimate victory of this principle may be described as a remote consequence of America’s discovery. Yet he does not devote much attention to the problem which caused, in the following decades, the celebrated controversy between Spanish, English, and Dutch writers. Sixth, activities that are regarded as common to the natives and to foreigners, such as digging for gold or fishing for pearls, must be open equally to all strangers.

In sum, Vitoria’s theory, at the same time generous and favourable to the welfare of individuals, but dangerous to the independence of peoples and detrimental to the sovereignty of the states, is largely due to a truly new global conception of world relations.

The notion of a just war and its lawful effects. This question deserves to be dealt with in detail, because of its complexity. But it is enough to outline the Vitorian doctrine on the subject, in order to determine the impact of America’s discovery. The Second Lecture on the Indians, known as the *Relectio de Indiis posterior*, is dedicated to the law of war. Citing the New Testament, Vitoria holds that a Christian state may wage war and that Christian individuals may engage in military service. He then attempts to define the grounds for lawful war. Fundamentally, he thinks that all just wars have their basis in a serious injury suffered, which can be either an attack calling for a defensive action, or another wrong also justifying offensive fighting. The rightful side must always seek peace.
and security as its ultimate goal, refrain from any inhuman measures, such as killing children or innocent people, limit its booty to the amount necessary to compensate for injury, and occupy lands militarily only if indispensable.

At Vitoria’s time, the law of war was probably—and understandably—the most developed part of international law. This is why only a few of his ideas can be traced to the conquest of the Indies. However, here as elsewhere, as a result of his disinterested, even charitable mind, and his attention to other authors, notably St. Thomas and Gratian, he contributes to the evolution of a reasonable, yet practicable and realistic, set of principles.

GENERAL PUBLIC LAW

The extent of the pope’s jurisdiction. On the subject of ecclesiastical and other powers, the Dominican professor published several lectures. He holds that both spiritual and temporal governments are perfect and self-sufficient, that they must be placed side by side, and that the Holy Father may only interfere in the kings’ actions through his religious authority. Remarkably, he applies these principles strictly to the question of America’s conquest. He rejects all excessive claims, saying that the pope is neither the temporal monarch of the entire earth, nor its spiritual master; even if he were, he could not delegate his power to princes, but ought to retain it, so as to leave it to his successors. Then, Vitoria draws the distinction between the two main sorts of jurisdiction. The pope’s spiritual competence extends only to Christians, as opposed to nonbelievers; he may not make laws for heathen people or sit in judgment upon them. As to his temporal jurisdiction, it exists merely so far as is necessary for the control of religious matters. Three consequences follow the latter proposition: first, he may arbitrate between princes in case of conflict; although Vitoria is not explicit on this point, he seems to think that the sovereign pontiff does not need to be asked for his opinion by the parties in the contest, since he is allowed to depose kings and set up new lords, “as at times has been done.” Second, he can entrust the preaching of the Christian faith in America to the Spaniards and even give them a monopoly if the presence of others would impair the barbarians’ conversion; he thus has the right to prevent a third country from trading with the Indians if he deems it necessary for the achievement of his spiritual goals. Third, he is entitled to depose heathen lords as soon as a large part of their subjects are converted if he fears the converts might suffer or apostatize under nonbelieving rulers.

After all, Vitoria’s conception of the pope’s influence, while rather nuanced and objective, still emphasizes the role to be played by the Holy See in the conversion of the Indians. His theory is by no means
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detrimental to the papal power. In reality, the authority attributed to the pope remains considerable, to the point that it somewhat contradicts other Vitorian ideas, notably that of a natural law applicable to independent and equal nations. It may therefore be said that the discovery of America influenced the beginnings of the international law doctrine in a sense not unfavorable to the pope's claims. However, this impact did not last, for later writers soon denied the pope any universal temporal rule.

The kings' relations with their own and other peoples. This question, though not directly belonging to international law, must be dealt with briefly, because Vitoria's answers to it are quite original. During the Renaissance, political theory had to address itself afresh to the long abandoned problem of the relationship between princes and their peoples. It gained a new actuality as a result of restored royal authority. The writers' response to that recent evolution was diverse, and it is tempting to draw a contrast between Machiavelli, who emphasized the autonomy of each state, gave most of his attention to the ruler (at least in The Prince), and abstained from condemning the forceful seizure of power; and Vitoria, who asserted a wide-ranging right of communication between the nations, was chiefly interested in the people, and insisted that their consent is necessary to legitimize monarchic power. Both had their followers as well as their critics, and both influenced the evolution of public law doctrine. But, here, only the impact of America's conquest is relevant, and it obviously was much greater on the theologian of Salamanca than on the Florentine Secretary.

In the De Indiis prior and in other works, Vitoria assumes that the authority of a kingly dynasty relies on a contract between its founder and the subjects. Thereafter, heredity prevails. Thus, a prince cannot resign by his own decision and impose a new, foreign lord without the consent of the people. Nor can the people depose their king, except for a reasonable cause, which Vitoria unfortunately does not define. In order to alter the course of things, and to establish a new political rule, an agreement is necessary between the present and the future prince and a majority of citizens. Unanimity among the latter is not requested: otherwise no change would ever be possible. However, Vitoria deems indispensable that the people's election of a lord be voluntary and exempt from any exterior pressure. He doubts that these strict conditions were met when certain Indians chose the king of Spain, because the aborigines perhaps did not understand their own decision or did not have sufficient freedom of choice. That is why he accepts in principle a true and voluntary choice made by the Indians as a rightful title, but he also mentions it among the unlawful titles, since he finds that, in fact, the legal requirements are not fulfilled.

As for the relationship between populace and kings, the discovery of America seems to have had a twofold impact. On the one hand,
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although the military occupation of the Indies resulted in some rebellions against the Spanish crown, the conquest strengthened the overall authority of the kings over their subjects and particularly over the Church, but not so much abroad as at home. The continuation of the trend towards an absolute monarchy, at least in Spain, is traced by some to the practices in the government of the American provinces. On the other hand, the same events caused a part of the political doctrine to place severe limitations on the princes’ power. That is particularly true of Vitoria, who not only admitted that the royal rule originated in the peoples’ consent or was otherwise illegitimate, but also alleged that the government may not prevent the citizens from trading with foreigners, thus laying down the foundations for the freedom of commerce.

CONCLUSION

The discovery of America was one of several events that caused the revival of an international and public law doctrine in the beginning of the sixteenth century. Yet it is extremely difficult to determine its exact impact on the content of many legal principles laid down at the time, for adoption of a rule of law is always due to an unlimited number of circumstances.

The most immediate effect of the discovery was clearly to pose new problems, which needed to be solved not only by human law, but, above all, according to divine and natural law. Hence theologians played a major role in the controversy over the legality of the seizure of the Indies. Vitoria’s De Indiis prior was the first important work devoted to this subject. It has been diversely appraised by later authors: most have underlined its objective and idealistic background; others have found it too legalistic, even hair-splitting. It is not the purpose of this essay to pass judgment on the Vitorian theory. Let it suffice to say that the Dominican displays a remarkable balance between sympathy and charity towards the Indians and an acute sense for the practical necessities of Spain’s policies as a new world power. In 1539, Vitoria must have been aware that the colonization of America would go on, whether it was held legal or not. He thus found it reasonable to justify the conquest with a number of legal arguments. But he framed them in such a way that none had an absolute effect. All lawful titles analyzed by Vitoria are conditional: their effect depends on the manner in which the conquerors behave themselves. In sum, he reaches a compromise between a realistic approach, which has him conclude that the colonization may be a rightful project in principle, and idealistic views, which make him admonish the Spaniards that this particular conquest will be legal only if they treat the Indians properly and convert them peacefully.

As for the impact of the discovery of America on modern international and public law doctrine, numerous propositions may be advanced with various degrees of certainty. First, partially because preach-
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ing the Gospel was its chief declared aim, the Conquest had the effect of emphasizing the part attributed to divine law as the foundation of the law of nations, at the expense of strictly human law. Moreover, it did not, contrary to what could have been expected, result in drawing a clear distinction between divine and natural law. Second, the discovery of people formerly unknown to them encouraged an admirable tolerance among certain European thinkers towards heathen people; Vitoria demonstrates an understanding for the Indians which he probably would not have for Saracens or Protestants. The same circumstance also brought about a kind of respect for other, different civilizations; of course, this did not prevent Vitoria from admitting that Spanish princes are entitled to keep the Indian lords from enforcing tyrannical, inhumane laws. Third, the exploration of the New World enhanced the notion of a community of mankind, which had already been familiar to earlier Doctors of the Church, especially St. Thomas, but received a larger meaning and more definite legal consequences in the De Indiis prior: that is, there was not only the right of intervention, but also a right of communication between individuals which could not be hindered by princes; there was, further, the right to emigrate, to travel, to sojourn and acquire domicile abroad, to receive the citizenship of the state where one is born; finally, there was the principle of the freedom of the seas. Fourth, the military conquest of the Indies caused scholars concerned with international law doctrine, Vitoria in particular, to develop the already existing law of war on a practicable, yet charitable, basis. Fifth, as a corollary of his conception of a divine and natural law between nations, Vitoria—like later writers—was led to reject the emperor’s claim to universal jurisdiction. Sixth, the exploration of the new continent did emphasize the pope’s influence so far as the Indians’ conversion was concerned, but it did not reinforce the Holy See’s pretensions to universal temporal power, except for matters which are at least partially spiritual. Seventh, America’s conquest resulted in fresh consideration of the relationship between the people and their king, leading the public law doctrine to consider limitations on the rapidly growing royal authority. That may well have been, in terms of law, its most promising and lasting impact.
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Medieval

Canonistic Origins of the
Debate on the Lawfulness of
the Spanish Conquest

by Robert L. Benson

Among Renaissance scholars during the past half-century and more, medieval historians have acquired a reputation as imperialists. The Renaissance scholars are right. In their recurrent revolts against the tradition which we may still associate with Jacob Burckhardt's name, medievalists have adopted one of two strategies: either they have claimed that the Middle Ages significantly anticipated, or even constituted a part of, the Renaissance, or else they have argued that significant aspects of the Renaissance remained essentially medieval.¹ In a larger sense, the differences between these two strategies are probably neither interesting nor important, for it is reasonably clear that the two arguments have the same net effect: both tend to emphasize similarities between Middle Ages and Renaissance, both tend to blur or even erase the boundaries separating the two periods.

When one examines Las Casas' doctrines on the legitimacy of Spanish dominion in the New World,² or Vitoria’s theories on the
juridical problems created by the Spanish conquest and his contribution to the beginnings of international law, one is impressed by the role that intellectuals could play in political affairs during the early and mid-sixteenth century, as well as by the intimate links between the academy and the court. Without wishing to deny the inherent importance and interest of such debates, however, a medievalist may view these themes from a somewhat different perspective—and it will be immediately apparent that this perspective belongs to the “revolt of the medievalists” which has just been mentioned. For a scholar specializing in the Latin Middle Ages, three major developments will inform his perspective: First, he may wish to see the origins of international law in the discussions by twelfth- and thirteenth-century jurists on empire and monarchy, that is, on political universalism and limited or unlimited sovereignty, as well as on just (or unjust) war and on the relations between princes. But since the medieval origins of modern sovereignty and diplomacy have little to do with the New World’s impact on the Old, we need not pursue the topic here. Second, the rebirth of scientific jurisprudence—of Roman and especially of canon law—in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries created the juristic preconditions for an international law. Third, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Europeans had already experienced, on a relatively restricted scale, a major confrontation with peoples who differed in language, culture, and especially religion. In this regard, Crusaders were the first Europeans to face the particular problems which the Indians of the New World posed for the Spaniards.

I should like to argue here that a substantial segment of the eventual law among nations, of international law, emerged from the law that was created for the crusading movement in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. By itself, needless to say, crusading law would not have sufficed to create the foundations of the proto-international law of the early sixteenth century. But the tradition that derived from crusading law furnished a central segment, perhaps the central segment, of that early international law. With this argument, in short, I want to claim some parts of Vitoria’s thought for the Middle Ages.

Within the complexity of Vitoria’s thought, one can discern several large questions which were crucial not only for him but also for the other great Dominicans—for Las Casas, most notably, and for Sepúlveda as well—who engaged in the great debate on Spain’s relation to the Indians: first, whether the Indians had natural rights to their property; second, whether the native government of the Indians could be legitimate; and third, under what circumstances the Spaniards could wage war against them and subjugate them. The other questions—the role of the pope in sanctioning such a war, for example—were subsidiary to these central problems. Each of these questions had, of course, a long
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history, and I can point out here only one strand of that history, a small strand but one which will represent the others.

In 1200, Pope Innocent III issued a decretal letter which we know, from its opening words, as Quod super his. It regulated delays in carrying out, and dispensations from, crusading vows. But, as often happened in the later Middle Ages, the commentators found other issues, far from Innocent III’s intention, in this decretal. In fact, it became the classic text provoking commentators to discuss the legitimacy of the infidel’s right to hold property and to exercise dominion, to govern himself legitimately, in short. A half century after Innocent III, the two greatest commentators of the thirteenth century both wrote long glosses on Quod super his: Pope Innocent IV (himself as great a jurist as Innocent III), and Cardinal Hostiensis.

The question was (here, the background of Vitoria’s central questions is obvious): Can a non-Christian exercise secular power legitimately? And can he exercise it legitimately over Christians? Innocent IV replies that it is not only Christians but, in fact, all rational creatures who have the full right to own property and to exercise political authority. All men, moreover, including non-Christians, have the natural right to choose their own rulers. This legal principle corresponds to—and, for Las Casas, was justified by—a twelfth-century Romano-canonical maxim of great influence: Quod omnes tangit ab omnibus comprobetur (what touches all should be approved by all). Consequently, the Roman pontiff does not have the right to deprive non-Christians of their property or non-Christian rulers of their rulership.

Still, Innocent IV was too much of a hierocrat to deny the lofty claims that were, by then, traditional in the papacy. The pope, he asserted, possesses a kind of universal authority over all men. This authority enables him to prevent the abuse of power by a non-Christian ruler over Christian subjects. But in Innocent IV’s opinion, even this papal power was limited: where infidels have conquered lands once held by Christians, the pope can depose the infidel ruler only if the infidel ruler is oppressing Christians. Nor are Christian soldiers lawfully entitled to attack non-Christian rulers, unless that is the only way to prevent the persecution of Christians.

Innocent posed another question: If an infidel population becomes converted to Christianity but their ruler remains an infidel, does the ruler legitimately continue to exercise authority over his newly converted Christian subjects? Innocent’s reply to this question was complex: The Holy Land, he pointed out, had once belonged to Christians but had been conquered by infidels. Therefore, the infidels held only a de facto title, not a de iure one, and consequently the Christians had a legitimate right to recapture it in a crusade. But could one use the same argument to show that the pagans had a right to reclaim Italy, which had once
been pagan? No, replied Innocent, since both the emperors and their subjects had been converted to Christianity in the fourth century, and consequently the Christian emperors were the de iure as well as the de facto heirs of the pagan emperors. Hence there could be no legitimate pagan crusade to recapture Italy.

Innocent IV was certainly not enthusiastic over the prospect of non-Christians ruling over Christians. But unless a non-Christian ruler persecuted the Christians, Innocent could find no ground in law for depriving him of rights of property and governance. In short, Innocent recognized fully—at least until the interests of the Christian religion were threatened—the theoretical legitimacy of an infidel ruler’s authority. 14

Innocent IV’s contemporary, the great jurist Hostiensis, did not agree. Hostiensis denied the legitimacy of any political authority exercised by non-Christian rulers, and apparently he meant to deny even the authority of non-Christian rulers ruling over non-Christians. 15 As a possible exception, Hostiensis conceded that a non-Christian ruler who recognized the lordship of the papacy might get a kind of toleration, though not actual legitimacy of rule. In the case of a non-Christian ruling over Christians, the dominion could never, in Hostiensis’s opinion, be legitimate without papal sanction. 16

Both of these views were explicated and argued over by jurists of succeeding generations. 17 It has been asserted among historians that the view of Hostiensis prevailed, was indeed the characteristic late medieval attitude toward the nonbeliever. In fact, however, more canonists followed Innocent IV’s opinion than Hostiensis’. 18 In the early fourteenth century, for instance, Oldradus de Ponte accepted Innocent IV’s arguments. 19 The great fourteenth-century jurist, Johannes Andreae, began by accepting Hostiensis’s view but in his old age abandoned it and took up Innocent’s recognition of the justice of an infidel ruler’s dominion. 20 By and large, fifteenth-century jurists in their commentaries followed Innocent IV: he had provided the communis opinio. 21

This might well have become—indeed, it was largely—a question of interest only to the schools, to professors and students of law: quite literally, in short, a merely academic question. But at the Council of Constance (1414-18), there were pleadings before the Council against the Teutonic Knights, who were pushing their conquests steadily toward the East. The Lithuanians, who were pressing the suit against the Teutonic Knights, had retained a lawyer—Paulus Vladimiri—who took his argument explicitly from Innocent IV, and argued against Hostiensis. 22 Thus, as we see in the early fifteenth century and again in the first half of the sixteenth century, the debates in the ivory tower could become central arguments in the world of politics and warfare.

It is clear that this tradition was accessible, and known, to Vitoria
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and Las Casas: it furnished one crucial part of their spirited and learned defense of the Indians. Moreover, one could examine other elements in their thought, and one would, for these other themes, find that they were arguing in a juristic tradition at least three centuries old. I cannot trace here the other strands of Vitoria's argument back to their sources in the twelfth- and thirteenth-century jurists' views. But such an inquiry would make an attractive and interesting book.

If all this is true, in what respect are Vitoria and the other Spanish masters of the sixteenth century truly original, in what respect were they the fathers of international law? Clearly, they were not original in the sense that they created these arguments individually out of nothing, nor in the sense that they were the first to put these old canonistic arguments together into a coherent doctrine. Rather, their originality consists, I think, in the fact that they appropriated an old body of argument from the schools, blew the dust off it, rescued it from the ivory tower, and revivified it by bringing it into the public forum and the royal court: these famous Dominicans applied what had been an antiquated theory to the most burning political, legal, and moral problem of Spain in their generation. But in the following generations, Grotius and others studied the dramatic debates of these sixteenth-century Spaniards. Vitoria and his colleagues were remembered, their predecessors largely forgotten.

NOTES

Since most students of the Renaissance, the Discovery, and the Conquest are unlikely to be familiar with recent scholarship on canon law in the Middle Ages, the principal themes of the Conference required attention to the medieval legal background of Las Casas' and Vitoria's thought. Presented here largely as it was delivered, this paper seeks to fill that gap, and to reach that audience. In other words, this study mediates the conclusions of medievalists, but without claims to scholarly originality of its own. For several valuable suggestions, I owe warm thanks to my friend Stephan Kuttner.

1. Wallace K. Ferguson, The Renaissance in Historical Thought: Five Centuries of Interpretation (Boston 1948), esp. Ch. 10 (“Reaction Against the Burckharditian Tradition: The Origins of the Renaissance Thrust Back into the Middle Ages”) and Ch. 11 (“The Revolt of the Medievalists: The Renaissance Interpreted as Continuation of the Middle Ages”).
2. On Las Casas, see Lewis Hanke, in this collection, 1. 363-389.
3. For Vitoria's thought, see Etienne Grisel, in this collection, 1. 305-325.
4. Walther Kienast, Deutschland und Frankreich in der Kaiserzeit (900-1270): Weltkaiser und Einzelkönige (ed. 2, 3 vols. Stuttgart 1974-75) Vol. 2, offers the most recent study of the tension between imperial universalism and national sovereignty in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; on the idea of the just war in this period, see the forthcoming book (Cambridge University Press) by Frederick H. Russell.
5. For orientation on the extensive scholarship concerned with this topic, consult the bibliographies published by the Institute of Medieval Canon Law (Berkeley, California) in Traditio from 1956 to 1970, and annually from 1971 in the Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law.
6. Touching only briefly on the questions discussed here, the recent study by James A. Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law and the Crusader* (Madison 1969), deals primarily with the law governing the crusader as pilgrim and the crusader’s vow; see the review by John W. Baldwin in *Speculum* 46 (1971) 131-133. The book by Frederick H. Russell (n. 4 above) will pertain more directly to the present inquiry.

7. It soon appeared under the title “De voto et voti redemptione” in the *Compilatio tertia* (3.26.4), and a quarter of a century later in the *Decretales* of Gregory IX (X 3.34.8), which furnished its text to Innocent IV, Hostiensis, and subsequent commentators.

8. On the central issues in this decretal, see Brundage (n. 6 above) 77, and “The Crusader’s Wife: A Canonistic Quandary,” *Studia Gratiana* 12 (1967) (=*Collectanea Stephan Kuttner* 2) 427-441 at 434-437.


10. Innocent IV, *Commentaria super libros quinque decretalium ad* 3.34.8 (Frankfort 1570) fol. 429vb-431ra: “numquid est licitum invadere terramquam infideles possidess vel quae est sua? . . . dominia, possessiones et iurisdictiones licei sine peccato possunt esse apud infideles; haec enim non tantum pro fidelibus sed pro omni rationabili creatura facta sunt. . . . Et propter hoc dicimus, non licet papae vel fidelibus auferre sua, sive dominia sive iurisdictiones, infidelibus, quia sine peccato ea possident” (Ullmann [n. 9 above] 129-130; Muldoon [n. 9 above] 573-574). Innocent regarded this doctrine as based on a natural right of property: “licebat cuilibet occupare quod occupatum non erat, sed ab aliis occupatum occupare non licebat, quia fiebat contra legem naturae quae cuilibet inditum est, ut alii non faciat quod sibi non vult fieri” (*ibid.*).

In the transcription of texts from sixteenth-century editions, abbreviated words have been fully written out, and modern punctuation is used.


12. Innocent IV, *Commentaria ad* loc. (continuation of the first text given above in n. 10): “Sed bene tamen credimus quod papa, qui est vicarius Iesu Christi, potestatem habet non tantum super Christianos sed etiam super omnes infideles, cum enim Christus habuerit super omnes potestatem” (Ullmann [n. 9 above] 130; Muldoon [n. 9 above] 574).

In general, scholars have identified Innocent as a vigorous exponent of the “hierocratic” position on the relations between *sacerdotium* and *imperium* or *regnum*, though less extreme in his views than the hierocrats of a half-century later. But see the analysis by John A. Watt, *The Theory of Papal Monarchy in the Thirteenth Century: The Contribution of the Canonists* (New York 1965) 58-73 and *passim*, judiciously characterizing Innocent’s thought as balanced between “hierocratic” elements (in purely theoretical discussions) and “dualist” elements (where practical and realistic political questions must be treated). Few scholars accept the recent efforts by Cantini (n. 9 above) and others to describe Innocent as a “dualist.” For a perceptive critique of the terms “hierocrat” and “dualist,” see Brian Tierney, “The Continuity of Papal Political Theory in the Thirteenth Century: Some Methodological Considerations,” *Mediaeval Studies* 27 (1965) 227-245.
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There is, of course, serious tension between most of Innocent's glosses on *Quod super his* and the strongly hierocratic views expressed in the publicistic pamphlet *Eger cui lenia*, which circulated under Innocent's name. This tension has even led a few scholars (for example Cantini [n. 9 above] 413) to deny the authenticity of *Eger cui lenia*. But as Muldoon has pointed out (n. 9 above, 575-578), *Eger cui lenia* does not actually concern itself with the legitimacy of a non-Christian ruler's authority. Moreover, see the valuable article by Peter Herde, "Ein Pamphlet der päpstlichen Kurie gegen Kaiser Friedrich II. von 1245/46 ('Eger cui lenia')," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 23 (1967) 468-538, arguing effectively that as a product of the *dictatores* at the Curia, *Eger cui lenia* evidently never received final papal approval and need not have perfectly reflected Innocent’s own views.

13. Innocent IV, *Commentaria* ad loc.: “Sed dices, quare non eodem modo licet eis repetere terram istam, scilicet Iudaeam, vel alias ubi dominati fuerunt infideles? Resp. quia dominii harum terrarum cum populis eorum conversi sunt. Fatemur tamen quod si populi conversi essent sed domini remanerint infideles, quod papa bene posset domino infidelii dominium et iurisdictionem dimittere super fideles, ... dummodo Christianos non gravaret iniuste. Item propter periculum posset cogi dominus ad recipiendum pretium vel commutationem” (Ullmann [n. 9 above] 128-129; Muldoon [n. 9 above] 574-575).

14. Innocent IV, *Commentaria* ad loc.: “contra alios infideles qui nunc tenent terram in qua iurisdictionem habuerunt Christiani principes, potest papa iuste facere praeceptum et constitutionem quod non molestent Christianos inuistine qui subsunt eorum iurisdictioni; immo quod plus est, potest eos eximere a iurisdictione eorum et dominio in totum.... Immo si male tractarent Christianos, posset eos privare per sententiam iurisdictione et dominio quod super eos habent. Tamen magna causa debet esse, quod ad hoc veniat; debit enim papa eos quantum potest sustinere, dummodo periculum non sit Christianis nec grave scandalum generetur” (Muldoon [n. 9 above] ibid.).

15. Hostiensis (Henricus de Segusio), *Commentaria in quinque libros decretalium* ad loc. (2 vols. Venice 1581; rpt. Turin 1965) 2. fol. 128ra-129ra at 128Vb: “Mihi tamen videtur quod in adventu Christi omnis honor et omnis principatus et omne dominium et iurisdictione de iure et ex causa iusta et per Illum qui supremam manum habet nec errare potest, omni infidelii substracta fuerit et ad fideles translata, ... unde constanter asserimus quod de iure infideles debent subiici fideli, non e contro” (Muldoon [n. 9 above] 578-579; Pennington [n. 9 above] 152). On the other hand, in his long gloss on X 3.34.8, Hostiensis also repeated some of Innocent IV’s views (e.g. in the preceding note) which were more favorable to *infideles—but Hostiensis did not identify these as his own opinion (cf. the statement “Mihi tamen videtur ...”).

16. Hostiensis (n. 15 above) ibid.: “Concedimus tamen quod infideles qui dominium ecclesiae recognoscunt sunt ab ecclesia tolerandi. ... Tales etiam possunt habere possessiones et colonus Christianos et etiam iurisdictionem ex tolerantia ecclesiae ...; alios autem infideles, qui nec potestatem ecclesiae Romanae nec dominum recognoscunt nec ei obediunt, indignos regno, principatu, iurisdictione, et omni dominio iudicamus, et eos qui Terram Sanctam vel alias partes quas Christiani acquisiverunt occupant ... auctoritate ecclesiae debere impugnari. ... Sed et ubi Christiani sub dominio infidelium habitant quibus nec resistere possunt, necesse est quod patientiam habeant et de facto ipsorum dominium recognoscant.”

17. The opinions of these jurists have been usefully summarized by Pennington (n. 9 above) 152-155, but a detailed study of the decretalist tradition of commentary on X 3.34.8 would be desirable; needless to say, such a study should include the numerous unedited commentaries from the thirteenth century.


20. Pennington (n. 9 above) ibid.


22. There has been much recent interest in Vladimiri’s thought and career. See
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Though Vladimiri’s career from 1409 to 1432 was largely devoted to the development of his ideas on international law and specifically on the topic of this paper, a single quotation will suffice. Tractatus de potestate papae et imperatoris respectu infidelium pars ii q.11, ed. Belch (n. 22 above) 2. 831-832: “utrum infidel, repetenti coram iudice chris­
tiano rem raptam vel subtractam, ministrai deberet iustitia, respondetur, quod non est hoc dubium secundum veram opinionem Innocentii [scil. quarti]: quia iusta rerum dominia ita sunt apud eos, sicut apud nos, ut notat inc. Quod super his .... Secus est secundum Hostiensem, tamquam nullum fuerit dominium, vel possessio talis rei apud infidelem.” Thereafter (pp. 832-842) Vladimiri gives a careful survey of canonistic opinions (citing also Thomas Aquinas) on this point and systematically rebuts Hostiensis’ view.

23. For Las Casas’ debt to the canonistic tradition, see Pennington (n. 9 above) 151, 155-162; for Vitoria’s, James Muldoon, “A Canonistic Contribution to the Formation of International Law,” The Jurist 28 (1968) 265-279.

24. In this regard, note the achievement of Paulus Vladimiri (n. 22 above), who anticipated not only their efforts to construct a theory of international law, but also their use of such a theory in an important political conflict.
The Clash
of Morality
in the American Forest

by Wilcomb E. Washburn

In the Age of Discoveries the explorers, conquerors, missionaries, commentators, historians, and philosophers of Europe were concerned not only with the physical qualities of the new-found lands, but with the moral qualities of their native inhabitants. The purpose of this paper is to discuss different aspects of that European moral judgment, particularly as it related to the comparison between European man himself and the American Indian.

In considering the documentary record of Indian-European contact, one faces a great number of distorting factors. These range from the moral commitment of missionaries to the ethical neutralism of contemporary anthropologists, from the crass motives of fortune hunters to the elevated vision of philosophical idealists; in addition, one must grapple with the widely varying Indian response to European contact, which ranged from total resistance to total acceptance.

Perhaps the fundamental stumbling block in the discussions of the moral conflict has been the uncritical use of concepts and terminology drawn from the past. Since the early reporters of the New World were predisposed by their background to look for a Terrestrial Paradise, or a Golden Age, or a Natural Man, it is not surprising that later commen-
tators have discussed the literature of the Discoveries in the same terms. The use of such expressions was less apparent in the writings of the first explorers, conquerors, and travelers than in the writings of the later philosophers, literary essayists, missionaries, and government officials who digested reports from the New World secondhand. Nevertheless, when any of these early commentators were moved by the novel customs of the New World natives (for example, by their absence of clothing, or by their friendliness) to comment that they lived in a “state of nature,” or in a Golden Age, or with “natural virtue,” the modern historian is not entitled to conclude (1) that the observer believed that his subjects literally and exclusively lived in terms of the said hypothetical age; (2) that he misunderstood the facts that he was reporting; or (3) that he was delivering a sermon on the defects of Western civilization.

The early reporting from the New World reflects also a substantial amount of accurate description that later historians must be ready to respect, even while identifying and discarding the accretions and distortions of myth, ignorance, special interest, and the like. Had Columbus’ observations of the natives of the New World been read with the same impatience that is regularly applied to the reports of many later and lesser figures, the significance of his achievement as well as of his observations would be grossly overlooked and undervalued. Columbus’ preeminent position as the first discoverer gives him a certain immunity to the barbs directed at later commentators. Even so, Columbus is often twitted for searching for, and finding hints of, a terrestrial paradise in the New World; and his comments on the gentle, loving character of the inhabitants of the islands he first reached are too hastily attributed to wishful thinking.

That the Indians first met by Columbus gave him and his men freely of what they had cannot be disputed. Whether they gave because they were kind, naive, trusting, intimidated, or in awe is a matter of interpretation in the context of both a social and moral environment that neither Columbus nor later observers have successfully delineated. If we evade consideration of the specifics of this interaction and accept the assumption that Columbus imagined the New World to be populated by Noble Savages, we are abandoning too rapidly the realm of historical fact and embracing presupposition too readily.

The greatest of the “stay-at-home” commentators on the discoveries (he did talk with Brazilian natives brought to France) was Montaigne: more than any commentator of the time, he recognized European ethnic and religious biases. Montaigne perceived that the differences in the behavior of the newly discovered aborigines and Europeans could not be dealt with by conventional references to “barbarism” and “savagery” (he noted that too often “men call that barbarism which is not common
to them"), but depended upon specific characterization of individuals and accurate descriptions of events. After a critical reading of the reported behavior of Europeans and Indians in their earliest contact, Montaigne drew an incisive judgment of the moral corruption of the conquerors. In comparing the virtues of the two sides, Montaigne noted:

as for devoutness, observance of the laws, goodness, liberality, loyalty, and frankness, it served us well not to have as much as they: by their advantage in this they [the Indians] lost, sold, and betrayed themselves.

As for boldness and courage, as for firmness, constancy, resoluteness against pains and hunger and death, I would not fear to oppose the examples I could find among them to the most famous ancient examples that we have in the memories of our world on this side of the ocean.

Montaigne sighed that "such a noble conquest" did not fall to Alexander or to the ancient Greeks and Romans.¹

Bartolomé de Las Casas, a participant-observer of the Spanish Conquest, combined a keen observational talent with a powerful moral condemnation of his countrymen who "destroyed" the Indies, as he put it, by virtually exterminating the populations of the Caribbean islands and of Central and South America. I will not attempt to rehearse Las Casas' comparison between the moral qualities of Spaniards and of Indians in the Spanish conquest; that has been done by American scholars such as Lewis Hanke and Benjamin Keen as well as by many dedicated European scholars such as Marcel Bataillon. Las Casas has been attacked by those who felt his description of the Indians was too favorable and his description of Spanish actions too harsh. He was accused by Sepúlveda at the time and by countless historians since of drawing an illusory picture of "gentle" Indians and "cruel" Spaniards to the point of creating a Black Legend. No one denies that many Indians were brutally murdered. While it is possible that Las Casas' estimates of the numbers killed were too large, I have never succeeded in getting those who denounce his alleged exaggerations to tell me how many dead Indians constitute a Black Legend of Spanish cruelty.²

One of the participant-observers often cited to show that even hardheaded Europeans were bedazzled and deceived by the New World atmosphere was Bernal Díaz del Castillo, whose Discovery and Conquest of Mexico, 1517-1521 includes a direct reference to the Amadis of Gaul, one of the most famous chivalric romances of the period. The oft-quoted reference, written by Díaz when he was an old man reliving the experiences of his youth, describes the first view the conquerors had of the capital of the Aztec empire:

when we saw so many cities and villages built in the water and other great towns on dry land and that straight and level Causeway going towards
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Mexico, we were amazed and said that it was like the enchantments they tell us of in the legend of Amadis, on account of the great towers and cues and buildings rising from the water, and all built of masonry. And some of our soldiers even asked whether the things that we saw were not a dream. It is not to be wondered at that I here write it down in this manner, for there is so much to think over that I do not know how to describe it, seeing things as we did that had never been heard of or seen before, not even dreamed of.3

Díaz del Castillo’s description of the City of Mexico is frequently interpreted as a distortion of the conqueror’s perception if not wholly a figment of his imagination. Yet the sophisticated twentieth-century interpreter might pay more attention to the sixteenth-century soldier’s explanation of why he referred to chivalric romances in order to help him describe Mexico, “seeing things as we did that had never been heard of or seen before, not even dreamed of.”4

The historian John H. Elliott is more tolerant of the explorers’ use of images inspired by the Golden Age of antiquity. Verrazano described the Rhode Island Indians as having faces as “gentle and noble as those of classical sculptures,” and other explorers “too often saw what they expected to see”; Elliott thinks that this should not really be a cause for surprise or mockery, for it may well be that the human mind has an inherent need to fall back on the familiar object and the standard image, in order to come to terms with the shock of the unfamiliar. . . . For America was a new world and a different world; and it was this fact of difference which was overwhelmingly borne in upon those who came to know it.

It was as difficult to describe the flora and fauna as the human inhabitants. “Of all the things I have seen,” wrote Fernández de Oviedo about a bird of brilliant plumage, “this is the one which has most left me without hope of being able to describe it in words.” Of a strange tree he wrote, “it needs to be painted by the hand of a Berruguete or some other excellent painter like him, or by Leonardo da Vinci or Andrea Mantegna, famous painters whom I knew in Italy.” Elliott’s sympathetic consideration of the Europeans’ attempt to “evaluate the puzzling world of the Indies by reference to the Garden of Eden or the Golden Age of antiquity” is perceptive and appropriate.5

European accounts of virtuous non-Europeans were sometimes assumed to be the result of ignorance; but if the authors’ praise of natives was charged to a desire to criticize European society, the veracity of their accounts was more stringently questioned. It is not surprising that this should be so: it is easier to challenge a person’s motives than his powers of observation or of interpretation.

A fair sample of the consequences of this attitude in contemporary literary criticism is expressed in Franklin L. Baumer’s introduction to the
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English translation of Henri Baudet's *Paradise on Earth: Some Thoughts on European Images of Non-European Man*. Baumer writes:

The European’s images of non-European man are not primarily if at all descriptions of real people, but rather projections of his own nostalgia and feeling of inadequacy. They are judgments on himself and his history. The outsider, whether primitive or civilized, is held up as a model of what he (the European) had been in happier days, or of what he would like to be and perhaps could be once again.6

The conscious and explicit use of the Noble Savage theme in order to criticize European society, while most commonly associated with Rousseau’s famous *Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality among Men*, long antedates it. An earlier example of the genre is incorporated in the work of Lahontan. The virtues of the savages of North America were spelled out in great detail in Lahontan’s *Mémoires sur l’Amérique septentrionale* (The Hague 1703). In the *Dialogues* (1703) between himself and a Huron, which appeared in the expanded English edition of the same year, he went beyond the descriptive to make a philosophical comparison between French and Indian ways of life. Lahontan’s work, Ira O. Wade has asserted, “was clearly not designed ultimately to be descriptive, but to be encyclopedic and propagandistic; inciting not to interest so much as to action.” Wade underlines his belief by discussing Lahontan’s work in the context of the utopian novels which flourished in France from 1676 to 1720. He ignores the degree of accuracy of Lahontan’s observations. The implication, in most studies of Lahontan, is that his work is essentially a criticism of France rather than a description of Indian society which, if it is assumed to have any reality at all, is assumed to reflect Lahontan’s critical purpose rather than his observational skills.7

Lahontan’s anti-clerical and anti-civilization bias caused nineteenth-century historians of Canada to disparage him. Scholars like Bruce Trigger have tended to ignore Lahontan’s work. But others like William Fenton and Cornelius Jaenen find many of his observations accurate.8 Though not so good an observer as Lafitau and Lescarbot (whose remarks also lend themselves to interpretation in the Noble Savage vein), Lahontan was a participant in many of the events he describes and had many opportunities to observe Indian behavior at close range. It is unfair to dismiss his favorable view of the American Indian because he sought consciously to use it in the service of his political views.

The use of the presumed virtues of American Indians primarily in the service of a European philosophical debate is rightly attributed to Rousseau. That Rousseau was not guilty of the naive primitivism often attributed to him was persuasively argued in Arthur O. Lovejoy’s essay.
on Rousseau’s *Discourse on Inequality*. Whether the *Discourse* “in general represents a movement rather away from than towards primitivism,” and whether Rousseau’s essay, rather than strengthening the primitivistic illusion, “tended to weaken it,” as Lovejoy asserts, is, however, subject to debate. Rousseau’s “praise of savagery” continues to inspire new interpretations in literary as well as historical and anthropological writings. 9

Before considering the conceptual and symbolic aspects of the interpretation of the moral conflict between Indians and whites in the exploration and settlement of America, let us consider the factual and historical evidence from which the moral qualities attributed to the Indians were drawn.

**CANNIBALISM**

To European tastes, cannibalism (though actually observed in only a few places) constituted perhaps the most appalling custom among New World inhabitants. Many Europeans failed to distinguish between ceremonial or ritual cannibalism and cannibalism without ritualistic significance. Early reports from the West Indies ascribed to the Caribs a liking for human flesh as a food. Later observers of the Aztecs generally acknowledged the elaborate religious ceremonials in which the practice was embedded. In either case the habit was usually reported with loathing and used as an example of depravity. While few Europeans were willing to say a good word for the habit, some—for example, Montaigne—pointed out that it could be considered less hideous than some European practices. Bartolome de Las Casas was similarly capable of regarding human sacrifice dispassionately. Keen quotes approvingly Teresa Silva Tena’s conclusion that Las Casas was “perhaps the only Spaniard of his age who was capable of looking at native culture from within, that is, in the case of human sacrifice, from the standpoint of the Mexican religion and Mexican point of view.” 10 Las Casas first of all insisted that the number sacrificed yearly by the Aztecs was not 20,000 a year, as some had claimed, but less than 100 or even less than 50 a year. The number of Indians sacrificed yearly by the Spaniards to their Goddess of Greed, Las Casas pointed out, exceeded the total number of victims sacrificed by the Indians to their gods for the entire century before the discovery of America. Las Casas even more daringly asserted that human sacrifice, while wrong, was an expression of the highest religious feeling, since those who offered the most precious sacrifices to God (whether a true or false god) could be regarded as the most religious of all.
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Again, the French savant de Gérando wrote in 1800: "The philosophical traveller will make a careful study of the dreadful practice of cannibalism, and perhaps will give us some way, if not of justifying, at least of excusing the errors of the human species." De Gérando sought to determine the precise nature of the practice:

Whether cannibal peoples eat only their enemies beaten in war; . . . whether they entertain ideas of vengeance in the custom; whether they seem to be very afraid of the same fate; whether there are any regular accompanying ceremonies; whether they find it at all repugnant to eat the flesh of their friends or of strangers; or whether they think by their act to inflict any suffering or shame on the soul of the massacred man.

In the years since Las Casas and de Gérando wrote, of course, answers to many of these questions have been provided by anthropologists and historians. 11

CONSTANCY IN FRIENDSHIP

Perhaps nothing was more frequently noted than the constancy of the Indian to whomsoever he had pledged his friendship. That bond overcame any loyalty based on racial affinity and never ceased to startle European observers of tribes throughout the Americas. The Moravian missionary John Heckewelder put it as follows:

The word 'Friend' to the ear of an Indian does not convey the same vague and almost indefinite meaning that it does with us; it is not a mere complimentary or social expression, but implies a resolute determination to stand by the person so distinguished on all occasions, and a threat to those who might attempt to molest him. . . .

Heckewelder frankly admitted that his object in the chapter in which he gave many examples of this behavior was to prove that those men are susceptible of the noblest and finest feelings of genuine friendship. It is not enough that by a long residence among them, I have acquired the most complete conviction of this truth; facts and not opinions, I know, are expected from me. 12

GENEROSITY

Frequently reported was the initial generosity of the native Americans to the explorers who entered their lands. Whether that generosity was an expression of fear, good will, or a functional necessity of tribal life, generosity and sharing were implicit in the cultural systems of many Indian nations. Generosity, as implied in the phrase "Indian giver," was often extended on the assumption that a return gift would be offered by the recipient, but reciprocal giving was virtually a functional necessity in a society lacking monetary exchange. The fact that generosity was
essential to the cultural and economic structure of Indian society does not make it less valid to speak of it as real or commendable.\textsuperscript{13}

ELOQUENCE

Indian leaders, in their conferences with European and American officials, displayed a level of eloquence that never failed to impress. That this eloquence was usually conveyed through an interpreter is all the more remarkable. More often than not the dignity of the speaker, the cogency of his argument, and the richness of his metaphorical discourse caused Europeans to compare their blanketed Indian adversaries to ancient Romans and Greeks. Though some observers have challenged the accuracy of reports of Indian eloquence, this ability has been the least doubted of all Indian virtues.\textsuperscript{14}

CIVILITY

What James Axtell calls the “ultimate Indian weapon against aggressive Europeans” was their courtesy, politeness, and civility. No matter how absurd the proposition or outrageous the demand, the Indian never brusquely rejected it or even rudely interrupted the speakers. As Father Hennepin put it, “That people, so barbarous and rude, have a piece of civility peculiar to themselves; for a man would be accounted very impertinent if he contradicted anything that is said in their council, and if he does not approve the greatest absurdity therein proposed.” This politeness frustrated priests trying to convert the Indians to Christian values. Another priest, Father Allouez, put the characteristic in less charitable terms:

Dissimulation, which is natural to those Savages, and a certain spirit of acquiescence, in which the children in that country are brought up, make them assent to all that is told them; and prevent them from ever showing any opposition to the sentiments of others, even though they may know that what is said to them is not true. To this dissimulation must be added stubbornness and obstinacy in following entirely their own thoughts and wishes.\textsuperscript{15}

CRUELTY/COMPASSION TO CAPTIVES

White captives taken by the Indians were often put through the most excruciating tortures before being dispatched (including being burned at the stake); other captives might be forced to “run the gauntlet” of tribal villages on their arrival at the camp of their captors; still other captives were adopted by the captors and became full members of their
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communities. How does one evaluate the morality of such varying treatments? (1) The whites were accorded treatment similar to that meted out to Indians engaged in intertribal warfare. Particularly cruel fates might be meted out to those who, like Colonel William Crawford in Ohio in the 1770's and 1780's, had been guilty of heinous crimes against the Indians. (2) In the warrior's code one showed no fear when trapped by fate in the captive's position. The victim of torture was honored by his tormentors not by reprieve but by respect for his ability to die like a warrior. At the same time his death served as expiation for the sufferings his captors had received at the hands of his fellow warriors. (3) "Running the gauntlet" was similarly conceived as a way in which all the residents of an Indian village could take out on the unfortunate captives their anger at the losses and sufferings received at the latter's hands. (4) The behavior of the captives was critically observed and steadfastness in the face of difficulty might be honored by adoption into the tribe. Adoption of captives in lieu of their torture and death can again be explained in terms of functional necessity. As noted by John Millar, in his *Observations Concerning the Distinction of Ranks in Society* (1771), and by many anthropologists since, the Indian tribe might be concerned with the depletion of its own ranks and the need to restore its numbers, as well as with the need to take revenge on a hated enemy. That Indian societies could so successfully integrate non-members into their societies in such situations never ceased to amaze Europeans. From a Christian point of view only the release of the captive unharmed qualified as noble or merciful behavior; and even this was too often attributed by whites to the workings of Divine Providence rather than of the Indian mind. In a Christian context, in which mercy took precedence over revenge, the behavior of the Indians towards their captives provided virtually no opportunity for the demonstration of nobility. 16

SEXUAL MORALITY

The sexual mores of most of the Indians were widely at variance with prevailing European and American customs. Christian ministers preached against the sins of the flesh; but native sexual freedom seemed to transplanted Europeans not only practically but morally defensible. Nowhere was this attitude more effectively dramatized than in the confrontation between Governor William Bradford of the Plymouth Colony of Massachusetts and the merry men of Merrymount who rallied around the Maypole of Thomas Morton further up the coast. The confrontation has been amusingly outlined by Morton and grimly by Bradford, and its echoes resound from the other literature of Puritan New England. Suffice it to say that the pleasure dome established by
Morton, based on peaceful trade and pleasurable intercourse with the Indians of the area, caused Governor Bradford to dispatch Captain Miles Standish to wipe out the settlement. 17

Can one make an objective moral assessment of the clash of cultures in the American forest? I have suggested in an earlier article several measures by which such a judgment could be made. One of these measures is the degree to which those who experienced both cultures chose one or the other when they had the choice. There is a good deal of hard data on this subject, most of it supporting the conclusion that Indian life had an overwhelming attraction for whites while "civilized" life had virtually no appeal to the Indians. James Axtell has recently fleshed out this conclusion in a series of articles and books which seek to explain why the Indian educational and nurturing system was so effective with whites while the reverse was not true. 18

Not all whites successfully adapted to, or were welcomed into, Indian culture, particularly since so many entered Indian societies by way of captivity. Yet the tradition of the white voluntarily opting for life among the Indians goes back to the first Spanish castaways in Yucatán in 1511. One Jerónimo de Aguilar, a member of a group which had been imprisoned in cages by the Maya and evidently designated for sacrifice, warmly welcomed Hernando Cortés in 1519 when the latter landed off the island of Cozumel. Another of the group, however, Gonzalo Guerrero, to whom Cortés sent Aguilar on a rescue mission, declined the offer, noting that he had married a chieftain's daughter and occupied a respected position among the natives of his village. From the sixteenth century to the end of the nineteenth, accounts of white captives taken prisoner by the Indians provide an index of morality in Indian-European relations. No one has systematically analyzed this data from an anthropological or historical point of view, although literary analyses are legion. I will not attempt to make such an analysis here, except to point out that even in the context of captivity during the stress of war Indian virtues were often grudgingly, often passionately, recognized by the captives themselves. Mrs. Rowlandson, author of the first English captivity narrative (she was captured during King Philip’s War in 1676), was surprised that during her captivity no attempt on her virtue was ever made. Nearly two centuries later, Mrs. Sarah Wakefield, captured during the Sioux Uprising of 1862 in Minnesota and writing in the hostile environment of the state immediately after the war, noted: "The Indians were as respectful towards me as any white man would be towards a lady; and now, when I hear all the Indians abused, it aggravates me, for I know some are as manly, honest, and noble, as our
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own race.” Neither Mrs. Rowlandson nor Mrs. Wakefield understood that tribal codes required most Indians to abstain from sexual relations during military expeditions. Indian restraint is no less commendable for that reason.19

While dissatisfaction with European society and the attribution of high moral qualities to Indian societies were frequently expressed by European observers, the American Indian himself was frequently appalled by the customs of the civilized European. Cornelius J. Jaenen, in a recent perceptive article and in a forthcoming book, has demonstrated how frequently Indians in contact with French colonists and administrators in the early period of contact execrated French customs and looked down upon Frenchmen. Gabriel Sagard-Théodat, cited by Jaenen on the subject of the Indians’ own hospitality, noted that “they found it very bad hearing that there were in France a great number of needy and beggars, and thought that it was due to a lack of charity, and blamed us greatly, saying that if we had some intelligence we would set some order in the matter, the remedies being simple.”20 The impact of native views on white observers has never been adequately recognized. The Indian example did genuinely affect those who came into contact with it; it did not serve merely as an amusing example of an exotic way of life to play with in philosophic disputes.

