

HONOR UNMASKED: REPRESENTATIONS OF MASCULINE HONOR IN
THE LATE 19TH AND EARLY 20TH CENTURY THEATRE OF JOAQUIN
DEICENTA, ROMAN DEL VALLE-INCLAN AND ALFONSO PASO

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department

of Hispanic Studies

University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Sumor J.A. Sheppard

December 2012

HONOR UNMASKED: REPRESENTATIONS OF MASCULINE HONOR IN
THE LATE 19TH AND EARLY 20TH CENTURY THEATRE OF JOAQUIN
DICENTA, RAMON DEL VALLE-INCLAN AND ALFOSNO PASO

Sumor J.A. Sheppard

APPROVED:

Pedro Gutiérrez-Revuelta, Ph.D.
Committee Chair
Department of Hispanic Studies

Lois Zamora, Ph.D.
Department of English
Chair, Department of Comparative Cultural Studies

Manuel Gutiérrez, Ph.D.
Department of Hispanic Studies

Nicasio Urbina, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Romance Languages and Literatures
University of Cincinnati

John W. Roberts, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
Department of English

HONOR UNMASKED: REPRESENTATIONS OF MASCULINE HONOR IN
THE LATE 19TH AND EARLY 20TH CENTURY THEATRE OF JOAQUIN
DEICENTA, ROMAN DEL VALLE-INCLAN AND ALFONSO PASO

An Abstract of a Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department

of Hispanic Studies

University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Sumor J.A. Sheppard
December 2012

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the future of the Castilian masculine concept of honor as traced in its treatment on the stage in the late 19th and early 20th century. Masculine honor has held a prominent and almost unshakeable place in hegemonic masculinity in Spain, but this started to change in the late 19th century. The start of a series of changes in the nation's governance, as well as its transformation into a Mass society, converged to create a crisis for this one aspect of masculinity. Using three influential authors from three different time periods in the 19th and 20th centuries (Joaquín Dicenta, Ramon del Valle-Inclán, and Alfonso Paso), the theme of masculine honor is traced and analyzed.

The study begins with an historical overview of honor, tracing its roots from antiquity to its beginnings in a self-governing Spain. Complementing this historical overview and definition of Castilian masculine honor and its corresponding honor code is a description of the type of society within it exists in the 19th and 20th centuries: a Mass Society.

The three plays analyzed here are *Juan José* by Joaquín Dicenta, *El Esperpento de Los Cuernos de Don Friolera* by Ramon del Valle-Inclán, and *La Corbata* by Alfonso Paso. Each play has been canonized as being an honor play but not all are found not be such plays here.

Dicenta's play's egalitarian view of masculine honor is twisted and contorts the concept for application in deviant, domestic abuse situations. Valle-Inclán's *esperpento*, although a parody of sorts of the honor-play, is really a didactic, anti-Semitic tool of propaganda very common during his era in Europe where the theatre was used to promote ideologies such as fascism. Paso's *La Corbata*, the most recent of the trio, is the only play where masculine honor is actually present. The representation links a declining masculine honor concept with a declining traditional, middle class being crushed by the forces of a Mass society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, Baruch HaShem! There are, in fact, many people without whom this dissertation would not have been possible. First I would like to thank my entire committee: Dr. Pedro-Revuelta, Dr. Lois Zamora, Dr. Nicasio Urbina and Dr. Manuel Gutierrez. I also thank the faculty of the University of Memphis' Department of Romance Languages and Literatures who first introduced me to Castilian literature and impressed upon me holistic analysis.

To family and friends I say thanks. Specifically, I thank: my mother and grandmother who taught me all the important things in life; my siblings—Dr. P.A. Sheppard, IV, Dr. D.N. Sheppard and Prof. I.K. Sheppard—who lent great moral support as well as countless hours of discussions; to awesome Skye-bean (!) whose presence actually bends time in the most delightful way; my father who let me vent and lent great moral support; to Mrs. Alma Rodríguez and her family; to Mrs. Catherine Hanna, my great friend and dissertation survival buddy; The Gilyard family (Mrs. Marguerite, Ms. Alice, Cassandra and the late Mr. Aaron) for the precious gift of babysitting; to my aunt Ms. Sylvia Perry and Dr. Maria Abril-Hernández for their generosity of heart and home; Prof. Dietmar Felber; and Mr. Thomas Whalen. Thanks to all of you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: A Brief History of Masculine Honor.....	9
Chapter 2: Modernity, Spain and Mass Society Theory.....	40
Chapter 3: <i>Juan José</i> , an Example of Honor Misused.....	54
Chapter 4: Valle Inclán's Anti-Semitic Enlightenment: Honor and Masculinity in <i>El Esperpento de los Cuernos de Don Friolera</i>	79
Chapter 5: The Means of Masculine Honor in Alfonso Paso's <i>La Corbata</i>	112
Conclusion.....	137
Bibliography.....	151

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1.....	143
Appendix 2.....	145
Appendix 3.....	148

To my mother, Celesia Maria Ferrand,
who helped me discover
all those levels
of *Madame Bovary* at NOCCA

Introduction

Since the *Reconquista*, masculine honor and the honor code have been crucial pieces to the development of masculinity for the newly self-governing Castilian man. Castilian masculine honor was where the state religion resided; it was where status and esteem was born or died—where in theory the secular reasoning of man was to coincide with the divine Law of God. Honor was intrinsic to the essence of the new Castilian man and woman emerging after the *Reconquista*. The Spanish honor code, as such, was not purported as a manifestation of societal degeneration. It was not a concept that functioned as a sign of Spanish society's incivility and barbarity. It is almost puzzling, then, to see this foundational piece of Castilian identity change from being an accepted, integral piece of hegemonic masculinity to becoming, by the late 19th century in many circles in Spanish society, either a symptom of a supposedly foreign *Weltanschauung* that needed to be either heavily renovated at best or completely eradicated at worst. More puzzling still is that the honor code that was being focused upon as an element in need of some change was most often an extreme dramatization of honor seen on the stage and not the masculine honor as it had been played out in reality for the past 400 years.

This dissertation will examine the changing representation of Castilian masculine honor and the honor code in an effort to discern its

fate in modern Spain. Through an analysis of three pivotal, modern, honor plays—each of different authorship as well as time period—it will be shown that honor, as reflected on the stage, highlighted a shift in perception of various aspects of masculine honor. That shift was rooted in larger societal forces such as the change in social character in a post-industrialized world, social movements and national decline. Masculine honor and the honor code have been a point of contention in Spain since the end of the Golden Age with some claiming it to be part of the essence of the Spanish man while others, in growing numbers, expressing the need to extricate the concept completely from popular society. It is because of this centuries long debate over the fate of the concept that I believe it merits investigating. This one theme alone, due to its longevity in Spain's literature, is able to work as a signpost of many types of macro-level societal changes in Spain, including hegemonic masculinity itself.

The first chapter of this dissertation functions as an overview of masculine honor in the West. The purpose of this chapter is to survey the origins and transformations of masculine honor from its oldest roots in the Hammurabi and Assura cultures to the delimited concept of masculine honor created in Spain under Los Reyes Católicos. Before delving into a discussion on the transformation of honor in Spanish society, it is of utmost importance that the roots of honor as a cultural near-universal that pre-dates Biblical influence be proven. The definition

of a “man of honor” and the “honor code” derives from this base and is adjusted to reflect religious belief during and after the *Reconquista*. This first chapter generally outlines the path masculine honor took from its origins in the East to Spain specifically. Working from this base, it will be clear when dramatists are actually employing the Spanish honor code in their works as well as when racism is used to discount the validity of the presence of masculine honor and its corresponding code in Spanish culture.

The 19th and 20th centuries gave rise to one of the most influential sociological theories of modernity: the theory of Mass Society. Comprising the work of Emile Durkheim, Louis de Bonald, Joseph de Maistre, Gustave Le Bon, Georg Simmel, and Ortega y Gasset (to name a few), Mass Society theory has been used widely for over 150 years to describe the modern West and is still pertinent today. In the making of a new Castilian man in the post-industrial setting of modern Spain, Mass Society was the setting and social character the main vehicle of the undertaking. The second chapter discusses Mass Society Theory, and more specifically social character.

Social Character is akin to personality but describes a human being’s macrocosmic orientation level (towards the past, to values presently instilled within or ever towards the future). These character types go beyond the power structure in that the character type displayed by people in a Mass Society are not correlated to their relation to power.

The ruling elites are not past-oriented as a whole while the underclass future-oriented, for example. The social characters presented in a Mass Society are dependant upon the change in the nature of society itself.

Social character as a whole in the West had evolved. Caused the by advances in technology as well as social mobility, a new social character had arisen. Social character is important in investigating the fate of honor in Spain as dialogued in theatre because this dialogue takes place in a Mass society. In understanding the full extent of the discussion taken up in theatre on this aspect of hegemonic masculinity, it should also be taken into consideration what type of man is being held up as the new hegemonic role model of masculinity and what is his relationship to honor and the honor code.

Analysis of drama occurs in the third through fifth chapters of the dissertation. The plays that have been selected represent internationally known authors whose widely-seen plays are canonized in Spanish theatre: *Juan José* by Joaquín Dicenta, *Esperpento de Los Cuernos de Don Friolera* by Ramón del Valle-Inclán and *La Corbata* by Alfonso Paso. All three are categorized as honor-themed plays but each one deals with the subject matter in a way that accents important ideologies of their time period and important changes in hegemonic masculinity's composition in a politically metamorphosing Mass Society.

The treatment of honor in theatre throughout Spain's history and the prevalence of the theme in its literature over many centuries lead

easily to the conclusion that it is of high value in the society. After the Golden Age, the lack of uniformity in the representation of honor increased continuously, reaching a full spectrum of representations at the close of the late 19th century. By this time, the honor code's long-standing status of being a social good was heavily debated as well as its aristocratic tendency.

The end of the 19th century for Spain was the beginning of an extended national battle over the type of government that would rule the nation. From the late 19th century until the late 20th century, Spain had two different republics, a monarchy, a dictatorship and a constitutional (or parliamentary) monarchy as its form of government¹. Each form of government held a different ideal—just as the governments of Ferdinand and Isabel had their own ideals and goals that first formed the nation. Multiple types of government—each with a different view of what modern Spain should be—disrupted the singular direction of the nation and thus a singular formulation of hegemonic masculinities and femininities.

The Republics specifically brought a rise in socialism and of the plight of the workingman (or proletariat). In that era of governance in Spain the reigning impetus was one that pushed for the free distribution of tangible and intangible goods in society historically claimed exclusive to the ruling elite. One intangible good was the honor code and an

¹ This study includes only one play of the Franco period and does not include any dramas from the post-Franco period. In the future, a study is planned to investigate the study of masculine honor in the period of constitutional monarchy in Spain.

egalitarian distribution of masculine honor. Joaquín Dicenta's *Juan José* is placed in this time period and houses egalitarian themes of social good redistribution in the guise of an honor play. Widely viewed and lauded, it will represent this dynamic period.

1918 until 1945 was a time period in Europe filled with competing ideologies—in and outside of Spain. Cultural divisions were not centered around *which* adjustments were needed to hegemonic Spanish masculinity but rather the *path* to achieve the perceived necessary changes. Some chose to show how Spanish culture was already authentically European and so were sometimes revisionist in their approach, including more diverse traditions in their makings of hegemonic Spanish culture. Others strove to find what needed to be eradicated in order for a “true” Spain to emerge. In the background of all of Europe during this era was an explosive xenophobia mostly directed at the minority Jewish populations and their supposed cultural and ethnic “tainting” of the general populace. Once again, masculine honor was considered heavily in the formation of the Castilian masculinity that was hoped to be formed. *Los Cuernos de Don Friolera* by Ramon del Valle-Inclán is an avant-garde play of the *esperpento* genre created by Valle-Inclán himself. Canonized as a modern take on the honor play, its parodic ambience and criticism of masculine honor is representative of not only the rejection of honor by many social elites of his time but also of a widespread use of theatre to further political ideologies in Europe

during the years of the Great Wars.

The last time period included in this dissertation is the period of the Franco dictatorship. Franco's government was known to be extremely conservative and religious, trying to regain the Spain of the Catholic Kings. Although masculine honor factored heavily in the formation of hegemonic masculinity in the 1400s, the fate and role of honor was questioned in a society ruled by the Franco dictatorship generations removed from any actual Spanish tradition-directed social character types. The Regime's dream of recreating in modern Spain the ethos of a past golden age was not completely realistic and thus masculine honor's place was not secured even in this time of dictatorship. Alfonso Paso's *La Corbata* was written in this era of Spain's history and discusses the realities of change in social character as applied to masculine hegemonics and honor in Spain. His is a drama that illuminates that masculine honor as an applied concept can not be separated from one's social character and that although seemingly in decline, it is worth maintaining.

In each of these pivotal times, the honor-themed play sought to modify the honor code aspect of hegemonic masculinity while making its case either for or against honor in general—as either a social good or evil, as something that ultimately needed to be spread and supported or erased and forgotten. This dissertation will explore three late 19th and early 20th century dramas in an effort to illuminate the discussion in

theatre of the fate of masculine honor in Spain.

Chapter 1: A Brief History of Masculine Honor

In this chapter, I will perform a concise tour de force of the concept of Western Honor beginning at some of the first instances of honor in recorded history and then tracing its development in Europe and Spain until the 19th century. The honor theme in Spanish literature as examined in this chapter is quite far from its stereotyped, immobile form; rather, it is one of the most reliable aspects of Spanish society with which one may gauge societal change—especially when it is applied to the theatre where its change in meaning and application is most often debated and displayed. In each major societal shift in Spanish history, the concept of honor changes with all other institutions, going through a metamorphosis of its own which allowed it and *continues* to allow it to provide a reliable index of social conditions to the present. But, what is ‘honor’?

Before delving into its roots and permutations, I want to define ‘honor’ as it will be used throughout this study. Honor can said to be, simply, “the good opinion of the people who matter to us, and who matter because we regard them as a society of equals who have the power to judge our behavior” (Bowman 4). From this basic definition, I will further separate the concept into two subcategories: reflexive honor and cultural honor. Reflexive honor is reactionary in nature and primitive in development (6). If one child shoves another one, the one pushed will usually be compelled to self-defense somehow— whether it be verbally or

physically—to restore what he has felt he lost in the unwarranted attack: his honor. Cultural honor, on the other hand, is far more complicated and includes the “traditions, stories, and habits of thought of a particular society about the proper and improper use of violence” (6). It is the cultural honor of Spain—its historical development and societal prompts for change—that interest me here and that will be the focus of this chapter.

Pre-Biblical Origins of the Honor Codes

IMMANUEL....No me negará usted que el romance de ciego, hiperbólico, truculento, y sanguinario, es una forma popular. DONE ESTRAFALARIO. Una forma popular judaica, como el honor calderoniano. La crueldad y el dogmatismo del drama español solamente se encuentra en la Biblia².

It is a popular belief, as dramatized in the above quote from the *Esperpento de los Cuernos de Don Friolera*, that the Spanish concept of honor derives from Judaic and Christian cultural beliefs. Even in authors as modern as Valle-Inclán, this belief is unquestioned and treated as fact when it is closer to invention—perhaps even hostile

² A quote from the Prologue of *Esperpento de Los Cuernos de don Friolera* by Valle- Inclán. In this work, which I will later analyze, it is assumed from the outset that the entire concept of honor in Spanish society is an import from the Jews and the Bible, having no previous origins in the region and thus a negative, foreign element introduced and assimilated into the society.

invention—to the continued presence of honor in Spanish society by the cultural elite. The concept and its subsequent honor codes did not appear spontaneously on the peninsula with the advent of widespread Christianity and relatively, freely worshiping Jews. It was *transformed* by them but not *birthed* from them as other civilizations that predate the Christians and Jewish people also had cultures in which honor and honor codes figured prominently. James Bowman, in his book *Honor: A History*, goes further and states that an “older and essentially pagan idea of honor survived long into the Christian era” in Europe in general (45).

In the ancient codices of the Hammurabi and the Assura one finds many instances of laws pertaining to masculine honor related to the treatment of adulterous wives. These two cultural groups are thought to have influenced the judicial and cultural beliefs of many other civilizations that followed them including Mosaic Law (Biblical law). Both the Hammurabi and the Assura had codes that described specifically the rights of a husband to kill an unfaithful wife and also her lover (Goldstein 29).

In the Hammurabi codes section 129 drowning is proscribed for both parties involved in adultery; only the husband may initiate a change for this punishment (Good 957). Also, if a wife were unfaithful to her husband while he was away she would be drowned—having to prove herself without sufficient means of support during the absence of her husband in order to be cleared from that death sentence (957-8).

Women were stoned for having more than one husband (polyandry), impaled for abortion, drowned for cheating in business sales, and even killed by the state if her father caused the death of a pregnant woman of the same class as she (961,965, 953).

Women's status in these ancient, influential societies is transparent: they were largely the possession of their male family members and/or husbands; and any honor they held was not their own but that of a male. They could only damage honor, not add to it. Honor was a purely masculine commodity and a woman who tarnished it would be used almost always through her death to restore it. Even so, in all the laws, quotes and literature cited here, there is also evident a tension—a force of change—in some of the stated punishments and the few exceptions made for the woman's escape. One source of change in such codes in general is the introduction of a new religion and thus new worldview.

Europe, in antiquity, had many different religions across the broad region. A great source of cultural unity in Europe is found amongst the Greek and Roman civilizations, which held many similarities in religious belief as well as governmental administration. Greek civilization, a precursor and great influence to the Romans, also upheld honor code norms similar to those of the Hammurabi and the Assura.

The Greek male—especially one of renown—had a personal stake in his honor that often stressed his individuality in the society. They

were sometimes seen as men “obsessed with their own reputations to an unprecedented degree, [and] tended to become unusually individual” (Bowman 46). This aspect of cultural honor is often crucial to the portrayals of honor in Spanish theatre. The Greeks also are said to be the first people to link hegemonic masculine honor to virtue (“arête”) and educational attainment (46). In Greek theatre, both this new concept of honor-virtue as well as the more standard understandings of honor was evident and applied.

In the Greek play Antigone by Sophocles, written hundreds of years before Roman advancement and colonization of the Iberian peninsula, it is plain what the status of women is in the society from the opening dialogue: “Remember we are women, we’re not born to contend with men” says Ismene in attempting to bring her sister Antigone to her senses (703). The play’s plot hinges on the discovery and judgment of Antigone who goes against the decree of her uncle, King Creon, in the performing of burial rites over her dead and traitorous brother who the king decides should not be buried. All cry for mercy for Antigone and acknowledge that because her brother was noble he deserved to be buried nonetheless; but Creon refuses. What is the basis of this refute? He refuses to have his honor diminished by bending to a woman’s will. Until horrors are foretold him, he does not relent and release Antigone; Creon has no fear or remorse for his decision. He is resolute, saying:

This girl was an old hand at insolence when she overrode the edicts we made public. But once she'd done it—the insolence, twice over—to glory in it, laughing, mocking us to our face for with what she'd done. *I am not the man, not now: she is the man if this victory goes to her and she goes free*” (715) [italics added].

Clearly, the greatest offense made by Antigone is not her defiance, per se, but that a *woman* would openly defy and criticize the king. Her action, in effect, attacks the King's honor as a man as well as a leader (which, of course, was almost always a man). It has the power to emasculate him; if he relents, he will lose his manhood to a girl. Throughout the first half of the play, Creon's dialogue explains quite plainly the part women played in the enacting of cultural honor in the Greek society of his day. “From now on they'll act like women, “ he states in reference to Antigone and her sister being held captive in bonds not able to move freely (718). Later, he remarks:

I'm not about to prove myself a liar, not to my people, no, I'm going to kill her! [...] Why, if I bring up my own kin to be rebels, think what I'd suffer from the world at large. Show me the man who rules his household well: I'll show you someone fit to rule the state [...] Therefore we must defend the men who live by law, never let some woman triumph over us. Better to fall from power, if fall we must, at the

hands of a man—never be rated inferior to a woman.”

(720)

A woman, here, is a reflection of a man’s ability to rule and control. She is something owned by that man and an inability to control her (actions, fidelity, attitude, speech) renders her “worthless” in the eyes of Creon and most probably also the types he stood to represent in the play (719). Women here can no more defend honor than a female character in a play from Spain’s Golden Age. The Ancient Greek hegemonic male identity presented in this play bears keen likeness to many Calderonian characters for whom honor seems paramount. Sophocles’ Creon is not influenced by the Bible but rather a continuation of previously held beliefs about masculine honor that find precedence in the Hammurabi and Assura.

The rise of Rome followed the decline of ancient Greek civilization. Roman law did include guidelines for the society’s honor codes, and those codes varied very little from the same honor system lambasted by Valle-Inclán in the quote that opened this chapter. For example, Roman women—similar to what will be discussed later in the case of *Reconquista*-era Castilian women—were not held to be equal to men in Roman society. Marcus Cato, a Roman statesman, was quoted as once saying “If you catch your wife in adultery, you can kill her with impunity; she, however, can not dare to lay a finger on you if you commit adultery, for it is the law” (Goldstein 29). Under Roman law, men—fathers and

husbands first, but ultimately all male relatives—had the right to decide on life and death matters of the female members of their society. Adultery, if committed by a woman, was considered a felony and called for death. If a family did not want to comply with the law, the state would follow through with the sentence and also prosecute family and non-family members for noncompliance (Goldstein 29). Outside of marriage, what honor meant for Roman men was a combination of strength and valor with piety; it was an understanding that moved towards a “realm of inward qualities” as integral to masculine honor that would only be further developed in the middle ages (Bowman 46).

Roman and Greek laws pertaining to the conduct of men in relation to adultery and family law refers to various understandings and rights of masculine honor in society. Both groups’ laws are similar and seem to derive their base understanding of masculine honor (including its rights and privileges) from the Hammurabi and Assura cultures which predate them and had large influence on the laws of many civilizations of the world.

The Romans and the Greeks not only influenced each other’s cultures but also the cultures of the lands they conquered. In both civilizations one finds evidence of a strong honor culture in the juridical and philosophical aspects of their societies as well as in their fiction and theatre. Their influence in the Iberian world was great not only in language and culture but also in the realm of developing masculinities.

The foundational indigenous cultures of the Iberian Peninsula were most certainly influenced by Roman civilization but the amount of influence cannot easily be ascertained, as very little—if anything—is for certain known about them. Based on the knowledge of Roman civilization, what can be ascertained is the transference of Roman cultural norms to the development of Iberian culture.

During the Roman era of rule of the Iberian Peninsula, there was not only influence of Roman (and thus Greek) culture in all of its forms but also of various subcultures which had been absorbed by the Romans in their quest for domination of the ancient world. One such cultural group was the Jewish peoples of the Middle East. There was Jewish influence in the Roman civilization, even before the changing of the official religion of the Empire to Christianity. Jewish people, after their lands were conquered by the Romans, spread into all regions of the Roman world on many levels in society. Many became Roman citizens and proselytized to Romans, even converting many all along the Mediterranean Coast to Judaism. In Iberia, their presence almost coincides with the arrival of the first Romans but even with the advent of individual-level religious influence, macrocosmic influence in the Roman Empire by the Jewish people was greatly delimited.

