

Self-Awareness in Colonial Latin American Philosophy

Part 2*

by *Walter Redmond*

Abstract. – This article traces how philosophers writing in Spanish lands in America reflected upon their own work. In the 16th century, concerns were pedagogical, in the 17th, a sense of American identity emerged, and in the 18th, new attitudes toward Europe developed which are more akin to later Latin American thought. The study shows how the logic and ontology of the *siglo de oro* (16th–17th centuries) resemble current interests in philosophy, describes an extraordinary “defense of intellectual America” by 17th-century Peruvians, and discusses the impact of Modernity. The first part of this article (which appeared in the *Jahrbuch* last year) treats of 16th-century Mexico, and this second covers the 17th and 18th centuries (including the Latin texts of a “*Defensio ingenii Americani*”).

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY; THE VICEROYALTY OF PERU

Prefatory material from three works from the Viceroyalty of Peru reveals new concerns about doing philosophy in America. The authors, complaining that Europeans were ignoring work done by Americans, enlisted classical poets and philosophers in their defense of American intellectual life. I refer here to the forewords of Valera and Espinosa Medrano to their works on logic (1610 and 1688), an “appraisal” (1636) of Alonso Briceño’s theological work by Pedro de Ortega Sotomayor, theology professor, chancellor of the University of San Marcos in Lima and later bishop, Espinosa’s presentation of his logic to King Charles II, and endorsements of his work by an anonymous spokesman for the Col-

* Part 1 was published in the last volume (41, 2004) of the *Jahrbuch*.

lege of St. Thomas in Lima and by Ignacio de Quesada (1688), *socius* of the master general of the Dominican order in Rome.¹

Professors in Peru were also concerned about teaching. Echoing Mercado, Espinosa vowed to “tame” the Virgilian “monsters” brought in from psychology and metaphysics, and lurking in the very forecourt of logic.² He put advanced or polemical digressions in appendices, which he said his reader could skip – “but he may not be sorry to review them later at his leisure”.³

Formal logic, it seems, continued to decline in the 17th century. Valera wrote both a lesser and a greater logic.⁴ But of the 460 pages of Espinosa’s logic, only 41 are devoted to *Summulae* and 419 to the greater logic. As far as the latter was concerned, the simplification of

¹ “Ad lectorem praefacio”: Jerónimo de Valera, *Commentarii ac quaestiones in universam Aristotelis ac subtilissimi doctoris Johannis Duns Scoti logicam* (Lima 1610); Pedro de Ortega, “Ex praescripto excellentissimi Comitum de Chichon Peruani Regi Proregis, censio operis [...]” (April 13, 1636); in the same year, he published *Aparatus historicus sapiens apologiam de vita et doctrina Joannis Duns Scoti* in Lima. Juan de Espinosa Medrano, “Candido lectori” and idem, “Carolo II Catholico Hispaniarum et Indiarum Regi”; St. Thomas College, “Collegii S. Thomae de Aquino Limensis Ordinis Praedicatorum. Commendatio operis”; Quesada: “Commendatio auctoris”; these works are all contained in Juan de Espinosa Medrano, *Philosophia thomistica* (Rome 1688). All quotes are from these sources. For Spanish translation, see Walter Redmond, “Juan de Espinoza Medrano. Prefacio al lector de la Lógica”: *Fénix* 20 (Lima 1970): p. 74–80, and for other texts (except letter to King) idem, “Documentos coloniales. Una defensa del Perú intelectual”: *Fénix* 26–27 (1976–7), p. 235–255. For commentary (and bibliography), Walter Redmond, “Una defensa de la América intelectual. Apologías por pensadores peruanos del siglo XVII”: *Latinoamerica: Anuario/Estudios Latinoamericanos* 14 (Mexico City 1981), p. 213–237; idem, “Defensores de la Hispanoamérica intelectual; Textos neolatinos del Virreinato del Perú (siglo XVII)”: *Boletín de la Sociedad peruana de estudios clásicos* 5 (1999), p. 45–67.

² “Vestibulum ante ipsum, primisque in frontibus artis/luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia curae [Virgil, *Aeneid*, 6:273f.]. Nos vero terrores hosce amoliamur, monstra cicurabimus, et rem juventuti horribilem ac duram emollire, breviare, et ut sic dicam, mansuefacere pro virili conabimur”. Espinosa, *Philosophia thomistica* (note 1), 41–2:1. Espinosa was familiar with the work of Vera Cruz, Mercado, Rubio, Valera, and Briceño.

³ “Liberum tamen erit lectori dum necessariis incumbit ista [parerga] praetermittere, ut postmodum dato otio ea perlustret et fortassen non pigebit”. Juan de Espinosa Medrano, “Prolusio”: *Philosophia thomistica* (note 1), p. 5.

⁴ Title page from Valera, *Comentarii* (note 1): “Totum hoc opus in duas partes distributum offertur. Prima continet breve quoddam logicae compendium quod vulgo solet ‘Summa’ seu ‘Summulae dialecticae’ nuncupari, quaestiones prolegomenales, praedicabilia Porphyrii et Aristotelis antepaedicamenta, praedicamenta, et postpaedicamenta. Secunda pars libris *Perihermeniarum* seu *De interpretatione*, libris *Priorum*, *Posteriorum*, *Topicorum*, et *Elenchorum* comprehendit”. The two “parts” do not correspond to the division between lesser and greater logic but straddle both.

logic of the previous century was over. Espinosa quoted 16th-century Spanish theologian M. Cano saying that he never quite understood the problem of universals (general concepts or contents applying to particular things) – but what would Cano say today, Espinosa wondered, when the same debate “was getting worse by the day”.⁵

I will now describe the pique these Americans felt that their work was not or might not be met in Europe with the attention it deserved. Then I will recount their “proof” that South America is better suited for intellectual life than Europe itself. The texts do not lack literary interest, and I have gathered them in an appendix.

ALL IS GOLDEN

Valera started things off with the question his “nasty critics were whispering in his ear”: “Can anything good come from Nazareth – or Peru?” How could his logic – the first philosophy book published in South America – compete with European works? He decided to go ahead anyhow since “God can raise up children of Abraham even from Peruvian stones”.⁶

He also defended his work on pedagogical grounds. As Mercado and Rubio, he appealed to the maturity born of long teaching experience; he had a right to pass on to others his own hard-won grasp of Scotus, and again as Rubio, he would thereby save students the trouble of preparing class notes.⁷

⁵ Over “objective distinctions” and “abstractions through intuitive acts”. “Quid si praecisionum objectivarum spinas et abstractionum per actus intuitivos et alias hujusmodi salebras a neotericis excitas et in dies magis ac magis asperandas incurreret, contrectaret?” Espinosa, *Philosophia thomistica* (note 1), 54:V (= M. Cano, *De locis theologicis Libri XII* [1563], 9:7).

⁶ For Latin text, see appendix.

⁷ “Nullum ei [Scoto] obsequium praestari posse sum arbitratus quam si imprimis suae doctrinae fundamentis dilucidandis pro mea tenui facultate insudarem ac dilucidata nostris Scholasticis offerrem”. His students and friends urged “ut ea scripta quae in libros Aristotelis de logica, philosophia et Metaphysica in hoc insigni seraphici patris nostri Francisci caenobio meis fratribus ac discipulis e suggesto pervulgaveram, non uno aspectu sed post sexdecim annos in philosophia ac sacra theologia edocenda expensis accuratiori indagine recognita ac politius limata typis mandarem, quo facilius possent ab eisdem prae manibus haberi ipsique ab ingenti et quotidiano in gymnasiis manu conscribendi vindicati labore (qui fere totum tempus religiosis satis carum ac pernecessarium conterit et consumit) opportunius fructuosiusque religiosis functionibus ac literarum exercitiis vacarent”. Only his logic was published.

Justus Lipsius, Renaissance professor and reviver of Stoicism in the University of Louvain, had omitted San Marcos from his list of non-European universities: “Shall I go to the New World where there is only barbarity?”⁸ The insult evoked the wrath of Peruvians. Diego de León Pinelo wrote *Apologetic Notes* to defend his university, “the soul” of Lima, and Espinosa felt “practically obliged” to publish his logic as proof that Justus was “not everywhere *justus*”.⁹ Valera, he knew, had also suffered from this “bias”, and he embellished upon his words: when Valera was asked “more than once” if anything good could come from a Peruvian, he “could but” reply that God was able to raise up children from Peruvian stones.¹⁰ To his Spanish patron Espinosa dedicated his book “along with the chaff – for what would I, a Peruvian, have heaped up but chaff?”¹¹

Espinosa wanted his work to be sent to the “other World”,¹² and both he and Valera, though admitting they were as limited as anyone else, expected to be read there and evaluated fairly.¹³ Both worried

⁸ Justus Lipsius, *Lovanium* (Antwerp 1605). In 1617 Garcilaso de la Vega mentioned the impression, widespread in Europe, that the New World is barbarous.

