Capital Values in Play: Representations of Economic Figures in Nineteenth-Century Spanish Theater

Davina Buivan Kotanchik
Sterling, Virginia

Master of Arts in Foreign Languages, George Mason University, 2008
Master of Arts in International Affairs, The Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University, 1996
Bachelor of Arts in Government, Cornell University, 1992

A Dissertation presented to the Graduate Faculty
of the University of Virginia in Candidacy for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Spanish, Italian and Portuguese

University of Virginia
May 2014

Abstract

Decades before nineteenth-century Spanish novelists such as Benito Pérez Galdós (1843-1920) published works reflecting tensions between classes and challenges to old values due to processes of modernization and urbanization, economic development and crises already preoccupied Spanish playwrights, whose works signaled anxiety regarding the condition of the economy and of the nation. By analyzing theatrical representations of economic figures such as the banker or stockbroker, the nouveau riche, the moneylender or creditor, and the have-nots during the period 1805-1894, I argue that the playwrights in question not only observed economic problems, but also proposed solutions to them.

In this study, I employ economic history, sociology and political economy as a background to interpret depictions of economic activity in 26 nineteenth-century Spanish plays. I attempt to demonstrate that, amid the establishment of new institutions such as stock exchanges and casinos, and phenomena such as consumer debt, agricultural stagnation and worker uprisings, the playwrights presented specific models of conduct, with the aim of shaping gender and social roles, and fostering regional or national renewal. Furthermore, I aim to illustrate that these models of conduct, particularly during tumultuous periods in Spain's domestic and international affairs, reflected competing ideologies or scenarios for the future course of the region or nation.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank everyone whose support enabled me to envision, research and write my dissertation. This study originated in a graduate course taught by David T. Gies, who has guided me most attentively through all stages of the project. His deep knowledge of nineteenth-century Spanish theater and his passion for teaching and learning are an enormous inspiration. I am grateful for his collegial spirit, optimism and unfaltering encouragement.

I thank the members of my committee, Randolph Pope, Gustavo Pellón and Charles Holt, for their time, expertise and attention. Their willingness to participate in this project and enthusiasm for the topic are greatly appreciated. My thanks also go to Donald Shaw and Ruth Hill for their invaluable advice and steadfast support over the past five years.

I am grateful to Paula Ruth Gilbert and Lisa Marie Rabin for encouraging me to change careers and to follow my bliss in the classroom. Colleagues Morgan Fisher, Tim McCallister, Rachel Finney, Adriana Rojas Campbell, Kátia Sherman, Jennifer Barlow, and Nora Benedict have shared with me hundreds of hours of study and discussion and emboldened me to keep going.

My friends, sister Nerissa, brother-in-law Jerry and husband Nick have given me strength, love and laughter throughout my graduate school experience and beyond. My deepest gratitude goes to Nick for his companionship, selflessness and buoyant sense of humor.

I give thanks to my sister-in-law, Nancy Sinkus, and her husband Jim for their hospitality and kindness. Additionally, I am indebted to the Kotanchik family for many memorable encounters over the years.

My niece, Daravan Shepard, who was born as I prepared to take comprehensive exams, shows me every day what it means to learn fearlessly. Lynette Bailey, Tracey Wood, Robin Berry and Catelynn Brown have given me ample opportunities to put this lesson into practice.

I dedicate this work to my parents, Vinh and Vinita Buivan, who have always looked forward to having a “Doctor” in the family.

Introduction

The widespread and unprecedented economic changes witnessed in nineteenth-century Spain were exhilarating and disturbing at the same time. With the increased availability of goods and the spread of new institutions such as casinos and stock exchanges, came the risk (and reality) of conspicuous consumption and indebtedness. There were new ways to place an entire family's worth in play, to become rich overnight or fall deep into debt. Generational conflict intensified, as values regarding money and marriage came into question. Gender roles were shifting as well.

Among the changes highlighted above, the emergence of persons and entities skilled at manipulating value —with the potential to alter society's values— was particularly intriguing and unsettling. As one discipline that became more important to understanding the unprecedented scale and pace of change, economics became integral to nineteenth-century thought and was reflected in all genres of literature. However, until now, literary criticism on the nineteenth century in Spain and Latin America has focused on representations of money and commodities primarily in novels and poetry. For example, Nicole Barraza's dissertation, *Follow the Money*: *Representations of Capital in Galdós* (2012), examines conspicuous consumption, speculation and work in such novels as *La desheredada* (1881) and *Miau* (1888). Ericka Beckman, in several articles, analyzes symbols of capitalist modernization in the poems of José Martí and José Asunción Silva; and, in a recent book, *Capital Fictions* (2013), she examines the stock market novel, advertising pamphlets and other texts from Latin America's early export age. To date, apparently no book-length work has canvassed nineteenth-century Spanish theater to compile a typology of economic players and examine how these characters were keys to understanding the times, as well as to envisioning a better or more prosperous society.

Why pursue this endeavor in theater? First, in theater, the action of the play is accessible to a broader public than the literate alone. Moreover, theater, as David T. Gies has pointed out, "as the most immediate of literary forms, reflected the rapid and, for many, unnerving changes taking place in society" (2). Many plays produced during this period provide not only descriptions of then-unfamiliar economic phenomena, but also, in many cases, prescriptions of conduct. By utilizing these characters to define gender roles and power relations, theater was promoting certain models of political economy. By focusing on theater in this project, and by bringing to it a discussion of power relations and gender roles, I aim to examine economics in literature from a new angle. With this in mind, I examine economic figures in nineteenth-century Spanish theater, including: the banker, the stockbroker, the *indiano*, the moneylender, the woman who bails her family out of debt, the servant who plays the stock market, the pauper, et al. Some key questions that I address in this project are: To what degree are these players labeled or classified as "other" and perceived as beneficial or harmful to society? I propose that the playwrights not only observed, but attempted to shape the economic realities around them. To what extent do their depictions of economic figures serve as justifications or condemnations of practices such as speculation and moneylending? Did the playwrights view material enrichment as necessarily bringing about an impoverishment of values? If not, what did they view as the positive aspects of economic and social change in their time? How did theatrical representations of economic figures during this period attempt to shape new values, and gender and social roles?

The emergence of newly empowered individuals in society such as speculators, women and servants gives rise to anxiety, reflected in the plays. What happens to a household when a woman learns to handle finances, in some cases more adeptly than a man, and demonstrates superior mastery of business practices? What if a servant comes to manage money more

efficiently than his or her master or mistress? How does a family reconcile its new goal of increased wealth with its efforts to uphold long-cherished values? Is an unmarried woman, a servant or a foreigner less of an outsider or other if she/he handles money more skillfully than the head of household? If, in a given play, women handle money more efficiently than men, what difference does it make if the playwright is a man or a woman? To what degree are women portrayed as moderating male economic misconduct? To what extent are men depicted as correcting women's economic misconduct? What are the implications for society? More broadly, is the new economy portrayed as making men less manly and women less womanly, thereby corrupting the collective, national character? By addressing these questions, I hope to arrive at a better understanding of how nineteenth-century Spanish theater attempted to come to terms with economic and social change, and which ideologies it privileged or rejected in the process.

The methodology I have chosen throughout this project is to employ economic history, sociology, and political economy as a background to examine the anxieties reflected in the plays. A crucial element of my analysis of the plays has been the work of historians Juan Pablo Fusi Aizpurúa, Jesús Cruz and Ángel Bahamonde Magro; economic historians Gabriel Tortella and David Ringrose, and sociologist Roberto Garvía, among others. Depending on the text at hand, I have taken a gender studies approach, as appropriate, but also employ other frameworks to interpret the texts, including political economy. Specifically, what contrasting models of behavior do the plays present, with a view to social engineering and regional or national prosperity? How do efforts to achieve national prosperity interact with government, law and custom? In order to arrive at some answers, I examine patterns of economic development and crises in nineteenth-century Spain, the introduction of business legislation and other conditions

necessary for the economic figures profiled to appear on the historical scene, as well as on the stage. I also investigate relevant aspects of Spain's domestic and international affairs in order to demonstrate that the playwrights were not only observing economic phenomena that caused anxiety, but also proposing solutions to regional and national problems.

An early finding of my research was that the lack of an institutional framework for protecting rights and privileges in the emerging financial sector and the ever-shifting composition of the middle class fueled economic insecurity (Davies 5). The plays I analyze demonstrate this anxiety. Such unease was exacerbated by the overwhelming changes in economy and society that were witnessed and documented by the playwrights. The modernization of infrastructure, in the form of railroads, canals and telecommunications, brought new opportunities for enormous potential returns, but also for bankruptcy. The appeal that city life held for rural dwellers in search of their fortune led to migration that aggravated the already precarious condition of the agricultural sector. Processes of mechanization and industrialization yielded new varieties of products and increased the speed of work and travel, thereby opening up time for leisure. The availability of new goods, technologies and financial instruments contributed to the creation of a consumer society and shifted the dividing line between the haves and the have-nots. There now were new ways and places to spend one's free time. Among these was the casino, a new social space in which not only gambling, but other activities were offered, such as reading rooms and parties for members and their families (Cruz, *Rise* 199). Such spaces drew people away from the home and thus challenged the unity of the family. All these economic phenomena spurred the emergence of a new class and challenged old values and social roles.

Indeed, among these values and roles, the family was a crucial area affected by economic change. In some circles in Spain, for example, there were attempts to tailor the raising of girls toward "rational" economic behavior; that is, for women to become drivers of progress by becoming familiar with economics and social sciences (Rodríguez 24-25). Since women were now assigned greater responsibility for looking after the economic well-being of their families, the basic unit of the nation, they now had an expanded role in promoting the nation's economic well-being. With purchasing power on the rise and accessible to a larger part of the population, and a variety of goods available as never before, women acquired new economic agency as consumers. In some instances, women also became creditors to their families, as seen in some of the plays I analyze.

In spite of women's apparently expanded role as economic agents, marriage was still the principal way in which they could climb the social ladder, hence many middle-class families' attempts to marry their daughters into the aristocracy in order to bolster their economic security (Davies 26). Members of the aristocracy, with their dwindling fortunes, may have perceived marriage to members of the middle class as a way to ensure their economic security as well. Indeed, marriage, treated as a business transaction by parents of young women, is a common plot among the plays I will analyze in this dissertation. While the commoditization of daughters via marriage is not new, the resistance of some daughters to arranged marriages in the plays I study points to generational conflict and a fundamental shift in ways of thinking about the institution of marriage. These new attitudes were distressing to the older generation, which is represented by the characters of the parents in these plays.

Like many women in the plays I profile, *indianos*, Spaniards who moved to the Americas and returned wealthy to the peninsula after making a fortune overseas, were vital agents of

economic and social change in the nineteenth century. In the colonies they earned fortunes in the slave trade, the mining and refining of natural resources, railroad construction, shipping and sugar cultivation. While overseas, once-poor Spaniards could also purchase titles of nobility. This possibility, combined with their vast colonial earnings, provided them with unprecedented social mobility. Back in Spain, *indianos* lavishly spent their new wealth on palatial mansions, opened shipping firms, and invested in industry and agriculture. This sudden social mobility was extremely attractive to those on the receiving end of *indianos*' newfound wealth, and disturbing to others, including the waning aristocracy. Whatever their reception in society, however, *indianos* were both beneficiaries and agents of immense economic growth in the nineteenth century. This influence is reflected in several texts I analyze.

Although rapid economic and social change in the nineteenth century gave some groups advantages they had not previously enjoyed, it also had a dark side. There was deep economic insecurity amid the prosperity, as members of lower classes began climbing the social ladder, people from the countryside moved to the cities, and certain professions became obsolete. To add to this anxiety, Spain and its European neighbors experienced multiple domestic and international financial crises throughout the century. There was a widespread distrust of companies and banks because of a lack of knowledge about how they operated. The concept of credit was not well understood. Yet borrowing from banks and individual moneylenders became the norm. To the extent that people invested in the stock market, most did not understand how it worked and tended to risk all their money in a single sector or company. The conspicuous consumption of luxury goods also became problematic, as middle-class families tried to keep up with neighbors or impress guests in their homes. All of these problems are profiled in the plays I have selected to study in this project.

Although the plays I study contain negative representations of women as *gastonas* and *petimetras*, I also have observed in them the definition and articulation of a prudent, thrifty *mujer económica*, or economic woman, as a foil to economic man[1], particularly when he goes to excess. Also evident in these plays are contrasting models of economic men and economic women. One type of economic man embodies hard work and character built through experience and adversity, while another is lured by easy money from gambling and speculating and favors leisure. One type of economic woman prefers practicality and savings, while another is unable to resist luxury and ostentation. The models of economic man and of *mujer económica* that are privileged in these plays could be sources of national renewal for Spain. Such national renewal became of increasing urgency as Spain's grip on its remaining overseas colonies weakened and would definitively be lost by 1898.

A potentially useful tool for analyzing these plays is feminist economics. Its proponents, including Marianne A. Ferber and Julie A. Nelson, assert that masculine ideals have shaped the formation of the science of economics and biased the discipline towards monitoring individual "transactions" (*Beyond* 10). Ferber and Nelson argue in favor of a "feminine" economic model that takes into account "interactions**,"** such as family relations and work at home, that traditional, androcentric models do not (*Beyond* 10). Indeed, I believe there is ample evidence among the texts analyzed in this project to support a feminist economics in literature, given the conflict between acting in one's self-interest and acting with a view to being "more integrally connected to the human and ecological communities" (Ferber and Nelson, *Beyond* 10). In this regard, I have

[1] John Stuart Mill defined "economic man" as "a being who invariably does that by which he may obtain the greatest amount of necessaries, conveniences, and luxuries, with the smallest quantity of labour and physical self-denial with which they can be obtained in the existing state of knowledge" (101).

attempted to draw connections, wherever appropriate, between Ferber and Nelson's "feminine," interactional economics and the selfless conduct of some of the women in the plays I study.

The plays I have selected for this study include comedies and dramas that date from 1805 (María Rosa Gálvez's *La familia a la moda*) to 1894 (Félix González Llana and José Francos Rodríguez's *El pan del pobre*). They echo the anxiety produced by the establishment of unfamiliar institutions and practices, growing foreign influence and investment, and historical events such as food crises, stock market crashes and worker uprisings. For this reason, I have organized the project as follows: Chapter One, "The Banker, the Stockbroker," which begins with the legal and institutional basis for the new economy. Chapter Two, "The Nouveau Riche," explores several types of figures who benefit from the new prosperity created in the banking, finance and commercial sectors. Chapter Three, "The Moneylender, the Creditor," examines a figure who becomes increasingly important as credit transactions abound during the period and the sources of his or her power. Chapter Four, "The Have-Nots," delves into the kinds of figures who have failed to prosper in the new economy and the causes of this failure.

In many instances, the types of figures in society that are reflected in the plays may stand for competing ideologies or models of national development. As certain ideologies or models are rejected and others embraced, the theatrical figures that exemplify them are criticized or praised accordingly.

The participants in society that are being criticized in the plays I study include the leisurely, who have abandoned military service or other respectable forms of work. These are, among others, don Miguel of the duque de Rivas's *Tanto vales cuanto tienes* (1828), and Carlos of Juan de Alba's *El porvenir de las familias* (1865). We will meet them in Chapter Two, "The Nouveau Riche." Another emerging player in society whose conduct is criticized is the

individual who becomes suddenly wealthy, through an inheritance or lottery win, but who fails to make charitable donations (don Aniceto of Eusebio Blasco's *¡Si yo tuviera dinero!* [1880] in Chapter Two) or to contribute to the arts (the banker Olmedo of Ramón Lías y Rey's *Achaques del siglo actual* [1849] in Chapter One). Still another figure who is criticized, and who pays tragic consequences for his failure to show compassion for the needy worker, is the factory owner (don Jenaro of Félix González Llana and José Francos Rodríguez's *El pan del pobre* (1894) in Chapter Four).

The figures in society who are being exalted include the impoverished but charitable, for example Luisa in José María Gutiérrez de Alba's *Vanidad y pobreza* (1860), which we will see in Chapter Four, "The Have-Nots." Also a model of charity, although with a different position in society, is Julia, the niece of the foundry owner in Félix González Llana and José Francos Rodríguez's *El pan del pobre* (1894), which I also investigate in Chapter Four. As we will discuss there, she is also a model for dialogue between disparate socioeconomic classes. A rare but refreshing figure in the new economy is that of the prudent stockbroker who warns his compatriots of the pitfalls of investing. Profiled in Chapter One, "The Banker, the Stockbroker," the inspirational Santillán of Manuel Angelón's *La bolsa* (1858) embodies this unusual degree of caution and loyalty. Yet another figure whose qualities are extolled is the struggling farmer, who remains dedicated to tending his land and nurturing his workers, in spite of the obstacles to agricultural development that nature and government policies have established. We first encounter this figure in Manuel Angelón's *La bolsa* (1858) in the character of Guzmán, the farmer who travels to Madrid to ask stockbrokers to invest in agriculture in his native lands (Chapter One, "The Banker, the Stockbroker"). In addition, we see Luis of *El usurero* (1860) who is proud to be a farmer, shares food and drink with his employees and shelters the needy

(Chapter Three, "The Moneylender, the Creditor"). As we shall see, these models of hard work and perseverance reflect hope of renewal in Spain's rural regions.

Chapter 1 The Banker, the Stockbroker

In this chapter, I examine representations of bankers and stockbrokers in Spanish plays published from the mid- to late nineteenth century. I identify and discuss some of the market and political forces, historical events and phenomena that gave rise to these figures. In addition, I look at the implications of their behavior for families and for society as a whole.

While the earliest play studied here was published in 1842, the legal basis for modern banks and the stock market was established just over a decade earlier, with the Código de Comercio in 1829 and the establishment of the Bolsa de Comercio in Madrid in 1830. In 1829, the Banco de San Fernando was founded. This institution served the government, to the detriment of the private sector. From 1829 to 1843, three-quarters of the Banco de San Fernando's gross profits were from operations with the government (Tortella, *Orígenes* 51). Industry and trade received a boost in 1844, when financier and politician José de Salamanca (1811-1883), along with other Madrid businessmen, proposed a government-chartered bank under the name of Banco de Isabel II (Tortella, *Orígenes* 52). Throughout the 1840s, banks would proliferate, not only in Madrid but also in the provinces. During these years, the textile industry was undergoing mechanization; such advances gave rise to the need for additional banking services (Tortella, *Banking* 69). By around mid-century, however, bankers moved their operations to the Bolsa, as speculation in other sectors became more economically attractive than the textile industry, which had ceased to be profitable (Cruz, *Gentlemen* 84). Funds that had once been invested in the wool trade now went to other sectors of the economy (Cruz, *Gentlemen* 84).

During the years in which the plays are set, there was great anxiety and uncertainty surrounding the Bolsa. Its operations were not well known to the public. Many of those on the inside, too, had difficulty understanding the activities in which they were taking part. The speed with which transactions took place, thus with which fortunes could be made or lost, was unfamiliar and unsettling. According to Ramón de Mesonero Romanos in his November 1837 article "La Bolsa," which appeared in his *Escenas matritenses*:

> Esta agitación va creciendo sucesivamente por minutos a medida que va acercándose la hora de conclusión, y ya en los últimos momentos es inexplicable el movimiento, la indecisión, el estado febril de la mayor parte de los concurrentes. Uno de ellos, agitado por la ambición, impulsado por la esperanza, duda, recapacita, vuelve, torna, mira el reloj, mira los semblantes; quisiera preguntar a las estatuas lo que debe hacer... ¡Miserable, detente, la suerte de tu esposa y de tus hijos penden de esa tu resolución! ... El vendedor le asedia, la hora se acerca, la campana fatal va a sonar... (100)

One's family could be devastated by an unfortunate outcome in the Bolsa, which occurs in many of the plays examined in this chapter. There was deep insecurity and constant anxiety among bankers and stockbrokers, as Mesonero Romanos's account shows. These occupations were stressful and the atmosphere in the Bolsa tense.

The Bolsa de Madrid evoked suspicion in observers such as playwright, novelist and lawyer Andrés Ruigómez (1848-1879):

> Durante esas horas de ardiente calentura, en que se despliegan todas las tácticas y todos los ardides, no se realiza ningún trabajo material, no se ejerce ninguna industria, no se cultiva ningún arte, no se estudia ninguna ciencia, no se crea

> utilidad alguna; ninguna riqueza, no se produce, en fin; nada bueno, ¡se juega! (245)

The absence of a tangible product, the failure to nurture any art form or to educate, contributed to an atmosphere of mistrust towards the figure of the stockbroker. Later in this chapter and others, we will again encounter the conflict between money and art, for example in *Achaques del siglo actual*, where a banker who marries into a wealthy family must give up his interest in the arts.

During the years 1843-1853, the Bolsa de Madrid flourished with an expansion of credit, a proliferation of new companies, and a rise in prices (Torrente Fortuño 119). It was during this time in the stock exchange that José de Salamanca[2] began to make his fortune. He would soon be joined in the Bolsa by investors of various backgrounds: businessmen, aristocrats and the emerging middle class.

In spite of the boom, the Bolsa was still in its infancy, with inexperienced personnel and clientele. There was widespread mistrust of the institution. There was ambivalence about business and politics alike: "Era inmoral enriquecerse y empobrecerse; inmoral triunfar en lo político o ser derrotado; inmoral fundar negocios o que éstos quebraran" (Torrente Fortuño 119). Moreover, there was ambivalence about stockbrokers. A profile of the stockbroker written by Ramón de Castañeyra in 1851 captures this duality:

> No conocía yo—dice—la honrosa cuanto lucrativa profesión de Agentes de Bolsa, que el progreso de la especulación ha aclimatado y hecho indispensable en nuestro suelo... El Agente no necesita ni mucha aplicación ni mucho estudio; nace como el poeta, aunque medra mucho más que el poeta. La Bolsa, por una de esas contradicciones tan frecuentes en la especie humana, ha venido a ser una

[2] In 1847, Salamanca would go on to be named Finance Minister (Tortella, *Orígenes* 34). He would also serve briefly as *de facto* prime minister in the same year, until an economic crisis forced him into exile (Tortella, *Orígenes* 163-64).

> necesidad en Madrid, cuando no tenemos una peseta. Sin embargo, en ella llueve el maná para los israelitas y en su cuadrilongo y desmedrado recinto se sacrifican diariamente víctimas humanas al ídolo de la actividad: el INTERES. Los sacerdotes sacrificadores de este moderno templo son los Agentes. (qtd. in Torrente Fortuño 123)

The figure of the stockbroker is at once loved and hated. On one hand he is perceived as possessing some priest-like but destructive power, like the "sacerdotes sacrificadores." On the other, he is seen as indispensable and productive.

To begin my study of the plays, I will examine the portrayal of a stockbroker and his relationship with members of a lower socioeconomic group living in close proximity to him. Juan Lombía and Juan de la Cruz Tirado's *Lo de arriba abajo, O, La bolsa y el rastro* (1842) is set in a building shared by two families of widely differing backgrounds. Upstairs, don Anselmo, a stockbroker, plans to marry his daughter Carolina to the son of a business partner who is worth at least one million duros (I: 1). He assumes this move will double his worth and pave the way to his nomination as a government minister (I: 1). Downstairs, secondhand clothing dealer don Gabriel has been monitoring the household financial situation and calculated that his family is deeply in debt (I: 1). While don Anselmo plans a lavish party with champagne and ice cream upstairs, don Gabriel's family downstairs owns a secondhand shop and has been going hungry. The unexpected arrival of don Gabriel's nephew Fernando from Cádiz brings the upstairs and downstairs families into unexpected and uncomfortable contact.

The Cádiz firm where Fernando was working has gone bankrupt, in part prompting his visit to Madrid. Don Gabriel is unruffled by this news, particularly since he has just discovered his own household is out of cash: "... esta es época de crisis comercial" (I: 2). This was a time of

constant flux in Spanish financial markets. During those years, there was a speculative frenzy in mining industries (Torrente Fortuño 141). The period 1839-1843 saw the lowest drop in prices in the financial markets (Torrente Fortuño 132). At the same time, from September 1840 to September 1841, the press conducted a defamation campaign against the Bolsa de Madrid which resulted in business losses and drastic price drops (Torrente Fortuño 93).

Fernando is drawn to Madrid for another important reason: he has fallen in love with a wealthy young woman whose life he saved in Cádiz and has come to town to look for her. His uncle's doubts about the likelihood of a marriage between these young people of such different backgrounds do not sway him. Fernando is convinced that "Hoy día con el trabajo y la actividad se llega a todo.... me enriqueceré" (I: 2). He is idealistic and ambitious and sees past socioeconomic differences.

It turns out that Carolina, don Anselmo's daughter, is the young woman Fernando is seeking. She has not been able to stop thinking of the young man who saved her life. When her friend Ramona brings up the possibility that he could be poor, she is undaunted: "¡Eso qué importa! Mi padre es riquísimo y tiene para los dos" (I: 3). She would prefer to marry someone who loves her over someone whom she has been ordered to marry. However, when she and Fernando are reunited, she immediately dismisses the possibility of continuing their relationship, due to class differences between them: "(*Sin reflexionar*.) ¡Qué lástima que sea mi padre tan rico!" (I: 7). Upon learning that Fernando belongs to the family downstairs, she is convinced her father will never allow the marriage.

In the meantime, don José, a young businessman and heir to a fortune, has contacted don Anselmo about marrying Carolina and received his approval. He is very confident: "Yo tengo talento y sé cómo se hacen las cosas... yo sé portarme con la gente" (I: 4). After only six months

in the Americas, he has become even wealthier. In the next chapter we will encounter several more *indianos*, Spanish men who, like don José, amass a fortune in the Americas and return wealthy.

Upon meeting don José, don Anselmo immediately regrets having agreed, via correspondence, to the marriage. He finds don José ugly and stupid. Nonetheless, he plans to present him to Carolina as tactfully as possible, "dorarle algo la píldora... la pintaré su honradez, su buen carácter y sobre todo su inmenso caudal" (I: 5). Don José soon demonstrates that he is not the ideal partner for Carolina. He becomes captivated with Ildefonsa, the object of don Gabriel's affections, in spite of the socioeconomic differences between them.

Running into Fernando, don Anselmo assumes the young man is in Madrid merely to collect payment for saving Carolina's life in Cádiz: "Es muy justo que lleve Ud. su salario" (I: 10). Almost reflexively, he reaches for cash and hands it to Fernando. Since he cannot imagine Fernando's presence in Madrid for any reason other than to ask him for money, he promptly dismisses him: "... no tengo el tiempo para perderlo con el hijo de un prendero" (I: 10). Furthermore, he orders Fernando to return to Cádiz and apply to work for his business partner don Ignacio Meléndez, to whom he offers to provide a referral. It happens that don Ignacio's firm is precisely where Fernando used to be employed —until its recent bankruptcy.

