

Competing Models of Masculinity in Gaspar Zavala y Zamora's *El amante generoso* (1791)

Kristie Niemeier

Union University

Abstract: Gaspar Zavala y Zamora's 1791 sentimental comedy, *El amante generoso* dramatizes the domestic conflict surrounding an arranged marriage. The portrayal of honor frames the conflict as a struggle between competing models of masculinity: the father Daerts, representing outmoded Baroque ideals, the fiancé Kerson, a *petimetre*, and During, the *hombre de bien*. Nonetheless, contradictory views over honor-as-reputation versus honor-as-virtue coexist within During, casting doubt on the viability of this model of masculinity in eighteenth-century Spanish theater.

Keywords: Zavala y Zamora, Gaspar – *El amante generoso*, *hombre de bien* – Masculinity – Honor

Popular Spanish playwright Gaspar Zavala y Zamora's 1791 sentimental comedy, *El amante generoso* dramatizes the domestic conflict engendered by a father's refusal to allow his daughter Christina to marry the suitor of her choice and his insistence that she wed another who will further the family's socioeconomic status. Zavala y Zamora's portrayal of dueling and honor ultimately frames the marriage conflict as a struggle between competing models of masculinity: the father Daerts, representing outmoded Baroque views of men, Kerson, whose French dress and superficial comments correspond with the *petimetre*, or dandy, and During, the enlightened *hombre de bien*.

Yet, *El amante generoso*'s honor conflicts, which center around a lawsuit between the suitor, During, and the father, Daerts, as well as a duel between During and Kerson, the man chosen for Christina, are little removed from property skirmishes. During, who espouses a sense of honor based on virtue and generosity, eventually prevails over Daerts, who stubbornly holds to a captious sense of Baroque honor. Daerts's threats against Christina and During's desire to protect Christina and aid her father presumably portray one sense of honor—During's—as superior. Nonetheless, in the case of *El amante generoso*, contradictory views over honor-as-reputation versus honor-as-virtue coexist within During, the *hombre de bien*, calling into question the viability of this model of masculinity in eighteenth-century Spanish theater.

The *hombre de bien* as an Enlightened Model for Masculinity

Throughout the eighteenth century, literary representations of love, influenced by a more optimistic view of individual emotions and inclinations, in turn generated enlightened models of femininity and masculinity. Mónica Bolufer Peruga, in “Hombres de bien: Modelos de masculinidad y expectativas femeninas, Entre la ficción y la realidad,” notes that religious texts from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries cautioned against a passionate love that originated from animalistic, and therefore sinful desires (12). She states that during the eighteenth century, moral discourse on love gave way to a more optimistic view of romantic sentiment, so that people’s natural inclinations need not be at odds with their education. According to Bolufer:

La ficción, en particular la novela y los relatos sentimentales o el nuevo teatro (el drama burgués la comedia sentimental), pero también los textos pedagógicos e incluso políticos del siglo XVIII, realzan, con una insistencia y una intensidad nuevas, el elogio de ese amor que debe llevar a la unión conyugal: un afecto tranquilo y constante, más parecido a la amistad que a la pasión. (12)

This model for love attempts to reconcile the natural inclinations of individuals with the enlightened ideal of social utility and peace. Literary representations of enlightened men and women depicted them as educated individuals whose natural inclinations led them to carry out their marital and civic responsibilities.

Bolufer observes that new notions of familial relations and individual sentiment articulated a model for masculinity that required men to rein in their passionate desires and convert them into more refined sentiments, in order to fulfill their roles as responsible, enlightened citizens, friends, fathers and husbands. This model of masculinity was portrayed as the figure of the *hombre de bien*. This figure embodied all the moral and social virtues in accordance with someone, who, while not overtly at odds with religious texts, was not necessarily a devout Christian (Bolufer 15). Rebecca Haidt argues that the roots of the *hombre de bien* are found in classical ethics, particularly Aristotelian Nichomachean Ethics. As Haidt notes, “*Hombría de bien* or ‘enlightened manliness,’ proposes the virtuous ability to control the body as crucial to a larger ethical scheme of masculine self-governance and, by extension, of reform of the nation’s (masculine) leaders” (12).

Sometimes the call for self-control was articulated through the negative portrayal of characters who did not practice restraint. According to G. J. Barker-Benfield, sentimental fiction sought to reform certain aspects of “explicit hard masculinity” as defined by traits like “atheism, materialism, blasphemy, swearing, cruelty to servants, cruelty to animals, and dueling” and “most of all, ... ‘the villainous aim of libertines’” (227).

Attacks against masculine misbehavior are carried out “By associating their targets quite frequently with the past—with the dueling warrior mentality of an earlier aristocracy ... as well as with barbarism” (Barker-Benfield 248). The *hombre de bien* appears in stark contrast to other male archetypes who do not exercise self-control. Bolufer states that the *hombre de bien* offers a more middle-class ideal as opposed to an aristocratic model of masculinity, frequently portrayed in literary texts as idle, indifferent, immoral, and coldly calculating in domestic relationships. The desire to act with virtue and exercise a useful function in society conform to an enlightened ethic that stands in opposition “al honor aristocrático cifrado en la gloria de las armas” (Bolufer 16). The portrayal of Daerts, the father who blindly insists on following through with Christina’s engagement to Kerson with threats of violence and hollow statements about family honor, fits this mold.

