‘Cuernos’ en la cabeza de la autoridad española: *Conquista y descubrimiento del Nuevo Reino de Granada*, una anatomía de la infidelidad.[1]

Susan Herman / Illinois, July1998

Resumen

EL Carnero usa los archivos judiciales de la administración colonial como su fuente narrativa. Este ensayo propone que la metáfora que controla el texto es la “doncella huérfana”, un cuerpo desnudo de verdades no escritas todavía y que debe ser vestida con adornos prestados antes de ser llevada ante el novio (Felipe IV de España) y sus invitados (los lectores del texto). Este estudio explora cómo Rodríguez Freile construye un sistema de “comunicación digital” que les exige a los lectores asumir una posición crítica sobre los crímenes de la administración.

Palabras claves: archivos, metáfora, administración colonial

Abstract

El Carnero used the judicial archives of the colonial administration as a source for narration. This essay proposes that the text’s controlling metaphor is the “doncella huérfana,” a “naked body” of as yet unwritten truths that must be dressed up in borrowed adornments before being brought out to the “bridegroom” (Philip IV of Spain) and his “guests” (the readers of the text). This study explores how Rodríguez Freile engages in a system of “digital communications” that invites the readers to take a critical position regarding the crimes of the Spanish administration.

Key Words: archives, metaphor, colonial administration

*****

The Project

This essay represents the next step in my inquiry into the text of *Conquista y descubrimiento del Nuevo Reino de Granada* (1636-38) and the narrative voice of its author, Juan Rodríguez Freile (1566-ca. 1640). Besides claiming that the chronicle’s popular title, *El Carnero*, refers to the judicial archives,[2] I have argued that the text’s controlling metaphor is the “doncella huérfana,” a “naked body” of as yet unwritten (i.e. “fatherless”) truths that must be dressed up in borrowed adornments (“ropas y joyas prestadas”) before being brought out to the “bridegroom” (Philip IV of Spain) and his “guests” (the readers of the “bride”/ text).[3] This allegory implies that the historian is a “godfather” who makes the orphaned maiden presentable and then “gives her away” to join her husband and society. It also suggests that the *doncella* loses her “virginity” on her wedding night, that is, History ceases being simply “bare facts” to become narrated Story; the art of writing (hi)story is thus an act of “deflowering” of “picking flowers” (“coger flores”) from the Santa Fe garden. Written History, it follows, is a “married woman”. And, as I have also argued, the world’s first “marriage” is adulterous: Eve, as depicted in the Chapter V digression on the Fall, gets the “wander lust” (“pasea”) and has an affair with Lucifer; *Adam is thus the world’s first cuckold.*[4]

Both of these marriage allegories are enclosed in a space created by an author who actively guides us through the text: it opens with “Póngale aquí el dedo el lector y espéreme adelante, porque quiero acabar esta guerra [entre los caciques de Guatavita y de Bogotá]” (IV, 74), and closes with, “Con lo cual podrá el lector quitar el dedo de donde lo puso, pues está entendida la ceremonia [de correr la tierra]” (V, 85).[5] Whether or not the *muisca* ritual is understood will be addressed below. For the moment, suffice it to say that Rodríguez Freile here engages in a system of “digital communications” that asks the reader to “walk through” the text with his fingers. The chronicle is in fact dotted with explicit references to *dedos* (on both hands and feet), too many to be addressed here. Following are some literal and figurative examples that demonstrate the process.

Signing with Horns

At age 19, Rodríguez Freile goes to Spain in the service of Oidor Alonso Pérez de Salazar, who is eventually named to a seat on the Consejo Real by Philip II. The young man’s fortune, however, is short-lived: “dentro de seis meses, poco más o menos,” he states matter-of-factly, his benefactor “murió, quedando yo hijo de oidor muerto, con que digo todo. Pobre y en tierra ajena y extraña, con que me hube de volver a Indias” (XVI, 257-58). The youth takes the trip “con deseo de seguir en ella el principio de mis nominativos” (XV, 233), a term that literally refers to one’s ‘titles’, but is also employed figuratively to indicate “rudimentos de cualquier facultad o arte”.[6] The future historian, then, had been embarking on a new career, probably aspiring to become, like his master, an “oidor” who “listens” to judicial cases. However, the reality is to be another. After this brief glimpse at the center, Rodríguez Freile is hurled by fate back to the periphery.

