

REASONABLE PERSUASION: SPEECH IN GARCÍA DE LA HUERTA'S *RAQUEL*

Megan Irene Eidson

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Romance Languages (Spanish).

Chapel Hill
2010

Approved by:

Irene Gómez Castellano

Rosa Perelmuter

Carmen Hsu

ABSTRACT

MEGAN EIDSON: Reasonable Persuasion: Speech in García de la Huerta's *Raquel*
(Under the direction of Irene Gómez Castellano)

This thesis investigates the nature of persuasive speeches made by Hernán García and Raquel in order to persuade King Alfonso to turn his attentions respectively toward the Castilian people and Raquel. Each speech uses particular techniques that are born within the genders of the speakers, and each speech is successful because of these strategies. These speeches reflect the contemporary political atmosphere of the author, García de la Huerta's, literary age and reflect a representation of the events surrounding the Esquilache riots. In this way, the author goes beyond a simple demonstration of the world as it is, but in fact accuses Esquilache of misdeeds by demonstrating him to have fallen into feminine habits of excessive greed and emotion that drive him. The author thus warns Carlos III against such influences that are evidenced in gendered persuasive discourse.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
II. The Rational Nobleman: Reasonable Persuasion.....	19
III. The Weeping Temptress: (Un)Reasonable Persuasion.....	33
IV. Conclusion	49
V. Appendix 1: Hernán García's Speech to Alfonso VIII	52
VI. Appendix 2: Raquel's Speech to Alfonso VIII.....	55
VII. Works Cited.....	58

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Born in Zafra in March of 1734¹, Vicente Antonio García de la Huerta led a fairly unsurprising first half of his life. His father served in the public administration and the author himself, after beginning to publish as early as 1755 and marrying in 1757, found employment with the Duke of Alba. This was also the beginning of a creative period in the García de la Huerta's life: he began publishing poetic works, the first one being *Endimión*, in 1755 (Cañas Murillo 4). In 1766, Andioc notes that García de la Huerta suffered an intense, drastic change in his life, and it is during this later period of his life that this author wrote his most famous work, *Raquel* (Andioc Introduction 9). Jesús Cañas Murillo notes this as the year of the “ruptura con la trayectoria anterior y el comienzo de la tercera fase de su biografía, la etapa de la persecución, los pleitos, y el destierro” (5). As Cañas Murillo also notes, there are various reasons given for García de la Huerta's flight from Spain. Fucilla puts it most simply: “Lo que sabemos es que él mismo ech[ó] la culpa de sus desgracias al poderoso conde de Aranda [...] y que pudo resultar de la injerencia del conde en una intriga amorosa de Huerta” (12). However, this change in García de la Huerta's life did not stop his writing, in spite of exile to Paris.

While abroad, García de la Huerta continued to publish poetry and once he returned home, he was brought back to Madrid and incarcerated when he was found to be at fault for writing a set of anonymous couplets against the Count of Aranda. The defense that García de

¹ For a detailed description of García de la Huerta's family lineage, see Alonso Cortés 333-343.

la Huerta wrote for himself was presented in 1769, but he would continue to be imprisoned multiple times before his death, and his travel was repeatedly restricted.² After the death of the duke of Alba in 1776, García de la Huerta was finally able to recover his previous employment with the Biblioteca Real and the work for which he is most famous, *Raquel*, was first presented in 1778, over ten years after the well-known *motín* of Esquilache. These riots were a revolt of the Spanish masses against Carlos III's Italian minister, Esquilache, whose influence in government had caused rising costs of bread and other staples for the Spanish public.³ In the next year, 1779, García de la Huerta published his retelling of Sophocles' *Electra*, which he entitled *Agamenón vengado*, and in 1784 came his translation of Voltaire, *La Fe triunfante del amor y cetro, o Xaira*. His fourth work, *Lisi desdeñosa* was only discovered more recently, and remains without a date of authorship.⁴ In spite of having written a total of four plays – two of which might be more properly called translations – and a large amount of poetry, *Raquel*, is easily the most well known and certainly the most studied.⁵

None of these other theatrical works commanded the success that *Raquel* did, as that particular play was put on for nearly three decades until it finally suffered censorship. García de la Huerta's plays all share common threads. In these works, he focuses on portrayals of female characters with problems of love and identity, and he draws these characters and their

² For more information on García de la Huerta's defense and imprisonments, see (Andioc "Introducción" 8-11)

³ For more information on this event, see Medina Domínguez(137-172)

⁴ For more information on the content of this comedy see Cañas Murillo (16)

⁵ The most notable examples of scholarly studies of this work are the multiple works of René Andioc, including "La Raquel de la Huerta y la censura," and "*Raquel* de la Huerta y el antiabsolutismo." Also significant is I. L. McClelland's chapter entitled "*Raquel*: An Artistic Interlude, 1778" from her book *Spanish Drama of Pathos 1750-1808* as well as Jerry Johnson's article, "The Relevancy of *Raquel* to Its Times." These and others will be discussed in the section that follows.

stories from other sources, whether Spanish or otherwise. *Lisi desdeñosa* is the only comedy he wrote, the others are tragedies that focused more directly on the question of governance and a king's which, as Medina Domínguez notes, was common of other playwrights as well: "La relación entre el rey y su público reproduce la disposición de los teatros del siglo XVIII" (149). Additionally he took great care with the versification and language used. All of these characteristics, especially that of the dynamic between the king and his subjects, are visible in his best known work of theater, *Raquel*.

Historically, the play provided a societal mirror – the Castilian court of Alfonso VIII – through which contemporary events could be understood, as Medina Domínguez notes in a very recent study entitled *Espejo de sombras: Sujeto y multitude en la España del siglo XVIII* (111). In this work, Medina Domínguez points out that the common people of Spain are simultaneously present and not present through the words of Hernán García and Raquel (111). The audience similarly could see some truth about their own circumstances through the artificial deception on stage but they were unable to affect positive change in government. Medina Domínguez goes on to point out that the play, in its ultimate destruction of Raquel and its swaying power with the Castilian noblemen, demonstrates the violent potential of the masses to its audience, those same masses (112).

Just as Jovellanos notes that the Spanish common people act passively in government and that there was limited class interaction, Medina Domínguez goes on to extrapolate from this that through the theater, the Spanish people passively received a message, such as that of García de la Huerta, in whose meaning they could not participate; he notes that the significance of the play is aimed at "complacer al public, tanto para el rey como para el actor, es sinónimo de contenerle, de evitar su motín" (Medina Domínguez 111). Although tensions

had been rising for some time due to Esquilache's influence in the rising cause of staple goods, the riots began on March 23, 1766, in a confrontation between two townsmen and several soldiers. As the numbers grew from two men to 2,000, the rioters marched through the streets damaging lampposts and knifing one of Esquilache's servants. Initially, government action seemed to only worsen the mob as the anger of the common people grew in response to the violence of the soldiers. Carlos III did not improve matters by not realizing their severity until days after the initial hostilities began. Although dissuaded by several ministers, Carlos III accepted the demands of the mob, which included that only Spanish ministers fill government positions and that the king himself voice his acceptance of these terms rather than standing behind other men. As has already been mentioned, *Raquel* seems to offer a solution to prevent these riots. This can be seen in the figure of Hernán García, who acts as the voice of the pueblo as well as the noblemen of Spain – allying the two groups – in their desire to remove the titular character from court.

García de la Huerta does so by posing Hernán García's alliance with the pueblo as a means of avoiding such a rebellious catastrophe. As has already been mentioned, it is difficult to determine when García de la Huerta began writing *Raquel*, but there is a clear connection between that play and the Esquilache Riots as the former critiques a king that has given into his whims and the latter was a revolt against a nobleman who had taken advantage of a passive king in order to exert his own control over the Spanish economy. The blindness of Alfonso to the needs of his people is a pointed critique of Carlos III, in whose reign “el predominio de la pasión en el gobierno <<despótico>> impide que el rey tome decisiones previamente meditadas con detenimiento” (Andioc *Teatro y sociedad* 173). Furthermore, in *Raquel*, the public is “enfrentado a las consecuencias de su propia falta de control y a la

necesidad de una figura de intermediación” (Medina Domínguez 115). Clearly, this parallels the reaction of the pueblo to the interference of Esquilache – who should be compared to the ambitious Jewess Raquel – and the sudden, violent reaction of the Spanish people. In the play, this violence is subdued until the last moments: the pueblo is initially placated by Hernán García’s persuasion of the king to abandon Raquel’s bed, but when Alfonso returns to it a second time, the noblemen have no recourse but to force her death.

These rebellious ideas were perceived as dangerous by the censors, and – although Andioc calls this one of the great mysteries of the eighteenth century – the play was shelved, thirty years after its first production, in 1809, in spite of its popularity (Introduction 8-12). As a dramatic hybrid of the Baroque and Enlightenment ideals, as well as a perceived danger to the public, *Raquel* maintains a shaky status within the canon of Spanish literature. The play’s precarious position in literary history has been noted by Jerry L. Johnson, “si no fuera por su famosa tragedia *Raquel*, habría pasado a la historia de las letras españolas de este período como un polemista más de los que tanto alboroto armaron saliendo o a defender o a negar el mérito artístico del drama de la Edad de Oro”⁶ (Johnson *Teatro español del siglo XVIII* 483). In spite of this, it is well accepted that *Raquel* was positively received by the Spanish public in 1778 and remained popular until it was finally censured in 1809, due to words that the censors deigned should not be heard within the theater by the public “que vive bajo el feliz gobierno monárquico que disfrutamos” (Andioc “La *Raquel* del la Huerta y la censura” 414). However, García de la Huerta’s relatively lackluster body of work warrants further investigation in spite of being often forgotten in favor of other dramatists of the eighteenth century, whose works are not as complex as *Raquel*.

⁶ García de la Huerta is commonly considered a polemicist because of his “convicción patriótica fierísima” and his participation in antiabsolutism (Johnson 483). For more information see Andioc, “*Raquel* de la Huerta y el antiabsolutismo.”

The draw to studying the historical context of *Raquel* seems to be based in the strong connection that this particular play by García de la Huerta has to the political environment of its time. Additionally, its polemical nature can be seen through the critique that Hernán García and the other noblemen bring against the king. While the exact month that García de la Huerta finished writing the work is debated, Andioc disagrees with his predecessors who suggest that the play was written before the Esquilache Riots (Andioc “La *Raquel* de la Huerta y la censura” 391). Andioc instead suggests that the play was finished immediately after the Riots were over and that the play gives insight into the political atmosphere of Spain at the time.

Both Andioc and, more recently, Josep María Sala Valldaura have noted that the three noblemen of García de la Huerta’s play – Hernán García, Álvaro Fáñez, and Garcerán Manrique – represent varying political stances in the issue of royal duty; as Valldaura succinctly puts it, “Cada uno [de los personajes] encarna una posición ante la dejación de la soberanía por parte de Alfonso VIII” (Sala Valldaura 329). This inherent political nature of the play not only connects to the neoclassic concern with the happenings of Spanish government but it also points to the implicit connection between literature and politics during the eighteenth century (Valero 171-197).

Of the literary critics who have approached the topic of *Raquel*, I. L. McClelland comes closest to a discussion of the rhetorical nature of *Raquel* as she gives an overview of the emotional content of the play. However, the chapter in which this discussion takes place only briefly mentions *pathos* and *logos* as a general feature of the play. She notes such passions in the context of an emotionally-charged conflict rather than in the frame of the speeches given by Hernán García and Raquel themselves (McClelland 201-205. McClelland

brings up, but does not develop, the play's use of gender, explaining that Raquel "uses a woman's weapons only when she finds that a man's will make matters worse", and also points to the actors' interpretation of passion through gesture and Alfonso's passion as a "circumstantial clash between personal and State interests" (208, 199). In her discussion of Hernán García and Rubén's respective speeches she approaches the topic of reasonable and unreasonable discourse in *Raquel* through her discussion on logic within the play in its entirety.