A newer and also undesirable masculine figure which emerged in the eighteenth century, the *petimetre*, or “fop,” represented a variation of the aristocratic model. Satiric portrayals of *petimetres* such as Ramón de la Cruz’s *El petimetre* (1764) and Tomás de Iriarte’s *El señorito mimado, ó la mala educación* (1787) criticized the frivolity, obsession with appearances and fashion, idleness and corruption associated with a culture of consumption. The *petimetre* focused on pleasure alone but failed to enjoy it “‘in a nobler way’ by cultivating reason” (Barker-Benfield 109). Christina’s fiancé, Kerson, typifies the figure of the *petimetre*, in his superficiality, his lack of generosity as shown in his insistence that Daerts provide a dowry, and in his ridiculous, cowardly behavior during a mock duel with Daring.

In contrast with these examples of unacceptable behavior, the representations of love in novels and sentimental comedies tend to exalt enlightened, virtuous male characters who are as irreproachable in their public duties as they are attentive and warm in their relationships as sons, friends and husbands. María García Garrosa, in her detailed analysis of French and Spanish sentimental comedies, notes that the code of ethics surrounding the enlightened notion of virtue, intimately connected to portrayals of the *hombre de bien*, was based on the interests of a society “a cuyo progreso debía contribuir el individuo.” This philosophy of virtue posits that happiness lies in exercising a useful function in society (145). One of the ways that characters display their virtue and useful role in society is through monetary generosity (García Garrosa 120). In *El amante generoso*, Daring’s acts of generosity, his seemingly controlled behavior in the face of Daerts’s threats and Kerson’s dueling challenge conform to the standards of enlightened masculinity.

The enlightened model for love, rather than overthrowing the traditional insistence on spouses’ equality of social status, introduces an emphasis on marriage based on esteem and friendship and a social critique of marriages contracted for purely economical purposes (Bolufer 17). The December 8, 1786 issue of *Correo de Madrid ó de los Ciegos* describes the consequences that result for women when fathers treat marriage with cold, economic interest and fail to consider the place of compatibility:

El matrimonio de la señorita es una negociación: el padre dispone léjos de ella, y sin su noticia, de la vida entera, y el destino de su hija. En lugar de un amante, que poco á poco hubiera cautivado su corazon, se le presenta un desconocido, un hombre indiferente: se le manda que pase á sus brazos, y se entregue á él sin reserva ... Las consideraciones del interes se tratan ante todas cosas; y este mercado, aunque hecho vajo el nombre de las leyes y de la religion, tiene algo de dureza y capricho. (71)

In *El amante generoso*, Daerts arranges for Christina to marry Kerson in order to further his financial interests. However, his anger at During, who in trying to protect Christina financially attempts to cancel Daerts's debt (12, 23),¹ reveals a strong element of caprice to his marital choice for his daughter.

The theme of love and criticism of arranged marriages also formulated an enlightened model of masculinity as personified in the figure of the *hombre de bien*, who subjugated his passions to reason and practiced self-control, while still expressing sentiments through physical signs like tears. In *El amante generoso*, During embodies this enlightened model, and it is his virtue which has captured Christina's heart. During's rational, restrained behavior in response to Daerts's claims of insulted honor and Kerson's dueling challenge demonstrates his superiority as a match for Christina and a masculine role model.

Zavala y Zamora on Love and Honor Conflicts

Sentimental portrayals of love and the problem of excessive parental control in their children's marital choices in English novels like Richardson's *Pamela* and *Clarissa* eventually found expression in popular Spanish theater, creating intriguing tensions given that many Golden Age literary elements, such as the portrayal of honor conflicts, also persisted. Yvonne Fuentes documents the direct influence that these English novels exercised in Spanish theater through dramatic adaptation of the novels (291-292) and numerous dramatic works that portrayed similar themes (303). In the case of Zavala y Zamora, Fuentes mentions some theatrical pieces, including *El triunfo del amor y la amistad*, *Jenval y Faustina* (1793) (303) and *Las víctimas del amor*, *Ana y Sindham* (1788) (Fuentes 304).

¹ Because *El amante generoso* only has two acts, and the acts are not delineated in scenes or with line numbers, I have chosen to use page numbers for all play references in this article.

Together with Antonio Valladares y Sotomayor and Luciano Francisco Comella, Zavala y Zamora was situated, by his contemporaries, among the popular playwrights who represented “la turba que provee nuestros teatros hoy en día” (qtd. in Pérez Magallón 69). And like Comella and Valladares, Zavala y Zamora has been studied relatively little by scholars.

Martin’s “The Dramatic Works of Gaspar de Zavala y Zamora” and Fernández Cabezón’s *Lances y batallas: Gaspar Zavala y Zamora y la comedia heroica* are the only monographs devoted solely to the author. Martin’s study of Zavala y Zamora’s heroic and sentimental comedies asserts that there is “very little variation in the types of plays that Zavala y Zamora wrote” (354). He cites several commonalities among the playwright’s renderings of these two dramatic genres, which include the subordination of characterization to the plot (279), use of duels (20) and repetition of themes such as the conflicts surrounding arranged marriages (19). Fernández Cabezón’s observations on Zavala y Zamora’s treatment of honor are useful for this study even though her project deals with the author’s heroic comedies. The consistent “sameness of situation and tone in almost all” of Zavala y Zamora’s dramatic works implies that many similarities exist between the portrayal of honor in the author’s heroic and sentimental comedies. Consequently, as Fernández Cabezón notes, honor is one of the principle motives² driving many of the author’s dramatic conflicts (62). The man—father, brother or husband—oversees the honor of female characters, and women’s chastity impacts the men’s reputation (63). However, it is the male authority figure who acts as custodian over women and the entire family’s honor. Marriage, then, represents a transference of custody: “el marido sustituye al padre y adquiere todas las prerrogativas de éste sobre la mujer” (64).

