

UCLA

Mester

Title

Leonora and Camila: Female Characterization and Narrative Formula in the Cervantine Novela

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1r70s99f>

Journal

Mester, 15(2)

Author

Donato, Clorinda

Publication Date

1986

DOI

10.5070/M3152013785

Copyright Information

Copyright 1986 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

Leonora and Camila: Female Characterization and Narrative Formula in the Cervantine Novela

Since the discovery of the Porras manuscript, the altered dénouement of the published version of *El celoso extremeño* has divided critics.¹ Leonora's change from adulteress to champion of her virtue led them to reject the revised novela on grounds of inverisimilitude. But recent critical study favors the changed ending and the new Leonora. In *From Novel to Romance*, Ruth El Saffar analyzes the changes in all of the characters and their relationships; her reading demonstrates the verisimilitude of Leonora's character by defending all of the revised characters and their interaction, resulting in a deeper work on all levels (40–50). Supporting the same version, J. J. Allen finds that the reworked ending fortifies the philosophical consistency of the novela by lending a dramatic quality to the issue of free will (11). Thus he ascribes the changes in Leonora to philosophical requirements. While both studies use the transformation in Leonora's character to build their arguments in favor of the published version, neither addresses it in detail, nor in comparison with other Cervantine female characters. Instead, a reading that focuses on comparative female characterization corroborates and extends El Saffar's and Allen's ideas. More importantly, it pinpoints the most basic decision Cervantes made in the new version: to break with the stock adulteress and to experiment with a newly formulated female character, one with choices. This decision directly implicates the dénouement, for this non-traditional female character now exceeds the bounds of the stock ending in a story of marital infidelity. Our comparison of "El curioso impertinente" with "El celoso extremeño" and the respective female protagonists bears this out.

When comparing the two novelas, the difference in setting establishes a varying amount of distance between the reader, the stories, and their characters, a distance which influences the reader's overall attitude. "El curioso impertinente" is set in Florence, outside the contemporary Spanish reader's domain—it is something that happened *there*, not here, creating a greater detachment than that which we feel when reading "El celoso extremeño," where the surroundings are more familiar. "El curioso impertinente" also creates a more marked sense of detachment through its presentation within the *Quijote* as a discrete written text, with a finite life limited to the pages of the manuscript. It even furnishes the pretext for a critical discussion among the characters of the *Quijote* once they have read the last page of the manuscript and we, as readers, have been shifted back to the *Quijote* narrative.

The use of this narrative device, the introduction of another manuscript within an ongoing narrative, this telescoping of narrators, differs from its use in "El colloquio de los perros." In "El curioso impertinente," it is not presented as a manuscript in progress,² but as a finished piece of literature that has been read by others and has a literary history of its own. These two elements, perceptible at the very onset of the story, automatically create distance from the characters who will be introduced, placing greater emphasis on the "moral" of the tale rather than the evolution and development of any single character or characters. Another element which lends support to this statement is the inverisimilar quality of Anselmo's personality flaw: foolish curiosity. While extreme jealousy was considered a natural consequence of erotic desire, as Golden Age love theory neatly summarized in the saying "donde hay amor hay celos," foolish curiosity can only trace its roots to another piece of fiction, the Rinaldo story in Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, where it is also used to impart a moral lesson (Meregalli 11-15). It is certainly a more implausible premise than is extreme jealousy, and again creates distance between the reader and the narration, fixing attention on the chain of reactions Anselmo's bizarre conduct will set in motion. This focusing is further strengthened by the absence of class mobility within the novela. Anselmo, Camila, and Lotario all emerge from the noble class and remain there until the end of the tale. The complication of social escalation is instead very much a part of "El curioso extremeño." Both Felipe's and Leonora's social status make quantum leaps within the story; Felipe's status had changed considerably before he met Leonora, but since the first few pages of the tale recount the vicissitudes of this movement, it becomes a prime aspect of his psychological baggage. In Leonora's case, the shift in position occurs almost simultaneously with her introduction into the story, providing insight into the development of her character. Class movement also comprises a factor in Loaysa. His hopes to marry into the top of the social strata dissolve, and he must choose instead to switch to an entirely new social context, that of the New World.

