

WILLIAM H. HINRICHS

THE INVENTION OF THE SEQUEL
EXPANDING PROSE FICTION IN
EARLY MODERN SPAIN

TAMESIS

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Acknowledgments	xv
1 The Birth of the Sequel: The <i>Celestina</i> 's Maculate Conception	1
2 From Knights Errant to Errant Women: The Sequels of Feliciano de Silva	46
3 A Cannon Shot from the Margins: The <i>Segundo Lazarillo</i> 's Unexamined Role in the Story of the Sequel and the Picaresque	94
4 The Author Strikes Back: Alemán's Picaresque Revenge	131
5 From the <i>Galatea</i> to the <i>Quijote</i> : Cervantes' Quest for Closure	178
Select Bibliography	223
Index	235

PREFACE

On September 23 and 24, 2005, a group of Hispanists gathered at Yale University's Whitney Humanities Center to honor the 400th anniversary of the publication of Miguel de Cervantes' *Don Quijote*. They had arrived a decade early.¹ What we call the *Quijote* today was not created in 1605 but in 1615 with the publication of its second and superior part. Thus in 2015, and only in 2015, can and should we celebrate its quatercentenary. The Yale conference on the *Quijote* was not the first untimely celebration of an early modern Spanish literary landmark. In 1999, a similar gathering of scholars had descended on Seville to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the publication of Mateo Alemán's *Guzmán de Alfarache*. The very title of the conference underscored their error. "Atalayas del *Guzmán de Alfarache*" derives from the subtitle to Part II of *Guzmán*, which had been printed in 1604 not 1599. Like their *Cervantista* colleagues, the Alemán scholars had arrived early, a half-decade too early in the latter case, for a quatercentenary celebration that should have been held in 2004.

The prematurity of these two conferences provokes a singular question: "What happened to the second parts?" Further, what happened to the rival second parts of 1602 and 1614 by Juan Martí and Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda that preceded Alemán's and Cervantes' concluding gestures? Indispensable in their own era, they appear to be invisible in ours. The answer is as brief as it is unsatisfying: Literature scholars ignore sequels because we do not understand them. Sequels are as ubiquitous in popular culture as they are absent in the Academy. They are the literary Other – versus the comforting if always dubiously defined "Original" – that we do not wish to confront. We do not know what to call these sequels; we do not know how to talk about them; we do not know how they function; and we do not know why people read and write them. Further, given that they represent the earliest and most intimate criticism most texts ever receive, they compete with the very type of work we claim to do. Sequels constitute a threat not just to authors of original texts but to their critics. They can supplant us.

¹ The Yale conference on the quatercentenary of the publication of Part I of the *Quijote* was but one of many that took place in 2005.

While the lack of attention to the sequel is not unique to Hispanism, the remedy is. It is Spanish literature, more concretely, early modern Spanish narrative stretching from the *Celestina* to the *Quijote*, that invented the sequel.² Born in the former text, the sequel achieved its plenitude in the latter. Imaginative expansion since 1615 has been a footnote to Rojas and Cervantes, along with the narratives that connect them. Their creations invented the sequel, and thus their creations can and must generate the theory with which to understand it.

Given Spanish sequels' place of priority, inattention to them in Hispanism is particularly egregious: In the story of the sequel, Spanish literature is not culturally belated but early. Perhaps it is disquietingly early. Perhaps this is why Continental and Anglophone scholars have given so little attention to the sequel in general and to Spanish-language sequels more specifically. Neither the *Celestina* nor the *Quijote* even appears in the two major anthologies of sequels compiled in the twentieth century. Merle Jacob's *To Be Continued: An Annotated Guide to Sequel* (1995) and John Simkin's *The Whole Story: 3000 Years of Sequels and Sequences* (1998) fail to list any early modern Spanish texts, much less those mentioned herein.

Theorization of the sequel is even more sparse. No book-length study exists. In fact, there is no comprehensive consideration of the sequel for any major literature. What little writing there is departs from eighteenth-century England and the novels of Fielding, Smollett, Sterne and Defoe, four authors united by one common precursor, Miguel de Cervantes. As Robert Alter writes in *Partial Magic: The Novel as a Self-Conscious Genre* (1975), it is "[i]n mid-eighteenth-century England, where the explicit imitation of Cervantes is most abundantly evident" (31). Marjorie Garber goes to the same source texts in writing a chapter on sequels in *Quotation Marks* (2002), as does David Brewer in writing *The Afterlife of Character, 1726–1825* (2005). Deriving theory from derivative texts takes us and them too far from the source and the sense of the sequel: wrong century, wrong language, wrong country.

