

Hierarchy and Historicism in Fernando de Orbea's *La conquista de Santa Fe de Bogotá*

Ruth Hill

La conquista de Santa Fe de Bogotá was probably written during the first two decades of the eighteenth century, when the region known today as Spanish-speaking South America was convulsed by the Bourbon succession and by the efforts of European imperial powers to gain a foothold through invasions and illegal trade.¹ In Santa Fe de Bogotá there was not a large population or a viceregal court to support the lavish production that Orbea's *libretto* suggests.² The play was almost certainly written to be performed in Lima,³ where opera was well-entrenched by the turn of the eighteenth century. There, operas alternated with plays by Spanish masters (Calderón, Lope de Vega) who themselves had produced works that incorporated song in the manner of Italian opera.⁴ Just as important, sacred *coloquios* "de música recitativa" were performed in processions as early as 1672 (Lohmann Villena 213). Orbea's play bears the subtitle of *comedia nueva*, which signalled his debts to French neoclassical tragedy and Italian opera from the previous century, and to an emerging operatic culture that borrowed composers and singers from ecclesiastical theatre in eighteenth-century Spanish America and Spain (Hill, "Hybridity" 46-49). My aim here is not to offer an exhaustive treatment of the play, but, instead, to analyze *La conquista de Santa Fe de Bogotá* in a way that underscores how even minor or neglected works can change the way we think about a period's cultural conventions, and about the interface of history, social hierarchy and theatre in Bourbon Spanish America. I begin by analyzing its structure, plot and the ideology of conquest inherent in its religious symbolism. I then present a comparative summary of the figures involved in the historical Conquest and the characters of the play, an analysis that will allow us to drill down into

the historicist spin that Orbea put on his tragedy, revealing the contours of social hierarchy in Bourbon Spanish America.

A few observations about the structure of the play are in order here. Orbea elides the question of time in *La conquista de Santa Fe de Bogotá*, though the events clearly take place in a period of more than 24 hours.⁵ The events occur in different settings: the indigenous King Osmín's castle and gardens, a river, open fields and encampments. Still, all of them occur within the limits of the Chibcha empire in what became known as New Granada. The unity of action is slightly weakened by the two minor characters, the indigenous Chiburrina and the Spaniard Martín, but the symbolic dimension of their actions effectively displaces the actions themselves, which do not contribute to King Osmín's personal tragedy. Structurally, *La conquista de Santa Fe de Bogotá* is not about the Spanish invaders. The reversal of fortune experienced by the play's indigenous king, and the increased self-awareness that he gains from it, are pivotal to the plot.⁶ Orbea establishes a dialectical relationship between pity and fear, the two emotions that classical and neoclassical tragedy sought to induce in the spectator.

The embedded prologue of the play is lengthy. With the actors and chorus singing a refrain, "Que mande, que triunfe,/que venza, que viva," Princess Palmira of Calamaz, General Tundama, King Osmín and the imprisoned Infanta Amirena of Popoyán discuss Osmín's grandeur and triumphs (I, 21-6). Tundama details the consolidation of Osmín's empire in a lengthy address to his King (I, 26-34). The beginning of the episode, which includes Act II and part of Act III, is signalled by the Mariscal's shouting from off-stage: "¡Viva el grande Carlos Quinto,/Emperador de Alemania!" (I, 37); and "¡Viva Carlos Quinto, viva!/Repiten las trompas y cajas" (I, 38). In a lengthy monologue, the royal seer Neméquene recounts the apparition of Fabro (the indigenous supreme deity), who intimated to him the arrival of foreigners and Osmín's precarious position (I, 39-43). But Osmín, Tundama, Amirena, and Palmira give speeches brimming with praise and battle fever (I, 43-52), as Orbea portrays them as blinded by their record of success. All are optimistic about Osmín's prospects for expelling the Spaniards, marrying Princess Palmira of Calambaz, and further consolidating his empire. In the last third of Act I, the Spanish conquerors first appear on stage, in three ships tossed about on a rocky river. The first encounter between the Old World and New World civilizations is a violent one that finishes victoriously for the Spanish, after many indigenous warriors flee (I, 56).

Act II opens with a sleeping King who is visited by a singing Nymph who represents Spain. She tells him that he is to be defeated, and she puts on his crown and takes his scepter (II, 63-6). Tundama and Amirena hear his agony and go to him. They console him and dismiss his visions, while out of his presence they condemn his weakness (II, 66-70). Neméquene comes on stage shooting fiery arrows and riding a dragon, against the backdrop of Osmín's castle and grounds. With the roar and fire of the dragon, the earth shudders. The indigenous scurry along the ramparts, shooting flaming arrows at the Spanish conquerors and Palmira below (II, 94-5). Neméquene appeals to his gods, who answer him with an earthquake that scatters the indigenous (II, 96). Abandoned by his gods, Neméquene falls from the dragon and the fighting ceases (II, 97). The oracle's fall and the Spanish routing of Osmín's forces constitute the turning point of the tragedy.

Act III begins with the offstage Chorus's prophecy concerning the triumph of Jiménez de Quesada. The tragedy's principal agnition occurs when King Osmín understands that Neméquene's prophecy and his dream about the nymph Spain were divine *signs* (98). Specific verses of the King's lengthy soliloquy demonstrate that Orbea knew how to combine rhetorical figures for maximum dramatic effect. The following octosyllabic verses were designed to humanize the Spaniards' enemy: "¿Para cuándo son las lanzas,/que tiene el sagrado Olimpo,/que vibrándolas al pecho/no me matan vengativos?/¿Para cuándo sus horrores/guarda el temeroso abismo?/¿Para cuándo de las furias/es el airado cuchillo?/¿Para cuándo de Mejera/es el tirano dominio,/que no le flecha a mi vida/en cada aliento un suspiro?/¿Para cuándo son las iras/de los Monstruos más impíos/que desgarrándome a piezas/no me rinden vengativas?"(III, 98-9). In these verses, Orbea amplifies Osmín's agony through a combination of interrogatives (or "rhetorical questions," as we commonly call them today) and anaphora (i.e., the repetition of *para cuándo* at the beginning of five consecutive verses). When these verses are read aloud, Osmín's desperation expands due to the interrogatives. It is made rhythmic, as monotonous as his impending death, through Orbea's use of anaphora. The King's new self-awareness even prompts him to demand his own death from the gods: "Matadme, todos, matadme" (III, 98-9). His tragic flaws are revealed as he laments: "¿Yo tributario? Qué pena./¿Yo sujeto a otro dominio/cuando tenía a mis plantas/del mundo los señoríos,/y al eco de mi poder/se estremecían rendidos?/¿Pues cómo (¡ay de mí!), pues cómo/Estranjeros han podido/domar de mi vanidad/lo heroico y lo presumido?" (III, 101). It is clear now that Osmín's death wish was not prompted by

genuine repentance: he would rather die than suffer public humiliation at the hands of the Spaniards. Hence his defiance, to which the spectator was supposed to react with fear.