⁹ Diego de León Pinelo, *Hypomnema apologeticum pro regali Academia Limensi in Lipsianam periodum* (Lima 1648) (The work was presented the year before). Antonello Gerbi, “Diego de León Pinelo contra Justo Lipsio”: *Fénix* 2 (1945), p. 188–231 and *Fénix* 3 (1945–46), p. 601–612. Espinosa, “Candido lectori” (note 1): “*Philosophiam thomisticam orbi literario, trepidus quidem pusillitatisque meae haud incius ut in lucem prodeat, pene coactus exhibeo. Sunt etenim Novi Orbis hominum studia de barbarie Europaeis valde suspecta; id sane honoris debere fatemur Lipsio, non undequaue ‘justo’*”.

¹⁰ “Hoc in se praejudicium expertus est perdoctus ille scotista Peruanus Hieronimus Valera, cujus auribus ‘numquid a Nazareth aut a Peruvio aliquid boni?’ non semel insurratum, ita ut e vestigio respondere cogeret: ‘quod potens est Deus de Peruanis lapidibus suscitare filios Abrahae’”.

¹¹ “Illustrissimo ac revmo. Ecclesiae Principi D. Fr. Thomae Carbonello”, Dominican bishop of Sigüenza and confessor of the King: “Rapis enim tibi nostra hujusce libri folia et simul in ipso paleas rapis; quid enim nisi paleas Peruanus homo congesissem?”

¹² “Denique ut nihil dissimulem, id solum fateor doloris jamdiu alte meo insedit animo: quod haec qualiacumque scripta in Hispaniam, id est in alium Orbem, prelo mandanda mittantur”.

¹³ Valera quoted Quintilian: “labuntur et oneri cedunt aliquando et nonnumquam fatigantur sapientes ac eruditi” and went on: “ne ergo illorum crimen execrandum incurras qui conviciis alios a benefaciendo deterrent et nisi quod ipsi fecerint nihil rectum putant”. Espinosa, quoting Pliny the Younger, “neque enim soli judicat qui maligne legunt”, added: “Quodsi aliis minus placebunt, certe non ideo discrucier quippe qui competentem habeo eam esse humani ingenii imbecilitatem ut quo uni arrisit id e vestigio alteri displiceat”. He ends with a final appeal: “ut a te non laudem sed veniam, non plausum sed benignitatem, praestolanti humanum te praebere ne graveris”.

about printing errors, Espinosa because, since typos could be taken as his mistakes, they could confirm so-called American “barbarism”.¹⁴

Quesada was reconciling. He witnessed how Romans with a “taste for true philosophy” were impressed by Espinosa’s logic. Peruvians, he said, ought to recognize that Europeans were in fact well disposed toward American authors, and he hoped that his commendation of his fellow Peruvian to Europeans would lead Americans to reciprocate their good will.¹⁵ A sense of gratitude, he said, should lead Americans to acknowledge that the scientific enterprise itself came from Europe, and intellectuals should resolve their differences with courtesy.¹⁶

Peru was famous in Europe for its wealth, material and religious, said Quesada, but something seemed to be missing: “That Americans further scholarship with the same zeal as Europeans and make significant contributions”.

Espinosa’s work was proof enough for him that university education was flourishing in Peru: “You shall see, learned reader, that in the land of Peru everything is golden: a golden age, golden centuries, fertile minds. Peruvians then, what do they lack?”¹⁷

¹⁴ Valera: “Scatet erratis editio haec, quia typographorum in his partibus inopia maxima est et qui occurrunt parum sunt versati et ad errandum procliviores”. Espinosa: “me a chalcographia quam longissime absente, [scripta mea] monstrosus deturpanda sint mendis [...] Cumque barbari putemur qui vulgi errore vocamur ‘indiani’, haud immerito vereor ne ejusmodi vitia et latininitatis sribiligines in libri regerantur auctorem”.

¹⁵ “Verum si haec a me in Peruani philosophi [Espinosa] commendationem dicta Europaeis testari licet, etiam et Peruani vicissim aliquando referre licebit quantum sibi Americani de Europaeorum benevolentia aut aequitate erga suos auctores gratulari debeant, cum Espinosae philosophiam ab his qui verae philosophiae gustum habent et probari et magnis encomiis commendari videam”.

¹⁶ A sentiment not out of place today. “Haec Europaeis Romae a Peruano dicta in commendationem gentilis sui et Peruani benigne, ut arbitror, lector excipiet, ut de Europaeis, ac in primis de Romanis plura aliquando, ut spero, Americanis et Peruani a me referentur. Decet enim literatus viros his officiis invicem et benevolentiae ac humanitatis argumentis decertare”.

¹⁷ “Verum unum superesse videbatur quo Novus Orbis cum Veteri paria faceret: nimirum quod Americani acceptas ab Europaeis (quod grati animi sensus fateri jubet) cum fide et religionis cultu scientias pari studio colerent, in eisque excolendis non mediocrem se fructum percepisse, ac incrementum etiam addere posse ostenderent. At certe quantum valeant in excolendis etiam altioribus scientiis Peruana ingenia, egregium, ut arbitror, specimen Europaeis feret haec Peruani Doctoris *Philosophia*, qua non immerito suaderi possis, erudite, lector, in Peruana Regione omnia esse aurea: aetatem auream, aurea saecula, in eaque reperiri felicia ingenia. [...] Quid enim Peruani deest? [...] Florere academias ac instituta scholarum exercitia haec Peruani philosophi commentaria satis superque demonstrant”. Quesada mentioned the canonization of St. Rose of Lima. Other 18th-century Creoles claimed that America was greater for wit than wealth. Examples in Juan José Eguíara y Eguren, *Biblioteca Mexicana* (Mexico City 1755).

Seneca thought philosophers should pass on more than they have received. Ortega applied the words to Briceño, pointing out his many novel ideas and original interpretations of Scotistic philosophy.¹⁸ Espinosa's main reason for publishing his logic was to oppose a "modern" movement which emerged within Spanish Scholasticism during the first half of the 17th century – a rebellion against traditional viewpoints that in some ways paralleled the beginnings of Modernity north of the Pyrenees.¹⁹ He said that, as a student of St. Thomas, from his boyhood²⁰ he set out to defend the "early pioneers" of philosophy from these "moderns". He had nothing against originality; if he did criticize modern claims he did so "not because they are new but because [their advocates] try to peddle them as if they were". He often told us when he himself was being original and twice mentioned that while analyzing "his opponents' new arguments" he "usually rethinks" his traditional positions.²¹

¹⁸ Seneca, Letter 64:7–8: "Facit amplius quod accepit ut major ista hereditas ad posteros transeat. Multum adhuc restat operis multumque restabit; nec ulli nato post mille saecula praecluditur occasio aliquid adjiciendi. Sed etiam si omnia a veteribus inventa sint, hoc semper novum erit: usus et inventorum ab aliis [hic ego insistam] scientia ac dispositio". Ortega, "Ex praescriptio" (note 1), went on: "Nemo adeo erit caecutiens ut praeter multa subtilia et sublimia ab eo inventa, inventorum saltem a suo Scoto mirificam scientiam et dispositionem sine dignatione non recipiat et insigniter exosculetur".

¹⁹ These "recentes", "recentiores", "neoterici", "juniores", or "nuperi" included the "nominalistic" Jesuits Pedro Hurtado de Mendoza (published 1615), Rodrigo de Arriaga (1632), and Francisco de Oviedo (1640), as well as Cistercian Juan Caramuel de Loblokowitz (Espinosa mentions a work from 1654 and two from 1651).

²⁰ "Thomisticam profiteor scholam, qui enim aliam possem in insigni clericorum Sancti Antonii Magni Seminario teneris ab unguiculis innutritus et usque ad Primariae Cathedrae prefecturam eductus".

²¹ Title page from Espinosa, *Philosophia Thomistica* (note 1): "Ubi peripateticorum doctrina dilucide exponitur, declaratur, veneranda antiquorum sapientia nova meditatione suspicitur, explicatur: Plato, Aristoteles, Porphyrius, d[ivus] Thomas, Cajetanus, aliique veteres scientiarum antesignani ab aemulorum invidia et neotericorum morsiculis vindicantur, defenduntur, et ut plurimum nova omnia hostium argumenta non invita (ut dicitur) Minerva, perpenduntur, enodantur". Author's preface: "Igitur antiquitatis canos thomista suspicio, a juniorum vulsibus defendo, et nova meditatione plerumque illustro; neque opiniones neotericorum displicent quia novae sed quia cum non sint pro novis venditantur. Neminem data opera incurro aut invidiose traduco; id vel inde liquet quodsi quem disserendo nunc impugno, in eadem (non raro) disputatione mox de aliis quae recte sentiat ingenue laudo ejusque industriam amplector". See Walter Redmond, "Latin American Colonial Philosophy. The Logic of Espinosa Medrano": *The Americas* 30, 4 (1974), p. 475–503, here: p. 500, for original points.

