

Travel Dialogues Under Counter-Reformation Pressure: A New Vehicle for Polemics in
16th Century Hispanic Literature

By

Monique Dascha Inciarte

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Comparative Literature

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Timothy Hampton, Chair

Professor Anthony J. Cascardi

Professor José M. Rabasa

Spring 2011

Abstract

Travel Dialogues Under Counter-Reformation Pressure: A New Vehicle for Polemics in 16th Century Hispanic Literature

by

Monique Dascha Inciarte

Doctor of Philosophy in Comparative Literature

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Timothy Hampton, Chair

This dissertation considers two literary texts in dialogue form: the anonymous *Viaje de Turquía* written in the 1550's about a Spaniard's experiences as an ex-captive of the Turks and his travels back to Spain through Greece and Italy; and Pedro de Quiroga's c. 1565 *Coloquios de la verdad*, about the experiences of an indigenous Peruvian who witnesses the process of colonization and the failed evangelization of the natives firsthand. Both texts contain a large amount of ethnographic detail (from the manner in which people pray, raise their families and celebrate, to the rituals surrounding the chewing of the coca leaf and the degustation of Turkish yogurt). The texts justify themselves in an introductory section (prologue) where the "authors" extol the virtues of knowing about other world cultures and praise the veracity of eye-witness reports. I argue that although these dialogues present themselves as travel narratives that offer the Spanish crown useful ethnographic portraits of non-Christian cultures, their ulterior motive, and ultimate effect, is a critique of Christian Spain. Using genre theory as developed by Frederic Jameson and Claudio Guillén, I review how the dialogues are criss-crossed by other genres that contribute to their literary and thematic force.

Chapter One introduces the texts, describes the theoretical framework and method of analysis that is used; and reviews the dissertation's structure. Chapter Two contextualizes the two dialogues, placing them within their historical times and places; and shows how the manuscripts' history, the play between interlocutors and their control of the narrative, the sort of portrait drawn of the non-Spanish culture, and other literary issues related to both form and the content reflect historical, philosophical, religious, and political realities. Chapter Three brings into play genre theory in order to identify the models for the dialogues under discussion, namely travel narratives (Marco Polo and John Mandeville), Plato's philosophical dialogues, and Lucian's satiric dialogues; and the other genres that they incorporate: other travel narratives of the period, autobiography, and picaresque.

Dedication

To Esteban and Vivian, who taught me to love both dialogue and literature.
And to David and Jacobo, lights of my life.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank the Chair of my committee, Timothy Hampton, who stepped in like a true white knight; Jordi Aladro and Mariano Gaos, who dragged me back to school; and Brian Buchbinder, my steadfast interlocutor.

Travel Dialogues Under Counter-Reformation Pressure: A New Vehicle for Polemics in 16th Century Hispanic Literature

Chapter 1 - Two Case Studies: *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad*

Right now,
suppose we had a mirror.
We could go out in the street, and if the sun were out
we could position this mirror:
then,
the reflection could reach anywhere.

Andrés Xiloj¹

“...people imagine that they know...when they don’t know, and, not having come to an understanding at first because they think that they know, they end, as might be expected, in contradicting one another and themselves. Now you and I must not be guilty of this fundamental error which we condemn in others; but as our question is whether the lover or non-lover is to be preferred, let us first agree in defining ... love, and then, [keep] our eyes upon the definition...” (Plato, *Phaedrus*)

Viaje de Turquía, written anonymously in the 1550’s, and Pedro de Quiroga’s *Coloquios de la Verdad*, written c. 1565, are two of the most engaging dialogues of their century: they teach, they persuade, and they entertain. These works were written at a time when the dialogue as a genre was enjoying something of a renaissance, an incomparable popularity among authors and readers alike, during Spain’s Golden Age. They tackle social and religious problems, affirming a clear affinity with Erasmian humanism, and demonstrate abiding literary value. But more important for my purposes, in a manner and style that spoke directly to their contemporary readers, they portray the non-Spaniard “Other”: the Turk and the indigenous Peruvian, respectively. The dialogic form of these texts permits the exploration of polemical issues in a setting where heretical ideas can be expressed without appearing overtly dangerous ideologically. Both works were unpublished in their time but certainly were circulated in manuscript form, a sort of *samizdat* that could evade official censorship.² Ultimately, although the two works present themselves as travel narratives that offer the Spanish crown useful ethnographic portraits, their ulterior motive, and ultimate effect, is a critique of Christian Spain.

Promoting liveliness and avoiding tedium are at the heart of these often humorous dramatic dialogues. Although it is true that Renaissance dialogues follow generic conventions, they rarely do so at the expense of the reader. The setting for the

¹ From recordings, quoted in *The Analogical Tradition and the Emergence of a Dialogical Anthropology*, Dennis Tedlock.

² See Fernando Bouza, *Corre manuscrito: una historia cultural del Siglo de Oro*.

colloquium is often a comfortable one, a *locus amoenus* or good place for discourse—along the paths of a bountiful garden, around a dining-room table loaded with delectable treats; the characters are not expected to deliver sermons to their audience, but to engage in friendly conversation about an interesting topic or an extended set of topics and, often, a polemic debate; one character will guide the reader and resolve disputes as the ultimate authority for the interlocutors; and although the subject may on rare occasions border on the lofty or the forbidding, the language, for the most part, remains colloquial, reasonable, and civil (Cuevas, 737).³

No doubt, one can make out some political agenda behind the entertainment, although the tenor of that political agenda remains – like many aspects of the dialogic genre – a disputed matter. Some critics, such as Cristobal Cuevas and Jesús Gómez view the genre as ideologically in tune with orthodox thinking—theological, philosophical and political.⁴ Others, such as Ana Vian Herrero⁵ and Jacqueline Ferreras Savoye,⁶ view the conceit of an apparently open conversation between peers as particularly apt for the non-dogmatic representation of multiple perspectives in a scheme that does not make any one dominant or authoritative. To them, the very presentation of multiple perspectives becomes subversive.

One fact beyond dispute, however, is that authors with an affinity with humanism chose to work within the generic constraints of the dialogue. The brand of humanism shared by these authors privileged the reasoning faculty of the human spirit over dogmatism and was a response to medieval scholastic education; highlighted the importance of personal experience in matters of truth and knowledge, and the art of a communicative exchange open to doubt and experimentation; sought to inspire a civic engagement on the part of the citizenry that would encourage virtuous and prudent actions; recommended learning how to speak and write eloquently and clearly. Dialogic *misceláneas*, for example, such as Antonio de Torquemada's *Jardín de flores curiosas*, were no less than encyclopedic explorations of the most diverse subjects: theology, medicine, science, art, natural history, and philosophy. The dialogic literary form that developed in the early sixteenth century implied a specific ideological conception of the

³ Cristóbal Cuevas (1999). "La Cultura del Renacimiento," in *Historia de España* of Menéndez Pidal, Vol. XXI, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.

⁴ Jesús Gómez, (2000). *El diálogo renacentista*. Madrid, Laberinto. Cuevas states that dialogues in general "desarrollan un corpus doctrinal muy ortodoxo y definido de antemano," (738) but his examples of this are dialogic catechisms, not the work of humanists like the Vives brothers or Valdés.

⁵ A. Vian (1993). "El diálogo literario en América en el siglo XVI", *Actas del I congreso Anglo-Hispano*, Alan Deyermond and Ralph Penny, Madrid, Castalia, II: 193-215.

⁶ J. Ferreras-Savoye (2002). "Géneros literarios en el siglo XVI: el diálogo humanístico, crisol de experimentaciones literarias," *Cuadernos Americanos* 94: 127-146.

world or, in Savoye's words, the "literary expression of a new conscience."⁷ If, as Savoye believes, a dialogue of the period by its very nature represented an anti-dogmatic, relativistic and pluralistic set of perspectives, it is perhaps in part because the dialogue has fewer constraints than other genres and so provides the broadest possible medium to express ideas and opinions on the greatest number of subjects.⁸

From a methodological standpoint dialogue, in contrast to the genres of soliloquy, monologue, lecture, sermon, disquisition, treatise, can also be conceived of as an emancipatory genre insofar as it stages the art of conversation: multiple discursive entities shattering the illusion of single, one-dimensional viewpoints (authorities, as it were). I am not speaking here of the related genres of catechism or teacher/student manuals where the discursive subjects are unequal and the dialogue is merely the vehicle for dogma. I refer to dialogues as they developed in the Platonic tradition, where various points of views are considered and logically analyzed according to given criteria established at the outset of the conversation.

Forged in the fires of inquisitorial Spain, the dialogue becomes a most effective weapon for opening up polemical issues, without provoking accusations of heresy. Just as fabulists, since ancient times and across cultures, have used animals and anthropomorphic figuration to satirize human traits more safely and more successfully than essayistic or moralistic exhortation,⁹ authors of the Spanish Golden Age satirized their society by holding up the deceptively warped mirror of the dialogue. Quiroga, for example, describes his dialogue as "a bitter and satirical work, that aims at everyone and touches all." ["obra acerba y satirica, que a todos tira y a todos toca."] (71) It is as warped, satirical mirrors of Christian Spain that I suggest we must approach both the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios*.

The dialogic genre undoubtedly helps an author explore dualistic representations and is particularly well-suited to the presentation of confrontation and comparison between two cultures. In *Viaje de Turquía* Pedro de Urdemalas recounts his experience as captive in Constantinople and details his travels from Turkey back to Spain through Greece and Italy. In *Coloquios de la Verdad* Tito, a Quechua-speaking native, describes colonial Peru, as well as his trip to Spain. In many dialogues—and most particularly in

⁷ J. Ferreras-Savoye, J. (1985). *Les Dialogues Espagnols du XVIe Siecle ou L'expression Litteraire d'une Nouvelle Conscience*, Paris, Didier Erudition, p. 7.

⁸ Savoye's critics have accused her of applying an overly mechanical correspondence between the dialogic form and truly dialogic (polyglossic) content.

⁹ The genre of animal fables is well represented in Spanish literature by a work such as *Calila y Dimna*, which also, not coincidentally, exploits the dialogue form. Margaret Parker has written about the dialogic and picaresque aspects of *Calila y Dimna* in "The Libro de Buen Amor, El libro de Calila e Digna and the Picaresque Connection" in *Bestia: Yearbook of the Beast Fable Society*, vol. 1, pp. 21-31, May 1989.

these—the cross-cultural comparison is achieved through a description of the personal experience of an intermediary figure, a go-between. Even if one authoritative position almost always dominates the debate, the characters' (apparently) open-ended and improvisatory conversations with or about the go-between allow them (and through them, the authors) to offer controversial ideas, discussions, and opinions that, standing starkly on their own, could be considered heretical within their own culture.

To the extent that the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* engage in a self-reflective anthropology of Spain's mores and ideas through their assessment of "foreign" cultures, these dialogues draw directly from a specific tradition that developed in the second century, AD. Both works have been described as Lucianic satires, modeled on the satirical works of Lucian of Samosata, whose dialogues were disseminated, translated and reworked by men such as Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam and Sir Thomas More. The *Viaje* and the *Coloquios*, however, are Lucianic in ways that have only begun to be studied. Ana Vian Herrero describes the many sides of Lucian thus: an atheist who mocks all forms of faith, fanaticism, and dogma, including Greek mythology, Christianity, and other superstitious systems of belief; a writer of the fantastic, who describes trips to the moon, and to Hades, allegoric dreams, and metamorphoses and transmigrations; a moral philosopher who believes in an objective moral universe; a skeptic master of philosophical subjectivity anchored in multi-perspectivism; a model historiographer; and an ethnographer, who delighted in the observation of foreign cultures (Vian 2005)¹⁰. I believe it is this face of Lucian—namely, an observer of foreign cultures; the Lucian of *The True Story*, *Anacharsis*, *Navigium*, *Eunuchus*, *Imagines*, or *Dialogi mortuorum*; the Lucian whose ethnography is not meant as such, but rather as a fantastical approach to an exoticized and peripheral Other, through which Lucian criticized the center, the Roman empire – that most influenced dialogues such as the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios*. We will look closely at Lucian in Chapter 3.

Rather than being explicitly stated, the criticism of Spanish/Christian society emerges from the dramatic, at times almost theatrical, breakdown of the form of the dialogue. In the *Viaje*, the moments of greatest narrative intensity are those where Juan or Mátalascallando interrupt Pedro's narrative about Turkey to ask superficial questions that completely miss Pedro's point. The interruption, in turn, sparks a debate where Pedro shows up his interlocutors as charlatans and poor Christians. The verbal repartee reaches such a pitch that the reader might expect the interlocutors will come to blows, for reasons that have nothing to do with the Turks. Pedro will not compromise his ideals for the sake of peace and excoriates Juan and Mátalascallando in much the same way he excoriates the Turks. One of the other two men, usually Mátalascallando, must interrupt once again, changing the subject and redirecting Pedro to his supposed object, the description of the terrible Turks. Those moments of sudden irrational conflict among the three friends make the dialogue crumble into an exchange unrelated to the ethnographic narrative: Pedro's

¹⁰ A. Vian Herrero (2005). "El diálogo lucianesco en el Renacimiento español. Su aportación a la literatura y el pensamiento modernos." *El diálogo renacentista en la Península Ibérica*. R. Friedlein. Munchen, Franz Steiner Verlag.

captivity and travels then become nothing more than pretexts for an exchange of repartees. Since the work avowedly is a travel narrative, this underhanded mode of criticism is nothing less than subversive, and Pedro's perspective on the Turks turns into an exposé of his fellow Christians who have lost their way.

On a diegetic level *Viaje de Turquía* (hereinafter "*Viaje*") and the *Coloquios de la verdad* (hereinafter "*Coloquios*") function as travel narratives, as well as dialogues.¹¹ They contain a large amount of ethnographic detail – from the manner in which people pray and celebrate, to the rituals surrounding the chewing of the coca leaf or the degustation of Turkish yogurt. As such, they use the capacity inherent in travel narratives to present overt ethnographic portraits of the "Other." Indeed, their introductory sections (prologues) extol the virtues of knowing about other world cultures. The *Viaje*, for example, begins: "That insatiable and unbridled desire to know and understand which nature has placed in all men, [...] can not be better satisfied than with pilgrimage and the seeing of foreign lands." ["Aquel insaciable y desenfrenado deseo de saber y conocer que natura puso en todos los hombres, [...] no puede major executarse que con la peregrinación y ver de tierras estrañas."] (87)¹² It goes without saying that this "unbridled desire," commonly called curiosity, has been considered sinful since Adam! In Chapter 3 we will explore how certain aspects of such works such as Mandeville's *Travels*—pseudo-autobiography, critique of Christianity couched ethnographically—inform and clearly shape our Renaissance dialogues.

Below the surface of the travel narratives, partially but not completely hidden, lies a substantive critique of the society and culture from which the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* emerged. Once the reader becomes aware of the self-critical dimension of those dialogues, the line between outward-looking ethnography and inward-looking satire becomes blurred. Is the point of the texts to find out about the Other's culture or about one's own (the presumably Spanish reader's); is it about Pagans or Christians? Because they are dialogues, the *Viaje* and the *Colloquios* engage the reader in a unique and

¹¹ The critical editions of the texts I will be using are Fernando García Salinero's edition of *Viaje de Turquía*, published by Cátedra in 1985; and Daisy Rípodas Ardanaz's edition of *Coloquios de la verdad*, published by the Seminario americanista de la Universidad de Valladolid, in 1992. Diegesis (narration or report) as opposed to mimesis (imitation or representation. Genette distinguishes between three "diegetic levels". The extradiegetic level of the narrative's telling) is, according to Gerald Prince, 'external to (not part of) and diegesis.' One might think of this as what we commonly understand to be the narrator's level, the level at which exists a narrator who is not part of the story he tells. The diegetic level is understood as the level of the characters, their thoughts and actions. The metadiegetic level or hypodiegetic level is that part of a diegesis that is embedded in another one and is often understood as a story within a story, as when a diegetic narrator himself tells a story, see Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse: an Essay in Method*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1972.

¹² This from Aristotle's *Metaphysics*.

distinctive rhetoric: they invite new ways of thinking about the Self and the “Other,” and the Noble and the Savage. As didactic, dialectic, and persuasive as they are entertaining, both these works present three characters engaged in a controversial exchange of ideas about the Other, but, in fact, tell only one single story, and it is about the Self.

The self-critical, satirical intent of both the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* is built into the very structure of their narrative and the characterization of the interlocutors. In the *Viaje* two inseparable friends Juan de Voto Dios and Mátalascallando, both clerics, bump into a university friend they have not seen for years, Pedro de Urdemalas, on the road to Santiago. Mátalascallando and Juan make their living exploiting superstitious believers by extorting money for a hospital project that will never get started. During the first day Pedro, who has escaped from captivity in Constantinople, recounts how he was taken captive, made a slave, and finally how he managed to escape. His narration is interrupted and shaped by the other two’s comments and questions. The second day is dedicated to Pedro’s description of the history, life, and customs of the Turks. The conversation permits a contrast of the two cultures, but instead of extolling the virtues of Spanish society, the comparison ends up shedding a critical light on Juan, who comes out as the champion of an ignorant, superstitious, hypocritical, and conventional Christianity.

Similarly, the four dialogues of the *Coloquios* are structured so as to generate self-criticism. The first dialogue deals with the Spaniards’ conquest of Peru where young Justino, who has just arrived and expects to make a fortune, receives advice from disillusioned Barchilón.¹³ The second begins when the pair hears the laments of Tito, an Indian who is about to commit suicide. With a knife (literally) at his throat, Tito joins the conversation and describes the horrors visited upon the natives by the men who have conquered them; the Spanish administration of justice and tyranny; and the customs and way of life of the natives. In the third he speaks of the coca leaf, how it is used and cultivated, and the harm it causes. In the fourth Barchilón attacks the Indians for their idolatry, resistance to conversion, and stubborn silence. Tito blames the Spaniards and describes the mistakes they are making in attempts at evangelization. He ends the colloquium by offering suggestions and proposals for successful indoctrination.

In both works, the “go-between” – Pedro in the *Viaje* and Tito in the *Coloquios* – is given considerable authority and credibility by the authors. In the *Viaje*, Pedro’s authority and credibility rest on his significant travel experiences (real, as opposed to Juan’s feigned ones) and his indisputable cleverness in the face of great adversity. The description of the time he spent as a slave of a powerful and ruthless man, Sinan Baxá, is peppered with instances in which he takes on entire communities of outwardly respectable men, such as the quack doctors of the king, in pseudo-disputations where he demonstrates his superior intellect (“entendimiento”) and virtue. Pedro uses his

¹³ Critics have noticed the similarity to Erasmus’ dialoue *The Soldier and the Carthusian*.

intellectual prowess to square off not only with Turks but also with renegades who come from different countries, and Jews. Pedro also continuously challenges Juan's and Mátalascallando's preconceived ideas and provincial thinking. His adversaries, whether Muslim, Christian, or Jewish, all come off badly. Most importantly, far from condemning all Turks qua Turks, he continuously refers to the good and virtuous men he meets in Turkey, men with "entendimiento," who helped him survive against the odds.

Similarly, in the *Coloquios*, Barchilón exudes a moral authority built from his lived experience. He is disenchanted with the way the conquest has progressed, just as he is keenly aware of the injustices suffered by the indigenous people of Peru. His many years as a witness of the Spaniards' as well as the Peruvian natives' spiritual corruption and degradation have proven to him that "el sueño y la riqueza de esta tierra y de este siglo [...] es sueño y burla." (56) He advises Justino to leave before he is himself destroyed by the horror of colonization. However, Barchilón will not be the one to testify. This task will be left to Tito, who has also traveled widely, and whose authority resides in the fact that he is native and so can speak of the reality of Peru from direct experience. His credibility increases since he is ready to die, his direct testimony at once condemnation and confession. As a descendant from the Incan aristocracy, Tito occupies a privileged narrator's position and functions as a perfect go-between: he is both a native informant and a Christian convert – one who knows the true cost of the conquest both for Spaniards and Peruvians. His narrative is harrowing and highly believable to a Christian audience, because, while blaming Spain for the extreme suffering of the Peruvian natives, Tito never wavers in his belief that Christianity is the true religion. More, he accuses the Spaniards of behaving in an un-Christian manner and ends his narrative with sermonizing recommendations on how to successfully evangelize Peru.

Finally, elements of pseudo-autobiographical picaresque narrative play their part in the subversive manipulation of the dialogue. The main characters are marginalized in distinctive ways that influence and determine their role as satirists. In the *Viaje*, Pedro is an almost perfect *pícaro*, a brother to Lazarillo de Tormes and Guzmán de Alfarache¹⁴, recounting episode upon episode where he becomes a witness to mendacity and must find a clever way out of impossibly difficult circumstances. He is a chameleon who, like Rabelais' *pícaro*, Panurge,¹⁵ masters many arts: letters, herbal and Galenic pharmacology, construction, military *savoir faire*, languages (he learns Turkish in record time), and medicine (which he learns also very quickly by developing a good eye and instinct). Although he is both stoic and cynical, he is unlike these down and out *pícaros*—Lazarillo, Guzmán, and Panurge—in that he is highly moral and principled. He is rather like a picaresque Christian Ulysses: his schemes and verbal manipulations are in the service of greater justice, universal truths and ultimately, a very Christian form of

¹⁴ *Lazarillo de Tormes*, anonymous as well, of course, was published in 1554; *Gumán de Alfarache*, by Mateo Alemán, was published in 1599.

¹⁵ The author at some point temporarily changed the names of his characters and, ironically, it is Mátalascallando, not Pedro, who receives the name of Panurgo! Rabelais' Panurge was also an ex-captive of the Turks.

salvation.¹⁶ He has moments of sermonizing but, unlike his interlocutors who toss meaningless platitudes about, he appeals to grander thoughts and sentiments and, very often, to common sense. William L. Markrich describes him thus: "...the type of the reformed pícaro who has become religious and strives for perfection, without being able, nevertheless, to forget his former associations and habits." (p. 24)

Similarly, in *Coloquios*, Tito tells how he has served many masters: a conquistador, a soldier, a merchant (who baptizes him), a hermit (who indoctrinates him in Christianity and teaches him to read and write) and a series of priests; how he travels to Spain, returns to Peru and his relatives; and falls back into idolatry. He presents himself as a combination of ingenuous spectator who uncomprehendingly witnesses the degradation of his culture and oppression of his people and tragic hero who defends evangelical truth and recognizes the hypocrisy of the Spaniards. As the model of the Roman *vir bonus*—a good man skilled in the art of speaking—he is well able to judge the infamy of conquest and forced evangelization from an ironic perspective. After all, he has been prevented from committing suicide by his interlocutors, who then threaten him with death if he should refuse to speak the truth to them.¹⁷

The self-criticism contained in the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* cannot be understood independently from the treatment of the "Other" in those dialogues. There exist theoretical frameworks to analyze the representation of the "Other" in travel accounts. Most notably, the work of Michel de Certeau on Montaigne's "Of Cannibals,"¹⁸ for example, inscribes it "within this...tradition, in which the discourse about the other is a means of constructing a discourse authorized by the other." (*Heterologies*, 68)

According to de Certeau, part of the authority claimed by the "true" witness—the role played by Pedro and Tito in our dialogues—is that his observations are direct descriptions, fresh representations of the world of the "Other." De Certeau identifies three stages in the structure of a travel account: the outbound journey, which he describes as the "search for the strange, which is presumed to be different from the place assigned it in the beginning by the discourse of culture"; then the "depiction of the savage society as seen by a 'true' witness," where all of the odd habits and customs are reviewed and relativized; and finally the return voyage, where the "Other" himself enters "our

¹⁶ Bataillon will call him "presque un martyr du christianisme," see *Bulletin Hispanique*, "Andrés Laguna, auteur de *Viaje de Turquía*", 146; and describes him as an "Ulysses espagnol, fécond en ressources." (*Érasme et l'Espagne*, p. 714).

¹⁷ Incidentally, the passage where this happens is dramatic and mimetic, as opposed to diegetic.

¹⁸ Michel de Certeau, (1986). *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other*, Minnesota, University of Minnesota Press.

languages and our lands” along with the narrative, colonized, one supposes.
(*Heterologies* 69)

The *Viaje*'s prologue extols de Certeau's "search for the strange", as "Aquel insaciable y desenfrenado deseo de saber y conocer que natura puso en todos los hombres, ... no puede mejor executarse que con la peregrinación y ver de tierras estrañas."(87) Our anonymous author explains that he is inspired to write the dialogue partly because so many false things have been written about the Turks. These things, he says, are "like angels painted with feathers and God the Father painted with a long beard...the devil with goat legs." ["los ángeles con plumas, y a Dios Padre con barba larga...y el diablo con pies de cabra"] Interestingly, these are indeed conventional, even doctrinal, representations so by listing them here he calls them false without saying it. He complains that these previous writings rest on the authority of hearsay evidence: "the text having no more authority than it is said that and that someone heard it from someone who came from there; and how they speak about hearsay in relation to things that are worthy of consideration," ["no dando a su escriptura más autoridad del diz que, y que oyeron dezir a uno que venía de allá; y como hablan de oídas las cosas dignas de consideración"] (89) He apologizes for the "vile style in which it is written" ["ruin estilo con que va escrito"], claiming that it is justified because he does not write as an "erudite author" ["erudito escriptor"], but as a "loyal interpreter," ["fiel intérprete"] (90), who actually saw what he writes about and who is interested in truth rather than rhetoric and elegance. The hero of the *Viaje*, though, Pedro de Urdemalas, never travels to Turkey in "search for the strange"; he is captured in battle and kept a prisoner in this "savage" land. He has no motive to create fabulous descriptions. Once there, however, he is forcibly made to discover "the strange". He lives in Turkey, gets to know the intricate dynamics of the system first hand, while remaining a Christian, and therefore a stranger to the most intimate tenets of the society he purports to understand. De Certeau's model fits neatly, however, to the extent that "the discourse that sets off in search of the other with the impossible tasks of saying the truth returns from afar with the authority to speak in the name of the other and command belief." (*Heterologies*, 68)

Pedro's authority stems from the personal contact he has with authentic Turks. He is able to represent the "Other" credibly because he is allowed into the deepest intimacy of the culture (the bedroom of the Sultan's daughter). In his capacity as a doctor and having learned Turkish, Pedro finds no door barred, no scene hidden. He can therefore give exhaustive accounts of the customs and mores of the Turks – selecting, of course, those customs and mores that will sound the strangest and most exotic to his interlocutors. To summarize, Pedro's assertion of authority relies on three circumstances: his visit to the "other" is unintended; he is not a "writer" selling books; and he ignores stylistic niceties, ie. his style is transparent. In other words, the exact opposite of the actual author!

De Certeau names "two strategic questions" around which the travel account renders the picture of savage society—cannibalism and polygamy: "Montaigne takes his

place in a long tradition...when he transforms these...‘barbarities’ into forms of ‘beauty’ judged deserving of that name due to their utility to the social body.” (*Heterologies*, 70) Indeed Pedro addresses the issue of polygamy in Islam (if not of cannibalism!): “My master Cinán Baxá had seventy three wives. Can there be a monastery with more nuns than that?” [“Mi amo Çinán Baxá tenía sesenta y tres mugeres. Mirad si hay monasterio de más monjas.”] He naturalizes the practice, if not actually judging it ‘beautiful,’ by saying “since they will be going in one way or another to hell, with the devil as their guide, they try to enjoy this world as most they can.” “[h]abiéndose de ir de una manera y de otra al infierno, con el diablo que los llebe, procuran de gozar este mundo lo mejor que pueden.” (440) He attributes to Muslims a justification that could not possibly be true but issues, instead, from a Christian perspective. Having remained a Christian, Pedro finds himself incapable of “saying the truth,” in de Certeau’s words. Let us note as well the obvious heretical comparison between a pagan’s seventy three wives and nuns in a monastery.

De Certeau’s three stages are more difficult to identify in the *Coloquios*. In his prologue, Quiroga explains that he will recount the problems and causes for the failure to evangelize the Indians of Perú, as a priest who has lived in that land, and “according to how I know and understand them from my very long experience the many years I have dealt with and indoctrinated those natural [men].” [“según yo los sé y tengo por muy larga experiencia de muchos años que he tratado y doctrinado aquellos naturales...”] (*Coloquios* 72) As recounted in the narrative, Barchilón experiences the outbound journey, as he travels to Peru initially and lives the life of the colonizer for a while, one supposes with some measure of success, well-integrated into an exotic colonial society. Justino himself is the traveler in the present tense of the *Coloquios*, Barchilón meets him as he comes off the boat. It is Tito, however, who provides “depiction of the savage society as seen by a ‘true’ witness,”¹⁹ as he becomes a stranger in his own land.

The return voyage is perhaps Barchilón’s return to his home culture, represented by his conversation with the young Justino in which he gives a negative cast to his experiences in Peru. However Barchilón does not allow the “Other” to enter either his language or his land. Instead, he characterizes everyone involved in the colonial project as barbarous and savage, both Spanish and indigenous, albeit each for different reasons. If an “Other” enters Spanish culture, it is Tito who lives an apprenticeship whereby he gets to know the Spaniards’ culture. However Tito does not exactly enter Spanish culture as a “savage”, as he becomes converted (something Pedro refuses to do in Turkey), travels to Spain, experiences disillusionment (parallel to Barchilón’s in Peru) and returns to a life that will quickly degenerate to the point where he prefers suicide to such a brutal, unchristian world. As a convert, Tito is “homeless;” he rejects his native culture only to find the new culture barbarous and hypocritical. Can one say Tito is “colonized”? If so, not without ambiguity: On the one hand, Tito’s narrative purports to be the voice of indigenous Peru, even after he converts. On the other hand, he endorses the project of

¹⁹ de Certeau, 69.

evangelization and colonization of the colonizer.²⁰ A further enigma is offered by his last statement to his friend before trying to commit suicide, “acuérdate que eres inca de nación; sirve a nuestros dioses y no olvides nuestra religión tan Antigua.”

Critics working within the disciplines of anthropology, history, and sociology, — Hayden White, James Clifford, Clifford Geertz, Dennis Tedlock— have successfully applied some of the approaches developed in the field of literary studies to their factual texts. It is useful to do the opposite, to consider for a moment how their ideas reflect back on works of narrative fiction. After all, the two texts under scrutiny in this dissertation present themselves as nonfiction works in some sense, insofar as they pretend to be ethnologies and travel narratives, of a sort, and set up the fictional conceit and frame of dialogue. There are many ways in which these social science theorists illuminate issues such as the treatment of marginality in different genres and the possibility of open dialogue within a given discourse, which we could call the emancipatory power of dialogue, a useful term suggested to me by Timothy Hampton.