Nevertheless, as the King vacillates between false bravado and self-loathing, trapped in a corner, once again his fear recedes and Orbea's poetics aims to elicit pity. Osmín's tearful recounting of historical examples illustrates this poetical stratagem:

¿Yo llorar mi majestad/de esta suerte? ¡Qué delirio!/Mas hombre soy, no soy jaspe;/mortal soy que no soy risco./Si lloró Alejandro, siendo/Monarca no competido;/lloró de Pompeyo y César,/la traición y el homicidio./¿Qué mucho que llore yo/cuando me miro vencido,/si tan ínclitos Campeones/humanaron todo el brío?" (III, 101)

Again, an interrogative marks these verses, to which Orbea adds an exclamation. Osmín appears to gather himself through this combination of figures. But directly thereafter he comes face-to-face with his mortality, accepts that he is crying, in Orbea's repetition of affirmation-negation. By paralleling his crying and Alexander's (which is heightened by Orbea's repetition of the verb *llorar* in various tenses and endings), Osmín places himself in the historical category of fallen emperors. Orbea's interrogative, which creates an enjambment in the last four verses, serves to place the Spaniards in the historical category of great conquerors (Pompey and Julius Caesar). Finally, it is noteworthy that Osmín's soliloquy constitutes an *aporia*: the monarch's contradictions and entrapment would serve the tragedy's aim of eliciting pity and fear from the spectators in eighteenth-century Lima.

Both General Tundama and Princess Amirena support King Osmín's submission to Charles V of Spain (103-04). Two indigenous singers named Gualeva y Florela confirm King Osmín's yielding to the Mariscal, in the following hybrid verses: "Mariscal tela/Mavorte sus rayos/Gelovra a sor/a peliache Osmín/España pacor/Marte canonsin/Mavorte casol/atacama o neyta/.../(*se repetirá en romance*)/Al gran Mariscal/de España blasón,/el guerrero Osmín/le postra el honor,/rindiéndole ufano/al Marte español ..." (III, 105). On the level of *elocutio* (or style), Orbea selected words and phrases that would intensify the surrender of the indigenous and the triumph of the Spaniards. He chose 'ufano' to characterize the King, and he applied to him the epithet 'the warrior Osmín.' Orbea's use of the epithet 'Mars' to describe Jiménez de Quesada was meant to sharpen the contrast between these men and their respective fates. It is as if an epic warrior were challenging a god. Finally, the desired effect on this tragedy's spectators should

be remembered. Songs were an integral part of ancient tragedy; they issued prophecies and sought to stir the emotions of their listeners. On the level of *dispositio* (or arrangement), this song occupies its place within Orbea's tragedy for a good reason: it would allow the audience a respite from pity and fear, the song effectively lulling spectators into tranquility.

However, I suspect that the audience's emotional equilibrium was short-lived. Right away, Amirena loses her golden lariat, for which the Mariscal and the General fight. Finally, the King demands it and then returns it to Amirena, who promptly gives it to Tundama (III, 108-10). The King orders the latter's death (III, 111), an action by which Orbea again intended to frighten the tragedy's public. But this act also serves to advance the plot, for it triggers another discovery on the King's part: Osmín's own people have turned against him. Offstage voices clamor: "Viva Tundama, que él sólo/merece el cetro y diadema" (III, 113). Though this agnition is derivative and only reconfirms his new awareness, it also has a generic dimension: it responds to the dialectical relationship between pity and fear that Orbea establishes throughout this tragedy. Osmín's interaction with the offstage masses is designed to evoke both fear and compassion:

"!Ah, pueblo infiel, indomable,/a tu Rey aqueste ofensa!/¿Tal deslealtad se permite?/¿Para cuándo las estrellas/en torbellinos de rayos/no arrojan todas sus flechas?/Vasallos, ¿qué error es éste?/¿Cómo la pasión os ciega,/faltando al debido culto/que se debe a mi grandeza?/Llama soy, rayos despido,/todo el corazón es etna" (III, 113).

At this point, my reader is perhaps thinking that he or she knows exactly why Orbea's tragedy has been neglected by scholars: the plot is original only in its outlandishness, the characters are not believable, and the songs are not upgrades to this dramatic house-of-cards. I can not say that I disagree. And yet, I hold to the belief that *La conquista de Santa Fe de Bogotá*, like a B movie or like pulp fiction, has a lot to tell us about the society in which the creator lived. The play's editor could find no historical trace of the author, but my own research offers us some important biographical clues: Fernando's surname, and the title and the plot of his tragedy, together suggest powerful ties to the region that included Cochabamba and Lima: the Viceroyalty of Peru.⁷ Notwithstanding the pressures of rationalism and empiricism, Catholicism was central to this Viceroyalty and all of Spanish America in the eighteenth century.