Espinosa's critique of the "moderns" was not his only contribution to a European debate. His chief fame actually rests on his defense of the Spanish Baroque poet Luis de Góngora in the culteranist controversy.²² Espinosa was known for his elegance not only in Spanish but in Latin and Quechua as well. Quesada and the spokesman for St. Thomas College praised his Latin; the latter, quoting St. Augustine, imagined the sisters *Philosophy* and *Philocalia* standing by his side as he wrote.²³ His Quechua verse play *The Prodigal Son* is the earliest extant piece of dramatic poetry in that language.²⁴

Espinosa voiced the "old complaint" that Europeans were not paying proper attention to works written in America.²⁵ Ortega complained in a foreword to a collection of Espinosa's sermons that Peru, indeed America, could fill European libraries with greater wealth than they had filled its coffers with treasure – if only the great minds "regularly flourishing by the thousands in the New World" had easier access to the press.²⁶

A NOBLER TRADE

1. Pedro de Ortega

An emblem on the title page of León Pinelo's defense of the Peruvian university pictures America addressing the sun: "Today I rise as you in everything; the New World is daily greater".²⁷ Over a decade before,

²² Juan de Espinosa Medrano, *Apologético en favor de don Luís de Góngora* (Lima 1662), reedited by Ventura García Calderón, *El apogeo de la literatura colonial* (Paris 1938), p. 57–186.

²³ "Philosophiam et Philocaliam germanas sorores esse et eodem parente procreatas; non penitus poetas a philosophia contemnendos esse" (St. Augustine, *Contra Academicos*, bk. 2, ch. 3).

²⁴ Juan de Espinosa Medrano, "Auto sacramental del hijo pródigo": E. W. Middendorf (ed.), *Dramatische und lyrische Dichtungen der Keshua-Sprache* (Leipzig 1891).

²⁵ "Ast haec vetus nostratum quaerela est".

²⁶ "Censura y aprobación": Pedro de Ortega, *La novena maravilla* (Madrid 1695): "De este ofir [de los ingenios americanos] de tan encarecido precio y excelencia pudiera el Perú y la América toda llenar las bibliotecas de la Europa con mayor afluencia, con más excesiva abundancia, que ha llenado sus numerosos reinos de tesoros y opulencias, si la penuria de impresiones no le embargara esta gloria, malográndole gran copia de raros y prodigiosos ingenios que a millares florecen de ordinario en ese nuevo orbe". Valera also complained of the scarceness of presses in America (see quotation above).

²⁷ "Hodie omnibus orior quasi tu; novus orbis quotidie major".

Ortega used astronomy and geography, philosophy and classical literature to “prove” the intellectual “superiority” of America over Europe; Espinosa and his admirer from St. Thomas College focused their apologies on South America.

Ortega took his cue from Valera; he wrote of Briceño: “But lo, a light rises, upside down and backwards, in the west, tomb of the sun! Can anything good come from the Indies?”²⁸ Yes, of course, the treasure fleets, but how about thinkers or teachers? He ironically thanked Europeans for admitting Americans “born on rude soil in harsh clime” to the human race and congratulated Peruvians on “being admitted to reason – if not to its use”. While not denying the influence of climate on mind and custom, he insisted, quoting Tertullian, that cultural factors like a tradition of learning are overriding and may be found anywhere.

Still, Europeans refused to renounce their prejudice. “We, far off in Pluto’s land abounding in gold and silver mines, are but dreamy shades of men”, and if a European Aeneas visited Peru, as once he entered the underworld to find his father Anchises, he would “wonder from afar the arms and chariots empty of men”, no more able to touch its people than embrace his father: “The ghost vainly grasped thrice fled his hands”.

With Tertullian, “an African, perhaps suffering the same affront as Peruvians”, he stressed that in spite of our language differences, we form one human spirit, for “not only for Latin and Greeks do souls descend from the sky”.

Indeed, said Ortega, hitting his stride, Peru is rather like Virgil’s Region of the Blest: “Here, a more bountiful air clothes the fields in purple light”, and its denizens “know a sun and stars of their own”, and he added a quote from Claudian: “Here dwells an age more precious, a golden breed”.

Clouds screen the sun, says Seneca, but do not keep it from shining, just as insult and injury conceal excellence without diminishing it. Peru may be overcast, said Ortega (perhaps thinking of Lima’s peculiar weather), but its light continues to shine. Seneca’s words apply to Briceño, thwarted by the disrepute of his land, cut off from recognition and reward: “Nature begets such people to show that virtue and genius

²⁸ To preserve their unity, I have placed the original Latin texts and references of this section in the appendix.

may arise anywhere”. Yet Briceño has overcome the obstacles: “Come then, Briceño, for one may rise skyward even from the hinterlands – arise now, fancying that you, too, are worthy of God”.

Ortega reminded the Viceroy, who commissioned his foreword, of the unfair treatment of talented, hardworking Peruvians, whose achievements go unacknowledged and unappreciated.²⁹ And he prayed “Mother Virtue” to help Briceño, “in whom all of us are”, to get his work published, which, he noted ironically, will count at least as an oddity. For people pay no heed to the sky unless something unusual appears; then they point to it, wondering whether it is an omen. Ortega predicts that the wise shall indeed hail Briceño as a nova, “this star that has blazed forth from a new sky”.

2. Juan de Espinosa Medrano

Espinosa offered his own “astronomical” defense of America. With Roman poet Juvenal he agreed that “the best, those setting the greatest examples, may be born under dull airs in the land of fools”.

But he adds: “Now, what if I should prove that our World is not shrouded in dull airs, but in naught yields to the Old World?”

It was indeed “not a Peruvian but a Roman poet”, Manilius, who said:

“the other part of the earth [lies] under those [stars],
trackless for us, its peoples unknown; their untravelled realms
draw common light from a single sun and shadows reversed,
and see in the sky turned about constellations
setting on the left and rising on the right”.³⁰

Espinosa asked his reader to mark these next verses:

“Yet their world is not the less nor worse for brightness,
nor are the stars born in their orb the fewer.
In naught else do they yield [...]”

²⁹ The fact that European disregard was a sore point for Ortega can be seen from his complaint to the Spanish Court that worthy Americans were passed over for appointment to public office; M. de Mendiburu, *Diccionario histórico-biográfico del Perú*, 11 volumes (Lima 1931–4), vol. 8, s. v. “Ortega”.

³⁰ Manilius (1st century A. D.) spoke of the southern temperate zone between the Tropic of Capricorn and the Antarctic Circle. Shadows are “reversed” because they fall to the south. To an observer in the northern hemisphere facing the equator, the night sky turns from left to right, but from right to left to someone facing the equator in the southern hemisphere.

Next he set out to prove that the southern hemisphere is actually “better” than Europe, even Athens. He cited St. Thomas Aquinas, explaining why for Aristotle the South Pole is “above”, that is, beneath the upper, right-hand part of the sky: “The South Pole must be above, since if the North Pole were so, the sky would move from left to left, which we do not say”.³¹

Since for the two great philosophers the Greeks themselves are “beneath and to the left”, reasoned Espinosa, Peruvians are born not in some wretched, gloomy wilderness, but under a better sky, “above and to the right”:

“So if Greece, Mother of Knowledge, Athens itself are beneath us and on our left, surely we, who have chanced to dwell on top of the world, may be proud of our land and sky”.

Their stars might be “right”, said Espinosa, but their fortune was wrong, and Manilius gave the reason:

“in naught else do they yield;
they are alone surpassed by one star:
Augustus, the heavenly body touching our world”.

Manilius was thinking of the Roman Emperor Augustus but Espinosa of King Charles II, who was not present to support intellectual enterprise. Peruvians had to be “Argonauts”, obliged to seek the golden fleece of recognition “from the antipodes” – and even so it came “late or never”. He would have offered the King “an entire world” but had to be content with his book on logic,

“a shadowy victim, a mock offering, a paper gift, yet a token of something great: undertakings of the mind, notions of the understanding – a witness from a new world that you hold sway over mind as well as body”.³²

³¹ If we look “down” to the north (“north” comes from a word meaning “nether”, also “left” in Umbrian), the sun appears to move “from right to right”, that is, from our right in a circle; if we look “up” to the south (“south” may be cognate to “super”), the sun appears to rise on our left.

