

CONTENIDO/ TABLE OF CONTENTS

HOFSTRA HISPANIC REVIEW
VOLUME 3, OTOÑO / FALL 2006

ENSAYO/ESSAY

Dossier:

Special Issue:
Positionalities in Colonial Latin American Studies
Edited by Benita Sampedro Vizcaya

Benita Sampedro Vizcaya (Hofstra University), *Introduction*

Selection:

David Rojinsky: "Found in Translation: Writing Beyond Hybridity in Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca's *Naufragios*"

Rocío Cortés: "Motecuzoma/Huemac y Quetzalcoatl/Cortés: referencia mítica sobre el fin del imperio mexica en la *Crónica mexicana* de don Hernando de Alvarado Tezozomoc"

Fernando Gómez: "Of Imperial Reason in the Hispanic Atlantic circa 1550, or the "Antijovio" of Gonzalo Jiménez de Quesada"

Orlando Betancor: "Decolonizing Material Culture: Colonialism and Will to Technology"

DIÁLOGOS/DIALOGUES

Gonzalo Millán con José Angel Leyva
Santago Roncagliolo con Alberto Buzaldi

VOCES/VOICES

César Vallejo, Clayton Eshelman, Hart Crane, Jeannette Clariond, Oscar Hahn, Roberto Ampuero, Forrest Gander, Valerie Mejer, Hugo Gutiérrez Vega, Eduardo Chirinos, Edmundo Paz Soldán, Jorge Eduardo Benavides, Silvia Eugenia Castellero, Ana Merino, Montserrat Álvarez, Guadalupe Wernicke, Juan Domingo Argüelles, Efraín Bartolomé, José María Memet, Leland Guyer

NOTAS/RESEÑAS/REVIEWS

Beatriz Curia sobre Zulma Palermo

Hebe Beatriz Molina sobre Graciela Batticuore, Klaus Gallo, y Jorge Myers

Roger Santiviáñez sobre Luís Correa-Díaz

Cristián Gómez O. sobre *La mitad del cuerpo sonríe. Antología de la poesía peruana contemporánea*

Galia Ospina sobre Harold Alvarado Tenorio

Carmen Ollé sobre Rosina Valcárcel

Mariella Nigro sobre Rafael Courtoisie

HOFSTRA HISPANIC REVIEW
REVISTA DE LITERATURAS Y CULTURAS HISPANICAS
DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

Miguel Ángel Zapata
Director

Alberto Escalante
Diseño Gráfico

Prohibida la reproducción de esta revista por cualquier medio,
total o parcialmente, sin permiso expreso de los editores.

Derechos reservados

ISSN: 1558-7487

OF IMPERIAL REASON IN THE HISPANIC ATLANTIC CIRCA 1550, OR THE “ANTIJOVIO” OF GONZALO JIMÉNEZ DE QUESADA

Fernando Gómez

Hofstra University

The *Antijovio* is a clear manifestation of Mannerism in Spain.

J.A. Maravall, *Estado moderno y mentalidad social (siglos XV a XVIII)*, (1972)

But in any business and especially in those relating to History, one has to tell the truth to the very letter.

Gonzalo Jiménez de Quesada, *El Antijovio*, (1952)

This essay constitutes a brief reintroduction of the problem of Mannerism within the bigger problem of the history of culture, and both within the perennial problem of historicity. Adopting a strong contextualist disposition with a keen eye on the immediate Anglo-American surroundings, what follows is an early engagement with why and how (political) Mannerism finds itself *in partibus infidelium*.⁴³ Outside professional and university life, the very name of Mannerism will not come easily to the demotic U.S. English tongue; it is an odd figure with no visible trace of a good name in the street. The same disconcerting obliviousness applies to the bigger cousin in the ‘Latin’ or ‘Hispanic’ family, the Baroque, bad or uncommon or foreign excess

in relation to the operative norm made native in official government buildings and monuments, the neo-classical revival via the later tradition of the Enlightenment. The suggested timespace here, however, is the sixteenth century, the moment of Mannerism, inevitably juxtaposed to the seventeenth-century moment of the Baroque, inside a truly monumental dimension of historical geography: the Hispanic Atlantic. The suggestion here is that political realism dovetails with the Mannerist distortion, or crisis, of the historical revival of Greek and Latin normativity, the Renaissance (Hauser 1965). Mannerism thus constitutes one possibly valid name for the early modern and colonial receptivity of the hegemonic matrix of aesthetic expressivity that could perhaps

⁴³ Mannerism has been allocated this position in most artistic histories and conventional literary territories typically mapped out by conventional units, call them the (foreign) humanities, within the profoundly unstable environments of higher learning. See Aronowitz (2000).

be circumscribed with the nomenclature of Latin Christianity.