The religious symbolism of Orbea's tragedy is expressed in song, the use of props and spoken verse. In Act I, Chiburrina complains about his living conditions: he is staying in Neméquene's cave (46). While shots ring out offstage, Chiburrina enters the cave and finds that a sacred image (*fabro*) has been destroyed (47-48). He appeals to another image in vain, and begins to strike it: "Ay Fabro, que ya me zurro./Fabrito, misericordia;/¿Adónde me guardaré?/No me socorres, pues toma,/(Dale)/borracho, falsa deidad./Te he de cascar otra soba/(Dale)/.../Pues que de nada aprovechas,/divinidad mentirosa,/anda al infierno, borracho,/a beber a todas horas./(Arroja el idolo y vase corriendo)" (48). Chiburrina here offers insight into the religious practices of the indigenous, but only to deny the validity of the same: Orbea has him mention the *fabro* and condemn it at the same time. Furthermore, Chiburrina's stereotypical incontinence was designed to convey that Indians always placed alcohol (*chicha*) above their deities. In Act III, Chiburrina again renounces his religion, tricks the Spanish soldier Martín, and appears inebriated (117-18). Spectators in Lima were supposed to view Chiburrina as the stereotypical drunken Indian who had, literally and metaphorically, gone off the reservation. Both Crown and Church had constructed the fiction of indigenous insufficiency: without spiritual and political paternalism (life in a *pueblo de indios* or on a *misión*, let's say), a Chibcha, or any other plebeian Indian, could not learn to live in a "civilized" (i.e., Spanish) manner. Orbea's *Chiburrina* may be viewed, then, as a reductionist trope for (mis)interpreting the *Chibcha* culture as a whole.

With the first on-stage appearance of the Spaniards, props and song communicate the religious underpinnings of the Conquest. The Spanish ships are roughing a river that I assume to be the Amazon, and in the captainship sails the Mariscal. Orbea's instructions for this scene prescribe natty attire for the Mariscal and his captains Belarcazar and Lugo, and they specify that Jiménez should be holding "un estandarte pintada una cruz y esta letra *Si Deus pronobis punat qui erit contra nos*" (I, 49). On the structural level, this icon adumbrates the events that will unfold before the spectator: God will be with the Spanish and will punish the indigenous who go up against them. But this battle standard with sacred ensign articulates the link between divine will and Charles V's imperialist pursuits. It is helpful to switch media and gears for a moment, in order to imagine this scene in the hands of an emblemist. "*Si Deus pronobis punat qui erit contra nos*" would serve as the motto for a drawing of Jiménez holding the battle standard, with the indig-

enous being trounced in the background, and the conquest of Santa Fe would serve as the historical example, or explicative text, of the picture.

In the first verses of this scene the visual appeal to the imagination is reinforced by an aural appeal, as the Chorus sings: “A la insignia sagrada/de nuestra Redención./Las cajas y trompetas,/el bélico rumor,/le haga rendida salva/la humilde adoración” (49). The force of the visual appeal, and its content, is amplified by *descenso* and musical accompaniment: the verses descend from the opening choral verses, and are repeated over and over, by different actors and singers. All sing, “A la insignia sagrada” (49). Jiménez sings, “A la insignia sagrada/de Nuestra Redención” (49). Captain Lugo sings, “Le haga rendida salva/la humilde adoración” (50). All sing again, “A la insignia sagrada” (50). Later in the tragedy, the original standardbearer Jiménez again refers to the battle standard and its sacred ensign as he threatens King Osmín: “Quitaréte la corona,/pisarála Carlos Quinto./Pondrá en tus bárbaros templos/los estandartes de Christo” (II, 83). The iconographic significance of this prop can be measured also by its transfer to Palmira, which is predicated on her baptism.

Palmira’s is a radical transformation that turns on a *Malinche*-like relationship with Jiménez, and from a structural perspective it is absolutely necessary to the plot of the tragedy. Without it there can be no happy ending – no unification of the indigenous and European *naciones* – which was central to both the ideology of conquest and the *comedia nueva* in the eighteenth-century Hispanic world (Hill, “Hybridity,” 46,60; “Bourbon Castile,” *passim*). When the two meet on stage for the first time, they are armed and alone. After a brief introduction, the Mariscal tells her: “La victoria corone este esplendor,/quedando prisionera,/ planeta hermoso en mi rendida esfera./Vuestra Majestad o gran Señora,/por Carlos Quinto presa queda ahora,/y si tanta belleza/exaltarla pretende su grandeza/con el Baptismo Sacro,/de mis armas seréis el simulacro” (I, 61). Because she is now a *Catholic and a princess*, she is the noble Spaniard’s social equal, and will become his wife and queen of their kingdom. But the symbolic dimension of this union, at least in its religious aspect, is expressed by the exchange of the battle standard with its sacred ensign.

In Act II, King Osmín, “embajador de sí mismo” (81), demands his beloved’s return. Palmira, already seated “con autoridad” on a dosel in the Mariscal’s tent (78), and Jiménez receive him. The closing scene of Act I is recalled in Princess Palmira’s reply to the King: “Y yo que sigo valiente/los estandartes de Christo,/pues me han dado nuevo aliento/los christales del

baptismo,/no apetezco que me déis/la libertad que has perdido,/ni soy tu esposa ni amante/cuando tan infiel te miro,/a no obedecer las leyes/de nuestro heroico caudillo” (83). Baptism has breathed new life into Palmira (‘pues me han dado nuevo aliento/los cristales del bautismo’), who now follows the battlestandards of Christ (‘los estandartes de Cristo’). Shortly thereafter Palmira tells Captain Lugo, the Mariscal and King Osmín: “Españoles, guerra, guerra,/no sé que espíritu animo/luego que toque esta insignia,/dichosa la luz que sigo” (87). Palmira’s transformation clearly includes a graduated passage from the contemplative to the active.

Having earlier touched the standard and sacred ensign to inspire her martial spirit, Palmira proceeds to carry the standard into battle. In the Spanish victory over the dragon-riding Neméquene and Osmín’s warriors at the castle, Palmira is “con el estandarte” (II, 92). The dragon, a Catholic symbol of paganism in medieval Gothic art, is slain by Palmira and the Mariscal, who effectively assume one function of saints according to medieval iconography (Mâle 288-89). After slaying the dragon, Palmira threatens Amirena with the “sovereign ensign” of the standard: “Aunque el infierno despida/los rayos de sus hogueras,/esta insignia soberana/tremolaré en las almenas” (95). At the close of Act II, the visual and the aural are again joined. She plants the standard (Orbea’s instructions read “Arobola el estandarte”) and declares, “¡Viva nuestro invicto César ! ... /Viva la gran cruz de Cristo!,” to which all the Spaniards sing twice, between spoken verses, “¡Viva la gran cruz de Cristo!/ ¡Viva nuestro invicto César!” (97). Finally, Mariscal tells a resigned Osmín: “En el trono presida parte a parte,/colocad soberano ese estandarte,” and Palmira rejoins: “El aliento me da,/Fénix. Viva, Señor, tu majestad./Esta insignia sagrada en este día/confunda la soberbia idolatría” (106-07).