Although studies such as the aforementioned works of Andioc, Hafter, and McClelland mention the clear rhetorical nature of García de la Huerta's work, however a complete and detailed analysis of the structure and language of persuasion and its engendered components has yet to be done. Without such an assessment the insistence on political speech and focus on the context of the work cannot be considered comprehensive. The present study wishes to contribute to this topic by acknowledging and analyzing the aforementioned persuasive and rhetorical nature of the language of both Raquel and the men of García de la Huerta's play. I argue that it is necessary to distinguish between the two types of discourse – the emotional and the logical – displayed through the conflicting discourses of Hernán García and Raquel and through both of which the complete significance of the work is revealed.

The rhetorical nature of the play is inherently neoclassical because it directly draws on the classical author, Aristotle, and in its analysis this work can be better placed in the cannon of neoclassical theater, a genre in which it has already been placed in spite of its relative transient baroque-neoclassic existence. In spite of some already mentioned thematic Baroque tendencies, *Raquel* demonstrates a strict adherence to the guidelines of Luzán,

including an attention to classical persuasive styles.

Luzán's writings remain some of the most notable of the eighteenth century reform of dramatic language. Although other such Spanish rhetoricians of this period included Gregorio Mayans y Siscar and Francisco José Artigas, "Luzán es considerado como el representante de un clasicismo peculiar que, aunque sin contenidos originales, se adapta a la situación española" (Hernández Guerrero 142). In *La poética* as well as his works describing the best means of conversing, Luzán emphasized the importance of good communication between men (Hernández Guerrero 143). With this in mind, the neoclassic authors broke from Baroque styles and moved towards a set of guidelines that fit the reformative intellectual atmosphere of this time. This was not the only means the eighteenth century found of reviving classical authors; they also looked to the ancient authors as a source of insight.

García de la Huerta among other playwrights retold or translated some Greek and Roman plays, or they often featured major mythological characters, events, and themes. *Agamenón vengado* will provide one example of such plays, but even more common was the use of historical settings and authorly intentions. As Deacon notes, Moratín not only mimicked Aristotle's method of writing comedy, but he also imitated Horace's purpose, that of simultaneously teaching and entertaining (Deacon "Eighteenth-century Neoclassicism" 307). These facets of neoclassical writing were documented in the writings of a small number of theorists who published during the eighteenth century, most notably the aforementioned Ignacio de Luzán, but also such authors as Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos in his essay, "Memoria para el arreglo de la policía de los espectáculos y diversiones públicas y sobre su origen en España." In this essay, Jovellanos proposes that he will discuss the

development of Spanish theater so that in the second portion of this work he can demonstrate its benefits for the general population. It is in this latter part that Jovellanos suggests reform of theater is necessary not only in the language, but also in the content so that the audience could be educated: “Entonces será el teatro lo que debe ser, una escuela para la juventud, un recurso para la ociosidad, una recreación y un alivio de las molestias de la vida pública y del fastidio y las impertinencias de la privada” (Jovellanos). He made this suggestion while simultaneously calling for a reform of the theatrical audience; he suggested that only those who could affect political reform should be those allowed to view theater; this should be accomplished by raising ticket prices. That is, Jovellanos demands that playwrights break from the ‘immoral’ plays of the previous century and engage in purposeful entertainment aimed at the middle and upper classes of Spanish society in order to cause changes at a national level. This is especially interesting in the case of *Raquel*’s censorship due to its “dangerous” message. Using historical context rather than the setting of the eighteenth century allowed theater to be “an ideal instrument for social and moral reform” (Glendenning 92).

Aristotle’s deliberative discourse is used not only in a rational appeal to Alfonso’s logic, but Raquel turns this on its head by appealing to the king’s passions in a similarly structured emotional appeal.⁷ This oft referenced but never assessed characteristic of *Raquel* requires investigation that will give further insight into the writing of García de la Huerta. By studying the choice of reasoning, the structure of the appeal, and the carefully selected words and metaphors, *Raquel* can be better understood as a political, historical, and literary text that was popular and relevant to the audience of its time, representative of a societal perspective that was deemed dangerous enough to censure because it might give the public

⁷ Aristotle does not negate the use of emotion and supports both types of appeal.

ideas about forcing governmental change of which the current political powers of Spain understandably did not approve.

This leaves a gap in a detailed study of the persuasive nature of the play, namely an in-depth analysis of Hernán García and Raquel's speeches, the rhetorical tools used, the manner in which they appeal to Alfonso, and how these two discourses are inherently engendered due to their disparate nature. García de la Huerta's work can be seen to construct two different types of appeals: the logical appeal of Hernán García versus the emotional appeal of Raquel. Hernán García's logical appeal is, as are all such appeals, an appeal to the rational motives of his listener, Alfonso VIII. Hernán García uses the human capacity for *logos*, that is, the ability "to deliberate about what is advantageous or harmful, right or wrong" to show Alfonso that Raquel is detrimental to Castile's prosperity (Cohen 34). Raquel chooses instead the appeal to *pathos*, in which she assumes the emotive role of the grieving ex-lover for her listener, Alfonso; this follows Aristotle's definition of such an appeal as the speaker assists his or her audience by adopting such a function (Kinney 91). Both of the characters engage in deliberative dialogue that, falling in line with Aristotle's definition, is meant to either dissuade Alfonso VIII from continuing his affair with Raquel or to persuade him to continue it. Hernán García specifically utilizes the *exemplum* to construct a double-sided argument, which first portrays himself as the ever-loyal vassal who has demonstrated his ability to stay by his king's side no matter the danger and second poses Raquel as the villainous invader. Furthermore, this allows him to critique Raquel in such a way that Alfonso cannot help but believe him.

The second portion of this analysis will focus on the remarkably different argument that Raquel presents to Alfonso VIII, which, although her response to Hernán García seems

to fall on deaf ears, is initially effective in changing his mind. Each of these two types of discourse counter the other completely such that if Raquel had made her argument first and Hernán García gave his second, Alfonso would likely have agreed with Raquel and then later changed his mind to consent to Hernán García's point of view. Because of their clear opposition and the tactics taken by each character, there is an inherent and complete dichotomy of gender within the language of García de la Huerta's *Raquel*.

The careful art of persuading kings requires tact, diplomacy, and a refined knowledge of rhetorical strategy. Aristotle suggests that such persuasion has myriad rhetorical devices to choose from, and three types of appeals – *logos*, *pathos*, and *ethos*. In the history of Spain, *logos*, or the logical appeal has been associated with masculine rhetoric while an abuse of passion – *pathos* – is related to an effeminate style of speech. Rebecca Haidt, in her study on *Seduction and Sacrilege*, demonstrates satire of ecclesiastical speech of the eighteenth century in her discussion of *Fray Gerundio de Campazas*, in which Padre Isla constantly applies feminine characteristics to Fray Gerundio, whose Baroque discourse and verbal excesses exposes this overindulgence of *pathos* that the Enlightenment rejects. In Vicente García de la Huerta's famed work, *Raquel*, presents a theatrical hybrid in which each of these persuasive options appears side by side. Raquel, the protagonist, enacts an exposition full of tears, exaggeration, and repetition of crimes against her, in a personification of the appeal to *pathos*. On the other hand, Hernán García petitions Alfonso VIII's sense of logic, *logos*, which he also embodies through the noble examples he presents against the backdrop of Raquel's villainy. Hernán García performs gender through his role as stoic nobleman while Raquel's engendered language is clear through her acts as a weeping temptress. Each of them, through their preferred means of persuasion, successfully persuades the king to either

remove Raquel from court or to allow her to stay. Through both of these characters, García de la Huerta shows the relationship between reason and masculinity, as well as between passion and femininity; but, it is through both types of rhetoric that the significance of the play is revealed: Raquel acts as an interloper in the Castilian court, which is amplified by her female speech which negates the principles of controlled, rational masculinity.

García de la Huerta follows Aristotle's rhetorical guidelines as he creates the discourse for both Hernán García and Raquel, the two most vocal characters in his play. Their opposition to each other brilliantly illustrates their qualities as masculine and feminine figures. Hernán García and Raquel assume gender roles that only can be clearly defined in comparison to the other respective character. Both of them perform gender in such a way that they reflect a persistent duality of the social perceptions of the eighteenth century; this demonstration of gender is most clear through Raquel who adopts feminine persuasive methods only when she sees that male ones will not work. Alfonso VIII proves to be such a malleable character that this gender dynamic floods García de la Huerta's *Raquel* as the two aforementioned characters vie for the ruler's attentions. The elements of Hernán García's logical appeal prove to persuade Alfonso not only through rational thought, but also by bringing the king's attention to various elements of his masculinity. As men, Hernán García and Alfonso are provided a significant associative point between the identities of the two, one who is subordinate to the other. Raquel, on the other hand, is an interloper on all fronts because she is an ambitious woman, as well as Jewish, as has been pointed out by scholars including René Andioc and Monroe Hafter, and she must find other means of relating the king to her cause. I argue that Raquel purposefully chooses to perform the role of passive, feminine victim with a discourse based on an appeal to *pathos* in order to establish a

counterpoint to Hernán García's reasonable, masculine rhetoric.

Raquel retells the tale of Alfonso VIII's affair with a Jewish woman through a series of conversations, particularly, arguments.⁸ In the first act, one of the noblemen of Alfonso's court, Hernán García, discusses the relationship between the king and Raquel with his fellow noblemen and ultimately brings his case before Alfonso himself. He produces a logical discourse on why Alfonso should abandon his relationship with Raquel and which appeals to Alfonso's reason and sense of duty. Succeeding in convincing the Spanish monarch to leave his lover, Raquel attempts unsuccessfully to defend herself by "masculine means," responding to his logic with her own. Just as Hernán García questions the way in which the king repays his vassals' acts of nobility with an irrational and destructive affair, Raquel then asks the king in disbelief, "¿Esta fineza/ no es el premio que tienes preparado/ a mi amor?" (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 98). This is a logic rebuttal that follows from Hernán García's reasoning but the king does not hear it, having been completely persuaded by his nobleman's ideal masculine speech. So, Raquel leaves, now exiled from the court and ostracized by the common people of Castile for her actions. Initially she appears to accept her fate; however, Rubén, her companion and advisor, convinces her otherwise. While his intentions are not entirely genuine – in reality he is just as ambitious as Raquel, herself – he persuades her nonetheless and they hatch a plan to win over Alfonso and bring Raquel back into his arms. The final dialogues of the play see their plot come to fruition and triumph over the noblemen's beliefs; but, in its climax, not only do the noblemen reject Raquel's authority but they force Rubén to kill her and they then kill Rubén themselves. In this murderous act, the revolt of the nobles – allied with the Castilian pueblo, whose voice can be heard throughout

⁸ Previous versions of this story include Lope de Vega's *Los paces de los reyes y judía de Toledo*, 1617, Antonio Mira de Amescua's *La desgraciada Raquel*, 1625, and Juan Bautista Diamante's *La judía de Toledo*, 1667.

the play – successfully returns Alfonso’s attentions to his duty as king by ridding the kingdom of Raquel.

Hernán García, using a logical argument which draws on the *exemplum*⁹ in order to convince the king, poises himself as the unfailingly loyal masculine hero who has shared conquests of war with King Alfonso VIII; this argument poises his positive maleness against Raquel’s negative female persona. This necessitates an unquestionably different type of response from Raquel. In fact, when she tries to imitate Hernán García to immediately refute his accusations, Alfonso meets her with no sympathy and stands firm in his intention to throw her out of Castile. Exiled and heartbroken, Raquel mourns her exile, the ‘fatal blow’ that she has received. It is only Rubén that can see the way to win back Alfonso, although he has his own ambitions in mind rather than the interests of Raquel. He suggests that she must give in to her “feminine” nature and save her tears for the king, as a physical sign of her grief and the mortal wound that she has suffered in being wrenched from his side: “Reprime, pues, el llanto; y si pretendes/ templar con él lo acerbo de tus penas,/ resérvale a occasion más oportuna. Del indignado Alfonso en la presencia las perlas, que aquí viertes sin provecho,/ de nuestra libertad rescate sean” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 104). While the two speakers, Hernán García and Raquel, both use a very structured, traditional, and carefully argued deliberative discourse, that is the extent of their similarities and the deviations relate entirely to their positions in the court as a man and a woman, and as an ally and an invader, respectively.