It must be noted that the although adherents to the Jewish religion started to exist in large numbers in Europe during the Roman era, their influence on the newly-forming societies was minimal. It can be found

that, although granted freedom of religion as well as citizenship rights and the ability to have their own courts, Jewish society did not have a pervasive influence on Hellenistic society (Zeitlin 212-13). It has been documented that any spread (religious or cultural) of Jewish beliefs in the Roman Empire was curbed dramatically by juridical decrees (235). With this in mind, the popular, Spanish belief that masculine honor codes and masculine honor derived from the influence of the Bible and Judaism in Spanish society would be erroneous. The Spanish honor codes' origin in the region pre-dates all Biblical interaction and macrocosmic influence in Europe. Any Biblically based influence on the masculine honor codes arrives after the foundations of masculine honor were set.

Pagan honor codes and masculine honor, as such, were not based in any intrinsic, personal development of morals and ethics applied in the society but rather on valor, feats, and outward exercise of power and influence in society. As seen in the codices and theatrical examples examined previously—even including the example of piety—morality and religion were not foundational to the Pagan concepts of masculine honor.

In the next section of this chapter, the influence Judaism and Christianity had on the honor codes of pagan Spain will be explored. As primary catalysts of this first metamorphosis of Spanish masculine honor, they have the unique ability to highlight not only the *form* but also the *function* of Spain's chivalric code—a code that emerges, not from

one source (as has been widely accepted), but from various sources of competing worldviews.

From Pagan Honor to Chivalric Code

As has been shown, there is not one single source of Spanish honor; still the understanding and application of the honor system has been quite similar in all the cultures contributing to it: honor has been mostly something owned and maintained by males in any of the given societies. Women reflect the male's honor in the fact that her virginity and fidelity are manifestations of his power and control. This way it stayed until new elements were introduced into Spain that brought about great change.

The first of these changes in the concept of masculine honor on the peninsula happens when Spanish society switches from being a predominantly pagan one to one ruled by societies whose religions sprang from the Hebrew Bible: becoming either a Christian or Muslim ruled nation. It has been asserted that the "main reason for the peculiarities, the uniqueness of Western honor since classical times is that Christianity, the culturally dominant religion in the West from the fourth century onward, had a built-in bias against honor" (Bowman 47). It is this built in bias that created an ideological clash in Spanish medieval society between the pagan world and the Biblically based one;

and its manifestation is clearly seen in the changes in the concept of masculine honor it produced.

Pagan honor was based mostly on deeds and the reaction of the surrounding society to a male's valorous feats or ability to uphold the law and control his family. Medieval honor in Europe stressed lineage, royalty and nearness to the king (and thus God) in its understanding of who or whom not only could defend honor but also who had the right to have any honor at all. Leaving behind a society of citizens and republics and democracy, Medieval Spain's hierarchy was built on blood ties to a sovereign who would have a God-given right to rule. It delimited honor to not only an exclusively masculine realm but also only to certain classes in the society.

A man's honor and his family's honor not only depended on deeds and male domination but also—and most importantly—upon fidelity to the king (and through *him* to God). Men were considered honorable by their birth first (Terry 1071). With a God-appointed king, peasants rarely were thought of to hold or were able to hold honor. It was an attribute of the nobles and their code “was based on loyalty and allegiance to one's lord. In fact, according to Maurice Keen, ‘to betray one's lord has, from the earliest days of chivalry and before, been held the darkest of all crimes with which the knight or warrior could be charged’” (1078).

Honor had thus begun to reflect the society's new religion. While incorporating the communal aspect of pagan honor and its basis on public reputation as well as heroic deeds, military feats, and the chastity of female members of its society, honor in the medieval period also now includes a fidelity to God shown through one's loyalty to a God-appointed leader or social superior as well as to God.

As is well known, the Middle Ages in Spain was a period controlled and developed (for the most part) under the rule of the African Muslims who invaded it. For nearly eight hundred years, the Iberian Peninsula was under some influence or rule of an advanced Muslim governing system. Though under Muslim rule, the Catholic Castilian world was not completely absorbed by it and maintained a separate sub-cultural identity that included a differentiated masculine identity. In this circumstance and under this system, purely from the right of governance, the Muslim rulers wielded great honor in the Castilian Catholic societies of the time; yet Muslim men were not the hegemonic masculine ideal of the Castilian Catholic elite due to their religion. In order to affect a macro-level, societal change that reflected this reality, it was imperative that Castilians systematically dishonor the Muslim male ruler. The promotion of not only Castilian self-rule but also its hegemonic ideal of masculinity in the Iberian world could not be done without it. In the achievement of this primary goal, a literary onslaught

aimed at removal of Muslim masculine honor and thus their right to rule was enacted.

Muslim men, in Medieval Castilian Literature are not depicted as not having honor. The literature that contains them most often shows a stripping of the Muslim ruler first of his honor—and this, usually by his own hand, not the hand of the Castilian—and then their rather inexplicably easy defeat. The first removal of their honor is through their women, which is followed from the re-conquering of the land. In these two acts, much like the fall of Adam was through Eve, the fall of the Muslim man (and indeed all the men who represent “otherness” in Medieval Castilian literature) is initiated through his woman—whether she is complacent to the deed or not.

One example of this dismantling of the Muslim community as rulers over Castile is the ballad *Pórtese el moro Alicante*. In this piece, a Muslim king wins a battle taking a nobleman prisoner. In an act of pity, he gives the nobleman his virgin sister. Through this act, the nobleman is able to produce another viable heir who then grows to avenge the deaths of his Castilian brothers. The nobleman’s heir of the Muslim princess ends the Muslim King’s rule, avenging the deaths of his half-brothers. The Muslims end in being expelled from Alicante once and for all.

Though seeming quite simple, the act of dishonoring the Muslim that allows for his defeat is manifold and subtle. First, we have the

Muslim King giving away his noble kinswoman to a foreign man of another religion. Although it is known that mixed marriages (mixed religious marriages) did indeed occur during the medieval period, it seems to not have been as widely accepted as one may assume in this pluralistic society.

The Muslim King has dishonored himself and in that opened perhaps the only door that would allow for his defeat. Much like the Jews in the story of Balaam and Balak (The Shocken Bible, Volume 1 Numbers 22-25) in which the Jewish people can not be cursed by the prophet Balaam as God had blessed them as rulers and inheritors of the land, the defeat of the Muslim must come from his own undoing. He, like the ancient Hebrews, must curse himself; and curse himself he does by not guarding and valuing what—according to the emerging, hegemonic, Castilian masculine honor—should have been most precious as well as most vulnerable to him: his fertile and virgin women. As Mirrer writes:

“It is essentially the *morica*’s [Muslim woman’s] sexual ripeness that the king is giving away; her “gift” is her virginity and her fertility...Virginity, much prized in a young woman, makes her valuable. It also makes her capable of being given away, for virgins, exclusively the property of their fathers or their brothers, may be freely exchanged, unlike other women (18).

The king, indeed, gives her away to the Castilian nobleman because she is a young virgin and fertile. He pities the nobleman who has just lost all his progeny but in doing so he inadvertently gives away a part of his wealth (as owner of his sister) as well as his honor for nothing in the Castilian Catholic Weltanschauung. This dishonor is not only completely unrecognized by the Muslim king but also never avenged (as it is never recognized). Without a proper retaliation to regain the honor, he is left unworthy to rule. Women and land were a reflection of honor; be they lost or given away, either way, in the medieval worldview it is a loss of honor. The Muslim king's pity is not interpreted as an act of kindness but as a tactical error in war.

The Chivalric code was one in which

“[h]onor, glory, reputation and renown were... integral..., as were also the martial and heroic virtues of prowess, ambition (desire for fame), fealty, oath keeping, loyalty to one's military leader, and generosity (largess) on his part in the distribution of rewards to his valiant soldiers”

(Watson 38).

The “largess” inherent in the Chivalric Code of honor as described by Watson in the above quote is one that is only applied seemingly to one's *own* group—not “others”—and so the Muslim undoes himself through the loss of his woman and thus his fertility. The ideal Christian society was one that was exclusively Christian by right and “pure” of even any

Muslim memory (Mirror 21,23). In the example of *Pártese el more Alicante*, by turning his own sister into a Christian's concubine, the Muslim king "legitimized Christian possession" of the land as well as "vindicated Christian hegemonic ideals" as the only defended and true ones of the society. The Muslim rulers, in examples such as these, are their own curses—their own undoing. The land spews them out, so to speak, and the new God-appointed rulers must take over. Here, only the Christian Castilian is left as their natural and superior successor.

The case of the Jewish people's experience of Medieval Spain's emerging hegemonic honor is quite different. Being a people that were in the land before the Muslim invasion yet never rulers of it, they are treated as the vanquished. In this same literary period where Muslim men are outdone by their own inability to guard or value what is intrinsically honorable, Jewish men are feminized and thus written into the literary history as being completely without honor or any other form of power. Much like the stereotypic woman of this time, his dominion is domestic and his desires far from noble. More importantly, as a people devoid of the masculine, there is no honor in their cultural/religious group at all as only men could wield and defend honor; thus Jews are left in a type of wretched state of baseness.

Many literary examples of the lack of group honor and feminized men in the depictions of Jews in Castilian literature can be found, as their descent into a figure of wretchedness only just begins during the

Medieval period of Castilian literature. Even after their complete absence from Spanish society, the associations between Jews and general despicableness will persevere even into modern Spanish literature. During the medieval period, Jewish men (the “other” competitor of the Castilian man) is continuously feminized in literature, not only in his desires and impotence in resolving his affairs but also in his utter lack of control of the Jewish woman and the Jewish child.

In the most famous poem *Cantar del Mio Cid*, there are but two Jewish characters. Their appearance as well as the service they provide is invaluable to the plot and resolution of the entire story as they fund the Cid’s quest to finally rectify the wrongs done to him. Having such an important role in the continued plot development, though, makes them conspicuous. It seems that in order to nullify their great contribution the saving the face of the great Spanish hero, these Jews must be completely emasculated and *that* they are.

First, let us attend to the matter of their names. These two Jewish male characters are given the feminine names of Rachel and Vidas. In the very detailed and dedicated study of *Mio Cid* in Spanish literature a debate has grown around whether or not these characters were originally supposed to be women or if the names were indeed orthographic errors of some kind. Mirrer writes:

[the name]Vidas harks back to the biblical Hawwa or “Eve”...
and Rachel is, of course, the name of the matriarch of

Israel... if the names Rachel and Vidas are indeed meant to designate male Jewish characters, as most critics believe they are, then, rather than an error in scribal transmission, the assignment of feminine type names to the Jews may have been an intended further touch of humor in their characterization. (71)

It becomes obvious then that the first attack at Jewish masculine honor is made at the naming of the characters. As representatives of their ethno-religious group then, their men are called *women* in this epic poem.

Further, these names are in stark contrast to the epithets given the Cid and Martín immediately before the Jews are introduced in the poem for the first time. The Cid is described as a man who “in good hour girded the sword” and Martín as “a brave lance” (72). More than just epithets denoting great military prowess, the images associated with the two Castilians at this point are extremely phallic. They are men and their symbols are phallic while the two Jewish male characters are given feminine names as well as well as feminine attitudes that will come to light later in their speech, action, descriptions and finally treatment by the Cid later in the poem. Following a Medieval tradition of feminizing Jewish males, this characterization makes the Jews ineligible (unlike the ruling Muslims) for positions of authority and power (75).

With the Muslim occupation waning, it would only be the Castilian man who wielded a sword or was an unbending lance. The fantasy of the Castilian as the last phallus standing is thus made complete by this last literary move that effectively turns the Jewish people into a bunch of women. Far from being an abnormal way to attack an “other” male, it seems that this tactic was quite popular during this time period (80). Upon further analysis:

“As the studies of Brandes (1980) and others have suggested, in the popular arena – for which CMC was originally intended—men’s preferred mechanism for dealing with threats from male enemies has long been to strip them of their markers of masculinity. In the CMC, “feminized” images of male Jews may have, imaginarily, done just that... In this manner too, the work shored up male Christian Castilian identity, formulating the Jews’ future exclusion from Spain.” (80)

Being removed from the masculine arena, the completely honor-less Jewish characters are not even worthy of later recognition or even proper resolution in the poem. They are left duped and hanging. It has been shown that unlike the Muslim conquerors, the Jewish men are made to be effeminate in the Castilian literature; but the Jewish women are treated very much the same as her Muslim counterpart, if not worse.

In the case of the Jewish woman, her plight is one of either conversion or death. As a reflection of her male counterpart's honor, her position in the Castilian Medieval literary tradition is pitiful. As the "beautiful Jewess", she is nothing more than a whore: "Universally known to be a loose woman; the term judía (Jewess) alone would tend to incriminate her. Viciously sexual in its semantic field, judía is virtually a synonym for harlot... (42-3)." As a potential convert, she is shamelessly exposed in public—her sexuality still unbridled—and usually sentenced to death by other Jews before being saved by the Virgin Mary or a saint, as in the case of Marisaltos from number 107 of Alfonso el Sabio's *Cantigas de Santa María* (39). Either way, her wanton ways only exhibit a lack of control. If she is to be the *reflection* of the Jewish man's honor and she cannot be controlled or is lost to other faiths or cannot be relied upon to reproduce the ethno-religious population, then the Jewish people have already been despoiled and the men are effectively dead, in this theoretical framework devised to eliminate all "other" males from Castilian society.

With both competitors disabled, the Castilian form of masculine honor rises. As was shown here, a great deal of effort was centered on the actual foundation of what was to become hegemonic, Castilian, masculine honor. During the Medieval period, it would seem that a hegemonic Castilian ideal did not yet exist but instead was emerging the only way it could: by the dismantling and literarily defeating the ruling

society's other masculine identities by removing them as viable, honorable, masculine alternatives. There could be only one honorable male and he would be Castilian. Along the way to this dream were alternating moments of stasis and change that would eventually lead to the complete metamorphosis of the concept of masculine honor in Spain, just as the society would be completely changed after nearly 800 years of some from of African occupation.

Honor in the Golden Age

The Golden Age brings about great shifts in power in Spain that affect all aspects of daily life. The end of the North African rule in 1492 heralds the beginning of Spain as a self-ruled, Christian country. With these governmental and religious doctrinal shifts came also a desire of ethno-religious cleansing of the population on the part of the new Christian rulers—removing from Castile anyone that did not fit the new, ideal Spanish citizen. It has been well documented that the Muslims as well as the Jews were eventually all expelled from Spain (the Jews later resettling in North Africa, the Byzantine empire, Latin America and many other non-European lands around the globe; the Muslims suffering a great loss of life and forced conversion before a de jure exile from Castile).

The Catholic Church, of course, exhibited a great deal of influence and power in Golden Age society, being that during the time there was

only one Christian denomination in the West and it was Catholicism. The Church fully denounced the feudal chivalric honor code and attempted to “make ‘honor’ a thoroughly Christian institute” (Watson 43). Honor needed to be revamped once again in order to reflect the reigning ideals and morals of the new, emergent society. Honor now needed to reflect the new national religion and worldview. That being said, it is not surprising that the great struggle shown in Spain’s literature of the Golden Age is the struggle between an honor based on chivalric code and another which would be wholly reliant on Christian ideals and morals to guide it, as:

“[w]henver a philosophy postulates the existence of some sort of transcendental being, divine essence, or cosmic first principle, the ultimate criterion by which human activity is judged will likely to be its relative degree of approximation to a supra-human standard”
(19-20)

which, in the case of honor in the Golden Age, is the standard of Christ and a personal relationship with God as well as a clean conscience and a lifestyle of decisions and actions that coincided with the prevailing Christian ethics, morals and beliefs.

The inclusion of conscience and self-reflection is one of the most unique characteristics of this stage of honor’s development in the West. The Renaissance/Golden Age in Western European history was a time of

“transition in the evolution of the code of honor” (Terry 1071). In “Vows to the Blackest Devil: Hamlet and the Evolving Code of Honor in Early Modern England” one finds that:

One of the most complex changes in the code of honor was a move from an external code to an internalized concept of what it is to be an honorable man. Men were no longer considered honorable simply by right of birth, nor were they able to claim to be men of honor by producing a long list of heroic deeds. Rather, honor was becoming, by the 17th century, a matter of conscience; honorable men needed to seek, in every situation, to behave in such a way as to please both their state and their God (1071).

This conflict in the direction of honor in Spain is evident in the many plays and other works of literature that discussed the topic. It is true that in the most stereotyped instances of the honor theme, the masculine code in nothing more than the “perverted outcome of chivalresque ideals, very acceptable to men who esteemed life more cheaply than their neighbors” (Vollmer 303). But not all works displayed masculine honor in the same light. In fact, in surveying just a few of the most well known authors of the Golden Age, one will most definitely see a competition of various masculinities and various concepts of honor which accompany them. In this time of flux in Spanish society, the fate

of masculine honor does not lie between competing religions or invaders versus the native populace; it lies in the internal struggle between *Castilian* men for the right of defining hegemonic masculinity for their entire society.

In the most popular work by Fray Luis de León, *La Perfecta Casada*, the duties of a married woman are described as well as what constitutes a “good” woman or the so-called woman of valor of Proverbs 31. Fray Luis takes the biblical doctrine and applies it to the woman of his time to write a manual of how to be the good and honorable woman/wife of Golden Age Spain. Many of his exhortations coincide with Vollmer’s assessment of the position of Spanish women in society as being “a mixture of the Moorish and Christian women of primeval times... She is kept rather secluded from the society of men, just as the Oriental woman is guarded by her jealous husband” (303).

The list of what is and is not a good woman or woman of valor is quite extensive but I have found nothing that contradicts the chivalric honor code’s concept of acceptable behavior of a woman. He states that she be “one revered by her family, loved by her sons, adored by her husband, blessed by her neighbors, praised and extolled by the present generation’ (305). All of the descriptions focus on the praise and acceptance of other people, much like chivalric honor. She is a good and honorable woman and this is proven in Fray Luis de Leon’s work by all the good things others think of her and say of her.

Other highlights of his list of a good woman or wife are that she should be a helpmate and not a burden of any sort; that she should find whatever she is good at in work and toil at it diligently and in doing so be an example in her house that all should toil as she does; she should not be out in the streets or always visiting neighbors but be inside her home; and finally, she should instill in her husband confidence that she will use the fruit of his labors wisely and thus he would have no need of spoils (304-6).

Each of the characteristics point to a woman who does not put herself in danger of even the slightest suspicion of dishonor upon her family. Honor in chivalric Spain being something that could be marred by just the slightest gossip, the woman who stayed indoors at her own home and who toiled all day alone or in helping her husband would have no time to be seen in any suspicious surroundings nor any friends or associates who could harm her—and thus her family's honor—with idle gossip. In *La Perfecta Casada*, woman is not equal to man at all but a helpmate that is a vehicle for honor. She is a being that must work continuously and be protected in order to avoid any stain from her husband's and family's honor.

Cervantes' description of honor has been said to be the “most true picture of Spanish ideals and customs...found” in the literature of the Golden Age (310). His characters often break with the convention of the day to exhibit the spirit more than the letter of the prevailing honor code.

In his life as well as in his fiction, Cervantes took actions that were in direct contradiction to the strict laws of the chivalric honor code but yet were still very much in line with the *spirit* of the code. Both his aunt and his two sisters marred Cervantes' honor; but in all three cases he spared their lives instead of committing an honor murder in order to restore honor to his family name (Northrup 399). His attitude was described as "weak but Christian" and it is that attitude that prevails in his characters (400). Above all, they are Christians and their honor and *defense* of it first coincides with their religious beliefs before anything else.

In Don Quijote, one finds many passages that sustain the assertion made that in the work of Cervantes there was the effort to "reconcile honor and Christianity" (402). During the Golden Age, one sees many of the same reasons to defend faith being thrown out in *Don Quijote*. Vengeance is a desire much looked down upon in Christianity as it is said to not be the right of the offended to seek but only belonging to God. In *Don Quijote*, there *is* no instance of vengeance with which the work deems acceptable and planned vengeance is something held in particular disdain. In chapter xxvii, Part 2 of *Don Quijote*, the good knight says in response to a group ready to duel:

But to take them up because of childish pranks and what was no affront but a joke, a piece of fun, hardly seems to be something for sane and rational beings to do, particularly since taking unjust revenge (and no revenge can be just) flies

in the face of the holy religion that we all profess, which orders us to do good to our enemies and love those who hate us, a commandment that, although it might seem somewhat difficult to keep, is only so for those who have less of God than of the world in them, and more of the flesh than the spirit; because when Jesus Christ, true god and true man, who never lied, or could or can lie, gave us our laws he said that his yoke was easy and his burden light; he was not, therefore, going to command us to do the impossible. So, my good sirs, you are obliged by both divine and human law to calm down.

This is but one example of many where the character of Don Quijote denounces vengeance as being a valid motive for taking up arms in the defense of honor. Vengeance is never just in this understanding of the world and most certainly goes against the society's professed religion of Christianity.

Other writers and dramatists displayed distinctly different attitudes towards women and honor. Lope de Vega was known for the high esteem with which he held women in his plays and in his life. Said to not even allow people to speak ill of women while in his presence, his plays explore the distinct valor of women in difficult situations; her loyalty and self-sacrifice; and finally her steadfastness and great soul (320). Tirso de Molina, on the other hand, generally portrayed women in

a degraded and frivolous light with the one exception being the Don Juan character that was used to admonish men who took advantage of women, dishonoring them and their families (327).

In the case of Calderón, we can find examples of contrasting ideas of where the future of honor should lie in Spain. In the play “El Médico de su Honra” a very traditional and hard-lined view of the honor and its codes in Golden age Spain is taken. In “El Alcalde de Zalamea”, it is quite the opposite as the end result is nearly revolutionary.

The point of most interest in the play “El Médico de su Honra”, which has as its plots a wife falsely accused of compromising herself and whom her husband, the good doctor, ultimately kills in order to safeguard his family honor, is that the doctor has conflictive feelings about the killing of his wife. He “experiences a revulsion of feeling and protest against the hard laws of honor, which demand that an innocent one must die; but his honor is in danger” and he complies with the law in order to remain respectable in the eyes of himself and others (344). The fact that there is displayed in this play an inner struggle even though the honor killing prevails, acts as a highlight of the clash between the chivalric code and the conscience of a Christian people.

In “El Alcalde de Zalamea”, a young woman is dishonored by a noble military man but her father—instead of killing her—plots to be revenged upon the man who has wronged his family’s honor: the man who dishonored his daughter. Here, an attack on a man’s honor does

not need to be nor is cleansed with the blood—innocent or not—of the women who sustained the attack but rather the *man* who made it (348).

In the time of Golden Age Spain, the future of hegemonic masculine honor was under debate. With the change of governmental rulers and the national religion, the chivalric code, although starting strong in the beginning of the Golden Age, could not continue to exist as a guide of honorable conduct in the society. This was a time period of metamorphosis in which “men had to cope with both an old medieval code of honor and the tensions of a new one, tensions that were created, to a large degree, by the contemporary insistence on the importance of the individual conscience” (Terry 1072).