It is important to note that Orbea’s representation of Princess Palmira as a standard bearer was not a quantum leap within the iconographic history of standard bearers. In the sixteenth century, the Dutch engraver Hendrik Goltzius departed from previous allegorical drawings of the standard bearer in his own *Standard Bearer* (1587). Goltzius depicted him as a courtier rather than a foot soldier: he is all plumes and lace and curls (Emison 94-6). In addition, allegorical drawings of Victory portrayed her as a woman (*Victoria*). For example, Frans Floris modelled his *Victoria Surrounded by Prisoners and Trophies* (1552), which was executed to celebrate Charles V’s triumphs over the Turks, after a tapestry (Emison 93-95). In order to grasp the meaning of Palmira’s carrying the standard and ensign into battle, spectators of *La conquista de Santa Fe de Bogotá* need not have seen Floris’s *Victoria*.

The iconography of Charles V's imperialist efforts had manifested themselves in painting, sculpture, architecture and plays. These forms of the dominant culture had constituted the imperial tradition of Charles V that was to belong to all members of the Habsburg Empire. Orbea inherited and extended this imperial tradition from a specifically-Spanish perspective: the trampled Turks of Floris's drawing become trampled Indians, and Victory is personified by Palmira, the converted Princess of Calambas.

Finally, the religious symbolism is heightened by the absence of religious feeling in the tragedy's other couple, Amirena and General Tundama. Tundama declares his love to Amirena in an acrostic aria, A-M-I-R-E-N-A (II; 71-72), and Amirena responds with an acrostic aria of her own, T-U-N-D-A-M-A (II; 72-74). Tundama then calls his kingdom to arms in recitative and in an aria that yields to choral praising of the Mariscal and Palmira (II; 75). Neither General Tundama nor Infanta Amirena views religion as an essential part of their union. Their planned empire is like a cathedral without windows.

Having reviewed the structure, plot and religious symbolism of *La conquista de Santa Fe de Bogotá*, we are ready now to confront Orbea's historicism with its many ideological impulses and implications. First, it is necessary to understand what the historical record – no matter how flawed or biased – tells us about the Conquest of the region in question. According to Fernández de Piedrahita's *Historia general del Nuevo Reino de Granada* (1688), the *zipazgo* (the vast empire of the Chibchas) had been founded by Neméquene. When he was killed, his nephew Thysquesuzha became the *zipa* (or supreme ruler) of Bogotá. The Prince of Chía, Zipa Thysquesuzha's nephew, was in hiding when the Zipa was stabbed to death by a Spanish soldier ([1942] 2: 73). General Saquezazipa, Neméquene's nephew and Thysquesuzha's cousin, elected himself *zipa* of Bogotá ([1942] 2: 91-93). The Spaniards wrested control of Bogotá from Zipa Saquezazipa. They also encountered Quimuinchateca, *zaque* (or supreme ruler) of Tunja ([1942] 2:40). (In Orbea's tragedy, Neméquene is the oracle consulted by King Osmín of Bogotá. Perhaps Osmín was a corruption of Quimuinchateca, the name of that *zaque* of Tunja.) "In real life," as we say, the death of Zipa Saquezazipa was quite unlike the one suffered by Orbea's King Osmín, according to Fernández de Piedrahita's summary of documents from the Archives of Simanca: "parece por las deposiciones de algunos testigos que después de haberlo tenido preso por más de seis meses y atormentándole con cordeles, le fueron dando fuego a dos herraduras que le tenían puestas en las plantas

de los pies hasta que murió” A Spanish soldier named Gonzalo Martín Zorro was one of four Spaniards blamed for torturing Saquezazipa to death with the common torture technique known as *cordeles* ([1942] 2:101). Orbea spun these historical events into absurdity. Here I recall Orbea’s two minor speaking characters: the indigenous drunk Chiburrina and the Spanish soldier Martín. The fictional Martín, in Act III, threatens Chiburrina with the very same method of torture that had contributed to the death of Zipa Saquezazipa: “¿Soga a mí? ¿Burlas a mí?/Pues yo te daré cordeles” (120). Further into the *Historia general*, I find another possible source for Orbea’s character: Pedro Blasco Martín Labrador, “basto en el lenguaje”([1942] 2: 161). Orbea’s Martín certainly is that.

The play’s military leaders are the Mariscal Jiménez de Quesada and General Tundama, who plots to kill Osmín and become king of Bogotá. Fernández de Piedrahita writes that Tundama was the vicious leader of the indigenous town of Duitama, near Iza. An “indio anciano,” whose left hand and ears had been cut off by Tundama, informed the Spanish that he had been punished for suggesting to the *cacique* that he send ambassadors bearing gifts to the Spanish encampment ([1942] 2: 36). The Spanish captains Lugo and *Belarcázar* are secondary characters in the tragedy, but according to Fernández de Piedrahita, Pedro Fernández de Lugo, *adelantado* of the Canaries, was named governor of Santa Marta in 1535. He made the *licenciado* Gonzalo Jiménez de Quesada his lieutenant general ([1942] 1: 178). Sebastián de *Benalcázar* was a *caudillo* loyal to Francisco Pizarro, who conquered the Kingdom of Quito. In 1536 he set off from Quito in search of El Dorado, and he discovered Popayán and Calambaz ([1942] 1: 197-99). Benalcázar and the German Federmann accompanied Jiménez de Quesada in his conquest of Santa Fe.