Clearly, the discussion of reasonable persuasion within *Raquel* goes hand in hand with an analysis of persuasive speech as a means of performing gender. The performance of gender is inherent in the choice of words as well as the choice of evidence that each of these

⁹ Emphasis on all Latin terms is mine.

two speakers present to the king, especially in that Raquel, following Rubén's advice, chooses to oppose Hernán García's speech completely, posing the uncontrolled passion of her grief against his controlled anger. Rebecca Haidt points out that masculinity in the eighteenth century was defined by attributes of dominance:

the long-standing association of 'masculine' with 'dominance' has roots in the parameters established by early Christianity's insistence on domination of the body. Masculinity was defined as the control of passions, desires and pleasures that played themselves out on a body representing such control through its exhibited avoidance of 'feminine' bodily aspect (Haidt *Embodying* 117)

That is to say, Hernán García asserts his masculinity also through his exposition on his manly actions and through his demonstrative controlled anger; Raquel, on the other hand poses herself as the opposite of this and thus feminine discourse is classified as uncontrolled, passionate speech accompanied by her feverish actions. Such actions are anti-masculine; as Haidt notes in her study of *Fray Gerundio de Campazas*, "His, [Fray Gerundio's], luxuriousness is feminized because extravagance, inordinate concern for one's physical appearance, and an inability to rationalize one's attitude towards pleasure are ideated in the oratorical tradition and in Gerundio's cultural milieu as 'feminine' tendencies" (*Seduction* 73). Raquel embodies all of these tendencies in her speech: she takes advantage of physical emotion to persuade Alfonso and decorates her speech with ornamentation that amplifies her pain in order to prey upon the king's sense of pity. This engendering of speech proves to be one significant element of Raquel's status as an interloper in Alfonso's court and a danger to the Castilian government's stability.

The present study will assess multiple aspects of Hernán García and Raquel's respective speeches including the different choice of appeals and an examination of the rhetorical devices used by the two respective speakers. Furthermore, an evaluation of the

types of arguments that each character emphasizes is then warranted. By considering these two modes of language, an engendering of language is clear in the brilliant and careful construction of the discourses. Even in the rhetoric manuals of Aristotle and other great writers, gender is constructed comparatively. Aristotle describes speech as masculine, and that which does not make for good discourse as feminine. Hernán García and Raquel, hundreds of years later, continue this comparative engendering of language by performing particular social conventions through their speech, such as emotional control and exaggerative ornamentation.

For the purpose of this study, the term “engendering of language” will follow the definition of “feminine language” given by Alison Weber in her book, *Teresa of Avila and the Rhetoric of Femininity*: Teresa of Avila used “a strategy which exploited certain stereotypes about women’s character and language,” which causes her language – and Raquel’s – to be markedly different from that of men, due entirely to the speaker’s role as a woman (11). Additionally, it is likely that this divided, gendered speech which utilized such stereotypical themes, imagery, and displays of emotion is yet another way that García de la Huerta was so intently aware of his audience and in this way made great efforts towards verisimilitude while maintaining the unities and the Spanish penchant for rhyme in theater. Finally, the play’s political aspects have been extensively explored and Raquel is well accepted as an interloper in Alfonso’s court who stands symbolically for the crimes that García de la Huerta saw in the government of Carlos III, which included the inability for nobility to critique the governance of the absolute king (Deacon “García de la Huerta,

Raquel, y el motín de Madrid de 1766”);¹⁰ this gendering of language further puts Raquel in opposition to the masculine ideals applauded by Hernán García’s oratory while reinforcing the political message of the play.

In order to accomplish this study, the two main persuasive discourses will be analyzed in chronological order according to the play. Each study will specifically apply the rhetorical theory of Aristotle in order to observe the way in which similar application of rhetorical structure can be used in two completely different and engendered appeals. As García de la Huerta strictly observes Luzán’s unities and other theatrical conventions, it follows to use Aristotle above Horace or Quintilian in this analysis as, in the area of theater, Luzán focuses almost entirely on Aristotle as a source of such information.¹¹ First, Hernán García’s early speech from act one will be analyzed and its masculine attributes will be pointed out so as to define the ideal of male speech in the scope of this play as seen by García de la Huerta, including the focused and engendered use of the *exemplum*. Attention will be given to the picture Hernán García paints of himself – that of a brave and loyal vassal to the king – with the intention of demonstrating Raquel’s dual role of usurper-invader and woman.¹² Specifically, he uses the *exemplum* to create an opposition between the Castilian noblemen who have proven their valor through their deeds, and Raquel, who has only proven her destructive nature. Second, Raquel’s own successful method of persuasion will be

¹⁰ Deacon further notes that in earlier versions of the manuscript such critique was even stronger and some of the scenes that passed the most serious judgments upon Carlos III were removed from the final product that we are familiar with today.

¹¹ Although Haidt notes that Quintilian “makes clear the gender ideals that inform the discourse on rhetoric,” which Aristotle does not comment on, García de la Huerta seems to respect the gender types of the eighteenth-century. These gender types follow the conventionally accepted divisions of this century, which are understood as the aforesaid dominant, controlled masculine versus the submissive, irrational feminine. Further, Aristotle allows for Raquel’s use of emotion in her appeal and so this again negates the use of any classical sources other than Aristotle (Haidt *Seduction and Sacrilege* 70)

¹² Throughout this study I will refer to ‘vassals,’ in the sense of good and loyal subjects of Castile, who are, specifically, the noblemen of Alfonso’s court.

assessed as an application of the Aristotelian theories of *pathos* and the implications of such philosophy on the role of women in García de la Huerta's work. Here, the text will be discussed with particular emphasis on her language of suffering, followed by a discussion of the differences between the discourses of herself and Hernán García; this will include an assessment of the role of gender within García de la Huerta's play.

CHAPTER 2

The Rational Nobleman: Reasonable Persuasion

García de la Huerta opens *Raquel* in the midst of a problematic stage of Alfonso VIII's reign: the titular character's seemingly tireless ambition, in combination with Alfonso's affection for this woman, has left the Castilian people neglected and the king's noblemen up in arms about the state of government affairs. This twelfth century frame provides a safe historical mirror through which García de la Huerta is able to critique the present state of Spain. While there are three noblemen – Hernán García, Alvar Fáñez, and Garcerán Manrique de Lara – who each represent a different political perspective, it is Hernán García who balks at Raquel's haughty attitude and the respect that she presumptively demands.¹³ The king, surprised that the noblemen of his court deny Raquel any sort of admiration, prompts a persuasive speech to be given by this outspoken vassal. He proceeds to do so through a structured speech that follows the Aristotelian order of exordium, narratio, confirmatio, and peroratio.¹⁴ This four-part argument described by Aristotle is embellished through an appeal to Alfonso's logic and sense of duty as a king. Through this speech he ultimately defines within the limits of *Raquel* masculine speech so that Raquel has no choice but to oppose him in a completely feminized manner, using an appeal to *pathos* that employs language full of excess passion and emotion. Such behavior when seen in men "risks the

¹³ For more information about this division of the characterization of the noblemen of Castile, see Jerry L. Johnson's *Teatro del Siglo XVIII*.

¹⁴ These are the Latin words for the four parts of a speech. The corresponding Greek terms are as follows: prooemium, diegesis, pistis, and epilogos. For more information on these and other parts of discourse see (Aristotle *On Rhetoric* 229-231).

disruption of his gender, thereby posing a threat to the stability of the national order” and thus in this time period excess of such behaviors were limited to women alone (Haidt *Seduction* 65). It will be seen through this analysis that in this discourse, Hernán García classifies that that which is good and familiar is that which is Christian, Castilian, and also that which is associated with conquest. He does this by citing the voice of the masses, using *exemplum*, and positioning Raquel as the voice of the invader.

Hernán García opens with an *exordium*: a brief statement that responds to Alfonso’s demanding questions and introduces the remainder of his argument in the manner of Aristotle. Aristotle describes the introduction as needed in all types of speech to provide a beginning and to introduce the listener to the matters at hand (Aristotle 233). Kennedy’s translation of Aristotle’s *On Rhetoric* specifically describes the exordium of deliberative speeches as serving the sole purpose of “to attack or absolve and to amplify or minimize” (Aristotle 235-236).

Hernán García begins his speech by introducing himself and Raquel as two opposing voices speaking to the king. Raquel’s name is not used until much later in the speech in order to pose her as a danger to the king’s rule while distancing Alfonso from their familiarity. She, “Esa voz, que de escándalo y desorden/.../esa voz que en el Templo originada,” is moreover linked to that evil that “profanó del lugar los fueros santos” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 92). This prioritizes Hernán García’s characterization of Raquel: she is first the Jewess, Raquel, and, second, Raquel, the king’s lover. With her religion brought to the forefront, her destruction of Alfonso’s kingdom is amplified to be the destruction of Christendom. The metaphor of the voice hearkens back to the serpentine voice of bad counsel heard by Count don Illán in the *Poema de Fernán González* which subsequently

causes the invasion of the Moors. Not only does the metaphor of the voice link to the medieval Spanish epic, but it also has a direct Biblical connection to the episode of the “Cleansing of the Temple” in which moneylenders and merchants are cast out of the Temple by Jesus. Using this evidence, Hernán García introduces the division between good and evil: he, the Christian nobleman, stands on the side of that which is good and advantageous, and Raquel remains opposing him as a destructive, chaotic, invasive force. What might seem on the surface to be a casual statement of lineage is not; it instead connects Raquel as not only a threat to Alfonso as an individual man but also to Christianity as a whole, as her voice comes from the Temple to profane the aforementioned holy places of the saints – in other words, the Catholic Church. In this way, Hernán García does not appear overzealous – in other words, he demonstrates masculine control – in his accusations of Raquel and shows concern for the divine hierarchy of the Spanish throne through attention to the biblical story, “The Cleansing of the Temple” also gives weight to his argument.¹⁵ Raquel herself is the Jewish force that profanes this place of worship, against the express commands of Jesus in the Gospels: “My house will be a house of prayer, but you have made it a den of robbers” (*New International Version*, Luke 19.46). In this way, she embodies both a past and present threat to the Christian, Castilian nation.

Hernán García is careful to avoid an excessive diatribe. He aims to circumvent any feminine displays of unnecessary emotion by simply introducing the issue as one of an interloper irreverently committing crimes against Spain’s principal values and secondarily presents the more pertinent problem of Raquel: “de la Majestad los privilegios/ tan

¹⁵ These cleansing episodes are cited in Matthew 21.12-27, Mark 11.15-33, Luke 19.45-48, and John 2.12-25. In these episodes – although they take place in varying locations – Jesus enters the temple to find it turned into a market place. He casts out the merchants and the moneylenders, and asserts that a house of prayer has been profaned.

injuriosamente ha vulnerado” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 92). The introduction does not end with this statement of crimes against the crown; Hernán García goes on to quickly explain the nature of his argument, providing an auditory map for the listener. In order to accomplish his goal of vilifying Raquel he both poses the noblemen of Castile as those truthful, reasonable, loyal vassals while he attacks the seductress and amplifies her role in the king’s neglect of the Spanish nation in his two-fold *exordium*. Hernán García’s clear exposition pointedly lays out his complaints in the first line of his speech, noting the chaos that Raquel has brought to Spanish government in comparison with the nobleman’s own stoic presence.

As Aristotle suggests, this *exordium* ends with an explanation of what Hernán García intends to accomplish in this speech. With the clarity that is typical of neoclassic characters, Hernán García is able to delineate the faults of Raquel to which the king has been blinded by his passions. “Si el fin, si los intentos se examinan,” the king’s vassal suggests, “y el celo que la anima contemplamos,/ aliento es del amor más encendido” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 92). Here he coolly repeats his accusation, which once again amplifies the seriousness of Raquel’s crimes through repetition, but contributes yet another element to the gravity of the female threat: that of ambition. This elucidates the key problem that Hernán García sees: the king has turned away from his sense of reason and given in to his irrational passions, which are moreover unchristian, un-Castilian, and worst of all, feminine. The noble Hernán García, from his point of reasonable masculinity endeavors to return Alfonso to similar control.