³² “Haud secus mihi evenit (o Rex optime maxime), qui ad tantae majestatis aras pro dignitate non bovem sed orbem sane integrum, si suppetere vires, dedicare vellem. Clementiori tamen velut Herculi, non nisi umbratilem hostiam, doni figmentum, minusque chartaceum venerabundus offero. Est tamen exiguum hoc obsequium, magnae rei argumentum: mentis quippe molimina intellectusque conceptiones, ex Novo Orbe majestati tuae pollucemus ut non solum corporibus ibi sed etiam animis te regnare contestemur”.

3. St. Thomas College

The spokesman of St. Thomas College's carried Espinosa's astronomy and geography further. Europeans have a "hostile spirit" if Espinosa is correct, he said, alluding to Virgil's *Aeneid*: Had the gods not been hostile to the Trojans, Laocoon's spear piercing the wooden horse would have exposed the Greeks concealed inside, and Troy would still be standing.³³

He, again, accommodated Manilius's lines to Peru:

"in naught else do they yield;
they are surpassed by one star:
and by the 'starry cross' touching our world".

The Southern Cross, then, is another reason why Europeans should consider Peruvians fortunate, for it guided Peruvians through southern seas as the North Star did Europeans in the north. For the author, the constellation fulfilled a prophecy of Isaiah, which he quoted in Hebrew: Christians would sail vast distances across the equator and the Tropic of Cancer to preach the Gospel in the Kingdom of Peru, deferred in God's plan for this moment. He referred these lines of Ovid to the ideal religious unity of Peru and Europe:

"God is among us, and our dealings are with heaven;
from ethereal dwellings comes that spirit".

The reader, then, should expect much of Espinosa's work since in Peru and Europe "all must be alike: sky, land, the human mind". Not only is his logic unsurpassed in America, but "Europe itself, some may say, has yet to send us its equal".

The author also tinkered with the Manilius quotation: Europeans should see Americans "surpassed by one star: St. Thomas"; with words borrowed from Virgil, he added that their "world never of any dweller would boast as much".

It is fitting that Thomism, he thought, go beyond Europe so that people everywhere would "draw common light from a single sun". Aquinas, whose genius, as Lucretius said of Epicurus, "surpassed mankind, dimming all, as the sun, now risen, dims the stars".

³³ Virgil, *Aeneid*, 2:50–52.

He urged Europeans to acknowledge that Peru could contribute to the advance of philosophy, just as it enriched Europe with gold. He quoted a saying in Greek, “lacking silver we send a song”, and closed with these extraordinary words: “Peru will be happier when it begins a nobler trade, and to an Old World, long enriched with its gold and silver, sends wisdom”.

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY; MODERNITY

Scholastics reacted in different ways to the impact of modern thought in the 18th century. Some ignored it or repudiated it, but “eclecticism” was a more typical attitude, and many combined Scholasticism with the new philosophy and science. At the same time, a shift in intellectual self-awareness occurred that was much more fundamental than the previous changes we have noted. Thinkers saw a “disparity” between Europe and America, between Modernity and their traditions. Europe was more “advanced” than America, they felt, and the modern ideas developed there should be “transmitted” to America.

Celis and Díaz de Gamarra are examples of eclectics who wished to disseminate the new thought in Peru and Mexico. They referred to “Scholastics” or “Peripatetics” (Thomists and Scotists) in the third person, often patronizingly, yet retained many of their key philosophical positions. On the other hand, they both opposed many modern doctrines on religious grounds, and their apologetic intent was far greater than the pre-modern Scholastics we have been considering. Also, like other modernizing schoolmen, they were more enthusiastic about science and mathematics than philosophy. And they saw it as their mission to bring recent learning from Europe to America.

1. Isidoro de Celis

Celis, like the pre-modern philosophers we have treated, had pedagogical reasons for writing his philosophy course, *Elementa philosophiae*: He wished to shorten and simplify the subject-matter of philosophy for his students. When made to study huge boring tomes, he said – echoing Valera and Mercado –, they either drop out or take the line of least resistance. He thought a streamlined approach would foment

among the youth, who were “the hope of kingdoms and the future promise of the republic, a love of letters upon which the good of society largely depends”.³⁴

Vera Cruz, Mercado, and Valera also reduced and condensed their material, and Rubio was obliged to do so. But Celis did it with a vengeance. Twenty of his logics could be put into Espinosa’s one. 16th-century authors had been interested both in the lesser and greater logics, but Rubio, who wrote no formal logic at all, and 17th-century logicians were much more concerned with issues of the greater logic. Celis had little interest in either. He reduced the latter to “Scholastic exercises”, giving the bottom line and cutting nearly all background polemic (Mercado and Rubio would have been scandalized). The practical result was that in philosophy, students must learn “conclusions” rather than weigh arguments. Despite their protests of “simplifying” the matter, the pre-modern Scholastic authors we have been studying intended their works for colleagues, and the students – to the sorrow of many – were expected to follow the technical discussion. Celis’s work is more like the “textbooks” of today.

Celis was being modern when he added “method” as the fourth act of the mind to the traditional three (as in the Port Royal logic),³⁵ or when he discussed “doubt”, the “*cogito ergo sum*”, and “clear and distinct” ideas (from Descartes). Nonetheless, he remains quite traditional. “Method”, for him, means standing guard over the other three,

³⁴ Isidoro de Celis, *Elementa philosophiae quibus accedunt principia mathematica verae physicae prorsus necessaria*, 3 vols. (Madrid 1787), Prologue: “Cum enim studiosae juventutis animos ac vires excitare ipsique litterarum amorem, unde commune omnis societatis bonum magna ex parte dependet, instillare plurimum exoptemus ut voti tandem compotes evaderemus, operae pretium existimavimus et studiorum cursum breviorum reddere et faciliorem rerum tractandarum rationem perpetuo servare. Miserranda siquidem semper dolui juvenum conditione qui ingentia plerumque volumina memoriter perdiscenda coguntur, unde saepissime fit ut prolixiorum tractatum taedio affecti ac diuturno labore fracti, vel scholis penitus valedicant vel saltem maximum litterarum horrorem concipiant atque eo dumtaxat animo studia protrahant ut, cum ea arbitrato suo omnino deserere prohibeantur, quantocius studium etiam invite decurrendum absolventes gravissimo jugo ac onere vix ferendo tandem eximantur. Studiosa juvenus, regnorum spes atque optima Reip[ublicae] pars futura, ad ingenuarum artium amorem allicienda est”.

³⁵ A. Arnauld/P. Nicole, *La logique ou l’art de penser* (Paris 1662). The traditional acts of the mind are apprehension, judgment, and reasoning. Method is important for F. Bacon, Descartes, Leibniz, and other modern philosophers.

more basic, acts of the mind. The *cogito* is not the first principal of thought, nor is the clear-and-distinct criterion fundamental. Like Rubio, he used the distinction between subjective and objective concepts in his rejection of psychologism and of nominalism.³⁶

His main interest was modern science and mathematics (arithmetic, algebra, and geometry), which he saw as “necessary to true physics”, to which half of the *Elementa Philosophiae* is devoted. Yet Celis fitted science into the Scholastic classification of philosophy as “particular physics” (distinguished from the more traditional “general physics”). He was also modern by adding ethics to the traditional core subjects of logic, physics, and metaphysics.³⁷

The *Elementa philosophiae* was proposed as a “national philosophy course” in Peru and was well received in Mexico, where it was judged to be a good compendium of, and in some ways to be clearer than, the *Institutiones philosophicae* of F. Jacquier, popular in Spain in the late 18th and early 19th centuries.³⁸ Celis was credited with introducing Newton into Peru.

Like Espinosa, Celis was praised for his Latin, and he was urged to publish his poetry in that language.³⁹ But his *Filosofía de las costumbres* appeared in Spanish in the same year as his Latin course, and he presided an examination in Spanish, as far as we know, for the first

³⁶ “Nec enim sustineri potest, ut Stoici voluere, solas ideas, vel solas voces, ut placuit philosophis illis quos ‘nominales’ appellat d[ivus] Thomas, universales esse. Etenim scientiae non instituuntur propter ideas nec propter meras voces ideas exprimentes, sed de ipsis praecipue agunt rerum naturis quae per ideas repraesentantur ac tandem vocibus exprimuntur”. Celis, *Elementa philosophiae* (note 34), 1:63–64.

³⁷ For references see Walter Redmond, *La lógica en el Virreinato del Perú* (Lima 1998).

³⁸ F. Jacquier, *Institutiones philosophicae* (Alcalá 1785, 1794; Madrid 1814). A document transcribed by M. Mejía Valera, *Fuentes para la historia del la filosofía en el Perú* (Lima 1963) called Celis’s work “un compendio de Jacquier”, and Mexican Jesuit J. A. Alzate wrote in his *Gaceta de literatura de México*, vol. 1 (Puebla 1831), p. 347, that Celis’s work was “un compendio muy bien formado de [la obra de Jacquier]. Pero un compendio a veces más claro y mejorado en método”. See L. A. Eguiguren, *Diccionario histórico-cronológico*, vol. 1 (Lima 1940), p. 948; C. D. Valcárcel, *Historia de la educación colonial*, vol. 2 (Lima 1968), p. 78; A. Salazar Bondy, *La filosofía en el Perú* (Lima 1967), p. 44.