Orbea’s principal female characters, Infanta Amirena of Popoyán and Princess Palmira of Calambaz, have a tenuous relationship to history, if we can believe Fernández de Piedrahita’s *Historia general*. The fictional Palmira’s imprisonment and detainment in the Mariscal’s camp was actually suffered by Saquezazipa, who was dragged from Bogotá to Bosa where Jiménez was based ([1942] 2: 93). (Nothing historical indicates that Saquezazipa and the Mariscal were sexually involved.) The “señora independiente de los reyes de Tunja y Bogotá” was named Furatena, not Amirena, and she was the “primer fundamento de la falsa voz que corrió de haber encontrado Amazonas” ([1942] 2: 24). Although Orbea’s *title* refers to events that took place during the *conquest* of this region, Amirena the

“Amazona bella” (I, 24) recalls chronicles of the *discovery* and subsequent *exploration* of what would later be called the New Kingdom of Granada. Orbea’s characterization of the Amazons, for example, appears to have been inspired by Fray Gaspar de Carvajal’s description of the female warriors in his account of the exploration of the Amazon River region headed by Pizarro’s captain, Francisco de Orellana (95-107). The latter began his search for the País de la Canela in 1541 shortly after the founding of the Spanish cities of Popayán (1536), Santa Fe de Bogotá (1538) and Tunja (1539) (Hernández Millares in Carvajal 20-3). In Orbea’s tragedy, however, Amirena rallies her tribeswomen to attack the forces of the Spanish Mariscal Jiménez de Quesada in Santa Fe de Bogotá (I, 45).

Before the Spanish invasion, the Saquezazipa seized power when the Prince of Chía, the rightful heir to Thysquesuzha, went into hiding, and Saquezazipa was recognized by the Chibchas. The Spanish and many indigenous viewed Saquezazipa as a tyrant, and they disputed his right to rule. If one is searching primarily for historical parallels, Orbea’s numerous anachronisms can easily be characterized as poetic defects, or poetic license gone awry. It is possible, for example, to interpret the rebellion against King Osmin, in Act III, as an anachronistic performance of popular resentment of Saquezazipa: General Tundama is named Prince of Chía in Orbea’s tragedy after Osmin’s rise to power (I, 35). I suspect, however, that something other than poetic license was at work here. Indeed, the exchanges between two minor characters in the play suggest that tyranny is in the eye of the beholder: the “Indio ridículo” and the Spanish soldier Martín undercut the motivations of the Conquest as these had been, and were being, represented by members of the dominant culture. In Act II, for instance, Chiburrina describes Martín as “ambicioso,” as “este español codicioso,” and then adds: “Los españoles nos tienen/a los indios por muy bobos./Mas que cuarenta españoles/sabe más un indio solo./Él viene a buscar su huaca./Voy a pegársela al tonto...” (88). Gold, obliquely conveyed by the term ‘huaca,’ is the Spaniards’ underlying motive. Martín confirms this with his grumbling about unfulfilled expectations: “Que venga un hombre de España,/pobre y metido a soldado,/y en lugar de encontrar oro,/¿le han de cascar de flechazos?” (II, 88). In Act III Chiburrina turns the Western European stereotype of the noble savage against the Spanish soldier in a falsely intimate address: “¿Martinillo querer oro?/Pues allí una huaca tienes./Valga el diablo el español/quien con el oro le mete” (118). Orbea’s portrait of the Spanish soldier is scarcely more flattering than his portrait of the ‘Indio ridículo.’ After his

mischievous captive eludes him once again, Martín decides to abandon the Spanish military efforts: he runs and hides (131). Clearly, Orbea did not seek justification for the Conquest in Saquezazipa's tyrannical interruption, alleged or true, of the indigenous succession. For Orbea, rebellion and conquest alike relied on unity.

In my own view, historical events in the New Kingdom of Granada and in the other kingdoms of the Viceroyalty of Peru provide us with the immediate ideological motivation for *La conquista de Santa Fe de Bogotá*. The Spanish War of Succession, which began in earnest in 1701 and ended with the signing of the Utrecht Treaty in 1713, influenced political events in Spanish America. Officials loyal to the Habsburg claims were replaced by Bourbon partisans in order to obviate popular resistance to the succession of Philip V. From this perspective, King Osmín's eventual surrender to Jiménez de Quesada could possibly reinforce the changing of the guard occurring in Spain and its dominions: the transition from Habsburg to Bourbon rule. Occasional poetry and occasional theatre were the perfect vehicles for that indoctrination campaign (Hill, "Bourbon Castile," *passim*), and Orbea's tragedy was likely written to be staged during civic celebrations in honor of a viceroy or king. Other popular uprisings contemporaneous with Orbea stemmed from the illegal trading and smuggling that flourished in the Kingdom of New Granada and the Viceroyalty of Peru, and from the Crown's attempts to restrict such transactions (Anonymous, pt. 1, ch. 11, ff. 124-32; Groot, *passim*; Grahn).

Orbea's immediate ideological motivations are embedded in the respective attitudes toward rebellion shown by two of his tragedy's principals. The Spanish Mariscal, rather than the indigenous King Osmín, is more intolerant of popular rebellion. He instructs a vengeful Osmín: "Espera que esta venganza/la ha de tomar mi grandeza/y atraídos a tu dosel/te volverán la obediencia./Y este traidor general/que en las montañas se alberga,/acosado de mi brío,/le mataré como fiera./El Pueblo en bandos está,/monstruo de siete cabezas./Pues desde aquí el alboroto/publica en voces diversas" (III, 114). The rebellion against Osmín suggests historical parallels with Charles V, not with Saquezazipa. Historically, Jiménez de Quesada did not play a major role in the Habsburg monarch's suppression of the *comunidades*, roughly 200 years before Orbea's writing of *La conquista de Santa Fe de Bogotá*. General Tundama and the masses ('el Pueblo') who rebel against Osmín are not idolatrous: they are *sacrilegious*, within Orbea's understanding of the figure of the monarch, for they disobey their king. The enduring

medieval ideology of monarchy, which defined the monarch's divine and political bodies (cf. Kantorowicz) and was present in eighteenth-century Spanish American drama (Hill, "Hybridity, Genre and Ideology"), is directly superimposed on King Osmín in Act III. But earlier in the tragedy, the Mariscal expresses this political theology when Osmín confronts him: "Un rayo en el pecho animo./El invencible guerrero/Poderoso Carlos Quinto,/Emperador de Alemania,/Rey del Orbe y dueño mío,/de paz me envía a tu Corte./Dice su poder invicto/que dejéis la religión/de bárbaros sacrificios,/venerando las verdades/de la Sacra Ley de Christo" (II, 82).