Whereas James Clifford, a founding theorist of the "new ethnography," argues in *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* that ethnography is a genre of writing and therefore subject to and shaped by literary rules and conventions, I argue that the two literary texts under analysis function in interesting ways as ethnographies. According to Susan Pinette, one of the literary devices that Clifford analyzes as an aspect of traditional ethnographic representation is dialogue, suggesting that it offers to the ethnographer the possibility of moving beyond the inadequacies of mimetic representations, "These fictions of dialogue [...] [go] well beyond the more or less artful presentation of 'actual' encounters."²¹ In Clifford's words, "[New ethnography] locates the cultural interpretations in many sorts of reciprocal contexts, and it obliges writers to find diverse ways of rendering negotiated realities as multi-subjective, power-laden, and incongruent. In this view 'culture' is always relational, an inscription of communicative processes that exist, historically, between subjects in relations of power." (14-15) Dennis Tedlock, proponent of dialogical anthropology, terms this new approach a "betweenness of the world of the dialogue...[the] dialogue creates a world, or an understanding of the *differences* between two worlds, that exists between persons who were indeterminately far apart, in all sorts of different ways, when they started out their conversation." (173, 174). Reminding one of Bakhtin, Clifford and Tedlock both see the device of dialogue as giving way to a more open-ended in-between appreciation of the world.

²⁰ For Gayatri Spivak, “the subaltern,” the oppressed and silenced, can not, by definition, speak or achieve self-legitimization without ceasing to be that named subject under colonization. The scene where Barchilón and Justino prevent Tito’s suicide and threaten to kill him if he does not speak, takes on an iconic meaning from this perspective.

²¹ See her 2000 dissertation, "Alternative Ethnographies: Genre and Cultural Encounter in Early Modern French Texts," 3.

Another literary device mentioned by Clifford is autobiographical narrative. Pinette: "Writing against the trope of the detached, objective scientist, these experimental ethnographies place 'the ethnographer' a character in a fiction' within the text: 'The rhetoric of experienced objectivity yields to that of the autobiography' (14)," 4. Certainly in the case of *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la Verdad*, the ethnographer figures are presented as the first-person narrators, even though there is an outer frame and their authority is constructed precisely out of this first-personhood experiencing.

Clifford, in his essay "On Ethnographic Authority," refers to Bakhtin's concept of "heteroglossia," a term Bakhtin applied to the way certain genres (and certain authors) incorporate multiple voices into their texts, to describe a form of ideal ethnography, "With expanded communication and intercultural influence, people interpret others, and themselves, in a bewildering diversity of idioms...[t]his ambiguous, multi-vocal world makes it increasingly hard to conceive of human diversity as inscribed in bounded, independent cultures....Ethnographic writing cannot entirely escape the reductionist use of dichotomies and essences, it can at least struggle self-consciously to avoid portraying abstract, a-historical 'others', " (Clifford, 19). Both of these dialogues, use the device of a dialogized pseudo-autobiographical narrative in an attempt to bring to life and deploy multiple voices. We could argue that instead of abstract and objectified 'others,' the characters of Tito, Pedro, and their interlocutors are elaborated, developed, with a mixture of voices, registers, and intentions. Given the historical, religious and political context of their time periods and when one takes into accounts other representational texts of the era, these authors seem, indeed strangely self-conscious, "new ethnographers."

Very little criticism exists about the *Coloquios*,²² and although there is much criticism on the *Viaje*, not much has focused on approaching it as a critique of Spanish society and Christianity. Yet, both dialogues offer rich opportunities to witness how they work as complex and subversive satires of their respective societies, as indictments of a troubled Christian order, and as reflections of the larger religious and political realities of their time, as we shall see in Chapter 2.

A methodology informed by Genre Theory

One literary theorist who provides a useful way to think formally about the sorts of cross-cultural encounters represented in our two dialogues is Fredric Jameson. Jameson was interested in the relationship between literary texts and the ideology of their time periods, their "political horizon: "...from this perspective, ideology is not something which informs or invests symbolic production; rather the aesthetic act is itself ideological, and the production of aesthetic or narrative form is to be seen as an ideological act in its own right, with the function of inventing imaginary or formal 'solution' to unresolvable social contradictions." (Jameson, 79) In this way genres reflect

²² No entries in the MLA database, for example.

aspects of community, functioning as "ideologemes," but also transfigure and transform them (in a politically unconscious way) that "prod[uces] new images of collectivity." (Hampton, 28). New genres are also intergeneric, criss-crossed by other genres that represent earlier stories and their consequent reflection of other moments of time.

Jameson proposes three semantic "horizons" that lead the theorist forward towards an interpretation. He describes the first as a "narrowly political horizon," corresponding to the diachronic appreciation of historical, political, and social events. The cultural text is understood as a symbolic representation of these events. The second step is to extrapolate from the individual text to (reconstitute in the form of) the whole system of collective and class discourse. The text becomes "little more than an individual *parole* or utterance." This entails its recognition as an "ideologeme."²³ Finally, moving into the third horizon, as one relativizes even this level of interpretation by considering how this ideologeme fits within the greater historical network of ideologemes, one is able to distinguish the "ideology of form" "the symbolic messages transmitted to us by the coexistence of various sign systems which are themselves traces or anticipations of modes of production." (Jameson, 76)

A text then performs "the imaginary resolution of a real contradiction," (77) and we can see the potentially emancipatory work that it can accomplish. Hampton articulates it thus: "Genres are the bearers of collective values and fantasies." (Hampton, 28) Jameson refers to Bakhtin's ideas about the dialogical structure characterizing the relationship between and within texts when he states that even as "ruling class ideology will explore various strategies of the legitimation of its own power position, ...an oppositional culture of ideology will, often in covert and disguised strategies, seek to contest and to undermine the dominant 'value system.'" (Jameson, 84) These dynamics, involving contradictions, conflicts, and syntheses of sorts, are certainly dialectic and dialogical.

This dissertation will incorporate Jameson's three horizons in its analysis of the two dialogues. Accordingly the first stage will be an historical analysis of the texts themselves. Historically, the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* find their place in a line of literary works meant to comment on the state of Christianity and the structure of power in the Western world, often approvingly and on occasion critically (the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* should, for example be compared to dialogues by Vives and the Valdés brothers). Furthermore, the historical significance of the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* works on, at least, four levels: as individual travel narratives; as assessments of the "Other;" as discursive participants in a dialectical debate about the role of Spain and Christianity; and as representatives of the dialogic genre among the many genres cultivated in the Spanish Golden Age.

²³ "...ideologeme, that is, the smallest intelligible unit of the essentially antagonistic collective discourses of social classes." (Jameson, 76).

The next stage in understanding the significance of the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* requires a similar assessment in the field of the history of ideas – philosophical and religious trends. The 16th century is a time of great philosophical debate and perplexity. From Erasmism to Lutheranism to Illuminism and all the myriad of voices raised in reformist protest, to people like Calderón and others who are countering this protest with equally forceful conservative discourses, Europe is a cauldron of philosophical questioning triggered by the splintering of the Christian world. The Spanish dialogues play their part in promoting certain philosophical currents and downplaying the importance of others. Pedro de Quiroga was a friar whose work also fits into the Franciscan tradition of epistles of advice and information, written by well-respected religious figures such as Bartolomé de las Casas. These texts were intended to guide kings; often they were denunciations of the worst atrocities committed by the Spaniards in the New World, "informing" him of the acts of his "evil advisors."

In the *Coloquios*, Tito agrees that the natives exhibit many uncivilized traits. He describes them and explains why they are morally so degraded. He also excoriates the Spaniards for their immoral treatment of these men they consider "less valuable than animals." In the *Viaje*, Pedro characterizes many Turks as religious and virtuous, and it is left to his interlocutors to observe that they seem much more so than their Christian counterparts. At every turn of the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios*, the reader is invited to condone or condemn philosophical or religious positions. The same is true of political ideas, as both the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* contain an explicit analysis of Spain's power play in the Old and New World.

The *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* both describe the workings of power and politics in society. In the *Coloquios*, for example, Tito considers the Incan regime and its despotic qualities. He agrees with his interlocutors that this previous political reality was tragic and horrible in its own way. And yet he argues that the Incas were pagan and so knew no better. The Spaniards, he pleads, should not treat the natives so inhumanely, in so un-Christian a fashion. At the time many of the dialogues are written, Spain's hold on the power chessboard of Europe is weakening. This is precisely when the authors of the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* chose to present their critical views on the European struggle against the Ottoman Empire, Charles V's role in the Sack of Rome, and the Spanish Conquest of the New World. Accordingly, the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* cannot be understood outside of a political understanding of those three momentous events, due consideration of the battle for power in the European courts, and their competition with respect to New World possessions and riches.

Both dialogues are rich in details about the various strata of the societies they describe. Although many such details may at first appear to be nothing more than an attempt at exoticism, they may also be regarded as meaningful information against which the Christian reader of the time was to assess his or her own environment. In the *Viaje*, for example, Pedro describes the Turks and their culture in great detail: everything from the clothes they wear, the food they eat, the way they pray, the way they celebrate, and

they way they marry. It is perhaps in those quasi-sociological or ethnological descriptions that one can expect to find manifestations of the “warped mirror” evoked earlier. Like those antique cut-out silhouettes where the background of a portrait reveals yet another (negative) portrait, by adjusting the socio-ethnological comments in the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* to the philosophical, religious, and political bent of the speakers, one can expect to reveal the “portrait behind the portrait”, the inverted – and thus subversive -- “mirror images” of Spanish society and of the Christian world.

Many literary issues have not yet been satisfactorily addressed where the neglected genre of travel dialogues is concerned. Much work remains to be done on the nomenclature of what is included in, and excluded from, travel accounts; on the nature of the ethnographic interest in these sorts of texts; on the special relationship between travel and dialogue; on the assertion of ethnological authority in travel dialogues; on ideological loyalties; or on the formation and transformation of the all-important traveling figure, the intermediary between cultures. How does the play between the interlocutors operate and how does it control the narrative; how does the dialogue relate to episodes that are much more like embedded monologues; how do the “go-betweens” indict their interlocutors in the form of an exotic ethnographic narration? If, as Ana Vian Herrero proposes, the dialogue is one of the generic paths to the novel, what kind of novels did the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* herald?²⁴

The dialogue as genre constitutes a relatively new field in the world of literary studies. It is only in recent decades that studies have appeared establishing the dialogue as an autonomous genre of the Spanish Golden Age, a genre with its own tradition within which different models can be distinguished. Critical editions have appeared of formerly inaccessible dialogues (in 1985 for *Viaje de Turquía*, and in 1992 for *Coloquios de la verdad*), and thorough catalogues have begun being compiled²⁵. Critics have now studied the didacticism of dialogues and their relation to Menippean satire. Most recently, critics such as Vian Herrero, Ferreras Savoye, Gómez, and Ciriaco Morón Arroyo have explored questions about the relationship of the dialogue to the novel, theater, the essay, and the short story. One area that has not yet been well studied, however, is how the classical tradition of the dialogue (Plato, Cicero, and Lucian) influenced Renaissance texts.

²⁴ Ferreras Savoye concludes her essay on literary genres of the XVI century, "El diálogo humanístico, al enfocar la realidad desde la experiencia individual, permitió representar literariamente aspectos nuevos y/o desconocidos del mundo real y de la vida humana, así como la variedad de opiniones al respecto, mediante el arte conversacional. Escribir diálogos humanísticos supuso un aprendizaje literario real y podemos considerar la enorme producción de diálogos humanísticos del siglo XVI como un entrenamiento a la representación escrita de la realidad en todos sus aspectos, que ha contribuido de manera decisiva, y mucho más de lo que se suele creer, al advenimiento de la novela moderna."

²⁵ The first significant attempt being Jacqueline Ferreras-Savoye's 1985 *Les Dialogues Espagnols du XVIe Siecle ou L'expression Litteraire d'une Nouvelle Conscience* (Paris, Didier Erudition).

Much has been written about the *Viaje* but not from the perspective developed herein. As for the *Coloquios*, this dialogue is only now receiving the attention it deserves, although very little criticism has been written to date.²⁶ Few or none of the topics discussed in the following chapters have been previously tackled for either the *Viaje* or the *Coloquios*, including issues as central as the influence of Lucian's satirical and ethnographic dialogues on the *Viaje* and the *Coloquios*. This is why we now turn to the contextual variables that partook in the emergence of *Viaje de Turquía* and the *Coloquios de la Verdad*.

²⁶ What exists addresses very topical issues, such as the relationship of Quiroga's ideas to Bartolomé de las Casas, for example. In *The Cambridge History of Latin American Literature*, Roberto Echeverría says, "Although the missionary/native collaboration in the Andes has not been documented as systematically as that between the Franciscans and the Nahuas in colonial Mexico, the relationship between the intellectual work and writing of Europeans and native Andeans needs further exploration. The conceptual coincidences, for example, between a native writer such as Guaman Poma de Ayala and the accounts of Fernando de Montesinos, Fray Buenaventura de Salinas y Córdoba, and Fray Martín de Murúa, suggest that much more might be learned about this type of colonial cultural production in Peru. See...Quiroga (*Coloquios de la verdad*) for a series of dialogues revealing a pro-Andean missionary outlook on colonial/native relations." (p. 55)

Chapter 2 – Always historicize! - History, Politics, Society, and Literature

Part 1 - *Viaje de Turquía*

History/Politics

The Habsburg king Charles I of Spain became Emperor Charles V in 1516 and abdicated in 1556, in favor of his brother Ferdinand I, who received from him the Habsburg Monarchy, and his son Philip II, who received the Spanish Empire. The empire included much of Central, Western, and Southern Europe as well as numerous Spanish colonies in Asia, the Caribbean, and America. During the years of his reign he fought the Italian Wars against the French kings Francis I and Henry II pushing the former to join forces with Suleiman the Magnificent under a Franco-Ottoman alliance.

Charles V opposed the Protestant reformation brewing in Northern Europe and pushed for the convocation of the Council of Trent (1545-1563), commonly viewed as the event that began the Counter-Reformation. The council, which held 25 sessions beginning in December 1545 and ending in December 1563, issued condemnations on what it defined as Protestant heresies and specified Church doctrines on many of the issues that had been disputed up to that point. Although reforms were ratified that dealt with corruption and abuse in the Church, for example, no concessions at all were made to Protestantism. Charles oversaw the Spanish colonization of the Americas during the period that saw Hernán de Cortés' and Francisco Pizarro's conquest of the Aztec and Incan empires. The first Index of prohibited books published in Spain appeared in 1551.

But it was Philip II who viewed himself as the champion of Catholicism, devoting himself to combat both the Ottoman Turks and the heretics. He intensified the Inquisition (which had been established in 1480 by the Catholic Monarchs Ferdinand II of Aragon and Isabella I of Castile, his great-great grandparents) and banned books printed by Spaniards outside of his kingdom.

Philip introduced stern measures which restricted intellectual freedom in his realms. In September 1558 a pragmatic issued at Valladolid announced his attention [sic] to strengthen the censorship of books to protect his subjects from novelties and heresies which threatened the Catholic religion. From now on no bookseller would be allowed to import, hold or sell any book prohibited by the Holy Office of the Inquisition; the Holy Office would prepare an index for public display in bookshops. Books could not be published until every page had been scrutinized by members of the royal council (grammars and children's books were exempt, but even these had to go before the local authority). The penalties for unauthorized printing or sale of prohibited books were made more severe. Under the Catholic Monarchs there had been fines and confiscation of

prohibited books; now the death penalty was introduced. Philip ordered books to be inspected in shops, monasteries and universities. He instructed the rector and masters of the University of Salamanca to search the library, and also to report to the Inquisition members of the university who had been found to possess suspect works, or who taught or held Lutheran doctrines. The promised Index was published in 1559. Prepared by Fernando Valdés, archbishop of Seville and Inquisitor General, the list concentrated on theological works of the Reformation and vernacular translations of the bible.²⁷

Under Philip II, Spain reached the peak of its power and suffered its greatest defeats. *Viaje de Turquía* is dedicated to him, as we shall see below, and *Coloquios de la Verdad* was dedicated to one of his right-hand men. What were the philosophical and religious currents then, that required such censorship?

Reformation and Erasmism in Spain – Time of Upheavals

During the sixteenth century, a number of reformist movements flourished in much of Europe: “The Renaissance shifted interest from heaven to earth, while geographical expansion enlarged the known earth. The renaissance manifested more enthusiasm for classical than for Christian antiquity, while at the same time nationalism enfeebled the Holy Roman Empire and weakened the papal theocracy. ... In the midst of this ferment the Reformation shattered the monolithic structure of the Holy Catholic Church.” (Bainton 3)²⁸ Peninsular Spain, while considering itself the official champion of Christianity was far from being merely a bastion for the monolithic Church; Spanish intellectuals played their part in the European arena where a myriad styles and tendencies battled and coexisted, in a constant movement of ideological advances and retreats. During the first half of the century, there existed a relative freedom of ideas in Spain, resulting in an explosion of activity in the fields of the arts and sciences. But after the Council of Trent, when ideological repression became *de rigueur* and censors needed to give their imprimatur to every printed piece, certain kinds of intellectual work went underground.²⁹

²⁷ From David Goodman's "Philip II's Patronage of Science and Engineering," in *British Journal for the History of Science*, Vol. 16, no. 1 (Mar. 1983), p. 49.

²⁸ Toland H. Bainton, *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*.

²⁹ [U]ne distinction s'impose clairement entre la période des rois catholiques et de Charles-Quint et celle de Philippe II. ...Pendant la première partie du siècle, on vit encore des rêves d'une unité politique et religieuse de l'Europe. En pleine expansion, le pays participe entièrement à la scène internationale et connaît une époque de jeunesse et d'optimisme en se souciant peu du contrôle des idées. [Il y a un] changement de climat qui s'opère entre les années 1555 et 1563 pendant lesquelles s'impose une attitude de repli et de méfiance dont les principales manifestations sont la loi de l'imprimerie de 1558 et l'Index de Valdés de 1559....Il est impossible d'énumérer les cas de tous ceux qui se sont

According to Marcel Bataillon, one of the first scholars who seriously studied Erasmus' influence in Spain, Erasmus was already famous in Europe by 1511 when *In Praise of Folly* was published. His reputation had been formed by "la sagesse des Adages, par le christianisme intérieur de l'Enchiridion, par l'élégance de ses traductions de Lucien et d'Euripide." (Bataillon, p. 78)³⁰. Erasmism was at the heart of Renaissance Europe's movements for Reform and Counter-Reform, and central to the spiritual history of sixteenth century Spain. Spanish Erasmism took a culturally complex, humanistic and laic form although it was still fundamentally religious. It powered the critique against hierarchical authorities of the church (especially the papacy), even as it encouraged an interiority of faith that required a return to, and critical interpretation of, scripture.

Erasmism took, or shared, with humanism many values: the importance of the written word, for example. Both movements took advantage of the new printing technology in order to propagate its ideals. If it was important for individuals to confront scripture directly, much work had to be done in order to print and translate texts into vernacular languages. Although a bit later than in the rest of Europe, where twenty versions of the scripture were printed between the discovery of the printing press (1440's) and the Lutheran rupture (1519), the first translation of scripture was printed in Zaragoza in 1485, the second in Toledo in 1512.

The two movements shared a special concern with language and the importance of balancing out content with the style of expression. The desire to know scriptures more simply and intimately, without priestly or other authoritarian intermediaries, meant that Erasmist humanists cultivated Biblical languages, especially Greek. Just as humanism put the human being at the center of the world, Erasmists put him at the center of the scriptures.

The value of old rituals, ceremonies, and calls to "good acts" were questioned and supplanted by an appeal for an internal piety nourished by the sense that true inner faith was enough for God.³¹ Erasmism nursed a vivid contempt for scholasticism, recommended a return to true Christian life, and encouraged the open critique of abusive priests and the study of Latin.

auto-censurés en renonçant à écrire ou à publier dans ces temps difficiles et ces temps de soupçon auxquels font allusion déjà Louis Vives...Peut-être trouve-t-on ici une explication partielle de l'existence du nombre si considérable de manuscrits de l'époque dans les bibliothèques espagnoles. Martínez Bujanda, "La Censure Littéraire," (14).

³⁰ Marcel Bataillon, *Erasmus et l'Espagne: Recherches sur l'histoire spirituelle du XVIe siècle*, 1937, and a Spanish version in 1950.

³¹ This was not a new tendency, of course, but had arisen in the last centuries of the Medieval period, in certain Franciscan currents and in the Benedictine concept of the "common life," tendencies that sought the essence of the primitive church. (Menéndez Pidal, *Historia* 180)

In the *Enchiridion militis christiani* Erasmus clearly stated his thoughts about how to live the best Christian life, hearkening to a primitive Christian community devoid of empty rites and ceremonies. It was translated into Spanish with the title *El Enchiridion o Manual del Caballero cristiano*. This work was to become the touchstone for the concrete ideas he learned from Italian humanism, a set of beliefs that would become the paradigm for Christian Erasmism:

Se trata de una vuelta a la lectura directa de la Escritura, a la imitación de vida de la primitiva comunidad Cristiana y del retorno a la sencillez evangélica. Erasmo nos dejó una visión optimista del hombre y la necesidad de una sociedad en concordia y sin guerras, sociedad cristiana pero no clericalizada y, mucho menos, sujeta al monacato, sino dentro de una cultura humanista, conocedora de los valores clásicos, renovada religiosamente y purificada, principalmente su jerarquía, de las corrupciones que se le habían ido añadiendo a lo largo de la historia. Erasmo es un humanista, un literato, un reformador moral y no dogmático, un crítico de las costumbres desviadas, principalmente de la jerarquía, un renovador del cristianismo, al que pretende vincular con sus fuentes escriturarias y con el ejemplo de la primitiva comunidad. (Menéndez Pidal 181)

According to José Luis Abellán,³² among the many reasons for the warm Spanish welcome given to Erasmus' *Enchiridion* was the satirical nature of Erasmus' critique on the immoral and corrupt state of the clergy.

In *Erasme et L'Espagne* Bataillon describes three chronological periods of Spanish Erasmianism. The first runs from 1516, the date Charles of Gaunt succeeds to the Spanish throne, to 1536, after the death of Erasmus when the persecution of Erasmists gets under way.³³ During those first years, from 1516 -1525, Erasmism is limited to the world of those involved in the Latin editions of Erasmus' works. Then from 1527-1532, Erasmus becomes more popular as the presses of Castille and Aragon translate Erasmian

³² See José Luis Abellán, *El erasmismo español* (1982) and *Historia crítica del pensamiento español* (1986).

³³ Bataillon reiterates, however, that Erasmism and pleas for reform were not born with Luther's revolutionary act but, rather with Cisneros' Spain, which already contained the seed of everything that was to follow. In 1511 Cisneros actually invited Erasmus to Spain. Erasmus refused and is reputed to have said "non placet Hispania." See also Menéndez y Pelayo in *Historia de los Heterodoxos Españoles*, "la reforma se pedía por todos los buenos y doctos; ... la reforma empezó en los tiempos de los Reyes Católicos y continuo en todo el siglo XVI; que a ella contribuyó en gran manera la severísima Inquisición; pero que la Gloria principal debe recaer en la magnánima Isabel y en Fr. Francisco Jiménez de Cisneros." (674)

works into Spanish.³⁴ Bataillon characterizes the influence of Erasmus during this period thus, "Atténuation des critiques contre l'Eglise hiérarchique et les moines, exaltation du sentiment de la grâce qui renouvelle les coeurs, tels sont décidément les deux aspects complémentaires de la métamorphose que subit la pensée d'Érasme sur la terre espagnole." (337) During this period Bataillon also describes how Erasmism is used to justify imperial politics, as exemplified by Alonso de Valdés' dialogues and certain new formulations of Christian doctrine, as exemplified by Juan de Valdes'.³⁵ During the 1530's, many of the men who surrounded Charles V were favorably disposed towards Erasmus. Not just the Valdés brothers but also chancellor Gattinara, J.L. Vives, Pedro de Lerma, Diego Gracián de Alderete, Alonso Virués, Bartolomeo Carranza, and the archbishops Juan Alonso de Fonseca of Toledo and Alonso Manrique de Lara of Seville. They were attracted to the idea of a more intimate and spiritual faith, in contrast to the dogma served up by ritual-loving priests.³⁶

The third wave of Erasmism, runs between 1535 and 1555³⁷. Bataillon describes a Protestant stream that springs from illuminism and adapts Erasmian thought to its own purposes, moving towards the Lutheran doctrine of 'justification by faith alone' without formally rejecting Catholic dogma. These departures from orthodoxy seem so great that many leading Erasmian humanists, such as Juan de Valdés, are suspected of crypto-Protestantism. From this point on Erasmism is flatly condemned.³⁸

³⁴ The first work of Erasmus' translated into Spanish was *Tratado o Sermón del Niño Jesu y en Loor del estado de la niñez*, in Seville, 1516. Other translations followed but the most influential was that of the *Enchiridion militis christiani*, edited in 1525 in Alcalá and translated under the direction of Alfonso Fernández de Madrid, in 1526.

³⁵ "Montesinos places Valdés within the 'liberal' and mainstream Erasmist elites in Spain, stating that Valdés did not want to break with Rome, but desired the moral reformation of the church, and that he put his Erasmianism to the service of imperial policies. He describes V. as a tolerant and gentle person who looked beyond the Catholic anti-Protestant propaganda, tried to understand the Protestant demands, and advocated accommodation with them." Pérez Romero disagrees, In Pérez Romero, *The Subversive Tradition in Spanish Renaissance Writing* (p. 171).

³⁶ For some of the following sections on Erasmism in Spain I am indebted to Markrich, as well as Bataillon.

³⁷ Coinciding with the foundering of irenism.

³⁸"The iluminista movement belonged to the clerics who were not satisfied with the formalistic organization and rites of the monasteries and who yearned for a closer link with the divine through the 'via illuminativa' or 'ecstasis.' ...outside the convent, clerics and laymen alike, men and women searched for a new form of religious expression by means of discussions on spiritual matters and by group readings of the Scriptures and of the Letters of the Apostles. Such spiritual exercises awoke in those participating in them an unlimited confidence in divine providence and grace and awareness of man's insignificance. A concomitant result of this new faith was its contempt for formalism and ritual not inspired by love, but by fear of punishment." (Markrich, 3) Paul IV's Index of

It is important to note that not every critic agrees with Bataillon's assessment of the unique importance of Erasmus for Spain's intellectuals. In his book *El erasmismo y las corrientes espirituales afines: Conversos, Franciscanos, Italianizantes*, Eugenio Asensio credits other spiritual trends that were current in the fifteenth and sixteenth century that he calls "los parientes pobres del erasmismo..." (35-6) The first of these is the Hebraic tradition that remained alive in *converso* thought. Elements of judaism such as an enthusiasm for scripture and ritual reading are akin to Erasmian ideas, even though Erasmus preferred the New Testament (Ascencio, 54) to the Old. *Conversos* who needed to distance themselves from their Jewish past sought out spiritual religious experience. Asensio reminds his reader that Bataillon appreciated that "el enaltecer el cuerpo místico tuvo aquí algo de reacción contra el prejuicio de limpieza de sangre" (Asensio, 63). Asensio traces this Jewish-*converso* thread through Franciscan thought, in men such as Luis de León and Alfonso de Zamora— "La documentación amontonada por *Sefarad*³⁹...[ha] mostrado la continuidad de la tradición hebraica en las Universidades...Salamanca y Alcalá copiaban con celo, y se pasaban mutuamente comentarios rabínicos, gramáticas bíblicas y traducciones literales de la Escritura." (Asensio, 51)— and Illuminism. Asensio characterizes Illuminism thus: "[un] menosprecio de la vida activa y de la oración vocal, incitación constante a la quietud quietísima, al sosiego, a dejar obrar a Dios en el alma. La primera etapa del progreso espiritual es la 'annihilación,' la segunda, 'entender a Dios por agujero,' la tercera 'cuadrar al entendimiento' en la entrañable contemplación de la inmensidad divina." (93) This is the "via spiritus" of Illuminism that attracted men like Juan de Valdés. Finally, Asensio considers the influence of Italian spirituality shaped by humanism, exhibited by men such as Savonarola, Pico de la Mirandola, and Egidius. In general, what Asensio sees in Spain during those centuries is a lack of theological clarity, "La vida religiosa de la época prospera en una fabulosa confusión doctrinal." (80)

***Viaje de Turquía* and Erasmism**

Bataillon calls *Viaje de Turquía* "...une oeuvre qui, par l'agilité du dialogue, par l'ingéniosité de la fiction, par l'ouverture d'esprit et l'expérience du monde dont elle témoigne, est sans contredit le chef-d'oeuvre de la littérature à la fois sérieuse et divertissante que l'Espagne doit à ses humanistes érasmiens. ...ce livre postulait comme auteur un humaniste, un helléniste, certes, mais un homme instruit par la vie autant que par les bibliothèques, et doué d'un sens exceptionnel de l'humour. " (713-4) For Bataillon this dialogue equals Erasmus best colloquia in its richness of observation and vitality. It

1559 listed all of Erasmus' writings. In the same year Philip II, the dedicatee of the *Viaje*, presided over the 'auto-da-fe' where many men were burned as heretics for having "advocated the ideas of the Protestant Reformation in Castille." (Markrich, 6) In the previous year the author of the *Viaje* had finished his manuscript.

³⁹ Journal *Sefarad: Estudios hebraico, sefardíes y de Oriente Próximo*. First published in 1941. Has published many original manuscripts and much research.

is clear to him that the author knew Erasmus' works well and distilled his spirit in the work. He recognizes in the work a "serious and instructive genre" (725) much touted by Erasmists as a literary ideal, and also a foreshadowing of Cervantes' *novelas* in its brand of inventiveness that melds the real with the imaginary (Cervantes, of course, was also a captive, as well as a soldier.)

Erasmus' influence on the author of *Viaje de Turquía* can be seen in Pedro de Urdemalas' nonconformity and his anti-scholastic tone; in his appeal to the guidance of Church fathers and to reason, as well as faith, in assessing spiritual matters. He advocates peace "derived from his espousal of religious tolerance and evangelical charity to be practiced toward all peoples and in all languages" (Markrich, 5). Pedro praises knowledge of ancient languages, especially Latin, and condemns widespread ignorance in Spain, well exemplified by his interlocutors; he has no problem describing Turks as brave, sober, and hard-working. He judges negatively the politics of empire. (Bataillon, 726) His descriptions of Turkish ceremonies and rituals suggest a kind of relativism that is far from a condemnation, or an apology, for that matter, of Islam. Pedro's relativism is well demonstrated in a section of the *Viaje* where he describes his visit to Rome and delivers an irreverent portrait of the Pope. In the passage Mata has been asking Pedro all sorts of questions about what he has seen in Rome, especially the types of food and drink he has seen. Next he asks about the churches. Finally he asks, "¿Vistes al Papa? Pedro answers, "Sí, y a los cardenales. Mata wants to know "¿Cómo es el Papa?" Pedro responds, "Es de hechura de una çebolla, y los pies como cántaro. La más neçia pregunta del mundo; ¿cómo tiene de ser si no un hombre como los otros? Que primero fue cardenal y de allí le hizieron Papa. Sola esta particularidad sabed, que nunca sale sobre sus pies a ninguna parte, sino llébanle sobre los hombros, sentado en una silla." (*Viaje de Turquía*, 342)⁴⁰

Pedro repeatedly appeals to the need for balance in judgment and condemns the variety of charlatanism he sees within his own culture as well as in others, be it on the part of doctors, relic mongers, or religious authorities. He continuously appeals to a kind of spiritual religiosity that is far from the ritual inscribed in the church and is nurtured, rather, by knowledge that comes through personal experience. When Mata and Juan ask Pedro how he consoled himself in the harshest of situations while he was still captive and planning his escape, he answers that "Siempre al menos iba urdiendo para quando fuese menester tejer." They are expecting him to say that he prayed and fasted, not that he was "tramando ardides"! Juan asks "¿Quántas vezes pasabais cada día este rosario?"