Let us imagine our main protagonist, Gonzalo Jiménez de Quesada (1506–1579), the perhaps infamous *conquistador* of Nueva Granada (present-day Colombia) and also perhaps famous founder of Bogotá, faithfully defending the good name of his Roman Emperor in the historical vicinity of the sack of Rome by imperial troops (1527). It is in the aftermath of these ruins, that our man of arms and letters produces a historical narrative called *Antijovio* (1567).⁴⁴ The title already gives the nature of the controversy away. This chronicle is produced unambiguously against the ‘malicious’ *Historiarum Sui Temporis* (1553–60) of Paolo Giovio (1483–1552), an Italian humanist who may be situated in the inner circle of Pope Leo X, a declared enemy of Charles V. This international political situation of explicit confrontation allows us to come to terms with the main theme of this article: the reconstruction of the business of letters and the intelligence of history within the interests of imperial geopolitics. *Antijovio* represents, at least for this twenty-first century reader, a rather vivid picture of murky geopolitics in the sixteenth century, not a negligible prefiguration of our (post-)modernity. The massive chronicle—some 650 pages and 55 chapters in the 1952 edition—is mostly a partisan pro-Spanish account of the constant wars among the various collectivities inside the continental European territory.⁴⁵

The fighting ground breaks open into myriad collectivities, not quite neatly assembled in ‘nations’ as we may know them today: Spaniards, French, Germans, Hungarians, Polish, Danish, Italians, Greeks, Turks, Persians, Portuguese, “the Oriental India,” “the furthest point of the earth, the Western Indies”. (The English are somewhat marginal to the picture (32, 47), with or without the “morbid King Henry VIII, seized by loving frenzy” as narrated in the thirty-first chapter). There is a sharp division between the faithful and unfaithful (Christianity, fidelity, gentility, 30, 246), and this is possibly the most resilient dichotomy always operating within the singularising matrix of intelligibility, whether it be called imperialism or convergence.

Lacking explicit references to Machiavelli, *Antijovio* is nonetheless a *de facto* mobilisation of Machiavellian features on the side of the emperor Charles V. It is a-theoretically Machiavellian in its vindication of cunning and dissembling, and pragmatically ‘realist’ in the contemporary sense of being exclusively concerned with big-power politics. (Although ‘realist’ is not a word Jiménez de Quesada uses). Following Checa Cremades’ account of Mannerism as the ‘perversion’ or ‘deviation’ of the norm of the classical seduction of High Renaissance (1982, 1985), and Frankl’s history-of-ideas recreation (1963), one sees ‘reality’ and ‘truth’ in this text as coterminous with state reason and national interest. Equally, national interest

⁴⁴ The first modern edition of *Antijovio* was Jiménez de Quesada (1952). All page numbers refer to this edition. Frankl (1963) was the crucial mediation for the present writer’s acquaintance with this text.

⁴⁵ Castro (1966, 99) includes a passing reference to the discovery of *Antijovio*, of interest to the “compatriots” of Jiménez de Quesada, “after a neglect of nearly 400 years.”

(the sign 'Spain') is identical with imperialist expansionism in the chronology of early modernity/coloniality. In Jiménez de Quesada's world, it is not quite that 'fact,' or 'objective knowledge,' do not exist. It is not that 'anything goes' either. It is rather that whatever assertions of certainties, or belief system, you wish to put out there on the discussion table will be fiercely fought out, ceding not an inch to the enemy in a vision of a no-exit adversarial world in constant flux. 'Facts,' never emerging to consciousness without some insinuation of profit or gain, hardly ever become the endgame of politics, but the beginning. There is no fixed text in this 'word-processing world' of constant fighting ('world,' bigger dimension than 'word'). 'Fact' is always already tangled up in the business (*negocio*) and the profit (*ganancia*) of those engaging in fact-making and its unmaking.

There is no knowledge for its own sake, or 'objectivity,' outside the pursuit of business and profit. The same goes for 'history': there is no falling for the seductions of an a-political world. Accordingly, the exercise of the letter is here not, and cannot ever be, based on 'mirror of nature' presuppositions, which is another way of saying that the singularity of concepts such as reality, or truth, will not hold itself together for too long. One may call it a radically plural conception of truth or reality with the occasional singularising mechanisms of the force of empire (the

force of the Spanish empire during Jiménez de Quesada's lifetime, during our own times a different force of globalising convergence our writer could not have possibly predicted). The process of imperialism may be conceptualised as an imposition of a set of inequalities, or the reconfiguration of (in-)visible timespaces, or some ideal arrangement or convergence that appears to combine homogeneities and heterogeneities of a certain kind in a certain way, a 'pan-nationalism' of sorts, that could be more or less lasting. Concepts such as reality and truth, then, find themselves in the midst of unavoidably factitious camps, and tomorrow brings no utopian release into a permanent opposite such as social-contractualism.⁴⁶ The various 'national' collectivities, more or less permanently formalised, fight against each other in the same way that Jiménez de Quesada 'fights' against Giovo's *Historiarum Sui Temporis*. The Spaniard knows this chronicle through the Spanish translation of Gaspar de Baeza (*Historia general de todas las cosas sucedidas en el mundo en estos cincuenta años de nuestro tiempo*, Salamanca [1562–1563] and Granada [1566]).

