INDICE

SIGNS OF THE OTHER IN THREE EARLY MODERN AMERICAN TEXTS: CONTEXTS FOR *A DISCOURSE WRITTEN BY ONE MILES PHILIPS*

José María Rodríguez García
Universidade da Coruña

Miles Philips was an English seaman arrived in the Spanish Caribbean in 1568 on the disastrous trading and plundering expedition headed by the Elizabethan privateer John Hawkins and his young captain Francis Drake. Shortly after his return to England in 1582, Philips wrote a personal account of his fifteen-year American odyssey, during which time he became first a war prisoner and the «chamberlaine of a gentleman Spaniard» (1568-1570), then a bond-servant in the silver mines (1570-1575), later a victim of the Inquisition of New Spain and a reconciled penitent (1575-1580), and finally a fugitive from the civil and religious authorities which had determined that he should marry a Catholic *mestiza* after his reconciliation. The *Discourse* is an unusually rich sixteenth-century document on the interrelated questions of identity formation and of cultural diversity, and more precisely on the possibility that meaningful transfers may take place even between cultures which insist on highlighting their mutual differences at the expense of their affinities. I also trace this issue in a number of contemporaneous texts written in or about the Americas, including Bernal Díaz's *Historia* and Michel de Montaigne's «Des coches» and «Des cannibales.» Philips repeatedly depicts himself as a recalcitrant Lutheran and a staunch English patriot, one who never wavered in his professed allegiances. Accordingly, he uses as a foil to his ideal self-image the *otherness* of the native Amerindians and the Spanish Catholics whose languages and customs he nevertheless masters to perfection to the point of earning the confidence and respect of the enslaved Aztec workers and developing the ability to pass for a Spaniard. In short, although Philips claims that the core of his English Protestant identity remained inaccessible and invulnerable to the corrective technologies of the Inquisition, his reduction of *other*-identities to a limited number of external signs (all of them based on such variables as race, language, religious liturgy, and modes of production) suggests that the seemingly transcendent *essence* of national identities is in reality a construct which can be variously imitated, controlled, and even reproduced by skilled individuals and groups.

Sixteenth-century encounters between Europeans and native Indians in the New World produced a wealth of personal accounts, philosophical reflections, historiographic narratives, and legal tracts. Of these various kinds of texts, two in particular have received much attention in literary-cultural studies: the works of moral historians and essayists who never traveled to the world of the Americas, but who were nevertheless aware that military and colonial encounters also involved collisions between divergent cultural worlds; and accounts by direct participants in the encounters who for the most part were too busy publicizing the superabundance of riches in the Americas among a European audience —or else too shocked by the alien experiences they had in that distant environment—to engage in any profound intercultural reflections. Montaigne provides one such instance of the skeptical, sedentary thinker who reflects on Northern Europe's own history of military conquest and intellectual indoctrination by the Romans as he writes about the Americas.

For his part, Richard Hakluyt epitomizes the dutiful propagandist of English Protestantism and commercial interests in America who himself never ventured across the Atlantic Ocean. I will be concerned in this essay mainly with one of the first-person accounts included in Hakluyt's immensely influential *Principall Navigations of the English Nation* (1589-1599) —the *Discourse Written by One Miles Philips* (c. 1582-1584). This short narrative features the adventures and the anti-Spanish ideas of a perfectly trilingual English captive employed by his Spanish captors in a variety of jobs, including the supervision of the native Indians used as slaves both in the Mexican silver mines and in the construction of the Jesuit monastery to which Philips was assigned as a penanced convict after his trial by the Inquisition in 1575. The *Discourse*, which to this day has been strangely neglected by students of early modern English autobiography and cultural studies, furnishes an interesting example of three alternating avenues opened to the acculturated individual wishing to construct himself as the subject of a narrative and the agent of a historical process. These avenues are dissimulation, improvisation, and imaginative or emotional responsiveness to the appearance of an *other*-reality. In Philips's personal account the Renaissance practice of dissimulation coexists with the situation known to new-historicist critics as «improvisation» or peaceful negotiation of a middle position between the two mutually conflicting cultural environments involved in a colonial encounter (Greenblatt 1990a: 228-29). Dissimulation and improvisation may lead the individual subject to the erroneous belief that he can at all times manipulate an alien reality to his advantage— that he can keep his own involvement in the alterity of the encountered reality if not under his complete control at least in check.

We should not accept at face value Philips's emphatic claim that his engagement in religious, linguistic, punitive, and domestic practices radically different from his own never put him anywhere near experiencing a mental trauma. The same ardor with which he promotes an ideal self-image characterized by an unfailing self-possession and an inbred capacity to resist any form of external imposition and coercion works rather toward undermining the authority and authenticity of his narrative. The *Discourse* as a whole seems altogether more concerned with stigmatizing the alliance between the Spanish imperial policy and the economic and judicial practices of the Inquisition than with registering the effects of the geographical and cultural specificity of America on an English Protestant subject. In discussing Philips's narrative presentation of his experiences in America, I make use of the ideas of Michel de Certeau, Tzvetan Todorov, and Stephen Greenblatt on the dialectical complementarity of self-identity and alterity, and of historical reality and symbolic representation. All three literary anthropologists have eloquently written on the earliest Renaissance thinker to theorize on the question of cultural relativity: Michel de Montaigne. They have also engaged —with varying degrees of sympathy— the work of Emmanuel Levinas and Jacques Lacan, the two best-known modern philosophers of alterity. For didactic purposes I have foregrounded Lacan's psychoanalytic and linguistic ideas to the detriment of Levinas's ethico-philosophical stance on an *upper-case* Other, one which is by definition transcendent and ineffable. As Michel de Certeau has convincingly shown, Lacanian psychoanalysis is *not* just another commodified therapy, let alone a reduction of history to a series of psychological themes. Psychoanalysis is a historiographic operation and the main instrument of a historicist ethic which sees human time as an open-ended process of continual displacements, repressions, and unsought yet also unavoidable returns (1986: 1-7 and throughout).

French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan famously wrote in one of his shorter pieces that «the unconscious is the discourse of the Other» (1966: 379). This oft-quoted aphorism encapsulates many of Lacan's ideas on language, identity, and the unconscious. Here I will summarize the ones which I consider to be highly relevant to my discussion:

1) A first implication of saying, «the unconscious is the discourse of the Other,» is that I am what I am only in relation to what I am not. The place where «that which I am not» lies, is the unconscious, the repressed side of my personality which now and then sends me a message to let me know that I have not yet done away with it.
2) The Other is something which cannot be fully known by means of conventional reason and discourse. Rather, the Other makes itself known to us by means of strange linguistic usages, and in these cases language itself becomes *other*. For this reason, feminist writers have used the ironically deprecating phrase «hysterical discourse» and the punning witticism «the (M)Other tongue» to characterize their effort to break free of the roles demanded of women by a masculinist society.
3) What I am is determined by what I think I am not. Although I am «inhabited» and «possessed» by the Other, most of the time I am not even aware of this presence. But if I should lose the inhibitions and constraints that society places on my conduct and my thinking, the Other would quickly take possession of my consciousness. Lacan uses the language of witchcraft and mysticism (which favors such terms as «inhabited,» «possessed,» and so forth) to argue the point that individuals who historically have been in closer proximity to the transcendent Other than the average person have been called heretics and witches, or else declared insane. That is to say, although the upper-case Other predates and survives whatever constructed ethico-juridical divisions are implemented in a given society, its various manifestations are often stigmatized, functioning as a foil to the orthodox values promoted, extolled, and often even enforced by that same society. A subject who identifies with what he takes to be the mainstream of his culture and repudiates its negative counterbalances will still remain under the influence of the same forces he has rejected and located outside himself and his world, in an *other*-culture. This is the double bind that underlies Miles Philips's failed attempts at demonizing what he sees as specifically Catholic *and* Spanish types of comportment and belief.

The opposition outside/inside and the correlation between divided societies and split subjectivities are central to any articulation of the dialectic between a seemingly unified subject and the threats to that unity brought about by the presence of something unmanageable by this rational subject. Neither is the subject a self-contained, autonomous unity nor does this overwhelming presence lie outside the subject, objectified in the form of an alien culture. Along roughly these lines, I will be arguing that a large number of sixteenth-century writers (Miles Philips among them) show a pronounced tendency to project the darker aspects of their own culture and psyche onto the experiences of foreign cultures and individuals, who are then seen as the material incarnation of a frightening and destructive otherness. That is to say, with varying degrees of awareness these writers attempt to perpetuate the distinctions between external and internal realities, and between rational discourse and irrational drives.