From this point, Hernán García transitions to the portion of his speech that consists of the *narratio* by showing Alfonso the remaining source of reason in the king’s court: “voz es

de tus Vasallos, que de serlo/ testimonio jamás dieron más claro” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 92). This provides the logical basis for the narratio: the noblemen who have stood by the king against myriad dangerous evils act as a source of reason even when the king seems to have lost his senses. Raquel is positioned as the Other in every way: through her gender, her religion, and her social interests that do not benefit the Castilian people. Not only this, but emphasis is put on her voice at that which sets her apart as villainous. As the play continues, this will also prove to be a dividing point between Hernán García and Raquel as their two voices serve very different purposes. Establishing Hernán García and the other noblemen of the court as loyal vassals through shared battles against the king’s enemies, the narratio successfully utilizes the *exemplum* to paint a lucid picture of Alfonso’s allies.

Hernán García follows the *exordium* with the deliberative narratio as described by Aristotle in his *On Rhetoric* for the purpose of proving himself to be a loyal vassal of the king, and thus a worthy source of advice. Specifically, Aristotle defines *narratio* in the context of a deliberative oratory as:

least common in deliberative oratory, because no one narrates future events, but if there is narrative, it will be of events in the past, in order that by being reminded of those things the audience will take better counsel about what is to come (either criticizing or praising). But then the speaker does not perform the function of an adviser. If something is unbelievable, promise to tell the cause of it immediately....
(Aristotle 242)

That is to say, the *narratio* of a deliberative oratory, such as that of Hernán García, describes the events of the past in order to make the listener more amenable to the accusations that will follow in the *confirmatio*. Hernán García’s speech further moves within this definition as he needs to demonstrate his trustworthiness as a man of valor in order to go into his critique of Raquel – which takes place later, in the *confirmatio* – which Alfonso, blinded by love, will find incredible and hard to comprehend. This trustworthiness will provide the basis for

Hernán García's rational opposition to the – in the words of Hernán García – untrustworthy Raquel.

Hernán García opens the narrative portion of his discourse with a powerful statement of the loyalty of Alfonso's dutiful masculine vassals. Hernán García, referring to the hopeful future he sees – without Raquel at the king's side – while simultaneously alluding to the past fealty of Alfonso's noblemen, avows: "Estos, porque tu error se desvanezca,/ los mismos [los vasallos] son que en tus primeros años,/ cuando para el recobro de tus Reinos/ Marte armó de valor tu tierno brazo" (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 92). This statement conditionally refers to a future time when Alfonso comes to understand the mistakes he has made with Raquel and his men still stand beside him to defend his lands. Using this description as a springboard, Hernán García effortlessly employs the *exemplum* to show that their loyalty to Alfonso has withstood countless battles, untold bloodshed, insidious invaders, and mutinous usurpers and thus their fealty will not be defeated by this latest danger, Raquel – such examples demonstrate the ideal maleness from which Alfonso has strayed.

The *exemplum* is an example which literally takes the form of an "illustrative story or anecdote;" Hernán García employs three *exempla* to prove that he and Alfonso's other vassals are trustworthy to set a standard of masculinity. The first of these is the brief reference to the role of Alfonso's noble followers in the crusades (Lanthum 74). While in the speech this is the first *exemplum* stated, it is chronologically the more recent event; however, it serves as a point of transition between the present day and the earlier *exemplum*. As he describes the blood that has been shed by Spanish nobles on Alfonso's behalf, he clarifies that it was "los que acompañando/ el cruzado pendón en Palestina,/ Rey de Jerusalén te coronaron" (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 92). This provides Hernán García with potent

evidence that he and the other nobles that presumably followed Alfonso in this quest are both moral and loyal, having born the dangers of this event for God, king, and country. This *exemplum* is followed with the more expansive description of the threat that Alfonso bore to his throne during his youth, as his uncle commanded his army during the civil war, in the name of Alfonso's land. By describing his uncle as by "vínculos de sangre pretextando," and acts in a femininely subversive way compared to the overt, masculine actions of Hernán García and the other vassals. In this second *exemplum* Hernán García more specifically divides loyalty to the king between those who have been loyal always and those who have only been loyal in more recent times; in it he notes that even when other men of Iberia demonstrated loyalty to Alfonso's uncle, Hernán García was one of those loyal to his king. The third describes the African armies which Alfonso's men bravely faced together. All of these *exempla* to show their loyalty in the countless battles they have fought in the name of the king.

Clearly Hernán García embeds his argument in the past, citing that he and the other noblemen have been loyal to the king from the very beginning; he uses descriptions of the invaders and describes the act of removing such usurpers to demonstrate the act that they committed myriad times in the past, and they intend to do one more time in the case of Raquel; such steady loyalty also falls into the standards set by unwavering masculine control. Through all three *exempla* he calls their enemies "fieros usurpadores" and he recalls the "inmensos escuadrones de Africanos" to demonstrate that these enemies did not fall easily but instead required the bravery and warrior's skill of men including Hernán García (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 93). Hernán García does not only use vocabulary that focuses on the fierceness of his enemies but also recalls the courageous men who, with "cuyas gloriosas

armas” confronted “terror y afrenta tantas veces” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 93). Such courage and bravery proves their societal positions as men of honor and puts them at the pinnacle of maleness, not only in his discourse but also in characteristics of masculinity. As Hernán García uses such language to describe the threat that Alfonso’s uncle, Fernando, posed to the throne but includes a particular aspect of the story that is relevant to Raquel’s own circumstances. In the first *exemplum*, the audience would have inferred that the Christians engaged in the crusades to purge the Holy Land of the Moors. This act of cleansing that was first introduced by the biblical reference in the exordium will be followed here as Hernán García describes how the faithful Castilian men took up arms in order to “desterraron/ de Fernando el dominio o tiranía/ que vínculos de sangre pretextando, se arrogo tu tutela” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 93). Such purging can only be successfully accomplished from men who fit this ideal male figure that Hernán García describes through these *exempla*. This removal of a false king foreshadows Raquel’s own exile as Hernán creates this logical argument: he has laid a foundation of his own loyalty and of her as the instable threat to which Alfonso cannot help but see the advantage of throwing out.

As Hernán García amplifies the great loyalty that the noblemen of Castile feel for Alfonso, he also repeats the action of throwing invaders out of Castilian land. By imparting the frequency of this particular threat, Hernán García depicts with finality the devotion and bravery of the noblemen who have faced countless terrors on the king’s behalf. He also positions this solution as warranting repetition now, in the case of Raquel. He closes by mentioning that so many and so great are these deeds that it is not necessary to remind Alfonso of them all, but that with these three examples his qualifications seem airtight.

Further, these examples act as basis for Hernán García to issue a logical, rational,

masculine plea for Alfonso to turn his irrational attentions away from Raquel and back to Castile as he creates a simple metaphor relating the prosperity of Castile to its king: “¿Pero cómo han de estar sino marchitos/ campos a quienes niega el Sol sus rayos,/...flor que no riega diligente mano?” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 93). This question not only examines how Alfonso repays the loyalty of his men but also asks that an explanation be given for the common people whom he references through the metaphor of a field that produces only spines when neglected by its king. He has just finished explaining how they have kicked out malicious invaders from Castile, but this explains that when the opposite occurs – when it is the king who is instead who is absent from his kingdom – the kingdom cannot function. Additionally, this message is similar to that of Tomas de Iriarte’s fable, “El jardinero y su amo” in which the master of a house has to plead with his gardener – who first cared too much for the flowers and forgot about the fish, then vice versa – “Hombre, no riegues tanto,/ que me quede sin peces,/ ni cuides tanto de ellos/ que sin flores, gran bárbaro, me dejes” (Iriarte). Alfonso has similarly paid too much attention to Raquel, so he has forgotten to care for his kingdom just as the gardener in Iriarte’s poem forgets to take care of the fish. Hernán García puts himself and the noblemen in the position of the master of the house who reminds the gardener of his duty – although clearly Hernán García is not in a dominant position over the king. He does so by repeatedly describing his men as fearless and unwavering in their duties as the king’s men. This not only furthers Hernán García’s reasonable persuasive argument but also gives him and the other noblemen particular traditional masculine attributes of loyalty, bravery, and Christian piety.

As Hernán García transitions to the *confirmatio* portion of his speech, he begins to more forcefully accuse Raquel and to call her by name in this rhetorical proof of her

culpability. Hernán García’s intent in this proof is to demonstrate the element of feminine chaos that the irrational Raquel has brought to the Castilian government and to dissuade Alfonso from continuing his relationship with her. Aristotle explains this portion of a speech as “demonstrative [i.e., logically valid]” and thus the logical appeal naturally continues through this section (Aristotle 242). Hernán García’s *confirmatio* provides a logical presentation of all of the ways Raquel – a woman, whose destructiveness at this point in the argument might be connected to that of Eve – has harmed Castile. In the *narratio* he laid out the masculine duties that he has performed as a loyal Castilian man and that he carried out with the masculine absence of passion appropriate of such a man. This following segment of his discourse will lay out the evidence that not only explains the feminine aspects of Raquel but moreover the vileness that each of these has unleashed on Castile’s ruler:

Raquel...Permite, Alfonso, que la nombre,
y sit e pareciere desacato
que quejas de Raquel se te repitan
pague mi cuello culpas de mi labio.
Raquel (vuelvo a decir) no solamente
el Reino tiraniza Castellano,
no sólo a los Ricos Hombres triunfa,
no sólo el Pueblo tiene esclavizado
[...]
sino que (lo que es más), de Alfonso Octavo
el alma y los sentidos de tal suerte
domina y avasalla (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 93-94)

Until this portion of the oration he has not mentioned Raquel by name; instead he has chosen to refer to her as ‘that voice,’ as he did in the *exordium*, or chosen not to refer to her at all. It is at this point that he moves the focus entirely towards Raquel and Alfonso in order to prove that she – the woman, the Jew, the Other – is the source of dissent and instability in Castile while Alfonso still retains the ability to right all that has come undone. It is this act of proving or confirming Raquel’s guilt that consists of the first portion of the *confirmatio*.

First and foremost, in this *confirmatio* Hernán García lays out his evidence of the non-masculine and irrational chaos through extremely brief *exempla* so that Alfonso cannot doubt Raquel's culpability. He can now attest to Raquel's guilt because he has established his own voice as that of good counsel and reason. The list is long and by repeating 'no sólo,' the number of crimes is amplified into a series of seemingly endless grievances. Hernán García carefully elucidates the many ills that Raquel has brought to Castile: "Raquel (vuelvo a decir) no solamente/ el Reino *tiraniza* Castellano,/ no sólo de los Ricos Hombres triunfa,/ no sólo el Pueblo tiene *esclavizado*,/ no sólo ensalza viles Idumeos..." (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 94).¹⁶ And so, the list continues. These two verbs, *tiraniza* and *esclavizado*, explicitly define what Raquel has done to Castile, but also imply that she has taken the role of king from Alfonso for herself. By enumerating her sins in such a way, Hernán García initially paints a hopeless picture through these short examples he seems to leave no optimistic possibility of repairing these wrongs. As he tells it, Raquel's destructiveness has harmed every man or woman in Castile and left each on without recourse. He continues by telling Alfonso that "Ya no conquista Alfonso" (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 94). Up to this point Hernán García has constructed the following appeal to Alfonso's logic: he has indicated that Raquel is the source of all of the Castilian ills and even now, in the moment of the speech, a danger; he has then established himself as a reliable authority to explain such things to the king, and finally, he has begun his tallying of the many crimes of Raquel while including this infinitesimally small glimmer of hope for the king.