The honest, as opposed to frivolous, commitment of Europeans to Indian values is evident in the life of the Scots trader James Adair who spent much of his life among the Southeastern Indians. In his History of the American Indians (London 1775), Adair celebrates Indian values, contrasting them with the corruption which he and other colonists perceived in English society in the eighteenth century. Adair’s attitudes foreshadowed and reflected the rising revolutionary fervor. He and other observers recognized that Indian generosity implied a reciprocal relationship which diminished the pure “virtue” of the trait—as defined in Christian terms of charity as unconcerned with expectation of reward. Yet these observers were in effect exalting the societies in which these traits had evolved as norms for the individuals composing them.21

I would assert that the new anthropological approach to primitive man (see Appendix) is similar in many ways to the earlier approach to the Noble Savage: it differs in its use of more sophisticated analytical tools and more comprehensive anthropological and historical data. Both eighteenth-century and twentieth-century approaches were and are hotly contested by those who read the evidence literally and narrowly and who point out the contemporary uses to which the knowledge was or is being put. I welcome the utilitarian approach of the primitivists and neo-primitivists, whether that of Las Casas, Rousseau, James Adair, Lévi-Strauss, or Stanley Diamond. The uses to which they put their
research is not necessarily an impediment to their true perception of phenomena and values in the societies they studied. The ridicule to which all have been subjected is a measure of their critics' unwillingness to entertain a responsible discussion of values, and hence of action. The burden of proof, I would suggest, has now shifted from those who would affirm the positive values of primitive society to those who would deny them.

APPENDIX: NEO-PRIMITIVISM

All writers—whether historians, essayists, novelists, theologians, or anthropologists—have to select among the myriad facts those they will emphasize. The attack on the presentation of the American Indian as Noble Savage, though persistent, has failed to demolish the concept, partly because it has failed to understand that the term represents not only a literal or individual, but a conceptual and societal, truth. Literary artists have had to confront this problem most directly. James Fenimore Cooper, to take a classic example, was chided for the favorable image of the Indian in *The Leatherstocking Tales*. One of his critics, Cooper noted, asserted that Cooper's Indians were "of the school of Heckewelder, rather than of the school of nature." Cooper responded that the anonymous critic (Lewis Cass) was reputed to be "a very distinguished agent of the government, one very familiar with Indians, as they are seen at the councils to treat for the sale of their lands, where little or none of their domestic qualities come in play, and where indeed, their evil passions are known to have the fullest scope." Cooper asserted the privilege of "all writers of fiction, more particularly when their works aspire to the elevation of romances, to present the beau idéal of their characters to the reader." To "suppose that the redman is to be represented only in the squalid misery or in the degraded moral state that certainly more or less belongs to his condition, is, we apprehend, taking a very narrow view of an author's privileges." Such selectivity does not invalidate Cooper's (or Heckewelder's) view of the Indian although it puts those views in their appropriate contexts.

Anthropologists as well as novelists have occasionally been charged with falling for the myth of the Noble Savage. While anthropologists are legitimately concerned with the values of the people they study, they shy away, as Robert Redfield pointed out in the final chapter of his *Primitive World and Its Transformations*, from the problem of "the nature or content of the intrinsic good..." The traditional anthropological position is that of cultural relativism: the belief that it is not possible to establish one way of thought or action as better than another.
Anyone who has attended the business meeting of an anthropological convention knows that anthropologists do not really believe this, at least when considering their own or other advanced cultures. Yet if an anthropologist seems to intrude his own values in his ethnographic consideration of a “primitive” people, he leaves himself open to “savage” criticism from his colleagues. Thus Oscar Lewis criticised Robert Redfield’s early description of the Mexican village of Tepoztlán because of the value system that he felt Redfield brought to the work. As Redfield noted, Lewis felt that his values “contain the old Rousseauan notion of primitive peoples as noble savages” along with its “corollary that with civilization has come the fall of man.” Redfield’s response was quiet but effective: “Perhaps he [Lewis] would be glad merely to accept my confession that I saw and suggested to the reader of my book certain good things in Tepoztlán: a sense of conviction in the people as to what life is all about; and a richness of the expressive life of the community.”

Just as Redfield denied that his point of view invalidated his analysis, so can the same justification be cited in support of countless other non-anthropological observers who were struck by similar “virtues” in the peoples they encountered during the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries and who expressed their admiration in the form of value judgments and verbal abstractions.

More recently anthropological as well as philosophical redefinitions of the “primitive mind” and its attendant concepts such as the State of Nature and the Noble Savage have given new respectability to discussions of the values in, and the values of, primitive society. The towering figure in redefining the “primitive mind” is of course Claude Lévi-Strauss. In *The Savage Mind* Lévi-Strauss evokes the thought of Rousseau who, with “profound insight” and “unusual acumen,” not only formulated rules about totemic classification, but sought to “arrive at invariants beyond the empirical diversity of human societies” in the fashion of the best ethnographic analysis. Lévi-Strauss quotes approvingly Rousseau’s injunction, “One needs to look near at hand if one wants to study men; but to study man one must learn to look from afar; one must first observe differences in order to discover attributes.”

Hayden White, in his study of “The Forms of Wildness: Archaeology of an Idea,” throws a searching light on the dilemma of the writer concerned with primitive virtues. White notes that Tacitus the historian, Montaigne the philosopher, and Lévi-Strauss the anthropologist (he might have added Cooper the novelist) are all “linked by the ‘fictive’ uses they make of the concepts of ‘barbarism,’ ‘wildness,’ and ‘savagery.’” By conceptualizing mankind in opposing classes of “natural” and “artificial,” “by manipulating the fictions of artificiality and naturalness,” they, and we in turn, are better able to understand our own role as members of civilized communities.
In using terms like “savagery” and “nobility” in these comparative, educative, and normative fashions are we doing injustice to the facts? Not necessarily. The words can bear both factual and rhetorical burdens. Neither Marx, Freud, Nietsche, or Rousseau, as White points out, assumed that primitive man was flawless or that primitive society was an ideal to be sought. Yet all recognized the significance of the primitive stage and the necessity to understand and use “primitive” values in guiding man from his historical past to his historical future. 

More recently an even more positive avowal of the virtues of the primitive life and world view has been made by the anthropologist Stanley Diamond. In the sophisticated critiques of scholars like Diamond, there are, of course, no paeans of praise for the Noble Savage; but neither were there such unsophisticated expressions, as Diamond points out, in the works of Rousseau. Both the eighteenth-century philosopher and the twentieth-century anthropologist sees values—or virtues—in the primitive view, and use this recognition to discourage modern “civilized” man from treating “primitive” man as an object to be manipulated rather than as the possessor of a culture whose values need to be sympathetically considered in the process of redefining and refining our own.

In the fashion of Lévi-Strauss, Diamond reiterates Rousseau’s “call for a proper anthropology, the purpose of which is self-knowledge and the means the authentic understanding of others.” Rousseau, writing in the eighteenth century when “mankind was an open system” and “men could still be rediscovered,” had charged that “for the three-hundred or four-hundred years since the inhabitants of Europe have inundated the other parts of the world, and continuously published new collections of voyages and reports, I am convinced that we know no other men except the Europeans; . . . under the pompous name of the study of man, everybody does hardly anything except study the men of his country.”

The renewed interest in primitive virtues is incorporated in recent studies of man’s experience as a hunter (a role he has played for 99 percent of human history), as for example in Man the Hunter. Professor Lee, the coeditor of this work, has stated elsewhere the moral implications of the hunting state as follows:

From the hunters we inherited several things: first a pollution-free environment; second, an egalitarian social system; third, a good family life; fourth, a robust physique; and fifth, a taste for steak. Today we find ourselves faced with an ecological crisis and also the threat of nuclear annihilation, so the hunting way of life may yet prove to be our most stable and successful adaptation.

In following Lee’s presentation at the conference at which these remarks were made, Kent Flannery noted that his job was “to explain how man
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fell from this Garden of Eden, which Dr. Lee has described, into his present disastrous condition."

Obviously it is possible nowadays as it was in Columbus’ time to exaggerate or distort the truth, but it is valid now and was valid then to speak of primitive virtues.

NOTES


2. For example, Lewis Hanke, The Spanish Struggle for Justice in the Conquest of America (Philadelphia 1949; rpt. Boston 1965); Bartolomé de Las Casas in History: Toward an Understanding of the Man and his Work, ed. Juan Friede and Benjamin Keen (DeKalb, Ill. 1972); Marcel Bataillon, Études sur Bartolomé de Las Casas (Paris 1965).


8. Personal conversation with the individuals named.


12. Quoted in Washburn (n. 1 above) 73, 78.


14. For example, Lawrence C. Wroth, “The Indian Treaty as Literature,” The Yale
Governing the New World


25. Hayden White, in Dudley and Novak (n. 7 above) 32-33, 35-36.


27. Communication with Extraterrestrial Intelligence (CETI), ed. Carl Sagan (Cambridge, Mass. 1973) 93-94; Man the Hunter, ed. R. B. Lee and Irving DeVore (Chicago 1968). Distinctions between primitive societies in America, Africa, and the Pacific have not been dealt with in this essay. Although elements of primitive “nobility” were perceived in early European contact with Africans, in general the concept of the Noble Savage declined with extensive European contact with Africa. See George W. Stocking, Jr., “French Anthropology in 1800,” Isis 55, 2:180 (1964) 134-150, at 144. Recent emphasis on the virtues of the hunting life utilize extensive African research. Not all, however, emphasize the virtues of their subjects; see, for example, Colin Turnbull, The Mountain People (New York 1972).
“H prandesca thungum tembuni.” “Enquam.” By these Latin approximations of Tarascan sounds, theologians and canonists of sixteenth-century Europe were apprised of what two inhabitants of the province of Michoacán said to one another when they wished to say they were married. The ritual is reported in 1556 by Alonso de la Veracruz in his Speculum coniugiorum, the first canonical treatise to be published in the New World. He translates the first phrase as “I accept you as wife,” or as “I delight because I shall accept you as wife,” and the second as “So be it.” The words are used between two persons who have lived together for several years without having spoken of marriage. The formula is especially common, he adds, when either has a living spouse who they learn has died, or when relatives discover that they are living together: then the two who are cohabiting utter these words which make a marriage.1

The regular method in use among the “nobles” is more formal: they include negotiations between the relatives of the boy and girl; an emissary sent from the father of the boy to the father of the girl; outfitting of the girl and her handmaids. Accompanied by her servants and a priest of the gods, she walks to the house of her spouse’s parents. In her hands she carries a shirt, a knife, and a broom made of rushes. The shirt is for

Marriage
in Michoacán
by John T. Noonan, Jr.
Governing the New World


25. Hayden White, in Dudley and Novak (n. 7 above) 32-33, 35-36.


27. *Communication with Extraterrestrial Intelligence* (CETI), ed. Carl Sagan (Cambridge, Mass. 1973) 93-94; *Man the Hunter*, ed. R. B. Lee and Irving DeVore (Chicago 1968). Distinctions between primitive societies in America, Africa, and the Pacific have not been dealt with in this essay. Although elements of primitive “nobility” were perceived in early European contact with Africans, in general the concept of the Noble Savage declined with extensive European contact with Africa. See George W. Stocking, Jr., “French Anthropology in 1800,” *Isis* 55, 2:180 (1964) 134-150, at 144. Recent emphasis on the virtues of the hunting life utilize extensive African research. Not all, however, emphasize the virtues of their subjects; see, for example, Colin Turnbull, *The Mountain People* (New York 1972).
Marriage
in Michoacán
by John T. Noonan, Jr.

“Hiprandesca thungum tembuni.” “Enquam.” By these Latin approximations of Tarascan sounds, theologians and canonists of sixteenth-century Europe were apprised of what two inhabitants of the province of Michoacán said to one another when they wished to say they were married. The ritual is reported in 1556 by Alonso de la Veracruz in his Speculum coniugiorum, the first canonical treatise to be published in the New World. He translates the first phrase as “I accept you as wife,” or as “I delight because I shall accept you as wife,” and the second as “So be it.” The words are used between two persons who have lived together for several years without having spoken of marriage. The formula is especially common, he adds, when either has a living spouse who they learn has died, or when relatives discover that they are living together: then the two who are cohabiting utter these words which make a marriage.¹

The regular method in use among the “nobles” is more formal: they include negotiations between the relatives of the boy and girl; an emissary sent from the father of the boy to the father of the girl; outfitting of the girl and her handmaids. Accompanied by her servants and a priest of the gods, she walks to the house of her spouse’s parents. In her hands she carries a shirt, a knife, and a broom made of rushes. The shirt is for
her spouse, the knife to cut logs for the temples of the gods, the broom to sweep with. The boy gives her jewelry to wear. They eat a special bread together. The priest gives each gifts specially prepared for them, saying, “May the Gods grant that you live together well as one, keeping faith to one another.” The parents also speak to them, telling them to love each other, to give gifts to each other, to avoid adultery, and to see that no one kills them for adultery. They tell the girl in particular that they, her parents, will be made infamous if she is found speaking to another man on the road. The priest speaks to the man saying, “If you take your wife in adultery, leave her and send her to her own home peacefully, without inflicting injury upon her.” Then all the relatives and neighbors eat together, and the father of the groom shows the couple the fields they must farm and gives gifts to the priest and to the women who accompanied the bride and sends gifts to the father of the bride (V. 2.2.314-316).

Among the lesser people, the preliminary palaver of the relatives precedes the ceremony, but the priest does not accompany the bride, and the gifts are confined to the groom giving the bride a loaf of bread or a garment, and the bride, if not too poor, reciprocating. The father of the bride warns her, “They will kill you and me together if you commit adultery” (V. 2.2.316).

Following the ceremony, the groom takes the knife his bride had brought and, going up a mountain for two, three, or four days, cuts wood for the temples of the gods. Meanwhile, the bride sweeps the house and a great part of the path which leads to the house. Then, the groom returns, and for the first time they have intercourse, and she covers him with the shirt she had brought (V. 2.2.316).

Sometimes, without their parents’ knowledge, a pair “incited by love” reach an understanding: “You shall farm for me, I shall sew your clothes and make bread for you” (V. 2.2.317). Sometimes, especially among the poor, a pair simply come to live together, bringing with them all they own, exchanging no promises, although if we (Veracruz means himself) ask the man who his wife is, he would point to the woman, and if we ask the woman her husband she would point to the man. Asked if they had each given the pledge of marriage, they might either say “Yes,” or only that as soon as they saw each other, they joined in coitus. If asked what they were thinking at the time, they say “Nothing,” or that they were thinking they were marrying, or that they thought they were sinning. That they were thinking nothing seems plausible to Veracruz, given that they are “very phlegmatic” (V.2.3.321).

“The inhabitants of this world”—Veracruz speaks generally of the Indians—are “timorous” and are “very readily moved by slight fear” (V.
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describes simple folk who "today marry, promising marriage (sic) that they will be one until death," and "other poor men" who "enter the woman's house and remain there as married without saying anything" (Relación 213). These cases look like the cases Veracruz has investigated where a promise to farm is exchanged for a promise to sew or where the couple have given him various accounts of their intentions. The Relación notes that with the silent coupling "it is sufficient" if the parents or relatives agree. It adds that in secret marriages they use the future not the present tense, "because they have this way of speaking in their tongue" (Relación 217). Veracruz ignores both these points of considerable canonical interest but, unlike the Relación, he gives an account of the unions ratified by Hiprandesca thungum tembuni.

The most striking differences are on incest, endogamy, and polygamy. In addition to the universal barrier of the first degree of consanguinity mentioned by Veracruz, the Relación says that paternal uncles cannot marry nieces. The Relación inserts in the speeches of the noble bride's father references to the bride and groom being of the same stock and a declaration that their ancestors are Chichimecas, and adds—it is one of the writer's infrequent editorial comments on his sources—that "they do not mix their lines like the Jews" (Relación 213). Veracruz says nothing of such restrictions. As to polygamy, where Veracruz refers, vaguely enough, to Atabalus and the lord of Tezcuco, the Relación describes in exuberant detail the establishment of the Cazonci, Michoacán's hereditary ruler: he is portrayed as having both a corps of bare-breasted female slaves and a harem of daughters of noble families, the latter of whom bear him a multitude of children who are then given princely treatment (Relación 183). Over these the Yreri, or mistress of the house, dominates and is "like the natural wife" of the Cazonci, while the noble girls are referred to as wives of the god Cueraueri (Relación 182). Technically, of course, the Cazonci is not married to them; later, however, the new Cazonci is said "to marry" all his father's wives (Relación 230). In the saga of the Chichimecas, which makes up the body of the Relación, Tariacuri, the founding father, sends home one wife and is then given two sisters for brides (Relación 81); the goddess Xaratanga promises Tangáxooan, the master-to-be of Michoacáñ, that she shall cause him "to have women enclosed in [your] house" (Relación 136). These images of polygamy are accepted as part of the ideal life of powerful men. If Veracruz had been familiar with them, it is hard to see why he would not have incorporated some reference to polygamy in his description of customs in Michoacán.

Veracruz, it might be supposed, had once read the Relación and was now recalling parts of it from memory, but the similarities are too great to attribute to memory alone. The principal possibilities are that Veracruz pruned, corrected, and supplemented the Relación from other
Marriage, Veracruz says, is a sacrament of the Church, but it is also "a human contract," which "occurs differently in different nations." It "cannot be known at all accurately" by those ignorant of the language of the nation (V. Preface 9). He himself had known Tarascan for almost a decade when he wrote the first draft of his book, and he circulated the manuscript for another decade and revised it considerably before having it printed in Mexico City in 1556.4 He speaks with justice of his "long familiarity" with the tongue (V. Preface 9). His best descriptions come from his conversations with the people of Michoacán.

A substantial portion of his narrative corresponds to the Relación de las ceremonias y ríos, población y gobierno de los indios de la provincia de Mechaucán compiled by an anonymous Franciscan between 1539 and 1541 and presented to the viceroy, Don Antonio de Mendoza, in 1541.² On a first comparison, Veracruz appears to have had the chapter on the marriage of "los señores" before him as he paraphrases the words which the Relación ascribes to the priest admonishing the groom to treat an adulterous wife gently (V. 2.2.318). At the same time, he has edited selectively, not only omitting details—the composition of the wedding bread from tamales stuffed with ground pinto beans, the blankets which are the gifts given to the priest and the bride’s companions—but adding information: the girl carrying the broom of reeds is his.

"How the Lower Class People [Gente baja] Marry" of the Relación is paralleled fairly closely by Veracruz in his account of the father’s speech to his daughter. Veracruz has added the information about the gifts they exchange (Veracruz 2.2.316). The custom of the groom gathering wood while the bride sweeps is recounted in the next section of the Relación as it is in Veracruz (V. 2.2.316; Relación 214).⁶ The Relación describes the covering with the garment, noting that if the wife is a noble, a slave will do the covering. Veracruz treats the custom as that of the lesser folk only (V. 2.2.316).

Other parallels are the complaints of quarreling couples to Petámuti; his efforts to reconcile them, followed by his judgment of divorce if they do not amend; the impossibility of second divorces; the ease of divorce in the lower class; the custom of marrying the mother in anticipation of marrying the daughter.⁷ But there are also notable discrepancies. Veracruz alone has the information about marrying two sisters in succession (V. 2.3.325). The Relación alone has the custom of marrying the spouse of a deceased brother or sister; a description of the parents’ option, when their daughter has intercourse with a boy, of disgracing the boy or confirming a marriage; and an account of the actual wedding ceremony of Don Pedro Ciuranaguari, a native who, while acting as the Spanish governor, was a principal informant for the Relación.⁸ The Relación
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describes simple folk who “today marry, promising marriage (sic) that they will be one until death,” and “other poor men” who “enter the woman’s house and remain there as married without saying anything” (Relación 213). These cases look like the cases Veracruz has investigated where a promise to farm is exchanged for a promise to sew or where the couple have given him various accounts of their intentions. The Relación notes that with the silent coupling “it is sufficient” if the parents or relatives agree. It adds that in secret marriages they use the future not the present tense, “because they have this way of speaking in their tongue” (Relación 217). Veracruz ignores both these points of considerable canonical interest but, unlike the Relación, he gives an account of the unions ratified by Hiprandesca thungum tembuni.

The most striking differences are on incest, endogamy, and polygamy. In addition to the universal barrier of the first degree of consanguinity mentioned by Veracruz, the Relación says that paternal uncles cannot marry nieces.9 The Relación inserts in the speeches of the noble bride’s father references to the bride and groom being of the same stock and a declaration that their ancestors are Chichimecas, and adds—it is one of the writer’s infrequent editorial comments on his sources—that “they do not mix their lines like the Jews” (Relación 213). Veracruz says nothing of such restrictions. As to polygamy, where Veracruz refers, vaguely enough, to Atabalus and the lord of Tezcuco, the Relación describes in exuberant detail the establishment of the Cazonci, Michoacán’s hereditary ruler: he is portrayed as having both a corps of bare-breasted female slaves and a harem of daughters of noble families, the latter of whom bear him a multitude of children who are then given princely treatment (Relación 183). Over these the Yreri, or mistress of the house, dominates and is “like the natural wife” of the Cazonci, while the noble girls are referred to as wives of the god Cueraueri (Relación 182). Technically, of course, the Cazonci is not married to them; later, however, the new Cazonci is said “to marry” all his father’s wives (Relación 230). In the saga of the Chichimecas, which makes up the body of the Relación, Tariacuri, the founding father, sends home one wife and is then given two sisters for brides (Relación 81); the goddess Xaratanga promises Tangáxoan, the master-to-be of Michoacán, that she shall cause him “to have women enclosed in [your] house” (Relación 136). These images of polygamy are accepted as part of the ideal life of powerful men. If Veracruz had been familiar with them, it is hard to see why he would not have incorporated some reference to polygamy in his description of customs in Michoacán.

Veracruz, it might be supposed, had once read the Relación and was now recalling parts of it from memory, but the similarities are too great to attribute to memory alone. The principal possibilities are that Veracruz pruned, corrected, and supplemented the Relación from other
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sources, or that he and the Relación have at points a common source, while otherwise drawing on different sources and describing different traditions. The latter seems more probable. Veracruz is meticulous in citing scholarly authorities, but he does not acknowledge the Relación. Instead, he says explicitly that the account of the nobles' marriage is what "we have learned from the senior men and the priests of the demons" (V. 2.2.316). The Relación declares that it is the work of "the old men of this city of Mechuacan" (Tzintzuntzan) (Relación 6). It adds "this people has no books" (Relación 3), so that both Veracruz and the Relación are depending on the oral memory of their informants. The two Spanish works are closest in their rendition of four formulas spoken at the marriage ceremony: the admonition, "Look that you be not killed on account of any adultery"; the admonition to the bride, "Look that you be not found by anyone on the road speaking with any man, for then they shall defame us"; the admonition of the priest to the noble groom, "If you take your wife in adultery, leave her and send her to her home peacefully without inflicting injury upon her"; and the admonition of the father to the lower class bride, "In no way leave your own husband in bed at night and go elsewhere to commit adultery. Beware lest you do bad medicine and be an omen for me. And you shall not live long on earth if you do evil. They will kill you and me together if you commit adultery."

The focus of all these formulas on marital fidelity and the treatment of adultery are paralleled in the Relación's saga of the Chichimecas. One of its most dramatic stories is the promiscuity of Tariacuri's first wife once she is out of his sight and his doleful, depressed, and gentle reaction to it (Relación 71-74). The behavior of Tariacuri, the hero of the saga, appears as an exemplum embodying the teaching of the priestly formula at the marriage of nobles. The killing of an adulteress or an adulterer, as threatened in the lower class ceremony, is not found in the saga, where the worst punishment threatened for adulterers is the customary splitting of the ears (Relación 73).

The similarity between Veracruz and the Relación is then explained by the fact that both give the words and practices of a ritual: it confirms the authenticity of the ceremony. Until now, it has been supposed that the Relación was the "unique source of information contemporaneous with the Conquest for the history and ethnology of the Tarascan people." That judgment must be revised.

Veracruz's main source appears to be his own observation of the humbler people of Michoacán. The most common practice, and one he supposes to have been universal before the Christians came, is the exchange of promises to farm and to sew: "for among these people, the custom is for a wife to make her husband's clothes" (V. 2.2.319). A marriage after years of life together also "happens often" (V. 1.35.171).
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When the Indians were asked what was in their heads when they had intercourse without a ceremony, the answers appear to be given to Veracruz himself. Presumably he uses a euphemism when he reports some of them saying they were “sinnen”; the “Nothing” has a more authentic ring (V. 2.3.321). His comments on the Indians’ timorousness and gentleness come from his own experience with them. *Hiprandesca thungum tembuni* is Veracruz’s attempt to render in the Latin alphabet the sounds he had repeated to him (V. 2.2.319).

Whose customs is he describing? Four principal languages, reflecting distinct cultural groups, were spoken within the province of Michoacán: Chichimeca, Nahuatl, Otimi, and Tarascan. Before coming to Michoacán, Veracruz had lived in Mexico City where the Aztecs spoke Nahuatl. In Michoacán, he had taught at Tiripetio, a Tarascan center, and at Tacámbaro on the edge of the Terra Caliente. He had established Augustinian houses at Actopa, the center of the Otimi, at Xilitia on the border of the Chichimecas and at Chiantla, in the south. Tarascan was the language he knew, yet he does not suppose that all of Michoacán was Tarascan, and he does not use the name, foisted by the Spanish on the Indians (*Relación* 247), at all: he speaks of “the unbelievers of this province of Michoacán” (V. 2.2.314). The ritual of the nobles’ marriage in the *Relación* ended with an invocation of the Chichimecas’ ancestors; presumably it reflected Chichimeca dominance in the government.

Veracruz omits the reference, possibly because his Purépeche informants did not use it. Speaking of an area where the largest town had probably no more than 10,000 inhabitants, he insists on the variety of marriage customs within Michoacán: there is no uniformity, “not in the province as a whole, not even in a single city” (V. 2.3.327). The Indians differ among themselves as to religion (V. 1.32.159). Their rulers have established different rules for marriage (V. 1.32.160). Marriage is a sacrament of the Church, but it is also “a human contract,” which “occurs differently in different nations.”

In a splendid demonstration of the variety he is confronting, he follows the account of a Michoacán ceremony with a ceremonial marriage among the Aztec nobles of Mexico. First, the astrologers are consulted as to whether such a union would be lasting and produce children; then, if the augury is good, the boy’s parents send women to the girl’s home to ask her parents for her, but the girl’s parents are evasive. The women return on a second embassy and praise the ancestry of the boy and his parents’ riches. The girl’s parents consult with their relatives and with her, and send an embassy of women from their house to the boy’s parents. The boy’s parents exhort him to live well with the girl and to love her; the girl’s parents exhort her to serve her husband. The nuptial day is set. The girl is carried to the groom’s house. The pair is seated on a bench before a fire, and two female soothsayers bind them
with linen cloth. The bride gives the groom a shirt while he gives her a tunic. Food is put before them. The groom is fed by the bride. The bride is fed by the groom. They remain before the fire four days, sleeping there and leaving only to relieve themselves; since if either goes outside the immediate area, it is said to be a sign that they do not love one another. Their parents and relatives get drunk while they stay sober, praying the gods to bless their union. At the end of four days, the soothsayers carry the bride and the groom to a bed decorated and prepared for them. The ceremony is over (V. 2.3.328-330). The selection of details by Veracruz in this account as in his account of the Michoacán ceremony—in the one, the knife, the shirt, and the broom; in the other, the fire before the couple bound with linen—has the austerity and clarity, although not the geometrical purity, of a Sanchez Cotan.

Why did Veracruz present these tableaux? His aim was not that of the Relación, a general historical, political, and ethnographic survey. He is no Bernardino de Sahagún, carefully preserving the legends and the rites of a past civilization. He wrote as a canonist, philosopher, and theologian. His purpose in Speculum coniugiorum—Mirror of Marriages—was to instruct other theologians and canonists when they treated the marriage cases presented by Indian converts to the Christian faith (V. Preface 8). Veracruz was a scholastic bred by Salamanca, a Thomist, a pupil of Vitoria, “our former teacher and the unique and most perfect theologian of our age” (V. 3.18.637). His book was devoted to analysis of the law, and 95 percent or more of its matter was drawn from the Bible, the Decretals, the canonist commentators on the Decretals, and St. Thomas Aquinas, not from close observation of the Indians. It was no more and no less dependent upon actual practice than is the typical American legal treatise. His aim was “to join theory to practice” and “so to fit the decisions of the popes to the customs and mores of the neophytes that no room will remain for delay in judging the cases which arise” (V. Preface 8).

The aim was to help the Indian converts through the Church, but this did not distort his descriptions. The easiest ecclesiastical solution for a convert with a marriage problem was to invoke the Pauline privilege which permits remarriage on abandonment by the unconverted spouse. Veracruz insists that such abandonment is rare (V. 2.28.491). Alternatively, if the marriage made before conversion could be treated as invalid, the convert would be free as a Christian to marry at will. Veracruz is at pains to insist that the majority of the unions made by the Indians in Michoacán were true marriages (V. 2.2.313-320); the custom of divorce did not mean that the unions were not meant to last (V. 2.4.331-333); the
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incest rules of the Church did not bind the Indians who were outside the Church (V. 1.10.415). The only grounds for invalidation which Veracruz finds frequent are two: fear and prior marriages. The Indians, so easily frightened, often married under compulsion, and they often entered second unions while an earlier spouse still lived. On either of these grounds, a convert may often be released from a marriage made before his conversion (V. 1.8.53). Veracruz applies the canon law here.

In the marriage ceremony itself the formulas on fidelity are important evidence for Veracruz's position that the ceremony establishes a special conjugal relation; but a canonist could not have helped noticing that, of the three classical "goods of marriage," fidelity, offspring, and indissolubility, only fidelity was mentioned in the nobles' ceremony, and mentioned in such a way as to allow for dissolution if it were not observed. From this he draws no inferences adverse to the marriage's validity; nor does he even advert to the absence of any verbal expression of consent by the man and woman, the consent which, canonists held, "makes a marriage." The tension between what he is describing and standard doctrine is evidence of his descriptions' accuracy.

"The joining of male and female in matrimony we say is natural, because nature teaches it; therefore we affirm it is found among the unbelievers, among whom natural things still remain whole" (V. 2.2.317). The proper citation to Thomas' Summa theologica accompanies this assertion. The belief in a common human nature and a corresponding natural law orients Veracruz, no doubt, toward finding similarities and detecting patterns in the marriage customs. To this extent, it operates as a bias. The bias is controlled. When he describes cohabitation without divorce, or living together "like two brute animals" (V. 2.3.321) without any exchange of promises, he describes patterns not readily reconcilable with his own assumptions, and he does not shrink from them. Easy divorce, incest in unions beyond the first degree of kinship, polygamy among distant princes—all of these practices which constitute departures from the secondary precepts of Thomistic natural law—Veracruz describes with care and without prejudice. In its context, even "brute animals" is more descriptive than pejorative.

The parting advice Veracruz always gave his own students of theology in the provinces of Michoacán and Mexico, and which he wrote down so they might have it permanently, was to seek always "the advantage of these poor natives, helping them, consoling them, favoring them in their works, spiritual and temporal, so that they may recognize the fervor of charity and love of God and of neighbor in the ministers of His Church. . . ." The phrase "poor natives" has a patronizing sound; but the impulse is nonetheless benevolent. Veracruz is very far from the ruffians who had established Spanish control of Michoa-
cán. He responds with love to what he sees as the timorous, innately gentle human beings of this New World—the same beings who engage in almost uninterrupted fighting in the saga of the Chichimecas, and who stop fighting only to sacrifice selected prisoners to the gods and to eat ceremonially the worst of their enemies (Relación 20-168). In this land he had himself become a new man, dying to his old self, Alonso Gutierrez, privileged intellectual of Salamanca, reborn as Alonso de la Veracruz, Augustinian friar, whose very name was taken from the port where he had touched the New World’s shores. In the first sentence of the Preface to the Speculum coniugiorum, he speaks not of poor natives, but of “the new men, newly discovered, of the New World.” It is they whom he seeks “to aid most” (V. Preface 8).

That these new men are human beings, identical in all essentials with Europeans, is the underlying assumption and pervasive theme of Speculum coniugiorum. Without the profound conviction that human beings “newly discovered” are one in nature, dignity, and end with those in Europe, the adapting of papal decisions to Indian customs would make no sense. Marriage is a “human contract,” occurring “differently in different nations”—ethnographic variety is given full weight; but examination, comparison, and judgment is possible only because Veracruz believes all human beings are rational and share common impulses ordained for a common end.

Consequently, Speculum coniugiorum is a work which, carefully recording what its author has learned and seen of customs in Michoacán, is the first ethnographic account by a theologian or canonist of the marriage customs of the western hemisphere; it is an account, moreover, which is integrated into a theological-canonical dissertation, where the marriage customs are described in the context of established Christian law. Contemporary with the Council of Trent but too recent to be taken into its thinking, practical in its aim but too concerned with theory to be easily applied, loyal in its fidelity to the decretals of the popes but too conservative to dissolve all difficulties by involving papal power, Speculum coniugiorum heads that Spanish reexamination of Catholic marriage doctrine which culminates, at the turn of the century, in the masterpiece Disputationum de sancto matrimonii sacramento of Tomás Sánchez (1602). Presenting the Roman Curia and the theologians of Europe with the convert’s marriage as a problem of intellectual and legal complexity, Veracruz prepared for, if he did not provoke, that exercise of papal power over the marriage of unbelievers, whose effect upon the Catholic doctrine of marriage was to be profound and permanent. The marriages of the new men of the New World, described by Veracruz, opened a new chapter for Catholic Europe. Natives of modern America, whose patterns of marriage recall those of Michoacán, we are its most recent beneficiaries.
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NOTES

1. Alonso de la Veracruz, Speculum coniugiorum (Mexico 1556) Part 2, article 2, p. 319. Hereafter cited as V.
2. “Broom”: Stramen, literally “wand,” in V; “broom” from the context. I am indebted to my wife, Mary Lee, for the correct translation. The kind of broom made from rushes described by Veracruz appears in the illustration done by an Indian artist of the period in the Relación (n. 5 below) 213.
3. V. 2. 5. 335; Veracruz appears to speak of people (plebs) here, as distinct from nobles.
4. In the Preface 8, Veracruz indicates that he wrote the first draft in 1546; but in the printing “many things were added, and many deleted,” Peroratio after 3.20. 657.
5. Relación de las ceremonias y ritos, población y gobierno de los indios de la provincia de Mechuacán (1541), facsimile reproductions of MS §IV.5 of El Escorial, with transcription, prologue, introduction, and notes by José Tudela de la Orden and a review of the Tarascan words by José Corona Núñez (Madrid 1956) [hereafter cited as Relación]. This is the best edition of the manuscript; unfortunately it was unknown to Eugene R. Craine and Reginald C. Reindorp when, using the defective Morelia edition of 1903, they prepared their English translation, The Chronicles of Michoacán (Norman, Okla. [1970]). The manuscript is undated, but probably completed by the end of 1541: Tudela, Prólogo, p. ii. Its probable author, Tudela concludes at p. ii, was the Franciscan Maturino Gilberti, author of the Diálogo de doctrina christiana en la lengua de Mechuacán (n. p. 1559), and of Vocabulario en lengua de Mechuacán (n. p. 1559), and the only Franciscan known for a certainty to have a command of Tarascan. It was argued by the modern Spanish Augustinian Gutierrez Cabezán that Veracruz himself was the author: he had the knowledge and the opportunity. Tudela rejects this view because the illustration of the manuscript, done contemporaneously, shows a Franciscan presenting the work to the Viceroy. It could now be added that Veracruz could not have been the author of both the Relación and the Speculum.
6. Craine and Reindorp (n. 5 above) 41 translate nuevamente as “again” so that the Relación seems to speak of second marriage. I believe “nuevamente” should be rendered “recently”—the custom is general.
7. Complaint to Petámuti, reconciliation, divorce: Relación 215-216, V. 2. 5. 335; ease of divorce: Relación 214, V. 2. 6. 336; marriage of mother and of daughter: Relación 214, V. 2. 3. 325.
8. Relación 214 (marriage of deceased sibling’s spouse); 215-216 (parents’ option); 207-210 (Don Pedro’s marriage).
9. Relación 217-218. The greatest garbling of the Morelia edition occurs here at p. 57: it supplies punctuation which suggests that mother-son marriages are an exception to the incest rule, a curiosity blindly followed by Craine and Reindorp 43. The Morelia edition also transcribes “hermanos de padre” as “hombres de padre,” making nonsense of the text on paternal uncles; Craine and Reindorp, however, cap the confusion by translating “hombres de padre” as “priests,” thereby inventing a rule of clerical celibacy for the priests of Michoacán. For V. see 1.43.222.
10. A translation of the Latin of Veracruz (2.2.315), which reads: “Videte ne aliquis vos interficiat ob aliquod adulterium” (Parents of bride to both). The Relación 212 reads: “mirá no os mate alguno por algún adulterio o injuria que cometerés” (Priest to bride).
11. A translation of the Latin of Veracruz (2.2.315), which reads: “Vide ne inveniariis ab aliquo in via loquens cum alio viro, quia tunc infamabunt nos” (Parents of bride to bride). The Relación 212 reads: “Mirá que no os hallar en el camino hablando con algún varón, que os prenderán, y entonces daremos que decir de nosotros en pueblo” (Priest to bride). (From the context, it should be not the priest, but the bride’s father or parents.)
12. A translation of the Latin of Veracruz (2.2.315), which reads: “Si mulierem tuam in adulterio deprehenderis, relinque eam, et mitte in domum propriam, pacifice, sine hoc quod ei injuriam inferas.” The Relación 212, reads: “... si notares a tu mujer de algún adulterio, déjala mansamente, y envíala a su casa sin hacéle mal...”
13. A translation of the Latin of Veracruz (2.2.316), which reads: “Nullo modo relinquas proprium virum in lecto noctu, et vadas alibi aliquod adulterium commitere. Cave tibi ne facias maleficium, eris mihi augurium. Et non diu vives super terram: si malum feceris occident te, simul et me, si adulterium commisseris.” The Relación reads: “Hija, no dejes a tu marido echado de noche, y te vayas a otra parte hacer algún adulterio; mira no seas mala, no me hagas este mal; mira que serás aigerio y no vivirás mucho tiempo mira que tú sola buscarás tu muerte; quizá tu marido entra en los cués a la oración, y tú sola buscarás tu muerte: que no mataran mas de a ti; mira que no andaba yo así, que soy tu padre; que me harás echar lágrimas, metiéndome en tu maleficio y no solamente mataran a ti, sino a mi también contigo.”

14. Contrary to the text here of the Relación, and also contrary to the spirit of the marriage formulas, the annotation to the Madrid edition, p. 73, states, “Los adulterios tenían pena de muerte.” Veracruz speaks of the death penalty only for the adultery of a once-divorced woman (2.5.335).

15. Tudela (n. 5 above) v. See, for instance, the use of the Relación by George M. Foster, Empire’s Children: The People of Tzintzuntzan, Smithsonian Institution, Institute of Social Anthropology, 6 (Mexico 1948) 6-7. Veracruz presents an account of marriage which would lead to considerable modification in work such as Foster, 11.


18. Ennis (n. 17 above) 43, 45.

19. Ibid., 42, 56.

20. For example, the whole saga of the Relación reflects a Chichimeca perspective.

21. For 10,000 as the probable population of Tzintzuntzan, by contemporary Spanish count in 1554 and by modern demographic estimate, see Lesley Bird Simpson, “The Population of 22 Towns in Michoacán in 1554,” The Hispanic American Historical Review 30 (1950) 249.

22. See 2.2.316 for a similar warning that he is describing only one of several ways.

23. For an account of the marriage of Aztec nobles much fuller than Veracruz’s, differing in a number of details, but on the whole similar, see Bernardino de Sahagún, Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España (5 vols. Mexico 1938) 2. 150-157.

24. He excepts the unions made with no promises, 2.3. 321.

25. Some of the unions in violation of natural law, however, he judges to be invalid.

26. St. Augustine, De bono coniugali, 29. 32; in Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum (Vienna 1866 on) 41. 227.

27. Gratian, Decretum, dictum post c. 2, C. 27, q. 2.

28. Reproduced in Grijalva (n. 17 above) Edad iii, Capítulo 33, fol. 157v. The benevolent side of friars like Veracruz and their respect for the Indians as persons are set out in detail in Robert Ricard, La “conquête spirituelle” du Mexique (Paris 1933) 337.

29. See the account of these creatures in the Relación 256-271.


31. It is God not the Church, he thinks, who says what marriages can be dissolved. Cajetan to the contrary, the pope cannot dissolve unconsummated marriages, V. 2.28.490. This position influences his conservative reading of Pius V’s decree Romani Pontificis of 1571 in the 1572 edition of his work 3.18 (see the republication of this edition, Milan 1599).

The Theological
Significance of the Discovery of America
by Lewis Hanke

In reading the historical literature on the Renaissance and the Reformation, one gets the impression that Spain and Portugal had relatively little to offer, and that theology particularly was a learned enterprise that flourished only in certain soils, particularly those near Rome. American experience and American problems received almost no attention at the Council of Trent (1545-63), that great ecumenical gathering of bishops which was probably the most thoroughgoing reform in the history of the Roman Catholic Church. The Council was principally concerned with launching a theological attack on the Protestants, and the powerful Jesuits and other ecclesiastical authorities in Europe had not yet developed much interest in New World problems.

However we may explain the fact that most European thinkers in the sixteenth century paid little or no attention to the Iberian scholastic renaissance, this neglect continued for three centuries. Standard histories of philosophy and theology and general histories of the Church rarely made any reference to America or to the disputes which its discovery provoked among Spaniards of the Conquest period. Even such a generally conscientious and competent scholar as the nineteenth-century historian of the papacy, Ludwig von Pastor, included little on America in his massive opus, and not until Robert Streit began in 1916 to publish his monumental Bibliotheca missionum did the scholarly world have any solid bibliographical and documentary basis for the study of
the history of the Roman Catholic Church in America. For this and other reasons, during the last half century the world of American and European scholarship has become more generally aware of the doctrines and disputes of the Dominicans Francisco de Vitoria, Bartolomé de Las Casas, and other Spanish theologians who concerned themselves with the ecclesiastical problems raised during the years between 1492 and the Council of Trent. But even now much remains to be discovered in this field, though what has been learned is not always recognized. The most detailed study on the salvation of pagans, by the Spanish Jesuit Ángel Santos Hernández, for example, devotes little attention to America, although some substantial contributions on the subject have been published in Spanish and in other languages.

Throughout the Middle Ages Christian theologians debated whether pagans could be saved. The Catalan Raymond Lull declared in the thirteenth century: "God has such love for His people that almost all men in the world shall be saved; since, if more were damned than saved, Christ's mercy would be without great love." This assertion, however, was solemnly condemned as heretical by Pope Gregory XI, and the question whether force should be used to promote conversion to Christianity also produced deep disagreements. In the early fifteenth century the Order of Crucifers (Teutonic Knights) claimed that papal and imperial privileges authorized them to conquer the lands of pagans on Poland's frontiers by force of arms, a position which was strongly opposed by Paul Wladimiri, rector of Cracow University, at the time of the Council of Constance (1414-18). The Knights cited Aristotle's "natural slave" theory to justify their actions against the pagans.

