

[*Introduction*]

In the early modern period, European publics were captivated by tales of Christians held prisoner by religious and political adversaries. Imperial expansion, spearheaded by Portugal and Spain in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, increased the geographical range in which subjects could fall into enemy hands as well as the forms that narratives of captivity could take. Imperial administrators heard survivors' oral reports. Pirates and privateers interrogated captured enemy pilots, who, in turn, presented accounts to their own sovereigns upon their release. Inquisition officials evaluated depositions attesting to ransomed captives' religious integrity. Audiences witnessed theatrical representations of captivity as well as sermons and public processions of ex-captives seeking to raise alms for ransom. Armchair travelers perused "true histories" of shipwreck and captivity published in book as well as pamphlet form. This study explores the role of captivity in the production of knowledge, identity, and authority in the early modern imperial world by examining texts written by and about European and Euro-American captives in a variety of languages and genres.

The practice of captivity, of course, attests to the violence that infused relations between people of different faiths and cultures in an age of extraordinary religious divisiveness and imperial ambitions within and without Europe. Yet far from simply exploiting tales of captivity to emphasize oppositions and hostilities, early modern writers frequently assert the value of the captive's cross-cultural experience and the expertise derived from it. This book focuses on both the use of the captive's knowledge and the use of the authority derived from such knowledge, particularly in works describing European exploration and colonization in the Americas. The production and circulation of captivity accounts in new and exotic locales responds, on one hand, to a desire for eyewitness information about cultures and lands where Europeans hoped to extend commercial and territorial dominion. But narrators also emphasize the pleasure that their accounts offer readers by presenting an experience both novel and familiar, in literature and in life. Early modern representations and uses of captivity thus point to epistemological as well as generic transformations that predate and prefigure those associated with what would come to be known as the Scientific Revolution

and the “rise of the novel”: the privileging of experiential authority and the proliferation of prose fiction claiming to be both true and entertaining.

Iberia was not only at the forefront of the overseas exploration that resulted in new sites of captivity for Europeans but also in the vanguard of these epistemological and generic transformations. The role of the sixteenth-century Spanish Empire in the production of knowledge about the natural world and the development of scientific practices has been increasingly (albeit far from universally) acknowledged in the English-speaking world, in large part owing to the work of such scholars as Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra and Antonio Barrera-Osorio. But Portugal’s even earlier pursuit of empirical knowledge about navigational routes and foreign lands in its pursuit of empire is rarely recognized outside of Portuguese scholarship. The fourth viceroy of India and cosmographer dom João de Castro (1500–1548) expresses a common Portuguese claim about the superiority of experiential knowledge when he asserts, in his *Tratado da esfera* (ca. 1538), that the erroneous opinions of the “ancients” can be corrected through “[a] muita experiencia dos modernos, e principalmente a muita navegação de Portugal” [the vast experience of the moderns, and especially the extensive navigation of the Portuguese]. Castro offers an early articulation of the link between experience, navigation, and the surpassing of classical knowledge, which in the following century would be rendered in the famous frontispiece of Francis Bacon’s *Instauratio magna* (1620) as a ship sailing through the pillars of Hercules, with the biblical motto “Multi pertransibunt et augebitur scientia” [Many shall pass through and knowledge shall be increased]. Bacon probably derived the frontispiece from a Spanish treatise, Andrés García de Céspedes’s *Regimiento de navegación* (1606), but his debt to Iberian precedents is also evident in his comparison of his own project with that of Columbus, in terms of their shared conviction that new knowledge remained to be discovered by experience.¹

1. [João de Castro], *Tratado da esfera por perguntas e respostas*, in Armando Cortesão and Luís de Albuquerque, eds., *Obras completas de D. João de Castro*, 4 vols. (Coimbra, 1968–1982), I, 23–114, esp. 50 (hereafter cited as Castro, *Obras completas*). Translations throughout this book are my own unless otherwise noted. I have modernized my citations from pre-twentieth-century editions of Spanish and Portuguese texts only with respect to accent marks, the letters *f/s*, *b/v*, *y/i*, *g/j*, and *h*, and word division; English sources have been modernized with respect to *f/s* and *u/v*. Bacon refers to how Columbus’s “reasons, though rejected at first, were afterwards made good by experience” in his *Novum organum*, in James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath, eds., *The Works of Francis Bacon*, 14 vols. (London, 1857–1874 [orig. publ. London, 1620]), IV, 38–248, esp. 91. On the role of the Span-

Bacon elsewhere employs another, more specific travel metaphor that also has concrete antecedents in Iberian expansion. To illustrate the difference between the Aristotelian use of sense experience and the one that he promoted for the proper interpretation of nature, Bacon explains in *Novum organum*, “Both ways set out from the senses and particulars, and rest in the highest generalities; but the difference between them is infinite. For the one just glances at experiment and particulars in passing, the other dwells duly and orderly among them.” In contrast to the Aristotelian tendency to “[fly] from the senses and particulars to the most general axioms,” Bacon’s inductive method requires detainment in the realm of experience in the effort to produce new discoveries rather than explanations of what is commonly perceived. Bacon’s correlation of scientific and navigational discovery, empiricism and imperialism is not exclusively metaphorical, as scholars like Mary

ish Empire in an “early scientific revolution,” see Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra, “Iberian Science in the Renaissance: Ignored How Much Longer?” *Perspectives on Science*, XII (2004), 86–124 (rpt. in Cañizares-Esguerra, *Nature, Empire, and Nation: Explorations of the History of Science in the Iberian World* [Stanford, Calif., 2006], 14–45); and Antonio Barrera-Osorio, *Experiencing Nature: The Spanish American Empire and the Early Scientific Revolution* (Austin, Tex., 2006). Ralph Bauer discusses the Spanish and English Empires’ contribution to a modern, “mercantilist” system of knowledge production in Bauer, *The Cultural Geography of Colonial American Literatures: Empire, Travel, Modernity* (Cambridge, 2003); for a different argument about colonial British America’s contribution to natural history and modern science, stressing instead a “polycentric” empirical enterprise that depended on Euro-Americans as well as Amerindians and Africans, see Susan Scott Parrish, *American Curiosity: Cultures of Natural History in the Colonial British Atlantic World* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 2006), 315. On the Portuguese contribution to modern science, see Francisco Contente Domingues, “Science and Technology in Portuguese Navigation: The Idea of Experience in the Sixteenth Century,” in Francisco Bethencourt and Diogo Ramada Curto, *Portuguese Oceanic Expansion, 1400–1800* (Cambridge, 2007), 460–479; Onésimo T. Almeida, “Portugal and the Dawn of Modern Science,” in George D. Winius, ed., *Portugal, the Pathfinder: Journeys from the Medieval toward the Modern World, 1300–ca. 1600* (Madison, Wis., 1995), 341–361; and R. Hookyas, “Science in Manueline Style: The Historical Context of D. João de Castro’s Works,” in Castro, *Obras completas*, IV, 231–426; Hookyas addresses Renaissance notions of experience on 322–349. See also Brian W. Ogilvie, *The Science of Describing: Natural History in Renaissance Europe* (Chicago, 2006), 17–21. Ogilvie notes the lack of explicit theorization of the concept among Renaissance natural historians but stresses the importance of firsthand observation, evident in Castro’s use of the term. Unfortunately, Ogilvie excludes Iberian natural history from his account based

Baine Campbell and Timothy J. Reiss have argued. But the Portuguese had long been aware of the importance of “dwelling among them,” in a literal sense, for the acquisition of experiential knowledge that would serve the goals of imperial expansion. In the fifteenth century, Portuguese commercial interests in Africa were facilitated by the mediation and interpretation of *lançados*, sailors who “threw themselves” into the native societies of newly explored territories. Timothy J. Coates has described how the Crown’s initial policy of encouraging *lançados* was replaced in the early sixteenth century with the more controlled use of *degredados* [penal exiles], whose role as involuntary colonizers was necessitated by Portugal’s small demographic base and wide-ranging imperial ambitions. Vasco da Gama brought along several such *degredados* in his voyage to India in 1497–1499, and Pedro Álvares Cabral’s follow-up expedition to Calicut in 1500 left two of them in Brazil. Pero Vaz de Caminha’s letter to King Manuel describing Cabral’s landfall in South America claims that the decision to leave the convicts there rather than take indigenous hostages to Portugal would get “muito melhor informação da terra” [“far better information about the land”] as well as “mais os amansar e pacificar” [“tame and pacify (the natives) all the more”].²

on an unfounded assumption about Iberians’ lack of participation in “the broader European community” (24). On Bacon’s debt to Spanish models and sources, particularly García de Céspedes’s *Regimiento de navegación*, see Cañizares-Esguerra, “Iberian Science,” *Perspectives on Science*, XII (2004), 89–93; and Bauer, *Cultural Geography of Colonial American Literatures*, 19–22; the connection between the two frontispieces has previously been made by Juan Pimentel, “The Iberian Vision: Science and Empire in the Framework of a Universal Monarchy, 1500–1800,” *Osiris*, XV (2000), 17–30, esp. 24.

2. Bacon, *Novum organum*, in Spedding, Ellis, and Heath, eds., *Works of Francis Bacon*, IV, 50; Pero Vaz de Caminha, *A carta de Pero Vaz de Caminha*, ed. Jaime Cortesão (Rio de Janeiro, 1943), 217; “Letter of Pedro Vaz de Caminha to King Manuel,” in William Brooks Greenlee, trans. and ed., *The Voyage of Pedro Álvares Cabral to Brazil and India from Contemporary Documents and Narratives* (London, 1938), 3–33, esp. 19. Caminha’s letter was first published in Manuel Aires de Casal’s *Corografia brasílica* (Rio de Janeiro, 1817), I, 12–34. See [Álvaro Velho], *Journal of the First Voyage of Vasco da Gama, 1497–1499*, trans. and ed. E. G. Ravenstein (London, 1898), 178–179, for the names of five of the *degredados* accompanying Gama’s expedition. On Baconian empirical and imperial discourse, see Mary Baine Campbell, *Wonder and Science: Imagining Worlds in Early Modern Europe* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1999), 74–75; and Timothy J. Reiss, “Seated between the Old World and the New’: Geopolitics, Natural Philosophy, and Proficient Method,” in Julie Robin Solomon and Catherine

The Portuguese Crown and chroniclers began to take advantage of the experience and expertise of those who had “dwelt among” foreigners—whether voluntarily or involuntarily—during the first exploratory and commercial voyages to Africa, sponsored by the Infante dom Henrique (Prince Henry “the Navigator”) in the 1440s. In 1444, a Portuguese squire named João Fernandes willingly left the expedition of Antão Gonçalves to stay among the Muslim Berbers of Rio do Ouro in the western Sahara. Although he is often described as the first *lançado*, Fernandes did not intend to adopt permanent residence there. According to a contemporary chronicler, Gomes Eanes da Zurara, Fernandes stayed behind “samente pola ver e trazer novas ao Infante, quando quer que se acertasse de tornar” [only to see (the land) and to bring news to the prince, whenever he managed to return]. Indeed, Fernandes was able to return to Portugal seven months later when Prince Henry, always