So, the contemporary reader may imagine Jiménez de Quesada in the Kingdom of New Granada writing his chronicle of deeds of war in repudiation of a previous anti-Spain account. The Romance-language vulgarisation exercised by his modest *letrado* pen has a double political purpose: to bring to this

⁴⁶ It may be a good idea to think about the easy conventionality that builds a big separation between contractualism and absolutism. Maravall (1972, 161–245, 323–400) almost ontologises the bilateral character of political power, also in relation to the historical creature of the absolutist Monarchy. This dialogic nature of endless negotiation of political power, also for Empire, is also connected to the issue of its limits, the relations between power and property, and the manufacturing of sovereignty and legitimacy.

political earth the high-flying intellectual humanism of the Italian while assembling the national or nationalistic troops around the most convenient 'reality'. Tellingly, the adjectives 'national' ('Spanish') and 'imperial' are made to behave as if coterminous, impartiality being for Jiménez de Quesada a silly piece of unreality, a kind of gossamer floating around in a conception of life that appears to be, at least in its writing mode, a battlefield.⁴⁷ If the engagement of these early modern and colonial textualities is not easy, the reconstruction of the most likely historical and social conditions of production of this writing exercise, *Antijovio*, will find many lacunae. We still do not know of any reader responses to *Antijovio* in relation to the most unfortunate of conquerors, as Jiménez de Quesada is often called, since he never reaches the social status of Hernán Cortés or Francisco Pizarro. We may imagine him instead a relatively marginal figure, something of an outcast, side by side with the rebellious explorer Lope de Aguirre (d. 1561), as depicted in Werner Herzog's film *Aguirre: The Wrath of God*, also engaged in the perpetual chase of El Dorado. There is one big difference in relation to the nature of the allegiance: Jiménez de Quesada is always in *Antijovio* a truly faithful and loving vassal, if historically a somewhat erratic administrator who never had the confidence of his superiors. (Lucena Salmoral (1988) gives

us information about the confiscation of his property and his declaration of 'indigent' to the Audiencia in 1573). The truth of the matter of this history that aspires to the status of officialdom, but never quite gets there, is also about the restitution of the credibility or good name of its author, sixty years old and fragile by the time of finishing the book.⁴⁸ The possible benefice that always accompanies this historical exercise in transatlantic letter writing has to do with the repair of a state of dispossession of the writer, a role only of second importance to successful military deeds (*armas y letras* and in this order). This will be in a nutshell the likeliest condition of production of the imperialist ethos of *Antijovio*, aiming at the restoration of the good name of Charles V in the heels of Giovio's 'evil deeds.' It appears that our former *adelantado*, hardly a perfumed court figure or a text-obsessed humanist of philological inclination, let alone a dignified member of the influential monastic orders, never went beyond the status of admiral in the social hierarchy of his time.

Having insinuated the (early modern, colonial, even postmodern) constructed 'nature' of a conflictive reality, one can take stock of the chronicler's numerous claims to be writing a "true history" (325, 298, 453). These claims are insistent, and are always placed in relation to the negative example of the

⁴⁷ *Antijovio* constructs a kind of self-legitimizing existential historicism, a kind of "been there, done that," in relation to the fundamental imperial fault lines of early modernity, always in reference to a fractious and unstable European territory. It gives us the fog of war in the muddy trenches of a larger geography mapped out very differently in the imaginary bird-like vision of Kamen (2003: esp. chs. 2–5. Kamen's emphasis on strengthening the intimacy between Empire and foreignness, and thus denationalizing any kind of nationalistic patrimonialism of the "Spanish"—or perhaps better, "Hispanic"—Empire is worth thinking about further.

⁴⁸ The appendices in the 1952 edition indicate the author's intent, seeking the possibility of the good review of "Luis Quixada," the President of the Council of the Indies for the services of these good letters (603, 614).

'false history' of the adversary. Giovio turns the 'truth of the history' upside down (242). Things "never happened that way" (248). His plot has one too many holes (287). His story is like a poor dress with many missing parts (402). His narrative is a 'witches' brew' of a tale (576–577). In fact, "giovanesque" becomes a term of playful abuse: invention, mistake, nonsense, childishness, awkwardness, maliciousness and evil intent (273, 347, 420, 582, 591, 604). Our proud writer does not appear forced to have recourse to great or ancient philosophical doctrines of (im-)possible constructions of ontology (or reality, or what is out there, the ground of belief, etc.), to make his case heard. *Antijovio* is instead a rather anti-intellectual recollection; it does not love knowledge for its own sake, exhibiting a nil temptation towards a non-utilitarian or 'aesthetic' disposition amid these decidedly not beautiful letters. This is geopolitical love for the sake of a profit that apparently did not arrive in the end. No time to stop and smell the roses: there is here the effort to broker knowledge already in a radically international setting that is far from being safe, predictable or settled.