In speaking of Camila, we have defined the basic limitations the author imposed on her character by portraying her as the typical adulterous female. More detailed proof of this will be provided later, but it is also important to note that the characters of both Anselmo and Lotario are subject to the same limitations. There is nothing in the behavior of either of them which hints at introspection or inner turmoil. Their reactions lie within the realm of the contrived and the expected—they move in pre-set patterns. Once Anselmo unfolds the wish his driving curiosity has ordained, one can predict with a fair degree of accuracy the evolution of the characters' interaction and the eventual

infidelity. There is nothing in the author's portrayal of these characters which sets them apart from any other man or woman in their social category, excepting, of course, the hyperbolic curiosity necessary to precipitate the formulaic events: the characters and their interaction respond perfectly to cliché and convention. Except for Anselmo's outlandish quirk, the two friends are described as:

. . . dos caballeros ricos y principales, y tan amigos, que por excelencia y antonomasia, de todos los que los conocían *los dos amigos* eran llamados. Eran solteros, mozos de una misma edad y de unas mismas costumbres. (Curioso, *DQ XXXIII*, 23)

Camila also fits accepted norms:

Andaba Anselmo perdido de amores de una doncella principal y hermosa de la misma ciudad, hija de tan buenos padres y tan buena ella pro sí, que se determinó con el parecer de su amigo Lotario, sin el cual ninguna cosa hacía, de pedilla por esposa a sus padres, y así lo puso en ejecución. (Curioso, *DQ XXXIII*, 24)

Camila is repeatedly described as good, beautiful, chaste, and virtuous, as any woman of her class would be described. The epithet of goodness no longer holds, however, when assailed by Lotario's advances; vanity, the direct corollary of praised beauty, becomes her main characteristic:

Finalmente, a él le pareció que era menester, en el espacio y lugar que daba la ausencia de Anselmo, apretar el cerco a aquella fortaleza, y así acometió a su presunción con las alabanzas de su hermosura, porque no hay cosa que más presto rinda y allane las encastilladas torres de la vanidad, puesta en las lenguas de la adulación. (Curioso, *DQ XXXIII*, 71)

Once she has succumbed, she passes from vain to inconstant and "easy," arousing suspicion and jealousy in Lotario, who has seen an unknown man carefully take his leave from Camila's house:

sólo creyó que Camila, de la misma manera que había sido fácil y ligera con él, lo era para otro; que estas añadiduras trae consigo la maldad de la mujer mala: que pierde el crédito de su honra con el mismo a quien se entregó rogada y persuadida y cree que con mayor facilidad se entrega a otros, y da infalible crédito a cualquiera sospecha que desto le venga. (Curioso, *DQ XXXIV*, 87)

From this judgment of her character, we next see her depicted in the guise of the deceitful woman, who succeeds at scheming much better than does a man, though she fails at reasoning:

pero, como naturalmente tiene la mujer presto para el bien y para el mal, más que el varón, puesto que la va faltando cuando de propósito se pone a hacer discursos, luego al instante halló Camila el modo de remediar tan, al paracer inremediable negocio . . . (Curioso, *DQ XXXIV*, 92)

Once the ruse risks detection by Anselmo, Camila flees; this action provides the final link in the chain of Camila's "female-pattern" behavior. As we have said before, there is nothing in her character which breaks with the traditional view of female conduct. This role is further reinforced through the use of proverbs on womanly comportment to accompany each phase of her adulterous relationship.

