ROLENA ADORNO *Yale University*

A Latin Americanist Looks at *Early American Literature*

In her letter inviting me to participate in this anniversary commemoration, *Early American Literature* editor Sandra Gustafson wrote: "I see this anniversary as an opportunity to reflect on the maturation of the area of literary studies covered by *EAL* and to build ties to neighboring fields." Coming from the neighboring field of colonial Latin American literary studies, I was delighted to accept her invitation because, nearly forty years ago, I had answered a call for papers for an MLA convention panel on Native American studies. As I recall, the panel's sponsor was the MLA-affiliated Association for Studies in American Indian Literatures. In any case, my proposal was rejected on the basis that I had my "own" division, that is, "Latin American Literature before 1900," under whose rubric Native American studies that focused on areas south of the Rio Grande could be entertained. (I was working at the time on the account of an extraordinary native Andean writer from Spanish colonial Peru, whose manuscript work remains part of my scholarly signature to this day.)[1]

Revealing the dilemma of inclusion versus exclusion that we debated in the 1970s, the Native Americanist panel's topic was: "Is American Indian Literature a Separate and Distinct Literature of This Continent or Is It a Sub-Branch of American Literature, an Ethnic Sub-Branch, or Are There Two Bodies of Indian Literature, the Quick and the Dead?" (*Program of the 1976 MLA* 1023). Had my paper proposal been accepted, I would have answered that American Indian Literature was not a "separate and distinct literature of this [North American] continent" but that it could include not only Mexico, which sits on the North American continent, but also Central and South America, too. Yet a project in "my" field, the creation of the journal *Latin American Indian Literatures*, affirmed the tendency of that time, which was to keep separate the geographical and therefore cultural

areas of study of Native American cultures. In short, the exclusionary tactic was practiced in the hemispheric South as well as the North.

Yet in the period that extends from the late 1960s to the early 1980s, the objective was not to exclude from consideration but rather, for the first time, to identify, highlight, and make worthy of study areas of cultural production that had been ignored. These efforts to "create space" characterize scholarly initiatives for all Americanist literatures (Anglo-, African-, Asian-, Latin-, Latino-, and so forth) of the late 1960s and 1970s, when women's and gender studies, ethnic studies, and gay and lesbian studies also emerged. Suzanne Bost has observed, with respect to her areas of scholarship in postmodern and feminist theories and Chicana/o studies: "After all, the intellectual formations and identities I study did not exist prior to 1848, maybe not even prior to 1968" (235).[2] Today's ongoing efforts to be both precise *and* inclusive are exemplified by the evolution of my principal division's name from "Latin American Literature before 1900" to "Latin American Colonial Literature" to the current "Latin American Colonial Literatures," to the proposed "Colonial and Pre-Columbian Latin American Literature."

The current mission statement of *Early American Literature* supports the same goals of precision and inclusiveness:

> *Early American Literature*, published three times a year, is the journal of the Society of Early Americanists and of the MLA's Division on American Literature to 1800. Its province is American literature through the early national period (about 1830). Founded in 1965, *EAL* invites work treating Native American traditional expressions, colonial Ibero-American literature from North America, colonial American Francophone writings, Dutch colonial, and German American colonial literature as well as writings in English from British America and the US.

While honoring the journal's current inclusion of "colonial Ibero-American literature from North America," I want to go back in time to highlight some of the studies in the nearly fifty years of *EAL*, from 1967 to the present, that track its engagement with the Ibero-American world. Several of those essays slip farther south than the North American continent (which, we must always remind ourselves, includes Mexico, formerly the viceroyalty of New Spain).

For a quick overview, I cite the scholarly approaches and topics of

Ibero-American interest that have appeared in the journal, organizing them chronologically by the first year of their respective appearances. *Approaches*: literary translation from Spanish to English (1967), direct comparison of Spanish- and English-language texts (1977, 1990, 1995, 2000, 2008), textual analyses of exclusively Spanish-language texts and traditions (1990, 1992, 2008, 2012). *Topics*: the challenges of literary translation (1967), Native American cultural productions (1979), slavery, race, and ethnicity (1985–86, 2001, 2006), the debates about New World "inferiority" (1989), women's writings (1994), the hemispheric perspective and "turn" (1995, 2003, 2010), African-American writings (2001), American exceptionalism (2001, 2010), Spanish-language publishing in the United States (2008), and review articles of monographic studies on the Ibero-American world (2013).

The colonial-era Ibero-American authors examined in *EAL* constitute a limited and predictable "canon": Álvar Núnez Cabeza de Vaca (1990, 2010, 2012), Bartolomé de las Casas (1990, 2000, 2007), Christopher Columbus (1992), and Fray Bernardino de Sahagún (2008). Cotton Mather (1967, 2008) and Joel Barlow (1992, 1995) are the early Anglo-American authors whose Spanish-language texts and topics have been the subject of *EAL* essays. Although studies of Washington Irving's works have appeared in *EAL*, they have not included essays on *The Life and Voyages of Columbus* (1828, 1829), whose ubiquity and influence spread over nearly a century of reeditions.[3]

As one can see above, the Ibero-American world emerged slowly as an object of *EAL* contributors' interest, and I review now more closely some of its landmarks.

In the restless decade of the 1960s, shortly after the journal was founded, the 1967 volume of the *EAL Newsletter* included Thomas E. Johnston's translation into English of Cotton Mather's Spanish-language catechism and a pamphlet on his statement of Puritan faith that included a "thorough condemnation of Roman Catholic belief" (9). The 1970s produced just a few pieces, notably Hans Galinsky's 1977 comparison of "sample passages" of three "exploration reports" (one English, one French, and one Spanish), to show that they constituted "a common form type in early American literature" (5, 6).