Don Anselmo's reaction to news of his partner's bankruptcy is denial: "Eso no es posible; la casa de D. Ignacio es de las más fuertes en España. Esa es una calumnia, inventada tal vez con la idea de vengarse...." (I: 9). He has lost a large sum of money invested in that very firm. Nevertheless, he orders that the party he has planned be held. He cannot afford to give the appearance that his business has collapsed.

Don Anselmo's refusal to admit his bankruptcy extends to his most recent dealings in the stock market:

> ¡Oh! La victoria es mía. No quedan ya en circulación ningunos títulos postergados. Mañana cumplen los plazos de las compras que he hecho, y los vendedores tendrán que abonarme la diferencia que yo quiera, puesto que ninguno podrá pagarme en papel.... (I: 11)

Stubbornly, he believes he can still salvage his financial situation. To his chagrin, however, the Madrid market is flooded with the type of assets he has purchased, thereby pushing the price downward (I: 13). Therefore, he will not receive the proceeds he expected. He is bankrupt. With his home due for auction, he learns from the attorney that he will be unable to cover his obligations with all his current holdings (II: 3). Furthermore, his books are inaccurate. The lawyer who inspects them questions don Anselmo's net worth:

> PROCURADOR. Dudo mucho que estas cantidades incluidas en el haber puedan realizarse. (*Señalando un papel*.)
>
> ANSELMO. Pero en cambio el valor de esta casa que está Ud. encargado de vender, no está incluido.
>
> PROCURADOR. Si en la subasta sacamos por ella 22,000 duros será todo lo de Dios. (II: 3)

Now that there has been official verification that he is unable to pay his obligations himself, don Anselmo's only hope for solvency is don José's inheritance (II: 1). Although don Anselmo dislikes don José for his looks and lack of intelligence, he cares more about obtaining cash than about his daughter's wedded bliss, or about how he might feel as father-in-law to this unpleasant young man.

In the midst of don Anselmo's panic over the finances, his servant, Vicente, appears with a receipt and demands 8,000 reales in late wages, "...y en tanto tomará Ud. el portante para Francia o para las Indias" (II: 2). Vicente's awareness of his master's likely next move stems from the frequent incidence of such departures at the time. During this period, the early 1840s, it was not unusual for stockbrokers to vanish abruptly when business went awry:

> La alegría en el nombramiento, el frenesí desbordado en las operaciones (sobre todo a plazo); la inseguridad misma en el cargo, pendiente siempre del vaivén político, dispuesto a ampliar plazas o suprimirlas de un plumazo...dieron lugar a situaciones difíciles y peligrosas, a disgustos grandes... Se dio el caso, sí, de fuga de algún Agente con toda su familia....No es de extrañar que, de cuando en cuando, menudearan los permisos y solicitudes de ausencia de los Agentes...Los Agentes iban a tomar baños: esta era la preferencia. Otras iban simplemente a descansar, "a respirar el aire libre en los montes de Toledo" o en El Molar. (Torrente Fortuño 126)

The whirlwind of activity and constant insecurity of a stockbroker's occupation contribute to the impulse to leave town when tense situations arise. The discussion of banker or stockbroker flight abroad continues later in this chapter, as we look at José María Díaz's *Los tres banqueros* (1860).

Faced with don Anselmo's indignant wrath, Vicente cheekily reminds him of the reversal of fortune that the stockbroker has just suffered: "Como criado suyo tiene Ud. derecho a despedirme; pero como acreedor le tengo yo para quedarme a cuidar de que no vuelen también los muebles y las alhajas" (II: 2). The servant has now become his master's creditor. The fear of

this reversal of power relations is but part of the anxiety experienced by stockbrokers and bankers at the time.

When don José reappears, don Anselmo assumes he has come bearing money to help pay his obligations. He expects to receive 80,000 duros from don José (II: 4). However, by now don José has heard about don Anselmo's bankruptcy and has something important to confess:

> JOSE. (*Con aparente tristeza*.) ...Vengo sumamente contristado....porque.... precisamente le ha sucedido a Ud. esa desgracia, cuando yo no puedo hacer nada de provecho.
>
> ANSELMO. ¿Pues qué, el inmenso caudal de Ud.?
>
> JOSE. ¡Inmenso! No es gran cosa...ni aun lo sé a punto fijo....la mayor parte consiste en propiedades.... lo que es dinero efectivo o realizable, crea Ud....porque....ya se ve.... (II: 4)

Financially ruined, don Anselmo is no longer useful to don José. No longer the source of cash he claimed to be, don José is no longer useful to don Anselmo. They quickly dissolve the agreement about don José's marriage to Carolina.

As bidders fill the house, don Gabriel and his brother Lino approach don Anselmo to ask for Carolina's hand in marriage to Fernando. At first, don Anselmo refuses on the grounds that Fernando is poor. However, don Gabriel has an irresistible alternative offer for him:

> DON GABRIEL. ... Según he averiguado está Ud. en el caso de presentarse en quiebra...
>
> ANSELMO. (*Con altivez*.) ¿Y qué le importa a Ud.?

DON GABRIEL. (*Con flema*.) A mí nada, porque no soy su acreedor; pero a Ud. puede importarle mucho el saber que hay un hombre que tiene voluntad y medios para sacarle de su apuro.

ANSELMO. (*Con viveza*.) ¿Qué dice Ud.?

LINO (*Bajo*.) ¡Si se necesitan millones!

DON GABRIEL. (*Bajo*.) Calle Ud. (*Alto*.) El hombre de quien yo hablo es rico.... pero no rico así como quiera, sino *terque qua-terque* millonario...

ANSELMO. ¿Y qué? ¿con qué condiciones...?

DON GABRIEL. Ama a su hija de Ud....y aunque no es un pobre petate como mi ahijado, otras consideraciones le han obligado a acallar hasta hoy los impulsos de su amor. Noticioso de la desgracia de Ud. y calculando que el matrimonio proyectado tal vez no iría adelante, perdiendo la novia el dote... ha creído que podía ya declararse, y me ha encargado que dé a Ud. cuenta de su pretensión. (II: 4)

Ultimately, Fernando is revealed to be this individual, although don Gabriel hides this fact at first. Don Anselmo has no choice, as he has nothing left to lose. Don Gabriel has discovered documentation indicating that Fernando is the *hijo natural* and thus the true legal heir of don José's father (II: 16). The young man thus gains access to a sizable inheritance formerly associated with don José and is in a position to assist don Anselmo financially and marry Carolina.

It is don Gabriel, a member of the downstairs family of secondhand clothing dealers, who saves the upstairs stockbroker's family from financial ruin and brings about the marriage of a young man and woman from different socioeconomic groups. He achieves this, thanks to his

mastery of legal and formal language. In the next chapter, "The Nouveau Riche," we will see a woman with mastery of legal documentation accomplish a similar feat in María Rosa Gálvez's *La familia a la moda* (1805). The ability of the secondhand clothing dealers to master legal and formal language attests to the fluidity of class boundaries. In Chapter 4, "The Have-Nots," we will look more closely at don Gabriel's family and the development of its financial expertise and power.

I now turn to examine representations of several bankers with widely differing approaches to their profession and attitudes about money. In Ramon Lías y Rey's *Achaques del siglo actual* (1849), set in Madrid in 1847, young friends Estevez and Flores work for the wealthy banker Olmedo. Olmedo is intrigued by the fresh perspectives the younger men bring to their work:

Estevez enjoys the finer things in life, as these insights by Flores indicate:

> FLORES. Parece que no estás hoy en tu centro. Apostaré que estuviste anoche en alguna de esas grandes reuniones, a que concurres, y de las que sales siempre de mal humor...Yo sé la causa, y voy a decírtela; tienes, amigo Estevez, una decidida propensión a todo lo que más puede perjudicarte: te has empeñado en vivir en la calle de la Montera o de Carretas, frecuentas las casas de más tono, asistes todas las noches a los teatros, y siempre en luneta principal; no faltas al Casino, ni a los puntos que más dinero cuestan, y ¿cómo es posible, que rodeado por todas partes de oro, de brillantes, de ese funesto lujo que arruina a tantas personas de fortuna, no padezcas extraordinariamente, al ver que tu habitación, aunque en el centro, es un camarote? ¿Que solo tienes un frac y

> una mala levita? Que te has reducido a comer por seis reales, que andas siempre a pie, y no puedes ya disponer de un par de duros. (I: 1)

Estevez is irritable. He does not eat well or have adequate clothing or living space because he has spent his money in the Casino or theaters. In the next chapter, "The Nouveau Riche," we will delve into the Casino in more detail. From Estevez's perspective, it would seem that the life of a banker or stockbroker demands constant movement and sacrifices in health, sleep and nutrition. We will revisit this theme of bankers' and stockbrokers' poor health later in this chapter, in *La victoria por castigo* and *El dinero y la opinión*.

Estevez's desire to be seen in the right places costs him money he could use instead to buy food. For example, he has insisted on living on the calle de la Montera, a major shopping street in central Madrid (Cruz, *Middle* 122). He is impressionable. He is determined to become rich and famous:

> ESTEVEZ. Deseo figurar entre los hombres ricos y felices... No puedo sufrir que otros que valen menos que yo, disfruten placeres, que a mí están vedados; que pasen su vida en continuos goces, mientras yo consumo la mía en diarias privaciones, amarrado a un miserable pupitre, porque no tengo oro! No: ¡yo saldré de la oscuridad y lo tendré! ... no sé cómo, ¡pero no importa! (I: 2)

His phrase "hombres ricos y felices," and his assumption that his boss is a happy man (I: 1), suggest that he wants to be like Olmedo. Through marriage to Olmedo's daughter Julia, he will discover that "ricos y felices" is a difficult combination to achieve.

Unlike Estevez, Flores lives in modest surroundings and is content with his lot in life: "... tú te consideras desgraciado porque te comparas con los ricos, en cuya sociedad te has lanzado, y yo me considero feliz, porque me comparo con los pobres de que me rodeo..." (I: 1). Unlike

Estevez, he is pragmatic and intuitive. He accurately predicts the deterioration of their friendship after Estevez marries into Olmedo's family:

> ESTEVEZ. ¡Haces muy mal en dudar de mi amistad!
>
> FLORES. Yo no dudo, amigo mío; no ha sido esta mi intención....pero hazte cargo, ¿qué papel vendría yo a hacer? no tengo las maneras, ni el tono de otros; si asistiera a esas reuniones, querría presentarme como los demás, jugar fuerte, en fin, divertirme y gozar de la vida... y ¿cómo puedo hacer todo eso con treinta duros mensuales que me da tu suegro? (II: 3)

Although Estevez seems oblivious to it, Flores recognizes that his friend has crossed a boundary between socioeconomic groups beyond which Flores will no longer be accepted. Estevez might be accepted in new circles, thanks to his wealthy wife, but Flores, with his modest salary and habits, will not. Additionally, Flores detects characteristics in Julia that will present an obstacle to the men's continued friendship: "...tu mujer es bastante orgullosa: aunque no tiene ella la culpa, sino quien la ha educado así" (II: 3). He knows he and Estevez will see each other less and less because Julia's wishes will come before her husband's. Therefore this remark about Julia's upbringing also foreshadows trouble in the marriage that Estevez does not anticipate.

Behind all his trappings of wealth, older banker Olmedo is not as happy as his young disciples believe. Firstly, he is puzzled by his young underlings' attitudes towards happiness and money, as they differ significantly from his. Secondly, in spite of all his wealth, he feels his life is incomplete:

> OLMEDO. ¡Qué carácter tan original! No tiene un cuarto, y está siempre contento, en tanto que yo, a pesar de mis millones, ¡soy desgraciado! Siento en mi existencia un vacío, que todo mi oro no basta a llenar; y es, que aun

> bajo la capa de millonario no soy para todo el mundo más que un hombre oscuro, salido de nada, ¡un ignorante! (I: 4)

Olmedo realizes he has done nothing with his life except to make or spend money. He seems to envy Flores for being satisfied with so little. He laments not having had a son like Estevez (I: 4). Perhaps for this very reason, he chooses Estevez to be his daughter Julia's husband. He seems to want to relive his youth vicariously through Estevez.

Olmedo's life as a banker leaves him with leisure time and a sense of a void in his life, which might account to some degree for his rule over Estevez and Julia's married life. He makes all decisions for them: ordering them to live in his house and determining where they may or may not go and how Estevez will spend each day. He does not seem to know how to be a father or father-in-law, other than to encourage Julia and Estevez to spend money: "Ahora resta hablar de los gastos, diversiones, etc. etc. En cuanto a eso no hay que apurarse ni economizar," he instructs his son-in-law (I: 5).

Social and financial obligations unfamiliar to Estevez accumulate, now that he has married into a wealthy family. His reluctant agreement to marry Julia, instigated by Olmedo, has deprived him of his freedom. The marriage also costs him his first love, Luisa (I: 12). Still, however, Estevez believes he will enjoy some freedom later, if he can only keep up with the burgeoning demands of his new social life now:

> ESTEVEZ. ... vamos, la moda es un tirano, y es preciso someterse; deberé resignarme por hoy también, pero luego...
>
> JULIA. Oh, después tendremos entera libertad.
>
> ESTEVEZ. Y la aprovecharemos para ser felices lejos de los curiosos, y de los importunos. ¡Qué momentos tan deliciosos pasaremos!

JULIA. Muy deliciosos.

ESTEVEZ. ¿No es verdad?

JULIA. Sin duda; pero desgraciadamente no serán muchos.

ESTEVEZ. ¿Por qué?

JULIA. ¿Se olvida usted de que tenemos ópera tres veces por semana? ¿Y las visitas? ¿Y en invierno los demás teatros, los conciertos, las reuniones, los bailes?

ESTEVEZ. ¡Ay Dios mío! los bailes, los teatros, las visitas; en verdad, ¡no me acordaba de nada de eso!

JULIA. ¿Pues en qué está usted pensando? (II: 5)

Whenever Estevez attempts to make plans, Julia's or Olmedo's intentions supersede them. His wife and father-in-law want to see and be seen about town. That is the extent of their activities. Julia is as naive as her husband in believing they will be free to do what they wish later.

Once married, Estevez has free time but is unable to use it as he wishes. When he expresses a desire to further his studies and contribute to the arts, for example, his father-in-law Olmedo dismisses it:

OLMEDO. Amigo mío, dejemos las artes para quien vive de ellas; en cuanto al estudio me ha parecido siempre sospechosa esta palabra aislada en boca de un joven; así que he pensado seriamente en darle a usted una posición...Así pues, he comprado una gran posesión en Valencia, donde es uno un potentado con ocho mil duros de renta; iremos todos los años a pasar un par de meses en nuestro palacio, y llevaremos un tren capaz de deslumbrar a todos nuestros vecinos.... Mi hija dará bailes, yo comidas y usted.....hará cortesías... Hay una

> elección, es usted el candidato universal y su nombre sale triunfante de las urnas electorales.
>
> ESTEVEZ. ¡Oh! sí, ser deputado es el objeto de todos mis deseos; ¡nada hay más noble, más honorífico! pero no es así como quisiera sentarme en los escaños del congreso. (III: 8)

Olmedo's disdain for formal education may represent a critique of the educational system. According to Tortella, the educational system in Spain was in disorder from the seventeenth century onwards, collapsed at the beginning of the nineteenth and did not begin to recover until government officials and educators initiated reforms in the middle of the nineteenth century (*Development* 47). As a consequence of this lag in education —in other words, in the development of human capital— Spain was less able than its neighbors to absorb economic and technological innovation (Tortella, *Development* 47). Instead of pursuing education and arts, as Estevez wishes he could do, he will be forced merely to meet and greet neighbors. Creativity is being stifled, as Estevez is wasting time merely seeing and being seen.

Olmedo's dismissive attitude toward the arts might not be shared by the majority of bankers during this era. Wealthy bankers, such as José de Salamanca, Alejandro Aguado and others built extensive art collections and invested their funds in opera and theater companies, arts presses and literary journals, and the hiring of architects and decorators (Vázquez 204). This funding not only showcased these bankers' wealth and social status, but also constituted significant economic and political investments (Vázquez 204). These bankers' support of the arts also demonstrated that they were an emerging new elite responsible for the creation, control and production of a "high culture" (Vázquez 204). In a less positive sense, however, Spanish critics

attacked speculators like Salamanca and Aguado because it appeared they were using art only as a means of self-promotion (Vázquez 204).

One activity that Olmedo does approve of for Estevez is politics. The older banker's recommendation of a political career for his son-in-law underscores the importance of a widespread practice adopted by Spanish bankers during the nineteenth century. For the bankers, seeking public office was not merely a question of vanity —it ensured the survival of their business. According to Jesús Cruz:

> Competition revolved around having contacts inside the spheres of power. Businessmen established these contacts by making use of their influence in order to obtain public positions... Holding a public position generally ensured the necessary contacts in order to obtain a supplying contract, or to negotiate a government loan. Thus, public positions were pursued not only for social prestige, but also as a business imperative. (*Gentlemen* 67)

Olmedo has decided that his son-in-law will devote his time to becoming acquainted with the community so as to acquire votes. Ultimately, Estevez is expected to seek election so that their family business will be more secure.

Another new pressure on Estevez manifests itself when Flores becomes the owner of a house. Having given his entire life savings of 300 duros to help an old woman who could not afford to participate in a lawsuit, Flores was named her sole heir in her last will and testament (III: 3). The inheritance enabled him to buy a house, but he now needs money to meet relevant obligations, such as registration and taxes. Flores's act of charity has led to his newfound wealth, which carries with it obligations he did not expect. His friend is reluctant to help:

FLORES. ...debo aprontar de veinte a veinte y cinco mil reales en el momento, y vengo derechito a pedírtelos.... Creo que es portarse con franqueza, como buen compañero y probarte que no soy orgulloso...

ESTEVEZ. ...Ciertamente, me sería muy grato complacerte en esta ocasión, pero....

FLORES. ¡Calla! ... ¿hay un pero?...

ESTEVEZ. No hay duda que mi suegro es excelente, tiene gusto en complacerme, pero se le pidiera una cantidad tan grande como la que necesitas, temería por su parte alguna observación... tú le conoces, es muy maniático y pretende que no debe prestarse a los amigos sopena de perder el dinero y la amistad. Estoy muy lejos de participar de sus ideas, ¿pero qué quieres? no está en mi mano hacerle adoptar otras. (III: 3)

Newfound wealth turns out to be a burden for both these young bankers, albeit in different ways. It also strains their friendship. Eventually, Luisa, who has overheard this conversation, provides the funds Flores needs. Thus Flores's newfound wealth also becomes a burden for his friend, and later, wife Luisa.

The unfamiliar financial and social pressures imposed on Estevez and Flores might be better understood when examined against the economic situation of Spain in 1847. In the preceding year, a financial crisis that began in England and France began to exacerbate the already tenuous situation of the banking system in Spain, where prices of shares in the Banco de Isabel II, an institution established chiefly for speculative purposes, fell precipitously after a steep rise (Tortella, *Orígenes* 33). By 1847, Spain was in a deep recession, and numerous *sociedades anónimas* went into bankruptcy (Torrente Fortuño 185). As bankruptcies began to

proliferate, first the business elite and then the general public began to make massive withdrawals of savings from the Bolsa and banks, thereby crippling the miniscule Madrid financial market (López-Morell 85). Additionally, competition between the Banco de Isabel II and the Banco de San Fernando led to a banking crisis (Tortella, *Development* 162). At first, competition between them increased fiduciary circulation and made credit cheaper in Madrid, but events leading to the European revolutions of 1848 —for example, the closure of the Paris Bourse— and the inexperience of the banks nearly led them to bankruptcy (Tortella, *Development* 162). By early 1848, the Spanish government decided to merge the two banks (Tortella, *Development* 163).

Exerting further pressure on Estevez, Julia initially seems to be a mere extension of her father's power and acquisitiveness. She has grown up in luxury and spends her time shopping for clothing and going to the theater or opera house. Olmedo encourages her extravagant purchases: "... compra, hija mía, compra lo que quieras.... Cuanto más gastes más contento estaré" (Lías y Rey I: 5). She expects her father to handle all her problems. In Julia's character, immaturity accompanies a love of money and material goods, as it does in Ramírez in Cayetano Rosell's *El dinero y la opinión* (1857), Mendoza of Manuel Angelón's *La bolsa* (1858), and Fernando in Manuel Ortiz de Pinedo's *La victoria por castigo* (1885). All of them are figures we will explore later in this chapter.

When Estevez questions some of Julia's frivolous purchases, she justifies them by blaming social expectations:

> ESTEVEZ. Pero confesarás al menos que esos gastos....
>
> JULIA. ¿Son superfluos? ....por eso los hago.
>
> ESTEVEZ. Sin embargo....

> JULIA. Ah! ya entiendo: no somos ricos.... pues es precisamente una razón para gastar más. (III: 9)

Julia shares her father's desire to maintain appearances. Her preoccupation with fashion is one manifestation of this desire. She feels compelled to buy expensive clothing because being fashionable is a performance. She wants to be seen at the theater, at parties and at the opera in new clothes. In this way she exemplifies the "*mujer fina*...[one of the] new consumer subjects in need of acquiring an array of new symbolic objects in order to perform in the diverse spaces for social interaction of the bourgeois public sphere" (Cruz, *Middle* 105-06). She knows no other way of life than to spend money.

While the male bankers in *Achaques del siglo actual* experience financial difficulties, it is the women who tend to provide the solutions. We will witness a similar phenomenon in José María Díaz's *Los tres banqueros* (1860) later in this chapter. In *Achaques del siglo actual*, Luisa, by lending Flores money, ensures that Flores is able to pay to keep his house. Julia, by asserting her independence from her father, is able to repair her marriage to Estevez. Thereafter, they are able to live by their values and wishes, instead of only her father's. However, Julia does not volunteer to help her husband in the same way Luisa has hers. Instead, a contrite Julia approaches Estevez only after he has abruptly walked out on her and started his own *sociedad anónima* with Flores. Her apology to Estevez is motivated in part by a realization that she would prefer to be with the type of banker he is than the type of banker her father is.

Two very different stockbrokers grapple with questions of marriage and reputation in Cayetano Rosell's *El dinero y la opinión* (1857), translated and adapted from the French play by Émile Augier, *Ceinture dorée*. Inés, the daughter of wealthy stockbroker don Álvaro, has three suitors with differing perceptions of money and its importance relative to other aspects of life.

She is annoyed by their presence, since she believes their main interest is her dowry. She disagrees with the idea of marriage as "una especulación" (I: 3). Additionally, she prefers that a potential husband see her as "una mujer, y no un saco de dinero" (I: 3). Her resistance to her father's attempts to marry her off signals generational conflict about the question of money as it relates to marriage.

Inés's music teacher, Solferino, uses flowery language and claims music is a substitute for language in decline (II: 1). While Solferino perceives other men as romantic rivals for Inés's affection, she is not interested in him. Nor does her father consider Solferino a contender for marriage for Inés —he is more interested in money than in music. Just as in Antonio Alcalde y Valladares's *Quiero dinero*, which we will explore in Chapter Two, "The Nouveau Riche," a young woman studying piano opens the play, but her music is eclipsed by her family's plans for her to marry for money. We have encountered this phenomenon before, in Ramón Lías y Rey's *Achaques del siglo actual*. Later in this chapter, we will explore this tension between arts and culture on one hand, and money and materialism on the other.

Don Álvaro's initial choice of a suitor for Inés is Fajardo, his stockbroker. Earnest and forthright, Fajardo has strong convictions about money and its proper uses. His values put him at odds with don Álvaro:

> ÁLVARO. ...hoy, en España, no se conoce más nobleza que la del oro, ni mayor potentado que el dinero, ni más probidad que la que da de sí la riqueza.
>
> FAJARDO. No lo niego: usted avasalla el mundo; pero en un rincón de él vive un caballero, que pobre y todo, no quiere humillarse a nadie... (*Se cubre*.) ¡Porque representa a la conciencia pública! (I: 3)

Fajardo respects that don Álvaro has money and power, but urges concern for less fortunate people. Don Álvaro was not born rich. He is quite proud of the fact that he arrived in Madrid "en abarcas" and made a fortune through hard work.

Although Fajardo is receptive to the prospect of marrying Inés, he and don Álvaro part ways after arguing over the manner in which don Álvaro is rumored to have made his fortune:

> FAJARDO. Critican el origen de su fortuna: hablan de especuladores que se declararon en quiebra, porque contaban con un crédito de que usted les privó repentinamente.
>
> ÁLVARO. ¡Calla! Pues, no estaba yo en mi derecho?
>
> FAJARDO. Pero añaden que usted compró sus efectos a precio tan ínfimo...
>
> ÁLVARO. ¡Para que los sacaron a la venta!
>
> FAJARDO. Hablan asimismo de ciertos accionistas arruinados...
>
> ÁLVARO. Sí, en empresas ruinosas.
>
> FAJARDO. Pero que no lo fueron para usted...Así como de pleitos escandalosos... (I: 11)

It is not don Álvaro's reputation that presents a problem for Fajardo —it is his money. Fajardo "...no quiero ser cómplice de su fortuna, participando en ella" (I: 11). Indignant and defensive, don Álvaro maintains that he has earned his fortune respectably. He now needs to find another suitor for Inés.

Another stockbroker, Ramírez, becomes a suitor to Inés. He strives to "mantenerme en un buen término medio... como que no hay ningún sentimiento estable que no esté basado en la aritmética" (I: 13). He relies on mathematical calculations in his work, as well as in questions of marriage and class. For example, his comment to don Álvaro, "... la aristocracia del dinero no

vale menos que la del sangre" (I: 13) refers to the emergence of a new class based on money earned, in contrast to the aristocracy based on birth. Indeed, those in the financial occupations shared a distinctive set of characteristics that made them a class all their own. To this effect, Jesús Cruz observes:

> In all societies, bankers tend to constitute a distinctive group. Their life style was comparable to that of the aristocracy of the old regime. Because of the way in which many of them ascended on the social scale, they have been considered the paradigmatic upper bourgeoisie of a liberal society. The truth is that as a social group they never clearly belonged to the aristocratic stratum, but neither do I believe that they could be considered a prototypical bourgeois group. In Madrid, as in other urban societies of Europe in transition from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, the bankers were an elite with clearly defined traits. (*Gentlemen* 65)

Cool and calculating, elitist Ramírez provides a contrast to conscientious Fajardo, who thinks of the poor and urges don Álvaro to do so as well. Ramírez's mathematical approach to work and life beyond work are consistent with Georg Simmel's remarks, in his *Philosophy of Money*, on the calculations required to survive modern times: "The money economy enforces the necessity of continuous mathematical operations in our daily transactions. The lives of many people are absorbed by such evaluating, weighing, calculating and reducing of qualitative values to quantitative ones" (449). As a result of his mathematical approach to all aspects of life, Ramírez does not appear to have room to express emotion.