The statement “conque tuve que volver a Indias” is immediately followed, in what appears to be an illogical break, by the case aptly called “Mestizo, sordo y mudo.”[7] A *vecino*, García de Vargas leaves his wife and mother-in-law at home while he takes a trip into town; on his way back, the husband observes a deaf-mute coming from the general direction of his house. At this point, a fatal encounter takes place:

> [García] preguntóle por señas, de dónde venía; el mudo le respondió por señas, poniendo ambas manos en la cabeza, a manera de cuernos; con lo cual el don García fue a su casa revestido del demonio y de los celos con las señas del

> mudo, topó a la mujer en las escaleras de la casa, y diole de estocadas. (XVI, 258)

García then stabs his mother-in-law as well. Though the jealous husband attempts to flee and to pass himself off as crazy, his overwhelming sense of guilt eventually leads him to accept his death sentence, which is imposed because "no se halló culpa contra la mujer, ni más indicio que lo que el don García confesó de las señas del mudo" (XVI, 258). In brief, García is not a cuckold, but he temporarily believes himself to be one because he misunderstands the deaf-mute's signing. The latter, places horns on his head to literally indicate that he has been out in the yard ("plaza") observing the slaughter of a "novillo" whose resistance to the butcher's blade amuses the onlookers. While 'novillo', like 'cabrón', can be a figure for the 'cuckold', the deaf-mute's message, in this case, is literal. It is a misreading of the sign then that leads García to cut down the two women.[8]

How is this case of colonial justice related to the author's personal history? If we view the death of Pérez de Salazar as the central event of Rodríguez Freile's admittedly fragmentary autobiography (his 'vida'), the case of the "Mestizo, sordo y mudo" can first be read as a 'displacement' of that trauma, in the Freudian sense, onto a story of slaughtered innocents (castrated bulls and women). Furthermore, if we accept that once dead, an 'oidor' no longer 'hears', then for all intents and purposes, the "hijo de oidor muerto", is an orphaned colonial who no longer has the 'ear' of the authorities. At age 25, young Rodríguez Freile's ability to speak and be heard is abruptly cut off; his speech is muted. Though the chronicler's hearing may go undisturbed, the deaf-mute whose 'signings' inspire misreadings, is still an apt figure for the author-narrator.

What does this say about the 'reader' of the horns? Don García interrogates and rushes to interpret a fool-like figure who "tenía por costumbre...tomar entre las piernas un pedazo de caña, que le servía de caballo" (XVI, 258). Is Rodríguez Freile also a 'signifying'[9] fool? Who is really the 'fool'? Who is the cuckold? Are we, the readers, so focussed on the cases of adultery in *Conquista y descubrimiento* that we are missing the message of the 'slaughtered innocents'?

The case of the *sordo-mudo* ends with the extremely inconclusive *moraleja*, "He puesto esto para ejemplo y para que los hombres miren bien lo que hacen en semejantes casos" (XVI, 259). At issue is the dilemma of knowing who is, or is not, faithful. What are the signs? The question goes unanswered; the narrative, once again, simply breaks abruptly to return the reader to the 'affairs of state'.

The Cuckolding of Philip II

The example of the "Mestizo, sordo y mudo," as we have noted, is triggered by the statement "con que tuve que volver a Indias" and closes with the unresolved *moraleja*. The text then briefly alludes to the upheavals of the 1580's in the Nuevo Reino and the need for Philip II to send Doctor Antonio González as his envoy in 1589—"pasada ya la jornada que el duque de Medina hizo a Inglaterra, de que no surtió cosa importante, antes bien mucha pérdida" (XVI, 259). This very cursory reference to the loss of the Spanish Armada the previous year allows Rodríguez Freile to make a passing allusion to Sir Francis Drake's earlier raids on Cartagena and Santo Domingo, and then return the narrative to Spain: "Esto pasaba en Indias, y de ellas el año de 1587 se fue a España a donde intentó también saquear la ciudad de Cádiz" (XVI, 259-60). The British entrance and departure from Spanish shores, to which the author was a passive eyewitness, is then described at great length, but Drake's victory is silenced.

In a figurative sense, a cuckold is a man, who is being ridiculed because he is blind to those who skirt his authority (those who mask infidelity with verbal inventions). The curious reader will note, therefore, that Sir Francis Drake is, in effect, a dangerous presence who, like the lovers in the chronicle's various tales, stalks Philip's 'casa real' in the Caribbean. The suggestion that nothing very important happened during the Duque de Medina's expedition to England is Rodríguez Freile's form of 'signifying', for his elaborately circuitous narrative points out the set of horns growing on the monarch's head as a result of this historic loss.