The 1980s brought to the fore a focus on race and racial (mis)understandings in Enlightenment thought. In 1985–86 Nancy V. Morrow took up

the issue of African slavery in the New World, focusing on Anglo-America. Examining Edmund S. Morgan's statement of the paradox about "the rise of liberty and equality [having been] accompanied by the rise of slavery" (236), she interrogated the works of Locke, Montesquieu, and Jefferson to suggest that it is to these proponents of a "Moderate Enlightenment" that the conflicted, unresolved status of chattel slavery in North America in large part can be attributed (252). In 1989 John Canup examined Cotton Mather's (1663–1728) consideration of "Criolian Degeneracy" as the overriding problem facing New England (27). Canup's account reveals Mather's ambivalence about the decline in white New England settlers' religious devotion. Mather wondered: was it just the settlers' moral falling off, easily occurring far away from metropolitan authority and thus readily remediable, or was it, more ominously, a natural falling off into the habits of the Indians, due to the specter of "degeneration through transplantation"? (28).

The 1990s heralded the pan-American commemoration of the Columbus Quincentenary. In the heat of the debate about the New Historicism, *EAL* editor Philip Gura issued a salutary caution about the importance to literary scholarship of taking into account history and relevant historical studies: "I suggest that we cannot be New Historicists without better knowing our history, that is, without attention to what the best historians of colonial America are saying about a region or a period, even if subsequently we choose to reject their formulations as inadequate" (104–05). While he was responding to the debate about the scholarly treatment of historical times and contexts *within* a single region or a period, his important advice could (and can) be followed for colonial Anglo- and Ibero-America, especially as objects of comparison.

Some of *EAL*'s scholar-contributors took up the quincentenary challenge by addressing the topic of European explorers and New World exploration. Ralph Bauer was the most notable of these because his interest was sustained, not occasional, and because he advocated and practiced the use of original-language texts and sources. Equally memorable was his proposal of a term that, modified early in the new millennium, would become the phenomenon we have come to know as the "hemispheric turn." In 1995 Bauer proposed that, to be appreciated fully, Joel Barlow's *Columbiad* should be read in light of two of its Spanish-language sources of inspiration: Alonso de Ercilla's epic poem *La Araucana* (1569, 1578, 1589) and

El Inca Garcilaso de la Vega's imaginative history of the Incas, *Comentarios reales de los Incas* (1609, 1616), which focused on the viceroyalty of Peru. The former is a poetic reimagining of the Spanish attempt to conquer the Araucanian Indians of Chile and the latter, a mythical-historical chronicle of the Incas and a personal memoir. In suggesting such a constellation of readings, Bauer called his approach a "hemispheric perspective" ("Colonial Discourse" 206).

The 1990s also brought to *EAL* topics that had been percolating since the '60s and '70s, namely, women's writings and African-American literary production. In 1994, Lee Heller reviewed editions of four novels, written by four US American women and originally published between 1791 and 1812, that appeared in Oxford University Press's Early American Women's Writers Series (1986, 1992). Expressing the need for establishing broader cultural contexts, Heller remarked that the volumes' scholarly editors tended "to emphasize the Americanness of American literature" but that they were "less good at situating these novels in relation to other literatures" (88).

Around the same time, in the mid-1990s, the journal paid closer attention to African-American writings, and in that arena, questions of identification and classification echoed the concerns of the 1970s Native Americanist debate that I cited earlier. African-Americanist scholars debated how to situate African-American writing vis-à-vis the Anglo-American literature of the United States. In *We Wear the Mask* (1997) Rafia Zafar concluded that the United States has produced, in effect, "two national literatures," the Anglo-American and the African-American (190). Reviewing Zafar's book several years later along with a half dozen others pertinent to the consideration of US literary genealogies and African-American writing, Robert S. Levine suggested that if, as Zafar argued (190), African-American literature operated both "in and beyond the contexts of Anglophone American society," then, he posited, "one could develop an argument about the mutually constitutive aspects of literatures that perhaps more productively could be thought about in the context of an emerging, hybridized (or multicultural) national literature" (105). Levine characterized six of the seven books he examined by "an exceptionalist notion of American difference or distinctiveness" (112–13), which was an issue that would continue to be entertained in subsequent debates.

The decade launched in the millennial year of 2000 brought more

sustained comparativist explorations of Anglo-American and Ibero-American literary experiences. In 2000, *EAL* published a substantive comparativist essay by E. Shaskan Bumas on Protestants' readings ("uses") of Las Casas's *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias* (Brief account of the destruction of the Indies) in Europe (England, but also Holland and Germany) and colonial Anglo-America. Bumas argued: "by collapsing into one both las Casas's reportage and the political significance of the condemnation of what it is reporting, las Casas is stripped of his Catholic and Spanish context, making him something of an honorary Protestant and a posthumous ally to the Protestant cause" (108). Bumas further suggested that the Puritan John Eliot, appropriating to himself Las Casas's moral authority, ended up presenting himself "as a superior version of Las Casas" (108). Bumas offered a fine example of what happens when a historical figure in one culture becomes a literary subject in another, and he keeps separate—without ignoring them—the often-conflated categories of historical and literary analysis. He closed with a salutary observation: "That Eliot measures the English conquest against the Spanish is a persistent reminder to scholars today of the benefits of including Hispanic studies (not to mention native studies) in discussions of the literature and history of England and the U.S.," adding: "To understand what the English are up to, one must know the cultures they are distorting as well, what strengths are being elided" (128).

In 2003, *Early American Literature*'s volume 38 announced the results of the "Summit of Early Ibero- and Anglo-Americanists," which had been organized by Ralph Bauer and convened in Tucson, Arizona, in May 2002 (Bauer, "Notes" and "Summit").[4] In the summit's mission statement Bauer suggested that Anglo-American scholarship might do well to follow Ibero-Americanist scholars' lead in considering more closely the imperial past: "while the Hispanic American tradition of literary scholarship and pedagogy has managed to look beyond questions of national legacy to the larger Spanish and Portuguese imperial tradition, early [Anglo] American literature in English has until quite recently been taught as an anticipation of the literature of the United States," that is, until the 1990s there had been "no concerted effort among scholars to view Anglo-American colonial literature in the British imperial context" ("Summit" 124).