Perhaps this constant calculation also makes Ramírez oblivious to signs that his prospective father-in-law has been less than ethical. He believes their work to be honest and

respectable: " ... hacemos nuestra suerte honradamente, a fuerza de trabajo" (I: 13). He and don Álvaro claim to be unconcerned with what others might say about their business, since their consciences are supposedly clear. However, this may be just another example of don Álvaro's denial of any wrongdoing in making his fortune.

In presenting himself to don Álvaro as a potential suitor for Inés, Ramírez reveals many talents, not limited to handling money. He speaks some English, thanks to a three-month stay in London. During this period it was common for Spanish stockbrokers and bankers to conduct business in London, and in Spain, public interest in the subject was high. In the newspaper *La Iberia*, for example, there was a column that contained reports about deals made on the London stock exchange ("Jugadas de Bolsa").

Ramírez has also been a sailor and can draw, sing and write poetry (I: 13). This combination of skills could indicate there is hope for the arts to be cultivated, even as money and social status become more important in bourgeois society. Earlier in this chapter, Olmedo and Estevez discussed the same issue in *Achaques del siglo actual*. Although don Álvaro emphasizes to Inés Ramírez's artistic abilities, his comments to Fajardo on the subject suggest that he cares more about Ramírez's "ocho mil duros al año", which significantly exceeds Fajardo's worth (II: 7). He appears to be using his knowledge of Ramírez's skills selectively to convince his daughter to agree to the marriage.

Although Ramírez finds Inés rude and annoying at first, he tries to impress her by boasting of his fight with another young man (II: 7). When don Álvaro takes him aside to compliment him on this approach to winning Inés's heart, Ramírez coolly assesses his own position in terms of the stock market: "De modo que está en alza mi papel" (II: 8). Mistakenly, don Álvaro assumes Ramírez has made up the story. Yet when he learns the young man has in

fact been in a fight, he asks, "¿No le da a usted vergüenza?" (II: 8) He now sees Ramírez as childish. Love of money is associated with immaturity in the figure of this stockbroker.

After the Barón de Yuncos, the Generala Meneses and the Vizcondesa del Pino congratulate Ramírez on his planned wedding to Inés, he learns of a possible complication of his future:

> BARÓN. Ya me admiraba yo de que un joven tan bien quisto como usted se mezclase con una gente...
>
> VIZCONDESA. Claro. ¿Quién ha de cargar con la hija de un hombre...
>
> RAMÍREZ. Menos lo entiendo ahora. ¿Qué tienen que ver los desaciertos del padre con la reputación de la hija?
>
> BARÓN. Sus desaciertos, no; pero su dinero, sí.
>
> RAMÍREZ. ¿Luego sería preferible casarse con la hija de un bribón arruinado?
>
> GENERAL. ¿Qué duda tiene?
>
> RAMÍREZ. Señora, no lleve usted a mal, pero eso me parece un absurdo.
>
> GENERAL. ¿Absurdo, eh? Pues mire usted, el hombre que tiene una hija virtuosa y una fortuna ilegítima, se me figura que anda por el mundo con una mano limpia y otra sucia. (II: 10)

Such warnings from individuals with titles of nobility or high military rank about marrying the daughter of a dishonest businessman are to be taken quite seriously during this period. According to Jesús Cruz, the success of a firm in the nineteenth century depended largely on the good reputation of its owners (*Gentlemen* 69). "A banker's family and its social standing was his most important capital ... A malicious rumor or a family scandal ...could hinder the progress of a family's businesses" (Cruz, *Gentlemen* 69-70). Although both Fajardo and Ramírez insist that

don Álvaro's reputation, good or bad, does not matter to them, in Madrid society at this time, it certainly does. Marrying into don Álvaro's family, in light of rumors of crooked business dealings, is risky because the son-in-law could lose customers even if the rumors turn out to be untrue.

For all his denials, Don Álvaro has indeed stolen from his stockholders (III: 1). However, like a child, he does not take responsibility for this action. He blames his ill-gotten gain on someone else: the lawyer who awarded him the money (III: 1). Keeping the secret carries a cost. Although he pretends that everything is all right, his daughter notices he is not well and frets about him:

> INES. Vamos a almorzar
>
> ÁLVARO. No tengo gana.
>
> INES. El médico te manda no estar en ayunas mucho tiempo.
>
> ÁLVARO. Pero si estoy ocupado. (II: 2)

Don Álvaro is trying to hide the papers on his desk from his daughter. His loss of appetite and frayed nerves suggest that the lifestyle of a banker is detrimental to one's health and, on a larger scale, that the banking industry is a threat to the health of society.

In a hastily composed letter, don Álvaro tries to make good by paying the son of the man who lost the lawsuit to him: "...acabo de examinar los papeles del pleito que costó diez mil duros a su señor padre de usted; y convencido de que por seguir el dictamen de mi abogado procedí injustamente, lo declaro con toda sinceridad, y me apresuro a restituir a usted una suma que graba ya sobre mi conciencia..." (II: 5). Clearly he has waited for many years, as he is now paying the son of the man, likely deceased by now. That it took him this long to experience a

change of heart demonstrates that until now, don Álvaro has valued money more than honesty or compassion, or than his own reputation.

Fajardo, who turns out to be the young man whose father was wronged in the lawsuit returns the money to don Álvaro immediately because he does not believe in accepting charity (II: 10). Nor does he want a donation made in his name, as he would rather make one in his own name. He strongly recommends that don Álvaro donate to the poor his entire fortune—not only the 10,000 duros in contention in the lawsuit (II: 10). For Fajardo, don Álvaro's attempt to repay the debt comes too late and is insufficient: "¿Quién repararía en medios para alcanzar su fortuna primitiva, si con solo restituir cuando ya no se necesita, se pudiera cobrar la honra? No, señor" (II: 10). In contrast to Ramírez, Fajardo does not believe that simple arithmetic will help don Álvaro cover his debt, which is beyond monetary. He compares dishonest business such as don Álvaro's to original sin, in that it marks a man forever (II: 10).

A drop in stock market prices announced by Ramírez leaves don Álvaro bankrupt. However, don Álvaro's loss enables Fajardo to ask for Inés's hand in marriage, as it no longer matters whether Fajardo is rich or not (III: 18). The figure of the honest stockbroker, Fajardo, prevails over the cold and dishonest ones.

Another positive representation of the stockbroker, this one as a loyal friend and prudent professional, appears in Manuel Angelón's *La bolsa* (1858). In the Madrid of this time, almost anyone could become a stockbroker, but not all stockbrokers are like truthful Santillán. Santillán's childhood friend Mendoza, a young man new to Madrid, is in love and wants to marry María. He asks her father for his blessing but fails to obtain it because she is to marry an "ex-baron feudal" (I: 3). Mendoza becomes convinced that he needs to become rich quickly by playing the stock market:

SANTILLAN. ¿Qué harás?

MENDOZA. Puesto que sin un tesoro

Nunca mía podrá ser,

Estoy resuelto a tener,

Santillán, montes de oro.

... Aquí mi caudal está (*Saca una cartera.*)

Anda a la bolsa con él,

Compra acciones.... o papel....

Y Dios le triplicará. (I: 3)

Naively he believes success will come easily and asks Santillán to invest his money for him. Santillán objects, urging him repeatedly to return to their native Aranjuez —ultimately threatening to end their friendship if he does not go (I: 2, II: 1).

In Santillán's caution for his friend, another possible link between immaturity and money is apparent which we also encounter in Ramón Lías y Rey's *Achaques del siglo actual* and Manuel Ortiz de Pinedo's *La victoria por castigo*: "Aquí debió mi cariño / Abandonarte a un fracaso, / Si yo pudiera hacer caso / De las palabras de un niño" (II: 2). The lure of the stock market is causing a man to fail to act his age. In time, Mendoza's childishness extends to risking his life foolishly by nearly becoming involved in a duel over an insignificant matter.

Mendoza's attraction to the Bolsa is understandable, given the grandiose nature of the investments he witnesses and the seemingly illustrious men who are making them. Santillán has among his clients top government ministers, lawyers and engineers. Their investments include the railroad and the 1858 Canal de Isabel II project (I: 3). This was a period of extensive infrastructure development in Spain. With the June 1855 adoption of the Ley General de

Ferrocarriles, a decade of vast expansion of the rail system began in Spain. Construction of this vital component of transportation infrastructure was regarded as a critical driver of industrial growth and marker of progress and civilization (Fusi Aizpurúa 117). Foreign investment, particularly by French financiers such as the Rothschilds, Pereire and other groups, played a key role in this development. In the decade prior to the adoption of the 1855 legislation, 440 km of rails had been deployed (Fusi Aizpurúa 117). In the decade following it, 7,000 km of concessions were granted (Fusi Aizpurúa 117). By 1865 the length of rails opened to traffic reached 5,000 km (Fusi Aizpurúa 117).

Another large-scale infrastructure project in which Santillán's clients invest is the Canal de Isabel II, opened in June 1858. It was the first project to manage the water supply to Madrid. As Cayetano Rosell wrote in his *Crónica de la Provincia de Madrid*:

> Sabido es que el mayor obstáculo que en [la capital] se tropezaba para el acrecentamiento y bienestar de la población, era la escasez de aguas, que no sólo impedía el fomento y hasta la conservación del arbolado, sino atender a los usos domésticos más indispensables, sobre todo en los rigurosos meses del estío. De cuantos proyectos se habían ideado en varias ocasiones para dotar a Madrid de un caudal suficiente de agua, el preferible a todos, por lo mismo quizá que era el más costoso, consistía en encauzar y conducir a la capital el río Lozoya, tomado en las inmediaciones de la villa de Torrelaguna. Dudábase de que la elevación del río fuese tal, que llegara su corriente hasta la misma corte; y no bastando tampoco los recursos del Tesoro a sufragar los gastos de la empresa, se creó una por acciones en que pudiera todo el mundo interesarse. (Rosell, *Madrid* 243)

The Canal de Isabel II was intended to address a number of critical issues that had long plagued the capital. It was expected to attract widespread public interest.

The original budget for the Canal de Isabel II project was set at 60-80 million reales[3], but the actual cost was closer to 127 million reales (Ambros Atance). Construction lasted for seven years. However, the canal was useless from its opening due to leaks from the dam, which was built on a type of limestone unable to retain the water (Ambros Atance). Therefore, in retrospect, the inclusion of the Canal de Isabel II among the stocks held by the bankers in this play could be a critique of investment in wasteful infrastructure projects. Later in this section we will see other sectors of the Spanish economy on which Santillán believes his compatriots should focus.

For Santillán, the large-scale business deals involving the nation's progress are a source of pride. He boasts of the speed of rail transportation and the accomplishments brought about by growing investments: "Recorren en pocas horas / Las bravas locomotoras / De tantos ferro-carriles; / Y juntando el capital, / En lucha noble y constante, / Va empujando hacia adelante / A la industria nacional" (I: 3). He also proudly notes the progress of Spaniards who have gone overseas to make money. However, he makes clear that these types of business, which are carried out in the Bolsa, are not the place for Mendoza.

While his clients belong to the urban political and business elites, Santillán seems compelled to warn all his fellow natives of the countryside against involvement in the stock market. He cautions his own employee, Macario, against gambling under his roof when he overhears him try to convince a hometown friend to play the stock market. Additionally, he provides his friend Mendoza with numerous reasons why he should not play the stock market:

---

[3] According to Ambros Atance, one real in 1858 would be equivalent to 0.24 Euros today.

"¡A la bolsa! ¿Estás en ti? / ¿Sabes que es un monstruo fiero? / ...La Bolsa!...¿Quién se resuelve / En tal sitio a naufragar, / Cuando la bolsa es un mar / que ni el cadáver devuelve?" (Angelón I: 3). Santillán does not see in Mendoza the qualities necessary to survive in the Bolsa, where the large eat the small (I: 3). He is convinced Mendoza will fail.

It may be no coincidence that Santillán shares a name with Ramón de Santillán González (1791-1863), Spanish Minister of Finance, January -March 1847, and co-author, with Alejandro Mon, of a tax reform of 1845 that led to increased investor confidence (Tortella, *Orígenes* 42-43). The historical Santillán also prepared the 1848 merger of the Bank of San Fernando, which primarily provided credits to the state, and the Bank of Isabel II, which primarily provided loans to speculators (Tortella, *Orígenes* 33).

The Santillán in the play does not merely preach about the ills of the stock market. With the aim of dissuading Mendoza, he introduces him to people who have experienced the lure of the stock market and strayed from their professions. Andrade, once a *mozo de fábrica* from a small town, has earned a fortune and become arrogant:

ANDRADE. Claro está, el público ríe
Y aplaude nuestra desgracia,
Mas llega el día siguiente
Y todo de aspecto cambia.
Se anuncia alguna sociedad,
Se firma alguna contrata,
Hay primas que recoger...
Estos que ríen de rabia,
Y hacen burla de nosotros

Porque la envidia les mata,

Son los primeros que acuden

Y visitan nuestras casas,

Y se arrastran por el suelo

En husmeando que hay plata. (I: 4)

Now that he is rich, he likes to believe his detractors are simply envious. Also part of this circle is Carranza. Once a poet, he now writes bad *zarzuelas,* sells hastily written texts to the publishing house of Lalama and is preoccupied with his shares in the canal project (I: 4). In addition, there is Pascual, a writer paid by a government ministry to publish a "periodicucho" (I: 4). As the pejorative suffix suggests, he now cares little for quality writing. The General is making money from his compatriots' suffering. He is betting on a bear market in hopes of being called on by the queen to assemble a cabinet: " ... Juego dinero a la baja; / Y espero que el desaliento / Cunda muy pronto en España ; / Ya sabe V. los Ministros, / Si alguien los hace, es la plaza" (I: 4). Representations of this group of men who have been distracted from their original careers by the pursuit of riches may form a critique of the decline of certain professions, particularly writing, due to the stock market. In the history of these four bankers, there is also government corruption and a lack of writer integrity.

Santillán tries to steer Mendoza towards activities other than investing: "Enciérrate en un garito. / Tú no quieres comerciar, / Porque otra cosa prefieres. / ... Lo que quieres / Félix del alma, es jugar" (I: 3). Knowing his friend does not have the knowledge to conduct business in the city, he would rather have Mendoza go to a gambling den to make money quickly than to let him play the stock market. Since Mendoza does not have the necessary understanding of the stock market, to play it would be tantamount to gambling, in Santillán's eyes.

Another, more practical alternative to the stock market that Santillán offers Mendoza is a return to the countryside: "Feliz quien en sus regiones / Comercia en gansos o miel / Y no piensa en la Babel / De treses y de millones" (I: 3). Although Santillán has been successful in his transition from rural to urban life and work, he maintains that farming is a potentially more fulfilling occupation than stock trading, particularly for his inexperienced friend. The "treses" to which Santillán refers are likely government bonds that paid interest of 3% per year but were rated at 35% of their par value, thereby putting the true interest rate at nearly 9 percent (Tortella, *Orígenes* 42). These bonds resulted from the consolidation of the old government's floating debt, formerly in the hands of private lenders and of the Banco de San Fernando, and entered the market in 1845 (Tortella, *Orígenes* 42). The importance of this new financial instrument is that it increased investor confidence and led to a boom period in the Bolsa de Madrid that would last until 1846:

> Muchas fortunas que habían sido dudosas antes, encontráronse de pronto sólidamente establecidas y Madrid vio convertidos en flamantes opulentos que pocos años atrás se hallaban en modesta medianía ... aquella masa de valores inciertos, en que consistía la mayor parte de las fortunas, se había convertido en valores reales y efectivos fundados en una renta segura... En tal situación se volvieron todos los ojos a la Bolsa... Entonces se despertó aquel furor de especulación, que hacía nacer cada día una sociedad anónima... Realizáronse instantáneamente grandes fortunas, y este ejemplo llevó a la Bolsa a toda clase de personas sin excepción. (Torrente Fortuño 158)

The apparent ease and speed with which people of all backgrounds could make a fortune on the Bolsa is alluring to Mendoza, although he may be unfamiliar with *treses* and related instruments of his new surroundings.

In relation to Santillán's suggestion for Mendoza to return to the country, Guzmán, a rural resident who has bought Mendoza's land, approaches Andrade, Pascual, Carranza and the General for a loan of 12,000 duros to develop it. His requests, and their scornful reaction, reveal the place of the agriculture question in domestic affairs at the time: "Con irresistible afán / Vais de la bolsa a la guerra. / Y olvidáis la madre tierra, / Esta tierra que os da el pan" (I: 5). Guzmán, as a representative from the countryside, is urging those in power not to focus on commerce and war, but instead to consider the domestic food supply. Guzmán's plea also seems a critique of the central government's apparent neglect of agriculture: "Pero si cuatro banqueros / Se juntan para explotar / La falta de trigo, un mar / Encontrarán de dineros" (I: 5). As the bankers' lack of interest in Guzmán's presentation demonstrates, the Madrid stock market diverts capital and people from agrarian uses. Indeed, Gabriel Tortella argues that nineteenth-century Spain suffered from underdevelopment of agriculture, which in turn stifled overall economic development (*Development* 67). Several policies hindered Spain's transition to modern agriculture. One was tariff protection, which kept inefficient farmers in business and thus diverted resources from potentially more efficient new technologies and products, as well as from the cultivation of crops in which Spain had an advantage (Tortella, *Development* 67). Another obstacle to agricultural modernization was farmers' mistrust of industry, trade and banks, as peasants would hoard precious metals rather than use them to invest or make deposits (Tortella, *Development* 71). In light of the policies and factors detailed here, Guzmán's allusion to the "falta de trigo" is

prophetic, given that by the 1885, two decades after Angelón wrote *La bolsa*, Spanish production of wheat per unit of surface area was among the lowest in Europe (Fusi Aizpurúa 111).

Against this historical background, Santillán's attempts to persuade Mendoza and Macario to return to the countryside do not appear to constitute an attempt by urban elites to put rural natives in their place. Santillán himself has come from the country. His encouragement to others to return to their farms appears to be a call for agriculture to catch up to industry, or for rural natives to maintain economic ties to their villages and small towns. Moreover, his gesture of handing Guzmán cash from the funds Mendoza has just given him to invest in the stock market appears to be a symbolic reallocation of wealth towards agriculture. As Ángel Bahamonde Magro and Jesús Martínez point out in their *Historia de Espana del Siglo XIX*, Spanish migration from rural areas to the cities did not take on the same pattern as in countries with more established industrial cultures (429). Instead of being based on an attraction towards cities and towards job markets, Spanish urbanization at this time was more about rejection of one's residence in rural areas (Bahamonde Magro and Martínez 429).

Another alternative to the stock market that Santillán urges Mendoza to investigate is a move to the Americas. He has a job for him in Havana and is prepared to accompany him there. The change Santillán is suggesting to Mendoza is for them to become *indianos*, Spaniards who leave for the Americas and become wealthy there. We will look at several types of *indianos* in the next chapter, "The Nouveau Riche". Although María views Santillán's offer of a job in Cuba as a sign that he is a generous, loyal friend to Mendoza, her father is horrified by the prospect of his daughter's departure for the "tierra de esclavos" (IV: 7). He would prefer that she return to Aranjuez with him:

DON JUAN. Volveremos a Aranjuez

Y allí de la bolsa ajenos

Tendré quien cuide a lo menos

Los días de mi vejez. (IV: 8)

This plea is perhaps an appeal for Spaniards to return to their place of origin and take care of their elders —rather than leave their homeland for the Americas to become wealthy. Alternatively, it could be another recommendation for the government to allocate more resources to development in the countryside, as opposed to Madrid, where the Bolsa is located.

In his exploration of the stock market, Mendoza goes too far, just as Santillán predicted. His initial success on the market is not enough for him. Initially he plans to make one million reales in order to be able to marry María. However, having won two million, he now wants more. He stubbornly resists Santillán's advice, "Toma el coche de Aranjuez / Y sé feliz con María" (II: 2), claiming that he can have marriage and money at the same time:

MENDOZA. Hombre, aunque a María quiero,

No creo que esté reñido

Con el amor del marido

La codicia del dinero.

SANTILLAN. Date prisa de liquidar.

MENDOZA. Tu plan no quiero seguir

El papel ha de subir.

SANTILLAN. El papel ha de bajar.

Tú no comprendes de pronto...

... Juzgo que en ti puede el juego

Más que el amor de María. (II: 2)

Santillán correctly guesses that Mendoza's newfound "pasión" is not for his bride, but rather for further earnings. Making money on the stock market is incompatible with marriage, Santillán believes. Mendoza and Santillán's perceptions of the market are at odds. By playing the stock market, Mendoza is navigating unfamiliar territory. Santillán predicts it is only a matter of time before his friend will lose everything —his money as well as his chances of having a happy marriage with the woman he loves. Now Mendoza wants not only additional money, but also power. "... sí, soy rico, / Pero no soy poderoso. / Y serlo fue mi destino; / Sería temeridad / Detenerme a la mitad / De ese brillante camino" (II: 3). Santillán now looks to him like an obstacle to an illustrious future.

Against Santillán's expert advice, Mendoza has played the stock market and won. He is convinced his streak will continue. Santillán warns that what he has gained materially, he has lost in spirit:

MENDOZA. ...rico no hubiera sido
Como te escuchara a ti;
Jugué por mí y ante mí,
Y he ganado.
SANTILLAN. Y has perdido.
MENDOZA. No puedo darte razón
Pues he juntado un tesoro.
SANTILLAN. Y lo que has ganado en oro
Has perdido en corazón. (II: 2)

While Mendoza is thrilled with his earnings, Santillán is convinced that monetary enrichment has come with spiritual impoverishment.

Although he himself does not heed Santillán's advice, Mendoza does admonish Perico, Macario's friend from the countryside, to stay away from the Bolsa:

MENDOZA. ... Oye lo que hacer debieras.

Regresar a nuestra granja,

Comprar una yunta buena,

Arrendar algún cortijo,

Trabajar tanto que puedas,

Y aprovechar la ocasión

Antes no se vuelva negra.

PERICO. Y casarme....

MENDOZA. Sí señor,

Casarte con Magdalena,

Vivir como hombre de bien,

Y dejarte de quimeras.

Con que ¡largo! (II: 4)

By advising him to invest in oxen to work the land, Mendoza may be reminding Perico of the neglect of the agricultural sector. His recommendation that Perico be married seems to suggest that in spite of his insistence to Santillán that marriage and the Bolsa are not incompatible, his true feeling is that Santillán is right.

To Mendoza's further alarm, Perico reveals that Santillán's servant is carrying out stock market transactions for him. Like Mendoza, Perico insists that he will play just one or two more times on the stock market, and then he will stop and return to the village from which he comes. It is easier for Mendoza to dispense this advice to another than to follow it himself.

Mendoza's inevitable losses bankrupt not only him, but his father-in-law as well. In this sense, Santillán's reference to Icarus with the wax wings (III: 5) is apt, as Mendoza has destroyed the family with his excessive pride. As a possible exit from this situation, Carranza has an offer for Mendoza (IV: 9). He has created his own company, a *sociedad anónima* and would like Mendoza to participate. As mentioned above in Torrente Fortuño's *Historia de la Bolsa de Madrid*, *sociedades anónimas* were forming daily at mid-century as a result of the booming stock market.

As a prudent stockbroker and loyal friend, Santillán resolves the problems caused by Mendoza's foray into the stock market. He demonstrates a sense of responsibility and protection for his friend, who is less well informed than he. Initially he has Mendoza bet on a bear market. However, when that approach fails, he himself takes action to help Mendoza: "Vamos Mendoza a saber / De tu debe y haber" (IV: 4). That is, he forces Mendoza to be responsible and open about his finances. He presents him with a settlement document. His foresight of Mendoza's financial ruin led him to buy the property Mendoza had sold: "Conseguí que el labrador / Desengañase al bolsista" (IV: 4). Although the farmer comes from a neglected sector of the economy, it is he who opens the fledgling stockbroker's eyes. Santillán has acted as a corrective force on Mendoza. Thus Mendoza resolves to move back to the country. Santillán refers to the urban life and work Mendoza leaves behind as Sodom, the city of sin in the Book of Genesis: "No vuelvas la vista atrás / Ve que atrás queda Sodoma" (IV: 10). With this resolution, the diversion of capital and people away from agriculture and the arts towards the stock market is mitigated by the return of some rural natives to their place of origin, where they may develop the land.

In each of the next two plays we will explore, conflict in a marriage develops over money or the lack thereof. A banker is responsible for creating or aggravating this discord. In Luis Mariano de Larra's *La bolsa y el bolsillo* (1859), Enrique, a banker, and his wife Julia enjoy an extravagant lifestyle, thanks to his investments in the stock market. In contrast, Arturo, a lawyer, and his wife Luisa live simply on his modest salary. At first he is perfectly content with his profession: "A cada uno su empleo. Siembra tú el campo fértil de los negocios, y déjame a mí labrar la tierra árida de los procedimientos. Yo recogeré humildes espigas de plata, y tú granos de oro" (I: 7). He does not mind that when they go out to visit clients, she wears a dress purchased last year. She, in turn, mends an old glove for him. However, once in contact with Enrique and Julia, they learn about the Bolsa and begin to crave a different lifestyle.

Luisa senses that she and Arturo are out of touch with the rest of society: "... hoy todo el mundo es millonario... Todo el mundo hace fortuna, todo el mundo llega al fin de sus deseos, mientras nosotros ... nosotros pasaremos treinta años de nuestra existencia en pleitear por la viuda y por el huérfano...iremos en coche de alquiler, viajaremos en tren de segunda clase..." (I: 1). She does not know what the Bolsa is until Enrique explains it to her (I: 6). Arturo also wonders what the fuss is all about: "¡Oh! ¡La Bolsa! No se sabe lo que en ella es mejor, si perder o ganar" (I: 1). In this sense, they are like impressionable children, while Enrique is their teacher or bad influence.

At Arturo's urging, Luisa agrees to spend more time with Julia and Enrique. Although at first Luisa does not enjoy Julia's company, she is surprised and intrigued to hear that Julia and Enrique keep their money separate:

> JULIA. (*A Enrique.*) De dónde vienes?
>
> ENRIQUE. De la Bolsa.

JULIA. ¿Y cómo van los fondos?

ENRIQUE. Han subido.

JULIA. ¿Ya has liquidado los tuyos?

ENRIQUE. Con mil reales de ganancia por acción.

JULIA. No vendrá mal el alza a mis capitales.

LUISA. ¡Calla! ¿tenéis cada uno de vosotros vuestro bolsillo?