Gimelli Martin, eds., *Francis Bacon and the Refiguring of Early Modern Thought* (Aldershot, Eng., 2005), 223–246. Reiss’s argument about Bacon’s association of the acquisition of knowledge to the imperial project importantly acknowledges Spanish and Portuguese antecedents (224, 231). Reiss also discusses the connection between experimental discourse and the outward voyage—a halting, repetitive journey that involves detainment and confinement before proceeding—in *The New Atlantis* (in which both the mariners and Bensalem’s inhabitants speak Spanish), in Reiss, *The Discourse of Modernism* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1982), 180–197. On Portuguese Crown policies toward *lançados* and *degradados*, see Timothy J. Coates, *Convicts and Orphans: Forced and State-Sponsored Colonizers in the Portuguese Empire, 1550–1755* (Stanford, Calif., 2001), esp. 86–88. Coates characterizes *lançados* as renegades and points out Portuguese fears that such individuals would not only abandon their faith but serve a foreign (Moorish or Mogul) army. Other historians, however, emphasize the utility of *lançados*, and their mixed-race descendants, as commercial and cultural mediators for the Portuguese in Africa, Asia, and South America; see T. H. Elkiss, “On Service to the Crown—Portuguese Overseas Expansion: A Neglected Aspect,” *The Journal of the American Portuguese Society*, X (1976), 44–53; Jorge Couto, “A Contribuição dos ‘lançados’ para os descobrimentos,” *Vértice*, II (1988), 31–34; and Alida Metcalf, *Go-betweens and the Colonization of Brazil, 1500–1600* (Austin, Tex., 2005), esp. 17–35. This book corroborates and extends beyond the Portuguese Empire Metcalf’s argument about the important role of go-betweens (in her terms, “physical” and “transactional” go-betweens, like captives, as well as “representational” go-betweens, like authors) in the colonization of Brazil. George E. Brooks describes the reception and integration of *lançados* and their Luso-African descendants into West African communities in Brooks, *Landlords and Strangers: Ecology, Society, and Trade in West Africa, 1000–1630* (Boulder, Colo., 1993), 137, 188–196. The Portuguese reliance on *lançados* and *degradados* has been attributed to Portugal’s small population and lack

eager to learn about trading prospects in the region, sent Antão Gonçalves back to look for him. Prince Henry and his navigators frequently relied on captured natives to serve as interpreters and informants as they explored the West African coastline in the 1440s, but Fernandes surely knew that his report would be valorized over those of potentially duplicitous foreign captives.³

Indeed, the chronicler Zurara declared the “serviço especial” [special service] that Fernandes had performed for Prince Henry to be “digno de memoria, no qual não posso tantas vezes considerar que me não maravilhe mais que assaz” [worthy of remembrance, and extraordinarily marvelous each time I consider it]. A century later, the renowned historian of the Portuguese Empire João de Barros described Prince Henry’s favorable reaction to the gold and slaves brought back by Gonçalves as “pouco em comparação de ver

of sufficient manpower for colonization; aside from the aforementioned historians, see also A. J. R. Russell-Wood, *A World on the Move: The Portuguese in Africa, Asia, and America, 1415–1808* (Manchester, 1992), 106.

3. On João Fernandes, see Gomes Eanes da Zurara, *Crónica de Guiné* (ca. 1453), ed. José de Bragança, 2d ed. (Oporto, 1973 [orig. publ. Paris, 1841]), 140, 149–150, 157–159, 325–329 (quotation on 140); and João de Barros, *Da Ásia de João de Barros e de Diogo de Couto* (Lisbon, 1778; rpt. Lisbon, 1973 [orig. publ. Lisbon, 1552]), 75–83. For an English translation of Zurara’s work, see Zurara, *The Chronicle of the Discovery and Conquest of Guinea*, trans. Charles Raymond Beazley and Edgar Prestage, 2 vols. (London, 1896 and 1899). Fernandes’s experience is described and contextualized in Metcalf, *Go-betweenes*, 26–27; and Peter Russell, *Prince Henry “the Navigator”: A Life* (New Haven, Conn., 2000), 203–206. Russell asserts that the “novelty and importance of what he did has not received in modern times the recognition it merits, perhaps because of the emphasis historians of the Portuguese discoveries have always put on seaborne exploits” (203). On the use of foreign captives as interpreters, see Jeanne Hein, “Portuguese Communication with Africans on the Searoute to India,” *Terra Incognitae*, XXV (1993), 41–52. Hein cites a 1436 directive from Prince Henry ordering his captain to seize an individual in the most distant land explored in order to serve as an interpreter on future voyages. Caminha’s “Letter to King Manuel” acknowledges the common practice of taking hostages as interpreters but asserts the greater utility of degredados: “Acordaram que não era necessário tomar por fôrça homens, porque era geral costume dos que assim levavam por fôrça para alguma parte dizerem que há alí de tudo quanto lhes preguntam; e que melhor e muito melhor informação da terra dariam dois homens dêstes degredados que aquí deixassem, do que êles dariam se os levassem, por ser gente que ninguém entende. Nem êles tão cêdo aprenderiam a falar para o saberem tão bem dizer que muito melhor estoutros o não digam, quando Vossa Alteza cá mandar” [“They agreed that it was not

ante si João Fernandes são, e salvo, e cheio de tanta novidade, e estranheza de terra” [little in comparison to seeing João Fernandes before him, healthy and safe, and full of such novelty and strangeness of the land]. For their part, Zurara and Barros seem to marvel at not only Fernandes’s geographic and ethnographic information about an exotic land but also the narrative intrigue of his tale: the seizure of his clothes and belongings by his Berber captors, the hardships he was willing to suffer among “uma gente pouco menos de selvagem” [a people little less than savage], the kindness and affection with which he is eventually treated, and his surprisingly plump, Berber-looking appearance upon his return. In Zurara’s and Barros’s hands, Fernandes’s tale becomes an exemplary and dramatic narrative of captivity and redemption, however voluntary his sojourn and benevolent his treatment. Fernandes’s value to the chroniclers certainly overlapped with his value to Prince Henry, for they both relay his information about the societies and trading practices of the interior of the western Sahara. But their indulgence in narrative detail, and Zurara’s frequent exclamations regarding Fernandes’s exemplarity, suggest other ways in which the tales of ex-captives, and not simply their knowledge of foreign lands and peoples, could be used to delight and instruct audiences.⁴

Prince Henry and the authors Zurara and Barros all instrumentalized Fernandes’s cross-cultural experience. Yet Fernandes’s sojourn in West Africa was also motivated by self-interest, as he hoped to be rewarded for service

necessary to take men by force, since it was general custom that those taken away by force to another place said that everything about which they were asked was there; and that these two convicts whom we should leave would give better and far better information about the land than would be given by those carried away by us, because they are people whom no one understands nor would they learn [Portuguese] quickly enough to be able to tell it as well as those others when Your Highness sends here”]; see Caminha, *A carta*, ed. Cortesão, 216–217; “Letter,” in Greenlee, trans. and ed., *Voyage of Pedro Álvares Cabral*, 19.

4. Zurara, *Crónica de Guiné*, ed. Bragança, 149 (first and third quotations); Barros, *Da Ásia*, 79 (second quotation). Barros implies Fernandes’s status as a captive when he recounts how the Moors “levaram pela terra dentro” [took him inland] and stripped him of his clothes and food, in contrast to the warm reception that Prince Henry offered to the Moor taken to Portugal, among whose relatives Fernandes remained. Zurara extols the exemplary suffering of Fernandes, whom he calls a “homem de boa consciencia e assaz católico cristão” [man of good conscience and a very Catholic Christian] (158–159). On Fernandes’s transformed but contented appearance on his return, see Barros, *Da Ásia*, 83.

rendered to the prince. In fact, Fernandes was himself instrumentalizing a prior experience of captivity, for Zurara tells us that he made the decision to stay in Rio do Ouro because he had previously been a “cativo entre os Mouros, em esta parte maior do mar Medioterreno, onde houvera conhecimento da linguagem; mas não sei se lhe prestaria entre aqueles” [captive among the Moors, in this larger part of the Mediterranean Sea, where he gained a knowledge of the language; but I don’t know if it helped him among those people]. Zurara later confirms that Fernandes’s Berber hosts spoke a different language than the Arabic that Fernandes had presumably acquired among his Moorish captors. Former captives in North Africa would, in fact, occasionally serve as interpreters on Portuguese voyages, but Fernandes sought to use his linguistic expertise acquired in captivity to immerse himself in another culture and thus position himself as an even more useful intermediary. According to Zurara, Fernandes viewed his former captivity as an opportunity to undertake a key role in the discovery and transmission of new knowledge about unfamiliar lands. The experience of individuals like Fernandes could profit not only figures of authority (and authors like Zurara and Barros) but also the ex-captives themselves.⁵

Fernandes’s dual captivities point to the connections between the fifteenth-century Mediterranean world, where Christendom was confronting a growing Islamic empire under the Ottoman Turks, and the new territories abroad where the Portuguese—soon to be followed by the Spaniards and other Europeans—were seeking to extend their own commercial and imperial reach. As Fernandes’s itinerary illustrates, captivity among Muslims was an experience familiar to Iberians long before they embarked on overseas exploration. Religious orders dedicated to the redemption of captives in Muslim territories of the Iberian peninsula were formed in 1198 and 1218, and the conflict between Christendom and Islam at the core of the practice is indicated in Alfonso X’s mid-thirteenth-century legal definition of captives as “aquellos que caen en prisión de homes de otra creencia” [those that are imprisoned by men of another faith]. Captive-taking intensified in the century following the Reconquest owing to military conflicts with the Ottoman Empire and the rise of the North African-based piracy of the “Barbary corsairs.” Algiers, in-

5. Zurara, *Crónica de Guiné*, 149, 326. One of Vasco da Gama’s interpreters had also been a captive of Moors; see [Velho], *Journal of the First Voyage of Gama*, trans. and ed. Ravenstein, 23. See also Dejanirah Couto, “The Role of Interpreters, or *Linguas*, in the Portuguese Empire during the 16th Century,” *E-Journal of Portuguese History*, I (2003), 1–10.

corporated into the Ottoman Empire in 1518, was the center of such a profitable economy of captive redemption that it became known as the “Indies” of the Turks, according to several seventeenth-century authors. In this context, accounts of captivity in a variety of official, learned, and popular genres both reflected and contributed to widespread anxiety in the Iberian peninsula about the possibility of capture and enslavement by Moors and Turks. Certainly Iberians’ prior and greater familiarity with Muslim captors in the Mediterranean shaped how captivity in other locales would be interpreted and depicted. Yet Fernandes’s career shows how the exploration of new lands also transformed and enhanced the uses that North African captivity could serve. As that exploration extended to a “New” World, a transatlantic (and, indeed, global) exchange ensued that was just as mutual. That is, models for representing captivity among non-Christians were not simply exported from the Mediterranean to the Americas; as argued in Chapter 1, accounts of Moorish and Turkish captivity also draw on New World sources for both specific content and, more broadly, rhetorical strategies.⁶

The Portuguese king João III, to whom João de Barros dedicated his *Décadas da Ásia* (1552), valued the experience of ex-captives like João Fernandes just as much as the Infante dom Henrique a century before him. Accompanying the first governor appointed to the Portuguese colony in Brazil, Tomé de Sousa, was a letter written by João III to one Diogo Álvares, a Portuguese sailor who had been shipwrecked in Bahia and captured by the Tupinambá Indians in the early sixteenth century. Historical accounts differ as to whether Álvares was saved from cannibalistic sacrifice because of the intervention of the chief’s daughter or his own fortuitous use of a gun salvaged from the shipwreck. In any case, he subsequently rose in status

6. Alfonso X, *Las siete partidas del rey don Alfonso el Sabio . . .* (ca. 1263) (Madrid, 1807 [orig. publ. Seville, 1491]), II, 327. The Trinitarians and the Mercedarians, the two main orders devoted to the ransom of captives, were founded in 1198 and 1218, respectively; see Mercedes García Arenal and Miguel Ángel de Bunes, *Los españoles y el norte de África: Siglos XV-XVIII* (Madrid, 1992), 279. For references to Algiers as the Turkish “Indies,” see Diego de Haedo, *Topografía e historia general de Argel* (Madrid, 1929 [orig. publ. Valladolid, 1612]), II, 88; and Francis Knight, *A Relation of Seaven Yeares Slaverie under the Turkes of Argeire, Suffered by an English Captive Merchant . . .* (London, 1640), 32, 55. On Spanish captives and redemptionist activity in North Africa, see Ellen G. Friedman, *Spanish Captives in North Africa in the Early Modern Age* (Madison, Wis., 1983). George Camamis demonstrates the prevalence of the theme of captivity in Spanish Golden Age literature in Camamis, *Estudios sobre el cautiverio en el Siglo de Oro* (Madrid, 1977).