Political life thus conceptualised in this pan-relational and circumstantialist fashion, is also, for Jiménez de Quesada, hard, but simple. What one does is true and what the other does is false, almost in the Sartrean spirit that 'hell is the world of the others,' and there are few intersecting points available to the interested parties. Between Giovio and Jiménez de Quesada, none, apparently. The Spanish chronicle is not a historical exercise in stereotypical Anglo-Saxon double-talk politeness. Giovio is the name

of the enemy and his chronicle is mostly a slur on the non-negotiable good name of Charles V. The abundant use of humour in *Antijovio*, precursor of Spanish *cachondeo* or Cuban *choteo*, always has a cutting edge. If the Italian exhibits an anti-Spanish feeling (e.g. "enemigo del nombre español," 203), at least according to our Spanish writer displaced in the barbarous Americas, anti-Italian etiquette is only too appropriate to defend the good name of the Bruges-born emperor Charles V. Quite literally making the name 'Giovio' a laughing matter, this chronicle shoots laughter out, like a silver bullet, into the international world of imperial geopolitics. This colonial text aims at Charles' itinerant court yet always against a kind of negative space, mostly the politically fragmented Iberian and Italian peninsulas, the hot spot of the Netherlands, the fragmented lands of what later will be called Germany, etc. Giovio is the immoderate, vicious, self-contradictory chronicler for whom the names of disgrace and (imperial) Spain go together (338, 340). If the main theme of *Antijovio* is the theme of war, the inter-textual structure of this war chronicle—if only unidirectionally in the rebuttals of accounts in *Historias Sui Temporis*—unambiguously and enthusiastically participates in the adversarial and eternal game of politics. This history is 'naturally' partisan to the degree of mocking all impossible claims at non-partisanship or neutrality. *Antijovio* was written with the calculation that the chronicle would 'play politics' with the ideal benefit of home court advantage; that is, that it would have been read aloud collectively within the earshot circle of faithful men capable of influencing the foreign-born Emperor. There is here no utopian otherness of

more desirable world to this political world of open confrontation with no unequivocal principles, or non-political, grounds for reason. With gradations of intensity and tension, higher and lower stakes, there is no way out or transcendence here.⁴⁹ By neglecting messianic eschatologies, the never truly predictable pressures of the immediate circumstance will dictate what to do. By suspending the scatological fixation on any one concrete, if obscure object of obscene desire, *Antijovio* explicitly constitutes a historical written version of dirty politics in the conviction that is no innocent alternative to this 'dirt.' Jiménez de Quesada makes no big fuss about this unprincipled groundlessness, and leaves this most 'natural' thing on earth pragmatically with no name, though one might call it *Realpolitik*.

In engaging *Antijovio*, the contemporary reader will feel disoriented in a messy, quite unpredictable landscape that is full of the fog of war. Jiménez de Quesada's vivid prose paints in thick brushstrokes a dog-eat-dog's world of men shuffling their feet in foreign geographies, of mud, weaponry and cannon balls being fired, sacks of cities, brutal displays of imperial justice, dismembered bodies, alliances and turn-coat counter-alliances, perceptible and imperceptible strategies, fighting of all kinds in any space possible, winning and losing, conniving, hiding, running for your life. There is occasional suggestion of imperial messianism in *Antijovio*, but it is never the angular cornerstone as it is in Dante or Campanella, for instance. Never quite matching the stature of official chron-

iclers such as Santa Cruz, Hernando de Tordesillas, Pedro Mejía, Ginés de Sepúlveda or Cervantes de Salazar, not to mention more illustrious figures such as Vasco de Quiroga (Gómez 2001) or Francisco de Victoria (Gómez 2002a and 2002b), Jiménez de Quesada, first-generation conqueror of the land of New Granada, between the two populous colonial centers of New Spain and Perú, must rhetorically assume a kind of unpolished *sermo humilis* and play down the importance of his decidedly anti-intellectual penmanship. There is something of a strategic coyness here, a kind of a casual and unpretentious, even populist manner of speech, hopefully better suited to conquer the ear and eyes of those in the vicinity of Council of Indies. The most accessible romance language may take the narrative higher in the rungs of this officially non-egalitarian society. The possible achievement of legitimacy is thus performed via a kind of militaristic existential historicism *avant la lettre*. 'been there, done that' in the thick middle of war that tests the true mettle of men. Not too far away from the foot-soldier Bernal Díaz del Castillo in relation to the polished pen of Gómara, Jiménez de Quesada makes his the conventions proper of eye-witnessing historical news of foreign and dangerous lands. He is a man of arms and letters, an embedded reporter (the chronology of 1539–1550 includes numerous travels in Europe, according to Lucena Salmoral). Without the need to quote from polished authors such as Alberti, Vasari, Machiavelli, Aristotle or the Fathers of the Church, -it would be anachronism to find fault in Jiménez de Quesada's

⁴⁹ Film fans may think of the endlessness of messy politics, the murderous eroticism of dirty politics, or *porca politica*, in relation to the film *Z* (1969) by Costa-Gavras.

lack of appreciation for ‘indigenous’ American sources—there is no doubt that some of the ‘perfume’ of these authors is in the air of *Antijovio*. Yet erudition is not the forte of our military man. Building a convincing critical apparatus is not the *modus operandi* behind the impetuous flow of this *relación*. In this restricted sense, *Antijovio* is decidedly not a scholarly piece of writing. If at times disjointed and erratic, the chronicle does not hesitate to talk the talk and walk the walk of an imperialist ethos with no need for an apology in a world that could already be called Hobbesian before Hobbes. Formulas of compassionate Christianity, redemption and peaceful reconciliation occasionally sprinkle the pages of *Antijovio*, but these formulae appear rather insubstantial, colourless, more parroting the official language than anything. One possible reader response will conclude that the life (or history) that matters is always up for grabs and that only the most virtuous—in the Machiavellian sense of the word—manage to grab the life that matters (power and knowledge, privilege and benefit): firmly, but never permanently. If true Machiavellians, whether most commonly inside than outside the closet, cannot sleep tight at night in the anticipation of the uncertainties and challenges of tomorrow, no one can.