Daerts’s murderous threats against his daughter are not unique among Zavala y Zamora’s *comedias*. Martin’s examination of Zavala y Zamora’s lachrymose comedies observes a “plethora of situations centered around the implacable fathers who are determined to marry their sons or daughters to people not of their own choice” (22). In addition to *El amante generoso*, other sentimental comedies by Zavala y Zamora which feature this type of familial conflict include, *Las víctimas del amor*, *Ana y Sindham* (1788), *La Justina* (1788) and *El triunfo del amor y la amistad, Jenval y Faustina* (1793). While honor tends to subjugate love in Golden Age theater, some of Zavala y Zamora’s characters are motivated more by love, or sentiment, than their reputation. In the case of *El amante generoso*, During voices concern for Christina’s safety, and decides to discontinue his pursuit of her rather than continue to put her at risk (12). In the final act, he even offers to finance Christina’s dowry so that she may marry Kerson and avoid her father’s wrath (30).

²The other two motives cited by Fernández Cabezón are exaltation of one’s homeland, or *patria*, with war as a means to defend it, and romantic love (68); both themes are deeply entrenched in dueling and honor.

The Marriage Conflict

Similarly to *El sí de las niñas* and many other eighteenth-century *comedias*, the central conflict in *El amante generoso* revolves around a love triangle that is the result of a prospective arranged marriage. Daerts, the father, plans to marry his daughter Christina to Kerson, but Christina is in love with During. However, while many of the other dramatic conflicts focus more on the lovers, the portrayal of dueling and honor in *El amante generoso* reveals that the relationships among the male characters, specifically the Daerts-During conflict and the During-Kerson conflict, take precedence over the relationship between During and Christina. These conflicts set up During as the only man worthy of Christina, and more importantly, as the superior example of masculine behavior.

The Daerts-During Lawsuit

From the first stage directions and opening scene, *El amante generoso* generates sympathy for Christina, and through revelations about her love history with During, the play appeals to sentiment and reason to argue for During as the superior suitor. The first scene portrays Christina's physical anguish when she is staged: "sentada en una silla de brazos, reclinando sobre la mano la mejilla, como manifestando su situación el abatimiento de su espíritu" (1). Her opening lines punctuate her suffering: "Corazón, ¿cuándo podrás / latir con algun descanso?" (1). Christina's maid, Eliseta, expresses concern about her recent pattern of staying in bed, crying and gazing at her watch to wait for her "idolatrado / Capitancito" (2), a ploy to stir both the audience's sympathy and curiosity about the possibility of a forbidden love affair.

Nonetheless, the suspense surrounding a potentially rebellious romantic tie does not endure for long, because the second scene soon uses Christina's musings about her problems to suggest that During is a man of reason. Christina insists to her maid Eliseta that she has made "la elección más ventajosa" (2), and later in Scene IV she reiterates that it is During's "juicio y providad" that have given him the right to her hand (5). Early in Act I during a conversation with Eliseta, Christina reveals to the audience that: "A During / le hizo dueño de mi mano, / y mi corazón" (2). Fabricio, Daerts's majordomo, summarizes the case for During as a reasonable husband for Christina toward the end of Act I, in a plea with Daerts to remember:

que fuera mas acertado
casar á la Señorita
con During. El es honrado,
es atento, es virtuoso;
es vuestro sobrino al cabo,
y se aman con un extremo

puro, que habeis fomentado
vos mismo. (14)

Adding to During's intellectual and moral traits and the couple's mutual attachment, Fabricio, showing more insight than Daerts, reminds his master that matching Christina with During is a more sensible plan.

Daerts himself originally supported the pair, so the key question, then, is what initiated Daerts's change of heart about During, particularly when both reason and sentiment support the union? Christina's conversation with Eliseta during the second scene of Act I discloses information about a lawsuit between During's father and Daerts that led to her father's bitter, violent anger toward the younger man:

Mi Padre
desde aquel momento infausto
en que el de During le puso
demanda á los mayorazgos
que poseía por muerte
de Daerts su primo hermano,
tio carnal de During,
no tan solo le ha negado
la entrada en casa, si que
con el rigor mas extraño
me intimó , que no volviera
á hablarle por ningun caso. (2-3)

As a result of a lawsuit over family property initiated by During's father, Daerts forbids Christina from marrying or speaking to a suitor that he had previously embraced as a potential husband.