Clearly, in the early modern period the two most important forms of alterity that caught the attention of European writers were those represented by native American cultures and by Christian heterodoxies and mysticisms. The American Indians and some unorthodox Christians were often said to be inhabited and possessed by the quintessential antagonist of Christianity—the devil. We can add to these a third type of deviant conduct that often appears in conjunction with the ethnic and religious heterogeneity found in a given domain: feminine or feminized sexuality. American Indians, religious heretics, and feminized Western men were also said to let their actions be governed by the pleasure principle rather than the superego's sense of duty. Some well-known examples of this demonization of cultural differences in English Renaissance literature can be found in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*, Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Othello*, and *The Tempest*, and,

to a lesser degree, Christopher Marlowe's *Edward II*, *Dido Queene of Carthage*, and even *Doctor Faustus*. The masculinist discourse of Renaissance humanism often turned women, pagans, heretics, and even scientists into a motley crew of sodomites, witches, and magicians. These minority groups were often thus employed as scapegoats, as the negative pole in a powerful dialectic of identity construction by which disciplinary societies periodically reinforce their collective self-image as heterosexual, church-going, law-abiding, male-centered communities.

Unlike this domesticated, lower-case other, the transcendent, upper-case Other is that which cannot be accepted into a preexistent mindset and world without radically disrupting this world's sense of self-identity and continuity. The Other cannot even be faithfully represented by means of conventional discourse, since it also challenges the ideal of a logical, linear, and rational discourse propagated by a disciplinary Western society. Can then any one form of a radical and essentially unspeakable otherness be incorporated into the discourse of Western culture without this alterity being tamed and ultimately transformed into an enabling function of Western hegemony, into a negative counterbalance? If so, then this lower-case other functions exclusively as a recognizable projection of the fears, anxieties, and misgivings that any given culture experiences about what it has repressed in the process of forging its own collective identity. Historically Europe has not shown much interest in getting to know *other*-cultures on their own terms. This is certainly one of the lessons taught by such works as Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko*, or even Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, a tragedy in which the Romans make every effort to rehabilitate Antony and spare the life of Cleopatra so that both characters can be triumphantly paraded on the streets of Rome as willingly cooperating subjects. As Octavius puts it in the last scene of the play:

> Cleopatra,
> Not what you have reserv'd, nor what acknowledg'd,
> Put we i' the roll of conquest: still be 't yours,
> Bestow it at your pleasure, and believe
> Caesar's no merchant, to make prize with you
> Of things that merchants sold. Therefore be cheer'd,
> Make not your thoughts your prisons: no, dear queen,
> For we intend so to dispose you, as
> Yourself shall give us counsel.... (5.2.178-86)

Had Octavius succeeded in disciplining the protean Cleopatra, she would have become —like the figure of the incarcerated Moctezuma that we find in Hernán Cortés's and Bernal Díaz's chronicles— the living proof of European cultural and military superiority and the recipient of Caesar's boasted Roman pity. Through Antony's and Cleopatra's suicides Octavius misses his chance at reconciling his worthy opponents to the rule of Rome. Yet, as Linda Charnes has brilliantly explained, he quickly seizes the opportunity of inscribing the self-defeated Cleopatra, in the closing parliament of the play, into the «time-worn literary tradition of women who kill themselves for love... For Octavius, such a recuperation ensures a political and symbolic, as well as martial, victory.» Cleopatra's suicide is the act that within the play «enables her to escape the 'censure' of Rome as harlot-on-parade, [and] that enables Octavius' new construction of her as a woman who dies for love,» like the legendary Carthaginian queen abandoned by Aeneas—Elissa Dido—who also does the right female thing once she has lost her erratic lover (Charnes 1993: 204 n52).[1] To summarize: Shakespeare's play is built around an interesting hesitation between an acknowledgment of

---

1 See also Charnes (1993: 144-47); Hidalgo (1997: 150-52).

alternative ways of experiencing the world and the imperial argument for the submission of Egypt to Rome, women to men, and passion to instrumental reason.

The earliest Renaissance writer to articulate a powerful critique of the Western tendency to categorize alien worlds as a foil to Christian European cultures was the sixteenth-century Frenchman Michel de Montaigne. In two short essays entitled «Des coches» and «Des cannibales» Montaigne reflected on the similarities and differences between the Old World and the New, and between ancient and Renaissance notions of virtue. In «On Coaches» he pronounces the justly famous words, which for French poststructuralist anthropology have functioned as the foundational statement on the problematics of alterity: «Notre monde vient d'en trouver un autre» [«Our world has just encountered another»] (1967: 367). This is a reworking of the more Eurocentric turn of phrase used in «On Cannibals»: «ce monde nouveau que nou venons de découvrir» [«this new world which we have just discovered»] (1967: 98). In the latter essay Montaigne claims that the two epithets most frequently used in connection with the American Indians —«barbarian» [*barbare*] and «savage» [*sauvage*]— need not imply a dehumanizing view of these peoples: the Americans are «barbarians» in the etymological sense of this term to the extent that they have customs which are different from our own, and «savages» only to the extent that they are less calculating than the Machiavellian Europeans (99).[2] Their anthropophagy is indeed less barbarous than the cruel punishments and tortures employed by the Europeans, who also neglect to care for the elderly and the sick. This is something the Amerindians would not dare to do (100-01). Montaigne further argues that the Indians behave in battle in a much more valiant and noble way than the Europeans, and that they have developed a type of oral poetry which is every bit as pleasant and as profound as the Petrarchan lyric (102-03).

Montaigne continues his exploration of the idiosyncrasies of the American peoples in «On Coaches.» In this essay he is more explicit about the identification of sixteenth-century Indian cultures with Roman virtue. Hence his comparison of the Roman chariots of Mark Antony and Heliogabalus to the golden litter of the Inca king. He also compares the magnificence of Roman engineering works to the spectacular Peruvian stone highway. Finally, the Roman notion that we are living in the Autumn of the World is compared to the Incas' catastrophist ideas about the end of their own world. Montaigne sees in the New World of the Americas a reflection of the ancient world of Roman virtue. Both worlds are removed from sixteenth-century Europe, one in space and the other in time. In «On Coaches» Montaigne also says a great deal about himself, explaining, for instance, that because of poor health he can no longer travel on horseback (1967: 363-64). He writes that in his old age, on the increasingly rare occasions when he leaves his beloved Château de Montaigne, which lies about thirty miles West of Bordeaux, he travels on a stagecoach. This is also how he gets around in the city of Paris. He regrets that he will die before the construction of the Parisian Pont-Neuf is finished (365). The Pont-Neuf was to connect the Jewish quarter to the Catholic old district, thus allowing those like Montaigne who were of mixed Catholic and Jewish descent easier access to the symbolic site of their repressed otherness.[3] Montaigne's mother,

---

[2] For a more nuanced and sophisticated account of Montaigne's play on these epithets, see de Certeau (1986: 72-73).

[3] Frame notes that the Catholic Montaigne family experienced an inner religious schism in Michel's generation (1965: 29-35). Of eight siblings—Michel being the first-born—two became Protestants: Thomas (Seigneur de Beauregard) and Jeanne (who curiously would later become the mother of a Catholic saint, Jeanne de Lestonnac). The remaining six, including the Pyrrhonist Michel, never publicly broke with the Church of Rome.

Antoinette de Louppes de Villeneuve, was of *marrano* stock: she was the daughter of the Aragonese exile Pedro López de Villanueva, who settled in Toulouse in 1492. Although in his works Montaigne makes a few neutral or at times even sympathetic comments on the customs and the persecution of the Jews, he never discusses his own Jewish roots and seems to have recorded in writing his mother's maiden name only twice (Frame 1965: 16-23). In going physically across the Pont-Neuf, Montaigne might also have enacted in his consciousness an imaginative return to the concealed branch of his family lineage, thereby coming to terms with a censored chapter in his biography, one whose absence from the text of the *Essais* attests precisely to its repression by the author.[4] To recapitulate: throughout the essay on cannibals, Montaigne combines a narrative of his frustrated journey back to his concealed religious origins in the Jewish community with that of the Europeans' experiencing for the first time the otherness of a New World which so closely resembles our classical heritage. That is to say, Montaigne uses certain unfamiliar traits of the Indians to hint, however unwittingly, at his own sense of belonging to a pre-Christian culture often stigmatized as an *other*.[5]