The solution to the tragedy is predicated on Osmín's transformation into an honorable king who respects the higher powers – into a monarch on the Hapsburg model. For only then does he turn over his empire and his beloved Palmira to the Spanish Mariscal and die while defending this decision. Unlike the other indigenous people, he has earned an honorable burial, a royal farewell: his soul is redeemed through earthly defeat, and his people will be redeemed by their joining the *Monarquía*, as the marriage of the convert Palmira and Mariscal Jiménez was meant to suggest to the play's eighteenth-century spectators in Lima. That marriage, needless to say, was another figment of Orbea's historicizing imagination. As Fernández de Piedrahita points out in the concluding paragraph of his chronicle, the Spanish nobility in New Granada refused to wed indigenous noblewomen:

La tercera y ultima singularidad sea, por mas que la tribuya la razon a la mucha altivez de sus conquistadores, que aviendo en el Nuevo Reyno tantas mugeres nobles, hijas y hermanas de Reyes, Caziques y Uzaques, que sin menoscabo de su lustre pudieran recibir por esposas los mas nobles que passaron a su cõquista, como se practicó en las demás partes de la America, no se hallará que alguno de todos ellos casasse cõ India, por mas calificada que fuesse; y no a mi entender porque notassen desigualdad en la sangre, sino porque mirandolas gentiles y en la sujecion de prisioneras, se desdeñó el pundonor Castellano de recibir en consorcio a quien ni asintiese a el con libertad de señora y educacion de Catolica, de que resultó ocurrir a Castilla los casados por sus mugeres, y los que no lo eran a elegir de su misma nacion a las hijas o parientas de aquellos, o a las que por otro accidente decoroso avian passado a Indias.... ([1688] 599)

It is true that noble indigenous ancestry was a social plus in viceregal Spanish American society: the descendants of Incas and Aztecs did not belong to the *casta de indios*, which hierarchical category contained only the plebeian

indigenous; they belonged to the *casta de españoles* and to the noble estate (Hill, *Hierarchy, Commerce and Fraud*, chs. 5 and 6). Still, it cannot be forgotten that certain *definiciones* or *constituciones* (so-called “blood purity statutes”) of religious and military orders, schools and universities rejected the candidacy of men born out-of-wedlock, men occupying the lowest estate (*villanos*), heretics, those punished by the Inquisition and their descendants, and neophytes (Jews, Moors, Africans, Indians, et al.) and their descendants (*conversos*, *moriscos*, *mestizos*, *mulatos*, et al.). Some statutes spelled out clearly that neophytes could not be admitted; others referred to the legal and social condition incurred by the aforementioned groups, *infamia* (Hill, “*Casta as Culture*,” *passim*).

For example, Constitution 238 of the *Constituciones y Ordenanças de la Universidad y Studio General de la ciudad de los Reyes del Piru* reads: “Yten qualquiera persona que vuere sido penitenciado por el sãcto officio, o sus padres o abuelos, o tuuiere alguna nota de infamia, no sea admitido a grado alguno, ni a examen del, ni se le dé” (41 verso). Another exclusionary statute, one that is contemporary with Fernández de Piedrahita and Fernando de Orbea, can be found in *Constituciones del Colegio Mayor de Nuestra Señora del Rosario en la Ciudad de Santa Fe de Bogotá*. Constitution 3 is a blood purity statute that provides a wealth of detail about which students were considered most desirable and why:

Todos los Colegiales que de aqui adelante se huvieren de recibir, constituimos que se les haga informacion, por lo menos de limpieza, calidad que piden todos los Colegios, singularmente Mayores: y es precisamente necessaria para servir al Santo Tribunal de la Inquisicion. Mas tambien estatuímos que sean preferidos quanto fuere posible los ilustres en sangre; y no siendo notablemente inferiores en capacidad, sean escogidos necessariamente, pues en esto consiste una gran parte de la grandeza deste Colegio y sus veneraciones y aprecios; por lo qual estatuímos. Lo primero, q’ todos los Colegiales seã legitimos, sin q’ lo contrario sea dispensable; y aun queremos que sean legitimos sus padres, y que se dispense con grandissimas causas en lo contrario. Lo segundo, que sus padres no tengan officios baxos, y mucho menos infames por las leyes del Reyno, sin que tampoco se pueda dispensar en esto. Lo tercero, que no tengan sangre de la tierra; y si la huvieren tenido sus progenitores, aya salido demanera que puedan tener un Abito de nobleza, y no de otra suerte.

Y lo quarto, que sean personas de grandes esperanças para el bien publico. (10 verso)

The heightened importance of blood purity, in the late sixteenth century and seventeenth, allows us to understand Fernández's use of 'pundonor Castellano': the latter feared the social complications that stemmed from unions between Spanish and indigenous nobles, although the latter belonged to the *casta de españoles* and were admitted to schools reserved for the nobility (see the third stipulation above).⁸ The marital bliss of indigenous princess and Spanish conqueror in *La conquista de Santa Fe de Bogotá* so defied the historical record of New Granada (but not of Lima) that it had to be a bit of overdetermined invention, a happy ending that did not come out of the emerging dramatic culture in the Viceroyalty of Peru (tragic opera and *comedia nueva*, unlike classical tragedy, favored happy endings), or the playwright's powers of invention alone.

Perhaps Orbea saw in the blood purity statutes a source of disunity among Spaniards and an obstacle to the Crown's total control over its New World subjects, no matter their ancestry.

La conquista de Santa Fe de Bogotá was written to be performed in a post-Conquest, rebellious period of the Viceroyalty of Peru's history. It underscores that unity among all members of his fictional Kingdom of Granada, irrespective of their positioning within the social hierarchy, is a religious and political duty. Orbea's fictional and historiographical influences further suggest that the strengthening of the monarchy was a concern in this period. According to Virgil's epic, Aeneas subjected the Latins but agreed to mix with them to form a new tribe and political system. Virgil made an emblem of Emperor Octavius Augustus in his hero Aeneas so that the Roman people would reconcile themselves to the present ruler, forgetting the former state of things (Luzán, *Poética*, bk. 4, ch. 3, 436). Structurally, Orbea transferred Virgil's allegory to a New World context. The marriage of Spanish hero and indigenous princess suggests a joyous transition from indigenous to Spanish rule. While the Mariscal resembles Aeneas, who made a pact with King Latinus, General Tundama resembles Latinus's ally Turnus, who violated that pact and dishonored the King before expiring. Orbea also adapted Virgil's ideology to a New World context, working to secure the obedience of all subjects to the new political system of the Bourbon king, not because Philip V was Bourbon, but because he was king. Thus, although the political theology that underpins the Habsburg monarchy is pronounced in Orbea's tragedy, the impulse is not a partisan one (pro-Habsburg or pro-Bourbon).