ENRIQUE. Como tenemos cada uno de nosotros nuestro corazón. (I: 4)

Enrique's mention of separate hearts rings true. For all their talk of their respective investments and earnings, he and Julia are not as united a couple as Arturo and Luisa, who call each other "amigo" and act accordingly. Indeed, as Julia eventually reveals to Luisa, material goods came to substitute for companionship as her marriage with Enrique cooled early:

> JULIA. Desde entonces coloqué todo mi amor, todas mis afecciones en las cajas de los sombreros y en los armarios de mis trajes. El lujo y la elegancia ocuparon en mi alma los sitios de la felicidad, del bienestar, de la familia: desde entonces llamo a la butaca mi tía, a mi traje de baile mi amiga, a mi capota nueva mi hija. (I: 11)

Nonetheless, Julia's ability to buy herself luxuries such as jewelry with her own funds piques Luisa's curiosity.

Impressed by Julia's apparent expertise on how to make money, Luisa begins to question the modest and frugal lifestyle she and Arturo share and contemplates spending part of the inheritance her uncle left her (I: 8). Arturo is critical of one of his clients, a dishonest businessman, and wonders why he worked so hard to defend him for so little pay (I: 8). This anxiety leads Arturo to consider the Bolsa in a new way: "¡La Bolsa!... Cuando pienso que a

estas horas hay personas que salen de allí habiendo ganado diez, doce, veinte mil reales...más todavía...que entrarán en su casa con buen humor...” (I: 9). To teach his wife a lesson, he resolves to visit the Bolsa just once. He expects to play and lose and then be able to tell her he will not do it again.

> ARTURO. (*Llevándole a la izquierda con aire misterioso*.) ¿Se puede exponer en la Bolsa una cantidad fija, dos mil reales por ejemplo, y perderlos?
>
> ENRIQUE. Perfectamente.
>
> ARTURO. ¿Y no jugar más?
>
> ENRIQUE. No hay inconveniente. (I: 10)

Taking advantage of their silence to each other, Enrique deceives and divides the couple. As he is handling their business dealings in confidence, husband and wife are unaware of each other’s actions:

> ENRIQUE. ... Mientras que el marido juega y pierde buenamente... (eso es cuenta suya) la mujer por su parte me da órdenes muy bien formuladas; y yo, sin cuidarme de ejecutarlas, la hago ganar todo cuanto quiere: ¿la engaño realmente? No tal. Luisa comprende demasiado bien los negocios para que, siendo mujer de un abogado, ignore que legalmente una mujer casada no puede jugar. Desde el momento que ella acepta esos beneficios imaginarios, mi dinero está colocado con un buen interés: todavía no he visto el primer dividendo, es cierto; pero hoy, gracias a mi querido Rodríguez, a quien he confesado casi mi estratagema, espero alcanzarle. (II: 6)

Enrique assumes incorrectly. Luisa believes she is making real money —“un total de seis cifras por lo menos” (II: 12)— and plans several expensive purchases for after she has paid Enrique his

commission. Nonetheless, husband and wife continue to hide their business dealings from each other and become increasingly distracted by their respective investments.

Enrique and Julia's influence brings about changes in behavior in Arturo and Luisa. Arturo cannot stop after his initial success —"Aquella facilidad de ganancia me arrastró a pesar mío" (II: 7). He keeps playing the stock market and ultimately suffers a loss worth "los cuatro mil duros de mi herencia" (III: 2). Luisa, for her part, becomes distracted and, when Arturo asks her to read aloud to him from the Código Penal, absentmindedly looks up the Código de Comercio instead. Arturo and Luisa become irritated with each other and argue about her new clothes (II: 14). Each begins to wonder what the matter with the other is, as they both become constantly agitated and emotional (III: 8). Evidently, the tension and instability of personal relationships mirrors the tenuous nature of the stock market, as we also see in *La victoria por castigo*, *Los tres banqueros* and *El dinero y la opinión*.

Under the pressure of the financial secrets they are keeping from each other, Arturo and Luisa's relationship begins to resemble the detached, strictly business relationship between Enrique and Julia. Arturo and Julia mistakenly assume that an intercepted business letter from Luisa to Enrique is evidence of a love affair between them.

The truth must come out when Luisa approaches Enrique to claim her "saldo...es esa la palabra, ¿no es cierto?...un saldo a mi favor de...de cuatro mil ciento siete duros y algunos céntimos" (III: 9). Although Luisa has acquired a new vocabulary of financial terms and knowledge of some financial operations, Enrique must now admit he faked her earnings:

> LUISA. ¡Dios mío! pero entonces esas operaciones...
>
> ENRIQUE. Eran fingidas.
>
> LUISA. Esas ganancias...

ENRIQUE. Eran imaginarias; pero no son por eso menos suyas. Guárdelas usted, señora, afín de reparar la falta de su marido.

LUISA. (*Vivamente*.) ¿De mi marido?

ENRIQUE. De su marido, que se ha aventurado, a pesar mío, en el terreno resbaladizo de la Bolsa, donde perdía formalmente por su parte, mientras que usted pensaba ganar por la suya. En todo esto, la única cosa verdadera es el profundo sentimiento que usted ha sabido inspirarme. (III: 9)

Enrique is impressed by Luisa's determination and effort to learn about the stock market. In addition, he is likely envious of the nature of her relationship with her husband, as it is warmer than his relationship with his wife.

Another banker who creates divisions between husband and wife appears in José María Díaz's *Los tres banqueros* (1860). The scene is Madrid in the 1850s. Carlos, a banker, has experienced the collapse of his business and panics at the thought of telling his wife and daughter.

CARLOS. ¡Arruinado! ¡Completamente arruinado! No importa; trabajaré; haré de nuevo mi fortuna; sé por experiencia que nada resiste a la actividad, al trabajo, a la inteligencia. La vida del comerciante es casi siempre una mezcla confusa de deleite y de ansiedad. ¡El comercio! Barco que flota a la merced de vientos encontrados; la habilidad del piloto consiste en llevarle a puerto, ¡siquiera llegue sin mástiles y sin velas! (I: 1)

The volatile world of business, with its constant anxiety and unpredictable highs and lows, is overwhelming to Carlos. Again, as in *La bolsa*, the market is depicted as a stormy sea, with forces beyond the control of businessmen who attempt to navigate it. Insecurity and anxiety are

common among bankers. These emotions are understandable in light of the circumstances surrounding the bankers' work, as Jesús Cruz points out:

> The *hombres de negocios* had to act in an economy which still lacked integration, where slow communications and poor legal resources created permanent insecurity. Even the most conservative businessman lived with the constant threat of suspension of payments looming over his head. In general, the stability of the banking business depended upon two factors: its diversification, and the control of information about the markets. Regarding the first factor, we can safely say that the bankers of the era were a combination of merchants and financiers, with the former occupation almost always being the more important. The pure financier—one who owned a firm which specialized exclusively in the administration of capital—did not yet exist [...] In Madrid, for example, it was extremely difficult to distinguish a banker from a merchant...The second element that has been seen as a factor of stability in the banking business regards the control of information about the markets. Securing this control was not an easy task. It was necessary to compete with a state accustomed to intervening in the commercial networks. (Cruz, *Gentlemen* 65)

The business and legal environment in which bankers had to operate was constantly changing and lacked structure. This uncertainty contributed to their constant agitation.

In spite of his efforts to hide the truth from her, Carlos's wife, Irene, has no illusions about her husband's work. She senses trouble, as she understands bankers: "Se arruinan más de una vez; y afectando siempre una tranquilidad que no tienen, pasan las noches trabajando sin otro afán que el de ocultar a su mujer la verdad de su situación desesperada" (I: 2). Once Carlos

confirms what Irene already suspects, they agree to pay off his debts with funds that were deposited in Carlos's name by a señor Leyva just prior to his death. This sum of money is supposed to become the dowry of Carlos and Irene's daughter Paulina when she comes of age. Although Carlos has brought up the problem, it is Irene who lays out the plan of action:

> IRENE. A fuerza de trabajo, de actividad y de inteligencia, ya lograremos reunir esa cantidad, y se la entregaremos cuando sea grande.
>
> CARLOS. ¿Y si llegara esa época y no pudiéramos?
>
> IRENE. Entonces yo misma se lo confesaré todo, y Paulina nos agradecerá el haber conservado limpia y sin mancha la honra de su padre. (I: 2)

Honor is important to Irene. For this reason, she insists that they pay the debt that very day. Irene's determination to prove their solvency marks a shift in the locus of honor: away from the private space of marriage to the public space of finances. During the Golden Age, for example in dramas such as Lope de Vega's *Peribañez y el Comendador de Ocaña*, one's honor depended on the behavior of others (Taylor 101). More specifically, women had to maintain their sexual purity or else disgrace the husbands, fathers and brothers who were to protect them (Taylor 101). The only acceptable response to an affront to sexual honor was bloody revenge (Taylor 101). In *Los tres banqueros*, honor, instead of being connected to the woman's body, is now based on the ability to pay one's expenses. In Chapter Four, "The Have-Nots," we will encounter a similar new concept of honor in José María Gutiérrez de Alba's *Vanidad y pobreza*. There, honor will be connected with one's willingness to give money to the needy.

Ernesto de Leyva y Cortés is Carlos's banker and the son of the man who entrusted the money to Carlos for Paulina's dowry. He warns Carlos that to use the account in Paulina's name would constitute a violation of the law. However, he feels responsible for Carlos's loss on the

stock market because it was he who advised him. Consequently, he offers his own funds to cover the loss.

Leyva was in love with Carlos's wife Irene before she was married. To Irene, Carlos is "el hombre más honrado de la tierra" (I: 9), as she insists to Leyva. However, her perception of her husband turns out inaccurate as Leyva reveals that what Carlos sustained was a bankruptcy—not a debt, as he had represented it to her. Carlos has deceived her as to the nature of his financial losses. Leyva sheds light on the situation for Irene, "Se trata de un robo... de un robo, señora, que castigan las leyes con penas severísimas" (I: 9). In spite of this, she goes to great lengths to save her husband's honor.

Irene refuses Leyva's offer of a loan, on the grounds that "no sería más que cambiar de acreedor" (I: 6). Leyva threatens Carlos with jail and dishonor if she does not agree. There is documentation that could save Carlos's honor, but Leyva is withholding it, to his advantage:

> IRENE. ...Es cierto que el señor de Leyva y Cortés consiguió en nuestra casa cierta suma de importancia, sin otra garantía que un recibo concebido en estos términos: "Declaro haber recibido del señor de Leyva y Cortés, en calidad de depósito, la cantidad de dos millones de reales." Pero también lo es que el generoso anciano, pocos momentos antes de expirar, le dijo a mi marido: "Carlos, nada me debes; sean los dos millones de reales que te dejé en depósito la dote de Paulina: la he tenido en la pila, y quiero hacer algo por ella."
>
> LEYVA. Pero es el caso, Irene, que ese recibo se encuentra hoy en mi poder.
>
> IRENE. Imposible.

LEYVA. Véale usted; no por esto pondré en duda la veracidad de lo que usted me ha referido: pero a la historia le faltan ciertos detalles que solo yo conozco, y que creo conveniente decir a usted. El señor de Leyva y Cortés, pocos momentos antes de morir, encargó a un sobrino suyo que buscase entre sus papeles este documento con el firme propósito de inutilizarle; pero el tal sobrino, hombre de cálculo y de previsión, no supo o no quiso cumplir a tiempo la voluntad del anciano, y las cosas se quedaron como estaban. Ese sobrino era yo.

IRENE. ¿Usted? En efecto, ahora me lo explico todo. Por una parte, esos dos millones de reales aumentaban considerablemente una herencia que ha hecho de usted el primer banquero de Madrid, constituyéndole además en acreedor nuestro. (I: 8)

Irene's pursuit of the receipt demonstrates that not only is she aware of the power of such documentation, but also she has identified an abuse of legal and economic power on Leyva's part.

Scheming Leyva creates more trouble between husband and wife by reporting how another banker has dealt with the collapse of his business:

LEYVA. ...he dicho que Gutiérrez del Arco, el banquero, se había presentado en quiebra y huido al extranjero...

CARLOS. ... ¿Conque se ha fugado?

LEYVA. No le quedaba otro partido.

CARLOS. ¿Después de una quiebra?

LEYVA. Una quiebra es las más veces el resultado de espantosas desgracias.

> CARLOS. Como usted guste; pero cuando se puede escoger entre la fuga y la muerte, para hacer callar a la maledicencia, no se huye, se levanta uno la tapa de los sesos.
>
> IRENE. ¡Ah! (I: 9)

By inciting this discussion, Leyva is playing on Carlos's guilty conscience as well as Irene's fear of her husband's dishonor and death. Again, as in *Lo de arriba abajo, O, La bolsa y el rastro*, a banker considers a drastic exit from his dire financial situation.

Confusion over an intercepted letter addressed from Irene to Leyva leads Carlos to doubt his wife's love and fidelity (II: 8). While the document appears to be a love letter, it is in fact a business letter. Unbeknownst to Carlos, Irene has written to Leyva to refuse an invitation to appear at his office. Carlos's resulting insecurity and jealousy might be another manifestation of the constant "ansiedad" of a banker to which he repeatedly alludes (II: 6). Still, he attributes it to the suspicion that his wife and Leyva are having an affair. A similar misunderstanding occurs in *La bolsa y el bolsillo* due to Luisa's correspondence with Enrique. In both plays, a husband's hasty conclusion that his wife is having an affair seems to stem from the mistaken assumption that she could not possibly be conducting business transactions. This assumption would seem to be based on social and gender norms that were in the process of shifting at the time.

Leyva is ruthless and dishonest. Although supposedly a friend of the family, he divides that very family, as Enrique did in *La bolsa y el bolsillo*. Just as it seems he has succeeded in intimidating husband and wife alike, Carlos approaches him with surprise evidence that Leyva owes Carlos repayment of a loan made long ago to his benefit. Carlos recalls a visit from Leyva's father:

> CARLOS. ... usted ignora que un día vino a mí su padre, pálido, con la voz ahogado, diciéndome, “Mi hijo me ha arruinado, Carlos.” (Porque su fortuna de usted hoy proviene de su tío Villanueva.) “Mi hijo me ha arruinado, y no satisfecho con esto, ¡acaba de deshonrarme!..."
>
> LEYVA. ¡Carlos!
>
> CARLOS. No hago más que repetir las palabras de su padre de usted, “Mañana," añadió, "irá probablemente a la cárcel.” Se trataba de no sé qué deudas contraídas en obsequio de una bailarina...Sin embargo, la deuda admitía mala reputación, se hablaba de tribunales...En fin, el caso fue que yo las pagué...y usted lo ignoraba. (III: 6)

In causing his bankruptcy, Leyva dishonored his own father. It was Carlos who spared Leyva from jail, paid his debts and physically fought a third person to defend Leyva’s good name. The evidence against Leyva mounts, with Carlos’s knowledge of the younger man’s past indiscretions and the “recibo” —a wound Carlos sustained during the fight many years ago (III: 6). Leyva thus owes Carlos an enormous debt, instead of vice versa.

It is only on the verge of death that Irene reveals Leyva’s blackmail to Carlos. Leyva led Carlos to believe that the elder Leyva tore up the receipt for the 2 million reales, but Irene has obtained and kept it, out of a desire to maintain her daughter’s honor (III: 11). In this family, the man has blundered into financial difficulties, but it is his wife who works for a solution, as Luisa did for Flores in *Achaques del siglo actual*. Irene does so by collecting important financial documentation, thus saving the family’s honor —at the cost of her own life.

Insecurity and anxiety lead a stockbroker to take desperate measures in Manuel Ortiz de Pinedo’s *La victoria por castigo* (1885), set in Madrid in April 1860. Don Juan, a wealthy

stockbroker, is ready to sell his shares and directs his employee Fernando to carry out this operation for him. Fernando, who has grown up poor, fears losing his job once the sale is over. He is in love with don Juan's daughter Luisa, and wishes to marry her.

Having earned the family's trust, Fernando takes advantage of it now that he perceives his position to be threatened. From his journalist friend Salgado, he hears of a Carlist uprising, of which don Juan is not yet aware, and keeps this news from his boss. As an observer wrote of stock market fever at mid-century, "En el juego de la Bolsa tienen mayores probabilidades de ganar quienes estaban mejor informados de la marcha de los acontecimientos" (Torrente Fortuño 159). Indeed, Fernando takes advantage of his timely access to information in order to exploit don Juan's lack thereof for financial gain. He waits for the ensuing run on the stock market to cause prices to fall, whereupon he can purchase don Juan's shares cheaply and make millions once the market recovers.

He makes a friend, Perea, his accomplice. He asks Perea to buy all the shares he can. During the rush to sell, Fernando waits until the price has dropped before selling don Juan's shares, so as to ensure his boss's ruin. Perea then buys the shares at the lowest price possible. Don Juan is thus ruined.

Fernando's justification of his decision to use Perea is: "Perea quebró una vez; pero, ¿quién elige hombres de bien para estas cosas? (*Pausa*.) Don Juan me ha mandado vender, y he vendido...¿qué deslealtad hay en esto?" (I: 3) He is rationalizing his actions and avoiding responsibility by attacking Perea's character.

Fernando proceeds to lose over 200,000 duros, or 4 million reales, in don Juan's name (II: 5). His plan is to offer don Juan the amount he needs to cover his losses and promptly ask for Luisa's hand in marriage. However, feeling slighted by Luisa, he concocts a further scheme:

"Salvar a su padre: he aquí todo. Sí: ¡su padre es su posición, su fortuna! A quien le salve entregará su alma ... Yo cerraré el paso al padre y a la hija. ¡Poder del oro! Si la conspiración fracasa, la fortuna de don Juan pasará a mis manos por ley del azar... ¿Es otra cosa el juego? ... nadie sospecha que estoy detrás" (II: 11). For financial gain, he is taking advantage of information he has withheld from don Juan.

At the Bolsa, news of the failed Carlist revolt has been greeted with panic (II: 15). To Fernando's horror, Salgado informs him that the newspapers have already reported the revolt. The speed with which the news circulates could be the undoing of his plan.

Although don Juan is the victim of Fernando's schemes, he himself might not be an honest businessman, as his reputation suggests. His daughter Luisa has grown up in luxury and never lacked for anything. However, once she learns how her father earned his fortune —in the stock market— and how others in the community perceive him, she is appalled. Her visit to the Teatro Real reveals that her father has made money from the suffering or exploitation of others:

> LUISA. Pues bien: estrené yo aquella noche el collar de rubíes conque me sorprendió usted el día de mi santo. "¡Hermoso collar!" dijo un caballero que conversaba con una señora en la platea de al lado. "La hija de una bolsista," replicó ésta con desdén. "¡Magníficos rubíes!" repitió su interlocutor y ella, mirándome con descaro, dijo: "¡Parecen gotas de sangre!" ¡Ah! ¡Qué vergüenza! (I: 5)

The association of Luisa's rubies with blood reflects the violence of the Carlist uprisings, as well as that of the insurrection in the Andalucian countryside at the time (Bahamonde and Martínez 343). The scorn of her fellow theater-goers at the sight of her necklace prompts Luisa to question the origins of the family fortune. She refers to her father's job as "maldito juego que todo lo

emponzoña" (I: 5). Socially conscious, she wants nothing to do with anything bought with his money.

Luisa, who blames herself "por no haberme opuesto desde el primer día a esta vida de azares de la Bolsa" (III: 2) —is prepared to give up all she owns and work hard to save her father's honor: "¡Oh! cuánto me alegro de no haber tomado nunca afición a este lujo, a este tren...a esta casa! Así podré desprenderme de todo sin pena, si sirve para salvarnos" (III: 1). She could represent the younger generation, with her offer to pay for mistakes of her elders. Luisa has another means to help her father: she is an artist whose paintings have brought her prizes (III: 1). Her art may be able to compensate for her father's possibly tainted money. Again, as in *Achaques del siglo actual,* there is an exaltation of art as opposed to money.

Once confronted by Luisa, don Juan immediately offers to liquidate all his business operations. However, it is clear by his conversation with Fernando that he has not stopped calculating: "Ahora lo esencial es que usted tome sus medidas... que las pérdidas, si no se pueden evitar, no sean grandes..." (I: 6). Still, Don Juan discovers that his loss exceeds his savings by at least 40,000 duros (II: 5).

The "solution" that Fernando suggests to don Juan involves the marqués de Romero, but don Juan dismisses this possibility almost immediately: "¿Vender la mano de mi hija? ¿Usted se atreve a indicar? ... Parecerá una súplica" (II: 5). Luisa is not yet aware of the situation. Don Juan cannot bear for her to know that he has dishonored the family. He refuses to ask the marqués for help. This is exactly what Fernando wants, since he plans to bail out don Juan himself and marry Luisa. However, his plan backfires once the marqués offers to use his fortune to help don Juan. Don Juan now feels so indebted to the marqués that he would like Luisa to marry his son.

To borrow funds necessary to cover his losses, don Juan makes plans to leave for Barcelona to visit a prospective lender. Additionally, he arranges for all of his available funds to be brought to Fernando by a collector. Thanking Fernando, he expresses happiness that he has such a loyal friend in him (II: 6). However, Fernando, absolutely determined to stop Luisa's wedding to the marqués's son, sends a telegram to the lending institution in Barcelona ahead of time, indicating that don Juan will be unable to repay the loan. Luisa is wary of her father's plan to leave town: "¿Salir de Madrid? ¿Quiere usted exponerse a que duden? Cuántas veces he oído hablar de estos viajes repentinos" (III: 1). Again, as in *Lo de arriba abajo* and *Los tres banqueros*, a banker's abrupt departure from Madrid is assumed to be permanent because such departures are so commonplace.

When Luisa presses Fernando and don Juan for the names of the people who benefited from don Juan's loss, they cannot or will not name those individuals:

> LUISA. ¿La suma que usted pierde, no la gana otra persona?
>
> JUAN. No hay duda.
>
> LUISA. ¿Quién es? ¿Cómo se llama?
>
> JUAN. Lo ignoro.
>
> LUISA. ¿Lo ignora usted? ¿Es eso posible?
>
> JUAN. Sí; en estas operaciones se reserva el nombre del que compra y del que vende...Sólo figuran los que intervienen...
>
> LUISA. ¡Oh! ¡Quien nos arruina se cubre la cara!...¿Qué juego es este donde nadie dice su nombre? (III: 3)

Money has led to impersonal relationships. The anonymity of money also allows stock agents to masquerade as one another. Fernando's colleague Perea has played the stock market in

Fernando's name. Unaware of this switch, colleague Linares believes that it is Fernando who has bankrupted him.

Fernando's friends and colleagues have different approaches to using this information, which they know affects the stock market. These approaches reflect their attitudes about the nation. Salgado's mention of the uprising in Baleares and Carlist troops in San Carlos de la Rápita, the newspaper wars and Fernando's reference to the Spanish army in Africa were all historical facts as of April 1860. Not only do these events spur the drop in the prices on the stock market, but they may also reflect concern for the future of the nation. It is Salgado the journalist who provides the information Fernando needs to set his plan in motion. However, he shows pride for his nation. Despite having early access to the news, he does not play the stock market. His reason is, "No quiero dinero a costa de la ruina de mi patria" (II: 2). Spain's honor is important to him. Moreover, it is Salgado who reveals that Linares is spreading word that Fernando has bankrupted his own friends, including don Juan. Fernando's horrified attempt to stop the news from spreading is futile, as Salgado warns, "En mi periódico no hay cuidado... es tarde ya...En primer lugar, yo no sé a cuántos periódicos habrá ido Linares; se publican tantos...más de los que hacen falta: en segundo lugar la noticia es de aquellas que gustan" (III: 6). Although Salgado's newspaper sounds unscrupulous, Salgado does exercise moderation.

Linares is portrayed as an opportunist who exposes Fernando's plans. He has gone to all the newspapers to notify them of Fernando's actions and named don Juan as one of Fernando's victims. In contrast to Salgado, Linares is unconcerned with the political and military crisis and consequences of his revelation. Indeed, he rushes to the stock exchange to take advantage of the chaos by selling off millions more shares (II: 2). Linares keeps a loaded revolver in his desk: "Un

chisme indispensable en la mesa de un banquero ... para liquidar en un día negro" (II: 1). Once more, the idea of escaping responsibility occurs to a banker.

Fernando does not understand the concept of honor and believes it can be quantified and bought. Linares begs to differ:

> FERNANDO. ¿Qué cantidad pierdes?
>
> LINARES. La que no puedes pagar...la honra.
>
> FERNANDO. ¿La honra? con pagar tus diferencias, la recobras en seguida.
>
> LINARES. Ese es tu error, ¡creer que todo se arregla con un puñado de oro!
>
> Ahora que eres poderoso, verás que lo puedes comprar todo, ¡menos la tranquilidad de conciencia! (III: 7)

Like Ramírez in *El dinero y la opinión*, Fernando attempts to apply mathematical calculations to his life inside and outside the Bolsa.

The visit of Fernando's mother, Teresa, exposes a clash of values between herself and her son and between the rural and the urban. Her simple style of dress –"traje sencillo de señora de pueblo" (II: 4) — reveals her modest origins. Immediately she observes a change in her son since his departure from home, as he fails to meet her at the railway station. The gap between city and country is apparent as Teresa is overwhelmed by the city: "Es mucho este Madrid.—En los pueblos no se gana para pagar la contribución, y aquí se hacen las gentes poderosas de repente" (II: 4). This comment may be a critique of the gap between rich and poor as well.

Alone in the house, Teresa is uneasy among unfamiliar surroundings: "Cada vez que se abre una puerta, me parece que vienen a decirme, "Sal de aquí; nada de lo que ves te pertenece" (II: 12). Her first impulse is to reach for her rosary. Her anxiety amid the luxury around her, particularly in the absence of religious images with which she is familiar, underscores the clash

between rural and urban, older and younger generations and rich and poor. Moreover, Teresa's failure to locate religious objects in her son's home highlights the transition he has made away from religion and towards money. As Georg Simmel points out:

> There is no period of time in which individuals have not been greedy for money, yet one can certainly say that the greatest intensity and expansion of this desire occurred in those times in which the modest satisfaction of individual life-interests, such as the elevation of the religious absolute as the ultimate purpose of existence, had lost its power. (*Philosophy of Money* 237)

The second half of the nineteenth century, when the action of the play takes place, indeed seems to be such a time. However, much earlier in the century, this tension between religion and money as one's purpose in life had already been represented in theater. For instance, in María Rosa Gálvez's *La familia a la moda* (1805), which we will examine in the next chapter, "The Nouveau Riche," doña Guiomar, a widow from the country like Teresa in *La victoria por castigo*, arrives at her family's Madrid home to find, to her dismay, that there are no religious objects in the guest room where she sleeps. Instead, her relatives have adopted an extravagant lifestyle in the worship of money and material goods, not God.