Spain continued to evolve as a nation, entering an Industrial and then Post Industrial era, making it a modern country in an increasing modernized Western Europe; but becoming modern, like all other societal changes, is multifaceted—changing even the most miniscule aspects of daily life. In modernity, it can be argued, one often finds the creation of Mass societies, societies “in which industry and bureaucracy have eroded traditional social ties” and where the members of such a society often “experience feelings of moral uncertainty and personal powerlessness” (Macdonis 393). Such is the case of Twentieth Century Spain. Honor, ever changing to reflect the current beliefs, will be debated once again in the 19th and 20th centuries. In understanding 20th Century Spain and its literature through the theory of Mass society, it shall become clear that

honor ultimately was not dying out in the 20th Century like some hated, evil relic from the Middle ages; but rather, like a caterpillar beginning its chrysalis, was preparing itself for the changes to come.

Chapter 2: Modernity, Spain and Mass Society Theory

The modernization of the Western world was birthed from the Industrial Revolution. With the mechanization of various modes of production, age-old social stratifications started to crumble. Nobles were no longer the source of power and finance as the rise of a new merchant class became apparent and new sources of income as well as independence became available to the once stagnant caste-like class designations. If in Golden Age society being noble allowed doors of influence and power to be opened, in the industrial age it would be being a member of the growing, affluent bourgeoisie that would open doors to worlds of wealth and influence formerly closed to the commoner by birth.

But mechanization also brought about many other systematic changes in the Western society. It was not just the change in settlement patterns (moving from the countryside living in small towns and villages to living in densely populated cities); every aspect of life was touched by this move from the agrarian to the mechanized (Macionis 393). As noted by Macionis³ table comparing the traditional versus the modern western society, many levels of cultural and foundational social structure was fundamentally changed in the process. When looking at the cultural norms and values, concept of present time and basic technology used, the changes almost seem to produce polar opposites:

³See Macionis' table comparing and contrasting traditional and modern societies in Appendix 1

- The values of the traditional society of Europe, spanning from the Renaissance/Golden Age moving backwards in time as far as we can chronicle, were homogenous in nature and founded heavily on ideas of what was sacred in the society of the time. Being a homogenous culture, there was little tolerance for subcultures and countercultures and few flourished or had any positive or lasting impact on the society in general. This condition led to very slow change in all areas of the society causing any macro-level changes to take generations in order to be evident at all.
- In the modern, industrial and post-industrial Europe, one finds that values are heterogeneous in nature and sub and counter cultures not only are tolerated but flourish—allowing for a much more rapid change in attitudes and beliefs which become evident in but a single generation.
- In a traditional Europe, the present was linked to the past and to the traditions that that past held. What one did in the present was because of the accumulation of human actions and decisions that brought the society to the current point in which it found itself; and thus the present was ever linked to the past.
- The Modern West envisioned the present linked to the future, ever looking forward. The consequences of such a shift affected both the macrocosmic and the microcosmic. If society is no longer revering the past, it is much less likely that the younger

generations will look towards their elders (living representations of the past) for guidance and wisdom. Instead, it is to their peers—the living future—that they look to for direction.

- In the traditional society, there were very few roles available for members of the society to fill and even fewer statuses for those individuals. People mostly communicated in a very personal fashion, face-to-face, and held very little autonomy and privacy in their lives. In this highly patriarchal society, there was very little social mobility; a well-established social inequality; a woman's world revolved around matters of the home; and the strongest form of social control was that of informal gossip—which has been noted⁴ to be the greatest threat to one's honor throughout Spanish history right up to the period of modernization.
- In the modern society, there is a flourishing of roles and statuses for the individual society member. Roles and statuses could also now be achieved and not just given by birth. Change in settlement patterns brought about a greater amount of anonymity and privacy to the individual. Women increased in number in the public work arena and thus began eroding the firmly established patriarchy of the traditional days. Policing of the populace was no longer done by gossip but by formal police who, by and large, used more

⁴ The play *El Médico de su Honra* and the book *La Perfecta Casada* both support this view. The slightest negative gossip was to be avoided or defeated at all costs.

scientific methods of deducing crime and exacting punishment than hearsay.

- The extended family in the modern society was less important as it was no longer the main vehicle for socialization; it was replaced by new institutions like the formal schooling system which previously was exclusively for the elites of the traditional West. Modern Europe was a place where basic, elementary education was becoming a norm and higher education was increasingly more available to those not of noble birth.
- The traditional society was one where the scale of government was small and state intervention in the community was limited and rare, left mostly to the ruling locals or nobility. National economies were based on the agricultural with little or no white-collar work to be done and the little manufacturing that took place was mostly done in the homes of the citizens. Religion was paramount and was not pluralistic in nature. It guided the mores and norms of the society, the complete worldview of the citizenry.
- In a modern society, the scale of government is enlarged, affecting its level of intervention in daily life—from mandatory schooling to encoded laws and policing to wage regulation and maintaining standards of qualities of goods produced by the populace. There is an increase in white-collar work and the main source of national product no longer comes from agriculture but from factories and

other types of mechanized, mass production. Even the position of religion is changed. In the modern society, science and its statutes rise and spread, effectively lessening the grip of religion which also had a nationalistic component in the pre-modern West. With science at its helm, the modern society becomes pluralistic religiously as the rational aspect of scientific thinking positively affects tolerance of different ideas and worldviews.

Spain's Anomalism

Spain's case, though, was different. Unlike her European neighbors, modernity was not whole-heartedly welcomed. Much of her unity and solidarity as a nation had come from her staunch resistance to foreign invaders of another faith (Rubio 276). It was that unity created from religious belief that served later as the foundation for future battles she would wage against the various socially isolating and anti-tradition aspects of modernization that were never fully integrated—if they were integrated at all—into Spanish society.

Many of the effects of modernization transform society into a more secularized, anti-Christian organizational body and those aspects Spain diligently fought (282-3). The Renaissance/Golden Age in Spain did not, for example, revere more “the Triumphes de Petrarche than the

Genesis of Moses”(293). King Charles’ last testament for his son was that he root out heresy in the Christian nation. Later, Spain defended a theocentric concept of humanism in contrast to the anthropocentric and naturalistic one gaining popularity during the French enlightenment (284). If it be true that “From 1812[...] to the present day, the tremendous effort of the majority of Spaniards was primarily this defense of themselves against the attack of so-called liberals who wished to bring about, at all costs, the Europeanization of the Peninsula”, then it is not surprising to find that in Modern Spain there has not been a complete, Western styled modernization and that concepts like masculine honor, which had been Christianized in the in the beginning of the Golden Age, had not quickly fell out of public favor as they seemed to have done in other European countries.

If one considers, for example, the society’s values, time orientation and norms, the lag in modernization is apparent. Modern Spain’s time orientation is neither present linked to past, nor present linked to future (as is for most all of the Modern West); but rather, it functions as present linked to eternity, as it seems to have always been. Eloquently put by Rubio:

Other peoples consider what bearing each act in life has on the preceding and the following in an effort to forge a logical chain, to integrate their life, to give it a reason on a purely terrestrial, horizontal plane, in

short, to weave a logical biography of cause and effect with no break. But the Spaniard, whose method lies in the most intimate recesses of his soul, knows that on this present moment depends eternity.” (287)

Morally linked norms and sacred based value systems still pervade here. It is here where honor lives, not as a vengeful relic from the past patriarch, but as an important aspect the hegemonic, Castilian man’s masculinity—for he is not just Castilian but also Christian in his archetypal form. Honor, which after its Christianization, bestows itself upon a man for proving his actions and thoughts in line always with and pleasing to not only his king or leader but more importantly God and his statutes. He is raised to stay the course and raises his children to never sway from the path, as it says in Bible, which puts him into direct conflict with Modern Western culture that had become so thoroughly secularized. Honor, though seemingly pagan in its conception, had emerged into the Spanish consciousness as Christian and thus would find no easy place in any of the hegemonic tiers of Modern Western society. Dignity, on the other hand, could serve as its counter and possible destroyer as a concept supposedly devoid of religious fervor or taint.

Throughout time and in different cultures, ‘dignity’ has been given many definitions but no matter how convoluted or simple, they all point to the inherent value of a human being in their society (Fuller 179). As a

designated replacement in the Modern West to honor, dignity has been most popularly understood as a secular concept outside of religion and hinging upon “the status of individuals as ends in themselves, rather than as a means to some extraneous ends” (Kelman 531). This view of dignity highlights that for its true existence in the world, a human being must be in a utopic environment: being completely free from any social ill or repression, completely safe from perils like war and poverty in all forms and completely free to choose—they must also have a “stable sense of identity and community” (532). It is a definition that describes a complete individual autonomy encased in a perfect government that somehow provides a messianic-like environment devoid of rankism for the citizens yet functions invisibly in man-made perfection. Secularist definitions of human dignity describe a type of heaven devoid of God and replaced by man but such definitions also assume that the concept of dignity does not have religious origins.

Biblically, the word ‘kavod’ not only means ‘honor’ but also ‘respect’ and ‘dignity’ (Shultziner 666-7). The two meanings are encompassed in the one word. From a Biblical point of view, dignity is “an essential and inherent human worth that must not be violated”, but contrary to the modern secular definition, “God implanted in human beings a sacred kernel of worth, and demanded that we protect human dignity in us and in others, and thus damaging human dignity is a direct offense to God” (667). This difference in definition is great as a

secularist, Modern definition places dignity's source as intrinsic to the human being whereas Biblical definitions place the source extrinsically in God (673). In both definitions, all human beings have dignity (unlike honor); it cannot be won or removed, but the secularist definition is devoid of any community aspect. Dignity as a secular concept is predicated upon a complete autonomy of the individual and guarded by a state that somehow protects other citizens from the possible negative repercussions of unbridled autonomy in each individual. Biblical dignity is heavily communitarian in practice while also individual in nature.

As a replacement to masculine honor in a secular Modern West because of its unisex application, superficially dignity seems perfect but it is apparent from the Communistic criterion for attaining secular dignity that it is not realistic or applicable to any present human state. Still, secular dignity is often seen as the polar opposite of masculine honor and touted as a viable choice for modernizing societies. In Spain, the tension between not only honor and secular dignity but also secular dignity and Biblical dignity have created an additional tear in a communal decision towards a unified acceptance and vision of Modern Spain.

Though not accepting of all of modernity's changes, Spain indeed accepted the great majority of them, and thus for her too nearly all major aspects of the traditional world that were once guarded and closed were opened and made to be more egalitarian and impersonal. The combined

effect of these modernizations (mechanical as well as philosophical) in the Western world has been described by many sociological theorists as creating a Mass Society, “a society in which industry and bureaucracy have eroded traditional social ties” (393).

Mass Society Theory and Its Applications

Many of the changes noted here could be said to be arguably good ones—at least on a macrocosmic level—but ever looking forward and ignoring or relegating the past and its contributions to human development as unimportant relics does have its flaws. With each gain there has been a loss and that loss is usually the social bond that individuals inherently held in traditional societies. It is this loss of social tie (kinship and neighborhood) that ultimately leave the individual society member atomized, experiencing frequent feelings of “moral uncertainty and personal powerlessness” (393).

Mass Society theory proposes that the modernization of society creates an almost irrevocable loss of human heritage that creates systematic problems of identity in its members. In this theory of modern society, “Old hierarchies have been replaced by a society in which everyone is an isolated individual. But because social order is unavoidable, it is created by herding people into organizations and movements led despotically from above” (Bothamley 331). The individuals, then, are socially isolated from one another-- *not* physically

isolated; experiencing the same social influences and propaganda, they are left without a way to discuss these life molding and changing influences in a rational manner due to their social isolation (Rose 380-1). This situation causes certain social characters, or personality types specific to the societal state, to arise while others that were associated with previous stages to fade away becoming obsolete.

“Social character” refers not to a personality type as personality is described in psychology, coming into being through a series of personal experiences and circumstances; but rather, it “is that part of ‘character’ which is shared amongst significant social groups and which, as most contemporary social scientists define it, is the product of experiences of these groups” (Riesman 4). In Mass Society Theory, there are three different types of social characters: tradition-directed, inner-directed and other-directed.

Tradition-directed individuals arose in societies in which societal conformity was achieved by characterologically grounding individuals’ obedience to traditions (Riesman 11). Such societies are found presently in much of the undeveloped and underdeveloped world and in such historical times as the Medieval West.

Inner-directed character types came into being in the West as the dominant character mode of conformity during and after the fall of the feudal system and the rise of modernization. The Inner-directed character corresponds to the personality needs of an individual living in

the modernized West (versus the traditional world of the tradition-directed character) as summarized in Appendix 1. This type “can manage to live socially without strict and self-evident” life choices (14).

In contrast to the tradition-directed character, the inner-directed character type has an internalized structure that binds him to his path and station in life, *guiding* him to make his life choices. The Inner-directed finds “*the source of direction for the individual in ‘inner’ in the sense that it is implanted early in life by the elders and directed toward generalized but nonetheless inescapably destined goals*” (15). Conformity is gained in an inner-direction society by allowing for a wide choice of life-goals or aims but ones that—once chosen—remain basically fixed throughout the individual’s life. Tradition has not completely died here and many of the life choices to be made are still, more or less, by the individual’s family and life circumstances. What has happened is that there has been a fracturing of tradition due to the rise in division of labor that allows the individual to be more flexible as he adapts to his ever-changing environment (16). This character type as well as the third type is prevalent in Modern Western society.

The third character type, Other-directed, is found highly dominant in very advanced modern societies such as the United States where very few people produce any kind of raw good or manufacture anything. In Western countries of low and moderate modernization like Spain, they share societal hegemony with inner-directed types (18).

Other-directed character types are usually of the upper and middle classes and of the younger generations. As Riesman defines:

What is common to all the other-directed people is that their contemporaries are the source of direction for the individual—either those known to him or those with whom he is indirectly acquainted, through friends and through the mass media. The source is of course “internalized” in the sense that dependence on it for guidance in life is implanted early. The goals toward which the other-directed person strives shift with that guidance: it is only the process of striving itself and the process of paying close attention to the signals from others that remain unaltered throughout life. (21)

Thus, conformity of behavior is achieved but not by instilling a stable map of life, per se, but rather an inner desire to please and be like one's contemporaries—not ancestors—unlike in the other two character types which still held a reverence for tradition in either a high or moderate degree.

It will be shown in the analysis to follow that all three plays explore the theme of honor in modernity by using personae that represent one or more of the social characters described by Riesman as integral in the modern Mass Society. Further, the conflict in the usefulness and future of masculine honor in Modern Spain, as battled out on the stage, will be

affected by the natural conflict arising out of the competing social characters present in the plays.

Chapter 3: *Juan José*, an Example of Honor Misused

Written in 1895, *Juan José* is one of the most celebrated plays of now much less known playwright Joaquín Dicenta y Benedicto. The play tells the story of a working class man named Juan José whose fate seems to be guided not by himself but by the more powerful and rich classes of his day. Depicted, as well as received, by audiences of the day as a man of honor, Juan's story is one of a man struggling to sustain his relationship and supposed masculine honor. In the end, Juan murders both his former employer as well as his ex-girlfriend as he finds himself incapable of accepting the alleged betrayal of his girlfriend and his fate devoid of honor, freedom, mate and employment.

The plot seems to be one typical of honor plays—taking into account that the main protagonist is of the lower classes—only changed by the addition of social critique Dicenta was most known for. Some have even proposed that the play *Juan José* is an attempt to redefine the concept of honor in Spanish society; but I beg to differ. Upon close analysis of the play, it is evident that Dicenta has not created a new definition of the concept of honor through his character but one that exemplifies how the concept of honor could be used and twisted with the rise of modernization and secularism in Spain to suit an individual's needs and to justify—even if only to the self—base and sometimes sociopathic actions most repulsive to the society at large.

***Juan José* in Historical Analysis**

Since the first publication of *Juan José*, the play has been hailed as one of the first attempts, if not *the* first, to bring the problems and realities of the working class man to the forefront of Spanish society (Gies 326). Many of Dicenta's contemporaries⁵ had understood the play as being an example of social commentary in theatre (or "social theatre"⁶) while many later critics interpreted the play as a modern take on the type of Calderonian honor play that popular, modern Spanish society has come to abhor. In this section, I shall review the basis of these interpretations and prove them to be false. *Juan José* is neither a play that may be put into the genre of social drama nor a modern adaptation of the Calderonian type honor play as it does not fulfill the basic requirements for either. Modern though it be, *Juan José* exemplifies a different type of play: one that shows how man in the modern West manipulates the concept of honor for his own purposes.

⁵ Rafael Delorme in 1895 hailed *Juan José* as the leader that many had been looking for in the socialist movement in his article "El socialismo en el teatro" published in *El País*. Leticia McGrath, in her book entitled *Joaquín Dicenta: Spain's forgotten Dramatist*, notes that *Juan José* was indeed praised as the first social drama from Spain and as a play having great popularity amongst radical and younger Spaniards, which later caused the play performance to be prohibited in many areas of the nation (92).

⁶ Francisco García Pavón in *El Teatro Social en España (1895-1962)* studies in detail this genre of Spanish plays. He defines social theater as 1) plays that focus on class struggle and the reactions caused by unjust societal mechanisms and 2) a play in which the protagonist is a working class who recognizes the unjust system and that it needs to be reformed (McGrath 91).

The social drama play has been defined to be a work in which the main impetus of the play is displaying societal wrongs that oppress in some fashion or other its main characters and whose protagonist understands those mechanisms and the need for an imminent reform (McGrath 91). The center of action and reaction in such a work does not revolve around personal relationships and specific circumstances, but rather the unjust society on a macrocosmic scale that is by definition ignorant of specific people, regions, and personal relations. Such a drama aims to describe and reveal a system of abuse and/or neglect of the masses. Does *Juan José* fit this definition?

The answer to that question is unequivocally “no”. Juan José, the character and main protagonist of the play, displays no such analysis of his situation as it relates to society at-large in the work’s fictional universe. Although his prose has been duly noted as unrealistic for a man of his education and class by Hunter Peak in his work on social drama in Spain, the character does not display higher level thinking skills when attempting to understand his situation. Juan José does not see his circumstances as something that is truly beyond his control and simply a manifestation of a negative aspect of societal norms and mechanisms that need to be changed or completely abolished. He understands his situation in a very personal way. Hall, in his essay “Dicenta and the Drama of Social Criticism”, states that Juan José is “yet another descendant of the romantic hero, this time a poor bricklayer who

is eventually made into a criminal by the harsh treatment he suffers from an unjust society” (55). His life’s turn for the worst is caused by a supposedly arrogant, rich man who uses his money (a form of masculine power in modern society) to lure away women from their less affluent mates.

Act one, scene four, of the play reveals Juan’s analysis of his impending break with his girlfriend, Rosa, of about a year. Juan states: “Y luego, Paco, ese mozo que no ha tenido más que hacer en el mundo que heredar la parroquia y los *dineros* de su padre, no la deja ni al sol ni a sombra. Él se figura que no me entero. ¡Sí me entero! (*Con acento amenazador.*) ¡Que lleve cuidao! (pages 82-3)” It is made plain by his statement that Juan does not interpret his situation beyond a sociological microcosmic level. It is a specific situation that is happening to him and is between him, his girlfriend and Paco (the other suitor/his boss).

Although in act one, scene one, the character Ignacio speaks about social injustice and that there needs to be a unification of the working class to protect their rights against exploitation, there is no such revelation in the character of Juan José. It is Ignacio who states that there is a need “*Pa* luchar por nosotros, *pa* vengarnos de los que nos explotan... Por hacer una revolución así, nuestra, de nosotros” (75). This analysis of the evident, societal injustice is not from the perspective of Juan nor is it ever truly acquired by him. It is the perspective of a

much older and wiser character that has lost his job and pension income despite the fact of being protected legally from such an occurrence.

Surrounding the main action in the play, then, is an environment somewhat conscience of the needs for social change and the inequality inherent in the society of this fictional universe; but this sobriety is not integrated in the character of Juan José. That being said, it is possible that Juan could then be understood as a *representative* of the ignorant working class. Unaware of his true state, he functions as the ultimate example of the dangers and impotency in making what should be the impersonal personal—incapable of seeing the forest from the trees—but such an interpretation also is not supported in the work.

Juan recognizes the injustice done to him by his employer Paco as not arising from the unjust *system* but rather out of personal *malice and vendetta*: Paco wants Rosa and will do anything to destroy Juan's ability to continue their relationship, according to our protagonist. This fact, introduced very early in the play, negates completely the interpretation of *Juan José* as being a social drama. Rather, in the midst of what should be social upheaval, Dicenta has placed characters whose drastic life changes and life choices have little or nothing to do with the apparent, societal ills. It is not the society that is speeding the end of Juan's relationship and his escalating delinquency; but rather Paco's undying lust for Rosa, Rosa's undying desire for a more luxurious life, and Juan's steadfast decision to never let Rosa go. The characters are surrounded

by but are not a part of the awareness of a macrocosmic imbalance in justice as expressed briefly by Ignacio. They hear but are not affected in motive or action by the criticisms of society made by the other working class characters.

Juan José is neither able to fit the genre of an honor play. Many critics have placed this play in the honor genre⁷. I disagree, as it is not an honor play. The confusion is found between what is actually an honor play (in the tradition of Calderón and Lope de Vega) and a work that uses elements common to honor plays but is *not* one.

As discussed in “Chapter 1: A Brief history of Masculine Honor”, Calderonian honor was a concept based on the Golden Age honor that was in theory and realization a blend of the chivalric and the Catholic. Actual Golden Age honor was applied only to Castilian men. In order to be considered honorable they were to uphold the foundational values of Catholicism as well as righteous laws of the state in all manners of conduct. Although one can find competing views of masculine honor throughout Golden Age theatre’s interpretation of the honor code, there are indeed common threads amongst all the plays in which vengeance is sought by a male in order to protect his honor.

⁷ Unamuno wrote in his article “La Sociedad Galdosiana” written in 1920 for *El Liberal*, that Juan José’s character was powerful and fought against a tragic destiny. Baroja notes that the one constant and motivating force for Juan is his honor and not any social injustice in *Libros y Autores Modernos* written in 1933.

One highly important element is that the male believe in God (in the Catholic sense) and that he endeavors to exercise this belief in his life. Since honor had been catholicized, men with honor became automatically Catholic men. Here, a conflict arises in Juan José's character. The only time God is spoken of in the play is in a colloquial phrase. The only time any kind of religious fervor is discussed, it is in relation to the idolization of another character (i.e., Juan's adoration of Rosa without which he would make himself a martyr, or in the case of Rosa who refers to Paco as a god in her eyes). The main characters idolize human beings and the material world in various forms—not the Catholic ideals necessary for either of them to employ any Golden Age honor code. At least as a concept developed in the Golden Age, honor cannot be applied, as the characters are not deemed honorable by their simple lack of faith and apparent pagan-esque idolatry.