Pedro: ¿Queréis que os diga la verdad?

Juan: No quiero otra cosa.

Pedro: Pues en fe de buen christiano que ninguna me acuerdo en todo el viaje, sino solo le trayo por el bien paresçer del ábito.

⁴⁰ Bataillon notes that in this passage Pedro is describing the Pope with a naturalist eye, see *Érasme*, p. 728.

Juan: Pues ¡qué erejía es esa! ¿pagabais a Dios las mercedes que cada hora os hacía?

Pedro: Ninguna quenta tenía con los *pater nostres* que rezaba, sino con solo estar atento a lo que decía. ¿Luego pensáis que para Dios es menester rezar sobre taja? Con el corazón abierto y las entrañas, daba una arcabuzazo en el cielo que me parecía que penetraba hasta donde Dios estaba; que decía en dos palabras: Tú, Señor, que guiaste los tres reyes de Lebante en Velem y libraste a Santa Susana del falso testimonio, y a Sant Pedro de las prisiones y a los tres muchachos del horno de fuego ardiendo, ten por bien llevarme en este viaje en salvamento *ad laudem et gloriam omnipotentis nominis tui*; y con esto, algún *pater noster*; no fiaría de toda esa jente que trae *pater nostres* en la mono yo mi ánima." (264-5)

Pedro has no need for hypocritical *pater nosters* even as he calls upon his God with an open heart. Pedro's belief is ardent yet personal, nurtured by a close reading of scripture.

Manuscript/Print History

The authorship of *Viaje de Turquía* is still hotly-debated. Manuel Serrano y Sanz was the first who posited an author, Cristóbal de Villalón, and for a long time editions of the *Viaje* were printed under this name. Doubt was cast on this attribution first by A.G. Solalinde and, most famously, by Marcel Bataillon who offered up his own possible author, Andrés Laguna. The issue remains undecided and this dissertation will in no manner pretend to weigh in on this debate. The fact of anonymity itself, however, is very suggestive and we will consider why the author of the work might have made this choice.

The oldest manuscript, M-1, whose date is given in the dedication as 1557, is in the Biblioteca Nacional. According to Salinero, this copy seemed to have been prepared and edited for printing by the author or a copyist close to the author. But the dialogue remained in manuscript form until 1905, when Serrano y Sanz finally prepared a manuscript that was printed.⁴¹ There are five surviving manuscript copies that were copied in different periods and that include different sections. This does not mean that there were not other, even many, manuscript copies that circulated in the 16th through 19th centuries, of course. According to Fernando Bouza in *Corre manuscrito*, there is a tendency in criticism to consider that printing is synonymous with diffusion and, therefore, that manuscript culture equals non-diffusion. This is hardly the case, he argues, "...el manuscrito era tan común y corría de mano en mano. En esto, lejos de reducirse a usos privados o bibliofílicos, la *escritur ad vivum* se presenta como un eficaz complemento o, incluso, un competidor de lo tipográfico, ofreciendo un ágil sistema de copias o traslados que, como veremos en buena medida llegó a estar profesionalizado." (Bouza, 16)

⁴¹ Manuel Serrano y Sanz, ed, "Viaje de Turquía," in *Autobiografías y memorias, II* (Madrid: NBE, 1905)

The Dedication; Double voicing

Already in the dedication to *Viaje de Turquía*, the anonymous author introduces themes that will become central to the dialogue as well as a technique that I will call double-voiced in the sense that the text ostensibly expresses one thing even as it implies another. Let us look closely at this beginning.

The work is dedicated “to the very great and very powerful, Catholic and extremely Christian Sir Philip, King of Spain, England and Naples...[from] the author, health and a desire for [your] true happiness and victory” [Al muy alto y muy poderoso, Cathólico y Christianíssimo Señor Don Phelipe, Rey d’España, Ynglaterra y Nápoles...el autor, salud y deseo de sinzera felicidad y victoria.” (see Bataillon, Doc. Lag., p. 103-118) In these unambiguous terms the author implicitly expresses his desire that Christianity, championed by Philip, should vanquish Islam. Next, the author praises man’s ethnological instinct, inspired by natural curiosity about other men and other lands:

Aquel insaçiable y desenfrenado deseo de saber y conosçer que natura puso en todos los hombres, Çésar invictíssimo sujetándonos, de tal manera que nos fuerza a leer sin fructo ninguno las fábulas y ficciones, no puede mejor executarse que con la peregrinación y ver de tierras estrañas, considerando en quanta angustia se enzierra el ánimo y entendimiento que está siempre en un lugar sin poder extenderse a especular la infinita grandeza deste mundo...”(87)

The author criticizes fiction for seducing innocent readers, implying that it satisfies curiosity deceitfully, leaving nothing behind that is useful, thereby setting up his own narration as not-fiction but, rather, a real account by a real eye witness, on the one hand, and as imminently fruitful by comparison. He recommends travel that will give the reader the tools to “speculate about the infinite greatness of this world...”

Next, the author conjures up the ghost of Homer reminding us that even he did not know how to begin [“entonar”] except with “Help me sing, oh my muse! about a man who saw many lands and various human customs.” [“Ayúdame a cantar ¡o musa! Un varón que vio muchas tierras y diversas costumbres de hombres.”] He fashions his dedicatee, Philip II, as a new Odysseus, remarking that he well knows the virtues of travel since he has traveled widely even as a young man (in Spain, Italy, Flanders and Germany 42). Knowing “the very ardent desire Your Highness has to see and understand the strange things of this world, inspired only by the zeal to defend and augment the Holy Catholic faith” [el ardentíssimo ánimo que Vuestra Majestad tiene de ver y entender las cosas raras del mundo con sólo zelo de defender y augmentar la sancta fe católica], and knowing that the greatest enemy he faces is the “Great Turk,” the author will vividly

⁴² An allusion to the voyage made by the Prince to visit the Imperial states (October 1548 to April 1549). (See Bataillon, 109-110)

paint for His Highness this "commentary in the manner of a dialogue about the power, life, origin, and customs of his enemy, and the life the sad captives lead" ["comentario a manera de diálogo a Vuestra Majestad el poder, vida, origen y costumbres de su enemigo, y la vida que los tristes cautivos pasan"]. Why is he doing this? Elliptically, he states, "so that according to this you may follow your good purpose," ["para que conforme a ello siga su buen propósito."] But how exactly is this information supposed to help the King? Presumably, hearing about the plight of the sad captives will inspire the King to rescue them and learning about the Turks will help develop strategies to vanquish them.

The author explains that he is inspired to write partly because so many things have been written about the Turks. But these things he says, are "like angels painted with feathers and God the Father painted with a long beard...the devil with goat legs." [los ángeles con plumas, y a Dios Padre con barba larga...y el diablo con pies de cabra"] He complains that these writings are not given more authority than that "someone said so" or that someone who had "come from there was heard saying so." Things worth considering are ignored: "the text having no more authority than it is said that and that someone heard it from someone who came from there; and how they speak about hearsay in relation to things that are worthy of consideration" ["no dando a su escritura más autoridad del diz que, y que oyeron dezir a uno que venía de allá; y como hablan de oídas las cosas dignas de consideración"] So the author goes on to say he will tell of the time of his captivity, ironically since his information will also be what "someone who has come from there has said."⁴³ This becomes one of the first instances of what I will call "double-voicing:" where the text says one thing yet means, or suggests, another. The authorial voice extols personal experience yet offers its own testimony as an adequate replacement and criticizes second-hand knowledge yet pretends his own reflections constitute a valid substitute for it. The text appears to offer a clear and direct statement but opens the possibility of a different interpretation.

He apologizes for the "vile style in which it is written" ["ruin estilo con que va escrito"], claiming that it is justified because he doesn't write as an "erudite author" ["erudito escriptor"], but as a "loyal interpreter," ["fiel intérprete"], who actually saw what he writes about and who is interested in truth rather than rhetoric and elegance. He establishes his authority by explaining that after his time in captivity, he spent two full years in Constantinople, during which time all doors were open to him since he was 1) a doctor and, 2) spoke all languages known in those parts. He was invited to the "chambers of the grandees of that land, nothing of what happened was hidden from me," ["las cámaras de los mayores príncipes de aquella tierra, ninguna cosa se me escondía de

⁴³ This prefigures the situation in the dialogue to follow where Juan admits, with the cynical encouragement of both Matalascallando AND Pedro, that he will listen to Pedro's travel adventures in order to learn significant details so that he appears more authentic and more convincing to his listeners in the future, when he lies to them, pretending to have traveled to foreign places. This makes the reader's place parallel to Philip's, and parallel to Juan's: voyagers by proxy.

quanto pasaba."] (90) In the next section, he speaks dismissively of some commentators who have suggested ways for vanquishing the Turk, involving all Christians princes and Church personages liquidating their holdings and sending ("contribuyendo") many paid people ("gente pagada"). This seems to suggest simply supplying soldiers to fight battles. He continues saying that there are prophecies even in Turkey about the arrival of the Christians: "They called us pagans and infidels," "Llamánnos ellos a nosotros paganos y infieles," (93). The Turks await the Christians who are prophesied to vanquish them, the Turks will regroup forces in Mecca and conquer the Christians in their turn, triggering the "fin del mundo." The author goes on to say that the Turks sit around and read the prophecy, bursting into tears; he says he himself "would wish that this were true and they divined their ill, ["querría que fuese verdad y ellos adivinasen su mal."] I imagine he desires just the first part of the prophecy to be true! He says that "would that God would be served and things here would liberate Your Highness" ["Fuese Dios servido que las cosas de acá dexasen a Vuestra Magestad"] and then he would see how everyone would rally to his side, referring to the internecine problems of the Christian world.

The author ends his dedication with a vigorous exhortation to Philip II to destroy and annihilate "that Turkish monster, vituperation of human nature" ["aque! monstro turquesco, vituperio de la natura humana"], in the name, it would seem, of those "sad and oppressed Christians, " captives in those lands. He says that he dedicates this book about "las fatigas de los christianos cautivos" to His Majesty whom he considers the only one, besides God, who can remedy their travails. The date in my edition (García Salinero) is March, 1557.

The great irony of ending the dedication by calling the people he will be discussing "aque! monstro turquesco, vituperio de la natura humana," is that his Pedro de Urdemalas will actually try to prove to his two companions that many of their pre-conceived ideas about the Turks are completely wrong and unjustly derogatory. Pedro's overall message throughout his relation is imbued with the spirit of tolerance. In many instances, Pedro speaks of the virtues possessed by many of the Turks whom he meets on his travels. He pointedly compares these men to his venal compatriots, very often exemplified by his interlocutors. The exaggerated language in this section is reminiscent of a similar section in *Don Quixote* where the morisco character talks about how horrible his own culture is. By condemning his own culture, and himself, in this over-the-top manner, he demonstrates its fundamental unfairness.⁴⁴ We are left with a mystifying statement that, in essence, contradicts everything that will come after. (See Mas, "Quel abîme entre le ton de l'épître dédicatoire et le reste du livre," 130; See Ortolá, p. 39-47)

To complicate matters further, the entire prologue-dedication is itself a pastiche of prologues belonging to previous works: *Les Observations* of Pierre Belon, the *Trattato* of

⁴⁴ Tito, in *Coloquios de la Verdad*, vituperates the Incas and his own peers, comparing them negatively with the Christians, in such an extreme manner that the reader understands the opposite.

G.A. Menavino, the *Miscellanea* of B. Georgievitz, the *Letters* of O. G. de Busbeq, 45 and Ludovico Domenichi's Prologue to *I Commentari di Theodoro Spandugino Florencia* 46 . According to Marie-Sol Ortolá, who calls the prologue a plagiarized dedication ("dedicatoria plagiada," 40.

De ellas...toma las fórmulas retóricas corrientes, tal como la *captatio benevolentiae* o la dedicación al príncipe, y elimina la repetición y amontonamiento de detalles. Entreteje los diferentes textos para destacar su mensaje aparente, hablar de la crueldad de los turcos y la miseria de los cristianos cautivos, su sinceridad de testigo de vista y el destinatario de la obra. Se arroga con la mayor desfachatez del mundo el papel de cautivo y crítico erudito del mundo turco, función que desempeña con brillo su héroe, Pedro de Urdemalas. No obstante, el autor inserta en la materia ajena comentarios propios, indicios sutiles e implícitos de lo que contiene verdaderamente el diálogo. Ortolá, p. 39

Mas has observed that the items that drop out of the original texts are often the most tendentious or partisan statements therefore the text "manifeste ainsi un souci d'objectivité destiné à montrer les Turcs sous leur vrai jour" (Mas 147).

An example of one of these double-voiced clues from the dedication is the section where the authorial voice proposes to speak of the Turks but parenthetically mentions the enemies at home:

[S]abiendo que el mayor contrario y capital enemigo que para cumplir su deseo Vuestra Magestad tiene (dexados aparte los ladrones de casa y perros del Ortoláno) es el Gran Turco, he querido apuntar al bibo en este comentario a manera de diálogo a Vuestra Magestad el poder, vida, origen y constumbres de su enemigo, y la vida que los tristes cautibos pasan, para que conforme a ello siga su buen propósito. (88-89)

The true meaning, message or purpose of the dialogue consists of two main spokes, the expression of an ideology or stance and the evolution of a new literary style. The "ladrones de casa" are those corrupt clerics who have forgotten the true message of the gospels and the New Testament. By offering his text "in the manner" of a dialogue so that it will be livelier and more intimate, the author expresses his literary pretensions. The dedication already offers a mix of history, literature, folklore, and ethnological curiosity about the lives of other men, a mix that contributes to make of the *Viaje de Turquía* a novelistic work.

⁴⁵ For discussions on these sources see William D. Markrich's doctoral thesis, "*The Viaje de Turquía*": a Study of its Sources, Authorship, and Historical Background. See Chapter 4.

⁴⁶ See Bataillon, *Le Docteur Laguna*, note to text 12.

In the dedication, personal experience over book knowledge is extolled; in the dialogue Pedro de Urdemalas encourages his interlocutors, Juna de Voto a Diós and Mátalascallando, to travel and experience the world outside Spain on their own, even as he offers his direct experience as a valid substitute. In the same way that the authorial voice of the dedication criticizes previous accounts about Turks because they are based on hearsay evidence even as his own supposedly authentic account is based on these very same documents from which he has copied entire sections; observations in the body of the dialogue by the protagonist Pedro are presented as eye-witness accounts but are also themselves composed of plagiarized texts from these same authors. In the dedication, the author insists his purpose is to bolster Philip's chances against the Turk yet, obliquely, and almost parenthetically, he refers to the overwhelming problems that Philip faces at home. Within the dialogue Pedro sets himself up as a martyr for Christianity, resisting conversion in the face of torture, even as he continuously compares the virtuous, and pious, Muslims, to hypocritical and abusive Christian clerics, represented by his interlocutors.

Frame, Language, *Costumbrismo*, and Literariness

In its outward form, the *Viaje de Turquía* is a two-part framed dialogue. The two parts correspond to the two days during which the conversation takes place. On the first day Pedro de Urdemalas describes his adventures as a Turkish captive in Constantinople, his escape, and his perilous return to Spain through Greece and Italy. On the second day he talks about the life of the Turks. The frame is his conversation with the two old friends who have bumped into him on the "French road," a place that is never identified in the text. Pedro's appearance is frightening at first, he is dressed as a beggar and has clearly neither washed nor eaten in days. His desperate demeanor is belied by his confident tone as he recognizes his old friends and assures them that he has experienced marvelous events that have made him wiser.

Juan de Voto a Dios is a clergy member who has studied theology in Alcalá where he once lived with Pedro and Mátalascallando. The latter is his servant and assistant in the business of collecting donations with the pretext of building hospitals.⁴⁷ The two present themselves as honorable men of God but are in truth charlatans who live off the money they raise.

⁴⁷ Marie-Sol Ortolá suggests that Juan's character can be read along mythic, folkloric, and literary lines as the figure of the arrant Jew who is punished by god (see Bataillon as well for more on this); as John the evangelist blessed with divine goodness; as "Juan Tonto-Juan Listo," a folk pícaro who has much in common with the pícaros of the Arabic maqamas; as the stereotype of a lapsed brother (an exploitative liar); as a John the Saint; and as the figure of the false pilgrim. See Chapter 1 of *Un Estudio del Viaje de Turquía: autobiografía o ficción*.

Curious yet suspicious, Juan and Mátalascallando ask Pedro to give an account of himself and of the Turks. This, then, is the justification, and frame, for the dialogue. Within the frame, Pedro recounts his adventures in what we could term autobiographical monologues, which are really episodic narratives. His two interlocutors participate in the narration by making observations, asking questions, and, pointedly, expressing awe or doubt as they react to Pedro's stories. Their interruptions provide comic relief during the narrative sequences where Pedro recounts the harsh and, oftentimes brutal conditions of his captivity; and provoke many of Pedro's digressions which hinge on comparisons between the customs of different peoples and the customs of the Spanish.

The language of the characters is popular (colloquial) and conversational, sometimes crude, which is appropriate for a conversation between three rogue figures.⁴⁸ The author uses Spanish popular traditions: folkloric characters, popular speech, proverbs and sayings; and little stories from oral tradition/oral literature (Bataillon, 131-132). He describes manners and customs with details that make the Turkish world lively and intimate. In terms of the author's documentary (ethnological) intention, Mas observes in the work "un souci de presentation littéraire" that, thanks to its *costumbrismo* (focus on manners and customs), "revêt... un aspect documentaire d'une richesse rare en son temps" (112).

The combination of historical detail, literary devices, and folkloric elements again suggests to Ortolá, as well as to Ana Vian and Jacqueline Ferreras) the genesis of a novelistic work.⁴⁹ Morón Arroyo highlights the aspects of the work that will make it a predecessor of the essayistic genre.

***Viaje de Turquía* as Corrective – Martyr of Christianity**

Pedro seeks to correct misapprehensions on the part of Spaniards who, according to Mas, "en avaient une connaissance erronée et en retenaient les aspects qui se prêtaient le mieux aux sarcasmes et au mépris. Pedro la présente dans de longs exposés, dépourvus de haine raciale ou de passion religieuse." (Mas 111) He admires the way the Turks observe their religion because it seems more sincere (virtuous and moral) than that of the

⁴⁸ For more on linguistic registers in the text, see Emma Martinell Gifre's article "La conciencia lingüística en el *Viaje de Turquía*." Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 2007. Interestingly, she posits another possible author for the dialogue, Juan de Ulloa Pereira.

⁴⁹ Bataillon, Mas and Corsi all describe the text as a documentary novel, for example, "un roman d'aventures d'intention documentaire." (Bataillon, 14). Having investigated the Turkish sources of the text, Markrich disagrees, considering its historical authenticity proves the author's actual, not literary, voyage, even though he acknowledges the presence of literary allusions, including the apotegmas of Erasmus and the *Silva de varia lección* of Pedro Mexía (Ortolá, 22)

Christians. His view seeks a certain kind of objectivity (Bataillon's emphasizes his naturalist eye.)

Throughout the dialogue, Pedro is making the case for Christian renovation with a clearly reformist intention. Pedro refers to the New Testament and gospels; the epigraph "*initium sapientiae timor Domini*" serves as a symbol for a story of realization of spriritual conscience and a transformation through faith in God. The dialogue closes with a sermon by Juan that ends with a declaration of faith in and submission to God, "...ni criatura podrá apartar del amor que tengo a Dios." Pedro is a prophet, he demonstrates unflinching faith and continuously resists the pressure to convert, even when subjected to actual physical torture. His stance makes him into a martyr figure: "la principale sauvegarde pour le roman autobiographique de Pedro, la grande excuse de son franc-parler en matière de religion, c'est que le héros a été, dans toute la force du terme un héros de la foi, presque un martyr du christianisme" (see Bataillon, *Bulletin Hispanique*, "Andrés Laguna, auteur de *Viaje de Turquía*," 146).

Ortolá discusses the use by the author of the classical allegory of the descent to hell: "percibido de este modo, el texto se presenta como una novela ejemplar y filosófica, cuyo héroe es un cristiano recuperado que se dedica a narrar cuidadosamente y con orden el proceso de su renovación. En su historia teje la historia política, religiosa y cultural de los turcos entre quienes se ha efectuado el cambio, y de los españoles, con quienes vivía en la ceguera más absoluta antes de la toma de conciencia y del viaje a ultratumba. Destaca sutilmente las debilidades de la cristiandad y la falta de honestidad de los católicos mediante esas confrontaciones audaces de individuos y culturas distintas." (Ortolá, 23)

Anonymity as a device

Markrich thinks that manuscripts of *Viaje de Turquía* must have circulated secretly because the author feared persecution or death if he entrusted his manuscript to print. Clearly, the fact that he wanted his work to be anonymous is related to the danger that such a text would represent for its creator.⁵⁰ As Markrich points out, three Spanish masterpieces were published anonymously or under a fictitious name during the decade of 1550-1560 (*Lazarillo de Tormes*, the *Crotalón* and the *Viaje*). "In times of religious and political persecution, the number of anonymously published books increases for good reasons" (Markrich, 10). He is calling for renovation within the Church at a time when reformers are being burned by the inquisition. Further, I agree with Ortolá that the anonymity of the text is key to understanding the "desenvoltura" with which it presents

⁵⁰ Salinero points out that if we attribute authorship of the work to Dr. Laguna then there is an added reason that would explain its anonymity: a descendant of conversos would have had to be doubly careful representing travels in Turkey during the very years that so many new Christians were leaving Spain for Constantinople.

its subversive message. His denunciation of the institutions of his country can succeed because he places himself at the margins, distanced from what he is criticizing. This trick of voluntary marginalization is doubled: he is nameless (and so his critique belongs to everyone and no one) and he fits his subversive observations into the narrative frame of a trip to the outside, away from the center he wishes to focus in his lens. I agree with Ortolá that "el propósito verdadero del diálogo consiste en cambiar las disposiciones críticas del lector y oyente al mostrarles la realidad desde otra óptica, desde un ángulo distinto del usual y excitar su curiosidad. Pues existen otros mundos, otras maneras de actuar, vivir, pensar, entender al ser humano, que no son españolas." (Ortolá, 39) The device of anonymity allows this opening to happen more easily; the voice weaving together the strands of dialogue and debate (Juan, Mata and Pedro can be seen as representing the different points of view of Spaniards of the period) becomes a construct that holds in itself the possibility of disagreement, of changing one's point of view through dialogue with another person, of the wisdom of evolving opinions that reflect more world experience rather than less. The reader is asked to stand at the margin and, as it were, overhear the discussion, identify with the anonymous author as a sort of everyman who has not yet made up his mind. The dialogue begins with Juan, who says "La más delectosa salida y meas a mi gusto de toda la çibdad y de mayor recreación es ésta del camino francés, así por la frescura de las arboledas, como por gozar de la diversidad de las gentes, variedad de naçiones, multitud de lenguas y trajes que Señor Santiago nos da por huéspedes en este su peregrinaje.

Mata: Como todas las cosas que debaxo de la luna están tienen su haz y embés... (*Viaje*, 99)

These interlocutors who will represent the Spaniards of the day with their prejudices, stereotyped ideas about foreigners, and degraded religious ideas begin by signaling a degree of openness to what comes next. This "French" pilgrimage puts them in contact with men who have travelled and Juan instinctively associates this with a certain kind of pleasure. At this point it is only vicarious. He speaks no other languages but pretends to speak many, he has never left Spain but presents himself as a great traveler. It is Pedro who will unveil his ignorance and his lies even as he satisfies, ironically, his enjoyment of "diversidad," "variedad," and "multitud" by telling him his traveling tales.

Part 2 - Coloquios de la verdad

"Preguntado un indio de los de esta tierra si era ya cristiano, dijo que sí, que ya sabía hurtar, blasfemar y engañar a su prójimo, y hacer todo lo que veía que hacían los cristianos." (*Coloquios de la verdad*, 160)

In the first part of this chapter we have discussed the way heretical ideas linked to humanism and Protestantism seeped into the intellectual production of Spanish writers in spite of repressive strategies put into place by the Spanish Church and Inquisition, especially after the Council of Trent (1545-1563). In the next chapter we will look at the

models for the dialogic genre and we will see that our two dialogues combined specific elements from these previous genres in order to produce something altogether different that responded to the particular realities of their contexts.

Now let us consider *Coloquios de la verdad* more closely in order to see how it works as a subversive text that delivers a scathing attack on ecclesiastic and political authorities and their failures at conquest and evangelization in Peru.

The *Coloquios de la verdad* uses the dialogic form creatively and is self-conscious about belonging to a well-established genre of satire. The author promises to present a well-crafted work that will delight and instruct. French historian Pierre Duviols has called the *Coloquios* “Uno de los primeros monumentos literarios del Perú.”⁵¹

Manuscript/ Print History

Very little is known of the life of Pedro de Quiroga, author of *Coloquios de la verdad*. It seems that he was born in Spain around 1520 and died sometime between 1588 and 1592. A friar and priest, he lived in Peru where he witnessed the chaotic years of civil strife following the conquest of Peru. Critics think that the *Coloquios de la verdad* were composed during 1563-1565. Some mystery surrounds the manuscript history of *Coloquios*, first edited in 1922 by Julián Zarco Cuevas. There are two existing manuscript copies. It is known that the first, currently in the monastery of San Lorenzo of El Escorial, passed down from the library of Dr. Gaspar de Quiroga, the dedicatee of the *Coloquios*, to that of Luis de Castilla, although no one knows when or why. Later it was acquired by the Count Duke of Olivares and finally, upon Olivares' exile in 1643, incorporated into the collection of the Real Biblioteca de El Escorial. The second is a copy of the first, included by Manuel José de Ayala in his collection of “indigenous documents” during the last third of the 1700's, currently housed in the Biblioteca de Palacio in Mafra, Portugal.⁵²

⁵¹ Pierre Duviols (1971). “L'extirpation de l'idolâtrie” in *La lutte contre les religions autochtones dans le Pérou colonial*. Institut Français d'Etudes Andines, Lima. p.191, Note 10. Part of its importance stems from its incorporation of the Quechua language,

⁵² For more on this chain of custody see: Nicolás Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispana Nova*. 1783-1788: 1672; Francisco de B. San Roman, *El testamento del humanista Alvar Gómez de Castro*, in *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, v. 15, Madrid: 1928, p. 543-566; Gregorio Marañón, *El conde-Duque de Olivares*, Espasa-Calpe, Madrid: 1936; Julián Zarco Cuevas, *Catálogo de los manuscritos castellanos de la Real biblioteca de El Escorial*, Imprenta Helénica, Madrid: 1924-1926; Jesús Domínguez Bordona, *Catálogo de la biblioteca de alacio*, v. I. *Manuscritos de América*, Patrimonio de la República, Madrid: 1935; Rubén Vargas Ugarte, *Manuscritos peruanos en las bibliotecas de América*, A Baiocco y Cía, Buenos aires: 1945.

Zarco Cuevas' edition in 1922 was first printed in the *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas* of Seville and soon after again, as part of the Center's multi-volume *Biblioteca colonial americana*. During the time the *Coloquios* has been available in print, it has been considered an invaluable source of information about the political and social situation of early colonial Peru. It has been used variously to affirm the extreme faults of the Spanish crown vis à vis the treatment of its colonial subjects, the corruption of ecclesiastic personnel, the failure of evangelization and political organization in the colonies, as well as to note the inadequacies of indigenous people (their extreme humility and obedience, their seeming lack of a natural ability to judge reality [*sindéresis*], their propensity towards idolatry).

The dedicatee of the *Coloquios*, Dr. Gaspar de Quiroga, was a relative of Pedro's and one of Phillip II's right-hand men, who became General Inquisitor in 1573 and was a member of the State Council (Consejo de Estado).⁵³ Clearly, by dedicating his work to Gaspar and since Quiroga appears to have returned to Spain partly in order to present his dialogue, he was hoping to find protection by a powerful grandee as well as an audience among royal circles.⁵⁴ Gaspar was named Cardenal in 1578⁵⁵. In 1583 he presented a new Index of Prohibited Books, very different from the previous one from 1559. Martínez de Bujanda explains, "Quiroga a recueilli dans son Index pratiquement toute la littérature protestante, ce qui fait grossir énormément le nombre des ouvrages latins et allemands....le but premier de l'Index de Quiroga est de lutter contre le protestantisme et d'empêcher la diffusion des idées qui pouvaient aller à l'encontre de l'enseignement orthodoxe du Concile de Trente." (Bujanda, "La Censure," 12-13) It is possible that if Pedro de Quiroga's text had been presented earlier or later it might have been printed and disseminated widely. But it is precisely during those years, when he returned to Spain, that the censorious climate would have prevented publication. Of all of the people whom he could have chosen to protect and disseminate his work, Gaspar de Quiroga was probably the least able to do it. Already in 1556 Philip II had forbidden the publication of any work that dealt with problems in the Americas.⁵⁶ Jesús Gómez believes that this explains why many works, including dialogues like the *Coloquios*, were not published. Later, Viceroy Toledo himself deplored "the freedom of speech customary in the Indies

⁵³ Vasco de Quiroga was Gaspar's uncle.

⁵⁴ See Ana Vián Herrero, "Pedro de Quiroga, autor de los coloquios de la verdad: perfil de un comisario inquisitorial cuzqueño" in *Dejar hablar a los textos*.

⁵⁵ It is he who liberated fray Luis de León from his Valladolid jail in 1576.

⁵⁶ "La polémique entre Bartolomé de Las Casas et Ginés de Sepúlveda sur la légitimité de la conquête de l'Amérique par les Espagnols avait soulevée des questions qui concernaient la sécurité de l'état. Par la loi du 9 octobre 1556, Philippe II imposait à tout ouvrage sur l'Amérique une censure préalable accordée par le Conseil des Indes. Tout au long du XVI^e siècle, nombreux sont les décrets qui précisent cette réglementation ou qui visent à faire retirer de la circulation les ouvrages dans lesquels on parle des problèmes américains. (Martínez Bujanda, "La Censure Littéraire...", 6-7)

during the sixteenth century"⁵⁷ and would have most probably not allowed the dissemination or printing of Quiroga's work. During his viceroyalty social and political censorship was vigorously maintained.⁵⁸

It seems clear that Quiroga did not want his work to be another chronicle, letter or *relación*, of which there were so many, that could be easily ignored. He chose a genre that was popular at the time and imbued it with literary qualities calculated to be attractive and entertaining. He would have been familiar with Lucian's and Erasmus' dialogues. Erasmus's dialogues were in vogue and printed in America. Interestingly, *Coloquios de la verdad* is one of only four other dialogues in Spanish America at the time (Gómez).