When Teresa inquires about rumors she has heard about don Juan's overnight financial ruin, Fernando attempts to change the subject: "Es difícil que usted entienda" (II: 4). His unwillingness to explain to her is not only an attempt to cover his wrongdoing, but also an indication of the generation gap and differences between rural and urban life. Furthermore, Fernando may be hinting that the language of a stockbroker is an elite code that people like his mother do not understand. The contrasts between city and country life become even more obvious as Teresa presses for more information:

TERESA. Yo no comprendo que haya un papel, diga lo que diga, que destruya en un día toda una hacienda.

FERNANDO. En Madrid los hay. (II: 4)

Teresa's puzzlement at the power of the written word to destroy a man's reputation may owe itself to differences in communication in urban and rural areas. Coming from the country, she is likely accustomed to the diffusion of information by word of mouth, instead of in print as in Madrid.

Surrounded by expensive paintings and furniture at the house in Madrid, Teresa doubts that her son has earned everything he owns. "Un empleado de una casa de comercio... ¡No me aflijas, repitiéndome que esto es tuyo!" (II: 4). Fernando attempts to deflect her criticism by attributing her indignation to "Las ideas del pueblo..." (II: 4). Like Luisa, Teresa refuses to use luxury items she believes were purchased with money acquired corruptly: "Si en este lujo hay algo que te deshonra, no me siento en una silla..." (II: 4). Both women uphold strong principles about honor and honesty. Additionally, with her religious beliefs, Luisa could be a younger version of Teresa: "Los hijos tienen obligación de sacrificarse por sus padres. Dios lo dice" (III: 1). While Teresa's expectations of respect from her son are not met, Luisa demonstrates such respect by offering to pay for don Juan's losses, even though her father may have come by his fortune dishonestly.

To Teresa's surprise, there are some good, honest people in Madrid who handle money for a living. The collector who comes to the house while Fernando is out, for example, could be considered a counterexample to corrupt businessmen such as Fernando. The collector leaves a large sum of money for Fernando. Teresa's initial fear of being left alone with the money —"No lo deje usted de ningún modo. ¿Cómo he de hacerme yo cargo de ... ese capitalazo? ¡Virgen

Santa!" (II: 12)— gives way to astonishment that the collector himself is not rich. In fact, he takes pride in his ability to provide for his family's needs and no more: "La honradez es nuestro capital...no respondemos con otro...gano lo necesario para atender a mi subsistencia y la de mi familia" (II: 12). "El dinero es según se mira. El susto es para los que cobran o pagan...Esos sí que pasan unas amarguras" (II: 12). The collector is pleased to have met Teresa and sees his mother in her:

> COBRADOR. Cinco años hace que no veo a mi madre... ¡Pobrecita!
>
> TERESA. ¿La quiere usted mucho?
>
> COBRADOR. ¡Ella me enseñó a ser honrado! (II: 12)

The collector's relationship with his mother contrasts with Fernando's relationship with Teresa. His statements about a modest living and the neutrality of money seem to indicate that Fernando could have turned out differently. Regardless of the money handler's upbringing, it would appear that financial occupations and institutions were associated in this time with the separation or devastation of families. In this letter to *El Cascabel*, a reader writes: " ... Los Bancos, en general, son hoy la destrucción de la propiedad y en lugar de llevar el consuelo y la alegría en las familias, no llevan más que luto, desolación y desconsuelo..." (qtd. in Torrente Fortuño 353). For the families in *La victoria por castigo*, *Los tres banqueros*, and *Achaques del siglo actual*, this rings true.

Unaware of the provenance of the large sums of cash in her son's home, Teresa assumes they belong to don Juan and offers them to Luisa and don Juan: "¡Mi hijo! ¡Pues así que tiene él en casa pocos mazos de billetes! Un dineral" (III: 4). Unwittingly, she has solved don Juan's financial problems.

Fernando's disrespect causes Teresa to scold him, "Pobre, disfrazado de potentado" (II: 4). She cannot believe that someone who has not worked very many years could possibly have power. Her advice to him —"Haz por don Juan cuanto puedas. ¡Le debes cuanto tienes!" (II: 4)— comes too late. Mother and son argue over the money that the collector has brought to his home. During this heated discussion, Fernando sounds like a small child instead of a grown man as he scrambles about the house in search of "¡Mi dinero! ¡Es mío!" (II: 16) In this society in which money has become so important, it seems as though immaturity or regression tends to accompany the love of money. Although Teresa is determined to leave –"¡Quédate con tu oro maldito!" (II: 16)– Fernando's heart pain stops her. Fernando's love of money and rejection of rural values has signaled a rift within the family. His mother's attempt to return to the countryside further reflects that such an obsession with money threatens the harmony of the family. In a broader sense, the potential breakup of this family reflects discord within society as a whole.

Fernando's weak heart seems to point to the potentially unhealthy nature of his profession. Despite his youth, he has chest pains. His mother notes that he is pale and asks whether he is ill, but he attempts to gloss over his poor health. Stock trading has prematurely aged him and made him ill. The stress is part of the price he pays —the punishment for becoming rich overnight. His heart disease seems to represent the materialism that has made society unhealthy.

The constant anxiety of the stockbroker, much like that of the banker as detailed by Cruz, is a testament to the all-consuming and warlike nature of the stock exchange: "¡Esta es la Bolsa! ¡Esta la lucha eterna! ¡Ay de los vencidos!" (II: 3). The excitement Fernando experiences by trading stocks allows him to justify the postponement of his happiness: "¡Esta agitación continua

me mata! ¡Bah! ya pasará. ¡Vencer o morir! He aquí todo. Después tendré tiempo para recobrar la salud... ¡para ser dichoso!" (II: 3) This belief that he has time to do so is illusory.

The delivery of yet another large sum of cash to his home as payment for his stock market "victory" exposes the uselessness of Fernando's newfound fortune and power. Rather than sell his daughter to Fernando, don Juan takes Luisa and leaves. Even the servants leave. Consequently, Fernando thus finds himself rich but alone. Before he can celebrate or spend the money, he collapses and dies in his mother's arms of an apparent heart attack.

The outcome of Fernando's exploitation of information and of people close to him is tragedy. His desperation to keep his job and to "win" on the stock market are extreme manifestations of the insecurity and anxiety experienced by bankers and stockbrokers during this era. In the next chapter, I will look at the nouveaux riches, the forces that produced them and their sources of anxiety.

Chapter 2 The Nouveau Riche

In this chapter, I will examine the nouveau riche. Some of the economic actors profiled in this chapter are: the *indiano*, the new businessman or businesswoman, the *petimetra*, the person of leisure, and the gambler, among others. The nouveaux riches I discuss in this chapter owe their representation in the plays largely to the emergence of a middle class in Spain and to the expanded role of women, regardless of their class, in the Spanish economy. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the abundance and variety of economic actors, technological advances, the availability of free time and new ways to spend it had created new sources of knowledge, skills and concerns about the unfamiliar. A new class emerged during this period, traditionally categorized as "bourgeois" and "bourgeoisie," although these terms have been disputed in the Spanish context:

> Both Marxist and liberal historiographies are definitely in agreement when they speak of the existence of a new ascendant class that, either through alliances or on its own, was able to take control of the means of production and transform juridical structures so as to accommodate capitalism. (Cruz, *Gentlemen* 265)

The core of a middle class developed in Spain, according to Jesús Cruz, in spite of delayed industrialization and modernization:

> ... while Spain did not fully become a middle-class consumer society until the 1950s, in some regions and especially in urban areas there has been a significant middle-class presence since the mid-nineteenth century. In this geographic space, bourgeois social groups embraced and promoted a culture of consumption, comfort, and domestic hygiene before the country's industrialization. (*Rise* 55)

Spain's economic backwardness due to late industrialization, the weakness of the middle class, the lack of legal institutions to protect and enforce new rights and privileges, and the desire to preserve the middle class's rights and privileges contributed to an atmosphere of economic insecurity. As Catherine Davies points out, "The paucity of industrial growth meant the middle-classes were not strong and liberal reforms were not implemented on a sufficient scale to match the pace of increasing modernization" (5). Consequently, the middle class was a shifting, unstable space, charged with much anxiety about the possibility of losing status and the ownership of goods.

This anxiety over socioeconomic change also stemmed from the creation of an abundance of new, unfamiliar financial instruments in play, and the presence of relatively few people in society adept at using them. In the plays I explore here, women must adapt to these new economic realities of the period, but only in some instances does such adaptation occur

successfully. Women acquire some degree of agency as the action unfolds, but the moralistic tone of some of the plays studied here suggests that men and women alike must manage household and economic resources responsibly, and safeguard and promote to their family certain values regarding economic behavior. Models of economic behavior, ideal and less-than-ideal, are elaborated for men and women alike.

Most of the women in the works studied in this chapter represent departures from the *ángel del hogar* model, which prescribed the exclusion of women from the public world of men on the basis of their alleged inability to perform activities outside the home and their alleged weakness (Aldaraca 30). Indeed, women find themselves increasingly in public spaces and therefore become aware of codes of conduct outside the home. It was believed that education could eliminate the negative characteristics of women and of helping them to participate more effectively in these new socioeconomic contexts in nineteenth-century Spain (Nash, quoted in González-Allende 71).

The normative base for economic woman and her participation in life outside the home had already begun to form from the Enlightenment onward. According to Elisabeth Franklin Lewis:

> Debido a la confluencia, a finales del siglo [XVIII], de una serie de inquietudes sociales y transformaciones culturales —la búsqueda de soluciones a los problemas económicos, la pobreza y el desempleo; el nuevo interés por la beneficencia como instrumento de modernización económica y social, y el desarrollo de un lenguaje de la sensibilidad cada vez más asociado con la feminidad— se abrió un espacio importante para la participación femenina. (Lewis 94-95)

That is, the unsettling atmosphere created by socioeconomic change helped to redefine the role of women.

In some circles, increased participation by women in processes of socioeconomic change was encouraged. In a speech given at the Universidad de Madrid in 1869 by Gabriel Rodríguez, Profesor de la Escuela de Ingenieros y Caminos, on the influence of economics on Spanish life, the role of woman as guardian of the household and thus of her husband, to some extent, was defined as follows:

> ...no pudiendo haber progreso sin vosotras, siendo el hombre en mucha parte de su educación y de modo de ser, obra exclusiva vuestra, es indispensable que sin hacer caso de ridículas y anticuadas preocupaciones, consagreis vuestra atención y vuestra actividad al estudio de las ciencias económicas y sociales. ¡Ah! si esto hicierais, ¡qué no podríamos esperar del porvenir de nuestro país! ¡Con qué facilidad atraeríais al esposo al interior de la familia, viviendo con él en mayor comunidad intelectual y moral! (Rodríguez 24-25)

The increased complexity of economic life in the nineteenth century added to a mother's responsibilities for raising her children and a wife's responsibilities for maintaining domestic harmony.

The nineteenth-century woman now had not only increased responsibilities, but also increased social mobility through the institution of marriage. The dowry transforms a daughter into a commodity and her mother tries to sell her to potential suitors in order to reinforce the economic security of the family. According to Catherine Davies, upward mobility between the privileged classes and other classes in the nineteenth century was difficult, and only marriage could provide this mobility; as a result, the middle class tried to marry its daughters off to

members of the aristocracy (26). Another factor that affected upward mobility was the impoverishment of the aristocracy.

The absence of a stable middle class meant that many people competed to enter and remain in this shifting social space. There was anxiety about financial ruin for many reasons. According to María Jesús Matilla Quizá, this economic insecurity stemmed from a lack of confidence in private companies, the absence of a reliable banking network, the lack of coordination in the domestic market and an international economic crisis (381-82).

The new socioeconomic context of the nineteenth century presented many risks. The increased availability of goods and the use of credit combined to increase the risk of conspicuous consumption and indebtedness. With the new phenomenon of casinos, it was now possible to place the entire family's worth in play, thereby falling into debt or becoming suddenly rich. There was potential not only for material enrichment, but also for material and spiritual impoverishment.

I now turn to examine the plays in which these phenomena, trends and anxieties manifest themselves. The first, chronologically, is María Rosa Gálvez's *La familia a la moda* (1805). Doña Guiomar, a widowed aunt, comes to visit her family in Madrid. Immediately she is labeled backwards and old-fashioned because she is from the Cantabrian countryside. She is the widow of an *indiano*, a Spaniard who returned wealthy from the Americas (we will explore the figure of the *indiano* in greater depth later in this chapter). The encounter between doña Guiomar, her brother don Canuto and her sister-in-law Madama reveals divergent values concerning money, religion and nation, as doña Guiomar discovers evidence of her family's financial irresponsibility. Don Canuto and Madama have spent his American wealth on gambling and

luxury goods. We will see in Chapter Three, "The Moneylender, the Creditor," the consequences of their excesses.

Religious, noble in manner, plain and straight-laced, doña Guiomar criticizes her brother for not having placed any saints in the guest room in which she is staying. Specifically, she wants the Virgen de Covadonga, patron saint of the Montañas, as she is a country woman, but this request highlights the difference between her and her city relatives. The types of nouveaux riches represented by don Canuto and Madama have long abandoned religion and the values associated with the countryside: simplicity and modesty. As highlighted in Chapter One, "The Banker, the Stockbroker," a disruptive feature of the new economy is the replacement of religion by money.

News of her niece and nephew's whereabouts and studies —her niece is in a convent and her nephew is studying French— leads doña Guiomar to lament the state of Spain's youth:

> DOÑA GUIOMAR. ¡Oh España! En qué triste estado
> tus naturales se han puesto,
> pues no saldrá, según esto,
> de ti un hijo bien criado.
> Jamás se hubiera pensado
> que tú, de ilustres varones
> madre en tantas ocasiones,
> hoy tan abatida estés,
> que sólo de hablar francés
> des a tus hijos lecciones. (I: 2)

Her criticism of the bad upbringing of children and failure of education in Spain is an allusion to Spain's historical greatness. The nation is now on the wane due to the slavish adherence of some, such as Madama, to foreign fashions, language and culture. Indeed, during this period, consumer desires for certain luxury goods, such as textiles, laces, and other garment-related products were being oriented towards goods produced outside of the peninsula (Haidt 141).

When she does meet her nephew Faustino, his unwashed appearance and use of "tú" offend his aunt and indicate a lack of respect towards elders and women. Doña Guiomar confronts him: "¿Qué pillo es este / que así me habla y se propasa?" (I: 3) Faustino also addresses his mother using "tú" and heeds only masculine authority. His attitude towards women is summed up by his remark, "El diablo son las mujeres" (II: 2). His dance with a chair reflects this attitude as well (II: 11). He is using the chair, an inanimate object, as a substitute for a female dancing partner. This action reflects his lack of consideration towards women.

Faustino's mother is largely responsible for his rude conduct. As her French-derived honorific suggests, Madama is a *petimetra*, a leisurely big spender with a preference for things foreign, particularly French. Her frivolity is presented in sharp contrast to Guiomar's plainness. Just as Guiomar's love for las Montañas demonstrates her patriotism for Spain, Madama's preference for the French language, culture and fashions signals her lack of patriotism. As Rebecca Haidt argues:

> ... petimetras emblematize a domain of misguided, subjective experience: they are female shoppers unable to direct their will and agency in the marketplace toward useful ends. The well-dressed, individual women ... are depicted as alienated from the interests of home, husbands, or children, and bereft of implements of productive labour such as a spinning wheel or a needle. They have no guiding

> counsel, no orienting context for their actions and decisions. Both verbal and visual petimetra-images emblematize a relationship between women's desires for imported textiles and adornments, and the exercise of dangerous choices with regard to national economic development. (144)

Madama opposes the marriage of her daughter to Carlos just because he does not speak French (II: 4). In fact, Carlos is well brought up and has served in the military. He is loyal to Spain. However, Madama wants her daughter to marry the marquis, who does speak French, as such a marriage would allow Madama and don Canuto to acquire titles. The marquis, in contrast to Carlos, demonstrates bad manners by ignoring doña Guiomar when he arrives. His sword and affectation make him merely ornamental. His disregard for doña Guiomar reflects the nobility's failure to see the economic and political potential of the common people. We will discuss in greater detail the nobility's decline and attitudes towards the common people in Chapter Four, "The Have-Nots."

Madama's French ways have influenced Teresa the servant, who first appears on the scene "vestida a la francesa ridículamente" (I: 1). Moreover, Madama's snobbishness and ill temper also are examples for her servant, a haughty complainer with a bad attitude. Teresa has adopted Madama's attitudes about Spain and France, for example explaining to doña Guiomar why Faustino is being sent to France to study: "que la educación grosera / de España no le ha de dar" (I: 2). Pablo, another servant, recalls that he and Teresa loved each other once, "mas las petimetrerías / te han hecho serme inconstante" (I: 1). This working class woman's lack of national pride has diminished her chances of marrying, which might suggest that, more broadly, love of the foreign might prevent solidarity from developing within a socioeconomic group such as the working class.

The nationalistic tone of the play privileges the Spanish (doña Guiomar) over the blind imitation of French fashions, language and culture (Madama), as well as nobility of character (Carlos) over nobility of title (the Marquis). With her sister-in-law's visit, Madama is losing control, power and agency. These reversals signal a profound change underway in society.

Another play in which a woman is familiar with business, but is represented somewhat less positively than doña Guiomar, is Francisco Botella y Andrés's *La muger de medio siglo* (1858). Doña Sabina, a rich, unmarried woman, purchases items from a French *modista* and has been doing business using an agent, don Tadeo, for the past 18 years. She laments and fights the signs of her aging, but loves and is resigned to supporting her nephew. She prefers for don Tadeo to be discreet about their business together, particularly as she does not want her nephew to know how she is planning to provide for him.

Federico, her nephew and only heir, comes to visit and immediately asks to borrow money; he is in love and needs her help in winning his beloved. He is certain of her support: "Yo aprovecharé ese cariño. Al fin y al cabo, una soltera de cincuenta años, ya no sirve más que para que la esploten los sobrinos... ¡Ay! ¡cuánto deseo encontrarme en posesión de su herencia! ...Calla, que me parece que oigo sonar dinero" (I: 10). Federico is a product of a materialistic age.

Federico's initial assumption that don Tadeo is a secret suitor of his aunt's —"¡Quién había de decir que una mujer tan honrada como usted, tendría algo que ocultar!" (I: 10)— indicates that he cannot envision her conducting business. Once informed that don Tadeo has been managing his aunt's money for years, he treats him as though he were a criminal, despite don Tadeo's assurance that he has promptly paid her any annual interest due:

SABINA. Siempre me ha llevado las cuentas corrientes y en toda regla.

FEDERICO. Lo supongo. Pero también le roba á usted la reputación. (I: 10)

Federico's opposition to his aunt's work with don Tadeo demonstrates a mistrust of business agents and, possibly, of the very idea of a woman engaged in business. Furthermore, his claim that don Tadeo is dishonest and has been cheating doña Sabina out of her money is based on his assumption that his aunt *needs* a man to conduct business for her, as opposed to *choosing* to hire a man to conduct business for her. His dismissal of don Tadeo and suggestion of taking over management of his aunt's financial affairs is rude: "Largo de aquí, señor chupaguindas; mi tía no necesita de usted. Para manejar dinero, aquí estoy yo" (I: 10). Moreover, his offer to run her business for her makes no sense, since the purpose of his visit to her home is to ask for a sizable loan. Don Tadeo acknowledges this shortcoming of Federico's, warning his client: "Ponga usted su capital en manos de ese calavera, y antes de poco está usted arruinada" (I: 10). He perceives Federico as irresponsible and a womanizer.

When Federico confesses to his aunt that he is in love and would like to borrow money, she agrees immediately to give him 20,000 duros. However, she tells him they will all go to her country home together. His reaction is reserved: "(La tía será el único estorbo para nuestros amores, pero no importa, poco puede vivir)" (I: 11). Just as he expresses doubts about the arrangement she proposes, she remarks skeptically about the love that he insists is genuine and lasting: "Pche...no me fío mucho de los jóvenes..." (I: 10).

As don Tadeo prepares to disburse the funds to doña Sabina, Federico reveals the identity of his bride-to-be. Unbeknownst to them all, he has been courting the daughter of don Tadeo, Leonor. Don Tadeo is the "padre intolerante que la hizo venir de Málaga, para sustraerla á mi cariño" (I: 12). In confirming his identity, don Tadeo reveals that although he had never met Federico when his daughter told him she wanted to be married, he had heard rumors about the

young man's bad behavior. An inflexible father, however responsible he might be financially or morally, can drive away his daughter and send her into the arms of a less responsible man, thus into worse economic circumstances.

Before agreeing to give the money to Federico, doña Sabina, in an attempt to save her reputation, stipulates that he support her financially after his marriage. Nevertheless, her disappointment at losing the 20,000 duros is reflected in her advice to her servant Rosa: "Cásate, Rosa; cásate en el momento...¡desgraciadas de las solteras que llegan á mi edad!...¡Ay! los sobrinos, los sobrinos son la mayor plaga de la sociedad!...¿Sabes el porvenir que me espera? Envolver sobrinos, menear la cuna... ¡He aquí la ocupación de las tías!" (I: 13) She might have been independent for a time, but she bails him out in the end. He has not learned from his past mistakes because she gave him money. Her plaintive tone points to the likelihood of this type of financial rescue by many members of her generation. The older generation thus sacrifices happiness and money, while the younger generation may not learn to save.

A play in which an irreponsible young man like Federico reforms himself and becomes economic man is Ventura de la Vega's *El hombre de mundo* (1845). The protagonist, a former don Juan, is now married and "newly rich" in the figurative sense, i.e. that he has learned to embrace a less materialistic, less hedonistic lifestyle, value quality over quantity and treasure his wife rather than attempt to court multiple women. Reformed, he is conscious of his role as head of a household and family and critical of other men who may be behaving as dishonestly as he once did. His conduct signals a philosophical shift from being an unreasonable *romántico* to becoming a hardworking economic man.

Don Luis, once a seducer of women, is now married to Clara. He disapproves of the romantic choices of his sister-in-law Emilia, who in turn disapproves of him, as she has heard

about his previous exploits. Clara is unconcerned about her husband's past and argues that even a rake can change:

CLARA. ...Dicen que los calaveras
son después buenos maridos.
Ya lo veremos. Sintiera
convencerme de que tiene
alguna excepción la regla.

DON LUIS. No seré yo la excepción,
puedes creerlo. Estoy fuera de combate. La mayor
diversión que ahora me queda
es ponerme en un rincón
y pasar horas enteras
viendo como pillo al vuelo
los guiños de inteligencia
de los amantes. Es mucha
mi práctica en la materia
y tengo ya tan presentes
las astucias y las tretas
que he visto usar... (I: 2)

He insists he is out of the game. He no longer spends time participating; he is a spectator. Although he once used an elaborate set of tricks to seduce women, he has now chosen to use that capital in a different way: for example, warning women against men who act as he once did.

Don Luis insists he does not miss the money he had as a bachelor: "Yo con todas mis riquezas, / jamás he sido feliz. / La felicidad es ésta; / ¡ésta que ahora gozo! Hallar / una dulce compañera, / ¡una casa, una familia!" (I: 2). He has embraced a simpler life at home with his wife.

Reunited with his friend don Juan, his partner in crime from earlier playboy days, don Luis insists that his values have since changed. It is as if don Luis were confronting an earlier version of himself, embodied in his friend. To Juan's surprise, don Luis claims he did not marry for money or even for love, but he is satisfied with his lot in life. Describing his change of lifestyle and reasons for being with Clara, he explains:

> DON LUIS. No tiene un maravedí.
>
> Ni el dinero me movía,
>
> ni amor me ofuscaba el alma;
>
> por eso pude con calma
>
> observar lo que valía. (I: 6)

The "calma" with which don Luis has begun to observe the world around him is more in line with Enlightenment rationalism than with the romanticism of his prior existence as a seducer. In contrast to don Luis, don Juan is not ready to leave behind the life of a seducer, and he plans to continue wandering throughout Europe and spending money.

Independent Clara insists on leaving her husband at home when she goes shopping because she claims she does not want to annoy him (I: 5). Among her purchases, Don Luis finds a man's ring that does not fit him, and he begins to fret that she is behaving towards him as he might have behaved towards her in his previous life. Additionally, he has an encounter with Antoñito, the husband of a woman with whom he was once involved, and becomes convinced

that Antoñito is seducing Clara. Luis has begun to fear being treated in the same way in which he once treated his conquests. He becomes convinced that his wife is being unfaithful to him and that he is being made to look like a fool.

Throughout the play, his past comes back to haunt him, and his doubts about Antoñito's integrity and his wife's fidelity demonstrate that he is paying a price for his past actions. Although his suspicions turn out to be unfounded, Clara makes him pay —in the monetary sense— for having doubted her. In a surprise move, she announces that she now owns property in Andalusía, thanks to him; he bequeathed it to her, among the terms of a separation letter he wrote while under the belief that she was being unfaithful. As punishment for her husband's foolishness in accusing her of infidelity, Clara transfers his property to her sister as a wedding gift (III: 19). Although he has spent years seducing women and enjoying an advantage in that game, he has met his match in Clara, who turns out more adept at reading and understanding contract language than he and who restores rationality and order to the marriage.

From *hombre de mundo,* we now look in depth at the figure of another man who has been to places many of his compatriots will never see: the *indiano.* In the Duque de Rivas's *Tanto vales cuanto tienes* (1828), an *indiano* is portrayed positively. Returning to Spain from a long stay in the Americas, where he has amassed a fortune, don Blas encounters financial disorder in his family home. This *indiano* proves to be the voice of reason and moderation amid his siblings' excess —in contrast to don Canuto of *La familia a la moda.*

To understand the character of an *indiano* like don Blas, who figures prominently in *Tanto vales cuanto tienes,* it would be useful to view some definitions of *indiano. Indianos* are portrayed and defined in diverse ways in the plays I examine here. Early images of the *indiano* include a non-aristocratic Spaniard who becomes miserly, and one who becomes generous and

charitable (Mariscal 56). One of the best-known *indianos*, the Marquis Juan Manuel de Manzanedo (1803-1882) was the richest man in Madrid by 1875, in absolute as well as relative terms (Bahamonde, *Américas* 202). He used his fortune to fund urban planning projects in Madrid and to invest in the development of banks, real estate and other institutions. The fact that he and other *indianos* brought the bulk of the fortune they made overseas back to Spain for investment and infrastructure development sets the *indiano* apart from compatriots who made their fortune in that era but scattered their earnings across the globe (Bahamonde, *Américas* 201). In this sense, the *indiano* could be a source of national economic renewal, and analysis of the literature of the period bears this out. Eva Copeland points out that Galdós places the *indiano* at the center of two of his novels —*Tormento* (1884) and *La loca de la casa* (1893)— and depicts him as a conduit for Spain's renewal in the second of them (225). The play I have chosen to analyze in which the *indiano* is portrayed this way is from 1828. Thus, at least half a century before Galdós, writers already envisioned this regenerative role for the *indiano*.