Daerts explains to Christina late in Act I that During's claim to family lands will leave both father and daughter in a state of poverty:

¿Es
poco, ... obligarnos
á descender á la suma
miseria en que nos hallamos,
desde la opulencia grande
en que nos vimos? (13)

Consequently, Daerts frames the property battle using an honor code more reminiscent of the Golden Age, because without the family lands, he will lose his social status.³ The fact that Christina would benefit from During's acquisition of the property does not factor in to the father's thought process. When Daerts finds During inside his house in the sixteenth scene of Act I, Daerts states that the younger man is committing yet another "agravio" or "offense" against him, and: "Lo que os pido es, que á insultarnos / con vuestra vista jamás / volvais" (12). Although Daerts refers to "us" ("insultarnos") talking of this insult, he clearly thinks only of himself and not his daughter.

While Daerts appeals to the honor code to defend his stance against During, the abuses he commits against Christina and During portray his notion of honor as inflexible, outdated and corrupt. The evident connection between Daerts and Early Modern concepts of honor emerges in the stage directions preceding his first entry: "Daerts con bastón, sombrero, y espada" (8). Clearly he is part of the nobility, and the physical presence of the sword marks this identity. The sword also augments the threat of violence associated with the character, and in the ninth scene of Act I, the audience hears Daerts utter his first vow to kill Christina if she does not relinquish her love for During and assent to his order that she marry Kerson:

ofendido, é irritado,
seré capaz, no lo dudes,
con aquesta propia mano
que te bendijo mil veces,
verter tu sangre. Cuidado. (8)

The danger for Christina resembles conflicts in many Golden Age honor plays, because her choice to marry During presents a perceived threat to her father's honor.

Nonetheless, despite the physical presence of Daerts's brandished sword, the frequency of Daerts's threats empty them of any imminent danger at the same time that they cast this father in an unfavorable light. After the previously mentioned quote from the ninth scene of Act I, Daerts threatens to take Christina's life three more times in the seventeenth scene (13-14) and an additional time in the nineteenth scene of the same act (15). When Christina pleads with him to forgive her for letting During into the house, reminding her father they both have the same familial blood coursing through their veins, Daerts reminds her that he is capable of spilling that same blood (13). He soon renews his threat to Christina: "ó casarte con Kerson, / ó morir hoy á mis manos" (13). Christina informs Daerts that if there is no alternative, then she will resolve to die rather than risk offending either During by marrying Kerson or Daerts by marrying During (13-14). Daerts's threats immediately reach their apex when he replies, "Pues, hija vil, si

³ The relationship between property and honor extends back into the middle ages, as Robert Nye has amply demonstrated (16).

á eso aspira, / verás” and approaches Christina “arrancando un puñal” (14). Fabricio promptly restrains Daerts while Eliseta removes Christina from the room. Despite the tension surrounding this scene, it is important to note that it occurs rather early in the *comedia*. After this, the suspense surrounding Daerts’s vows to kill Christina lessens considerably, as the playwright draws more attention to the duel between Kerson and During as well as Christina’s eventual decision to save her family from financial ruin by marrying Kerson (26). This resolution arises as a result of the concern surrounding the imminent loss of social status rather than the threat of violence, suggesting that Daerts’s threats against Christina are more hollow than effective.

The conflict between During and Daerts exposes old views of marriage and honor as counterfeit through the contrast between the two men. Daerts’s lack of control and cowardice reveal that he does not deserve the control that he exercises over Christina. During, however, exhibits restraint in his interactions with Daerts, and proves that he is the better man.

The During-Kerson Duel

During accepts a challenge from Kerson and arranges a mock pistol duel in order to ridicule him. The duel between Christina’s potential suitors reveals During’s rational superiority over Kerson and also Daerts, who has selected the shallow nobleman for Christina. The initial catalyst for this honor conflict reverts to the moment when Kerson arrives at Daerts’s house early in the morning, during the tenth scene in Act I, to find Christina up and completely dressed:

... Eso
indica que algun cuidado
teneis, y nacer no puede
de otra causa, hablemos claros,
que de amor. (9)

Two scenes later, Kerson playfully attempts to persuade Christina to reveal to him the identity of her secret lover, swearing that he is not jealous (9), because

Ni yo
me avengo á ser vuestro esclavo,
ni á que vos los seais mia:
no, Madama; libres ambos
viviremos, como viven
hoy, los hombres ilustrados,
vos á vuestro gusto, y yo
al mio ... (10)

This statement reveals Kerson's intention to maintain an open marriage as well as his complete lack of romantic interest in Christina. During, who has hidden himself in the same room, overhears Kerson speaking of his agreement with Daerts to marry Christina (9), and becomes angry with her, believing that she has betrayed him (11).

Kerson does not become angry with During, even when he realizes that this man desires Christina (12), until the sixteenth scene of Act I, when During insults him in front of Daerts and Christina. In this same scene where Daerts arrives home and finds During in his house, Kerson stands by and watches their exchange, offering commentary. As During tells Daerts that he has only entered their home to bring the older man honor, Kerson humorously interjects, "Alabo / la presuncion." During insults him by stating that in order to behave and speak with honor and virtue, "por ningun caso, / hablará ni obrará, como / hablais vos, y habeis obrado." In response, Kerson initially reacts by "echando mano á la espada," to which During dismissively replies, "Luego seré / vuestro; ahora sosegaos" (12), stopping Kerson in his tracks. This exchange unveils Kerson's impetuous side, as well as During's scorn for his opponent, complete control over the situation and lack of fear over facing the other man.