The world of Anselmo, Lotario, and Camila is one of convention and social code. The characters' worries about their actions go no further than the external values of society and the consequences that await them if they are caught in violation of that code. Lotario limits his visits to Anselmo's home after the marriage for reasons of decorum and personal honor; Camila frets over Lotario's prolonged visits during Anselmo's absence for the same reason; once Camila has entered into her relationship with Lotario, the limited amount of wooing he courted her with nags at her conscience for superficial reasons; Lotario jumps to conclusions about Camila's fidelity when he sees Leonela's *galán* steal away, again for motives of individual honor and esteem. By contrast, the characters of "El celoso extremeño" are cerebral. Our introduction to Carrizales takes the form of a psychological portrait:

Iba nuestro pasajero pensativo, revolviendo en su memoria los muchos y diversos peligros que en los años de su peregrinación había pasado, y el mal gobierno que, en todo el discurso de su vida había tenido. Y sacabe de la cuenta que a sí mismo se iba tomando, una firme resolución de mudar manera de vida y de tener otro estilo en guardar la hacienda que Dios fuese servido de darle, y de proceder con más recato que hasta allí con las mujeres. La flota estaba como en calma, cuando pasaba consigo esta tormenta Felipe de Carrizales, que éste es el nombre del que ha dado materia a nuestra novela. (Celoso, *Novelas ejemplares* 165)

Once Leonora enters Carrizales house, she is described as being simple and childlike, not because of stupidity, but rather because of lack of experience due to age:

Leonora andaba a lo igual con sus criadas, y se entretenía en lo mismo que ellas, y aun dio, con su simplicidad, en hacer muñecas, y en otras niñerías que mostraban la llaneza de su condición y la ternera de sus años. (Celoso, *Novelas ejemplares* 168)

But experience does come to Leonora, and it is her growth process that is charted in the novela, a process of psychological maturity that

in the end culminates in a simple yet forceful dignity, stemming from her realization of self. We catch a glimpse of this side of her character in the *sala* where the maids, Leonora, and Loaysa gather, once he has been successfully brought into the house:

Esta alababa la boca, aquélla los pies, y todas juntas hicieron del una menuda anatomía y pepitoria. Sola Leonora callaba, y le miraba, y le iba pareciendo de mejor talle que su velado. (*Celoso, Novelas ejemplares* 180)

Leonora is circumspect and thoughtful in the midst of such easy talk and abandon. She acknowledges the physical beauty of Loaysa, but it remains a rational assessment. Language as a manipulative device and the possible levels of rhetorical communicating are, in any case, an enigma to Leonora. We find her silent in situations she is not familiar with and doesn't know how to assess, though her distress is conveyed through emotional reaction. Leonora has no answer for the *dueña's* persuasive arguments that she go into the bedchamber with Loaysa; we only know of her protests through the author's commentary:

Tomó Marialonso por la mano a su señora, y casi por fuerza, preñados de lágrimas los ojos, la llevó donde Loaysa estaba . . . (*Celoso, Novelas ejemplares* 182)

We again find Leonora silent when placed before what is certainly the most difficult situation of her life—that of explaining to her husband what actually happened in the room with Loaysa. She is only capable of expressing herself through tears and caresses. The linguistic development of Leonora as it parallels the amassing of experience she has been faced with will be discussed in greater detail. For comparison, it would be wise to touch briefly on the linguistic abilities of the characters in "El curioso impertinente."

As we have already seen, the actions of the characters in "El curioso impertinente" are never the result of deliberation and introspection, but rather, fulfillment of conventional expectation. The language the characters adopt discloses the same convention. Highly literate, these characters appear well trained in the oratory arts; any verbal interchange is always carefully constructed, but never breaks through the barrier of its artifice to establish true communication. Language depends on eloquence for its effect. Communication is never direct, but always filtered through some pre-existing literary patterns. Anselmo and Lotario speak through parables, proverbs, tales, scripture and poetry; Leonela, Camila's maid, judges Lotario's honor through the popular ABC of love; Camila succeeds in her great moment of deception thanks to dramatic soliloquy. Such linguistic artifice contributes to the creation of stylized characters who cede their identity to the moral lesson of the tale. Charac-

ters and plot structure are subordinate to the moralizing message, brought home through the narrator's didactic tone and presentation of the theme. The narrator presides as the supreme arbitrator, foreshadowing the moral consequences of the building future action:

Mas al honesta presencia de Camila, la gravedad de su rostro, la compostura de su persona era tanta, que ponía freno a la lengua de Lotario.