This spatial and temporal movement back and forth across the ocean, which recedes from 1589, to 1588, to 1587, then back to the 1590's is a turning point that shatters the text. After this moment, the cases become bitterer; they are fewer, and less coherent than those in the first part of the chronicle. The best known and most fully realized stories occur in Freile's youth before his trip to Spain, before his world becomes permanently fractured. However, they should nevertheless be viewed through the prism of the *sordo-mudo*'s horns. Let us now examine one of them.

The Issue of Fidelity and the "Naturales"[10]

One must return now to the question, "Are we readers so focused on the cases of adultery that we are missing the message of the slaughtered innocents?" In this regard, the *doncella huérfana*, a metaphor for the art of historiography, is also Rodríguez Freile's response to his own rhetorical question "¿qué tiene que ver la conquista del Nuevo Reino y ritos de sus naturales, con los lugares de la Escritura y Testamento viejo y otras historias antiguas?" (V, 82). This extended digression interrupts the narration of Gonzalo Jiménez de Quesada's conquest of the Andean tribes, and it induces the author's "curioso lector" to compare the story of Adam and Eve, the prototypical model of a deceitful woman who cuckolds her husband, with a Muisca ritual of running around a set of sacred lakes in a drunken stupor. Ironically, Rodríguez Freile calls this ceremony "correr la tierra", the same expression commonly used by Spaniards to designate military incursions into territories held by the indigenous population. Furthermore, within the context of a text infused with the theme of adultery, the phrase "correr la tierra" evokes the 'correrías amorosas', the bedroom 'conquests' of its leading citizens.[11] This entire inquiry appears in the aforementioned parenthesis that the author asks the reader to form with his finger; the curious reader's digit thus physically and figuratively points to that portion of the text which allows one to establish a comparison between the morals of the 'cristianos' with those of the 'naturales', and the contrast does not necessarily reflect badly on the latter.

It has been my contention that the adulterous marriage is an allegory of colonial rule, in which the subjects of the Spanish crown resist dominance in a variety of subversive acts. The

paradigm is most clear in Chapter X, which narrates the story of Doña Inés de Hinojosa, a woman who cuckolds two husbands. The first, don Pedro de Ávila, is "bien hacendado", a *mujeriego*, and a *jugador;* "con lo uno y con lo otro traía maltratada su hacienda, y a la mujer, con los celos y juego peor tratada" (X, 150).[12] Inés then takes a musician, Jorge Voto, as her lover, who in turn kills the husband and marries Inés. Unfortunately, her second spouse is also a womanizer and a gambler, and, he too is cuckolded when Inés replaces him with the *encomendero* of Chivatá, Pedro Bravo de Rivera, and son of the conquistador of the same name. In summary, Inés de Hinojosa, is an abused wife, who first places horns on the heads of husbands and then has them run through with the swords ("aceros") of her lovers.

Before we pass final judgment on this New World "Eve" gone bad, however, it should be noted that the entire story is framed within the politics of the *encomiendas* during the presidency of Andrés Díaz Venero de Leiva (1564-74), and his wife María (D)ondegardo. In a parody of Juan de Castellanos, this 'first couple' is represented as ruling "con gran cristiandad": he is a great defender of the *naturales*, who sends an oidor to listen to their grievances, and in general, he is the "padre de la patria" whose reign is a "siglo dorado"; she is a "mujer valerosa," who "le ayudaba mucho a las obras de caridad, porque nadie salió de su presencia desconsolado" (X, 148).[13]

In order to demonstrate just how her "acts of charity" are carried out, Rodríguez Freile must first dispatch the unsuspecting husband to Tunja, to judge the case of Jorge Voto's murder. While he is out of town, an *auto* is announced prohibiting the *encomenderos* from using the natives for their "servicio personal". Among those listening to the town crier is Captain [Gonzalo García] Zorro who is immediately angered by the law and its penalty of 200 lashes: "!Voto a Dios, señores capitanes, que estamos todos azotados! ¿Pues este bellaco, ladrón [el rey o su oficial], ganó por ventura la tierra?" (X 149). When this conflict develops between the Crown and the *conquistadores*, María de Dondegardo, steps in and consults with the protesters behind closed doors; when they come out, the reader is simply informed: "Echóse la culpa al secretario; el secretario al escribiente, y éste a la pluma; con lo cual se sosegó este alboroto" (X, 149-50). The wife has subverted her husband's mission --her "obra de caridad" is to make a secret arrangement with the *encomenderos* ("los consolados"), an act that effectively places a set of horns on Venero de Leiva's presidential head.