A second encounter between self and other in a colonial context that I want to touch on very briefly before I deal with Miles Philips's *Discourse* takes place in Bernal Díaz del Castillo's *Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España* (c. 1568; publ. 1632), which recounts the early stages of the Spanish conquest of Mexico under Hernán Cortés. Bernal Díaz was shocked by the spectacle of the Aztec sacrifices consisting in cutting open the body of the living sacrificial victim on an altar, plucking out the heart, and eating it up. Yet what horrified Bernal Díaz the most was not the inhumanity of this ritual, but the uncanny feeling of having witnessed a less traumatic version of such barbarous rites in Spain before. In Europe, that is, we do not eat our war prisoners —we simply torture and kill them and dispose of their bodies as decently as we can. Something that disturbs Bernal Díaz through several chapters of his narrative is the haunting similarity, never explicitly articulated, between the Mesoamerican Indians' ritual ingestion of their own consecrated bread and potions and the Catholic sacrament of the Eucharist. Yet what seems to unsettle even more the Spaniards' sense of cultural identity is the uncanny connection between the Aztecs' eating of their sacred bread and their ritual anthropophagy. After all, most church-going Christians also periodically eat of the symbolic body of Jesus Christ and drink of his blood with no regrets about it. In the *Historia*, this realization is preceded by a detailed description of the Aztecs' religious practices and institutions using words and references borrowed from the ecclesiastical organization of the Catholic Church: the city of Mexico is divided into «parroquias,» and each one of these has a place of retirement from civil business resembling our «monasterios»; the main temple and grounds in the monumental center of the city remind Bernal Díaz of the cathedral and «plaza» of Salamanca; and the Aztec priests wear «vestiduras largas de mantas prietas y

---

4 Hampton nicely argues that Montaigne's declared fondness for horsemanship together with his mother's Spanish origin reinforce the connection made in the essay between Montaigne's cultural identity and that of the horse-riding Spanish conquistadors (1997: 91-92).

5 Todorov, who does not consider Montaigne's censoring of his Jewish ancestry, arrives at a different conclusion in his assessment of the Frenchman's writings on the American peoples: «The Other is in fact never perceived or known. What Montaigne praises are not 'cannibals' but his own values ... If Montaigne were to perceive tomorrow that the 'cannibal' did not resemble the Greeks, he would logically have to condemn them. He wants to be a relativist; no doubt he believes he is a relativist. In reality he has never stopped being a universalist» (1993: 42). For the full argument on Montaigne's ideas on cultural diversity, exoticism, and primitivism, see Todorov (1993: 32-43, 265-70).

las capillas largas asimismo, como de dominicos, que también tiraban un poco a las de los canónigos» (Díaz del Castillo 1986: 176-77). The Indians can then variously bear a direct resemblance to sixteenth-century Christian Europe, to ancient Rome (as was the case with Montaigne), or even to the rejected other of Europe —Africa— both in its contemporaneous manifestation (the Muslim cities of the North referred to by Hernán Cortés) and in that of ancient empires (the Carthage referred to by Fray Toribio de Benavente or the Egypt called to mind by Fray Bernardino de Sahagún).[6]

This listing of analogies between the liturgies of the two cultures occupies most of chapter XCII of the *Historia*, while chapter XCIII deals with the Spaniards' building of a small Christian chapel inside the lodgings provided for them by Moctezuma in Mexico-Tenochtitlan. Although the Spaniards arrived there uninvited, Moctezuma had the good sense to treat them as royal guests and let them flaunt their own religious beliefs to avoid precipitating an armed confrontation. Thus Bernal Díaz writes: «Y en dos días teníamos nuestra iglesia hecha y la santa cruz puesta delante de los aposentos, y allí se decía misa cada día hasta que se acabó el vino» (177). The construction of the first Catholic temple in Mexico signals the beginning of a veritable competition for representation between the two cultures and a reciprocal objectification of their differences. In this connection, Stephen Greenblatt has shown how in the early stages of the European conquest of America the Europeans' perception of certain similarities between the Indians' religious worship and their own was obscured and perverted by the unconcealed mercenary goal of dispossessing the Indians of both their riches and their sense of identity. In their initial dealings with the native Amerindians, the Europeans enacted a «movement ... through identification to complete estrangement: for a moment you see yourself confounded with the other, but then you make the other become an alien object, a thing, that you can destroy or incorporate at will» (Greenblatt 1991: 135).[7] Instances of this instrumentalization of alterity are registered several times in Bernal Díaz's *Historia*, notably in chapter XCIII, in which the Spaniards overcome their feeling of wonder and sheer fright at the practices of ritual anthropophagy in the temples adjacent to their lodgings, and decide to stage the Christian spectacle of the Eucharist with the purpose of rivaling with the Aztecs. Bernal admits that their decision to celebrate the Holy Communion within the walls of Moctezuma's palace did not arise out of a sincere and spontaneous religious feeling, but rather was meant to reaffirm their shaken sense of cultural identity, and just as important, to expose the Indians in charge of guarding them to the rites and icons of Christianity:

> Y después que se acabó [el vino] cada día estábamos en la iglesia rezando de rodillas delante del altar e imágenes; lo uno, por lo que éramos obligados a cristianos y buena costumbre, y lo otro, porque Montezuma y todos sus capitanes lo viesen y se inclinasen a ello, y porque viesen el adorar y vernos de rodillas delante de la cruz, especial cuando tañíamos el Avemaría. (177)

---

6 Although Cortés allows himself to round out the description of a Mexican city-state like Churultecal by comparing it to an African metropolis, and Bernal Díaz occasionally equates Aztec temples with Muslim mosques, for the most part these authors' civic and urban analogies are with Spanish cities (Salamanca, Valladolid, and Burgos, among others). For Benavente's and Sahagún's comments see relevant passages in Xirau (1973).

7 For an alternative interpretation of this substitution of the colonizers' reality for that of the colonized, which emphasizes the remarkably high control exerted by the Europeans over the human and geographical environment they encountered in America, see chapter 1 of Pagden (1993). Unlike Greenblatt, Pagden does not see much «confusion» in any of the stages of the Europeans' dealings with the Indians.

Like Montaigne, then, Bernal Díaz has had to come into contact with another culture in order to discover a residue of rejected barbarism within himself—in his case, the anthropophagous impulse that is common to all Indoeuropean religions and the hierarchical and manipulative element built into all forms of religious worship, whether Christian or pagan. Unlike Montaigne, however, Bernal Díaz has a mercenary investment in also looking for differences between himself and the Indians, and such differences, when found, are given a universalist and pejorative significance. Hence his use, throughout the *ethnologic* chapters of the *Historia*, of the Christian categories of «infierno,» «sierpe,» and «diablo» literally to demonize the Aztecs, and his dismissal of the blood-smeared sacrificial altar as a «concavidad muy ricamente labrada la madera de ella,» which however «tenía en las paredes tantas costras de sangre y el suelo todo bañado de ello, como ... los mataderos de Castilla» (174). Bernal Díaz projects onto the reality of the Aztecs' religious rituals the images that played a negative role in the Spaniards' religious imagination: the Christian hell and the devil. The character of the devil inevitably acts as a foil to the longed-for yet unattainable Otherness of the Christian subject: the divine substance. In sum: the alterity of the Mexican Indians, which could have enabled a mutually enriching relationship had it been accepted on its own terms, is instead quickly demonized and placed in the service of a conquering and dispossessing ideology.[8]

I now turn to another sixteenth-century text collected in Richard Hakluyt's *Principall Navigations of the English Nation* (publ. 1589-1599). The title of this captivity narrative is *A Discourse Written by One Miles Philips Englishman ... Containing the Cruelties That the Spanish Government Used to Him Selfe for the Space of 15. or 16. Yeres Together*. Philips's narrative is a piece of anti-Spanish propaganda written sometime between 1582 (the year of Philips's return to England) and 1588 (the year of the Spanish Armada), and used by Hakluyt to propagate the infamous Black Legend. The *Discourse* was written and published in the years when Philip II of Spain was still the ruler of all the European settlements in the New World, and the Counter-Reformation had just been given a decisive impulse with the strengthening of the Inquisition. Quite surprisingly, Philips's first-person narrative has been consistently overlooked by modern historians of England's early trading and colonizing efforts in America. In fact, the *Discourse* remains the only source of information we have about Philips's fifteen-year stay in the Caribbean and New Spain, from 1568 to 1582. Much more is known about the trading expedition on which he was embarked in 1568: it was headed by two famous sea explorers —John Hawkins and Francis Drake— and had as its destination the Spanish colonies in America. As historian John Sugden has told the story, John Hawkins was a slave-trader in the West Indies who had great success in trading with the Spaniards despite Phillip II of Spain's prohibition of such commercial exchanges.[9] In the course of one of these schemes, Hawkins arrived in the Mexican port of San Juan de Ulloa, which served as the outlet for the nearby city of Veracruz. His three vessels were keeping guard over the tiny port's entry when a large Spanish fleet happened to arrive from Spain. Hawkins negotiated with the Viceroy of Mexico, Don Martín de Enríquez, his peaceful departure from San Juan in exchange for permission to sell some merchandise and purchase the victuals needed for the journey out. Although a pact seems to have been sealed on these terms, the Viceroy, fearful of unwanted English competition, broke his vow of immunity

---

[8] For the related question of the conquistadors' writing of their own deeds of valor to compete for riches and prestige with the old Castilian nobility, see Rodríguez García (1997).