Without belief in the Catholic God, which was made an inherent quality of the modern concept of masculine honor, the protagonist Juan also cannot be expected to uphold his actions as those pleasing God and the state. In fact, because Juan José is *not* moored to upholding the laws of church and government, his actions are guided by the opinions of others and the whims of his fancy. Although he knows that stealing is wrong, he steals for his self-made god Rosa. After learning in Act 3 scene 2 from Cano that he is nothing more than a "lincenciao de presidio" and that he can no longer near the "gente honraa" of whom he counted

himself, he screams in rejection and despair of the reality presented to him; yet, Juan was never a part of the “gente honraa” simply from the fact that he did not believe in the Catholic God, according to the Golden Age code of honor. He was never attempting to align his actions and conscience with the will of the state and of God.

Even his vengeance is not in line with or justified by the Golden Age code. In all such called vengeance plays, the plot is focused on marital infidelity. It is the husband deciding whether or not to take full vengeance (although not a common practice in Golden Age reality⁸) upon his wife for tarnishing his masculine honor because of her supposed or real adulterous acts.

Here, once again, Juan’s situation does not apply. He very plainly rejects the notion of marriage and instead applies his own. Act one,

⁸ Abigail Dyer, in “Seduction by Promise of Marriage: Law, Sex and Culture in 17th Century Spain” notes that in Navarre, there was noted only one case of a father killing his daughter for premarital sexual relations. It was most common for the families to sue for their daughters’ dowry replacement and legal virginity. Becker, in his dissertation entitled “There is No Harm in a Boy Talking to a Girl”, notes that in 17th Spain cases of cohabitation were treated as a crime. Couples participating in cohabitation were fined and most often exiled as well. Rarely they were whipped and then fined and exiled. In the case of extra-marital affairs, there was no difference in treatment of male or female adultery. Men were fined heavily, excommunicated, and exiled. Men who attacked and abused their wives based on hearsay of adultery were often fined and exiled and in many cases, the women were allowed separation. Men were also still liable for violent actions committed against adulterous wives if a period of time had elapsed since knowledge of the adultery first became apparent. In general, women and men were not often accused of adultery outside of court cases in which separation were sought or cases in which cohabitation was tried as a crime. Although very much a punishment in reality, murder as vengeance for female adultery was not as common as in literature and the circumstances were far more limiting and dangerous for the husband in question.

scene four illuminates this point clearly. When speaking to the best friend character Andrés about Rosa's supposed infidelity and the marital status of Juan and Rosa, Juan replies that it does not matter as in "las cosas del querer, se firme con éste" and points to his heart. When his heart says yes, he continues, it is signed for life.

Juan is not married but applies to his situation (much like he does the title of an honorable man) not only the accepted legal and cultural terms of marriage but also the retributions of adultery as designated under the Golden Age code of honor though they *do not* and *cannot* apply to him. As such, he is a character using the code to justify his actions that go dogmatically unrestrained by anything but his own creation of reality as he sees fit.

Juan José is not a modernized or modified honor play. It is not an honor play at all. It is a work that exemplifies a very dark aspect of Mass society—an aspect that allows inner-directed, deviant individuals the unmitigated use of traditional concepts in order to mask sociopathic tendencies while vilifying and disregarding, as is the norm, the traditions and history related to those concepts.

Social Character in *Juan José*

The fictional personalities in *Juan José* display a variety of social characters. Some of them fit neatly into Mass Society theory while others are a bit more convoluted or seem to be in a state of transition.

The primary focus of this section is the main character Juan José, his actions and reactions throughout the play in conjunction with his understanding and application of masculine honor; but first, Juan's social character must be identified.

Although at first glance, it would seem that Juan José exhibits an other-directed social character because of his lack of application of a traditional definition of masculine honor (as established previously in his aberrant application of the honor code to himself and his situation) and his rejection of traditionally, socially accepted institutions like marriage, but upon deeper analysis I have found that this is not the case. I propose that Juan José actually has an inner-directed social character based upon incomplete and/or incorrect knowledge of the traditions upon which he has based his identity. The aberrant nature of the conceptual foundations on which his social character is based affects not only his understanding of masculine honor but also allows him to use the concept to abuse and ultimately kill in the name of it.

Throughout the play, the audience is reminded of the singularity of Juan José amongst his peers in very subtle ways. While some of the play's characters seem very aware of the social injustice surrounding them, Juan José is engrossed in his love affair. While Andrés acknowledges his views on marriage to stem from a rejection of certain social norms held in esteem in Spanish society, Juan José redefines marriage on his own terms and *thus* legitimates his relationship with

Rosa, if only in his own mind. While Andrés looks on in horror as the murderous Juan José emerges, Juan José himself seems to almost accept his acts as somehow legitimate and predictable. Juan José is not an other-directed character—a follower of the popular masses looking to his peers for guidance. He is quite another animal.

The dichotomy between Juan José and the other characters in the play demonstrate that he is neither an other-directed individual nor a tradition-directed one (which by this time in Spain had completely died out with the advent of the industrial age). If he were other-directed, perhaps the whole sad drama would have been avoided as he would have taken the advice of his best friend Andrés concerning Rosa and “cogerla por el moño y madurarla las costillas con un garrote, y abrirle la puerta y darle dos patás y ponerla al fresco” (84).

Juan would have looked for advice from his friends and colleagues and been more concerned with what *they* thought of his situation with Rosa and most likely followed the advice of the men his age and of his class; but he does not. In fact, Juan always rejects the advice of the other characters (such as Andrés’ suggestions to breakup with an unfaithful person and to not antagonize his employer Paco, and Cano’s suggestion to forget the past and start life anew elsewhere in Spain after the break out of jail). Juan José relies instead on his own system of beliefs and values when making decisions in his life. This is key to indentifying the inner-directed social character.

Juan José is a character best described as inner-directed, basing his identity on being an honorable, yet poor man, and making all life decisions stemming from this understanding of self. Having only partial knowledge of the Peninsular, hegemonic delimitations of masculine honor (believing in the Catholic understanding of God, choosing marriage over living in sin, and upholding all actions to the laws of God as interpreted in Catholicism and the state of Spain), Juan creates his own boundaries and definitions to fill the gaps in information. Like a patron in a cafeteria, he picks and chooses what he would like masculine honor to contain and then absorbs them into his concept. The problem is that his concept does not closely coincide with that of the dominant society of *any* era. It is a creation of his mind that bolsters *his* personal desires and imaginary. It is an invention of his fancy that functions to separate him from hegemonic behavioral norms of his era (as evident in the consistent surprise or bewilderment of characters in the play to Juan José's reactions to adversity and personal loss). It gives him an almost complete autonomy from most all forms of non-punitative social control. It is a frightening state that leads ultimately to the deaths of two characters.

Even with an incomplete knowledge, Juan cannot be assumed to be entirely ignorant of the basic requirements of traditional, Iberian, masculine honor. He, at some point, chose to take it on as the base of his identity. Why? Perhaps because there is no concept more used than

masculine honor in Spanish society historically as well as in the fictional universe as a façade to hide the abusive man⁹.

Juan José: Intimate Partner Abuse in Late 19th Century Spanish Theatre

Although not always identified as such, intimate partner violence (IPV) has been a great social problem as well as a popular theme in world literature since antiquity. From the so-called “beautiful, female, murder victim” who can be traced to 16th Century English ballads to modern popular culture world wide in the forms of songs, cinema, literature and theatre, intimate partner violence has held a dark, yet prominent place in the Western psyche¹⁰. In the case of *Juan José*, it is evident that the

⁹ Becker, in his dissertation entitled “There is No Harm in a Boy Talking to a Girl”, notes that in 17th Spain many abusive men attempted to justify their actions of abuse of their wives and mother in laws by stating that the woman had somehow tarnished their honor and thus deserved the stabbings, beatings, and other physical assaults. It is to be noted that in a majority of these cases, the men were indeed considered by the men and women of the towns to be abusive and their wives were usually granted separation and monetary income much like alimony if they requested to leave the abusive man. This indicates that although in reality abusive men attempted regularly to masquerade their behavior by claiming to have an honor-based right to physically harm their spouses, society at large drew a line between recovering masculine honor and being a physically abusive spouse. Men did indeed have honor but it did not confer them the right to be abusive.

¹⁰ Daniel Cohen, in his essay “The Beautiful Female Murder Victim: Literary Genres and Courtship Practices in the Origins of a Cultural Motif, 1590-1850”, discusses the main criteria for one being a “beautiful, female, murder victim” consisting of not only being beautiful, a female, and a murder victim but also generally young, unmarried, and murdered by a young, unmarried, male in the context of some romantic or sexual encounter. Additionally, there are the elements of the woman having some early virtue or innocence, that her murder

play is not a modern display of the honor theme but rather a play about IPV.

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) is a general term used to describe what previously was known as “woman abuse’, ‘violence against women, and ‘male-to-female violence” (DeKeseredy 3). The definitions of IPV vary but include four major types of violent behavior: emotional or verbal, physical, psychological and sexual abuse between intimate partners (to be defined as a couple who claims to have mutual love but who may or may not be married) (Hattery 12-13). The protagonist of Dicenta’s *Juan José*, Juan José, is an abusive male displaying for the audience all the signs and symptoms of being in an abusive relationship as well as being the abuser in that relationship that ends in the murder of his female, intimate partner. His motives are neither for the retention of his honor nor the protection of it, but rather for vengeance, control and the completion of earlier threats made to Rosa.

Juan José has already been shown to not be an honorable man in any historical sense of the word. He has created for himself an “honor code” that is comprised of requirements which include: self-identification as an “honorable man”; willingness to work; willingness to be in a monogamous relationship with a woman for a time period to be

was the result of some sort of “fall” from that state and finally the erotic or pornographic description of her corpse. This type of fiction has been popular in the West for centuries, according to his study. The connection between the description of this genre of literature as the vengeance plays of honor are remarkable in so that the female victim fits this profile extremely well.

determined by the male in question; and willingness to provide a certain standard of living for the female partner and self. In return for being in a relationship with a man under the “honor code” of Juan, the man should receive: undying love, unshakeable trust, and willingness from his female partner to bear all hardships of life with that man without the protection of marriage. The breaking of the “honor code” of Juan seems to lead directly to the death of the female partner. This highlights yet another failure of Juan’s self-made “honor code”-façade: in all cases of honor murders, the perpetrator was either attempting to protect or regain his honor. Juan was not trying to do either; thus, this play cannot be categorized as an honor play even though it seems that honor plays a central part in the plot movement. Honor is but the façade.

The genre of honor plays in Spain includes a great many twists of plots and the addition of a number of themes—whether religious or secular—but of the so-called “wife-murder” plays, the husbands are not merely seeking vengeance. They all believe that in the deaths of their wives, they will gain or protect their masculine honor in society and thus not decline in social status due to her real or supposed adultery. In *A secreto agravio, secreta venganza*, the husband Lope kills his wife and her ex-fiancée because of his suspicion of infidelity and thus loss of honor. His homicides (although never fully verified to him in the play, only the audience knows that Leonor has indeed contacted her former fiancée in hope of meeting with him) are committed in an attempt to

retain his positive, masculine, social honor. In *El médico de su honra*, although Gutierre is obviously committing an act unjustifiable under the honor code, the wife-murder is done in hopes to restore a perceived loss of honor by his wife's actions. Like in *A secreto agravio, secreta venganza*, the end of the play brings a resolution in the protagonists' mind that his honor has been restored in the death of his supposedly adulterous wife. Even in *El pintor de su deshonor*, the protagonist Juan is a married man who attempts to restore his perceived lost or tarnished honor with the killing of his wife Serafina and her ex-fiancée. Although here the protagonist does not find solace or power in the deaths, Juan is still in the category of men who murdered their wives in an effort to prevent being a public cuckold. Note also, these men are indeed murderers and not killers. A murder, Biblically, is the killing of an innocent person. It is murder that is prohibited in the Decalogue, not killing. Since their wives, as presented in the plays, did no actual wrong that would warrant death, their homicides are then murders when understood in the Biblical framework in which the masculine honor code resides. The focus, then, to be applied in these situations is first and foremost on the motive of the men: protecting or restoring their masculine honor. Secondly, one must confirm if a sin warranting death has indeed been committed.

In the case of Juan José, the motive for the murders committed is not the retention or protection of masculine honor but pure vengeance.

Juan's unjustified self-classification of being an honorable man as well as his double homicide motivated by vengeance demand the reevaluation of his character. He portrays *another* type of modern man—not one struggling with applying a Golden Age honor code in a modern West, but rather an abusive man using something resembling Golden Age honor as a façade to justify his sociopathic behavior.

To date, many risk assessment questionnaires and standards have been developed for the use of victims of IPV to self-assess abusive relationships as well as for clinicians' to assess the level of dangerousness of abusive relationships (meaning leading to critical physical or lethal danger to victims). They are also used to determine if a person is in an abusive relationship at all. The similarity of questions included in these questionnaires demonstrate clearly the general agreement amongst experts of this field in what constitutes an abusive relationship and also what kinds of behavior generally lead to spousal or intimate partner homicide. For my purposes here, I will use two of such measures: one questionnaire to demonstrate the existence of the abusive relationship between Rosa and Juan and another measure to assess the level of "dangerousness" of Juan (his potentiality of being a murderer of his intimate partner). Tracing the character of Juan José throughout the play, I will clearly show his perfect fit into the schemata of abusive intimate partner as well life-threatening escalation for Rosa. Starting from Act 1, Scene Three (the introduction of Juan) until the final scenes

of the play, Juan's actions and mental processes reflect those of an abusive male partner and—unlike the assessment of authors who would like to place the final murders in the category of “crime of passion”—Juan's trajectory is always clear to the reader who looks past his façade of an honorable man lost in time and misplaced in socioeconomic class. Like the brightly colored frogs of the Amazon whose fluorescent skin functions as a warning of their lethally, poisonous bodies, there is mortal danger written all over this character.

The first question to be answered here is: ‘Is Rosa in an abusive relationship?’ The answer to this question lays in the descriptions of Rosa's relationship in the play by herself, by other characters, Juan's behavior and thoughts as well as the scenes of domestic violence presented in the play. Using the aforementioned questionnaires designed to assess the existence of an abusive relationship as well as literature pertaining to abusive partners, it is clear that not only is Rosa in an abusive relationship but also that her relationship—based on the experience her character has, Juan's actions and thoughts and the exchange between them both—exhibits most all the warning signs one should be aware of that frequently lead to violence (lethal and non) in intimate relationships. An assessment of Rosa's character will be made using a questionnaire devised to ascertain if one is in an abusive situation. This questionnaire can be found in appendix 2.

The first aspect of their relationship to be analyzed pertains to time management and accountability. Does Juan make Rosa account for her time (i.e. how long she takes to do an errand, travel from one place to another, etc.)? The answer to this question is 'yes' and lies in the first act of the play. Here we find Juan introduced for the first time in Scene IV of Act I (81). He is annoyed because Rosa is late. She is supposed to be there and not dally. The implication of this scene is that Rosa knows that she is never supposed to be late and that if late she will have to answer to Juan about what she was doing. In Act I Scene XI, Rosa emphasizes that she is waiting for Juan and that she controls her behavior and with whom she speaks because she does not want to do anything that would anger him. She tries to resist singing for Paco and his friends because "Él tiene su carácter , y si lo toma a mal..." The 'él' she is speaking of is Juan. From the point of view of Juan and of Rosa, as presented in the play, there is a definite accounting of Rosa's time, an accounting of that time and the fear of Juan and his temper.

I cannot, as a reader, ignore the fact that Paco is indeed attracted to Rosa and that it is established that he would like very much to speak to her in private. Neither can it be ignored that the character of Isidra functions to facilitate that desired, private meeting; but the desire of Paco and actions of Isidra do not explain nor justify the abuse of Juan towards Rosa. Juan makes Rosa, his live-in girlfriend, account for her time walking from work to home. He has made it clear that disobeying him or

doing anything against his wishes will cause his temper to flare and this has caused Rosa enough fear that she is willing to curb her interests and change her lifestyle in order to abate that anger which will be directed at her. The nature of Juan José's relationship with Rosa is introduced to the audience through this brief history of abusive behavior towards her—here demonstrated by his control of Rosa through intimidation and manipulation so as to make her account for her time. Juan José's jealousy and suspicions drive him to this abusive act.

This begs two questions: does Juan have unfounded suspicions about Rosa's behavior and is a jealous person in general. Does Juan accuse or suspect Rosa of having affairs in the course of the play? The answer here again is 'yes'. In Act I Scene IV Juan says that he *does not* know why but he has started to—over time—become worried or suspicious that Rosa may not actually be faithful and it is killing him, making him a martyr, enflaming him. She does not seem the same, from Juan's point of view. It is to be noted that his friend Andrés does not know why he would think such a thing; it *is* unfounded and even Juan does not know from whence it came. He expresses jealousy of Paco, his rich boss, and even says that if anyone were to take Rosa from him (although he never wanted to be a bad man) he would be worse than bad.

From the point of view of Rosa, this accusatory behavior is also noted and interpreted as unfounded. In Act I, Scene XIV, Rosa seems surprised at the accusation Juan throws at his boss, but she is not to

speak. Juan has demanded that she be quiet and do as he says. It is in Act II, Scene III where Rosa is finally able to speak, as Juan is not around, and expresses her agreement that Juan became angry without cause and caused great ruin to befall them both. In Scene IV of the second act, Rosa speaks again against the unfounded jealousy and accusations, saying that it is not the woman's fault if a man looks at her in a flirtatious manner. She is suffering and has done nothing. It seems as if they all have turned against her. Where are her friends?

This brings to light yet another aspect of their relationship. Does Juan discourage Rosa from making friends with other men or women and additionally is he ever rude to her friends? Does he control her social circle and her ability to even have friends made of her own volition? The text answers both these questions with "yes". Returning to Act I scene XIV, Juan behaves in a physically violent manner with Rosa as he states "¡No te he dicho que no quiero verte con nadie, y menos con él?" He doesn't want to see her with ANYONE. In combination with physical force ("cogiendo a Rosa por la muñeca con dureza y llevándola al primer término" are the stage directions), the audience is made very aware that Juan has made it clear that she is not to make new friends, as Juan does not desire it. He is attempting, and has been for some time it seems, to control her ability to expand her social network and socialize in general. Earlier in the scene, Juan refuses to enter the room where Paco and his friends (male and female)

are listening to Rosa sing and later insults Paco by saying that he is no friend of his, accuses him of being in love and trying to steal Rosa and ends by daring anyone to follow Rosa out of the bar. In Act Two, Juan threatens and offends Isidra—the only female character that shows concern for Rosa and in whom she can confide.

The actions of Juan lead Rosa to feel increasingly alone and isolated. This is yet another factor in assessing abuse. If a partner makes one feel increasingly alone and isolated, the chances are increased again of being in an abusive situation. It is the case here. When we are first introduced to Rosa in Act I Scenes IX and X, Rosa expresses her sadness when she thinks of her situation of poverty and her relationship. She vacillates in opinion until at the end of Act II, between anger and sadness, she resolves to leave her situation if Juan does not change his ways.

The ways, specifically, that need to be changed are his violent mood swings and physical threats and violence towards Rosa and others. Juan is shown to be jealous, violent and controlling; but most threatening is his ability to go from seemingly a loving, hard-working man to a man capable of horrible violence not only to his so-called life, Rosa, but also anyone else who causes that anger to rise, his blood to boil (as he so aptly described it himself).

As quoted earlier, Rosa is very well aware that Juan's emotions can change drastically and end in an anger that is frightening as she tells

Paco that she does not want to anger him by not obeying his wishes. In Act II, Scene III, Juan enters the scene frustrated and nearly depressed because of his inability to find work due to his threats towards Paco. He then becomes angry and jealous of Isidra and her help (perceived as help from Paco), insults and threatens her, and used a veiled threat with Rosa (with whom he began the scene confiding his frustration). In Scene VII of the same act, the emotional seesaw continues with Juan pleading and begging, accusing Rosa of betrayal, seeming sad and finally ending with anger and physical abuse. Once again, Rosa's relationship with Juan becomes one clearly defined by abuse rather than an escalating lover's spat.

Juan, in just the first two acts of the play has been violent with other characters in the play in the presence of Rosa (discussed earlier when he is said to be looking for a fight by Paco); he has assaulted her twice—once in public and the other in the privacy of their apartment where he had to be stopped by another character from further physically abusing of Rosa); he has threatened to kill Rosa and implied that she is his life which also indicates a suicidal tendency and most definitely a lack of value of human life; and they fight over money as they have none due to Juan's scenes caused by his jealousy that has lost him his job. Of the twenty-seven questions listed in Appendix 2, I can easily answer 'yes' for Rosa for thirteen of those questions. Compounded with the fact that in Act III Juan is in jail for robbery, Rosa, by the standards of even the

simplest IPV assessment, would fall into the category of being in a seriously abusive situation. Of course, the readers of the play know that her situation is seriously abusive by its end, when Rosa and Paco are both dead at the hands of Juan Jose, so her situation would most accurately be described as extremely abusive or lethal. Rosa's character is one that is not of the category of an infamous woman but that of an *abused* woman and victim. Her abuser is Juan José, a character masking his abusive and homicidal tendencies under the guise of an honorable and broken-hearted man.

In Act I, Scene IV Juan is worried and then suspicious and then angry in speaking of his capabilities to be "peor que malo", then describing his undying love for Rosa and then deeply sad. This scene occurs in the presence of a friend when speaking of Rosa. Throughout the play, Juan displays in the presence of Rosa as well as in her absence thoughts and actions that clearly communicate the abusive nature of their relationship, his role as abuser, and finally his high potential for homicide of Rosa. Stating that he can be 'worse than bad' is not only a veiled threat to the absent Rosa but for all of society as he speaks in a public place to a friend.

The genre of honor play in Spanish theatre is quite populated and has been studied for centuries, but the play *Juan José* does not belong in this genre. This is not to say that there are no modern, honor plays in Spanish theatre but rather this play has been incorrectly categorized.

Juan José is a play that looks at a modern, inner-directed Western character with an incomplete and modified knowledge of the honor code in Spanish society who uses that popular aspect of Spanish masculinity to masque and justify his abusive personality and ultimately the homicide of his former, intimate partner Rosa and her boyfriend Paco. Juan is not married to Rosa; is not made a cuckold (per his status of single); does not align his actions with God and state; does not seem to believe in God and deifies Rosa in the play. Juan José does not commit the homicides in an effort to regain or to defend his honor, but rather he murders for vengeance—making real his earlier threat made to Rosa to kill her if she were to ever leave him. His homicides are examples of the ultimate act of control made by abusive partners and are the most extreme forms of IPV¹¹.

Juan José, its initial reception by audiences, and its erroneous categorization as an honor play only amplify its function as a type of socially acceptable absolution of IPV leading to homicide, which in the opinion of this author, further exacerbates one of the greatest societal ills of not just the West but of the Twenty-First Century world: the continuance of violence against women as a socially acceptable norm.

¹¹ In 1988, Dr. Jacquelyn Campbell devised the Danger Assessment tool to assess the level of lethality for women in an abusive relationship (appendix 3). Of the fifteen questions asked in the questionnaire, nine can be answered yes for the character of Rosa, putting her at high risk of mortal danger. Having such a high score on this assessment in reality has been a reliable, positive indicator of homicide (even in this fictional universe Rosa is predictably murdered in the end).