In *Tanto vales cuanto tienes*, the brothers and sisters of don Blas, who is expected to return shortly from the Americas, interpret literally the expression that forms the play's title: you are worth only as much as you own. For most members of this family, monetary gain is the objective, and a person's material wealth is the measure of others' interest in interacting with him or her. The superficial reigns supreme in this home; according to the *indiano*'s sister doña Rufina, it is of utmost importance "que Blas no nos encuentre viviendo como gitanos, como perdidos" (I: 10). Appearance is everything to her, as evidenced by her home furnishings, which are "inmutable," as well as her claim to be a marquise. Opportunistic, arrogant and haughty, doña Rufina hopes to take advantage of her brother's new American wealth. Before the arrival of her *indiano* brother, she falls deep into debt by buying furniture, dishes and other luxury items

for the house. She assumes that with his extensive treasure from the Americas, her brother will easily be able to pay off the debt she has incurred.

Doña Rufina's excesses are detailed from the beginning of the play, where she goes on the following shopping spree, one of many:

> RUFINA. Corriendo toda Sevilla,
>
> ...conseguí del ebanista
>
> Que vive en calle de Francos
>
> Una cómoda, un sofá,
>
> Una mesa y lavamanos,
>
> Con que pondremos decente
>
> Al menos de Blas el cuarto. (I: 10)

These purchases, ostensibly for don Blas, are clearly for more than one person to use. Once doña Rufina begins shopping, she is unable to restrain herself, in part because the array of goods is so staggering. On her shopping trips, she encounters: "...también alquilar ofrece / dos fuentes y cuatro platos / de plata, con sus cubiertas, / mantel, servilletas, vasos... / Finalmente, todo aquello / que parezca necesario / para los primeros días" (I: 10). Since she does not have the cash to pay for the goods, she buys on credit, on the belief that don Blas will pay all these expenses upon his return to Sevilla.

Doña Rufina's materialism is a distortion of the idea of the home as an integral component of Western bourgeois identity in the nineteenth century:

> [The nineteenth-century home] embodied the main symbolic elements of bourgeois lifestyle: family life and material refinement. The family provided individual fulfillment and a basis for collective order, while the bourgeois house,

> its abundant material culture indicating social position, served as an expression of the right of privacy and a foundation for a new capitalist economy based on consumption. (Cruz, *Rise* 53)

Given that the house and its interior furnishings are viewed as markers of identity and social status, doña Rufina accumulates luxury items for the home. Additionally, furniture is a sign of a family's purchasing power, its tastes, its lifestyle and its social function (Cruz, *Rise* 78).

As demonstrated in *Tanto vales cuanto tienes*, the home is an idea as well as reality:

> As an idea, the nineteenth-century home was represented as a space embodying all beneficial outcomes from the culture of domesticity and consumer culture, as well as an essential instrument of social distinction. As a reality, the home is always the result of compromise between social aspirations, daily requirements, and economic possibility. (Cruz, *Rise* 67)

In order to show off to the rest of the community and thus gain social acceptance, doña Rufina pushes the limits of the economically possible by taking out loans and buying furniture on credit.

Doña Rufina's excessive consumption of material goods owes in part to a desire to show off to and outdo the neighbors; i.e. to the role of imitation as a driver of increased consumption. Today, this phenomenon would be referred to colloquially as "keeping up with the Joneses." In nineteenth-century Spain, emulative consumption was limited to a small segment of society, due to the low standard of living among the lower classes (Cruz, *Rise* 78) —hence the economic inequality that don Blas observes and condemns when he arrives in Sevilla.

The increased availability of goods is one factor in doña Rufina's extravagance, but so is social pressure:

> In Spain, the culture of domesticity originated and evolved in much the same way as it did in the rest of Europe, although it took hold more slowly given the particularities of Spanish social and economic development. While its roots extend back to the Renaissance, its transformation into a hegemonic practice did not happen until the second half of the nineteenth century, much later than in England and France. Not unlike in other countries, domesticity in Spain was driven by three major impulses: changes in religious thought; advances in technology, industrialization, and consumer culture; and evolving values and attitudes carried out initially by the Enlightenment and later by romanticism with its deep impact on affective relations between the sexes. (Cruz, *Rise* 54)

Not only is there perceived pressure to buy goods, but there is also real pressure due to prevailing attitudes within her circle.

Doña Rufina's disdain for the servants and other members of lower classes stems from her having been married —for one month— to a marquis. She is a hypocrite because she denies her modest origins. She is ashamed of her father's profession, about which her daughter Paquita reminds her: "Pero ¡si mi abuelo era / un miserable barquero, / y sólo de marinero / a Lima fue!..." (I: 7). Furthermore, in anticipation of the imminent return of don Blas, doña Rufina no longer approves of Paquita's plans to marry Juan, as she feels Paquita could now climb the social ladder thanks to don Blas's newfound fortune : "mas ya que viene su tío / nuestras deudas a pagar, / y la casa a levantar, / casarte mejor confío" (I: 7). Doña Rufina is a bad mother. Selfish, tyrannical and scheming, she does not train her daughter, nor does she provide her with a sustainable way of life. Indeed, by buying on credit, she is depriving her daughter of the chance to be able to afford to live adequately.

The counterweight to doña Rufina's attitude is don Blas's modest character and moderate approach to living. He is described by his brother don Alberto as follows: "Un hombre a quien se le da / poco del fausto y grandeza" (II: 22). Simple and plain in appearance and speech, don Blas inventories doña Rufina's belongings and scolds his siblings for their irresponsible behavior: "...tenéis dos lacayos, / vajilla de plata y otras / comodidades y aun lujos, / que nunca los pobres logran. / ¿Os faltará economía? / Pues a mí, que de estas cosas / entiendo, el manejo dadme..." (III: 9). In the next chapter, "The Moneylender, the Creditor," we will see how don Blas stops his siblings from wasting additional money.

Don Blas's unease with his sister's acquisitiveness emphasizes how unstable and constantly shifting the social space of the middle class was in the nineteenth century and the moral gap between him and his siblings. Since he eschews elegance and luxury, he feels uncomfortable in the presence of the two servants his sister has hired and is horrified to hear her refer to them as her "lacayos." When she insists to him, "Lo exige nuestro rango," he corrects her: "Será el tuyo; pero el mío..." (II: 21). This exchange between brother and sister illustrates that one is not born to a socioeconomic rank, but one rather performs it.

As manipulative as doña Rufina can be, don Blas turns out to be more skillful at playing the money game. Upon learning of the arrival of various creditors, the cabinetmaker and don Simeón at his family's door, and of the reasons why they wish to see him, he bluffs, claiming that he was robbed of his fortune on the way back to Spain. Doña Rufina falls for this trick and, believing that her brother is no longer wealthy, becomes angry and orders her staff to discard the entire meal prepared in honor of her brother. As a result, don Blas realizes that "aquel cariñazo era / no a vuestro hermano, a sus bienes" (II: 31). So irritated is doña Rufina that she no longer wishes for him to remain in the house, even though he apparently has nowhere else to stay.

Blinded by greed, doña Rufina meddles in the relationship between Paquita and Juan by dismissing him as soon as she learns of the fortune don Blas made in the Americas. With regard to Paquita's dowry, she announces, "Tú aquí lo has de recibir, / y bien le puedes decir / que lo tratado, tratado" (III: 8). Her use of the term "lo tratado, tratado" indicates she views family matters as pure business.

Realizing that his sister does not genuinely love him and that her true motive is to benefit from the treasure he acquired in the Americas, don Blas revises his last will and testament. This agile reaction to the changed reality that greets him on his return to Spain demonstrates his familiarity with contractual language, another advantage he holds over his family. His young niece Paquita is the only family member who expresses genuine affection and compassion towards him. Upon hearing the news of his purported financial loss, she returns to him the pearl necklace that he gave her years ago, so that he will have some means of financial support. She refuses to wear it, for "es de mucho lujo / para la situación en que nos vemos. / Además, francamente, / si acaso lo conservo, pronto estará empeñado" (III: 13). By shunning luxury and pre-empting her mother's sale of the pearls, Paquita demonstrates she is a pragmatic, economic woman. Her action represents hope for her generation, notwithstanding the financial irresponsibility of some of her elders.

When don Blas reveals the truth, he insists that he and the family "arreglemos nuestras cosas ... como muy buenos hermanos, / que al fin lo somos, ahora / arreglaremos el modo / de vivir en paz" (III: 9), but his sister contradicts him: "¿Qué tenemos que arreglar?" This family conversation could be an allegory of power, which envisions the redistribution of wealth and peaceful coexistence among rival political factions. A symbolic redistribution of wealth also occurs in *La bolsa* (which we saw in the first chapter), where Santillán, a stockbroker, provides

cash to a farmer. In response to this suggested redistribution of wealth, doña Rufina becomes angry, insults her brother by calling him "marinero o aljamel...con tu tosca facha y tus sucios modales" (III: 9) —although their father was a sailor— and throws Paquita out into the street. Her reaction represents the middle class's insistence on maintaining its privileges and resistance to the lower classes' economic betterment. At the end of *Tanto vales cuanto tienes*, doña Rufina's greed is punished, and Paquita is compensated for her goodness (Delamarre 478). Don Blas rewards her by granting her a dowry and punishes the others by giving them nothing.

Discussions of shifting values throughout the play, particularly of values concerning work, are important markers of social change during the period. Doña Rufina boasts that brothers don Miguel and don Alberto continue "grados y honores buscando" (I: 7). Moreover, when don Blas arrives, he calls for the "señor capitanazo" Miguel, but the truth is that Miguel has changed professions. Indeed, Paquita asks why Miguel no longer goes with his regiment, but no one answers her. Don Miguel abandons his military duties for the opportunity to win easy money by gambling. Doña Rufina explains, "...le he encargado / que nos busque algún dinero / aunque sea con quebranto, / pues siempre los jugadores / hallan quien les preste" (I: 10). Later it is revealed that don Miguel has sustained losses at gambling and therefore fallen into debt. This family conversation, and another in Juan de Alba's *El porvenir de las familias* (1865) (to be discussed later in this chapter), hold commonalities with regard to generational conflict. Values are breaking down for economic reasons: in the nineteenth century, the once-honorable life and work of a soldier is beginning to be valued less than the opportunity to become rich easily by gambling. When don Miguel criticizes don Blas's conduct during the alleged theft of his treasure, don Blas points out don Miguel's lack of experience in battle:

DON BLAS. ...no es gran bravura estar

hecho sólo a blasfemar

allá en la casa de juego.

DON MIGUEL. Soy un militar de honor,

y tengo al lado una espada

con que daré una estocada

al mismo Cid Campeador.

DON BLAS. Honor..., siendo un petardista?

¿Espada...? Suele, quizás,

traerla de adorno y no más

quien tiene lengua tan lista. (II: 30)

This rebuke reflects a concern that the masculine honor associated with the occupation of being a soldier is becoming obsolete. Don Blas also expresses anxiety over the moral impoverishment that accompanies the rejection of military duty and attraction towards gambling and other leisurely pursuits. Later we will encounter parallels between don Blas's commentary about don Miguel's new activities and Fernando's commentary in *El porvenir de las familias* about having earned a living with their own blood and suffering on the battlefield.

If don Blas is an economic man and don Miguel is not, then don Alberto and doña Rufina are not economic persons either. By describing don Blas as a simple, non-materialistic man, don Alberto calculates in advance: "Rufina, tanto mejor: / mientras menos gaste Blas, / a entrambos nos toca más..." (II: 24). In addition, upon discovering that don Blas has insured his treasure, doña Rufina becomes "fuera de sí de contenta" (III: 18) saying to don Alberto, "aún no hemos perdido el juego" because to them, obtaining don Blas's money is not about family at all, but rather about games and gambling.

Doña Rufina does not play this game adeptly. She makes the following calculations, which indicate that all the money that don Blas has sent to the family up to now has been spent:

RUFINA. La primera vez mandó
seis mil y tantos doblones,
que en pretender y en funciones
mi hermano Alberto gastó.
Envió poco después
diez mil pesos, que el demonio
se llevó en mi matrimonio
con mi difunto marqués;
y ha tres años recibimos
ocho mil, cuya mitad
se gastó en la necedad
de aquel pleito que perdimos,
y los demás para el juego
cual sabéis se destinaron;
y a la verdad que volaron
más pronto que árbol y fuego. (I: 11)

Instead of accepting responsibility for her losses, doña Rufina tends to blame others, or circumstances, such as lawsuits or gambling. She does not understand that one cannot spend more than one possesses —one of the meanings of the title of the play. For this reason, don Blas scolds her for not having saved— that is, for not having been an economic woman. He now has a pretext for taking economic control of the family by means of his last will and testament. We

will see additional facets of don Blas's role within the family in Chapter Three, "The Moneylender, the Creditor."

Another clash of values within the family is at the center of Antonio Gil y Zárate's *Don Trifon, o Todo por el dinero* (1841). Don Trifón, a wealthy capitalist, lives in luxury with many expensive home furnishings. His sister Petra criticizes his preoccupation with the stock market, bond prices and potential earnings and his business dealings with Livorio, a speculator. Trifón's response to Petra's scolding is: "¿Es usted hombre? pues basta; el dinero es su Dios único; y desde el bueno hasta el malo, desde el sabio hasta el más rudo, podrá no creer en Dios; pero en el oro, es seguro" (III: 4). From his perspective, money is a new religion and universal in its attraction.

His daughter Leonor, in love with the poor poet Carlos, becomes caught in the middle of the clash of opposing values. Do culture (Carlos) and honor (Petra) lose out to money (Trifón and Livorio)? Leonor's fate seems to depend on the outcome of the battle between the forces represented by her aunt and Carlos on one side, and her father and Livorio on the other.

Carlos and Livorio's definitions of how best to live life differ. Livorio, as a speculator, is free of worry about money and for that reason urges his former classmate to abandon books in order to become rich, but he is also devoid of culture. Carlos has culture by way of his books and is free of the vice of money.

Carlos has had money before but lost most of it due to "la facción" and questions the value of being noble during a time of revolution (I: 1). Don Trifón also alludes to revolution: "¡La patria está sobre un volcán!" (III: 4). These comments reflect the changing political landscape, civil unrest and regional skirmishes during the years of the First Carlist War (1832-1839) and beyond. During the period 1840-1843, Baldomero Espartero was Regent (Shubert

108). He became the idol of the urban lower classes, particularly in Madrid (Shubert 108). In 1841, Espartero crushed moderate military uprisings across Spain (Bahamonde and Martínez 233).

Amid this instability, Leonor and Carlos fall in love and ask Doña Petra to become their ally. However, Leonor's father has other plans. Of love and marriage, Don Trifón shrewdly remarks that they have nothing to do with each other: "No es asunto este de amor....¡Linda boda haríamos!...Caudales, y no inclinaciones junto" (III: 4). The money, and not the human beings behind it, is all that he believes important. Trifón and Livorio agree they need Leonor's aunt, Doña Petra, on their side because she is a rich widow and the inheritance she could give to Leonor is attractive to them. In this way she is like doña Guiomar in *La familia a la moda* — perceived by family as useful only for her money, but in fact more powerful than they because she knows how to use it as leverage.

Livorio thinks aloud about the inheritance amount, which is tempting regardless of any attraction he might or might have towards a woman ("aun á la mas fea cara el dinero la hace divina" (III: 1). He is not in love with Leonor. In fact, he is thinking of another woman he might marry who would bring him "renta igual" (III: 1). His reference to this second woman in terms of income shows his indifference. He does not view them as individuals. To him, they are goods, from whose use he expects to benefit. For Carlos the poet, in contrast, marriage is a question that has nothing to do with money. It is about love.

Don Livorio does not like doña Petra but believes he needs to stay on her good side in order to obtain Leonor's inheritance: "ocho mil duros de renta" (III: 1). Rational doña Petra questions don Livorio's motives for marrying her niece: "¿Con que tanto le esclaviza mi sobrina, á lo que entiendo?" (III: 2). She suspects that don Livorio has another potential mate and is

merely using Leonor: "¿Tiene, segun la ocasión, una ostensible pasión, y otra guardada?"(III: 2). She intends to do whatever is necessary to intercept a possible marriage between don Livorio and her niece: "Y viendo estoy que si yerra sus tiros á mi sobrina, bien aceptará esta ruina por el tesoro que encierra" (III: 3). By looking after her niece's interests, Petra is protecting her family from values she does not embrace. Additionally, upon discovering that Carlos may have been the true author of the pamphlet that might lead to her brother's imprisonment, she confronts him: "¿Con que usted es, caballero, quien compromete á mi hermano?" (III: 7). Her rock-hard convictions lead her to defend her family against dishonor. Trifón does not hesitate to reveal that Carlos is the true author of the pamphlet (III: 7). By doing so, he seems to represent the betrayal of culture by means of money.

Livorio's lack of character is immediately apparent to Petra, as she suspects Livorio was an accomplice to Trifón in the matter of the pamphlet (III: 4). Trifón, unlike Petra, judges Livorio's suitableness as a potential son-in-law in terms of his accomplishments in the stock market: "Un yerno que si le busco con candil, no he de encontrar otro mas...en la Bolsa los negocios más granados son los suyos" (III: 4).

Petra presents Carlos as an ideal suitor for Leonor, reminding Trifón about Carlos's studies, knowledge and good family, but he finds fault with Carlos for being "¡Un poeta! ¡Un pobretón!...La poesía no tiene en la Bolsa curso" (III: 4). Carlos does not fit into Trifón's moneyed world. Yet he is a willing accomplice in Trifón's plan to create chaos in the political world and make money from it.

The pamphlet that Carlos writes for don Trifón leads to accusations of libel and rebellion, but Trifón seems unconcerned, even when Petra begins to fret (III: 5). His lack of concern that his name is directly associated with a scandal and his preoccupation with his possible election

signal the ease with which politicians are swayed by money, as well as a lack of patriotism. Trifón does not show any signs of concern until he finds out he is going to jail.

When the notary appears and informs Trifón of the sentence, Carlos rushes to correct the situation by admitting that the pamphlet is in fact his work. Carlos firmly declares that it is he, not Trifón, who should go to jail (III: 8). Arts and culture thus appear willing to sacrifice themselves, and money goes free. This tension between the arts on one hand and money on the other is a recurring theme that we encountered earlier, throughout Chapter One, "The Banker, the Stockbroker." There, in *Achaques del siglo actual*, banker Olmedo and his son-in-law clash over the place of arts in society. Relieved, Trifón quickly confirms the information given by Carlos. The notary refuses to take Carlos to jail and insists that it is Trifón who must go, according to the law. This leaves Leonor furious at Carlos, which fills Livorio with glee, as he wished to sabotage Carlos. Carlos is determined to defend Trifón and win Leonor back.

Livorio's use of the diminutive suffix in "escritorzuelos," (III: 7) in reference to Carlos, indicates his disdain for writers and, more broadly, the nouveau riche's disdain for culture. Acquitted, Trifón is carried home by a cheering crowd and lets a bystander refer to him as "valiente escritor" without correcting him (IV: 3). Trifón admires Carlos's "pico de oro" (IV: 3). Although a poet who does not care for money, Carlos finds his speech is being appropriated in order to help make money for Trifón. Once alone, Trifón claims to be, " ... diputado, escritor; y el gobierno con pavor ve mi fama, mi oro y ciencia....mi entrada será señal de su derrota inminente" (IV: 4). He has not learned his lesson from his near-brush with jail and takes credit for Carlos's work. This dishonesty reflects the exploitation of the literate and intellectuals by the rich and powerful.

When Petra brings her brother a letter indicating that due to the stock market's rise, all who have business with him have come to claim their funds, he panics, knowing he owes millions he does not have: "Y ¿qué me importa la patria a mí?...La patria soy yo" (IV: 5). As far as his money is concerned, he does not care about anyone else's financial well-being. In this sense, he is unpatriotic. In his alarm over being bankrupt, he vacillates between nonchalance towards his nation and identification with it. He then turns to attempting to expedite the marriage of Leonor and Livorio. Meanwhile, Carlos is already at work on a document intended to help Trifón recover his fortune (IV: 6, IV: 7).

Livorio, too, is bankrupt, since his stock market strategy has backfired. He has short sold stock —that is, sold stocks that he does not own, in the belief that the market will decline. However, the stock market has in fact risen, putting him in debt. Now, if the marriage does not take place, he will be unable to pay: "(El dote debe ser mucho)" (IV: 9). Just when Livorio believes he can use the dowry to cover his debt, Trifón has some stipulations: there will be 3% interest, and his son-in-law will be able to access only that interest as long as Trifón lives; the principal will remain locked away until Trifón dies (IV: 9). Evidently, whoever best manipulates the new, tricky math of the changing times makes or keeps his or her fortune.

Livorio's attempt to negotiate a better deal not only leads to deception by Trifón as to his indebtedness, but also underscores both men's perception of marriage as a mere business transaction:

> LIVORIO. Pues iba a hacer buena boda.
>
> TRIFÓN. ¿Que no es buena boda?
>
> LIVORIO. No.
>
> Deme usted la suma toda:

Con la renta ¿qué hago yo?

TRIFÓN. La suma es de usted desde hoy

Mas yo se la hago valer,

Y sus productos le doy;

Me lo debe agradecer.

LIVORIO. Bien la haré valer yo mismo. (IV: 9)

All that is needed is for Leonor to give her consent, according to Trifón: "Quiero en pago de su amor que ahora mismo le dé el sí" (IV: 9). Trifón's reference to his daughter's marriage in financial terms reflects that he does not necessarily care about her happiness.

Alert to this negotiation, Petra is displeased at the prospect of her niece's marriage to Livorio and devises a scheme (IV: 10). She informs Livorio that her brother's losses are far greater than stated. Since Trifón is bankrupt, she must bail him out with her own funds. When she reveals the extent of her wealth —"diez mil duros de renta....otros treinta mil de ahorro" (IV: 10)— Livorio begins to look at her in a new way. In spite of the age difference, she suddenly becomes attractive to him because of her fortune.

Livorio is outraged at Trifón's deception about the amount of his debt. Trifón and Leonor, in turn, express shock at the announcement of Petra and Livorio's wedding. Petra proposes the following condition:

PETRA. Mi hacienda yo les daré

Si consientes esta boda.

LIVORIO. ¿Qué, toda la hacienda?

PETRA. Toda;

Ni un olivo guardaré.

Y los treinta mil de ahorros

También regalo a Trifón;

Para amarnos con pasión

Así quedaremos horros. (IV: 11).

This offer effectively eliminates Livorio, as he realizes there is nothing left in Madrid for him and leaves for Paris (IV: 11).

Petra's bluff to Livorio is a first step in the restoration of order to her family. Furthermore, her ability to pressure Trifón to allow Carlos and Leonor to marry, and to force Trifón to stop playing the stock market and publishing pamphlets, underscores a woman's use of her savings and mastery of business to bring together the family unit she believes ideal. Carlos becomes Leonor's husband, and Trifón is bailed out of debt. In this way, Petra acts as a corrective force towards her family, like doña Guiomar in *La familia a la moda* or don Blas in *Tanto vales cuanto tienes*. Family prevails over money and politics, and the lesson for all resounds in Trifón's call, "¡Si hicieran otros lo mesmo!" (IV: 12). However, it remains to be seen whether Petra is left better off, having given away all she owns.

Another young male figure underestimated by his prospective in-laws, like Carlos in *Don Trifón, o Todo por el dinero*, appears in José Martín y Santiago's *El amor y la lotería: juguete cómico en un acto y en verso* (1871). The impoverished Isidoro Carpanta would like to marry Inocencia, but first he needs to ask her father don Severo for his blessing. Don Severo expresses skepticism about anyone who dares to court his daughter. Glancing at the love letter Inocencia has just received from Isidoro, he proclaims:

DON SEVERO. Tonterías;

pues; lo que me esperaba.

Los políticos y amantes
iguales son en sus farsas.
Siempre las oposiciones
hacen promesas bizarras;
... Pues los muchachos, lo propio
prometen a las muchachas;
que hablarán á la familia,
que se pondrán la casaca...
llegan al poder...y entonces...
se casan, ó no casan. (I: 1)

Cynical don Severo thinks he knows what suitors are like. He assures his daughter he knows Isidoro and his kind. He believes all men are alike when it comes to making promises, but in fact, he is utterly unprepared for who Isidoro turns out to be. While don Severo distrusts politicians and assumes all potential suitors for his daughter would be the same, he throws himself headlong into a business relationship with Isidoro once he discovers what the young man does for a living.

Don Severo loves to play the lottery:

DON SEVERO. ... ¡Jugar a la loteria!..
Esa es mi delicia, y mi...
Y eso que ya han suprimido
la que me hacía tilín:
es claro; miró el Gobierno
y dijo:--“Si de raíz

no corto el mal, al Erario
desde ahora tengo en un tris;
pues tras los cuatro millones
de este terno de Caín,
me van a sacar más oro
que dar puede el Potosí"... (I: 2)

The "eso que ya han suprimido" is an allusion to the government's shutdown of one of its national lotteries, an observation grounded in historical fact. According to economic historian Cecilia Font de Villanueva, the way in which the Spanish *lotto* (a type of lottery common across Southern Europe) was organized at the time —unlike in any other European country that offered a *lotto*— allowed players to bet as much as they wished, instead of setting limits (130). This practice placed the Treasury at grave risk:

> En función de esta modalidad de juego el riesgo que corría la Hacienda era grande. A causa de las cábalas que solían circular antes de los sorteos, era frecuente que se diera la circunstancia de que la cantidad de apuestas realizadas a un mismo número fueran elevadas. En el caso de que dicho número resultara ganador el gasto para la Hacienda podía ser considerable. Para evitar este riesgo se recurría al "cerrado" de los números sobre los que se habían acumulado las apuestas, lo que implicaba no aceptar más apuestas sobre ellos y con ello limitar la cantidad que el Estado gastaría en cada sorteo. (Font de Villanueva 130)

Additionally, the *lotto* was centralized in Madrid, which made screening bets difficult. Refusing to decentralize lottery operations on the grounds that this move would run counter to fiscal reform objectives, the Spanish government instead attempted to limit prize amounts (Font de

Villanueva 131). In November 1861, a player placed an unusually high bet and won one million pesetas, the largest prize to date, and sparked lottery fever throughout Spain (Garvía 34). Government efforts to discourage such high bets failed, and by early 1862, the Treasury was paying out more in prize money than it had managed to collect during the previous year by issuing debt (Garvía 34). Later that year, in the wake of this embarrassing incident, the government dismantled the *lotto*.