The work's literary qualities have been less studied than its contributions to colonial historiography.⁵⁹ And yet it is clear that the work has great literary value. The fact that an ambiguity of meaning allows the work to be used for multiple, and sometimes contradictory, arguments, speaks to its literary sophistication. The *Coloquios* is Quiroga's only known work.

The Danger of Writing – Quiroga Begins

The author's introduction to *Coloquios de la verdad* is different from that of *Viaje de Turquía's*. In some ways, as I will suggest, Quiroga's tone is more directly pedagogic and justificatory than the *Viaje's* anonymous author's. Quiroga clearly expresses the fact that his purpose is to give a good example, "edificar" the reader,⁶⁰ and expose the vices of his contemporaries.

⁵⁷ Hanke Lewis, *Selected Writing of Lewis Hanke on the History of Latin America*, "Free Speech in Spanish America," 278.

⁵⁸ See Vian Herrero, "Pedro de Quiroga..." for discussion of Quiroga's later years, role as commissioner of Cuzco, and involvement in the Inquisition in the Indies, on occasion censoring books himself, 409-411.

⁵⁹ In *The Cambridge History of Latin American Literature*, Roberto Echeverría says, "Although the missionary/native collaboration in the Andes has not been documented as systematically as that between the Franciscans and the Nahuas in colonial Mexico, the relationship between the intellectual work and writing of Europeans and native Andeans needs further exploration. The conceptual coincidences, for example, between a native writer such as Guaman Poma de Ayala and the accounts of Fernando de Montesinos, Fray Buenaventura de Salinas y Córdoba, and Fray Martín de Murúa, suggest that much more might be learned about this type of colonial cultural production in Peru. See...Quiroga (*Coloquios de la verdad*) for a series of dialogues revealing a pro-Andean missionary outlook on colonial/native relations." (55) See: Pease edition of Porras Barrenechea (*Los cronistas del Perú*), the best source for the indigenous chroniclers and the entire colonial Peruvian tradition of historiography. (*Cambridge History...*, 56)

⁶⁰ The *docere* part of Horace's *docere et delectare*.

The first page of Quiroga's manuscript has a brief description of the text, "[t]rata de las causas e inconvenientes que impiden la doctrina Cristiana y conversión de los Indios de los Reinos del Perú. Otrosí trata de la entrada y conquista de aquel Reino y de los daños y males y agravios que los Indios padecen y el estado en que al presente está la justicia y doctrina que se les administra." The author identifies himself as "un sacerdote que en aquellos Reinos ha residido." He does not lapse into an encomium, as the author of the *Viaje* does, simply acknowledging that it is "[d]irigido al muy ilustre señor doctor Gaspar de Quiroga, presidente del Consejo Real de los Estados de Italia, del consejo Real de Su Majestad, y de la Santa y General Inquisición, etc."⁶¹

There are three important things that we learn in this brief passage: the text will seek to explain the reasons that Christian endeavors to evangelize the indigenous population in Peru are failing; it will address the degraded state of this population; and, finally, the author points to the ultimate veracity of his account, because, as a priest, he has been ostensibly involved in the direct attempt at evangelization, actually having lived in "those kingdoms," and being, therefore, an eye-witness. Directly, almost brutally, the author has presented his topic and justified his authority to speak about it. It has the flavor of first hand testimony even though none of the speakers of his colloquia is actually modeled on the clergy.

The next section breaks down the work into four separate parts, each a colloquium which the author himself describes and summarizes thus: the first section describing the conquest and the entrance of the Spanish in Peru, in the words of Barchilón who is advising the young fortune hunter Justino, recently arrived in America; the second part is about the sorry state of the natives of Peru, their past and present mistreatment, the way justice is administered, the tyrannical ways of their "caciques" and "señores naturales," and their habits and lifestyle. The third section ends admonishing the reader with the brief description "Es materia notable," and deals with "una yerba u hoja de un árbol llamado coca," its uses, cultivation method, the damage it causes, and, finally, its qualities, effects, and flavor. The fourth and final colloquium, ending with the sentence "Es materia digna de ser entendida," is about Christian doctrine and conversion, the reasons conversion is not successful, and "lo que de aquellos indios se entiende acerca de su cristiandad y la orden que se debe tener en doctrinarles."

One odd fact is noticed immediately: the brief qualitative descriptions or admonishments to the reader, in the third and fourth sections, suggest that, at least from the author's point of view, the parts fall into a hierarchy of interest or importance. The first two receive no qualitative comment at the end at all. The penultimate assures the reader that it is "materia notable," and the last, that it is "materia digna de ser entendida."

⁶¹ To be fair, there is a very brief and simple encomium-like section at the end of the author's letter.

What is one to make of these annotations? Can it be that the author is saying that the colloquium about the uses and abuses of the coca leaf is of more “note” than the others? One can understand that the last section about the failure of Christianity and suggestions for improving conversion rates is important, since this is the apparent purpose of the text, after all. But why single it out as especially “worthy of comprehension?” I suggest that, in part, it establishes a pedagogic tone, whereby a teacher admonishes his student not to let his or her attention flag after the more dynamic first part of the text is over. In fact, the first and second colloquia are true dialogues, whereas the third and fourth are really monologues or first-person narrations, where the native Tito, expounds on a variety of topics, although the interlocutors trigger the exposition. These last two sections offer more doctrine, as it were, and, therefore, from the point of view of the author, deserve greater attention and concentration. The coca chapter is interesting as well because of the contrast it presents to the genre of New World Chronicles. Here the nature of the coca leaf and its uses does not flavor the narration with an exoticism reminiscent of Columbus' descriptions of his travels; it is not natural history.

The last section of the preliminary pages is an “Epistola del autor,” a text functioning both as prologue and justification. After repeating the names of the dedicatees mentioned above, the author introduces his purpose in writing and his fears surrounding the presentation of the text.

Antes de agora tengo entendido el trabajo y peligro que es escribir y a lo que se sujetan y obligan los que escriben, y no sin razón de muchos doctos y avisados ha sido temido, porque lo que se dice en cierta manera se puede enmendar o equivocar, pero lo que se escribe, esto ya va volando y está puesto al ojo y parecer de todos. Trago es éste, muy ilustre Señor, que muchos y valientes varones no le quisieron gustar, y pasto que a muchos doctos ha hecho volver del camino. No lo alabo, pero éstos antes quisieron quedar sin nombre que ser juzgados; porque ya está en común opinión que el que escribe, y el que edifica, ha de ser su obra muy a sabor de todos gustos, cosas harto imposibles la una y la otra. Al fin, ninguno se puede escapar de juicio en este siglo y en el futuro. El príncipe y el pequeño están sujetos a juicio, y más el que escribe como yo obra acerba y satírica que a todos tira y a todos toca. Poniendo, pues, el cuello a este yugo tan pesado, quiero tirar por él y probar qué es lo que otros tanto temieron, porque de los dos extremos mejor es morir de valiente que de temor. (Quiroga, 71)

The author asserts that many educated men have chosen not to leave anything written because of the fear of being judged, “lo que se dice... se puede enmendar...pero lo que se escribe, esto ya va volando.” This is an indirect beginning to his *apologia*, seemingly a nod at prologue conventions of humility, since we soon find out what really worries him. His work is a satire that “a todos tira y a todos toca,” quite at odds with the conventional dictum that “el que escribe, y el que edifica, ha de ser su obra muy a sabor de todos gustos.” From the beginning, Quiroga warns the reader that he, too, is implicated in his

denunciation. The movement has been from the general proposition that writing anything is dangerous simply by dint of its permanence in ink and the inability of authors to so easily retract their statements and opinions, to the dictum that writers who seek to educate should write in a way that pleases everyone (an impossibility), to the confession that he is not interested at all in pleasing everyone, rather the opposite, it is “an obra acerba y satírica” that attacks everyone.

According to Ana Vian, historiographical works sought to avoid the conventions of the *captatio benevolentiae*, considered inappropriate and unsuitable to this genre.⁶² But I would argue that Quiroga’s unapologetic tone here in this passage of his introduction is more than an attempt at expressing the historiographical objectivity of his text (implying, perhaps, that it is so objective it need not seek the good will of a patron, for example). Rather, it warns that what follows is not a narrative that will seek primarily to delight the reader, although its literary quality will insure it does to a certain degree, but that it will discover the depths of degradation and exploitation in the world of Colonial Peru. The description that “[a] todos tira y a todos toca,” assures us that while the context of this critique is indeed colonial Peru, the subjects of his attack are much wider, implicating the religious establishment as well as the governing powers.

Quiroga continues by stating his avowed purpose clearly “mi intento solo ha sido investigar y fatigar mi espíritu por dar un modo de atraer los indios de los reinos del Perú a nuestra santa fe católica, señalando los inconvenientes y causas que hasta ahora lo han impedido.” (72) Is this a necessary assurance that he is well ensconced in the “santa fe católica,” and so can criticize it from inside, as it were? Assuring his audience that he is no heretic, he writes that his satire will not question the absolute truth represented by the Catholic Church, just its messengers. His work will also seek to illuminate some of the other—perhaps less remembered or observed?— truths about Christianity and some of the other—perhaps more humane— methods of proselytization. One detects a similarity to Erasmian-influenced humanist reformers; the outer limit of this satire that ‘touches all’ is the church, the ultimate goodness of which he does not question. This was the period, however, that immediately followed the Council of Trent and in Quiroga's words one can hear a response to repression and an attempt to deal with the sudden reduction of options for open debate. Post-Trent, what could writers and thinkers do who believed in bringing about a self-critical debate within the church? Either they fled to Rome (Valdés brothers), Geneva, or Amsterdam, or they tried to write within the parameters of the Church's universalism. He continues “la doctrina Cristiana...siendo como lo es tan una y tan santa, se la enseñan por tan varios modos y tan violentos y contrarios a lo que enseñan.” The problem, as he sees it, is that the violent means of teaching this unquestionably saintly set of beliefs (made dogma and "absolute truth" in Trent), belies its fundamental teachings.

⁶² See Vian, “Sátira Lucianesca y avisos a la corona...,” p. 211.

A disciple of Bartolomé de las Casas (*Del único modo de atraer a todos los pueblos a la verdadera religión*, is thought to have been composed between 1522 and 1524), Quiroga's perspective is that these natives (“naturales”) for which “tengo compassion,” are so deficient in reason (“de tan bajo juicio”) that they very easily become confused (even those who have “buen entendimiento”). Unlike Las Casas, however, Quiroga will later detail some of the defects of native culture. As has been pointed out by critics, Quiroga’s denunciation of Spanish atrocities is less vitriolic than Las Casas.⁶³ In fact Quiroga fits into a tradition of debate within the church that had been going on for decades. From las Casas, de la Veracruz, Santo Tomás, to theologians like Ignatius of Loyola and, later, José de Acosta and Francisco Suárez within the Jesuit order itself the question was: what does it mean to be a Christian?

This same section introduces another very important set of ideas that revolves around the idea of “truth.” Quiroga writes his text according to what he knows and “tengo por muy larga experiencia de muchos años que he tratado y doctrinado aquellos naturales.” He speaks from direct experience, as an eye-witness and participant and, importantly, in the present tense. This is a theme that was crucial for writers of historiography in their claim to veracity.⁶⁴ In the last section of his letter he writes, “concedo... que escribo cosas de poca erudición y doctrina, pero yo no enseño, sino aviso lo que está tan claro que, de claro, está olvidado. Sólo me obligo a la verdad, pues la tomo por título de esta obra.” Beginning with a note of humility, he states that his work constitutes an “aviso,” a warning, of something that is obvious yet forgotten, is evident but ignored.⁶⁵ The “truth” alluded to, as expressed in Renaissance historiography, attempts to unite truth and didactic purpose. The historian has a privileged position from which he can bring out what is clear and buried, rescuing it from oblivion. According to Margarita Zamora for Renaissance historians and, by extension, colonial historians writing about history in the Americas, historical events, are “always placed at the service of the interpretation of a suprahistorical ‘Truth.’” She continues, “[d]uring the larger part

⁶³ Jesús Gómez says “Pedro Quiroga no entiende de visiones simplistas. No justifica la conquista de América doctrinalmente, como hace Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda en su *Democrates secundus*, pero tampoco denuncia la barbarie de la conquista y de los conquistadores, como hizo el padre Las Casas. Simplemente, reconoce la necesidad de oír la voz del otro, del indio, ...por boca de Tito.” In *El diálogo en el renacimiento español*. P. 71

⁶⁴ Eye-witness accounts were essential since Herodotus; see M. Zamora’s, “Historicity and Literariness: Problems in the Literary Criticism of Spanish American Colonial Texts,” in *Modern Language Notes* 102, 2, 1987, pp. 334-346.

⁶⁵ Quiroga’s text can be related to the genre of “warnings to the crown” very popular in the colonial context and descendants of the “mirrors of princes.” For more on the “literature of warnings,” in Peru in the decade from 1560-1570, see G. Lohmann Villena’s “Notas sobre la estela lascasiana en el Perú. El licenciado Falcón y las Corrientes criticistas,” in *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español*, v. 41, Madrid, Instituto Nacional de Estudios Jurídicos CSIC, 1971, pp. 373-423.

of the colonial period historical truth was defined according to the ideology that subsumed the interpretation of the facts and that, in the final analysis, derived its authority from the Christian and classical traditions.” (Zamora, 338) Clearly, part of the “truth” Quiroga is talking about that has been lost and needs to be rediscovered is intimately connected with fundamental Christian beliefs. The double axis of truth and Christian fundamentalism helps shape Quiroga’s text, just as it does the *Viaje de Turquía*, and we will return in a later section to analyze it more closely. While it is true that Quiroga resembles Renaissance historians in his appeal to what he argues is a Christian truth (ie. the need to treat the natives humanely) his text also begs the question about how Colonial and Spanish historiography are different.

Frame and Literary Characterization of the interlocutors: Barchilón and Justino

As we have seen, Quiroga presents his work as consisting of four colloquia. The scheme is actually more complex than that of *Viaje de Turquía’s* because while in the latter the three interlocutors are introduced at the same time and their voices are present throughout, *Coloquios de la Verdad* begins with a dialogue between the two Spaniards. This dialogue would appear to introduce Tito, the central figure in the remaining three sections. The last two sections are really monologues where the interjections of the other characters are brief and function chiefly to set up Tito’s dilated responses.⁶⁶

Let us look at the way the interlocutors are presented in the initial frame story. Barchilón is described in Quiroga’s introduction as “antiguo de la tierra del Pirú,” and later “ermitaño.” He opens the dialogue lamenting the fact that so few men know what true Christian happiness (“bienaventuranza”) consists of (*Coloquios*, 74). Temporal goods clearly do not constitute happiness since it is always the richest men who are least happy (“los más ricos de ellos son de contentamiento más pobres”). He is a perfect example of the inevitable turning of the wheel of fortune, “soy uno de los a quien la fortuna subió y puso en riquezas y honor mundano.”⁶⁷ Now he is dressed in garments of

⁶⁶ For a full treatment about the names Quiroga chooses, see Daysi Ripodas de Arnaz, “Barchilón, enfermero de indios. Del Hospital de Huamanga al Diccionario de la lengua,” in *Estudios sobre la política indigenista española en América*, volume 3, Valladolid, Seminario de Historia de América de la Universidad: 1977; “‘Barchilón,’ hombre y vocablo. Historia de un americanismo,” in *Boletín de la Academia Argentina de Letras*, LII: 1987; as well as the introduction to the edition of the Quiroga’s text. Ripodas thinks that Barchilón is based on the historical figure of a remorseful Pizarrist who became a nurse in a hospital for indigenous people in Huamanga. Tito was a common name in indigenous patrician circles. Besides this, his name could suggest a familial tie to Titu Cusi Yupanqui, son of Manco II, who was considered legitimate heir of Cuzco’s throne. He led the resistance to the Spaniards from Vilcabamba until 1572. Justino and Cayo (Tito’s friend) were common names of their respective times and places.

⁶⁷ Ana Vian Herrero describes him thus: “Representa más bien la figura de un Las Casas (y otros como él), primero conquistador y encomendero y luego transformado por una conversión no súbita, tras la experiencia.” (in “El diálogo literario en América en el siglo

rough wool. He sententiously proclaims “el no medirse el hombre ni contentarse simiente es de la primera maldad y pecado del mundo, pues ni los ángeles ni los hombres quisieron contentarse con el bien que poseyeron hasta que lo perdieron.” This introduces themes that will be expanded upon later from a moralistic standpoint: the dissatisfaction that makes people travel and seek fortune elsewhere, the greed that allows man to exploit his fellow man, the lapse from true Christianity.

Barchilón notices a young man asleep under a tree. He exclaims, “¿Qué otra cosa es caerse un hombre dormido sino cansarse de vivir? ¡Oh miseria del hombre, y qué poquita vida que tienes y cuán presto te cansas de vivir!” The idea that a man would prefer to die rather than live will return in the scene where Tito appears trying to kill himself and Barchilón refuses to understand such hopeless despair. The sleeping man, a “soldado que llega de Castilla al Pirú,” is rudely awakened by Barchilón, who says “[d]espertarle quiero, no muera durmiendo.” This forceful waking is a prelude to the violent interruption of Tito’s attempts at suicide that will occur in the middle of the second colloquium. The soldier turns out to be an old friend of Barchilón’s, Justino who has been dreaming wonderful dreams of power and riches. Says Barchilón, “tal es, por cierto, el sueño y la riqueza de esta tierra y de este siglo, que todo ello es sueño y burla.” When he recognizes Justino, he cries, “¡Oh, hermano! ¿Es posible que tu mal destino te condujo a esta tierra?” (75) For his part, Justino is shocked by the poor appearance of his friend, “venía yo lleno de esperanzas de tu riqueza, y hállote vestido de saco y aspereza.” Reminding us of Pedro de Urdemalas, Barchilón replies, “he dejado el camino mundano, y favorezco los naturales de este reino y hago vida penitente.”

As Barchilón’s character develops, his role becomes clear, he will try to convince Justino that he has made a mistake, that this land is hell, that instead of fortune it offers corruption and horror, “te ruego me digas qué avenida de río te hizo caer en el canal de esta tierra sin ventura para los que la huellan. ¿Con qué cebo te pescó el demonio? Justino replies, “[n]o vine sino con deseo de ver tierras y saber y valer más.” (76)⁶⁸ Justino does not accept responsibility for the mistakes made by others and in this way the polemic terms are set up by which Barchilón will try to explain to him everything he ignores about the New World, including the good work done by the first conquistadors, twisted by those who came later. For Barchilón, the origin of all evil is in man’s wanting to arrogantly govern a land that he does not understand. Justino is a “chapelón,” a neophyte whose head is filled with dreams of fame and fortune. He recognizes that Barchilón is preaching at him and resists him as he can. But after listening for awhile he admits, “voy ya abriendo los ojos y el entendimiento a las cosas de esta tierra, porque te ruego me aconsejes y des parecer cómo me deba haber, porque ya entiendo ser verdad lo que dicen, que es otra lengua y gente la de esta tierra muy diferente de la nuestra.” These arguments take up the rest of the first colloquium.

XVI," in *Actas del Primer Congreso Anglo-Hispano*, Ed. Deyermond and Penny, Editorial Castalia: Madrid, 1993.

⁶⁸ Reminding us of the prologue of *Viaje de Turquía*.

The framing dialogue, then, sets in motion a variety of philosophical concerns. The older wiser man tries to warn the younger about the dangers of trying to control people he does not understand: the problem with the continued Spanish conquest is one of failed ethnology, the conquerors/evangelists have not taken the necessary step of understanding those they would wish to conquer/evangelize. With greater understanding of Indian culture, conversion rates would rise. The principles of conquest and evangelization stand unquestioned Barchilón can talk all he want, describe the many errors of the Spanish, the truth is that Justino, who considers himself an innocent, can not really absorb and understand his words. Somehow, although Barchilón is an eyewitness of sorts and his first-hand experience is unquestionable, he can not convince Justino of the truth. This requires the entrance of another interlocutor: a native informant. The text of *Coloquios de la verdad*, therefore, will supply, via a "true and authentic native voice," that ethnographic information that has been missing and without which none of the Spanish endeavors can succeed. Barchilón interrupts his peroration, "Pero ¿no oyes, Justino, voces de indio que parece quejarse de su fortuna?" (86)

Tito

We meet Tito as he is about to commit suicide. He kisses the rope that hangs from a tree, he kisses the tree, and he cries out, "¡Oh Señor y Rey Mío, oh gran Señor! ¿Adónde estás...[e]stás con tu padre y Señor nuestro, el sol?" (87) Perhaps this "gran Señor" is Christ. He feels abandoned, "¿Y para esto desamparaste y dejaste a tus pobres? Señor y Rey mío, llévame..." (Barchilón and Justino are hidden in the trees, wanting to hear the Indian's complaint, waiting to jump in just in time to save him.) Strangely, at first Tito speaks his thoughts first in Castilian, then in Quechua. This does not last long; his laments continue in Castilian only. Does the Quechua last long enough for Quiroga to give the reader a flavor of the language? Long enough to establish the authenticity he is so bent on constructing on the part of this native interlocutor? Or is Quiroga adding the Quechua as an exotic element that is calculated more to delight the Spanish-speaking reader? It will return only once again, briefly, as we shall see.

Tito does not say why he is killing himself, he speaks and reassures his friend, Cayo,⁶⁹ and indulges in a philosophic reverie whereby he repeats how welcome death is, "que mal tan breve como es morir no puede ser muy grande, a lo más, no tan grande, como vivir la vida que yo vivo." He begs the Sun, his God, to come take him away. As he is about to hang himself, he asks his friend not to cry, "si no tienes ánimo para verme morir, vete y déjame que no quiero sepultura ni que me des mortaja. El que hubiere menester este árbol para hacer su casa, ése me enterrará o me lanzará en este río" (89). On this practical note he prepares himself to die, giving this last bit of advice to his friend: "acuérdate que eres inca de nación; sirve a nuestros dioses y no olvides nuestra religión tan Antigua."

⁶⁹ Vian sees Cayo as an Erasmian *umbra* his role as Tito's friend and confidante is important only to confer a verisimilar setting for the suicide.

Now Barchilón and Justino race to the scene in order to save Tito who has hung himself. Barchilón, who is feeling guilty because they have waited so long, cuts Tito down from the tree, as Justino unsuccessfully runs to catch Cayo. When Justino returns, Barchilón complains that he has not been able to rouse Tito. What follows is perhaps the most notable scene of the entire text. As we have seen, Barchilón has by this time said many things to Justino about the way the Indians have been mistreated and exploited and how this has corrupted the souls of the Spaniards. Justino, it will be remembered, has assured him that his eyes have begun to open. Nonetheless, this novice youth who has, after all, only just arrived in Peru, rushes at Tito, “Déjame a mí con él, que yo le haré hablar y aun cantar. ¡Ah, perro!...¿Por qué no habláis? Déjame, le pese a Lucifer, abrámosle a azotes. ¿Hase de reir un indio de nosotros?” (91) His response to Tito’s attempt at suicide is violent and vile. He is scandalized by the thought that he may die before telling his story and satisfying their curiosity—as if it were a personal affront. It is at this point that Tito’s Quechua momentarily returns, “¿imánam, Señor ya? ¿Imananta maqawanki Dios ya? [“¡Ay, ay! ¿Qué pasa, señor? Por qué me maltratas, Dios?”] Still hitting him, Justino cries, “Habla en Castilla pues que lo sabéis hacer, si no vuestro pellejo lo pagará. Habla, habla lengua de España.” As we will see later, part of the problem that Quiroga saw in the attempt at evangelization was that the Spaniards never tried to learn the language of the natives, a language he says that is “fácil de aprender o, a lo menos, de entender (162).

Justino’s instinctive disgust (“ah, perro!), his anger (“¿Hase de reir un indio de nosotros?” his “prepotencia” (“yo le hare hablar y aun cantar”) all turn him into Barchilón’s portrait of the greedy Spaniard “que ni entiende ni quiere entender” (79). So much for Barchilón’s advice to “trata[r] con la gente de esta tierra suave y llanamente” (84)! Justino threatens the dying man with death (“si no vuestro pellejo lo pagará”) if he does not speak and if he does not speak in Spanish. He wishes to hear Tito’s story, and threatens him with his sword. Tito, therefore, will not be a willing witness; his testimony will be coerced. He shows his mettle, however, when he responds, “No más, señor, que yo hablaré, déjame ya.” (91) Tito speaks no more Quechua after this point, only Spanish, “¿Qué quieres que hable o diga? Pregúntame lo que quisieres, que yo diré tanto que me mates por que calle, como me atormentas ahora por que hable.” (92)⁷⁰

In “La codificación del habla y del personaje del indio en los *Coloquios de la Verdad* (c. 1569) de Pedro de Quiroga,”⁷¹ Ana Vian addresses the image that was established of Indians from an early date. According to her, this image swung from the pole of the Indian as a brutish and irrational animal (Fernández de Oviedo’s “perro cochino”) to the other extreme, the Edenic Indian (Bartolomé de las Casas’ utopian and rhetorical figure, the “noble salvaje”). Quiroga, like many preachers and evangelists, also

⁷⁰ An interesting question that is not addressed here is how this reflects legislation of the time that required Hispanization. The linguistic policies of the time changed many times.

⁷¹ In *El personaje literario y su lengua en el siglo XVI*. Editorial Complutense, Madrid: 2006.

constructs Tito as a rhetorical, argumentative and fictional character, although perhaps more complex and certainly dystopic rather than utopic. Tito is able to receive and understand the Christian faith; he is far from the archetype of the picturesque Indian wearing a multicolored crest of feathers, he is a man who is more than qualified to receive the Christian religion but at risk for losing it because of the mistakes of colonial and religious representatives. Tito's reason and wisdom, "yo hombre soy como vosotros de quien con harta más razón me podría yo santiguar y huir," is such that it is in his words, through his voice, that the author presents his dangerous critique of Spain, of Christianity, and of his fellow man.

Finally, Tito's "voice" is similar to Thomas More's Raphael in *Utopia*; their character resides on two narrative levels. Their voices are "double, invisible and all-seeing, omnipresent to the whole and to each detail, a cartographic eye, a viewpoint outside any point of view whose discourse can seem to be an image. But [their] "I" ...[is also] a character, presented in the discourse and [an] actor seen and memorized by the storyteller. It is a viewpoint within the picture, a major element of the deconstruction of its figure in the narrative and in history."⁷² Tito's voice doubles the voice of the author, Quiroga, in many interesting ways, as we shall see below.

Literary Language – The *Coloquios* as “monumento literario”

Quiroga mixes colloquial with more pure traditional language; cultured vocabulary and sentence structure with idiomatic expressions and refrains; and familiar locutions with Latin quotes from the gospels. He uses three languages: Spanish, Quechua, and Latin and peppers his text with general Americanisms (cacique, maíz, tambo) and specifically Quechua words (*inga, coca and cocales, yanacunas, moyas, mitayos, sarapayas, carache, apo, viracocha*).⁷³ Despite his mixing of registers and languages, the predominant language of the work is a homogenous Castilian (of a purity alluded to in the beginning of this chapter). Quiroga's work does not exhibit the mixing of language that was already common in Spanish America. Even Tito, except when he briefly speaks in Quechua, speaks in perfectly idiomatic metropolitan Castilian.

There are not very many other instances of dialogues experimenting with idiomatic language and the insertion of other languages, as had become common in the

⁷² Louis Marin, *Utopics: Spatial Play*, New Jersey, Humanities Press: 1984, p 73.

⁷³ The *Coloquios de la verdad* contain one of the first instances of literary Quechua, including various implied registers, outside of institutional texts such as catechisms or grammar textbooks. For more on Quiroga's use of Quechua and its implications see "Lengua dominada, literatura y mentalidades: los fragmentos quechuas en los *Coloquios de la Verdad* (c. 1569) de Pedro de Quiroga," in *Homenaje a Ramón Santiago* (eds. Alicia Puigvert and Inmaculada Delgado), Ediciones del Orto, Madrid: 2007.

theater of the time.⁷⁴ Interestingly, one significant exception is the Greek and Turkish of *Viaje de Turquía*. Vian makes the point though that in the *Coloquios*, Quechua is presented seriously with no attempt at making it comic (unlike the Greek that appears in *Viaje*, for example).

As in any other literary dialogue, and certainly as in *Viaje de Turquía*, the language is argumentative and rhetorical and serves both aesthetic and ideological objectives. (Vian, 251) Quiroga combines styles and registers: the uncontaminated Castilian that attempts to reflect familiar and quotidian aspects of reality; the high-flying and sublime language of Tito and Barchilón that makes their denunciation vivid; the contemplative paragraphs in Quechua; the Latin and Biblical references. Each part of the dialogue requires different styles according to the argument that is being made, as well as the tenor of the communication.⁷⁵

Satire, Heterodoxy, Criticism

Let us remember now the main questions as presented in earlier chapters. We are looking at two sixteenth century Spanish dialogues that purport to present themselves as travel narratives that offer the Spanish crown useful ethnographic portraits of an “Other.” The two Spaniards in *Coloquios de la verdad* force Tito, “*a punta de espada*,” to tell them his story. He obliges, and takes the opportunity to recount not only his story but also the story of the Incan state and of Quechua culture, from pre-Colombian times to the present. Tito plays *avant-la-lettre* native informant to the Spanish ethnographers. He recounts some history but also a lot of anthropology. The complication is that although Tito still prays to his God, the Sun, he has been baptized, has come over to the other side of the divide. He is a Christian. And not only a converted Christian, a native savage who has seen the light, but a true Christian believer, who will finally ask the Spaniards: How could the Spanish, bringing the one true religion to our continent, act in such un-Christianlike a manner. In the course of the dialogue, Tito has gone from being hapless victim, to exotic storyteller (in picaresque fashion and not without a sense of humor and amusement); from riveting native informant to inquisitor; from subaltern to judge. How does Quiroga represent this movement in his text? How does he stage the philosophical and religious debates of the day? This is what will now occupy us in the rest of this chapter.

Political context

⁷⁴ The work of 16th century Erasmian dramatist Bartolomé Torres Naharro is an example. His novelistic dialogues and plays are striking for their use of a hybrid mix of languages.

⁷⁵ As expressed by Tasso in “Dell’ arte de dialogo,” and practiced by Golden Age authors; see Vian Herrero, Ana, “Los personajes de los diálogos y su forma expresiva: la voz de las retóricas áureas.” In *Hommage à Robert Jammes* (ed. F. Cerdan), *Anejos de Criticón 1*. Presses Universitaires du Mirail, Toulouse: 1994.