During these years of the new millennium the "hemispheric turn" became a "brand." Bauer credited the use of the term to Lisa Voigt and Eric

Slauter and the conference they organized at the University of Chicago in 2004 (Bauer, "Early American Literature" 230n3).[5] Susan Scott Parrish's 2005 *EAL* essay, "The 'Hemispheric Turn' in Colonial American Studies," followed suit; Parrish reviewed Bauer's *The Cultural Geography of Colonial American Literatures* (547–50), as well as the Chicago conference and three others, held at Brown, the University of Michigan, and Dartmouth (550–51).

In 2008, Bartolomé de las Casas reappeared in the pages of *EAL*. David A. Boruchoff reviewed a particularly controversial monograph on Las Casas, Daniel Castro's *Another Face of Empire: Bartolomé de las Casas, Indigenous Rights, and Ecclesiastical Imperialism*, published by Duke University Press that same year. Boruchoff characterized Castro's arguments as making judgments about the present serve as the measure for what had been thought and done in the past (499) and concluded that "for all the neo-Marxist overtones of struggle between oppressors and oppressed, there is an old-fashioned belief in absolutism, effective authority, and the agency of aristocratic actors alone" (501).The fact that *Another Face* was reviewed immediately in *EAL* testifies to the continued potency of Las Casas's legacy and the persistence of Las Casas studies in the Anglo-American academy. If taken into account in no other way, the British imperial past always has been remembered by early Americanist scholarship for its rivalry with imperial Spain: Great Britain was one of the most influential early promoters of the "Black Legend" of Spanish history, thanks to the renderings into English of Las Casas's "brief account of the destruction of the Indies." (In my forty years of teaching experience I have found that students always come to the table with a fully assimilated, popular notion of Spain's "black" history, and this usually includes arguments against Las Casas's credibility as historical witness.)

In 2008 Boruchoff appeared again in the pages of *EAL*, this time authoring one of the finest fruits to date of the Anglo-American–Ibero-American comparativist initiative. He took the cases of the Franciscan friar Bernardino de Sahagún (1500–80) and the Puritan preacher (father of Cotton Mather) Increase Mather (1639–1723) to "examine the rhetorical means by which two seemingly disparate figures in the religious history of the colonial Americas sought amid difficult and distressing circumstances to keep alive the promise of the Church triumphant" ("New Spain" 5). Boruchoff dug deep into his authors' rhetorical formulations and their concep-

tual differences. He refrained from making blanket generalizations about Spanish Franciscan missionary culture or about Anglo-American Puritanism; Boruchoff's discerning focus on his two main figures' writings teases out the revealing differences of individual perspective as set against the wider frame of the respective religious and institutional cultures.

In 2008, Nicolás Kanellos, the founder of Arte Público Press, whose Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage Project endeavors "to find, preserve, and make accessible the written culture of Hispanics in what came to be the United States from the colonial period to 1960" (94n1), published an enlightening article on the origins and development of Spanish-language publishing in the early United States. Citing and augmenting the work of Anna Brickhouse in *Transamerican Literary Relations and the Nineteenth-Century Public Sphere*, Kanellos examined "the precursor publications attempting to create an Hispanic American public sphere and provide a basis for emergent nationalism in the two decades before Brickhouse's 1820s timeline" (95n5).

In 2010, *EAL* published a state-of-the-field overview of hemispheric literary studies in Ralph Bauer's "Early American Literature and American Literary History at the 'Hemispheric Turn.'" Bauer began with a helpful review of early American studies in their various "turns," if I may call them that, from their appreciation "mainly in terms of what they contributed to the later (national) literary culture of the US" to their focus, starting in the 1990s, on relationships with English Renaissance and eighteenth-century studies, which crystallized the definition of the field as the "literature of British America" (217; "Notes" 285). Then came the "hemispheric turn," which he described as emphasizing "the relations among and similarities between the literatures and cultures of the New World, focusing on what distinguishes the cultures and literatures of the New World at large from that of the Old—the colonial past and neocolonial present, for example, racial and cultural diversity, processes of transculturation and creolization, and so on" (218).

Suzanne Bost responded. She argued that American studies "is still US-centric in its terminology, its questions, and its periodicity" (235). Challenging conventional views of historical causation and the "politics and practice of comparison" (238), Bost cited Gloria Anzaldúa on the notion of the past "as a zone of possibility, not a genealogical inheritance" (237) and the arena where present-day identifications with pre-Columbian in-

digenous traditions are welcomed, adding that she would prefer to be considered a "contrastist" rather than a comparatist (238). Bost and Anzaldúa challenged the historicist model on the grounds of its assumption of historical effects emanating from identifiable historical causes, its implicit conviction about historical development or progress, and its claim to the inalterability of the record of the past. I agree with this position, and it is one of the central arguments of my *The Polemics of Possession in Spanish American Narrative*, where I argued that narrative authority always trumps any pretension to historical authority, whose referents are sought not in historical deeds recounted but in the oral and written narrative traditions that had consecrated them (8, 322).

Focusing fully on the "hemispheric turn," we need to ask: have we made it? That is, imagining ourselves behind the wheel of an unwieldy all-terrain vehicle (no power steering!), I further ask: *can* we "make the turn"? My hopeful answer is "yes," but we have not rounded the corner yet. There are several conditions to be met. The first is to read the pertinent texts in the original language, be that language English, Spanish, Portuguese, French, or Creole, and so forth. This is critically important. What about Native American languages? What about African American forms of colloquial expression? The same criteria apply. The next criterion is the need to be knowledgeable about the region(s) and period(s) that provide the background for our literary and cultural studies, as noted by Philip Gura, while at the same time (I am quick to add) refraining, à la Bost and Anzaldúa, from falling into the temptation to view differences of historical context as evidence of the presence or absence of historical progress. Fulfilling these criteria is important because without them we imagine, falsely, that language is transparent, that all renderings from other languages into English are expert and unmediated, and that differences of culture and history do not matter. Such suppositions lead us easily to see commonalities where there are none or, at the very least, to exaggerate the significance of similarities that are merely superficial.