Where does Rodríguez Freile stand in this conflict between *encomenderos* and the Crown? When the two sides join forces to 'disappear' the new laws into the "archivo del fuego", the party that truly looses is the silent Native American for whom the chronicler speaks. It is essential to understand that this juxtaposition of the case of the 'first lady' and Capitán Zorro's protest with the case of the adulterous Inés de Hinojosa is a pure invention of Rodríguez Freile. The *auto* regarding personal service is announced in 1564, as described, by Fray Pedro Aguado[14]; Venero de Leiva is not only present during the protest, he plays a key role in the pacification of the various parties, including stopping the *auto*'s publication; he does not absent himself from Santa Fe, and more important, governmental authority never passes to his wife. The murder of Jorge Voto, on the other hand, takes place seven years later on August 19, 1571.[15] The deal with the *encomenderos* was cut by Venero de Leiva himself, but in this case, Rodríguez Freile finds it more politic to empower the wife so that he can then blame the woman for the law's disappearance. On the other hand, the author is quick to point out in the matter of sentencing Pedro Bravo de Rivera, Venero de Leiva does represent the Crown's interests: not only does he order the adulterer to be beheaded, but also, "Al don Pedro confiscó los bienes: la encomienda de Chivatá, que era suya, la puso en la Corona, como lo está hoy" (X, 159).

In any event, as shall be demonstrated in a final example of the sign of the horns, the text sides with the 'naturales', or at least, los 'hijos naturales'. Rodríguez Freile definitively finishes off the government of Venero de Leiva with the following epilogue: "Durante su gobierno mataron al Capitán Zorro en un juego de cañas". The plural "mataron" is then made specific:

> Matóle un hijo natural del Mariscal Venegas, dándole con la caña que le tiró por una sien. Pasóle siete dobleces de toca y un bonete colorado que traía, metiéndole la vara por la sien, de que cayó luego en la plaza. (X, 160)

He dies like a speared bull, or better yet, the spear through the temples provides a concrete physical image of horns growing out of his head.

Of further interest is the fact that the previously aggressive Zorro, is now a 'toro', who does not defend himself against the 'matador' who clearly warns him: "!Adárgate, capitán Zorro! !Adárgate, capitán Zorro!". ¿Why does he not protect himself from the challenge of this *mestizo*?[16] Is he more a *novillo* (a "cuckold") than a "bull." Is he simply blind to what is going on around him? Or, is this another case that defies interpretation? The author twice states: "El caso fue desgraciado". Finally, the 'hijo natural' escapes the law "El mozo se ausentó, que no pareció más" (X, 160).

Rodríguez Freile thus leaves the last word on the presidency of Venero de Leiva to the vanished *mestizo* who literally places a set of horns on a *conquistador*'s head with his primitive, but sharp, rod; it is at first believed that it is tipped with steel ('acero'), but it is later discovered that "la vara con que tiró no tenía más que el corte del machete o cuchillo con que se corta en el monte, pero éste, afilado" (X 160) If there is no official justice for the 'naturales' under the law, at least the author's 'agudeza' offers the possibility of poetic justice at the hands of an 'hijo natural'.

This anecdote would appear also to be related to a *mestizo* in the case of Jorge Voto, namely, Hernán Bravo de Rivera, Pedro's half-brother, and presumably an 'hijo natural' of Capitán Pedro Bravo de Rivera, who along with Mariscal Venegas is one of the original *conquistadores* of the Nuevo Reino. Hernán attempts to warn Voto three times of the plot against him: first while he is sleeping in the inn, where the *mestizo*, "disfrazado en hábito de indio," enters his room, dagger in hand, with orders from the encomendero de Chivatá to kill Inés's husband; nevertheless, "en lugar de matarlo le tiró recio el dedo pulgar del pie" (X 154) intending to inform him of his imminent assassination. Upon waking up, however, Voto 'short circuits' the communication by shouting "aquí andan ladrones"; he erroneously equates 'indio' with 'ladrón' and eventually pays with his life for the