**Chapter 4: Valle-Inclán's Anti-Semitic Enlightenment:
Honor and Masculinity in *El Esperpento de los Cuernos de
Don Friolera***

Lionel Gossman has noted that almost anyone in the West who “put pen to paper in the nineteenth century, it seems, is vulnerable to the charge of anti-Semitism” (1). This assertion about the extent of anti-Semitism in the West does not in any way insinuate that an instantaneous genesis of this form of racism in literature happened, but rather that the time period shows a swelling of the belief. As will be seen here, the history of anti-Semitic literature in Europe is long; and although its peaks in different countries do not always mutually coincide, its legacy in the European canon cannot easily be ignored.

A brief survey of Western production by some of the region's most celebrated artists highlights the pervasiveness of anti-Semitism in various disciplines. Chaucer's *Prioress' Tale* from the medieval time period uses the blood libel to inspire his readers (Besserman 57). Lord Byron, well known for his work with Isaac Nathan in *Hebrew Melodies*, later went on to author *The Age of Bronze*, a poem written in 1823 that employs the stereotype of the conspiracy of the world-running Jew who schemes to control and enslave all of humanity (Scrivener 76). Handel's *Messiah* was an interpretation from a libretto by Charles Jennens which contained an alternate and anti-Semitic interpretation of Isaiah 40:9 that

makes the piece one that “rejoic[es] against Judaism” (Mariseen 167-8). Dicken’s *Oliver Twist* has its nefarious Fagin whose very description is a composite of anti-Semitic stereotypes of Jewish people (Meyer 239). Hemingway used anti-Semitism as a thematic device in his famed novel *The Sun Also Rises*, using the Jewish Cohn character to illuminate how a man should not be in the 19th century by illuminating his faults as something inherent in Jewish masculinity (Wilentz 187). Finally, Louis-Ferdinand Cèline who has been described as

“one of the most, if not the most, original, formally inventive French novelists of the twentieth century...most often considered on par with those of Proust, Joyce, and Kafka...was... at the same time a pro-Nazi, anti-Semitic demagogue” whose hateful proclivities were never shielded from the public nor lacking in his oeuvre (Carroll 254-5).

In 1899, Emile Durkheim responded to the same brand of growing anti-Semitism in France with theory and explication. He wrote: “When society suffers, it needs someone to blame, someone upon whom to avenge itself for its disappointments; and those persons whom opinion already disfavors are naturally singled out for this role. It is the pariahs who serve as expiatory victim (322).” Europe in the late 19th century

was rife with economic upheaval and anti-Semitism¹². Durkheim's essay was written in response to the Dreyfus affair in France but all over Europe from England to Russia, anti-Semitic thought was reaching epidemic proportions that seemingly culminated in the atrocities committed in World War II which posited a complete extermination of the Jewish people. It was a climax in Judeophobia and an anti-Semitic desire to "purify" the populace.

Spain was no anomaly in this European anti-Semitic phenomenon and obsession with homogenous, "purified" populations—populations "purified" of the Jew. Her position of lacking any significant (if any) Jewish presence within the state for the populace to blame and spurn is usually seen as unique, but further study into other countries in Europe with similar conditions produces the same resulting anti-Semitism. As recent as the 1990s in countries all over Europe (Slovakia, Romania, Poland, Azerbaijan are just some examples) and outside of the region (Japan), there has been documented, widespread anti-Semitism in popular beliefs (Smith 204).

The roots, dissemination and resilience of this particular form of racism found in anti-Semitism will not be delved into here but it merits

¹² Brustein and King, in the abstract of their article "Anti-Semitism in Europe Before the Holocaust", published in the *International Political Science Review* journal in 2004, assert that it was "commonly accepted that the years 1899-1939 represent a high-point in anti-Semitism in western societies." Within the text, it is noted that a high point of Anti-Semitism in Western, Christian societies has been noted in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (36).

noting that Spain—usually siphoned off from European study in many disciplines—is once again largely ignored as being part of the cohesive, European unit in the investigation of this social ill in the region. Spain, like many other countries in Europe that did not have significant Jewish populations, still produced anti-Semitic beliefs in her culture¹³. Blame and spurning did indeed occur in Spain with the “expiatory victim” being named the Jew. Throughout the centuries this social reality also found its way into her literature.

El Esperpento de Los Cuernos de Don Friolera is an artistic manifestation of this desire to “purify” Spanish culture in order to bring into being a hegemonically ideal Castilian man who is free from the supposed deforming character traits a culture miscegenized with non-European cultures creates. It is a hateful and racist literature, most harmful to the Spanish self who continued to house the legacy of the

¹³ Although there has always been a continued Jewish presence in Spain, the great removal of Jews after the 1492 expulsion coupled with the forced or coerced conversions that created *conversos* caused a vacuum of authentic Jewish presence and participation in Spanish culture. This created an atmosphere much like that found in countries that had no Jewish presence but still produced a strong anti-Semitism for an apparently “ghost” population. Even though one may trace some insignificant Jewish presence in Spain continuously throughout her existence, it is a tricky affair as it would necessitate using the same anti-Semitic thought processes which first produced the concept of ‘race’ itself to trace those with “tainted”, Jewish blood (whether by never accepting conversos as Christians or assuming a widespread crypto-Judaic population hidden within the nation). I will say here, then, that the anti-Semitic displays in Spanish culture post-expulsion and spanning hundreds of years afterwards are not negative reactions to a widespread, unassimilated minority but rather a xenophobia directed at an insignificant (at times) and/or imaginary population of Spanish Jewry.

“other” (whether he be Muslim or Jewish, Semitic, African or Arabian) in its structures, literature, speech, and DNA.

Here, Valle-Inclán not only attempts to persuade his audience against the other-directed character type gaining ground in the developed West, but also attempts to convince them that it is primarily the continued Semitic influence in Spain which erodes its masculine backbone, turning the noble Spaniard into the cuckold—the horned Jew. In this parody is something dark. Its esperpentic gaze turns fictionalized masculine honor into a Semitic infection of the Spanish soul that in turn makes cuckolds (and by extension Jews) of them all.

Anti-Semitic Spain

In the creation of the first, unified, Spanish state, it was Los Reyes Católicos who first aimed to homogenize the majority of the peninsula—not only in ethnicity and culture, but also in religion and race—by eliminating as much as possible the presence of the “other” in Spain¹⁴.

Salo Baron notes:

One of the characteristics of national movements was the attempt to create homogenous national states. Societies thus organized often felt more acutely than others the

¹⁴ Bernard Vincent notes in his article “Moriscos del Reino de Granada después de 1570” that Spain had sought many times to expel this religious group and quotes Fernand Braudel as saying that they “habían limpiado a Granada para atestar Castilla”(594). It is well known of the expulsion of other religious and ethnic minorities from Spain; but this account brings to light how adamant and obsessive the “cleansing” of the state was taken by its government and populace.

presence of alien minorities, particularly the Jews who were distinguished from the majority by both religion and ethnic origin. (14)

One of the most cited and banned “other” was the Jew, in the majority of European cases. Spain was no exception to the European rule in its choosing of its “expiatory victim”.

In one of the most famous Castilian poems, “El Cid” (c.1140), the profundity of anti-Semitism in Castile is clearly shown. The two Jewish men who help El Cid are effeminate, given the names of women and completely emasculated before El Cid who does not repay them even at the poem’s end. As the *reconquista* of Iberia took place, popular anti-Semitism was on a rise that would last centuries. In 1215, “practicing Jews were required to wear a badge on their hats or bonnets” (Hannaford 21). By the late 1200s, the “Jews of Toledo were imprisoned in their own synagogues. The wealthiest among them were forced to pay exorbitant ransoms. Many were tortured and forced to convert” under the reign of Alfonso X, the Wise (Carroll 328).

The anti-Semitism of medieval Spain was present not only in the perils of daily life and the literature of the era but also codified in its music. Jessica Bedol’s Master’s thesis entitled *Social Alienation and Political Subversion: Anti-Judaism in Medieval Spanish Music* examines how anti-Semitic public beliefs not only inspired medieval musical compositions but also were used as tools to disseminate hateful

stereotypes of the Jewish people to its audiences (IX). In the *Cántigas de Santa María*, for example, each song depicts Jews as either enemies of the state (the king) or of the Catholic faith (3).

Anti-Semitic beliefs had become thoroughly entrenched in the culture and thus language of Castile by the 15th century—the same vernacular that Jewish Iberians were central to inventing through their translations in 1260 under the reign of Alfonso X (Carroll 327). It is in the vernacular—the everyday language of the people—that continued to flourish that one finds the canonization of anti-Semitism in Spain:

<<Al Judío y al Puerco, no le metas en tu güerto.>> Lo mínimo, pues, que puede esperarse de sujetos de tal calaña--<<los de mala ralea>>, <<los de la mala intinción>>, <<los del infame linaje>>-- es que hagan <<judiados>>... El refranero y el léxico castellano—y el catalán y el gallego—andan sombrados de términos, expresiones, o simples exabruptos antijudíos. Y algo no muy distinto puede decirse del romancero, del cancionero popular, de las leyendas, de los cuentos infantiles, de las narraciones orales y escritas en general, de muchas fiestas tradicionales y celebraciones rituales... En esta línea no puede pasarse por alto que algunas creencias arraigadas, que sorprendentemente se prolongan hasta tiempos cercanos,

atribuyen apéndice caudal—rabo--, como las bestias y diablos, a <<los de la mala semilla>>. (Núñez 7)

The word “race”, even, has been traced to having a medieval and Castilian origin (Nirenberg 73, 77). As explained by Nirenberg in his essay “Race and the Middle Ages: The Case of Spain and its Jews”, the roots of the word *raza* were to describe “defects linked specifically to Judaism” and by extension Semitics in general (Nirenberg 78; Mignolo 319). The same negative stereotypes used today were the foundations of the creation of the word *raza* as applied to human beings, alluding simultaneously to Jewish lineage as well as specifically the defects of one having such lineage, such as being morally corrupt or prone to incite treason or avarice and the like. Nirenberg further notes that a Spanish dictionary published in 1611 “defined ‘raza’ as ‘the caste of purebred horses, which are marked by a brand... Race, in [human] lineage is meant negatively, as having some race of Moor or Jew’” (79). Thus, the word *race*, as it applies to humans, was created to give name to a commonly held belief that had become so popular as to warrant its inclusion in dictionaries.

Throughout the Medieval era, the pogroms against Jews in Spain would worsen as many were tortured, forced to convert, murdered and robbed, culminating in the expulsion in 1492¹⁵; but anti-Semitism would

¹⁵ It is important to remember, as Maria Angeles Martín Romera points out on page 28 of her article “Antes de la Libertad Religiosa: El Antisemitismo en España desde la baja edad media hasta el siglo XVII”, that the act of expulsion of the Jewish peoples

not be expelled with the expulsion of the visibly, practicing Jewish population. The 16th through 19th centuries in Spain would produce an anti-Semitism of a slightly different kind, as being Jewish in the Spanish Empire had been outlawed by the expulsion (Baron 17). During these times, the concept of *raza*, as it was applied to human beings, was developed to mean something biological—something beyond culture and carried in the blood. It was during this era that the focus on *limpieza de sangre* developed in Spain as a way to oppress and discriminate against Jewish Iberians who had converted to Christianity and as well their now Christian descendants. Baron notes:

With the development of the doctrine of *limpieza de sangre* the Iberian Holy Offices prosecuted not only individuals accused of judaizing but also maintained a fiction that, once a Jew, a person would always remain a Jew down through many generations. In fact, persons claiming “purity of blood” in Spain often secured from the Inquisition certificates of full *limpieza* or, as the case may have been, that no more than a quarter, an eighth, or even a sixty-fourth of Jewish blood coursed through their veins. (21)¹⁶

“se entiende de un creciente intolerancia religiosa, además, es común a toda Europa durante la Baja Edad Media. El pueblo hebreo ya había expulsado de otras zonas como de Inglaterra en 1290, Francia en 1394, o distintas regiones del Imperio Germánico. España, en todo caso, fue tardía en incorporarse.”

¹⁶ These same percentages would later be used in the Americas in Spanish and British colonies to categorize Americans not wholly of European decent giving rise to racial categories such as *mulato* and *mestiza* (to name only two of over a dozen

Laws designed to filter those of “pure-blood” from those of “tainted-blood” focused on all aspects of life in Spain and its colonies. As early as 1449 in Toledo were laws passed to prohibit *conversos* (Jewish converts to Christianity during this era) to hold public offices (Carroll 347, Romera 34, Baron 21). In the 16th century, Pope Paul IV ratified the aforementioned *limpieza de sangre* statute of Toledo (after which he issued the *Cum Nimis Absurdum* for all of Christendom) effectively restricting almost all aspects of Jewish life (ownership of property, ability to attend universities, ability to hire servants, to be called “sir”, to dress as they pleased, etc.) down to the formation of ghettos as they were now to live only on one street (Carroll 375). “La Limpieza de Sangre se convirtió en una obsesión, el carecer de ella era una afrenta. Estaba asociada a las cualidades de nobleza y honor cuya importancia también aumentó a finales del siglo XVI” (Romera 37).

It is not surprising, then, to find the ramifications of *limpieza de sangre* in Spain’s colonies of this period. “The crown quickly made *limpieza de sangre* a requirement for passage into the New World” in an effort to ensure the fidelity of the colonists (Frederick 76)¹⁷. In Louisiana in 1776 a Spanish Captain who wanted to marry a widow named

such classifications) in Spanish and Quadroon, Octoroon and Mulatto in English.

¹⁷ Interestingly enough, Frederick notes further on page 76 of her article “A Blood Test Before Marriage: Limpieza de Sangre in Spanish Louisiana”, that the application of *limpieza de sangre* to Spanish colonies changed its meaning as added to the dichotomy of Jewish and gentile were Old World and New World. It was the distinction between Old and New World that would eventually win out and the new ideas of biological race and races growing out of this application.

Margarita Wiltz was forced to concede to his fiancée being subjected to the test of *limpieza de sange* which started with 30 pages attesting to her Jewish-free lineage (Frederick 75). In Columbia in the early 19th century it was the Antioqueño's who were said to be Jewish—to be *conversos* and thus Jewish—and that their presence tainted the colony even though the region prospered (Twinam 84-5).

20th Century anti-Semitism in Spain has been usually studied in continuation with the previously noted history. Works like Gonzalo Chillida's *El antisemitismo en España: la imagen del judío (1812-2002)* include a more recent past that covers the era in which Valle-Inclán lived whereas others like *El olivo y la espada: estudio sobre el antisemitismo en España (siglos XVI-XX)* spans an even earlier era and greater breadth of time, attempting to give the reader a more thorough understanding of the entrenchment this social ill has in the culture of Spain. *Los judíos en la España moderna y contemporánea* by Caro Baroja also examines the history of anti-Semitism in Spain. At one point Baroja likens the Spanish treatment of the Jewish people between the 15th and 17th centuries as being of the same character as that of Nazi Germany and many other Eastern European countries from during the World Wars period, connecting Spanish medieval anti-Semitism to the 20th century anti-Semitism found in fascism (Serrano 46). These works and others like them stand as a testament to not only the existence but also the longevity and impact on the *Weltanschauung* of Spain as it pertains to

the Jewish faith and its adherents (whether they be an actual population within its borders or a phantom menace to desired societal norms).

The presence of the Jew in Spain had been understood as a negative and had been portrayed as such for hundreds of years. This fact is central to understanding how it is that one finds once again this stance being taken up by the *avant-garde* Valle-Inclán in *El Esperpento de los Cuernos de Don Friolera*. Anti-Semitism had been a traceable feature in literature, history, linguistically, and culturally in Spain for centuries. By no means used by all, it had been used liberally and consistently enough as a theme, motif, aside or otherwise in a variety of disciplines to still hold a viable place in 20th century Spanish thought.

The early 20th century in Spain was reeling from the recent loss of colonies and the declined status of Spain in the international scene. It is in this climate that various nationalistic groups formed, each proposing a different path of recuperation for Spain. It was not uncommon to find in such right wing, nationalistic groups huge amounts of anti-Semitism. The Falange, for example, espoused anti-Semitic beliefs while using Golden Age Literature to bolster its view of a fascist Spain. The movement was based on a desire to return the “positive virtues” of “Catholicism, *hispanidad*, tradition” and the like to the Spanish people (Schwartz 206). In fact, many of the authors they felt represented the lost Spain they were trying to recover had produced anti-Semitic works. Lope de Vega and Quevedo were favorites of the Nationalists and of Nazi

Germany. The two authors were well known for anti-Semitism in their works (Beusterien 6; De Patricio 156).

Carlism, a movement in which Valle-Inclán was a very active member for a great deal of his life, was a traditionalist, nationalist and conservative movement that formed (along with other Rightist groups) the Nationalist movement in Spain during the Civil War (Rohr 198). Charged with restoring “*hispanidad*”, Nationalist leaders employed medical terminology to accuse “Jews of conspiring with Freemasons and Communists to bring Spain foreign ideas such as the ‘plague’ that was liberalism”(199). They, the Nationalist conglomerate, needed to “‘purify’ Spain of the anti-Patria, the anti-Spain, embodied in the ‘Jewish.... Conspiracy’” (200). Kiernan notes in his study on Carlism that:

“It harped more and more on the Soviet and Jewish conspiracies against civilization... anti-semitism had always been endemic in the movement, and was now swelling.... even Carlism and fascism, however this might be obscured by ‘the fog of Falangist rhetoric’, were really not far apart” (169).

Although at the time of the writing of the *esperpentos* Valle-Inclán was widely known for being an inactive or non-member of this movement, in his earlier years he was well known as a long-standing Carlist. He had given 5 of his children names that clearly connected them to the Carlist cause and was even decorated by the party with its highest honor

(Patterson 170, 171). Patterson notes in his study on the use of an “aesthetic propaganda” in Valle-Inclán that “we can identify a clear political subtext with the idea and purpose of the *esperpento*”, calling the *esperpentos* “generalist” in their political posture (168,182). For Patterson, he is a “writer-propagandist”, a “literary *cruzado*”, and in the words of the author himself in 1910 at a Carlist banquet, one who dedicates himself “a manejar la pluma en defensa de mis ideas y si es necesario, ese brazo lo pondré a disposición de la Causa para manejar otras armas si el caso llega” (172). Valle-Inclán, like many other writers and intellectuals of his time, was no bystander. Throughout the years, he used his art to spread his beliefs. Some of those beliefs were manifested in reality in his conservative political leanings of Carlism that—like most political parties of the era—had an anti-Semitic lean.

It is probable then that as most writers of the 19th century produced anti-Semitic works, a great many European writers of the early 20th century would share in this fate. Valle-Inclán’s 20th century Spain was overflowing with an anti-Semitism that fell into the category of demonology (Smith 211). No matter which side a person was on, whether they were on the right or the left in Spain, the ultimate political slur was to call the other side Jews (Rohr 202). Anti-Semitism was deeply rooted in Spain and continued to function as a social threat or personal slur in early 20th century Spain. Moreover, anti-Semitism was

used to highlight supposed social ills—whether they be popular movements or popular mores.

The esperpentic form used in *Los Cuernos de Don Friolera* is often tacitly critiqued as witty parody or satire. It takes a popular genre or literary theme and puts it in the house of mirrors, amplifying all its flaws and grotesque faults; but the distortion resulting in *Don Friolera* is superficial. Its true *raison de être*, similar to much European literature of this era, is didactic in nature. The play aims to change Spanish society by reminding it of its “pure” self while highlighting the negative cultural influences that have disfigured it. *El Esperpento de Los Cuernos de Don Friolera* is not a parody of the Calderonian honor code that wishes to simply poke fun at the form or make it ridiculous. Its purpose is to uproot a supposed contagion of barbarity in popular Spanish culture that kills the ability of the ideal Castilian man to exist and the Spanish society to be truly European. In order to do so, it first names the contagion (Jewish influence) and then it explores the dangers it brings to Spanish society upon the average man and previously ideal Spanish family (namely insanity, inhumanity, other-directed character types and the loss of masculinity).

The contagion is not the Calderonian honor code, as one may suspect. It is, in fact, Judaic influence in Spanish culture. This is not a play about Calderonian honor as much as it is a play about how the Spaniard is still afflicted by the so-called honor-less, Jewish man even

though he no longer exists as a societal force or a reality in Spain at the time.

illuminating the Cave: Form and Content in *El Esperpento de Los Cuernos de Don Friolera*

The honor play in Spanish theatre is most often seen as a kind of tragedy. Rarely in the 20th and 21st centuries does one see an honor play that has not been somehow modernized in form. Valle-Inclán's *Don Friolera* is no exception. Form as well as content in *Don Friolera* work together to provide the audience with the message of pre-Islamic Spain's superiority and the necessity to remove Judaic influence from its breast. By using a form that hails Roman and Grecian high culture and a content that focuses upon shame and degradation brought into culture by assimilation, *El Esperpento de los Cuernos de Don Friolera* efficiently strikes at the presence of the "other" in Spain as something harmful and vile while giving the audience a solution to the problem: returning to its mythic roots of pure, Iberian homogeneity.

The form in *Don Friolera* is a classic one: the basic comedy with the epilogue, the main play and prologue. The difference here is that the epilogue and prologue do not function as they would in the classic play which simply introduces the theme or moral to be discussed or wraps up the conclusion; but rather, here it is developed as a frame of the "main" play itself.

Central to the esperpentic form is that the audience be sufficiently distanced from the characters so as to be able to truly appreciate the distortions to come without being able to identify personally with the characters themselves. The frame of the epilogue and the prologue here are extremely important to this *esperpento* because it is here that the audience is to relate to the characters, not in the main play itself—as in antiquity, the epilogue and prologue addressed the audience directly, thus breaking the invisible barrier between audience and dramatic, fictive scene. The characters of the epilogue and prologue have not been esperpentized. They do not go through the concave mirror. They are presented as beings much like the audience but more. They are also creative beings and critics of the world around them. Just as much as the main body of the play is a product of Valle-Inclán, it is also the product of the critique of these characters that represent an un-caricatured state of the thinking, analytical Spaniard.

These guides (or relatable characters) of *Don Friolera*, then, are characters that represent the "pure" Spain. They open and close the play, surrounding it in their viewpoint. The main play, thus, is constructed and given meaning and direction by the northern, more "purified" and European Spain represented here by Estrafalarío and Manolito. Valle-Inclán's "pure" European characters of the frame pass judgment on not just the honor theme in general or Calderonian honor, but also on what the play presents as the hegemonic ideal of the modern

Castilian man at the time and an entire, historically, multi-ethnic and cultural region of Spain.

Northern Spain has always been understood as the last bastion of untouched Iberian culture. The language and culture of the Basque region is like no other on the peninsula. Unlike all other regions which have languages, dialects and cultures which can easily be seen as having Romanic and Islamic as well as other foreign influence, the Basque region has historically been understood as a possible window into the indigenous peoples and cultures of the peninsula. For the great part of their recorded history, being an attached yet free state much like its neighboring Andorra, the Basque region has the reputation and history of being a people who would govern themselves and who would not be taken over by any country by force (Strong 325). This being said, it is no wonder that Valle-Inclán would choose the puppeteers of his marionettes to be from this region. In addition to making them Basque, the conspicuous costume also reminds the viewers of the time period of the Carlist uniform with their berets—a connection that will not be explored in this dissertation but it interesting to note.