What topics, in the Anglo- and Ibero-American domains, lend themselves to significant and productive study across linguistic and literary-cultural boundaries? The topics reviewed above are ripe for such consideration. For example, Morrow's and Canup's studies, which focused on Anglo-American texts and traditions, can be illuminated further by the examination of their Ibero-American counterparts. Morrow's essay could be

augmented and updated with an examination of Latin American Enlightenment thinkers, such as the Mexican Creole Jesuit Francisco Javier Clavigero (1731–87), on questions of race, ethnicity, and geographic-climatic determinism. A way into the topic would be to consider Ibero-Americans' critical assessment of Guillaume-Thomas Raynal's philosophical and political history of European trade and settlement in the East and West Indies (*Histoire des deux Indes* [1781]). For its "implicit comparison between Spain and Great Britain, and, more importantly, between the freedom achieved so recently by the Thirteen Colonies and the oriental despotism to which Spanish America was still subject" (Brading 446), Raynal's *Histoire* would be an excellent point of departure for juxtaposing Anglo- and Ibero-American Enlightenment traditions pertaining to the Americas.

Although Canup's only reference to the Ibero-American world was through his use of Cotton Mather's term "Criolian," to represent "Spaniards born in America" (27), the "Creole dilemma," as I will call it, provides opportunity for further reflection on Mather, particularly in juxtaposition to his slightly senior contemporary, the Mexican Creole polymath Carlos de Siguënza y Góngora (1645–1700). This is not a fresh idea; the Mexicanist scholar Alicia Mayer González produced a substantial Spanish-language monograph on the subject more than fifteen years ago: *Dos americanos, dos pensamientos: Carlos de Siguënza y Góngora y Cotton Mather* (Two Americans, two modes of thought: Carlos de Siguënza y Góngora and Cotton Mather). It would be useful to undertake this comparison from the Anglo-American side and then juxtapose the two results.

American exceptionalism is a topic that has come up repeatedly in *EAL*. In her 2010 response to Bauer, Bost argued that it was time to "move past US exceptionalism" insofar as "the US is a recent minority in the hemisphere" (235). In the same issue, Bauer highlighted the challenge set forth by Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra in *Puritan Conquistadors* (2006) to consider a "'Pan-American Atlantic' approach that challenges us to consider the Spanish-American experience as 'normative,' rather than as peripheral, and the British-American (or US) experience as the variant of the paradigm set by Spain (hence, 'Puritan Conquistadors')" ("Early American Literature" 224). Cañizares-Esguerra, in fact, has characterized the common (unexamined) definition of US exceptionalism as an exclusivist and exclusionary "Anglo Protestant exceptionalism" (34).

In Latin America, intellectuals took up the issue of American excep-

tionalism from their own perspective in the decades following independence from Spain. With the exception of Domingo Faustino Sarmiento (Argentina, 1811–88), Spain was not the entity against which they measured themselves; it was the United States. Roberto González Echevarría has tracked these nineteenth-century debates: For Sarmiento, the United States was an example to follow in many realms, but the powerful essays of José Martí (Cuba, 1853–95) and José Enrique Rodó (Uruguay, 1872–1917) warned against the influence of the United States as a "leading imperial nation whose technical and industrial strength was made obvious by its easy defeat of the Spanish" (45); Martí, who did not live to see an independent Cuba, focused on US imperialist political policies while Rodó's greatest concern was the influence of the United States' materialistic culture (48).

In the 1940s Ibero-American intellectuals took up the issue of Latin American exceptionalism in the academic and diplomatic settings of the United States (Adorno, "Havana and Macondo" 378). Mariano Picón-Salas's 1944 formulation of Latin American cultural history was one of the first, and Alejo Carpentier followed up in 1949 ("Prólogo") and 1975 ("Conciencia"), setting Latin America apart from the rest of the world as having had a different history from the outset insofar as America was "the theater of the most sensational ethnic encounter registered in the annals of our planet" (133, my translation). Complementarily, Octavio Paz's 1961 essay "A Literature of Foundations" had defined Ibero-America's exceptional status based on external factors, that is, on being conceptualized and imagined from Europe. His lapidary pronouncement that "[t]he American continent had not yet been wholly discovered when it had already been baptized" is explained by his statement that "[b]efore having our own historical existence, we began by being a European idea. We cannot be understood if it is forgotten that we are a chapter in the history of European utopias" (174–75). The most powerful of Paz's statements grew out of his classic 1950 essay *El laberinto de la soledad* (*The Labyrinth of Solitude*), in which he analyzed the Mexican character and juxtaposed it to that of the United States, with its internal minorities and its external marginalized neighbors. In "Mexico and the United States" he turned upside down typical Anglo-American notions about US exceptionalism (375).

In short, nineteenth- and twentieth-century Anglo- and Ibero-American formulations of American exceptionalism and Enlightenment-era polemics about the character of the New World natural environment and its native

and nonnative inhabitants are but two of the overarching topics that bridge the cultural, intellectual, and literary histories of the Americas and provide objects of study for significant comparativist scholarship. In my view, the cultural productions of the eighteenth through the twentieth centuries in Ibero- and Anglo-America lend themselves to more productive comparative examination than does the consideration of their respective conquest-and-settlement eras, which were separated by more than a century and defined by the spiritual and intellectual "baggage" that explorers and settlers carried to the New World as well as their experience, once established, with entirely different geographical areas and native cultures and societies.