Theologians paid considerable attention to what they called "God's virtuous heathen," but they achieved no consensus in the centuries preceding Columbus. Many believed that only a few could be saved. Thomas Aquinas, however, had a more generous position than that of the Augustinians, for example, for he held that God would employ extraordinary means to bring the conscientious pagan into the Christian fold, according to the axiom of the scholastics, Facienti quod in se est, Deus non denegat gratiam: "God does not refuse grace to one who does his best." But this was a theoretical attitude, rarely put to the test of reality, for few Europeans actually saw or had meaningful relations with many heathens (virtuous or not), inasmuch as their missionary activities had taken place largely on the periphery of the medieval world. Thus the first time Christians confronted millions of people unaware of their religion and were faced with the many practical and theoretical problems of converting them was when America was discovered. One student has explained in this way the inability of the medieval thinkers to cope with American problems:
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Medieval philosophers, including the Thomists, were generally under the influence of Aristotelian and Ptolemaic natural science and geography. Hence from a philosophical and theological point of view they were unequipped at first to deal with the new and astonishing problem of a New World. A fairly good parallel would be if, in our age, we should suddenly discover that intelligent life exists on a nearby planet. The theologians would be running all over the place trying to explain, and we would probably end up discussing many of the same questions that the Spaniards of the sixteenth century did.8

As Richard M. Morse has concisely explained:

Initially Spanish jurists and theologians were at a loss in characterizing the Indian. Certainly he was not a Christian. Neither could he rightly be considered an infidel or a heretic, categories amply defined in such sources as Las siete partidas. Was he an innocent child of nature with a human mind and soul, amenable to life in a Christian community? Or did his idols and human sacrifice show him to be inherently bestial and nonrational, a creature of Satan, an Aristotelian “natural slave?”9

Missionaries who attempted to “get inside” the alien culture of the Indians became the first “cultural relativists,” and many wavered “curiously between the dogmatic zeal of proselytizing and the pluralistic, freely inquiring temper of the Renaissance.”10

Spaniards were not only in the forefront of those who explored the vast reaches of the New World—Marcel Bataillon has pointed out that they roamed over as much territory in the 70 years after 1492 as had been explored in the previous thousand years by other Europeans—but they were pioneers too in tackling the theoretical and theological issues involved. Spanish efforts to Christianize the Indians have been characterized by Robert Ricard as a “spiritual conquest” of no less significance than the astounding military conquests of Hernando Cortés, Francisco Pizarro, and the other conquistadores who carried the banners of Spain to the far corners of her empire in America.11 As Enrique Tierno Galván says, in the discovery of America “the present and the past came together in a collision without precedent.”12

Europeans did not entirely ignore American developments, despite their preoccupation with the Turkish peril and the Protestant revolt. Bartolomé Sybilla in his Speculum peregrinarum quaecstionum (1516) made one of the first attempts to understand the implications for Christians of the existence of masses of Indians in the New World who had had no previous contact with Christianity. Then Emperor Maximilian (1459-1519) became interested in the souls of the Indians and requested an opinion from Juan de Heindenburg, better known as Trithemio, who replied in his Curiositas regia (1521) that “those infidels who had led innocent lives would suffer no positive punishment whatsoever, though
they would be excluded from supernatural felicity or divine vision." Here Trithemio was applying the concept of limbo, which medieval theologians had developed to explain what happened to the patriarchs of the Old Testament and also to explain what happened to infants who died without baptism. About the same time as Trithemio, the archbishop of Turin, Claude Seyssel, elaborated the doctrine that ordinary pagans would be consigned to limbo, the intermediate stage between heaven and hell. None of the Spanish thinkers who wrestled with the theological problems created by the discovery of America seems to have followed the example of Trithemio and Seyssel in trying to apply the medieval limbo idea to the American Indians; indeed, the concept of limbo has never been and is not now an official teaching of the Church.  

There seems to have been no sustained interest in Rome during the early years concerning America and the Indians, as John W. O'Malley makes clear: "Although representatives of the missions in the New World were present at the Fifth Lateran Council which met in Rome from 1512 until 1517, there is not a single mention of the New World in its acts and orations which have survived." An individual authority, however, such as Cajetan (Tommaso de Vio), cardinal and former Master General of the Dominican order, showed good sense and concern when he replied in 1532-33 to various pastoral questions sent him by Dominican missionaries in America. Cajetan had earlier argued strongly that conversions could not be forced and could be effected only by good preaching and good instruction by holy missionaries. He naturally denounced as unjust and immoral the wars of conquest in America.

Early in the history of America a new element entered into the problem—the idea that all Spaniards, laymen and priests alike, had an obligation to Christianize the Indians. During the long centuries of the Reconquista, when Spain was slowly recovering her lands from the Moslems, there had developed no doctrine that the Spanish people had an obligation to help convert the Jews or Moslems. There was little effort by anyone in Spain to Christianize the Moslems, though there were some concerted attempts to convert Jews, especially by St. Vincent Ferrer. One of the methods used was compulsory attendance at sermons, but there seems to have been little or no theological doctrine behind these attempts, and certainly there was no feeling that lay Spaniards had a special responsibility to bring Jews or anyone else into the Christian fold. As Harold B. Johnson, Jr. has stated in a thoughtful analysis of missionary efforts in medieval Spain, even the Crown "had not been especially eager to convert Jews and Moors until the late fifteenth century, and then only for reasons of Castilian internal politics."

With the opening up of the New World with its millions of pagans,
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however, the idea emerged that all Spaniards should look upon the Indians as potential brothers and attempt to Christianize them. The Spaniards who enjoyed tribute and labor from Indians were expressly charged to aid in their conversion, a commitment never imposed on the encomenderos in medieval Spain. Most important of all, the Spanish crown regarded the conversion of the Indians as establishing the "justness" of Spanish rule.

The missionaries were fired with a burning zeal to convert the Indians, and many of the hundreds of missionaries who hurried to America were determined to reestablish in the New World the foundations of Christendom which had been so severely shaken in Europe by the Protestant revolt. Their harvest was impressive. As Alonso de Zorita pointed out in an eloquent statement to the Council of the Indies in 1584, if Spaniards had made very little headway in converting the Moors in Granada during a 70-year period, in America they had achieved much: "Usually the missionaries taught the Indians to read, write, and observe good customs. Many have been taught how to play musical instruments so that they can play in church, while others have been taught grammar and rhetoric. Some have become excellent Latinists and have composed very elegant orations and poetry." Some six million Indians were baptized by 1540 according to one estimate.

But the success in America had not been accomplished easily. From the earliest years of the conquest there had been sharp differences of opinion, among lay and religious figures alike, on the capacity of the New World natives for Christianity and European civilization. The archives of the Council of the Indies, from the time it was established in 1524, began to fill with divergent testimony on the nature of the Indians, and occasionally Europeans who stayed at home had an opportunity to see a few Indians or their handiwork. Thus Albrecht Dürer in 1520 marvelled at the artistic ability shown by the Indian jewelry and featherwork sent by Cortés to Charles V for exhibition in Brussels. And when Cortés was engaged in getting several of his natural children legitimized he sent a group of Aztec jugglers to Rome to assist in obtaining papal approval. Charles V also once spent a pleasant afternoon in Valladolid watching Indian dancers and listening to their exotic music. But the first time that theological and ideological questions originating in America were reflected in a publication in Europe occurred in 1537 when the Latin letter written in 1535 by the Dominican Julián Garcés, the bishop of Tlaxcala in Mexico, was printed in Rome (see Appendix). This rare item, whose only known copy, well preserved, is in the John Carter Brown Library, was part of the campaign to convince Pope Paul III that the Indians could and should be Christianized, and their bodies and property protected from rapacious conquistadores.

The Council of the Indies, which considered that it had the principal
authority and responsibility in the matter, had sought advice in many quarters, and a flood of sharply contradictory opinions resulted. One Dominican, Domingo de Betanzos, submitted such an unfavorable response that other ecclesiastics concluded that he considered Indians incapable of Christianity. Therefore they carried the dispute not only to the Council of the Indies but to Rome itself, where in 1537 Pope Paul III was prevailed upon to issue the famous bull *Sublimis Deus* which declared Indians “truly men” and capable of the faith, in notable words. The first two paragraphs read as follows:

The sublime God so loved the human race that He not only created man in such wise that he might participate in the good that other creatures enjoy, but endowed him with capacity to attain to the inaccessible and invisible Supreme Good and behold it face to face; and since man, according to the testimony of the sacred scriptures, has been created to enjoy eternal life and happiness, which none may obtain save through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, it is necessary that he should possess the nature and faculties enabling him to receive that faith, and that whoever is thus endowed should be capable of receiving that same faith. Nor is it credible that any one should possess so little understanding as to desire the faith and yet be destitute of the most necessary faculty to enable him to receive it. Hence Christ, who is the Truth itself, that has never failed and can never fail, said to the preachers of the faith whom He chose for that office “Go ye and teach all nations.” He said all, without exception, for all are capable of receiving the doctrines of the faith.

The enemy of the human race, who opposes all good deeds in order to bring men to destruction, beholding and envying this, invented a means never before heard of, by which he might hinder the preaching of God’s word of Salvation to the people; he inspired his satellites who, to please him, have not hesitated to publish abroad that the Indians of the West and the South, and other people of whom We have recent knowledge should be treated as dumb brutes created for our service, pretending that they are incapable of receiving the Catholic faith.23

By this time Las Casas had re-entered the fight on behalf of the Indians, after a long period of silence in the Dominican convent on the island of Hispaniola. He emphasized the need to educate the Indians and to persuade them individually of the truth of Christian doctrine. He entered into conflict with those missionaries—especially certain Franciscans—who favored rapid and wholesale baptism of the natives, without too many questions asked or catechisms learned. So hot did this argument become in America that it was referred to Spain, where the Emperor Charles V called upon a distinguished committee of theologians at the University of Salamanca, headed by the Dominican Francisco de Vitoria, which in 1541 decided in favor of those who insisted
on proper doctrinal instruction. In this instance the Dominicans of Salamanca supported this position, while some of their old competitors the Franciscans took the opposite one. Yet there were larger issues involved, and adherents of both positions were to be found in all the missionary orders. It is even clearer that the theological problems posed by the discovery of America puzzled and profoundly disturbed Spanish ecclesiastics, no matter which order they belonged to.

Could the Indians really be educated? The Franciscan school for Indians at Tlatelolco in Mexico was opposed, particularly if the objective was to get them ready to be ordained for the priesthood; and in this instance the Dominican Betanzos was among those who opposed. As usual, the dispute was carried back to Spain for further discussion, and we find one prominent Franciscan, Alfonso de Castro, who supported the education theory in his treatise (1542) *Whether the Natives of the New World Should be Instructed in the Mysteries of Theology and the Liberal Arts.*

Castro had taught for 30 years in the Franciscan convent in Salamanca and had become famous for his treatise against Protestantism, *Adversus omnes haereses* (Paris 1534). With Francisco de Vitoria, he was considered one of the outstanding theologians of the time. His 1542 opinion in favor of instruction for the Indians is also of value in understanding the arguments against instructing them, which were:

1. The Indians are inconstant in the Christian faith;
2. They live obscene lives. Because they are like swine, Christians should not throw pearls before them;
3. The sacred texts of the Bible should not be shown to the people.

On the last point, Castro argued that the "mysteries of the Christian faith have value in themselves"; thus the Bible should not be hidden from the people. In this Castro's doctrine coincided with that of Bishop Juan de Zumárraga of Mexico, who in his "Conclusion exortatoria" favored translating the Bible into the popular languages so that it might be read by everyone: "I do not understand why our doctrine should be hidden away from all but those few called theologians. No one can be called a Platonist unless he has read Plato. Likewise, no one may be called a Christian who has not read the doctrine of Jesus Christ." Castro's argument that Scripture should be made widely available to the people must have surprised some of his contemporaries and perhaps explains why he buttressed his own views with the written support of five other established theologians, including the already famous Dominican Francisco de Vitoria. They not only approved Castro's doctrine, but explained in detail why they did so. They had never been to the New World, and they may never have seen the Indians brought to Spain by missionaries or *conquistadores*. But they perceived the deep issues involved in Castro's treatise, and their formal opinions, as drawn up at the time Castro presented his treatise to Charles V, are a notable part of the
Governing the New World documentation available on the theological aspects of early American history. Vitoria had this to say:

Everything that has been said by the Reverend Father Fray Alfonso de Castro seems to me to have been said in a way that is learned, pious, and religious. I am all the more amazed that anyone should have been the author or inventor of such dangerous (or better, deadly) advice for keeping those barbarians from learning and instruction, both human and divine. Certainly not even the devil could have thought up a more effective means than this for instilling in those peoples a perpetual hatred for the Christian religion. Many have abandoned Christ the Lord and the apostles after they had received the faith in different places. But it has not been thought for that reason that Christian doctrine should not be taught to others or that anyone should be kept from instruction.26

Four other theologians also approved Castro’s doctrine, including Luis de Carvajal who stated:

I think that care should be taken that the peoples of the Indies be instructed with the liberal arts and the knowledge of Sacred Scripture. For who are we that we should show the partiality that Christ himself did not have? On the contrary, if these new peoples should see that they are carefully kept from our mysteries, we would give them the opportunity to form a most deadly suspicion. Further, it is ridiculous to admit them to baptism, to the Eucharist, and to the absolution and forgiveness of sins, but not to the knowledge of Scripture. Now it is indeed true that when the unworthy are admitted to a participation in the sacraments that which is holy is thrown to dogs. But whoever are by right admitted to these are for that reason worthy to share in the mysteries.27

But the opponents of Indian education triumphed. In the year after Castro’s treatise appeared, Betanzos and the Dominican Provincial Diego de la Cruz sent the Emperor Charles V a letter in which they declared strongly against Indian education:

Indians should not study because no benefit may be expected from their education, first because they will not be able to preach for a long time inasmuch as this requires an authority over the people which they do not have; moreover, those who do study are worse than those who do not. In the second place, Indians are not stable persons to whom one should entrust the preaching of the Gospel. Finally, they do not have the ability to understand correctly and fully the Christian faith, nor is their language sufficient or copious enough as to be able to express our faith without great improprieties, which could lead easily to serious errors.28

The Mexican ecclesiastical council in 1555 forbade the creation of an Indian priesthood, which meant that the Tlatelolco school lost one of its principal reasons for existence and the seminary withered away, even though some missionaries continued to fight for what they considered
Christian treatment of the Indians. The policy and practice that led Tlatelolco to failure and that made it difficult if not impossible for the Indians to enter the clergy had grave consequences for both Mexico and the Church. As Robert Ricard, whose book on the "spiritual conquest" of Mexico is one of the best brief treatments we have of the early ecclesiastical history of Mexico, explains, the Church came to be considered a largely foreign institution whose fortunes were dependent upon the favor of the governing power at the capital, the ruling white Spanish group. Indians began to enter the priesthood in the seventeenth century, it is true, but in a sporadic fashion, and they were relegated to humble positions in rural parishes. There came into being, says Ricard, two groups of clergy who knew very little of each other, who loved each other hardly at all, and whose mutual antagonism may be symbolized by the rivalry between the two Virgins: that of the Indians, the Virgen de Guadalupe, and that of the Spaniards, the Virgen de los Remedios, the Gachupina. The Indians were served by a poor and miserable clergy, but the Spaniards had a white clergy that belonged to the ruling class and enjoyed enormous revenues. Ricard concludes that "if the colegio at Tlatelolco had trained only one bishop for the country, the whole history of the Mexican Church would have been far different."  

The controversy over the nature of the Indians and also the related question of whether force should be used in their conversion to the Christian faith came to a head—at least so far as Las Casas is concerned—in 1550 at Valladolid, where he attacked the ideas of an outstanding Spanish scholar, Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, who held that Indians were definitely inferior to Spaniards, and that force was necessary to make them Christians. The Emperor Charles V and his advisers were sufficiently impressed by the problems created by this dispute to order conquests in the New World stopped until it could be determined whether they were just, and to set up in Valladolid a council of theologians and jurists to listen to the arguments of Las Casas and Sepúlveda.

We know a great deal about this dispute, thanks to the treatises written by the contestants. We find detailed arguments against Sepúlveda expressed with a singular force and richness in Las Casas' Defense Against the Persecutors and Slanderers of the Peoples of the New World Disclosed Across the Seas. In this polemical volume, Las Casas sets forth in tremendous detail his passionate conviction that "all the peoples of the world are human" and consequently can become Christians—if only they are properly educated by peaceful means in the true faith. This remarkable doctrine was the first enunciation and detailed theological justification in the modern world that all mankind is one, that all may be saved—a fundamental doctrine of "open admission" to the celestial world. When the full story of the theological significance of the discovery
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of America is known, surely the *Defense* will be recognized as one of the fundamental documents in the history of those great disputes which shook the Iberian world in the sixteenth century. 33

NOTES

I wish to acknowledge with thanks the suggestions and questions of Dr. Stafford Poole, C.M., my colleague in Las Casas studies. Specific quotations are taken from privately communicated comments on an earlier version of my paper.

1. *Bibliotheca missionum*, ed. Robert Streit and Johannes Dindinger, Vols. 1-3 (Münster 1916-26). To date 29 volumes of this great work have appeared.

2. For a recent work embodying much research, see the volume edited by Juan Friede and Benjamin Keen, *Bartolomé de Las Casas in History. Toward an Understanding of the Man and His Work* (DeKalb, Ill. 1974).


For a general survey, see Venancio D. Carro, O.P., *La teologia y los teólogos—juristas españoles ante la conquista de América* (ed. 2 Salamanca 1951). The item entitled “America, theological significance of” in the *Catholic Dictionary of Theology* (London 1962) 1. 69-70, is an unusual, imaginative, and path-breaking statement in some ways; however, to indicate how isolated the editors are bibliographically, its authors do not cite any of the numerous Spanish publications on the subject, and even ignore writings in English. Their bibliographical note includes largely works in French, and their article does not refer to any of the principal events and ideas in my paper. A useful general view has been provided by Ernest J. Burrous, S.J., “The Impact of New World Discovery upon European Thought of Man,” in *No Man is Alien: Essays on the Unity of Mankind*, ed. J. Robert Nelson (Leiden 1971) 85-108.


The latest statement of the Roman Catholic Church was made of course at Vatican II in its “Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions,” in *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter M. Abbott, S.J. (New York 1966) 660-668. The basic thought was: “The Church rejects, as foreign to the mind of Christ, any discriminations against men or harassment of them because of their race, color, condition of life, or religion” (668).


6. Professor Benjamin Keen has called to my attention this use of Aristotle, and states that further information may be found in the Polish-language publication by P. Czartoryski, *The Early Reception of Aristotle's Politics at Cracow University* (Cracow 1963).


8. The quotation is from Dr. Poole’s privately communicated comments.

9. *Introduction to Contemporary Civilization in the West* (2 vols. New York 1954). See 1. 490-491. This quotation comes from Professor Morse’s brief but excellent introductory
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remarks on the Las Casas-Sepúlveda dispute. This publication for the first time brought to the attention of students of Western European civilization courses the basic viewpoints in the Valladolid controversy.

10. Ibid.
13. This paragraph is based largely on Santos Hernández (n. 3 above) esp. 80-81. The Protestant movement was far different. As George H. Williams stated: “In the Age of Discovery and Reformation the initial forces of Christian renewal were by and large the forces which tended to restrict rather than enlarge the scope of Christ’s salvation of the world”: “Sectarian Ecumenicity: Reflections on a Little Noticed Aspect of the Radical Reformation,” Review and Expositor 64 (1967) 41-160. See, by the same author, “Erasmus and the Reformers on Non-Christian Religions and Salus Extra Ecclesiam,” in *Action and Conviction in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of E. H. Harbison*, ed. Theodore K. Rabb and Jerrold E. Seigel (Princeton 1969) 319-370: “There was little concern for the salvation of Peoples beyond the hearing of missionaries” (370).
17. See Johnson’s comments in Lewis Hanke, *All Mankind is One* (DeKalb, Ill. 1974) 167-170.
23. It is surprising to discover that the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (16 vols. Washington 1967-74), which is usually excellent in its coverage of American themes, does not mention the New World in its article on Paul III (XI. 13-14). It does refer to the bull *Sublimis Deus*, but states that its purpose was “to examine the condition of the Church and to suggest reform”!
24. Hanke (n. 22 above) 71-72.
24. For the text of this and valuable comments, see Juan B. Olaechea Labayen, "Opinión de los teólogos españoles de dar estudios mayores a indios," Anuario de estudios americanos 15 (1958) 113-200.

25. The Conclusion exortatoria de la obra is the final part of Zumárraga’s Doctrina breve. See Hanke (n. 17 above) 24. For additional information on Franciscan efforts to educate the Indians, see José María Kobayashi, La educación como conquista (la empresa franciscana en México) (Mexico 1974).


27. Ibid., 25.

28. Ibid., 25.


30. Ricard (n. 11 above) 419. Professor Benjamin Keen has called to my attention the fact that after 1600 the Virgen de Guadalupe was the patroness not only of the Indians but the creoles as well, as opposed to the Gachupina, the Virgen de los Remedios. More information on this development may be found in Jacques Lafaye, Quetzalcoatl et Guadalupe: la formation de la conscience nationale au Mexique (Paris 1973).

31. Trans. and ed. Stafford Poole, C.M., from the Latin MS in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (DeKalb, Ill. 1974).

32. For an analysis of the treatise and a historical background on the question of the capacity of the Indians, see Hanke (n. 17 above).
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LETTER OF THE BISHOP OF TLAXCALA, JULIÁN GARCÉS, TO POPE PAUL III. ROME, 1537

The following quite enlarged facsimile reproduction of this letter is published by authorization of the John Carter Brown Library, Brown University, which purchased the item a few years ago. Antonio de León Pinelo evidently saw a copy in the seventeenth century, for he described it as follows: "D. Fr. Julian Garces, Dominico, Obispo primero de Tlaxcala, Carta sobre la capacidad de los Indios, i otras cosas, al Papa Paulo III, en Latin, imp. 1537." Epitome de la Biblioteca Oriental y Occidental, Náutica y Geográfica (Madrid 1629) 112.

Agustín Dávila Padilla called the letter "elegante y piadoso" and printed it both in the original Latin text and also in Spanish translation, Historia de la fundación y discurso de la provincia de Santiago, del Orden de Santo Domingo (1596), cap. 42-43.

The text of the letter has been reproduced other times, but so far as I know the present facsimile of the printed version is the first one from the Rome imprint of 1537. This item is so rare that even José Toribio Medina never located a copy, though he believed that the work existed because León Pinelo had testified to its publication, Biblioteca Hispano-Americana, 1493-1810, I (Amsterdam 1958), no. 101.

Modern commentators praise the Garcés letter. Alfonso Trueba considers it "un monumento literario, resumen de la filosofía humanista-cristiana que los dominicos pusieron en práctica en el nuevo mundo... la Carta Magna de los indios de América," Dos libertadores: Julián Garcés y Fray Domingo de Betanzos (Mexico 1955) 3.

Alberto de la Hera describes the Garcés letter in these terms: "Probablemente nunca hasta antes entonces recibieron en la corte de Roma un documento tan importante en favor de la causa indígena; si Paulo III lo leyó, y es muy probable que lo leyera, porque no sería muy corriente que le llegaran cartas semejantes, debió dejar en su ánimo una fuerte impresión. Debió, por lo menos, abrirle los ojos respecto a las Indias, hacer saber al Padre común de la criстиandad que entre sus hijos había muchos de los que aún no se había ocupado con la debida sollicitus. La carta de Fray Julián Garcés pudo significar la entrada en el ánimo papal de todo el continente hispano-americano, la gran conquista para el catolicismo en la Edad Moderna," El derecho de los indios a la libertad y a la fe (see n. 22 above) 67. The original size of the item is 6" × 4" (print 5" × 3").
DE HABILITATE ET CA

PACITATE GENTIVM SIVE IN
dorum noui mundi nucupati ad fidem Chris
sti capellendam & qualibenter iucipiæ.

R O M A E Anno M. D. XXXVII.
REVERENDO PATRI FRATRI THO
ma: Badia, sacræ theologÆ professori ordinis prædicato-
rum ac magistro sacri palæti dignissimo, frater Ber-
nardinus Mináya eiusdem ordinis conuentus sancti do-
mi Dominici ciuitatis magnæ Tenuixitan feu
mexico Indiarum inuicitis. Cæsaris, præcinctæ
sancti Iacobii de obseruantia. Salutem.

Vm secûdum principis Apostolo-
rum doctrinam, bonis operibus
aturus semper inuideat sathanas,
Et dolenti rugitu tanq leo quaerent
do circuaret quem deuoret. Hinc est
quod ipse dolès de perdizione dos
mini sui super Indorum gentes, ui
dès quod a faucibus suis eriperen
tu, in cœdès Christi, eius sanguine lauaco felicet san
do baptismo dealbarentur, non solù autem saecularum
Christianorum: sed quod peius est ecclesiasticorum opis
nione afferentium eos incapaces fidei catholicae impedi-
mentum apponere, ne in doctrina Christi instructur
procuravit. Sed in contrarium res se habet & veritas quæ
omnia vincer et superat. Naturaliter enim homines sunt,
Et ex consequenti animas habet capaces poenæ & gloriam
mediorum: in tales fines. Et utra hæc ipsa experiens re
ste a multis religiosis & a me perplures annos inter ipsos
conuersantibus habita. Proculdubio sunt habillores ad di-
scriplinam capessandam quam nos ad doctrinam eis im-
pendendam. Ne ergo ex tali opinione diuulgata, ac infas
mia, diabolis arri ùe iœ insposi re operant in vinea domi-
ii desistant & tande & tam sancto apostolico opere: Etmis
hi inter alios Christi Nicolas incumberet pro eis in tantone
gocio respödiet, ve testimiteri apud omnes efficacius &
validius esset habuia reuerendo domino fratre Juliano
Garece, ordinis prædicatorum primo Indiarum episcopo
po Tlaxcalensi literas sue sanctitati directas significans
requid de eorum capacitate sentirer, quorum literarum
ego num nuntius, Nunc ve eiusdem caulis mortis & ve
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ius ac lucidius omnibus Indorum capacitas Occidentali
um: innotescat dominacionem tuam humili
iter oratius 

us familiaritas tua cum aliis reverendorum dominorum
fratris Ioannis de Cumarraga ordinis minorum, episcopi
Mexicani, et aetoris Bernal de Luca consiliarii consili

orum praefectarum Caesaris Caroli, idem as probans
iium & testificantium: uberes arce ex officio tuo, auctorita
tes sedis Apostolicæ, madares imprimi, et par est. Tu qui
pium huiusmodi Deo accepturn munus iudicasti: nec
non tot animarum saluti consulere voluisti, tua humanis
tare id fieri mandaisti. Ex quo ingentes tibi ago gratias,
abo qui inquit videre ne contemnatis unum ex his puli
lis: dignam, et dignas, reportaturo mercedem. Vale
dignissime pater.

Q VALITER QUAM SPONTANEAE
ac grantanter Indii seu gentiles noui mundi discedoperit a
Carolo imperatore Christianissimo semper Augusto, suis
scipiant verbum Dei & fidei orthodoxam ac catholicam
amplectantur, oratio.

SANCTISSIMO DOMINO NOSTRO
Paulo I. Pontifici maximo frater Iulianus Gasces ordi
nis predicatorium, Episcopus primus Tlaxcalen. In noua
Hispania Indiarum Caesaris Caroli, salutem sempiter
nam dicir.

Væ circa novellum gregem ecclesiae sanctæ ags
gregatum, tibi beatissime pater acquisitum nos
querim, declarare non pgebis, quatenus exulta
re valeat spiritus tuus in domino salutari. Er ne prologi 16
 ga enarratione tibi praecipe, qui tot ac tantis totius or
bis negoriis prouidere debes, fastidium generem, tem ip

am in valuis aggregidori. Nulla sunt obstinazione orthos
doxyhdei infecta, aut perturbaes (vt ludai & Mahumeta
ni) Indorum pauni Christianorum decreta non hauris
unt modo, sed exauriunt, ac veluti ehibunt s citius hi &
alactius articulorum fidei seriem & consuetas orationes
quam l Hispanorum infantes ediscunt, & tenent quicquid
 a nostris
a nostris traditur. Aluntur intra monasteriorum ambitum per suas classes & coutubernia, per scolas & doctrinia. Ex dictioribus recenreni: quaedam deminuitor: quingenteni. Et sic de singulis ordinatim secundum magnitudinem civitatum & oppiporum ac multituidinem viuum eorum uicinorum: Non clamosi, non iurgiosi, non litigiosi, non inquieti, non digoll, non tumidi, non injuriosi, placidi, pavid, disciplinati, ad magistros obtemperantissimi, obектив ad sodales, non querulosi, non mordaces, non contumeliosi, omni prorsus vitio quo nostrates puere lici (catent) liberi. Secundum quod illa erat patitur. Ad liberalitatem propèssimi: utrum vni vel multis des nihil interept, quia quod vni datum est singulis impartiendum curare: parsimonia mirabili, non bibaculi, non gulosi, ingenita & velut innata medietia ac disciplina. Sis quidem videre est eos ordinate seriati mo: incidentes, seu sedere seu stare iubeantur, seu flexis poplitibus prestanti ad puluinaria: Praeter suum tam quod se nemo commutem semcam appellant) post panem seu tlaxcali, nihil obi nix flagitantes, habent enim & nostrates fructus omnes, id est quorum semina ad Hispamia allata sunt: Tanta est terrae feracitas ac focudìa, Habet & suos fructus, Iam vero ingenii docilitas supra modum, seu cantare iubeas, seu legere, scribere, pingere, fingere, cætera quid genus liberalium artium & aliarum ad rudimenta omnia perspicaces & acutissimi intellectus dexteritatem singularis, quod præter cæli elementum ac temperiem (vt sepe mihi animo recoluenti occurrit) prestat mira in cibo simplicitas ac parsimonia. Cum intra monasteria fratri ac disciplinam arceantur, nulla a majoribus querimonia, questione sit, qua inaequali disparitate tractentur, qua severius cæscententur & a pedagogis tardius ad domos dimittentur, quod equa libus inaequalia, aut imparibus paria demandentur offitia. Contradicet nemo, nullus obiurgat, sed parentum cura ac solertia ad id tendit ut quam eruditissimus in Christia nisimo suos natus euadat. Iam vero ecclesiasticus cantus, seu organis cum, seu armoniacus, seu rhymicus absolutissime ab eis perdisce tur, ita ut extraritii musici non magno/
pere desyderentur. Qui in campo pugiles exercebantur
campstrari vocabantur (tutte Augtino) quia semimani
bus eorum pudenda ulabantur, que campstraria dicet
bantur & perizomata in litteris factis (ind. tomallii di
cant) apud quos tanta cura & verecundia ac obdariatio ut
in publicum etiam tantilli infantuli (de mexico loquot)
sine tomaller, id est, subligari prodeata nemo. Nunc contra
eos quos de indigenis male sensisse compertimus dicem
suum et refulando vanissimam opinemem illorum qui
eos incapaces insimulans, inculpatis; ac ecclesiae gres
mio abiicindos assequaret. Predecate aut Dommmus eum
stellarium omne creature, quicrediderit & c. De hominibus
plani lequebatur non de brutis, nullam exuisens gen
tem, nullam nationem excludens, quippe in ree cuange
lico omne piscium genus conclauaturis apostolis quibus
praedixerat faciam vos piscatores hominum. Nam quod
dicit elegentur bonos, males foras militerunt, non de diac
militantis, sed de illa triumphantis ecclesiae piscatione los
quobatur, quando segregabit ous ab heus. Vnde in pis
catione Petri ante passione merita tumebantur pro mul
tidine piscium etiam nauticarum pene inmergebatur, sed
post resurrectionem (aii Ioannes) Cum tanti essent non
est ruptum ree, quia de piscatione triumphantis loques
batur ecceiae. Multenim: retia militantis ecclesiae plices
implent, tumebunt, ac egrediuntur, siue haresibus, siue pra
nis moribus, qui triumphantis retia non intractur: Vnde
de piscatione post resurrectionem Dominici numerum
determinatum apposuit pisciui, quia novit Dominus qui
unt eiu. (aii apostolus) quia haec retia multi exituri intrat
illa nullas egrediuntur intractur. Laudate Hierusalem Domi
num (aii Psalmista) quia confortavit eas: portarem tua
rum, beneedixit filius tuis in te. Et ne putaremus in eum
quantum centum quinquaginta tres id est, beatorum anis
mas, si stice in decem et septem ab uno ascendendo
ac intermedios numerando, is numeros surgit centum
quinquaginta tres, quia decem praeceptorum obtenueto
res & septemarius neri in donis Spiritus sancti perceptrae
res tantum intabunt, quia multi sunt vocati, pauci vero
elecei
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elest. Restituitur ut nulli apertum quod vidit Ioannes in Apocalypsi ostium claudamus, quia ille qui habet clasuem David: qui aperit & nemo claudit, solus noster numerum electorum in felicitate superna, nulli ergo hominum qui ex fide spontanea petat baptismum ecclesiae, est por tacaudenda; iuxta Augustini sermonem. Et de verbis apostoli Cipriani super hac recitantis. Nullum ergo retrahat queso ab hoc opere falsa talium afferent qui dias bolicis instigati suggestiolumbus incapaces religiosis nostræ afferunt. Indes istos: haec certe vox sathanica est, & dolen sis daemonis suum subuerum iri cultum, ac ex auriissimum Christianorum faucibus erumpens; quorum tara est cupiditas, ut sitim eius explere volentes, rationales creaturas ad Dei imaginem factas, bestias & iumenta esse co tentant, nullo al o fine, nisi ut quibus illarum curta com missa est, nulla sit liberanda eae et ridis suis manibus cu piditatis lux, quin postius illarum obsequio, uti pro art bitrio permitrant. Quis enim tam impudenti animo ac perficiata fronde incapaces fidei afferere auder, quos mes chanicarum artium capacissimos intuemur: ac quos ed am ad ministerium nostrum redactos bonæ indolis fideles & solertes experimur? Et si quando beatissime pater tua sanctitas aliquem religiosum virum in hac declinare sentiam aud eris, & si eximia integritate vitæ vel dignitas te fulgere videatur is, nò ideo quicumque illi hac in re praeter autoritatis sed eundem parum aut nihil insudasse in illorum conversione certo certius arbitetur, ac in eorum adiscendâ lingua aut inuestigandis ingenios parum studu inte perdar. Nam qui in his charitate Christiana labos rarunt, non frustra in eos iactare retia charitatis affirmat, illi vero qui solitudini dediit aut ignavia prepediti nem ad Christi cultum sua industria reduxerunt, ne incul pari possint q inutiles fuerint quod propriae negligentiae vitis est, id in hidelium imbcellitati adscribunt, verăq sua desidiam falsæ incapacitatis impositione defendi ac non minorem culpam in excusationem committunt q erat illa a qua liberari conatur, sedit nāq summe istud hoimo genus talia afferentium hanc Indorum miserrimam turbam nam
aliquot religiosos retractatur ne ad eos deinde intruendos proficiscantur. Quamobrem nonnulli Hispanorum ad illos debellandum accedunt horum frerum judicio illos negligere perdere ac maectar opinari solent non esse flagitium, vel de apparere quod hoc satan illae humani generis hostis in lucis angelum transfiguratus inuenit ut gentium illarum differentio similem, sibi exhibendum cultum conferuer. Nunc vero de horum signarum hominum ingenio quos vidimus ab hinc decennio quo ego in patria conversatus eorum potui perspicere, mores ac ingenia per scientia testificans eorum te beatissime pater (qui Christi in terris vicarium agis) quod vidit, quod auduit, & manus meæ contrectaet runt de his progenitis ab ecclesia, per quaecumque minisciorem meum in verbo vitæ, quod singula singulis referre, id est, paribus paria rationis optime compones sunt & integri sensus & capitis, sed in superfetatisibus permissis & vifores spiritus & sensuum viuacitate dexteriori in omnibus agiliori & intelligibili praesantiores reperimus. De majoribus quod barbaræ feritate ac crudelitate vetula humanum modum fuerint audiui, vrote antros postagi, id est, hominum carnium voratores: truces ac cruenti, sed quanto crudeliores & immaniores fuere, tan to acceptius Deo holocaustum offeretur si bene conversarunt: Cuiuspars maxima nos sumus, si tales erga eos exteremimus verbo & exemplo, manu, lingua, quales eos nobis in similem caenum incidissetsemus voluissentsemus habere, lucifacere animas eorum laboremus, pro quibus Christus fudit sanguinem. Barbaris eis & idololastram obiis cimis quasi meliores habuerimus patres nostros a qui bus duetamur originem, quosque beatus Iacobus apostolorum eisdem prædicavit, eorum ad hodie cultum convertit, ex pessimis optimis reddens: vnde tot clarissima matrimorum doctorum, & virginitum lumina emicuerunt, quos hic longum esse & non necessarium recedere. Quis dubitat durante seculo multos ex his sanctissimos futuros, & omnia virtute conspicuos? Nunquid territio apud Hispanias res agent, submisiva est cerua quæ faridica putaretur? Ecce cerua, id est, brutum animal Hispanum prophetism.
Id est Sardicam ac deam adorabant. Ferras Hispanicorum
quondam tanta erat, ut Sylvius Italicus ex Italica Bethicæ
ciuitate oriundus, dicator de maiestibus suis cultum incly
tum. Prodigia gens animi & prope earum facillum morte:
Nam quibilibet locorum florentum viribus annos, Imparti
dens qui spectens venisse fenecitam, & facti modus in des
xtra est. Viriatus ille quem testi Iulino (de gentilitate lo
quor) Hispanicam hactenus clarissimum ducem, pastor erat
armentarius. At post Christianum suceptum, cum
side veram nobilitatem haereditare possidemus, tot millis
tes tot duces præclarissimos, quibus & Romæ Imperator
ribus via mirum in modum creuit, ac in id quod de ea au
diuimus prorecta est. Si tam inculata & vepribus errorum
obtest Hispaniam ante apostolorum prædicatione postea
ales fructus suæ in seculo suæ in ecclesia partire, quæ
les futuros nunquam anse credidissent, quia hac mutas
tio dexterae excellit, dent mihi tantis pro eodem omni
petitis Dei ac domini liberatoris cunctorum auxilio, sauc
re, & patrocinio mirabilem fortasse Indorum populum
in hoc nouo mundo reperto futurum? Nuncidum (alía)
abreniata est manus Domini ut salutare negaret?
Quo tempore Settorius in Hispanicam apud semiferos ho
mines Romanorum duæ erat literas Hispanicæ & græcas &
latinæ nouerat ab his nationibus subfugari, verum tamé
est, quod si Hispanicæ proprias vires agnouisset (aet Tró
gus) nunquam Romanis colla dixerat, litteras ergo Hispanic
didicerat, nec eorum linguam minus calibant, &
semibarbari adhuc erant. Quod mirum, si miselli
isti in extremo terrarum margine constituti, nullo culuros
rum hominum commerto, nullas vias hodie literas affes
cuti, belurum instar essent, nullum animal habentes pro
vestura ipsi asselli bipedes omnia rurdomig; vectitarent,
nula exterrum hominum notitiam, nullo cultu, aut vitu,
aut vestitum, aliisque humanæ vitæ ornamentis præditi,
nul
lo literarum commerto, nullo vehiculorum aut nauitius
rum usu, inculti essent ac pene barbati &c. Si omnibus
his præditi Hispanicæ prisco tempore extiterit: Quid
de his desperandum? Cum de nobis a nostris minime del
peratum sit. Cum in ea regione tam illustres viri cuases
runt in virgins homine: Ecclesiæ benedictur omnis homo
qui titem dedit Psalma. sequitur & videas filios fili
orum tuorum, qui sunt homines neuti mundi indigérntq;
side & virtutibus eos quorum sunt ministri ad side, cons
uerst, forte superaturis sunt. Et queniam eos pennis Il
teras non didiciisse prædixerim (palanodiam cano) ping
ebant enim non scribant, id est non litteris sed imaginis
us vebantur. Siquidem absentibus seu tempore seu los
comemorabile vellet signiicare: quod & Lucanus insi
nutat in hac verba,
Phœnices primi, famæ si creditur aucti
Manuram rudibus vocem signare figuris
Nondum flumina mensibus contexerit libris
Nouerat, & aequus tantum, volueratque speculare. Scul
praquis erubabant magicas animalia linguis.
Nunc vero tanta est ingenii corum felicitas (de puere loc
quo) ut & latine & Hyspane scribant, nostri puere ele
santius Latine sciant atque quantur: non minus quam
nostri qui se eis rei studio dedidere; Confessiones ab eis
sunt, quæ vel maxime nouellis in ecclesia difficilatatem ad
ferunt & arduitatem præ se ferunt, vbi fides præcipuam
locum tener, cum secura cordis extrinsecus reuelantur,
ac alteri pandantur laus humani. Er pecata non mino
ri perspicuitate ac veritate quæ a Christianis natis (ne dice
propensiori) carumq; frequentia gaudent, imo aliqua vel
minus enucleata, vela confessionibus forsan non intelle
cta, quæ semel confessi sunt, examinatim repetere sponta
næ non verètur, columbina plane simplicitate, itaq; quo
ad confessiones apostillos tosum annus habetur: ut quæ
dragstima inter nostre disciplinas ordinarias & a puere
id est flagella non modo renuentes, sed & vtrra suscipien
tes, clam tempore & loco, utra communis quæ sunt in
die veneris sancta & omnibus sextis festis anni, quodq; ad
huc difficiliius extimetur a nostri (qui nec in abiciendis
quidem concubinis dicto pareant prelatorum) tanta fas
cilitate vxorum pluralitarum abiciunt quas in paganis
mo habuerunt, vnaque contenti, ut miraculi infar sit, sur
ta quo
ta quorum consuetudo (de paruis loquor) geti innata est aperitusme pro confessione accusant, non restitutionem recusant aut procaustinant. Construat ecleias magnas quas armis regisadornant. Conuentus fratrum proce-
ctorum suorum, & domus duotarum mulierum ab imperi-
rattice domini elizabeth miffarum, quibus bono animo
dant suas filias, sicur fratibus filios, ut ex ipsis quan-
toris us sancta ecclesia augatur. Cum indigent aqua ad fra-
tres cum oblationibus, veniunt, processiones petunt, idic-
sumilis facient pro pueros insirmis petentes evangelium si
bi dicit, & manus sacras super ipsos imponi. Cum insans
nascitur, ad sacramentum baptismi fulcipiendum a patre
vel materre portatur, & quando moritur, ad fratres concur-
runt ut sepeliantur. Cum vir scei vxorem non Christiana
illum ad baptismum ducit, & mulier virum ut desponet
sur ad modum Christianorum, & pater filium, mater his
am, frater fratrem, & vicinus vicinum. Quo circa quae per-
me ipsum & a fide dignis religiosis personis de fide & mos
ribus ilorum acceperim, compedio dicam. Rogatus qui
dam cur extra tempus quadragesimae conferiri vellit re-
spondit se aegritudine presenti sopponeffte confessione
Deo si euaderet, ideo voti rei conferiri debere. Item alius
ad quid rem cito confessionem repeteret a confessore ros
gatus qui sciret eum paulo ante alii confessum, respondit
Verum equidem est, sed quod confessorem hum no ples
ne intellextisse suspicaretur, repeteret se velle confessione : in supers & polteea nonnullorum recordatum fuisset pecce-
torum, quae fassus anera non suisset. Petrus quidam & las
cohus Neophiti ex primoibus eorund post confessionem
sacramentale imaginaria viatione duas videre videbatur
vias, olidam alteram, alteram odoramentorum aquis ros
farum referram : Coteplatosq, Nagdalenam & Cathas
rinam : quorum simulacra ex pictura didicerant, facida
dicentes quam antea venebatis via est, rosarum spiramis
ne odora, quam sequimini post baptismum, quod in con-
spectu decem milium animarum animo & fereuenti ser-
mone referentibus, multi baptismum petierunt. Qua no
ete salvator nolet secundum ecclesiae representationem

B
natus est, gloria in excelsis Deo, a cantantibus lingua sua auditum est a pluribus: Cum tamen hymnus ite tune in eorum linguam converterus non est, ut post, unde arguitur non humana industria, sed divina virtute miraculum accidisse Anhelanti cuidam violentia comprimere puls tam, ait illa, nunquid non Christianus est: Cui respondit denti sum: hoc quod agis addidit illa Christiana pietas prohibit: quo audito ille, ab incepto proutius reliquit. In quadragesima admonitus pro religioni haberii iunum, cum aegritudine laboraret nullo modo persuaderi potuit a Christianis ut carnibus veliceretur. In confessione se accusavit eorum quidam quod cum propriam cognoscebat, alterius cuius ardebatur, defydario recordatione fuerit voluptuosa allectus. Rogatus furit a quodam religiosus qui eam, utrum orate, deberet in sacris mysteriis an ceuere, atque attenues verba divina uscultare: Alius similiiter audito, quod ludas incessibus & impenitentiae lacrimam finuere, ait confessori. Ego sum ludas qui & si confessus fuerim, non integre tamen ideo confessionem repper tendam putavi. Duo alii ex rubore peccatum pessimum in confessione occultantes, nimia aegritudine presitus, satis sacramentaliter crimen compunctionis & lachimarum imbre perfuisti, ut locum morbo absoluti sunt. Christiana eos cum maritum gentilem sorritit, rogatum baptismum ac ceperit, illo abnuente, debitum immo in debitum maritas leneget, quousque lauchro sancto perfusum videtis, plus res confessi ex eis non absoluti, vel quia in fornicatione erant, vel quia restitutionem procrastinarent, quantocuius adimpleto confessi praecripto recurreret & se represant pro absoluto sine, quod mea opinione sidei non exiguum argumentum est. Si confessio eisdem ex occupatio ne confessoris, aliaque causa denegatur, dolent, flent, gemit tumque offendunt sacramenti famem simulque insitiat. Plus est post baptismum petunt baptizari: quibus cum Christiana religioni id non licere dicitur, respondent, sicimus id quidem, sed tunc non credeimus, aut verba baptizati: toto non intelleamus. Martinus vocabatur, qui in extre mis paulo ante quae decedebat, affirmavit matrimoniam: Cede pas-
rens, nonne vides fratres aduenire cum cruce & domina quandam permagnificentam lineam mihi rostari offerentem Cum in thecoaca agerent Christiani in hospitio primum: essentq alio profexi, ait quidam eius oppidi indigena lo tiis: Nunc maxime Christiana religione fratres viuendum est, cui solisimus, & testes sibi nostrre Christianos non habeamus. Sed dices nullo teste res gesta probatur, quasi & testes ipsi mentiri non possint: Rutium, in iudicio humana non res est nullius ponderis aut momeri, quasi vero super hoc humanum iudicium requiramus, & non diuinum potius admiremur: qui velit in nouo nascentis ecclesia celpite, fructum promittere ac miracula suscitare, quae apud sanctos quos ab antiquo veneratur ecclesia penitus flore. Suffragatur tamen huic nationi maxime hie mos duplici de causa tenuitatem vitius vilitate & simplicitate vestitus, humilitatis & obedientia genti innata, quibus nullae regiones mundi abundant sicut illa. Quia explicam se videor beatissime pater quae mea dicere, quae tua aus dire intererant super emporio indicio, id est, earum commertior rerum, quas creator & psalmator omnium sua providentia preparaverat in termino iam iam labentis secu li in quo fines seculorum deuenerunt; Reliquum est cons testari sanctitatem tuam Paule beatissime doctor gentium ne tantam nactus occasione sanctitiei aut torpori locui des: Quo minus id agas vt omnes nos commonefatas ex horteris, excites, alq promoueas, ne tam in excelsi opifcis opere dormitare, sed vigilare, & non sogniter agere studiam, hoc tibi ipsi in primis persuadeas sanctissime pater velim, ex quo evangelii veritas in mundum effulge recto, id est, nostra felicitas declarari, quae Dei in hili os per gratiam liberatoris adoptati sumus, post promul gatam per apostolos duces ac preceptores nostros salutis viam, nihil vnq pensi maioris quod ego sciam in ecclesia extitisse catholica quam habe apud Indos talentorum dis pensatio. Si enim proceducis fragilibusq huius miserae vitae rebus tantopere laboramus, quanto magis niti debe mus vniuerse te duce Paule beatissime pater, ne oblatam in presensiarum opportunistam bene gerendae rei facult
ratem desidia ac negligentia nostra perdamus. Videant
vniuersi in Apostolico pectori nihil gratius insedere, q
huic tanto negotio vi omni, & nihil, nutu, voce, voto, te
velle fideles tuos excubare, adesfe, vigilare, quae parte nos
bis verbi ostium (ve ait Apostolus) apertum est, illuc plus
rimos operarios destinare quo in secundo huius India
ce spire centeno consurgat spica fructu, quae diuitem spe
alar, charitatem auger, fidem sustentet, tanto ydololatras
alacriori animo & ampliori ardore ceremus ad nostra
professionis vexilla colligere in Asia, quanto Turcharum
in Europœ suavitiam in nostros amplius cernimus debacs
chari. Hinc aurum eruamus ex visceribus fidei Indorum
illus aurum mittamus in subsidium militum nostrorum,
longe ampliores ab Inda terminos & diabolo ariamamus
quam ipse cum mahumetanis suis, nobis subducem ex Eu
ropa, duplici daemonum muros ariete quatiamus, vt hinc
ab eorù posseiones antiqua indigenas cruamus: Et iisque
aurum extremum ab Europœ finibus exclamamus. Pros
moucantur rex Christi bone, fidelium tuorum termini,
Esaiæ vaticinium impleatur iam. Ecce isti de longe venis
ent. Ecce illi ab aquilone & mari: Et isti de terra Australi.
Laudate coeli & exulta terra: iubilate montes laudem q
quia consolatus est Dominus populum suum, & pauperù
suorum misericordiam. Et dixit Sien, dereliquit me dominus
& dominus oblitus est mei. Et infra: Leua in circuitu ocus
los tuos & vide isti, congregati sunt venerunt tibi. Ego vi
uo dicit dominus, quia omnibus his velut ornamentum ve
stirius & circundabis tibi eos quasi sponsa, quia deferta
tua & solitudines tua & terra ruinae tuæ nunc angusta erit
pro habitatoribus, & longe fugabuntur qui absorbant
re. Si tanta diligentia Dominus levis Christus Deus ac li
berator noftrorum Indos adire persuadet renitent
temac diciem, quocunque mittte me praeterquam ad In
dos. Et Bartholomeum qui ibidem daemones mirabiliter
torrit, Indos qad fidei conversisseorum diuitas respues
sem, et fidei evangelicae potiores aurosodinas quas seques
tur ostendit. Et iis sanctissime pater imperatorœ tuum
Deum imitati, æmulati comitati convenit. Cum illum
milites suos apostolos in Indos destinatam ac pene vir gentem videas. Sed dices non credent ydolatræ Christo, non parebunt euangelio. Crediderunt (inquit in gestis Apostolorum Lucas) prædicante Paulo quotquot prædestinati erant adeo ad vitam æternam nullus est. non crediderex prædestinati. Quam vero libenter idem fuscipit, prædicatoresque uercantur & audiant, ecclesiæ adiònis cent, religiosis subdantur Indi itius nouæ Hispanicæ res; ftes sumus omnes qui interipsos verati umus, de valde aut distantibus ab huius præeunturæ terminis, a venerabili parre fratre Bernardino Minæny nunc priore sancti Dominici huius ciuitatis Tenuitilan seu Mexico verum habemus testimonium, qui cum duobus tiosis religiosis vix in prouintiam de Nicaragua, viam trecentum lucas rum & amplius peragravit, ydolatas docendo, ydola cô fringendo, comminuendo & comburendo, vexilla regis Christi Dei ergendo, & ecclesiæ fundando. Ad quæ oit libentissimos & promptos Indos (qui nunquam viderat religiosos prædictantes eis) inuentit : baptismum sponte nexus, potentis, cum laumulis roseis, cibo, & potu eis obuiás tes; viasque ampliantes aræ, tergentes, & luò modo, cu gratiarum actione dicentes, benedictus qui venit in nomine Dominini. Stabilem quippe comitem (quem reges sedepsi appellant) te supernus ecclesiæ rex constituit ut circa stationem tuam perugil temper insistas, huc raman & illuc ubi maior necissitas poterat transeuntes milites ac comites tuos, vestimenta et alimenta gregarii sui distribuere debeas, ne stipes dionum inopia, equitum pedium; penuriae; militares legnus agatur, minus procedat, imperatoris culpa adscriba, tur, id te agente ut conhdimus, co ronam (sicur par est) deportas turo beatam.