[9] Although Sugden (1990) concentrates on Francis Drake, chapter 3 of this biography, fittingly entitled «The Troublesome Voyage of John Hawkins,» brings Hawkins center stage.

and attacked Hawkins's vessels (Rowse 1965: 9-11; Sugden 1990: 32-36; Hawkins 1907: 55-60). As a result of this attack, one of the three English ships —the «Jesus»— was badly damaged and part of its crew, including Hawkins, managed to leap to the «Minion» and stole away to the West Indies. Hawkins immediately set sail for the Galician city of Pontevedra (where he had the «Minion» repaired), and from there safely made it back to England on 25 January 1568. Philips was left behind with another 45 English sailors aboard the damaged «Jesus,» taken prisoner by the Spaniards, and sent to work as a bond-servant in the capacity of overseer of Indian miners.

Philips's account of his journey and captivity takes place in the last third of Hakluyt's compilation of travel narratives, where the focus of the collection moves from North America to the Caribbean, Mexico, and Central and South America. For the description of these Southern territories and how the Spaniards managed them, Hakluyt relies mainly on first-person narratives written by English sailors taken as hostages or captives. The concept of «captivity,» understood here as the first-person account of the hardships and isolation suffered by English settlers who were abducted by Indians yet resisted *nativization*, can be usefully applied to Philips's situation. Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse have listed a number of features characteristic of captivity narratives which I have also found in Philips's *Discourse*: the narrator's willful reduction of alien landscapes and bodies to a «blank» which generates a «lack» out of which a «longing» for «signs of the English homeland» appears; the narrator's longing is for a lost speech community of Adamic innocence which predates not just the series of «removes» from one's originary community but also Adam's Fall; and the consideration of language, family, and nation as concentric spheres of spiritual experience through which the captives reaffirm their English identity and that of their community (Armstrong and Tennenhouse 1992: 205-16). Both Miles Philips and Mary Rowlandson base their narrative authority upon their self-representations as individuals capable of holding on to their English identity when separated from their English experiential realms, and capable also of producing through writing an account of their loss of a community-based identity and their longing for returning home, which in the last analysis is also a longing for a pre-modern world and for prelapsarian Eden. In Philips's particular case, both his captors and the series of masters to whom he was given as a bond-servant made every effort to acculturate him, to make him adopt Catholicism and the Spanish language, and eventually take a Catholic, Spanish-speaking *mestiza* for his wife and mother of his children.

Hakluyt makes reference to Philips's captivity narrative only indirectly in the Preface to the First Edition of the *Principall Navigations*, where he claims that a faithful view of Mexico and the Caribbean can be gathered from «sixe verie excellent discourses of our men, whereof some for 15. or 16. whole yeers inhabited in New Spaine, and ranged the whole Countrie, wherein are disclosed the cheefest secretes of the west India, which may in time turne to our no small advantage» (Hakluyt 1907: 1.10-11). As explained by historian Richard S. Dunn, the main protagonist in many of the later narratives edited by Hakluyt was not the American environment but «the gallant English explorer ... the heroic Elizabethan seamen who passed through dangers as great as those of Columbus» (1959: 197-98). Miles Philips is one such gallant explorer, and the main dangers he passed through in the alien world of the Americas were neither an adverse physical environment nor its native inhabitants, but the first European settlers of the Caribbean and Mexican territories—the ultra-Catholic Spaniards. Like the rest of the Elizabethan adventurers bound for America, Philips, in the course of his oceanic journey, was lectured on the diabolic nature of the Spaniards and the holiness of Protestant England (Sugden 1990: 37). For sailors and officers alike, denouncing and fighting the Spaniards aboard their ships meant at

one and the same time a demonstration of Protestant fervor and zeal, an act of English patriotism, and an opportunity for financial advancement.

The conflicts between John Hawkins and the Spaniards did much to popularize both the Black Legend and the myth of the inordinate cruelty of the Spanish Inquisition in America. To counter these charges, Salvador de Madariaga produced a statistical study showing that witchcraft trials in England during the rules of Elizabeth and the first three Stuart kings resulted in more executions than all the Inquisitorial processes carried out in early modern Spanish America. Under Elizabeth Tudor, about 19% of those who came under suspicion of withcraft were burned, a percentage that jumped to 41% under James I, who was himself the author of a celebrated treatise on witchcraft, fittingly entitled *Daemonologie*.[10] By contrast, only 1% of the presumed heretics tried by the American tribunals of the Inquisition were put to death. Within this percentage must be placed the eight English subjects —three of them being shipmates of Miles Philips— executed between 1567 and 1595, all eight having a long history as pirates in the Spanish Caribbean. According to both international and Spanish law, the English had no right to be in the Gulf of Mexico and consequently were justly treated as outlaws by the Spaniards (Madariaga 1955: 220-23; Sugden 1990: 33). What seems undeniable is that a virulent anti-Spanish bias crystallized in England under the rule of Elizabeth, who authorized treacherous acts of buccaneering like those of Hawkins and Drake to satisfy the trading demands of the merchant middle class without incurring the enormous expense of organized colonial wars and settlements in America. In supporting the plunders of Hawkins and Drake, England began to develop as a strong Atlantic power at the same time as it championed a European-wide campaign against Spain's imperialist ambitions in the New World (Meinig 1986: 28-32). This evidence seems to support Richard Helgerson's consideration of Hakluyt's writings as an important catalyst in the collective enterprise (shared by writers as diverse as Edmund Spenser, Edward Coke, Michael Drayton, and Richard Hooker, among others) of constructing Elizabethan England as a paradigmatic early modern nation-state and a commercial yet paradoxically «anti-imperialist» power, a term which at the time was roughly synomymous with «anti-Spanish» (1992: 185-87). In this new socio-economic formation the aristocratic ethic characteristic of the Spanish conquistador was challenged by the economic initiative of the industrious English (Protestant) trader.

Although Miles Philips abhorred the Spaniards, such hatred did not prevent him from conversing daily with his captors to the point of acquiring native command of their language. Interestingly, he came out of his ten-year captivity an even more staunch Protestant and English patriot. Hence his interest in the *Discourse* in articulating a powerful diatribe against the abuses of the Inquisition. To this end, he insists that the Holy Office was feared and hated by the Indians, by the three monastic orders active in New Spain —Jesuits, Franciscans, and Dominicans— by all other foreigners, and even by many of the Spanish *encomenderos*.[11] Phi-

---

[10] In his study of the development of the idea of religious toleration in post-Reformation Europe from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, Kamen explains that the violence with which Elizabeth persecuted Catholic secular priests peaked between 1575 and 1585, coinciding precisely with the years of Philips's captivity (1972: 161-62).

[11] Interestingly, the first Jesuit missionaries sent to New Spain adopted a deliberately ambiguous stance on the Indians' religious syncretism, on the Spanish monarchy's political authority over the American territories, and on the utopian aspiration of arriving at a heavenly paradise on earth. The Jesuits even went so far as to represent themselves as the *other* of the Spanish monarchy: «Los jesuitas se convirtieron en los voceros de los agravios, las aspiraciones y las esperanzas criollas: hacer de la Nueva España la Otra España» (Paz 1979: 42).

lips repeatedly accuses the Inquisition of acts of cruelty, tyranny, and greed, and conflates these actions with the imperialist ambitions of Spain.[12] What is interesting in this respect is that the reduction of the Holy Office and the Spanish Crown to instances of parasitic preying would remind any sixteenth-century Spanish reader —had he the opportunity to peruse Philips's *Discourse*— precisely of the plunders of the English, in which activity Philips was a willing participant. Just as Columbus attributed bestial and inhuman acts to the Caribbean Indians to justify their extermination, so Philips attributes similar excesses to the Spaniards, thus reducing everything Spanish to diabolical inquisitorial practices.[13]

Philips managed to prosper under the supervision of the Spanish masters/employers to whom he was committed as forced labor. In point of fact, not once was this «gallant explorer» employed in heavy manual labor. First he worked as a foreman in the silver mines, and later, after his detention and trial by the Inquisition, was employed in the same capacity in the construction of a Jesuit church. In both cases he oversaw crews of Indian workers and developed a friendly relationship with his masters/employers. He also befriended the Indian mine workers, whom he was allowed to exploit in his own benefit on the only free day they were given during the week. As he had an obvious economic incentive, Philips applied himself to learning Nahuatl. As he puts it, he

> learned their language or Mexican tongue very perfectly, and had great familiaritie with many of them, whom [he] found to be a courteous and loving kind of people, ingenious and of great understanding, and they hate and abhorre the Spaniardes with all their hearts, they have used such terrible cruelties against them. (Philips 1907: 323)