among his captors and adopted an indigenous name, Caramuru. Álvares's successful integration with the Tupinambá was well known even to his distant sovereign, who viewed it as useful to the establishment of royal government in an area where previous private colonization efforts had failed. In the letter, dated November 19, 1548, the king praises Álvares's "muita prática e experiência que tendes dessas terras, e da gente e costumes dellas" [much practice and experience that you have of these lands, and of the people and their customs], exhorting him to assist the new Portuguese arrivals and conciliate them with the natives. He commands Álvares to help Governor Sousa in every way possible, "porque fareis niso muito serviço" [because in this you will render much service]. This former captive's "much practice and experience" was even more highly valued than that of João Fernandes, not despite but because of his lengthier residence and more extensive assimilation, which included having children with an indigenous wife, Paraguaçu. Confirming Álvares's success at forging a powerful role out of his experience as a captive—a success already intimated in the letter from João III—is the legendary status that he acquired in later centuries, as a mediator and facilitator of the early Portuguese colony, as well as progenitor, with Paraguaçu, of a famous line of *mameluco* descendants.⁷

Mameluco, the Portuguese term for a person of mixed indigenous and European ancestry in Brazil, recalls the Mediterranean and North African coordinates that Iberians traditionally associated with captivity. *Mameluco* derives from the Arabic *mamluk* ("owned"), which refers to the captives (usually Christian) who converted to Islam and rendered military service to Muslim rulers beginning in the ninth century, similar to the Janissary Corps of the Ottoman Turks. Sometimes, like Diogo Álvares among the Tupinambá, these slave soldiers rose to power in their adoptive society, as in the Mamluk sultanate that ruled Egypt from 1250 to 1517. The Por-

7. "King João III to Diogo Álvares, 19 November 1548," in "Cartas Regias sobre Tomé de Sousa, 1548–1551," Arquivo Público do Estado da Bahia, cópias 627. I thank Alida Metcalf for generously sharing her transcription of this document. Antonio de Santa Maria Jaboatão identifies Diogo Álvares and Paraguaçu's numerous descendants (as well as the offspring of Álvares's children with other indigenous women) over two centuries in "Catálogo genealógico das principaes famílias que procederam de Albuquerque, e Cavalcantes em Pernambuco, e Caramurus na Bahia," *Revista trimensal de historia e geographia; ou, Jornal do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*, LII (1889), 5–497, esp. 84–91, 138–140. As Metcalf explains, Álvares's twelve daughters married European men who became prominent figures in the colony, and three of Álvares's sons were granted nobility; see *Go-betweens*, 86.

tuguese use of the term to denote persons of mixed European and Amerindian descent suggests an assumption about the propensity of captives in the New World to procreate with their captors, an assumption fully realized by Diogo Álvares. The Spanish use of the word for janissary, *genízaro* (from the Turkish for “new soldier”), makes a similar association: the 1734 *Diccionario de autoridades* defines *genízaro* as “hijo de padres de diversa Nación: como de Español y Francesa; o al contrario” [child of parents of different nationalities: like a Spanish man and a French woman; or the reverse]. Despite this intra-European example, the entry also includes a citation from a seventeenth-century history of Chile, Alonso de Ovalle’s *Historica relacion del reino de Chile* (1646): “Esta ha sido la causa de que estos *Genízaros* vivan como Gentiles, por haberse criado entre ellos” [This is the reason why these *janissaries* live like gentiles, for having been raised among them]. The *genízaros* to whom Ovalle refers are the mestizo children of Christian captives in southern Chile, whose upbringing among Araucanians renders them indistinguishable from their mother’s or father’s captors. In the New World use of *mameluco* and *genízaro*, biological *mestizaje* supplements the sense of enslavement and conversion that obtains in the terms’ Arabic and Turkish roots.⁸

8. *Diccionario de la lengua castellana, en que se explica el verdadero sentido de las voces, su naturaleza y calidad, con las frases o modos de hablar, los proverbios o refranes, y otras cosas convenientes al uso de la lengua* [*Diccionario de autoridades*] (Madrid, 1734), s.v. *genízaro*; Alonso de Ovalle, *Historica relación del reino de Chile* (Santiago de Chile, 1969 [orig. publ. Rome, 1646]), 284. On captives in Chile, see Carlos Lázaro Ávila, “Los cautivos en la frontera araucana,” *Revista española de antropología americana*, XXIV (1994), 191–207. Metcalf speculates on the connections between the Arabic *mamluk* and Portuguese *mameluco* in *Go-betweens*, 95; although she suspects that the association was made because many “mamelucos were the sons of Indian women who were servants and slaves,” it may also result from the knowledge of white captives of Amerindians who had mixed-race children. *Mamluk* and *janissary* existed in English in the sixteenth century, but a closer (albeit rare) equivalent to the Spanish and Portuguese figurative use of these terms is one more familiar to us: *hybrid*, whose first appearance the *Oxford English Dictionary* dates to 1630, although it only began to be commonly used to denote human “cross-breeds” in the nineteenth century; see Robert J. C. Young, *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race* (London, 1995), 6. Henry Cockeram’s *English Dictionarie; or, An Interpreter of Hard English Words . . .* (London, 1623) defines “hybridan” in terms quite close to the *Diccionario de autoridades*’s “*genízaro*”: “whose parents are of divers and sundry Nations.”

It is just such a conflation of captivity and racial mixing that led some Europeans, in contrast to João III, to view captives with suspicion. In another seventeenth-century Chilean history, *Memorias de los sucesos de la guerra de Chile*, the ex-soldier Jerónimo de Quiroga claims, not the value, but the threat that Spanish captives and their mestizo offspring represent to the Spanish colony: “Hase reconocido con grandes experiencias que todos estos españoles o mestizos cautivos, criados o nacidos entre los indios, aman tanto sus vicios, costumbres y libertad, que son perjudiciales entre nosotros” [It has been recognized from much experience that all those Spanish and mestizo captives, born or raised among the Indians, love their vices, customs, and freedom so much that they are harmful among us]. In particular, adult Spanish captives are

peores que los más fieros bárbaros, porque son bárbaros con discurso, y así fuera conveniente echar de la frontera a todos los que nacieron, se criaron o estuvieron muchos años cautivos, en especial si son hombres ruines, como lo son casi todos, menos los hombres principales, como no tengan nada de indio: que una pequeña raza los hace declinar de sus obligaciones, y he observado que en pasando diez años el cautiverio, en todos se hace naturaleza aquel trato continuado y vida suelta y viciosa, y son generalmente todos unos.

worse than the fiercest barbarians, because they are barbarians with reason, and for this reason it would be best to expel from the frontier all those who were born, raised, or held captive for many years, especially if they are vile men, as most of them are, and except for the principal men, as long as they do not have anything Indian: for a little racial taint makes them decline in their obligations, and I have observed that after ten years of captivity, everyone naturalizes through continuous contact that free and vice-ridden life, and all generally become one.

The liberty that Quiroga attributes to the life of the captive would seem to contradict the state of captivity itself. However, it is precisely the freedom from Christian constraints and the resulting temptation to “go native” that make captives and mestizos such threatening figures. Whether biologically hybrid or transculturated captives, as “barbarians with reason,” they obscure the clear demarcation of adversaries on a colonial frontier where Amerindians continued to resist Spanish domination until the nineteenth century. According to Quiroga, cultural contamination can extend even to those of

higher status and pure blood after an extended period of time in captivity, for continuous contact tends to make them “all one.”⁹

Quiroga’s imputation of barbarism and moral degeneration to captives and mestizos alike resembles arguments that have been made by northern Europeans about the Spanish and Portuguese themselves. In 1899, R. S. Whiteway attributed to the Portuguese “an alacrity not found in other European nations, to mix their race with others differing entirely in status from themselves.” He characterized the resulting “deterioration in the Portuguese race” as one of the “moral causes”—along with the “adoption of Oriental methods of diplomacy”—of the decline of the Portuguese Empire in the East Indies. Whiteway’s reference to the 1493 papal bull dividing the unexplored globe between the “half-savage Spaniards and half-savage Portuguese” suggests a similar perspective on Iberian “mixing” with Moors and Jews before

9. Jerónimo de Quiroga, *Memorias de los sucesos de la guerra de Chile* (ca. 1690), ed. Sergio Fernández Larraín (Santiago, 1979), 229. García Arenal and Bunes describe similar perspectives in Iberia on the harm posed by captives returning from North Africa, as a result of their contact with Moors and Turks; see *Los españoles y el norte de África*, 249. In this book, I use “hybrid” to describe not only mixed-race individuals but also texts that are the product of diverse parentage (in terms of authorship as well as literary/cultural provenance). I use “transculturated” to characterize persons who selectively absorb elements of another culture and “transculturation” to describe this transformative process, whereas “intercultural” simply denotes an activity that occurs between different cultures (i.e., “intercultural mediators” mediate between cultures). Fernando Ortiz first proposed “transculturación” as an alternative to the anthropological concepts of *acculturation* and *deculturation* in Ortiz, *Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y el azúcar (advertencia de sus contrastes agrarios, económicos, históricos, y sociales, su etnografía y su transculturación)* (Havana, 1940), translated as Ortiz, *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*, trans. Harriet de Onís (New York, 1947); see also Ángel Rama, *Transculturación narrativa en América Latina* (Mexico City, 1982); and Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London, 1992). Román de la Campa summarizes the different perspectives on transculturation in Latin American criticism, from Ortiz’s and Rama’s use of the concept to explain the participation of subaltern ethnicities in modern national identities, to its critique as a “totalizing paradigm . . . , a will to cultural or racial synthesis all too willing to erase difference”; see “Of Border Artists and Transculturation: Toward a Politics of Transmodern Performances,” in Campa, *Latin Americanism* (Minneapolis, 1999), 57–84, esp. 65. In this study, I examine how writers present transculturation as a potential form of service to imperialism, but I also highlight instances in their texts that denote a refusal or inability to “erase difference.”

the period of expansion. Although the Black Legend of the Spanish Empire initially arose from depictions of a more military than sexual conquest, the explanations given for the savage cruelty of Spaniards in the New World have sometimes revolved around arguments about the “tropicalization of the white man”—moral degeneration as a result of contact with a barbarous environment—which are similar to those applied to the Portuguese.¹⁰

Beginning in the 1930s, the Brazilian sociologist Gilberto Freyre turned Whiteway’s account of imperial decadence on its head by making Portuguese (and, to a lesser extent, Spanish) “alacrity” in miscegenation as well as in the adoption of indigenous customs the reasons for the distinctive superiority of Iberian colonialism. According to Freyre, centuries of contact and intermingling with Jews and Moors on the peninsula prepared the Iberians, and the Portuguese in particular, to engage in a more humane form of imperialism that involved integration and miscegenation with the native inhabitants of Asia, Africa, and the Americas. Freyre first developed the notion of Portuguese adaptability and racial tolerance with respect to master-slave relations in colonial Brazil in *Casa-grande e senzala* (1933), published in English as *The Masters and the Slaves* (1946). He extended the concept to all of the Portuguese colonies in *O mundo que o português criou* (1940) and

10. R. S. Whiteway, *The Rise of Portuguese Power in India, 1497–1550* (Westminster, 1899), 17, 21, 25. On the Spanish and Portuguese Black Legends, see William S. Maltby, *The Black Legend in England: The Development of Anti-Spanish Sentiment, 1558–1660* (Durham, N.C., 1971); and George Winius, *The Black Legend of Portuguese India* (New Delhi, 1985). Boaventura de Sousa Santos offers examples of the “black legend” of Portugal and the Portuguese among the British” in his “Entre Prospero y Caliban: Colonialismo, pós-colonialismo e inter-identidade,” in Maria Irene Ramalho and António Sousa Ribeiro, eds., *Entre ser e estar: Raízes, percursos e discursos da identidade* (Oporto, 2001), 23–85, esp. 49–52, published in English as Santos, “Between Prospero and Caliban: Colonialism, Postcolonialism, and Inter-identity,” *Luso-Brazilian Review*, XXXIX, no. 2 (Winter 2002), 9–43, esp. 21–23; see also Carmen Nocentelli, “Discipline and Love: Linschoten and the *Estado da Índia*,” in Margaret R. Greer, Walter D. Mignolo, and Maureen Quilligan, *Rereading the Black Legend: The Discourses of Religious and Racial Difference in the Renaissance Empires* (Chicago, 2007), 205–224. On the “tropicalization of the white man,” see Antonello Gerbi, *The Dispute of the New World: The History of a Polemic, 1750–1900*, trans. Jeremy Moyle, rev. enl. ed. (Pittsburgh, 1973 [orig. publ. Milan, 1955]), 571–576; Gerbi cites seventeenth- through twentieth-century arguments about Europeans’ moral and physical transformation in the tropics, most frequently with negative qualifications.

introduced the term “Luso-Tropicalism” to describe the distinctive character of Portuguese imperialism in several lectures of the early 1950s as well as in the subsequent publications *Integração portuguesa nos trópicos* (1958) and *O luso e o trópico* (1961). In these volumes, Freyre describes not only a mode of civilization and colonization but a form of knowledge production—a “Lusotropicology” consisting in “saber de experiência feito” [knowledge of experience made], according to his frequent invocation of Camões:

Não há exagero em dizer-se do Português que foi um dos iniciadores de um humanismo científico que opôs ao saber hieraticamente clássico o corajosamente indagador de novas realidades, uma vez alterada a situação de clima e de ambiente, quer físico, quer social, do Europeu: transferido o Europeu, não como transeunte, mas como residente, da Europa para os trópicos.