With regard to inclusive literary historical canonization, that is, redefining national literatures to incorporate previously overlooked linguistic and ethnic traditions, Ibero-American national literatures have embraced surviving testimonies of pre-Columbian traditions since the 1950s;[6] incorporating contemporary native and other traditions has been the work of more recent years. In the same decade Anglo-American nativist interests also took on a significant public role. Rupert Costo and Jeannette Henry, Cahuilla and Cherokee, respectively, founded the American Indian Historical Society in 1950 and incorporated it in 1964. In that year they launched the society's journal, *The Indian Historian*, which brought together scholarship on Native American cultures, and not exclusively those of the United States. The contents of the journal's fifteen-year run included original analyses of native cultures as well as reviews of significant publications on the same, and it took positions on current issues of Native Americanist interest.[7] The journal has been described as "a significant forum for the emergent Native voice," helping to "advance the growth of American Indian Studies through decolonization and re-education from a native perspective" (Bennett n.p.).

With respect to comparative literary-cultural analysis of Anglo-American and Ibero-American texts and traditions, I favor the notion of juxtaposition over that of comparison. Whereas "comparison" seeks likeness and tends to blend characteristic (superficial or substantial) features into similarity if not sameness, "juxtaposition" acknowledges surface similarities but sets in relief productive differences. This is a two- or three-step process: first comes the identification of reasons why the potential or selected textual entities can be compared, factors ranging from the coincidence of topic, literary theme, narrative strategy, and so forth, to that of

cultural conundrum or crisis. Next comes the consideration of these texts, as I am fond of saying, *en su salsa*, that is "in their own sauce," by which I mean examining them in their respective contexts (linguistic, ideological, cultural, gendered, etc.). Then, finally, they can be placed side by side, with a fresh understanding of all the factors, or caveats, that individualize them. This "digging deeper" actually brings the objects of study closer together because they can be seen not only in their particularity but as variants of common themes or as unique inhabitants of larger common domains. At this point they might realize the "hemispheric turn." Two of the finest *EAL* examples of this practice are Bumas's essay on Protestant readings of Las Casas and Boruchoff's study of Sahagún and Mather, cited above.

Not all scholars are as able or accomplished as Boruchoff and Bumas, and for this reason, scholarly collaboration across academic fields offers fruitful opportunities for our disciplines and specialties at large. That was the promise of the Anglo- and Ibero-Americanist summit, and we would do well to revive it. But here we face the barriers set up, implicitly, by our respective guilds (our academic departments, our scholarly fields). Their "border guards" (senior colleagues, department chairs, college deans) will be satisfied, we imagine, only if we write exclusively for our particular field-and-discipline audiences and so, we conclude, we can ignore the rest. The result is that we often dismiss as irrelevant not only pertinent scholarship that is written in languages we do not read but also scholarship written in our own languages by authors who do not belong to our particular guild. A notable exception is the fine 2012 *EAL* essay by Cassander L. Smith on, again, Cabeza de Vaca. Smith takes into account all the relevant scholarship (including my own [Adorno and Pautz; Cabeza de Vaca]), and although we use most of the same evidence to come to differing if not opposing conclusions, our indirect scholarly exchange is, I believe, productive for both our respective academic fields.

The most influential area of scholarly effort in this wider arena is the literary anthology focused on the multiple cultural traditions of the Western Hemisphere. To suggest how we might move forward in this area, I turn to the widely circulated, influential projects of the past decade: Paul Lauter's *The Heath Anthology of American Literature* (1998), Carla Mulford's *Early American Writings* (2002), and most especially Susan Castillo and Ivy Schweitzer's *The Literatures of Colonial America* (2001). The Anglo-Americanist Sandra Gustafson (at the time book review editor of *EAL*),

the Ibero-Americanist (Luso-Brazilianist) Lisa Voigt, and the Anglo- and Ibero-Americanist comparativist Ralph Bauer reviewed them in this journal and elsewhere.

Pertaining almost exclusively to the anthology of Castillo and Schweitzer, the comments I cite here exemplify the challenges faced by such complex, multifaceted projects. Among their peers, the Castillo-Schweitzer project took the broadest, truest hemispheric approach. For which they are to be much credited. By that same token, they faced the greatest risks. (In the interest of full disclosure, I have to confess that, anticipating similar challenges, I demurred from undertaking a proposed literary anthology project that would have focused solely on the Spanish-speaking Americas. It had been, for me, project enough to have recently written a small volume of 145 pages on three centuries of Spanish colonial literature [*Colonial*].)

In her review of the Castillo-Schweitzer and Mulford anthologies, Gustafson concluded that "the effect in both volumes is to present the United States as the culmination of colonial endeavor in the New World, a view that threatens to reinforce nationalist stereotypes rather than challenge the United States reader's ignorance of other Americas" ("The Americas" 209). She expressed concern that the unevenness of length of headnotes in the Castillo-Schweitzer volume would lead student readers to conclude that little was known about non-English authors and their writings (210), but she expressed the hope that her "friendly criticisms and suggestions for further editions" would be heeded because the work embodied by such projects as these deserved to succeed (211). The Castillo-Schweitzer anthology and its companion volume have been heralded for helping "to transform both the study and the teaching of early American literature within more multinational, multilingual, and transatlantic frameworks" (Burnham et al. 540). In her recent *PMLA* piece, Gustafson described the Castillo-Schweitzer anthology, as well as Mulford's *Early American Writings*, as offering "class-room ready multilingual approaches to the field" ("What's in a Date?" 966). Multilingual in origin, the works appeared, of course, in English translation.

As an Ibero-Americanist working directly in the Portuguese and Spanish languages and their literary traditions, Lisa Voigt noticed that there are only two Portuguese text excerpts in the entire Castillo-Schweitzer anthology (410). She implicitly suggested that the brevity of the Castillo-Schweitzer headnotes for non-English-language authors may have been

a blessing; that is, she calls out and gives examples of their many errors (413–14). As a way of underscoring the difficulties produced by English-language anthologies, she analyses the foundational Portuguese-language text of 1500, Pero Vaz de Caminha's "Carta a Dom Manuel," which announced the historic Portuguese arrival on the coast of Brazil; it appears in part 1, "Exploration and Contact to 1600." By recontextualizing and rereading the "Carta"—so often misunderstood as the account of an idyllic or at least entirely peaceable exchange between Europeans and New World natives (427)—Voigt shows that its English-language anthological rendering with its errors and misleading inaccuracies could have been much more effectively handled by scholars working in the pertinent Iberian linguistic and literary tradition. Thus she gently acknowledges the powers but also signals the limitations of these Pan-Americanist initiatives. Her point about the "relatively marginalized status of Lusophone letters within early American, *as well as Latin American*, studies" (416, emphasis added) is also well taken.