This last portion of his reasonable argument brings Hernán García to the goal of his persuasive endeavor. It is this bit of optimism that prompts him to question all of the previous evidence that he laid out to prove his loyalty. This late in the speech, Raquel has

¹⁶ Emphasis is mine.

become just another invader that must be cast out of Castile by the loyal men of Alfonso's court. To the point, Hernán García demands of his king: "¿Para esto al noble esfuerzo de tu brazo/ venciste Reyes, conquistaste Imperios?/ Sí: para que Raquel atropellando/ tus glorias, tus hazañas, tus conquistas" (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 94). In a twisting of the insultatio, Hernán García here clearly makes his point in a very modern, cheeky manner. Much like a mother might erect a tower out of blocks for her young child to knock down, such has Alfonso built up his nation for Raquel to demolish. In making this opinion apparent, Hernán García requires that Alfonso decide whether or not his own deeds should be minimized by Raquel's. Additionally, this is an implicit accusation of the "feminization" of the king, who has abandoned his power in order to pursue his emotional affair and for this reason he no longer behaves as a king nor as a man. This question and answer also summarizes the reasoning behind his entire argument in a concise and simple way, unhindered by his anger at Raquel. First, that the noblemen have set a standard of loyalty to the king, and, second, that Raquel is at fault for the king's flight from his royal duties. Moreover, Hernán García does not go without his own suggestion to Alfonso as he ends this *confirmatio* and leads into his conclusion. In order to cement his side of the persuasive argument, he tells the king, "oye de tus Vasallos los clamores,/ si algún sentido perdonó el encanto" (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 94). Once again, this is a self-referential moment in his speech; Hernán García has brought his argument back to where he began it: with the cries of the nobles and the pueblo to be heard. It is this moment when the pueblo begins to cry out for the king's support that Medina Domínguez compares to the *motín* de Esquilache. Moreover, they can be heard over the voice of the venomous woman at the king's side. And, if Hernán García was correct in his claims that Alfonso only requires the remedy of wisdom – that which only a man so noble as

Hernán García can provide – then, with a reasonable assessment of Raquel’s influence on his reign, as well as the ambitious nature in which she has engaged in their relationship, the king will be found cured of all ills and misdirections.

It is with affected modesty that Hernán García ends his proof and quickly finishes his speech in a brief *peroratio* in the last sample of engendered speech of this discourse. This section focuses only on the offense that Hernán García has made against the king and the noble vassal goes so far as to kneel in order to emphasize his intentions. Before further explaining his point of view, Hernán García puts himself in stoic, masculine opposition to the strong emotions that Raquel demonstrates in the third act of the play by explaining that his fervor is simply hidden in order to perform this exposition: “Por contener la furia impetuosa/ que en mí se compromete, yo me encargo/ de exponerte las quejas y motivos” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 95). This poses Hernán García as a model of his own advice. As a brave hero should, he has been able to assess the situation from a reasonable standpoint that was not blind to all of the ills that the temptress has brought to Castile. This line especially allows Raquel no means to oppose Hernán García: he has demonstrated that he is the most reasonable voice in court and even if Raquel acts dispassionately, as a woman she will appear to the eighteenth century audience be merely unnatural rather than reasonable.

Hernán García closes this speech by mentioning once more that he is a loyal vassal specifically recalls all of the *exemplum* that he provided in his narratio by choosing the word “testimonio” – which implies that Hernán García was not only a participant in the past events but also an observer – while also pointing to the evidence he has previously given against Raquel. His humble nature renders him immune from any of the haughty retorts thrown by Raquel, and the king insists on her expulsion from court and exile. By skillfully utilizing the

devices and methods suggested by Aristotle in order to persuade Alfonso that he must leave Raquel, Hernán García succeeds in his goal while simultaneously establishing himself as a model of masculinity in his speech. This model of reasonable masculinity will be opposed by the emotionally charged discourse of Raquel.

Just as this speech has accomplished its goal of convincing Alfonso to give up his ardent relationship with Raquel, it also leaves the woman with no choice but to follow Rubén's advice to give in to her feminine ardor and allow Alfonso to see her weep, so that "tu dolor en tus ojos todos vean" (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 108). Because Hernán García has not only chosen a logical appeal but has also gone the route of the masculine warrior-hero, Raquel must go the opposite route in her attempt to change the king's mind. Without doing so she appears only wrong, out of place, and anti-Castilian.

CHAPTER 3

The Weeping Temptress: (Un)Reasonable Persuasion

Exiled, Raquel initially seems to give up on Alfonso's love as she laments her amorous wounds. With some persuasion and plotting on the part of Rubén, Raquel realizes a renewed desire to repair her relationship with Alfonso. On Rubén's suggestions, – “yo sé,” Rubén insists, “que interiormente/ por verte muere, por hablarte anhela,/ y que hasta conseguir desenojarte” – she will gain Alfonso's pity and appeal to his love for her by allowing him to see her weep and Alfonso will feel as if he is dying in her absence. While this effort to return to the good graces of the king maintains an extremely structured form, she invests her own emotions into it so that she can appeal to the passions of Alfonso. This speech, while more brief than that of Hernán García proves to be an almost complete diversion from the rhetorical devices and motivations, as well as the aspects of Alfonso's personality to which it appeals.

As Kastely notes in his study on the rhetoric of emotions, Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is “in effect, an argument for the inadequacy of *logos*” (223). He asserts that, although logic is attributed by the classics to humans alone, humans are imperfect creatures and, following from this statement of the shortfalls of logic, he proposes that Aristotle was in fact championing emotion and *pathos* as a more effective type of appeal. Further, if logic were a perfect persuader, Raquel would be unable to sway Alfonso. But, this is not the case. Raquel instead proves one of two things: either emotional appeals are truly more effective means of persuasion or Alfonso is extremely malleable. The latter can be assumed to be

truer in the case of this play considering its critique on the passiveness of Carlos III before his minister, Esquilache.

Regardless of Alfonsos's own capacity for being persuaded, Raquel uses the "woman's weapons," as McClelland calls them, appropriate of a woman in order to convince Alfonso to allow her to return to court (208). Femininity in the eighteenth century was seen to be associated with "incompetence, irrationality, and inconstancy" (Haidt *Seduction* 69). Raquel embraces this feminine tendency towards unrestrained excess in order to appeal to Alfonso's love for her and also to evoke his pity. This assessment will ultimately better demonstrate the gender dynamics within the play as well through an examination of language used and the thematic vocabulary that is deemed feminine. Her logically structured argument poses a series of unreasonable demonstrations of emotion, all of which can be attributed to Raquel's female disposition.

First and foremost, Raquel's appeal is that of *pathos*, or emotion; this opposition to Hernán García's appeal of logic appears as traditionally described by the Greeks. Kennedy summarizes Aristotle's description of *pathos*, explaining it to be "awakening emotion in the audience so as to induce them to make the judgment desired" (Kennedy in Aristotle 111). Further, emotions portray a particular interpretation and reactions to present circumstances and additionally serve as a more basic appeal than that of logic – Kastely refers to them as a wholly different rationale (Kastely 230). Aristotle dictates that each emotion must be approached in a threefold manner:

There is need to divide the discussion of each into three headings. I mean, for example, in speaking of anger, what is their *state of mind* when people are angry and against *whom* are they usually angry and for what sort of *reasons*; for if we understood one or two of these but not all, it would be impossible to create anger [in someone]. (Aristotle 113)

Raquel intends to trigger some classical emotion in Alfonso VIII and it is in this triad that it can be understood. If she successfully does so, she might reverse the decision that he made due to Hernán García's persuasive efforts.

It might seem initially difficult to suggest that Raquel's speech appeals to any one individual emotion. However, Aristotle divided emotion into nine categories, including anger, love, grief, and pity, which "involve either pleasure and heat, or pain and cold" (Belfiore 183). These four in particular are those which, through a twenty-first century understanding of emotions – such that a mere nine categories seem insufficient – might apply to Raquel's desperate speech. Additionally, these sentiments can be assessed through the Aristotelian view until only one of them remains as it applies to Raquel's dialogue. Anger, as Aristotle says in his second book, is a "desire, accompanied by [mental and physical] distress, for apparent retaliation" (Aristotle 116). Although Raquel is certainly an ambitious character, she clearly does not yearn for any sort of revenge but rather a restoration of her previous powers as the king's consort. Similarly, love and grief can also be easily dismissed. While Raquel laments the loss of a lover, the emotion of love as Aristotle describes it has to do with relationships of friendship and kinship rather than passionate affairs. David Konstan points out also that an appeal to love in the Aristotelian manner would "reside in a selfless concern to provide goods for the other to the best of one's ability" (Konstan 182). Konstan also describes the emotion of grief; although Aristotle does not specifically discuss this emotion it does fall under his umbrella of emotions that are called 'pain.' However, this only applies to the loss of a loved one and not the loss of someone living, such as in Raquel's abandonment by Alfonso. Finally, the only emotion that is still left to apply to Raquel's plight, both in modern and classical terms, is that of pity. It is this that is also appropriate in

its application to *Raquel* as it has been analyzed in its application to the Greek tragedies and an imitator such as García de la Huerta directs the reader to once again utilize such ancient theories in understanding the actions and sentiments.¹⁷

Pity, as explained by Aristotle, differs from the subtly pleasurable anger in that it is a cold emotion being only painful (Belfiore 187); his definition follows the Greek tradition and suggests an inherent rhetorical purpose. Aristotle describes pity as

...a certain pain at an apparently destructive or painful event happening to one who does not deserve it and which a person might expect himself or one of his own to suffer, and this when it seems close at hand; for it is clear that a person who is going to feel pity necessarily thinks that some evil is actually present (Aristotle 139)

Thus, there are two players when the emotion of pity is present: the person who pities, and the object of his or her pity – in other words, the pitiable. Also, this emotion is inherently connected to the present and the future where as an emotion such as grief is grounded completely in the past. That is to say, pity intends to demonstrate a current threat or wrong experienced in order to demonstrate that it contains portents of a possible destructive future.¹⁸

Within these standards, Raquel's speech clearly fits the description of an appeal to Alfonso's pity because she preys upon the common link between herself and the king – that they are both suffering the emotional pain of a love lost – and she implies that this 'evil,' as Aristotle calls it, will continue without end; this quiet threat causes Alfonso to regret his previous decision to exile Raquel. Admitting that he too has felt the emotional pain that Raquel has

¹⁷ For more information and case studies of such tragedies, see *Tragic Pleasures*.

¹⁸ Konstan provides one potent example of pity in his discussion of Euripides's *Suppliant Woman*. In this play, "Aethra 'pities these childless, grey-haired mothers of sons;'" these sons are those Argive men who have died in an unsuccessful attack on Thebes (Konstan 206). While their condition might seem pitiable regardless of the viewer's status, position, class, etc., Aristotle does in fact set further ground rules for addressing the emotion of pity. That is, he insists on a common thread between the person who feels pity – in this case, Aethra – and those who are pitied – the grey-haired women. He denotes the causes of pity as things that are not caused by chance; such accidental events such as death, disease, hunger, and old age are therefore not pitiable because they are neither intrinsically evil nor controlled by man (Aristotle 140). Moreover, "they pity those like themselves," while "sufferings are pitiable when they appear near at hand" (Aristotle 141).

gone through, he tells her, “A mí, a quien el perderte es ya preciso,/ y muriendo vivir en esta ausencia,/ corresponde, Raquel, este ejercicio./(...)/Raquel, no has de partir; antes el hilo/ se corte de mi vida” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 108). With these words, Alfonso has admitted that Raquel’s words have persuaded him completely to take her back rather than suffer her absence any longer.

First of all, Raquel is successful in her appeal to Alfonso’s pity for the reasons first outlined by Aristotle: a common bond with the person who feels pity and also nearness of some threat already suffered by the pitied. Although Raquel and Alfonso are certainly of different status and also different genders, they share one important circumstance: that of lovers. This relationship allows Alfonso to understand Raquel’s plight and without this comprehension such an appeal would fall on deaf ears. Moreover, she demonstrates the resulting pain via their shared loss – the dissolution of their affair – and also her seemingly impending doom.

Raquel opens the speech with a brief introduction that summarizes her intent and opposes Hernán García while maintaining a sharp focus on showing Alfonso her softer, emotional side – just as she and Rubén agreed would ultimately change Alfonso’s mind. Thus, even though she uses *pathos*, she does it on purpose, controlling the effectiveness of her own rhetorical choices in an almost Machiavellian manner.¹⁹ From her knees, she implores Alfonso, “a vuestras plantas/ segunda vez me trae aquel designio/ de que anuléis el rígido decreto/ de mi ausencia, o mi muerte” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 118-119). Just as Hernán García ended his plea on his knees, so Raquel begins hers from her knees. This action both imitates the nobleman but also sets the stage for her impassioned oratory. Further

¹⁹ This is similar to the way in which Alison Weber suggests that Teresa de Ávila’s written style “is seen as a pattern of linguistic choice motivated by deliberative strategies and constrained by social roles” (15).

demonstrating the strength of her sorrow, she has fallen to her knees imitating the Greek women of classic tragedies. As Alfonso insists that she continue her explanation of lamentation, it opens Raquel up to expanding and emphasizing her womanly dirge.