By anticipating Kerson's next move, During maintains his dominance in this honor conflict. When Kerson arrives at During's house early in Act II, the latter informs the audience, "Que vendrá, creo / á desafiarme" (16). His previous scornful treatment of Kerson, including the initial insult and the dismissive statement, "Luego seré / vuestro," as well as his anticipation of Kerson's arrival call into question who really initiates this dueling challenge. Yes, Kerson comes to During's house, but During has manipulated him like a puppet. During determines that Kerson has no intention of following through with his challenge, and resolves "con una burla, / probarle, / y avergonzarle," because Kerson "es / tan covarde, como necio" (16). The stage directions show him making an arrangement with his maid Rosen after this statement, revealing to the audience that a surprise lies in store. Kerson appeals to his noble bloodline to initiate his challenge:

Los que nacieron
nobles como yo, no sufren
que haya labio tan grosero,
que se atreva á denigrar
su puro honor con dicterios. (16)

During concedes Kerson's right to complain about the insult (16), but then counters that this does not permit Kerson to kill him in a duel. He appeals to the law—"¿Y sabeis, que prohibidos / están por el Rey los duelos?" and to reason: "desmentireis el concepto en que os haya puesto yo, con matarme? No por cierto" (17)—and lectures Kerson that a true nobleman would follow the law (16). During censures Kerson for foolish, ignoble behavior and insists that fighting a duel would only confirm the very insults that instigated his challenge:

... sois un hombre
 de poco juicio, y de menos
 verdad; que teneis muy baxos
 y villanos pensamientos:
 que sois vicioso: y en fin,
 que á ser venis un compuesto
 de todo lo malo? Y bien,
 desmentireis el concepto
 en que os haya puesto yo,
 con matarme? No por cierto
 Solo os acreditareis
 de mas dichoso, ó mas diestro
 en el manejo de espada
 Elegid pues otros medios
 mas seguros, para que
 quede vuestro honor bien puesto. (17)

Ostensibly this reasoning affirms During's rational superiority over Kerson; During notes that a duel only shows who can handle a sword with more skill. Within this argument During has also reiterated his initial insult. Since he has already stated his intention to ridicule Kerson in the beginning of the scene (16), his call to "Elegid pues medios / mas seguros" (17), and his appeal to Kerson to behave with virtue "para que / quede vuestro honor bien puesto" (17) contain a hidden warning that the audience understands. If Kerson follows through with the duel, During will humiliate him and expose him as a coward. Kerson's reputation will be in a worse state than if he had simply desisted with his challenge.

However, Kerson proceeds with the challenge, allowing During to trap him into what Kerson believes is a life-threatening situation. Kerson responds to During's insults by calling him a coward, a comical assertion given that moments later, when During closes the door to give the two more privacy, he expresses stark fear that a duel is imminent: "Qué miro? perdido soy" (17). Once During leaves the scene, Kerson continues to voice his dismay and confirm his lack of bravery:

Por la espada vá. ¿Qué haré
 en tan evidente riesgo,
 si ni aun tenerla en la mano
 sé? Si riño, no hay remedio
 me mata: y si no, es capaz
 de hacer público el suceso
 y mi cobardia. ¡Que haya
 yo abusado de su cuerdo
 consejo! En fin, ya lo erré,
 apelemos al remedio. (17)

During never permits Kerson to escape from his challenge. He enters the room carrying two pistols and declares in an aside that he knows how to proceed without breaking the King's anti-dueling law or being labeled as a coward (17). This comment suggests that During, despite his appeals to virtue and the law, is not immune to the pull of the honor code nor the desire for revenge.

During accelerates the pace of this dueling ceremony by usurping various steps in the codified ritual, heightening Kerson's fear, revealing that Kerson knows little about dueling protocol, and augmenting the humor for the audience. Next, During informs Kerson that he has two pistols "Cargadas ... / las dos, con igual esmero / por mi mano" (17-18), and tells Kerson to take one of them. He reminds Kerson that he has selected pistols because as a soldier he would have an unfair advantage with a sword. During informs Kerson that he has loaded the pistols, which is a lie, because the audience soon learns that Rosen has loaded them (18). However, if Kerson knew about the honor code, he would realize that generally seconds should load pistols, and when possible, the pistols should be new and unfamiliar to both participants (Murciano 83). In the case of the most severe insults, the offended party was sometimes permitted to have both participants use his pistols (Murciano 84), but the verbal insults that the men have exchanged should not warrant this type of change. Nonetheless, During hands Kerson one of his own pistols instead of providing neutral weapons for both (17).

The scene which follows demonstrates Kerson's ineptitude and lack of bravery. Still unaware of the contents of the pistols' chambers, Kerson examines his weapon with fear, voicing his complete ignorance about weapons, as well as dueling procedures: "Qué he de hacer?" (18). His cowardice in part stems from his lack of training in armed combat, a reminder that the nobility in eighteenth-century Spain was far removed from their military origins, despite their continued reliance on medieval principles. Kerson attempts to extricate himself from this situation by claiming that During's logical reasoning has successfully convinced him about the evils of dueling: "vuestras razones / tan rara impresion me han hecho, / que tengo por acertado ... / Que lo dejemos" (18). The sudden appeal to reason, of course, stems from fear rather than a change of heart. During, however, in an aside, assures the audience that he intends to fully expose

Kerson's cowardice: "Pues ya mostró su temor, / poner por obra resuelvo, / la burla que le previne" (18). To Kerson he states that it is too late, and they will proceed. During taunts Kerson's declaration of "respect", which he attributes to his gun: "Esta pistola, no es eso?" (18), a mocking reference to the former's previous insistence that the only way to restore one's honor is through a duel.