Bauer's assessments of the *Heath* and Castillo-Schweitzer compilations also make clear the importance of literary anthologies to the canonization and crystallization of our fields. He laments *The Heath Anthology of American Literature*'s focus on colonial Spanish-language writings exclusively from lands now within the United States, because it divorces them from their "proper intellectual, historical, literary contexts" ("Early American Literature" 221) and risks "reinforcing US American ideas of exceptionalism and manifest destiny" (222). "As though touched by Hegel's nineteenth-century 'spirit' of America," Bauer writes, this popular narrative of successive periods of American history renders the Native Americans as its "inhabiters," the Italian explorers as its "discoverers," the Spanish as its "conquerers," the English as its "settlers," and US Americans as its "founders" (222). Referring to the limitations and critiques elaborated by Gustafson and Voigt, he acknowledges nevertheless that *The Literatures of Colonial America* laudably aimed to respond to the limitations of a "US-centric metanarrative of hemispheric literary history" insofar as it did not confine its purview to territories now within the United States (222).

On this point, I note that part 2, entitled "New World Identities: Exploration and Settlement to 1700," is divided into seven sections: "New Spain," "New France," "Middle Atlantic: The Chesapeake and the Indies," "New England," "Middle Atlantic: New Netherland," "Middle Atlantic: Penn-

sylvania," and "Native American Views." While part 2's "Middle Atlantic" is thrice divided into finely discriminated segments, Lusophone writings are not represented and all the far-flung (Caribbean, North, Central, and South American) domains ruled by the monarchs of Castile are gathered together under one (mistaken) rubric, "New Spain." "New Spain" refers roughly to today's Mexico and New Mexico, that is, the viceroyalty of New Spain (Nueva España).

Given the variety of geographical ("Middle Atlantic"), political ("New France"), and thematic ("Native American Views") designations used in this typology, what term would I have chosen for those vast Spanish-held territories? Perhaps "Spain in the Americas"? What is most unfortunate about labeling the entire overseas Spanish Empire "New Spain" is not the misapplication of a limited politico-territorial designation to a much larger domain, but rather the assignment of far greater cultural privilege to the territories that reinforce the US-centric perspective. Yet the more I reflect on the problem of how to position Anglo-American colonial-era literary cultural production vis-à-vis that of others in a hemispheric perspective, the more challenging the problem becomes.

Thus anthologizing continues to be a vexing if not vexed pursuit. At the 2014 MLA Convention, the Division of Chicana and Chicano Literature took up its version of the issue. Its bilingually titled panel "¿Anthologizing *latinidad*?" examined *The Routledge Companion to Latino/a Literature* and the Norton series; one panelist's talk was provocatively titled "We Don't Need No Stinking Norton," the subtitle of which was "Anachronism and Archival Fragments" (*Program of the 2014 MLA* 1230). On the same convention program, the division featured a roundtable session on "The Future of the Chicana and Chicano Literature Division," posing the question: "What do we want this division to be as we move further into the twenty-first century, and how do we imagine Chicana/o literature in relation to other US Latina/o literatures?" (1177–78). It is clear that determining how to situate our respective academic fields into ever broader (and proliferating) classificatory domains is our abiding challenge.

As if to demonstrate the fallacy of the historical-development-and-progress argument, I seem to have come full circle. I opened this essay with the identification-and-classification question posed for Native Americanist traditions at a Modern Language Association convention of nearly forty years ago and noted the debates in the 1990s in the field of African-

American literary studies. As is evident from all the foregoing remarks, the literary anthology, given the enormousness of its mandates and the demands on its editors, will always be a minefield of ambitions, constraints, and criticisms as it entertains the diverse perspectives and conflicting agendas of its editors, publishers, and reviewers. But the greatest burden is always placed on the users of the literary anthology, its instructors and their students, and it is in their interest that these issues matter.

There remains one more fundamental issue, and it is provoked not only by the practice of literary critical exegesis but especially by the phenomenon of the ubiquitous and indispensable multilingual (actually, English-language) literary anthology. This is the question of language in translation. In our respective literary cultural fields, our study of language implies recourse to etymology and familiarity with philology, particularly for us as early Americanists working in historical periods. As a native-English-speaking Latin Americanist, for example, I do not expect to understand—without the minimal tool of the *OED* at my side—all of Samuel Purchas's lexical terms and common usages any more readily than I apprehend those of Shakespeare. Lost in the translation of Purchas or Shakespeare into contemporary Spanish, or of Cabeza de Vaca and Cervantes into contemporary English, are their earlier usages and meanings, denotative as well as connotative. To us as scholars, and given the problems of translation, sensitivity to philology can help us find common cause, bring together the needs and interests of our fields, and collectively improve the quality of our literary scholarship, our anthologizing, and our teaching. Bringing it all together is the key. *EAL* provides the forum, I wager, where this can be accomplished.

As it begins its second half century, we should ask: is *Early American Literature* ready for this challenge? The answer depends on the vigorous encouragement of, and engagement with, the areas of study identified in its current mission statement and, with regard to Ibero-America, to extend the border to south of the North American continent. And this means that we must break down (or open a little farther) the closed doors of our guilds and be willing to engage and listen to one another. Most of all, it requires that we overcome the bias that language—particularly the English language—provides a transparent, universal standard for all literary communication and that its multilingual "surrogates," via English-language translation, have already revealed all their secrets. I hope that the fiftieth-

anniversary commemoration that draws us together may offer this propitious new beginning.