³⁹ “Sólo resta que nos comuniqué por medio de la prensa sus hermosas poesías latinas, cuyo mérito apenas tiene igual en ninguno de los modernos, aun entrando en este número las del siglo XVI”. “Noticia de un libro nuevo del padre lector jubilado Isidoro Celis, socio academico de nuestra sociedad amantes del país”: *Mercurio peruano* 369 (July 17, 1794), p. 181.

time in 1788.⁴⁰ The switch to the vernacular of course marked a profound change in philosophical attitudes.

2. Juan Benito Díaz de Gamarra y Dávalos

Gamarra finished his studies in Europe, where his Scholastic tranquility was shaken by “recent” philosophy. He returned to Mexico with new books and new ideas, which he worked diligently to spread. He was modern in the same ways as Celis. But his *Elementa recentioris philosophiae* was an introduction not only to “philosophy” but to “modern philosophy”. This Latin work appeared in 1774, but seven years later, he published *Errores del entendimiento humano* (still, he wrote three textbooks for teaching Latin).⁴¹ His philosophy included ethics and a history of philosophy. He was more interested in – and was more “modern” in – science than philosophy (his science is twice as long as his philosophy).⁴²

Gamarra called himself an eclectic. He had one foot in Scholasticism and the other in Modernity and from either he hurled insults at the other. Scholastic metaphysics, with its “numberless, useless questions”, is a “muddle”, and the thought of “pernicious” atheists and materialists is “nonsense”.⁴³ He derided traditional doctrines yet used them when he needed them. The classification of distinctions “are certainly not worth the full treatment” Scholastics gave them, he said, but a few pages later, he uses no less than four types of Scholastic distinc-

⁴⁰ “Breve resumen de los tratados y proposiciones [...]”. Walter Redmond, *Bibliography of the Philosophy in the Iberian Colonies of America* (The Hague 1972), p. 27–28.

⁴¹ The first volume also contained a geometry written by Gamarra’s student Agustín de la Rotea (who, by the way, failed to find a publisher for his non-Euclidian geometry). Gamarra, a *polígrafo*, also wrote on religion and archeology.

⁴² His *Physica* consists of 265 pages and his philosophy of 133.

⁴³ Quotations are from Gamarra’s metaphysics. Juan Benito Díaz de Gamarra y Dávalos, *Elementa Recentioris Philosophiae volumen primo* [...] (Mexico 1774). “Peripatetici philosophi tam perturbate metaphysicam tradiderunt nihil ut obscurius cogitari possit” (p. 2). “Scientiam hanc clariori et accuratiōni, quo fieri poterit, ordine complectemur; cumque obscuritas maxima ex innumeris prorsusque inutilibus quaestionibus oriatur quibus illam Arabes et vulgares Peripatetici miserime deturparunt, quaestiones illas veluti inutiles omitemus, atque ens ipsum ejusque species et proprietates omnes contemplabimur” (p. 3). “Materialistae increduli nempe perversissimique homines tuentur nihil praeter physicam sensibilitatem in homine esse [...]”. He names the philosophers defending “hunc errorem [...] perniciosissimis libellis quibus religionem moresque corrumpunt [...]”, and argues “contra hos ergo incredulos perditosque homines” (p. 21–22).

tions to make his point.⁴⁴ In his philosophy of religion, he abandoned most traditional analyses in favor of Cicero and contemporary authors, yet he devoted most of his short treatise to “refuting the scoffing atheists” in Scholastic objection-reply style.⁴⁵

He laid out his eclectic program explicitly. True philosophers should so yearn for truth, he said, that “they will follow neither Aristotle nor Plato, neither Leibniz nor Newton, swearing allegiance to the words of no master”. As an eclectic, he said, he wished neither to attack ancients for being ancient nor praise moderns for being modern, and if he did side with the latter it was simply because he thought – reversing Espinosa’s judgment on his own “moderns” – so many of their claims were right, and this he would “show conclusively in physics”. Yet he “quite cheerfully departed” from modern views, especially on the “most important” mind-body question, where he “held with the Peripatetics of old”.⁴⁶ The relation of soul and body was the second of the two issues he treated in “psychology”, which for him formed part of metaphysics rather than natural philosophy.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ “Sed haec aliaque id genus quae fuse a Peripateticis explicantur tanti certe non sunt ut uberius exponi debeant”. He did admit the distinctions are helpful in theology (p. 11).

⁴⁵ “Atheorum cavillationes refutantur”, (p. 57). “Natural theology” is the third and last part of his metaphysics. He quotes Cicero’s *De legibus*, *De natura deorum*, and *De divinatione*; Lactantius’s *De opificio Dei*, St. Augustine; opponents are Hobbes, Spinoza, Bayle, Toland.

⁴⁶ “Qui ‘philosophorum’ nomine gloriantur, inquirendae veritatis desiderio accensi ita esse debent ut, nulli sectae addicti, non Aristotelem, non Platonem, non Leibnitzium aut Newtonum, sed veritatem sequentes, nullius debeant jurare in verba magistri. Nos igitur qui philosophiam eclecticam profitemur, omni partium amore sublato, nec philosophos antiquos impugnemus quia veteres nec recentiores laudamus quia recentiores sunt, sed eo praecise quod, juxta ingenioli nostri tenuitatem, palmam antiquis in multis praeripere videntur, ut pluribus in locis probavimus et magno rationum pondere in physica etiam ostendemus. Ceterum amor quo recentiores amplectimur non adeo nos abripit ut illorum placita nullo discrimine posito exosculemur, quin potius ab eorum sententia libentissime recedimus cum veritati contraria nobis videtur, quod in hac gravissima quaestione [soul-body] manifestum facimus in qua rejectis recentiorum opinionibus veterum peripateticorum sententiam amplectimur” (p. 44).

⁴⁷ Elías del Carmen Pereira, O.F.M. (1760–1825), teaching in Cordoba, Argentina, is another example of new wine in old skins. Though he “followed the example of the more cultivated nations” by refusing to quibble over prime matter, he defined “matter” as extended particles, physically but not mathematically indivisible, and “form” as their combination giving rise to its specific properties. In a sort of “particle-wave” theory of light, he saw “globules” wherein light is propagated as the matter and the form the rapid vibratory motion transmitted. Manuscript *Physica generalis* (1784), kept in the Facultad

REFLECTION

Philosophers working in America during the 16th and 17th centuries did not see themselves illuminating a lagging culture with the latest European learning. With Celis and Gamarra, the intellectual atmosphere was obviously different. Philosophy was undergoing paradigm changes.

The primary evolution of Ancient Western philosophy took place among Greek-speakers, not Latin-speakers. The key innovations in medieval Scholasticism and modern philosophy were made outside Iberia. 20th-century phenomenology did not unfold primarily in English-speaking countries. The primary development of “late” Scholasticism from the 15th through the 17th century included the *siglo de oro* of Spain, Portugal, and the Spanish colonies.

“Belonging to a primary development” in philosophy contrasts with tracking a development elsewhere and responding to it. The texts we have examined show that pre-modern Scholastics in America felt they belonged to a primary development of philosophy. Many expected to be – and some were – taken seriously in Europe and complained when they were not. Valera and Espinosa offered their own logics, and Ortega offered Briceño’s theology as proof of the fine work that was being done in American “letters”. But eclectic Scholastics in the 18th century often had misgivings about Scholasticism, and they all accepted the ascendancy of modern European science and, to some extent, philosophy.

Colonial thinkers were not preoccupied by the need to be original, but contributing to a tradition, not just “handing it on” (*tradere*), as Ortega said explicitly, was important to them. Mercado chose to be original, Espinosa promises “new arguments” on his title page, and Rubio insisted that he had thought up a certain point before his better known *confrères* Suárez and Vázquez.⁴⁸ In fact, except when merely

de Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales, La Plata University; Spanish translation in J. Chiabra (tr.), *La enseñanza de la filosofía en la Época Colonial* (Buenos Aires 1911), p. 173–333. Walter Redmond, “Colonial Thought in Latin America”: *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Routledge 1998), vol. 5, p. 421–426.

⁴⁸ On applying an Aristotelian distinction (993B20–24) to logic. “Hanc sententiam jam diu a nobis excogitatam novissime probant Doctor Franciscus Suárez [...] et doctissimus pater Gabriel Vázquez nostrae Societatis [...]”; Rubio, *Commentariū [...] Dialecticam* (Alcalá 1603), columns 72–76. See W. Redmond, “Lógica y ciencia en la ‘Lógica mexicana’ de Rubio”: *Quiipu* 1, 1 (1984), p. 55–82, here: p. 72.