Kerson next attempts to persuade During to move the duel to a remote location—presumably a reasonable expectation, since dueling manuals called for both a neutral location as well as a delay in combat (Murciano 63-64), neither of which are observed by During. Thus, During's insistence that they continue forces Kerson to face the potential implications of the honor code he has professed to follow: "pues aqui / me insultasteis, aqui debo, / tomar la satisfaccion" (18). The men are standing in During's house, which is hardly a neutral location. During permits no waiting period after Kerson's initial challenge, and his last statement, which speaks of During's desire for satisfaction as opposed to Kerson's, affirms that he controls this process, and that he has created this plan to exact his own brand of revenge.

The statement "debo, / tomar la satisfaccion" confirms that while Kerson may believe that he initiated this challenge, During has controlled this *lance* from the beginning. He has assumed the role of the offended party, but also the seconds, witnesses for both sides generally charged with selecting the type of duel and weapons (35). Finally, During assumes the role of a *juez de campo*, the second who serves as a ceremonial facilitator, telling participants when to measure their paces and fire (Murciano 85-90). Acting as a sort of *juez de campo*, During asserts ultimate control over this duel by firing the first and only shot before Kerson realizes what is happening. As Kerson argues that the noise from their pistols will alert the authorities, During interrupts him:

Kerson:	Pero no veis, que al estruendo, acudirá la justicia, y[-]
During:	Nada miro; y supuesto que vos estais tan remiso, de aquesta manera [a]vengo el agravio que me hicisteis. (18)

Immediately after this statement, the stage directions show that During "Dispara la pistola, y Kerson cae como muerto, soltando la suya" (18).

During robs Kerson of any notice or opportunity to prepare himself for this shot, maximizing the surprise for both the character and the audience. Kerson initially believes he has been fatally shot: "Muerto soy" (18). During's insulting response, "Lo que hace el miedo" (18), confirms that Kerson has only collapsed because of fright, not because of a gunshot wound. During's "lesson" for Kerson and his authority over this

duel expose Kerson as a coward, but this encounter does not necessarily cast During in a completely virtuous light. He has assumed total control of the duel and purposefully kept Kerson in a state of perpetual confusion. This clear advantage over Kerson appears all the more dubious when one remembers that During, as a member of the military or, “Oficial Sueco,” already has an unfair advantage.

Once Kerson realizes that the guns only contained powder, he expresses admiration for During, a fact observed by Joan Pataky-Kosove in *The “Comedia Lacrimosa” and Spanish Romantic Drama (1773-1865)* (91). However, Kerson vows that “aunque pierda la vida / he de vengar el desprecio” (18). During’s trick has humiliated Kerson, a fact that may eventually endanger the latter’s reputation more than any previous insult. Furthermore, Kerson’s stated intention to avenge this insult carries no weight with it now that During has exposed him as a coward without any ability to engage in combat. Kerson poses no threat to During and does not attempt any additional challenges. The stage is set for During to win Christina’s hand.

Financial Generosity as the Final Resolution

Enlightened virtue and reason, as personified in During, appear to prevail when the law finds in favor of his case for possession of the family’s lands. In the nineteenth scene of Act II, an official notice reveals to During and the audience:

Comunico á Vmd. la agradable noticia, de por sentencia definitiva le declaran los Jueces dueño legítimo de los mayorazgos, cuyo derecho litigara. Por ella mandan á Daerts, reintegre á Vmd. el total de los caídos, que por decreto 11 de Enero del año anterior, se mandaron depositar á satisfaccion de Vmd ... intimando á él, y sus sucesores, un perpetuo silencio á cerca de esta demanda.
(20)

The law rules that During is the “legitimate” owner of the land and orders Daerts to transfer all property to the younger man. Thus, During, not Daerts, is the one who receives “satisfaction.” The younger order has toppled the older, established order. However, in the process, Daerts finds himself facing a ruined status in society because of his lack of property. He states that he and Christina will descend to a miserable state of poverty (13). If Daerts permitted During to marry Christina, she would not face this poverty, but he himself would have neither the *mayorazgo* nor his previous position of honor.

Consequently, Daerts, rather than change his resolution on Christina’s marriage, turns to Kerson for financial assistance. When Daerts asks if Kerson will help, Kerson replies that he has neither money nor friends who will give him a loan. To Daerts’s request that he sell some jewels or other valuables, Kerson notes that his possessions “hacen falta a la decencia, / y ostentacion con que debo / presentarme” (22). This

exchange suggests that Daerts's plan to financially maintain the family through Christina's marriage to Kerson would fail on multiple fronts. Besides the flaws in Kerson's character, a key element of importance to Daerts—Kerson's wealth—may be yet another illusion created by a nobleman in denial about his financial status.