NOTES

1 Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala, *El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno* (GkS 2232°), Royal Library of Denmark. My projects on the subject included my coedited critical edition and my monograph *Guaman Poma*.

2 The same has been true for me. In 1974 I subtitled my Cornell doctoral dissertation on Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala's *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno* "A Lost Chapter in the History of Latin-American Letters," which implied that something lost needed to be recovered.

3 I have studied the *Life and Voyages*' long currency and the polemics into which it was drawn in "Washington Irving's Romantic Hispanism."

4 Under Bauer's leadership, Raquel Chang-Rodríguez, Michael Clark, David Shields, and I formed the summit's steering committee.

5 The symposium, "In Comparable Americas: Colonial Studies after the Hemispheric Turn," was sponsored by the Center for Latin American Studies and the Franke Institute for the Humanities, University of Chicago, and the Newberry Library, Chicago, April 30–May 1, 2004.

6 I surveyed the pre-Columbian literary heritage preserved in the early Spanish colonial era in *The Cambridge History of Latin American Literature*, where I also tracked the modern study of these traditions, beginning in the 1880s and blossoming in the 1950s and afterward ("Cultures in Contact").

7 *The Indian Historian* 12.3 (1979), for example, included a study of the popularization of native American religion in American magazines of the period 1865–1900 (Wilson), a critical review of the Smithsonian Institution's *Handbook of North American Indians, California* (Costo), and my Peruvianist study on the Spanish-colonial-era *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno* of Guaman Poma ("Icon and Idea").

WORKS CITED

Adorno, Rolena. *Colonial Latin American Literature: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford UP, 2011.

———. "Cultures in Contact: Mesoamerica, the Andes, and the European Written Tradition." *The Cambridge History of Latin American Literature*. Ed. Roberto González Echevarría and Enrique Pupo-Walker. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 1: 33–57, 437–52.

———. *Guaman Poma: Writing and Resistance in Colonial Peru*. 2nd ed. Austin: U of Texas P, 2000.

———. "Havana and Macondo: The Humanities in U.S. Latin American Studies, 1940–2000." *The Humanities and the Dynamics of Inclusion since World War II*.

Ed. David A. Hollinger. Cambridge: American Acad. of Arts and Sciences; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2006. 372–404.

———. "Icon and Idea: A Symbolic Reading of the Visual Text of Guaman Poma." *The Indian Historian* 12.3 (1979): 27–50.

———. *The Polemics of Possession in Spanish American Narrative*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2007.

———. "Washington Irving's Romantic Hispanism and Its Columbian Legacies." *Spain in America: The Origins of Hispanism in the United States*. Ed. Richard L. Kagan. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2002. 49–105.

Adorno, Rolena, and Patrick Charles Pautz. *Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca: His Account, His Life, and the Expedition of Pánfilo de Narváez*. 3 vols. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1999.

Bauer, Ralph. "Colonial Discourse and Early American Literary History: Ercilla, the Inca Garcilaso, and Joel Barlow's Conception of a New World Epic." *Early American Literature* 30.3 (1995): 203–32.

———. *The Cultural Geography of Colonial American Literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

———. "Early American Literature and American Literary History at the 'Hemispheric Turn.'" *Early American Literature* 45.2 (2010): 217–33.

———. "Notes on the Comparative Study of the Colonial Americas: Further Reflections on the Tucson Summit." *Early American Literature* 38.2 (2003): 281–304.

———. "Summit of Early Ibero- and Anglo-Americanists, Tucson, Arizona, May 2002: Mission Statement." *Early American Literature* 38.1 (2003): 123–25.

Bennett, Pamela Diane. "A Contextual Analysis of the Indian Historian." Thesis abstract. U of Arizona, 2004. Web. 27 Nov. 2014. ⟨http://www.ais.arizona.edu/thesis/contextual-analysis-indian-historian⟩.

Boruchoff, David A. "New Spain, New England, and the New Jerusalem: The "Translation" of Empire, Faith, and Learning (*translatio imperii, fidei ac scientiae*) in the Colonial Missionary Project." *Early American Literature* 43.1 (2008): 5–34.

———. Rev. of *Another Face of Empire: Bartolomé de las Casas, Indigenous Rights, and Ecclesiastical Imperialism*, by Daniel Castro. *Early American Literature* 43.2 (2008): 497–504.

Bost, Suzanne. "Doing the Hemisphere Differently: A Response to Ralph Bauer." *Early American Literature* 45.2 (2010): 235–39.

Brading, David A. *The First America: The Spanish Monarchy, Creole Patriots, and the Liberal State, 1492–1867*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

Brickhouse, Anna. *Transamerican Literary Relations and the Nineteenth-Century Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Bumas, E. Shaskan. "The Cannibal Butcher Shop: Protestant Uses of Las Casas's 'Brevísima relación' in Europe and the American Colonies." *Early American Literature* 35.2 (2000): 107–36.

Burnham, Michelle, et al. "MLA Honored Scholar of Early American Literature, 2013." *Early American Literature* 48.3 (2013): 539–41.

Cabeza de Vaca, Álvar Núñez. *The Narrative of Cabeza de Vaca*. Ed. and trans. Rolena Adorno and Patrick Charles Pautz. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2003.

Cañizares-Esguerra, Jorge. *Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550–1700*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2006.

Canup, John. "Cotton Mather and 'Criolian Degeneracy.'" *Early American Literature* 24.1 (1989): 20–34.

Carpentier, Alejo. "Conciencia e identidad de América." *Ensayos*. Vol. 13 of *Obras completas de Alejo Carpentier*. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 1990. 131–40.

———. "Prólogo." *El reino de este mundo* (*relato*). Mexico City: Compañía General de Ediciones, 1969. 7–17.

Castillo, Susan, and Ivy Schweitzer, eds. *The Literatures of Colonial America: An Anthology*. Malden: Blackwell, 2001.