“covering the matter” for their students, these teachers – especially those who wrote for publication – made their own assessment of each philosophical topic and defended it with careful argumentation.

The disdain that historians have so often shown for Latin American colonial philosophy may reveal a value judgment: philosophy should respond without “lagging” to primary innovation. They did not, as a rule, consider the possibility of America influencing Europe; paradoxically, Rubio may have had more influence on European philosophy – even north of the Pyrenees – than any other philosopher working in Latin America until recently.

American response to European philosophy could be ambiguous. Andrés Bello, brilliant early 19th-century lexicographer, litterateur, and philosopher, thought it was time for Latin America to make a second declaration of independence, this time intellectual. On the other hand, none would claim much originality for his own thoroughly European *Filosofía del entendimiento*.⁴⁹ Recent philosophers who see Latin America (with Africa and Asia) as an intellectual periphery and accuse the primary centers of being as domineering in culture as they are in economics are hardly un-European in their own views on fact and value.

Latin American historians have agonized over the supposed dilemma between imitation and isolation, between slavishness and “tropicalism”.⁵⁰ Leopoldo Zea said the Hispanic American chose to “amputate” the past, “severing” one form of his being from the other. The Hispanic American,

“as he became more and more aware of his dependent relationship with a world which he did not consider his own and with a past which he considered foreign, tried to break once and for all with that world and that past”.⁵¹

These words indeed apply to later attitudes to the colonial past but obviously not to the self-consciousness of American intellectuals themselves in the colonial centuries.

⁴⁹ Published posthumously in 1881; it contains much interesting material (e. g., sign-ideas); O. Carlos Stoetzer (tr.), *Philosophy of the Understanding* (Washington, DC 1984).

⁵⁰ The word is from Francisco Larroyo, *La filosofía americana – Su razón y sinrazón de ser* (Mexico City 1958), p. 22.

⁵¹ Leopoldo Zea, *Dos etapas del pensamiento en Hispanoamérica*; English translation in J. H. Abbott/L. Dunham, *The Latin-American Mind* (Norman 1963), p. 7–8.

The evolution of intellectual self-awareness in the colonial period must be something like this, to judge from our sources. In the 16th century, philosophers were concerned with finding balance in teaching technical material (analogous to our own teaching-research dilemmas). Much of their published work, indeed, gives the impression of being philosophy for philosophers. However, toward the end of the century, in Rubio we see a conflict between doing philosophy “here and there”, and between his “letters” (which his General in Rome admitted could be done better in Europe) and his *afición* for the Indians. So there was a “difference” between America and Europe: It was easier to be an intellectual in Europe.

In the 17th century, this difference was the object of lively protest in Peru. Intellectuals felt they had a right to publish their works and to be heard by their colleagues both in Europe as well as in America. Their very protest shows that they assumed they belonged to the primary development of philosophy – their complaint was that Europeans seemed to forget the fact.

Pre-modern Scholastics were contemporary in their intellectual activity. This is obvious in the cases of Vera Cruz, Mercado, and Rubio, who worked in both Mexico and Europe, and even shuttled back and forth. In Cuzco, Espinosa contributed to two contemporary European debates, one in philosophy and the other in literature. At the same time, they were “committed” to America. Vera Cruz and Mercado wrote on many “practical” issues, and Rubio thought his “intellectual” activity in America benefited the Indians more immediately than if he had been in Spain. Vera Cruz, Rubio, and Espinosa were trilingual (besides Spanish and Latin, they spoke Purépecha, Nahuatl, and Quechua respectively), and Espinosa also wrote poetry and plays in Quechua.

One thing was common to all these Scholastics, “pure” and “modernizing”: their obvious dedication to good teaching.

To sum up (and oversimplify), modern intellectuals in Latin America have been worried that America was not receiving European philosophy as it should; pre-modern Scholastics were worried that Europe were not receiving American philosophy as it should.

APPENDIX – SELECTED TEXTS

DEFENSIO INGENII AMERICANI

1. Valera

Forsan sciscitaberis (lector optime) cur in hac feracissima praeclarissimorum ingeniorum aetate tam multiplici rerum cognitione referta, in qua innumerabiles philosophandi magistri quotidie prodeunt peritissimi et qui de proposita materia graviter ac subtiliter disputant non pauci, ita ut nihil jam amplius desiderari posse videatur, meae inopiae ac inscitiae periculum fecerim, nec importunas criticorum voces in meas aures:

numquid a Nazareth aut a Peru aliquid boni?

insurrantes formidaverim. Tametsi tibi respondere possem quod

potens est Deus de Peruanis lapidibus suscitare filios Abrahae.⁵²

2. Ortega

Sed ecce ab occidente solisque sepulchro inversa oritur et praeopostera lux: ab Indis aliquid boni exeat? Aurum, argentum, margaritae, ac thesaurorum ingentes classes esto inde proveniant; ingenia, doctores, quis annuat? Sat sit gentem in crasso solo et duris editam sideribus ad rationem hominumque atomam speciem et consortium admisisse. Gratulor in primis vobis Peruanis ad rationem admissis, nescio an ad usum! Gratias quoque iis qui gratis admittitis, quod non estis soli homines, quodque nobis etiam cor et a natura et conditione vindicatis brutorum.

Sanctius his animal, mentisque captior altae

Natus homo est.⁵³

Peruanus. Verus tu, o Simonides, patriam convenit esse gloriosam! [...] ⁵⁴

Loci temperiem non abnuo multum referre ad ingenia et mores didici ex Hypocrate, Platone, Tulio, audio “Batavam aurem” veteri proverbio, Thebis apud Tertullianum, hebetes et brutos nasci, Athenis sapiendi, dicendique acutissimos. Sed ipse paulo inferiori plures accumulatur causas acuminis et hebetudinis quae accedunt.

Acuunt [inquit] doctrinae et disciplinae, artes et experimentae, negotia, studia; obtundunt inscitiae, ignaviae, desidia, libidines, inexperientiae, otia, vitia [...] super haec, si et aliae quae praesunt potestates, enimvero praesunt secundum quidem nos [fideles intelligit] Dominus Deus et Diabolus emulus, secundum autem communem opinionem [infidelium] et providentia et fatum et necessitas et fortuna et arbitrii libertas.⁵⁵

⁵² Mt 3:9,c 3:8; Jn 1:46.

⁵³ “Job” in margin.

⁵⁴ Ortega here clarifies the difference between “Indies” and “Indians” and disassociates Briceño’s heredity from the latter (he quotes A. Ercilla’s *La araucana*, 5, p. 149–152 in Spanish on *conquistador* Francisco Peña, an ancestor of Briceño): “Pues Peña, aunque de lengua tartamudo/Se revuelve con tal desenvoltura/Cual Cesio entre las armas de Pompeo/O en Troya el fiero hijo de Peleo”. Writers of the period often distinguished between Creoles and Indians. Gerbi, “Diego de León Pinelo” (note 9), p. 212–216.

⁵⁵ Tertullian, *De anima*, ch. 20, par. 3; the quotation is from par. 4–5.

Hactenus. Quibus nihil aptius in rem nostram.

Arguta ergo et obtusa indoles ex aliis etiam reducitur quam ex regionis coelo, quod adeo est apud plagas has tenue et ad subtilia, sublimia, et praecocia ingenia procreanda temperatum, ut condendis suis Athenis innumeri sub eo loci Minervae superessent. Imo Mexillus et Clinias, absque negotio et longa peregrinatione et procuratione, generosos, justos, ac suaves mores pollicentem situm Platoni suo passim nanciscantur. Nec Cotyli et eorum pusi, pro praecoci lingua et loquacitate usuque rationis festino, aut in deliciis aut miraculo sunt, tota ditio Colytus est.⁵⁶

Fidem haec superant, nugae (inquiunt) Indianae sunt. Malum inexpiabile! Dissiti sumus et in altero hoc mundo quasi in Regno Plutonis ad quod aurum, argentum, et metalla spectant, umbrae vanae imagines hominum et somnia; ut quando Aeneas iste superus Europeus ad nos descendat,

Arma procul, currusque virum mir[a]tur inan[is].⁵⁷

Etiam si nos, nostraque videat, contrectet, et amplexetur, non credit:

Ter frustra complexa manus effugit imago.⁵⁸

Vanus potius ipse et vanum falsumque ejus iudicium.