Kerson's strong interest in the outcome of the lawsuit confirms his lack of funds and the inevitable failure of Daerts's plan to secure his future through Christina's marriage. Throughout *El amante generoso*, Kerson's attitude toward marriage, particularly his disdain for the notion of fidelity, have portrayed him as the diametrical opposite of During, whose love for Christina points to a sentimental view of this social institution. Toward the end of Act II Kerson eagerly asks Daerts, "Vaya, Daerts, / que hay de boda, y que tenemos / de pleyto, que son los puntos / que me interesan" (29). Upon hearing that the ruling in the lawsuit has left Christina without a dowry, Kerson informs the family once and for all that there will be no wedding (29). Both Daerts and Kerson's selfish desires have led them to contrive a wedding and treat Christina as property, but their moral bankruptcy leads to their financial failure.

Meanwhile During, as the *amante generoso*, attempts multiple times to monetarily rescue Christina and her father. In Act I During offers general financial assistance, and Daerts replies that he would never receive help from the hand of his enemy (12). A couple of scenes later Daerts's servant Fabricio reveals that During has secretly helped with the daily expenses of their household (15). After the lawsuit awards him the lands and orders Daerts to compensate During, the younger man tries to forgive this debt by sending Daerts a signed receipt for the fine, an act which Christina's father labels an excessive insult and proceeds to tear up the receipt (23). To accept this offer would mean conceding defeat and control to During, and Daerts still hopes a marriage to Kerson will enable him to avoid this embarrassing step.

Instead of threatening Christina with death again, Daerts places in her hands the charge with saving their family or permitting its destruction through her acquiescence or refusal to wed Kerson:

Un remedio
solo, nos queda, y está
en tu mano, ...
que depende de el, tu bien
estár, mi honor, mi sosiego,
y aun mi vida; pues perdido
mi honor, ni aun la vida quiero. (25-26)

Daerts's plea constitutes an attempt on the part of the author to stir sympathy for Christina and their family's plight, though in effect Daerts has simply changed the nature of the threat. Whereas previously Christina faced death at her father's hand for failing to obey his will, now she faces responsibility for her father's death if she does not

marry Kerson. In fact, Daerts hands her a dagger and states: “Sí, sí: pues toma este acero / fiera: termina mis días / tristes, odiosos, y negros, / con tu parricida mano” (26). Daerts still torments Christina in order to protect his reputation, while During’s generosity, at times conducted in secret, attempts to protect her.

The scene where Daerts hands the dagger to Christina, which appeals more to sympathy and reflects eighteenth-century popular theater’s interpretation of sentiment, differs little from the scene where he threatens her. Both are attempts to coerce Christina. After Daerts’s impassioned plea, Christina notes:

No hay medio;
ó hacerme yo para siempre
infeliz, ó ser objeto
de la censura del mundo
abandonando en su acervo
dolor á mi Padre. Ay, Padre
mio! Ay During! (26)

This emotional outburst reflects the impossibility of Christina’s situation and suggests that while During may have triumphed in the lawsuit against her father, his victory remains incomplete, because Daerts has again prevented him from winning Christina.

Daerts’s words of comfort to Christina—“Consuelate, / Christina amada, que el Cielo / te hará dichosa, premiando / tu obediencia y tu respecto” (26) ring hollow because he has forced her obedience, and the match will yield neither a moral nor financial profit for the family. Christina’s acquiescence is of little dramatic value, as the main conflicts occur between the male characters, in particular between Daerts and During. Daerts’s efforts to win the lawsuit and maintain ownership of his *mayorazgo* remain doomed to failure, because Kerson’s lack of intelligence, character and money render marriage to him a non-option.

Thus from the beginning of the play, During is the only real option for Christina. After Kerson’s final refusal to marry Christina without a dowry, During’s generosity reaches its zenith when he offers to pay her dowry, delivering this sentimental monologue:

... Qué os sorprende
la oferta? La amo, me veo
ya sin derecho á su mano
y aunque ella misma el derecho
me quita, por cuya causa
debiera ofenderme, es menos
la ofensa que ella me hace,
que el amor que yo la tengo ... (30)

With this offer During affirms once again that he deserves Christina. According to During, the denial of his engagement to Christina should offend him, but he instead chooses the non-violent path of charity.

In fact, During has also revealed that the principle motive for his lawsuit was not to right the wrong committed by Daerts against his father by stealing the *mayorazgo*, but rather to provide for Christina:

Mi Padre, antes de morir
aclarar quiso, el derecho
que tenia á los crecidos
bienes, que vos poseyendo
estabais. Se hallaba pobre,
bien veis, que debia hacerlo.
Seguí, despues, la demanda
yo, con el hidalgo objeto,
de hacer feliz á mi prima,
si llegaba á poseerlos,
con ellos, y con mi mano. (28)

During's reference to his right to the lands repeats an earlier statement in Act I about Daerts's dishonest proceedings with his family (5). Despite Daerts's ranting about his wounded honor, During is the one who may rightfully claim that he has been offended. However, he has exercised restraint by aligning himself with the law and following the legal proceedings initiated by his father rather than resorting to violence to contrive a resolution. During's last offer of charity toward Daerts finally leads the older man to concede Christina's hand to During and acknowledge that he has been wrong to contrive a marriage with Kerson and deny the superior suitor. Daerts speaks contritely of:

el rubor que me causa
pensar que he sido tan necio,
que la mano de mi hija
un dia llegué á ofreceros:
y que por vos he ultrajado,
y desairado á un sugeto
tan digno como During. (30)

With this statement, the *comedia* resolves the conflict of a problematic arranged—forced—marriage for Christina. As the victor over Daerts and Kerson, During has apparently emerged as the paragon of enlightened masculinity. Nonetheless, the duel

between During and Kerson suggests that tensions persisted within the representation of this *hombre de bien* which threatened to undermine the play's goals and resolution.