F I N I S.
The Philippines: Reluctant Beneficiary of the Missionary Impulse in Europe

by Gerald H. Anderson

The accidental European discovery of America occurred in the course of the Spanish effort to reach "the Indies" by a westward route. The continuing Spanish effort to reach the Spice Islands (the Moluccas) in the sixteenth century led to the discovery of the islands which we now call the Philippines, and elicited a remarkable missionary effort from Spain that resulted eventually in the achievement of what remains today "the only Christian nation in Asia"—with more baptized persons in the Philippines than in all the rest of Asia together.

We shall focus here on the missionary impulse expressed through both conquistadores and clergy in the initial effort of evangelizing or "Christianizing" the Philippines, acknowledging that "Spanish policy in the Philippines was largely shaped in terms of previous experience in North and South America." And we shall draw attention to the ambivalent response of the Filipinos to the missionary effort to evangelize them.

What were the motives of the Spanish conquistadores? "I wish I knew," says Samuel Eliot Morison. "Was it mere adventure and glory,
or lust for gold or (as they all declared) a zeal to enlarge the Kingdom of
the Cross? Bernal Díaz del Castillo well said, in his Historia verdadera of
the conquest of Mexico, 'We came here to serve God, and also to get
rich.'

The combination of commerce, crown, cannon, and cross in the
conquest and conversion of the Philippines is reflected from the very
beginning by Ferdinand Magellan, who was commissioned by the
Emperor Charles V to find a westward route to the Spice Islands—which
hopefully were on the Spanish side of the famous Line of Demarcation
(if extended around the world) laid down in the Treaty of Tordesillas
(1494).

Magellan seriously took up the task of evangelization within a few
days after his arrival in the archipelago which he named after Saint Laza­
rus (to be renamed by Villalobos in 1543 Las Islas Filipinas, for the Infante of
Spain who became Philip II). On Easter Sunday, 31 March 1521, solemn
Mass was celebrated for the first time in the Philippines by Father Pedro
de Valderrama who accompanied Magellan. The occasion is described
by Antonio Pigafetta, the Italian who acted as chronicler for the
expedition:

On the last day of March, [which was] Easter, the Captain General had the
priest prepare to say mass, and through the interpreter he sent a message to
the king that he would not come ashore to dine with him, but to hear mass.
For this reason the king sent him two slaughtered pigs. When the time of
the mass had come, about fifty unarmored men went ashore, in the finest
dress that they had, and carrying their arms. Before arriving in the launch­
es, they had six bombards fired, as a sign of peace, and they jumped ashore.
The two kings embraced the Captain General, and they went in marching
order up to the place of consecration, not far from the shore. Before the
mass began, the Captain bathed the bodies of the two kings with musk
water. At the offering of the mass, the kings went to kiss the cross just as we
did, but they made no offering. At the elevation of the Host, they remained
on their knees, and adored with clasped hands. As the body of Our Lord
was elevated, all of the artillery was fired, having been signalled from the
land by muskets. And some of our men took communion.

After dinner that evening Magellan erected a huge wooden cross on
the summit of the highest hill on the island of Limasawa, overlooking
the sea, and formally took possession of the islands in the name of
Spain. "When the cross was set up," says Pigafetta, "everyone said a
Pater Noster. And an Ave Maria, and they worshipped it. And the kings
did likewise."

In the days which followed, Magellan personally took the initiative
in preaching, through his Malay slave-interpreter Enrique, to the native
notables concerning the Faith. Magellan's catechetical instruction in­
cluded the admonition that:
they should not become Christians out of fear, nor to please them, but
voluntarily. And that no distress should be caused to those who wanted to
live according to their own law, but that Christians would be better re-
garded and more charitably [treated].

They should also be advised, said Magellan, that his men "could not
have intercourse with any woman who was a pagan, without grievous
sin."7 Pigafetta reports that in response to Magellan’s instruction, the
natives
said they did not know how to reply to his beautiful speech, but they put
themselves into his hands, and hoped he should treat them as his faithful
servants. The Captain embraced them and with one hand grasped the hand
of the prince and with the other the hand of the king. He told them that by
the faith he owed to God and the emperor his lord that he promised and
granted them perpetual peace with the king of Spain his lord.8

Magellan’s missionary zeal extended even to the practice of what
John Leddy Phelan calls "medicinal" baptism. On one occasion reported
by Pigafetta,

The Captain told them that if they burned their idols and believed in Jesus
Christ and if the sick man wished to be baptized, he would be healed imme-
diately, and that if it turned out otherwise, then they could cut off his
[Magellan’s] head. . . . They made the best procession that they could from
the square to the house of the sick man, who could not speak or move. And
they baptized him and his wife, and ten girls. Then the Captain had some-
one ask him how he felt. And immediately he spoke, and said that by the
grace of God he was well. And this was a manifest miracle in our time.9

Pigafetta added, “When the Captain heard him speak, he gave great
thanks to God.” And Phelan observes, "Well might we imagine the
intrepid Magellan wiping his brow in relief."10 To insure against a relapse
in the health of this new convert in whom he had such a personal stake,
Magellan “sent him a mattress, a pair of sheets, and a counterpane of
yellow cloth, and a pillow, and every day until he regained his strength
he sent him almond milk, rosewater, attar of roses, and some sugared
preserves.”11

By 14 April, after only one week in the large port of Cebu, a center of
population and trade, Magellan had celebrated a blood compact of
friendship with Rajah Humabon, the king of Cebu, and persuaded the
king and his wife, along with the king’s nephew and his wife, and 800 of
their followers to be baptized. The king was given the name Charles,
after the emperor; his nephew and heir was christened Ferdinand, like
the emperor’s brother; their wives were named Joan and Catherine
respectively.

Prior to their baptism, Magellan explained the civil obligations and
temporal benefits of baptism to the king and his chiefs:
Governing the New World

Through the interpreter the Captain told the king that he thanked God for inspiring him to become a Christian, and that he would much more easily overcome his enemies than before. He replied that he wanted to become a Christian, but that some of his chieftains did not want to obey him, saying that they were as good men as he was. The Captain had all the chieftains of the king summoned, and told them that if they did not obey the king as their king, that he would have them put to death and would give their goods to the king. They replied that they would obey. He said to the king that if he returned to Spain, he would come back again with so much great power that he would make him the greatest king in these parts because he was the first to come as king to be a Christian.12

After the mass baptism, Pigafetta says, “The Captain and the king called one another brother. . . . And within a week the whole island was baptized. And because they did not want to obey the king of our people, a village of some other people on a neighboring island was burned down. And they set up a cross there, because this people was pagan, that is to say idolatrous.”13

Magellan not only had the native chieftains reaffirm their oath of allegiance to Humabon, but also now required Humabon to swear allegiance to the king of Spain. Miguel Bernad, the Filipino historian, points out that “this identification of baptism with an oath of allegiance to an earthly ruler was dangerous. Later, the repudiation of one would mean the rejection of the other.”14

Inspired—and overly confident—because of his apparent success thus far, Magellan proceeded to coerce all other chieftains in the neighboring islands to recognize Humabon as their king, to pay him tribute, and, inferentially, to obey the king of Spain.15 One chief, Lapu Lapu, on the small island of Mactan near Cebu, resisted and refused, thus provoking Magellan into a brash attack. In the ensuing battle on Mactan on 27 April 1521, Magellan lost his life and the Spaniards were routed.16 When Rajah Humabon later offered “whatever merchandise they wanted” in exchange for the body of Magellan, the defiant Lapu Lapu responded that they “would not exchange him for the greatest riches in the world but that they wanted to keep him so that they would not forget him.”17 The remains of Magellan were never recovered.

More serious even than the defeat at Mactan—in terms of implications for Christianity in the Philippines—was the massacre which followed in Cebu. On 1 May Humabon sent word to the Spaniards on their ships in the harbor “that the jewels that he had promised to send the king of Spain were ready, and that he begged them to come eat with him this morning.”18

Approximately 26 or 27 men went ashore for the farewell banquet in their honor.19 There was treachery, however. Apparently Magellan’s Malay slave, Enrique, who served as interpreter, had been mistreated by
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the Spanish officers after the death of the captain, and he conspired with Rajah Humabon to capture the ships and their cargo. Humabon was under pressure from his chiefs—once it was clear that the Spaniards were not invincible—to break the alliance and allegiance to Spain, for the sake of honor and freedom, and also in response to the Europeans’ misconduct with the native women.

As soon as the banquet began Humabon’s warriors rushed in to massacre the unwary guests, including the head chaplain—Father Valderrama. Only one or two escaped to the ships which promptly set sail for the southern islands.

Thus, less than three weeks after they had celebrated a compact of friendship with Magellan, had sworn allegiance to Spain, and were baptized as Christians, the people of Cebu murdered the very Spaniards who had “converted” them to the Faith. This raises numerous questions—theological, historical, cultural, anthropological—as to what happened and why, but most of them are beyond the scope of this essay.

A major problem in adequately assessing any incident such as this in the history of missions is, as Bishop Stephen Neill has pointed out, that “Christian history has been written far too much from the side of the operators and far too little from the side of the victims... We know fairly well what it feels like to be a missionary; we know much less of what it feels like to be the object of the missionary’s attentions.”

In the case of the abortive mission to the Philippines we have not had any account from “the victims” of “the missionary’s attention”; we have only the report from the side of “the operators”—from Pigafetta’s journal. In recent times, however, as Filipino historians have written their own history, there appears to be a new effort to interpret some of the dynamics which may have been at work in the Cebu episode from the Asian perspective. Gregorio F. Zaide, for instance, says that “Pigafetta’s unfriendly write-up of Enrique, insinuating the latter’s responsibility for the Cebu disaster, smacks of racial prejudice.”

Even Miguel A. Bernad, who is more sympathetic to Spanish considerations than some other Filipino historians, speaks of the “false start” of Christianity in the Philippines and asks, “Was it not perhaps a pathetic case of misunderstanding? Were not the Spaniards and the natives operating on different wave-lengths... Without proper instruction, without even a common language in which instruction could be given, how could the natives have been expected to understand—within one week—that baptism was not a mere ceremony of friendship but a sacrament of conversion?”

Magellan tried to do “too much too quickly with too little,” with the result that not only did his own missionary effort fail, but it caused a negative reaction among the Filipinos which made it much more difficult for those who followed. They would find “the natives no longer
Illustration from Gaspar de San Agustín’s Conquistas de las islas Filipinas (Madrid 1698), depicting the complementary nature of the spiritual and the temporal conquest of the islands. San Agustín, O.E.S.A., was in the Philippines from 1668-1724, and this work covers the period 1511-1614.
friendly. Hospitality had been replaced by hostility, trust with treachery."25

Three other Spanish expeditions reached the Philippines—Loaisa (1526), Saávedra (1528), and Villalobos (1543)—but with negligible results. Horacio de la Costa says, “The information gathered by all three voyages regarding the Philippines was on the whole unfavorable. It was a very poor country. . . . The people were unfriendly. . . . The Philippines was not a particularly good colonial investment.”26 But Spain still hoped to secure a permanent colony in the Philippines as a base for trade and missionary work in China.

The permanent Spanish occupation of the islands began in 1565 with the arrival of the expedition under the command of Miguel López de Legazpi. He was assisted by the Augustinian friar Andrés de Urdaneta, even though Urdaneta—an experienced navigator who had survived the Loaisa expedition—had moral reservations since he correctly believed that the Philippines lay on the Portuguese side of the Line of Demarcation and thereby belonged to Portugal.

The situation was more difficult now than it had been for Magellan. “Cebu, which had welcomed Magellan with open arms, had to be conquered by Legazpi’s sword.”27 On 27 April 1565—exactly 44 years to the day since Magellan was killed at Mactan—Legazpi’s fleet anchored in Cebu harbor. After failing to persuade the natives to receive them peaceably, the Spaniards attacked and took the town. A prudent and benevolent governor, Legazpi eventually convinced the native ruler, Tupas (Humabon’s son), of his friendly and peaceful intentions. A peace treaty was drawn up whereby the Filipinos agreed to recognize Spanish sovereignty and pay tribute, and whereby, in return, Legazpi promised to protect them from their enemies and to conduct trade between Spaniards and Filipinos on a reciprocal basis.”28 Tupas agreed to cede a piece of land to the Spaniards for their fort and town-site, and thus Cebu became the site of the first Spanish settlement in the Philippines.

In contrast to the rapid and rather indiscriminate approach of Magellan to baptizing the natives, the policy of the Augustinians with Legazpi was conservative and cautious. The friars did baptize the widowed niece of Tupas (christening her Doña Isabel) late in 1565, and performed her marriage ceremony a few days later to a Greek sailor in Legazpi’s crew—the first Christian wedding in the Philippines. And on 28 March 1568, both Tupas and his son were baptized. In general, however, “the Augustinians were determined not to repeat the mistake of the Magellan fiasco—to baptize large groups without a reasonable assurance that the Spaniards would remain permanently in the islands.”29

On the other side, there was a general reluctance and passive resistance among many native groups toward the efforts of the mission-
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aries to convert them.\textsuperscript{30} In the first three years (1565-68), not more than a dozen baptisms were administered. By 1570, five years after Legazpi’s arrival, the total number of baptisms had not exceeded 100. “Between 1570 and 1578 the number of adult conversions was strikingly unimpressive. In fact the Augustinians . . . confined most of their baptisms to children. The adults remained suspicious and unresponsive.”\textsuperscript{31}

In 1571—for reasons of better protection against the marauding Portuguese, better provisions, better prospects for gold, and a better base for reaching China—Legazpi moved his capital to Manila, a thriving Muslim kingdom on the northern island of Luzon. After defeating the forces of Rajah Soliman, the Muslim ruler of Manila, Legazpi quickly established a municipal government and began building a Spanish city, with a church and convent for the Augustinian friars, a fort, a palace for himself, and 150 houses for the Spanish colonizers. By the time of Legazpi’s death in August 1572, much of the lowland Philippines, except for the southern islands of Mindanao and the Sulu—where the Muslims were firmly entrenched—had been brought under Spanish rule.

The missionary enterprise, which got off to such an exceedingly modest start during the years between 1565 and 1578, picked up in scope and vitality with the arrival of large contingents of additional personnel beginning in 1578.\textsuperscript{32} Travelling on the famed Manila Galleon, the Franciscans arrived in 1578, the Jesuits in 1581, the Dominicans in 1587, and the Augustinian Recollects in 1606. “The number of missionaries increased from 13 in 1576 to 94 in 1586. By 1594 the number of regular clergy had risen to 267,” ministering to approximately 288,000 baptized Filipinos, out of a total population of about 500,000.\textsuperscript{33}

Manila’s first bishop, Fray Domingo de Salazar, a Dominican, arrived in 1581; and in 1595, Manila became an archbishopric with three suffragan dioceses: Cebu, Cáceres, and Nueva Segovia.

In 1594 the Council of the Indies in Spain partitioned the Philippines among the four religious orders then at work in the archipelago, and additional assignments were given to the Recollects upon their arrival in 1606. This sort of “spiritual geography” gave to each religious order its own separate territory of missionary activity in the islands. It was a form of negative cooperation among the rival orders, an attempt to increase effectiveness through minimizing duplication of effort.

The missionaries founded the Colegio de San Ildefonso and the Colegio de San Ignacio in 1595, the Colegio de Santo Tomás in 1611, and the Colegio de San Juan de Letran in 1620. Hospitals were started in Manila by the Franciscans in 1578, by the Dominicans in 1587, and another by the Franciscans in 1612.

Despite the “false start” under Magellan, and the initial reluctance of the Filipinos to accept missionary efforts in the Legazpi era, “by 1605, thanks to the missionary zeal of the Spanish Augustinians, Dominicans,
Franciscans, and Jesuits, the majority of the population had been baptized. Since that date, the Filipinos have been overwhelmingly Catholic in numbers."34 The eminent Filipino church historian, Horacio de la Costa, says, "Judged by any standards, the conversion of the Philippines to Christianity by these missionary religious was a remarkable achievement."35

Working within the framework of the *patronato real* and the *encomienda* system—institutions which characterized the Spanish colonial enterprise—the missionary effort was largely responsible for the "Hispanization of the Philippines." The accompanying "Filipinization of Catholicism," however, was marked by two perennial problems of the Church in the Philippines: nominalism within its membership, and an abnormally slow development of the native clergy.

With never enough clergy to minister adequately to the spiritual needs and nurture of its constituency, following the large influx of members beginning about 1580, Filipino Catholicism throughout its history has been troubled by nominalism within its membership both in terms of loyalty and of comprehension and practice of the Faith. As recently as 1965, for instance, a missionary priest in Manila reported that "67 percent of all Filipinos live in Catholic families in which nobody goes to Mass on Sundays...[and] at most 3 percent of all Filipino families are regularly practicing Catholic families." Together with nominalism goes a Philippine "folk Catholicism"—vestigial elements of pre-Christian spiritism and folkways conjoined to a superficial veneer of Catholic belief and devotion.

The shortage of clergy in the Philippines resulted in large measure from the abnormally slow development of the native clergy. Though some Filipinos were trained for the priesthood, the predominant attitude among the Spanish missionaries was that the *indios* were socially, if not congenitally, unfit for such an honor. Filipinos who were ordained belonged almost exclusively to the secular clergy, were poorly trained for the most part, and were rarely permitted to occupy ecclesiastical positions above parish assistants. No Filipino was elevated to the episcopacy during the entire 333-year period of Spanish colonial rule. It was not until 1905, after the American acquisition of the Philippines, that the first Filipino was named to the episcopate, when Father Jorge Barlin was made bishop of Nueva Cáceres (Naga).36

A final observation on what happened in the process of "Christianizing" the Philippines comes from Father Miguel A. Bernad. In his book, *The Christianization of the Philippines: Problems and Perspectives*, Bernad asks: "If at the beginning of the Spanish conquest native society was as well organized and native culture as well developed as we have depicted, why did the native Filipinos seem so backward in later cen-
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...turies?” By 1720—a century and a half after the Spanish conquest—“something had happened to the natives, to their society and their culture . . . a radical change had taken place for the worse. Obviously a cultural stagnation—perhaps even a retrogression—had taken place. How did it come about?”

The author agrees with Philippine national hero José Rizal that “Filipino indolence” was not an indigenous habit but an acquired one, caused by several factors. First, Filipinos in large numbers were impressed into service to fight the Spanish wars of conquest—“fatal expeditions that wasted the moral and material energies of the country.” Second, Moro raids—provoked by the Spaniards—for nearly three centuries caused enormous suffering and destruction. Most important, “the Spaniards took away from the Filipinos almost all motivation for working,” because the Spaniards in the Philippines “disdained any kind of manual labor and dedicated themselves to a life of leisure.” Rizal was right: the Filipino people “lost pride in their past, faith in the present and hope for the future.” Bernad concludes: “The people indeed became Christians, but they paid a terrible price: no less than their personal dignity, their liberties, and their social fabric.”

Spain also paid a heavy price for this “economically profitless colony”; but she did not count the cost: it was essentially a spiritual investment.

NOTES

1. Filipino historians rightly remind us that this was “the rediscovery of the Philippines—a ‘discovery’ to European peoples,” since the native peoples obviously knew the islands were there. Gregorio F. Zaide, Philippine Political and Cultural History (2 vols. Manila 1950-56) 1.113.


Governing the New World

6. Ibid., 46. See Zaide (n. 1 above) 1.115; Bernad (n. 4 above) 7-8; and Peter G. Gowing, Islands Under the Cross: The Story of the Church in the Philippines (Manila 1967) 19-20.

7. Pigafetta (n. 5 above) 57.

8. Ibid. (adapted).

9. Ibid., 68-69.

10. I am indebted to Professor Phelan for drawing this incident to my attention in his splendid study of “Prebaptismal Instruction and the Administration of Baptism in the Philippines during the Sixteenth Century,” in Studies in Philippine Church History (n. 4 above) 37-38. Phelan may not be quite fair, however, when he speaks of Magellan, a layman, as “the proto-missionary of the Philippines.”

11. Pigafetta (n. 5 above) 69.

12. Ibid., 62-63.

13. Ibid., 66.


15. Pigafetta (n. 5 above) 66, 75; Zaide (n. 1 above) 1. 118.

16. Details of the battle are in Pigafetta (n. 5 above) 75-79.

17. Ibid., 79.

18. Ibid., 80.

19. See Zaide (n. 1 above) 1.121 n. 1. Variations in details and accounts of the entire expedition occur because Pigafetta prepared several manuscripts and narratives based on his records and observations. Those manuscripts which have not disappeared have gone through numerous editions and translations. The Pigafetta eyewitness account used here is from the first direct translation into English of the original published in French in 1525. A full account of the various known Pigafetta manuscripts, their publication, translation, and editions is given by Howard H. Peckham in the introduction (pp. vi-xv). This is followed by further clarification of discrepancies in the various manuscripts of Pigafetta’s journal in “A prefatory note to this translation” by Paula Spurlin Paige (pp. xvi-xvii). She maintains that the French translator’s original of this account is “a more reliable manuscript” than the Italian manuscript of Pigafetta’s account in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan, which James A. Robertson used for his English translation, Magellan’s Voyage around the World (3 vols. Cleveland 1906).

20. The Saavedra expedition learned in 1528 that eight members of Magellan’s expedition had survived the massacre in Cebu in 1521 and were sold by the Cebuans to some Chinese merchants and taken to China. See Zaide (n. 1 above) 1. 134; and Horacio de la Costa, “The Voyage of Saavedra, 1527-1529,” in The Beginnings of Christianity in the Philippines, ed. Philippines Historical Committee (Manila 1965) 43.


22. Zaide (n. 1 above) 1.122 n. 3.

23. Bernad (n. 4 above) 17, 18, 20.

24. Phelan (n. 10 above) 23.

25. Bernad (n. 4 above) 21. Despite Magellan’s failure as a missionary, his tragic death at Mactan, and the debacle in Cebu, Samuel Eliot Morison describes his expedition as “the greatest voyage in recorded history”; Morison (n. 3 above) 303. Surprisingly, Morison says the same about Columbus’ first voyage; it too is “the greatest recorded voyage in history,” ibid., 90.


27. Bernad (n. 4 above) 21.

28. Zaide (n. 1 above) 1. 144; Cushner (n. 26 above) 80.


30. Phelan says, “Historians have tended to underestimate the persistence and the effectiveness of passive resistance of many native groups to the first efforts of the missionaries” who came with Legazpi. Ibid., 35.
The Philippines: Reluctant Beneficiary

31. Ibid., 36. Six Augustinians prepared to sail with Legazpi from Mexico in 1564, but one died before departure. Thus Urdaneta came to the islands with only four fellows: Frs. Martín de Rada, Diego de Herrera, Andrés de Aguirre, and Pedro de Gamboa. After Urdaneta returned to Mexico with Fr. Andrés de Aguirre in 1565, only three were left. By 1576 there were still only 13 friars at work. See Zaide (n. 1 above) 1. 140; Antonio de Morga, Historical Events of the Philippine Islands, annotated by José Rizal (Manila 1962) 7-8; Catholic Directory of the Philippines (Manila 1970) 72; and the monumental history of the Augustinians in the Philippines, including an exhaustive bibliography on the Legazpi-Urdaneta expedition, by Isacio R. Rodríguez, O.S.A., Historia de la provincia Agustiniana del Smo. Nombre de Jesús de Filipinas (4 vols. Manila 1965-68).

32. Phelan (n. 10 above) 37.

33. Ibid., 36-37.

34. Horacio de la Costa, “The Development of the Native Clergy in the Philippines,” in Studies in Philippine Church History (n. 4 above) 68.

35. Horacio de la Costa, “Episcopal Jurisdiction in the Philippines during the Spanish Regime,” in Studies in Philippine Church History (n. 4 above) 45.

36. Horacio de la Costa (n. 34 above) 69. This classic essay concludes: “The system of the patronato asked for a second-rate native clergy, and got it” (104).

37. Bernad (n. 4 above) passim.

38. Phelan (n. 2 above) 13-14; also Nicholas P. Cushner, Spain in the Philippines, Institute of Philippine Culture Monographs 1 (Quezon City 1971) Ch. vi.
Right to Counsel:
The Message from America

by David Mellinkoff

For more than three centuries America has been an inheritor of the common law tradition of England. In varying degrees the law of Englishmen has been a part of our culture from the beginnings of settlement here, and in varying degrees it continues so today. Without denying a tittle of the magnitude and importance of that legal inheritance, I suggest, on the basis of only preliminary investigation, that the historic traffic in legal notions has not all been from East to West.¹

In this brief installment of that thesis is some evidence that in at least one instance—the right to counsel—an Old World idea of justice, rejected in England, took firm hold in America, and that in the end, the American experience helped to convince the mother country. England's ultimate adoption of right to counsel does not qualify as an initial impact of the discovery of America, for it comes hard and late—in the nineteenth century; but the intellectual process of the change from rejection to acceptance is, I believe, firmly rooted in early American soil.

Some of the sharpest criticism of the law has come in formulations of what Bacon called "imaginary laws for imaginary commonwealths," discourses he thought were "as the stars, which give little light, because they are so high."² Not all Englishmen were content with so "little light," nor content to camouflage their assaults on law and lawyers, especially lawyers, in Utopian or Brobdingnagian exotica. For those who would not wait, America was a laboratory for experimentation with Old
World ideas whose time had not yet come at home. Right to counsel, I believe, was one such experiment that worked.

It is well known that until passage of the Prisoners' Counsel Bill of 1836, Englishmen indicted for felony were denied the right to have lawyers speak for them to the jury. Until 1695, the same rule applied to indictments for high treason. Though the precise degree of application of English law to the American colonies is still a subject of scholarly controversy and investigation, on right to counsel two points are worth noting: 1) Charters to English colonizers in America typically provided that locally enacted laws should not be contrary to the "Laws and Statutes" of England, or not contrary simply to the "Lawes" of England; 2) No-right-to-counsel was not part of the "Statutes" of England; whether it was nonetheless part of the "Lawes" of England was another matter. Certainly there is a solid legal ring to Lord Chief Justice Jeffry's seventeenth-century dictum denying the right to counsel with the common lawyer's touchstone: "... the practice of the law is so; and the practice is the law." Still, in legal interpretation there was room for maneuver.

The principal reason given for the rule denying counsel to indicted prisoners was Lord Coke's, that an ordinary lawyer was unnecessary, for the court was counsel for the prisoner. And even when counsel was allowed in cases of high treason, the old rule (it was said by such grand rationalizers as Serjeant Hawkins) should still apply to indictments for felony, counsel there being unimportant because such trials were not, like treason trials, likely to be so zealously prosecuted. The underlying rationale, that counsel for prisoners might make it more difficult to get rid of undesirables, even the guilty, was most often left unspoken. The irrationality of a system of justice that permitted counsel for trivial but not for capital offenses was clouded in the accidents of legal history, and the Crown, savoring its prosecutors' advantage, was not eager to set the matter right. Some lawyers supported the denial of their services to "criminals" as a prophylactic to the purity of the profession. Critics who would approve prophylaxis for lawyers, even catharsis, were skeptical of this professional diffidence. To those already suspicious of bar and establishment, denial of right to counsel was yet another demonstration of unholy alliance. This is the setting for experimentation with right to counsel in America, an innovation that left some colonizing dissidents torn by conflicting antipathies: indignation at the unfairness of permitting Crown lawyers to prosecute to death lawyerless defendants, and an even more pervasive loathing for the whole profession of lawyers.

The Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution, granting the right to the accused in criminal prosecutions "to have the assistance of counsel for his defense," was adopted in 1791, less than 50 years before England followed suit. But the Sixth Amendment reflected what
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had become general practice in America before the federal union, in some influential instances a century and a half to almost two centuries before passage of the Prisoners’ Counsel Bill. From an abundance of materials for study, I offer here some Puritan and Quaker contributions to right to counsel that are, I believe, a part of the process that eventually led England to change her way.

An early example of the hate-the-lawyer, love-the-lawyer ambivalence in America is to be found in the colony of Puritans in Massachusetts Bay. The first code of law there, called the Body of Liberties of 1641, includes this:

Every man that findeth himselfe unfit to plead his owne cause in any court shall have Libertie to imploy any man against whom the Court doth not except, to helpe him, Provided he give him noe fee or reward for his paines.

This would have the double effect of prohibiting professional lawyers and permitting non-professional counsel, both contrary in some respects to the practice in England at the time. The provision does not specifically say that it applies to indictments for felony, but the language is all-inclusive. The draftsman of the Body of Liberties was a lawyer turned minister, Nathaniel Ward, who left England during the reign of Archbishop Laud and returned after Laud’s downfall. While still in New England, Ward gave some indication of holding more professional views of the way trials ought to be conducted than did the Governor-lawyer of the colony, John Winthrop. In the year the Body of Liberties was adopted, Ward preached a sermon deploiring, among other things, the then prevalent practice of judges privately counselling litigants in the very cases that came before them. Winthrop defended the practice, saying it was done in criminal causes and should likewise be all right in civil causes, that the alternative was that “we must then provide lawyers to direct men in their causes,” and that the practice tended to settle controversies, and to give judges a better understanding of the issues, “no advocate being allowed, and the parties being not able, for the most part, to open the cause fully and clearly, especially in public.”

Another lawyer, Thomas Lechford, practiced in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, drafting legal instruments and doing some court work until he too returned to England where he published Plain Dealing: or, News from New-England. His comments on the Massachusetts Bay legal system must be viewed in the context of his own difficulties with the system; for he fell afoul of the locals for both religious and legal differences, the latter resulting in his being “debarred” from pleading for others in court. In his book, Lechford asserted that the local courts of general jurisdiction in causes civil, criminal, and ecclesiastical operated arbitrarily and without a proper record of their proceedings:
"They have put men to death, banished, fined men, cutt off mens eares, whipt, imprisoned men, and all these for Ecclesiasticall and Civill offences, and without sufficient record. . . . And humbly I appeale to his royall Majesty, and his honourable and great Counsell, whether or no the proceedings in such matters as come to be heard before Ecclesiasticall Judges, be not fit to be upon Record; and whether Registers, Advocates, and Procurators, be not necessary to assist the poore and unlearned in their causes, and that according to the warrant and intendment of holy Writ, and of right reason. I have knowne by experience, and heard divers have suffered wrong by default of such in New-England. . . . But take heed my brethren, despise not learning, nor the worthy Lawyers of either gown, lest you repent too late." 15

The extent to which Lechford's specific message was heeded either in England or New England is not recorded. But it is of record that in the next major revision of the laws of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, The Lawes and Liberties of 1648, the ban on paid lawyers was eliminated sub silentio. 16 And 12 years later special counselling to litigants from judges was banned. 17 Whether these measures carried with them the right to counsel on criminal indictments is again not specifically spelled out, but we do know that under the tutelage of Governor Winthrop, Massachusetts Bay was chary about putting onto the statute books anything that the Crown might consider "contrary to the Lawes of England." Winthrop's Puritan conscience did not corrupt his sound legal judgment that the less put in writing the better; he thought too that while a law formally enacted in America might be deemed contrary to the laws of England, what happened as a matter of practice or custom would not necessarily fall under the ban. 18 Later, in 1692, 1697, 20 and 1699, 21 Massachusetts Bay did officially enact right-to-counsel statutes (disallowed by the Crown), and a further statute of 1701 22 which seemed to approve the practice. In any event, before the Revolution Massachusetts defendants indicted for felony were permitted counsel, who, in the manner of a host of lawyers since, urged the jury "to remove all popular Prejudices and Passions . . . and to give their Verdict agreeable to Law and the Evidence, uninfluenc'd by any other Motive." 23

The detailing of specific contemporary influence in England of New England's attitudes on right to counsel must await further research. But circumstance makes the speculation worthwhile and further research in order. We know, for example, that there was a two-way traffic of Englishmen, specifically Puritans (other than Ward and Lechford), across the Atlantic. Sir Henry Vane, for a short space governor of Massachusetts Bay Colony, returned to England and for a time enjoyed the confidence of Cromwell. 24 Other Puritan leaders were drawn back to England to participate in the overthrow of Charles I. 25 The similarity of thinking suggests cross-fertilization. In the legal ferment of the Com-
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monwealth period, law and lawyers came under heavy fire. John Warr, raging against "The Corruption and Deficiency of the Laws of England" (1649), argued that the ancient law of England never did prohibit counsel. "[I]t may not be understood thereby that any persons shall be prohibited to have counsel of pleaders, or of learned men in the law, for his fee, or of his parents and next friends." In any event, he concluded: "In a word, why may not a man plead his own case? Or his friends and acquaintances as formerly, plead for him." A committee of the House that included Cromwell and Algernon Sidney (a friend of William Penn) proposed as one of numerous legal reforms that did not fly, "That as well in matters of fact as law, where there shall any person plead as counsel against the prisoner, in such case the prisoner may have counsel." Another member of that committee, Bulstrode Whitlocke (a friend of Penn and at one time a friend of Vane), addressed the House in 1649 with a strong plea for right to counsel: "... I confess I cannot answer this objection, That, for a trespass of a sixpence value, a man may have a counsellor to plead for him; but where his life and posterity are concerned, he is not admitted this privilege and help of lawyers."

Others too in England urged the right to counsel, and in 1695 there was a limited change permitting counsel on indictments for high treason. But this was class legislation, high treason being a crime of gentlemen. Ordinary felony defendants were still left to shift for themselves, though not without protest against the manifest unfairness. Even the stalwart Blackstone, whose best-selling Commentaries were widely influential in America as in England, thought the denial of counsel an anomaly: "For upon what face of reason can that assistance be denied to save the life of a man which yet is allowed him in prosecutions for every petty trespass?"

Apart from New England, a major American center of adoption of right to counsel was Pennsylvania (and neighboring Delaware and New Jersey), which came under the Quaker influence of William Penn, who in the course of a busy life made two round trips to America. No friend to the profession of lawyers, the Quakers felt the rigors of prosecution and persecution more than any other Protestant sect in England. Penn's philosopher friend John Locke drafted The Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina in 1669, outlawing advocacy as a paid profession, but recognizing the right to the assistance of unpaid pleaders. A year later, Penn, in one of his frequent brushes with English law, personally experienced the uneven hand of English justice in the celebrated case of Rex v. Penn and Mead, in which an English jury refused to convict despite harassment from the bench. In that case the defendants were without counsel, presumably by choice since it was not a prosecution for felony. Nonetheless, Penn's co-defendant took occasion to berate the
judge for asking him a potentially incriminating question: "Is this like
unto a Judge, that ought to be Counsel for the Prisoner at the Bar?"35

Penn’s Frame of Government for the Pennsylvania colony did not outlaw paid lawyers as did Locke’s Constitutions, but recognized the right to personal and lay advocacy.36 And his own Charter of Privileges to the people of his chartered lands in 1701 followed the pattern of the abortive Commonwealth proposal, declaring “That all Criminals [here in the usage of those accused of crime] shall have the same Privileges of Witnesses and Council as their Prosecutors.”37 This was followed in 1718 with a statute, one of the earliest in colonial America, providing not only for the right to counsel, but for the assignment of counsel to prisoners in capital cases38; and in 1776 the Pennsylvania Constitution granted the right to counsel in all criminal prosecutions.39

We must pass now to the point where England finally, in the nineteenth century, repeatedly pondered, rejected, and finally granted the right to counsel. Here we need no longer rely on inference and circumstance to establish the influence of American law.

In the repeated debates on proposals to change the law in England, proponents pointed to England and Ireland as almost alone in the civilized world in denying the right to counsel. But, said defenders of the system, that was because outside of England, criminal justice was so loaded against the accused that counsel was an absolute necessity. Thus it was argued that Scotland was not a model to follow, for there the protective English rule of juror unanimity did not prevail.40 Again, that France was not a proper model for English justice, for there the prisoner was subject to interrogation by the prosecution.41 Against these arguments the example from the New World was the answer. Right to counsel, Sir James Mackintosh told the Commons on 25 June 1824, “was granted in the United States, an instance of similar laws to those of England.”42 In 1826, a Parliamentary Report on Criminal Justice in the West Indian colonies (the Dwarris Report) showed right to counsel even there.43

In 1834, the government appointed a commission looking to “the more effective administration of Criminal Justice”44 in England, a commission described by the late Sir William Holdsworth as “remarkable for the academic distinction of most of its members.”45 It included among others John Austin and Andrew Amos, Professor of English law at University College, London. The commission did its work well. On right to counsel they reported the views of William Ewart, M.P.:

The United States of America, which borrowed their legal proceedings from England, formerly followed our example in denying to a prisoner the right of full defence. But now, I believe, in every one of the United States the prisoner has the privilege of defence by counsel or attorney.46
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Better than that, Professor Amos asked the distinguished Boston lawyer John Pickering to report on the practice in America. Pickering wrote: "It has long been our settled practice to allow them [i.e. counsel] in all criminal cases." The commission included his letter in its report, commenting, "It may not unfrequently happen that time will be consumed by unnecessary speeches of Counsel; as to which we may cite the observations of an eminent American Barrister." Pickering had this to say:

It is true that time of the courts is occasionally wasted in listening to the idle declamation of raw and inexperienced practisers, but this is an evil of little consequence, as we think, in comparison with the mischief of placing the criminal in any degree within the power of the judge, and putting the latter in the two incompatible relations of judge and counsel.

The commission concluded with what the restrained Holdsworth described as "a devastating criticism" of the denial of counsel.

The report became available as the debate on a new Prisoners' Counsel Bill reached its conclusion in the summer of 1836. Leading the bill's support was a former opponent, now convinced and convincing, Lord Lyndhurst, born in Boston, Massachusetts four years before the Declaration of Independence, son of the painter John Copley. Lyndhurst spoke twice during the debate, each time citing American precedent from the colonies where English law prevailed, and also from the lost colonies:

In the United States, where the common law of England was the law of the country, it had long been the practice to allow counsel to prisoners, and no inconvenience or complaint had resulted from it; nor was it followed by the existence of those evils which it was supposed would result from the practice if it were adopted in this country.

The measure carried. Right to counsel had come home.
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Part V

IMAGES IN THE ARTS
First Visual Images of Native America

by William C. Sturtevant

The European iconography of native America has many sources. The people and their artifacts and behavior could be observed at first hand in the New World; Indians and Indian objects were also taken back for display, and to some extent for study, in sizable numbers beginning with the earliest European voyages. Images spread from the primary observers through verbal descriptions—oral as well as written—and in drawings, paintings, engravings, and sculpture. Disentangling the sources and gauging the reliability of depictions is a necessary preliminary to using them to enlarge our understanding of Europeans’ changing conceptions of the non-European world, just as it is for using this evidence for the historical ethnography of the vanished native societies it depicts.

We can attempt a preliminary classification of these sources:
1. An artist may draw or paint directly from life either in America or in Europe. Such field sketches have very rarely survived.
2. An artist may work up his own or others’ field sketches to produce a finished illustration considered more suitable for reproduction or for exhibition.
3. An artist may copy a finished work by himself or by another, with inevitable variations, either intentional or accidental. When a shift in medium is also involved, as from watercolors to oils or from oils to engraving, the changes are likely to be even more significant.
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4. An artist may rely on his own unassisted visual memory; obviously, the longer it has been since he saw the original, the less accurate the depiction is likely to be.

5. An artist may rely on the visual memory of someone else. Ideally, one can imagine the original observer personally directing the artist's corrections of successive drafts, in order to approximate with increasing accuracy the observer's mental picture. Such cases were probably rare, although an occasional author's criticism of his artist suggests such work: for example Robert Beverley explained the impossibility of correctly showing Virginia Indian canoes entering a weir,² and J. F. Lafitau complained of his picture of Canadian Indians traveling in the winter that "le Graveur a oublie de les envelopper de leurs fourrures, ainsi que la saison le demande."³

6. An artist may rely on written descriptions by others. But he cannot transform words into forms without some visual preconceptions, and it may be difficult to judge whether accurate results represent merely fortunate interpretations of purely verbal sources.