In its take-no-prisoners attitude, *Antijovio* as a historical expression of the naturalness of imperialism is adult history, not for the faint-hearted. There are no consolations, no places for the imagination to nurse its wounds or care for its concerns. The adversarial life that is here put to the test of competing constructions of ontological designs is closer to the pure immanence of everyday

messy politics, or the mercurial contingency, than to some ideal form of final judgement. I subscribe entirely Frankl’s formula of circumstantialism as the basic philosophy of history of Jiménez Quesada, with or without occasional allusions to the Fathers of the Christian Church. And what are the historically available intelligent (intellectual) responses to this kind of militaristic, anti-intellectual circumstantialist historicism in a situation of imperial domination? One may change this historical formulation of the orthodoxy of neo-scholasticism for our orthodoxy of (neo-)liberal internationalism inside the latest, often unacknowledged empire, for one possibly valid equivalent. The historicism in *Antijovio*, mostly or exclusively about the might and the deeds of the soldiers, identifies life with martial law (or the identity of reason, or coherence, and force), and the singularity of the ‘law’ (or the regulation of the life-world), is progressively identified with no laws, except those of the latest empire, inevitably reconfiguring previous imperial configurations. It is the deliberately exaggerated contention of this article that *Antijovio* prefigures Hegel, that Hegel constitutes a culmination of a certain imperial and conventional Europe, also inside cultures of scholarship and pedagogy in Uncle Sam’s modern house on the hill (123). Empire will be the force that brings these seemingly disparate circumstances together and the construction of a possible foundation for a discursive reason of and for Empire or convergence will be ‘playing’ with the lack of a need for non-foundationalism and even non-discursivity. The institution of absolutist monarchy is the allegorical personification of this togetherness (207).

'Free' life is unattached, incoherent and undesirable. The 'good life' is imperial reason as reason/s of state, and reason is also undistinguishable from force. Good reason is forceful state reason (and one recalls the ominous dictum of the Chilean military forces, *o por la razón o por la fuerza*). The singularity of these concepts—truth, order of reason, nature, life, history, etc.—is for our writer a desirable phenomenon of convergence that can only be accomplished through the imperial force that pulls with greater force within and against contractualism. Reason and force are thus the mirror images, two sides of the same coin, in an expanding plural world of plurality of worlds. Singularity being the force, or the thesis, of Empire, *Antijovio* under-theorises plurality as the fight for supremacy of those not yet imperial forces, the hypo-thesis. Empire is the force that singularizes the word of truth against the Babel plurality of histories and worlds. (Synthesising or imperial histories often build on the ruins of preceding empires: witness Roberts (1992), operating in the shade of the re-emergence of Churchillian language within the channels of contact, transmission and legitimisation of the latest empire). *Antijovio* is faithful to its contemporaneous Hispanic Empire—its matrix of intelligibility and possibility, its declared realm of distribution and circulation after all—without quite ever entertaining the possibility of non-, let alone post-imperial configurations. Jiménez de Quesada's account, unencumbered about specifics, is crude, even rude, a rather uncompromising, even brutal life according to the rule emanated by the supreme ruler of the emperor. Detachment, or freedom, from this convergence is an unthinkable ghost of life, or utter nonsense. No empire in full vi-

gour, it is clear, stops riding its high horse willingly.

One might dissect this occasionally erratic, if not chaotic, chronicle as belligerently patriotic, even jingoistic and xenophobic. This ethos comes explicitly to the fore, the use of deictics and possessive pronouns: "our deeds" (*nuestras hazañas*), "my nation" (*mi nación*), and "the modern Spanish" (*los españoles modernos*) for example, as soon as the various 'nations' come into play (518, 530, 608, 619). With a distinct geopolitical mindset, there is no expression of doubt as to the desirability of this time of the now, or modernity (245, 355, 509). There is here no big push for the reconstruction of thick textures of these foreign nations, not even his own. Mostly mindful of military avatars in the early decades of the sixteenth century, the intelligence of *Antijovio* is a crisis-driven response always seeking to restore the good name of the Emperor against the perceived counter-intelligence of the Italian in the always difficult neighbourhood of Christian Rome. Giovio is the textual prop, the scapegoat figure, the punching bag and the butt of the jokes that make the rather loose prose occasionally get carried away from the main patriotic theme, here indistinguishable from the bloody strife informing empire-building. Utopia is historically for our chronicler no other than Charles V's empire. Breaking away from this force of this 'natural' monarch is tellingly 'anti-natural' treason (*desnaturarse*: 512, 514, 534–535). Nature, or nativism, is made to coincide with the official world of the status quo, albeit in the loose style of the hard lines included in *Antijovio*. This nature seeks concurrence, if not the potential complicity of the readers, through