Costo, Rupert. "Errors Multiply in Smithsonian Handbook." *Indian Historian* 12.3 (1979): 2–5.

Galinsky, Hans. "Exploring the 'Exploration Report' and Its Image of the Overseas World: Spanish, French, and English Variants of a Common Form Type in Early American Literature." *Early American Literature* 12.1 (1977): 5–24.

González Echevarría, Roberto. *Modern Latin American Literature: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford UP, 2012.

Guaman Poma de Ayala, Felipe. *El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno*. Ed. John V. Murra and Rolena Adorno. Quechua trans. Jorge Urioste. 3 vols. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 1980. Web. 27 Nov. 2014. ⟨http://www.kb.dk/permalink/2006/poma/info/en/frontpage.htm⟩.

Gura, Philip F. "Turning Our World Upside Down: Reconceiving Early American Literature." *American Literature* 63.1 (1991): 104–12.

Gustafson, Sandra. "The Americas in Writing." *William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd ser. 60.1 (2003): 207–13.

———. "What's in a Date? Temporalities of Early American Literature." *PMLA* 128.4 (2013): 961–67.

Heller, Lee E. "Conceiving the 'New' American Literature." *Early American Literature* 29.1 (1994): 83–90.

Johnston, Thomas E. "A Translation of Cotton Mather's Spanish Works: *La Fe del Christiano* and *La Religión Pura*." *Early American Literature Newsletter* 2.2 (1967): 7–21.

Kanellos, Nicolás. "José Alvarez de Toledo y Dubois and the Origins of Hispanic Publishing in the Early American Republic." *Early American Literature* 43.1 (2008): 83–100.

Lauter, Paul, et al. *The Heath Anthology of American Literature*. 3rd ed. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton, 1998.

Levine, Robert S. "Slavery, Race, and American Literary Genealogies." *Early American Literature* 36.1 (2001): 89–113.

Mayer González,Alicia. *Dos americanos, dos pensamientos: Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora y Cotton Mather*. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1998.

Morrow, Nancy V. "The Problem of Slavery in the Polemic Literature of the American Enlightenment." *Early American Literature* 20.3 (1985–86): 236–55.

Mulford, Carla, ed., with Angela Vietto and Amy E. Winans. *Early American Writings*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.

Parrish, Susan Scott. "The 'Hemispheric Turn' in Colonial American Studies." *Early American Literature* 40.3 (2005): 545–53.

Paz, Octavio. "A Literature of Foundations." *The Siren and the Seashell*. By Paz. Trans. Lysander Kemp and Margaret Sayers Peden. Austin: U of Texas P, 1976. 173–79.

———. "Mexico and the United States." *The Labyrinth of Solitude*. By Paz. Trans. Lysander Kemp, Yara Milos, and Rachel Phillips Belash. New York: Grove, 1985. 357–76.

Program of the 1976 MLA Convention. PMLA 91.6 (1976): 971–1208.

Program of the 2014 MLA Convention, Chicago. PMLA 128.5 (2013): 1049–1384.

Smith, Cassander L. "Beyond the Mediation: Esteban, Cabeza de Vaca's *Relación*, and a Narrative Negotiation." *Early American Literature* 47.2 (2012): 267–91.

Voigt, Lisa. "'Por Andarmos Todos Casy Mesturados': The Politics of Intermingling in Caminha's *Carta* and Colonial American Anthologies." *Early American Literature* 40.3 (2005): 407–39.

Wilson, Charles Reagan. "Shamans and Charlatans: The Popularization of Native American Religion in Magazines." *Indian Historian* 12.3 (1979): 6–13.

Zafar, Rafia. *We Wear the Mask: African Americans Write American Literature, 1760–1870*. New York: Columbia UP, 1997.

Notes on Contributors

ROLENA ADORNO is the Sterling Professor of Spanish and chair of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Yale University. Her most recent book is *Colonial Latin American Literature: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford UP, 2011), and she is the author of *The Polemics of Possession in Spanish American Narrative* (Yale UP, 2007), which was awarded the Katherine Singer Kovacs Prize from the Modern Language Association. Her coauthored *Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca: His Account, His Life, and the Expedition of Pánfilo de Narváez* (U of Nebraska P, 1999) received prizes from the American Historical Association, the Western History Association, and the New England Council of Latin American Studies. She is at work on a study of the appropriation of Spanish themes among nineteenth-century American writers from Washington Irving to Mark Twain. Her articles on this topic have appeared in *Daedalus* and *The Yale Review*. Appointed by President Obama, she is a member of the National Humanities Council, the advisory board of the NEH. Adorno is a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a recipient of the Modern Language Association's Award for Lifetime Scholarly Achievement.

THOMAS AUGST is associate professor of English at New York University. He is the author of *The Clerk's Tale: Young Men and Moral Life in Nineteenth-Century America* (U of Chicago P, 2003). He is also coeditor, with Ken Carpenter, of *Institutions of Reading: The Social Life of Libraries in the United States* (U of Massachusetts P, 2007) and coeditor, with Wayne Wiegand, of *Libraries as Agencies of Culture* (U of Wisconsin P, 2001).

ELIZABETH BARNES is professor of English and American studies at the College of William and Mary. Her publications include *States of Sympathy: Seduction and Democracy in the American Novel* (Columbia UP, 1997), *Love's Whipping Boy: Violence and Sentimentality in the American Imagination* (U of North Carolina P, 2011), and "Drowning [in] Kittens: The Reproduction of Girlhood in Victorian America" (*American Literature* 86.2 [2014]).

CHARLES BRADSHAW is associate professor of English at the University of Tennessee at Martin. He is writing a book about conspiracy and the development of the early American novel.

MICHAEL BRANCH is professor of English at the University of Nevada, Reno, where he teaches American literature, film, writing, and environmental studies. He is cofounder and past president of the Association for the Study of Literature and