Names are of great importance in this farcical play and the names of the main characters of the epilogue and prologue prove also to be allusions to historical, important figures for Spain. Manolito is a priest and I propose carries the name to link him with Jesus Christ, if only in name alone. Manolito is a diminutive form of

Immanuel/Emmanuel/Manuel which in Hebrew means “God is with us”. In the New Testament, the prophecy which made this name popular was linked to the Jesus Christ, thus making Immanuel one of his names. Being in a predominantly Catholic society, this allusion would not have been lost on the audience as any use of the name Immanuel or its derivatives in literature would necessarily call to mind this reference. Estrafalario, the other main character of the epilogue and prologue, means “strange”. The allusion here refers to Seneca¹⁸, who has also been called “Seneca the Eclectic”(Rubio 270). Valle-Inclán has as the judges of the popular honor theme in this play two of the largest figures of the Spanish psyche: Jesus and Seneca. It is they that will set the stage for the audience, distancing them from grotesque, supposed representations of the fallen Spaniard.

The two characters of Manolito and Estrafalario are also inner-directed character types, as described by Mass Society Theory. The inner-directed character type, we well remember, is based in tradition and uses his history and moral foundations to guide his present-day decisions while still being flexible in the face of modernity. Such character types make their decisions based on the foundations imbued to them by their parents and elders—not the thoughts of their peers, as the

¹⁸ According to Dario in his essay “The Soul of Spain”, “ever since Ganivet asserted that Seneca embodies the true Spanish spirit, it has been repeated to the point of satiety” (270). The philosopher, born in Spain but Roman, was prolific in his writings on various subjects and holds, as the quote shows, a prominent place in the making of the imaginary of an ideal, Spanish type.

upcoming, history disdaining, other-directed character types do. When keeping in mind that tradition and inner-directed character types have been more valued types in Western society, having the audience's guides be inner-directed also bears great weight in this play.

It is, then, representations of Jesus and Seneca embodied in the characters of Manolito and Estrafalarío—inner-directed characters—that are the model Spaniards laying and delimiting a new base for hegemonic masculinity as the play begins. In the end, in *El Esperpento de los Cuernos de Don Friolera*, the "real" Spaniard men are a Northern, un-miscegenated type whose religion and reason go hand in hand in his personality.

The characters that the audience is to be distanced from, then, are equally important in an *esperpento*. In *Don Friolera*, the character that is the aim of the play is the titular Don Friolera, *el cornudo*. The Don is a military man who becomes exponentially obsessed with not being made a cuckold although the horns are put upon him before the play even begins; and it is the horns put upon him that are paramount to understanding what or whom he represents in this struggle to avoid the title of *el cornudo*.

Using a word that means "horned" to signify cuckold has roots in anti-Semitic beliefs. An erroneous translation of Exodus 34:29 by Jerome changed Moses from having a divine radiance upon his descent from Mount Sinai to being horned (the Hebrew word for radiant/emanate

is transliterated as “karan” which is related to the Hebrew “keren”, meaning “horn”); this error gave root to the belief that Jews had horns and connected them with evil, and ultimately Satan in the Christian, popular, Renaissance culture of Europe (Berlin 191). Thus, the “horning” of Don Friolera, colloquially understood as his being made a cuckold, is also the Judaizing or making into a Jew of the titular character. As discussed earlier, it was quite common in the making of the Castilian, hegemonic male that any contending male “other” be stripped of his viability as a candidate for idealization. In the case of the Jewish Spaniard, he was stripped in literature of all masculinity (unlike the North African who lost his due to a fictitious dishonorable act). The Jewish Spaniard’s created state of cuckold was the *denouement* of his supposed lack of masculinity and was something that, as can be seen from the uses of *cornudo* in Spanish, was eternally bound to him and made intrinsic to his nature.

Additionally, when Don Friolera’s character type is analyzed using Mass Society Theory he is shown to be an other-directed type. The other-directed character type is the most modern and transformed of characters of the Modern West yet the attributes of this type are not still not generally accepted as desirable in most of the Modern West. One with an other-directed character does not base their decisions on a foundation laid in their early development or their beliefs and neither do they appreciate the role of tradition and elders in current affairs or their

lives. They are guided by a groupthink mentality and look to their peers for guidance and advice. From the beginning of the play it is evident that Don Friolera makes his decisions ultimately on what his peers suggest and what he believes is the most popular stance. This type has no mooring, so to speak, and changes and sways as the popular current does. For a tradition-directed or inner-directed character type, the other-directed character (product of the most modern of Western states when seen in great numbers in a society) lacks internal guidance and basic integrity.

Don Friolera's character, then, represents the Spanish man in a type of fall from grace. This fall makes him the *cornudo*, the horned one, the Jew of Spain that although removed from society hundreds of years earlier was capable of incarnating himself in unsuspecting Spanish men who were susceptible to the remnants of Judaic influence in Spanish culture. Valle-Inclán's Don Friolera, then, at once causes pity and revulsion in the audience, as the function of his character is to be the anti-Semitic warning of what miscegenation destroys in a once "pure" Spain.

What is most directly destroyed is embodied in Don Friolera's daughter Manolita. It is no far stretch to see his daughter as being connected to Christianity and representing the "purity" of religion and Castile. She is described as being angelic and pure. The name Manolita is a diminutive form of Manuela/Emanuela which is the feminized form

of Manuel/Emanuel which, of course, is another name for Jesus of Nazareth. Christianity is, then, represented in the prologue as well as in the main play by two characters that epitomize Spanish “purity”. The heavy-handed, meaning-laden names given to key characters in the play only make its content and intended message clearer to the audience.

The aim of the play *El Esperpento de los Cuernos de Don Friolera* is to convince the audience that it—the play itself—is a tool of enlightenment, that somehow the audience is in Plato's proverbial cave and that the play's frame is the lit world seen by that one man who got out of the proverbial cave. There was a problem in Spain and with the Spanish man; and the play says very, very clearly that that problem was still the Jew in its midst. The anti-thesis of Jesus/Manolito and Seneca/Estrafalarío is the Jew (and in some cases an “other”) and any person, place or thing touched and presumably changed by him. Analyses of each main section of the play starting from the Prologue and ending with the Epilogue clearly delineate this didactic goal.

In the Prologue of *El Esperpento de los Cuernos de Don Friolera*, Estrafalarío and Manolito come upon a very simple puppet play in which honor is the theme and intimate partner homicide the conclusion to fears caused by gossip. In a discussion of why this form was so popular, it is Estrafalarío who states that it is because of the influence of Judaic culture in Spain that the Spaniards have such a lust for blood-- it is for that reason and that reason alone that they have such a lust. Although

Estrafalarario thinks the puppeteers show is a great example of what the honor play should really be (ironically, it too contains the same anti-Semitism Estrafalarario exhibits later in the play), he does not attribute it to being truly Castilian in nature. After all:

"Pudiera acaso ser Latino. Indudablemente la comprensión de este humor y esta moral, no es tradición castellana... no saben nada de estas burlas de cornudos... tan contrario al honor teatral y Africano de Castilla. (28)"

The type of honor play that Estrafalarario, and by extension the play itself, is promoting is one which hails the pre-Judeo-Christian culture of the Peninsula. The characters support for one understanding of honor and the rejection of another theatrical display is founded in the desire for "purity" and exclusion of what is seen as foreign influence in Spanish culture.

Here, not only is the concept of honor seen as tainted by foreign influence (African, non-pagan, Judaic, "other" etc.) but Castile is seen as a tainted culture in and of itself, somehow separate from the rest of "pure" Spain and thus "impure" by default. Castile is plagued with "impurity" then and her culture and concepts that hegemonically represent Spain to the world (as well as to herself) are coming from a cultural center that is infected. This is the message that Estrafalarario so succinctly sends to his audience.

In the Prologue of *El Esperpento de los Cuernos de Don Friolera*, Estrafalario states clearly that the popular ballads of the day which to him glorify a foreign based honor are nothing more than:

Don Estrafalario. Una forma popular judaica, como el honor calderoniano. La crueldad y el dogmatismo del drama español solamente se encuentre en la Biblia. La crueldad sespiriana es magnífica, porque es ciega, con la grandeza de las fuerzas naturales. Shakespeare es violento, pero no dogmático. La crueldad española tiene toda la bárbara de los Autos de Fe. Es fría y antipática. Nada mas lejos de la furia ciega de los elementos que Torquemada: es una furia escolástica. Si nuestro teatro tuviese el temblor de las fiestas de toros, sería magnífico. Si hubiese sabido transportar esa violencia estética, sería un teatro heroico como la Iliada. (30)

Thus, the main play itself is to be framed by anti-Semitism. The reason for the blood lust is because of the Judaic influence¹⁹.

¹⁹ Note that what Estrafalario defends is an aesthetic that houses action. Earlier in the prologue, the Estrafalario's character states " Los sentimentales que en los toros se duelen de la agonía de los caballos, son incapaces para la emoción estética de la lidia. Su sensibilidad se revela pareja de la sensibilidad equina, y por caso su cerebración inconsciente, llegan a suponer para ellos una suerte igual a la de aquellos rocines destripados." It is this line of thinking that allows him to denounce a supposedly Judaic-induced "blood lust" while praising bullfighting: bullfighting supposedly reflects the distance of distinct beings, of gods and men, of men and beasts, of creator and created, in his argument.

An analysis of the play encased by the prologue and epilogue reveal a fall from grace story that ends in the destruction of the Castilian world. Don Friolera begins "pure" but falls after he is tainted and takes with him his once perfect world as he becomes "horned" or rather changes from being a Castilian man of honor to a proverbial, Jewish man without it. In the *esperpento*, all his faults are amplified and contorted, but the greatest contortion of those faults will be in the first scenes while he is first being introduced.

When the main play begins in Scene One, the audience is privy to Don Friolera's stream of conscious decision-making process of what should he do about the idle gossip in the form of an anonymous message he receives about his wife's supposed infidelity. It is here at the very beginning that it becomes clear that Don Friolera is an other-directed character type.

In the first scene, Friolera discusses with himself and becomes more and more obsessed with what the public will think of him rather than his own feelings or assessment of his current condition. First Friolera states "Afortunadamente, no pasará de una vil calumnia. Este pueblo es un pueblo de canallas" and that he will seek "un traslado por si tiene algún fundamento" (34). Then he falls quickly first into elevating public opinion with stating that "El oficial pundonoroso, jamás perdona la esposa adúltera. Es una barbaridad. Para muchos lo es" and later "El principio del honor ordena matar" displaying not only the beginnings of

his other-directed character type but also his fall from a “pure” rational Spaniard into a malleable barbarian himself (36).

He continues his monologue with a brief return to reason, stating that there is no base in the anonymous message and that "Si esa calumnia fuese verdad, ateo como soy, falto de los consuelos religiosos, naufrago en la vida... En estas ocasiones... el hombre lo pase mal", but ultimately makes his decision on what he should do based on what another character of his social group tells him (38). It is this first interaction with another character in the play that seals his fate as Don Friolera looks to his peers and not inside himself for what he should ultimately do about the fear created by the private accusation made against his wife. What would a peer do? The peer would kill the wife and *then* transfer. And so the play begins.

A previously happy, rational, self-identified atheist Spaniard whose past has made him known as a man of integrity falls prey to an irrational logic and fear produced by a southern Spanish culture saturated with foreign “other” beliefs popularly accepted as being rooted in Judaic and African literatures and cultures (if there is even a separation of the Judaic and the African here) that descend upon him in the environment, “infect” his mind, and ultimately cause the Spaniard to cuckold or “horn” himself with very little direct interaction with other characters.

It is worthy to note that Don Friolera’s understanding of the Honor Code and what was normal in reality in cases of adultery or supposed

adultery is false. As previously stated in this dissertation, the death penalty as sentence for adultery for women or men was always extremely rare in Spain. The Honor Code went hand in hand with the Christian belief of forgiveness and mercy. Few men sought their wives' deaths for adultery or supposed adultery. Being that the Honor Code also intrinsically included a belief in the Catholic understanding of God, a self-proclaimed atheist like Don Friolera would have not been subject to it anyway. As quoted earlier, he first musings of the play include the phrases: "Si esa calumnia fuese verdad, ateo como soy, falto de los consuelos religiosos..."(38). The fact that he is concerned with it, like Juan José of the previous chapter, either highlights his imperfect learning of the concept or functions in this play as an example of how deep rooted and far-reaching the "disease" of Judaic influence in Iberian culture had spread. Don Friolera states himself that his decision ultimately will be made by consulting his peers since he has no religious authority or belief with which to consult and being that the Spanish state is "tainted" in *El Esperpento de Los Cuernos de Don Friolera*, he is met with "tainted" advice and a set of horns.

In this first scene too, Don Friolera is not only shown to be confused with what is barbarous but also consciously aware of the lack of a supposed, unique European quality in popular Spain. He is, thus, also forced into a corner in this scene by the "tainted" culture. Before the end of the scene, Friolera states that he would continue his rational

thought except that he doesn't have the "derecho de filosofar como en Francia" (38).

Friolera is also a military man. In Scene Eight in the play the military is represented as having a pride in African descent which accounts for their viciousness. The sentiment is yet another attack on the presence of the "other" and miscegenation in Spain by making her military leaders ridiculous barbarians who cannot understand the likes of the French but revel in their violence and "impurity". Being a military man in Spain, then, does not coincide with being a "pure" European man of thought or as having a rational mindset.

The rest of the play shows the audience a wife who is eventually turned from her husband by his suspicions and unfounded accusations, Don Friolera's loss of friends and how his confronting of the characters that have supposedly ruined his marital bliss with their insinuations and improper behavior has fanned the flames of gossip even more. His loss of honor in public is eventually subject to a secret, court martial hearing and a military confrontation with Don Friolera that ends with him being congratulated for not retiring and choosing to murder his wife.

In these same scenes spanning 2 to 11, Spain will be described in the worst of lights. She is "atrasado" and with an "oscurantismo" in Scene Seven for the lack of divorce and lack of philosophy, and proud of "impurity" in Scene Eight (as noted previously). As for Don Friolera, he ends mistakenly killing his daughter Manolita, the so-called angel, while

attempting to murder his wife. In the end, on at least an allegorical level, his Judaized “infection” causes him to kill innocent Christian Spain.

The story of Don Friolera is a story of a Spanish man’s descent into madness and hell. He is stripped of his European qualities and “pure” nobility and falls into a barbarity that is birthed from a Spain which here is corroded and deformed due to her “taint”, her inner “disease” the “otherness”. At the end of his story, Don Friolera has not only fallen from grace but also murdered Christianity and the future of Spain at the same time. His story ends in implosion and the Spain depicted here is as obstinate and stagnant in her state of supposed degeneracy as ever.

The Epilogue closes the play and the audience is brought back to the reality of Estrafalarío and Manolito. The scene is held at a jail that was once a monastery in southern Spain. Outside a blind man sings a ballad that is an eerie re-telling of the story of Don Friolera. Such ballads encompassed a great deal of popular Spanish literature (much like the impromptu puppet play of the epilogue praised by Estrafalarío). In it, the wife is a true adulterer; the daughter is used as a pretext to go out and Don Friolera is but a good man who seeks to cleanse his honor. In this re-telling, the daughter is mistakenly killed but then the lovers are beheaded and Don Friolera is promoted and lauded by the royal family. It is this type of popular literature that contains the supposed contagion and are part of the social critique being made in the play. From a jail cell with Manolito, Estrafalarío says that such ballads are a “

vil contagio, que baja de la literature del pueblo” (130). It should be bought only to be burned, as it has nothing in common with the puppet show seen in the Prologue on the borders of Portugal, he says.

El Esperepento de los Cuernos de Don Friolera can fit into many genres. It is a farce, for sure, as well as a critique of the Calderonian theatrical honor and its popular treatment in Spanish theatre; but the purpose or *raison de être* of the play is not just to be a farce. It is to change the attitude and sensibility of the public that watches or reads it. It is to promote one version of Spain over another version of it. A later publication of *Los Cuernos de Don Friolera* in a set of *esperpentos* by the author entitled *Martes de Carnaval*²⁰ (Fat Tuesday or Mardi Gras Day) further communicates this aspect of the play (Osuna 103). That decision by Valle-Inclán further stresses the play’s use of the acts of carnival’s masking and costuming to emphasize the taking on of the horns, the self-cuckolding, being here critiqued as a social contagion.

The direct criticisms of Spanish culture made in the Prologue and Epilogue are rooted in the notions of a “pure” Spain that has been “defiled” by Jewish (and to a lesser extent an African/un-named “other”) cultural influence. The theory purported here is that hegemonic Spanish culture should be more like that of the Northern, more “pure” Spain

²⁰ David Gilmore, in his essay “The Democratization of Ritual; Andalusian Carnival After Franco”, notes that Andalusian Carnival specifically was not only a time “to provoke” but also to critique society (37). *Don Friolera* ends in Andalucía and it is interesting to note that in a tale meant to critique that it uses Mardi Gras festivities described by Gilmore on page 42 of his essay as having themes of politics and public morality to achieve its end.

instead of the “impure”, “tainted” and “infected” culture of Castile and Andalucía. Here, the removing of the contagion would also remove the inability of Spain to be like the rest of Western Europe and would elevate her, allowing her to develop into her best self. Herein lies the literary anti-Semitism of the piece and the didactic meaning that encompasses the play. Mark Gelber writes:

Nevertheless, the ubiquitous, negative images of the Jew, whether essentially mythic or not, are often perceived as examples of real Jews, not only by audiences contemporaneous with the appearance of a specific text, but also by later readers. Thus, a dialectic can be perceived between the gradual growth and acceptance of anti-Semitism as a more or less constant feature of western civilization and the different permutations of negative Jewish images in literature. (3)

Although at the end of the play, it would seem that Estrafalarío speaks only of a bad literature that needs to be removed, a holistic analysis shows that what he is truly alluding to is any presence of the Jew (or in some cases an “other”) in Castile. Like many Western European people of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, this play understands the absolute “purity” of the Western European from supposed flaws that have contaminated their cultures as the solution to

perceived cultural failings or backwardness. The society had to be simply and primarily cleansed from the Judaic. Sheaved in anti-Semitism, Valle-Inclán's creation is innovative only in its form but not in its message. It is but old wine in a shiny, new bottle given to unsuspecting guests at a dinner themed *turn of the century hate*.

Chapter 5 The Means of Masculine Honor in Alfonso Paso's *La Corbata*

The honors that have been given the work of Alfonso Paso over the length of his career are numerous and reoccurring: Premio Carlos Arniches, Premio María Rolland, Premio Nacional de Teatro, Premio de la Crítico de Barcelona, Premio Leopoldo Cano, Premio de Jose Antonio de Periodismo, the Encomienda de Isabel la Católica in 1961 and the Medalla de Trabajo in 1973, to name a few. *La Corbata*, written near the end of the Franco regime in 1963, won the Premio Nacional de Teatro for the 1962-63 season. Often lauded as one of the most prolific contemporary writers of Spain, Alfonso Paso fell out of favor after the Franco Regime due to a connection of his fame with the government but the breadth and influence of his work speak for themselves. In their international proliferation and continued canonical presence, Paso's works describe a Spain in a metamorphosis from dictatorship to its present government of a representative monarchy on various levels. In dealing with many themes and social circumstances, it is most interesting and pertinent to this study to analyze *La Corbata* which has at its center the concept of masculine honor in a contemporary Spain.

Unlike in the previous plays presented here, *La Corbata* handles masculine honor as an organic, holistic process rather than a stagnant code reflectant of a time past. Throughout the play, male and female

characters are shown to participate in the formation and maintenance of masculine and familial honor and both are seen as integral to the essence of the Spanish honor concept. In the end, it is a corrupted society and once again other-directed character types that debase, destroy and are a brutal, mortifying force to the family and the essence of Spanish culture and Weltanschauung.

Although not widely known for being an experimental author, the title of the play makes reference not only to the middle class and the infamous *corbata* or tie that seems to denote them in society—delimiting white collar workers from blue collar workers; but also to the tie as a symbolic noose that incapacitates the middle class making them impotent to the social forces that have bound them with the it (likening it to a noose or a chained collar); and most extraordinarily to the stage itself and theatre as the *corbata* in scenography and stage direction is the space of the stage where the line of fiction and reality meet—it is the area beyond the curtained floor of the set that extends out into the audience. These three allusions of the title highlight Alfonso Paso's critique made in the play as it illumines the ties that bind and crush the middle class while exploring social character in a Mass Society, contemporary Spain.

The play itself happens in two acts of three different settings and three different families. On the stage are three different scenes: the one to the left is a upper class living room setting; the middle houses a middle class salon; the left is a shack-like setting of a very poor person.

Each setting represents the living room or family room of a different family of a different class. The main plot of the play revolves around the out-of-wedlock pregnancies of the daughters of each of the three families representing three different socioeconomic classes. Although at the play's end, each family weds their daughter to the unborn child's father each do so for radically different reasons. In this play, it is the reason—the motive—for marriage that is explored and the family dynamics of the decision rather than the end result of marriage itself or of repercussions from sex and pregnancy outside of marriage.

The focal point of each family in the play is the triad of mother, father and daughter and each of their lives intersect in the common space of business and employment. Although the upper and lower class families have more than one child (the middle class family even including the paralyzed mother of the wife) the main plot of the play revolves around the interaction of the smaller, familial triad.

The upper class family is comprised of Carlos, Eugenia and their daughter Marileo. The characters of the middle class family are Antonio, Mercedes and Esperanza while those of the poor family are Miguel, Luisa and their daughter Nila. Carlos, the upper class husband, is the employer of Antonio and also the owner of a business that was to buy and raze the land where the shack of Miguel, the lower or underclass father, is located.

Most certainly one of the main themes of the play is the inequality

of the classes and the tenuous situation of the middle class who resides on shaky ground theoretically as well as physically in the play (as the home of Antonio and Mercedes literally nearly collapses from the shaking caused by shoddy structure and a nearby train that passes frequently near their apartment). Manipulation and tension caused by economic inequality and the fear of continued or perceived impotence to change socioeconomic status is one of the main forces of the play and a large part of its critique of Spanish society of the time. This theme is interwoven with the exploration of masculine honor in modernity and the decline of social morality and ethics linked to the rise of the other-directed social character type.

The Honor-less Male in *La Corbata*

As noted earlier, Alfonso Paso was most noted for being an author who portrayed “realistic scenes” in his critiques of society (Sublette ix). Often using various techniques, it was the realistic nature of his pieces that most unifies his work. In *La Corbata* the realism he was most known for represents the concept of masculine honor in Spain in a manner much different from the oft-stereotyped vision of bloody wife murders and homicide by a close-minded, fanatical, self-absorbed Castilian man who seemed overly concerned with public prestige. What is presented in this play is a reality-based honor code instead of the aberration usually portrayed on the stage in honor plays.

La Corbata opens with the introduction of Carlos' family life. Two couples in an upper class sit and interact. The couples are affectionate and everyone seems to get along quite well. It is not until later that it is revealed that the couples are comprised of a married man, his wife and their respective lovers. What started out as a classic portrayal of perfection in the uppermost classes turns tawdry and immoral. This is the introduction of Carlos.