7. An artist may base his work on recognizably naturalistic native depictions, in the rare cases where they are available. Mesoamerican art such as treated elsewhere in this volume probably provides the only such New World models used by European artists for nearly 200 years after Columbus.⁴

8. Artists lacking appropriate models often assumed that all non-Europeans resembled each other, and transferred images from known cultures (classical, Oriental, or African) to the New World setting. More common still was the assumption that Indians and their artifacts vary little⁵: Brazilian Indians appear in Mexico, Patagonians are found in central New York, Florida Indians hold Brazilian clubs, Natchez Indians in Louisiana use a North Carolina temple, and Pocahontas wears a Tupinamba feather costume.

9. Medieval Wild Men and monsters from ancient European tradition reappear in the New World,⁶ or subtly affect ideas about appropriate Indian appearance and dress.

10. When Indian models are missing or inadequate, the artist may introduce details from his native European culture—the engraver of Le Moyne's Florida scenes for de Bry showed typical French or Belgian hoes and pack baskets, and nautilus shell cups rather than the correct conch shells.⁷

11. Attempts to convey more information may lessen fidelity. What happens at night or inside a dark house may be shown in full daylight, and activities occurring at different times or locations may be grouped in the same illustration (like habitat groups in modern museums which contain an unnatural number and variety of animals and plants).
12. Finally, European stylistic conventions inevitably affect New World scenes. The expectations of the intended viewers must have exerted a powerful influence, particularly when the artists' intentions were propagandistic. Canons of composition affected accuracy in minor matters such as posture; they also altered relative scales within an illustration and rearranged figures and structures in a natural setting. But the shapes of artifacts (and of exotic plants and animals) can often be recognized through the distorting screen of European artistic conventions. The human form, however, does not escape conventional depiction until well into the seventeenth century: the first convincing European paintings of Indian physiognomy and body build of which I am aware are those by Albert Eckhout done in Brazil in 1641-43.8

Any depiction before photography was invented—and even many photographs—contains some of these distorting elements. One frequently finds, for example, classical figures in European poses wearing correct Indian clothing and ornaments.

When one subtracts from European pictures the elements anthropologists can verify as authentically Indian, what remains are European preconceptions and misconceptions. Anthropologists use several sorts of evidence: most useful but rarest are artifacts in museum collections matching the illustrations in type, provenience, and date. Provided one remembers the likelihood of culture change, other ethnographic artifacts from the same or closely related cultures and archaeological data also make useful standards of comparison, as do accurate illustrations from the same region. The written literature of ethnology, including ethnohistory, is often helpful. Clearly this method requires a detailed examination of all identifiable cultural traits in each illustration.

The listing in this study is a by-product of research over the past decade, which had a different focus, namely illustrations of eastern North American Indians before 1860.9 The list is incomplete, since extended systematic searches have not been made and critical studies have not been completed for most of the illustrations. However, the items mentioned all deserve closer ethnographic examination. The list omits illustrations that plainly have no basis in New World ethnography and ones that derive from those listed here without adding any new, first-hand information.

The listing continues to 1590, the publication date of the first volume in the collection issued by Theodor de Bry and his family.10 Research on all subsequent illustrations of American Indians must take de Bry into account, for he served as artists' source for at least two centuries. The complex filiations that resulted have barely begun to be studied. De Bry collected a great deal of material (some of it since lost) from both published and unpublished sources. Very often he or his other engravi-
ers were better artists than those who produced his models. The results give a homogenized impression: the figures are all "neoclassical," the compositions artificial and European. But more careful examination shows that in his own way he was faithful to his sources, for the transfer of clothing, houses, and other artifacts from one culture to another occurs infrequently. Thus where de Bry’s models are lost or unknown, his pictures should be taken seriously as primary ethnohistorical documents.

Here is the catalogue of extant illustrations prior to de Bry and having some claim to ethnographic accuracy. Most, perhaps all, are not primary field sketches—but no earlier originals are known. Systematically omitted are European illustrations based on native Mexican artistic works.\textsuperscript{11}

1502. A Portuguese manuscript map of the coasts of the South Atlantic (known as Kunstmann II because Friedrich Kunstmann discovered it in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich) is supposed to date from 1502. The Brazilian coast bears a scene of a white man skewered on a spit being turned over a fire by a kneeling, naked, curly-haired, bearded, brown-skinned man. The only artifact shown is the spit, which seems less likely than a barbecue frame to be the appropriate Tupinamba cooking method. Probably the picture is not directly based on observations, although the scene is said to represent an incident during Amerigo Vespucci’s 1501-02 voyage when one of his sailors was killed by Indians and roasted and eaten before his companions’ eyes.\textsuperscript{12}

1505. The earliest illustration meriting serious attention is a woodcut which shows standing and seated Indians wearing feather garments and eating humans, with two European ships in the background (fig.\textsuperscript{2}). There are two versions of this, varying only slightly in the image but more in the type-set inscription of four lines of German beneath.\textsuperscript{13} Some of the ethnographic details depicted correspond to the description of coastal Brazilian Indians in a German translation of a Vespucci letter, which is paraphrased in the inscription. The men are erroneously shown bearded. But the feather ornaments seem partially accurate—especially a rosette worn as a bustle by a figure at the left (the Tupinamba ornament called \textit{enduape}), and the collars, anklets, and armlets.\textsuperscript{14} However, the skirts—consisting of a belt from which hangs a row of very large feathers—are dubious. Impractical, they do not precisely parallel known Brazilian Indian attire. European artists, finding it difficult to imagine people without clothing but exuberantly decorated with feathers, including feather belts,\textsuperscript{15} might well invent this form of feather skirt by following verbal descriptions. In any event, it has a long, complicated career in subsequent depictions from many parts of the hemisphere.

1513-1519. In these years Maximilian I supported a project to
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depict a triumph, which resulted in a series of 109 miniature paintings on which were based 137 woodcuts done between 1516 and 1519. Preliminary sketches for the miniatures were prepared by Jörg Kölderer; the paintings, which were then done in the Regensburg studio of Albrecht Altdorfer, many of them by himself, survive in the Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna. The last scene in the triumph, titled "people of Calicut" (Kalikut, Calegut), was to depict, according to Maximilian, "One rank with shields and swords. One rank with spears. Two ranks with English bows and arrows. All are naked like Indians or dressed in Moorish fashion. They shall all be wearing laurel wreaths." Altdorfer painted this scene in brilliant colors (Albertina 284, Inv. Nr. 25259) following these directions closely: first a man on a decorated horse, then four ranks of five men each, the first with shields and swords, the second with spears, the third and fourth with bows and arrows. All wear headdresses and skirts of plumes, feather arm and leg bands, and sandals (but not laurel wreaths). None of the details of weapons or clothing look particularly American, although the use of feathers may be a remote reflection of ideas about how Brazilians looked.

However, when Hans Burgkmair made beautiful, very detailed woodcuts of this scene he transformed the composition and introduced remarkably accurate ethnographic details. The leader now wears a turban and rides an elephant. He is followed by a crowd, all wearing laurel wreaths, which includes a naked man and woman, men in loin-cloths with shields, swords, and bows, and finally 11 accurately depicted Tupinamba Indians from Brazil (fig. 3). Two are women wearing feather skirts and crowns, one carrying a pet parrot and the other a pet monkey. The men wear complex feather-decorated skirts and feather crowns which are the modern Brazilian Indian "radial crown" or "horizontal diadem" types (rather than the "vertical crown" or "vertical diadem" shown in other early pictures of Brazilian Indians). Five of the men carry large clubs, the standard Tupi paddle-shaped type even to the proper fur and feather ornaments around the proximal ends of the shafts. Two hold bows which could be English longbows, but they also carry seven long arrows with heavy fletching as Tupinamba arrows were, quite different from the English arrows carried by a loin-clothed man on the adjoining pl. 129. The details of the Asians were apparently derived from woodcuts done to illustrate the account of Balthasar Springer's 1505-06 travels in India. But the Tupinamba attire and weapons must have been based on direct observations of at least the artifacts—the people themselves do not look Indian, and two are even bearded (although there are no other similarities to the 1505 woodcut).16
Woodcuts by Hans Burgkmair, 1516-19, in The Triumph of Maximilian I. Tepinamba men and women wearing feather skirts. (From the atlas supplement to Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses 1, Vienna 1883-84).
1515. Albrecht Dürer also worked for Maximilian I, for whom he drew decorations in ink in the margins of 45 pages of a copy of a Book of Hours printed on vellum, initialing and dating them. To illustrate Psalm 24 he drew a figure that has been identified as an Indian standing on an overturned ladle (fig. 4). But it seems not to have been noticed that this represents a Tupinamba man, evidently quite accurately shown. In some respects it resembles Burgkmair's figures; one wonders whether both artists may have seen the same Indians or Indian objects. The cap of short feathers shown by Dürer appears also on one, or perhaps three, of Burgkmair's men; it is a type for which there are recent parallels among interior Brazilian Indians. The staff carried by Dürer's man is reminiscent of the ceremonial feather scepters documented for the Mundurucu and their neighbors in the Rio Tapajós region. The feather skirt is complex, and some details of construction are shown. It is possible that the designs on the circular shield reflect Indian originals. The sandals worn by the man are wrong, for none were used in Brazil (could they be related to Altdorfer's sandals?). A previous identification of the ladle as made of horn and being "native" or "indigenous" is probably erroneous; the form looks more European than American.
ca. 1519. The so-called Miller Atlas in the Département des Cartes et Plans, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (Rés. Ge DD 683) contains a world chart, ethnographically uninteresting, by Lopo Homem and a series of maps by Pedro and Jorge Reinel with fine, quite important illuminations. A map of Brazil (fol. 4r) contains a fine jungle scene with eight Indians (fig. 5), of whom four naked men (with light brown skins) are chopping and collecting brazilwood, while three posing with bows and arrows wear feather crowns, skirts, and capes (the feathers are bright red, blue, yellow, and green). Another, kneeling, wears a blue cloth skirt and a crown of red, brown, and orange feathers. These figures may well be based on direct knowledge—the capes, particularly, resemble known Tupinamba examples. In the same atlas a "Carta Atlantica" has a scene labelled "Ante-Yllas" but placed in northern South America. It shows four black-skinned men, two unclothed (one with bow and arrow, one with axe) and two wearing pink and purple loincloths, and wearing bracelets, arm bands, and ear ornaments of gold. They hold European metal axes with rectangular blades. This scene betrays no first-hand knowledge. 18

1524. A well-known map of Tenochtitlán follows a lost original sketch made by a conquistador in 1519-20. The woodcut shows the island city linked by causeways and an aqueduct to the mainland, with the main pyramids and other structures of the central temple precinct labelled and recognizable (although obviously distorted by the artist). An area with small birds and a garden represents Montezuma's zoo. The chinampas, the artificial island fields surrounding the city, can be recognized only from other evidence, for the designer interpreted them as rows of houses. On the lake's east side a weir-like structure represents the dike built by Montezuma and Nezahualcoyotl. Thirteen small canoes float in the lake, their shapes reminiscent of those in native Aztec drawings, but the paddlers shown only diagrammatically. 19

1526-1557. The chronicler and fine naturalist Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo y Valdés spent about 30 years in the New World, including some 20 years in Santo Domingo, beginning in 1514. In addition to many drawings of plants and animals he prepared at least 20 ethnographic illustrations relating to Hispaniola, Central America, Peru, and Patagonia. Exceedingly important, their value is increased by the lack of artistic talent for which Oviedo himself apologized in explaining that only drawings could make his descriptions clear. Their originality is certain; indeed no previous models are known for any of them. They have not yet been adequately studied, however, or even completely published. Two were reproduced as woodcuts in Oviedo's Sumario of 1526: a hammock and a fire drill, of Hispaniola and Panama. 20 To later versions of these in the 1535 publication of the first 19 books of his Historia general were added seven more woodcuts illustrating Hispaniola Indian culture: three
Die pagt anzeigt, dass das volk und die geschichte durch den erstenlichen König in Portugal oder von seinen unterhonen. Die leins sind also nackt, blischt, baum woll gestalt von leb. it heiben hals. sten. stern, stern und mann aus dem mit der elende beede. Auch haben die man nugen angebracht und bucht voll edel gestaun. Le hat auch nynamn keine sundet sine alle dung gemat.

Das die man haben die weber welche in gefallen, das sich müßten, sich weber oder freunde, darum haben sie von geschad, Sie steyen auch mit aänder, Sie ein und einander selbe die eschlagen werden und heizen das selbig fleisch in denselben. Sie werden als hundert und fünffzig tag und haben kein regiment.
Fig. 2.

The earliest European picture of Indians with some ethnographic accuracy: Tupinambas of coastal Brazil in a 1505 woodcut, now in Munich.
Figure 5.

Indians in feather costumes collecting brazil-wood (Miller Atlas, about 1519).
Fig. 9.

An Aztec man at the court of Charles V in 1529, in a watercolor by Christoph Weiditz.

Fig. 8.

An Aztec nobleman at the court of Charles V in 1529, in a watercolor by Christoph Weiditz.
Fig. 11.

Brazilian Indians, probably Tupinambas, and their houses and palisade, on the map by Pierre Desceliers, 1546.

Fig. 10.

Tupinambas on Jean Rotz' 1542 map of Brazil, including many accurate ethnographic details.
views of a slit gong, a forked tobacco-snuffing tube, two types of house, a hafted stone ax, a man paddling a dugout canoe, and a gold-panning scene. In 1557, the year of the author’s death, Book xx of his *Historia general* was published, with a woodcut of a Patagonian camp (and another of an Indonesian building). Manuscript versions of all of them (figs. 6, 7) survived except for the two in Book xx. In addition, there are original Oviedo sketches of a post-contact Hispaniola man’s genital covering, a Cueva man with a carrying pole (in Panama), the handle of a Cueva atlatl and the whole implement with a whistling dart, a tall house at Natá, Panama, a scene of two Indian dugouts lashed together to carry Spanish horses, and a curious seesaw in the plaza at Teçoatega, Nicaragua.

Figure 6.

*Method of starting fire with a palm drill, as used by the Indians of the Antilles and Panama, in a drawing by Oviedo, before 1557.*
1529. In the Germanisches Nationalmuseum in Nuremberg are 11 fine depictions of Aztec Indians brought by Cortés to the court of Charles V, and drawn from life in Toledo or Barcelona by Christoph Weiditz, a visiting artist from Augsburg. Obviously accurate representations, they include a sequence of three views of a man lying on his back and juggling a log with his feet, a scene of two men playing *patolli* (a pachisi-like gambling game), and two men playing the native game *tlachco* with a rubber ball. A set of six separate standing figures includes a man holding a wooden bowl, another with a wooden cup, a third man (fig. 9), a warrior with shield and spear, a nobleman holding a feather standard and a tame parrot (fig. 8), and a woman. Four of the men wear breechclouts with a skirt-like row of large feathers pendant from the belt (curiously similar to the Brazilian feather skirts). 24

1539. The printed *Carta marina* of Olaus Magnus shows Greenland in two separate sections, on each of which an Eskimo opposes Europeans—one with a spear, the other with a bow and arrow. Neither figure has any ethnographic value. On Greenland’s eastern section sit four structures shaped like European conical tents with one to four doors in each, while off the coast lies a curious vessel resembling a European dory with double oars and a domed cover topped by a pointed ornament. Olaus Magnus is thought to have seen Eskimo kayaks preserved at Oslo and Trondheim in 1505 and 1518, but this boat does not resemble kayak forms. 25
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1542. Jean Rotz' Boke of idrography in the British Library (Royal Ms. 20E.IX), dated 1542 by him (p. 32), contains 12 large maps of sections of the world, many with diverse and generally accurate ethnographic scenes. A map on pp. 7-8 shows barefoot men with bows and arrows wearing long blue and gold shirts, in eastern North America and in South America; similar figures turn up in Africa on pp. 17-18, and again in eastern North America on pp. 23-24; one cannot assume any direct observation. More likely men appear in Labrador (pp. 21-22, 23-24), with long shirts of brown hides or fur, ragged but tailored with short sleeves, each holding a long bow. Almost certainly accurate are two fine conical wigwams in Labrador (pp. 23-24). Finally, superb Tupinamba figures occur on the Brazilian coast (p. 28; see fig.*10), clearly based on first-hand information.

c.a. 1544. The Harleian world map (British Library Add. Mss. 5413), a large vellum roll measuring 8'2" × 3'10", shows many figures on all continents, of which only a hammock in Brazil seems ethnographically reliable.

1546. A world map by Pierre Desceliers in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, includes numerous Indian figures in South America, shooting bows and arrows, carrying logs, and engaging in other activities (fig.*11). Some wear feathers and some are naked. In North America a probably imaginary scene represents Roberval's landing on the Saint Lawrence in 1542, including 12 small Indian figures apparently in breechclouts or loincloths with furs over their shoulders and armed with long bows and a lance.

1547. A manuscript atlas in the Huntington Library (HM 29), inscribed "Nicolas Vallard de Dieppe 1547," contains 15 decorated maps, six relating to the New World. All of these depict Indians. The most important is map 11 of northeastern South America, which shows pink-skinned Indians dressed in skirts of red, white, and blue feathers (fig.*12). Some of them engage in cutting and transporting brazilwood for a European, with domed huts nearby, including one showing the interior in which two figures recline in a hammock over a fire, a scene clearly based on first-hand knowledge. Indians with bows and arrows and a club and others engaged in mining are also depicted. Map 12, centered on the Río de la Plata, shows naked pink-skinned Indians, one with a fancy feather crown, others with bows and arrows, others mining and carrying logs on their shoulders. Map 6, of the South Atlantic and the shores of South America and Africa, shows naked Brazilian Indians, one with a feather crown and three with logs on their shoulders. Map 1 covers northern South America, but portrays people in yellow cloth garments, houses on stilts, coconut trees, and people riding camels—thus ethnographically uninteresting. Map 10 includes northern South America, Central America and Mexico, southeastern North America,
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and the Antilles. No figures appear in the West Indies, but in both North and South America figures wear fringe skirts of yellow, white, blue, and red. Some of the South Americans are mining. Tenochtitlán is shown as a European city on an island radiating causeways—evidently a derivative of the 1524 Cortés map. Map 9, of New France, pictures a group of Europeans once thought to include Jacques Cartier but recently described as depicting Roberval, and several probably imaginary fur-clothed Indians. 

1550. A map on vellum, 7'2" x 5'10", "faict a Arques par Pierres Desceliers P[res]byte re: Ian: 1550" (British Library Add. Mss. 24,065) has many figures on all continents. The only ethnographically realistic ones lie in Brazil, where, besides several hammocks, there is a battle scene with men wearing kilts of long feathers and wielding bows and arrows and properly-shaped Tupi clubs. In North America are domed huts (also shown in Australia and elsewhere), and Canadian figures in unconvincing long furry shirts—probably as imaginary as the unicorn and other odd animals nearby (although just off the coast are two realistic polar bears on floating ice).

1550. The imitation Brazilian village set up for Henri II’s entry into Rouen (1550) contained 50 Indians—Tupinambas and perhaps “Tabagerres”—and 250 Frenchmen dressed (or rather, undressed) and acting like Indians. Two independent contemporary illustrations of this elaborate and fantastic scene survive. A watercolor view shows the city of Rouen in the background, a bridge in the foreground, and at the left a small wooded island with a closely packed crowd of naked people—three babies, and about 13 adults including at least one woman. All are painted red all over, correctly representing the common Tupinamba use of urucú (Bixa orellana). Some wear rather sparse blue or yellow crowns (not obviously of feathers), and one man (?) has a plain sash extending from his right shoulder to his left hip; none wear feather skirts. Two circular shields (a possible Tupinamba artifact), one to three bows, and a simple straight club are shown. Going under the bridge at the right is a small European boat rowed, not paddled, by two naked red figures while four more stand up in it. Close to the bridge abutment in the center foreground are four burning houses (part of the mock battle staged by the Indians): three of these seem not to be of the proper form, but one is barrel-vaulted in the Tupinamba style. Nearby are seven naked red figures, of whom five carry lances or bows. The other illustration of this village is a woodcut, crowded with details but too small and crudely done to be valuable ethnographically. The thatched houses and canoes seem to be French inventions. But some of the men wear feather skirts, head ornaments, and armbands; their bows and circular shields are not distinctive, but there are also a few clubs in the special Tupi...
shape (although badly drawn). Two figures recline in a hammock strung between two trees.\(^\text{30}\)

1551. The world map by Sancho Gutiérrez in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek includes a dozen or so Indians in Brazil and Patagonia. These figures would be worth detailed examination. Three other figures placed in southern North America are probably pure inventions.\(^\text{31}\)

\textit{ca. 1552.} Galeotto Cey described his travels in the West Indies, Mexico, and northern South America between 1539 and 1552 in a short manuscript containing 43 small marginal drawings, including one Indian face and 22 Indian artifacts, mostly labelled as to type (but not provenience). These are quick, rather diagrammatic ink sketches, but they depict artifacts of types readily recognizable from later evidence, and they are not based on any other known illustrations.\(^\text{32}\)

1553. The Codex Tudela in the Museo de América, Madrid, is an ethnographic work attributed to Andrés de Olmos, containing a Spanish text, copies of native Mexican paintings, and six fine standing figures of Indians done in colors by a European artist in a wholly European style. These are remarkable, and remarkably early, illustrations of cultural types which are quite precisely identified in captions. There are three Aztecs or Mexica (two women and a man), a Tarascan woman, a Yopi man from Acapulco, and a man from the coast of Guatemala (fig. \(^\text{i13}\)), each shown in distinctive dress. One Mexica woman pours chocolate from one vessel into another (fig. \(^\text{i14}\)), the Mexica man holds a rattle, and the Guatemalan has a bow and arrow.\(^\text{33}\)

1553. A large world map on parchment signed “Faicte a Arques par Pierres Desceliers Presbtre: 1553:” was lost by fire at Vienna in 1915, but surviving photographs\(^\text{34}\) indicate many figures on all continents, some of them related to those on the 1550 Desceliers map. In Labrador appeared Europeans, domed huts, and Indians in long gowns with bows and a club, while in Patagonia were four Indians (one bearded) wearing Asian-style loincloths; all were certainly not based on direct observations. In northern South America was a mining scene and a pallisade, and in Brazil Indians in feather skirts and headdresses—some in a circular dance; others fighting with bows and arrows, Tupi-shaped clubs, and a circular shield; others carrying brazilwood on their shoulders; and two resting in a hammock strung between two trees. The battle and the scene of two crowned figures in a hammock are clearly related to parts of the 1551 Rouen woodcut; one would suppose they were derived from the latter, except that the shapes of Desceliers’ clubs seem to be somewhat closer to the true Tupi form—hence they both may derive from a now-lost common source.

1553. Pedro de Cieza de León’s published description of Peru
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contains 42 small woodcuts, but only 12 different ones, for four woodcuts are repeated from five to 13 times each. The text is an important primary source on the ethnography and history of aboriginal Peru, but the illustrations are of slight value. Only two or three appear to have any basis in Andean reality (figs. 15, 16), while the rest show Europeans or are wholly European artists’ conceptions of subjects described in the text (plus one nice depiction of four llamas, on folio 124r).35

Figure 15.

The Inca emperor in a woodcut published in 1553 by Pedro de Cieza de León.

1554. The large (128 × 220 cm.) printed Mappemonde by Sebastían Cabot, of which the only known copy is in the Département des Cartes et Plans, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (Réserve Ge AA 582), includes quite a few human figures. Several in the New World—in southwestern North America, in Brazil, off the Chilean coast—wear a long robe attached on one shoulder, blue with red stripes, which may possibly be based on Mexican models.36 Brazil contains other figures with pots on their backs, and one chopping wood with a European axe.

1555. The title page describes a beautiful atlas of 59 maps in the Bibliothèque, Ministère de la Guerre, Paris (DI. Z. 14), as “Cosmographie
Figure 16.

Cuzco as a European town, with an Inca at left, in a woodcut published in 1553 by Pedro de Cieza de León.

Universelle selon les Navigateurs, Tant anciens Que modernes. Par Guillaume Le Testu pillote en La Mer du ponent: De La ville Francoysse de grace” [i.e., Le Havre], and a note on folio 8 specifies that “Se livre fvt acheue Par guillaume Le Testu Le cinquesme Jour davuril 1555 Auant pasques.” The ethnographic illuminations on the maps are often good and convincing (although somewhat less so than the best on the Rotz map); they also contain a great variety of animals both real and fantastic, and a wonderful series of human monsters of the classical-medieval types. American Indians are depicted:

Fol. 42: a fantastic man with animal head near the Straits of Magellan.

Fol. 43: also near the Straits of Magellan, a battle scene with three men, two with skirts of yellow, green, and brown feathers, and one with a yellow and brown loincloth. Weapons are a spear, a spear with fletching, and a circular shield.

Fol. 44: at the “Rio Terre de Plate” some rather extravagant figures appear, described on the facing recto, wearing gold ornaments, blowing
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trumpets, and carrying a king on a litter. Others engage in a battle, carrying gold-decorated blue shields and wearing red, green, and yellow skirts.

Fol. 45: in “Terre Brasil” occur many “Caniballes” (described on the facing recto): naked pink-skinned men and women including two in a hammock over a fire and one butchering (with a European axe) a human body on a table while human body parts lie about; one woman wears a spotted dress and holds a curious object in each hand. Bows and arrows, circular shields, and a club are also shown.

Fol. 46: in “Bresil” a fine group of walking figures (with pink skin and brown hair) (fig.*17) includes a woman who supports a baby on her hip with a woven sling (such as Indians in Brazil’s interior still use) and carries a grey pot on her head. Two men each have a log on the right shoulder and a bow and arrow in the left hand; between the men and the woman is a pet monkey.

Fol. 47: on the north coast of South America are “Les Caniballes” described on the facing recto—nine naked pink-skinned men, women, and children, the men with bows and arrows, spears, round shields, and a paddle-shaped club and the women with small baskets on their heads and one with a bundle on her back (fig.*18).


Fol. 50: in “Perv” are two men, one with a feather skirt and the other a feather crown.

Fol. 51: Indians wearing short feather skirts are slaughtered by Spaniards in “Partie de la defaicte databalipa av Perv.”

Fol. 52: in North America are five unclothed men and two wearing short yellow and brown kilts, one with a club and one having just shot a deer, and three European-style houses.

Fol. 53: in eastern North America—“partie de la region de bacaillaux”—are scattered European-style tents or buildings. In the center a group of closely-packed naked pink-skinned men (two with white beards) hold bows and one arrow.

Fol. 54: New Spain is decorated with European-style figures engaged in mining and forging.

Fol. 55: again in “Partie de la Nevfve espaiaigne” five rather Oriental figures wear turbans and robes tied on their left shoulders, while the text on the facing recto rather contradictorily says “Les Hommes de Ceste terre sont sauvages, nayant congnoysance de Dieu: Lesquels viuent de Racines, & aultres Grains, & Fruicts.”

Fol. 56: in North America (“une partie de la Region de bacaillaux”), about where the Ohio River would be, a fine man with pink skin, brown
hair, a short yellow and brown loincloth or skirt, on an excellent pair of snowshoes, aims an arrow at a most peculiar beast (fig. 19).

Fol. 57: in "La Terra neufue, partie de La Region dicte bacaillaux" are four European-looking towns—"ochelagga," two "Canada," and one other—all surrounded by stockades.

Fol. 58: a map of eastern North America shows in Labrador a fight among five pink-skinned Indians wearing short kilts of yellow feathers, three with short striped jackets, and with circular shields, spears, and a club; to the west of this scene are four conical light-brown wigwams or tipis without poles emerging from the peaks and one with faint lines that may indicate pole construction (like the ones on the Rotz map). Below is what can only be a conical tipi, with five poles emerging from the peak (but without smoke hole or "ears"), with horizontal stripes of yellow, blue, white, and brown—this is remarkable evidence for European knowledge of such a Western structure at a date long before they had penetrated far enough into the Continent. Nearby is an Indian in a striped jacket drawing a bow against a deer, while above this scene appear a dog-headed man, a hog-headed man, and two fantastic beasts; at the left edge is a European structure and a bearded pink-skinned man in striped jacket (of feathers?) like the others, holding a strange hooked club.

1556. The woodcuts in Part III of Ramusio’s collection of voyages are largely imaginary or derivative. There are 21 pictures (including plants) copied from Oviedo, a derivative of the Cortés map of Mexico, and a much-reproduced plan of the St. Lawrence Iroquoian fortified town of Hochelaga near Montreal that has been proven imaginary. On folios 424v-425r is a map of "Nuova Francia" with incorrectly dressed Indians but also some three to six canoes that may be remotely based on Indian birchbark models, especially one shown overturned to shelter an Indian. A map of Brazil (fol. 427v-428r) includes a view (fig. 20) of Indians in a hammock inside a house, and others cutting and gathering brazilwood with pet monkeys nearby; these may indicate ethnographic reality.

1557. Hans Staden from Hamburg, after being held captive by the Tupinamba of coastal Brazil for about ten months in 1553-54, published an account of his adventures (with an appendix on Tupinamba customs) illustrated by 42 different woodcuts (of which three were printed twice) showing Indians and Indian artifacts (figs. 21, 22). Small and crudely done, they are nevertheless extremely important ethnohistorical evidence, for they vividly depict varied activities and were clearly drawn by Staden or under his direct supervision. Perhaps because of the focus on cannibalism (and the ritual surrounding it), these woodcuts became the basis for more skillfully elaborated versions, especially by de Bry.
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Figure 20.
Indians of coastal Brazil shown on a woodcut map published by Ramusio in 1556 (Detail).

Figure 21.
Tupinamba men with feather ornaments, lip and cheek plugs, necklace, body tattooing, typical club, bow and arrows, in a woodcut published by Hans Staden in 1557.
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Figure 22.

Tupinamba sacrifice of a captive for a cannibal feast, in a woodcut published by Hans Staden in 1557—the prototype for an extended series by other artists.

1557-1584. André Thevet, a Franciscan who went as chaplain with Villegagnon to Brazil for some three months in 1555-56, published three works bearing woodcuts illustrating American Indians. His data came partly from his own observations, partly from French sailors long resident among the Indians, and partly from European and perhaps Indian voyagers whom he interviewed in France. The first of these books was *Les singularitez de la France antarctique, avtrement nommée Amerique...* which included 17 woodcuts of Brazilian Indians engaged in various activities: cutting down palm and brazilwood trees, collecting the fruits of four different kinds of tree, making the fermented maize beer *chicha*, eating, making fire and smoking a cigar (fig. 23), engaged in the famous weeping greeting (fig. 24), curing hides, burying a corpse, in a warlike procession, in two battles, killing a captive (fig. 25), and roasting his flesh. Although at least the captive-killing scene is based on a Staden woodcut, these illustrations contain many new details based on Brazilian reality. However, two scenes of Amazon warriors are entirely imaginary, while three views of hunting and warfare in New France—“Canadeens,” i.e., St. Lawrence Iroquoians—and in “Terre Neuue,” have no ethnographic validity except for some rather distorted snowshoes and long-houses. Derivatives of these Canadian scenes and of many of the Brazilian ones appeared in the first volume of Thevet’s *La cosmographie universelle* (2 vols. Paris 1575), with a few new Tupinamba views and also portraits of
Figure 23.

Thevet’s woodcut of Tupinambas smoking a cigar and starting a fire with a hand drill of exaggerated size (Les singularitez, 1557, fol. 101r).

Figure 24.

The Tupinamba custom of greeting a visitor or a returning member of their community with weeping, in Thevet’s woodcut (Les singularitez, 1557, fol. 85v).
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Tupinamba execution of a captive, in an illustration derived from the woodcut by Staden shown in fig. 22 (Thevet, Les singularitez, 1557, fol. 76v).

The Tupinamba "king" Quoniambec and "un Roy des Canibales" (i.e., of the Potiguara north of the Tupinamba). A view of Trinidad includes several small Indian scenes without ethnographic value. Wholly imaginary are views of Indians attacking two bison, and of the "maniere de chasser des Geans." In 1584 Thevet issued a large volume of engraved portraits which included much-improved versions of his portraits of Quoniambec (661r) and the Potiguara king, here identified as "Nacolabsov, Roy du Promontoire des Cannibales" (650r) and given a new head-dress with plumes added at the top that strongly resemble Timucua plumes in de Bry's engravings after lost Le Moyne originals, first published in 1591. This resemblance is significant because Thevet also gives us a portrait of "Paraousti Satouriona, Roy de la Floride" (663r) which is reminiscent of other Florida figures in de Bry. On the latter evidence Hulton and Quinn suggest that Thevet had access to now lost Le Moyne originals. Another new portrait here, labelled "Paracoussi, Roy de Platte" (fig. 26), Thevet claimed is after a portrait made from life by a sailor who visited the Río de la Plata. He says that Paracoussi wears "vne pierre bien polie au trauers des narines" and that his fingers have been cut off; this portrait certainly shows neither feature, whereas the one labelled
"Paraousti Satouriona" can be interpreted as showing both. Two other portraits, neither one very convincing, are of "Atabalipa, Roy du Peru" (64r) and "Motezume, Roy de Mexique" (64r).

1558. An atlas of 12 sheets by Diogo Homem, in the British Library, includes on folio 12 a cannibal feast in interior Brazil, and nearer the coast some Indian houses and a man with crown and skirt of feathers drawing an arrow in his bow. In "Terra Incognita" to the south are two skin-clad figures of the giants reported to live there.

1562. Pictures of a Tupinamba man and woman published this year in a costume book do not obviously derive from any earlier pictures, and yet seem to reflect ethnographic reality. The woman wears a feather rosette and leg bands, and a belt of very short feathers, and carries a baby in a sling; the man has a small forehead ornament of upright feathers, a knife around his neck, a large feather rosette on straps hung from one shoulder, bands just below his knees, and carries a bow and two large arrows.

ca. 1565. Only one original drawing survives of the many that Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues made on the French expeditions to northern Florida in 1562 and 1564-65. Even this is at some remove from a field sketch, for it is a miniature on vellum, and the artist had clearly forgotten appropriate colors such as those of Indian skin and hair and also included some objects with European shapes. However, many details of Timucua Indian dress, ornament, and artifacts depicted seem accurate.

1565. Girolamo Benzoni's *History of the New World* contains 17 woodcuts, one of plants and the rest illustrating Indian activities as he observed them between 1541 and 1556 in the West Indies, along the Caribbean shore of South America, in Central America, and in Peru (fig. 27). These possess great ethnographic value, although the specific locations they depict often cannot be determined. Many lie behind de Bry's engravings.

1566. The earliest pictures of Eskimos appear on two versions of a broadsheet advertising the public exhibition in Europe of a "wild woman with her little daughter" captured by French sailors in "Terra Nova"—that is, presumably Labrador (fig. 28). Both the woman and the child are dressed in recognizable Eskimo hooded parkas and trousers, and have leg wrappings that probably represent misunderstood Eskimo boots. The woman's chin bears tattoo marks in a typical Eskimo pattern which the author of the handbill's caption explains (tattooing being unfamiliar to Europeans at that date): "Die malzeichen die sie im Angesicht hat seind gantz blauw wie Himmelblaw unnd dise machen die Mann jren Weybern darbey sie sie erkennen dann sonst lauffen sie under einander wie das Vihe und man mag die zeichen mit keinerley materi wider.
Indians of the Colombia-Parama coast pouring molten gold down the throats of Spaniards, then butchering and eating them. Benzoni's caption (Historia del mondo nuovo, 1572, fol. 49v) notes that the penis sheaths are part of their usual attire.

abthün. Dise zeichen machen sie mit safft von eineley kraut das da im Lande wechst.”  

1568. A map of Patagonia on folio 7 of a 20-sheet atlas by Fernão Vaz Dourado in the Biblioteca Duques de Alba, Madrid, includes two somewhat dubious scenes of Indian archers wearing loincloths of a rather Asian style.

1568. An atlas by Diogo Homem, in 28 sheets, in the Sächsische Landesbibliothek, Dresden—now much damaged, but with earlier good reproductions preserved—shows on a map of Brazil (fol. 5) a dubious small scene of a cannibal man roasting a human leg on a spit, and at the southern tip of the continent, in the “gigantù Regio,” two naked men with clubs.

1569. An anonymous sculpture on a dated monument in the parish church of Burford, Oxfordshire, has been described by Stuart
Piggott as depicting four Brazilian Indians.\textsuperscript{54} The case is doubtful. Piggott's identification rests primarily on the unclothed figures' strange headdresses, which vaguely resemble Brazilian feather crowns. They seem, however, to be similar to the Etruscan stylized palmettes which have been demonstrated to lie behind other "headdresses" in sixteenth-century European depictions supposedly inspired by Aztec models.\textsuperscript{55} The other evidence Piggott cites is also shaky: the facial features are not so clearly non-European as they are stylized, and the odd ornaments do not seem "unambiguous [representations of] tropical fruit including gourds." Piggott was unable to adduce any American associations from the text of the monument or from what is known about the man who erected it.

1576-1577. A set of illustrations of Eskimos derives from Martin Frobisher's two voyages to southern Baffin Island in these years. At least one of them seems to have been drawn in Baffinland by John White.
Fig. 12.

Indians in northeastern South America, on a 1547 map by Nicolas Vallard.

Fig. 13.

Man from the Guatemala coast, 1533, Codex Tudela.

Fig. 14.

Aztec woman preparing chocolate, 1553, Codex Tudela.
Fig. 19.

An Indian on snowshoes, on a 1555 map of North America by Guillaume Le Testu.

Fig. 17.

Indians on a 1555 map of Brazil by Guillaume Le Testu.
Fig. 18.

"Les Canibales," probably Potiguara Indians in northern Brazil, on a 1555 map by Guillaume Le Testu.
Fig. 26.

Paracoussi, king of the Rio de la Plata, according to a portrait published by André Thevet, Les vrais pourtraits, 1584, fol. 656r.
The others are based on drawings done either in the field, during the return, or in England, of an Eskimo man brought back in 1576 and of a woman, child, and man with his kayak brought back in 1577. Although the relationships among the surviving drawings are not yet entirely clear, all substantially reflect ethnographic reality, and the ones by White himself are important ethnohistorical sources. The distinct originals or first-generation copies of now lost originals include a watercolor by John White of a standing man holding a bow; another watercolor (a copy of a lost original by White) of the same man, with a kayak paddle added; a rear view of the same pose, also after a lost White original; and the same man (identified as the 1576 captive) posed differently, with a kayak in the background, in a watercolor by Lucas de Heere. Frobisher’s men appear in a skirmish with Eskimos, with a man paddling a kayak in the foreground (a copy of a lost original by White). A woodcut shows an Eskimo kayaker using a spearthrower to launch a dart at a flying bird, with Eskimo figures, another kayak, a dogsled, and two tents in the background (fig. 29); a watercolor by John White depicts a standing woman carrying a baby inside the hood of her parka.56

Figure 29.
Woodcut based on the group of Eskimos with a kayak brought to England by Martin Frobisher in 1557; from Dionysse Settle’s French account.
1578. Jean de Léry, who spent most of the year 1557 in Brazil, published a fine account in which he attacked the reliability of Thevet’s descriptions and included five well-done woodcuts of Tupinamba Indians. At least one of these (the weeping greeting on p. 315; see fig. 30) is copied, with improvements, from Thevet. The others show personal ornaments, weapons, a baby sling, hammocks, dancers with rattles, and a mourning scene. Two years later appeared a second edition of this volume which used the same blocks to reprint the five illustrations, and added three new, stylistically inferior scenes derived from Thevet: a battle (between pp. 204 and 205), the sacrifice of a captive (p. 214), and a landscape (p. 214, with a strange animal which is the three-toed sloth on folio 99v of Thevet’s 1557 and 1558 edition and on 940v of his Cosmographic). 57

1580. An anonymous illuminated map of the valley of the Río de San Miguel, from its sources to San Francisco de Chamacuero, Michoacán, contains many figures—of armed and armored Spaniards, a cart, horses, cattle, and many Indians wearing breechclouts with quivers attached at the back and shooting with bows and arrows. These depictions appear to be ethnographically useful, although they may be influenced by the
native Mexican artistic tradition and thus fall outside the strict limits of this survey. 58

1580. In the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, an atlas of 16 sheets by Fernão Vaz Dourado shows practically identical naked Indian archers with hunting dogs wearing collars, in Patagonia (fol. 2), northern South America (fol. 3), around the Caribbean (fol. 4), and in Labrador (fol. 5). These are probably not based on direct observation. 59

c. 1580. John White painted two fine watercolors of standing Timucua, a man and a woman, evidently copying lost originals by Jacques Le Moyne, whom he must have known in England within the period ca. 1572-88. The ethnographic details in these appear to be highly accurate—much more so than in the surviving Le Moyne original or de Bry’s engravings of Timucuas which follow lost Le Moyne originals. 60

c. 1582. The “Fontainebleau” tapestry, one of the eight Valois tapestries in the Uffizi Galleries, includes a scene of savages defending an island against an attack from ships. The original design by Antoine Caron, representing the festivals held at Fontainebleau in 1564, makes these defenders classical warriors. Among many changes introduced for the final work, evidently by Lucas de Heere, are modifications in these figures which are said to convert them into American Indians. The small reproduction I have seen is less than convincing on this point. 61

c. 1586. A manuscript said to be in an American private collection contains 199 colored drawings, with captions in French, which are originals or derivatives of ones done on Francis Drake’s circumnavigation (1577-79) and his voyage to the Caribbean and North America (1585-86). Among these a great many—at least 40—show figures, activities, and artifacts of Indians of North Carolina (and perhaps Florida), the West Indies, Mexico, Central America, Peru, and Chile. A published list of the labels indicates Indians were drawn in Antigua, Margarita, Trinidad, “Ihona,” “S. Matre,” Nicaragua, “Caribara,” “Loranbec,” “Leresne” (in Peru), and “Borborat.” But most cannot be pinpointed until it is possible to examine the drawings and their full captions, compare these with the accounts of Drake’s voyages, and apply anthropological criticism. The only two reproduced merit considerable interest: the “Hinde de Loranbec” probably represents a man in coastal North Carolina (at Raleigh’s colony in 1586) shooting at a bird; the other, unlocalized, shows five unclothed Indian men clubbing rabbits at the end of a fenced enclosure where the animals have been driven by fire. 62

1587. An anonymous map of western New Spain, from Guatemala to California, contains a few figures of Indians wearing breechclouts and carrying bows and arrows and spears. These are very small and sketchy, and of doubtful ethnographic value. 63

c. 1588. The 18 surviving watercolors by John White of coastal North Carolina Algonquians near Raleigh’s short-lived colony are per-
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haps the most interesting and important sixteenth-century illustrations of Indians from both an ethnographic and artistic point of view. White finished these versions in England on the basis of the (now lost) field sketches he made in America in 1584, 1585-86, and 1587. There are nine of standing figures against a blank ground, two complete villages (fig. *31), a charnel house, a dance (fig. *32), a group seated around a fire, three scenes of cooking and eating, and a composite view of various fishing techniques. While the physiognomies, body types, and some postures and compositions are not accurate, it is difficult to fault the forms of the artifacts White drew. Most of what we know about the material culture of the Carolina-Virginia Algonquians, in fact, comes from these drawings. White’s pictures had a significant impact on European images of eastern North American Indians, at first through engravings modified by de Bry (but still quite accurate) after now-lost versions by White, and then via hundreds of more and more debased derivatives by other artists. 64

I have enumerated 268 separate depictions (counting each map sheet with all its illuminations as only a single drawing). While more will certainly be found, the order of magnitude is unlikely to change. The list represents only about 40 different artists. These totals seem remarkably low, considering the thousands of Europeans involved in the first century of exploring and conquering America, the many artists in Europe who had opportunities to see the hundreds of Indians and the thousands of Indian artifacts exhibited there, and the interest among Europeans in the peoples and products of the New World. The explanations are two: much must have been lost; and more importantly, European artists of the sixteenth century were only beginning to develop the practice of drawing exotic peoples and artifacts from life with regard for accuracy taking priority over esthetic considerations—a tradition that we tend now to take for granted, especially after some 135 years’ experience with photography. In fact, it was precisely the new European need to visualize and comprehend the broader world that led, finally in the eighteenth century, to the rise of scientific illustrating.

NOTES

1. We lack a careful listing of the early Indian visitors and the earliest Indian objects to reach Europe. An initial survey by Carolyn Foreman in Indians Abroad, 1493-1938 (Norman, Okla. 1943) has not been followed by corrections and better studies. Artifact collections have received little attention; there are scattered publications on the few objects that have survived into modern times—two good examples are Karl A. Nowotny’s Mexikanische Kostbarkeiten aus Kunstkammern der Renaissance im Museum für Völkerkunde Wien und in der Nationalbibliothek Wien (Vienna 1960) and Gert Nooter’s Old Kayaks in the Netherlands, Mededelingen van het Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde 17 (Leiden 1971)—but no one has attempted a census of such early pieces from the whole
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New World or from any major part of it. A preliminary survey has not even been done of the written evidence for collected objects which have not survived. Such evidence is abundant, although scattered, in the primary sources on the exploration of the New World, in early travel accounts, and even in administrative archives, while a great mass of unexplored material lies in catalogues—both printed and manuscript—of Cabinets of Curiosities and other early collections, in sales catalogues, and in descriptions by visitors who saw the collections. Indicative accounts based on such materials in European collections have been published for Asia by Donald F. Lach, "Collections of Curiosities," in *Asia in the Making of Europe*, Vol. 2, *A Century of Wonder, Book One: The Visual Arts* (Chicago 1970) Ch. 1, and from a different point of view by Adrienne L. Kaeppler, "Cook Voyage Provenance of the 'Artificial Curiosities' of Bullock's Museum," *Man* n.s. 9 (1974) 68-92, for the Pacific islands; see also William C. Sturtevant, "Museums as Anthropological Data Banks," in *Anthropology Beyond the University*, ed. Alden Redfield, Southern Anthropological Society Proceedings 7 (Athens, Ga. 1973) 40-55.


4. Eastern North American Indian pictographic images occasionally appear in late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French sources while in the nineteenth century Plains Indian paintings were copied, and depictions from archaeological objects began to be used by antiquarians and their artists.

5. As José de Acosta wrote in 1576-77, "It is a popular error to treat the affairs of the Indies as if they were those of some farm or mean village and to think that, because the Indies are all called by a single name, they are therefore of one nature and kind. . . . The nations of Indians are innumerable, and each of them has its own distinct rites and customs . . ." (introduction to his "How to Procure the Salvation of the Indians," published in 1589, as translated from the Latin by John H. Rowe on p. 16 of his "Ethnography and Ethnology in the Sixteenth Century," *The Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers* 30 [1964] 1-19).