Pero el provecho que las muchas virtudes de Camila hicieron poniendo silencio en la lengua de Lotario, redundó más el daño de los dos, porque si la lengua callaba, el pensamiento discurría y tenía lugar de contemplar, parte por parte, todos los estremos de bondad y de hermosura que Camila tenía, bastantes a enamorar una estatua de mármol, no que un corazón de carne. (Curioso, *DQ XXXIV*, 66)

The narrator also takes any opportunity to moralize, gratuitously appending edifying commentary at every juncture. Leonela's recounting of her own love affair to Camila provides a case in point:

Apuróla (Camila) si pasaban sus pláticas a más que serlo. Ella (Leonela) con poca vergüenza a las criadas, las cuales, cuando ven a las amas echar traspiés, no se les da nada a ellas de cojear, ni de que lo sepan. (Curioso, *DQ XXXIV*, 85)

The elements we have discussed suggest a purposeful narrative with a specific, known direction, in which the moral kernel determines the tone, structure, setting, dénouement, and the necessity of a stock female personage. The story ends tidily, with a short conclusive line that brings the narration full circle:

Éste fué el fin que tuvieron todos, nacido de un tan desatinado principio. (Curioso, *DQ XXXV*, 128)

These characters have served their purpose, and the author feels free to neatly dispose of them, not only by ending the tale with such a cut and dried statement, but also by switching out of the story to the priest's critical commentary on the manuscript he has just finished. The lives of this trio of characters do not seep beyond the bounds of the narration, as do instead those of "El curioso extremeño," nor does the narrator encourage such speculation, as the abrupt jump from one level of fiction (manuscript) to that of the fictive reality (priest in the inn) indicates.

An overview of the techniques used to develop the characters in "El celoso extremeño" is also in order. Felipe, Leonora, and Loaysa are not stock characters; each one comes from a different background and social category, as we have already seen. This background is carefully outlined with the introduction of each character: the peregrinations of Felipe, the poor, but noble origins of Leonora, and the milieu of the "virotés"

in the case of Loaysa. This biographical data serves to establish the experience, or lack thereof, that each character brings to bear on his interaction with the others. The diversity of experience as opposed to the monotone of the "curioso" characters, sets up a polycentric narration where characterization is not subordinate to a moral lesson, but rather defiant to it. Though here, as in "El curioso impertinente," some of the devices of didactic prose identified previously can also be detected, they are overpowered by the characters themselves. This ambiguity in authorial attitude is easily proved if one compares the interventions of the implied author in the first part of the story with the narrator who enters the novela in the first person at the end of the story to express his consternation over the evolution of events. The change in *dénouement* is more consistent with such fully developed characterization. The altered *dénouement* also provoked a change in the moral lesson, as J. J. Allen points out in his article "El celoso extremeño and el curioso impertinente." As we mentioned earlier, Allen believes that free will and determinism are the crucial philosophical problems of the published "celoso" version, concerns which lie dormant in the Porras version:

As we have seen, the message of the Porras version was drawn as follows: 'todos los que oyeren este caso es razón que escarmienten en él y no se fíen de torno ne criadas, si se han de fiar de dueñas de tocas largas.' The published version, in perfect consonance with the ballad which was quoted earlier, adds one significant phrase, as if to underline the resolution of the dilemma, which is absent from the manuscript version: 'exemplo y espejo de lo poco que hay que fiar de llaves, tornos, e paredes *cuando queda la voluntad libre*.' Since the wife is no longer an automatic casualty of the train of events set in motion by her husband's error, Cervantes can without inconsistency insist in his conclusion upon the freedom of the will as a basic premise of his story. (10)