We have referred to the civil strife lived in Peru in the years after the conquest. James Lockhart describes this period as beginning in 1532 when Francisco Pizarro entered Peru from the North and captured Atahuallpa, the Incan Emperor, in Cajamarca, and ending in the late 1550's, with the defeat of Francisco Hernández Girón, leader of the last settlers' rebellion. In between there were numerous conflicts:

These wars, not readily reduced to comprehensibility, were at first very largely personal and factional feuds between Pizzarrists and the Almagrists, but they were also conflicts between the rich and the poor, the well-established and the newly arrived. As time went on the factional element grew weaker, and the element of discontent and rebellion grew stronger. After the initial episode, in which both sides had an arguable legal case, ["War of Salinas" between Pizarro and his rival Diego de Almagro] the civil wars were fought between supposed loyalists and supposed rebels, and even to some extent between the sedentary coastal region and seditious Upper Peru.⁷⁶

Lockhart's concern in his book is to argue that, although characterized by "war, political chaos, and bad governors," (6) there was basic economic and social development during this period. But he acknowledges that other critics, like John Hemming, have considered that significant economic and social developments, as well as experiments in government, were possible only in the decade of the 1560's, after the period of civil wars, and especially after 1569, during the twelve-year rule of Viceroy Francisco de Toledo. Hemming describes the challenge: "the authorities now had to evolve a system of government for the country...[t]he Crown wished simultaneously to preserve its purity of Christian conscience and foster the Peruvian natives; but also to maintain its own revenues and reward the Spanish colonists – clearly incompatible aims. In this time of experiment, Peru seethed with political theories.

Rolena Adorno in her essay "Felipe Guamán Poma de Ayala: An Andean View of the Peruvian Viceroyalty, 1565-1615," describes the character of those years and decades thus, "The decade of the 1560's, in particular, saw the proliferation of treatises concerning the former indigenous regime and the contemporary state of affairs in the Vice-royalty, often with proposals for a reformed and more just Peruvian colonial society in the

⁷⁶ James Lockhart, *Spanish Peru, 1532-1560: A Social History*, p. 5.

future.⁷⁷ The sudden outpouring of memorials, essays and treatises advising the King how to administer the country as remarkably critical and idealistic.⁷⁸

The root of the problem, at the close of the civil wars, was the lack of a protective political authority. Natives were “at the mercy of a group of predatory masters” (Hemming, 367). Their numbers were declining and, if further ignored and abandoned, they would never willingly or spontaneously accept conversion to Christianity. Let us remember that the tentative date of composition for the *Coloquios de la verdad* advanced by critics is 1563-1565. This work, then, belong to this body of “memorials, essays and treatises” that aimed to argue a point of view to the King. As we have seen, in entrusting his narrative to Gaspar de Quiroga Pedro seems to have been seeking out, in part, Philip's ear.

During the years 1550-1555 illustrious men had written on behalf of the natives and/or of the need for reformation within the church, Bartolomé de las Casas, Alonso de Veracruz, Domingo de Santo Tomás, and Álvaro Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, among many others.⁷⁹ In 1555, an edition of the *Siete Partidas* of King Alphonse the Wise (13th century) was published, annotated by Gregorio López.⁸⁰

During the 1560's, there was also a subversive revival of native religion that alarmed Church leaders and led to councils devoted to self-criticism and the articulation of constructive policies to battle heathenism.⁸¹ Their crusade inspired an important literary by-product. Juan de Betanzos wrote the first Quechua dictionary to help priests

⁷⁷ The situation of the native Andean population no doubt motivated many of these writings on contemporary social matters; the vanquished Inca was the subject of others. Ironically, the Andean people themselves cannot be seen through these texts, even though they were often present as anonymous informants. It has been possible through such documents to learn about the preoccupations and anxieties of the Europeans during the first century of their rule in the Andes." (1)

⁷⁸ John Hemming (1970). *The conquest of the Incas*, Macmillan Publishers Ltd, Oxford.

⁷⁹ Bartolomé de las Casas (*Brevisima relación de la destrucción de las Indias* (published 1552); Alonso de Veracruz (*Recognito Summularum* (1554) *Dialectica Resolutio cum textu Aristotelis* (1554); Domingo de Santo Tomás (*Grammática o Arte de la lengua general de los Indios de los Reynos del Peru* (1560), first book printed in Quechua, first Quechua grammar compilation), and Cabeza de Vaca, *Nafragios y comentarios* (1555).

⁸⁰ This version was very influential and was the one most used in America.

⁸¹ The Second Ecclesiastical Council, for example, was held in Lima in 1567 and dealt with the issue of how to suppress and eradicate heathen practices. This Council “gave a significant impulse to vernacular instruction” See Alan Durston’s *Pastoral Quechua: The History of Christian Translation in Colonial Peru, 1550-1650*. (p 71)

succeed in their missionary work.⁸² Others were published by Domingo de Santo Tomás, in 1560 and Diego González Holguin, in 1608.⁸³ Up to about 1560, catechesis seems to have been carried out mostly in Spanish and Latin.

There also appeared many studies that sought to thoroughly document native religions. Besides chronicles about the Incas, that included sections on religion, manuals were written whose purpose was to help missionaries suppress idolatry. Hemming includes Pedro de Quiroga in this list, along with other authors such as Polo de Ondegardo, Juan de Betanzos, the first Augustinians, Francisco de Ávila, Critóbal de Molina of Cuzco, Cristóbal Carrillo de Albornoz, Hernando de Avendaño, and José de Arriaga.

Pedro de Quiroga

For many decades information about Pedro de Quiroga was scant. More recently, documents have been found that have permitted a better rendering of the author's portrait, even though many details are still unknown. In her article, "Pedro de Quiroga, autor de los *Coloquios de la verdad*: perfil de un comisario inquisitorial cuzqueño," Ana Vian Herrero attempts to reconstruct the author's biography. He was born in Medina del Campo sometime between 1510-1520. He went to Peru around 1546 where he began to learn Quechua and joined the evangelical mission (which we surmise from the dedication of the *Coloquios*). The question of Quiroga's religious status remains unclear, although Rípodas has argued convincingly that he must have belonged to the Franciscan Order, among other reasons because of this Order's thoughts on evangelization and *indigenismo* and the reflection of these ideas in Quiroga's work.⁸⁴ After living in Peru for many years, he returned to Spain for an unknown period during which time he either composed the *Coloquios* or had it copied. He was back in Peru by 1570 having been named Canon of Cuzco in 1568.

In an attempt to associate the duties of ecclesiastic and civil visitors, in 1570 Viceroy Toledo named Quiroga, as well as many others, to a new office. Quiroga became

⁸² In the 1540s Betanzo wrote the earliest known Christian texts in Quechua: a translation of a *doctrina Cristiana*(*cartilla*); two dictionaries, a confesionario, and a series of *coloquios*, which at that time constituted brief sermons, also known as *pláticas*.

⁸³ Holguin's dictionary, considered one of the best Quechua dictionaries, is still widely used by Quechuists. The Third Council of Lima, 1582-1583, the most important of the three councils celebrated in Lima, decreed that indigenous languages must be used for the purposes of evangelization. It forbade the use of Latin and produced a trilingual catechism, known as the "Catechism of Toribius" in Spanish, Quechua and Aymara.

⁸⁴ *Indigenismo* can be described as a pro-Indian political movement that proposes political, social and economic revindication for the native and mestizo populations in Latin American countries. See Ascensión Hernández de León-Portilla's, "Fray Alonso de Molina y el proyecto indigenista de la orden seráfica"

the ecclesiastic visitor of Arequipa Province. According to the "*Libro de la visita general del Virrey don Francisco de Toledo, 1570-1575*," the Viceroy sought to name as visitors people "de más autoridad, confianza y experiencia en las cosas desta tierra, y más celosos del bien de los naturales." Perhaps his reputation as an expert on American reality and respectful protector of the natives had been solidified, in part, by the *Coloquios*. Shortly after his arrival in Peru, Toledo wrote of his "General Visit": "...el principal efecto de la Visita general y personal mía era el de extirpar las idolatrías, hechicerías y dogmatizadores para que la doctrina de los Evangelios caiga en disposición y tierra que puede hacer fruto..." Thus began the famous extirpation campaigns that attempted to repress the activity of "sorcerers and dogmatizers," and banned all native religious rituals and ceremonies. And so it appears that the author of the *Coloquios* became an agent of extirpation, perhaps believing that Toledo's intentions were noble given that, as Murra notes, Toledo was "the only viceroy to devote such personal attention to the Andean population."⁸⁵ Quiroga died sometime between 1588 and 1592. All of this biographical information has been recently gleaned (and inferred) from various testimonies as well as a comparison of signatures placed upon different documents, including the dedicatory epistle of the *Coloquios*.

What Tito Says

And so, with the sword to his throat, Tito talks. But just before he begins to answer Justino's questions, there is an interesting interchange between Justino and Barchilón that again presents some of Quiroga's main themes. Barchilón appeals to Justino to leave the Indian alone, marveling at his lack of pity so newly off the boat, as it were. Justino rejoins that Barchilón is a fine one to talk since, after all, he and his ilk, those who first arrived in the new land, treat men in this cruel fashion. "Los que vinisteis primero y los que acá estáis nos enseñáis el cómo hemos de hacer nosotros, y vuestra es la culpa, que hicisteis el uso." (92) At once condemning and assigning blame, Justino refuses to recognize that he has mistreated Tito. This turn, however, affects Barchilón in a most astounding manner: he appears to revert to some previous state, perhaps validating Justino's accusation. "Cata que es el diablo el indio, santiguándome estoy de él y de sus pláticas y razón...porque indio no es posible saber tanto ni dar de sí tan buena razón." Even as he has been presented from the beginning as someone who feels truly sorry for his past actions and sensitive to the plight of the Indians, here he demonstrates that he believes Indians to be less able to reason than Christians, to such a degree that Tito's good

⁸⁵ Murra, of course, also says: "He [Toledo] sponsored many institutional innovations; some of them were consistent with ideas to end the Las Casas "benevolent" approach to Indian affairs, which he brought with him from court. He tried to put an end to the influence of Bishops Gerónimo de Loaysa of Lima and Domingo de Santo Tomás in Charcas, men from another era, who spoke Quechua and had earlier corresponded with Las Casas (Las Casas 1892)." John V. Murra, "Litigation over the Rights of 'Natural Lords' in Early Colonial Courts in the Andes." In *Native Traditions in the Postconquest World*, eds. Elizabeth Hill Boone and Tom Cummins, p. 57.

sense and clear articulation up to this point must signify the devil who is trying to trick them. Barchilón bears the brunt, in this instance, of Quiroga's satire. He is unveiled as a hypocrite who has nursed paternalistic impulses toward the natives and who considers them subhuman.

Barchilón's admission also signals to the reader that Tito is extraordinarily articulate; the text sets him up as logical, sensible, and honorable. He responds to Barchilón simply and logically (in a tone that invokes common sense in much the same way as it is used by Pedro de Urdemalas when addressing the hypocrite and conventional Juan), "Demonio es el que hace obras de demonio, que yo hombre soy como vosotros de quien con harta más razón me podría yo santiguar y aun huir." He excoriates Barchilón for finding it strange that an Indian speaks reasonably, "¡Oh, cómo andáis errados! Dadme que un hombre tenga razón y libertad y veréis cómo dice perlas." All men have reason, he suggests, although not all have freedom, and if even as he speaks other "tristes y miserables" are quiet, it is not because they don't have reason but because the Spaniards won't listen. So Barchilón himself now asks Tito to speak, in a sense authorizing him to speak, because of his clear reason, and recognizing that he, Tito, is best entitled to recount how things stand in this land.

Barchilón first questions Tito about his suicide attempt. He wants to know why he had such a will to die. Echoing the frame of *Lazarillo de Tormes*' auto-biography, Tito can only answer by beginning at the beginning, by telling the story of his life.

Tito begins his narration by acknowledging the dangers inherent in writing/speaking. And just as Quiroga warns the reader that he, too, is implicated in his denunciation, Tito warns Barchilón: "pienso decirte ... secretos, cosa que cierto tú y todos los españoles ignoráis..." Because Tito recognizes that his speech will constitute an attack on Barchilón as well, he makes him promise that he won't deliver him unto his enemies. But this *dédoublement* whereby Quiroga's prologue parallels Tito's, again makes us consider the extent to which Quiroga is using Tito's voice to present his critique, and also how Tito's subsequent ethnology is merely a strategy to turn the tables on his audience and force them to look at themselves in the starkest of lights.

Just as Pedro de Urdemalas conjures up Homer with his "Ayúdame a cantar ¡o musa! Un varón que vio muchas tierras y diversas costumbres de hombres," Tito now invokes the true God, "hacedor y causa de todo lo que tiene ser, desata mi lengua, habilita mi entendimiento para que pueda decir lo que siento y no quede en silencio lo que es tan necesario y general!" A particularly Christianized Homer, one could even say, since, here, the age-old muses are gone. Interestingly, for us, Tito says that his other name is Pedro, although "de estos nombres de cristiano tengo más de una docena, que tantas veces he sido bautizado." (95)

The ethnological dimension of Tito's subsequent narrative is hinted at this preliminary stage when he describes Cuzco before the conquest and when he explains

what Quechua words like *Viracocha* mean (95) and when he explains that the Quechua speakers collective memory lies in their songs which, of course, the Spanish can't hear because they refuse to learn Quechua (108).

He recounts the cruelties of the first stages of the conquest as an eyewitness, "Allí estuve presente a todo lo que hicisteis." (95) One of the great errors committed by the Spanish, according to Tito, is that they did not observe differences in station among the men they had conquered. He counts himself as "inca de nación y deudo de los reyes que estos reinos conquistaron y poseyeron, gente que fue bien estimada y tenida como entre vosotros a los que llamáis caballeros." He himself is rudely treated when the Spanish Captain he approaches for protection treats him as a servant equal to those Tito, himself, employed as servants and vassals. He refers again to Barchilón's stereotype of Indians when he says, "de mi natural, aunque indio, fui siempre de altos y nobles pensamientos." One begins to envisage here something like the argument consistently made by Pedro de Urdemalas, namely that nobility and reasonableness do not belong to nations but, rather, to individuals.

Tito recounts his picaresque adventures, serving first the captain, then a soldier, a merchant, and a hermit. The picaresque dimension —downright Lazarillo-like in its synopticism—pops out when Tito says things like, "se comenzaron mis ojos a abrir...teníais Dios y religión santa y buena; pero entendía que, atrevidamente, hacíais en contrario de lo que nos aconsejábais." (96) Repeatedly, Tito sees Spaniards espouse religious and moral ideas they do not observe in their behavior. The *Coloquios* literary connection to the picaresque genre will be further explored in Chapter 3. It is the merchant who first speaks to Tito about the Christian God. But his indoctrination is spotty and *pro forma*. The merchant does not really explain anything, simply insists on the form being observed; he has Tito baptized. But Tito doesn't understand, "y quebranté [la ley de Dios] yo muchos años porque la ignoraba, más que por malicia." But this experience begins to open up his path towards the Christian God and he quotes the Book of Wisdom, in Latin, "Optavi, et datus est mihi sensus," (I willed, and Sense was given me."), a sentiment that resonates with las Casas' view that the natives only need to be taught to understand the true religion. With the hermit, Tito finally finds the example of an upright Christian man and he learns, "que había entre vosotros buenos y malos." (97) He is much affected, however, by the fact that this man is reviled by his fellow men, "por ser este hombre bueno y justo sentí que le perseguíais, y que era de vosotros desamado por lo que decía y hacía en favor de los naturales de este miserable reino." Tito is struck by the contradiction that an honest and saintly man should be persecuted by other so-called Christians; he also makes clear that part of the hermit's goodness involves his advocating for the natives. Like Pedro de Urdemalas, Tito echoes here again the fact that there are good and bad Christians just as there are good and bad Indians. It also strikes the reader that in this spot Tito addresses the two men who listen to him, his audience, and by extension the readers, as it were, as "vosotros," implicating them and us in his accusation. We, like them, cannot recognize true righteousness in a man anymore and resent those who would protect the natives.

After the hermit dies, Tito continues to learn more about Christianity from priests who give him "buenos consejos y doctrina, y siempre me ayudaron a mis letras que yo tanto deseaba saber." Here Tito once again stands out as someone who has from the beginning been interested in "learning his letters," learning to speak in Spanish, articulating and advocating for himself and others, telling his story. Eventually, Tito decides to travel to Castille and discovers on the one hand "vuestra locura y desordenada codicia" and on the other the grandness of a majestic King and a wonderfully ordered land. He observes that Spaniards do not make good transplants "Sola la lengua conserváis, que todo lo demás está corrupto. No sois buenos para árboles trasplantados, que mudáis el fruto y buen natural." Upon his return to Peru, Tito falls in again with the customs and rites of indigenous culture. Thus he ends with the story of his life and begins his condemnation.

Tito's main argument in what follows is that Spain has treated the natives much worse than any other conquering power has treated its subjects throughout history and yet they are Christians, "¿cómo sufre vuestro Dios tales insultos como los que habéis cometido con color de ser cristianos? (100)

When Barchilón remarks that life under the Inca wasn't that great either, Tito offers a description of life before the conquest. In essence, he says that the Spanish removed the Incan king along with the laws that ordered their society. Once again, the conquerors conquered in the name of religion yet treat the natives irreligiously; they conquered in the name of their king but send him documents that lie, keeping him in the dark about the true situation in Peru; they mistreat those among themselves who are good and righteous; they corrupt officials and judges. Tito admires the Spanish king and believes that if he knew the truth, he would rectify the situation in Peru. One of the greatest problems Tito identifies resides in the language of communication between the colonies and Spain: the words that find their way to the king are lies.⁸⁶

At this point Justino responds to Tito and, like Job's friends who have come to comfort Job in his sorrow when he has lost everything and is waiting to die, he states that he accepts Tito's description of the conquest but insists that if God permitted said destruction it is because of the people's sins, "entregóos Dios en nuestras manos por vuestras maldades y por vuestra idolatría tan sucia y abominable." (104) Like Job, Tito answers "esta tierra en qué os ofendió? ¿Qué os hicimos los indios de ella? (105).

Ethnology

⁸⁶ Not only lies, in fact, the *Audiencia* of New Spain actively impeded letters addressed to Spain, examining them before delivery. Communications were sometimes smuggled into Spain. See Hanke, *Selected Writings*, 281.

What follows in subsequent sections belongs to an extraordinary ethnological mode whereby Tito describes the situation of the natives under the Incas and then, at greater length and in greater detail, their situation during and after the conquest. Unlike the ethnology of *Viaje de Turquía*, describing Turkish well-established habits and customs, the Peruvian native habits and customs he describes in the bulk of the narrative are new, consequences of the destruction wrought by the Spaniards. Both characters are eye-witnesses but whereas Pedro has been a sort of tourist in foreign lands à la Mandeville, Tito, has been a victim and what he recounts is the process whereby the natives have lost their traditions. This ethnology doesn't unfold in narrative form as in the *Viaje* but in justificatory and reactive fashion. Tito describes certain actions (reactions) of the natives such as why they don't defend themselves in certain ways, why they don't want to work hard (everything they make goes to tribute) as Barchilón condemns their habits. Tito explains the conduct of the Indians as a response to a misapprehension on the part of the Spaniards. Between those lines, one reads ethnology.

As touched upon above, Quiroga models much of what Tito says on Bartolomé de las Casas' work. Much of the ideology that permeates his text is echoed in las Casas. Unlike some critics of Spanish policies,⁸⁷ "Las Casas was able to distribute his published and unpublished tracts throughout Spain and the New World" (Hanke, *Selected Writings*, 279) and it would have been easy for Quiroga to access them. About *El Unico Modo de atraer a todos los pueblos a la verdadera religión* Hanke says: "la doctrina enunciada por Las Casas en esta obra, ...era bien sencilla. Citaba, ...las palabras de Cristo, 'id y predicad a todas las criaturas,' y los dos hombres estaban acordes en que los indios americanos [estaban] incluidos. Las guerras contra ellos eran injustas y tiránicas, declaraba Las Casas...era ilegal emplear la fuerza para dominarlos y convertirlos ... era innecesario." (Hanke, 73)⁸⁸ Las Casas defended Amerindian culture and religion, by means of a comparative study of religions and yet on a basic level "Christian doctrine was excluded from the comparisons" (*Del unico modo*, 240/2).

I hope this chapter has shown how *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad* are works that reflect and criticize the societies from which they sprang.

⁸⁷ Such as Antonio de Montesinos who had been punished by King Ferdinand for his vocal defense of natives.

⁸⁸ In *The Fall of Natural Man: the American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology*, Anthony Pagden says of de las Casas' that he was "trying to prove ...that beneath the glaring cultural differences between the races of men there existed the same set of social and moral imperatives....to demonstrate a fundamental similarity between widely separated cultural groups..." (Pagden, 121) The text he chiefly refers to is de las Casas' *Apologética historia*.

Chapter 3 – Generic Models

[I]t is through the notion of genre that one may grasp the collective dimension of literary form.

Timothy Hampton, *Literature and Nation*

Interpretation is not an isolated act, but takes place within a Homeric battlefield, on which a host of interpretive options are either openly or implicitly in conflict.

Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious*

The authors of *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad* both chose the specific form of the dialogue to tell their story, a genre that saw its first stages of development with Plato and was explored throughout the following centuries by writers such as Lucian of Samosata, one of the classical writers who was best known in the Renaissance,⁸⁹ and who most influenced our authors. During the sixteenth century the dialogue became one of the most popular literary forms and perhaps this is when it attained its maturation.⁹⁰ In this chapter we will appraise the characteristics of Platonic and Lucianic dialogues that were taken up in our two texts, we will briefly consider some elements of medieval dialogue that might have influenced later works (such as debates and catechisms), and we will examine other Renaissance dialogues (by authors such as Juan Luis Vives and the Valdés brothers). The *Viaje* and the *Coloquios* are also crisscrossed by other genres that contribute to their literary and thematic force: travel literature, autobiography, and picaresque. In order to understand how the two dialogues work as literary narratives, as ethnologies, and as critiques, we must also take stock of the elements contributed by these other genres involving the way they relate issues of marginality to their fictional conceits and their treatment of satire and dialogue. Our dialogues engage in intertextuality and generic hybridity, as we shall see, but not in a simple or direct way;

⁸⁹ There were, of course, other classical writers of dialogues, from the Greeks Xenophon (430-354 B.C.E.) and Plutarch (ca.45-120 AD), to the Romans Cicero (106-43 BCE), Tacitus (ca. 56-ca. 117 AD), and Seneca (ca. 4 BC-65 AD). But these writers were not the models for the Renaissance authors of our study and so we will not spend time reviewing them. In the middle ages, the genre continued its development with dialogues by Saint Augustine (354-430), Saint Gregory (d. 385 or 386); and Boethius (480-524/5 A.D.) There does not appear to be much continuity between these dialogues and Renaissance dialogues, although there exist very few studies that consider the subject. It appears that Renaissance dialogues were principally hearkening back to the classical tradition.

⁹⁰ Jesús Gómez's bibliography in *El diálogo en el Renacimiento español* catalogues over 170 dialogues, including those in print and in manuscript form. See also J. Ferreras' catalogue, 1985 and 2003.

other texts and genres appear in transformed states, newly interpreted, as it were, for contemporary settings.

Jameson/Hampton/Genre or "Always historicize!"

Not surprisingly in a work that attempts to analyze dialogues, we will have recourse to Fredric Jameson's ideas about the dialectical processes at work in literary texts, the ways texts function as ideological artifacts, as well as the generic relationships that link them.⁹¹ Timothy Hampton summarizes Jameson's concept of genre usefully for us: "it is through the notion of genre that one may grasp the collective dimensions of literary form, the power of form to shape collectivity by molding the experience of time and space. Genres are the bearers of collective values and fantasies. They are...the 'institutions of literature.'" (Hampton, p. 28)

In the *Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*, Jameson describes how an individual text and the individual thinking mind of an author or artist is inextricably linked to a larger whole, a larger structure (tradition, movement, historical situation). When applying Jameson's dialectical criticism, the text is not isolated from its context but, rather studied within its "political horizon," as we saw in Chapter 1. The critic does well to remember that she or he fits into a given context, too. We have looked closely at the political and historical horizons that surrounded our authors in Chapter 2. Selden says of Jameson's ideas, "Jameson's 'political unconscious' takes from Freud the...concept of 'repression', but raises it from the individual to the collective level. The function of ideology is to repress 'revolution'. Not only do the oppressors need this political unconscious but so do the oppressed who would find their existence unbearable if 'revolution' were not repressed." (97)⁹² When in *Viaje de Turquía* Mata asks "¿...no traírais alguna punta de luterano desas tierras extrañas?" Pedro realizes that he has gone too far in his indictments and quickly back peddles. According to Salinero "El erasmismo ha pasado a tener el tinte más peligroso de luteranismo." (*Viaje* 125) The author never mentions "esas tierras extrañas." Despite his appreciative ethnology of Turkey, Pedro never wavers in his desire to return to Spain, in his encouragement to Philip to destroy the Turks, and in his religious rigor. Pedro de Quiroga not only takes for granted and represents many of the stereotypes about native Americans espoused by his countrymen, he also is an active member of Toledo's Extirpation Campaigns.

Texts in this way reflect aspects of their time and place. They also transfigure them and produce "new images of collectivity." (Hampton, 28); "imaginary resolution[s] of real contradictions." (Jameson, 77). Where Jameson describes how texts perform these

⁹¹ Timothy Hampton, *Literature and Nation in the Sixteenth Century: Inventing Renaissance France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001).

⁹² Judith Butler's work about subjection at the level of the psyche provides an interesting counterpoint to this view.

"imaginary resolutions," Claudio Guillén describes his notion of the dialectics between genre and countergenre. This idea enters into his wider appreciation of literary history as system, "ie., as an order (of interacting parts) and a cluster of orders, changing and yet enduring through the centuries" (*Literature as System*, 4). Guillén, like Jameson, is trying to view a singular text as a unit standing on its own and at the same time observe the way that it fits into a larger pattern of texts. The movement linking these two moments of criticism has an order for Guillén that parallels Jameson's three horizons. As expressed by McKeon, "[Guillén] sees genre as invitation to match one thing with another, 'an invitation to the matching...of matter and form'" (matter here understood not as 'content' but language, already shot through with formal elements. (McKeon, 1); "Now, the concept of genre looks forward and backward at the same time. Backward toward the literary works that already exist. Forward, in the direction of the apprentice, the future writer, the informed critic. (McKeon, 35) I think it is this movement forward that constitutes a genre's role as countergenre to what came before. It dovetails with Hampton's description of genres as bearing collective values (looking backward) and fantasies (looking forward). It is a 'challenge and response' understanding of the conflictive relationship between literary genres

By looking now at the different genres that criss-cross our sixteenth century dialogues we will be able to see how they represent a new literary experiment, challenging and responding to previous genres and trying to envisage a new horizon, a utopia perhaps, a fantasy. I want to concentrate on the notion of countergenre because I think that the two dialogues we have been exploring are examples of a countergenre that arises at a particular moment in time to hold and express ideological contradictions within the cultures that spawned them.

Unleashing the Emancipatory Power of Dialogue

Although some pre-Socratics wrote dialogues, few works survive. The birth of the genre is considered to be the dozens of dialogues composed by Plato (4th century BC). Plato's influence on the genre is undisputed, especially given the prestige accorded to him by his student, Aristotle. According to Juan Gómez in *Forma y evolución del diálogo renacentista*, the dialogue fits half way between philosophy and poetics or between poetics and rhetoric:

Dirigido fundamentalmente hacia la argumentación y hacia la expresión de ideas, sin embargo, el diálogo hace uso de toda una serie de procedimientos poéticos tales como el retrato de los interlocutores y el marco espacio-temporal de la disputa, relacionada con la teoría de la imitación o mimesis, definida por Aristóteles en su Poética. (Gómez 13)

The reference is to a passage in Aristotle where "Socratic dialogues" are mentioned as an example of poetry or literature in prose:

There is another art which imitates by means of language alone, and that either in prose or verse...but this has hitherto been without a name. For there is no common term we could apply to the mimes of Sophron and Xenarchus and the Socratic dialogues. (Aristotle, *Poetics*, Section 1 part 1⁹³)

None of the “mimes” of Sophron or Xenarchus (around 430 B.C.) have been conserved but the references as used by Aristotle seek to answer the question as to whether the use of verse is what defines the poetic nature of a work. Aristotle states that both these sorts of “poetics” lack a name, as yet, but they prove that indeed Poetry cannot be defined merely by its use of verse. Mimesis, for him, is related chiefly to the imitation of the interlocutor’s personalities and with the representation of special and temporal circumstances as developed within the dialogue. [Gómez, 14] The mimes referred to by Aristotle are imagined by scholars as little plays that combined realism and funny entertainment, usually presenting only two performers in conversation.

Plato

Plato’s influence on the literature and philosophy of the Renaissance can only be compared to Lucian of Samosata’s, whom we will discuss in the next section. Plato is said to have simplified the genre of the mimes by reducing it to purely argumentative conversation even as he retained the amusing element of the character sketches. He is considered to have perfected the genre of the dialogue, especially in the Socratic cycle; only the *Apology*, among all his philosophical texts, is not in dialogue form. In Plato’s dialogues, a speaker, usually Socrates, and one or more interlocutors discuss some philosophical question. The work contrives to capture the subtle nuance and lively repartee of actual intellectual conversation. The interlocutors, led by Socrates, embark on a philosophical quest— such as the meaning of love, truth or beauty— and by teasing out the relation between our words and our thoughts by means of a series of questions, they arrive at a conclusion about what the concepts really mean. They arrive at the “truth” of the question together, through the very practice of dialogic discourse. Plato's dialogues were, according to Dmitri Nikulin⁹⁴, the first literary genre of prose that was accessible to the general public. In Athens, publication of Plato's dialogues often coincided with large communal celebrations. At a time when philosophy and literature were one and the same, dialogue played a central role.

Common responses to Plato’s dialogues often include skepticism about their ultimate dialogism: it often seems as if the only worthy philosophical stance or opinion in Plato’s dialogues belongs to Socrates; the dialogue appears as an excuse to hear Socrates’ monologues; interlocutors are set up to make Socrates look good. Plato’s works are presented as pedagogical models but the question as to whether it is good pedagogy to

⁹³ Tran. by S. H. Butcher on *The Internet Classics Archive*.
(<http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/poetics.html>)

⁹⁴ *Dialectic and Dialogue*, Stanford University Press, Stanford: 2010.

demean, mock, and silence students always remains. It is easy to understand how Plato's dialogues can be critiqued along these lines. It is certainly true that Socrates often flatters his interlocutors only to poke holes in their arguments later. He often puts words in their mouths, making them stand-ins for ideas expressed by others. He purports to "know nothing of the truth, nothing about anything" and then builds up a complicated and very sophisticated philosophical world-view by the end of the dialogue.