6. For example, the Ewaipanoma tribe of headless people on the Caura River in Venezuela which Indians reported to Sir Walter Raleigh are shown in pictures in the text and on the map issued with the Latin translations of Raleigh's *Discoverie of the Large, Rich, and Beautiful Empire of Guiana (Brevis & admiranda descriptio regni Guianaee, avi abundantisssimi, in America . . .)* [Nuremberg 1599]); these pictures are clearly in the tradition of the Blemmyae, a race formerly thought to live in Ethiopia or India (see Rudolf Wittkower, "Marvels of the East: A Study in the History of Monsters," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 5 [1942] 159-197).


9. See William C. Sturtevant, "Catalogue of Early Illustrations of Northeastern Indians," *Ethnohistory* 12 (1965 [1967]) 272-273. Many of the illustrations now mentioned were first pointed out to me by others. I particularly remember suggestions from D. B. Quinn; others who have helped in the search include Donald Robertson, Christian F. Feest, Monique de la Roncière, Paul Hulton, and Helen Wallis. For criticism of an earlier draft of the present paper I thank Suzanne Boorsch, Paul Hulton, D. B. Quinn, John H. Rowe, and R. T. Zuidema. Many of the early illustrations treated here are of Brazilian Indians; for this region at a later period (but still pre-photography) a recent volume provides a fine example of the value of an anthropological approach to early illustrations: Thekla Hartmann, *A contribuição da iconografia para o conhecimento de índios brasileiros do século XIX*, Coleção Museu Paulista, Série de Etnologia 1 (São Paulo 1975). Too late to affect the text of this article I learned that in December 1975 a major exhibition opening in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, will incorporate many of
the items mentioned here. The exhibition catalog prepared by Hugh Honour and a book by him to be published simultaneously by Pantheon (New York), *The New Golden Land: European Images of America*, will contain many illustrations and much text relevant to this topic.

10. That massive compendium of heavily illustrated accounts of travel and exploration eventually included 13 parts or volumes on America, the last of which appeared in 1634. The several editions in various languages included 304 different engravings of New World subjects, scores of which depict Indians; the count of the different de Bry engravings is based on the lists published by George Watson Cole, *A Catalogue of Books Relating to the Discovery and Early History of North and South America Forming a Part of the Library of E. D. Church* (5 vols. New York 1907; rpt. New York 1951) 1.316-478. For comparison of some of de Bry’s engravings with their sources, and a detailed estimate of their accuracy, see my ethnological commentaries on the engravings after John White’s drawings of coastal North Carolina Indians in Paul Hulton and David Beers Quinn, *The American Drawings of John White, 1577-1590, with Drawings of European and Oriental Subjects* (2 vols. London and Chapel Hill 1964), and on the de Bry engravings of Florida Indians after Jacques Le Moyne in the volume on the latter soon to be published under the editorship of Paul Hulton.

11. For these, see Heikamp and Robertson in this volume (455, 483).


13. One copy is in the New York Public Library and another in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich; both are reproduced and the dating discussed by Rudolf Schuller, “The Oldest Known Illustration of South American Indians,” *Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, Indian Notes* 7 (1930) 484-497. D. B. Quinn tells me that the copy sometimes said to be in the British Museum is a ghost. According to Rubens Borba de Moraes, *Bibliographia brasiliana* (2 vols. Amsterdam and Rio de Janeiro 1958) 2.355, both versions are thought to have been printed by Johann Froschauer in Augsburg in 1505. A small woodcut based on elements from the large one, showing a standing man with a spear, a seated woman nursing a baby, a small child, and hanging at the left a human head and leg being roasted, was used by Jan van Doesborch about 1511-23 in printing two broadsheets in Antwerp: *De novo mondo* (of which a copy survives in the University Library, Rostock), and *Of the Newe Landes* (of which there is a complete copy in the Grenville Library in the British Library, and imperfect copies in the Huntington Library and the Bodleian Library); see *De novo mondo. Antwerp, Jan van Doesborch about 1520. A Facsimile of an Unique Broadsheet . . .*, ed. and intro. Maria E. Kronenberg (The Hague 1927).

Samuel Eliot Morison in *The European Discovery of America: The Southern Voyages, A. D. 1492-1616* (New York 1974) 91 dismisses as mere reprints from earlier works the illustrations printed with early editions of Columbus’ letter on his first voyage.

A woodcut in a Latin Bible published in Lyon in 1518 “peut être classée parmi les premières illustrations ayant reproduit en Europe un indigène d’Amérique” according to René Naville, *Amerindiens et anciennes cultures précolombiennes* ([Geneva] 1973) 32-34, but the only basis for identifying an Indian as the one possible figure here is that he seems to wear a feather crown (in addition to European dress). The caption is merely a line from Psalm 51: “Ecce homo qui non posuit deum aductorem [sic] suum.”


16. The Altdorfer miniature is beautifully reproduced and well discussed (except for its American aspects) by Franz Winzinger, *Die Miniaturen zum Triumphzug Kaiser Maximilians I* (2 vols. Graz 1972-73) *Faksimileband* pl. 57; *Kommentarband*, p. 57 (Suzanne Boorsch called these volumes to my attention). Paul Hulton tells me that fine reproductions of the woodcuts are given by Walter Oakeshott, *Some Woodcuts by Hans
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Burgkmair (Oxford 1960); I have used the good reproductions and art-historical commentary by Stanley Appelbaum, The Triumph of Maximilian I: 137 Woodcuts by Hans Burgkmair and Others (New York 1964). The typology of the feather headdresses is that of Ribeiro (n. 15 above); for Tupinamba clubs and arrows see Métraux (n. 14 above) 80-82. The crucial phrase of Maximilian’s description, quoted above in Appelbaum’s translation, reads according to Winzinger “sind alle nackhendt auf Indianisch oder alla morescha geclaidt.” The modern German distinction between indiansch ‘American Indian’ and indisch ‘Asian Indian’ did not become fully established until the late nineteenth century; in fact, the evidence cited by Georg Friederici implies that if any distinction was made in the early sixteenth century it was the reverse of the modern one: Americanistisches Wörterbuch, Universität Hamburg, Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslands-kunde 53. Reihe B: Völkerkunde, Kulturgeschichte und Sprachen 29 (Hamburg 1947) 313-315.


19. The map was first published in Nuremberg with the Latin translation of Hernando Cortés’ second and third letters on the conquest of Mexico. The engraving is reproduced and critically discussed by Manuel Toussaint, Federico Gómez de Orozco, and Justino Fernández, Planos de la ciudad de México: siglos XVI y XVII, Estudio historico, urbanístico y bibliográfico (Mexico 1938) 85-93. Another reproduction, with detailed identifications of the buildings and locations shown, is in Ignacio Marquina, El templo mayor de México (Mexico 1960) 25-26, fig. 1. For the zoo, with specific reference to this illustration, see H. B. Nicholson, “Montezuma’s Zoo,” Pacific Discovery 8 (July-August 1955) 3-11.

20. Oviedo of the natural historia de las Indias / Sumario de la natural y general historia de las Indias (Toledo 1526) fol. xxiv, xliii; conveniently reproduced in Sterling A. Stoudemire’s translation, Natural History of the West Indies, University of North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures 32 (Chapel Hill 1959).

21. La historia general delas Indias / Primera parte dela historia natural y general delas indias y las tierras firmes del mar oceano (Seville 1535); the second edition, titled Cronica delas Indias. La historia general de las Indias agora nueuamente impressa correge y emendada. Y con la conquista del Peru (Salamanca 1547), contains the same illustrations on the same pages but printed from new, somewhat better-done blocks. The gold-panning scene is reproduced on the covers of Alberto M. Salas, Tres cronistas de Indias: Pedro Mártir de Angelería, Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo, Fray Bartolomé de las Casas (Mexico and Buenos Aires 1959).

22. Libro XX. De la segunda parte de la general historia de las Indias (Valladolid 1557) fols. xxi v, xlii.

23. When the complete work of 50 books was first published, as Historia general y
natural de las Indias, islas y tierrafirme del mar Océano (4 vols. Madrid 1851-55), the editor José Amador de los Ríos worked from an autograph manuscript, complete except for Book xxviii, which is now believed to be in the Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid (Colección Salazar y Castro H-28 to H-34). Amador de los Ríos printed Book xxviii from an early (not autograph) copy, now also in the Real Academia (Fondo de Jesuitas MS. 108), and mentioned also partial copies in the Biblioteca de Palacio, Madrid; in the Colección Muñoz, Real Academia de la Historia; and in the Biblioteca Colombina, Seville (I fill in some of these references from p. clxxiii of the introduction by Juan Pérez de Tudela Bueso to the 1959 reprint [Biblioteca de Autores Españoles 117-121], and from Lino Gómez Canedo, Los archivos de la historia de América: Periodo colonial español [Mexico 1961]). Oviedo's text usually mentions his drawings as though they appeared within the text. Amador de los Ríos inserted plate and figure references at these spots, and gathered the illustrations onto engraved plates at the ends of his volumes—but unfortunately he ruined them as evidence by having them drastically modernized and by adding some impossibly exotic fauna (including a kangaroo), thus causing modern scholars to discount them entirely. Amador de los Ríos implied that Oviedo's sketches were in the manuscript he worked from; but the “original” manuscript now in the Real Academia contains no illustrations, nor do any of the subsequent copies in the same repository, as Dalmiro de la Válgoma y Díaz-Varela, secretary of the Academia, kindly informed me in a letter of 14 April 1975. The original drawings corresponding to Amador de los Ríos' engravings for Books vi, vii, ix, and xxxii appear in what are believed to be autograph manuscripts of these books (plus Books iv and xxxvii, which lack illustrations) purchased by the Huntington Library in 1926 from Maggs Brothers, London; four of these drawings were reproduced in The American Heritage Book of Indians, ed. Alvin M. Josephy, Jr. (New York 1961) 81, 99. One of the two volumes in which the Huntington Library manuscripts are bound bears a label reading “Cáceres. Biblioteca de Don Josef Colon.” Strangely, these manuscripts seem not to correspond to any of those mentioned by Amador de los Ríos, and yet they must be the source of his engravings. Still stranger, some time before 1937 Samuel Kirkland Lothrop obtained photographs of 55 Oviedo drawings, amounting to all (or almost all) the illustrations in Books v-x, xii, xxix, and xxxii, and one from Book xlii. Prints of these photographs survive in the Tozer Library, Peabody Museum, Harvard University; I thank Antonio Rodriguez-Buckingham for locating this file and sending me office-machine copies. Of these, Lothrop published two (of three) from Book xix and one (of four) from Book vii, crediting them to “the original manuscript of Oviedo” but not saying where that manuscript was, in his Cocle: An Archaeological Study of Central Panama; Part 1: Historical Background, Excavations at the Sitio Conte, Artifacts and Ornaments, Memoirs of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University 7 (Cambridge 1937) 15, 18, 21; the Natá house picture from Book xxix has recently been copied from Lothrop's monograph by Timothy Severin, The Horizon Book of Vanishing Primitive Man (New York 1973) 123. In Lothrop’s photographs of two drawings (one from Book xii and one from Book xxxii) there is clearly legible a stamped label reading “BIBLIOTECA” surrounded by an oval frame reading “REAL ACADEMIA • DE LA HISTORIA •”. Comparing Lothrop’s photographs with the four Huntington Library sketches reproduced by Josephy shows that they are the same: the manuscripts of Books vi, vii, ix, xi, and xxxi from which Lothrop photographed the sketches are those now in the Huntington. Where are the illustrated manuscripts of Books v, viii, x, xi, xxix, and xlii that Lothrop also had photographed? Judging by the bad derivatives in the 1851-55 edition, Book xliii contains a general view of the ceremonial center at Teoateca and sketches of voladores dancers and a seesaw at that place; Lothrop photographed only the last. The only other American ethnographic illustrations present in the 1851-55 edition but not in Lothrop’s photographs are a Patagonian camp in Book xx (of which there is a woodcut in the 1557 publication, at fol. 24f), and two Inca club types and the Inca royal diadem in Book xlii.

24. These illustrations and their context are described by Howard F. Cline, “Hernando Cortés and the Aztec Indians in Spain,” Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress 26 (1969) 70-90, who reproduces the pictures from Das Trachtenbuch des Christoph Weiditz von seinen Reisen nach Spanien, 1529, und den Niederlanden, 1531/32, ed. Theodor
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Hampe, Historische Waffen und Kostüme 2 (Berlin 1927) pls. 11-23, where the woman, the nobleman, and the warrior are reproduced in (poor) color and the rest in sepia, and the pictures themselves are described on pp. 23-26. Six of the illustrations are reproduced from Hampe by Josephy (n. 23 above) 102-103. According to Cline, “the extant drawings may be later 16th-century copies of now lost originals” (p. 89 n. 10). In some form these illustrations were seen by de Bry, who departed from his usual practice and transferred a few of them to an improper context, inserting into the foreground of an engraved view of Cuzco two of Weiditz’ log jugglers (now standing on their heads rather than lying on their backs) and his ball players: Theodor de Bry, Americae pars sexta. Sive, historiae ab Hieronymo Benzono scriptae, sectio tertia . . . (Frankfort 1596).

25. Edward Lynam, The Carta Marina of Olaus Magnus, Venice 1539 & Rome 1572 (Jenkinson, Pa. 1949) includes excellent reproductions and identifies the tents as igloos and the boat as an “umiak or double kayak”—it is hardly a kayak, single or double, while the quite different umiak would be indistinguishable at this scale from a small European boat. Finn Gad, The History of Greenland, Vol. 1. Earliest Times to 1700, trans. Ernst Dupont (London 1970) 174, 178-179 also refers to this illustration as a kayak and mentions Olaus Magnus’ claim to have seen one in Oslo. A derivative of the man with a spear illustrates Ch. xi, Depygmae Gruntlandiae, & rupe Huitsark, in Olaus Magnus’ Historia de gentibus septentrionalibus . . . (Rome 1555) 70; although the hundreds of illustrations of northern European artifacts, crafts, and activities in this volume are undoubtedly important ethnohistorical sources, Kaj Birket-Smith has correctly dismissed the Greenland figure as an artist’s invention (“The Earliest Eskimo Portraits,” Folk 1 [1959] 1-14).


28. Map 11 is reproduced in black and white by Josephy (n. 23 above) 140-141, while map 9 is shown in color by Nicholas Horder, Simon Dresner, and Martin Hillman, The Conquest of North America (Garden City, N.Y. 1973) 218-219, and in black and white by Adrian Johnson, America Explored: A Cartographical History of the Exploration of North America (New York 1974) 57 (the supposed Cartier scene only), and by Morison, The Northern Voyages (n. 27 above) 452-453, where the Roberval identification is proposed (p. 387). The Mexican portion of map 10 is reproduced in poor color by Josef Berger and Lawrence C. Wroth, Discoverers of the New World (New York 1960) 75.

29. The South American portion is reproduced in color by Horder et al. (n. 28 above) 103, while the North American illustrations are reproduced in color by Cumming et al. (n. 26 above) pl. 139.

30. The watercolor is in a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Municipale, Rouen (MS V28 [1268]) titled L’entrée du tres magnanime tres puissant et victorieux roy de France Henry deuxixime (sic) de ce nom en sa noble cite de Rouen . . . en rithme francoyse. A fine color reproduction is in Roy Strong, Splendor at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and the Theater of Power (Boston 1973) 88-89. Suzanne Boorsch (to whom I am indebted for showing me Strong’s book) tells me that none of the other illustrations in the Rouen manuscript depict Indians. The woodcut, titled “Figure des Brisilians” and measuring 17.8 X 26.3 cm. to the border lines, first appeared in C’est la déduction du sumptieux ordre plaisants spectacles et magnifiques théatres dressés, et exhibus par les citoiens de Rouen . . . (Rouen 1551) folios K ii-v-iii. It also exists in another, slightly different version (a new woodcut, not a later state). According to Margaret M. McGowan, “Form and Themes in Henri II’s Entry into Rouen,” Renaissance Drama n.s. 1 (1968) 199-251 (from whom I also take the title of the manuscript), about two-thirds of the verses in the Rouen manuscript were printed, with woodcuts, by Jean Dugort, Les poutres et figures du sumptieux ordre plaisantz spectacles . . . (Paris 1557). I have not seen this last, but it evidently contains the second version of the 1551 woodcut since the Cabinet des Estampes, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, credits to Dugort their separated
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print of this scene (Of 4e, fol. [p. 26]). On Tupinamba body painting, shields, and houses, see Métraux (n. 14 above) 189-191, 84, 48-49.

31. The whole map is reproduced on a very small scale by George (n. 27 above) 192-193, while a colored reproduction of the North American figures is in Berger and Wroth (n. 28 above) 91.

32. The manuscript, written in Italian on 80 folios, bears the supplied nineteenth-century title Viaggio e relazione delle Indie, 1539-1552 (British Library Add. Mss. 13967) and is dedicated to Bartolomeo Delbene. Search has thus far failed to locate any published reference to this account or to its author—the present writer plans to pursue the matter.


34. Die Weltkarte des Pierre Desceliers von 1553, ed. Eugen Oberhummer, for the Geographische Gesellschaft in Wien (Vienna 1924).

35. Pedro de Cieza de León, Parte primera de la crónica del Peru. Que tracta la demarcacion de sus provincias: la descripcion dellas. Las fundaciones de las nuevas ciudades. Los ritos y costumbres de los indios. Y otras cosas extrañas dignas de ser sabidas (Seville 1553). It is very strange that there are so few early depictions of Peruvian Indians. One other possibility, a scene of Atahualpa with the Spaniards at Cajamarca, on the title page of Francisco de Xérez, Verdadera relación de la conquista del Perú (Seville 1534) is rejected by John H. Rowe (in lit. 5 April 1975) as “probably based on the description in the author’s text and a lot of imagination. It has no ethnographic value. The artist has made no attempt to incorporate Xérez’ details regarding the livery worn by the Inca ruler’s guards, and the litter bearers are shown carrying bows (!) which, of course, are not mentioned in the text.” A poorly-explored source of European depictions of ethnographic value is the paintings of Inca nobility and coats of arms (probably none of them dating from the sixteenth century) in the Colonial painting style that flourished in the Andean region. For some remarkable eighteenth-century examples see John H. Rowe, “Colonial Portraits of Inca Nobles,” in Selected Papers of the XXIXth International Congress of Americanists, New York, 1949 (3 vols. Chicago 1951) Vol. 1, The Civilizations of Ancient America, ed. Sol Tax, 258-268.

36. Most of these appear in a black and white reproduction published by Cumming et al. (n. 26 above) 75; a larger reproduction showing the two North American figures in rather poor color is in Berger and Wroth (n. 28 above) 38-39.

37. Several of these scenes have recently been excellently reproduced by Cumming et al. (n. 26 above): fol. 53 as pl. 163 (in color), fol. 54 as pl. 147 (in black and white), fol. 57 as pl. 141 (in color), and fol. 58 as pl. 99 (in black and white).

38. Terzo volume delle navigazioni et viaggi . . . , ed. Giovanni Battista Ramusio (Venice 1556). A good reproduction of the map of New France is in Johnson (n. 28 above) 52-53. The plan of Hochelaga is reproduced on p. 55 of the same work. Bruce G. Trigger, “Cartier’s Hochelaga and the Dawson Site,” in Iroquois Culture, History, and Prehistory: Proceedings of the 1965 Conference on Iroquois Research, ed. Elisabeth Tooker (Albany 1967) 63-66 has suggested that this woodcut was based on written descriptions since it contains details known to be erroneous.

39. Hans Staden, Warhaftige Historia und beschreibung eyner Landschaft der Wilden,
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Nacketen, Grimmigen Menschfressen Leuthen, in der Newenwelt America gelegen, vor und nach Christi geburt im Land zu Hessen vnbekant, biss vff dие ij. nechst vergangene jar, Da sie Hans Staden von Homberg aus Hessen durch sien eygne erfahrung erkan in yetzo durch den truck an tag gibt (Marburg 1557)—this is the true first edition, rather than an undated one printed by Weygandt Han at Frankfort, erroneously dated 1556 by some writers, that contains entirely different and non-American illustrations. I have used an edition translated and edited by Edmundo Wernicke: Juan Staden, Vera historia y descripción de un pais de las salvages . . . Universidad de Buenos Aires, Museo Etnográfico, Biblioteca de Fuentes 1 (Buenos Aires 1944); it reproduces the 1557 woodcuts, slightly reduced, with useful brief commentaries on them.

40. The first and second editions, Paris 1557 and 1558, differ only in the dates on the title pages—the illustrations are printed from the same blocks. However, the edition printed by Christophe Plantin at Antwerp in 1558 has different illustrations: degraded, reduced, and laterally-reversed derivatives of those in the Paris editions. Thevet's was one of the first books to be printed with engraved illustrations, and he boasted in his Vrais pourtraits (n. 43 below), "J'ai attiré de Flandre les meilleurs graveurs, et, par la grace de Dieu, ie me puis vanter estre le premier qui ai mis en vogue a Paris l'imprimerie en taille douce"—as Paul Gaffarel points out in his introduction to the Paris 1878 edition of Les singularitez, pp. xvi-xviii. Whoever did the actual drawing, the accurate elements in the depictions may be based not only on Thevet's instructions but also on the Indian artifacts he brought back as curiosities (see, e.g., Thevet's remarks in his Ch. xxxv).

41. In the 1558 edition on 76V; in Staden (n. 39 above) fol. T iii; see also n. 57 below. Thevet's version here or on fol. 945V of his 1575 Cosmographie in turn served as the basis for a crude woodcut in Pero de Magalhães de Gandavo, Historia da provincia sácta Cruz a qui vulgarmete chamamos Brasil [Lisbon 1576] 40V, which otherwise contains only a view of a European killing a fantastic monster (32V). Other evidence that Thevet's artist copied from available materials is the obvious relationship between Thevet's bison (147V) and the first published illustration of a North American bison in Francisco López de Gómara, Primera y segunda parte de la historia general de las Indias . . . (Saragossa 1553) fol. cxviV.

42. The same blocks were used, sometimes in later states, for some of the illustrations while others were recut on new blocks and still others were redone as significantly different versions but incorporating earlier elements. A good edition of the relevant parts of the Cosmographie, with useful annotations and reproductions of all the Brazilian woodcuts, is André Thevet, Le Brésil et les Brésiliens, ed. Suzanne Lussagnet, with intro. by Charles-André Julien, Les Français en Amérique pendant la deuxième moitié du XVIᵉ siècle 1 (Paris 1953). Also in this volume are selections from manuscripts by Thevet, one dated 1587 and the other probably written in 1585, which are preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale; evidently their only illustrations are two maps of no ethnographic interest.


44. For example, as worn by a figure at the lower left of de Bry (n. 7 above) pl. 11.

45. The suggestion is made in the forthcoming volume edited by Hulton (n. 7 above), where it is also proposed that Thevet transposed the captions of his portraits of Paraousti Satouriona and Paracoussi. While Thevet's descriptions of the two can be interpreted to indicate this, I cannot myself identify any elements in the portrait labelled Paracoussi that recur in de Bry's Florida engravings.

46. With this should be compared the portrait of "Athalippa Rex ultimus Americae" issued three years earlier by Abraham de Bruyn, Omnium pene Europae, Asiae, Africae, atque Americae gentium habitus . . . (Antwerp 1581) as one of four figures on pl. 58, the others being "Indica mulier cum viro, in America" and "Nobilis foemina in America"—these latter requiring comparison with other Thevet woodcuts.

47. A fine color reproduction was published by Cortesão and Teixeira da Mota (n. 18 above) 2. pl. 108. A good one, also in color, is in Hordern et al. (n. 28 above) 141.

48. "Le brésilien" and "La brésilienne" in François Deserps, Recueil de la diversité
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des habits, qui sont de present en usage, tant es pays d'Europe, Asie, Affrique & isles sauvages, le tout fait apres le naturel (Paris 1562; the same blocks used in the Paris, Francois Des Prez 1567 edition), reproduced by Lynn Glaser, Engraved America: Iconography of America through 1800 (Philadelphia 1970) pl. 10 A, B. Derivative but very similar woodcuts appeared in Joannes Sloperius, Omnim fere gentium, nostraeet aestatis nationum, habitus & effigies (Antwerp 1572) for which they were copied by Ant. Bosch, called Silvius. I presume (although I have not compared them) that two prints in the Cabinet des Estampes, Bibliothèque Nationale, Of 4e, fol. [p. 3] are from the 1562 or 1567 works.

49. The painting is now in the New York Public Library. It has been reproduced several times; among the best are one in black and white in Hulton and Quinn (n. 10 above) 2. pl. 145a, and one in color in Josephy (n. 23 above) 155. A critical description and commentary is in Hulton and Quinn 1.139-140. Variants of this drawing and 41 others by Le Moyne served as the basis for a set of engravings in de Bry's America. All will be reproduced and analyzed, with an ethnological evaluation by the writer, in a volume on Le Moyne edited by Paul Hulton.

50. La Historia del mondo nuovo di M. Girolamo Benzoni Milanese. La qual tratta dell'isole, & mari nuovamente ritrovati, & delle nuove città da lui proprio vedute, per acqua & per terra in quattordici anni . . . (Venice 1565). The same blocks, sometimes in slightly later states, were used to print the edition published in Venice by Pietro and Francesco Tini in 1572, of which there is a modern facsimile: Girolamo Benzoni, La Historia del Mondo Nuovo, pref. by Ferdinand Anders, Frühe Reisen und Seefahrten in Originalberichten 2 (Graz 1962). Fine reproductions of excellent impressions of early states of eight of these woodcuts, attributed to a fictitious 1563 edition of Benzoni, appear in the Columbus volume ed. by Vigneras (n. 18 above). However, the standard English edition, History of the New World, trans. and ed. W. H. Smyth, Hakluyt Society 21 (London 1857), has made new illustrations, and in the case of the one on p. 73 the interesting penis sheaths of the original (1565 fol. 49r) have been prudishly omitted.

51. One version of this broadsheet, printed in Augsburg, was reproduced from an example in the Zentralbibliothek, Zürich, by Friedrich Wilhelm Sixel, "Die deutsche Vorstellung vom Indianer in der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts," Annali del Pontificio Museo Missionario Etnologico gia Lateranense 30 (1966) 9-230, Abb. 12 (p. 22). Another copy in the Museum der Bildenden Künste, Stuttgart, was pointed out to me in 1968 by Elizabeth Carmichael. The other version (fig. 28), printed in Nuremberg, is in the British Library (shelf mark 1750.c.2.(4)) and was called to my attention by David Beers Quinn. The Augsburg version seems slightly more likely to be primary; in any event, the woodcuts are nearly identical, and the surrounding texts differ only slightly in spelling, wording, and syntax and in one minor numeral. The first two lines, at the top, can be taken as the title: Warhaftige Contrayey einer wilden Frawen mit jrem Tochterlein gefunden in der Landschaft Nova terra genannt und gen Anttorff bracht und von wenniglich allda offentlich gesehen worden und noch zu sehen ist (in the spelling of the Nuremberg version; the quotation in the text above follows the Augsburg version).

52. Reproduced by Cortesão and Teixeira da Mota (n. 18 above) 3. pl. 248 and by Morison, The Southern Voyages (n. 13 above) 603.

53. Both the early and modern conditions are illustrated in color by Cortesão and Teixeira da Mota (n. 18 above) 2. pl. 131.


56. The drawings by John White and the three certainly copied from lost originals by White are in the British Library. The Lucas de Heere watercolor is in the University Library, Ghent. The woodcut (a source for several subsequent illustrations, including some on early seventeenth-century maps of Greenland) is a folding plate added to [Dionysse Settle], La Navigation du Capitaine Martin Forbisher [sic] Angolois, és regions de west & nordwest, en l'année M. D. LXXVII . . . ([Geneva] 1578). The historical and ethnographic aspects of all these are discussed, and the illustrations reproduced (the two
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original Whites in color), by Hulton and Quinn (n. 10 above) 1.13, 43-47, 141-145; 2. pls. 62, 63, 84ab, 85b, 146a, 147a. Color reproductions of White’s standing man and woman, and of the front and back views of the standing man, are in Cumming et al. (n. 26 above) pls. 285-288. The de Heere sketch is reproduced (wrongly credited to Harvard) in Josephy (n. 23 above) 270, which also has a fine color reproduction (p. 285) of Frobisher’s Eskimo fight; the latter appears again, in poorer color, as the frontispiece to Morison, The Northern Voyages (n. 27 above) which also reproduces (in black and white) White’s two standing figures (pp. 524-525) and Settle’s woodcut (p. 530, credited to the English edition of 1577, where it did not appear). A detailed ethnological evaluation, with reproductions of the de Heere and the two White originals, is given by Birket-Smith (n. 25 above) 5-14.

57. Jean de Léry, Histoire d’un voyage fait en la terre du Bresil, autrement dite Amerique . . . ([La Rochelle] 1578, and Geneva 1580); the original illustrations are on pp. 121 (107), 231 (207)—repeated on 249 (222)—275 (246), 315 (284), 335 (301) (the 1578 locations shown first, the corresponding 1580 reprints in parentheses). These were reproduced, with brief descriptions, by Hulton and Quinn (n. 10 above) 1.145-147, 2. pls. 148a-e, who also reproduce copies of lost originals by John White which they suggest (1.145) were in turn copied not from Léry’s woodcuts but from lost originals on which the woodcuts were based—however, I see no evidence for this in the treatment of ethnographic details. Sérgio Milliet’s translation of Léry’s book edited by Rubens Borba de Moraes, Via­gem a terra do Brazil (São Paulo 1941; rpt. 1972) contains useful introductions and annotations, and reproduces all but the mourning scene of Léry’s 1578 and 1580 illustrations (but without identification: they are the ones facing pp. 66, 67, 82, and 178, with the 1580 additions facing pp. 114, 147, and 178; the other unidentified illustrations in this volume are I believe all from de Bry, except for the map).

It would be worthwhile to compare all the Staden, Thevet, Léry, and de Bry Brazilian illustrations detail by detail, for they are undoubtedly interrelated in complex ways and both Thevet and Léry contributed valid new materials as they reworked older illustrations. In P. H. Pott’s excellent book Naar wijder horizon: kaleidoscoop op ons beeld van de buitenwereld (The Hague 1962) 32-34 is a series starting with Staden’s view of the killing of a captive and including de Bry’s and several subsequent versions, but not those of Thevet and Léry (or Magalhães de Gandavo). Florestan Fernandes’ great work “A função social da guerra na sociedade Tupinambá,” Revista do Museu Paulista n.s. 6 (1952) 7-425 (ed. 2 São Paulo 1970) compares the Staden and Thevet Singularitez (Antwerp 1558) versions of this scene (pl. 15) and also reproduces four clearly interrelated battle scenes from Thevet and Léry (pls. 8, 9). Fernandes recommends Staden’s woodcuts as more accurate sources, reproducing nine of them.

58. The original map, measuring 82.5 × 61 cm., is in the Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid (Relaciones de Indias, 11-4-4). A good color reproduction with brief commentary is number XXII in Mapas españoles de América, siglos XV-XVII, ed. Jacobo Maria del Pilar Carlos Manuel Stuart Fitz-James, 10. Duque de Berwick (Madrid 1951).

59. Reproduced by Cortesão and Teixeira da Mota (n. 18 above) 3. pls. 315-318.

60. These are among the John White drawings in the British Library. They are reproduced in color by Hulton and Quinn (n. 10 above) 2. pls. 60-61, and by Cumming et al. (n. 25 above) 209. Critical discussions will be found in Hulton and Quinn 1.8, 10-11, 33-34, 139-140, and in Hulton’s forthcoming volume on Le Moyne.


62. The manuscript bears a nineteenth-century title, Histoire naturelle des Indes: contenant les arbres, plantes, fruits, animaux, coquillages, reptiles, insectes, oyseaux . . . The drawings are listed in C. F. G. R. Schwerdt, Hunting, Hawking, Shooting, Illustrated in a Catalogue of Books, Manuscripts, Prints, and Drawings (4 vols. London 1928-37) 2.321-326, which reproduces the rabbit hunt as a frontispiece and the Indian of Loranbec as pl. 155, both in color. There is a black and white reproduction of the latter, with discussions, in Hulton and Quinn (n. 10 above) 1.7, 15, 34, 110-111, 132, 2. pl. 156a.
63. The original, a double folio in the Archivo General de Indias, Seville, is reproduced as number XXXV in the series edited by the Duque de Berwick (n. 58 above).

64. All the White originals, in the British Library, are superbly reproduced in color by Hulton and Quinn (n. 10 above) together with reproductions of all the de Bry engravings based on White and of early watercolor copies of four Indian subjects from slightly variant lost White drawings. Other good modern color representations of some of the White originals, sometimes accompanied by black and white reproductions of others, are in Cumming et al. (n. 26 above) 196, 209; Josephy (n. 23 above) 177, 178; and The World of the American Indian, ed. Jules B. Billard (Washington 1974) 105, 106 (cropped), 107-109. The well-known book by Stefan Lorant, The New World: The First Pictures of America (New York 1946) should no longer be used—his color reproductions are very inaccurate (being made from hand-tinted photostats prepared some 15 years earlier), and his text is unreliable (the 1965 “revised” edition is no better). The historical and artistic contexts of White’s Indian drawings are fully discussed by Hulton and Quinn; the present writer contributed detailed ethnological evaluations to the same volume and then compared the originals directly with the published color reproductions for some critical notes on “Ethnographic Details in the American Drawings of John White, 1557-1590,” Ethnohistory 12 (1965) 54-63.
American Objects
in Italian Collections of the Renaissance and Baroque: A Survey

by Detlef Heikamp

THE APPRECIATION OF MEXICAN ARTIFACTS IN ITALY AND ABROAD

Mexican antiquities brought to Europe in the sixteenth century were often made of easily perishable material such as wood, mosaic, or feathers, but they managed to survive, treasured in the collections of princes and scholars. In the study of these objects, old descriptions and illustrations of pre-Columbian objects are of significant interest. Our main sources are mythological treatises and the inventories of the private museums of Italian scholars. Here the rudimentary beginnings of pre-Columbian archaeology are to be found. Of the thousands of curiosities in private collections, the pre-Columbian objects were relatively few. And similarly in the scholarly literature of the six-
teenth and seventeenth centuries, the pre-Columbian object appears only in a marginal way, usually as an object of comparison with classical mythology or Christianity. Thus, we are working with a genre of literature far removed from the usual interests of Mexican archaeology.

This category of publications, in which the topic of America is subordinate to the main purpose of the book, Thomas R. Adams calls "partial Americana." With the exception of a few sporadic references, these sources were never subject to the systematic research they deserve. This essay, then, is only a first and introductory step towards a complete survey of the subject.

A considerable number of pre-Columbian artifacts have come down to us from Italian collections. Many pre-Columbian wood and mosaic objects now found all over Europe can be traced back to Italy. Italian scholarly literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries plays a special role because these artifacts were considered worth illustrating more frequently in Italy than in other countries such as England, Germany, or Spain. These images are quite different from those in travel books, where historic events were usually represented; for there the artist did not work from nature, but illustrated the text he had at hand. These, too, should be systematically collected and examined for their historical truth and for their pictorial interdependence and derivation.

The representation of single pre-Columbian objects, on the other hand, always depended either on first-hand viewing of the artifacts by the illustrator or on drawings which were furnished to him. In some cases, the original object still survives, and so the accuracy of the representation can be tested. Sometimes the image's precision rivals modern scientific illustrations. Drawings of things no longer existing are, of course, of special documentary value. The illustrations reveal to us to what extent men of the Renaissance and Baroque could comprehend the essence of exotic cultures, and they are visual complements to the written sources on indigenous art.

The question is why the Italian sources, though also meagre, contain more illustrations and descriptions of Mexican artifacts than the sources of other countries. The answer might be that the Italian collections, together with those of German-speaking countries, were richest in pre-Columbian antiquities. Under the reign of Charles V, the heathen testimonies to Mexican culture were tolerated. In Brussels, one of the crossroads of Europe, some of them were publicly exhibited in 1520. This tolerance towards Mexican culture survived, it seems, in Italy and Germany; meanwhile, in Spain after Charles V everything pre-Columbian—heathen—had to be annihilated.

Are the Mexican antiquities which reached Europe in the sixteenth century and which are still preserved a part of those shipments made by
Fig. 32.

An Indian dance at the village of Secoton, coastal North Carolina, on 15-16 July 1585, as painted by John White about 1588.

Fig. 31.

The village of Pomeiooc in coastal North Carolina, as painted by John White about 1588.
Fig. 33.

Mexican mask.
Fig. 34.

Mexican mask.
Fig. 39.

St. Ambrose, featherwork picture.
Fig. 40.

St. Jerome, featherwork picture.
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Cortés? Romantic imagination and wishful thinking suggest this hypothesis repeatedly, though no piece, not even in the Vienna collections, gives proof of this assumption. The wide dispersion of material in the former collections of Florence, Bologna, Prague, Ambras Castle, Munich, Nuremberg, Stuttgart, Kassel, and Brunswick also contradicts this hypothesis.

For example, a greenstone mask in the possession of Duke Wilhelm of Bavaria was shipped from Mexico to Europe for Cosimo de' Medici much later, in 1572. Philipp Hainhofer, art agent of many German princes, mentions "ain indianischer idolo, aus pietra isada" in the Kunstkammer of the duke of Stuttgart in 1616. Probably many of these greenstone idols were archaeological finds made by Spanish grave robbers in search of gold. As modest sidelines of the plunderers' main activity, they reached Europe, where they were much in demand for collections. It can hardly be accidental that all pre-Columbian greenstone idols of the former Medicean collections in Florence belong to remote archaeological cultures.

We do not know how the wooden mosaic objects and the pre-Columbian featherworks reached European collections, but at any rate, even here the hypothesis that they reached Europe with the first shipments cannot be proven in any way.

The kind of interest scholars took in Mexican idols may be seen in Lorenzo Pignoria's Imagini degli dei indiani (1615) and Lorenzo Legati's description of the Museo Cospiano (Bologna 1677). The Mexican idols enlarged the history of religion, adding to ancient mythology, the Moslem world, and the creeds of the Far East the knowledge of formerly unknown heathen beliefs. Europeans were fascinated by the strange, fantastic, and heretical images. Their novelty had to be made understandable, however, by reference to literary authorities and the mythological traditions of classical and Egyptian antiquity. This attempt was generally made with the most erudite and far-fetched comparisons.

Sometimes the illustrations of Mexican gods have a surprising degree of authenticity and convey the character of the deities much better than words could. An intellectual, though not as yet an aesthetic, interest in exotic civilization asserted itself.

Still the task of illustrating Mexican art was an extremely difficult one for European draughtsmen. Eduard Seler's judgment of the reproductions of Aztec manuscripts in Lord Kingsborough's Antiquities of Mexico (1830-48) applies even more to such illustrations from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: "Even the best intentions and most outstanding ability were not sufficient to assure correct portrayal of this wealth of foreign forms and intricate symbols in all respects."

What was often admired in the Renaissance and Baroque periods
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was the technical skill and craftsmanship with which these objects were made. In any case, a systematic examination of the aesthetic judgments and the terms used for these in the European literary sources on Mexican art would be very useful for exploring this problem.

In the late seventeenth century, illustrations of Mexican artifacts became even more rare in Italian literature, as the taste for the bizarre, together with the Kunstkammer, became obsolete. The Mexican theme had entered novels and plays, but it was no longer nourished by visual knowledge of Mexican art. The illustrations of Mexican manuscripts in Francesco Gemelli Careri’s Giro del mondo (6 vols. Naples 1699-1700) are an exception. Here, however, Mexican glyphs are rendered according to the European naturalistic view; the Mexican kings look like actors in costume. In Bonanni’s illustrations (1709) of American idols every reminiscence of the originals, which the draughtsman must have had before him, has vanished. One can occasionally find a fascinating example of an Italian artist’s encounter with the remains of Mexican indigenous culture, but always as a rare exception having no lasting influence on the art of his own country. The discovery of an aesthetic value in primitive art was primarily a phenomenon of the nineteenth century.

THE MUSEO ALDROVANDIANO

As a botanist and zoologist, Ulisse Aldrovandi (1522-1605) was passionately interested in the New World. He dreamed of organizing an expedition to Mexico; under his leadership, painters and writers would systematically explore the flora and fauna of that country. The main focus of his museum, therefore, was on the natural sciences. Besides embalmed and stuffed animals, fish, shells, corals, herbariums, and botanical and zoological drawings, the collection also contained ethnological material. Aldrovandi was a man of encyclopedic knowledge and vast cultural interests. It is not surprising that the well-known Aztec mask (figs. 33, 34) was found among his possessions. His collection was left to the city of Bologna and the mosaic mask ended up in the Museo Archeologico, where its existence went almost unnoted. Luigi Pigorini acquired it through an exchange in 1878 for the Museo Preistorico Etnografico in Rome. Shortly thereafter, the Bolognese felt that their museum had been shortchanged, and a lengthy polemic ensued in the newspapers. A letter from Pigorini to the Gazzetta dell’Emilia describes the state of the mask when it was acquired by the Roman museum: its condition was deplorable; it had been neglected, was broken in two and held together with string.

The mask is illustrated in Aldrovandi’s Musaeum metallicum, which was not published until 43 years after Aldrovandi’s death. Comparison of the woodcut with the mask reveals that the mosaic incrustation was
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obviously much better preserved in the sixteenth century. On the cheeks of the mask, snakes' heads with wide-open jaws can be recognized. This was overlooked by the sixteenth-century artist. Confronted with the task of reproducing the complicated design of the mosaic in detail and carefully transferring the various colours to black and white, the draughtsman simply resigned. Instead, he made frequent use of schematic patterns. The white teeth bared at the corners of the mouth of the mask become three-dimensional in the woodcut. In general, however, it is a remarkably true representation.

When examining this woodcut of the mask, one must bear in mind the high standard of scientific book illustrations in Italy, mainly in botany and zoology. Ulisse Aldrovandi was very much aware of this problem in the pictorial representation of plants and animals. He even wrote a treatise on the subject and continuously kept artists in his service to draw the material to be treated in his future books.

The ability the painters developed in Aldrovandi's service was also of great advantage to the ethnological illustrations. The representation of frightening or bizarre masks was a familiar subject for the mannerist artist, who also was acquainted with the mosaic technique present in European art as well. Masks covered with shell mosaic decorate, for example, the grotto of the Medici villa

CVLTER LAPIDEVS INDICVS

Figure 35.

Mexican sacrificial knife. Woodcut in U. Aldrovandi, Musaeum metallicum (Bologna 1648).
of Castello. Such circumstances may have facilitated the illustration of the wooden mask discussed here.

A knife with a wooden handle in the form of a bird of prey and with an obsidian blade illustrated by Aldrovandi (fig. 35) is lost to us today. Judging by the representation, it was not covered with mosaic; however, the original incrustation may have fallen off. The knife was of the same type as those preserved in London and Rome. Aldrovandi also reproduced an undecorated knife with a narrow blade and plain handle (fig. 36). This seems to be the same kind of knife as the one described in an eighteenth-century inventory of the Florentine collection and already belonging to the Medicean collections in the seventeenth century.

Culter Lapideus alter.

Figure 36.
Stone knife. Woodcut in U. Aldrovandi, Musaeum metallicum (Bologna 1648).

The unfamiliar shapes and proportions of the Mexican idols reproduced by Aldrovandi in the Musaeum metallicum evidently posed greater problems for the illustrator. The draughtsman did not succeed in avoiding a rather crude simplification. Hieratic forms of an exotic culture became vague and clumsy. The illustrations remind one in some cases of the woodcuts in Giovanni Battista Della Porta’s De humana physiognomia (1586). The forms of Mexican gods are changed to grimacing caricatures. The strict stylising of the originals is interpreted naturalistically and from a psychological viewpoint.

In fig. 37, no. 1 seems to represent a mask with the features of an old man; no. 2 is probably an Aztec or Mixtec labret; no. 3, a Mixtec head. No. 4, representing the nose god, is quite similar to a piece in the Ethnological Museum in Munich and other examples preserved in many collections. No. 5 is difficult to identify; it may be a spindle whorl. In fig. 38, no. 1 may represent the god Tlaloc; the perforation in the centre, however, is unusual. No. 2 cannot be identified with certainty, no. 3 seems to belong to the Olmec culture, and no. 4 is probably one of the countless green stone statuettes of the Mixtec-Puebla culture.
In the collection of the nobleman Tommaso de' Cavalieri in Rome, Aldrovandi had seen shields with featherwork "elegantissime elaboratos." Cavalieri (died 1587) is a well-known Roman personality of the sixteenth century, but certainly not because he kept in his museum pre-Columbian artifacts. Michelangelo's fame having been reflected on him, his memory was kept alive in future generations. As Vasari put it: "He was and is one of the best friends Michelangelo ever had." Michelangelo made several famous drawings for him in 1532-33. Cavalieri was also a great amateur of classical works of art and he possessed a notable collection of ancient statues, the list of which was published by Aldro-
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Figure 38.

Mexican heads and figurines. Woodcut in U. Aldrovandi, Musaeum metallicum (Bologna 1648).

vandi. That these ideal realms of Western art could be contiguous to the interest in the exotic, that works of Michelangelo and pre-Columbian feather implements were kept under the same roof, is a fact to be kept in mind while viewing the scene of the Roman Renaissance.

In his collection, Aldrovandi had a Mexican feather picture of St. Jerome which is lost today. Missionaries in Mexico brought great numbers of these pictures back to Europe. Because Aldrovandi was a
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dedicated ornithologist, these works were especially important to him and he described them enthusiastically.

In connection with this, four featherwork pictures representing the Church Fathers St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory should be mentioned (figs. *39-42). They were a gift of the Augustinian monk Pietro Lanfranconi in 1668 to the Santa Casa of Loreto.²⁷

The material of which these pictures were made, in spite of its ephemeral character, resembled precious stones. The iridescent colours of hummingbird plumage surpassed everything known of birds in the Old World. These pictures were made under the direction of Spanish missionaries and based on European prints or paintings, so that the two-dimensional native Mexican representation of man and space is absent in them, as a result of European perception. They were one of those rare cases in which the marvellous and exotic features of the art of a tropical country were combined with the familiar. Consequently, Mexican feather pictures were described with greatest admiration and were mentioned frequently in Italian literature on Mexico.²⁸

Between 1665 and 1667, when the Museo Aldrovandi already belonged to the city of Bologna, it received a valuable acquisition. Valerio Zani, who had given Ferdinando Cospi the well-known Mexican manu-

Figure 41.