Tertullianus, prout era Afer et ultra mare dissitus, eodem quo nos ictu ac injuria forte percussus, ita graviter questus est:

Vanus es si huic linguae, aut Graecae, quae propinquae inter se habentur, reputabis hujusmodi, ut neges naturae universitatem. Non latinis nec Argivis solum anima de coelo cadit; omnium gentium unus homo, [varium] nomen est, una anima, varia vox, unus spiritus, varius sonus, propria cuique genti loquela, sed loquela materia communis; Deus ubique et bonitas Dei ubique.⁵⁹

Ita sane Deus et bonitas Dei magnifice nobiscum agit:

Largior hic campos ether et lumine vestit,
purpureo solemque suum sua sidera norunt.⁶⁰

Nisi quod interjacent et eorum nitidam ac puram lucem prohibent multa et magna. Nec propterea vos, o mea sidera, sistite!

Quaedam soli [ipsi] quoque obstant, at [ejus vis et lux] integra est etiam inter opposita, et quamvis aliquid interjacet quod nos prohibeat ejus aspectu, in opere est, cursu suo fertur. Quotiens inter nubila [e]luxit non est sereno minor nec tardior [...], quoniam multum interest utrum aliquid obstat tantum an impediatur. Eodem modo virtuti opposita nihil detrahunt; non est minor sed minus fulget; [...] non aequae apparet ac nitet, sibi eadem est et more solis obscuri in occulto vim suam exercet. Hoc itaque adversus virtutem possunt damna et injuria quod adversus solem potest nebula.⁶¹

Quis non accenditur, etiam exanguis et exanimis? Homines itaque sumus, ejusdem naturae et conditionis, licet alterius Orbis, ubi Claudiano carmine lucem videas:

⁵⁶ Ortega takes these three examples from Tertullian, *De anima*, ch. 20, par. 3, where reference is made to Plato, *Timaeus*, 24C-D, and *Laws*, 704B.

⁵⁷ Virgil, *Aeneid*, 6:651 (emended); Virgil is visiting the region of the Blest with the Sybil.

⁵⁸ Virgil, *Aeneid*, 2:793 and 6:701; Ortega reads *complexa* for *compressa*. Aeneas attempts in vain to embrace the shade of his father Anchises in the Region of the Blest.

⁵⁹ Ortega gives the reference: Tertullian, *De testimonio animae*, ch. 6.

⁶⁰ Virgil, *Aeneid*, 6:640–641. Virgil describes the Region of the Blest.

⁶¹ Ortega gives the reference: Seneca, Letter 92 (17 and 18).

Purius [Americos] que magis mirabere [campos],
cultoresque pios; [istic] pretiosior aetas,
aurea progenies habitat.⁶²

Adest in exemplum et exemplar Briceño noster, cui nulla genii ingeniive elegantia, nullum a natura negatum est ornamentum, immo congestum, quidquid veram hominibus gloriam solet conciliare, ut de illo melius quam de Clarano suo efferat Seneca:

Quosdam [...] in hoc natura tales generare ut approbet virtutem/ingeniumque beatissimum sub qualibet cute et/in omni loco nasci.⁶³

Enimvero, quamvis natura inique se gessisse videatur tales animos in dissitis adeo et impeditissimis ad praemium et ad gloria sedibus male collocando, nunc quod satius est facit; quosdam enim edit locorum natura et opinione impeditos sed nihilominus prae-rumpentes obstantia.

Age ergo, mi Briceño, subsilire in coelum etiam ex angulo licet! Exurge modo et te quoque dignum finge Deo!⁶⁴ [...]

Nunc primum ad Briceñum, in quo omnes sumus, [manum refer, Mater Virtus] ut hoc cultissimum et elaboratissimum opus, quod in offensa fide catholica, imo sat de illa meritum, currit, lucem videat. Dignum sane ut saltem, quia insolitum prodit, spectaculum dulce fiat.

Hic coetus astrorum quibus immensi corporis pulchritudo distinguitur populum non convocat; si quid praeter consuetudinem emicuit, omnium vultus in coelo est, spectant, interrogant, ostendunt, et oblitii aliorum, de adventitio quaerunt prodigium sit an sidus. Probi, candidi, sapientes, sidus hoc novum, quod e coelo novo fulsit, decernent, recipient, plaudent.

3. Espinosa Medrano

Profecto inique nobiscum agitur, nam (juxta illud Satyrici) multorum
prudentia monstrat,

summos posse viros magnaue exempla daturos
vervecum in patria crassoque sub aere nasci.⁶⁵

Sed quid si ostendero nostrum Orbem non crasso aere circumdari, Orbique veteri nihil cedere? Id certe non Peruanus sed Romanus vates vere simul ac eleganter cecinit Manilius:

Altera pars Orbis sub quis [jacet] invia nobis
ignotaeque hominum gentes nec transita regna,
commune ex uno lumen ducentia sole

⁶² Claudianus, *De raptu Prosepinæ*, 2284–2286. Pluto encourages Proserpina: “Think not you have lost the day; other stars and other orbs we have, and you will see a purer light and admire the Elysian sun and its pious dwellers; there a more precious age, a golden race, and we have ever what men above merit but once”.

⁶³ Ortega gives reference: Seneca, Letter 66 (combining phrases from 1 and 3); Claranus was a schoolmate of Seneca’s.

⁶⁴ Ortega continues to use images from Seneca, Letter 66 (3).

⁶⁵ Espinosa gives the reference: Juvenal, *Satire* 10, speaking of philosopher Democritus.

diversasque umbras, laevaue cadentia signa
et dextros ortus coelo spectantia verso.

Attendas nunc quaeso, lector, ne nos pro manibus aut umbris habeas inanibus:

Nec minor est illis mundus nec lumine pejor
nec numerosa minus nascuntur sidera in Orbe[m].

Cetera non cedunt; uno vincuntur in astro

Augusto, sidus nostro quod contigit Orbi.⁶⁶

Iam vero si poetis fidem abneges testantibus sane nostrum Orbem claro lumine, aere subtili, ceterisque nihil antiquo cedere, philosophos dabo, et quidem maximos: Aristotelem et sanctum Thomam majora docentes. Ille equidem libro secundo De Coelo et Mundo, cap[itulo] 2, aperte tradit polum hunc antarcticum esse sursum coeli, seu partem superam, simulque dexteram illius:

Polorum autem [inquit] is quidem qui apud nos videtur, pars infera est; is autem qui nobis manifestus non est, partis rationem superae subit.⁶⁷

Subscribit Philosopho Angelicus, [De] interpretatione, lect[ione] 4:

Necesse est [inquiens] quod polus immanifestus, scilicet Antarcticus, sit sursum coeli. Si enim polus arcticus, qui semper est nobis manifestus, esset sursum, sequeretur quod motus coeli esset a sinistra et ad sinistram, quod nos non dicimus.

Pergit Stagirita:

Et eos qui illic habitant in hemisphaerio supero esse, atque in dextris; nos autem in infero ac sinistris.

Haec ille. Nec hilum discrepat Divus Thomas:

Concludit secundum praedicta [inquit] differentiam habitationis terrae, dicens quod, ex quo polus immanifestus est sursum, illi qui habitant sub illo polo sunt in hemisphaerio superiori et apud dextrum coeli; nos autem qui in hac parte terrae habitamus sumus in inferiori hemisphaerio et in sinistra.

Non igitur Peruani in obscuris despectisque mundi angulis, crassiore sub aere nati, sed in praestantiore terrae situ, melioremque coelo sibi ardentem: quantum partes supernae inferioribus, dextraeque sunt sinistris potiores. Quodsi etiam Graecia disciplinarum omnium mater, et quod caput est Athenae ipsae, nostri respectu in imo laevoque loco subsident, possemus certe summum mundi verticem nacti de solo coeloque superbire.

Potest dici [pergit divinus Aquinas] quod Aristoteles locutus est secundum Graeciam in qua habitabat, quae quidem est ad sinistram in quantum est versus occidentem, est autem deorsum in quantum est sub polo Arctico.

Sidera igitur Peruanis dextra quidem sunt, sed sinistra fortuna. Sed cur? Nisi quoniam ab Europaeis uno vincuntur in astro, Augusto scilicet Carolo Rege optimo maximo:

Cetera non cedunt; uno vincuntur in astro

“Austriaco”, sidus “vestro” quod contigit Orbi.

Abest Regis prospectus, abest fausti sideris facies benevola, influxus praesentaneus; altero enim Orbe dissiti caremus calore illo coelesti quo princeps virtutem artesque omnes fovet, erigit, nutricatur, et efflorescere facit. Praemia proinde, gloria honoresque virtutibus debita, pene ex Antipodibus petenda et ut vel sero vel nunquam contingant

⁶⁶ Manilius, *Astronomicon*, 1:377–385.

⁶⁷ Aristoteles, *De coelo*, 285B.

meruisse no sat est, sed oportet et Argonautas esse. Ast haec vetus nostratum quaerela est, nec est cur illam hoc loci repetam. Legendus omnino inter alios illustrissimus doctor D[ominus] Petrus de Ortgega hujusce Urbis Episcopus, qui causam hanc erudite, nervose, arguteque peroravit.