It is not an exaggeration to speak of the Portuguese as having been one of the initiators of a scientific humanism that opposed to the hieratically classical knowledge another type of knowledge courageously inquiring into new realities, once having been altered both the physical and social situation of climate and environment of the European; the European having been transferred as a resident, and not as a passer-by, from Europe to the tropics.

For Freyre, as for Bacon, experiential knowledge required a “dwelling among” rather than a glance “in passing,” a knowledge that the cultural and ethnic diversity of medieval Iberia made the Portuguese (and Spaniards) uniquely poised to acquire. In Freyre’s Luso-Tropicalism, “tropicalization” was a sign of modern scientific inquiry rather than moral degradation.¹¹

11. Gilberto Freyre, *Integração portuguesa nos trópicos / Portuguese Integration in the Tropics* (Lisbon, 1958), 34, 100–101; this is a bilingual edition. Luis de Camões’s reference to “um saber só de experiências feito” [a knowledge only of experience made] appears in canto IV, stanza 94, of *Os Lusíadas* (Lisbon, 1931 [orig. publ. Lisbon, 1572]), 154. Freyre sometimes extends his claims to the Spanish Empire, referring to “Hispanotropical” civilization or symbiosis; see, for example, *Integração portuguesa nos trópicos*, 22, 88. Cláudia Castelo surveys the development of the notion of Luso-Tropicalism in Freyre’s lectures and published works in Castelo, “*O modo português de estar no mundo*”: *O luso-tropicalismo e a ideologia colonial portuguesa (1933–1961)* (Oporto, 1998), 17–43. In “The ‘Kaffirs of Europe’: A Comment on Portugal and the Historiography of European Expansion in Asia,” *Studies in History*, IX

In a sense, the appropriation of the Brazilian sociologist's theories by the Portuguese Estado Novo in the 1950s and 1960s mirrors Prince Henry's and João III's valorization and use of the knowledge acquired by Luso-Tropical "residents" like João Fernandes and Diogo Álvares. Although similarly essentialist and exceptionalist notions of national and imperial identity already existed in Portugal, Freyre's benevolent interpretation of Portuguese colonialism was warmly received by a dictatorial regime anxious to hold on to its last remaining colonies, despite pressure from the international community and African liberation movements. In early 1961, Angola initiated its war of independence, soon to be followed by Portugal's other African colonies of Mozambique and Guinea Bissau; later that year, Goa, Daman, and Diu of the Portuguese Estado da Índia were annexed by the Indian Union. As if to counteract the real and impending loss of its overseas empire, in the same year, a government commission—formed to commemorate the quincentennial anniversary of the death of Henry the Navigator—sponsored the publication of *O luso e o trópico* (simultaneously in English, French, and Portuguese), Freyre's definitive articulation of Luso-Tropicalism. In *Race Relations in the Portuguese Colonial Empire*, published a few years later as a historical critique of Freyre's notion of inherent Portuguese tolerance, Charles Boxer cites the 1961 decree abolishing the racist "Statute of Portuguese Natives of the Provinces of Guiné, Angola, and Moçambique," which

(1992), 131–146, Sanjay Subrahmanyam describes how Luso-Tropicalism preserves, but inverts the hierarchy of, the distinction drawn by northern Europeans about Portuguese colonialism: "Rather than being a sign of weakness, miscegenation was portrayed as the great Portuguese strength, that which gave their tropical culture its resilience, and above all a sign of their humane attitude towards the colonised" (141). Subrahmanyam finds the contrast between northern European and Portuguese attitudes toward native peoples to be overstated, at least in the early modern period. Similar valorizations of *mestizaje* as an essential—and superior—quality of Latin American civilization have been made in other national contexts; José Vasconcelos describes the *mestizo* "Ibero American race" created by Spanish colonization as ushering in an era of universal hybridization in Vasconcelos, *The Cosmic Race/La raza cósmica*, trans. Didier T. Jaén (Baltimore, 1997 [orig. publ. Mexico City, 1925]). J. Jorge Klor de Alva discusses more recent examples of celebratory official discourse on *mestizaje* (as a synthesis culminating in "the embrace of the West") in "The Postcolonization of the (Latin) American Experience: A Reconsideration of 'Colonialism,' 'Postcolonialism,' and 'Mestizaje,'" in Gyan Prakash, ed., *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements* (Princeton, N.J., 1995), 241–275, esp. 249–251.

well illustrates the convergence of Luso-Tropicalism and colonial state ideology:

The heterogenous composition of the Portuguese People, their traditional community and patriarchal structure, and the Christian ideal of brotherhood which was always at the base of our overseas expansion early defined our reaction to other societies and cultures, and stamped it, from the beginning, with a marked respect for the manners and customs of the peoples we encountered.

As critics of Luso-Tropicalism like Boxer have long noted, such a characterization not only erases past and present violence and racism from the history of “our overseas expansion” but also casts the integration of individuals like João Fernandes and Diogo Álvares as motivated by an essential Portuguese cultural trait rather than pragmatism or necessity. Fernandes and Álvares, as much as Prince Henry and João III, recognized that dwelling among indigenous peoples produced knowledgeable intermediaries who could help to extend Portuguese power abroad. The role that Luso-Tropicalism itself would play in the ideological defense of the Portuguese Empire highlights the imperial interests served by the integration and knowledge acquisition that the theory celebrates.¹²

These interests were not lost on the author who most contributed to the legendary status of Diogo Álvares “Caramuru” in the Brazilian imagination of its colonial origins. In *Caramuru: Poema épico do descobrimento da Bahia* (1781), the Brazilian-born friar José de Santa Rita Durão cast Álvares as no less than the hero of the Portuguese colonization of Brazil. Durão’s epic poem was composed a few decades after the members of a literary society in Bahia, the Academia Brasileira dos Renascidos, debated Álvares’s primacy

12. C. R. Boxer, *Race Relations in the Portuguese Colonial Empire, 1415-1825* (Oxford, 1963), 2. On the reception of Freyre in Portugal as well as Portuguese antecedents to Luso-Tropicalism, see Miguel Vale de Almeida, “Tristes Luso-Tropiques: The Roots and Ramifications of Luso-Tropicalist Discourses,” in Almeida, *An Earth-Colored Sea: “Race,” Culture, and the Politics of Identity in the Postcolonial Portuguese-Speaking World* (New York, 2004), 45–64, a revised translation of Almeida, *Um mar da cor da terra: “Raça,” cultura e política da identidade* (Oeiras, 2000). Castelo, “O modo português de estar no mundo,” 96–101, describes the appropriation of Freyre’s theories for state propaganda in the 1950s and 1960s, from Salazar’s invocations of Luso-Tropicalism in interviews in the foreign press to the commission, publication, and distribution of Freyre’s work by governmental ministries.

in the “discovery” of Brazil and his role in the foundation of the colony. One member, who was composing an epic entitled *Brasileida*, denied Álvares’s suitability as its protagonist because Álvares had been a “captive dos Índios, ainda que depois passasse de servo a senhor” [captive of the Indians, even if he later went from servant to master]. In contrast, Durão presents Álvares’s captivity as allowing him to acquire the linguistic skills, ethnographic knowledge, and indigenous alliances necessary to bring about the peaceful establishment of Portuguese rule and religion. Durão’s portrayal of Diogo Álvares “Caramuru” thus imaginatively substantiates, three centuries later, João III’s recognition of the captive’s contribution to Portuguese colonization. Indeed, Durão portrays Álvares as a figure known to and honored by not only the Portuguese sovereign but also Charles V of Spain and the Holy Roman Empire and Henry II of France. Through his succor of a shipwrecked Spanish vessel and his report to the French king during a voyage to Paris (where his indigenous wife is baptized), Álvares shares his experiential knowledge and mediating abilities across national and linguistic borders.¹³

Yet Durão’s motivation for writing *Caramuru* extends beyond recovering and revalorizing Álvares’s service to João III (and other European sovereigns). In the “Reflections” that precede the poem, Durão announces the patriotic sentiment that inspired him to write *Caramuru*, referring to his “amor da Pátria” (love for [his] homeland). Durão’s attachment to his native land of Brazil, despite leaving there at the age of nine, inspired him to emulate Luis de Camões’s renowned epic celebrating Portuguese expansion in the East, *Os Lusíadas* (1572). Diogo Álvares’s tale of captivity, romance, and rise to power in Brazil affords Durão an opportunity to extol his homeland and present it as an equally important part of the Portuguese Empire, even if it was not viewed as such in Álvares’s time. Unlike Camões, Durão cannot present himself as a participant in some of the events depicted in the poem or invoke his “longa experiência” [long experience] in the imperial arena as a source of authority. Instead, Durão asserts his Brazilian birthplace, identifying himself as “natural da Cara-Preta nas Minas Gerais” [native of Cara-

13. José de Santa Rita Durão, *Caramuru: Poema épico do descobrimento da Bahia* (São Paulo, 1945 [orig. publ. Lisbon, 1781]); Domingos de Silva Teles, “Carta para o director perpetuo,” in João Lúcio de Azevedo, “Academia dos Renascidos: A história. ‘Desaggravos do Brasil’ e o poema ‘Brasileida,’” *Revista de língua portuguesa*, XIX (1922), 85–95, esp. 89–94. On the discussions about Diogo Álvares’s role in the discovery of Brazil in the eighteenth-century Brazilian academies, see Carlos de Assis Pereira, *Fontes do “Caramuru” de Santa Rita Durão* (Assis, Brazil, 1971), 1–9.

Preta in Minas Gerais] on the title page of *Caramuru* (Plate 1). Durão's portrait of a Portuguese resident in Brazil as a knowledgeable and powerful intermediary reflects favorably on his self-presentation as a native of Brazil writing in Portugal. For Durão, Portugal's appreciation of its largest overseas colony depended on the mediation of authors like himself, as much as Portuguese sovereignty in Brazil relied on the negotiating abilities of ex-captives like Diogo Álvares.¹⁴

Durão's vindication of the epic grandeur of the "events of Brazil" participates in the intellectual defense of American homelands that increasingly preoccupied American-born writers in the eighteenth century. Antonello Gerbi has described the "dispute of the New World" instigated by naturalists and historians of the European Enlightenment like the comte de Buffon, Cornelius de Pauw, and William Robertson, who asserted the inferiority of the American climate and its deleterious effects on the flora, fauna, and inhabitants of the New World. Among the American responses to such allegations is a work completed in 1757 and aptly entitled *Desagravos do Brasil e glórias de Pernambuco* [Brazilian Retaliation and Glories of Pernambuco], with which the Brazilian friar Domingos de Loreto Couto sought to "refutar alguns erros, e calumnias, com que alguns Autores, que têm escrito do Brazil, mancharão a opinião dos nossos Índios, e de algumas pessoas beneméritas" [refute some of the errors and calumnies with which some authors, who have written about Brazil, have tarnished the image of our Indians, and of some worthy people]. As Couto insinuates, such "calumnies" were often directed at not only Amerindians but also Americans of European descent, who in the sixteenth century began to be ascribed with degeneration as a result of negative environmental and astrological influence. Juan López de Velasco's *Geografía y descripción universal de las Indias*, written between 1571 and 1574, asserts the detrimental consequences of the New World climate and constellations on the bodies of Spaniards who reside in the Indies, and especially on the *criollos* born there, in whom "las [calidades] del ánimo suelen seguir las del cuerpo, y mudando él se alteran también" [the qualities of the soul tend to follow those of the body, and when this changes they are altered too]. Arguments about climatic determinism impugned not just the bodies but the spiritual, moral, and intellectual capacities of American residents, as well.¹⁵

14. Durão, *Caramuru*, 13; Camões, *Os Lusíadas*, 374.

15. Domingos do Loreto Couto, *Desagravos do Brasil e glórias de Pernambuco* (Rio de Janeiro, 1904; rpt. Recife, 1981), 7; Juan López de Velasco, *Geografía y descripción*

CARAMURÚ.
POEMA EPICO
DO
DESCUBRIMENTO
DA
BAHIA,
COMPOSTO
POR
FR. JOSÉ DE SANTA RITA
DURÃO,

Da Ordem dos Eremitas de Santo Agostinho, natural da Cata-Preta nas Minas Geraes.