As the play progresses, his duplicity, greed, overt concern for public opinion and near-pure utilitarian view of the majority of his personal life are clearly the crux of his life decision-making processes. Any concern for what seems to be honor is nothing more than the avoidance of public mockery understood as a threat for his business expansion and public status. He wants to *seem* a certain way to be able to enjoy his lifestyle to the fullest. Honor does not enter here, yet after the characterizing opening scene of his duplicitous lifestyle, Carlos reacts to his daughter's pregnancy, saying:

Eres una zangolotina imbécil y su trovador un niño
 bobo que si no fuera por mi dinero tendría que
 aceptar un puesto de tres mil pesetas en cualquier
 sitio. Se empieza saliendo con los muchachos en coche
 y volviendo tarde. Se termina teniendo que casarse de
 prisa y corriendo. ¡Déjame hablar! No sé quien
 empezó la desmoralización de esta casa ni como

ocurrió. Lo único que sé es que ni tu ni tu madre me estorbáis un solo propósito. No vais a hundirme mi carrera, hagáis las estupideces que hagáis...Supongo que me desprecias, pero muchísimo menos de lo que yo te desprecio a ti. (Paso 14-15)

Carlos, the upper class male character, has the façade of honor about him but he is not actually employing the honor code in his decision-making process nor as any guide in his life. One of the first characters to be introduced in the play, Carlos's family life is used as a juxtaposition to his professed confusion and anger to his daughter's unplanned, out-of-wedlock pregnancy. Displaying a concept of masculine honor more in line with the modern mockery of it in the West, honor in the familial scenes of Carlos is a part of a charade carried out on the stage of life. Even his reaction to the supposedly unacceptable behavior of his daughter is ludicrous in light of the information of his own comportment in his personal and business life.

What is also to be noted is his obvious characterization as an other-directed character type. Traditional ideals and values are not the basis of Carlos' decision-making process in the play. His motives are to protect social prestige and thus his career and his business. The concern for the reputation he holds with others is of the utmost concern for him and thus he is ruled by the judgment of his peers or what he feels his peers will think is acceptable and nothing more. He calculates

the public's future responses as well as how his family should behave and respond in the face of the predicament based solely upon his desire to please his peers and retain a certain amount of acceptance within his class.

In speaking to his wife and daughter about the wedding he says:

Carlos: Echar tierra al asunto. Que no se comente mucho cómo va ésta boda. Mucho canapé, mucho whiskey el día del la boda y la mejor sociedad allí....

Tenéis carta Blanca para el dinero...[to his daughter,

Marileo] Mientras comáis de lo que yo gano, como mis empleados. ¡Aquí! Procura no contarle a nadie nada.

Y tú, Eugenia, vete aprendiendo eso deque para ser sietemesino ha nacido muy gordito.

Eugenia: Nadie se lo va a creer.

Carlos: Ya lo sé. Pero piensan que intentamos engañarlos, con eso se tranquilizan. ¡Y no hay escándalo!

¿Comprendes? Es... otro pacto. (Paso 15)

One part of hegemonic masculine honor is most definitely reputation, but it is the reputation gained from acting in an honorable manner—in line with God and the state. Here, it is evident from Carlos' reaction that the motive for the wedding is not to rectify as much as possible how the daughter has erred because of her lack of concern for aligning her actions with that of traditional, Godly behavior but rather for

the sake of Carlos' career and public persona. Never does Carlos refer to himself as being an honorable man nor imply that anyone else does so; yet his concern for the situation superficially falls into the realm of a masculine honor issue. His actions are those of an other-directed character-type who seeks to protect purely himself from potential economic and social harm— making his actions contrary to the honor code. It is just not something that is “done”, so to speak, and so he seeks to rectify as much as possible the breaking of this social violation.

Following the reasoning of Carlos is the father of the lower class family Miguel. In the consideration of the honor code and being a man of honor in the society, Miguel does not conform its the ideals and practices. He is highly conversionable and in the end uses this aspect of his other-directed character type to deceive his fellow socioeconomic class members in an effort to further his personal aspirations of higher status in the community. His reaction to his daughter's out-of-wedlock pregnancy has nothing to do with religious sentiment and in fact expresses a complete lack of concern with traditional Catholic religiosity. His is a reaction married to economic concerns first and thus follows suit with Carlos' reaction of making first and foremost utilitarian the other members of his family as well as the Catholically sacred union of marriage.

The introduction of Miguel in the play shows him lying in his hovel on a mattress from which his wife would like him to move. His slovenly

and slothful state is described as a normal feature of the family life. He refuses to work and finds most jobs available to him at his skill level to be beneath him but still desires and demands to be a person of status in the community. In stating this, Miguel does not, then, provide for his family. His family—comprised of his daughter and wife—provide for him.

Upon learning of the pregnancy of his daughter and the intent of her boyfriend to marry her, his initial concern (unlike that of his wife Luisa) is of an economic nature. His daughter provides an income for the family and thus she cannot be lost. He states:

Miguel: Eso de que Dios mande casarse con una cura por medio no lo tengo asimilado. De modo que cállate. ¿Tú qué quieres?

Esteban: Casarme.

Miguel: La chica gana dos mil pesetas en Boetticher. Y aquí se necesitan. ¿Tú qué ganas?

Esteban: Dos mil.

Miguel: Vente aquí y no se hable más. Juntamos los sueldos de todos y donde comen tres comen cuatro.

Esteban: Está mi madre.

Miguel: ¿Gana algo?

Esteban: Tiene una pensión de mi padre. Quinientas.

Miguel: ¿Come mucho?

Esteban: No.

Miguel: Pues que venga. Y no me vengas con historias. Yo a ésta la perdí en una excursión a Aranjuez. Según ella era el viento y el murmullo del agua. Según yo las ganas. Alguna vez tienen que caer. Es lo natural. ¡No pongas esa cara Luisa! No es ninguna tragedia! (Paso 23-24)

Ironically, the treatment of Nila, Miguel's daughter, like so much of a work mule or cash cow—property owned and thus mandated to be retained or compensated for—would usually fall into the realm of critiques of masculine honor. Here, it exists within the fictional reality of a character that does not fit the hegemonic norm of masculine honor.

The subtle dehumanization of his daughter, her boyfriend and their unborn child is reminiscent of the more overt dehumanization of female members of the family of Carlos. By converting the situation from one which revolves around morality (or the lack thereof) to one whose nucleus is family economics, the action of accepting marriage as a resolution to the problem is changed as its motive is not the retention or amplification of masculine or familial honor but rather the boosting or maintaining of a certain economic level and monetary flow in the Miguel household. The two will marry and they will be married by a priest but it is not because Miguel feels that his honor is tarnished but rather because he thinks it be the better economic decision for his personal well-being.

Both families, that of Carlos as well as that of Miguel, are indeed

subject to a powerful patriarchy that oppresses and objectifies the female members of the family, placing their human value in the family as nothing more than utilitarian, economic pieces. Their chance existence is to add capitalistic value to the male head of household—to Carlos and to Miguel—and nothing more. Any action by the women that deviate from that role is seen as a potential attack and causes their further debasement.

In the case of Marileo and her mother Eugenia, as seen in the above quote, verbal and emotional abuse accompanies deviation from their prescribed roles. Carlos reminds them that they are—when not in his good graces—to behave like one of his employees and are in fact like his employees. The entire family is a farce played for the public to further the personal, professional goals of Carlos. Hatred and enmity underlie the cool reactions of Carlos to his wife and daughter. Both are seen as kinds of liabilities and money pits. Carlos describes his wife Eugenia, whose name means ‘well-born’ or ‘well formed’, to his mistress as being like a goat of whom she should have no fear and never be jealous (Paso 7).

The mental abuse that is seen in the family scenes of Carlos is portrayed in a comedic manner but is evident, dangerous and real. Carlos reigns in each scene like an obscene king of modern progress and duplicity over the merely tolerated, female characters. Usually attributed to the masculine honor, Carlos’ attitude in the realistic drama of Alfonso

Paso surfaces in a character devoid of traditional morality connected with Catholicism and lacking the even the premises of being an honorable Castilian man.

The physical violence usually connected with the Spanish honor code surfaces in Miguel's household. Miguel, completely free from honor code restrictions in his decision-making processes, employs the same kind of systematic dehumanization of the female members of his family as Carlos but here it is accentuated by physical violence (actual or the threat of it). He admires the fear instilled in others by Fidel Castro, saying to his wife:

“<<Fidel astro cambia fascistas por aspirinas.>> ¡Eso es situación, luisa! Eso sí que los tiene a todos temblando.Ese dice no y se mueren de miedo unos cuantos. ¡Cómo tiene que ser! ¡Cómo tiene que ser!” (Paso 27)

Later, Antonio is fearful of entering the house of Miguel, saying to Carlos that “me va a matar” to which Carlos replies “A usted no le mata nadie. Usted tiene que morir en el mostrador” (Paso 81). In effect, Carlos intends for the death of Antonio indirectly at his own hands—not the literal hands of Miguel.

Although completely encapsulated in situations of hypocrisy, ridiculousness, tongue-in-cheek dialogue (and often buffoonery in the case of Miguel) that most definitely cause laughter, there is a serious critique being made of the other-directed character type in general and

the male other-directed type specifically here. All is not said in jest and the scenes, for all of their hilarity, derive their light-hearted feel from creating a distance from which the audience may gaze into and analyze the apparent contradictions, social deviances, and multiple levels of violence without becoming themselves part of the problem presented. This line is crossed and the tone of the play changes at *la corbata*, the thin, invisible line that separates the audience from the actors, the titular name and focus of the play and the defining uniform of the middle class man who straddles those existences.

The Process of Masculine Honor

The most dramatic and striking scene in *La Corbata* is that in which the characters of the middle class break the invisible barrier between fiction and reality. Crossing the stage's *corbata*, Antonio and Mercedes seem to call out to the audience itself pleading for a change in their fate and mercy in the case of the inexistence of the life-changing lottery ticket. It is the public that becomes the tellers and the various lower level lottery office workers. It is their story that Antonio and Mercedes respond to and to whom their send up their prayers in response to hearing about the same family problems they face daily. The story of Mercedes and Antonio becomes the story of the middle class in Spain.

As noted earlier, since the advent of Los Reyes Católicos, the

concept of masculine honor in Spain was defined to be something which could only truly be held by a man of Catholic faith (possibly one could extend to include Christian in general) who sought to align his actions and beliefs, his motives and course taken, with God as well as with the state in its highest form. A man who did not have those religious beliefs could not truthfully be a representative of one bound by and living a life ruled by any socially recognized honor code. Here, for the first time in this study, a character is found that does indeed meet the basic requirements for employing the masculine honor code. Antonio is not only a man of professed faith but also a male character that shows through action in the play that he included his beliefs and faith in a great majority of his life decisions. It is right to say that he employs the honor code in his decision-making process and that this play be included in the long history of Spanish honor plays.

At the introduction of the middle class family, it is apparent that religion and belief in God as members of Catholicism is an integral part of the life of Antonio and Mercedes. Mercedes is described as always praying for her family and even saying the most common prayer of Catholics—the Saint Anthony prayer—to find things misplaced. The couple is also seen praying together at one point. Although temporarily Antonio is frustrated by misfortune, he never abandons his faith. This aspect of characterization is extremely important for Antonio's character, as he is to embody not only the Castilian man but more specifically the

Castilian man of honor in this play.

Like the other families presented in the play, Antonio's daughter Esperanza is also pregnant out-of-wedlock. Paralleling his middle socioeconomic status, the reaction of Antonio's is also in the middle—containing the anger of Carlos as well as the indignation of Miguel (although in the case of Miguel the indignation derives from losing his 'castle' and of having inadequate housing rather than from an undeniably de-flowered daughter). Antonio's reaction lies in the middle of the two other-directed men on its face but is actually *completely* different because of the Weltanschauung from which it sprang. Antonio has an inner-directed social character, so although the fate of his daughter will appear to be the same as that of the other daughters (i.e., she will be married to the child's father and they will leave with the father of the bride) the process undergone to arrive at this conclusion has a different reasoning and thus produces—in effect—a different outcome personally as well as socially for the characters and their family.

Upon hearing that his daughter is pregnant, Antonio's first reaction is to yell that his daughter be thrown out of the house. Here, the women's voices have validity in the Antonio's decision making process under the modern, masculine honor code which he was bound to from childhood and which he has never rejected. His daughter pleads and his wife, Mercedes, tells him immediately that he will repent the action for the rest of his life. It is a mistake. Unlike in the other households

where the voices of the women are immediately silenced and their opinions are removed from any involvement in the final decision made by the male heads of the households, in the family of Antonio, Mercedes not only counts but is an important part of the process.

In response to Mercedes' comment of a future filled with regret over the rash decision to throw their daughter out on the streets, Antonio reinforces the family unit holistically as a *group* working towards a goal as he verbalizes his stream of consciousness. He asks:

¿De qué ha servido todo lo que te enseñamos aquí?

Di. ¿De qué ha valido que yo trabaje tanto y tu

madre haya estado esclava de todos vosotros? ¿De dónde

has sacado ese ejemplo? Déjame Mercedes. Si le hago un

favor echándola, porque su hermano la va a matar. ¿Tú

te das cuenta de lo que has hecho? ¿Te das cuenta de que

eso es una tragedia? Di. (Paso 45)

Unlike in the Carlos and Miguel households, here Antonio creates a picture of a unit working towards a goal and each member having its responsibilities to the body of the family. His family does not work *for* him but rather the parents work and sacrifice for the betterment of the whole—financially, morally, ethically and spiritually. Mercedes is also not cut out of the process as the other wives are (routinely being dehumanized and told to shut up, sometimes even being threatened). Her voice functions as a reminder of mercy and a voice of reason. It is an

agent for a family discussion about what should be done and why.

Esperanza, although not of the parental unit, is an important person in the family as she is their future and their goal was to ensure hers. The reality of the changing attitudes and times is apparent. It is obvious that Carlos' attitude towards premarital sex is not the most popular outlook in his society at the time. His extreme offense is portrayed as borderline hilarious and outdated, but not invalid nor irrelevant; it appears to be in need of subtle change rather than abolishment. In the dialogue with Esperanza, it is that subtle change that is sought after rather than the complete abolishment of her father's masculine honor code and possibly their morality with it. This path of evolution of the honor code through dialogue is extended to Esperanza's boyfriend who also enters the scene as a future family member and thus able to participate in the process of honor code application to the situation.

As Antonio stands firm on his foundational beliefs in the exchange, the window of evolution for masculine honor opens. In being told by Esperanza and Gustavo, his daughter's boyfriend, that women are not so "pure" anymore and are not "weak", Antonio responds:

Es así. ¿No lo comprendes? Tiene que ser así. He vivido siempre pensando que los hijos son una bendición , que Dios provee, que la mujer es pura y débil, que la conciencia no debe venderse. ¿Qué

queréis? ¿Convencerme de la noche a la mañana de que todo eso no es cierto? Di, tú... maldita sea.

¿Quieres convencerme tú de eso? ¿Quieres que me crea que éste no se aprovechó de ti?

Esperanza: No se aprovechó.

Antonio: Entonces tú eres una cualquiera.

Esperanza: Tampoco.

Antonio: No hay salida. O él se aprovechó de ti o tú eres una cualquiera.

Esperanza: no es así.

Mercedes: No le grites a tu padre.

Antonio: ¿Cómo es entonces? ¡Vamos, dilo!

Esperanza: Pues...

Gustavo: (Conmovido) Yo me aprovechó, don Antonio.

Antonio: ¡Ah! ¿Lo ves? Eso sí. Eso lo entiendo. Y se arrepintió del pecado que acababa de cometer....

Gustavo: Sí. Me arrepentí del pecado que acababa de cometer. (Paso 48-9)

In this dialogue it is obvious that Antonio is most certainly an inner-directed character type and that his personal *Weltanschauung* is based upon a foundation that is not completely malleable; but also apparent is that there is *indeed* a vehicle of change *within* that framework. In questioning his daughter in regards to wanting him to change overnight,

the question itself highlights that there is a possibility of adjustment to his foundational views. Being an inner-directed character type, Antonio's reaction is warranted. How *could* he change overnight? Although change is not impossible, it cannot happen for him as it would and does for the other male other-directed social characters of the play. Such a change in Antonio would not be a mere adjustment to a reaction to a situation but rather one of a fundamental world view upon which all other decisions in life are made.

At the end of the conversation, Gustavo, Esperanza's boyfriend, concedes to Antonio and repents in order to mollify what would seem to be an inconsolable relic of a man, but on a much deeper level something else has been discovered—not by Antonio but by Gustavo as the younger representative and the next inheritor of modern, masculine, hegemonic honor. What Esperanza tries to explain to her father and what her father finds abhorrent spring from two different types of social customs and thus the dialogue was about two different concepts.

Antonio's horror is at the violation of a moral code mandating a certain behavior as being 'good'. That behavior was the chastity of women and sexual relations being confined to marriage. Breaking of that morality would turn one into a whore or a loose woman. Esperanza and Gustavo's initial plea, on the other hand, is to try to enlighten Antonio on the mores of the time. Morals and mores, although related, are different. Morals refer to eternal principles—to what is either deemed right or

wrong—whereas mores refer to what is customary and thus current, common practice in the population (Wheelis 94). Although mores may in time turn into morals or become part of the overarching morality of a society, they are not usually immediately absorbed. Mores tend towards “the secular, and temporary and relative” while morals towards “transcendent and permanent and absolute” (Wheelis 95).

Antonio’s reaction is one that arises from an affront to his morality. The origin point of his argument comes from the standpoint of a still current morality. Esperanza and Gustavo start their retorts from the place of mores. Being such stated, the conflict would have never been able to find resolution if not for the cognizance of Gustavo that they were really talking about two different things. And so, Gustavo concedes, in my point of view, not because he wants to simply abate the anger of his future father-in-law but rather because he becomes aware that Antonio’s (and as we shall see later his own) morality was affronted. Whether or not to include the mores of the present time of the play somehow into that morality is another issue to be dealt with separately.

This reading is further bolstered by Gustavo’s later monologue. After Antonio explains the pain he feels and the love he has for his family and daughter, Gustavo’s reflection shows the complete opposite of disdain for the main protagonist of the play. He reveals to Antonio his thoughts, saying:

...la ciudad. Nunca me ha parecida tan lejos. Y

pensaba que allí hay hombres que aceptan que su mujer les engañe y hasta guían el coche que el amante ha comprado. Y allí hay miles de muchachas que se quitan los niños como usted se quita la ceniza del traje. Y al otro lados hay ricos repugnantes que cuando les dice usted la palabra <<honor>> contestan riendo: <<eso me suena.>> Y pobres que venden hasta la hija que va a nacer por dos mil pesetas. Y en fin, don Antonio, pensaba yo, no sé de qué manera, todos esos cuentan más que usted y que yo. No sé por quién pero están protegidos. Hoy ha dicho usted aquí unas palabras que hacía tiempo no escuchaba. Creo que se las oí a mis padres hace tiempo. <<Los abuelos están aquí.>> <<Esa niña se ha perdido.>> << La tragedia más grande que le puede ocurrir a un hombre es que le engañe a su mujer.>> Suenan... ¿Sabe a qué? Como a falso, como a mentira. Parece como si estuviésemos una clase de hombres, solo una clase, en un callejón, tirando de una cuerda formada por todas esas ideas. Como si gritáramos y una buena manada de cerdos a uno y otro del callejón no quisieran escucharnos. Viejas ideas. Pero siempre—no sé por qué—las tuvieron los hombres buenos. (Sonríe)... Si

encuentro a alguien que le interesen esas ideas le mandaré aquí a que le escuche a usted. A lo mejor estamos en un pozo. Somos la asquerosa clase media metida en su callejoncito con su cuerda de ideas, de frenos, de martirios. Pero lo mejor de mi país ha discurrido siempre por el callejoncito ese. (Paso 51)

Somehow, Antonio is correct. Somehow the base of the society is still moored to the inner-directed tradition and hegemonic, masculine honor makes sense even when current mores contradict and sometimes attack that morality in which they exist. At the end of his monologue, as Antonio leaves the apartment, one gets the feeling that a new familial relationship has been formed. A new avenue for dialogue and survival of masculine honor has been widened, extending into younger generations who will hold the staff of “hombres buenos” in Spanish society.

Here, the process of applying the masculine honor code to situations is not a completely male-dominated action. It is not theatrical in the sense of dramatic, rash and vengeful pronouncements. Masculine honor is stressed as also family honor and being such the women in the family unit have as much say in creating and maintaining that honor as they would in potentially marring it by some dishonorable deed. Each member—male and female—have their role to fill and each also has their own personal stake in retaining something that “todas las indemnizaciones del mundo no pueden pagar” (47).

Near the end of the play, after Mercedes and Antonio plead seemingly to the public for help in recovering a ticket that was never bought, Mercedes begs for her husband's job at the feet of Carlos—a man whom her husband has told has no honor, is useless, faithless, and an incurable druggie who crushes and beats the soul of Spain using the clueless poor and politicians as the torturous whips and chains to do so. She goes to the house not only to help her husband who could never bring himself to face the humiliation that would await him but also to help her family and to continue to fulfill her role in the family unit. Because of her speedy action, Antonio is given employment again and their lives go on—a slightly harder lot than before, but it does go on.

As was found in the other plays included in this study, as a positive representative of the Castilian man Antonio embodies the inner-directed character type. No normal human being is completely unconcerned with how other members of society perceive him. Even sociopaths are concerned with their public persona, usually using a positive façade to mask their anti-social behavior. It is not that Antonio's character has no interest at all in public perception of his daughter's pregnancy nor that he does not think that it has an ill effect on him. He most certainly is but it is his *reasoning* that is different from the other male head of household characters that differentiates him and the *origin* of the reasoning that he employs. Antonio, in contrast to the other male characters, has a belief system which he uses to make all his decisions.

The teachings and morality of his upbringing are not swayed from in his decision-making process.

From his understanding of gender roles, faith and morality given to him as a child, Antonio makes his judgments and finds meaning in the world. Even in the small path of change available to him, Antonio notes that it is not something that would happen over night and thus an explanation must be found that fits his reality. In the application of the honor code in his life, it is evident that far from being an isolated experience, the masculine honor code and hegemonic masculinity under it is part of a holistic framework that includes, is shaped and interacts with family members—male and female alike. Masculinity, here, is shown to be a counterpart to femininity in that it is balanced as well as informed by it. Unchecked masculine force in the households is found in the upper and lower classes in the play—places where masculine honor concepts are not employed. It is in those situations that one finds the abuse of family members, dehumanization, as well as the utter lack of the family unit being an integrated whole. For all of its irony, it is the traditional middle class where one finds the modern family—apparently, something which is not modern at all.

An often used quote regarding Alfonso Paso's plays and his success near the end of the Franco regime gives two options for entertainment: “¿Qué prefieres esta noche, cine o Alfonso Paso?” (Mingote). His dominance during the era, the sheer number of works he

produced and the number of awards attests to his proliferation as well as popularity. His audience was the same middle class slowly being shaken and squeezed to death in his play—a class that ultimately can only reach out in impotence to one another, finding resolution in being resolute to survive with their traditions though the answer to their pleas be nothing but deafening silence.