Haec dixerim in Patria dumtaxat commendationem, non quia ingeniorum in illa florentium in me quidquam vel umbrae periclitari praesumam. Quis enim ego ut tot tantorumque virorum in Peruvio litteris, ingenio, doctrina, morquaque amaenitat ac sanctitudine praecellentium specimen audeam exhibere?

4. St. Thomas College

Praeclarissimum opus viri multis titulis spectatissimi Ioannis de Spinosa Medrani, Peruani, summa voluptate perlegimus ac tantam multiplicemque eruditionem mirati, nolimus nostram commendationem deesse in argumentum gratitudinis, quod et communem Patriam nobilitet ejusque famam novo eruditionis titulo comparatam ad Europaeos deferat ac de nostra in primis schola optime meritis sit.

Depulit equidem praefatione sui operis opinionem, forsitan quorundam animis insitam ac minus Peruani propitiam, quam, parem ac zonae torridae tamdiu creditae, fabulam dixerim, et philosophorum Principis ac doctoris Angelici testimoniis, quae Europaei minime suspecta habeant, polum Antarcticum cui America subjacet, adeo polo Artico Veteri Orbi semper conspicuo praestare demonstrat, ut Athenae etiam, quamvis olim sapientiae sedes, sinistrum dumtaxat ac inferiorem in orbe locum tenere dici debeat, et si id addi liceat, “laevam” ipsis inesse “mentem”, ut Virgilii verbo utar,⁶⁸ si cum Peruani conferantur et positionis locorum et polorum discriminis ratio habeatur.

Verum etsi si cetera nobis minus propitia sidera forent, quid non sperare liceat Americanis ab ea siderea Cruce qua nos felices Europaei ipsi arbitrantur, quo benigno sidere, seu Cruce stellis quattuor in formam crucis dispositis, Americani Meridionales et Peruani, ut Europaei aspectu Stellae Polaris, dum navigant diriguntur. Nihil est quod hac in parte Europeis Veterique Orbi invidemus:

Cetera non cedant; uno vincuntur in astro,

“Et Cruce siderea”, nostro “quae” contigit Orbi.

Merebatur equidem inter astra crux reponi divini foederis ac reconciliationis hominum caeleste signum, felicius ac duraturum magis formata iride concretionem nubium ac refractione lucis evanidae.

At quibus nisi Americanis et Peruani haec felicitas tanta contigit, ut benignissimi hujus sideris seu fulgidae Crucis et aspectu recreentur et dirigantur luce et influxibus foveantur? Sed quid non promississet Americanis sider[e]a Crux ab initio conditi orbis, ipsorum semper vertici imminens?

Promittebat puriores ac ardentiores fidei et sanctitatis radios e caelis aliquando effundendos, et tandem impletum iri celeberrimum Isaiae vaticinium quo mittendos apostolicos viros angelosque ad propalandam fidem Crucisque mysterium detegendum tot retro saeculis divinus Propheta vaticinabatur:

⁶⁸ See Virgil, *Aeneid*, 2:54 and idem, *Eclogue* 1:16: “Et, si fata deum, si mens non laeva fuisset, impulerat ferro Argolicas foedare latebras, / Trojaque nunc staret, Priamque arx alta maneres”. *Laevus*, like “sinister”, means “left”, “unlucky”, “awkward” etc.

לכו מלאכים קלים
 אל-גוי ממשך...
 גוי קר-קו ומבוסה

“Ite, angeli veloces, ad gentem dilatam, [...] ad gentem lineae et lineae et conculcatam”.⁶⁹

Quae enim aut Isaiiae olim aut Orbi Veteri regio “lineae et lineae” praeter Peruanum Regnum, quo ut perveniri possit, et lineam tropici Cancrī et lineam aequinoctialis, et diffusas in immensum plagas

corusco semper sole rubentes et torridas semper ab igni⁷⁰

false olim existimatas, pertransire oporteat. Haec sane regio “lineae et lineae” magis Prophetarum oraculo quam soli delitiis divitiisque, aut poli felicitate nobilitata.

Conculcata [quidem] pedibus pauperum⁷¹

cum fidei collum subdidit Peruana Regio olim superba imperio ac divitiis. Et si quando occulto Dei iudicio in superiorem aetatem “dilata”, longam traditatem [?] (quae magnarum rerum quae diu expectantur sors esse videtur) novis in dies editis sanctitatis miraculis quae cum plausu Ecclesia suspicit suisque accenset, majori nunc fecunditate compensat.

Ferat haec non invitus, amicus licet ignotus lector, in nostrae gentis laudem, nec nobis Europaei invadeant aut “nos jam nemo despiciat”;⁷² quos tandem etsi tot terrarum et marium longis tractibus ac spatiis disjunctos, mutuo tamen foedere eadem fides ac religio conjungit, ut jam eadem sorte pares, etsi cetera deessent, illud usurpare liceat:

Est Deus in nobis, sunt et commercia caeli
 sedibus aethereis spiritus ille venit.⁷³

Nec vero haec incassum a nobis dicta eruditus lector existimet, ex quibus etiam agnoscat quid de hac Philosophia sperare liceat. Omnia enim similia esse necesse est: caelum, solum, geniumque hominum. Et quae alia de magnitudine, acumine, ac sublimitate ingeniorum, quae Americana et Peruana Regio alit, argumenta clariora quaerenda sunt praeter hoc unum nobis tibi que, lector, exhibitum: scilicet hanc Peruani auctoris Philosophiam, qua nullam adhuc multis in partibus praestantiorē, ut de nostris modeste loquamur, et, dicent alii forsitan, cui nec parem ad nos Europa transmisit. [...]

Quamvis unum semper, et quo nostram scholam in primis sibi devinxit, ceteris anteponat d[ivum] Thomam, quem ubique pressis vestigiis fidissimus interpret sequatur. Sane fateri libet hoc etiam ab Europaeis nos

astro vinci,

d[ivo] Thoma,

⁶⁹ Isaiah 18:2. The Hebrew words behind *angeli* and *dilatam* (see Proverbs 13:12) here mean “messengers” and “tall”, *lineae et lineae* translates literally the elements of a word signifying “strong”, and the Hebrew for *conculcatam* has an active sense of “trampling, conquering” (Isaiah exhorts Egyptian ambassadors seeking an alliance with Judah against Assyria to return home).

⁷⁰ Autor’s reference: Virgil, *Georgics*, 1 [:233].

⁷¹ Autor’s reference: Isaiah 26 [:6].

⁷² Autor’s reference: Song of Songs [1:6].

⁷³ Autor’s reference: Ovid, *Ars amatoria*, 3.

nec nostra unquam:

Ullo tantum se tellus jactabit alumno.⁷⁴

Sed et haec sanctissimo viro injuria fieret si Veteris Orbis solum finibus hujus doctrina clauderetur. Ultra Europam ferri debuit, ut una esset d[ivi] Thomae schola universis Orbis: qua late patet et ut

commune ex uno lumen ducentia sole⁷⁵

minora scholarum sidera uni doctorum soli [divo] Thomae lucem acceptam referrent:

qui genus humanum ingenio superavit, et omnes

restrinxit stellas exortus uti aerius sol.⁷⁶

Hinc praeclarissima illa lumina quae ubique in sua philosophia sapientissimus d[ominus] Espinosa spargit, et quibus difficillimas quaestiones explicat, ut fateri etiam vicissim Europaei debeant Peruana ingenia aliquid ad philosophiae et sapientiae incrementum non minus conferre posse quam totius Europaeae regna auri ferax fertilisque regio nec sibi solum dives, auri, argentique ac unionum etiam magis pretiosis acervis locupletavit.

Vulgatum olim erat inter amicos cum cetera deessent quo benevolentiam demonstrarent, et ne omnino sterilis amicitia foret:

αργυρίου χηρούμενοι ίαμβον ίάλλομεν

“argento destituti, carmen et laudationem mittimus”.

At erit felicior Peruana Regio cum diu jam auro, argentoque locupletato Veteri Orbi etiam sapientiam mittit nobilium commercium initura, et quae tua singularis laus est, sapientissime Espinosa, non sola America celeberrimum nomen claudet; ibi “Espinosa” nominis fama ad alterum Orbem, et quod nobis collatum beneficium acceptum tibi referimus, ubique terrarum d[ivum] Thomam regnare in scholis per te Orbis universus agnoscet.

⁷⁴ The first is an accommodation of Manilius’s line; Autor’s reference: Virgil, *Aeneid*, 6:877, where Anchises speaks of Augustus’s nephew.

⁷⁵ The author repeats Manilius’s line 379.

⁷⁶ Autor’s reference: Lucretius [*De rerum natura*, 3:1043–4], referring to Epicurus. Text gives *restrinxit* and another reading has *aetherius* instead of *aerius*.