'misreading' of this digital sign. He then compounds his fate when he twice ignores the unequivocal message Hernán Bravo carves on his table: "Jorge Voto no salgáis esta noche de casa, porque os quieren matar" (X, 155). Both Capitán Zorro and Jorge Voto are fairly warned, yet, for whatever reason, they prefer to be killed than to listen to these two weapon bearing *mestizos*. These 'hijos naturales' are honorable; they personify the text's affinity for the "the semi-marginalized *meztizo*, for the "half-outsider," a phrase employed by Claudio Guillén to describe the essential nature of the *pícaro*.[17]

Conclusions

A growing body of criticism is placing *Conquista y descubrimiento* within the general 'mode of satire', or the more specifically Hispanic tradition of 'the picaresque'. The most useful framing of this issue is found in Roberto González-Echevarría's *Myth and Archive*[18]. As he found in, the combination of the transgressions against the institution of matrimony and the legalistic background, is one of the elements that links *El Carnero* to the Spanish picaresque. Without straying too far into the multiple definitions of "satire" and/or the "picaresque," I should simply wish to stress that whether *Conquista y descubrimiento* is read as a medley of satiric sketches about the human condition[19], or as a "storehouse" of cases organized in "pell mell fashion" (González Echavarría, 90), the critical focus has been on the individual stories abstracted from their specific historical context in 16th and 17th century Nuevo Reino de Granada, as well as from the first person singular voice of the narrator.

My own view is that Rodríguez Freile can be read as a picaresque historian, who presents himself as an "orphaned half-outsider", a "hijo de oidor muerto", who, like the "mestizo, sordo y mudo," signs in code. The *Conquista y descubrimiento* in its entirety, not just the cases, can be viewed as a picaresque report, an unsolicited 'relación, (González Echevarría, 91).[20] It is an ironic eyewitness account presented to Philip IV of Spain, but unlike Lazarillo de Tormes, a cuckolded husband seeking to explain his current circumstances to an anonymous "Vuestra Merced," Rodríguez Freile is doing the cuckolding by literally and figuratively 'signing' and 'signifying' with his fingers.

The author jousts with the reader, but like the two *mestizos* Hernán Bravo and Diego Venegas, his adversaries are fairly warned, though they, like the cuckolded husband, may not wish to hear the message. The irony is that a casual reader of *Conquista y descubrimiento* might only see "cuernos" and focus on the tales of adultery, but the teller of the tale may be indicating slaughtered cattle--an innocent wife, an abused native population. By identifying with those who resist, he in effect aims the *cuernos* at the head of Philip IV, a 'bridegroom' blinded by the artificial beauty of his "doncella huérfana", the 'historia' of the Nuevo Reino de Granada; he cannot, or will not, see the 'verdad desnuda' that lies beneath the surface.

Notes

[1] This paper was originally presented as "The Cuckolding of Spanish Authority: *Conquista y descubrimiento del Nuevo Reino de Granada,* an Anatomy of Infidelity" on December 30, 1995, at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association in Chicago for the panel "Writing the History of *El Nuevo Reino de Granada*" organized by Alvaro Félix Bolaños.

[2] Susan Herman. "Toward Solving the Mystery of the Placement of the Name Carnero on Juan Rodríguez Freile's History". *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos*, XXIII:3 (October, 1989): 37-52.

[3] Susan Herman. "Conquista y descubrimiento del Nuevo Reino de Granada: 'doncella huérfana'", *Boletín Cultural y Bibliográfico* XX:1 (1983): 77-85.

[4] Susan Herman. "Conquest and Discovery: Subversion of the Fall in *El Carnero*," *MLN* (*Modern Language Notes*) 108 (1993): 283-301.

[5] Juan Rodríguez Freyle, *El Carnero*. Ed. Miguel Aguilera. Medellín: Editorial Bedout, 1973. Henceforth all references to chapters and page numbers are to this edition. While I generally prefer the Aguilera text to more recent ones, I adhere to the convention of the "Freile" spelling of the author's second surname because that is the name that appears on the author's certificate of baptism.

[6] Diccionario de la lengua española.

[7] Oscar Gerardo Ramos. "'El Carnero', libro único de la colonia," pp. 31-46. *El carnero*. By Juan Rodríguez Freyle. Ed. Miguel Aguilera. Medellín: Editorial Bedout, 1973, p. 34.