Creating a parallel structure to that of Hernán García, Raquel introduces her situation as well as her grievances and in doing so appeals to Alfonso's heart that had been closed off by the earlier reasonable words of the nobleman. Just as Hernán García cited the two competing voices in the court – his own and that of Raquel – now Raquel turns to explain the reasons for her pained cries as evidenced by her vocal, weakened state. As has been stated by various scholars of female writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, feminine discourse implies a concentration of irrationality and excess, as opposed to its controlled, dispassionate, masculine counterpart. These 'speech strategies' have been described by Weber as "plans of action [that] are devised in order to accommodate conflicts between individual autonomy and social obligations, strategies in which the social distance of the participants and their relative power in society are crucial factors" (14). Thus, Raquel carefully and purposefully chooses how she will exploit her femininity in order to appeal to the king's emotions. Raquel uses these feminine aspects in her speech through exaggeration of her circumstances, repetition of the crimes against her, and language that implies crying, while she simultaneously emphasizes her subservience.²⁰

She first states, as she will repeatedly as a reminder to the audience, that "Mi llanto y mis sollozos/ sólo son expression de mi martirio" (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 119). This is one of the first instances of exaggeration in Raquel's speech; this particular aggrandizement serves the purpose of amplification while it also simultaneously negates Hernán García's

²⁰ It is impossible to know when or if the actors themselves cried during this speech, as there are no stage directions to this effect, however the language makes explicit references to this sorrowful action.

allegation that she is a danger to the Catholic faith by characterizing her experience as martyrdom. Aristotle discusses exaggeration as suiting someone speaking emotionally, such as Raquel (Aristotle 211). This overstatement of Raquel's pain is especially clear in comparison with her words in the opening of Act II. Although she speaks of her bitter tears, and she seems resolved to her fate – “Cuando remedio ya ninguno queda,/ ¿no es prudente ceder a la desgracia?” – she does not insist that “vuestro mandato/ la vida ha de costarme” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 107,119). This embellishment of her impassioned state falls into Haidt's description of the feminine in conjunction with extravagance and superficiality (Haidt *Seduction* 130).

This is not the only time that Raquel insists that separation from Alfonso is equal to death. Raquel extrapolates upon this, stating that “sé que obedecer vuestro mandato/ la vida ha de costarme, cuando miro que no pueden cortarse a menos riesgo lazos que tanto amor y tiempo ha unido” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 119). Although Raquel would not have known that Alfonso had, upon exiling Raquel from court, lamented that he felt as if he were dying, the temptress now amplifies her pain. Her series of exaggerations also imitate the *narratio* of Hernán García as she lists them all in relation to her own exile. Not only, has she suffered “la grave angustia/ de mi espíritu vago y peregrino” because of “los insultos a que quedo expuesta/ del feroz vulgo,” but she has additionally been forced to endure that which is “inexcusable/ ausentarme de vos,” and, again, she must fault the pueblo for such pain (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 120). This turns on its head Hernán García's exposition on the great deeds of the Castilian noblemen. She utilizes his attention to banishment but treats it as a crime in and of itself, whereas the nobles earlier treated it as a just punishment for invaders. Hernán García needs no such flourishes, but in order to counteract his masculine persuasion,

Raquel in this instance must rely on superfluities and additions to make her grief more intense in the eyes of Alfonso, her audience. What is reasonably one crime is thus expounded into what seems to be many grievances through her repetition and rephrasing of her exile. The exaggeration is perhaps the most visible way that her speech appeals to the pity of Alfonso; the fickle king cannot help but empathize with their shared unhappiness.

Interlaced with this excessive description is the repetition of the grievances that she has suffered. She explains that interlocutors interrupted her happy romance. This acts as an opportunity to accuse her offenders of their crimes while also responding to the accusations of Hernán García. Calling the claims against her “los insultos que quedo expuesta/ del feroz vulgo,” Raquel puts herself in opposition to the masses but this time positions herself as the pitiful victim. The metaphor of the voice sneaks quietly into her speech as she references this, the voice of the People. She compares the “tan constante pasión, amor tan fino,/ de tantos años la correspondencia” to the threat that she feels from “la voz del Pueblo” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 120)²¹. This is the source of the constant anguish that she embellishes. The crime that she is suffered is none other than the already mentioned exile that she endures. She characterizes this as the source of all of her pain, and this requires Alfonso to turn his attention towards the subject of separation rather than his royal duties. In this way, these two decorative aspects of the speech draw the king away from the ideals of his noblemen and bring Alfonso back into the clutches of the ambitious Jewess. However, this is not the end of her appeal to Alfonso’s sense of pity: she utilizes vocabulary that implies that she has cried, is crying, and will continue to cry as she tolerates her lamentable condition away from her beloved king.

²¹ This threat that she feels from the voice of the Spanish common people might be compared to that which Benito Feijoo describes in his chapter “Voz del pueblo” in his *Teatro crítico universal*, in which he describes the voice of the pueblo as fallible.

First, Raquel poses her own sorrowful experiences in her near-exile as revealed through her weeping, as she insists that “mi llanto y mis sollozos” are evidence of the pain that she has undergone – her martyrdom. However, she continues to emphasize this physical display of emotion, playing into the irrational and emotive portrayal of the eighteenth century woman who engaged in such impassioned displays as they carried over tradition from the baroque female stereotypes. She makes a point of recalling the source of her tears, explaining to Alfonso that “ausente, triste, y desterrado vivo./ Ésto, señor, mis lágrimas pretenden” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 121). Through these tears she not only is following Rubén’s directions but she is giving Alfonso evidence of the sorrow that she has felt. Hernán García cannot show the anger he feels for Raquel because of masculine conventions of this and prior periods, but Raquel is capable of this reasonless display of emotion.²² Her emotion is certainly warranted, but it is this in addition to the aforementioned exaggeration and repetition of crimes that creates an unreasonable discourse that relies on illogical emotion to make its point and sway Alfonso to allow Raquel to return to her former place. The pain that she demonstrates and evokes in Alfonso also provides one of the important aspects that Aristotle suggests in an appeal to pity: if Alfonso loved Raquel as she loved him, he can relate to her position as one who has lost love. Also, he should be able to relate to her sadness over said grievance and feel sympathy for her plight through his own, similar feelings. However, there are reasonable elements of this speech as well that cause her to be so successful in her persuasion of the king.

²² Although *Raquel* does not fall into the category of the sentimental dramas popular in the late eighteenth century, the *comedias lacrimosas*, a similarity between García de la Huerta’s most popular work and these plays cannot be denied. These comedies utilized emotions to further the didactic nature (Kosove 42). This is twisted in the case of Raquel: her excessive, exaggerated emotions contribute to further her role as seducer of the king and destroyer of Castilian stability. Her emotions contribute to García de la Huerta’s message but not by causing the audience to sympathize with her plight.

Aristotle insists upon logic in the confirmatio portion of a persuasive speech, and Raquel does not diverge from this suggestion although she uses a very simple logic that focuses on her love and passion for the king.²³ She sets out to prove a few points in this proof. First, that not only are the Castilian masses wrong about her, but that they have spoken against the king by speaking against his consort. From here, she insists on emphasizing that not only was she loyal in the past – as she discussed in her short narratio – but also that she will remain forever loyal. Her third point, which allows her to shift to the concluding portion of her speech, suggests that she left his side only out of her genuine love for Alfonso. She accomplishes all of this through her use of exaggeration, repetition of the grievances she has tolerated, and references to her tears. However, she also must respond to Hernán García’s accusations that she is disloyal to Castile because the king had abandoned his people in favor of his lover.

In order to prove that Raquel is a loyal and worthy subject and lover for the king, she testifies to her unending love and devotion to the king. Although she does not have the same great deeds as Hernán García has, she is able to provide some evidence of the loyalty that she has shown to the king. Principally, her loyalty to the king is shown in one manner through her repetition of her adoration for the king. In one such instance, “así os adora,/ un recuerdo tal vez, que fuisteis mío,” she says, and explains that this is the source of her sadness. Her memories of their time together do not prove to be the only source of such claims of loyalty. Raquel draws upon a vision of the future as she attempts to assure Alfonso that she will benefit the king as a loyal and undeterred lover, and that she will be of greater worth to the king than the vocal public ever could be. Additionally, here she emphasizes her purposeful

²³ Aristotle suggests that this portion of a speech should be “demonstrative [i.e., logically valid]” (242). He also reflects that in a deliberative discourse examples are the best way to perform the *confirmatio* (243).

female passivity through her rhetorical choices. Here, she amplifies her female role as the jilted tragic lover who has no other recourse but to cry and will continue to be loyal to the king, even in exile. The final avowal of her loyalty comes in the last lines of her speech.

The conclusion to this oration is notable for two main reasons: it both repeats this lamentation which draws pity from Alfonso, but Raquel also mimics the actions of Hernán García as they both conclude their discourses against one another on their knees before the king. She has forced Alfonso to play witness to the emotional and physical manifestations of this pain: “instan, Señor, inconvenientes,/ temores, sobresaltos, y peligros,/ a que me ausente, ¡ay, Dios, cuántos ahogos/ el espíritu siente al proferirlo!/ dadme, Señor, Licencia” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 121). Finally, after rehashing this evidence and giving one last exclamation of her sorrows, Raquel falls to her knees to once again offer a conclusive summary to this discourse:

ultima ofrenda que a mi amor dedico,
os quede por seguro que ni el tiempo,
destierro, ausencia, penas ni martirios,
recelos, amenazas ni desastres,
ni de la muerte el riguroso filo
serán bastantes a borrar del pecho,
de tanta fe depósito y archive,
la imagen vuestra que por tantos años
labró el amor, el trato y el destino. (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 121)

Raquel begins by stating not only that this will be the last time that she comes before Alfonso, but she also gives a summary of what she has accomplished in this speech. That is to say, she has reviewed the crimes against her, the pain of her absence, and she will continue to suffer after she leaves. With this exaggerated display of emotions throughout the speech – following always the suggestions of Rubén – Alfonso reacts just as was planned. He is surprised and accepts Raquel back into arms with no concerns. She has successfully

triggered Alfonso's pity for her by evoking his own sadness and she has further reassured the king that it is safe to allow Raquel's return because she is loyal to him through her love.

At this point, it can be understood Raquel follows not only contemporary definitions of pity, but she follows that of the classic model posed by Aristotle. However, this leaves some final questions regarding the text. First, Aristotle posed that all emotions were motivated with some 'final cause' that warranted their use in persuasive discourse. Although Aristotle provides some specific guidelines regarding the motivations of some of the eight other emotions, he "does not explicitly state what the desire (final cause) involved in the form of pity is, in the *Rhetoric* or the *Poetics*, and it is somewhat difficult to determine what it might be" (Belfiore 187). Belfiore also suggests that the cause of pity relates to that of fear. By arousing fear in the listener – in this case, Alfonso – of an evil that could befall him as easily as it befell Raquel, she "arouses pity in order to persuade people to act in a definite way" (Belfiore 188). From the major repeating themes and vocabulary utilized by Raquel in this speech, it is possible to point to what fear she is trying to provoke in Alfonso. This vocabulary is also used by Alfonso himself, as he responds to her with surprise and elation.