Isidoro's name, Carpanta, suggests hunger ("carpanta," def. 1). Indeed, as he candidly explains to don Severo, "estoy tan pobre, tan pobre...que no sé si cena habrá" (I: 3). With this background and his job as a clerk, he is unlikely to receive don Severo's blessing to marry Inocencia. He can barely provide for himself, let alone for a wife. However, he is eager to make money and rise in society. He appears "pobre pero decentemente vestido" (I: 2). He is entrepreneurial, as he describes himself to don Severo:

DON ISIDORO. Yo soy escribiente.
No sé si hablaré en mi daño;
pero engañarle no quiero;
escribiente de un cajero de una sociedad...
De crédito, en la que no
echaré coche, ni rentas;
pero donde haciendo cuentas
de otras, la mía hice yo.
...á los dos días formé
una sociedad ...

DON SEVERO. (*Con indiferencia*.) ¿De qué?

DON ISIDORO. De juego a la lotería.

DON SEVERO. ¿Qué dice usted? (*Saltando en su asiento*.) ...

¿Me da usted parte? ... ¡Lo ha de ignorar mi mujer! (I: 3)

Once his new job as lottery company founder is revealed, Isidoro immediately becomes irresistibly appealing to don Severo, Rosa and their servant, Germana. Reselling the lottery was illegal at the time, yet resellers like Isidoro abounded during this period, due to an uneven distribution system across lottery networks (Álvarez Nogal 96). As represented by don Severo, Rosa and Germana, people from all walks of life buy lottery tickets. Those who have entered with Isidoro's help include, for example: "banqueros...diputados...generales, y... modistas!!..." (I: 3). The opportunity to become wealthy extends to people of various classes and occupations.

Having helped don Severo enter the lottery, Isidoro reiterates his desire to marry Inocencia, but don Severo remains dismissive and abdicates responsibility for the decision to his wife: "Esos son otros cantares, / mi señor don Isidoro. / Y de esto que es preciso / que se entere mi mujer... la querella / usted la arregla con ella; / y yo despues..." (I: 3). Once entered in the lottery don Severo can think about nothing else. Like love, lottery fever drives a person to distraction. A person can be just as crazy about fantasizing a win as he/she is about love.

Isidoro's revelation that he has begun a lottery company excites Rosa as much as it did don Severo. Unbeknownst to her husband, Rosa also plays the lottery and has done so for the last three decades, as she explains to Isidoro. However, she lost out when the government shut down the lottery and wonders aloud whether there might be a better way to run the operation:

ROSA. ...por que

como todos los ahorritos

que hacer puede una mujer

ochavo á ochavo, no juntan...

vamos...¿me comprende usted?

... No he podido

jugar un décimo de

la moderna, y mucho meno

pudiera hacerlo esta vez,

porque los premios son grandes,

y los décimos...también! (I: 4)

In suggesting that people pool their betting money, Rosa is referring to a then-innovative Spanish social practice, which political scientist and sociologist Roberto Garvía calls syndicate play (70). This institutionalized form of lottery play took root around the mid-nineteenth century, and since then, Spanish people have continued the tradition of buying and sharing lottery tickets with family, friends, colleagues and acquaintances, which may account for why Spain remains one of the heaviest lottery consumers in the world (Garvía 70). Isidoro's newly founded company, he claims, allows people to participate in the lottery in precisely this way.

Although he manages to enter her name and money in the lottery, Isidoro does not manage to extract a guarantee from Rosa regarding his desire to marry Inocencia. Love and the future of one's children are no longer important questions to address while lottery fever is spreading throughout one's household.

Isidoro flirts with Germana, who is certain he has come to see doña Rosa instead, but he convinces her that she is his beloved and that he was flirting with Rosa to obtain her contribution. This is how Germana enters the lottery pool as well:

DON ISIDORO. (*Sacando su cuaderno.)*

¿Ves que cartilla?

Pues en ella estás puesta,

y has de ser rica.

¿Te convences ahora

de que te quiero? (I: 7)

Intrigues and misunderstandings emerge following Isidoro's private conversations with Rosa and don Severo's with Germana. Don Severo assumes Isidoro is having an affair with Rosa. Germana adds to the confusion by claiming to don Severo that Isidoro declared his love for Rosa. Don Severo pays her for the information. Rosa assumes don Severo is having an affair with Germana. Again, lottery and love are intertwined, as members of the household confuse one with the other in conversations with Isidoro that they have witnessed. This confusion also occurs in *La bolsa y el bolsillo* and *Los tres banqueros* (Chapter One), where husbands assume that their wives are being unfaithful when they are in fact engaging in business with other men.

Isidoro informs the family that they have won the grand prize. Only now, as they rejoice, does don Severo bring up the subject of Isidoro's possible marriage to Inocencia again. It is clear to the audience, but not to the family, that Isidoro has played every one of them in a confidence game. The lottery, much like love, has made fools of them all.

Germana is silenced by Isidoro when she tries to set the record straight. She becomes angry upon discovering that Isidoro plans to marry Inocencia. She glares at the family as Rosa asks her to leave. The poor and the working classes, who need the winnings the most, are left out of the game. I will discuss some have-nots like Rosa in the final chapter.

Money and marriage mingle again in Antonio Alcalde y Valladares's *Quiero dinero: pieza en un acto y en verso* (1860), where matchmaking attempts by an opportunistic aunt go

wrong. In this work, competing marriage scenarios seem to represent different paths for Spain to follow. The impetus for these marriage scenarios is an *indiano*'s return from the Americas, and the images of the *indiano* in this text are distinct from others presented in this chapter.

Young Amalia is practicing piano for a relative, Benito, who is returning soon to Spain from exile in Havana. Her late uncle's dying wish was for Amalia to be married to cousin Benito. However, her aunt, doña Pepa, has other ideas. Pepa wishes to marry Amalia off to don Rufo (about 60 years old), who is coming back to Cádiz from Manila on a "fragata cargada de oro y de plata" (I: 1). She believes a man of a certain age will free Amalia of the "caos" that surrounds them and their current "sociedad...mala" (I: 1). Amalia is not sure she wants to marry an older man. She suggests that her aunt take don Rufo as a husband and let her marry Benito, as her uncle would have wished. Amalia feels she would sacrifice a promising future if she married don Rufo, but Pepa threatens to disinherit her if she refuses. Later, to Amalia, don Rufo reveals that he feels he is sacrificing himself for the sake of her old aunt's schemes.

Amalia's musical talent and love for all things Italian suggest one possible path for the nation: one favoring arts and culture, not merely riches, and inclusive of foreign influences. Don Rufo's references to Cervantes –"sea usted mi Dulcinea y yo seré su Quijote"– and offers to take Amalia to Lima, Tranquebar (India) and other kingdoms , as well as his insincere expressions of love from their first meeting amuse her (I: 2). His love of Cervantes seems out of place in this new age in which money is Pepa's obsession. However, it does suggest a possible future for Spain that involves a return to old values.

Doña Pepa's story about the death of all her children in infancy of various diseases and defects (I: 4) may represent failed attempts at building or governing the nation. Since her ship has set sail from Manila to Cádiz, she plans to use all the treasures aboard to pay for her wedding

(I: 4). Don Rufo's disapproval of this plan, along with his allusion to Cervantes, supports the representation of Doña Pepa as government powers that steer the nation in the wrong direction.

Amalia and Benito appear, and don Rufo is disturbed by Benito's explanation of why he was sent to Havana: "El Gobierno es quien me aturde / que ha sacado de presidio / a ese ladrón...aquí urgen / muy serias explicaciones" (I: 8). Don Rufo threatens Benito. He claims to know something about him and will bring soldiers to get him. He predicts the young couple will go hungry because the aunt is going to disinherit Amalia. Don Rufo still wants to marry Amalia, apparently. Benito challenges don Rufo to a duel to settle things once and for all. The contrast between young Benito, the *indiano* who made his fortune in Cuba, and the older Rufo, who returned to Spain from Manila, seems to parallel contrasting visions of Spain's future. Don Rufo's suspicion of Benito reflects a mistrust of *indiano* wealth acquired in the Americas.

Benito's new money trumps Pepa's, as he assures Amalia he has land in Cuba. Therefore the loss of her inheritance would not affect them. The young couple decides to leave for the Americas. Doña Pepa tears up her will and hereby disinherits them. When Benito announces to the aunt that he and Amalia are leaving for Havana, don Rufo calls it a "Golpe de estado" (I: 14). The future, therefore, seems to be secure with Spain turning toward Cuba.

The sinking of Pepa's ship, and with it, her dreams of wealth, leads her to beg don Rufo to marry her. He refuses at first. She wails that she is now poor and Benito and Amalia cannot help her because they, too, are poor. However, the family is saved by Benito's vast fortune in trade which he made in Cuba: "El Gobierno me amparó y con su apoyo y mi suerte...," he became rich (I: 15). Pepa realizes that he was not banished or exiled after all, and that she will be supported. Again, Cuba seems to be Spain's future.

The ability of Benito's Cuban wealth to save the family reflects Spain's anxiety over Cuba in the mid-1850s. According to Christopher Schmidt-Nowara, "Once again, a liberalizing revolution in Spain, this time in 1854, had the paradoxical effect of reaffirming the metropolitan government's commitment to colonial slavery" (28). Tensions had continued throughout the 1840s between Spain and Cuba over the question of "whitening" (Schmidt-Nowara 28). Spain still needed Cuba because it was among the only remaining colonies and had a labor force and sugar economy. Indeed, there was "increasing interest in the colonial question in Spain in the 1850s. The Moderate president Juan Bravo Murillo created an Overseas Council, the Consejo de Ultramar, in an attempt to consolidate the colonial administration, which was scattered among several ministries" (Schmidt-Nowara 34). Political change in Spain had the potential to alter policies towards Cuba in ways that threatened Spain's economic interests:

> The revolution of 1854 brought the Progressive Party back to power in Spain after ten years of increasingly repressive Moderate rule. The Progressive colonial policy at that moment consisted of appeasing the Cuban slaveholders who had been thrown into a panic by rumors of abolition, sale to the United States, and the annexationist adventures. On the other hand, advocates of liberal reforms in the colonies made their appearance in Spain. (Schmidt-Nowara 35)

Benito, as the *indiano* returning home, is portrayed positively. His Cuban fortune will save Spain and help to renew the nation.

Some nouveaux riches come into their wealth reluctantly. Others, for example some *indianos*, never reintegrate into Spanish society and find that money, although it may buy a title, cannot buy everything. In Francisco Botella y Andrés's *El rico y el pobre* (1855), characters who display these anxieties coexist. We see an *indiano* with a dark side—not the *indiano* as Galdós

envisioned him, as a potential source of national renewal. (I discuss Galdós's vision of the *indiano* earlier in this chapter, in the context of my profile of don Blas in *Tanto vales cuanto tienes*.) This manifestation of the nouveau riche cannot buy off the poor, and here the poor do not easily move into the role of the nouveau riche because their values dictate otherwise. Honor and convictions win out over the temptation of the poor and hungry to accept money that does not belong to them. We will also encounter poor people with honor and convictions in Chapter Four, "The Have-Nots," where we will examine José María Gutiérrez de Alba's *Vanidad y pobreza* (1860).

In *El rico y el pobre*, young Adela frets about her family's welfare and how marrying her poor suitor would not help the situation. She cries and prays for her family's situation to improve. She is a good daughter, whose values mirror those of her parents.

Definitions of nobility in this play vary depending on who is speaking. Adela's mother, María, tells her of the soldiers among whom Adela's father fought to liberate Spain. According to her, to be noble is to fight for Spain, not necessarily to be born with a title: "La noble sangre de los hijos de ese pueblo regó las calles y selló el triunfo de la libertad...Nobles españoles, tan solo con su sangre lograron hacer célebre, tan célebre, el inolvidable Dos de Mayo" I: 1). Nobility is not merely a title. It is also patriotism.

Antonio, Adela's brother, is poor but idealistic: "...no está lejos el momento en que el pueblo oprimido recobre sus derechos y selle con su sangre el nombre de la santa causa...Me contemplo un gigante capaz de hacer desaparecer de un soplo esos palacios que insultan nuestra pobreza y esos banquetes que ultrajan nuestra miseria" (I: 3). He represents the politically active youth who feel revolution needs to repeat itself until equality is attained. This appears to be a critique of the haves by the have-nots. The mention of revolution and hunger is a possible

allusion to the government crises and uprisings in 1854, particularly following a bad harvest, a rise in grain prices and grain shortages (Bahamonde and Martínez 307). In Chapter Four, "The Have-Nots," we will encounter another restless youth with revolutionary ideals.

Adela's father Pedro fought for his country, is loyal to the Crown, and now is forced to ask a noble for help because his family cannot eat. This encounter between Pedro and the Conde exposes the tensions in society between the nobility and the lower classes. The Conde's response, which includes a story about an exiled prince, indicates his dissatisfaction with the current queen:

> CONDE. Sabes que hace tiempo un príncipe castellano gime en el destierro la ingratitud de los que son sus verdaderos hijos; una pandilla de hombres ilusos proclamó con dañado intento reina de esta desgraciada nacion á una princesa á quien por ningun título corresponde la corona...el digno príncipe volverá otra vez á ocupar el trono...¿De bastante os sirve vuestra reina, no estais pereciendo de hambre? (I: 6)

Pedro staunchly defends his queen and says he has sealed his oath of loyalty to her in blood. The time he served in the military likely coincided with Carlist Wars of succession; Isabella II's reign was able to be maintained largely through support of the army, for which Pedro fought. The Conde wants Pedro to remain aware of his financial dependency on him, and the story is his way of reinforcing his economic power over Pedro.

The Conde's financial assistance to Pedro's family comes with a price: in return for money, he wants Adela's hand in marriage. In response to Pedro's impassioned refusal, the Conde reduces their discussion to a business deal he considers already signed, and tantalizes him with a bag of gold: "Ta...ta... ta... la voz del hambre es más imperiosa que la de la honradez, y

pasado el primer arrebato yo creo que concluiremos el negocio...no resistirá, la presa es mía, no hay duda, el oro quebranta la más sólida virtud" (I: 6). Pedro's continued refusal highlights the moral gap between them: "No, nunca, el oro de esta bolsa está envenenado y me mataría con su brillo" (I: 6). The confrontation and persistent hunger lead Pedro to reveal to Adela that she is the adopted daughter of his long-lost brother, who went to the Americas after an affair. He gives her a family heirloom, a portrait in gold of his mother. Never has he been desperate enough to give it away until now. He urges her to keep it forever and to stay with Antonio forever. This pendant symbolizes the family's noble values even in the face of terrible poverty. Pedro is thus urging his children to stand firm together. His family's close bonds represent the solidarity and convictions of the poor masses.

The Conde imposes his power by bringing his men to take Pedro away, and to force Adela to go live with the Conde. He holds her hostage at his home in the belief that eventually his wealth will win her over. However, his efforts to surround her with luxury do not lead to her accepting him as her husband. For example, according to the stage directions, when she first emerges in the Conde's home, Adela "lleva un rico traje, pero descuidadamente prendido: está extremadamente desfigurada y pálida" (II: 5), as if the new riches that have been forced on her are making her uncomfortable and ill. In spite of the Conde's flattery of her and promises that in their garden she will be "la más preciosa flor" (II: 5). To him, she is mere decoration.

By resisting the Conde's advances, Adela acts in a noble manner, whereas the Conde, with his purchased title, behaves anything but nobly. Adela remains true to the values with which Pedro raised her and declares to the Conde, "Respetadme, porque tengo aun sobrada energía para hacerme respetar. Hija de una familia pobre, pero libre como el viento...jamás besaré la mano que me humilla" (II: 5). Instead of remaining the flower and object of love the Conde envisions,

she insists upon her freedom and dignity. The Conde's money cannot buy him her love. In a broader sense, the Conde's behavior mirrors the abuse of power by the nobility or by the government. Adela, with her willingness to drink poison rather than live a life she despises, suggests the firm resistance of the poor to oppression or enticement by the rich.

In Chapter Four, "The Have-Nots," we will reexamine the nobility's suspicious conduct, with that of the Barón in *Vanidad y pobreza* and that of the Conde in *Los hijos del trabajo*, and a discussion of the economic realities behind them.

Upon seeing his daughter dressed in luxurious fabrics in the Conde's opulent home, Pedro assumes she is now one of "them" and feels dishonored. Over her pleas for understanding and forgiveness, he speaks of his heartbreak and vows revenge. Although for Adela, the clothing is not sufficient to make her the Conde's wife, for Pedro it is more than enough to dishonor her and their family. However divided they may seem, they remain firm in their resistance to the Conde, even when Pedro is thrown in jail without cause.

At the Conde's home, Adela finds sympathy from another oppressed person, this one of a different race. Tomás, a black servant of the Conde's, feels sorry for her because she has been taken from her father. As he tells Pedro, "¿Veis el color de mi rostro? El os dice que pertenezco á la desgraciada raza, esclava siempre de inhumanos señores...esa raza, que á la fuerza ha de besar la mano que la humilla, está deseando romper los hierros que la encadenan..." (II: 11). Tomás's conversation with Pedro may be a call for the downtrodden and oppressed of various groups to unite against their oppressors, a warning to the oppressors of possible consequences, or a reflection of a concern of the elites that there will be continued uprisings and chaos. The government seemed unable to maintain public order at the time, given nationwide protests

against food taxes, Carlist assemblies in Catalonia, an unprecedented worker uprising in Barcelona (Fusi Aizpurúa 64).

Ultimately, the warning proves valid as Tomás kills the Conde; he is an example of when the poor and oppressed cannot take it any longer and revolt. However, while Tomás turns to violence to stop his oppressor, Pedro does not. Further evidence of Pedro's honor and convictions, even in the face of oppression, is that Pedro returns the Conde's lost wallet without looking inside. Pedro demonstrates steadfast values. Despite being poor, he does not give in to temptation to take another's money, and not looking inside the wallet demonstrates his respect for other people's belongings and finances.

The wallet contents prove that the *indiano*, now dying, is Pedro's long-lost brother. Poor when he left, he purchased his title after becoming wealthy overseas. The Conde's death represents the failure of this *indiano* to reintegrate into Spanish society. Brother loses brother. They are on different sides economically and politically.

In contrast to the family loss at the end of *El rico y el pobre*, the unity of the family is preserved following a crisis, in Juan de Alba's *El porvenir de las familias*, (1865). In this play, a mother governs the family resources because the father is incapable of doing so. In Chapter Three, "The Moneylender, the Creditor," we will explore the role of the mother, Matilde, and the daughter, Angelita, as creditors to their family. Here, we will examine the father's gambling problem and its impact on the family. Carlos spends much of his time in the casino, while his wife and daughter save money. Carlos's father-in-law, Fernando, has taught Matilde and Angelita to save. Additionally, Fernando has fought for his country, while Carlos has not. A generational and moral gap thus develops between Carlos and Fernando.

The generational or moral gap is also reflected in the debate between Rafael, the false friend who betrays Carlos, and Frasquito, the servant (II: 6). Rafael believes that his generation is going to prosper by speculating, whereas Frasquito foresees its fall due to pride. Frasquito criticizes his master for gambling: "too lo gasta el amo" (I: 1). He wants to marry Manuela. In order to be deserving of her, ultimately follows the grandfather Fernando's example by enlisting in the military. By doing so, he says, "espero que Dios me asista. / y llegue a ser general... / o cabo de escuadra un día" (III: 13). With the help of God and arms, instead of by gambling and seeking other easy means of making money, the servant plans to earn his living. The desire of the servant to follow the example of the grandfather, the father-in-law of his master, is a possible solution to the generational or moral gap. Even if Carlos does not take his father-in-law's advice, Frasquito has been listening and will heed him.

By recalling the "seduction" of his master by money (III: 3), Frasquito calls attention to the phenomenon of casinos in the mid-nineteenth century. Casinos emerged as a public space in which the classes would mingle, a place of leisure because the elites now had more free time. Leisure is represented in this and other plays as a new vice, a social ill that needs to be treated, controlled and corrected. As Fernando describes it, gambling is a "cáncer de la sociedad" (III: 11), a quickly spreading trend that threatens the moral health of society. The increase in free time and its application to social activities, such as in casinos and gambling dens, could be linked to an expansion of urban life (Cruz, *Rise* 171). Complicating matters further was the growing perception of these leisure activities as normal and routine. Thanks to liberal revolutions across Europe, the rights of leisure were codified as an integral aspect of citizenship; participation in this leisure society, a creation of the middle class that is related to modernity and national

development, is an indispensable part of bourgeois life in the nineteenth century (Cruz, *Rise* 171).

Like museums, athenaeums and expositions, casinos, from the 1830s onward, offered diverse cultural activities and helped to articulate polite bourgeois society (Cruz, *Rise* 198). The greatest concentration of casinos was found in Andalucía, where the action of *Tanto vales cuanto tienes* takes place. Initially only middle and upper-class men could be casino members, but later, these social institutions diversified, becoming community organizations that also accepted women as members. Casinos' offerings included not only gambling, but also a wide range of social activities, by way of magazines and books available in their libraries and reading rooms, and dances and parties for members and their children (Cruz, *Rise* 199). Thanks to the availability of all these services and amenities, a man could easily spend the entire day blissfully in the casino, hence the concern that don Miguel in *Tanto vales cuanto tienes* and Carlos of *El porvenir de las familias* will succumb to temptation outside of the home or military regiment.

In *Tanto vales cuanto tienes* and *El porvenir de las familias*, opposing maternal models are presented: doña Rufina on one hand, and Matilde on the other. The mother in *Tanto vales cuanto tienes* ultimately pays for her greedy response to her brother's return and newfound fortune. In *El porvenir de las familias*, the role of both parents and of the grandfather in the preservation of moral values is crucial in safeguarding the economic future of the younger generation. The mother is represented as fundamental in the construction of the nation, and the one who instructs her daughter is contrasted with the materialistic, tyrannical one (González-Allende 74). As for masculine figures, don Blas and Fernando are presented as pragmatic savers, whereas don Miguel, don Alberto, and Carlos are spendthrifts or failures. The daughters, Paquita and Angelita, exemplify generosity, charity and, particularly in the case of Angelita, prudence.

They, along with Matilde, are economically forward-thinking women. With socioeconomic and institutional change, values are thrown into question, and generational and moral gaps widen. As demonstrated in these texts, while women now have increased responsibility for managing households' money, both sexes must accept responsibility for the economic and moral well-being of the family and, collectively, the nation.

Another play in which new ways of becoming wealthy are questioned is Joaquín García Parreño's *El dinero y la nobleza: comedia en cuatro actos y en prosa* (1873). Fernando, a young marquis, has accumulated enormous debt. His father-in-law pays all of his expenses and fixes all his mistakes. Although married, Fernando has his eye on another woman, and he assumes his wife Elisa is ignorant of his actions and intentions. He likes horses, weapons and outward trappings of wealth, particularly those he cannot afford. Pedro, Elisa's godfather, is worried about bequeathing his fortune to don Manzano because he is certain Fernando will squander it, as he has don Manzano's savings.

Manzano is simply an honest businessman with little education and no worldliness. He takes pride in hard work and experience. His attitude suggests that formal education and foreign ideas are overrated. Manzano and Pedro represent opposing sides of the debate over where the nation is heading. Manzano believes that with hard work, one can get anywhere and that trade will help build the nation:

> MANZANO. ...el comercio, es la verdadera escuela de los hombres de Estado.
>
> PEDRO. ...la nación no es una casa de comercio. (I: 4)

Pedro has little respect for politics or business, for he believes those have become the province of the leisure class or the lost. He advises Manzano to begin with his own household before attempting to run the nation or try to marry his daughters off to ruined marquises (I: 4).

Manzano suggests that Elisa persuade her husband to become an ambassador, in order to make himself useful (I: 5). While Elisa is convinced that Fernando would not listen to her, Manzano insists, "el amor se gasta muy aprisa,...es preciso administrarlo como la renta" (I: 5). It is the woman's duty to allocate love, like income, wisely. Pedro admonishes,"Una mujer debe ser la preocupación y no la ocupación de su marido" (I: 5). To them, Fernando has too much free time. Manzano and Pedro thus attempt to impose on Elisa a model of womanhood.

Manzano and Pedro hint to Fernando that the honeymoon is over and he needs to make himself useful, but he insists he has no ambition. In any case, there are only three professions someone of his class can take up: general, bishop, or *labrador* (II: 1). They point to the example set by his friend Hector, who has served his homeland. The contrast between Hector and Fernando parallels that between the father-in-law Fernando and Carlos of *El porvenir de las familias*, and between don Blas and don Miguel in *Tanto vales cuanto tienes* (also studied in this chapter). In each pair, the former has served his country, while the latter refuses to do so and chooses a life of leisure and/or gambling.

Creditors knock on Manzano's door and they are there because of loans Fernando signed in his father-in-law's name. The other men say Fernando should have negotiated better with the moneylenders and simply paid back the capital plus interest more promptly, but Fernando says to have done so would have been a blow to his honor. Bitter about having paid for Fernando's "honor" with his own "probidad," Manzano says, in an aside, that he plans to play a trick on his son-in-law (II: 2).

Elisa's submissiveness to her husband is evident in her seeking his approval and guidance in the tastes of "vuestra sociedad" (II: 4). Her conduct reflects the fawning of the middle class on the nobility, or the blind imitation of the nobility by the middle class. Fernando tells her to learn

from the world, not from the Condesa del Lago whom she admires; he seems to be hinting that she do as he says, not as he does (II: 4). He seems to look down on her "mal tono" (II: 4) and be more upset that his creditors are at the door than about any unhappiness of hers. However, his control of her may not be complete. Elisa tells Fernando her ideas on marriage and love: "el amor por otro que no sea su dueño, es un sentimiento vil contra la naturaleza y contra Dios...Pero, oye; también tiene su reverso la medalla..." (II: 1). At first Fernando thinks this means he owns her for good and she will cater to his whims. However, when she expresses her expectation that he will reciprocate, he becomes apprehensive: "(¡Diablo!)" (III: 1).

The creditors demand the rest of the payment, as Manzano paid only half the amount due (García Parreño II.v). As the contract stipulates, Fernando may pay the balance only with the permission of his wife, which he finds humiliating (II: 5). Elisa signs on his behalf, bailing him out (II: 5). Exasperated that this scheme to teach Fernando a lesson has been foiled, Manzano tries another approach. He puts up Fernando's room for rent and instructs the cook to change the whole menu Fernando has ordered for dinner:

> WATEL. Relevé o segundo plato...Carpas del Rhin, a la Lithuanien... Pollas a la Godard... filete de ternera, con uvas, a la Voltaire... Jamon de Wesfalia...
>
> MANZANO. Hará usted un cambio más sencillo y más llano. El pescado en salsa y con alcaparras...El Jamon...de ahí... de no se donde... de Extremadura... con tomates y la ternera con patatas... (II: 10)

Manzano's revised menu privileges the domestic over the foreign, the simple over the elegant. Although Manzano believes this is another step towards reclaiming control of his own household, Watel quits, saying that Manzano's orders defy the principles of art and would

compromise his reputation as a chef (II: 10). Manzano's exasperation with Fernando's influence over the servants is a symptom of generational and ideological conflict.