LISBOA
NA REGIA OFFICINA TYPOGRAFICA.

ANNO M, DCC. LXXXI.

Com licença da Real Mesa Censoria.

PLATE I. Title page of José de Santa Rita Durão, *Caramurú* (Lisbon, 1781).
Photo courtesy of Edward E. Ayer Collection, The Newberry Library, Chicago

American-born writers of all ethnicities responded vigorously to allegations of intellectual inferiority. In the preface to a treatise of Thomist philosophy published in Rome in 1688, the Peruvian Juan de Espinosa Medrano—fluent in Quechua, and generally thought to be indigenous or mestizo—dedicates several pages to refuting European assertions of the barbarism of American-born intellectuals: “Los europeos sospechan seriamente que los estudios de los hombres del Nuevo Mundo son bárbaros . . . los peruanos no hemos nacido en rincones oscuros y despreciables del mundo ni bajo aires más torpes, sino en un lugar aventajado de la tierra, donde sonríe un cielo mejor” [Europeans seriously suspect that the studies of New World men are barbarous . . . we Peruvians have not been born in obscure and despicable corners of the world nor in a duller atmosphere, but in an advantageous place on the earth, underneath a better sky]. Espinosa Medrano demonstrates how the affirmation of the superiority of America’s temperate climate and benign heavens in response to European theories of environmental determinism was not exclusive to criollo intellectuals. His reference in the same preface to “tantos y tan grandes hombres que sobresalen en el Perú en letras, en ingenio, en doctrina, en amenidad de costumbres, y en santidad” [so many and such great men in Peru that excel in letters, wit, learning, pleasant customs, and godliness] was surely meant to include himself—a published poet, playwright, translator, and author of works of the-

universal de las Indias . . . desde el año de 1571 al de 1574, ed. Justo Zaragoza (Madrid, 1894), 37–38. José Juan Arrom cites this passage as the first instance of the use of *criollo* to refer to a Spaniard born in the Indies (“Criollo: Definición y matices de un concepto,” in Arrom, *Certidumbre de América: Estudios de letras, folklore, y cultura* [Havana, 1959], 9–26, esp. 10–12). As Arrom explains, the term initially also applied to those of African descent born in the Americas; this continues to be the predominant sense of the Portuguese *crioulo*, from which *criollo* derives. In this study, I use “creole” in the Spanish sense of “a descendant of Europeans born in the Americas.” On the dispute over the inferiority of the New World and its residents, see Gerbi, *Dispute of the New World*, trans. Moyle; Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra, “New World, New Stars: Patriotic Astrology and the Invention of Amerindian and Creole Bodies in Colonial Spanish America, 1600–1650,” in Cañizares-Esguerra, *Nature, Empire, and Nation*, 64–95 (orig. publ. in *American Historical Review*, CIV [1999], 33–68); Stuart B. Schwartz, “The Formation of a Colonial Identity in Brazil,” in Nicholas Canny and Anthony Pagden, eds., *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500–1800* (Princeton, N.J., 1987), 15–50, esp. 37, 41–42, 46–47; Anthony Pagden, “Identity Formation in Spanish America,” *ibid.*, 51–93, esp. 80–83; and in the Anglophone context, Parrish, *American Curiosity*, 77–102.

ology, philosophy, and literary criticism—even though he humbly disavows his authority to list these men by name.¹⁶

Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra has argued that the defense of a superior American climate and the emergence of a “patriotic astrology” among seventeenth-century criollos required the early development of a notion of racialized bodies, usually assumed to arise only in the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries. The creation of different corporeal categories would leave creole claims of Amerindian and African inferiority intact while explaining the greater European receptiveness to the beneficial influences of the American climate and its stars. Although Cañizares-Esguerra finds references to mestizaje absent from the works that he surveys, Gerónimo de Quiroga’s late-seventeenth-century description of both Spanish and mestizo captives in Chile as “worse than the fiercest barbarians”—whether because of “racial taint” or “continuous contact” with Amerindians—suggests how cultural integration and miscegenation could play an even blunter role in theories of American “degeneration” than negative climatic and astrological influence. Quiroga decries the perverse transformation of captives as a result of their exposure to a distinct cultural, and not just natural, environment.¹⁷

Yet as we will see in Chapter 3, one of Quiroga’s contemporaries, the Chilean creole Francisco Núñez de Pineda y Bascuñán, offers an altogether different argument about his own captivity among Araucanians in the early seventeenth century. According to Pineda, his exposure to Amerindian culture as a captive indeed led to his adoption of and participation in certain indigenous customs. However, his captivity also provided him with the experience and knowledge necessary to explain the reasons and to propose solutions for the Spanish failure to pacify the Chilean frontier, in a work

16. Juan de Espinosa Medrano, “Prefacio al lector de la *Lógica*,” in Augusto Tamayo Vargas, ed., *Apologético* (Caracas, 1982 [orig. publ. Rome, 1688]), 325–329, esp. 325–327. Espinosa Medrano refers to himself as a “criollo” in the preface to his *Apologético en favor de don Luís de Góngora . . .* (Lima, 1662), a treatise defending the Spanish Baroque poet Luís de Góngora from the critique of the Portuguese writer Manuel de Faria e Sousa; see Tamayo Vargas, ed., *Apologético*, 1–109, esp. 17. However, the editor of the volume, Augusto Tamayo Vargas, discusses Espinosa Medrano’s probable indigenous or mestizo origins and suggests that he might have used “criollo” simply to denote his American birthplace; see “Lo barroco y ‘el Luna-rejo,’” *ibid.*, ix–lviii.

17. Cañizares-Esguerra, “New World, New Stars,” in Cañizares-Esguerra, *Nature, Empire, and Nation*, 92; Quiroga, *Memorias de los sucesos de la guerra de Chile*, ed. Larraín, 229.

addressed to the Spanish Crown entitled *Cautiverio feliz y razón individual de las guerras dilatadas del reino de Chile* [Happy Captivity and Individual Reason for the Prolonged Wars of Chile] (ca. 1663). Despite the generic distance between Pineda's autobiographical account and Durão's epic *Caramuru*—as well as their geographical and historical distance—both authors identify their American “locus of enunciation” with the site of a “happy captivity.” That is, Pineda and Durão implicitly respond to allegations of the intellectual inferiority of New World writers by addressing suspicions about the moral and cultural degeneration of captives. Rather than insist on the captives' intransigence, they present the transformation that results from contact with native cultures, not as detrimental, but as beneficial, allowing the captive—and, by extension, the writer—to speak from a position of authority and knowledge. If captives were sometimes viewed, as Quiroga states at one point about a mestizo renegade, as individuals who “una vez se conforma[n] con lo indio y otras con lo español, sólo para lo malo” [sometimes conform to the Indian and sometimes to the Spanish, only for the bad], these texts transform the captive's (and the author's) ability to “conform” to both sides into a positive and productive quality that does not subvert, but rather serves, imperial goals.¹⁸

18. Cañizares-Esguerra, “New World, New Stars,” in Cañizares-Esguerra, *Nature, Empire, and Nation*, 68; Quiroga, *Memorias de los sucesos de la guerra de Chile*, 228. In *How to Write the History of the New World: Histories, Epistemologies, and Identities in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World* (Stanford, Calif., 2001), Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra describes the eighteenth-century development of a “patriotic epistemology” that valorized the credibility of Amerindian and Creole elites over that of European natural historians and foreign travelers; authority to write about the New World was derived from “long periods of residence in America and close contact with the natives through mastery of their language” (248). Cañizares-Esguerra argues that, despite their approval of noble indigenous testimony, creole intellectuals continued to condemn mestizos as a source of dubious credibility (208–209). I draw on Walter Mignolo's use of the phrase “locus of enunciation” to describe the discursive attempt to legitimize “specifically American geocultural identities”; see Mignolo, “Afterword: Human Understanding and (Latin) American Interests—The Politics and Sensibilities of Geocultural Locations,” *Poetics Today*, XVI (1995), 171–214, esp. 176. Although, like Mignolo, I occasionally invoke the term “identity” to describe this gesture, my examples thus far should indicate that I am more interested in processes of *identification*—especially self-identification and self-representation—than in the *identity* of writers and captives, whether this is understood in the “hard” sense of an essential, shared condition or the “soft” sense of a flexible, fragmentary, multiple

Such strategies of self-authorization, and the fluidity and permeability of cultural and ethnic categories that they entail, have perhaps been more “invisible in European consciousness” than the notion of “sharp racial typologies” that Cañizares-Esguerra identifies as an overlooked sign of colonial Spanish America’s precocious modernity. Yet the valorization of the captive’s authority and knowledge is not, in fact, a uniquely criollo gesture, nor even one that is exclusive to American-born writers more broadly defined (including mestizos like el Inca Garcilaso de la Vega, whom I discuss in Chapter 2). As we have seen, Prince Henry’s and Gomes Eanes da Zurara’s favorable responses to João Fernandes date to the mid-fifteenth century, before the discovery of the Americas. But Portugal’s early and sustained recognition of the valuable role of captives and their narratives should also not be taken as a confirmation of Luso-Tropical exceptionalism. This study finds ample acknowledgment of the captive’s key role in knowledge production and imperial expansion in Spanish and English texts, and the occasional German and Italian authors—and African and Asian settings—of the works under discussion suggest the even broader geographical dimensions of this paradigm.¹⁹

sense of self; see Frederick Cooper and Rogers Brubaker, “Identity,” in Cooper, *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History* (Berkeley, Calif., 2005), 59–90. Cooper and Brubaker argue that the prevalence of the latter understanding of identity has obviated the usefulness of the term and propose several more specific alternatives (including identification, self-identification, and self-representation). In *Constructing the Criollo Archive: Subjects of Knowledge in the Bibliotheca Mexicana and the Rusticatio Mexicana* (West Lafayette, Ind., 2000), Antony Higgins examines specific cases of the construction of American loci of enunciation in eighteenth-century New Spain, where creole writers “[weave] between identifications with Western paradigms of culture and subjectivity, on the one hand, and with the available models of indigenous civilizations, on the other” (ix).