the vulgar use of the romance language, following an ideology of the 'same' (38, 58) against the venality of Italian and Latin 'foreignness' nesting in papal quarters. In a dialectical way, the sign 'foreign,' typically within the hegemonic matrix of intelligibility of international studies and foreign relations, is always closer to the potential threat of the explicit or implicit enemy. The 'same' language, with or without the inferiority complex in relation to the classical tradition, the same ethnicity or blood lines, already in an international soup of foreign letters in the European context where global fault lines will be fought for centuries to come, the same collective points of reference: Rome, Latin Christianity, the Bruges-born Emperor, the inclusive project of empire building... Desirability and sameness go here hand in hand with this imperial convergence of 'modern' timespaces. One may envisage the proliferation of heterogeneities as long as these do not pose a serious threat. (The utopian literature of the period is the polar opposite of the often hypocritical predilection for decorative, banal or 'multicultural' differences). What empire wants and does is good, or desirable and feasible, and whoever opposes that desire is bad, undesirable, or 'unnatural', at least according to the general rule of thumb of this blunt chronicler, who is also no novice in the crafty arts of rapidly changing political pressures. In the fast-moving wings of political contingency then, the structure of *Antijovio* is versatile and pliable in its use of Giovio. There is also no obsession with foundational principles, despite the official profession of 'Catholic'

monotheism assumed by the Hispanic Empire before and after Charles V. There is similarly precious little ideographic affection for site-specific recreation of humanities under imperialism in either the European or the American continents. In *Antijovio*, there is no pressing need to extract a theory out of the history of Western political thought.⁵⁰

Jiménez de Quesada's mental landscape is painted in thick-brush accounts according to a foreign affairs' model of engaging the expansive transatlantic world. There is no (mental, imaginary, intellectual) 'furniture' in this early moment of Spanish imperialism in the Euro-Americas; war destroys it and the fog of war makes it difficult for writer and readers to discern the environment. There are no blueprints for nation building; politics appears as some kind of atemporal, eternal, and disembodied lust, unaccompanied by any clear idea of what a final object of political desire will be. There is no 'objective correlative' of imperial geopolitics in *Antijovio*. Detailed ethno-geographies, fastidious chronologies appear to matter little. There is little joy except the *schadenfreude* at the expense of the figure of the enemy (Giovio). The Global Positioning System is the priority for our chronicle of choice, rather than fastidious foreign-language acquisition, deep knowledge of books, sensitivity towards multi-perspectivism, or awareness of philosophical traditions and competing conceptions of that non-obvious *thing* which often gets called 'history'? The subjective vehicle of this 'dirty love' of imperial geopolitics within the vast geography of

⁵⁰ Roberts (1997: 527–632). For the longevity of the colonial order and its neo-colonial transformation, see Halperin Donghi (1969).

the Euro-Americas is left mostly implicit. Perhaps due to its poor institutional conditioning and incidental bureaucratic status, *Antijovio* does not have institutionality, or bureaucracy, at the thematic core either. The 'nationalistic' call of 'Spain' is mobilised by Jiménez de Quesada so as to fill in the void of the ideal subject of the Hispanic Empire. Historically operating within an increasingly intolerant official ideology of blood purity, some of these race-and-creed entanglements are also marginal and under-theorised in *Antijovio*, although and while Jiménez de Quesada is no sheep in wolf's clothing. Accordingly, the name 'Spanish' will not break into meaningful subsections. Identical fast-paced style applies to religious conflict, despite the occasional reference to Lutheran heresy and the public burning of Lutherans (53, 54). Our proud writer does not consistently demonise the French or the Italians. He displays no inclination to touch theological points, even with a ten-foot pole. His prose is not guilty of lengthy eye-witnessing anthropological observations of life abroad. He just subscribes the official belief system without going outside its official sound bites. Either in relation to larger Europe or the Americas, Jiménez de Quesada displays no evidence of wanting to become 'bicultural.' The civilising impulse is never put in a state of permanent doubt.

There is no 'crossing over,' not even hypothetically or imaginatively in *Antijovio*. In temperament, Jiménez de Quesada is thousand of miles away from someone like Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca in relation to the Indian world, and from Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda in relation to the Mannerist magnificence of Christian Roman Human-

ism. There is still a dichotomy of 'inside' and 'outside' the expanding Empire, however blurry, unpredictable or dangerous it might be (Hungary, for example, is border territory, "frontería" (501), and Vienna is a 'situation' under long-lasting threat from the Turkish Empire). It is this eastern side of the Spanish Empire that appears to be the most delicate borderline, with two hot spots in the Netherlands and the fractious Italian environment, while the Americas are perceived as 'barbarous' background, outpost if not a hideout (13, 24, 25). One could say that the fighting takes place precisely on that blurriness of lines. There is apparently nothing on the other side of Spanish Empire except the enemy. And sometimes it is the enemy within, as with the rebellion of the *comuneros* (34ff), or the people of Ghent (463ff). Severe forms of public punishment take care of these anti-imperial resistances and the narrative of *Antijovio* renders this severity as the most natural, feather-light thing on earth. Within this early frame of imperial Eurocentrism, the term 'natives' refers first and foremost to those who can have some form of access to the language of the *Antijovio* and then to the rest of the imperial or mercenary forces, whereas the perennially subordinated term 'foreign,' refers to the rest of the world. Yet there is no clearly discernible laundry list of criteria for these two categories. The whole point of this circumstantialist conception of imperial history is to leave both nondescript and fluid. The referentiality of 'foreign' may change quickly due to the rapid game of alliances and counter-alliances in sixteenth century geopolitics. Perhaps for this reason, the language of race and ethnicity remains underdeveloped in *Antijovio*, or in the utopian experimentation of Vasco de