Through the recurrence of the topics of anguish, loneliness, exile, death, weakness, fatigue, etc., all stemming from the same initial cause – that of Alfonso's rejection of Raquel due to Hernán García's persuasive address – it is made very clear that these are the things that Raquel will make the king fear these things for himself. Immediately before hearing this speech, the audience has heard Alfonso's lamentations at the necessity of sending Raquel away in order to please the men of his court as well as the masses; however, although he does make some references to dying without Raquel, he more closely utilizes her choice of words in his own discourse after hearing her speak. Moreover, he is extremely sympathetic in his

responses to her speech, mimicking her language as he insists in reply “A mí, a quien el perderte es ya preciso,/ y muriendo vivir en esta ausencia,/ corresponde, Raquel, este ejercicio” (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 122). Previously, in speaking with Garcerán Manrique he had lamented his obligations to the people of Castile that had required him to send Raquel away. However, here he more specifically laments the ills that have befallen him, rather than what was demanded of him. This in combination with the speech of Hernán García demonstrates the king’s malleability. While a first persuasion could have taken place due to the skill of the speaker, such waffling by the king is not fitting of the warrior that Hernán García had described, nor is it an ideal attribute in such a ruling figure. Hernán García’s preferred mode of proving his point is through the *exempla*, while Raquel more subtly imitates the classic Greek woman in a number of ways.

As Aristotle describes speech, there is a striking difference inherent in the voices of men and women but there are also some guidelines that each gender should regard when speaking. Aristotle notes that men generally have deeper – he denoted them as stronger – voices than those of women; he relates the higher pitch and ‘weakness’ to very young, old, and castrated men (McClure 39). James Herrick points out that women were not considered full citizens in ancient Greece, although they enjoyed many freedoms even compared to some later cultures (49). He goes on to explain that “Making speeches was one activity from which Greek men typically barred Greek women. In the rhetorical arena, as in others, the treatment of women in ancient Greece stemmed directly from male attitudes” (Herrick 49). Aristotle himself does not allow many rules specifically for women although he does insist that too much of the reputation of men depends on the gossip of women (McClure 116). Because Aristotle largely passes over women in his writings, in order to understand Raquel’s

relation to the Greek tradition, such general observations might be made about the culture and literature as a whole rather than only in relationship to this rhetoric scholar.²⁴ Because of this omission of women from rhetorical theory and their lack of attention from such scholars, the differentiation between the type of appeal and the inclusion or exclusion of emotion on the part of Raquel and Hernán García, respectively, necessitates assessment from the perspective of the eighteenth century. Although García de la Huerta certainly borrows the rhetorical models of ages past, he does not let go of such socially ingrained gender roles.

Although Theresa Ann Smith notes in her book, *The Emerging Female Citizen: Gender and Enlightenment in Spain*, that women were gaining power and respect in the eighteenth century, it was slow going and some of these old values carried over from early modern Spain peek through in *Raquel*. Smith notes that during the Golden Age, many women, especially the wealthy and aristocratic, were gaining positions of power and influence, including status that allowed them sway in national politics (Smith 22). However, she also points out that during this period “the dominant gender paradigm remained one that made women the charges of men, both their subjects and their defining characteristics” (Smith 23). Of course, in the eighteenth century, Spain and the rest of the world was a long way off from modern norms of gender equality; although Feijoo produced a defense of women, he suggests that “happier marriages would result once people revised their incorrect view of the female sex. Equality would breed gentle husbands and faithful wives;” however, Feijoo does not, as Smith points out, call for a complete overturning of past doctrine and advocates only for better moral behavior rather than allowing women to change the social

²⁴ While modern feminist theory is certainly interesting when applied to plays such as *Raquel*, it breaks from the male-dominated classical tradition that is so appropriate for an assessment of the neoclassical theatrical work. See James A. Herrick, *The History and Theory of Rhetoric: An Introduction* for an overview of feminist rhetorical theory and a discussion of it in relation to the classical rhetorical sources.

order (Smith 34). Josefa Amar y Borbón acts as a more reformative voice in the eighteenth century. She went so far as to accuse men of enslaving their wives through objectification; Lewis describes Amar y Borbón's critique as "demonstrating the contradictions that[...]dehumanizing adoration of female beauty" (33). For better or worse, Raquel uses this adoration that she receives from Alfonso to her advantage. In *Raquel*, it is evident that many of the reasons the king's lover poses a problem and, moreover, a danger, are due to the triple threat of her ambition, her gender, and her religion. Her religion and ambition are two sources of the insults that Hernán García throws at her, but it is her gender that causes her to change her tactics when she confronts Alfonso in the second act.

It is her gender that requires her to weep as a woman would and to physically demonstrate the pain that she feels inside. The aforementioned trinity of complaints against her makes her not an ideal woman, but an ideal interloper. She defies the bounds placed upon her gender in as she defiantly tries to stand up for herself in the first act of *Raquel*. Responding to Hernán García's well planned speech, there is no beauty or femininity to her language as she retorts, "¿Esta fineza/ no es el premio que tienes preparado/ a mi amor? ¿En qué dudas? Raquel muera;/ muera pues en amarte te hace agravio" (García de la Huerta *Raquel* 98). As Aristotle defines emotion, in this first act only the heated anger can be seen in the figure of Raquel. This emotion requires none of the exaggerated lamentations that she later adopts that are much more typical of the canonical figures Spanish theater in García de la Huerta's contemporaries as well as those of prior the Golden Age and later romantic period.²⁵

²⁵ Raquel is by no means a demure lady, for examples of more characteristic feminine characters see: (Seventeenth Century) any of the women of the Spanish comedies, (Eighteenth Century) the plays of Leandro Fernández de Moratín including *El sí de las niñas*, and (Nineteenth Century) José Zorilla's doña Inés among others.

So then, all of this tumultuous information requires that the question be asked, what is the difference between male and female speech and why must they speak differently? Some evidence can be seen in the aforementioned evidence from Golden Age Spain and the gender rules that were carried over from that period. Raquel engages in that reckless language that Hafter differentiates from the language of other characters, including Hernán García. Hafter describes García de la Huerta's writing: "he represents prudent solutions by some form of *remedies/remediar*...while reckless, passionate solutions appear as *venganza* (120). However, as pointed out earlier, there is a glaring political factor inherent in this play. The present study would pose that Raquel's feminine gender is not in fact problematic nor is she victimized for her gender, rather it is this that makes her an ideal carrier for critique. Because of her bad behavior and her existence outside of the role typically assigned to women even in the eighteenth century, Raquel acts as a vehicle for García de la Huerta's political agenda in such an effective way that a male character could not have done so convincingly.

CHAPTER 4

Conclusion

Raquel and Hernán García acts as two polar opposites in García de la Huerta's tragedy. Both Hernán García and Raquel are successfully able to persuade Alfonso to their own causes. However, Raquel's persuasion exacerbates what was initially simply the Castilian public's dissatisfaction into a situation of riotous violence. There is no possibility but Raquel's death when the noblemen and the pueblo are once again denied a properly ruling king. Raquel's emotional appeal to Alfonso is rejected by the pueblo, and it is her gender that creates such catastrophic political repercussions as it is her gender that makes her the ideal vehicle for such political critique.

Hernán García's use of the *exempla* creates an image of the Castilian hero: he is a loyal vassal to the king and controls his emotions in order to bring his complaint before Alfonso. Raquel, on the other hand, must rely on her emotions to win back her lover: she exaggerates and includes vocabulary that leads the audience to understand the difficult plight that she has endured. Alfonso, feeling pity for this former lover, thus welcomes her back into his arms. This dynamic between the three main characters of the play creates a parodic performance of contemporary politics, and the victim of the play's insult is Esquilache.

As Haidt and Weber note, the definition of masculinity in the eighteenth-century exists in relation to what a man should not be. That is, a man should not be irrational, emotive, or inconstant. In the first act of the play, Hernán García poses himself as the masculine hero, and thus he himself defines that which is right, advantageous, and good.

Therefore, Raquel is the means of critique by being that other that defies all of these beneficial male attributes. The engendering of speech within *Raquel* defines this dynamic of the norm and the other in such a way that it provides a more definite understanding of the positioning of these two characters against each other. Hernán García, acting as the voice for both the noblemen and the common people of Castile, brings his problem before the king. Raquel can be compared with what García de la Huerta would have seen as usurpers in the Spanish government: men such as Esquilache were taking too much power for themselves and it was weighing upon the common people. Raquel maintains these same attributes – ambition and hunger for power – while adding additional critique and villainous characterization. She embodies excess as a female, thus accusing Esquilache of forsaking the norms of his masculine counterparts. By embodying these traits in a woman, men such as Esquilache are connected to the unreasonable and the un-masculine. Further, by temporarily giving in to Raquel’s persuasion, Alfonso – and therefore Carlos III – is demonstrated to be more feminine characters that have rejected their masculine duties in favor of feminine whims. Thus, García de la Huerta makes a clear claim that due to Esquilache, represented by Raquel, the rule of Carlos III has taken a turn in the wrong direction and must be corrected by returning to the responsible, masculine behavior that the king should have been following all along.

Not only does this femininity put Raquel outside of the ranks of what is pleasing, controlled, and masculine, but this suggests this deeper truth within the play for the audience: that those within government who would interfere with the king’s royal duty to the common people do not fit the Spanish ideal and are feminine in their persona. In Raquel’s violent end lies the danger of this play: by trying to quell the unwelcome feminine forces in politics, the

masculine pueblo could create unwanted rebellion such as the Esquilache riots.

Appendix 1: Hernán García's Speech to Alfonso VIII

Esa voz, que de escándalo y desorden
el viento puebla, oh noble Alfonso Octavo,
Monarca de Castilla, quien por siglos
cuenta el tiempo feliz de tu Reinado;
esa voz, que en el Templo originada
profanó del lugar los fueros santos,
y de la Majestad los privilegios
tan injuriosamente ha vulnerado;
si el fin, si los intentos se examinan,
y el zelo que la anima contemplamos,
aliento es del amor más encendido,
voz del afecto más acrisolado.
Voz es de tus vasallos, que de serlo
testimonio jamás dieron más claro,
que cuando más traidores te parecen,
que cuando los estás más infamando.
Estos, porque tu error se desvanezca,
los mismos son que en tus primeros años,
cuando para el recobro de tus Reinos
por tu amor derramaron de sus venas
la hidalga sangre: los que acompañando
el cruzado pendón en Palestina,
Rey de Jerusalén te coronaron.
Estos los mismos son que al Luso altivo,
al bravo Aragonés con el Navarro,
fieros usurpadores de tus tierras,
echaron con baldón de tus estados;
los que postrando el Leonés orgullo
en Palencia y Simancas, desterraron
de Fernando el dominio o tiranía,
que vínculos de sangre pretextando,
se arrogó tu tutela, cuando fuiste
pupilo en nombre, en realidad esclavo.
Aquellos son, cuyas gloriosas armas
de Tolosa en las Navas, y Alarcos,
terror y afrenta tantas veces fueron
de inmensos escuadrones Africanos.
Estos, Alfonso, son los que te hablan
por mi boca: los mismos que postrados
a tus pies el remedio solicitan
de extremos males, de insufribles daños.
Cuán grandes éstos sean, bien parece
que no hay necesidad de recordarlo,
cuando para notarlos y advertirlos,

cada rostro te muestra su retrato.
Repara en tus Vasallos: sus semblantes
te pintarán con infelices rasgos
la triste situación en que se hallan
sus altivos espíritus gallardos.
¿Pero, cómo han de estar sino marchitos
campos a quienes niega el Sol sus rayos,
jardines que descuida el jardinero,
flor que no riega diligente man?
Los campos del imperio de Castilla,
del valeroso Alfonso abandonados,
sólo espinas producen y venenos,
que ofenden y atosigan sus vasallos.
Raquel... Permite, Alfonso, que la nombre,
y si te pareciere desacato
que quejas de Raquel se te repitan,
pague mi cuello culpas de mi labio.
Raquel (vuelvo a decir) no solamente
el Reino tiraniza Castellano,
no sólo de los Ricos Hombres triunfa,
no sólo el Pueblo tiene esclavizado,
no sólo ensalza viles Idumeos,
no sólo menoscaba tus erarios,
no sólo con tributos nos aqueja,
sino que (lo que es más), de Alfonso Octavo
el alma y los sentidos de tal suerte
domina y avasalla, que postrado
obscuramente yace en su ignominia
siendo mofa de propios y de extraños.
Ya no conquista Alfonso; ya no vence;
ya no es Alfonso Rey: aprisionado
le tiene entre sus brazos una Hebrea;
¿pues cómo ha de ser Rey el que es esclavo?
¿Estos los timbres son de tus victorias?
¿Este el fin de tus triunfos y tus lauros?
¿De este modo coronas tus hazañas?
¿Para esto de la fama al metal claro
diste gloriosa voz con tus proezas?
¿Para esto al noble esfuerzo de tu brazo
venciste Reyes, conquistaste Imperios?
Sí: para que Raquel atropellando
tus glorias, tus hazañas, tus conquistas,
tus timbres adquiridos y heredados,
obscuriese, Alfonso, tu memoria,
deshonrase tu nombre y tu reinado.
Si sólo el fin los hechos califica,