19. Cañizares-Esguerra, “New World, New Stars,” in Cañizares-Esguerra, *Nature, Empire, and Nation*, 64–95, esp. 95. Historians have increasingly rendered the valorization of captives and their powerful mediating positions in different geocultural contexts more visible: see James F. Brooks, *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 2002); Linda Colley, *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1600–1850* (London, 2002); Carina Lee Johnson, “Negotiating the Exotic: Aztec and Ottoman Culture in Habsburg Europe, 1500–1590” (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2000); Francis Xavier Luca, “Re-‘interpreting’ the Conquest: European and Amerindian Transla-

The greater visibility of the Portuguese reliance on captives, lançados, and degredados can, however, call attention to the function and representation of those who “dwell among” foreigners under other imperial banners—as when Francis Bacon explains, in the *New Atlantis*, Bensalem’s method of acquiring information about foreign lands through mariners who “stay abroad” for no fewer than twelve years. The foregrounding of Portugal’s foundational role in European imperial expansion thus has a somewhat different effect than the scholarly efforts to reincorporate the Spanish Empire into a narrative of modernity typically limited to Northern Europe. Whereas the comparison of Spain and England in the Americas may reinforce, as Ralph Bauer argues, the notion of a “geo-political dialectic between imperial consolidation and Creole resistance,” the treatment of Portuguese ex-captives like João Fernandes and Diogo Álvares demonstrates how much imperial consolidation depended on transculturated individuals as well as how much those individuals were seeking to serve the project of imperial consolidation rather than to resist it.²⁰

Indeed, an examination of the role of captivity, not in fomenting oppositions, but in producing and circulating knowledge and authority complicates narratives of the emergence of national as well as creole identities in the early modern period. Captives’ experience and expertise were valorized across national borders, however greatly prevailing imperial ideologies may appear to differ (Portuguese “tropicalization,” Spanish “conquest,” English “commerce”). Furthermore, captivity contributed to the sharing of knowledge—whether through coercion or cooperation—across national, religious, and linguistic boundaries. Although the border crossing involved in captivity is at least initially involuntary, examples abound of captives who embrace,

tors and Go-betweens in the Colonization of the Americas, 1492–1675” (Ph.D. diss., Florida International University, 2004); and Metcalf, *Go-betweens*.

20. Francis Bacon, *New Atlantis and the Great Instauration*, ed. Jerry Weinberger, rev. ed. (Wheeling, Ill., 1989), 59; Bauer, *Cultural Geography of Colonial American Literatures*, 29; see also Barrera-Osorio, *Experiencing Nature*; the works of Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra cited above as well as his *Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550–1700* (Stanford, Calif., 2006); and Walter D. Mignolo, *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality, and Colonization*, 2d ed. (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1995). Like the majority of comparative American or “hemispheric” historical studies, J. H. Elliott focuses exclusively on the Spanish and English colonies in his otherwise masterful *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America, 1492–1830* (New Haven, Conn., 2006).

sincerely or strategically, their ability to traverse and mediate cultural differences. Such captives problematize not only “sharp racial typologies” but also sharp national and imperial typologies. Claims of captive degeneration like Quiroga’s can certainly be found in many imperial settings—and, as we have seen, similar notions were sometimes used to denigrate creoles, mestizos, and the Spanish or Portuguese themselves. Nevertheless, a more favorable and flexible discourse about captives persists alongside and confounds the imperial drive to differentiate and oppose.²¹

Many studies have, in fact, stressed ways in which colonial captivity narratives reinforce imperialist oppositions between civilized Europeans and barbarous “others.” Critics of Anglo-American captivity narratives have long analyzed how accounts of the suffering of Puritan, often female, captives at the hands of brutal Amerindians bolstered notions of steadfast religious communities and civilized English identities in a “savage” environment. Taking landmark studies by Roy Harvey Pearce and Richard Slotkin as a point of departure, Pauline Turner Strong has outlined a “selective tradition of captivity” in Anglo-American culture, based on “oppositional typification” rather than “transformative identification” between captive and captor. Although no comparable generic tradition of colonial captivity narratives exists in Spanish or Portuguese, critics have sometimes made similar arguments about the function of captives’ tales in Latin America, particularly in the context of nineteenth-century Argentina’s state-sponsored extermination campaigns against Amerindians.²²

21. In *Colonialism in Question*, Cooper defines *empire* as an expansionist political unit that “reproduces differentiation and inequality among people it incorporates,” wherein the “balance between the poles of incorporation (the empire’s claim that its subjects belonged within the empire) and differentiation (the empire’s claim that different subjects should be governed differently) was a matter of dispute and shifting strategies” (154). The different evaluations of captives and American residents reviewed in this introduction suggest that variable and conflicting strategies of “incorporation” and “differentiation” also applied to individuals of European descent who were born or lived in colonial territories.

22. Pauline Turner Strong, *Captive Selves, Captivating Others: The Politics and Poetics of Colonial American Captivity Narratives* (Boulder, Colo., 1999), 203–204; Roy Harvey Pearce, “The Significances of the Captivity Narrative,” *American Literature*, XIX (1947), 1–20; Richard Slotkin, *Regeneration through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600–1860* (Middletown, Conn., 1973). For similar readings of captivity in the Latin American context, see Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*, 185; David T. Habery, “Captives and Infidels: The Figure of the Cautiva in Argentine

On the other hand, scholars have sought to explain the scarcity of first-hand captivity accounts in Spanish America compared to British America by asserting such narratives' threat to the Spanish imperial or the Argentine national project. In one of the few comprehensive historical studies of captivity in Spanish America, Fernando Operé argues that captives' accounts represented a clear challenge to imperial interests by testifying to "Spain's powerlessness to control all its territories." Similarly, Susana Rotker's examination of captivity in nineteenth-century Argentina points out the incompatibility of captive women, tainted by their contact with Amerindians, with a national imaginary based on the exclusion of all nonwhite elements. Other critics have taken the notion of the captive's incompatibility or threat with respect to imperial goals and rhetoric as their point of departure, interpreting captivity as a site where the conquest was inverted through the capture of European conquistadors who assimilated into Amerindian society. Garnering the most attention in this regard is Gonzalo Guerrero, a Spanish castaway captured by Mayans on the Yucatán Peninsula in 1511, who not only refused to rejoin Spanish society and serve Hernán Cortés as an interpreter but who might have also taken up arms against the Spaniards. Guerrero has been the object of several contemporary fictional re-creations and even a commemorative statue and has been praised by scholars as an exemplary "good captive" and a "model of cultural syncretism."²³

Literature," *American Hispanist*, IV (1978), 7–16, esp. 9; Cristina Iglesia and Julio Schwartzman, *Cautivas y misioneros: Mitos blancos de la conquista* (Buenos Aires, 1987), 57; Efraín Kristal, "Captive in the Wilderness: An Argentine Adaptation of an Anglo-Saxon Image," in Armin Paul Frank and Helga Essmann, eds., *The Internationality of National Literatures in Either America: Transfer and Transformation* (Göttingen, 1999), 215–229, esp. 226–227. Despite the hegemonic tradition of "oppositional typification" in Anglo-American captivity narratives, critics have also acknowledged their fractured, hybrid dimensions; see Tara Fitzpatrick, "The Figure of Captivity: The Cultural Work of the Puritan Captivity Narrative," *American Literary History*, III (1991), 1–26, esp. 21; Michelle Burnham, *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682–1861* (Hanover, N.H., 1997), 3; Rebecca Blevins Faery, *Cartographies of Desire: Captivity, Race, and Sex in the Shaping of an American Nation* (Norman, Okla., 1999), 58–59; Strong, *Captive Selves, Captivating Others*, 204; and Colley, *Captives*, 15–16. Whereas these scholars primarily highlight transitory moments that may be uncovered by reading "against the grain" of the text, I examine works in a range of traditions that explicitly valorize the transculturation of captives.

23. Fernando Operé, *Historias de la frontera: El cautiverio en la América hispánica*

The presentation of Gonzalo Guerrero as a “counter model to the conquest” in both novels and scholarship depends, as Rolena Adorno has pointed out, upon the very lack of information about him in colonial accounts: “It is the unknown and the indeterminable of his case that foments the desire to give him body, life, and significance—significances relevant for us and not for the historical figure—through the act of narration.” This book, in contrast, focuses on individuals’ own acts of narrating their captivity after their return—and on the appropriation and retelling of their stories by other authors—in order to flesh out the significances of captivity for early modern readers and writers. Such an approach requires reading accounts of captivity in a transatlantic and (inter-)imperial context and not as the foundational texts of national identities and literatures or as “counter-narratives” to the conquest. The works examined here, in fact, demonstrate the degree to

(Buenos Aires, 2001), 27; Jaime Concha, “Requiem por el ‘buen cautivo,’” *Hispanía: Revista de literatura*, XV (1986), 3–15; Rolando J. Romero, “Texts, Pre-texts, Con-texts: Gonzalo Guerrero in the Chronicles of Indies,” *Revista de estudios hispánicos*, XXVI (1992), 345–367, esp. 363. In *Captive Women: Oblivion and Memory in Argentina*, trans. Jennifer French (Minneapolis, 2002) (orig. publ. as Rotker, *Cautivas: Olvidos y memoria en la Argentina* [Buenos Aires, 1999]), Susana Rotker explains the lack of “memoirs, diaries, testimonies, or narratives of the captive women of Argentina, where there were apparently more captives than in the United States” by arguing that, in the Argentine context, such women represented a “threat that must be forgotten” (50–51). For other discussions of the dearth of primary materials on captivity in Spanish America, see Susan Migden Socolow, “Spanish Captives in Indian Societies: Cultural Contact along the Argentine Frontier, 1600–1835,” *Hispanic American Historical Review*, LXXII (1992), 73–99; and Carlos Lázaro Ávila, “Los cautivos en la frontera araucana,” *Revista española de antropología americana*, XXIV (1994), 191–207. Although Brooks finds “surprisingly rich” sources including “an extensive body of written and oral folk literature in both Indian and New Mexican communities,” he also acknowledges that accounts of captivity “must be fretted from more familiar narratives where they have long lain hidden beneath epics of exploration and conquest”; see *Captives and Cousins*, 39–40. In contrast to both Rotker and Brooks, this book focuses on the central role of European male captives in a variety of genres, and even in works that have been described as “epics of exploration and conquest,” like Garcilaso’s *La Florida del Inca* and Durão’s *Caramuru*. On Gonzalo Guerrero, see also Rolena Adorno, “La estatua de Gonzalo Guerrero en Akumal: Íconos culturales en la reactualización del pasado colonial,” *Revista iberoamericana*, LXII (1996), 905–919 (trans. and rev. in “The Narrative Invention of Gonzalo the Warrior,” *The Polemics of Possession in Spanish American Narrative* [New Haven, Conn., 2007]); and Roseanna Mueller, “Two Unofficial Captive Nar-

which tales of captivity could take a central role in works that support and defend the imperial enterprise.²⁴

Nevertheless, the writing of captivity ultimately suggests more about tensions within imperial projects than about the seamless extension of metropolitan power, for it reveals ways in which ex-captives and American-born writers were able to appropriate the valorization of firsthand knowledge about other lands and cultures in order to authorize suspect, if not subaltern, voices. At the same time, the narrators' frequent assertions of their capacity to delight readers suggest that the transmission of cognitive pleasure, and not only factual information, constituted another viable avenue of authorization. The tensions of the early modern imperial world also include the fraught but not yet exclusionary relationship between "wonder and science," as Mary Baine Campbell argues in her book of the same name. As texts that flaunt both fictional and ethnographic sources and claims, early modern captivity narratives belong to a history of the novel as well as of science and point to the contribution of New World novelties to the histories of both. The authorial appeal to, in Campbell's words, the "value of a pleasurable emotion, or relation to knowing, that requires the suspension of mastery, certainty, knowingness itself" renders the reader's captivation with the story analogous to the protagonist's captivity, both involving a "suspension of mastery" that is not entirely recovered with the report of the captive's knowledge of another culture.²⁵

ratives: Gonzalo Guerrero's *Memorias* and Cabeza de Vaca's *Naufragios*," in Maria Elena de Valdés, Mario J. Valdés, and Richard A. Young, eds., *Latin America as Its Literature* (Whitestone, N.Y., 1995), 20–35. Mueller's reading of a modern novel (Mario Aguirre Rosas's *Gonzalo de Guerrero: Padre del mestizaje iberoamericano* [Mexico City, 1975]) as an autobiographical account comparable to Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca's *Relación* (1542, 1555) reveals the contemporary appeal of colonial texts that, she claims, "contradict and subvert the official stories of the chronicles" (23). On the questionable authenticity of the different versions of Guerrero's supposed memoirs that have been "discovered" and published, see Adorno, "La estatua de Gonzalo Guerrero," *Revista iberoamericana*, LXII (1996), 911n. 6.