Orbea articulated the only ideology of monarchy that was available to him and his contemporaries in this transitional period in the *Monarquía's* history. This political theology exemplifies what Raymond Williams has termed *residual culture*: "The residual, by definition, has been effectively formed in the past, but as an effective element of the present. Thus certain experiences, meanings, and values which cannot be expressed or substantially verified in terms of the dominant culture, are nevertheless lived and practiced on the basis of the residue (cultural as well as social) of some previous social and cultural institution or formation" (122). The political theology of Orbea's tragedy, which was written under the first Spanish Bourbon monarch, illustrates this definition of the residual. Further, the very base of Orbea's invention, his election of the conquest of Santa Fe as suitable material for a tragedy, exemplifies how the dominant culture in this period *incorporated* the residual. That incorporation can be seen in another type of performance of the Conquest that had no pretense of fiction: the parading of the battle standard throughout the viceregal capitals on the anniversary of the Conquest. The nobility, mayors, high court judges and viceroys participated in this parade, a symbolic practice that linked all phases of the history of the *Nación* together, as in an emblem of Victory – of the *Spanish* Victory over the New World heathens (*Gacetas* 1: 118; Hill, *Hierarchy, Commerce and Fraud*, ch. 1).

No Bourbon monarch had been involved in the historical conquest of Santa Fe, but the figure of the Habsburg monarch during that period of Spanish history had been strong. It was transferable because no fixed and shared forms for articulating the monarchy in Bourbon Spain had yet emerged to replace the political theology that had underpinned the Habsburg monarchy. Orbea inherited this political theology, and seized upon the ideology of conquest and felicitous miscegenation expressed by Virgil, expressing them in forms that might be effective in early eighteenth-century Spanish America. They in effect are pre-emergent forms of culture that compel us to link social experiences and forms through the concept of *structure of feeling*. Social experiences (dress, manners, language) "do not have to await definition, classification, or rationalization before they exert palpable pressures and set effective limits on experience and on action" (R. Williams 132). The social experience of monarchy-subject relations during the transition from Habsburg to Bourbon rule was being lived rather than classified or rationalized into set forms. Williams defines *structures of feeling* as "social experiences *in solution*" (133), and notes that it is primarily to emergent and cul-

tural formations “that the structure of feeling, *as solution*, relates” (134). Orbea’s tragedy was not supposed to represent the official Spanish history of the Conquest of Santa Fe de Bogotá: we have seen that it does not conform to the chronicles published before it was written. Rather, it was designed to convey an emotionally-charged and highly stylized version of the Conquest that would ensure the privileges of the higher orders and *castas* while smoothing out the ideological wrinkles, so to speak, in the Bourbon “conquest” of the Spanish Austrian throne.

University of Virginia

Notes

¹ Research for this essay was generously supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities, The John Carter Brown Library, and the Dean’s Office of the University of Virginia from January through May 2000. I am grateful also to Prof. James Muldoon and Prof. Richard Handler, for shaping my ideas about hierarchy, and to the organizers and participants of the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies International Seminar, “Interpreting Eighteenth-Century Colonialism,” in June 2000, for their insights. The essay that I wrote for that Seminar, “*Casta as Culture and the Sociedad de Castas as Literature*,” examines poetry and physiognomy, and complements this one.

² The Count de la Cueva, Jorge de Villalonga, was named Viceroy of New Granada in 1717 and assumed his duties when the Viceroyalty was officially established in November 1719. His tenure lasted four years, the duration of the first Viceroyalty of New Granada, and thereafter Santa Fe again became the capital city of the New Kingdom of Granada, which fell under the civil and religious jurisdiction of the Viceroyalty of Peru. The Viceroyalty of New Granada was re-established two decades later. Lieutenant-General Sebastián de Eslava governed from April 1740 until 1749, and unlike his predecessor and subsequent viceroys, his base was in Cartagena de Indias, not in Santa Fe de Bogotá. On the political and religious history of the Viceroyalty, see Romeo Castillo, ch. 1, and Groot, vol. 2.

³ I disagree with Arango Ferrer, who claims that the play was written in Spain because the manuscript belongs to the Biblioteca de Palacio. The last unnumbered verses of this play (III, p.146) follow the custom and diction of Italian operas, while addressing spectators in Lima: “Ilustre Lima aquí tiene/fine el Concepto expresado./Vuestra discreción tolere/los yerros que han sido tantos.” For a similar observation, see Arrom 111-12.

⁴ See Stevens in Torrejón y Velasco, 15-37, 38-55; Stein; Illari; J. Williams; Hill, “Hybridity.”

⁵ This practice was observed in Eusebio Vela’s new dramas, which were written and performed in New Spain during the first half of the eighteenth century. Luzán, who was to adapt Pietro Buonaventura Metastasio’s *libretti* into Spanish tragic operas in the 1740s and 50s, recommended the omission of temporal references if the playwright could not respect the Aristotelian unity of time (*Poética*, bk. 3, ch. 5, p. 346). Again, we see that Orbea’s *comedia nueva* anticipates cultural practices that were to firmly take hold later in his century.

⁶ Ideologically, of course, the tragedy of the *bogotaes* cannot be separated from the Spanish triumph, the latter representing the triumph of Catholicism. In this sense, the indig-

enous tragedy is constructed using the interpretative framework of universal history provided by the Old and New Testaments and patristic authors such as Augustine.

⁷ Diego de Orbea y Sorain was a Spaniard who served as the provincial governor (*corregidor*) of Cochabamba and married a woman from Lima. The Viceroy of Peru in 1721 described them as wealthy. Their son, Diego José de Orbea y Arnadia (1712-1773), graduated from the University of San Marcos with degrees in canon and civil law, and he became a knight of Santiago. He married a woman whose brother served on the royal court in Lima (Burkholder and Chandler 242). Perhaps Fernando de Orbea was Diego's brother, or even his uncle.