It is in the exaltation of free will as the new moral to the "Celoso" novela that the development of individual characters and the open-ended *dénouement* is given a transcendent value. This major change in narrative perspective originates within the character of Leonora, who exerts her power to choose despite the dictates of fate. Both "El curioso impertinente" and "El celoso extremeño" are set within the framework of destiny, but with a major difference. The characters of "El curioso impertinente" never act freely within that framework, their actions determined by the turning of Fortune's wheel:

Duro este engaño algunos días hasta que al cabo de pocos meses volvió Fortuna su rueda, y salió a plaza la maldad con tanto artificio hasta allí cubierta, y a Anselmo le costó la vida su impertinente curiosidad. (Curioso, DQ XXXIV, 111)

In "El celoso extremeño we find fate at work throughout the story, though its mention presents some ambiguities. When Carrizales first sees Leonora, it is presented as an occurrence of fate:

. . . quiso su suerte que, pasando un día por una calle alzase los ojos y viese a una ventana puesta una doncella al parecer de edad de trece a catorce años . . . (Celoso, *Novelas ejemplares* 166)

However, this act of fate is situated between two long introspective passages of Carrizales's reasoning: the first regarding his decision to never marry due to the recognition of his own exaggerated jealousy; the second, his rationalizations as to why he should marry after he has been struck by the young girl in the window. Rather than a factor which is beyond man's control, fate now becomes the excuse for justifying an action Carrizales knows he should not take:

. . . Y no soy tan viejo que pueda perder la esperanza de tener hijos que me hereden. De que tenga dote o no, no hay para qué hacer caso, pues el cielo me dio para todos, y los ricos no han de buscar en sus matrimonios hacienda, sino gusto los casados la acortan. ¡Alto, pues! ¡Echada está la suerte, y ésta es que el cielo quiere que yo tenga! (Celoso, *Novelas ejemplares* 166)

Popular sayings and fate become excuses for ignoring a recognized error. Carrizales is actually making a choice, and we see him fully in capacity of his faculties while making it.

In the case of Leonora, the exercising of free will is more dramatic. In choosing to *refuse* Loaysa, Leonora breaks the female character pattern that Camila embodies in the "Curioso" tale. As Ruth El Saffar has pointed out in her analysis of "El celoso extremeño" in *From Novel to Romance*, Leonora makes a decision which is self-defining, neither in accord with the promptings of the *dueña*, nor with Loaysa's and Carrizales's expectations of the limits of feminine virtue in such compromising situations:

To choose to accept Loaysa's adulterous advances would not be self-defining, since both Marialonso and Loaysa have predetermined that path. The only nondetermined choice is rejection of Loaysa. . . . Rejection of Loaysa and maintenance of her own honor under the most adverse and unlikely circumstances is therefore the only truly liberating step Leonora can take. Her freedom is found not in yielding to Loaysa—for that would only confirm Carrizales's version of her—but in showing through her resistance that the prison surrounding her was unwarranted. (47)

Instead of fulfilling everyone's expectations—Loaysa's, Marialonso's, Carrizales's, the reader's, and even, it seems, those of the plot and the

narrator, Leonora, not fate, takes control. Though Leonora's decisive step towards control culminates in her encounter with Loaysa, events leading up to the night spent in Marialonso's bedchamber hint at the possibility of such a paradoxical outcome, while the aftermath confirms a newly discovered sense of self. From her entrance in the novela, until her evening with Loaysa, Leonora's character is potential energy, waiting to be tapped. Like Michelangelo's unfinished slaves trapped in marble, enough of the surface mass has been chipped away to reveal this underlying potential.