24. Romero, "Texts, Pre-texts, Con-texts," *Revista de estudios hispánicos*, XXVI (1992), 345–367, esp. 363; Adorno, "La estatua de Gonzalo Guerrero," *Revista iberoamericana*, LXII (1996), 911. Concha reflects on the modern-day significance of the imaginary figure of the "good captive" in "Requiem por el 'buen cautivo,'" *Hispanía*, XV (1986), 3–15, esp. 14.

25. Mary Baine Campbell, *Wonder and Science: Imagining Worlds in Early Modern Europe* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1999), 3, 24. Campbell discusses "ethnographic pleasure"

Several aspects of my approach resonate with articulations of, as well as reactions to, postcolonial theory: reading captivity narratives as an index of ambiguities and contradictions, interrogating binary oppositions between colonizer and colonized or submission and subversion, invoking concepts such as hybridity and transculturation, and interpreting the relationship between metropole and colony as mutually determining and interdependent, albeit asymmetrical. Yet like many scholars, I have often found colonial texts to anticipate and illuminate the features and concepts usually assumed to emerge only in a postcolonial world. From this perspective, Frederick Cooper and Laura Ann Stoler have questioned the very opposition between colonial and postcolonial:

Today's world is often said to be one of global movement, of fractured social relations, implicitly or explicitly contrasted to a colonial world of spatial and cultural confinement. But it may be that we have taken the categories of colonial archives—organized around specific colonial powers, their territorial units, and their maps of subject cultures—too literally, and our colonial historiography has missed much of the dynamics of colonial

in terms of the imaginative possession of an exotic “other” in travel narratives and voyage collections (26–50); however, the pleasure of captivity narratives, as we will see in Chapter 1, appears to derive more from reading about the European or Euro-American as a captive, in a position of subordination rather than mastery. On the “tensions of empire,” see Ann Laura Stoler and Frederick Cooper, “Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda,” in Cooper and Stoler, eds., *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley, Calif., 1997), 1–56; Stoler and Cooper argue that scholars have traditionally granted imperial enterprises “more coherence than they warrant,” for competing strategies and contested categories not only characterize indigenous resistance but also lie “at the heart of colonial politics” (6). With respect to the New World empires, specifically, J. H. Elliott argues for the importance of analyzing the voices of the “conquerors, colonists, and chroniclers” with the same attention and subtlety granted to the voices of subaltern “others”: “In reality there are many voices, among the conquerors and the conquered alike. We may not like what some of those voices are saying, but, as historians, we have an obligation to give a hearing to each and every one. There is no more crying need at this moment than to observe the observers with that same sensibility to historical context and environment which we pride ourselves on possessing when we come to reconstruct the world of the observed”; see Elliott, “Final Reflections: The Old World and the New Revisited,” in Karen Ordahl Kupperman, ed., *America in European Consciousness, 1493–1750* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1995), 391–408, esp. 399.

history, including the circuits of ideas and people, colonizers and colonized, within and among empires. . . . Similarly, the current emphasis on the hybridities and fractured identities of the postcolonial moment looks far less distinctive when the interstitiality of colonial lives is brought into sharper relief.

Indeed, the intra- and interimperial circulation and transformation of subjects and texts that I trace in this book demonstrate that the early modern imperial world was hardly one of “spatial and cultural confinement” that obliterates the agency of its “captives.” Such a perspective does not deny the violence and pervasiveness of binary oppositions in the course and discourse of imperial conquest, evangelization, and colonial rule. I have already referred to the imputations of barbarism directed at captives and renegades, creoles and mestizos, Amerindians and Africans, and such fictions entailed powerfully real, if dramatically diverse, effects on people’s lives. Captives and American-born writers may resist some of the categories used to describe them, but they do not seek to dispute nor do they successfully undermine all national, religious, or cultural identifications and hierarchies.²⁶

Tracing these authors’ theoretical moves, instead of positing them as examples of postcolonial ones *avant la lettre*, is not only more historically and textually sound but also more revealing of the contradictory and complex ways in which colonial empires functioned. Furthermore, such an approach elicits a reconsideration of the transgressive potential frequently ascribed to hybridity and transculturation in postcolonial scholarship. In his discussion of the distinctiveness of Portuguese colonialism vis-à-vis its Anglo-Saxon counterpart—the way in which “ambiguity and hybridity between colonizer

26. Stoler and Cooper, “Between Metropole and Colony,” in Cooper and Stoler, eds., *Tensions of Empire*, 33–34. Stoler and Cooper also make the important point that “colonial historiography has been so nationally bound that it has blinded us to those circuits of knowledge and communication that took other routes than those shaped by the metropole-colony axis alone” (28); I explore some of these circuits in Chapter 5. For other discussions of the colonial anticipation of postcolonial notions of hybridity and categorical instability, see Young, *Colonial Desire*, 27, and Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London, 1994), 173. On Spanish colonialism, specifically, as a precursor and challenge to Anglophone postcolonial theory, see Sara Castro-Klaren, “Writing Subalterity: Guaman Poma and Garcilaso Inca,” *Dispositio/n*, XIX (1994), 229–244, esp. 230; and José Rabasa, *Writing Violence on the Northern Frontier: The Historiography of Sixteenth-Century New Mexico and Florida and the Legacy of Conquest* (Durham, N.C., 2000), 16–20.

and colonized, far from being a postcolonial claim, was the experience of Portuguese colonialism for long periods of time”—Boaventura de Sousa Santos points out the need to distinguish between the types of hybridity that “reinforce the power inequalities of the colonial relation and those that minimize or even subvert them.” He concludes that, although it is appropriate for Anglo-Saxon postcolonialism to focus its critique on “polarization,” the Portuguese context calls for a “critique of ambivalence.” Indeed, the knowledge of hybrid or transculturated figures like ex-captives often sought—and was usefully employed—to reinforce rather than undercut power inequalities. Just as we can find examples of the “ambiguity and hybridity” that Santos argues to be particular to the Portuguese Empire in early modern English and Spanish imperial discourse as well, so we must also approach claims of transculturation in other contexts (including a postcolonial one) with the same critical spirit. Nowhere is transculturation necessarily a process that subverts colonial discourse or deconstructs binary oppositions.²⁷

This book’s focus on narratives of European and Euro-American captives who “return”—for it is as a consequence of their return that they are able to write or be written about in European languages and genres—means that I have neglected what Joyce Chaplin calls “captivity without the narrative,” the enslavement of Amerindians in British America. Chaplin argues that Amerindian captives are both without narratives, lacking the “critical body of written testimony that has drawn attention to white captives and black slaves,” and outside of the narratives that have traditionally structured colonial Anglo-American and Atlantic history. In the context of the Iberian Atlantic, such absences apply not only to the Amerindians and Muslims enslaved through what were claimed to be just wars, but the Africans abducted through the transatlantic slave trade initiated by the Portuguese. Such captivities resulted in so few narratives that are available to us today

27. Santos, “Between Prospero and Caliban,” *Luso-Brazilian Review*, XXXIX, no. 2 (Winter 2002), 16–17. Barbara Fuchs challenges postcolonial celebrations of “hybridity” through the analysis of a colonial text that underscores its negative effects on indigenous populations in Fuchs, “A Mirror across the Water: Mimetic Racism, Hybridity, and Cultural Survival,” in Philip D. Beidler and Gary Taylor, *Writing Race across the Atlantic World: Medieval to Modern* (New York, 2005), 9–26, esp. 20–23. For other critiques of the celebratory use of transculturation in Latin American discourse, see John Beverley, *Subalternity and Representation: Arguments in Cultural Theory* (Durham, N.C., 1999), 41–64; and Gareth Williams, *The Other Side of the Popular: Neoliberalism and Subalternity in Latin America* (Durham, N.C., 2002), 26–29.

that Juan Francisco Manzano's *Autobiografía de un esclavo*—published in an English translation in 1840 and first printed in Spanish in 1937—is thought to be the “only autobiographical account written by a slave during slavery” in Spanish America. In several chapters, I highlight the incorporation of (or silence about) the captivity of Amerindians or Africans in the texts that I examine, but here it bears mentioning two narratives written by captives of Europeans that did circulate during and after their lifetimes.²⁸

Hassan ibn Muhammad al-Wazzan al-Fasi, known in English as Leo Africanus, was a Moor from Granada who moved with his family to Morocco when the Catholic sovereigns conquered the city in 1492; he traveled widely in Africa as a diplomat until he was captured by Spanish corsairs in the Mediterranean in 1518 and presented as a gift to Pope Leo X in Rome. Hassan al-Wazzan converted to Christianity and spent nine years in Italy, where he became a prolific author and translator, before returning to North Africa. Among his works is a pioneering historical and geographical description of Africa, *Della descrizione dell’Africa et delle cose notabili che quivi sono, per*

28. Joyce E. Chaplin, “Enslavement of Indians in Early America: Captivity without the Narrative,” in Elizabeth Mancke and Carole Shammas, eds., *The Creation of the British Atlantic World* (Baltimore, 2005), 45–70, esp. 46; Ivan A. Schulman, introduction, in Juan Francisco Manzano, *The Autobiography of a Slave / Autobiografía de un esclavo*, ed. Schulman, trans. Evelyn Picon Garfield (Detroit, Mich., 1996), 5–38, esp. 7. Juan Francisco Manzano's autobiography was first published in R. R. Madden, *Poems by a Slave in the Island of Cuba, Recently Liberated, . . . with the History of the Early Life of the Negro Poet, Written by Himself* (London, 1840); the many editorial interventions in the work's publication history lead Sylvia Molloy to argue that Manzano's autobiography is not only a text about dispossession but also a “dispossessed” text; see Molloy, “From Serf to Self: The Autobiography of Juan Francisco Manzano,” in Molloy, *At Face Value: Autobiographical Writing in Spanish America* (Cambridge, 1991), 36–54, esp. 38. The enslavement of Amerindians—officially proscribed with the New Laws of 1542—and of Moors in peninsular Spain has been less widely studied than the infamous transatlantic slave trade; see Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, *La esclavitud en Castilla en la Edad Moderna y otros estudios de marginados* (Granada, 2003), 1–64. Esteban Mira Caballos estimates that at least 2,442 Amerindian slaves were brought to Spain between 1493 and 1550 but affirms that they left no written testimonies of their impressions of their captors' world; see Mira Caballos, *Indios y mestizos americanos en la España del siglo XVI* (Madrid, 2000), 68, 109. On shifting Spanish Crown policies toward Amerindian slavery, see Silvio Zavala, *New Viewpoints on the Spanish Colonization of America* (Philadelphia, 1943), 49–68; on the different policies and practices of slavery in the Portuguese Atlantic, see Metcalf, *Go-betweenes*, 157–193.