Conclusion

Masculine honor and the honor code in the late 19th and 20th century Spain is not much changed from its first Castilian manifestation under Los Reyes Católicos. Castilian, masculine honor in the 20th century was delimited by personal, religious belief and governed by behaving in a manner (inwardly as well as outwardly) that would align the laws of state and God in citizens during this era. As a peninsular Europeanization encroached upon Spain the fate of masculine honor in Spanish culture seemed doomed as inauthentic to European civilization. This dissertation's aim was to discuss the trajectory of modern, masculine honor as presented in theatre in the late 19th and 20th century Spanish drama. Taking into account the major change in social character that transforms modern man in the West, the path of honor has been explored.

Unlike what popular culture would have one to believe, the concept of honor and the honor code did not start with Judaic influence in Iberia. Although Iberia has been shown to have a long and profound Semitic history until the 1492 expulsion, the roots of masculine honor in Castile is the same as it is for every other human civilization. Far from being an imported cultural element, various levels and forms of personal honor have been shown to be part of all cultures and seem to be developments from this more basic sense of personal honor in humanity. Honor codes

and the high value of masculine or familial honor have been traced back to some of the oldest human civilizations—predating Mosaic Law and its influence in Europe. To this end, one could assume with a great amount of surety that whomever the indigenous Iberians were, they probably too had their own, very similar honor codes.

In the understanding of what exactly constitutes a man of honor in Spain—not being Jewish or Muslim, having belief in God as a Catholic and aligning his actions with that of God and the state—it has been clarified not only what is in reality the honor code (versus its representation in theatre), but more importantly how that reality was changed for the purposes of the stage in either the promotion of honor or the call to eradicate it.

Added to the complexity of the discussion is the changing modern world and the change in social character that has derived from it. The West's metamorphosis of modernity brought with it a change in social character. The society became a Mass Society and the social character of its populations changed from being primarily inner-directed to heavily populated and perhaps ruled by the other-directed (albeit slower in Spain). The other-directed social character has never been a prized type in the West and only in modernization has risen to be a viable type at all. Still, the hegemonic preference for much of the late 19th and 20th centuries in Castile has been for the inner-directed character type. There is no class or political concern that bounds this social character; rather,

it is one that is moored in values used to make decisions instead of the sheep-like, shifting sands mentality of the other-directed social character. In all plays, each hero or new archetype was always of an inner-directed social character (following the expected pattern) while their nemeses were other-directed in nature.

Two of the plays analyzed here have been shown to be erroneously categorized as honor plays. Both Joaquín Dicenta's *Juan José* and Valle-Inclán's *El Esperpento de los Cuernos de Don Friolera* are canonized as honor-plays when they are in fact they are not. These two plays are great examples of how other social concerns have been masqueraded under the guise of masculine honor, using masculine honor and the honor code either positively or negatively to bolster their true argument.

Joaquín Dicenta's *Juan José* was often described as Spain's first socialist play as well as a modern, egalitarian depiction of the honor play. Here, we have seen that none of the statements repeated so often since its first publication hold firm. As a socialist play, it lacks the basic requirements of self-awareness or consciousness of the protagonist. As an honor-play it lacks any honorable characters; Juan José, the titular protagonist, cannot be said to be a man of honor. He is an atheist, abusive, generally violent, alcoholic man who employs the honor code as a very effective screen for his run-of-the-mill "wife-beater" status. Far from being a play about honor or socialist concerns, it seems to be a play that glorifies the most extreme form of intimate partner abuse—that

which leads to homicide—in that it glorifies the murderer Juan José, making him a defenseless, inner-directed hero in a cruel world when in fact he is the most cruel force in his fictive universe. Masculine honor here is employed but incorrectly and thus adds to the popular belief that hegemonic masculinity would only be hurt by this supposedly barbaric and backward concept.

In Valle-Inclán's *El Esperpento de Los Cuernos de Don Friolera* the heroes lie in the frame of the play—the epilogue and prologue—and not the main body of the play itself. Once again, the protagonist does not fit the role of Castilian man of honor as he is an atheist. Additionally, he is also of an other-directed social character. His personal denouncement into hellish circumstances is to be a parody of the fall of the Castilian man who shrugs off his “true”, authentic self embodied in Estrafalario and Manolito—both inner-directed social characters who guide the thinking and the morality of the play. Rooted in blatant anti-Semitic beliefs about the roots of honor as well as Jewish people in general, honor in Valle-Inclán's play is only a symptom of an ailing Spain that needs to rid itself of the “other” in order to attain a mythic, yet unrealized, authentic European self.

The only play analyzed here that actually is an honor play and discusses modern honor in Spain is Alfonso Paso's *La Corbata*. Once again, one finds the protagonist to be of an inner-directed social character but also fitting the description of the man of honor in Castile.

He is a Catholic, non-“other” trying to align his thoughts and actions with God as well as the state. His dilemma is his obsolescence on the macrocosmic scale of development in Modern Spain and the lack of worth placed in his existence. It is here that the dialogue is found. The play is not lacking in other complexities of socialism, classism, foreign influence and the like but the main focus is on what is a “real” man in Modern Spain. Largely ignored after the death of Franco and the removal of his regime, Paso’s work broaches the topic by showing that masculine honor and honor codes are not about ends but rather about means. It is about the process and the reasons for decisions and not necessarily that—as in this case—everyone gets married in the end. The legacy that the man of honor holds as the heart of the archetypal, Spanish man is fortified somehow but his fate seems as perilous as the shaken apartment from which the middle class scenes take place except that it is there and only there where human dignity is found and humanity embraced. It is there where family is truly holistic and works together to hold their world together beyond the monstrous forces outside trying to rip them apart every fifteen minutes.

Masculine honor in Spain was once revered. It is from the mental process that one undergoes in practicing an honor code that women were first afforded the right to fight for their own honor in virginity, child support, and marriage; that an obligation to care for family and those less powerful arose and also the acknowledgment that human dignity is

a concept resting in mercy and derived from the belief that all humans are a reflection of a Supreme Being (in this case God as understood in Catholicism). Stripped of its body, masculine honor and the honor code in Spain do indeed become something horrific. They become tools used to stir the passions of the public, to glorify social ills. A pathetic, apathetic, homicidal man becomes a vestige of times past using the mask of a mangled honor to deflect his true self and the social ills and deviance he represents in human nature. A hateful, “purist” literature written in the time of the rise of the Nazis and of widespread anti-Semitism in the West becomes a call of rediscovery of “authentic” self using that same mask of mangled honor to dehumanize the “other’s” presence in society, a virtual monster’s head on a stick to rile the masses to further emotionless eradication. But in its true form, masculine honor does not create the monsters. Its future and evolution in Castilian society partly rests in its capacity to not be dismembered—whether in fiction or non. In its essence, honor is mercy, compassion, weighed adjustment and concern for human dignity—the recently rediscovered (albeit secularized and possibly neutered) crown of Western Modernity. A universal and religious human dignity is where honor has *always* rested and perhaps in future themes of the Spanish stage where it will be found once again: a seemingly eternal signpost of conflict and change in ever-evolving Spain.

Appendix 1

Elements of Society	Traditional Societies	Modern Societies
Values	Homogenic; sacred character; few subcultures and countercultures	Heterogeneous; secular character; many subcultures and countercultures
Time Orientation	Present linked to past	Present linked to future
Norms	High moral significance; little tolerance for diversity	Variable moral significance; high tolerance for diversity
Technology	Preindustrial; human and animal energy	Industrial; advanced energy sources
Status and role	Few statuses, most ascribed; few specialized roles	Many statuses, some ascribed and some achieved; many specialized roles
Relationships	Typically primary; little anonymity and privacy	Typically secondary; considerable anonymity and privacy
Communication	Face to face	Face to face supplemented by mass media
Social Control	Informal gossip	Formal police and legal system
Social stratification	Rigid patterns of social inequality; little mobility	Fluid patterns of social inequality; considerable mobility
Gender Patterns	Pronounced Patriarchy; women's lives centered on the home	Declining patriarchy; increasing number of women in the paid labor force
Economy	Agriculture based; some manufacturing in the home; little white-collar work	Based on industrial mass production; factories become centers of production; increasing white-collar work
State	Small scale government; little state intervention in society	Large-scale government; considerable state intervention in society
Family	Extended family as the primary means of socialization and	Nuclear family retains some socialization functions but is more of

	economic production	a unit of consumption rather than of production
Religion	Guides worldview; little religious pluralism	Religion weakens with the rise of science; extensive religious pluralism
Education	Formal schooling limited to elites	Basic schooling becomes universal, with growing proportion receiving advanced education
Health	High birth and death rates; brief life expectancy because of low standard of living and simple medical technology	Low birth and death rates; longer life expectancy because of higher standard of living and sophisticated medical technology
Settlement pattern	Small scale; population typically small and widely dispersed in rural villages and small towns	Large scale; population typically large and concentrated in cities
Social Change	Slow; change evident over many generations	Rapid; change evident within single generation

Appendix 2

Abusive Relationship Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to help decide if one is living in an abusive situation. There are different forms of abuse. The questions below encompass all types and ask about the partner.

1. Does he continually monitor your time and make you account for every minute?
2. Does he ever accuse you of having affairs with other men or act suspicious that you are?
3. Is he ever rude to your friends?
4. Does he ever discourage you from starting friendships with other men or women?
5. Do you feel isolated and alone, as if there was nobody close to you to confide in?
6. Is he overly critical of daily things, such as your clothes or your appearance?
7. Does he demand a strict account of how you spend money?
8. Do his moods change radically, from very calm to very angry and vice-versa?
9. Is he disturbed by you working/not working or by the thought of you working/not working?
10. Does he become angry more easily if he drinks?

11. Does he pressure you for sex much more often than you'd like?
12. Does he become angry if you don't want to go along with his requests for sex?
13. Do you quarrel much over financial matters?
14. Do you quarrel much about having children or raising them?
15. Does he ever strike you with his hands or feet (slap, punch, kick, etc)?
16. Does he ever strike you with an object?
17. Does he ever threaten to strike you with an object or weapon?
18. Has he ever threatened to kill either himself or you?
19. Does he ever give you visible injuries (such as welts, bruises, cuts, lumps on the head)?
20. Have you ever had to treat any injuries from his violence with first aid?
21. Have you ever had to seek professional aid for an injury at a medical clinic, doctor's office or hospital emergency room?
22. Does he ever hurt you sexually or make you have intercourse against your will?
23. Is he ever violent towards children?
24. Is he ever violent toward other people outside your home and family?

25. Does he ever throw objects or break things when he is angry?
26. Has he ever been in trouble with the police?
27. Have you ever called the police or tried to call them because you felt you or other members of your family were in danger?

Answers to these questions are scored. Scores with a range of 120-94 are considered to describe a Dangerously Abusive situation; 93-97 would be seriously abusive; 36-15 Moderately Abusive; and 14-0 Non-abusive. Questions 1-14 have answer ranges from 0 to 3. Questions 15 through 28 have a range of 0, 4, 5, or 6. The answers possible are frequently (which is the highest number for the answer), sometimes (the second highest); rarely (which is the third highest) and never which holds a numerical value of 0.

Appendix 3
DANGER ASSESSMENT
Jacquelyn C. Campbell, Ph.D., R.N.
Copyright 1985, 1988

Several risk factors have been associated with homicides (murders) of both batterers and battered women in research conducted after the murders have taken place. We cannot predict what will happen in your case, but we would like you to be aware of the danger of homicide in situations of severe battering and for you to see how many of the risk factors apply to your situation.

Using the calendar, please mark the approximate dates during the past year when you were beaten by your husband or partner. Write on that date how bad the incident was according to the following scale:

1. Slapping, pushing; no injuries and/or lasting pain
2. Punching, kicking; bruises, cuts, and/or continuing pain
3. "Beating up"; severe contusions, burns, broken bones
4. Threat to use weapon; head injury, internal injury, permanent injury
5. Use of weapon; wounds from weapon

(If any of the descriptions for the higher number apply, use the higher number.)

Mark Yes or No for each of the following. ("He" refers to your husband, partner, ex-husband, ex-partner, or whoever is currently physically hurting you.)

___ 1. Has the physical violence increased in frequency over the past year?

___ 2. Has the physical violence increased in severity over the past year and/or has a weapon or threat from a weapon ever been used?

___ 3. Does he ever try to choke you?

___ 4. Is there a gun in the house?

___ 5. Has he ever forced you to have sex when you did not wish to do so?

___ 6. Does he use drugs? By drugs, I mean "uppers" or amphetamines, speed, angel dust, cocaine, "crack," street drugs, or mixtures.

___ 7. Does he threaten to kill you and/or do you believe he is capable of killing you?

___ 8. Is he drunk every day or almost every day? (In terms of quantity of alcohol.)

___ 9. Does he control most or all of your daily activities? For instance: does he tell you who you can be friends with, how much money you can take with you shopping, or when you can take the car? (If he tries, but you do not let him, check here: ___)

___ 10. Have you ever been beaten by him while you were pregnant? (If you have never been pregnant by him, check here: ___)

___ 11. Is he violently and constantly jealous of you? (For instance, does he say "If I can't have you, no one can.")

___ 12. Have you ever threatened or tried to commit suicide?

___ 13. Has he ever threatened or tried to commit suicide?

___ 14. Is he violent toward your children?

___ 15. Is he violent outside of the home?

___ Total "Yes" Answers

Thank you. Please talk to your nurse, advocate, or counselor about what the danger assessment means in terms of your situation.

Bibliography

- Baron, Salo W. "Changing Patterns of Antisemitism: A Survey." *Jewish Social Studies*. 38.1 (1976): 5-38.
- Berlin, Adele and Marc Zvi. Brettler and Michael Fishbane Ed. *The Jewish Study Bible: Jewish Publication Society Tanakh Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Print.
- Besserman, Lawrence. "Ideology, Antisemitism and Chaucer's *Prioress's Tale*." *The Chaucer Review*. 36.1 (2001): 48-72.
- Beusterien, John. "Lope de Vega's Auto Sacramental de la Circuncisión y Sangría de Cristo: A Focal Point of Anti-Semitism in Seventeenth Century Spain." *Hispanic Review*. 72.3 (2004): 357-374.
- Bowman, James. *Honor: a History*. New York: Encounter Books, 2006.
- Brustein, William I. and Ryan D. King. "Anti-Semitism in Europe Before the Holocaust." *International Political Science Review*. 25.1 (2004): 35- 53.
- Calderón, de B. P, and Briones A. Valbuena. *Dramas De Honor*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1967. Print.
- . *Dramas De Honor: 2*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1956. Print.
- Campbell, Jacquelyn C.. *Assessing Dangerousness: Violence by Sexual Offenders, Batterers, and Child Abusers*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1995.

- Campbell, Jacquelyn C. , Phyllis W. Sharps, and Nancy Glass, “Risk Assessment for Intimate Partner Violence,” in *Clinical Assessment of Dangerousness: Empirical Contributions*, ed. Georges-Franck Pinard and Linda Pagani, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000: 136–157.
- Carroll, David. “Poetics and the Ideology of Race: Style and Anti-Semitic Representations in Céline’s Pamphlets.” *Poetics Today*. 16.2 (1995): 253-281.
- Carroll, James. *Constantine’s Sword: The Church and the Jews*. New York: First Mariner Books, , 2002. Print.
- Cervantes, Miguel. Trans. by John Rutherford. *Don Quixote*. New York: Penguin Books, 2001.
- Dicenta, Joaquín, and Ferrer J. Mas. *Juan José*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1982. Print.
- DeKeseredy, Walters S. and Martin D. Schwartz. “Theoretical and Definitional Issues in Violence Against Women.” *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women*. Ed. Claire M. Renzetti, Jeffrey L. Edelson, and Raquel Kennedy- Bergen. Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 2011. 3-22.
- Durkheim, Emile. “Anti-Semitism and Social Crisis (1899).” Trans. Chad Alan Goldberg. *Sociological Theory*. 26.4 (2008): 321- 323.

- Florencio, Rafael Núñez. "El Enemigo Imaginario." Rev. of *El Antisemitismo en España: La Imagen del Judío (1812-2002)*, by Gonzalo Chillida. *Revista de Libros*. 85 (2004): 7-8.
- Frederick, Julia C. "A Blood Test Before Marriage: 'Limpieza de Sangre' in Spanish Louisiana." *Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Association*. 43.1 (2002):75-85.
- Gelber, Mark H. "What is Literary Antisemitism?" *Jewish Social Studies*. 47.1 (1985): 1-20.
- Gies, David Thatcher. *The Theatre in Nineteenth-Century Spain*. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Goldberg, Chad Allen and Emile Durkheim. "Introduction to Emile Durkheim's anti-Semitism and Social Crisis." *Sociological Theory*. 26.4 (2008):299-323.
- Goldstein, Matthew A. "The Biological Roots of Heat-of-Passion crimes and Honor Killings." *Politics and the Life Sciences* Vol. 21(Sept.2002): 28-37.
- Good, Edwin M. "Capital Punishment and Its Alternatives in Ancient near Eastern Law." *Stanford Law Review*_Vol. 19 No.5 (May 1967: 947- 977).
- Gossman, Lionel. "Philhellenism and Antisemitism: Matthew Arnold and His German Models." *Comparative Literature*. 46.1 (1994): 1-39.

- Hall, H. B. "Joaquin Dicenta and the Drama of Social Criticism".
Hispanic Review, Vol. 20, No 1. (Jan , 1952), pp. 44-66.
- Hattery, Angela. *Intimate Partner Violence*. Lanham, Md: Rowman &
 Littlefield Publishers, 2009. Print.
- Kelman, Herbert C. "The Conditions, Criteria and Dialectics of
 Human Dignity: A Transnational Perspective." *International
 Studies Quarterly*. 21.3 (1977): 529-552.
- Kiernan, V.G. Rev. of *Carlism and Crisis in Spain 1931-1939*, by
 Martin Blinkhorn. *Historical Review*. 92.362 (1977):166-170.
- Macionis, John. *Society: the Basics*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1992.
- Marissen, Michael. "Rejoicing against Judaism in Handel's *Messiah*."
The Journal of Musicology. 24.2 (2007): 167-194.
- McGrath, Leticia. *Joaquin Dicenta: Spain's Forgotten Dramatist*.
 Newark, Delaware: Juan de la Cuesta –Hispanic Monographs,
 2004.
- Meyer, Susan. "Antisemitism and Social Critique in Dicken's
 'OliverTwist'." *Victorian Literature and Culture*. 33.1 (2005): 239-
 252.
- Mignolo, Walter D. Afterward. *Rereading the Black Legend: the
 Discourses of Religious and Racial Difference in the
 Renaissance Empires*. Ed. Margaret Greer, Walter D. Mignolo,

and Maureen Quilligan. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 2007. 312- 324. Print.

Mirrer, Louise. *Women, Jews, and Muslims in the Texts of Reconquest Castile*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1996.

Northup, G.T. "Cervantes' Attitude toward Honor". *Modern Philology* Vol. 21 :4 (1924): 397-421.

Nirenberg, David. "Race and the Middle Ages: The Case of Spain and Its Jews." *Rereading the Black Legend: the Discourses of Religious and Racial Difference in the Renaissance Empires*. Ed. Margaret Greer, Walter D. Mignolo, and Maureen Quilligan. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 2007. 71-87. Print.

Osuna, Rafael. "La Figura Humana en Las Galas del Difunto de Valle-Inclán." *Journal of Spanish Studies: Twentieth Century*. 8.1/2 (1980): 103-116.

Paso, Alfonso. *La Corbata*. Ed. Edith Sublette. The Odyssey Press, 1967.

Patterson, Craig. "¿También de Teatro? Aesthetic Propoganda in Ramón del Valle-Inclán's La Guerra Carlista." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*. 82 (2005): 167-183.

Peak, J. Hunter. *Social Drama in Nineteenth-Century Spain*. Chapel Hill: North Carolina UP, 1964.

Rohr, Isabelle. "The Use of Antisemitism in the Spanish Civil War."

Patterns of Prejudice. 37.2 (2003): 195-211.

Romera, María Ángeles Martín. "Antes de la Libertad Religiosa: El

Antisemitismo en España desde la Baja Edad Media hasta el Siglo

XVII." *Videtur Quod*. 0 (2008): 1-43.

Rubio, David. "The Soul of Spain." *The Americas*. 1:3 (1945): 263- 88.

Schwartz, Kessel. "A Falangist View of Golden Age Literature."

Hispania. 49.2(1966): 206-210.

Scrivener, Michael. "'Zion Alone is Forbidden': Historicizing

Antisemitism in Bryon's *The Age of Bronze*." *Keats-Shelley*

Journal. 43 (1994): 75-97.

Shultziner, Doron. "A Jewish Conception of human Dignity: Philosophy

and Its Ethical Implications for Israeli Supreme Court Decisions."

The Journal of Religious Ethics. 34.3 (2006): 663-683.

Smith, David Norman. "The Social Construction of Enemies: Jews and

the Representation of Evil." *Sociological Theory*. 14.3 (1996): 203-

240.

Sophocles. "Antigone". *The Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces*

Volume 1. 6th ed. Ed. Maynard Mack. New York: WW Norton &

Company, 1992.

Strong, Wm. T. "The Fueros of Northern Spain." *Political Science*

Quarterly. 8:2 (1893): 317-334.

- Sublette, Edith B. Introduction. *La Corbata*. By Alfonso Paso.
Ed. Edith Sublette. The Odyssey Press, 1967.
- Terry, Reta A. "Vows to the Blackest Devil': Hamlet and the Evolving Code of Honor in Early Modern England." *Renaissance Quarterly*. 52:4 (Winter 1999): 1070-1086.
- The Shocken Bible, Volume I: The Five Books of Moses*. Trans. Everett Fox. New York: Schoken Books, Inc., 1997.
- Twinam, Ann. "From Jew to Basque: Ethnic Myths and Antioqueno Entrepreneurship." *Journal of Interamerican studies and World Affairs*. 22.1 (1980): 81-107.
- Valle-Inclán, Ramón María del. *The Grotesque Farce of Mr. Punch the Cuckold: Esperpento de Los Cuernos de Don Friolera*. Trans. Dominic Keown and Robin Warner. Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips, Ltd., 1991.
- Vincent, Bernard. "Los moriscos del reino de Granada después de 1570." *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*. 30.2 (1998): 594-608.
- Vollmer, Sylvia. "The Position of Women in Spain." *Hispania*. Vol. 8 No 5 (Nov 1925):303-348.
- Watson, Curtis. Brown. *Shakespeare and the Renaissance Concept of Honor*. New Jersey: Princeton Press, 1960.
- Wheelis, Allen. *The Quest for identity*. W.W. Norton and Co.Inc., 1958.

Wilentz, Gay. "(Re)Teaching Hemingway: Anti-Semitism as a Thematic Device in *The Sun Also Rises*." *College English*. 52.2 (1990): 186-193.

Zeitlin, Solomon. "Judaism as Religion: An historical Study." *The Jewish Quarterly Review*. Vol 34 No 2 (Oct 1943): 207-241.