Like Montaigne, Philips presents the Indians according to the stereotype of the *bon sauvage* which two centuries later was to become crucial to the articulation of Enlightenment and Romantic ideas of social integration and justice. Both authors use certain aspects of Amerindian cultures as a foil to the corresponding aspects of Western (Montaigne) and specifically Spanish society (Philips) that they wish to criticize. Montaigne is very critical of certain changes in Western societies brought about by the rise of the nation-state, namely the State's monopoly of the means of organized violence, and the widespread climate of chronic religious strife. For his part, Philips repeatedly plays out the xenophobic commonplaces that were to give rise to the Black Legend. His avowed victimization at the hands of his masters makes his self-identification with the Indians almost inevitable. Although Philips sees his own plight reflected in the enslaved condition of the Aztec Indians, he does not seem to accept, let alone state, that he has more in common with the transplanted Spaniards than with the native Amerindians. His conduct in fact illustrates the «narcissistic component of the man who sees himself in the other, without realizing that what he contemplates as his self *is* the other» (Wilden 1981: 173). Philips rightly *and* self-righteously denounces the Spaniards' cruelty without ever pausing to consider that he was himself conducting a slave-trading scheme when he was taken prisoner by the Spaniards. As Todorov has shown in his discussion of similar cases of hypocritical self-defense during the conquest and settlement of the Americas, the seemingly opposed attitudes of sym-

---

[12] While it is true that foreigners and Jews were often the most enterprising elements in the Spanish colonies in America, and that the Inquisition had the prerogative of decreeing fines and sequestrations, archival research has shown that in their judicial processes Inquisitors often displayed the qualities of fairness, reasonableness and mercy, and that almost invariably they used the confiscated goods and money in pious works and charitable foundations (Haring 1947: 189-91).

[13] This paragraph is indebted to Fernández Retamar's brilliant historical overview of the genesis and spread of the Black Legend (1989: 56-73).

pathy/understanding and hatred/destruction do complement each other, since they both aim at dispossessing the Indians and creating the conditions for a colonial situation (1984: 177-79).

When in 1564 John Hawkins received official approval for the slave trade, he merely carried into practice Elizabeth's policy of extermination and enslavement of natives of distant islands by merchants of genteel origin who liked to look at themselves as a new caste of mercantile knight-errants. Echoes of this confusion of the Elizabethan trade context and the medieval chivalric context can be traced in Book 6 of Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* (publ. 1596) —a book devoted to the virtue of «courtesie»— where an allegorical maid by the name of Serena is accidentally cast upon an island peopled only by cannibals who continually «seeke for booty» and «straungers to deuoure»:

> In these wylde deserts, where she now abode,
> There dwelt a saluage nation, which did liue
> Of stealth and spoile, and making nightly rode
> Into their neighbours borders; ne did giue
> Them selues to any trade, as for to driue
> The painefull plough, or cattell for to breed,
> Or by aduentrous marchandize to thriue;
> But on the labours of poore men to feed,
> And serue their owne necessities with others need. (6.8.35)

This is an extraordinary passage because it depicts the natives engaging in the same activity of opportunistic plunder that was in reality characteristic of the English privateers. The revealing turn of phrase used by Spenser —«adventurous merchandise»— was a euphemistic expression that designated acts of piracy supported by the English government. Plunder is here conflated with both cannibalism and pagan idolatry with the aim of demonizing everything that is not English Protestant —i.e. Spanish and Amerindian identities alike. In this passage from Spenser's poem, as the angelic Serena falls asleep she is approached by a group of cannibals, whose «Priest ... vow[s her] to the gods.» As they prepare for the «sacrifize to th' infernall feends,» they place Serena «by the Altar» and the Priest produces «a naked knife/ Readie to launch her brest, and let out loued life» (6.8.48-50). In all likelihood, Spenser is here dwelling on the early eyewitness accounts of the exploration of the Caribbean, perhaps even on the widely circulated account by Chistopher Columbus. The Admiral of the Ocean Sea set forth in his *Diario del primer viaje* the first extant description of Hispaniola (Haiti), where «avía hombres de un ojo y otros con hoçicos de perros que comían los hombres, y que en tomando uno lo degollavan y le bevían la sangre y le cortavan su natura» (Colón 1982: 51). In other words, Spenser, in the middle of a chivalric romance and immediately after a pastoral episode in Book 6 of his work, sends his reader back to the primal scene of the sixteenth-century colonial imaginary, which constructs all Amerindian peoples as cannibals, thereby providing an excuse to justify their destruction along with that of more peaceful natives.[14] In Spenser's text, the gallant Sir Calepine arrives on the scene of the intended human sacrifice in time to free the virtuous Serena, kill the cannibals with his mighty sword, and so restore the Christian rule so vehemently advocated throughout the poem. Clearly, Spenser, whose political career centered on the English plantations in Ireland, locates in the other at hand— the canni-

[14] For a trenchant critique of the colonialist myth of the Caribbean cannibals, see Fernández Retamar (1989: 6-9).

bals of his imaginary island— the same sanguinary impulse that makes the first stage of a colonialist enterprise possible.

Philips went quickly from actively cooperating in the Spaniards' exploitation of the Indians to becoming himself the victim of the Spaniards' acts of plunder. In 1575, four years after the establishing of the Inquisition in New Spain, Philips was publicly denounced as a «Lutheran heretick,» dispossessed of the wealth he had accumulated exploiting the Indians, and sent by way of penance to a Jesuit monastery. There he was given employment as overseer of the Indian workers who were building a new church near the monastery. Other Englishmen were employed in the kitchen of different Catholic missions or as personal assistants to prominent Dominican and Franciscan friars. All three groups —the friars, the Indian slaves, and the English captives— hated and feared the Holy Office yet treated each other «very courteously» (Philips 1907: 324). In the *Discourse* the monasteries function in the dual or duplicitous way characteristic of modern institutions: as corrective apparatuses designed to reconcile penanced heretics to the same dogma they had previously violated; and as sites of resistance in which, under the appearance of ritual practices of penance, the violators can carry on with their subversive practices.[15] Thus, from the moment Philips dons the infamous sanbenito, which paradoxically invests him with the dignity of a penitent, he becomes immune to charges of heresy. What Pierre Bourdieu calls the «habitus» of a subject —his internalization of the perceptions and actions peculiar to the members of the group in which he is immersed as if they were objective conditionings (Bourdieu 1990: 53, 56-57)— is here literalized and materialized into a penitent's habit. Philips's sanbenito functions accordingly in at least two conflicting ways: (1) as an external manifestation of the introspective process of acculturation to which the Inquisition subjects him; and (2) as a protective shield under which he can more easily exercise the arts of dissimulation to defear precisely the designs of the Inquisition. It seems that the Holy Office made the crucial mistake, characteristic of early modern institutions that rely heavily upon ritual practices, of assuming that, in destroying the *external* manifestations of Philips's cultural heterogeneity —his English prayers and clothes— he would also surrender his conscience. The Inquisitors did not anticipate Philips's *understanding* of the other; he literally *stands underneath* the external signs of the force seeking to acculturate him —his sanbenito and his Latin prayers— in order to acknowledge their antagonistic stance and, in the process of so doing, resisting assimilation. That is to say, he familiarizes himself with the ritual and mechanical aspects of the Spanish other —with the public display in Catholic symbols in the temples— to avoid a direct confrontation with more instrumental and personalized forms of aggression such as the process of torture.[16] This second type of contact would have involved a violation of Philips's sense of self through arbitrary acts of verbal and physical violence. Since Philips repeatedly fancies himself a gallant explorer and a knight-errant of sorts, he must have felt unusually threatened by the Inquisitors' habitual practice of flogging and at times even burning their prisoners to turn them into *willing* interlocutors in the interrogations. Through disciplinary processes such as mandatory schooling and professional training an early modern nation-state can make its subjects internalize certain power

---

[15] My account of these disciplinary institutions owes a great deal to Foucault (1978). For a very stimulating discussion of the Spanish Inquisition vis-a-vis Foucault's archeological practices, see Harpham (1994).