Giovan Lioni Africano, published by Giovanni Battista Ramusio in the first volume of his collection *Delle navigationi et viaggi* in 1550, and subsequently a bestseller with multiple editions and translations published in various European cities. Although produced during his captivity rather than upon his return, Hassan al-Wazzan's *Description of Africa* exemplifies both the reception and the strategies of many of the European and Euro-American captives discussed here. First, his authorial success points to the increasing valorization of eyewitness testimony in the sixteenth century. In the preface to the English translation, *A Geographical Historie of Africa, Written in Arabicke and Italian by John Leo a More* (1600), John Pory defends the author's credibility—"albeit by birth a More, and by religion for many yeeres a Mahumetan"—by pointing to his status and education, but especially to his "diligence" as a traveler: "And so much the more credite and commendation deserveth this woorthy Historie of his; in that it is . . . nothing else but a large *Itinerarium* or *Journal* of his African voiages: neither describeth he almost anye one particular place, where himselfe had not sometime beene an eie-witnes." Of course, it was not only Hassan al-Wazzan's firsthand experience that earned him an authoritative reputation in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe but the captivity that led to his conversion to Christianity and acquisition of Italian, thus making his knowledge accessible and credible to European publics. Yet however much European writers, editors, and translators might have appropriated the image and works of "Leo Africanus," Hassan al-Wazzan also demonstrates the advantages of self-fashioning for those who cross cultures, languages, and geographies. At the end of book one, he tells a parable of an amphibious bird who avoids tax collection by alternately posing as a bird and a fish and concludes, "For mine owne part, when I heare the Africans evill spoken of, I wil affirme my self to be one of Granada: and when I perceive the nation of Granada to be discommended, then will I professe my selfe to be an African." Hassan al-Wazzan—or Yuhanna al-Asad, the translation of his Christian name with which he signed after his baptism—illustrates the strategic value of variable and contradictory self-identifications, the ability to conform to both sides "for the good."²⁹

29. [Hassan ibn Muhammad al-Wazzan al-Fasi, a.k.a. Leo Africanus], *The History and Description of Africa and of the Notable Things Therein Contained*, trans. John Pory (London, 1896 [orig. publ. London, 1600]), I, 4, 6–7, 190. Samuel Purchas anthologized John Pory's translation in Purchas, *Hakluytus Posthumus; or, Purchas His Pilgrimes* (London, 1625), and John Smith praises him as an "excel-

It is another captive of Spaniards in the Mediterranean who affirms the value of the indigenous knowledges with which Europeans came into contact in the New World. Juan Bautista Túpac Amaru—the stepbrother of José Gabriel Túpac Amaru, leader of the 1780 indigenous rebellion in Peru—was a political prisoner following the suppression of the uprising for some forty years in Ceuta, one of the last Spanish colonies in North Africa. In a memoir entitled “El dilatado cautiverio bajo del gobierno español,” written shortly after his liberation and voyage to Buenos Aires in 1820, Juan Bautista sums up the Spanish conquest of the New World as depriving humanity of “conocimientos importantes a la ciencia social y natural” [knowledge important to social and natural science]. His footnote to “natural science” explains that, whereas Europe’s first botanic garden was established in Padua in 1545, Cortés and other conquistadors encountered gardens with medicinal plants already in use in the New World: “por consiguiente fueron más antiguos que en Europa y se podría correr sobre todo el cuadro científico de Bacon con igual certidumbre para mostrar esta verdad si los límites de este papel lo permitiesen” [and thus they were more ancient there than in Europe, and one could go over Bacon’s whole scientific table with equal certainty to demonstrate this fact, if the limits of this paper permitted it]. From Juan Bautista’s perspective at the twilight of Spanish control over its American colonies, the Iberian encounter with indigenous culture in the New World was an opportunity lost, for the conquest deprived the world of expertise that preceded and exceeded the knowledge gained through the scientific reforms associated with Bacon and other European naturalists and philosophers. For the captives and authors discussed in this study, firsthand knowledge of indigenous cultures was an opportunity to be exploited, and in doing so they contributed to the shift toward empiricism that also antedates Bacon’s

lent Statesman . . . who afterward turned Christian” when he borrows from his work in Smith, *The True Travels, Adventures, and Observations of Captaine John Smith* (1630); see Philip L. Barbour, ed., *The Complete Works of Captain John Smith (1580–1631)* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1986), III, 207. For an exhaustive biography and analysis of Hassan al-Wazzan’s works, see Natalie Zemon Davis, *Trickster Travels: A Sixteenth-Century Muslim between Worlds* (New York, 2006); Davis explores the Arabic and European sources of inspiration for the tale of the trickster bird (which al-Wazzan attributes to an invented Arabic story collection) and concludes, “He was building a bridge for himself, one that he could cross in either direction . . . he was also advising his Italian readers that the condition for his truth-telling was that he be not too tightly classified” (114).

famous defense of it. Nevertheless, the memoir of an Inca captive of Spaniards in North Africa reminds us that European imperial expansion did as much to destroy as it did to generate “knowledge important to social and natural science.” European and Euro-American captives might have been most successful at transmitting information that enabled the domination of indigenous cultures, even as they derived authority from their knowledge of those cultures.³⁰

This book is structured so that chapters addressing the valorization and instrumentalization of captives and captivity narratives in a transatlantic and interimperial context frame three case studies of the representation of captivity in the writing of American-born authors. Chapter 1 focuses on the relationship between Iberian accounts of captivity in the Mediterranean and in the Americas beginning in the sixteenth century. Instead of setting up a European paradigm against which colonial texts will be judged, the chapter emphasizes the mutual nature of the exchange by showing how fictional and historical accounts of captivity among Muslims—in such texts as Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra’s *Los trabajos de Persiles y Sigismunda: Historia setentrional* (1617) and João Carvalho Mascarenhas’s *Memoravel relação da perda da nao “Conceicam”* [sic] *que os turcos queymarão à vista da barra de Lisboa* (1627)—exhibit strategies developed in sixteenth-century New World accounts like Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca’s *Relación y comentarios* (1542, 1555). The transatlantic itinerary traced in the chapter shows how writing captivity on both sides of the Atlantic engages the problematization of the categories of truth and fiction that critics have argued to be central

30. Juan Bautista Túpac Amaru, *Memorias del hermano de Túpac Amaru, escritas en Buenos Aires* (Buenos Aires, 1976), 57, 62. Juan Bautista did not enjoy the “happy captivity” of Hassan al-Wazzan nor encounter the favorable reception enjoyed by the *Description of Africa* in sixteenth-century Europe; his memoir was only discovered in an Argentinian archive in the early twentieth century and was first published in Lima in 1941 as *Cuarenta años de cautiverio (memorias del Inka Juan Bautista Túpac Amaru)*. On the existence of medicinal gardens among the Nahuatl in Mesoamerica, which predate those of Europe, see Doris Heyden, “Jardines botánicos prehispánicos,” *Arqueología mexicana*, X (2002), 18–23, esp. 23. Parrish describes the valorization of Africans and Amerindians as “primitive” yet credible sources of natural, botanic, and medical knowledge in the colonial British Atlantic world—and colonial whites’ self-representation as necessary arbiters in the transmission of “potentially toxic” native and African knowledge to Europe—in *American Curiosity*, 215–306, esp. 217, 247.

to the rise of the novel. The simultaneous appeal to the captivity narrative's status as credible and pleasurable is an example of cultural exchange between the New World and the Old rather than of unidirectional influence from the center to the margins of empire. As narratives of intercultural contact, the tales of captivity produced at and for the center of empire are just as marked by cultural (as well as material) commerce with America as New World narratives are marked by their commerce with Old World literary forms and texts.

Chapter 2 is dedicated to el Inca Garcilaso de la Vega's history of Hernando de Soto's 1539 expedition to southeastern North America. Although he began to write it decades earlier based on oral information from a survivor of the expedition, *La Florida del Inca* was published in Lisbon in 1605, almost a half century after the mestizo author's relocation to Spain from his native Peru. Garcilaso weaves several tales of captivity into the narrative of Soto's disastrous expedition, which resulted in the death of its leader, the abandonment of the enterprise, and the dispersal of its participants. One of the best known of these stories is that of Juan Ortiz, a Spaniard who was looking for signs of the lost Pánfilo de Narváez expedition in Florida when he was captured in 1528. A comparison of Garcilaso's version of the tale to those of other chroniclers highlights his presentation of Ortiz as a valuable and valorized mediator and interpreter. *La Florida* also refers to captives and exiles who, unlike Ortiz, privilege their own or the "other's" cultural identity to the detriment of coexistence. Garcilaso's negative portrayal of these figures and explicit identification with Juan Ortiz underscore his self-definition as a mestizo author working to mediate and legitimize a space between two cultures. Written about and from places that Garcilaso did not consider home, *La Florida del Inca* provides an opportunity to explore the mestizo writer's conflictive process of identification and self-authorization, a dissonance that is less conspicuous in Garcilaso's later work devoted to his native land of Peru, *Comentarios reales de los Incas* (1609).

Chapter 3 centers on *Cautiverio feliz y razón individual de las guerras dilatadas del reino de Chile* by the Chilean creole soldier Francisco Núñez de Pineda y Bascuñán. Like *La Florida*, the work describes both the failure of violent attempts at Spanish conquest and a happy captivity among Amerindians. Completed by 1673, Pineda's manuscript remained unpublished until the nineteenth century, although it appears to have circulated widely during the colonial period. The double title is not misleading: what Pineda offers is a generic hybrid alternating between the autobiographical account of his six-month captivity among Araucanian Indians in 1629 and a wealth

of political and moral “digressions,” mainly concerning the past, present, and future of the Spanish presence in Chile. The latter issues occupy the bulk of the more than three-hundred-page manuscript. Both memoir and tract, Pineda’s twofold creation converges in one principal purpose: to squarely place the blame for the prolongation of the wars in Chile (i.e., the inefficacy of the conquest) on Spanish misrule, in particular the ineptitude, malice, and greed of Spanish administrators. Pineda uses his knowledge and experience both as a captive and as a creole, or “native son,” of Chile to explain and critique the failure of Spanish imperialism in his homeland. While *Cautiverio feliz* is unique among my texts and colonial letters as a firsthand autobiographical account of captivity, Pineda’s work is no less shaped by concerns of authority, knowledge, and cultural identity than the literary rewritings of conquest in *La Florida del Inca* and the text I turn to next, *Caramuru*.

If captives serve as a supporting cast of characters in Garcilaso’s version of the Soto expedition, and in *Cautiverio feliz* the autobiographical voice of the captive takes center stage, José de Santa Rita Durão elevates the captive figure to the role of epic hero in *Caramuru: Poema épico do descobrimento da Bahia* (1781), which I address in Chapter 4. Durão’s version of the legend of the sixteenth-century castaway Diogo Álvares “Caramuru” and his indigenous wife, Paraguaçu, presents both the most transculturated captive of any of the texts under study and the most successful portrait of Iberian colonialism in the Americas. *Caramuru* thus carries to an extreme the tendency of other authors to present the captive’s transculturation, not as a threat, but as an aid to imperial expansion. At the same time, the extent of the captive’s transformation and the agency of his indigenous consort reveal the tensions within the colonial project and its representation and problematize the notion of a uniform and monolithic imperial system of differentiation and categorization.

The final chapter turns from the function of captivity in texts of the Spanish and Portuguese Empires to the role of Spanish and Portuguese captives—as well as English captives of the Spaniards and Portuguese—in English writing about the Americas. Here we also find captives and captured texts valued for their ability to purvey knowledge that fosters the work of empire building, offsetting the taint of cultural difference that might have rendered them suspect to both their own and their captors’ societies. The chapter first examines how the English anthologizers Richard Hakluyt and Samuel Purchas incorporate Iberian sources—frequently texts captured by pirates—into their travel collections, *Principal Navigations of the English Nation* (1589, 1598–1600) and *Hakluytus Posthumus; or, Purchas His Pilgrimes* (1625).

The dependence on “captive” Iberian sources of knowledge in these anthologies as well as in Sir Walter Raleigh’s *Discoverie of the Large, Rich, and Bewtiful Empyre of Guiana* (1596) complicates the authors’ frequent anti-Spanish, anti-Catholic rhetoric, which has sometimes been interpreted as a sign of implacable nationalist opposition. The accounts of English captives of Amerindians, Spaniards, and Portuguese further demonstrate the crossing of national and religious borders in the production of firsthand knowledge about the New World, and English captives-cum-authors like Francis Sparrey, Peter Carder, and Anthony Knivet reveal flexible identities and narrative strategies that are similar to those of their Iberian counterparts. The chapter concludes with a consideration of England’s and Anglo-America’s most famous captive, John Smith, who explicitly argues for the authority granted by New World experience even as he freely incorporates the experiences of others into his historiographic and autobiographical works. John Smith’s dependence on Iberian sources—perhaps even for his tale of rescue by Pocahontas—points up the circulation of Iberian texts in England and illustrates how a common European project of knowledge production and religious dissemination in the New World at times transcends national and even religious divisions.

As all of the texts examined in this book demonstrate, the site of captivity reveals the constructed nature of borders and binarisms. This book’s attention to written works usually ascribed to distinct national and linguistic traditions—and especially to the texts and individuals that circulated between empires and across the Atlantic—also seeks to reveal the artificial nature of some of the borders that currently delimit scholarly fields. As captives show us, linguistic, geographic, and cultural borders are not impassable, and crossing boundaries can allow a mutually enriching dialogue across cultures—without crossing out difference.