St. Augustine, featherwork picture. Loreto, Treasury of the Santa Casa.
LORENZO PIGNORIA’S ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE IDOLS OF THE DUKE OF BAVARIA

Lorenzo Pignoria wrote an appendix to Vincenzo Cartari’s *Le vere e nove imagini de gli dei delli antichi*, entitled “Imagini degli dei indiani,” which first appears in the 1615 edition. Mexican, Chinese, and Japanese gods are the subject. The images of the Mexican gods are derived from the Codex Ríos. The book was repeatedly reissued and must have contributed considerably to seventeenth-century scholars’ awareness of the existence of exotic mythologies.

Two Mexican gods in the duke of Bavaria’s *Kunstkammer* are also represented (figs. 43, 44). Pignoria reported that he received the drawings of these two figures from Hans Georg Herwarth, a famous scholar belonging to an old Augsburg family. Herwarth occupied important governmental positions at the Bavarian court and was held in high esteem by Duke Wilhelm and his successor, Maximilian. Like Pignoria, he studied Egyptology, a subject much in fashion at the time. Their common interest in Mexican art probably stemmed from this fact,
Figure 43.
Mexican god. Woodcut in Lorenzo Pignoria, Imagini degli dei indiani (Appendix to Cartari, Venice 1647).
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Figure 44.

Mexican God. Woodcut in Lorenzo Pignoria, Imagini degli dei indiani (Appendix to Cartari, Venice 1647).
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because scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries believed in a connection between Egyptian and Mexican hieroglyphics and art. These hypotheses are still being revived occasionally today.

According to Pignoria, labels in Spanish attached to the Munich statuettes indicated that they had been venerated in Mexico City and that witnesses had often heard the devil speak through them. On the basis of this information, one of the gods can be identified with a statuette described in the 1598 inventory of the Kunstkammer in Munich. The Munich inventory, however, contains an error repeated by Pignoria: that Cardinal Francisco Ximenes Cisneros owned the idol. Ximenes died in 1517, three years before the first Mexican shipments of Hernando Cortés arrived in Europe. The text of the Munich inventory reads: “An Indian idol, externally covered with small, interlocking red and white rings, with large eyes of blue glass; the figure looks more like a devil than a human being. . . .” It may be the standing idol in fig. 46. It appears Egyptian at first sight; if one tries to associate it with Central American art, one first thinks of reliefs from the Maya temple district of Palenque, built in the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. The Munich piece is probably a figure fully in the round. On the basis of the description of the material used, it does not seem to be very old. The available data are too fragmentary to allow one to reach a real conclusion in the matter.

On the left margin of the woodcut, there are two further representations. One is an antique gem with two faces in profile. The other is a front-view face of an Indian, apparently pre-Columbian. It has some typically Aztec features. As is true of the other marginal drawing in fig. 47, the text fails to mention the origin of this representation. On the lower lip there is the tezcanecuilli, the white labret carved from the vault of a large seashell, as is often found in hieroglyphic manuscripts as well as in sculpture (fig. 45). The hair is tied together and stands upright in a tuft, as it was worn by chieftains. This style was called temillotl (stone pillar) or ixquatzontli (forehead hair) or ixquatecpilli (prince of the forehead). The cord (quau-icuia) tying the upright tuft ends in two tassels of quetzal feathers hanging down to the small of the figure’s back (fig. 46). The ear ornaments, stripes painted on the face, and forehead bands with floral designs are also possible elements of Mexican costume.

The ear discs, the bands on the upper arms and calves of the legs, seen on the sitting figure in the second woodcut (fig. 47), can also be considered Mexican attributes. The animal figure in the margin of the woodcut may represent a monkey, sacred to the god of dance in Mexican mythology.
The Bolognese nobleman Ferdinando Cospi (1619-86) preserved in his museum the Mexican manuscript now called the Codex Cospiano, found today in the university library in Bologna. The manuscript was originally considered Chinese, but Lorenzo Legati, in his book on the Museo Cospiano published in 1677, was already certain of its Mexican origin. He reports that the manuscript was a gift of Signor Valerio Zani in 1665. Besides four figures from the codex, Legati also reproduces two knife handles (figs. 47, 48). These are now kept in the Museo Pigorini. Both are often mentioned in literature, but no attention has been paid to their illustration in Legati's book (fig. 49).

As in the drawing of the wooden mask in Aldrovandi’s *Musaeum metallicum* (fig. 34), the mosaic pattern has not been reproduced quite exactly. The first piece has the form of a crouching figure with an animal head and a gaping mouth. It has been described as a knife handle, as has...
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the other specimen which certainly is one. However, Saville points out that in the belly of the figure there is a hole which is larger on the inside than at the opening. It is therefore difficult to decide whether it was indeed a knife handle or was intended to be placed on the top of a staff.

The muzzle of the animal's head ends in a volute, and a rounded groove has been hollowed out on its upper side. In the original, the form is less definite and less finished than in the woodcut. The eye is in the original a gilded bronze cabochon. The draughtsman has instead marked a pupil in the eye. The primitive forms have been perceived, more or less, in the naturalistic European way, although the draughtsman is rather successful in restraining himself.

The most considerable deviation from reality is the fact that the draughtsman represents the handle as a mirror image. His purpose was probably to achieve symmetry in respect to the other handle with the human head. In the woodcut representation (fig. 49), one notices that

Figure 46.
Motecuhcomatzin (from Codex Vaticanus A, 3738, fol. 60).
the emphasized modelling of the animal’s limbs and kerchief does not correspond to reality.

THE MUSEO KIRCHERIANO

The German Jesuit Athanasius Kircher (1601-80) owes his position in early Mexican studies to the fact that he dedicated one chapter of his immense study *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* to Aztec writing. He founded the Museo Kircheriano in the Collegio Romano, which contained considerable ethnological collections. When the holdings of the museum became the property of Italy in 1870, the original character of the collection as a *Kunstkammer* was not retained. The material was divided up and distributed to various museums, the ethnographical holdings becoming the nucleus for the new Museo Preistorico Etnografico. After the Second World War, a large portion of its stock was banished from the Collegio Romano, where the ethnographic material had remained even after 1870. It was brought to a gigantic but decaying palace of the fascist era, completely unsuitable as a museum, on the outskirts of the city. A great part of the pre-Columbian treasures is packed away there in storage and is not available for examination.

The founder of the Museo Kircheriano published a description of the collection in 1678; in 1709 the printed catalogue by Filippo Bonanni appeared. Besides the printed descriptions of the museum by Kircher and Bonanni, no manuscript inventories are known which might allow us to trace further back than the nineteenth century the rich pre-
Columbian holdings of what is now the Museo Preistorico Etnografico Luigi Pigorini.

In the text by Bonanni, two gods of the "New American Reign," possibly of Mexican origin, are described and illustrated (fig. 50). One of the illustrations depicts a sitting human figure of stone with a flattened profile of an oversized, grimacing head. The body, with its muscle relief, is represented according to the academic artistic rules of anatomy. The figure does not really remind one of its primitive prototype and renders impossible an archaeological identification. The same is true of the second figure, made of bronze and, according to the text, showing a cross between an ape and a man. In the print, however, it is represented more like a faun. The engraver failed to liberate himself from his European perception and to penetrate the exotic world of these gods.

THE MUSEO BORGIANO

The museum of the noble Roman family in Velletri was considerably enlarged by Stefano Borgia (1731-1804). In 1770 Borgia became secretary and in 1802 prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith. The widespread international activity of this institution allowed him to add exotic material to his museum. Besides the objects which he received from missionaries, he acquired other pieces from Italian collections. His interests lay in America as well as the Orient; his collection was divided between Rome and Velletri. After Borgia's death
in 1804, an inventory was made of the objects in his Roman residence, the Palazzo Altemps. Following the terms of his will, which had been contested in vain by his brother, these objects went to the Congregation. The collection was enlarged with time; in 1883 it was separated from the library of the Congregation and became the Museo Borgiano. In the twentieth century, this collection was joined to the Museo Missionario Etnologico of the Lateran and was recently transferred to the Vatican.

The Codex Borgiano, a Mexican manuscript which belonged to the cardinal, was transferred from the library of the Congregation to the Vatican Library. A note in a sixteenth-century hand, written in an Italian somewhat coloured by Spanish, indicates that the manuscript may well have been in Italy at that time. According to a remark by Alexander von Humboldt, the codex was acquired from Palazzo Giustiniani at S. Luigi dei Francesi, famous for its picture gallery and other art collections. In 1805 Humboldt was able to consult the codex, thanks to Cavaliere Camillo Borgia, the nephew of the deceased cardinal. On this occasion, Humboldt may have obtained the information about the provenance of the manuscript, which therefore appears to be quite reliable.

The collection in the museum at Velletri was dispersed in the nineteenth century, and no inventories have come to light. The summary of the contents of the “classis mexicana,” as it is recorded by a contemporary writer, mentions “multa lignea et testacea idolorum simulacra, forma et figura singuli, ac genti mexicanae propria.” These figurines can probably be identified with those found today in the Museo Missionario Etnologico of the Vatican. A recent study has shown that they come from the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta (Colombia), and not from Mexico.

MEXICAN OBJECTS IN FLORENCE

Aside from a few pre-Columbian objects in the state museums of Florence and the mosaic mask in Rome (formerly the property of Grand Duke Cosimo I) no object of Florentine provenance can with certainty be traced back to the Medicean collection. It has often been said that other pieces come from the Medicean collection or the possessions of old Florentine nobility, usually because they were acquired in Florence. These objects do indeed belong to the categories of artifacts typical of the Kunstkammern of the Renaissance and Baroque periods. For this reason, these items are discussed here, in spite of the fact that there is no real proof that they have been in Europe for centuries.

The sacrificial knife and the cedarwood mask in the Christy collection in the British Museum were obtained from “a celebrated collection” in Florence in the 1830’s. Bram Hertz, the former owner, reports about the mask: “I found in the case containing the mask a memorandum
Fig. 47.

_Sacrificial knife handle._

Fig. 48.

_Sacrificial knife handle._
Fig. 53.

Native Mexican manuscript paintings, Codex Mendoza, fol. 67r.
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which stated that it belonged to a convent of nuns at Mozza [?] and that it was of Egyptian origin, this later assertion I doubted very much."

The mosaic snake mask in the British Museum belonged to the Russian Demidoff princes until 1870. In 1824 this family settled in Florence, and it is probable that they acquired the mask there."

A Mixtec jade figure formerly in the collection of Enrico Hillyer Giglioli, director of the Museo d'Antropologia ed Etnologia in Florence, had been acquired in 1889 from the Florentine antique dealer Grazzini. Giglioli believed it to have been in Florence since the sixteenth century and concluded, though with little evidence, that it was once part of the Medici collection."

Bushnell, who illustrated the figure, recounts that it was in the collection of Cardinal Guadagni in 1650, but gives no source for his information."

Probably this report is based on an oral communication from Giglioli, who had shown his collection to Bushnell, and is to be traced back to the dealer. As dealers are often wont to give their objects grander provenances, his report must be taken cum grano salis. Furthermore, Cardinal Guadagni was not born until 1674. In 1912, after Giglioli's death, a printed catalogue of his collection appeared."

The jade figure cannot be identified in any of the short entries there. Nor is it to be found in the Museo Pigorini in Rome, which acquired the Giglioli collection.

Giglioli had also purchased from the dealer Sartori in Via Vigna Nuova in Florence an obsidian mirror which had been in the possession of Sartori's father. It would seem that the mirror originally had a frame and a stand, because on one side four pairs of notches are present. Giglioli also imagined this to have been former Medici property."

The two *atlats* of the Museo d'Antropologia ed Etnologia were acquired in Florence in 1902. Nothing is known of their provenance. Bushnell noted: "When the two Florence specimens were obtained by Professor Mantegazza, they were in an old leather-covered case in which they had evidently been kept for many years. This may account for their more perfect state of preservation."

It was customary in Europe between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries to keep jewels, vases of semi-precious stones, and other valuables in leather cases. This would imply that the *atlats* had been kept in a European collection for a long time. Unfortunately, however, the leather cases which would give us some clue to the origin of the *atlats* are not preserved, and how long the latter have been in Italy remains an open question. Oddly enough, one of the Florentine pieces, the so-called *atlato* A, shows the same scenes as the one which was acquired in 1932 by the Museo Pigorini. According to reports, that *atlato* was also purchased in Florence. Its owner had received it from an old priest, who had brought it from Mexico.
Fortunio Liceti published in his *Pyronarcha* (Padua 1634) a pre-Columbian wooden knife with mosaic incrustation (fig. 51). The blade is broken in half. Liceti had not seen the knife, but the owner, Signor Gaffarellius, who may be identified with Jacob Gaffarell, librarian to the duke of Richelieu, had furnished him with a drawing of it. Gaffarell was a distinguished theologian, jurist, linguist, and antiquarian.

The knife is lost, but judging from the illustration, which seems fairly accurate, it belonged to the same type as the other mosaic knife handles which are still preserved. Liceti believed it to be of African origin and the figure on the handle to represent the god of thunder. For this reason, he included it in his treatise.

A bone rattle (*omichicauatzli*) was acquired along with the other pre-Columbian objects from Bologna by the Museo Preistorico Etnografico in Rome. Its exact provenance is not known. A label from the seventeenth century was attached to it, but even in Pigorini’s day it was, with the exception of the word “Regis,” illegible.

A letter from Pigorini to the Consigliere di Stato, Commendatore Giacomo Malvano, 10 January 1891, reports another pre-Columbian piece. It was “an old Mexican object made of wood which I have not seen and hence cannot describe. It is covered with mosaic and in the possession of the duchess of Rignano. According to my information, it
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has the same characteristics as the Mexican mosaics which I published earlier. . . . But instead of a mask or a knife handle it would seem to be a kind of sceptre.” Pigorini hoped to acquire it for the Roman museum as a gift. He was unfortunately unsuccessful and nothing else is known about the piece.

NOTES

The present author is on this occasion again much indebted to Prof. Gerd Kutscher (Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut Berlin) for elucidations concerning some of the material presented in this paper. Dr. William C. Sturtevant gave valuable bibliographical information.

1. See in this collection, 2.530.
2. See the paper by William C. Sturtevant in this collection, 1.417 ff. For a comparable problem, the representation of early Christian and medieval art from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, see Giovanni Previtali, La fortuna dei primitivi dal Vasari ai neoclassici (Turin 1964).
6. See Heikamp and Anders (n. 5 above) 207.
7. See Adolf von Oechelhäuser, “Philipp Hainhofers Bericht über die Stuttgarter Kindetaufe im Jahre 1616,” Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher 1 (1891) 301. The piece is probably identical with the figure of Quetzalcoatl in the Lindenmuseum; see Eduard Seler, “Das Grünsteinidol des Stuttgarter Museums,” in Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur amerikanischen Sprach- und Altertumskunde (5 vols. Berlin 1902-1923; rpt. Graz 1960-61) 3. 392 ff. Piedra de hijada, the Spanish word for jade, was at that time the usual expression in Europe for Mexican greenstone.
12. At the conference, the illustrations of Mexican manuscripts in Italian source literature were presented in Dr. Donald Robertson’s paper as well as by the present writer. Agreement was made that Dr. Robertson should publish the material in this collection: see 1.483 ff.
13. See the section on the Museo Kircheriano, pp. 470-471.
15. Illustrations in Aldrovandi’s works concerning other American countries than Mexico will be published by the present author together with William C. Sturtevant.
19. Aldrovandi, Musaeum metallicum (n. 17 above) 157: “Sed in Themistiana Indiae Provincia, cum ferro, et chalybe careant, ex lapidibus Smaragdini et obscuri coloris (lapidis aethiopici speciem nonnulli vocant) Cultellos parant cum manubriis elegantissimis, quorum duae icones ante legentium oculos hic repraesentantur. Prima icon Cultrum latiorem cum manubrio ligneo diligentissime caelato ostendit. Secunda icon monstrat Cultellum longiorem, et angustiorem, cum manubrio ex lapide renali fabricato.” The woodcut of the knife with the handle in the form of a bird is mentioned for the first time in modern Mexicanistic literature in Tylor (n. 17 above) 339. Reproduced in Eduard Seier (n. 17 above) 4. 366; see too p. 367. Saville (n. 2 above) 82 ff. gives comprehensive information on the three mosaic-covered knives known in his day, to which two have subsequently been added.

The woodcut in Ferrante Imperato, Dell’istoria naturale (Naples 1599) shows a flake of flint (or obsidian?) which, due to its general form, cannot be dated more exactly; it could have been made during the time between the paleolithic period and the Bronze Age in the Old or New World.
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As Dr. William C. Sturtevant points out to me, the idols of the ancestors of the West Indian Arawacks were called *cemi*; see Georg Friederici, *Amerikanistiches Worterbuch und Hilfsworterbuch für den Amerikanisten* (ed. 2 Hamburg 1960) 157 f., 702 f. Judging from the woodcuts, it seems to the present writer that Aldrovandi applies the word to Mexican gods.


made of birds feathers." A feather picture of St. Jerome as described by Aldrovandi is preserved in Vienna, Museum für Völkerkunde. It is reproduced in Heikamp and Anders (n. 8 above) plate 27.

27. Santa Casa, Tesoro. The very faded feathers are glued to paper with painted decorations in gold, orange, white, green, red, and black. The pictures are ca. 43.5 x 31.5 cm. and are framed in ebony. Father Floriano Grimaldi kindly informs me that the following document exists in the archives of the Santa Casa concerning the donation of the pictures: 130 Registro Doni (1661-80), fol. 196: "A di 7 Nov. 1668. Quattro quadri di piume che sono i quattro dottori della Chiesa Occidentale, cioè S. Gregorio, S. Agostino, S. Girolamo e S. Ambrogio, con loro cornice d’ebano et attaccaglie di rame dorato con loro talchi donati dal Padre Maestro Pietro Lanfranconi d’Ancona dell’Ordine di S. Agostino hora Vescovo di Terni." According to Skippon (n. 26 above) 6. 701, there was in Loreto a “picture of the Madonna made of feathers.” It no longer exists today. For related material see “Tesores de Mexico, Arte plumario y de mosaico,” Artes de Mexico no. 137 año 17 (1970).

Dr. Alvar Gonzales Palacios tells me that according to the inventory of 6 September 1666 (written after the death of Don Camillo Pamphili) there was in the villa of Belrespiro at S. Pancrazio “Un quadretto di una Madonna in Piedi con Puttino in braccio alto palmi 1 1/2 fatto tutto di penna d’Ucelli, con vari Uccelletti, e Angioletti con sua Cornice torchina intagliata tocca di oro di mano indiana.” See Jörg Garms, Quellen aus dem Archiv Doria-Pamphilj zur Kunsttätigkeit in Rom unter Innocenz X, Quellenschriften der Barockkunst in Rom 4 (Rome 1972) 350.

28. See Heikamp and Anders (n. 8 above) 15. For further information concerning featherworks in Italy, see G. V. Callegari, “Mitra e manipolo a mosaico di penne nel Museo degli Argenti a Palazzo Pitti,” Dedalo 5 (1924-25) 500-513, with more extensive bibliography.


30. A list of the editions of Cartari is given by Walter Koschatzky in the reprint of the Venice 1647 edition, Imagini delli dei de gl’antichi, Instrumentaria Artium 1 (Graz 1963) xvii f. For the different editions of Pignoria’s appendix “Imagini degli dei indiani” see Franz Ehrle, Il manoscritto messicano 3738, detto il Codice Rios, riprodotto in fotocromografia a spese di S. E. il Duca di Loubat per cura della Biblioteca Vaticana (Rome 1900) 13 ff.

31. Cartari, quoted here according to the Venice 1647 edition (from which figs. 43 and 44 have also been taken) says: “Et perché fuor della Galleria del serenis. di Baviera io ho havuto alcuni disegni d’Idoli del Messico, però staranno registrati qui sotto un dopo l’altro. Questo primiero nell’acconciatura di capo è molto simile alle stravaganze Egittie, anzi che quella coda, che gli esce fuora del mento lo fa in tutto, e per tutto eguale in questa parte a quella figura della mensa Isiaca, che io nella esplicazione di essa, chiamai altre volte Oro. Et cosa di questa fatta si vede in una mia antichissima Corniola, il disegno della quale ho fatto rappresentare nella sopraposta Tavoletta. L’altro Idolo io direi, che fosse cavato dal Cercopithecus d’Egitto, poiché ha più figura di bestia, che di uomo. Nella soprascritta Galleria all’uno, et all’altro degli Idoli detti, è stata affissa una breve diceria in lingua Spagnuola di questo tenore; Idolo adorato nella Città del Messico, che fu mandato dall’Indie al Cardinal Francesco Ximenez Arcivescovo di Toledo, et Fondatore della Università d’Alcalá d’Henares; con testimonianza autentica, che il Demonio soleva parlare per quello ben spesso. Et questi due Ritratti (per darne la lode a
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chi viene) si sono havuti per mezo del nobilissimo Signore Gio. Giorgio Hervarto consigliere intimo di Quell’Altezza, huomo di singolare letteratura” (373-376).


33. See Heikamp and Anders (n. 5 above) 210.

34. The original text reads as follows: “Ein indianisch götzenbildt ausswendig mit weissen und roten ringlein ineinanderhaft uberzogen, mit grossen augen von blawen glass.” The description of this material is reminiscent of idols from the Antilles in Annemarie Schweeger-Hefel’s article, “Ein rätselhaftes Stück aus der alten Ambraser Sammlung,” Archiv für Völkerkunde 6-7 (1951/52) 209-228. The idol was already in Munich during the reign of Wilhelm V (1579-98), for whom the inventory was made. Thus it was not acquired by Maximilian I (1598-1651) as one is led to believe from Pignoria’s text.

35. See Eduard Selier, “Altamexikanischer Schmuck und soziale und militärische Rangabzeichen,” in Gesammelte Abhandlungen (n. 7 above) 2. 540 f. Figures 45 and 46 in my text were taken from Selier, 2. 537 and 542.

36. See Selier (n. 35 above) 2. 536 f.


38. The knife handles described by Legati (n. 29 above) 477 f.: “E già che de gli Indiani si è fatta menzione, e perché stimo, che i presenti due simolacri, che sono nel Museo, e de’ quali qui si pongono le figure, siano manifatture de’ medesimi, mi è parso tempo opportuno il darne in questo luogo qualche ragguaglio. Il volerli descrivere sarebbe, a mio credere un’ offendere chi ne ha saputo co’ diligentì intagli darne le copie. Non è però da tralasciarsi di motivare, che sono di legno, e coperti d’una crostatura così leggiera, e sottile, e composta alla Musaica di picciolissime squame di diverse figure e variamente colorite, che, se nel disegno non arreccano quella nobiltà, che porta la miniatu­ra, e l’essere col pennello dipinte, mostrano nondimeno una gagliarda pazienza di chi le ha saputo unire insieme, e dar perfezione ad un’opera così peregrina. Veramente a quel’uso siano stati fatti, e qual nome possano avere, a me non dà l’animò d’indovinare. So bene, che alcuni si sono imaginati, anche col fondamento di Plutarco, che dall’unione umana colla bestiale ne poteva qualche volta nascere un certo parto, detto Sfinge, che appresso de gli Egizii si figurava composto di Leone, e di faccia di donna vergine …; se vogliamo paragonarlo ciò, che fu detto delle Sfingi colle nostre imagini, non so vederne sicuro confronto; e massime, che una delle dilineate ha faccia umana senza capigliatura, e l’altra s’avvicina a quella d’un’terribile Orca ….”

The knife handles are also described in Breve descrizione del museo di Ferdinando Cospi (Bologna 1667) 20, no. 118: “Due idoli lavorati a mosaico in forma di sfinge,” and are mentioned in the Inventario semplice di tutte le materie esattamente descritte che si trovano nel Museo Cospiano (Bologna 1680) 13: “sfini di mosaico in legno.” Pigorini, “Gli antichi oggetti” (n. 16 above) 340, refers to these sources as does Marshall Saville, The Wood­carver’s Art in Ancient Mexico (New York 1925) 83 f.

On the knife handle with the human head, also see Präkolumbische Kunst aus Mexiko und Mittelamerika, Exhibition catalogue (Munich 1958) no. 236; Elizabeth K. Easby and John F. Scott, Before Cortés, Sculpture of Middle America: A Centennial Exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York [1970]) no. 295.

39. I am grateful to Dottoressa Valeria Petrucci, director of the Museo Preistorico-Etnografico Luigi Pigorini, Rome, for her help on this section.
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41. For example, vessels made of Mexican gourds (“Cucurbitae Mexicanae”). See Kircher, Kircheriana domus naturae artisque theatrum (Amsterdam 1678) 34: “Vides hic congeriem vasorum in modum scutellarum excavatarum; figurae sat amplae, sed pondere levissimo diversis figuris et tractibus subtilissimis varie effigiatae; ut etiam colorum multiplicitate depicta, ac demum vernice Sinico magni splendoris superinducto; vasa sunt ex Cucurbitis Americanis, Authori inde dono transmissa.”

42. See n. 41 above.

43. Filippo Bonanni, Musaeum Kircherianum sive Musaeum a P. Athanasio Kircho in collegio Romano Societatis Jesu . . . illustratum (Rome 1709).

44. Bonanni (n. 43 above) 38: “. . . Idolorum simulacra expressa sunt in Tab. XXI ex variis Indiarum Regionibus accepta. Sub n. 1 vedetur Animal nudum, et informe lapideum cujus facies humanae similis, Simiae potius dicenda videtur. Illud ex Novo Regno americano allatum est a quodam e nostra Societate Missionario, cui Vir idolatra Christi fidem amplexus tradidit, ut suam stultitiam detestaretur, qua monstrum adeo informe colucerat. “Non absimile illi alium ostenditur numero 2. ex aere formatum. Simiam refert caudatam, quae humanam figuram fere exprimit; differt tamen ab homine auribus oblongis, ungulisque acutis, quibus manus pedesque munientur.”

See here, also, Nota degli oggetti preistorici ed etnografici consegnati al sottoscritto [Luigi Pigorini] dalla direzione del Museo Kircheriano del Collegio Romano, e collocati nel Museo preistorico ed etnografico dello stesso Collegio, MS in the archives of the Museo Pigorini.

45. I am indebted to Father Joséf Penkowski, S.V.D., director of the Museo Missionario Etnologico, Vatican, for information on this collection.

46. See H. Enzensberger, in Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani 12 (Rome 1970) 739-742, with bibliography. For the history of the Museo Borgia, see Giuseppe Angelo Colini, “Collezioni etnografiche del Museo Borgiano,” Bollettino della Società geografica italiana Ser. 2, 10 (1885) 316-325; [Franz Ehrle], Il manoscritto messicano Borgiano del Museo etnografico della S. Congregazione di Propaganda Fide, riprodotto in fotocromografia a spese di S.E. il Duca di Loubat a cura della Biblioteca Vaticana (Rome 1898) 13 ff.


48. One copy is in the Vatican Library, Codex Borgianus lat. 551; two others are in the Stato temporale (n. 47 above) 372-467.

49. See Ehrle (n. 46 above) 5 ff.


52. For Mexican objects formerly in Medici collections, see Heikamp and Anders (n. 8 above). The following additions to that publication should be made: plate 7, small bird’s head of greenstone, not agate. Concerning the appreciation of such objects after the Conquista, see Otto Kurz, “A Mexican Amulet against Kidney Stones,” Science, Medicine and Society in the Renaissance: Essays to honor Walter Pagel, ed. Allen G. Debus (2 vols. New York 1972) i. 81-86. For the Teotihuacan mask, Heikamp and Anders (n. 8 above) plates 54-55, see David I. Bushnell, Jr., “North American Ethnographical Material in Italian Collections,” American Anthropologist n.s. 8 (1906) 245: “Unfortunately the eyes are
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not the original ones; they are made of glass, but appear to be very old. There is also some question as to the age of the painting in the mouth; very little of it is visible, and it was evidently done many years ago." On the supposed destruction of Mexican objects covered with turquoise mosaic in the Florentine Opificio delle Pietre Dure during the nineteenth century, see Elizabeth Carmichael, *Turquoise Mosaics from Mexico* (London 1970) 39 n. 3.

The present writer does not know the source of the account given by Jacques Soustelle, *Arts of Ancient Mexico* (London 1967) 132, that Benvenuto Cellini admired a fish with gold and silver scales which Charles V had received from Mexico and then had given as a present to the pope [Clement VII ?].

Two earthenware jars, pendant pieces to those illustrated in Heikamp and Anders (n. 8 above) plates 50-52, are in the possession of Marchese Leonardo Ginori Lisci, Florence. They are held by two carved wooden gilded Indians (not Moors). See *Gli ultimi Medici: il tardo barocco a Firenze*, 1670-1743, Exhibition catalogue (Florence 1974) 394, no. 226. For such jars in public and private collections in Madrid, see Genaro Estrada, *El arte mexicano en España*. Enciclopedia ilustrada mexicana 5 (Mexico 1937) 55 ff. Concerning a lost stone knife which may have been Mexican and was formerly in the Medici collection, see n. 20 above.

In the Laurentian Library, Florence, there are 82 coloured pen drawings of maps, city plans, ships, views of harbours and towns of non-European countries, and four drawings of Negroes. Inscriptions are in Spanish; they originally came from the Medici villa, Castello, and were attached to canvas, each with six numbers which can be connected to Medici inventories. They were restored in 1974. There is a view of Mexico City signed and dated by Juan Gomez de Trasmonte, 1628, a map of Mexico City also dated 1628, and a view of Veracruz. In part badly preserved, the drawings all seem to be by the same hand. See handwritten catalogue no. 24 in the Laurentian Library: *Carte geografiche gia nella Villa Reale di Castello*. For two non-Mexican pre-Columbian objects probably from the Medici collections, a necklace and a wooden bowl, see Enrico Hillyer Giglioli, "Intorno a due rari cimeli precolombiani dalle Antille, molto probabilmente da San Domingo, conservati nel Museo etnografico di Firenze," in *Verhandlungen des XVI. Internationalen Amerikanisten-Kongresses Wien, 1908*, International Congress of the Americanists, Proceedings, 1908 (Vienna 1910) 313-320. These two pieces are also discussed by Schweeger-Hefel (n. 34 above). Her supposition that they originally belonged to the collection of Cardinal Leopoldo de' Medici is mistaken, as she confused the latter with Grand Duke Peter Leopold of Lorraine. The pieces were treated again, together with comparable objects from the West Indies, by Bernado Vega de Boyrie, "Un cinturón tejido y una careta de madera de Santo Domingo, del periodo de transculturación Taino-Español," *Boletin del Museo del Hombre Dominicano* 3 (1973) 199 ff.

53. See Carmichael (n. 52 above) 34-35 n. 1 and 2, and p. 37.

54. For the family, see Cesare da Prato, *Firenze ai Demidoff. Pratolino e S. Donato* (Florence 1886) 58 ff. For the mask, see Carmichael (n. 52 above) 36 n. 6 with further bibliography. Lehmann, "Altmexikanische Mosaiken" (n. 2 above) 321 ventures the assumption that the mask is an otherwise missing one referred to in the Medici inventories. See also Heikamp and Anders (n. 8 above) 34 f.


56. Bushnell (n. 52 above) 244-245.


58. Now in the Museo Preistorico Etnografico Luigi Pigorini; see Giglioli (n. 55 above) 392.

59. Bushnell (n. 52 above) 244 n. 1. For the bibliography, see von Winning (n. 29 above).

60. Liceti, *Pyronarcha; sive de fulminum natura* (Padua 1634) 123 ff. describes the knife: "Simulachrum hoc feminea facie, capite velis, ac vittis circumplexum, reliquo corpore magna ex parte nudum, zona ad lumbos praecinctum; capite, collo, crunibusque contractis coronatum; (etsi coronam crurum et colli sculptor non expresserit) cum tetrae cauda
praestigio, ex ligno ad laurinum inclinante fragmentis rudium lapillorum diversi coloris incrustato compactum, manibus fulgentem lapidem olim mucronatum vibrans . . . . Praeterea vero simulachrum fabrefactum est ex ligno quodam, quod egregio Gaffarello simulachri possessori videtur esse Laurinum . . . . Lignum hoc praeterea superficietenus vndique tectum est, ac velut incrustatum minutis lapillis diversicoloribus, non politis, at scabris, atque diffactis ad figuram irregularem, vt indicaretur, vim fulminis esse, omnia vel durissima quaeque diffingere. Colores autem lapillorum ldolum contegentium quatuor sunt, ruber, flavus, viridis, & caeruleus . . . .

"Ita ergo satis verisimile nobis est, superius effigiatum Idolum, fuisse simulachrum fulminis in Libyae phano priscis adoratione veneratum. Gaudeat igitur in sinu sibi nobilis Vir Gaffarellius tam rarae antiquitatis possessor."

Pigorini, "Gli antichi oggetti" (n. 16 above) 33 brought attention to this publication and also proposed that Gaffarellius be identified as Jacob Gaffarell. As far as the present writer knows, the woodcut from Licet has never been reproduced in modern literature.

61. Pigorini, "Gli antichi oggetti" (n. 16 above) 341 f. For the full bibliography on this type of bone rattle, see Hasso von Winning, "A Decorated Bone Rattle from Culhuacan, Mexico," American Antiquity 25 (1959) 86-93.

62. In the folder for the acquisitions from Bologna, Museo Preistorico Etnografico Luigi Pigorini, Archives, "Si tratta di un antico oggetto messicano di legno (non l'ho veduto, e non posso quindi descriverlo) coperto di mosaico, conservato dalla Duchessa di Rignano. Dalle informazioni avute, dovrebbe avere gli stessi caratteri dei mosaici messicani da me tempo fa illustrati . . . . se non che in luogo di una maschera o di un manico di pugnale rappresenterebbe una specie di insegna."

Images in the Arts
The discovery of America and the Spanish Conquest of Mexico in 1519-21 brought about the confrontation of two radically different societies. The ensuing struggle resulted in the almost complete annihilation of the autochthonous civilizations which were overwhelmed by Spanish culture, especially in the plastic arts. The triumph of Spain was not complete, however, since elements in Mexico even today demonstrate survivals of the native past. George Kubler, in discussing both the survival and the extinction of pre-Columbian art motifs, evoked a sliding scale and a vocabulary to demonstrate why some things, such as certain New World plants, were accepted by Europeans in the colony, and others, such as religion and art, were not allowed to survive in the colonial world. Within an amazingly short period of time after the Conquest the materials, forms, subject matter, iconography, and even the spirit of the European artist infiltrated pre-Conquest art and produced the early colonial styles.

But what influence, if any, did the discovery of America and pre-
Conquest Mexican art have on European art? What pre-Conquest works of art reached Europe, and what vestiges of native art surviving into the colonial world passed through the Atlantic filter to Europe? How were the first native images of America received in Europe, and did they survive to exert any influence upon European artists?

Answers to these questions pose complex problems in terminology. To find them we will consider early colonial manuscript painting as the representative artistic genre because of its relatively longer survival into the colonial period than the other plastic arts. For native art did not die as suddenly among the manuscript painters as among the jade and rock crystal lapidaries, the builders of the pyramids, the makers of religious and ritual costumes, or the carvers of wood and the casters of gold and silver. For at least three generations after the Conquest of Mexico a style survived in the works of the manuscript painters which combined elements of the native past and the Spanish present. It could potentially have influenced the artists of Europe, especially since it combined the exotic forms of the New World with sufficient traits from European art to render it acceptable to Europeans. It can also be compared in a meaningful fashion with European painting.

Mexican manuscript painting will be considered in comparison and contrast with European works under three distinct aspects: iconographic, the figures the painter uses to convey intellectual concepts or meaning; material, the materials used, such as paper and canvas and the tools and techniques of the artist; and finally, the formal characteristics, the style of the artist and his handling of forms, especially human ones—linear versus painterly, two-dimensional versus three-dimensional, conceptual versus perceptual, and the presence or absence of devices for showing light and shade, among others.

For the native artist, objects in nature with cylindrical or spherical shapes such as legs and skulls are shown essentially as two-dimensional objects, thus losing their plasticity (fig.*52). Shoulders and arms, bare or draped, appear in frontal view, while legs are seen in side view with the loin cloth in frontal view. Where the third dimension must be shown, overlap is permitted but is qualified by a hierarchy of forms. Important forms such as heads can overlap arms just as they are proportionally larger than their respective bodies.

In native art colors are painted within sharply-defined linear boundaries or frame lines, which do not vary significantly in width. No shading qualifies these flat areas of color. The parts composing the human figure and its attributes also preserve their integrity. One limb does not blend into another; an arm is an arm, a leg a leg, and neither blends into the trunk where it would lose its isolation as a form. Unity is achieved by juxtaposition rather than by shapes and forms flowing into
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one another. Figures are distinguished from one another by clothing or paraphernalia rather than individual distinctions among figures. There is no portraiture, but name signs identify some figures and help to fill blank spaces.

The composition as a whole exhibits the same unitary view. Two-dimensional forms are sifted evenly over a page, enhancing its two-dimensionality. Figures "in front" are below, and those "behind" are above. The setting for the figures, human or divine, is also two-dimensional. Architecture is often merely a combination of front and side view, the so-called "T-elevation." A pond with a figure in it appears in cross-section; a field tilts on its side. A mountain becomes a flat object or a place sign. There is, in short, no landscape; native place signs are flat symbolic forms rather than specific scenes.

Native style is essentially conceptual, an art in which conventional forms represent classes of objects rather than the specific forms of nature in portraiture and landscape. The native artist apparently adds nothing beyond what is required to convey the meaning. His art functions mostly as a vehicle for iconographic content.

In contrast, European art of the sixteenth century is three-dimensional. Objects consistently appear as in nature. If the legs are shown in profile, so is the rest of the body. A spear can be held so that it crosses the face of the thrower, even if this detracts from the importance of the face. Colors vary from light to dark (chiaroscuro) or even from color to color to achieve on a flat surface the variations of light and shade in nature and thus give an illusion of the third dimension. As a rule lines are used sparingly, since they are rare in nature. Their width can be varied to indicate lost edges and rounded shapes, or they can be employed for hatching and modeling. Anatomy dictates the articulation of body parts. The body and its appendages form a unified whole rather than a mere juxtaposition of separate parts. In keeping with the humanist philosophy of the period, forms are perceived through the eyes of one beholder from a single fixed viewpoint.

When the artist's vision of the world is perceptual in this way, the world is three-dimensional. Architectural scenes will be drawn with linear one-point perspective, and the landscape will have depth and atmosphere. The European artist, unlike the native artist, did not work with such rigid iconographic restrictions. He could add details for their own sake or for embellishment.

It is important to stress here that our demonstration does not concern the influence of New World objects upon Old World painters. An animal such as an ocelot drawn from a specimen in a European zoo, or a plant from a botanical garden, is not germane to our demonstration; a person or object drawn by a Mexican artist in a Mexican style influ-
encing an artist in Europe is. The Old World derivative would ideally stand on the three legs of our tripod—iconography, material, and form. However, at least two legs of the tripod must be present for the example to be acceptable. For example, if the material is European paper (not native fig-bark paper) but the iconography and form are native, then we have an illustration of passage through the Atlantic filter. Material and form are a somewhat more significant pair than iconography and material as defining characteristics. Iconographic information, divorced from materials and form, was often transferred through written texts alone and thus does not necessarily represent the movement of the plastic arts through the Atlantic filter.

What works of Mexican art from the native pre-Conquest world actually reached Europe? The first wave of pre-Columbian art to reach Europe after the Conquest of Mexico was the gifts which Cortés received from Montezuma and then sent to the Emperor Charles V in 1519. Dürer admired them in 1520 while they were being exhibited in the town hall of Brussels and wrote in his journal how they impressed him in their materials and craftsmanship. But he does not seem to have permitted them to influence his style nor even to have copied them as a personal record of what he saw at the exhibition. Cortés' gifts remain to this day in the Museum für Völkerkunde in Vienna, the former imperial capital of the Hapsburg. They originally included objects of gold and silver; featherwork headdresses, shields, and fans; wooden objects such as masks, atlatls, and sacrificial knife handles, some covered with gold and mosaic; and two manuscript books painted in the pre-Conquest pictorial "writing."

Another arrival was a group of small stone pieces, many of them made of Mexican jade; they are reproduced in Detlef Heikamp's thorough and indispensable studies. One such piece is found in the Munich Schatzkammer or treasure room of the Residenz of the ruling family of Bavaria. A small green mask, supposedly Olmec, it was mounted in Europe in a small niche decorated with silver gilt, gilded bronze, gold, enamel, greenstone, onyx, rubies, and diamonds. The mask serves as the head of a bust-length figure with arms and other details of green enamel colored to match the green jade. Other pre-Conquest jades appearing in the Medici collections in Florence have been placed in similar, if less elaborate, Renaissance or Baroque settings. These pieces and others of onyx and a variety of stones went into the Wunderkammern and Kunstkammern of princely collectors of the time, especially in Germany and Italy, where the Medici in particular gathered together in Florence one of the greatest collections in Europe.

Easily transportable too were early colonial manuscripts, no longer
pre-Columbian in style but already acculturated by European artistic techniques and representational methods. For instance, the Codex Mendoza was commissioned by the viceroy Mendoza and painted about 1541-50 in order to portray the Indians of Mexico to the king of Spain and his court (fig. 53). Be before it reached Spain, however, it fell into the hands of French pirates and went first to France and then to England. Also Europeanized were other early colonial manuscripts such as the Codex Telleriano-Remensis. The various illuminated manuscripts by Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, painted in the mid- and late sixteenth century, are in some passages markedly European and show little understanding of native art forms (figs. 54-57). Sahagún intended his manuscripts, which are encyclopedias of Indian life, to be used in the work of conversion of the Indians in Mexico. But instead they
were sent to Europe where they languished in libraries and administrative archives until discovered and published in the early twentieth century.

Other works of colonial origin which came to Europe are the famous featherwork bishops’ mitres and ecclesiastical garments now in Austria, Spain, and Italy, and the screens with scenes from Mexican life now in Madrid. The mitres and ecclesiastical garments using the native Mexican materials and techniques are completely European in form and iconography, while the screens are also European except for their subject matter—scenes from colonial, that is, Europeanized Mexican life. Still later works from the colonial period include large-scale ceramics such as the vases from Guadalajara in the Quirinale Palace collections in Rome and others in the Medici collections in Florence. Although probably made by Mexicans, these vases are so European in material, form, and iconographic content that those in the Quirinale Palace passed as Austrian until quite recently. Neither the mitres and ecclesiastical garments nor the screens and ceramics transmit native Mexican art styles and forms to Europe. They signal the return of European artistic traditions after a sojourn in the New World.

But the true test of the influence of Mexican art consists not in the number of objects, either pre-Conquest or colonial, which went to Europe but in how Europeans were influenced by them. In actuality, only a few European paintings of New World Indians, European derivatives from early colonial manuscripts, and a number of prints exhibit such influence.

The Florentine Mannerist Ludovico Buti frescoed the ceiling of the Armoury of the Uffizi Gallery in 1588 with battle scenes of Christians and heathens including scenes from the Conquest of Mexico (fig. 58).
Figure 58.

AMBULABUM REGIAE

IN DIBUS CEBUL VI LAEILA 1592. TABULA MEMORABIL.

AD. BENEDICTOS.

Ipsi fuit exemplum regum in libro, quod est Roma, in bibliotheca Vaticana, in quo descriptum est unus simulacrum, quae celebant eius adoratis sacrificia. Mexicanis, universis ceremoniis et rituis expeditis, et Kalendis suis fecerunt, ditum et gloriam divinam, quem colerriget et complectitur F. Petrus a Rios, sodalicy municipi Fratum.

Nam hic idola erant

Et adcolent. Quod inter aliae, in capite, adoratorum speciebus, sancti locum, sedea veloci, sanctificato locum, describit, simulabrum, similis et incensoguil

Mexicanum sua celestibus ritibus spectata est, aqua, notabatur et huminmodus simulacrum. Observationem, et quomodo

et sanctissimus memoriam defenderat.
Fig. 59.

Notebook probably by Felippe de Winghe, fol. 58r.
Fig. 60.

West Indies Landscape by Jan Mostaert, ca. 1523-25.

Fig. 61.

Window Rock, Arizona.
Fig. 66.

Horsemen in feather skirts. Etching from Balthasar Küchler, Repraesentatio der Fürstlichen Auffzug und Ritterspi... (1611).

Fig. 68.

Floats, horsemen, and Moor in feather skirt, Heidelberg 1613.
Fig. 69.

Figure probably representing America. Watercolor from a tournament book, Nuremberg, late sixteenth century.

Fig. 70.

Indian. Drawing by Giulio Parigi, early seventeenth century.
TIMBALIER ET TROMPETTE INDIENS.

A Coiffure du Timbalier étoit un grand Perroquet, accompagné de deux petits sur
Fig. 73.

Indian Drummer and Trumpeter. Engraving by François Chauveau from Ch. Perrault, Courses de testes et de bagues faites par le roy . . . 1662 (Paris 1670).
Using a purely European technique, fresco, Buti painted in European, more particularly in Renaissance traditions of form, modeling, and three-dimensional space. Suggesting the grotesques of Raphael in the Vatican, which in turn derived from classical Roman painting, the Uffizi ceilings are decorated with exotic foliage and garlands with New World birds framing the main scenes. The numerous depictions of Mexican Indians, though painted according to European canons of proportion, anatomy, and light and shade, are fairly accurate in their details of native costume and even weapons.

The Medici collections in the Uffizi included weapons from all parts of the world, exotic costumes, and curiosities of natural history as well as works of art and objects from the Indies, and the Armoury was originally used as an exhibit hall for them. Heikamp has suggested that the Mexican costumes in the Buti frescoes also appear in the Codex Florentino of Sahagún painted in Mexico in 1578-79. If true, the Florentine Codex must have been in Florence by 1588 for Buti to see, which would explain the relatively high degree of accuracy in depicting the costumes, the weapons and their use. So in terms of costume and subject matter, these paintings were definitely influenced by Mexican early colonial art.