Quiroga and the Indian Lectures of Francisco de Vitoria, within a largely agrarian, unabashedly patriarchal and hierarchical society, multiracial, multiethnic, plurilingual, pluricultural. Jiménez de Quesada's society is perhaps proto-capitalist in the large scheme of things, and pre- or proto-egalitarian in relation to today's normalised concept of equal if nominal citizenship, yet this narrative remains operative within the theoretical egalitarianism of an intolerant form of Christian all-inclusiveness or catholicity. If the subject of the Hispanic Empire is left largely content-free and mostly nondescript or 'empty,' then, its 'we' is not loaded with many adjectives, but is left unencumbered and lightweight. Regional affiliations, national identifications, (counter-)imperial alliances within expanding capitalism, etc., may have surely been factors worthy of consideration in the formation of collectivities, but *Antijovio* is no ethnographic account, curious about social typologies. It does not appear to be troubled by cultural heterogeneities, since its focus is mostly about 'fixing' the counter-intelligence of Giovio against blurry political fault lines already in a big-picture vision of the world. The message is that the educators of princes will take care of assessing these (foreign) cultures while the advocates of big-power politics will prioritise 'non-cultural' aspects.

The unconventional nature of this transatlantic chronicle makes it an unlikely candidate for inclusion in political theory courses. Yet this very unconventionality represents a monstrous dimension that one could learn to perceive with fresh eyes, turn upside down, against other timespaces, and shake vigorously until some good money comes

out of it. Jiménez de Quesada's *Antijovio* brings a salutary unfamiliarity, shocking unacquaintance, the foreignness of a dis-relationship. There is nothing endemic, telluric, static or eternal in Jiménez de Quesada's middle-brow pen, which is mostly concerned with refurbishing the good name of Charles V after Giovio's "coldness and nonsense" (332). The reader travelling through this monstrous narrative will find nothing obsessive, deterministic or rigidly 'racist' in his prose, despite the uninhibited repudiation of treacherous enemies, who change coats and turn tables faster than expected. (There is no easy winner in the vast inter- or transnational imperial geopolitical game of early modern coloniality inside which Jiménez de Quesada operated, perhaps with little luck). There is no Huntingtonian clash of religion-based cultures, but instead a surprising nimbleness, even detachment, in his characterisation of collectivities, in the author's rapid-fire exchange with Giovio. The prose is unencumbered, intellectually or philosophically, due perhaps to the realisation of the fleeting nature of political achievements (the life of the founder of Bogotá, at least according to the biographies, perfectly illustrates this state of uncertainty and restlessness until the end). Trying to seize the political day, and with no time to waste, *Antijovio* seeks 'naturally' the complicity of compatriots within and against an internationally factious, yet expanding European assault on the world. Foreign affairs are subordinated to national interest and homeland security. For Jiménez de Quesada, the truth that matters is the official truth, however vacillating, internally contradictory or intentionally ambiguous in nature; especially if you are a soldier in the uniform,

there is little else that matters outside this world of officialdom. "The truth of history" (52) is always for the good name of one's own 'nationality.' The appeals to 'truth' are numerous, almost following a logic of seduction by virtue of repetition. State reason

is national interest, national interest is the truth of the (imperial) history that matters, and outside it, there is nothing else except splendid little wars with the good enemy and messy big wars with bad enemies and their histories.