¿qué sirven los principios acertados,
cuando son desaciertos los extremos?
¿Qué importa, Alfonso, que en tus tiernos años
llenases con tu nombre todo el orbe,
si es ignominia ya lo que fue aplauso?
Recuerda pues de tan pesado sueño,
y sacudiendo ese infeliz letargo,
oye de tus Vasallos los clamores,
si algún sentido perdonó el encanto
Advierte el deshonor que te resulta
de comercio tan torpe, y los estragos
que va causando en los cristianos pechos
del vil Hebreo el peligroso trato.
Ésta es la voz del pueblo que te adora
de su misma pasión arrebatado.
No disculpar pretendo la osadía;
los medios culpo, cuando el fin alabo.
Sin mi noticia el pueblo se conmueve:
yo lo digo, y pudiera confirmarlo,
si mi verdad necesitase pruebas,
algún adulator, que está escuchando.
Por contener la furia impetuosa
que en mí se compromete, yo me encargo
de exponerte las quejas y motivos
que ocasionan el bárbaro atentado.
Éste el suceso ha sido, ésta mi culpa:
ni me arrepiento ni la acción retracto.
Mas si acaso te ofenden estas quejas,
y el enojo y pasión te ciegan tanto,
que a castigar te incitan por delitos
las pruebas del amor más acendrado,
esgrime ya los filos de tu acero
contrami cuello fiel, que está esperando
Arrodillándose.
darte de mi lealtad el testimonio
postrero con la sangre confirmado.

Appendix 2: Raquel's Speech to Alfonso VIII

Oíd, que ya prosigo.
Si presumís, Alfonso, que este llanto,
si pensáis que estos débiles suspiros,
prendas en otro tiempo inestimables,
cuando suerte mejor y el cielo quiso,
vienen acaso a ser intercesores
entre vuestro rigor y mi delito
(si haber correspondido a vuestro afecto
merecer puede nombre tan indigno),
no lo temáis. Mi llanto y mis sollozos
sólo son expresión de mi martirio,
vapores que a los ojos ha exhalado
la amante llama que en mi pecho abrigo.
Con muy contrario intento a vuestra vista
vuelvo, Señor; pues si antes he pedido
suspendierais el orden de mi ausencia,
llevada de mi amante desvarío,
ya con mejor acuerdo sólo trato
de cumplir vuestro gusto, y sólo aspiro
a dar la última prueba en mi obediencia
del amor con que siempre os he servido.
Bien sé que obedecer vuestro mandato
la vida ha de costarme, cuando miro
que no pueden cortarse a menos riesgo
lazos que tanto amor y tiempo ha unido.
Mas si en esto, Señor, de mi fineza
los subidos quilates acredito,
dulces serán los últimos tormentos,
si han de manifestar cuánto os estimo.
Males no habrás de cuantos me propone
la triste idea del destierro mío,
que no les dé accidentes de deleite
al ser por vuestra causa padecidos.
La dura soledad que me amenaza
en la mortal ausencia que medito,
serán recreación del pensamiento
al contemplar sois vos quien la ha querido.
El cansancio, Señor, la grave angustia
de mi espíritu vago y peregrino,
trocará las congojas en descanso
y hará de la fatiga misma alivio;
y los insultos a que quedo expuesta
del feroz vulgo, adularán mi oído,
viendo que aborrecerme así ls mueve

de su Rey el afecto y el cariño.
Esto supe, y que es inexcusable
ausentarme de vos, pues mi peligro,
la voz del pueblo, su quietud, los cielos
lo tienen decretado y convenido;
si algún mérito tiene, amado Alfonso,
tan constante pasión, amor tan fino,
de tantos años la correspondencia,
la noble emulación con que habéis visto
mi ternura y la vuestra competirse,
votos con tal desgracia repetidos,
tantas promesas por mi mal frustradas,
con que no pienso ya reconveniros,
pues me tiene tomados mi desdicha
de cualquiera esperanza los caminos;
en recompensa sólo una fineza
me atrevo a suplicaros y pedirlos,
cuyo derecho no podrá usurparme
el rigor de esta ausencia o exterminio.
Ésta es, Alfonso, que, pues no es posible
apagar esta llama que respiro,
de mi pecho arrancar vuestro retrato,
ni de mi pensamiento este delirio,
os deba esta infeliz, que así os adora,
unrecuerdo tal vez, que fuisteis mío,
que en los años dichosos que me amasteis
y yo fui vuestra, pudo el amor mismo
ternezas aprender de mis afectos,
que siempre el mío fue vuestro albedrío,
y finalmente que por adoraros,
ausente, triste y desterrada vivo.
Esto, Señor, mis lágrimas pretenden:
Éste el intento es que me ha traído
A causaros molestias con mi vista,
Y esto lo que por último os suplico.
Esto hará mis tormentos menos graves,
mis malos menos duros y prolijos,
y aborrecible menos ese aliento,
mientras la Parca tuerza el vital hilo.
Y pues instan, Señor, inconvenientes,
temores, sobresaltos y peligros
a que me ausente, ¡ay, Dios, cuántos ahogos
el espíritu siente al proferirlo!,
dadme, Señor, licencia; y este llanto,
Arrodíllase.
última ofrenda que a mi amor dedico,

os quede por seguro que ni el tiempo,
destierro, ausencia, penas ni martirios,
recelos, amenazas ni desastres,
ni de la muerte el riguroso filo,
serán bastantes a borrar del pecho,
de tanta fe depósito y archivo,
la imagen vuestra que por tantos años
labró el amor, el trato, y el destino.

Works Cited

- Alonso Cortés, Narciso. "Don Vicente García de la Huerta." *Hispanic Review* 5.4 (1937): 333-343.
- Álvarez Barrientos, Joaquín. "Eighteenth-century Prose Writing." *A Cambridge Companion to Spanish Literature*. Ed. David Gies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Andioc, René. Introduction. *Raquel*. By Vicente García de la Huerta. Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1971.
- . "La *Raquel* y la censura." *Del siglo XVIII al XIX: Estudios históricos-literarios*. Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza, 2005.
- . *Teatro y sociedad en el Madrid del siglo XVIII*. Valencia: Fundación de Juan March y Editorial Castalia, 1976.
- Aradra Sánchez, Rosa María. *De la retórica a la teoría de la literatura (siglos XVIII y XIX)*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1997.
- Aristotle. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Trans. George A. Kennedy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Ariza Viguera, Manuel. "Algunos aspectos sobre la lengua literaria de García de la Huerta." *Revista de estudios extremeños* 44.2 (1988): 331-347.
- Belfiore, Elizabeth S. *Tragic Pleasures: Aristotle on Plot and Emotion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Cañas Murillo, Jesús. *Vicente García de la Huerta*. Salamanca: Editoria Regional, 1986.
- Cohen, David. "The Politics of Deliberation: Oratory and Democracy in Classical Athens." *A Companion to Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism*. Ed. Walter Jost and Wendy Olmstead. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Deacon, Philip. "Eighteenth Century Neoclassicism." *The Cambridge Companion to Spanish Literature*. Ed. David Gies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . "García de la Huerta, 'Raquel,' y el motín de Madrid de 1766." *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*. 56.208 (1976): 369-287.
- Deacon, Philip. "Spain and Enlightenment." *The Cambridge Companion to Spanish Literature*. Ed. David Gies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- Fucilla, Joseph G. Introduction. *Raquel*. By Vicente García de la Huerta. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 1974.
- García de la Huerta, Vicente. *Raquel*. Ed. René Andioc. Madrid: Editorial Castalia, 1971.
- . *Raquel, Agamenón vengado*. Buenos Aires: Colección Austral, 1947.
- Glendinning, Nigel. *A Literary History of Spain: The Eighteenth Century*. London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1972.
- Haidt, Rebecca. *Embodying Enlightenment: Knowing the Body in Eighteenth-Century Spanish Literature and Culture*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- . *Seduction and Sacrilege: Rhetorical Power in Fray Gerundio de Campazas*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2002.
- Hafter, Monroe. "Remedial Action in Huerta's *Raquel*." *Studies in Honor of Summer M. Greenfield*. Eds. H. L. Boudreau and Luis T. González-del-Valle. Lincoln: Society of Spanish and Spanish-American Studies, 1985.
- Hernández, José Antonio and María del Carmen García. *Historia breve de la retórica*. Madrid: Editoria síntesis, 1994.
- Iarocci, Michael. *Properties of Modernity: Romantic Spain, Modern Europe, and the Legacies of Empire*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2005.
- Iriarte, Tomás de. *Colección de obras en verso y prosa de Tomás de Iriarte*. Madrid: Imprenta de Benito, 1787.
- Kasteley, James L. "Pathos: Rhetoric and Emotion." *A Companion to Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism*. Ed. Walter Jost and Wendy Olmstead. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Kinney, Arthur F. "Continental Politics." *A Companion to Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism*. Ed. Walter Jost and Wendy Olmstead. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Konstan, David. *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- Johnson, Jerry L. *Teatro español del siglo XVIII*. Barcelona: Editorial Bruguera, 1972.
- Johnson, Jerry L. "The Relevancy of *Raquel* to Its Times." *Romance Notes* 14 (1972): 86-91.

- Jovellanos, Gaspar Melchor de. *Memoria para el arreglo de la policía de los espectáculos y diversiones públicas y sobre su origen en España*. Madrid: Atlas, 1952.
- Lama, Miguel Ángel. *La poesía de Vicente García de la Huerta*. Extremadura: Universidad de Extremadura, 1993.
- Lanham, Richard A. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Lewis, Elizabeth Franklin. *Women Writers in the Spanish Enlightenment: The Pursuit of Happiness*. Washington: Ashgate, 2004.
- Luzán, Ignacio de. *La poética o reglas de la poesía en general, y de sus principales especies*. Ed. Russell P. Sebold. Madrid: Cátedra, 2008.
- McClelland, I. L. "Raquel: An Artistic Interlude, 1778." *Spanish Drama of Pathos*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1970.
- McClure, Laura. *Spoken Like a Woman: Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Medina Domínguez, Alberto. *Espejo de sombras: Sujeto y multitud en la España del siglo XVIII*. Madrid: Marcial Pons Historia, 2009.
- Paquette, Gabriel. *Enlightenment, Governance, and Reform in Spain and its Empire, 1759-1808*. New York: Plagrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Pataky Kosove, Joan Lynne. *The <<Comedia Lacrimosa>> and Spanish Romantic Drama (1773-1865)*. London: Tamesis Books Limited, 1978.
- Qualia, Charles B. "Voltaire's Tragic Art in Spain in the Eighteenth Century." *Hispania* 22.3 (1939): 273-284.
- Rios Carratala, Juan A. *Vicente García de la Huerta*. Badajoz: Departamento de Publicaciones, 1987.
- Sala-Valldaura, J. M. *De amor y política: la tragedia neoclásica española*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2005.
- Sebold, Russell P. "Análisis estadístico de las ideas poéticas de Luzán: sus orígenes y su naturaleza." *El rapto de la mente poética y la poesía dieciochesca*. Madrid: Prensa española, 1970.
- Smith, Theresa Ann. *The Emerging Female Citizen: Gender and Enlightenment in Spain*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Valero, José Antonio. "Una disciplina frustrada: La historia dieciochesca." *Hispanic Review* 64.2 (1996): 171-197.

Weber, Alison. *Teresa of Avila and the Rhetoric of Femininity*. Princeton: Princeton University, 2009.