⁸ For a different view, see Schwartz. With respect to the early colonial period, I agree that "Indian lineage, in fact, was not necessarily a handicap, and if noble or royal, could be used to advantage" (Schwartz 189). However, as the blood purity statutes became increasingly powerful in Spain and transferred to the New World, and as the treatises and commentaries on nobility and canon law circulated there in the late sixteenth century and the early seventeenth, Indian ancestry became a far more complex construction, legally and socially. See Hill, *Hierarchy, Commerce and Fraud*, ch. 6, 7.

Works Cited

- Anonymous. *Descripción general de todos los dominios de la América que pertenecen a S.M. Madrid*, Biblioteca de Palacio, Colección Ayala, t. II, ms. 2537-2538.
- Constituciones del Colegio Mayor de Nuestra Señora del Rosario en la Ciudad de Santa Fe de Bogotá, hechas y ajustadas por su Insigne Fundador y Patrono, el Ilustrísimo Señor Maestro D. Fr. Christoval de Torres, del Orden de Predicadores; Predicador de las dos Magestadas, Phelipe Tercero y Quarto, y de su Consejo, Arçobispo del Nuevo Reyno de Granada*. Ed. Cristóbal de Araque Ponce de León. Madrid: Juan Nogués, 1666.
- Arrom, José Juan. *Historia del teatro hispanoamericano (Época colonial)*. Mexico City: Ediciones de Andrea, 1967.
- Burkholder, Mark A., and D.S. Chandler. *Biographical Dictionary of Audiencia Ministers in the Americas, 1687-1821*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1982.
- Carvajal, Gaspar de, O.P. *Relación del nuevo descubrimiento del famoso río Grande de las Amazonas*. Ed. and introd. Jorge Hernández Millares. Mexico City and Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1955.
- Constituciones y Ordenanças de la Universidad y Studio General de la ciudad de los Reyes del Piru*. Lima: Antonio Ricardo, 1602.
- Emison, Patricia A. *The Art of Teaching: Sixteenth-Century Allegorical Prints and Drawings*, exhibition catalogue, Yale University Art Gallery, 28 October 1986-4 January 1987. New Haven: Yale University Art Gallery, 1986.
- Fernández de Piedrahita, Lucas. *Historia general de las conquistas del Nuevo Reino de Granada*. Prol. G.O.M. Bogotá: Biblioteca Popular de Cultura Colombiana, 1942. 4 vols.

- _____. *Historia general del Nuevo Reyno de Granada*. Antwerp: Juan Baptista Verdussen, 1688.
- Gacetas de México: Castorena y Ursúa (1722)—Sahagún de Arévalo (1728 a 1742)*. Intro. Francisco González de Cossío. Mexico City: Secretaría de Educación Pública, 1949. 3 vols.
- Grahn, Lance. *The Political Economy of Smuggling: Regional Informal Economies in Early Bourbon New Granada*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1997.
- Groot, José Manuel. *Historia eclesiástica y civil de Nueva Granada*. Bogotá: Casa Editorial de M. Rivas & Ca., 1890. 5 vols. 2nd rev. ed.
- Hill, Ruth. "Bourbon Castile and Other 'Antiquities': Memory, Conquest and Tradition in Luzán's Occasional Poetry." *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 4. 1 (2003): 95-110.
- _____. "Casta as Culture and the *Sociedad de Castas* as Literature." *Interpreting Eighteenth-Century Colonialisms*. Ed. Byron Wells and Philip Stewart. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation (forthcoming).
- _____. *Hierarchy, Commerce and Fraud in Bourbon Spanish America: A Postal Inspector's Exposé*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP (forthcoming).
- _____. "Hybridity, Genre and Ideology in 18th-Century Cuban Theatre: A Reappraisal of *El príncipe jardinero y fingido Cloridano*." *Latin American Theatre Review* 31. 2 (Spring 1998): 45-65.
- Illari, Bernardo. Notes to Coro de Niños de Córdoba and Ensemble Elima, *Musique à la Cité des Rois: Torrejón y Velasco (1644-1728)*, dir. by Gabriel Garrido. *Les chemins du Baroque*, Nouvelle série, no. 5. France: Fondation Paribas, 1993.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1981.
- Lohmann Villena, Guillermo. *El arte dramático en Lima durante el Virreinato*. Madrid: Escuela de Estudios Hispanoamericanos de la Universidad de Sevilla, 1945.
- Luzán, Ignacio de. *La poética o reglas de la poesía en general y de sus principales especies (Ediciones de 1737 y 1789)*. Ed. Isabel M. Cid de Sirgado. Madrid: Cátedra, 1974.
- Mâle, Emile. *The Gothic Image: Religious Art in France of the Thirteenth Century*. Trans. Dora Nussey. New York: Icon Editions, 1972.
- Orbea, Fernando [de]. *Comedia nueva: La conquista de Santa Fe de Bogotá*. Prol. Javier Arango Ferrer. Bogotá: Biblioteca Popular de Cultura Colombiana, 1950.
- Romeo Castillo, Abel. *Los gobernadores de Guayaquil del siglo XVIII (Notas para la historia de la ciudad durante los años de 1763 a 1803)*. Madrid: Imprenta de G Sáez, 1931.

- Schwartz, Stuart B. "Colonial Identities and the *Sociedad de Castas*." *Colonial Latin American Review* 4.1 (1995): 185-201.
- Stein, Louise K. *Songs of Mortals, Dialogues of the Gods: Music and Theatre in Seventeenth-Century Spain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, and New York: Oxford UP, 1993.
- Torrejón y Velasco, Tomás de. *La púrpura de la rosa*. Prel. study and transcription by Robert Stevenson. Lima: Instituto Nacional de Cultura-Biblioteca Nacional, 1976.
- Vela, Eusebio. *Tres comedias de Eusebio Vela*. Ed. Jefferson Rea Spell. Mexico City: Imprenta Universitaria, 1948.
- Virgil. *The Aeneid*. Trans. Robert Fitzgerald. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.
- Williams, Jerry M. "Peralta Barnuevo's *Loa para la comedia*: The Tragic Reign of Luis I." *Dieciocho* 23. 1 (Spring 2000): 7-25.
- Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977.