WORKS CITED

- Alberti, Leon Battista. *On Painting*. London: Penguin, 1991.
- Arciniegas, Germán. *El caballero de El Dorado: Vida del conquistador Jiménez de Quesada*. Buenos Aires: Losada, 1942.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2000.
- Battisti, Eugenio. *Renacimiento y Barroco*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1990.
- Blanco Aguinaga, Carlos, Rodríguez-Puertolas, Julio and Zavala, Iris M. *Historia social de la literatura española (en lengua castellana)*. Vol. 1. Madrid: Castalia, 1984.
- Burckhardt, Jacob. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1958.
- Castro, Américo. *La realidad histórica de España. Edición renovada*. México: Porrúa, 1966 [1962].
- Curtius, Ernst Robert. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Checa Cremades, Fernando, and Morán Turina, José Miguel. *El Barroco*. Madrid: Ediciones Istmo, Colección Fundamentos, 77, 1982.
- _____ and Nieto Alcaide, Víctor. *El Renacimiento: formación y crisis del modelo clásico*. Madrid: Ediciones Istmo, Colección Fundamentos, 69, 1985.
- _____. *La Dispersión del Manierismo (Documentos de un coloquio)*. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1980.
- Dubois, Claude-Gilbert. *El Manierismo*. Barcelona: Ediciones Península, 1980.
- Echeverría, Bolívar. *La modernidad del Barroco*. México: Biblioteca Era, (2000 [1998]).
- Frankl, Víctor. *El 'Antijovio' de Gonzalo Jiménez de Quesada y las concepciones de realidad y verdad en la época de la contrarreforma y del Manierismo*. Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica, 1963.
- Friedlaender, Walter F. *Mannerism and Anti-Mannerism in Italian Painting*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.
- Gombrich, E. H. J. (1966). *Norm and Form: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance*. London: Phaidon Press, 1966.
- Gómez, Fernando (2001). *Good Places and Non-Places in Colonial Mexico: Vasco de Quiroga (1470–1565)*. University Press of America & Edition Reichenberger, 2001.
- _____. "Francisco de Vitoria in 1934, before and after," *Modern Languages Notes*, 117 (2002): 365–405.
- _____. "Historicidad, juricidad y para-literatura: En torno a Francisco de Vitoria (1486–1546)," *Anuario de Estudios Americanos*, Escuela de Estudios Hispano-Americanos, Seville, 59 (2002): 413–440.
- _____. "Estética Manierista en los albores modernos de la periferia americana: La Grandeza Mexicana de Bernardo de Balbuena (1562–1627)," *Hispanic Review*, 71:4, (2003): 525–548.
- _____. "Plights and Flights of Historical Reason within and against Pax Americana," *Nepantla: Views from the South*, 4:3 (2003): 567–589.
- Halperin Donghi, Tulio. *Historia contemporánea de América Latina*. Madrid: Alianza, 1969.
- Hauser, Arnold. *Mannerism: The Crisis of the Renaissance and the Origin of Modern Art*. 2 vols. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.
- _____. *The Social History of Art. Volume II: Renaissance, Mannerism, Baroque*. Third ed.. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Jiménez de Quesada, Gonzalo. *El Antijovio*. Edición dirigida por Rafael Torres Quintero. Estudio preliminar por Manuel Ballesteros Gaibrois. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 1952.
- _____. *El Antijovio*. Edición y presentación de Guillermo Hernández Peñalosa, prólogo de Eliécer Ruiz. Estudio preliminar de Manuel Ballesteros Gaibrois. 2 vols. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 1991.
- Kagan, Robert. *America and Europe in the New World Order*. New York: Alfred. A Knopf, 2003.

- Kamen, Henry. *Empire, or How Spain became a World Power, 1492–1763*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2003.
- Kupchan, Charles A. *The End of the American Era: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Geopolitics of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Alfred. A Knopf, 2002.
- Lucena Salmoral, Manuel. *Jiménez de Quesada: El Caballero de El Dorado*. Madrid: Sociedad Estatal para la Ejecución de Programas del Quinto Centenario/Anaya, 1988.
- Mandelbaum, Michael. *The Ideas that Conquered the World: Peace, Democracy and Free Markets in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Public Affairs, 2002.
- Maravall, Jose Antonio. *Estado moderno y mentalidad social (siglos XV a XVIII)*. 2 Vols. Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1972.
- Moraña, Mabel. *Relecturas del Barroco de Indias*. Hanover: Ediciones del Norte. Murray, Linda (1995 [1967]). *The High Renaissance and Mannerism: Italy, the North and Spain 1500–1600*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1994.
- D'Ors, Eugenio. *Lo Barroco*. Madrid: Aguilar, 1944.
- _____. *Lo Barroco*. Ed. Alfonso E. Pérez Sánchez. Madrid: Tecnos, 1993.
- Paz, Octavio. *Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz o las trampas de la fe*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1982.
- Porqueras Mayo, Alberto. *La teoría poética en el Renacimiento y Manierismo españoles*. Barcelona: Puvill Libros, (n/d. [1986?]).
- Roberts, J.M. *History of the World* London: Penguin, (1992 [1976]).
- Rodríguez Freyle, Juan. *El Carnero*. Prólogo de Ramón de Zubiria. Bogotá: Círculo de Lectores, 1985.
- Rowe, Colin. *Manierismo y arquitectura moderna y otros ensayos*. Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, GG Reprints, (1999 [1978]).
- Schell, Jonathan. *The Unconquerable World: Power, Non-violence and the Will of the People*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2003.
- Sypher, Wylie. *Four Stages of Renaissance Style: Transformations in Art and Literature 1400–1700*. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1955.
- Trías, Eugenio. *El lenguaje del perdón: Un ensayo sobre Hegel*. Barcelona: Anagrama. Venturi, Robert (1999 [1972]). *Complejidad y contradicción en la arquitectura*. Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, GG Reprints, 1981.
- Venturi, Robert, Izenour, Steven, and Scott Brown, Denise. *Aprendiendo de Las Vegas: El simbolismo olvidado de la forma arquitectónica*. Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, GG Reprints, (2000 [1978]).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. *Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the Changing World System*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.