Another early colonial pictorial manuscript is the Codex Telleriano-Remensis. Painted about 1549-50, and already Europeanized technically to some extent in its use of perspective and unified figures, the Codex Telleriano-Remensis, like the Codex Mendoza, was painted on imported European paper rather than native Mexican amatl or bark paper. Retention of the original black paint in the lines of the paintings and in some of the manuscript glosses indicates the use of native ink, but the presence of
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a brown, faded-from-black ink in other glosses indicates a European ink too. The historical section of the manuscript shows a misunderstanding of native historical “writing,” but the original forms of pre-Columbian iconography seem to have persisted more clearly in the section on religion. 19

Another manuscript, the Codex Rios, derives from the Codex Telleriano-Remensis directly or via an intermediary manuscript now lost but recorded as being in the de Rosny collection in Paris in 1875. 20 The glosses written in Italian, with a few Spanish words and phrases, and other internal evidence tell us that it was painted by Pedro del Rios or Pietro del Rio in Rome between 1566 and 1589. In the Codex Rios the pre-Conquest style has further deteriorated. The colors no longer remain within the linear boundaries as they do in the Codex Telleriano-Remensis, but it is still relatively close to Telleriano-Remensis in terms of iconography though somewhat less so in formal characteristics.

Pages in a codex in the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome, nos. 1564 and 1551 (fig. 59), from a notebook probably made by Felipe de Winghe in the late sixteenth century, derive in turn from the Codex Rios. 21 The forms have become so European as to be a world apart from its two predecessors, and materials, including the ink, are totally European. Similarly with iconographic content, key details of costume and the distinctive attributes of deities are reduced to such an extent that in some instances we can no longer identify the gods from the drawings without having recourse to the written captions. One notes with some surprise, for instance, the absence of the “glyphs” of the native writing system. Formal characteristics also have been radically changed. The Angelica Codex, in other words, translates early colonial forms into Old World forms and loses much New World meaning in the process.

The de Winghe manuscript serves as the link between the Codex Rios and certain woodcuts made by Lorenzo Pignoria of the Mexican gods, first published in 1615 as an addendum to Vincenzo Cartari’s Vere e nove imagini. 22 Pignoria also derived some of his material from López de Gómara and other published written sources rather than from visual sources only. Thus the iconographic content often does not reflect knowledge of New World shapes and forms. The gods are reduced to the formal proportions and anatomy of European art with almost no visual relationship to the remote pre-Columbian originals. In some cases what remains from Mexico is the caption, nothing more.

The print illustrations of Fray Diego Valadés’ work, Rhetorica christiana (Perugia 1579), on the other hand, were supposedly made in Mexico or by an artist who had lived in Mexico, yet there is little Mexican about them. 23 The use of the European print technique and European three-dimensional space and forms to illustrate native subject matter even
suggests they are the work of a European using written or oral sources. Valadés' book is sixteenth-century, and such misunderstanding of Aztec architecture so soon after the Conquest is quite remarkable, if Mexican. Even in sixteenth-century Europe we would expect an artist to have enough access to drawings or verbal descriptions to acquire a level of accuracy at least comparable to that in the Buti paintings.

Verbal descriptions must have been the stimulus for a series of widely known book illustrations from the Baroque period. Again, they demonstrate no knowledge of native shapes and forms but are a European artist's attempt at faithfully rendering a written text. By then much of the knowledge of the actual shapes and forms of the Mexican past was lost even in Mexico. Idols had been destroyed, temples and pyramids razed, manuscripts burned. Even colonial redactions of older manuscripts were out of circulation and kept in private or monastic libraries, in Mexico itself just as in Europe. Potential pictorial sources for the artist preserved in manuscripts were lost in libraries, archives, and the collections of the Wunderkammer.

**Why did native Mexican art have so little impact on European art?** First, there is no evidence that the best transmitter of Mexican influences, a native or early colonial artist trained in pre-Conquest artistic traditions, ever crossed over to Europe, or, conversely, that any European artist working in Mexico ever learned to work in a native style.

Second, few pre-Columbian objects probably followed the first wave of gifts sent to Europe, for they would have been in short supply within a few years after the Conquest. The Conquest itself resulted in the widespread and systematic destruction of original works of pre-Columbian art, particularly ritual objects, paraphernalia, and weapons. The "spiritual conquest" that followed effectively cut off the further production of "things pagan," as their continued manufacture would tend to preserve the native religion and pre-Conquest life style which the Spanish crown intended to suppress. Therefore, if works with native iconography, style, and materials did not arrive in Europe shortly after the Spanish Conquest, they would probably not arrive at all.

Third, as the sixteenth century wore on, a change occurred in the Spanish attitude toward curios from the New World. Early in the century the Emperor Charles V had displayed his gifts from the New World in Brussels for all Europe to come and see. Under his successor, Philip II the Prudent, who reigned as king of Spain from 1556 to 1598, this attitude changed radically. Philip, jealous of the purity of the Christian faith at home and anxious for it in Mexico, could not tolerate paganism in art any more than religion. He sent a Royal Cedula or order
to Mexico dated 1577 to call to Spain all the writings of the encyclopedist monk Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, with their rich world of illuminated figures, and forbade any further such writings as Sahagún’s manuscripts, which were a compilation of what was known about native life of the time and what could be remembered of the pre-Conquest past, including its religion. 27

In Spain, then, policy would seem to have dictated a conspiracy of silence. Public display of native art would have been public acknowledgment that Spanish religious policy and conversion had failed. One way that the pagan and native past could survive, however, was through its necessary inclusion in the official epic story of the Spanish Conquest. 28

The achievement of the conquerors was dependent on a proper recognition of the enemy’s merits.

Thus initial European curiosity about the New World and the literature of the Conquest preserved some examples of Mexican art, but no evidence indicates European appreciation of Mexican art to the extent that it was able to achieve recognition as a valid artistic expression to be considered in the same light as European art. 29 The precarious survival during the colonial period of a limited number of examples in European archives and princely collections did not result in a significant influence on European artists before the general twentieth-century interest in “primitive art.” 30 And even now, the influence of the art of pre-Columbian Mexico, essentially the product of a dead civilization, on the sculpture of Henry Moore and the architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright must be pursued in detail. The influence of the living cultures of Africa and Oceania on artists such as Picasso and Gauguin is much more widely known and easily recognized than the influence of pre-Columbian art of the Americas.

NOTES

3. Donald Robertson, “The Pinturas (Maps) of the Relaciones Geográficas, With a Catalog by Donald and Martha Barton Robertson,” in Handbook of Middle American Indians 12, Guide to Ethnohistorical Sources, Part 1 (Austin 1972) 243-278; see especially 256-257, “Table 1—Graphic Style,” detailing the differences between native and European painting with explanatory notes.
4. The drawings of Christoph Weiditz of the Aztec Indians whom Cortés took to Spain in 1528-29, discussed in Howard F. Cline, “Hernando Cortés and the Aztec Indians in Spain,” Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress 26 (1969) 70-90, do not qualify as a native influence on European art. Weiditz, a German, drew these Indians,
Although New World subject matter, as he would have drawn Spaniards, in a completely European style.


7. Detlef Heikamp, with contributions by Ferdinand Anders, Mexico and the Medici (Florence 1972) and Detlef Heikamp, "Les Médicis et le Nouveau Monde," L'Oeil 144 (1966) 16-23. See also Heikamp's article on this subject in this collection, 455-482.


9. Elizabeth Carmichael, Turquoise Mosaics from Mexico (London 1970) is important not only for its account but also for its bibliography and leads given for unraveling the past history of Mexican objects in the British Museum that came from Florence and elsewhere in Italy; see also Maudslay (n. 5 above) for an excellent pioneering study. For accounts of European princely collections see Francis Henry Taylor, The Taste of Angels (Boston 1948) and Heikamp (notes 7 and 8 above). For a fundamental study of European attitudes toward the New World, see Benjamin Keen, The Aztec Image in Western Thought (New Brunswick, N. J. 1971).


15. Heikamp, Mexico and the Medici (n. 7 above) 19-22, plates 28-34, and his "Les Médicis et le Nouveau Monde" (n. 7 above) 17, plate 2.
19. See n. 11 above; also Robertson (n. 2 above) 109-110.
22. See Heikamp, in this collection, 478 n. 30.
24. See the article by William C. Sturtevant, “First Visual Images of Native America,” in this collection, 417-454. See also Keen (n. 9 above) passim.
25. The short supply of modest authentic pre-Columbian objects for secular persons to send back to Europe as trivial curiosities was felt early in the colonial period and resulted in the making of forgeries, a craft which flourishes in Mexico up to the present time. See Leopoldo Batres, *Antigüedades mejicanas falsificadas; falsificación y falsificadores* (Mexico 1910).
29. For a study of changing attitudes through time toward pre-Columbian sculpture see Justino Fernández, *Coatlucue, Estética del arte indígena antiguo*, intro. by Samuel Ramos, Estudios de arte y estética 3 (ed. 2 Mexico 1959).
Jan Mostaert's
West Indies Landscape
by James Snyder

Carel van Mander, the first historian of Netherlandish art, published his "Book of Painters" (Het Schilder-boeck) in Haarlem in 1604. A Haarlemer himself, Van Mander tended to dwell on the accomplishments of the early Haarlem painters in landscape painting; one very interesting description appears in his biography of Jan Mostaert, an early sixteenth-century painter. He had seen an unusual piece in the house of Mostaert’s grandson: “A West Indies Landscape with many naked folk, a curious protruding cliff, and strange constructions of huts and houses.” Since the major expeditions to the West Indies had barely begun, one might question such an unusual subject, but the landscape, in Mostaert’s style, was discovered in 1909 by Edward Weiss in a private collection in Scheveningen. Today the panel is in the Frans Hals Museum in Haarlem.

Mostaert’s unusual landscape is probably the earliest known painted representation of the Americas by a major European artist. Its most engaging problem is the probable New World location of the scene. In 1931 Edouard Michel, attempting to identify the event and setting
more precisely, argued that it represented the conquests of Cortés in central Mexico, and that Mostaert executed the work for Margaret of Austria, ca. 1523-25, just after reports of the spectacular discoveries of gold in the Aztec cities had reached Europe. Margaret was a patron of Mostaert during those years, and the sponsor of the past expedition, Charles V, was Margaret's nephew and had been her ward at Mechelen. Charles had sent her news of the New World discoveries as well as a few souvenirs for her collection of artifacts. Michel's interpretation sounds good and it was accepted by most scholars of his time, including Friedländer and Hoogewerff, both experts on early Netherlandish art.

In 1948 Professor van Luttervelt challenged Michel's identification, pointing out two obvious flaws: (1) nowhere in the landscape are the colorfully costumed Aztecs, and (2) nowhere are the fabulous cities of Mexico reported by Cortés. For Luttervelt the panel depicts a more primitive land inhabited by nude natives who live in simple dwellings, and he concluded that the painting depicts the exploits of Coronado in the American Southwest, 1540-42. Luttervelt argued that the landscape was based on sketches made on the site and sent back to Europe. He recognized in the distant natural bridge a formation which resembled Window Rock in Arizona. The ladders reaching from one level of the cliff to another had been inspired by cliff-dwellings. The actual scene depicted was probably Coronado's skirmish with the Indians of Cibola, the "Seven Cities of Gold," where the Spanish believed large stores of gold and silver objects were to be found. The quest for the treasures of the Seven Cities of Gold—lying in an area between New Mexico, Arizona, and California—was, in fact, the whole purpose of the costly expedition.

The event recorded in the painting is the invasion of some primitive land by European soldiers, most likely Spanish conquistadores. They have arrived by sea in ships anchored in the distant bay to the far right. The landscape itself is very much like other mannerist panoramas by Mostaert in which one finds the same natural bridge and sprawling mountain ranges delicately rendered under a bright blue sky filled with scallop-shaped clouds. The striated mountain in the center, however, is a curious detail—van Mander made special note of it—and van Luttervelt's identification of the landscape as that in New Mexico and Arizona is persuasive. But can this landscape be considered an accurate topographical reproduction of some actual site transmitted to the artist by drawings made there?

In the seventeenth century, when van Mander saw the picture, the term "West Indies" still referred to all of the New World and not just the islands. The painting, therefore, could represent any number of expeditions, including the campaigns of Columbus in 1492-93, Cortés in 1519,
De Soto in 1539, Pizarro in 1531, or Coronado in 1540. But this particular depiction of nude Indians living in a primitive village at the foot of a high striated cliff and encountering soldiers equipped with cannons, best reflects the accounts of Coronado’s expedition. One detail is unaccounted for: the natives of Cibola wore rather elaborate costumes whereas these Indians lack clothes. Still, some particular event seems to be depicted and it could well be Coronado’s first major battle when he reached Cibola (either at the village of Ka-Kima or Kawikuh—15 miles southwest of Zuni on the border in New Mexico). Mostaert’s representation of the encounter does not seem precise enough, however, to be based on field sketches or even on a detailed account of the episode. Indeed, the encounter is merely a setting for an imaginative reconstruction of what Mostaert believed to be some lost primitive society in the New World where man still lived as in an Ovidian Golden Age. Mostaert apparently had access to some accounts of Coronado’s journey, perhaps merely by word of mouth, but he freely picked or remembered those details which suited his own conception of what a primitive society would be like. In other words, Mostaert’s West Indies landscape is not a true history painting but an imaginative reconstruction—even a pastiche. Just what diverse elements Mostaert drew upon becomes clearer when we review what sixteenth-century Europe knew of Coronado’s adventures.

The expedition to the Seven Cities of Gold is well documented, including Coronado’s own letters. About 20 years afterward, Pedro de Castañeda, a soldier in Coronado’s army, wrote the most complete account in a history of the campaigns; he presumably based his work on an early diary. Mostaert did not know Castañeda’s history, but similar accounts were probably brought to him by the “noble visitors” whom van Mander mentions; through his connections with the court in Mechelen, he perhaps even had access to some written accounts. As in many such “historical” sketches, whether written or painted, one or more notable incidents could serve to bestow some sense of authority on it. The incident seems to be the stoning of Coronado in the first village of Cibola on 24 June 1540, as reported by Castañeda. Indians hurled rocks at the Captain from cliffs at the entrance to the village, and Coronado would probably not have survived had his two officers not raced to his rescue and warded off the advancing Indians. In the painting one commander helps Coronado to his feet.

The most striking feature of Mostaert’s landscape is the terraced cliff with horizontal striations. This is a topographical feature of Cibola. Castañeda describes in detail the ladders reaching from one level to the other, the simple huts or shrines built within them, and the shelter atop the cliff for the elderly sentinel. Another significant detail: the leader of
the advancing natives is an elderly man with a long white beard, as is the sentinel who shouts from the hilltop. According to Castañeda these tribes were generally ruled by elders. One of the most colorful figures in Coronado’s dealings with the Zuni was a chieftain from Pecos, affectionately nicknamed Bigotes (“Big Whiskers”) by the Spaniards. It was also the practice in some villages, Castañeda continues, to have elderly chieftains or priests stand in huts on the heights of the village to make proclamations or shout instructions in times of need.

The village in the valley below the towering cliff, however, in no way resembles the Zuni villages as Castañeda describes them, and the
natives should be colorfully garbed and not nude. But the settlement and its inhabitants are in keeping with another tribe encountered by Melchior Díaz, one of Coronado’s officers who left the main company with a band of soldiers on the Sonora River before Coronado reached Cibola. Díaz and his troops marched back to the west coast of Mexico, then along the Gulf of California to the mouth of the Colorado River in southwestern Arizona, also searching for the lost Cities of Gold. Castañeda’s description of their journey was based on secondhand informa-
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tion, but other accounts may have described this campaign as well. Castañeda writes that Díaz encountered tribes of tall, naked men who lived in large straw cabins built into the earth like smokehouses, with part of the straw roof projecting above the ground just as they do on Mostaert’s painting. Perhaps Castañeda exaggerates, but he says that these earthen huts were often large enough to house a hundred old and young members of the tribe.

As for the animals in the landscape, Mostaert misunderstood the descriptions of the strange breed of cattle—buffalo—that roamed the plains, and the large sheep kept by certain tribes. His animals would be familiar to any Dutch peasant, with the exception of the monkey and the parrot perched on the tree stump in the lower left foreground, which are simply exotic additions, long known in Europe, to enhance an otherwise typically bucolic landscape.

The view of a distant sea in the far right corner presents no real problem. Not only was this a convention for mannerist landscapes in Mostaert’s day, just as the natural bridge was, but it could be justified as an allusion to the Spanish coming to the New World by sea or, perhaps, to the ships of Coronado’s naval commander who sailed the Mexican coast to the mouth of the Colorado. Its remoteness suggests that it is at best a marginal aspect of the story.

The historical moment depicted in the middleground, the stoning of Coronado, is but a minor detail in Mostaert’s landscape. The people, their exotic primitive abodes, and their animals are the real subjects. In a way, Mostaert shares with the Italian painter Piero di Cosimo (who executed one of the earliest series on the origins of man and civilization) a sympathetic attitude toward a strange people whom the Middle Ages would have satirized as grotesque descendants of the Wild Men, the barbaric tribes of the northern forests. Mostaert portrays them as dedicated family groups banded together in a communal society. In the lower left corner a wife beseeches her husband not to join the others in combat; older men lead the younger to meet the invaders; and the spontaneity of their coming together in this time of need generally contrasts with the rigid regimentation of the advancing Spanish army. To Mostaert, theirs was a primitive and tranquil paradise; and the cows and sheep gently grazing in the meadow across from the village enhance this image.

While Piero di Cosimo’s representations of early man were taken directly from classical theories of primitivism, Mostaert’s interpretation seems to me to stem from diverse sources which are only vaguely literary. For him this is the paradise of the innocents, a garden-like Eden invaded by peoples of a much more advanced civilization, whom we implicitly condemn. The atrocities committed by the invaders of the New
Jan Mostaert's West Indies Landscape

World were a point of concern even before Coronado's campaigns. Priests who accompanied the conquistadores told of the brutal massacre of thousands of Indians, whom they considered friendly and gentle. Such reports became a controversial issue at the court of Charles V. In 1542 the emperor wrote a strongly-worded proclamation to his governors, forbidding atrocities, and on his return to Spain, Coronado was himself dismissed from his post partially for that reason. In light of these facts, Mostaert's painting, while not a true Historienbild, serves as an important historical document for European impressions and attitudes of the New World only a few decades after the westward adventures began.

NOTES

1. Carel van Mander, Het Schilderboeck (Haarlem and Alkmaar 1604) fol. 129v: "een Landschap, wesende een West-Indien, met veel nacekt volck, met een bootsghe Clip, en vreemt gebouw van huyzen en hutten."
   The painting (oak panel, 86.5 x 152.5 cm.) was placed in the Museum van Stolk in Haarlem in 1912, no. 408, and later sold in Amsterdam 8-9 May 1928. It was purchased by N. Beets, Amsterdam, and from there it passed to the J. Goudstikker Collection in Amsterdam in 1936. It was finally acquired by the Dienst voor ‘s Rijks Verspreide Kunsten (Haarlem, Frans Hals Museum, no. 17). The panel, in fair condition, has been restored in parts. The tiny banner carried by the soldiers in the far right background apparently carried originally the red cross of Saint Andrew, the flag of the Spanish conquistadores—however, see n. 6 below for E. Larsen’s views.
6. There are numerous studies of Coronado’s expedition and the legends of Cibola: see especially Adolf F. Bandelier, The Gilded Man (El Dorado) (New York 1893) 11-257; and Contributions to the History of the Southwestern Portion of the United States, Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America—America series 5 (Cambridge, Mass. 1890). For texts relating the events of the campaign see George P. Winship, “The Coronado Expedition, 1540-1542” Fourteenth Annual Report of the U. S. Bureau of American Ethnology (Washington 1896) Part I, 329-613 (with an excellent bibliography), and The Journey of Coronado (New York 1904). A useful commentary is included in Spanish Explorers in the Southern United States—1528-1543, ed. F. W. Hodge (New York 1907) 273-387. More recently Eric Larsen has suggested that the event is the invasion of Brazil by the Portuguese, but I find his arguments difficult to follow: E. Larsen, “Once More Jan Mostaert’s West-Indian Landscape,” Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire de l’art offerts au professeur Jacques Lavallée (Louvain 1970) 127-137. Larsen identifies the scene as that of the invasion of Brazil by the Portuguese army about 1550. The Indians are those of the Tupinamba tribe. Larsen further argues that the earlier Spanish flag carried by the soldiers was a later addition, according to restoration reports. He also claims that the
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parrot on the stump in the foreground is a direct reference to Brazil as the “Land of the Parrots.”

Cf. Henri van de Waal, Drie Eeuwen Vaderlandsche Geschied-uitbeelding, 1500-1800 (The Hague 1952) 91; E. Reznicek, “Jan Mostaert . . . Episode uit de verovering van Amerika,” Openbaar Kunstbezit, 19a, IV, 1960, agrees with van de Waal (and N. Beets) that the event is the landing of Columbus on Goanin as described in the ship’s journal of 13 January 1493.

7. Cf. Otto Kurz, “Recent Research” The Burlington Magazine 92 (1950) 239; van de Waal (n. 6 above) 91 n. 8. Both scholars question van Luttervelt’s suggestion that Mostaert’s landscape is based on accurate topographical views made on the site. Van de Waal rightly points out that the landscape is much in the tradition of contemporary Netherlandish types.


9. See note 6 above.

10. See Hodge’s edition of Spanish Explorers (n. 6 above) for text and commentary.

11. E. Panofsky (n. 8 above) 33-68 (“The Early History of Man in Two Cycles of Paintings by Piero di Cosimo”).

America in Festival Presentations

by Suzanne Boorsch

If a prize were given for the greatest number of appearances in European fêtes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Hercules would win hands down, just as he was victorious in all his combats of classical mythology. Those who decided what form the celebrations for special occasions would take turned far more frequently for subject matter toward Greek antiquity, to the gods and heroes on or near Olympus, than westward to the New World. Nonetheless, America does appear in festivals, and a quick view of the time, place, and form of some of the appearances may add to our understanding of the idea our ancestors held of the New World.¹

In numerical terms, America appears quite often. But to say that I can list some 70 fêtes between 1492 and 1700 in which America figures is not particularly useful, and one does well to heed John Elliott’s warning that “this is a field in which the attempt to draw qualitative conclusions from quantitative data is more than usually dangerous.”² He points out that, although 60 references to America appear in 39 Polish books and manuscripts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, “the New World constantly reappears in a limited number of contexts.” As with Polish books, so with fêtes.

Time after time a ballet suite or festive procession included Indians in feather skirts and headdresses along with Moors, Tartars, Persians,
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barbarians, savages, or Turks, each lending its own slightly different, but always exotic, flavor to the international stew. The standard costume for American Indians was established early as the feather skirt and head­dress, sometimes with feathers also on chest, arms, or ankles. Distinc­tions between exotic types, however, could blur, and sometimes, as we shall see, this costume is found on people of other "nationalities." In any case, the inclusion of such American Indians cannot be said to reflect any particular knowledge about or interest in America on the part of the director of the festivity, nor would it have done much to expand the ideas of its spectators about the New World.

A few examples: for the marriage of Johann Friederich, prince of Württemberg, and Barbara Sophia, margravine of Brandenburg, in Stuttgart in 1609, Indians in feather skirts and with tattoos on chest, upper arms, and calves appear in the festive procession (fig.*66), following horsemen armored in antique style and preceding Turks in turbans and robes decorated with stars and crescents. In Paris in 1612, the fête for the engagement of the eleven-year-old Louis XIII to Anne of Austria included in the cortege of the "French Perseus," Montmorency, "Poles, Tartars, Indians, Moors, Arabs, Chinese, Persians, Turks, Africans, and savages," all captive, as shown in magnificent prints by Jan Ziarnko (fig. 67). In Heidelberg in 1613, the procession celebrating yet another mar­riage—that of the Elector Palatine with Princess Elizabeth of England—fused exotic references and showed "a black Moor ... with an Indian skirt and little Hungarian hat adorned with feathers" (fig. 68). A late-six­teenth-century illuminated tournament book from Nuremberg in the Metropolitan Museum again shows a black figure, in feather skirt, on one of the processional sledges (fig.*69). The parrot shown is also a com­mon American attribute.

When the Medicis put on a Guerra d’Amore in Florence in the carnival of 1616, an Asian and an African king fought over Lucinda, who was the queen of India. The soldiers in the queen’s guard, however, were dressed like American Indians, with feather skirts, headdresses, arm­and legbands, as shown in the drawing for the costumes by Giulio Parigi (fig.*70).

In Paris in 1645, the play La finta pazza, the main characters of which were Achilles, Licomedes, and other Greeks, was presented by the Italian troupe-in-residence for the Queen Mother, Anne of Austria, by then the recent widow of Louis XIII. Three divertissements were added to the play itself; in the last, eight Indians in feathered skirts and head­dresses came on stage, their ship supposedly having been blown into the fictitious port where the action takes place (fig. 71). They carried a cage full of parrots and proceeded to do a dance at the end of which the parrots flew away. The chief actor, Giulio Bianchi, in a letter calls these figures "Indians" more than once, but evidence of the confusion in
LE DUC DE GUISE, ROY AMÉRIQUAIN.

A cuirasse étoile de peau de Dragons, dont les deux restes se rencontrant sur les épa
Fig. 74.

The duke of Guise as American King.
P. 59 from Courses de testes et de bagues . . . 1662.
Fig. 75.

Indians hunting parrots. Drawing by Daniel Rabel for the Ballet de la Douairière de Billebahaut, about 1626.
Fig. 77.

Arch of the Lusitanians. Etching by Van der Borcht from Johannes Bochius, Descriptio publicae gratulationis . . . in adventu . . . Ernesti Archiducis Austriae (Antwerp 1595).
Fig. 78.

Brazilians in a forest. Woodcut from C'est la déduction du sumptueux ordre plaisantz spectacles et magnifiques théâtres dressés, et exhibés par les citoyens de Rouen . . . (Rouen 1551).
Fig. 80.

*Indians and Europeans using tobacco. Drawing by Filippo d'Aglié for the ballet Tobacco.*
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Festivities in the Place Royale celebrating the engagement of Louis XIII of France and Anne of Austria, April 1612. Engraving by Jan Ziarnko.

general consciousness is provided by the Journal of Lefebvre d’Ormes­son, who calls this a “ballet of Ethiopians and parrots.”

Again in a German fête—the inauguration of Leopold I as Holy Roman Emperor in the summer of 1658—an exotic touch is given by figures in what is clearly Indian dress (fig. 72), but this time they are called Moors.

The most spectacular of the festivals using America purely as an exotic allusion came in 1662, with the great carrousel put on by Louis XIV in front of the Louvre—the Place du Carrousel takes its name from this event. On the 3rd, 4th, and 5th of June five horse brigades of king and nobles paraded in elaborate costume through the streets of Paris for the entertainment of the populace, proceeding to the Place itself, where tournament competitions were held. Five so-called “na­tions” were represented: Louis XIV was king of the Romans; next came Persians; then Turks; then Indians—this time presumably eastern Indians, as the fifth brigade, led by the duke of Guise, were the Americans. The lack of differentiation between exotic types, and between eastern and American Indians, is clear. The so-called Indians this time
are in feathers, and the drummer has a parrot for headdress (fig. 73). Some of the Americans are dressed as savages, that is, with leaves for clothing, although savages were often a distinct category, as in the 1612 fête for the inauguration of Leopold (fig. 72). Fish scales, coral, tiger and panther skins, and dragon heads are some of the other elements of the fantastic—and fantastically expensive—costuming. The duke, as American King, was dressed in dragon skin, his horse caparisoned in tiger skin and serpents (fig. 74). As though all this were not exotic enough, the "American" brigade also included Moors with monkeys and bears.

A second common way in which America appeared was as one of the Four Continents or Parts of the World. In fact, I suspect that the single most important contribution directly to art history of the discovery of America—until very recent times—was the addition of the Four Continents to the roster of secular iconographical subjects. They joined the four elements, four seasons, four temperaments, and four times of day as convenient series for allegory or decorative schemes.

For the entry of Archduke Ernest into Antwerp in 1594, the Four Parts of the World appear on the skirt of the figure of Spain, shown with Austria and the Netherlands in an allegorical painting. In Florence in 1598, the decor for the funeral of Philip II included paintings of the Four Continents in the decoration of San Lorenzio, and mourning figures of them in Santa Croce.
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No royal entry had been celebrated in Lisbon for 38 years, when Philip III made his in 1619. One of the first decorations he saw was a four-fronted arch, each front representing a continent, erected by the association of Lisbon merchants. The side facing him as he debarked was America, and the Latin verse urged him to use America's wealth to continue the conquest of barbarians.

In his book on ballets published in 1682, Menestrier describes another fête in Lisbon, for the canonization of St. Ignatius Loyola, in 1623, in which four ambassadors from the Four Parts of the World come to pay homage. Seventy horsemen accompanied the four chariots, and the people of each nation performed "very agreeable" dances. The "American" dances included one in which children were disguised as monkeys and parrots. So far, I have been unable to find whether any illustrations of this fête are extant. But the Jesuits in the town of Pont à Mousson in Lorraine did illustrate their much less elaborate ceremony to honor the same occasion; one of the etchings in the commemorative book shows in simple form, but unmistakably, the Four Continents.

This theme was more elaborately developed in one of the best-known of seventeenth-century French festivals, the Ballet of the Dowager of Billebahaut, presented at the court of Louis XIII, in Carnival of 1626. Here representatives of the Four Continents (plus a fifth group, the Northern peoples) were central to the plot: their entrées, and their

---

Figure 72.
Moors. Detail from etching by Caspar Merian from Solemnia electionis et inaugurationis Leopoldi . . . (Frankfort 1660).
presentation of homage to the Dowager and her fiancé, Fanfan de Sotteville, constituted the entire production. Daniel Rabel’s imagination did well by the familiar theme: his drawings for the costumes, mostly preserved in Paris, show King Atabalipa borne in on a chair, musicians playing bagpipes, and a llama drawing a percussion instrument, in addition to the usual dancers in feathered skirts and headdresses. Parrots play a role here, too, and are hunted by the Indians with mirrors (fig. 75).

For the restoration of Charles II of England in April 1661, one of the arches bore figures of the Four Continents. America, a female as was usual when the continents were personified as one figure, wears the feather skirt and headdress and holds in her right hand what looks like a pile of mineral matter, doubtless representing the mineral riches of America.

In Florence that same year, for the wedding of Cosimo III de’ Medici and Margherita Luisa of Orleans, a horse ballet was mounted in an outdoor theater constructed in the Boboli Gardens. The chariots represented the sun and moon, and they were followed by horsemen and their retinues of foot soldiers representing the Four Continents. The Americans are described as wearing, “according to the usage of their country, on their bare skins various ornaments of feathers of diverse colors . . . and horsemen resplendent with gold had armor from which hung tassels made of feathers”; there was “a great abundance of gold, and gems, in which that region is so abundant. . . .”

Many more examples of the Four Continents in festivals could be shown; the theme was still being used for fêtes in the Second Empire.

Everything that has been mentioned so far has been from the very late sixteenth or the seventeenth century, and it seems quite clear that American subjects did not become part of standard repertory until a good century after Columbus’ first voyage. The history and development of fêtes themselves must also be taken into account; the kinds of production that became prevalent in the seventeenth century, the ballets and other stage productions, needed these stock figures more than the royal “joyous entries,” which were the principal kind of fête of the sixteenth century. The entries were characterized by specifically political references to America.

The Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I’s concern for posterity was manifest in his commissioning a number of books and cycles of woodcut illustrations with the express purpose of preserving his memory. His triumphal procession never actually took place, but the 137 woodcuts by Hans Burgkmair and others after drawings by Altdorfer and others attest to Maximilian’s idea of what such a procession should have shown, and planners of subsequent fêtes could have referred to them. Although the Indians in plates 129 to 131 (fig. 3) are called “people of Calicut,” it seems clear that American Indians were what Maximilian had in mind when he dedicated the inscription: “These people are subject to
the previously shown praiseworthy crowns and houses.” These crowns of course included Spain, whose dominion over most of the New World he would want to stress.

Maximilian’s grandson, Charles V, succeeded him as Holy Roman Emperor, and made a series of triumphal entries into the cities of his domain. But it should be noted that America is absent more often than she is present. Charles’s entry into London in 1522 included savages, but apparently no reference to America. In Seville in 1526, however, the fête celebrating his marriage to Isabella of Portugal did include an arch showing Spaniards, Italians, Germans, Flemings, and Indians at his feet.

The first illustrated Italian fête book showing the actual decorations commemorated Charles V’s entry into Milan in 1541. He is shown as an equestrian figure, atop an arch with three vanquished figures on the ground: a Turk, a barbarian, and an Indian, who is specifically said to represent the New World (fig. 76). The text, in verse, states: “our age will be more rich and perfect / With the New World discovered and vanquished.” Unfortunately the crude woodcut is all that is left of Giulio Romano’s conception.

It is interesting to note, however, that in the entry to Antwerp of Charles V and his son Philip in 1549, the three continents known since antiquity present homage, but America is not there.

In 1594, in the same entry into Antwerp of the Archduke Ernest in which Spain was shown dressed in the Four Continents, the Arch of the Lusitanians—that is, the Portuguese, then under the Spanish crown—showed Brazil along with other colonial territories on the front face (fig. 77), and the Rio de la Plata on the back. Four years later Ernest’s younger brother Albert succeeded him; again the Lusitanian merchants made reference to Brazil.30

In the funeral of Philip II in Florence, the decoration in San Lorenzo included 24 history paintings of events in Philip’s life. The one showing Philip receiving emissaries from the New World was the twenty-first in the cycle. It shows barefoot Indians in odd fringed costumes making their obeisance to Philip. An anonymous Florentine censor objected to the way the figures were dressed, saying that riches and jewels would have been more appropriately shown as attributes of the land discovered by the Florentine Amerigo Vespucci.

The three categories of the occurrence of America in festivals so far seen—America as exotic flavor, as one of the Four Continents, or as carrying specific political meaning—account for a large percentage of the appearances. A fourth category, less definable, and which can perhaps be called America in imaginative or fanciful use, includes the most captivating fêtes of all. A few examples will show that American subjects, from time to time, could escape both the literal and the stereotyped. The earliest is the very best. In 1550 when Henry II and Catherine
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Figure 76.

Triumphant Arch. Woodcut from Giovanni Alberto Albicante, Trattato del' intrar in Milano di Carlo V . . . (Milan 1541).

dede' Medici made their entry into Rouen they were entertained by, among other productions, a whole field full of "Brazilians" in a simulated habitat including log and thatched huts, hammocks, canoes, bows and arrows, parrots, monkeys—even the trees were painted red to look like brazilwood (fig. 78). Fifty of the 300 "Brazilians" were actual natives, brought back by ships in the lumber trade; the others were sailors and young women who appear nude but for a cover of red dye despite modesty and the chill of the Normandy air on the 1st and 2nd of October. The finale was a mock battle between two Brazilian tribes; and the king's "eye was joyously content" with the scene.

Another Medici fête in Florence, for the wedding of Cosimo II de' Medici and Maria Magdalena of Austria, in 1608, included among a variety of festivities over several days a play with six intermezzi, which had even less to do with the plot than the ballets of La finta pazza.
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Here the play was the Judgement of Paris, but the fourth intermezzo showed the ship of Amerigo Vespucci, the only famous explorer who was Florentine (fig. 79). Another ship makes a sudden appearance in a Florentine fête, in 1652—the ship of Columbus is seen in what is primarily a horse ballet, on the occasion of the visit of the Archduke Ferdinand Charles. On 15 February 1613 the court of James I in London celebrated the marriage of Princess Elizabeth to Frederick, Elector Palatine—the same marriage for which the Germans staged the procession we saw earlier, in Heidelberg. In London the festivities went on for several days. Among the masques presented for the occasion was one with sets and costumes by Inigo Jones and text by George Chapman. The characters included

Figure 79.

Ship of Amerigo Vespucci. Etching by Remigio Cantagallina from Giulio Parigi, Comedia rappresentata nelle nozze del . . . Principe di Toscana (Florence) 1608.)
Plutus (Riches), Capriccio, Eunomia (Law), and a chorus of Virginian priests—the Phoebades, or Priests of the Sun. These last sing songs to the sun but are then urged to worship "our Briton Phoebus," that is, James I. Most unfortunately, all that is left of Jones' designs is one for an Indian torchbearer, one of the antimasquers who played a role similar to the dancers of intermezzi. The descriptions of the other costumes are mouthwatering: the actors wore "strange hoods of feathers and scallops about their necks, and on their head turbans, stuck with several coloured feathers, spotted with wings of flies"; the chief masquers were "in Indian habits . . . the ground-cloth of silver richly embroidered with golden suns . . . a row of white ostrich feathers mingled with sprigs of gold plate. . . ." Clearly, the potential riches of the New World were on everyone's mind; some of the courtiers would have had investments in Virginia, and hopes obviously ran high.

America's wealth was its featured attribute again when Ferdinand of Austria, younger brother of Philip IV of Spain, made his entry into Antwerp in 1634 as the new governor of the Netherlands. Rubens created the designs for all the decorations. The Arch of the Mint was made in the form of Mount Potosi in Peru, then the richest silver mine in the world. Felicitas and Jason fetching the Golden Fleece at the top, Moneta holding a cornucopia, scales of justice, a caduceus symbolizing commerce, the Pillars of Hercules, the sun for gold, and the moon for silver, festoons of coins—the symbolism is rich and cannot be elaborated here. The engravings show the arch as it actually appeared; Rubens's oil sketches, still preserved in Antwerp, show that some changes were made from his original ideas.

Finally, the charming ballet Tobacco, presented at the court of Christine, duchess of Savoy, in Turin in 1650 (fig.80), consisted of two sections, of four scenes each. The first part showed the Indians who live on the Isle of Tobago; the second satirized representatives of European nations and their tobacco-using habits. Despite some allusions to historical characters in the introduction, and despite its purported American setting, the work has little to do with America as it really was.

That must be my general conclusion. Other fêtes could have been enumerated, but their collective import would be the same: where there is treatment of the realities of the New World, it is on a very superficial, usually abstract or symbolic, level. Most appearances of America have nothing to do with the realities. This should not be surprising; a festive or ceremonial occasion is seldom a time for examining profound questions, and as far as the New World was concerned, not very many people had even formulated such questions.

Festivals, whether public, like the royal entries or processions such as Louis XIV's carrousel, or private, for the entertainment of a court, may seem a small part of life. And yet for an illiterate populace, and indeed
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for many at court, they were a principal source of cultural information: they show what was thought by some and taught to others. Their content is thus an accurate reflection of the answers a pollster would have received, had he been there to ask a random sampling of the population: “What comes to mind when you hear the word ‘America’?”

NOTES

1. The works that come closest to dealing specifically with this subject are Marcel Paquot, Les étrangers dans les divertissements de la cour, de Beaumarchais à Molière (1581-1673) (Brussels 1933) and the articles on the Four Continents in festivals by James Hazen Hyde, cited in n. 14 below. Nearly 100 books and articles on European fêtes are listed in Roy Strong, Splendor at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and the Theater of Power (Boston 1973), certainly the most up-to-date general bibliography on the subject; the text is a very readable introduction to fêtes in general. The standard bibliographies of fête books themselves are: Jenaro Alenda y Mira, Relaciones de solemnidades y fiestas publicas de Espana (Madrid 1903); Berlin, Staatliche Kunstbibliothek, Katalog der Ornamentstichsammlung der Staatlichen Kunstbibliothek Berlin (Berlin 1939) 365-420, 511-517; Berlin, Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Staatliche Museen, Katalog der Lipperheideschen Kostiumbibliothek (ed. 2, 2 vols. Berlin 1965) 635-720; Leopoldo Cicognara, Catalogo ragionato dei libri . . . posseduti dal Conte Cicognara (2 vols. Pisa 1821) 232-267; John Landwehr, Splendid Ceremonies: State Entries and Royal Funerals in the Low Countries, 1515-1791, A Bibliography (Leiden 1971); E.F.D. Ruggieri, Catalogue des livres . . . composant la bibliothèque de E.F.D. Ruggieri (Paris 1873); Ernest Vinet, Bibliographie méthodique et raisonnée des beaux-arts (2 vols. Paris 1874-77) 1. 46-107.


3. The woodcuts used to illustrate the various editions of the Columbus Letter in 1493 and 1494 show American natives naked. But by 1505 a broadside was published in Augsburg showing men, women, and children in feather skirts, adults in headdresses. More images were made during the century, with considerable variety—and accuracy—in costuming, as eyewitnesses saw more and more different tribes in North and South America. The use of feathers, however, remained the identifying characteristic of American native costume in the European mind, so that by the time Claude François Menestrier wrote his Des ballets anciens et modernes selon les règles du théâtre (Paris 1682), he was categorical: in listing what the different nationals wore, he wrote: “les Américains ont un bonnet de plumes de diverses couleurs, une ceinture de même façon qui couvre leur nudité; ils ont encore un collier de ces mêmes plumes dont ils portent un bouquet de chaque main quand ils dansent” (252).

It seems useful to mention here that the modern book with the most reproductions of early illustrations of America is Lynn Glaser, Engraved America: Iconography of America through 1800 (Philadelphia 1970), although it does not attempt to be exhaustive. This book unfortunately is badly edited. Ernst and Johanna Lehner, How They Saw the New World (New York 1966) includes nearly 200 illustrations (although many are maps and portraits of explorers), and Stefan Lorant, The New World: The First Pictures of America, Made by John White and Jacques Lemoyne and Engraved by Theodore de Bry, with Contemporary Narratives of the French Settlements in Florida, 1562-1565, and the English Colonies in Virginia, 1585-1590 (New York 1946; rev. ed. 1965), illustrates the engravings after those two artists. The forthcoming catalogue by Hugh Honour of the exhibition The European Vision of America to be held from December 1975 to January 1977 in Washington, Cleveland, and Paris will include about 300 entries with many illustrations.

4. Balthasar Küchler, Repraesentatio Infernorum Auffzug und Ritterspil . . . (n.p. [1611]).
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10. See Christout (n. 8 above) 47, 204.


13. There is one instance, which should be mentioned briefly, of a fête that did not include Indians and yet was later depicted as having them. This is the festival of 1564 at Fontainebleau, shown in one of the well-known Valois tapestries, now in the Uffizi in Florence. Frances Yates has written: "Lucas de Heere . . . puts American Indian savages on the island and Turks into one of the boats . . . This was his own exuberant invention as costume expert, and is not a record of any real fête at Fontainebleau using such costumes" (*The Valois Tapestries* [London 1959] 54).


17. G. Kubler, “The Joyeuse Entrée at Lisbon in 1619,” *Jaarboek van het Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen* (1970) 157-211, and E. M. Vetter, “Der Einzug Philips III in Lissabon 1619,” *Spanische Forschungen der Görresgesellschaft* 19 (1962) 187-263, are important recent articles about this fête. Joam Baptista Lavanha, *Viage de . . . Filipe III . . . al Reino de Portugal* (Madrid 1622) is the only one of the many accounts that is illustrated. Besides the American face on the Arch of the Merchants, the Arch of the Jewelers showed Columbus representing the West, corresponding to Vasco da Gama who represented the East.

18. Menestrier (n. 3 above) 104 ff. I assume Menestrier had his information from *Relacion de las fiestas que ha hecho el Colegio Imperial de la Compania de Iesus de Madrid en la canonizacion de San Ignacio de Loyola* (Madrid 1622) no. 749 in Alenda (n. 1 above).


20. Margaret M. McGowan, *L'art du ballet de cour en France*, 1581-1643 (Paris 1963) discusses this fête, pp. 149-153; p. 292 lists sources, and p. 347 n. 1 gives details of the whereabouts of extant designs. In the course of these researches, I realized that an unattributed drawing in the Metropolitan (60.611.55) also was made for this fête.
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21. His Majestie's Entertainments Passing through the City of London to his Coronation (London 1661). This is mentioned in Hyde, Apollo (1927) (n. 14 above) 237; I have not seen it. The engraving exists separately in the Metropolitan's collection.

22. [Giovanni Andrea Moniglia], Il mondo festeggiante ... (Florence 1661). Illustrations of this fête are reproduced in Alessandro Baudi di Vesme, Stefano della Bella: Catalogue raisonné [originally published Milan 1906] with introduction and additions by Phyllis Dearborn Massar (New York 1971) nos. 70-72.

23. The Triumph of Maximilian I: 137 Woodcuts by Hans Burgkmair and Others, ed. Stanley Appelbaum (New York 1964) gives a concise introduction and both the text Maximilian dictated and the sixteenth-century verse inscriptions (all in English), in addition to illustrations of all the plates. Franz Winzinger, Die Miniaturen zum Triumphzug Kaiser Maximilians I (2 vols. Graz 1972-73) presents a sumptuous facsimile reproduction of the miniatures painted for Maximilian as well as scholarly text and thorough bibliography.


27. Giovanni Alberto Albicante, Trattato del' intrar in Milano di Carlo V . . . (Milan 1541), woodcut leaf F iiiV, quotation leaf Gt.


29. See Bochius (n. 15 above) engravings pp. 75 and 78.


31. See Borsook (n. 16 above), fig. 20.

32. C'est la deduction du sumptueux ordre plaisantz spectacles et magnifiques theâtres dressés, et exhibés par les citoyens de Rouen . . . (Rouen 1551), leaves Kii-L. Jean Ferdinand Denis, Une fête brésilienne célébrée à Rouen en 1550 (Paris 1850) remains important; a more recent discussion is Margaret M. McGowan, “Form and Themes in Henry II's Entry into Rouen,” Renaissance Drama n.s. 1 (1968) 199-251. The Bibliothèque Municipale of Rouen has a manuscript with 10 miniatures and a 50-page verse description of the fête different from the printed text.

33. Nagler (n. 7 above) 101-115; Giulio Parigi, Comedia rappresentata nelle nozze del . . . Principe di Toscana ([Florence] 1608); engravings only, no text.

34. Baudi di Vesme (n. 22 above) nos. 65-68.

35. Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong, Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court (2 vols. London 1973) 1. 256, 253-263. This book presents the complete texts and all the extant drawings for the masques Jones designed. The drawings are in the collection of the duke of Devonshire at Chatsworth.


37. Mercedes Viale Ferrero, Feste delle Madame Reali di Savoia (Turin 1965) pls. X, XI. The use of what are usually American attributes and costumes (feathers, monkeys, parrots) for the “people of Arabia” in La fenice rinovata of 1644 (Ferrero, pls. III and, specifically, IV) is also notable.