It is hard, in other words, to argue that Plato's dialogues are, indeed, dialogic, if by dialogic we mean, with Mikhail Bakhtin, the polyphonic interplay of various characters' voices contrasted with the subordination of characters to the single 'monologic' viewpoint of the author. In the end the Platonic dialogues always arrive at a disquisition by Socrates on the theory of ideal forms, on philosophy as the search for beauty and truth, on the unbridgeable chasm between the mind and the body, all seemingly quite "monologic," in Bakhtinian terms.

The heated controversy surrounding Ferreras-Savoye's characterization of Renaissance dialogues parallels this confusion. For her, the dialogues are either closed or open, the closed ones being monologic, in Bakhtinian terms, and the open ones, "polyglossic." (It will not be surprising to us that she classifies *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad* as examples of the last.) Some critics have branded her as an idealist and have argued that none of these dialogues are open in this sense but, rather, that they all, to lesser or greater degrees, like Plato's Socratic dialogues, present themselves as reflections of an epistemological conquest of truth when they are actually didactic catechisms (of a sort) that stage the conversation between a teacher or master and a student, where the teacher demonstrates a truth that has been established beforehand.

I want to argue that the polyglossic strength of Platonic dialogue does not so much reside in the grand constructions of Socratic philosophy but in the more modest, even plodding, presentation of a method for dialogue between interlocutors that seeks greater knowledge through conversation. Socrates may indeed (often does) eventually clamber up onto a soapbox but, for the readers, further interchange is not foreclosed, rather, it has just been modeled. The dialogic method that Plato puts into place stands on its own; when one speaks of the Socratic method one is far from the allegory of the cave. And so Socrates declares in *Phaedrus*, for example, that "...people imagine that they know...when they don't know, and, not having come to an understanding at first because they think that they know, they end, as might be expected, in contradicting one another and themselves. Now you and I must not be guilty of this fundamental error which we condemn in others; but as our question is whether the lover or non-lover is to be preferred, let us first agree in defining ... love, and then, [keep] our eyes upon the definition..." (Plato, *Phaedrus* 275) In an astonishing appreciation that sounds like modern semantics, Socrates here reminds his interlocutor that there are differences between what we ourselves say and what we think and that different people attribute different meanings to the same words and concepts. How can anyone have a conversation if the terms to be discussed are not defined first for the purposes of the conversation?

In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Bakhtin addresses the question of the extent to which Plato's dialogues are polyglossic (or dialogic) or not and he makes a telling distinction between the early and later Platonic dialogues: "Socratic notions of the dialogic nature of truth lay at the folk-carnivalistic base of the genre of Socratic dialogue, determining its *form*, but they did not by any means always find expression in the actual content of the individual dialogues. The content often assumed a monologic character that contradicted the form-shaping idea of the genre. In Plato's dialogues of his first and second periods, the dialogic nature of truth is still recognized in the philosophical worldview itself, although in weakened form." In the later dialogues, according to Bakhtin, the "monologism of the content begins to destroy the form of the Socratic dialogue..." and "ultimately, it degenerated completely into a question-and-answer form for training neophytes." In other words, "a catechism." (*Problems*, 110)⁹⁵

Dmitri Nikulin describes the uniqueness of Plato's work thus: "it uses the achievements of Socratic oral dialogical conversations in a constant and conscious opposition to Sophistic monological speeches." (Nikulin, 2) I think we could further say that even within Plato's Socratic dialogues the two threads exist. One is present at the microscopic level of language, the level at which it is acknowledged by the interlocutors that word meanings are unstable and run the risk of contamination by convention, and must therefore be examined and agreed to within a conversation. Clearly this constitutes an opening up of semantic possibilities, recognizing as it does the possibility of relativity in the meaning of words: "let us first agree in defining." The meaning of a word does not, in this radical formulation, reside in the dictionary, but, rather, something two or more interlocutors must agree about. The other thread indeed is monological speech, traced to Sophism by Nikulin, as Socrates' rejoinders literally get longer and longer.

Besides emphasizing the dialogic nature of truth, the other task performed by the Platonic dialogues is that the Socratic method stimulates rational thinking and the questioning of implicit moral beliefs, in a process that seeks to release individuals from the yoke of custom and convention. Socrates' questions, the ambiguities they hatch, are really a call for people to think freely, subjectively, without recourse to authorities and conventional ideas. It was this that enraged the "powers-that-were," the political establishment that accused him of corrupting the youth of Athens and condemned him to death. When the young are encouraged to think for themselves it is tantamount to a revolution: they start questioning the meanings of "love," only to end finding it natural to

⁹⁵ In *Socrates and the Fat Rabbis*, Daniel Boyarin argues that Bakhtin is not clear enough: "Bakhtin argues that Plato took a polyphonic speech form, dialogue, and turned it into a monological written form, dialectic. At the same time, however, once again following Bakhtin, we see that the comic narrative framework of the dialogues incorporates dialogically the more carnivalistic dialogism of the older form itself; the form, and Bakhtin does not make this clear enough, constitutes a dialogization of Plato's own monological impulse." (Boyarin, 30)

question the meanings of “power.” How could it possibly further the *status quo* to teach the young to admit that no one knows anything beautiful and good, that it is not wise to say you know when you do not, that true wisdom is to know one does not know? (*Apology*, 427) For Socrates, seeking the good and the beautiful through relationship in dialogue, gets you closer to the good and beautiful, but never to the place from where you could stand and say “I know.” The good and beautiful are always moving targets, unknowable because they themselves are dialectic in nature, as a good friend phrased it.⁹⁶ For Bakhtin, “At the base [of the Socratic notion of the dialogic nature of truth] lies the dialogic nature of human thinking about truth. The dialogic means of seeking truth is counterposed to official monologism, which pretends to possess a ready-made truth. ... Truth is not born nor is it to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction.” (*Problems*, 110) In conversation, in other words.⁹⁷

In the same way that Socrates’ call for a renewed search for truth through rational dialogue challenged the *status quo*, the Protestant Reformation’s criticism of the Church defied traditional norms of Christian piety, as we saw in Chapter 2. Luther’s propositions were not anti-religious by any means: he espoused what could be considered a form of Christian fundamentalism. Just remember the self-hating, God-obsessed, and terrified Luther. But by its validation of personal reflection and anti-authoritarianism, the reformation opened the doors to new panoramas of thought. It is no accident that sixteenth and seventeenth century “atheists” *avant la lettre* and converted Jews had an affinity with reformist tendencies. If a methodology is dialogic (seeks to define terms in conversation with one’s interlocutor and recommends thinking for oneself without recourse to authority) perhaps the content does not really matter, or, at the very least, is relegated to second place. You miss your chance to dictate, in other words, if you encourage people to view themselves as discursive entities with a valid point of view that can be expressed in conversation: methodologically, hegemony is dealt a critical and decisive blow. It is no accident that the authors who chose the genre of dialogue to present their ideas about the current state of their societies.

⁹⁶ I am grateful to Brian Buchbinder, one of my unfailing interlocutors, for having tossed around these ideas with me for years.

⁹⁷ From *Truth and Method*, Hans-Georg Gadamer, “[T]he continual failure of [Socrates’] interlocutor shows that people who think they know better cannot even ask the right questions. In order to be able to ask, one must want to know, and that means knowing that one does not know. In the comic confusion between question and answer, knowledge and ignorance that Plato describes, there is a profound recognition of the priority of the question in all knowledge and discourse that really reveals something of an object. Discourse that is intended to reveal something requires that the thing be broken open by the question....the path of all knowledge leads through the question...Knowledge always means, precisely, considering opposites. (358-9)

Lucian's Dialogues: Countergenre on the Margins

As we have said above, the Platonic influence on the dialogic genre of the Spanish Golden Age was to be equaled only by that of Lucian of Samosata, also known to us as “the Voltaire of antiquity,” whose dialogues are mostly satirical. For reasons that will become apparent, he is of great interest to us when thinking about Renaissance dialogues and especially the dialogues we are exploring. More than any other previous writer, Lucian marked *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad*, influencing both their form, and their content; and their ultimate challenge to Christian and Imperial power. We shall see that in Spain, part of his great attraction is explained by the reformist fervor awakened by the works of Erasmus.

Lucian, born around AD 115 in what was then a town on the Euphrates in Roman Syria, is associated with the Second Sophistic, a period that saw the revival of the teaching and practice of Greek rhetoric from the late fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Most famous for his dialogues, Lucian was influenced by Attic Old Comedy (namely Aristophanes from the 5th century B.C.), the dialogues of Plato and Cicero (5th and 2nd centuries B.C., respectively), and the satires of Menippus, 3rd century B.C.⁹⁸ Lucian wrote in Greek.

His dialogic oeuvre and style are very hard to classify because they are characterized by their great variety. In “El diálogo lucianesco en el Renacimiento español”⁹⁹ Ana Vian Herrero describes the many faces of Lucian thus: an atheist who mocks all forms of faith, fanaticism, and dogma, including Greek mythology, superstitious systems of belief and Christianity; a writer of the fantastic, who describes trips to the moon, and to Hades, allegoric dreams, and metamorphoses and transmigrations; a moral philosopher who believes in an objective moral universe; a skeptic master of philosophical subjectivity anchored in multi-perspectivism; an ethnographer; a rhetorician who defended the so-called simple style (Zappala); and a model historiographer. Vian sees Lucian’s work as representing the stage where the philosophical dialogues of Platonic nature become clearly marked as social, political and religious condemnation.

In *The Double Indictment*, an autobiographical dialogue, he summarizes his dialogic program. The three characters and interlocutors are Justice, Hermes, Dialogue, and the Syrian (Lucian’s *alter ego*):

Justice: Dialogue will now address the same jury ...

⁹⁸ Lucian actually uses the character of Menippus in many of his satires. (Leon Guilhamet, *Satire and the Transformation of Genre*, p. 5.)

⁹⁹ In Roger Friedlein, *El diálogo renacentista en la península ibérica*, Franz Steiner Verlag: Berlin, 2005.

Dialogue: [...] and now for the outrage committed on me by the defendant [meaning Lucian, the Syrian]. In former days, gentlemen, I was a person of exalted character: my speculations turned upon the gods, and Nature...I trod those aerial plains wherein Zeus on winged car is borne along through the heights...I was just setting foot upon the upper surface of that dome, when this Syrian took it upon himself to drag me down, break my wings, and reduce me to the common level of humanity. Whisking off the seemingly tragic mask I then wore, he clapped on its place a comic one that was little short of ludicrous: his next step was to huddle me into a corner with Jest, Lampoon, Cynicism, and the comedians Eupolis and Aristophanes, persons with a horrible knack of making light of sacred things, and girding at all that is as it should be. But the climax was reached when he unearthed a barking, snarling old Cynic, Menippus by name, and thrust his company upon me; a grim bulldog, if ever there was one; a treacherous brute that will snap at you while his tail is yet wagging.

Could any man be more abominably misused? Stripped of my proper attire, I am made to play the buffoon, and to give expression to every whimsical absurdity that his caprice dictates. And, as if that were not preposterous enough, he has forbidden me either to walk on my feet or to rise on the wings of poesy: I am a ridiculous cross between prose and verse; a monster of incongruity; a literary centaur.

Hermes: Now, Syrian: what do you say to that?

Syrian: *Syrian*. Gentlemen of the jury, I am surprised. Nothing could be more unexpected than the charge Dialogue has brought against me. When I first took him in hand, he was regarded by the world at large as one whose interminable discussions had soured his temper and exhausted his vitality. His labours entitled him to respect, but he had none of the attractive qualities that could secure him popularity. My first step was to accustom him to walk upon the common ground like the rest of mankind; my next, to make him presentable, by giving him a good bath and teaching him to smile. Finally, I assigned him Comedy as his yokefellow, thus gaining him the confidence of his hearers, who until then would as soon have thought of picking up a hedgehog as of venturing into the thorny presence of Dialogue.

But I know what the grievance is: he wants me to sit and discourse subtle nothings with him about the immortality of the soul, and the exact number of pints of pure homogeneous essence that went to the making of the universe, and the claims of rhetoric to be called a shadow of a fraction of statecraft, or a fourth part of flattery. He takes a curious pleasure in refinements of this kind; it tickles his vanity most deliciously to be told that not every man can see so far into the ideal as he. Evidently he expects *me* to conform to his taste in this respect; he is still hankering after those lost wings; his eyes are turned upwards; he cannot see the things that lie before his feet. I think there is nothing else he can complain of. He cannot say that I, who pass for a barbarian, have torn off his Greek dress, and replaced it with one like my own: that would have been another matter; to deprive him of his native garb were indeed a crime. (Lucian 480-481)

Gentlemen, I have made my defence, as far as in me lies: I trust that your present verdict will confirm the former one.

As Vian Herrero puts it, “this passage allows us to see the syncretism of influences: [that of] rhetoric, philosophic dialogue, invective, currents of Menippean satire and diatribe, ancient comedy and novel, new comedy, satirical drama, etc.” (Vian 52) Bakhtin’s also wrote often about Lucian. There is a section in *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* where Bakhtin describes the generic realm of the serio-comical, including the Socratic dialogue, and Menippean satire, represented so extravagantly by Lucian. (*Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* 106) The characteristic features of this “realm,” or genre, are a “deep bond with carnivalistic folklore,” “a joyful relativity” that imbues it with the carnival sense of the world, “a weakening of its one-sided rhetorical seriousness, its rationality, its singular meaning, its dogmatism.” (107)

In XVI century Europe the prevailing interpretation of Lucian was that he was the model moral philosopher: this was the Lucian of the Quattrocento humanism and, therefore, of the Christian humanism of Erasmus and More, both of whom translated various works of Lucian’s and, according to Zappala, considered that he exemplified moral eloquence in his works of satire (Zappala 168). In *Who Needs Greek?* Simon Goldhill puts it a bit differently when he says, "For Erasmus and his contemporaries... Lucian was a name to conjure with because his unsettling satire had a precarious moral purchase and because his ancient, and thus authoritative, comments on Christianity were dismissive."¹⁰⁰ I think the word "precarious" is just right, for Lucian as for other writers who present strong critiques of authority whilst standing on the fringes. Goldhill describes the second century as a period of cultural clashes and Lucian as an ironic representative of his society: a Syrian, born far from the center of empire, yet well-versed in Greek and Greekness; a traveler who is able to cross the Empire "as far West as Gaul." Goldhill finds it significant, and discusses at great length, the fact that Lucian was disinclined to use his own name. He traces the ways Lucian plays with the name 'Lucian.' (humorously referring to it as the "'L' word") and suggests that it is at the "heart of the issue of cultural identity." He traces this detail in a very interesting direction: "Lucian seems to have learnt a lot from his great predecessor in dialogue writing, Plato, when it comes to ironic hedging and careful withdrawal behind a mask (or two)." (Goldhill, 63). He refers, of course, to the confusion and mirroring between Plato and Socrates but also, I think, to the fact that Socrates' himself, Plato's character, plays around with perspective as he draws out his (un)lucky interlocutors. Goldhill considers that Plato and Lucian, among others, hide themselves within their texts as if they were anonymous.

The influence of Lucian on the Spanish Golden Age is more varied and complex; I will trace a time-line divided into three stages where each stage represents cultural and ideological changes as well, as proposed by Michael O. Zappala in *Lucian of Samosata in*

¹⁰⁰ Simon Goldhill, *Who Needs Greek?: Contests in the Cultural History of Hellenism*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 2002.

the Two Hesperias, useful as we consider his influence on the authors of *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad*.

The period of 1520–1560 coincides with the influence of Erasmus and ends with his decline beginning in the 1550's. During this time Lucian is associated closely with Erasmus, and Erasmus' translations of Lucian's dialogues are readily available and often imitated. During the second period, 1560-1600, Spanish authors directly imitate Lucian without the mediation of Erasmus, and Lucian is introduced into Jesuit schools by means of Greek grammar books. According to Zappala, "What Bataillon has termed (in *Erasmus y España*), 'Erasmismo sin Erasmo' is in fact the de-Erasmization of Lucian." (Zappala 170) In the third period, 1600-1680, Lucian's influence becomes harder to evaluate. Clearly the explosion of satire in the vein of writers like Quevedo continues Lucian's legacy as moral satirist. Other Lucianesque facets, such as fantasy and dream, become important as well. It can be argued that during the Tridentine and post-Tridentine¹⁰¹ period Lucian's more heterodox contributions simply "went underground," as it were, as printed imitations and translations were prohibited in successive Indices. Other forms of transmission, such as manuscripts and Greek and Latin grammar books that, strangely, were not included on any of the indices, preserved the Syrian's texts as a source of intellectual inspiration. Also, there was a lively clandestine book trade (163)¹⁰²

Let us look more closely, then, at some of the pre-modern Spanish dialogic creations "inspired," in part, by Lucian. Between 1520 and 1540, Erasmus' influence in Spain was growing; many of his dialogues, modeled on Lucian's, were popular, especially the otherworldly "menippean" sort. The texts produced are mainly political and historical, wrapped up in literary flights of fancy. Juan Luis Vives wrote *De Europea Dissidiis et Bello Turcico* in 1526; it is a dialogue modeled on Lucian's *Dialogus mortuorum*, short dialogues set in the Underworld, whose interlocutors are characters such as Pluto, Hermes, Charon, Menippus, Diogenes, Heracles, Alexander the Great, and Achilles. In the *Dissidiis*, a colloquium takes place before the judge, Minos, between five characters who discuss the religious, political, and strategic situation of Europe. There are intercalated reflections about the Christian world's moral and spiritual corruption and its inability to counter the Turkish danger because of its own internecine wars. The interlocutors are Minos, Scipio, Tiresias, Basilius, Colax, and Polypragmon. Vives' debt to Lucian is clear: he speaks about him in his correspondence with Erasmus. In his work *De tradendis*, he recommends reading Lucian although he considers him dangerous for very young students who demonstrate a propensity towards mockery and derision. (Santamaría, 188)

"Like Lucian's speakers, Vives's character-critics provide a running commentary of each other's speeches. The underworld setting, the review of souls, the use of curiosity

¹⁰¹ Council of Trent, 1545-1563.

¹⁰² On popularity and quantity of manuscript texts see Fernando Bouza's *Corre manuscrito*.

to motivate the investigation of the political strife of Europe, recall similar passages in... Lucian... and Erasmus, and look forward to Valdés' *Mercurio y Carón*... [T]he varied rhythm of Vives's conversations... also point directly back to [Lucian]." (171) Zappala argues that, as in Lucian's works, the dramatic construction of Vives's dialogue is "open," and fashioned so as to seem to arise from the interaction of characters, and ends with an enigmatic prophecy. This dialogue, unlike most Lucianic satire of the period, adopts Lucian's non-partisan and universal criticism. The date of the work corresponds to a period of special closeness between Vives and Erasmus, and the non-partisan criticism of *De Dissidiis*... is a point of convergence with Erasmus' pan-European" irenicism¹⁰³ (Zappala 171). Like the pacifists of the period "Vives inverts the civilization/barbarism topic to criticize his European contemporaries... Indeed Europe, Tiresias declares, is so strife-torn that some nations would prefer an atheist or even a Turkish ruler to a ruler Christian in name only." (Z. 172) Other Lucianesque, one could say carnivalesque, inversions in the *Dissidiis* include the antitheses pagan/Christian and court/village. Vives' characters demonstrate an ironically detached amusement. Tiresias, for example, "compares the power-plays between France, Spain and Italy to child's play." For Zappala, the end of the dialogue leaves the future unsettled: Minos asks Tiresias, speaking of Christian princes and their willingness to reform, "Piensas, Tiresias, por ventura, ... que van a escuchar tales consejos o, más exactamente, tales vaticinios? And Tiresias answers: "Acaso sí; acaso no." Zappala considers that these "cultural inversions, the ironic distance, the non-partisan view of the author, and the lively, open dialogue make this work one of the closest Golden Age imitations of Lucian." (174)

Alfonso de Valdés, secretary to Charles V and the head of the Erasmist movement in Spain during that time period, writes *Diálogo de las cosas acaecidas en Roma* around 1527 and the *Dialogo de Mercurio y Carón* around 1529. The first presents a justification for the "imperial" sacking of Rome in 1527. Influenced by many texts of Erasmus, it exhibits strains of Lucianesque diatribe, humor, and hybrid construction. Lactancio, a young courtly fellow and Arcediano, a priest who has lived through the events in Rome and has escaped by dressing as a soldier, talk about the event. According to Zappala the work manifests Erasmist piety and, like Vives' dialogue, calls for general reform and Christian unity. Other points in common are the indictment of hypocrisy and the comparison of men with beasts. The *Diálogo de Mercurio y Carón* is again set in the underworld: the God Mercury and the boatman of Hades, Charon, discuss Europe's political situation. This conversation is punctuated by the interruption of a number of "shades," headed for Hell or Heaven, who have miniature colloquia before their judges. They each give an accounting of their lives thereby presenting a satirical parade of types (kings, rulers, theologians, preachers, married men and bachelors, men and women, etc.).

¹⁰³ Irencism (from Greek eirene meaning "peace") refers, in Christian theology, to the attempt at unification of Christian apologetical systems by using reason as an essential attribute. It is often, in this context, used as a synonym for pacifism.

Other interesting dialogues of this period that clearly incorporate Lucianesque elements are *El Diálogo de las Transformaciones*, an anonymous work written sometime after 1532, in which a cobbler converses with his rooster that recounts his many transmigrations, clearly modeled on Lucian's *Gallus*; *The Eremitae* of Juan Maldonado, written in 1538, a comedic dialogue made up of successive scenes where three sets of friends recount their life stories in an autobiographical Lucianesque form; Gutierre de Cetina's *Diálogo entre la cabeza y la gorra*, written around 1540, which (recreates Pandolfo Colenuccio's Lucianesque *Philotimo*), a model of Lucianesque satire on morality and customs; Juan de Jarava's *Coloquio de la mosca y la hormiga* (1544), another Lucianesque satirical dialogue; and, finally, the anonymous *Diálogo entre Caronte y el alma de Pedro Luis Farnesio*, written around 1547, another hellish *mise-en-scene*, where Pier Luigi Farnese, Pope Paul IV's illegitimate son converses with Charon.

Another very important work written in the 1550's, modeled on Lucian's dialogues, is *El Crotalón*, modeled on Lucian's *Gallus*, a conversation once again between the cobbler, Micilo, and his rooster who has transformed into every possible shape and state imaginable. The rooster tells a tale every morning with the goal of making his master's work more pleasant. The author borrows much from Lucian, not just his topic and setting: there is "social, religious, moral and philosophical criticism of a particularly intense sort, certain literary strategies that he most probably learned in Lucian such as the use of a first person perspective, the association of transformation with travel, the narration of ethnographic marvels, the representation of debates around historiographical writing, the belief in language as a system of conventional signs, and emphases on subjectivity and inconsistency." (Herrero, 80)

Finally, also in the 1550's, we have *Viaje de Turquía*, which like the *Crotalón*, was anonymous and ran in manuscript form. As we will see shortly, *Viaje de Turquía*, bears as well the marks of Lucian the ethnographer, the Menippean antifilosopher, and the subjective historian. We will turn below to a more detailed appreciation of its use of Lucianesque elements. In the context of colonial literature we will consider how *Coloquios de la Verdad* also can be thought of as a Lucianic dialogue.

These works were unpublished although not unknown. In the words of Herrero, "en los últimos años 50, y antes de que [Luciano empezara] a ser 'deserasmizado' de modo programático y luego recuperado por los jesuitas para la vida académica... el Luciano predominante ... es un Luciano germánico, satírico y corrosivo, mirado con ojeriza, que en la España Tridentina sólo pudo asociarse ya a los marginales políticos o religiosos, a los 'gramáticos', a los exiliados y a los desafectos." (81) In other words, the outsiders. Whether distanced from their country and culture; or exiled religious and politically (like Vives or Valdés, with their *converso* origins); or ironically distanced from their community, many emulators of Lucian's works, including the authors of our dialogues, appear to be half-outsiders, to use a term used of Guillén's. I will end by noting the irony that the work of many admirers, translators and imitators of Lucian were censored and proscribed (including Erasmus and the Valdés brothers—Vives chose to

leave Spain altogether) even as his own works remained readily available, protected by their status as Classical works, on the one hand, and as good examples of excellent Greek of use in widely-circulated Greek textbooks. It was not skeptical, atheistic, heterodox Lucian who seemed dangerous after the Council of Trent—it was his students.

***Viaje de Turquía, Coloquios de la verdad* and Lucian**

A close look at some of Lucian's dialogue-narratives will allow us to identify some of the ways we can see his influence on *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad*. *Asinus*, for example, is a pseudo-autobiography where a first person narrator tells about its protagonist's travails, changes of fortune, and adversities. Like Pedro de Urdemalas and Tito, Lucian's humble narrator must rely completely on his wits in order to survive. He serves many masters, who often abuse him, and suffers constantly from hunger.¹⁰⁴ Like Pedro, who is Christian in a Turkish land and Tito who is in between two cultures, both being, therefore, outsiders, Lucian's character, transformed into an ass, is also at the margin of a society he witnesses and can not control. The characters attempt to move vertically in society. Finally, the three works develop scathing satires on religion. The picaresque dimension of *Asinus* has been described as "hallmarks of Lucian's whole opus" (Zappala, 183). Below we will review in greater detail the many ways our dialogues function as a picaresque narratives.

Also reminiscent of the picaresque, in another of Lucian's pseudo-autobiographical dialogues, *The Vision*, the protagonist says at the end of the narration of his dream

Similarly I have had an object in telling you my dream. It is that the young may be guided to the better way and set themselves to Culture, especially any among them who is recreant for fear of poverty, and minded to enter the wrong path, to the ruin of a nature not all ignoble. Such an one will be strengthened by my tale, I am well assured; in me he will find an apt example; let him only compare the boy of those days, who started in pursuit of the best and devoted himself to Culture regardless of immediate poverty, with the man who has now come back to you, as high in fame, to put it at the lowest, as any stonecutter of them all. (Lucian 23)

Here the narration is treated as an exemplary autobiography. The story is not only meant to entertain, it carries a moral weight. In the same way, Pedro and Tito acknowledge their interlocutors' curiosity and desire to hear their stories and yet insist throughout that there is much to learn if they will only pay attention.

¹⁰⁴ *Asinus* was attributed without question to Lucian during the Renaissance. Critics such as Lázaro Carreter take it as a more probable model for *Lazarillo de Tormes* than Apuleius' *Golden Ass*. See his *Lazarillo de Tormes en la picaresca*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1972.

Both *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad* point in many other ways to Lucian and his dialogues. Many of Lucian's work associate transformation and travel (*Icaromenippus*, *Zeus Tragoedus*, *The True History*, *Trip to the Moon*, *Dialogues of the Dead*). In *Icaromenippus*, for example, Menippus tells a friend how he flew to the moon in order to observe human life and from there to Olympus where he dined and slept with the gods and spoke with Jupiter about earthly matters, especially concerning different sects. Lucian melds the fictitious first person narrative to the sophisticated eye-witness report of the traveler. In *Viaje de Turquía*, when Juan and Mátalascallando first see him, they say he seems to be a figure arisen from Hades: "Parescéis capellan de la barca de Charonte (Viaje 111).¹⁰⁵ After hearing the first part of his story, Matalascallando exclaims, "Gran ventaja nos tienen los que han visto el mundo a los que nunca salimos de Castilla. ¡Mirad cómo viene filósofo y qué bien habla!" (116) and, later "Agora digo que no es mucho que sepa tanto Pedro de Urdimalas, pues tanto ha peregrinado. En verdad que venís tan trocado, que dubdo si sois vos" (123). In *Coloquios de la verdad*, Barchilon and Justino interrupt Tito as he tries to kill himself.

Works such as *The True History*, *Toxaris*, *Nigrinus*, *Symposium*, or *The Lapiths*, and *Hermotimus* develop themes of travel, truth, fantastic journeys, ethnographic marvels, and travel romance. *The True History*, for example, also a story made up of episodic voyages, is replete with feigned protests of veracity and they are related to the recounting of ethnographic oddities. In the *Viaje de Turquía*, Mátalascallando often interrupts his friend's narrative to inquire whether what he recounts can be true, so amazing and incredible it seems. Pedro answers with showers of realistic detail that aim to prove the truth of his account and with renewed assurances that what he recounts was witnessed by his own eyes. ("...porque puedo también hablar de experiencia, quierome meter entro y hablar como quien lo vio y no de oídas." *Viaje de Turquía*, 179). In Lucian's *Toxaris: a Dialogue of Friendship* two men, a Greek and a Scythian, converse about which of the two peoples offers the best examples of friendship. This text, like *Hermotimus*, a dialogue where the protagonist visits multiple sects and philosophical schools, trying to determine which will lead to the truer philosophy; and *Nigrinus*, where a portrait of the corrupt customs of Rome is set against the simple life of Athenians,¹⁰⁶ explore ethnographic themes, the author clearly offering up foreign cultures as an alternative to the conventions of the his society. In the *Symposium*, a banquet is set in a framing dialogue between friends. The satire hinges on the comparative bad behaviors of philosophers (the Stoics are the worst!), and points, in the end, to the "mundane transformations of supposedly civilized men and institutions into savagery..." (Guilhamet, *Satire and the Transformation of Genre*, 39). Let us remember *Viaje de Turquía*'s prologue, which lauds "aqueel insaçiable y desenfrenado deseo de saber y

¹⁰⁵ Reminiscent as well of Lucian's *Dialogues of the Dead*, where famous historical personages descend to Hades and participate in colloquia. Clearly influenced many Golden Age works such as Valdés' *Mercurio y Carón* and Vives' *De Dissidiis Europea*, not to mention the many *Dialogi Mortuorum* of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

¹⁰⁶ See Peretti, A., *Luciano: Un intellettuale Greco contro Roma*. Florence: 1946.

conoscer...” (*Viaje* 87) We can call this an ethnographic desire, wasted on the reading of “fabulas y ficciones,” that is best exercised with “la peregrinación y ver de tierras estrañas.” At the beginning of the dialogue, Juan says about the road to Santiago that it is “[l]a más deleytosa salida” because of the “diversidad de las gentes, variedad de naçiones, multitud de lenguas y trajes que Señor Santiago nos da por huéspedes en este su peregrinaje,” (99) and Pedro is “amicísimo de nuebos trajes y invenciones.” (111) In much of Pedro’s narration, he describes the customs of the Turks and the Greeks as much healthier, more sincere, and, often, more religious than those of the Christians.

Charon and *The True History* evince hybridity in their generic make-up, a characteristic shared by *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad* (Are our dialogues novels, travel narratives, monologues in a framed tale, tourist guides, ethnographies?) Briefly, our dialogues share with Lucian’s dialogues the fact that they seem at times aggregations of diverse texts (generic mixtures: history, chronicle, philosophical dialogue, philosophical and theological treatise, autobiography) in works such as *The Fisher*, *Zeus Tragoedus*, *Dialogues of the Gods*, *The Double Indictment and Phalaris*; the similarity with Menippean satire in such works as *Icaromennipus*, *Necyomanteia*, *Charon*, and others; the conversational and dramatic qualities of works such as *Dialogues of the Sea-Gods*, *Dialogues of the Gods*, *Dialogues of the Hetaerae*, *The Fisher*, *Charon*, and others.