Turning to early modern Spain, we find that the story of the sequel is cohesive, comprehensive and anterior to that of the English and French novels. Once identified and understood, the story of the Spanish sequel can be productively applied to the later texts and national literatures that absorbed its model. Part II of the *Quijote* and its precursors generate the theory with which to understand the English and French sequels of subsequent centuries. The story of the sequel in Spain begins with continuations of the sentimental

² Predictably, the *Celestina* was also commemorated prematurely, concretely, in 1999, the 500th anniversary of the 1499 sixteen-*auto* version, but three years before the quincentenary of the publication of its full 1502 twenty-one-*auto* form.

novel the *Cárcel de amor* (1492) in 1496 and the *Celestina* (1499/1502) in 1534 and 1536, passes through the picaresque of *Lazarillo* (1554) and its continuation in 1555, embraces the pastoral of the *Diana* (1559) and its rival Parts II of 1563 and 1564, and ends with the competition to continue *Guzmán* and the *Quijote* in 1602 and 1614 respectively. The continuators of this corpus allude to and comment on each other both in front matter and in subsequent narrative: Their sequels contain a history of the sequel. Further, express and allegorical meditation on the means and motivations of readers and writers of sequels appears in all the works to be examined in this study: These sequels contain a theory of the sequel, as well.

The selection of texts in this study proceeds from a natural development and self-aware dialogue between writers and texts, not arbitrariness or convenience. Temporal and geographic restrictions do not need to be imposed so much as recognized; they are present in the logic of the evolution of the sequel, a story which takes place in Spain between 1492 and 1615. This investigation focuses on the Golden Age narratives that invented the sequel and on the novelistic genres that the sequel in turn invented, from the sentimental and the Celestinesque novels, to the pastoral and the picaresque. The elements that continuations rejected and retained would refine and define these genres both positively and negatively. Thus the study of sequels provides a privileged window into genre formation.

Before looking at the functions of the sequel, it first behooves us to establish a nomenclature for its structures. Three major structures define sequels of the era and those to follow. Put in morphological terms, they are the prefix, in-fix and suffix. The first form precedes the lived time of the originating text's imaginative world, the second expands it from within by extending an episode or adding details to it, and the third and most common kind adds on at the chronological end. Each type of "fix" undermines old endings and beginnings while creating new ones. Crucially, in the act of undoing endings and beginnings, "sequelists" ultimately undermine any notion of definitive closure or definitive origin. After readers accept these additions, no beginning and no ending in prose fiction is fixed.

Two major forms of authorship further define literary continuation, autographic and allographic. The former consists of continuation by the originator's hand, the latter of continuation by another's hand. Most famously, Alemán and Cervantes respond to unauthorized allographic continuations with their own Parts II to *Guzmán* and the *Quijote*. Earlier allographic continuators include Nicolás Núñez, who adds a brief argumentative in-fix and physical suffix to the *Cárcel de amor*; the anonymous 1555 continuator of *Lazarillo de Tormes*; and the pair of continuators of the *Diana*, Alonso Pérez and Gaspar Gil Polo (1563/1564), whose strategies Cervantes so productively absorbs. Always ahead of his time, Fernando de Rojas is both autographic and allographic sequelist, continuing and completing an anonymous first *auto*

by another writer with fifteen *autos*³ of his own in the 1499 *Celestina* and then expanding the effort in 1502 with five more in the middle, the first great argumentative and physical in-fix. In the former effort he surpasses another writer; in the latter he surpasses himself.

I limit this study's generic scope to prose fiction. Drama and poetry, especially epic poetry, have decidedly different notions of authorship and originality. Topically, my discussion is limited to characters and arguments created by specific authors at specific points in time. This specificity allows authors to make claims to owning the characters they create and the imaginative worlds that they come to inhabit. Authors of works based on religion, popular tradition, mythology and history cannot make such claims to originality or ownership.

Even within the circumscribed period and place of this study, the functions of sequels and the means and motivations of their readers and writers vary: The sequel is not a static synchronic entity operating outside of time and place. It changes and continues to change, even as it changes the texts it continues. Nonetheless, a few generalizations can be essayed. First, sequels must be like and unlike their source texts, both close enough to persuade readers that they are connected to the original and different enough to persuade readers that they offer a worthwhile addition, whether the parts are physically or only figuratively bound together. In contrast to imitations, they do not aim to re-create or repeat an earlier text but rather to expand it. On a material level, sequels never diminish or detract from the sales of their precursors nor do they produce great monetary rewards – in early modern Spain anyway – for their writers.

Sequels are written for many reasons, including to redeem stories gone awry, to add on to stories that readers find incomplete, and to fulfill and finish stories that have reached their natural and necessary terminus. Towards all three objectives – correction, amplification and closure – sequels' various "fixes" subordinate an original story by turning its independent clause into a dependent one, converting figuration into prefiguration. Finally and crucially, sequels offer the most direct and intimate criticism that a work can receive. Great sequels are great readings of original works and the best window we can have into reconstructing reading practices of an earlier era. Approaching them as such offers a powerful new tool to the literary critic and opens up new readings of some of literature's most read works. Much study remains to be done both inside and outside Hispanism.

With that in mind, the first chapter of this book locates the seeds of the sequel in Fernando de Rojas's *Celestina* (1499/1502), examining the text's

³ While I am tempted to translate "auto" as "act," I have decided to leave it in the Spanish throughout this study because its meaning does not correspond exactly to the drama-specific notion of "act" in English.