[16] The last two sentences have been influenced by Bourdieu's articulation of the ways in which controlling institutions perform ritual displays of transgressive acts with the purpose of making the whole community participate in the disciplining of the violators (1990: 96-97, 238-39). See also Foucault (1978: 68).

structures; through the process of torture, however, it betrays its own repressive commitment to modes of corrective justice rather than inculcation, and to the use of brute force rather than enlightened reason (de Certeau 1986: 40-43).[17]

After the completion of his five-year sentence in the Jesuit monastery Philips was brought, along with the other English penitents, before the chief Inquisitor of New Spain and quickly reconciled to the Catholic faith in a ritual which involved the hanging up of their sanbenitos but no further examination of their faith. It is as if their long exposure to the ritualized rhythms of monastic life had somehow affected their habitus.[18] The new disciplinary constraints consisted in coercing them into advantageous marriages with *mestiza* women. The children born of this marriage would of course quickly internalize the Spanish component of their tricultural heritage, since Spanish would have been the common language of all family members. Marriage contracts are just one means of controlling individual subjects through their participation in forms of biological, cultural, and social reproduction. When a subject participates in one of these mechanisms, he willingly submits to the established order and its guardians (in Philips's case, the chief Inquisitor) in exchange for «powers and privileges, [to be transmitted,] maintained or enhanced, to the next generation» (Bourdieu 1990: 160-61). Philips of course refuses to participate in this system of biological and ideological reproduction, choosing instead the life of a fugitive. In undertaking this course of action, he becomes free to attempt his long-awaited return to the English speech community from which he had been separated in the first place.

Now was this Miles Philips who ran away from the Inquisition after what we may call a five-year «reconciliation captivity» the same Miles Philips who first arrived in New Spain after being trained to hate everything Spanish? And how familiar was Philips with Catholic doctrine and liturgy at the time of his arrival in the Spanish colonies in 1568? Scattered through his narrative are many clues suggesting that Philips knew enough about Catholicism, and was sufficiently skilled in the arts of reverse psychology and dissimulation, repeatedly to fool the Inquisition. First there is his knowledge of languages: he is perfectly bilingual in English and Spanish, and soon becomes fluent in the Nahuatl language, which no doubt turns him into an extremely useful instrument of empire for the Spaniards. This linguistic ability also allows him to pass for a Spaniard after he becomes a runaway captive, first in Mexico and later in Seville, where he stays for three months employed by a Spanish «workemaster» as a «weaver of taffataes» before his eventual return to England on an English ship in 1582 (Philips 1907: 335-36). Furthermore, although Philips does not openly admit to his proficiency in Latin, he may have been capable of reciting the Creed in Latin, which in turn would have been seen by the tribunal of the Inquisition as a vestige, or at the very least an index, of his former Catholicism. Philips explains that the most decisive evidence of Catholic orthodoxy the English captives could adduce in their favor to avoid the torment of the rack was their command of Latin liturgy:

> During which time of our imprisonment, at the first beginning we were often called before the Inquisitors alone, and there severely examined of our faith, and commanded to say the

[17] For a completely different view of torture, which sees this punitive practice as in fact reinforcing the concealed mechanisms of disciplinary power, see Foucault (1978: 54-58). On the generalized practice of torture in early modern England and its appearance in discourses of imperialism not unlike that of Miles Philips, see Greenblatt (1990b: 11-15).

[18] The medieval monastic communities were the original localized sites where the modern mechanisms of surveillance, division of labor, and work routine were organized around time-tables and the ritual of prayer (Foucault 1978: 149-52).

> Pater Noster, the Ave Maria, & the Creed in Latin, which God knoweth a great number of us could not say, otherwise then in the English tongue. And having the said Robert Sweeting [an English Catholic born of a Spanish woman and a resident of New Spain] alwayes present with them for an interpreter, he made report for us, yt in our own countrey speech we could say them perfectly, although not word for word as they were in Latin. (1907: 319)

These English sailors were also questioned on matters of doctrine, including the delicate subject of transubstantiation. Philips makes it clear that, when charged with being a Lutheran heretic by the Holy Office, either one complied with everything one was instructed or requested to do or else he risked being racked and even burnt at the stake:

> Then did they proceede to demand of us upon our othes what we did beleeve of the Sacrament, & whether there did remaine any bread or wine after the words of consecration, yea or no, and whether we did not beleeve that the host of bread which the priest did hold up over his head, and the wine that was in the chalice, was the very true and perfect body & blood of our Saviour Christ, yea or not: To which if we answered not yea, then was there no way but death. (1907: 319-20)

These examinations were conducted individually, and each person was administered a punishment in accord with their varying degrees of familiarity with Roman liturgy.[19] When Philips recounts the punishments inflicted on his fellow Englishmen, he explains how three of them were «burnt to ashes,» while sixty-one received between 100 and 300 stripes and committed «for slaves to the galleys.» Only seven sailors were spared any form of physical punishment and were instead «adjudged to serve in a monasterie» for 3 to 5 years. Philips could count himself among the lucky ones: as he waited to be interrogated, he brushed up on his Latin so that he could recite the Creed with great flair and conviction. He very likely became a dissimulator to avoid being racked. Although dissimulation is very elusive and hard to prove, it is safe to say that an individual engages in this type of behavior whenever he adopts a course of action contrary to his presumed beliefs, which nevertheless spares him either persecution or an open confrontation with potential adversaries (Zagorin 1990: 13-14). Dissimulators abound among negotiators, emissaries, and go-betweens. Twice in his narrative does Philips become an interpreter, a go-between who mediates between the two *other*-cultural worlds —those of the conquering Spaniards and the conquered Indians— to which he proudly remains an outsider throughout. Philips translates for the Spaniards the external signs of the Indian and English otherness, thus controlling the symbolic exchanges between three different cultures. In this capacity he is reminiscent of the Jewish *trujamanes* of Medieval Spain, who were employed by such rulers as Alfonso X El Sabio and Jaume I El Conqueridor as diplomatic negotiators and interpreters with the rival Muslim rulers. Now how does Philips's linguistic competence correlate with his experience of acculturation? Did his consciousness ever become Indianized or (to use a sixteenth-century word) «Hispaniolized,» made Spanish as he became increasingly immersed in the words and the rituals of his habitual interlocutors? And did his professed Protestantism ever risk relapsing into Catholicism?

In his study of otherness and communication in sixteenth-century Spanish America, Todorov puts forth an argument for the «inclusiveness» of the Indian mentality, which in his opinion accepts alien worships on an equal footing with native beliefs. This contrasts with

---

[19] For a good survey of the types of trials and examinations conducted by the tribunals of the Inquisition in sixteenth-century Spain, and of the most common punishments imposed on the convicted heretics upon completion of the inquisitorial procedures, see chapters 9 and 10 of Kamen (1985).

the «exclusiveness» of the European mentality, which rejects other worships and favors alliances between individuals rather than their common belonging to a larger community (Todorov 1984: 119-23, 251). In the European ideology of disciplinary power and competitive individualism, cultural diversity is objectified, reduced mainly to a series of analytical variables that the Europeans manage by means of an economy of translation and dissimulation. It could be argued further that Philips represents an early example of possessive individualism of the sort epitomized by Robinson Crusoe. Financially speaking, he makes the most of being held prisoner against his will, employing his time in industrious projects and thus finding —as it were by default— an alternative purpose for his crossing over to America. When after the completion of his five-year period of penance he runs away from the Spanish settlement to avoid marrying (like the rest of the reconciled English captives) a Catholic *mestiza*, Philips momentarily considers going back to work in the mines to make his fortune again. He reasons in this manner even though his hatred of the Spanish remains, by his own confession, intact. Eventually, however, he decides against going back to the mines for fear that the Inquisition would again confiscate his acquired riches:

> I could never throughly [sic] settle my selfe to marry in that countrey, although many faire offers were made unto me of such as were of great abilitie and wealth, but I could have no liking to live in that place, where I must every where see and know such horrible idolatrie committed, and durst not once for my life speake against it: and therefore I had alwayes a longing and desire to this my native countrey: and, to returne and serve again in the Mines where I might have gathered great riches and wealth, I very well saw that at one time or another I should fall againe into the danger of that divelish Inquisition, and so be stript of all, with losse of life also. (Philips 1907: 325)

Just as Bernal Díaz had seen the workings of his god's antagonist —the «diablo»— in the Aztecs' barbarous sacrifices, so Philips sees the «devil» in the Spaniards' love of wealth and physical punishments. Although the Inquisition seems to have acted in America in a much more lenient and relaxed manner than in Spain, Philips claims otherwise. We are here confronted with what Lacey Baldwin Smith has called the «Big Brother mentality» of large segments of Tudor societies since Henry VIII's accession. The governments of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I seem to have relied on a complex system of espionage and court and community surveillance to detect and neutralize heretics. In Elizabethan England, the English Catholics and the numerous foreign Jesuits arrived from Spain and Rome to give support to the persecuted Catholics were said to be driven strictly by plunder and evil, and were accordingly identified with the devil:

> The dark recesses of the human mind became Lucifer's chosen abode where he taught and practised «policy,» or what he cleverly disguised as the sound application of foresight and calculation to the acquisition of power and wealth, but which the godly knew to be pride, dissimulation, and Machiavellian cunning devoid of moral and religious standards, the negation of legitimacy, honour, loyalty, love, and order. (Smith 1986: 160-61, 185)