Finally, Guilhamet describes “...the characteristically Lucianic attack on false intellectuality...” (44) and his continuous denouncing of the “erroneous values of the wealthy and powerful,” (39) two characteristics that we also find in *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad*. Numerous times, Pedro shows up Juan as someone who pretends to know things he does not, for example, in the very humorous scene we mentioned in Chapter 2, where he questions him about his real knowledge of the road to Jerusalem (P: “Por qué tierras buenas vinistes?, ¿por qué cibdades? J: Pasado se me ha de la memoria. P: Y por mar, ¿adónde aportastes? J: ¿Adónde habíamos de aportar sino a Hierusalem? P: ¿Pues entrabais dentro Hierusalem con las naves?” *Viaje de Turquía*, 122), and the scenes where he mocks pseudo-teachers of Greek and Latin, men who know nothing. Pedro also has much to say about wealthy popes who starve the lower clergy and refuse to ransom captives of the Turk. There are many instances of the immorality on the part of wealthy leaders. Tito's discourse insists on the hypocrisy of Spaniards, especially those doing missionary work in Peru. He reminds his interlocutors that violence is contrary to the message the Christians are trying to teach yet their representatives do not do what they preach and so they do not teach anything at all, "A los animales y a las aves, cuando los enseñamos, se hace con un modo amoroso y dulce para que tenga efecto nuestro trabajo, y enseñais vosotros a los hombres, que son capaces de entendimiento y honor, con injurias y malos tratamientos." (*Coloquios*, 151) He is denouncing sermonizing conventions that mock true belief: "Cómo torcéis lo que queréis para que tenga la significación y entendimiento según vuestra voluntad!" (109)

A Note About *Disputatio* and Catechism

Two last two subgenres of dialogue that are worth considering briefly, inherited by many Renaissance writers from medieval versions, are *disputatio* and catechism. The *disputatio*¹⁰⁷ is interesting insofar as it often sets up representatives of two religions in a debate, often a Jew and a Christian. But the subjects of the arguments were usually preprogrammed and the elaborations, formulaic. Catechism and Inquisition manuals were handbooks first used in the 16th century for religious instruction, with different points of focus for Franciscans and Dominicans, in the form of questions and answers. I argue that, in fact, our authors were choosing specifically not to model their dialogues along the lines of these last since they are the ones most clearly aligned with the mainstream, orthodox functioning of religious discourse.

Eyewitnesses: The Travel Literature of Marco Polo and Sir John Mandeville

How do our sixteenth century dialogues relate to other books featuring travel that were in print at the time? Works by Marco Polo and Sir John Mandeville were among the most read texts in Europe during the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Was the same sort of ethnological information included in their travel narratives as was explored in *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad*? Let us first consider the nature of the narratives of Polo and Mandeville.

Polo's travel accounts, dictated to Rustichello in 1271, include descriptions of the extent, wealth, and population of Tartar and Chinese territories and of the Grand Khan's desire to convert to Christianity; he describes journeys in China, Burma, Persia and India; he provides a long history of the Mongol Empire, rife with details about funerals, life on the steppes, household customs. Like the narrator of *Viaje de Turquía*, Polo describes the Mongol practice of polygamy, a man could take as many wives as he liked (and like Pedro, he shortly thereafter mentions a yogurt-like concoction, "They drink mare's milk subjected to a process that makes it like white wine and very good to drink. It is called *kumiss*.") Polo describes the magnificent winter and summer residences of the Grand Khan¹⁰⁸ and the grandeur of the Chinese capital that later became Beijing (reminding us of Pedro de Urdemalas' admiration for Constantinople). Like the authors of *Viaje de*

¹⁰⁷ *Disputatio*: (Scholastic) Out of the *quaestiones disputatae* developed gradually a rigid form of scholastic disputation. The *defensor thesios* proposed his thesis and explained or proved it in syllogistic form. The *opponentes* argued against the thesis and its demonstration by repeating first the proposition and the syllogism proving it, then either by denying the validity of one or the other premises (*nego maiorem, minorem*) or by making distinctions restricting the proposition (*distinguo maiorem, minorem*). In the disputations of students under the direction of a magister the latter used to summarize the disputation and to 'determine the question'. From Dagobert D. Runes, Dictionary of Philosophy. <http://www.ditext.com/runes/d.html>.

¹⁰⁸ Descriptions which inspired Coleridge's verse about Kublai Khan's "stately pleasure-dome" in Xanadu (or Shang-du or Chandu). See The Travels of Marco Polo

Turquía and *Coloquios de la verdad*, Polo offers detailed descriptions of political and social systems, laws, wildlife, crops, customs, and cities. In some important ways, Polo idealized the sophistication of the Mongol world just as Pedro idealized the Turkish one: he admired the use of paper currency, attributing the Khan's magnificence in part to its advantages over gold and silver; marveled at the use of coal, even though it was known in some parts of Europe; and the imperial post system, involving different classes of service and including an ultra-rapid imperial post that used dispatch-riders in relay fashion.¹⁰⁹

Polo's brief preface to his travel accounts resonates with many of the sentiments expressed by the authors of our dialogues and is worth quoting at length:

Emperors and Kings, dukes and marquesses, counts, knights and burgesses, and all ye, whoever ye be, who wish to know of the various races of men, and of the diversities of the different regions of the world, take this book and have it read to you. You shall find in it all the mighty wonders, all the great singularities of the vast regions of the East—of the Greater Armenia, of Persia, of Tartary and of India, and of many a country besides—set down by us clearly and in due order, as they were recounted by Messer Marco Polo, called *Milione*, wise and noble citizen of Venice, *who saw them with his own eyes*. Some things there will, in truth, be that he did not see, but only heard tell of by men worthy of credit. And we will set down the things seen as seen, and those heard as heard, that our book may be *correct and truthful, without any falsehood*.

And all who read this book or hear it read, must believe it, as all the things contained in it are true. For I tell you that ever since the Lord our God did with his own hands mould our first Father Adam, there never was up to the present day any man, Christian or Pagan Tartar or Indian or of any other race whatsoever, who knew and explored so great a part of the various regions of the world and of its great marvels, as this Messer Marco knew and explored. Hence, it seemed to him, it were too great a pity, did he not cause to be written down all the great marvels he had seen or heard tell of as true, that others also, who had neither seen nor heard of them, might acquire knowledge of them by means of this book. And you must know that, to learn so many things, he lived no less than twenty-six years in those regions and provinces. When afterwards he was a captive in the prison of Genoa, he had all these things recorded in writing by Master Rustichello of Pisa, who was in the same prison, in the year 1298 from the birth of Jesus. And he only set down a small part of the things he had learned—namely those that he could remember.¹¹⁰

Polo's narrative is dedicated to those "who wish to know of the various races of men, and of the diversities of the different regions of the world," an echo of *Viaje de Turquía's*

¹⁰⁹ See Part I of *Travels*, "Description of China, and of the Court of the Emperor Kublai."

¹¹⁰ *The Travels of Marco Polo*, Translated by Aldo Ricci from the text of L. F. Benedetto. Asian Educational Services, New Delhi: 2001, p. 1-2.

dedication, where the author praises the natural curiosity that inspires man “to see foreign lands” and “speculate about the infinite greatness of the world.” This sentiment represents the ethnological interest evinced by Marco Polo and other “travel writers” including John de Mandeville, as we shall see shortly, as well as the authors of our two dialogues.

Polo assures his readers that the accounts belong to someone who was there and “who saw them with his own eyes,” and who “lived no less than twenty-six years in those regions and provinces” just as the author of *Viaje de Turquía* guarantees that his own information will also be what “someone who has come from there has said,” a “loyal interpreter,” and Quiroga identifies himself as “a priest who has resided in those [very] kingdoms.” All three authors insist on the veracity and eye-witness quality of their narrations.

In her 2004 book *The Invention of the Eyewitness: Witnessing & Testimony in Early Modern France*, Andrea Frisch argues that our modern notions of “modern witness” or “epistemic eyewitness,” arise (are invented) during a particular period of time during which the outmoded feudal conception of ethical eye-witnessing is transformed into a new notion inspired by “embryonic nation-state[s] in the age of print, and the firsthand account[s] of America.” (Frisch, 12) The view of the modern eyewitness privileges the “monologic discourse of first-person experiential knowledge.” In order to distinguish these two modes of conceiving of eyewitnesses she turns to the travel accounts of Polo and Mandeville. She argues that Polo's textual persona is closer to the more modern epistemic witness in that he emphasizes his closeness to the Mongol emperor and his knowledge of Asian languages, whereas Mandeville's seeks to “incarnate the ethos of his Christian audience.” (Frisch, 15) He does this by establishing from the very beginning that he is a Christian knight and therefore a reliable witness, what Frisch describes as his ethical status (49). I will argue that *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad* share with *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* some important generic traits. The most important of these is the ethical stances taken by Pedro and Tito, respectively, from the beginning, echoing Mandeville's assurance that he is a good Christian and part of the very community to whom he addresses himself. “Mandeville distinguishes himself as someone who has traveled east at a time when very few of his readers were doing so, he reinforces a sense of community with those same readers by representing his achievement as one that they have both the desire and the potential to realize themselves.” (51) But do our dialogues establish this stance with different motives and to different degrees? The interlocutor-narrators of our sixteenth century dialogues combine both versions of Frisch's eyewitness, they claim both a high degree of integration into the other cultures they seek to describe and they assure their readers that they are their ethical stand-ins, good Christians.

As far as I can tell, *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* and *Viaje de Turquía* have never been directly compared before this dissertation. And yet *The Travels* were clearly one of the models our anonymous author and perhaps Quiroga had in mind. *Mandeville's*

Travels most probably entered Spain in two ways: a translation ordered by King John I of Aragon from French (the original language) into Aragonese, at the end of the fourteenth century; and a Castilian version translated from a Latin version, many editions of which were published during the sixteenth century.¹¹¹

Judging from surviving manuscripts, *Mandeville's Travels* were more widely circulated in Europe than *The Travels of Marco Polo*. As a measure of its success we might consider a quote from one of the work's editors, Josef Krasa, to the effect that *Mandeville's Travels* "was accepted in Paris, Bruges, and London as a fair medium of exchange."¹¹² The work influenced almost every literature of Europe, mostly as a work of imaginative art, but also as an important marker in the history of geographical exploration and discovery, having fired the imaginations of men and women in preparation for the great voyages. Three hundred manuscripts in a variety of languages survive.

Mystery surrounds the actual identity and nationality of the author of Mandeville's *Travels*. In his short Prologue, he purports to have completed the *Travels* in 1356 having set out from England in 1322. The first part takes place in the Holy Land and the Near East; the second describes a journey "throughout Turkey, Armenia the little and the great; through Tartary, Persia, Syria, Arabia, Egypt the high and the low; through Lybia, Chaldea, and a great part of Ethiopia; through Amazonia, Ind the less and the more, a great part; and throughout many other Isles, that be about Ind where dwell many diverse folks, and of diverse manners and laws, and of diverse shapes of men." (See Prologue of *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville*¹¹³)

But Mandeville's connection to *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad* is much more material than these ethnographic elements, which it shares with Marco Polo (and plenty other travel narratives, for that matter).¹¹⁴ In the Prologue, Mandeville begins

¹¹¹ See *Libro de las maravillas del mundo de Juan de Mandevilla*, by Pilar Liria Montañés. Caja de Ahorros de Zaragoza, Aragón and Rioja: 1979.

¹¹² *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville*, ed. Josef Krasa, trans. Peter Kussi. Braziller, New York: 1983, p.13. Stephen Greenblatt remarks "that the work could be imagined not only as current but as currency, like the Chinese paper money that Mandeville, like Marco Polo, describes with wonder and admiration..." (Greenblatt 37).

¹¹³ I am using two editions of the work, the English version on-line at the Gutenberg Project and a Spanish version edited by Pilar Liria Montañés.

¹¹⁴ Works such as Herodotus' *Histories* and Ibn Battuta's *Travels*, just to name two very well-known travelogues, full of ethnographic material. To be fair, the question of Herodotus' ethnography is tantalizingly complicated, see François Hartog, *Le miroir d'Hérodote: essai sur la représentation de l'autre*, Paris: Gallimard, 1980. Along with the usual ethnographic accounts we would expect, Mandeville describes Greek Orthodox Christians, Samaritans, and Muslims in the first half, Numidians, Indians, and other less well-known peoples, in the second half. Mandeville's descriptions are also filled with

by extolling the “Holy Land,” “that men call the Land of Promission or of Behest, passing all other lands... the most worthy land, most excellent, and lady and sovereign of all other lands... blessed and hallowed of the precious body and blood of our Lord Jesu Christ.” He continues in this vein for a time and towards the end exhorts “every good Christian man, that is of power, and hath whereof, should pain him with all his strength for to conquer our right heritage, and chase out all the misbelieving men.” This is a clear call for a crusade, echoing the *Viaje de Turquía*’s author’s avowal that he writes so that Christianity, led by Philip, can finally vanquish Islam or of Quiroga’s explanation that his motive is to “atraer los indios de los reinos del Perú a nuestra santa fe católica”. This is what Frisch calls this Mandeville’s ethical stance.

Astonishingly, this opening section in Mandeville ends with a blistering attack on Christendom’s ruling elite. (Greenblatt, 28): “But now pride, covetise, and envy have so inflamed the hearts of lords of the world, that they are more busy for to dis-herit their neighbours, more than for to challenge or to conquer their right heritage before-said. And the common people, that would put their bodies and their chattels, to conquer our heritage, they may not do it without the lords. For a ssembly of people without a chieftain, or a chief lord, is as a flock of sheep without a shepherd. But would God, that the temporal lords and all worldly lords were at good accord, and with the common people would take this holy voyage over the sea! Then I trow well, that within a little time, our right heritage before-said should be reconciled and put in the hands of the right heirs of Jesu Christ.” (*The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* 5) Like the narrators of *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad*, the author has presented himself as a firm believer in a Christian superiority that conquers less worthy belief systems (Islamic, pagan) and then turns the critique around to force Christian subjects to face themselves squarely and honestly: the Christian world is in crisis and must be reformed. In his essay “Travel writing and ethnography” Joan Pau Rubies explains it thus, “Mandeville’s highly influential compilation was a cosmographical pilgrimage, in which the contemplation of the marvels of the world, with strange races of men, fabulous kings, and religious diversity, served as rhetorical counterpoint to the need for spiritual reform within Latin Christianity.”¹¹⁵

Just as in *Viaje de Turquía* Muslim characters appear that are wise and God-fearing and in *Coloquios de la verdad* pagan Tito is the incarnation of the *virus bonum*, Mandeville depicts a sultan “as the wise and temperate ruler of an obedient, devout, and for the most part honest people.” (Greenblatt 29) Like the narrator of *Viaje de Turquía*, who presents his work in entirely Christian terms (and purporting to proceed with his

exotic wonders, people such as the anthropophagi, one-eyed-men, Amazons, *blemyes* and dogheads, “one-legged men whose feet were so large they could be used as parasols against the blistering sun” (Grafton 72).

¹¹⁵ In *The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*, Edited by Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 2002.

narration with entirely Christian aims), Mandeville often gives a more sympathetic account of the Saracens than of the Christians. But the positive characterization of these representatives from the “other,” un-Christian side has another, more menacing, development. In a passage that begins in similar fashion to one in Polo’s travels where the Polos finally meet the Great Khan who asks them to tell him stories of Christian territories (in Polo, this reverse ethnography leads to the Khan’s eventual conversion), Mandeville describes how the Sultan asks him how the Christians govern themselves in their own country. Mandeville replies, “Right well, thanked be God!” To which the wise Sultan counters, “Truly nay! For ye Christian men ne reck right nought, how untruly to serve God! Ye should give ensample to the lewd people for to do well, and ye give them ensample to do evil. . . . They [Christians] should be simple, meek and true, and full of alms-deeds, as Jesu was, in whom they trow; but they be all the contrary, and ever inclined to the evil, and to do evil. . . . they defoul their law that Jesu Christ betook them to keep for their salvation. And thus, for their sins, have they lost all this land that we hold. For, for their sins, their God hath taken them into our hands, not only by strength of ourself, but for their sins.”¹¹⁶ (*The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* 93) This resonates with Pedro’s condemnation of the imperial and religious failures of the Spanish elites and Tito’s extolling of Christian values even as he denounces the crimes of a misguided Church, from the point of view of the “other” (although, in this case, converted). Clearly, these three works are calls for an ethical awakening in the Christian world. Greenblatt says about these passages in Mandeville, “in the face of Christian sinfulness, the political and military project proclaimed at the start has been evacuated, transformed into an appeal for moral renewal.” (Greenblatt 29)

In her book *The Rediscovery of Sir John Mandeville*, Josephine Waters Bennett reminds us that “[i]n the larger perspective of European history this was a period of constant agitation for a new crusade which kept interest in the Near East at a fever heat. It was the end of a period of exploration of the Far East that had excited the imaginations and aroused the cupidity of all Europe. The fall of Acre in 1291 was a challenge to Christendom rivaled only by the book of Marco Polo (1290) about the wonders and riches of the Orient.” (Bennett, 15) We can certainly recognize the parallels in the Spain

¹¹⁶ In an earlier section, still in this same chapter XV entitled “Of the Customs of Saracens, and of their Law. And how the Soldan reasoned me, Author of this Book; and of the beginning of Mohammed,” Mandeville explains, “For they know well, that the works of Jesu Christ be good, and his words and his deeds and his doctrine by his gospels were true, and his miracles also true; and the blessed Virgin Mary is good, and holy maiden before and after the birth of Jesu Christ; and that all those that believe perfectly in God shall be saved. And because that they go so nigh our faith, they be lightly converted to Christian law when men preach them and shew them distinctly the law of Jesu Christ. . . .” (91) Compare to Tito’s devout faith and love for Christ. Tito says, in effect, that true Christians would not subject the indigenous population of the New World to such ill treatment.

of the sixteenth century: the Turks menaced on the Eastern front even as the New World beckoned.

Columbus, for one, knew well the travel accounts of Marco Polo and Sir John Mandeville, both mentioned frequently in his letters and journal entries.¹¹⁷ A story is told that Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain would not fund Columbus on his voyages of discovery until after they themselves, had read Sir John Mandeville. Columbus was smitten by the marvelous descriptions of Marco Polo and Mandeville.

Given the popularity of these texts, the authors of our dialogues must have read and known them well. Our authors share with Polo and Mandeville a sense that travel to foreign places where people are different is an important way to learn about the world; that Christianity is in trouble from within and could take example from people of other religions who incarnate values of honesty and piety much more successfully; that their works offer the benefits of eye-witness reportage in a world where disinformation about “others” abounds. All of these works are also tied together in that in great measure they are works of imaginative fiction, where their promise of “truth” is partly a rhetorical flourish that becomes a literary strategy. In the words of Mandeville at the end of his Preface, “But lords and knights and other noble and worthy men that con Latin but little, and have been beyond the sea, know and understand, if I say truth or no, and if I err in devising, for forgetting or else, that they may redress it and amend it. For things passed out of long time from a man’s mind or from his sight, turn soon into forgetting.” (6) Much of what Mandeville describes is now considered to have been fantasy, “Mandeville was not an explorer, but a popularizer; not the creator of a dishonest travel-book, but the author of a romance of travel which belongs, primarily, to the history of literature.” (Bennett 19)¹¹⁸ The artistic creation of the character of Mandeville, including “its complex, self-reflexive mirrorings, its elusiveness, its fascination with otherness, its narrative disjunctions,” makes Greenblatt think of Calvino’s *Invisible Cities* and Barthes’ *Empire of Signs*, works by post-modern artists bent on dismantling stable structures of literary identity and meaning.¹¹⁹ For another prominent Mandeville critic, Mary B. Campbell in her book *The Witness and the Other World: Exotic European Travel Writing, 400-1600*, Mandeville’s work was not simply a “travel romance” (Bennett’s

¹¹⁷ Columbus’ copy of a text of Marco Polo’s has survived; it includes his annotations. Andrés Bernaldez, in *Memorias del reinado de los Reyes Católicos*, ed. M. Gómez Moreno and J. de Mata Carriazo (Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, 1962), writes of Columbus’ familiarity with *Mandeville’s Travels*.

¹¹⁸ Mandeville’s *Travels* were regarded as true for a long time and were eventually, more recently, discredited as true accounts. Polo’s stories, on the other hand, were derided in his time and for centuries after his death (hence his name, Il Milione, for the millions of lies he told). He has recently been vindicated and, although many stories are undoubtedly regarded as fantastic, he has been credited for many truthful accounts that have enriched the ethnographic portrait of the world of his period.

¹¹⁹ See Note 24, Chapter 2.

words); “Mandeville was up to something more novel...he was writing realistic prose fiction—for the first time since Petronius.” (Campbell 122)

Finally Mandeville shares with the writer of *Viaje de Turquía* his use of other people’s travel accounts within his own. He appropriated the narratives of Odoric of Pordenone, Hetoum (a Praemonstrant monk), Giovanni da Pian del Carpine, and Vincent de Beauvais. As with our anonymous text, Mandeville's *Travels* are a hybrid generic mish-mash: the passages that are plagiarized are altered, distorted, and manipulated so that they correspond to new rhetorical needs. They function as countergenres. In the next section of the chapter, we will look at some of the texts that the author of *Viaje de Turquía* “borrowed” heavily from in order to tell his “true” story.

Fiction and Truth in Spanish and French Travel literature About The Turks

In his dissertation, *The 'Viaje de Turquía': a Study of its Sources, Authorship, and Historical Background*, William L. Markrich details the standard reference works on the life and customs of the Turks that would have been available to the author of the *Viaje*. He lists works by Iaconicus Chalcocondyles, Paulo Giovio, Vasco Diaz Tanco de Fregenal, Sebastian Muenster, and a certain Rocco. Markrich explains, though that “[a]ll these ‘theoretical’ writers...wrote about a subject which could only be fully exploited by writers such as Georgivitz, Bassano, de Nicolai, Belon, and Menavino, who wrote with the authority of the eye-witness” (Markrich 115) He includes the author of the *Viaje* in this last group.

It is the opinion of Albert Mas, in his book *Les Turcs dans la littérature espagnole du siècle d'or*, that the bulk of these works represent abstract compilations devoid of originality or literary interest, “Son grand art consistait à relier entre eux ces événements et ces contes, à leur donner une unité vraisemblable, représentée par le je du narrateur, à les localiser dans le temps et dans l’espace afin d’accentuer l’authenticité d’un récit monté de toutes pièces et à les raccrocher à des points de repère qui, parce qu’ils étaient réels, leur transmettaient leur réalité.” (Mas, 114) For him what the author of *Viaje de Turquía* accomplishes, in part, is to transfigure some of the accounts he takes from previous texts into heart-stopping, suspense-filled, adventure. He also describes his art as the ability to form the episodic narration of travelling experiences into a coherent whole that contributes to its verisimilitude. We will consider the autobiographic nature of the work and its verisimilitude in the next section. Here, let us consider how the author of *Viaje de Turquía* reconfigures some of its contemporary sources more closely.

Pierre Belon travelled in Greece, Crete, Egypt, Turkey and Mt. Athos between 1546 and 1549. Markrich believes that Belon’s reminiscences helped the author of the *Viaje de Turquía* refresh his memory about what he had seen among the monks on Mt.

Athos. Many of the observations made by Belon about the lives and customs of the Turks and the monks on Mt. Athos are repeated in the *Viaje*.¹²⁰

Marcel Bataillon believes that A. Menavino's *Trattato de costumi et vita de turchi*, published in Florence in 1548, was the main source for the author of *Viaje de Turquía*. It recounts how Menavino and his father were captured by a famous Corsair in 1504, was handed over to Bajazet II, grandfather of Suleiman, how he survived several dangers and finally escaped from the Turks after 10 years. We have already seen in Chapter 2 how the dedication of *Viaje de Turquía* contains a pastiche of different selections from other works. One paragraph was completely lifted from Menavino, beginning with "y no mire vuestra Magestad el ruin estilo con que va escrito, porque no como erudito escriptor, sino como fiel intérprete y que todo quanto escribo vi, he abraçado antes la obra que la aparencia, supliendo toda la falta de la rectórica y elegancia con la verdad." (*Viaje de Turquía* 90) In Chapter 2 we discussed how critics have viewed the author's plagiarism as an attempt to "correct" some of the more partisan or tendentious aspects of the original. But in this instance, as in others, the Menavino is copied completely, verbatim. The irony, of course, is that in this early selection the theme is the individual style of language, "el ruin estilo," and the appeal to the truth-value of the work. The reworking of Menavino fits well into the double-voiced strategy that characterizes much of *Viaje de Turquía*.

Georgievitz, more widely read than the others, had also written of his Turkish captivity in pamphlets and letters. His influence on the author of the *Viaje* is palpable in two main instances: sections of the Dedication, which excerpt passages from two of his pamphlets, and from a later section where a poem appears, translated from a version by Georgievitz. There are many overlaps between the four letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, written between 1555 and 1561 and *Viaje de Turquía*. Busbecq arrived in Constantinople in 1555 and was a diplomat there for many years. According to Markrich, the *Letters* help confirm the accuracy of *Viaje's* author's observations on the life and habits of the Turks.

It appears the author of *Viaje de Turquía* used previous works about Turkey to bolster his descriptive details, sometimes lifting entire passages, reworking them in literary ways to make them more entertaining. In certain instances, he adapts them in a way that suggests that he is offering a corrective perspective, less xenophobic, more tolerant towards other cultures. In addition, the critique he presents of the Christian world establishes his intentions as markedly different from the authors he uses who also write about the Islamic world. "[N]o es la autenticidad histórica lo que parece buscar el autor, sino que, antes de nada, quiere difundir a través de los documentos de los que se sirve *ab initio* un mensaje de reforma" (Ortolá 21). One of the ways the author of the *Viaje* makes

¹²⁰ See Markrich 115-122.

his work more amusing and at the same more convincing and persuasive is by turning the erudite compilations of his contemporaries into an autobiographical narration.

Pseudo-Autobiography at the Margins: *Lazarillo de Tormes*, *The Golden Ass*, Lucian

As is the case with all anonymous works, many critics have spent much time trying to figure out the identity of the mysterious author of *Viaje de Turquía*. Most famously, Bataillon has made the case for Dr. Andrés de Laguna. Although his arguments and the polemics raised by them in the world of *Viaje de Turquía* criticism are intriguing, it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to consider this question. The issue has not been resolved and might never be, just as it is likely that we will never know who the author of *Lazarillo de Tormes* was. As we have seen, some of the questions that arise when considering the truth or fiction of the “eye-witness” reports of the narrator of *Viaje de Turquía* crop up as well as one approaches the thorny problem of John de Mandeville’s identity (and Lucian’s and Plato’s). Throughout my dissertation I have been studying *Viaje de Turquía* as a literary creation, not as the blow-by-blow true account of a real person’s travels. But this ambiguity that consists of a fictional narrator insisting that his travels/experiences are real and trustworthy is in itself a variant of the literary strategy that we call autobiography, in a line that takes us from *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville* to *Lazarillo de Tormes*, *Viaje de Turquía*: three enigmatic and anonymous authors playing a game of illusion between truth and lies, appearances and reality, even at the level of authorship itself.¹²¹

Viaje de Turquía and *Coloquios de la verdad*, like *Mandeville’s Travels* and *Lazarillo de Tormes*, are fictional, not authentic, autobiographies. The characters are not real, beginning with the first person narrator, the “I” who recounts his experience. In the case of the four texts, there is no identifiable person with whom this “I” could be connected. The events that make up the autobiography are variously taken from accounts found in texts by other authors, as we have seen in the previous section. And, finally, in the case of *Viaje de Turquía*, the text is a highly elaborated literary artifact, a dialogue, which functions partly to fragment points of view and confuses in this way the first person perspective. “El Viaje estriba en una alegoría que ilumina los pasos sucesivos que anda el ente de ficción—Pedro de Urdemalas—en su esfuerzo de alcanzar a Dios.”

¹²¹ In his *Essai de poétique médiévale* Paul Zumthor says, “Quelque chose d’initial, d’extra-textuel, en se figurant ainsi, s’abolit. Toute origine s’efface, la voix s’étouffe dans un texte composite, neutre, oblique, destructeur des identités personnelles. Pourtant, ce texte est dit par Quelqu’un, à qui il n’a pas cessé d’appartenir même si la silhouette s’en est effacée. Un déplacement s’est donc produit, dont il faut tenir compte sans en être dupe. L’auteur a disparu : reste le sujet de l’énonciation, une instance locutrice intégrée au texte et indissociable de son fonctionnement : ‘ça’ parle. (69) Although he refers to medieval autobiography, the three texts we are considering are perfectly described here. The author is doubly effaced because they are fictionalized autobiographies (constructing a fictitious “I”) and because they are anonymous.

(Ortolá 36) As any other art object, the text fits into a historical trajectory that, in this case, crosses genres and time periods.

For Francisco Rico the autobiographical point of view is the original condition of the picaresque genre, among others, and its particular genius. The first person narrative problematizes reality by presenting a glaringly illusionistic single perspective: “la persona es el único criterio eficaz de verdad. Los principios más discantados, los arquetipos de conducta que proponen los tiempos, se afirman y se niegan con idéntica facilidad. No hay valores: hay vidas, y lo que sirve para una tal vez es inútil para otra. Esa parece ser la lección de Lázaro.” The autobiographical structure allows the author to present an intimate look into a character that is “insignificant,” a representation that is imbued with “profunda simpatía novelística.” (Rico, 50).

In *Literature as System*, Claudio Guillén describes a work like *Lazarillo de Tormes* as pseudoautobiography. He describes the picaresque point of view as being precisely the filtering of everything through the mind-set of a first person narrator. In the pseudoautobiography the *pícaro*/narrator uses language as an instrument of dissimulation or irony, and so a double perspective is achieved whereby the entire story is a tale of self-concealment and self-revelation, a “confession of a liar,” as it were. It offers up its self-consciousness as a partial and prejudiced narrative view.

There is another sense in which we can consider the autobiographical accounts we have before us. Critics have explored the way *Lazarillo*'s story unfolds as a restructuring of the Genesis myth. In this view *Lazarillo* symbolizes man cast out of Eden.¹²² Allegorical readings of our texts invite us to consider how Pedro uses what he learns in his captivity to his spiritual advantage, as an opportunity for redemption. (Ortolá 78) Pedro descends to the spiritual underworld, Turkey, a Muslim country, well in keeping with the classical *topos* of the hero's descent to hell. We will see this motif of descent again in the section where we discuss Lucian's dialogues. Suffice it here to note that Menippean satire transforms this theme into scathing social satire.¹²³ The symbolic descent as metamorphosis is developed in yet another seminal pseudoautobiographical account, that shares much with *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad*, and is considered an important model for these, Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*.