[8] This crime is also recorded by Juan Flórez de Ocáriz, *Libro Segundo de las Genealogías del Nuevo Reino de Granada*. Edición facsimilar de la impresión de Madrid de 1676. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 1990. Arból X, párrafo 57, p. 142. It takes place in 1587; the husband's full name is Don García Pérez de Vargas Machucas; and his wife is Doña Luisa Xaramillo. Flórez de Ocáriz's wording suggests that the mute is coming from a bullfight ("lidiavan toros"), whereas Rodríguez Freile's text is clearly a case of killing steer for meat: "Habían traído...un poco de ganado para de él matar un novillo; desjarretáronlo, era brava y tuvieron con él un rato de entretenimiento" (XVI, 258).

[9] "To signify," to engage in a style of double-voiced wordplay common among North American Blacks, is a particularly useful concept for understanding the subtleties of Rodríguez Freile's language. See Henry Louis Gates, Jr. *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African-American Literary Criticism*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

[10] A longer version of the thesis presented in this section can be found in my "La encomienda de Chivatá: el caso de doña Inés de Hinojosa y la cuestión del (mal)tratamiento de los indígenas," *Inés de Hinojosa: Historia de una transgresora. Política del adulterio, de la colonia al siglo XX.* Ed. Isabel Vergara. Medellín: Editorial Universidad de Antioquia, 2000 .

[11] The verb 'correr' in medieval and Siglo de Oro usage carries many of the sexual connotations of modern 'andar'; 'correrías' is thus here understood to be equivalent to 'andanzas'. For the relationship between 'correr' and 'alcahuetería', see Francisco Márquez Villanueva, *Orígenes y sociología del tema celestinesco*, Barcelona, Anthropos, 1993, p. 49.

[12] In the popular novel turned 'telenovela', *Los pecados de doña Inés de Hinojosa* by Próspero Morales Pradilla (Bogotá: Plaza & Janés Editores Colombia, 1986), the first chapter's scene of rape and battery is an elaborate interpretation of Rodríguez Freile's very brief insinuation.

[13] While that portion of Castellano's verses dedicated to the Nuevo Reino de Granada proper is not published until the 19th century, a close examination of the language he uses to describe Venero de Leiva suggests that Rodríguez Freile had access not only to the published portion of the *Elegías de varones ilustres* (¿fecha de la primera parte?), but to the unpublished manuscripts as well:

> Gobernó, pues, aqueste caballero
> las tierras deste reino muchos años
> con toda rectitud y diligencia,
> justicia, caridad y amor de padre,
> favoreciendo pobres y viudas
> y siendo siempre general amparo,
> no menos de los indios que españoles,
> pues que necesitados y afligidos
> *no se partieron dél desconsolados* [my stress].

(Juan de Castellanos. *Historia del Nuevo Reino de Granada* Tomo II de 2. Madrid: Imprenta de A. Pérez Dubrull, 1886. Canto XXII, p. 13). The underscored verse highlights the fact that Rodríguez Freile transfers Castellano's characterization of the husband to the wife.

[14] Pedro Aguado. *Recopilación historial*. Ed. Juan Friede. Bogotá: Biblioteca de la Presidencia, Primera parte, Libro IV, Capítulos 21 y 22, pp.

[15] Ozías S. Rubio y Manuel Briceño. *Tunja y su provincia desde la fundación de la ciudad hasta 1817*. Tunja, 1962, p. 103.

[16] From other chronicles we learn that he is Diego Venegas grandson on his mother's side of the cacique of Guatavita, and that he is also related to Sagipa, or Saquezazipa, last *cacique* of Bogotá, who dies under torture, implemented, according to some sources, by Capitán Zorro. See Juan Rodríguez Freyle, *El Carnero*. Ed. Darío Achury Valenzuela. Caracas, Biblioteca Ayacucho, 1979. Note 27, pp. 83-84.

[17] Guillen, Claudio. *Literature as System*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971, p. 95.

[18] *Myth and Archive: A Theory of Latin American Narrative.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990, pp. 87-92.

[19] Johnson, Julie Greer. *Satire in Colonial Spanish America: Turning the New World Upside Down.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993, pp. 50-63.

[20] Johnson, Julie Greer. *Satire in Colonial Spanish America: Turning the New World Upside Down.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993, pp. 50-63.