Philips attributes to the Inquisition the same vices that the Spaniards and the English Catholics attributed at the time to the persecuting society that had come into being in Protestant England: greed, dissimulation, and a thoroughly secular and instrumental approach to human affairs.[20] At this point in the *Discourse*, then, the Inquisition —the most em-

---

[20] Hartman concludes his study of Tudor England as an increasingly persecuting society with these words: «Si 'inquisitorial' significa inmiscuirse en los secretos del alma de los demás y llegar hasta las raíces religiosas y morales de su conciencia con amenazas, tormentos y ejecuciones, entonces los monarcas de la Inglaterra de los Tudor fueron indudablemente inquisitoriales» (1984: 585).

blematic Counter-Reformation institution and a conspicuous and ambiguous site of irrational and threatening otherness for the Protestants —becomes only an economic force, in fact a competitor in the process of plundering the American colonies. The fear of losing everything one has acquired, the urge to extrapolate from a small personal loss the utter perdition of one's country, and in general a «commitment always to believe and look for the worst» are among the acknowledged symptoms of political hysteria and paranoia that afflicted English life between the years of Henry VIII's separation from Rome and those of James I's increasingly tolerant attitude toward his Catholic subjects (Smith 1986: 70, 165). This pessimistic and at times even catastrophist approach to one's own financial well-being had, at least among the more ambitious members of the London merchant class, another more immediate referent: the series of failed trading expeditions to the Guyana and the Caribbean between 1580 and 1600. Shakespeare himself echoes this feeling in 3.2 of *The Merchant of Venice* (1598; publ. 1600). In this play a young merchant adventurer called Bassanio organizes a trading scheme overseas in which his older friend Antonio invests and loses the money he borrows from the usurer Shylock for that purpose. Antonio takes this loan because he had previously invested all his fortune in other trading ventures taking place concurrently with Bassanio's. After he has learned about the wreck of all of the ships sponsored by Antonio, Bassanio complains to Portia of his friend's financial loss with these words:

> I have engag'd myself to a dear friend,
> Engag'd my friend to his mere enemy
> To feed my means. Here is a letter lady,
> The paper as the body of my friend,
> And every word in it a gaping wound
> Issuing life-blood. But is it true Salerio?
> Hath all his ventures fail'd? what not one hit?
> From Tripolis, from Mexico and England,
> From Lisbon, Barbary, and India,
> And not one vessel scape the dreadful touch
> Of merchant-marring rocks? (3.2.260-70)

Shakespeare incurs the anachronism of assigning to Renaissance Venice commercial interests in Mexico, where the English were at the time of the play's composition trying to thwart Spain's imperial efforts. Indeed, «Mexico and England» appear connected in the same verse, therefore implying that Spain and England are rivals in the colonial enterprise of exploiting the New World of the Americas. Bassanio, who despite his Venetian citizenship is consistently characterized throughout the play as the quintessential Elizabethan «gallant adventurer,» dreams of achieving through trade an honorable social status that allows him to marry into the Venetian nobility. Yet the only mercantile practices that the English conducted with America at the time of Shakespeare's writing of *The Merchant of Venice* were far from honorable, since they consisted largely of slave-trade schemes and acts of plunder and piracy against Spanish ships. As late as the turn of the sixteenth century, individuals such as Miles Philips and Shakespeare's Bassanio could still operate in this duplicitous manner as, on the one hand, chivalric adventurers and patriotic merchants, and, on the other hand, ruthless and greedy buccaneers. This split was made possible in part by their projection of the less noble aspects of their identity onto the groups stigmatized as an external and viscerally hated other: the Spaniards, the Jews, and the barbaric non-European peoples, among others.

By way of conclusion, I want to go back to the working articulations of alterity sketched out at the outset of this essay. The Other, says Lacan, is what I think I am not, what

I simultaneously try to invoke and fend off by means of language but which gets back at me independently of my will. The discovery of the New World provided Europeans, who were used to implementing exclusionary notions of identity, with the opportunity to correlate the ineffable Otherness of their metaphysical pursuits with the (lower-case) cultural otherness of the native Amerindians, to see what they loathed the most about themselves objectified in the bodies and the customs of non-European peoples. This projection was undoubtedly reinforced by the fact that these peoples were also removed from the Christian world in actual space and also in time, at least to the extent that they were widely held to be *primitive*.

Oral and literate cultures alike inhabit a world of signs in which various forms of otherness prevent their members from developing a fixed identity. In the narratives of the conquest of America, all too often an instrumental motive (e.g., the acquisition of riches, survival, revenge) leads the Western subject to adopt a thoroughly antagonistic stance toward all forms of otherness, thereby precluding the occurrence of meaningful cultural transfers. This was certainly the case with many of the Spanish conquistadors (Hernán Cortés and Bernal Díaz among them), and perhaps for the same reason there are surprisingly few early modern texts written in or about the Americas in which ego-shattering experiences of alterity of the sort narrated by Mary Rowlandson take center stage. For Philips the process of learning Spanish and learning about the Spaniards, like that of learning Nahuatl and learning about the Aztec Indians, never becomes an epistemological object, let alone a means of self-revelation. Rather, to him this process means only an excuse to hold on to his preexistent cultural identity and postpone an examination of the constructedness (the false consciousness, so to speak) of that identity. In learning Spanish and endlessly saying his Catholic prayers under the supervision of benign Jesuit priests, Philips managed to conceal the fragility of his English Protestant identity and so obtain certain benefits (economic, social, and judicial) that he otherwise would not have had. The false consciousness of Philips's English Protestant ideology alternates, through the practice of dissimulation, with the falsehood of his reconciliation.

There is no such thing as *the* authentic history of the subject.[21] We have hardly any reliable information about Miles Philips, and what we know about his experiences in America derives from his own personal narrative or else depends on the assumption that during his lifetime he underwent experiences analogous to those written about by other contemporaneous explorers and privateers. We may even conjecture what his life may have been like in England prior to his crossing over to America with Hawkins. It bears remembering in this connection that Henry VIII's break with Rome was not endorsed by Parliament's legislation until 1534, and that the first reforming bishops were consecrated only in 1535. If Miles Philips was about 30 years of age when he was embarked on Hawkins's «Jesus» bound for the Spanish American colonies, then he was born in what was still a Roman Catholic country. His childhood experiences must have included at the very least the witnessing —if not the direct experiencing— of episodes of religious persecution. Acts of persecution make the persecuted ones especially sensitive to any threats to their physical integrity: they consider themselves in terms of images of their bodies. This fixation with the body is also an acknowledged trait of the narcissistic personality in its development from

[21] When confronted with the task of defining himself, the speaking subject often attempts an unproblematic «exegesis» of his personal history, but this exegetical effort is thwarted or at the very least belied by traces of the censored chapter as they re-appear intermittently and fragmentarily at different points in his narrative (Lacan 1966: 270; 1977: 50). For an account of Freudian analysis along the same narratological lines, see de Certeau (1986: 26-27).

the formative mirror stage to the unleashing of aggressivity. Philips is very self-conscious about the way in which his body can be violated and/or misrepresented, as can be seen throughout his narrative from the early scenes of warfare, undressing, and torture to the episode of his escape, when he adopts several disguises and imitates different Spanish accents to perfection. Philips says he was the only one of the surviving English captives who was not tortured, who learned the language of the enemy so that he could hide what he thinks is his own otherness, and who neither married nor befriended anybody, not even his fellow English prisoners, who might also have been infected by the Catholic demon.