Lucius, protagonist of *The Golden Ass*, also recounts his travels/adventures in the first person with a view towards edifying the reader. Like Pedro, he has been idle and

¹²² See T. Anthony Perry on biblical symbolism in the *Lazarillo de Tormes*. “Lázaro, al contra su vida desde su nacimiento en el río—símbolo bautismal invertido, puesto que le abrirá las puertas del universo infernal—hasta su colaboración final con el arcipreste, no hace sino delatar los vicios de una sociedad anti-cristiana y llamar nuestra atención sobre la necesidad de una reforma religiosa radical.” (Ortolá, 81)

¹²³ See treatment above, in section on Lucian.

unspiritual in his past, before embarking on what becomes his redemptive quest, as it were. For this— as well as for his all-consuming curiosity, insatiable desire to travel to discover new things, and licentiousness— he is punished with a degrading metamorphosis into an ass. As with Pedro, Tito and Lazarillo, his experiencing adverse circumstances and his witnessing of man’s cruelty and frequent immorality, give him the opportunity to learn life skills even as they reveal to him the depths of human depravity; the autobiographical account of his travels serves as the perfect vehicle for social satire. Lucius’s “metamorphosis” into an ass parallels Lazarillo’s violent awakening when his head is slammed hard into the stone bull by the blind man (“Parecióme que en aquel instante desperté de la simpleza en que, como niño, dormido estaba,” First Tratado 11) and Pedro’s capture by the Turks and ensuing slavery (“Fue tan grande el alboroto que me dio y espanto de verme cuál me había la fortuna puesto en u instante, que ni sabía si llorase ni reyese.” *Viaje* 132)

We have discussed the outsized influence that Lucian of Samosata had on the authors of our dialogues (as well as on all the works we have discussed in this section). Here let us recall that Lucian’s texts often feature a character speaking in the first person, recounting his pseudoautobiography, that voluntarily descends to the netherworld (or to the stars and moon) in order to ask ancient philosophers and poets questions about life and metaphysics.¹²⁴ The answers come in the form of allegory, woven into the representation of alternate worlds (whether above or below).¹²⁵ Pedro’s descriptions of the Turkish world and Tito’s of colonial society are also inverted worlds that seek to illumine in veiled terms those same questions they have about life and metaphysics.

Picaresque and Satire

In her book, *Un estudio del Viaje de Turquía: Autobiografía o ficción*, Marie-Sol Ortola has written thoroughly about how *Lazarillo de Tormes* and *Viaje de Turquía* share many similarities. With recourse to her study and Claudio Guillén, specifically his essay

¹²⁴ *Menippus, Icaromenippus, Voyage to the Lower World, The True History, Dialogues of the Dead.*

¹²⁵ “Philonides: Now, if a man occupies a costly towering sepulcher, or leaves monuments, statues, inscriptions behind him on earth, does not this place him in a class about the common dead? Menippus: Nonsense, my good man; if you had looked on Mausolus himself—the Carian so famous for his tomb—I assure you, you would never have stopped laughing; he was a miserable unconsidered unit among the general mass of the dead, flung aside in a dusty hole, with no profit of his sepulcher but its extra weight upon him... You might have laughed still more if you had beheld the kings and governors of earth begging in Hades, selling salt fish for a living, it might be, or giving elementary lessons, insulted by any one who met them, and cuffed like the most worthless of slaves. When I saw Philip of Macedon, I could not contain myself; some one showed him to me cobbling old shoes for money in a corner. Many others were to be seen begging—people like Xerxes, Darius, or Polycrates.” *Menippus* 162.

“Towards a definition of the picaresque,” in *Literature as System*, I will next explore some of these elements that seem most relevant to our exploration of *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la verdad*. The stories of Lazarillo, Pedro de Urdemalas, and Tito develop along different paths; the lives of their characters incline differently, for sure, but they certainly share much in terms of their autobiographical, picaresque and, ultimately, satiric natures. We should note the fact that all three works are clearly influenced by Menippean satire.

In his essay Claudio Guillén describes some of the outstanding characteristics of the picaresque that he considers features of the genre. First, the narrative portrait of the *pícaro* includes the social environment that surrounds him and the tangled situations that are lead-ins to his adventures. There is a conflict between this individual and his environment and it causes the *pícaro* to move inwards, creating an individual and distinctive life experience. Guillén states, “the *pícaro* was a creative comment on sixteenth-century *vidas* in general—on how it felt to be a man among men (or rather to become one, against all economic and social odds), whether one was a beggar, a merchant, or a hidalgo, in post-Renaissance Europe” (Guillén, 79). All from humble origins, Lazarillo de Tormes, Pedro de Urdemalas, and Tito are presented as models of certain life experiences representing the social and political environments of their time and place. They have difficulty integrating into a Spanish society that exalts the notions of purity and noble blood. They all fight the odds against them throughout a series of hazardous situations that make up the plot of their serial narrative. Lazarillo and Pedro recount their respective adventures and the process of their [street] edification, beginning with the story of their fatherless, base beginnings¹²⁶. They have had (and suffered at the hands of) a series of masters who teach them how to get along. They learn from their surroundings although their knowledge comes from surmounting their dire predicaments and they are both disenchanted and disillusioned, left with pessimistic views about human nature.

Guillén argues that picaresque characters have a precocious affinity for solitude because they must fend for themselves. Their disenchantment combined with their own participation in the corrupted state of affairs makes them become “half-outsiders” and this is the source of an ambivalence which haunts the final narrative situation; the *pícaro* exists as an “inner” as well as “outer” man, tracing a distinction between being and appearance. The status as half-outsider confers special strengths, he is “reflective, philosophical, critical on religious or moral grounds...the *pícaro* is an ‘ongoing’ philosopher, as a constant discoverer and rediscoverer, experimenter and doubter where every value or norm is concerned, never ceases to learn.” (82).

¹²⁶ Lazarillo’s first Tratado presents his humble family’s situation; Pedro’s account mentions his mother towards the beginning of the dialogue and, later, Mata says of him that he is “hijo de partera, primo de barbero y sobrino de boticario.” (177)

Lazarillo, Pedro, and Tito, all three of whom we could clearly describe in this way as disenchanting half-outsiders¹²⁷, all learn a set of “life tools” that involve, variously, donning disguises, pretending to be who they are not and to know what they know not, and manipulating others to get ahead. The harrowing development of their life skills leads to the characters’ ascension up a social scale, even if the heights are, ultimately, a mirage. Indeed our three characters are critical, philosophically-inclined, observers and travelers who reflect upon all they see around them, they are witnesses to collective conditions of many different types and this leads to their propensity for satirical observations, especially of a religious kind.

Guillén ends his essay with a consideration of Américo Castro’s significant contributions to the study of Spanish history, specifically his stress on the situation of the Spanish New Christian, the *converso*, a “half-outsider” in Spanish society. He acknowledges the work done by Castro and others who sought to examine the importance of this group to Spanish letters, namely as authors and/or characters of picaresque novels.¹²⁸ This is true to such an extent that many critics take it as an article of faith that the picaresque genre is the genre of marginalization *par excellence*, and therefore intimately entwined with the complex, tragic, and fascinating story of Spain’s version of ethnic cleansing. It is widely believed that most Jews were forced to leave Spain in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (officially expelled in 1492) but, of course, many Sephardic Jews, if not most, remained in Spain. They became New Christians, as did those inhabitants of the Iberian peninsula who had belonged originally to the Arabic-centered culture of Al-Andalus. The Spanish-type *pícaro*, says Guillén, “asked himself not ‘What shall one believe?’ but ‘How will I act?’” (102), an appropriate question, certainly, for individuals caught between religions, cultures, and moral systems, such as Pedro and Tito, and thus an appropriate and ripe subject for satirical exploitation.

The oscillation between appearance and reality is rooted as well in ancient myth: the *pícaro* “has become the artist or creator of himself, to the degree that poetry (as Plato states in the *Republic*) is a species of impersonation, and art a kind of picaresque

¹²⁷ Lazarillo, is on his own, going from master to master, thinking only of how to better his own situation; Pedro is a Spanish Christian captive in Muslim Turkey, acting at various times as ambassador, mediator, or interpreter, also on his own and trying to figure out how to escape his captivity and return to Spain; Tito is a Christian convert, Quechua-speaking native of Peru, who leaves his home, goes to Spain, returns, and never again fully belongs to either culture, the last two truly men in-between or outside two conflicting cultures.

¹²⁸ Let us remember here that Marcel Bataillon believed the author of *Viaje de Turquía* was Doctor Andrés Laguna, a Jewish *converso*, see Bataillon *Le docteur de Laguna, auteur du “Voyage en Turquie,”* Paris: Librairies des Editions Espagnoles, 1958. Many critics have also argued that the anonymous author of *Lazarillo de Tormes* must have also been a *converso*, see Colbert I. Nepaulsingh, *Apples of Gold in Filigrees of Silver: Jewish Writing in the Eye of the Spanish Inquisition*, New York: Holmes & Meier, 1995.

deception” 103); the multiple and Protean variations are codes that represent an underlying unity. The picaresque vision oscillates between “rejection and surrender, nausea and attachment” (104). Finally, the picaresque genre surfaces in “days of irony and discouragement...[when it discloses] an awareness of civilization as oppression” (105), whether it be Spain during the reign of Philip II, al-Andalus under the yoke of the Almoravids, or Germany in the time of the Thirty Years’ War.

Conclusion: Countergenres or Looking Forward

We have seen how *Viaje de Turquía* and *Coloquios de la Verdad* look backwards towards texts that came before in a long line from Plato to Lucian to travel and picaresque literature. Our texts are hybrids that have absorbed, and in some cases included wholesale parts of, these other texts and/or their generic characteristics. From Plato our texts took the mimetic representation of an oral conversation meant to help the interlocutors get closer to a certain kind of knowledge, the dialectic movement toward truth. From Lucian our authors took aspects of fantasy, satire, heterodoxy and the clear intention to delight the readers, a reality that is recreated and imbued with comedy and play. From the genre of travel literature, they borrow the privileging of eyewitness report as well and the recognition of the salubrious effect of traveling and discovering the variety and extension of human experience. From the genre of pseudo-autobiographies of picaresque nature our authors absorbed the usefulness of satire in the mouth of marginalized witnesses. All of these genres explore issues of identity, often playing with a conceit of authorship that is sometimes explicit, sometimes veiled. They all hover in the space of marginality, the ideal coordinate from which they can weigh in on the happenings in the center.

The hybrid way in which our dialogues integrate and assimilate other genres and texts contributes to their status as countergenres. They take the texts of the past one step forward, making them relevant to their particular historical time and space, seeking to resolve contradictions belonging to their particular time even as they present documents which in some respects jive well with the ideologies of the time. Our dialogues breathe optimism about the possibility of progress and human perfectibility. They present a reformist vision that verges on the utopic, on fantasy.¹²⁹

K. J. Wilson dubbed the literary dialogues of the Renaissance as incomplete fiction.¹³⁰ The characters do not have a life of their own or a developing psychology in the sense we would say this of a novel's character, having a past and an uncertain future. They function as spokesmen for the authors. But that does not mean that they do not incarnate aspects of reality.¹³¹ They are fixed in "realistic" (mimetic) settings that

¹²⁹ In "La tendencia utópica en el Viaje de Turquía," Ortolá calls it "propensidad utópica" or "pensamiento utópico." (1)

¹³⁰ K.J. Wilson (1985), *Incomplete fictions: the formation of English Renaissance dialogue*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press.

¹³¹ See Savoye Ferreras, "Del diálogo humanístico a la novela."

observe basic rules of "*decoro*." And the works are literary fictions imbued with fantasy and comedy. Characters like Pedro de Urdemalas and Tito are also foreshadowing novelistic characters in their autobiographical retellings, based as they are on the conceit of experience as the guarantee of truthfulness. In the novel the autobiographical narration becomes fiction. Our characters are also reflecting on their past actions as they tell their tales.

Cotarelo and Pfandl saw in the narrator and protagonist of *Viaje de Turquía* a forerunner of Cervantes' comic Pedro de Urdemalas, namely a pícaro "sujeto audaz, trapisondista, mudable como su gusto, mentor de simples y embaucador de bellacos, enemigo del trabajo, sagaz para descubrir su provecho y tracista para lograrlo." (Cotarelo and Pfandl, 389) Whether or not this version of Pedro corresponds or not to the *Viaje's* (and in many ways it does not) it seems clear that the novel as it developed soon after the Golden Age of the Renaissance dialogue can be seen as its countergenre.

Bibliography

- Adorno, Rolena. "Felipe Guaman Poma De Ayala: An Andean View of the Peruvian Viceroyalty, 1565-1615." Journal de la Société des Américanistes 65.65 (1978): 121-43.
- . "The Indigenous Ethnographer: The "Indio Ladino" as Historian and Cultural Mediation." Implicit Understandings: Observing, Reporting, and Reflecting on the Encounters between Europeans and Other Peoples in the Early Modern Era. Ed. Stuart B. Schwartz. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Anonymous. Viaje De Turquía. Ed. Fernando García Salinero. Madrid: Cátedra, 1980.
- Armiño, Mauro. Qué Es Verdaderamente El Siglo De Oro. Madrid: Doncel, 1973.
- Asensio, Eugenio. El Erasmismo Y Las Corrientes Espirituales Afines (Conversos, Franciscanos, Italianizantes). Salamanca: SEMYR, 2000.
- Bainton, Roland H. The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1952.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. The Dialogic Imagination. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- . Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- . Esthétique Et Théorie Du Roman. Trans. Daria Olivier. Paris: Gallimard, 1991.
- Baldwin, Barry. Studies in Lucian. Toronto: A. M. Hakkert Ltd., 1973.
- Barletta, Vincent. Covert Gestures. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2005.
- Bataillon, Marcel. Le Docteur Laguna Auteur Du 'Voyage En Turquie'. Paris: Librairie des Éditions Espagnoles, 1958.
- . Erasme Et L'espagne. Geneva: Librairie Droz, S.A., 1998.
- Baylor, Michael G. , ed. The Radical Reformation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Bennett, Josephine Waters. The Rediscovery of Sir John Mandeville. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1954.
- Bialostosky, Don H. "Dialogic, Pragmatic, and Hermeneutic Conversation: Bakhtin, Rorty, and Gadamer." Critical Studies 1.2 (1989).
- Biller, Peter and Hudson, Anne, ed. Heresy and Literacy, 1000-1530. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Bobes Naves, María del Carmen. El Diálogo: Estudio Pragmático, Lingüístico Y Literario. Madrid: Gredos, 1992.
- Bouza, Fernando. Corre Manuscrito: Una Historia Cultural Del Siglo De Oro. Madrid: Marcial Pons, Ediciones de Historia, 2001.
- Boyarin, Daniel. Socrates & the Fat Rabbis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Buchanan, Ian. Fredric Jameson: Live Theory. London and New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2006.
- Bujanda, J.M. de. "La Censure Litteraire E Espagne Au Xvie Siècle." Canadian Journal of History 7 (1972).
- Burbules, Nicholas C. "The Limits of Dialogue as a Critical Pedagogy." Revolutionary Pedagogies. Ed. Peter Trifonas. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Caster, Marcel. Lucien Et La Pensée Religieuse De Son Temps. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres" 1937.
- Castro-Klaren, Sara. "Historiography on the Ground: The Toledo Circle and Guamán Poma." The Latin American Subaltern Studies Reader. Ed. Ileana Rodríguez. Durham and

- London: Duke University Press, 2001.
- . "Memory And "Writing" In the Andes." A Companion to Latin American Literature and Culture. Ed. Sara Castro-Klaren. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- Cortarelo y Valledor, Armando. El Teatro De Cervantes. Madrid: Revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos, 1915.
- Covarrubias, Sebastián de. Tesoro De La Lengua Castellano O Española. Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1994.
- Crapanzano, Vincent. "Hermes' Dilemma: The Masking of Subversion in Ethnographic Description." Writing Culture : The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography : A School of American Research Advanced Seminar Ed. James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- . "On Dialogue." The Interpretation of Dialogue. Ed. Tullio Maranhao. Chicago and London, 1990.
- de Bujanda, J. M. . "La Censure Littéraire En Espagne Au Xvie Siècle." Canadian Journal of History 7 (1972): 1-15.
- De Certeau, Michel. Heterologies: Discourse on the Other. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- . La Toma De La Palabra Y Otros Escritos Políticos/La Prise De Parole Et Autres Ecrits Politiques. Trans. Alejandro Pescador. Mexico City: Universidad Iberoamericana, 1995.
- . "Travel Narratives of the French to Brazil: Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries." New World Encounters. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- De las Casas, Bartolomé. Del Único Modo De Atraer a Todos Los Pueblos a La Verdadera Religión. Trans. Atenógenes Santamaría. Vol. VII 1. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1972.
- Durston, Alan. Pastoral Quechua: The History of Christian Translation in Colonial Peru, 1550-1650. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007.
- Duviols, Pierre. La Destrucción De Las Religiones Andinas: Conquista Y Colonia. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1977.
- . La Lutte Contre Les Religions Autochtones Dans Le Pérou Colonial. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 2008.
- Elliott, J.H. Spain and Its World 1500-1700: Selected Essays. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Entwistle, William J. "The Spanish Mandevilles." Modern Humanities Research Association 17.3 (1922): 251-57.
- Fabian, Johannes. "Presence and Representation: The Other and Anthropological Writing." Critical Inquiry 16 (1990).
- Ferreras, Jacqueline. Les Dialogues Espagnols Du Xvie Siècle Ou L'expression Littéraire D'une Nouvelle Conscience. Paris: Didier Érudition, 1985.
- . "Le Dialogue Humaniste Espagnol Ou Comment Écrire La Modernité (Entre Mimesis Et Rhétorique)." Europe Xvi-Xvii No. 6: Dialogue Et Intertextualité. Ed. Chabrolle-Cerretini and Zaercher. Nancy: Université de Nancy 2, 2005.
- Frisch, Andrea. The Invention of the Eyewitness. Chapel Hill: North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures, 2004.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. Truth and Method. London and New York: Continuum Publishing

- Group, 1975, 1989.
- García Salinero, Fernando, ed. Viaje De Turquía. Madrid: Cátedra, 1985.
- Godzich, Wlad and Spadaccini, Nicholas. "Novela Y Experiencia: Del Caballero Al Pícaro." Homenaje a Jose Antonio Maravall. Ed. María Carmen; Moya Iglesias, Carlos; Zúñiga, Luis Rodríguez. Vol. 2. madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 1985.
- Goldhill, Simon. Who Needs Greek?: Contests in the Cultural History of Hellenism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Gómez, Jesús. El Diálogo En El Renacimiento Español. Madrid: Cátedra, 1988.
- . Forma Y Evolución Del Diálogo Renacentista. Madrid Laberinto, 2000.
- González Echevarría, Roberto and Pupo-Walker, Enrique. The Cambridge History of Latin American Literature. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- González González, E. and Gutiérrez Rodríguez. Los Diálogos De Vives Y La Imprenta. Frotuna De Un Manual Escolar Renacentista (1539-1994). Valencia: Institució Alfons el Magnànim, 1999.
- Goodman, David. "Philip II's Patronage of Science and Engineering " British Journal for the History of Science 16.1 (1983).
- Grafton, Anthony. New Words, Ancient Texts: The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Gruzinski, Serge. The Conquest of Mexico : The Incorporation of Indian Societies into the Western World, 16th-18th Centuries Trans. Eileen Corrigan. Cambridge (UK and USA): Polity Press, 1993.
- Guha, Ranajit. "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography." Selected Subaltern Studies. Ed. Ranajit and Spivak Guha, Gayatri. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Guilhamet, Leon. Satire and the Transformation of Genre. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987.
- Guillén, Claudio. Literature as System: Essays toward the Theory of Literary History. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.
- . El Primer Siglo De Oro: Estudios Sobre Géneros Y Modelos. Vol. Grijalbo. Barcelona, 1988.
- Hall, Jennifer. Lucian's Satire. New York: Arno Press, 1981.
- Hampton, Timothy`. Literature and Nation in the Sixteenth Century. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press, 2001.
- Handler, Richard. "On Dialogue and Destructive Analysis: Problems in Narrating Nationalism and Ethnicity." Journal of Anthropological Research 41.2 (1985).
- Hanke, Lewis. The Spanish Struggle for Justice in the Conquest of America. Vol. Little, Brown and Company. Boston, Toronto, 1949.
- . Selected Writing of Lewis Hanke on the History of Latin America. Tempe: Arizona State University, 1979.
- Harllee, Carol Denise. "Sixteenth-Century Self-Help: Reception of the Dialogue in Spain." University of Virginia, 2005.
- Hartog, François. The Mirror of Herodotus. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Helms, Mary W. Ulysses' Sail: An Ethnographic Odyssey of Power, Knowledge, and Geographical Distance. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

- Hemming, John. The Conquest of the Incas. Oxford: Macmillan, 1970.
- Hernández de León-Portilla, Ascensión. "Fray Alonso De Molina Y El Proyecto Indigenista De La Orden Seráfica." Estudios de cultura nahuatl 36.enero-junio 2007 (2007): 63-81.
- Higgins, Iain Macleod. Writing East: The 'Travels' of Sir John Mandeville. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.
- Hillerbrand, Hans J., ed. Radical Tendencies in the Reformation: Divergent Perspectives. Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, Inc., 1988.
- Hulme, Peter. Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean 1492-1797. London and New York: Methuen, 1986.
- . "European Ethnography and the Caribbean." Implicit Understandings: Observing, Reporting, and Reflecting on the Encounters between Europeans and Other Peoples in the Early Modern Era. Ed. Stuart B. Schwartz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Irving, Washington. The Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus. Vol. 3. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1868.
- Jameson, Fredric. The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981.
- Jover Zamora, Mosé María, ed. La Cultura Del Renacimiento. Vol. 21. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1935-.
- Kahn, Charles H. . Plato and the Socratic Dialogue: The Philosophical Use of a Literary Form. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Kamen, Henry. "Toleration and Dissent in Sixteenth-Century Spain: The Alternative Tradition." The Sixteenth Century Journal 19.1 (1988).
- Kiefer Lewalski, Barbara. "Introduction: Issues and Approaches." Renaissance Genres. Ed. Barbara Kiefer Lewalski. Cambridge: Harvard English Studies, 1986.
- Kushner. "The Renaissance Dialogue and Zero-Degree Fictionality." Fiction Updated: Theories of Fictionality, Narratology, and Poetics. Ed. Calin-Andrei Mihailescu and Walid Hamarneh. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Lauvergnat-Gagnière, Christiane. Lucian De Samosate Et Le Lucianisme En France Au Xvie Siècle: Athéisme Et Polémique. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1988.
- Le Flem, Jean-Paul, ed. La Frustración De Un Imperio. Vol. 5. Barcelona: Labor, 1982.
- Liria Montañés, Pilar. 'Libro De Las Maravillas Del Mundo' De Juan De Mandevilla. Zaragoza: Caja de Ahorros de Zaragoza, Aragon y Rioja, 1979.
- Lockhart, James. Spanish Peru, 1532-1560: A Social History. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994.
- MacCormack, Sabine. Religion in the Andes: Vision and Imagination in Early Colonial Peru. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Malpartida Tirado, Rafael. Varia Lección De Plática Áurea. Málaga: Universidad de Málaga, 2005.
- . Aprendices, Escépticos Y Curiosos En El Renacimiento Español: Los Diálogos De A. De Torquemada. Málaga: Universidad de Málaga, 2005.
- Maranhão, Tulio. The Interpretation of Dialogue. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Marin, Louis. Utopics: Spatial Play. New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1984.
- Markrich, William L. "The Viaje De Turquía: A Study of Its Sources, Authorship, and Historical Background." University of California, Berkeley, 1955.

- Martinell Gifre, Emma. "La Conciencia Lingüística En El Viaje De Turquía." Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes (2007).
- Martínez de Bujanda, J. "La Censure Litteraire En Espagne Au Xvie Siècle." Canadian Journal of History 7.1 (1972): 1-15.
- . Tesaurus De La Littérature Interdite Au Xvie Siècle Sherbrooke: Librairie Droz, 1996.
- Mas, Albert. Les Turcs Dans La Littérature Espagnole Du Siècle D'or. Paris: Centre de recherches hispaniques, 1967.
- Mason, Peter. Deconstructing America : Representations of the Other. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Menéndez Pelayo, Marcelino. Historia De Los Heterodoxos Españoles. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1948.
- Merle, Alexandra Le Miroir Ottoman: Une Image Politique Des Hommes Dans La Littérature Géographique Espagnole Et Française (Xvie - Xviie Siècles). Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2003.
- Murra, John V. "Litigation over the Rights Of "Natural Lords" In Early Colonial Courts in the Andes." Native Traditions in the Postconquest World. Ed. Elizabeth Hill Boone. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1998. 55-62.
- Murray, David. Forked Tongues: Speech, Writing and Representation in North American Indian Texts. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- Nikulin, Dmitri. Dialectic and Dialogue. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.
- Ortolá, Marie-Sol. Un Estudio Del 'Viaje De Turquía': Autobiografía O Ficción. London: Tamesis Books Limited, 1983.
- . "La 'Preocupation' Pour L'Espagne Dans Le *Viaje De Turquía*." Tourments, Doutes et Ruptures dans l'Europe des XVIe et XVII siècles. Ed. Pierre Demarolle and Marie Roig Miranda Jean-Claude Arnould. Nancy: Honoré Champion Editeur, 1993.
- Pagden, Anthony. The Fall of Natural Man: The American Indian and the Origins of Comparative Ethnology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- . "Ius Et Factum: Text and Experience in the Writings of Bartolomé De Las Casas." New World Encounters. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Pérez-Fernández, Isacio. Bartolomé De Las Casas En El Perú. Cusco: Centro de estudios rurales andinos "Bartolomé de las Casas", 1988.
- Pérez-Romero, Antonio. The Subversive Tradition in Spanish Renaissance Writing. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2005.
- Pinette, Susan. "Alternative Ethnographies: Genre and Cultural Encounter in Early Modern French Texts." University of California, Irvine, 2000.
- Plato. "The Apology." Great Dialogues of Plato. Ed. Eric H. Warmington and Philip G. Rouse. New York: New American Library, 1956.
- Polo, Marco. The Travels of Marco Polo, Translated by Aldo Ricci from the Text of L. F. Benedetto. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services, 2001.
- Quiroga, Pedro de. Coloquios De La Verdad. Ed. D. Rípodas Ardanaz. Valladolid: Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericana - Casa-Museo de Colón y Seminario Americanista, 1992.
- Rabasa, José. "Dialogue as Conquest: Mapping Spaces for Counter-Discourse." Cultural Critique 6.Spring (1987).
- . Inventing America: Spanish Historiography and the Formation of Eurocentrism. Norman and

- London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993.
- . Franciscans and Dominicans under the Gaze of a Tlacuilo: Plural-World Dwelling in an Indian Pictorial Codex. Morrison Library Inaugural Address. Ed. Carlos R. Delgado. Vol. 14. Berkeley: The Doe Library, 1998.
- . "Writing Violence." A Companion to Latin American Literature and Culture. Ed. Sara Castro-Klaren. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- Rallo Gruss, Asunción. La Escritura Dialéctica: Estudios Sobre El Diálogo Renacentista. Málaga: Universidad de Málaga, 1996.
- . "La Sátira Lucianesca. *El Cróton* Entre Los Lucianistas Italianos Y La Sátira Erasmista." Estudios Sobre La Sátira Española En El Siglo De Oro. Ed. Carlos Vaíllo and Ramón Valdés. Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 2006.
- Rawlings, Helen. The Spanish Inquisition. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- . The Spanish Inquisition. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Romero, Dir. Carlos Alberto. "Libro De La Visita General Del Virrey Toledo - 1570-1575." Revista Histórica: Organo del Instituto histórico del Perú 7.2 (1924): 115-216.
- Rubies, Joan Pau. "Travel Writing and Ethnography " The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing. Ed. Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Schwartz, Stuart B., ed. Implicit Understandings: Observing, Reporting, and Reflecting on the Encounters between Europeans and Other Peoples in the Early Modern Era. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Tedlock, Dennis. "The Analogical Tradition and the Emergence of a Dialogical Anthropology." Journal of Anthropological Research 35.4 (1979).
- . The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.
- Tirado, Rafael Malpartida. "Encantamientos Del Diálogo Humanístico: La Memoria Y El Olvido." DICENDA. Cuadernos de Filología Hispánica 26 (2008).
- Torrejón, Martínez. Diálogo Y Retórica En El Renacimiento Español 'El Escolástico' De Cristóbal De Villalón. Kassel: Edition Reichenberger, 1995.
- Vaíllo, Carlos and Valdés, Ramón, ed. Estudios Sobre La Sátira Española En El Siglo De Oro. Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 2006.
- Vallée, Jean-François. "Dialogue Et Marginalité." Comparative Literature in Canada 20.2 (1989).
- Vian, Ana. "Sátira Lucianesca Y Avisos a La Corona En El Perú Colonial: El Bárbaro Y El Conquistador En Los *Coloquios De La Verdad* De Pedro De Quiroga (C. 1569)." Estudios Sobre La Sátira Española En El Siglo De Oro. Ed. Carlos and Valdés Vaíllo, Ramón. Madrid: Castalia, 2006.
- Vian Herrero, Ana. "'La Más Íntima Ley Formal Del Ensayo Es La Herejía'. Sobre Su Condición Dialógica." Compás de Letras. Monografías de literatura española 5 (1994).
- . "Pedro De Quiroga, Autor De Los *Coloquios De La Verdad*: Perfil De Un Comisario Inquisitorial Cuzqueño." Dejar Hablar a Los Textos. Ed. Pedro M. Piñero Ramírez. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2005.
- . "El Diálogo Lucianesco En El Renacimiento Español." El Diálogo Renacentista En La Península Ibérica. Ed. Roger Friedlein. Berlin: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2005.
- . "La Codificación Del Habla Y Del Personaje Del Indio En Los Coloquios De La Verdad (C.

- 1569 De Pedro De Quiroga." El Personaje Literario Y Su Lengua En El Siglo Xvi. Ed. Consolación and Vian Herrero Baranda Leturio, Ana. Madrid: Editorial Complutense, 2006.
- Webster, Steven. "Dialogue and Fiction in Ethnography." Dialectical Anthropology 7.2 (1982): 91-114.
- Ynduráin, Domingo. Humanismo Y Renacimiento En España. Madrid: Cátedra, 1994.
- Zamora, Margarita. "Historicity and Literariness: Problems in the Literary Criticism of Spanish American Colonial Texts." Modern Language Notes 102 (1987): 334-46.
- Zappala, Michael O. Lucian of Samosata in the Two Hesperias. Potomac: Scripta Humanística, 1990.
- Zumthor, Paul. Essai De Poétique Médiévale. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1972.
- . Langue, Texte, Enigme. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1975.
-