Conclusion

Christina may finally wed the man that she loves, the match supported by reason, virtue and sentiment. During, the more enlightened and generous of her two prospects, has won her hand. Daerts himself admits that he was wrong to try to force her to wed such an ill-suited choice as Kerson. This summary implies that sensibility and reason, expressed through Christina's impassioned pleas, tears and laments, as well as During's expressions of love, his virtuous intention to seek Christina's benefit, and his arguments against violence, have achieved a neat resolution.

Daerts's treatment of his daughter and his blindness to Kerson's true character and motives for marrying Christina criticize a model of masculinity based on honor-as-reputation. Martin aptly points out that "The conflict is sustained only by the stubbornness of Christina's father" (266). Through Daerts, this masculine model is portrayed as irrelevant and barbaric in the face of a superior example, the *hombre de bien* as represented by During.

The mock duel with Kerson demonstrates that the conflict over models of masculinity is not a simple issue of past versus present. Kerson is not a relic from the past but, as a type of *petimetre*, represents a contemporary example of masculinity gone wrong. He is superficial, and in his cowardice and ignorance of weapons, effeminate. During employs the mock duel to outwit Kerson and expose his bluff, proving that he is a more reasonable man. However, the staging of their encounter also exalts During's virility. Kerson's speculation about During's superior knowledge of the sword and pistol, and the physical representation of the pistol shot, while humorous, also create the impression of an actual duel. This scene no doubt appealed to audiences who may have enjoyed *comedias de capa y espada*, which frequently featured dueling. Yet the mock duel, coupled with During's statements that he should be the one who is offended, suggest that this *hombre de bien* was not immune to the pull of honor-as-reputation. If this is true, then how sustainable is the popular version of the *hombre de bien*? Could During have proven his superiority over Kerson and his own personal restraint through reason minus the physical display of the mock duel?

During, who espouses a sense of honor based on virtue and generosity, prevails over Kerson, who is without virtue, and Daerts, who stubbornly holds to a captious sense of Baroque honor. Daerts's threats against Christina, Kerson's greedy motives for marrying her, and During's desire to protect Christina and aid her father presumably portray a sense of honor based on virtue as superior. However, contradictory views over honor-as-reputation versus honor-as-virtue coexist within the *hombre de bien*, casting doubt on the sustainability of this model of masculinity in eighteenth-century Spanish theater.

WORKS CITED

- Barker-Benfield, G.J. *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992. Print.
- Bolufer Peruga, Mónica. "Hombres de bien: Modelos de masculinidad y expectativas femeninas, Entre la ficción y la realidad." *Cuadernos de Ilustración y Romanticismo: revista del Grupo de Estudios del Siglo XVIII*. 15 (2007): 7- 31. Print.
- Cabriñana, Julio Urbina y Cevallos-Escalera, marqués de. *Lances de honor: código del honor en España*. Madrid: Sucesores de Rivadeneira, 1900. Print.
- Carnero, Guillermo, 1988. "Sensibilidad y exotismo en un novelista entre dos siglos: Gaspar Zavala y Zamora." *Romanticismo 3-4 Acti del IV Congreso sul Romanticismo spagnolo e ispanoamericano*. Genova: Università di Genova, 1988. 23-9. Print.
- . Introducción. *Gaspar Zavala y Zamora, Obras narrativas*. Ed Guillermo Carnero. Barcelona: Editorial Sirmio y U de Alicante, 1992. 1-35. Print.
- Fernández Cabezón, Rosalía. *Lances y batallas: Gaspar Zavala y Zamora y la comedia heroica*. Valladolid: Aceña, 1990. Print.
- Fuentes, Yvonne. *El triángulo sentimental en el drama del dieciocho. Inglaterra, Francia, España*. Erfurt, Germany: Kurt und Roswitha Reichenberger, 1999. Print.
- García Garrosa, María Jesús. *La retórica de las lágrimas: La Comedia Sentimental Española, 1751-1802*. Valladolid: Secretariado de Publicaciones, 1990. Print
- Haidt, Rebecca. *Embodying Enlightenment: Knowing the Body in Eighteenth-Century Spanish Literature and Culture*. New York: St. Martin's, 1998. Print.
- Herrera, Josef. *Correo de Madrid ó de los ciegos*. Hemeroteca Municipal, May 2008. Microfilm.
- Martin, Frederick Carlyle. "The Dramatic Works of Gaspar de Zavala y Zamora." Diss. University of North Carolina, 1958. Microfilm.
- McClelland, I.L. *Spanish Drama of Pathos 1750-1808*. 2 vols. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1970. Print.
- Murciano, A. *Prontuario del duelo*. Madrid: Depósito de la Guerra, 1902. Print.
- Nye, Robert. *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Early Modern France*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993. Print.
- Pataky-Kosove, Joan L. *The "Comedia Lacrimosa" and Spanish Romantic Drama (1773-1865)*. London: Tamesis, 1977. Print.
- Pérez Magallón, Jesús. *El teatro neoclásico*. Madrid: Laberinto, 2001. Print.
- Zavala y Zamora, Gaspar. *El amante generoso*, n.p., n.d.