Consciously or not, Philips displays the unmanageable conduct characteristic of the aggressively narcissistic personality of the feudal lords opposed to the centralizing pretensions of the early modern absolutist State. Among the features of this personality, which perhaps are best exemplified in Elizabethan England by historical figures such as Robert Lord Essex and Sir Walter Ralegh (and in Shakespearean drama, by Hamlet and the two Richards), are a nostalgia for images of personal autonomy and control over one's surroundings, and a tendency to see anyone who opposes one's will as either an antagonist or a competitor. As explained by Lacan, the narcissistic individual «cannot bear the thought of being freed by anyone other than [him]self» (1966: 105; 1977: 13). Philips's symptoms of sexual regression (he is the only one who does not take a wife), paranoia, and obsessive acquisitiveness often displace the primal instinct for survival as the main motive of his actions. Indeed, Philips's attribution to the Inquisition of an acquisitive mentality is a projection of his own mercantile ethic, as is his paranoid reaction against all the obstacles encountered by his will. If he was about 30 years of age when he was made captive, then England was still officially a Catholic nation when he was born and so he belonged to the English generation who experienced first-hand the trauma of being exposed to contradictory doctrines at home, at school, and in church. In other words, Philips might have encountered *other* inquisitorial mentalities and institutions in England prior to his landing in America. It is a striking coincidence that Philips arrived in America in the year the English Parliament passed a statute which sentenced to death any English subject ordained abroad as priest who remained in England longer than forty days. Perez Zagorin has sketched out a narrative of the vicissitudes that the English Jesuit priests sent in disguise into England from Spain or Rome had to go through to escape their death sentences:

> They were forced to dress as laymen, use false names, and pretend to various occupations. They had to move for safety from one place to another, find refuge in Catholic households willing to risk receiving them, and secure hiding places for themselves in the event of search. They had to be prepared to respond to dangerous questioning and to be ready for arrest at any moment. (1990: 189)

These are exactly the same precautions and habits Philips had to adopt from the moment he decided to run away to avoid being «reconciled» to the Catholic faith through the bourgeois technology of marriage and reproduction within a *criolla* family. Armstrong and Tennenhouse have argued that seventeenth-century Englishmen who had undergone a prolonged experience of acculturation among the North American Indians —a physical as well as emotional encounter with an *other*-community— were easily reinserted back into their originary European community because such virtues as endurance, will power, resourcefulness, and determination in the face of adversity were at the time being extolled as the chief qualities of the English entrepreneurial ethic. The proverbial example of this ethic is furnished by Robinson Crusoe. In the case of women (e.g. Mary Rowlandson), the traumatic experience of captivity was recuperated instead by means of the woman's return, at the end of her captivity, to the domestic and familial sphere in the Old World and the transformation of her experience of separation into a written account of nostalgia for a paradisal family.

To conclude, Miles Philips's *Discourse* provides a textbook example of at least three developments characteristic of early modern England, a culture in which the exiled individual was variously confronted with adverse geographical and human environments: (1) the extreme reactions of a narcissistic personality which reveals itself in contact with that environment and the threats it poses for the integrity of the ego; (2) the unwitting projection of the paranoid politics of Elizabethan England onto the same environment, in which persecution and dissimulation become common situations; and (3) the imperial rivalry between England and Spain, and their respective ideologies of conquest and means for reproducing them. These three preexistent circumstances jointly provide a pre-text for Philips's oblique engagement with the otherness of America. Ultimately, however, it is almost impossible to ascertain the degree of Philips's permeability to the threats and the allurements of the Other, in either its American or its Spanish manifestations as a watered-down, objectified other. This interpretive impasse is aggravated by the fact that the *Discourse* is filled with instances of symbolic representations which do not allow much leeway to the subject moving back and forth between two or more cultural environments. The rituals of the Inquisition, the task of translating for the Spaniards, the various forms of camouflage and dissimulation—these are all instances of false involvements in the transfers between cultures, since their unquestionable potential for disengaging the subject from its originary culture is attenuated by Philips's two driving motivations: survival and greed. The *Discourse* thus registers and promotes images which do not seek to enable the reader's direct acquaintance with experiences of otherness, but rather act mechanically upon what Philips conceives beforehand as a harmlessly predictable and controllable *other*-world.

WORKS CITED

Armstrong, Nancy, and Leonard Tennenhouse 1992: *The Imaginary Puritan: Literature, Intellectual Labor, and the Origins of Personal Life*. Berkeley: U of California P.

Bourdieu, Pierre 1990: *The Logic of Practice*. Trans. and ed. Richard Nice. Stanford: Stanford UP.

Charnes, Linda 1993: *Notorious Identity: Materializing the Subject in Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

Colón, Cristóbal 1982: *Textos y documentos completos*. Ed. Consuelo Varela. Madrid: Alianza.

de Certeau, Michel 1986: *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Intro. Wlad Godzich. Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota P.

Díaz del Castillo, Bernal 1986: *Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España*. c. 1568. Ed. Joaquín Ramírez Cabañas. Mexico: Porrúa.

Dunn, Richard S. 1959: Seventeenth-Century English Historians of America. *Seventeenth-Century America: Essays in Colonial History*. Ed. James Morton Smith. Chapel Hill: U. of North Carolina P. 195-225.

Fernández Retamar, Roberto 1989: *Caliban and Other Essays*. Trans. Edward Baker. Intro. Fredric Jameson. Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota P.

Foucault, Michel 1978: *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon.

Frame, Donald M. 1965: *Montaigne: A Biography*. New York: Harcourt.

Greenblatt, Stephen J. 1990a: Culture. *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. Chicago: U. of Chicago P. 225-32.

— 1990b: *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture*. New York: Routledge.

— 1991: *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: U. of Chicago P.

Hakluyt, Richard 1907: *The Principall Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*. 1589-1599. London: Dent. 8 vols.

Hampton, Timothy 1997: The Subject of America: History and Alterity in Montaigne's «Des Coches.» *The Project of Prose in Early Modern Europe and the New World*. Ed. Elizabeth Fowler and Roland Greene. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 80-103.

Haring, C.H. 1947: *The Spanish Empire in America*. New York: Harcourt.

Harpham, Geoffrey Galt 1994: So... What *Is* Enlightenment? An Inquisition into Modernity. *Critical Inquiry* 20: 524-56.

Hartman, Thomas R. 1984: La represión intelectual y religiosa en la Inglaterra de los Tudor. *Inquisición española y mentalidad inquisitorial*. By Ángel Alcalá et al. Barcelona: Ariel. 575-86.

Hawkins, John 1907: *The Third Troublesome Voyage of the Right Worshipfull Sir John Hawkins, with the Jesus of Lubec, the Minion, and Foure Other Ships, to the Parts of Guinea, and the Coasts of Tierra Firma, and Nueva Espanna, Anno 1567 & 1568*. In vol. 7 of Hakluyt, *Principall Navigations* 53-62.

Helgerson, Richard 1992: *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England*. Chicago: U. of Chicago P.

Hidalgo, Pilar 1997: *Shakespeare posmoderno*. Seville: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla.

Kamen, Henry 1985: *Inquisition and Society in Spain in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. 1965. Bloomington: Indiana UP.

— 1972: *The Rise of Toleration*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lacan, Jacques 1966: *Écrits*. Paris: Seuil.

— 1977: *Écrits: A Selection*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton.

Madariaga, Salvador de 1955: *El auge del Imperio Español en América*. Buenos Aires: Sudamericana.

Meinig, D.W. 1986: *Atlantic America, 1492-1800*. Vol. 1 of *The Shaping of America: A Geographical Perspective on 500 Years of History*. New Haven: Yale UP.

Montaigne, Michel de 1967: *Oeuvres complètes*. Ed. Robert Barral and Pierre Michel. Paris: Seuil.

Pagden, Anthony 1993: *European Encounters with the New World: From Renaissance to Romanticism*. New Haven: Yale UP.

Paz, Octavio 1979: Nueva España. Orfandad y legitimidad. *El ogro filantrópico. Historia y política, 1971-1978*. Barcelona: Seix Barral. 38-52.

Philips, Miles 1907: *A Discourse Written by One Miles Philips Englishman ... Containing the Cruelties That the Spanish Government Used to Him Selfe for the Space of 15. or 16. Yeres Together*. c. 1582-1584. In vol. 6 of Hakluyt, *Principall Navigations* 296-336.

Rodríguez García, José María 1997: From the Communal «We» to the Individual «I»: The Rhetoric of Self-Legitimation in Bernal Díaz's *Historia*. *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos* 31: 475-503.

Rowse, A.L. 1965: *The Elizabethans and America*. New York: Harper.

Shakespeare, William 1954: *Antony and Cleopatra*. 1608. Ed. M.R. Ridley. The Arden Shakespeare. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

— 1955: *The Merchant of Venice*. 1600. Ed. John Russell Brown. The Arden Shakespeare. London: Methuen.

Smith. Lacey Baldwin 1986: *Treason in Tudor England: Politics and Paranoia*. Princeton: Princeton UP.

Spenser, Edmund 1981: *The Faerie Queene*. 1590-1596. Ed. Thomas P. Roche, Jr., and C. Patrick O'Donnell, Jr. New Haven: Yale UP.

Sugden, John 1990: *Sir Francis Drake*. New York: Holt.

Todorov, Tzvetan 1984: *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Harper.

— 1993: *On Human Diversity: Nationalism, Racism, and Exoticism in French Thought*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

Wilden, Anthony 1981: *Lacan and the Discourse of the Other*. In *Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis*. By Jacques Lacan. Trans. with notes and commentary Anthony Wilden. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP. 159-311.

Xirau, Ramón, ed. 1973: *Idea y querella de la Nueva España. Las Casas, Sahagún, Zumárraga y otros*. Madrid: Alianza.

Zagorin, Perez 1990: *Ways of Lying: Dissimulation, Persecution, and Conformity in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.