Leonora has never experienced autonomy before, nor will she be granted such an opportunity until alone with Loaysa. Leonora passes from her parent's authority, to that of her husband and her *dueña*; she lives on terms of equality with her maids. It is interesting to note that we don't hear Leonora speak until someone from the outside, someone she is not obliged to obey, tries to exert his influence over her. It is at this point that she attempts to take hold of the situation through the spoken word. Leonora utters the first order of her life:

Así es verdad – dijo Leonora – Pero ha de jurar este señor primero, que no ha de hacer otra cosa cuando esté aca dentro, sino cantar y tañer cuando se lo mandaren, y que ha de estar encerrado y quedito donde le pusiéremos.

—Sí juro – dijo Loaysa

—No vale nada ese juramento – respondió Leonora – que ha de jurar por vida de su madre, y ha de jurar la cruz y besarla, que lo veamos todas. (Celoso, *Novelas ejemplares* 176)

Leonora insists that the oath be made according to her specifications. This item is of particular significance to the character, as an authorial gloss describing the anticipation of the women as they open the door for Loaysa indicates:

pero que ante todas cosas hiciese que de nuevo ratificase el juramento que había hecho de no hacer más de lo que ellas le ordenasen, y que si no le quisiese confirmar y hacer de nuevo, en ninguna manera le abriesen. (Celoso, *Novelas ejemplares* 178)

In the lines of dialogue that follow, Leonora reiterates her command:

. . . mira que jure por la vida de sus padres y por todo aquello que bien quiere, por que con esto estaremos seguras . . . (Celoso, *Novelas ejemplares* 178)

Since insistence on the oath in the narration underscores its importance in Leonora's development, it must be analyzed as such. For the first time in the novela, Leonora has taken a stand; she has won the approval of her peers, and has taken a step, albeit naive, toward realizing her

self-worth. Her ability to use the spoken word to achieve her ends becomes a personal victory, one she takes particular pride in, thus the importance of the oath:

—Pues si ha jurado – dijo Leonora–, asido le tenemos. ¡Oh, qué avisada que anduve en hacerle que jurase! (Celoso, *Novelas ejemplares* 178)

This is the first time she has ever taken control of anything, and she wants to make sure it doesn't slip away. Her sudden willingness to help Loaysa enter is closely linked to her desire to test the limits of her control, typical of personality development. This small change in her character from passive to active has an immediate effect on her interaction with the maids. The sudden shift in household hierarchy is represented by the physical lifting of Leonora onto the shoulders of the maids, and the author's likening of this gesture to the homage usually paid to a university professor:

. . . y habiéndoles mostrado la llave que traía, fue tanto el contento de todas que la alzaron en peso como a catedrático, diciendo:

—¡Vival ¡Viva!

Y más cuando les dijo que no había necesidad de contrahacer la llave, porque según el untado viejo dormía, bien se podían aprovechar de la casa todas las veces que la quisiesen. (Celoso, *Novelas ejemplares* 178)

The incident is to be viewed as a personal gain in autonomy, rather than as the first step in the female-pattern game of deception. Leonora's refusal of Loaysa bears this out. Her compliance with the scheme is an experimental encounter with power and control, a sounding of the boundaries that exist between people and their range. Cervantes has captured that delicate moment in adolescence when relationships of authority are tested in the struggle to carve one's personal niche. The fragility of this newly found esteem is immediately revealed when Leonora is faced with the overbearing power of the *dueña* whom she has not yet learned to control. Once locked up with Loaysa, however, she fights his advances, for not only has she been thrown in with him against her will, but he has clearly transgressed the stipulation of the oath. By attempting to penetrate the limits which Leonora's carefully worded oath had set, Loaysa's amorous advances are interpreted as a challenge to her potential as an autonomous individual with options. The psychological impact of the evening with Loaysa must not be overlooked. Though she has come out of it physically unscathed, she has taken a psychological fall from innocence through the experience. She has discovered her free will, but is left to work out the psychological implications for herself. The newly added moral of free will has a separate meaning for Felipe, Loaysa, and Leonora. In Felipe's case, it is wrong

to attempt to deny another person experience by force or, to use the words of the narrator, through "llaves, tornos, y paredes" (Celoso 186). It is likewise wrong to exert one's will over the other as the *dueña* and Loaysa sought to do, expecting Leonora's "verdes y pocos años" (Celoso 187) to succumb to the experience and desires of others. In regard to Leonora, we can only echo again the sentiments of the author, who exalts the triumph of free will, but at the same time understands the psychological turmoil he has left unresolved in the character of Leonora:

Sólo no sé, que fue la causa que Leonora no puso más ahinco en disculparse y dar a entender a su celoso marido cuán limpie y sin ofensa había quedado en aquel suceso; pero la turbación le ató la lengua, y la prisa que se dio a morir su marido no dio lugar a su disculpa. (Celoso, *Novelas ejemplares* 187)

Clearly, Leonora is not to be dismissed as a passive, servile woman, nor as a simple-minded, frivolous young girl. In light of the new dénouement, a study of her character reveals the itinerary of a developing adolescent personality, redeemed in a transcendent sense by her inherent goodness, trapped instead by the contingent reality which has left her unprepared to handle the overwhelming (for her experience) situation she awakes to after her night with Loaysa. The author cannot step away from such a character with the type of blunt statement we find at the end of "El curioso impertinente," where, having satisfactorily finished with Camila and Lotario, Cervantes closes with the death of Anselmo, attributed to his foolish curiosity.

Anselmo's vice is both the starting and finishing point of the story; extreme jealousy does not function in the same way in "El celoso extremeño." Though the story begins with Carrizales, it does not end with him. Instead, Cervantes reserves his final words for Leonora's psychological dilemma, which becomes a shared dilemma among the author, the reader, and the other characters, for no explanation is offered for her behavior. Neither Loaysa nor her parents knows why she decided to enter a convent after Carrizales's death, and Cervantes wonders why she desisted in her efforts to exculpate herself of the suspected adultery. The reader also puzzles over her actions, but accepts her as a fully developed character who has achieved self-mastery, though the penalty was high. The new Leonora no longer serves a moralistic dénouement; rather she generates a complex, perspectivist, and, ultimately, more modern ending.

Clorinda Donato
University of California,
Los Angeles

NOTES

1. The 1788 discovery of the Porras manuscript containing a version of "El celoso extremeño" which critical consensus dates around 1605, some eight years prior to the publication of the *Novelas ejemplares*, has made the altered dénouement of the 1613 published version a topos of Cervantine scholarship. Early twentieth-century critics felt that Leonora's transformation from adultress to strong female who resists temptation jeopardized the verisimilitude of the entire novela. Ruth El Saffar summarizes the history of critical thought on the novela in the notes to her discussion of it in *Novel to Romance* 40-41.

2. In "El coloquio de los perros," Campuzano explains that the text is partial; the second night of the dialogue between the two dogs has not yet been committed to paper. This is reiterated at the end in the words of Peralta: "Aunque este coloquio sea fingido, y nunca haya pasado, paréceme que está tan bien compuesto que puede el señor alférez pasar adelante con el segundo."

WORKS CITED

- Allen, John J. "El celoso extremeño and el curioso impertinente." *Studies in the Spanish Golden Age: Cervantes and Lope de Vega*. Ed. Dana B. Drake, José A. Madrigal. Miami: Ediciones Universal, 1978.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Ed. Francisco Rodríguez Marín. 8 vols. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1911-1913.
- _____. *Novelas ejemplares*. Ed. Sergio Fernandes. Mexico: Editorial Porrúa, S.A., 1978.
- El Saffar, Ruth. *Novel to Romance: A Study of Cervantes' "Novelas ejemplares"*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- Meregalli, Franco. "La literatura italiana en la obra de Cervantes." *Arcadia: Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft*. 6.1 (1971): 1-15.