Manzano's reappropriation of power is also evident in his announcement to Fernando that he has decided to carry out reforms in the household. To his surprise, Fernando has not been consulted on any of them. In response, Fernando adopts and maintains a mocking tone, certain that Manzano is bluffing.

Fernando is shocked that his room has been rented and he will now be forced to occupy a guest room: "¿Y mis caballos? ¿Estarán también en el cuarto segundo?" to which Manzano tartly replies, "Si pueden subir las escaleras..." (III: 3). His ambition to live in the house free of charge has been challenged.

When Fernando informs him that he plans to move out and find a place of his own, Manzano asks whether he will become a bridge or canal engineer, for otherwise he would not be able to afford "nueve mil reales de renta" (III: 4). Hearing this amount, Fernando is surprised. Manzano explains how he arrived at this figure:

> MANZANO. El balance es muy fácil de presentar. Usted ha recibido un millón de la dote de mi hija. El regalo de la novia y los gastos de boda absorben doscientos setenta mil. En derroches y cuentas pagadas por mí, ciento sesenta mil; acabamos de entregar á los acreedores, cuatrocientos mil, restan por consiguiente ciento ochenta mil, que colocados á un interés, legal, representan nueve mil reales de renta al año; no puede estar más claro. (III: 4)

Manzano has been keeping track of Fernando's expenditures, and only now reveals that he has billed them against his daughter's dowry —thereby further pressuring Fernando to remain in his

home and accept the guest room. With his detailed calculations, Manzano holds the advantage over Fernando, who has no grasp of how much he has spent or squandered so far.

Upon learning of the arrival of a letter from the Condesa, Elisa becomes convinced that her husband is having an affair and is devastated. However, although she is overwhelmed by anxiety and grief and tempted to open the letter, she does not. Her father's protective impulses, on the other hand, lead him to break the seal and read the letter, over her protests: "...el secreto de una carta es sagrado" (III: 8).

Fernando's outrage that the seal on the letter was broken mirrors Elisa's: "¿La ha abierto usted? ¿Y sabe usted, caballero, que ese es un proceder indigno, que esa es una acción propia de un hombre mal educado?" (III: 10) To read someone else's private correspondence is an offense. Fernando is emphasizing Manzano's lack of manners and the difference in upbringing between them both.

While neither Manzano nor Fernando acts nobly —Manzano because he opens the letter, and Fernando because he has not made himself useful to society— it is Elisa who does act nobly, restoring honor to the family. To the shock of the men, she tears up the letter, throws it in the fireplace, and declares her husband dead and herself the widow of the "late" marquis. She so impresses Fernando —"Tú llevas mi nombre más dignamente que yo" (III: 13)— that he makes a gesture of his own. He causes the family to believe he is volunteering to go away and die: "Yo emprenderé una carrera, la de mi padre, las armas...paro con mi amigo Hector...me alistaré en su regimiento" (IV: 3). The family's assumption is that he is going to fight in a war —as his friend Hector did— thereby fulfilling his duty towards his country and earning an honest living as a soldier. However, Fernando's hasty attempts to silence Hector eventually reveal that in fact Fernando is merely planning to fight in a duel that resulted from a prior indiscretion he

committed. Therefore, his seemingly noble behavior in the face of disgrace is not noble at all, but rather an extension of his misconduct. Elisa, however, prodded by Pedro, urges Fernando to fight in the duel nonetheless, as proof of his honor and love for her.

With the duel called off by the Barón, the marriage is no longer threatened. Pedro reveals that he has purchased the palacio de Mora and offered it to Elisa as a wedding gift. His invitation to Manzano to live near them is accepted. Manzano now toys with the idea of farming, although he also murmurs about the possibility of running for the post of *diputado*. As we saw in our discussion of *La bolsa* in Chapter One, farming would represent a return to old, rural values, while running for office might not.

Throughout the play, Pedro's moderation and Manzano's extreme, emotional responses are juxtaposed as the two friends debate how to respond to Fernando's impact on the household and on Elisa's economic well-being. Manzano tends towards impulsivity and desperate measures. For example, after Elisa's declaration of Fernando's "death," Manzano considers him gone and orders his grandparents' home to be sold —even over Elisa's protests:

> ELISA. Pero él creerá que esto es una venganza.
>
> MANZANO. Y creerá la verdad. (IV: 1)

Manzano is determined to make every one of Fernando's former assets useful. In attempting to have the palacio de Mora sold, he intends for every part of the property to be allocated to his employees: to productive endeavors that contrast with Fernando's leisurely ways. With this and every other incident involving Fernando, Pedro urges Manzano to consider the consequences more thoroughly before proceeding:

> ELISA. Pues bien, no le desespere usted más á Fernando.

MANZANO. ¿Qué no le desespere? ¡Desesperarlo porque procuro hacer economías!

PEDRO. Lo que tú haces son tacañerías, y ellas de rechazo van á tu hija. (III: 8)

Much like don Blas in *Tanto vales cuanto tienes* and Petra in *Don Trifón, o Todo por el dinero* (also in this chapter), Manzano acts as a corrective force against leisure and excessive spending in his family. However, Manzano almost misfires in his determination to protect his daughter—he is not necessarily being prudent, but rather stingy. These contrasting scenarios Manzano and Pedro present for managing a household parallel contrasting ways of governing a nation as well. In 1873, when *El dinero y la nobleza* was published, there was a change of government, following the failure of the *monarquía democrática* that had been established in 1870 (Fusi Aizpurúa 77).

What if one were to become newly rich? What would one do with the money? Eusebio Blasco's *¡Si yo tuviera dinero!* (1880) offers some answers to these questions. As the use of the conditional in the title indicates, this play involves a hypothetical discussion by prospective lottery winners and heirs.

Don Aniceto's relatives, who have not seen him in a year, have come bearing presents. Although his servant, Andrés, comments that don Aniceto is a bit miserly, Don Aniceto brings gifts for everyone as well: a hat for niece Aurora, a fan for doña Escolástica, and a pipe for Pepe. He gives the servants money for having played *brisca* with him and given him business advice and says "ya no sois criados ni nada" (I: 4). In turn, he advises them to save some money each week to grow their fortune.

Aurora is planning to marry Pepe, a hardworking, good young man, but he is poor. This is why the widow doña Escolástica, whom don Aniceto is interested in marrying, is convinced

that Aurora is going to go hungry if she marries him. Pepe is skeptical about the lottery, which is being drawn today: "Puede ser que tuviéramos seis mil disgustos" (I: 5). While don Aniceto looks forward to the drawing, Pepe believes other things —for example, his independence— are more valuable than money and cites the accomplishments of Michelangelo, Alexander the Great, Dante and others (I: 5). His rejection of money and the lottery illustrates his love for arts and culture.

While don Aniceto claims to care for arts and culture as well, he insists that *someone* had to pay for Alexander's soldiers to eat, for Columbus to sail across the ocean, etc. His rationale is that money is necessary and that if he had some, he would "impulsar las artes, reformar las costumbres, fomentar el progreso, dar pan á los pobres y enseñar a los ricos" (I: 5). He does not want to be a "cesante aburrido" (I: 5). In this pronouncement he sounds idealistic, expressing the same economic goals that a good government might pursue.

If don Aniceto were to win the grand prize (*el premio gordo*) in the lottery, he is confident that he would be generous:

> ANICETO. Pues a mi sobrina Aurora le regalaría cinco millones nominales en papel de Estado para que tuviera treinta mil reales de renta.
>
> AURORA. ¡Ay, qué gusto!
>
> ANICETO. La casaría, por supuesto, con Pepito...
>
> PEPE. ¡Claro!
>
> ANICETO. Y como regalo de boda, les daría un coche. (I: 8)

To doña Escolástica, he would give the house (I: 8). He would help support servants Ramona and Andrés and any future children of theirs (I: 8). However, when they miss winning the lottery by one digit, don Aniceto is less receptive to the idea of the marriage between Pepe and Aurora.

Don Aniceto is counting on receiving some income today, as a loan he made to the Conde has come due. In a reference to the floods in Murcia in 1879, Aniceto muses that if he had money, he would give "un millón para las viudas ... otro millón para los huérfanos...otro para reparación de casas...otro para fundar una escuela...proteger las industrias, horadar los montes, llenar el suelo de rails y el aire de alambres; ayudar a todos los menesterosos" (I: 7). This list of hypothetical donations reflects wishful thinking with regard to what Spain's leadership might do with such funds. At this time, the Spanish railroads had just emerged from a decade-long period of crisis (1866-1876) and were attempting a new start (Tortella, *Development* 123). Incomes had not been sufficient to cover costs of railroad construction, and the financial failure of the railroads had triggered the total collapse of the banking system in the 1860s (Tortella, *Development* 123). Infrastructure projects, charity to the poor and hungry, arts and industry all were competing for government attention. With these lofty goals in mind, Don Aniceto offers to forgive the Conde his debt.

Don Aniceto's friend Fernando, an *indiano*, is back from Cuba after spending 10 years there. He was "primero empleado, luego comerciante, después empresario, banquero..." (I: 10). He was expelled from Spain by his female boss who wanted to marry him, he claims. However, he is excited by every new opportunity: "¡El negocio, don Aniceto, el negocio! No hay otro remedio" (I: 10). Indeed, Fernando moves quickly from one job to another and from one woman to another. He is always in a hurry. He has built a railroad, two markets, the canal in Castilla, a tramway in Cuenca, and still had time to travel and see women (I: 10). Fernando's varied employment history spans the range of major infrastructure projects at the time and highlights the prominence of investments in railroads and other means of transportation in the Spanish

economy, particularly after the *Ley general de ferrocarriles* of 1855 (Bahamonde and Martínez 401).

Fernando is popular with women and believes money can buy their attention: "Verdad es que con el dinero se hace uno amar de las mujeres" (I: 10). He is off to Alcázar to collect money for don Aniceto, whose uncle has died and left him 6 million duros. Don Aniceto wants to introduce Fernando to Aurora, but Fernando resists because he is certain her dowry is insufficient. Everyone is excited that don Aniceto is inheriting money.

Following the news of the inheritance, new furniture is being moved in. Don Aniceto is re-decorating, much to servant Ramona's chagrin (II: 1). When don Aniceto becomes upset with the carpenter's bill, Ramona notes the change in him (II: 3). He blames doña Escolástica for overspending (II: 5). Additionally, he has become vain; he checks his reflection in the mirror. He now repeats, "¿Para qué sirve el dinero?" (II: 7). This time, unlike last, he says, "¿...*si no se aprovecha por beneficio propio*? Ganar amigos, vencer á los contrarios, fascinar a las gentes" (II: 7). No longer does he think of contributing to the public infrastructure projects he considered before becoming wealthy. However, he feels the burden of his newfound wealth. He instructs Aurora not to tell anyone in the shops that she is related to him (II: 9). Otherwise, knowing he is rich, they will charge more money (II: 9).

In contrast to don Aniceto, Aurora demonstrates charity by taking the money he has given her and donating it to the poor (II: 9). She no longer recognizes him and is annoyed with his attempt to identify a new suitor for her (II: 9). He encourages her to go to the opera and not think about tomorrow (II: 9). He is pressuring her to enjoy leisure time and marry for money, not for love.

Another change in don Aniceto that wealth has brought about is that his interests now turn to the possibility of buying political office. Fernando returns from Toledo and assures don Aniceto that he could easily become a *diputado* because the rival candidate, although an excellent speaker and journalist, is poor (II: 2).

Fernando also announces his imminent departure for London, where he plans to marry an Englishwoman with a decent dowry. Such a passage to Great Britain was common for *indianos* like Fernando who had made money in the sugar trade in Cuba during this period. Ángel Bahamonde Magro points out that while Spain was the political metropolis for Cuban capital, Great Britain was the economic metropolis (*Américas* 53). Therefore, once in London, Spanish merchants continued to invest in the sugar trade for a time, but then tended to become involved in a variety of other economic activities:

> En suma, los comerciantes hispano-antillanos con casa abierta en Londres... desarrollan...una secuencia en principio especializada en el tráfico del azúcar entre Gran Bretaña y Cuba para luego diversificar tanto el flete como los rumbos geográficos, en nuevas áreas de actuación cada vez más ajenas al ámbito económico del azúcar. De forma paralela a este fenómeno, los comerciantes diversifican igualmente su patrimonio acudiendo a las amplias y rentables ofertas de inversión británicas. Progresivamente este progreso de *britanización* acabará por abocar a un paulatino abandono de las actividades comerciales y el deslizamiento progresivo hacia el rentismo. (Bahamonde, *Américas* 71)

Ultimately, however, these merchants tended to degenerate into rent-seeking activities, which may be defined as "spending time and money not on the production of real goods and services, but rather on trying to get the government to change the rules so as to make one's business more

profitable" ("rent-seeking"). Fernando's eagerness to leave for London, possibly for these purposes, demonstrates his opportunism and lack of patriotism.

When don Aniceto protests Fernando's decision to go to London, Fernando offers to stay in Madrid and marry Aurora instead (II: 2). He seems to be manipulating don Aniceto (II: 2). Once Fernando is confident that don Aniceto will be able to buy the post of *diputado*, don Aniceto now gives his approval for Fernando to marry Aurora (II: 18). His hunger to buy political influence has made him gullible.

Don Aniceto also has become miserly. The Conde comes to see him to ask for an extension on repayment of the loan. He does not beg because "Las personas á cierta altura no suplican" (II: 7). Don Aniceto tries to buy the Conde's house for the lowest price possible and thinks it will be easy, but the Conde resists. The house is not mere property to the Conde. He was born there and all his memories are there. Don Aniceto continues to press for a low price.

Another unpleasant change in don Aniceto due to his newfound wealth involves his attitude towards charity. After giving money to Pepe to benefit flood victims, don Aniceto is angry that his name was not associated with the donation (II: 9). Don Aniceto wants it known that he donated more to the cause than a certain duke, for example (II: 9). Pepe is perplexed because don Aniceto has told him many times that charity is not for showing off (II: 9). This dispute is don Aniceto's pretext for forbidding Pepe's marriage to Aurora.

Yet another casualty of don Aniceto's love of money is his relationship with doña Escolástica, who has found him particularly irritating since he received the *encomienda* and had his portrait done (II: 13). Money has changed him, and not for the better. He has not used the money for any of the public infrastructure projects he initially mentioned. Instead, he is determined to buy political office, just as banker Olmedo expected of his son-in-law in *Achaques*

del siglo actual (Chapter One). He now intends to allocate his wealth towards his own advancement, rather than married life:

> ESCOLÁSTICA. ... La casa antigua y la nueva, tan mías como de usted en el momento en que nos casemos, y ya es tiempo de que se ocupe usted de esto y deje las obras y los proyectos políticos y todas las extravagancias que se le han metido en la cabeza.
>
> ANICETO. ¡Oiga usted, señora doña Escolástica, si me tiene usted por extravagante, creo que hace usted mal en casarse conmigo! (I: 17)

Thus don Aniceto and doña Escolástica end their engagement. Their breakup symbolizes the division between selfish moneyed interests and family life. In Chapter One, we also encountered this conflict between family and the obsession with money in *La victoria por castigo*.

Don Aniceto's inheritance also leads him to boast about money and to privilege the foreign over the domestic. According to Manolita, the papers report that don Aniceto will be named a marquis (II: 15). When he boasts of having given 60,000 reales to the flood victims (II: 15). Manolita is unimpressed, as someone else gave 60,000 duros (II: 15). Beyond that, she is not interested in discussing money. She criticizes their "sociedad tan metalizada, tan rebajada, tan miserable, tan egoista, tan abyecta" (II: 15). Although once expected to marry an English count, and subsequently an Italian knight, she loved a man who loved her for herself (II: 15). Don Aniceto does not understand this decision, insisting that she was destined "para fomentar el comercio extranjero...hablar en todos los idiomas ménos en castellano" (II: 15). Don Aniceto seems to be supporting foreign trade and foreign cultures over Spanish. Manolita has a greater sense of national pride and demonstrates that, in her romantic choices, she has come home and rejected money for money's sake and the possibility of marrying into a title. Although she is

critical of Spanish society for having become selfish and materialistic, she has remained firm about marriage as an expression of love rather than of money.

Although Fernando seems poised to marry Aurora, he is reunited with an old love. It turns out that doña Escolástica is the married woman who pursued him years ago. Once he learns of her three houses and the *papel del Estado* (government bond) that she would have given don Aniceto the day after their wedding, Fernando suddenly seems interested in courting her again (III: 3). When she reveals that she has come to claim the house don Aniceto promised her, Fernando keenly notes that that would make a total of four houses in her possession (III: 3).

In the wake of his broken engagement to doña Escolástica, and in light of the Conde's debt to him, Don Aniceto intends to marry the Conde's daughter. However, the Conde refuses to let his daughter marry don Aniceto, now his creditor (III: 5). Don Aniceto takes out the promissory note and rips it up, but the Conde is firm. The Conde and his daughter then discuss her impending marriage to the Marquis of Ladrón. According to the Conde, the match is perfect because the boy is a noble (III: 5). The boy's family name, "Ladrón," suggests that the nobility consists of thieves ("ladrón," def. 1). This match reinforces the tradition that nobles marry only nobles. As a result, everyone expects don Aniceto to marry doña Escolástica and keep his word.

Unsuccessful in his quest to become a *diputado* in Toledo, don Aniceto has learned a hard lesson:

> ANICETO. Y para esto... ¡para esto tengo dinero!... ¡Para que aquellos a quienes se lo debía carezcan de él haciéndome objeto de la más sangrienta de las burlas! Pues si el dinero no sirve para sobornar el orgullo, para fascinar a la opinión, para aherrojar a la fortuna y para comprar lo que no se hereda; entonces, entonces, Aniceto, desengáñate de una vez, caiga la venda de tus

> ojos y di que tenía razón tu tío cuando te escribía el año pasado, que los ricos sin talento, los millonarios sin méritos propios, los poderosos sin patriotismo, podrán, mientras les dure su dinero, deslumbrar a la multitud con su lujo insolente, pero la opinión, que hace siempre justicia, se reirá de sus alardes mientras aplaude al sabio, al modesto y al virtuoso! (III: 6)

Now a laughingstock, don Aniceto sees that talent trumps money and understands his uncle's earlier warning about which values to espouse. He also has learned that money does not buy love (III: 6). When he gathers the others to apologize, they assure him that they have all received the money they needed or expected —much to his surprise (III: 7). Fernando, as executor of the uncle's will, had informed don Aniceto that he had inherited the entire estate. Apparently, before dying, the uncle was certain that don Aniceto would spend the entire fortune "en todo menos hacerse amar de las gentes" (III: 8). In order to prevent this from occurring, his stipulation was as follows:

> NOTARIO. Dejo a mi sobrino Aniceto quince mil duros, de los cuales ha de emplear cinco mil en obras de beneficencia [...] A mi querido amigo Fernando de la Vega, treinta mil, rogándole asimismo que dedique la mitad a obras buenas...
>
> ANICETO. Pues mira, lo que debes hacer...
>
> FERNANDO. (*Llevándoselo aparte*.) ¡Chist! ¡Los acabo de repartir entre todos estos, diciendo que es usted quien lo hace; ¡silencio! ¡Ya ve usted que he cumplido lo que él me ordena! (III: 8).

In addition to setting these conditions, the uncle donated money: to his native lands in la Mancha to plant pine trees, to the Teatro Español, to a poets' hospital, to bullfighters, to athenaeums, and

to coachmen (III: 8). His stipulation that these donations remain anonymous exemplifies a virtue: not expecting to receive credit for one's material contributions —in contrast to don Aniceto's boast about his donation to flood victims (III: 8). The uncle's donations support agriculture, the arts, Spain's bullfighting tradition and some of the poorest working men. These contributions reflect a redistribution of the national wealth more in favor of the less privileged sectors and classes. We witnessed a similar redistribution, albeit symbolic, of wealth in *La bolsa* (Chapter One). There, stockbroker Santillán gives to Guzmán, the farmer, cash that Mendoza had originally designated for investment in the Bolsa de Madrid.

Aniceto's remark, "todos somos muy generosos...con el dinero ajeno" (III: 8) rings true. It is easy for him to imagine what he might do with a lottery prize or inheritance, but once money is in his hands, he acts quite differently. The discrepancy between what he imagined doing with the money —building infrastructure, feeding the poor, developing schools, etc.— and what he actually does parallels the gap between politicians' promises and their achievements. Viewed in this light, his critique of "ricos improvisados" (III: 8) seems aimed not only at the newly rich, but also at the government, which may not be using money in a way that benefits the nation.

In the next chapter, I look at a figure who makes possible much of the economic activity seen in the plays I have analyzed in preceding chapters: the moneylender. The figure of the moneylender takes many forms, including the *usurero* and also the woman who takes on the role informally.

Chapter 3 The Moneylender, the Creditor

In this chapter, I examine representations of the moneylender or the creditor. For our purposes, the practice of moneylending, or usury, may be defined as the charging of financial interest in excess of the principal amount of a loan or, in some instances, interest above the legal

or socially acceptable rate (Visser and McIntosh 175). A creditor may be defined as "one to whom an organization or person owes money" ("creditor").

Most of the representations of moneylenders I explore here are negative. The moneylenders tend to be portrayed as abusers of power who profit from the suffering of others. The cruelty of such moneylenders stems from the conversion of money as a medium of exchange into power itself:

> Usury is what marks the distinction between money being simply a socially contracted abstract mechanism to lubricate the interaction between supply and demand, and money as an end in itself. As an end in itself, as a social commodity legitimized through usury to tax other economic activity, the honest process of living by the sweat of one's brow is short-circuited. The true dignity and full reward of ordinary labour is compromised. Money thus becomes self-perpetuating power in itself rather than just a mediating agent of power. And it is the relentlessness of compound interest in the face of adversity that sets the potential cruelty of usury apart from equity-based return on investment. (Visser and McIntosh 181-82)

The abusive moneylenders I profile here illustrate the point above that usury redefines the concept of work, or "living by the sweat of one's brow," as it constitutes an unproductive activity that requires skill and constant calculation, rather than labor. Since usury transforms money into an end in itself, the moneylender is prone to greed and miserly behavior as he attempts to preserve his power.

Perhaps the best-known moneylender in nineteenth-century peninsular literature is Francisco Torquemada of the Benito Pérez Galdós novels: *Torquemada en la hoguera* (1889),

Torquemada en la cruz (1893), *Torquemada en el purgatorio* (1894) and *Torquemada y San Pedro* (1895). The character also appears in other Galdós novels, for example *La de Bringas* (1884) and *Fortunata y Jacinta* (1886-7). He is notorious for his cruelty towards others and willingness to exploit human suffering. Greed is his main motivation. The novels trace his social ascent, family life and limited attempts at reform.

Throughout the Torquemada novels, the moneylender's physical appearance is emphasized, along with the social situations in which he becomes involved (Guerra Bosch 75-76). In the plays I examine in this chapter, which were written and performed before Torquemada appeared on the literary scene, there is less attention given to the moneylenders' physical appearance. For example, there are no stage directions on the moneylenders' dress or on their physical features. Their conduct takes precedence. Some of the moneylenders and creditors I look at are depicted as outsiders or individuals whose values do not coincide with those of their clients.

Before discussing those who practice moneylending as an occupation, I would like to highlight women in the informal role of creditors or moneylenders to their families. As we saw in Chapter Two, "The Nouveau Riche," María Rosa Gálvez's *La familia a la moda* (1805) focuses on the visit of doña Guiomar, a widowed aunt from the country, to spendthrift relatives in Madrid. As she prepares to write her last will and testament, doña Guiomar would first like to become acquainted with her niece and nephew. After discovering her relatives' debt and other forms of misconduct during her stay, she takes charge of the household finances.

From the beginning of her visit, the constant absence of her brother, don Canuto, and her sister-in-law, Madama, irritates doña Guiomar. Don Canuto gambles. Madama attends parties. Everyone in don Canuto's household wakes up late, which strikes doña Guiomar as odd. She

views late risers as lazy. By lunchtime in the city, she has already eaten lunch and taken her siesta.

Upon meeting her, Doña Guiomar's spoiled nephew wastes no time in bringing up the subject of her last will and testament:

FAUSTINO. Pues dime tú a qué has venido
y dejemos lo demás.
Mi padre dice que vienes
(y de ello está muy contento)
a hacer aquí testamento
para dejarme tus bienes
que conocerme querías
antes, dijo... Pronto y listo
hazlo pues que ya me has visto,
y no andes con tonterías. (I: 3)

While Faustino is the eldest male child of the family and by custom would be assumed her heir, his impoliteness offends her. He addresses her using "tú" and pressures her to hurry and write the will. She thus begins to doubt his suitability as an heir. The question of who will inherit doña Guiomar's fortune thus remains open. Indeed, the next time Faustino sees her, he asks his aunt for money and orders her not to be stingy (II: 7). Ultimately doña Guiomar makes it clear that she will not bequeath her fortune to him. His behavior embarrasses her:

DOÑA GUIOMAR. Bien veis su mala crianza:
¿dónde con ella ha de ir?
¿Dónde, por sus groserías

piensen, y sus malos modos,
que los españoles todos
son brutos con picardías? (II: 11)

From her reference to "los españoles todos," it is apparent Doña Guiomar is concerned with Spain's image in the eyes of the rest of the world. To improve that image, she chooses to withhold her money from members of her family who lack manners.

Faustino's parents, Madama and don Canuto, prove to be poor role models for their son. Madama is an indifferent mother who neglects her daughter, as doña Guiomar points out after bringing her niece Inés home from the convent:

DOÑA GUIOMAR. La he querido libertar,
que encerrada no ha de estar
sin votos ni vocación.
En el colegio pagué
de alimentos atrasados
ocho años devengados,
que en ti gran descuido fue. (II: 9)

Madama has failed to pay for Inés's meals, while spending lavishly on herself. Doña Guiomar berates her for sending her daughter to the convent and abandoning her motherly duties. Madama has a distant relationship with Inés and sees her as a commodity. To Madama, if Inés married a marquis or other nobleman, she would enable her parents to rise through the social ranks. If Inés lived at home instead of in a convent, she would be a financial liability to her parents.

Don Canuto returned rich from the Americas but squandered his fortune by gambling. Don Facundo, a lawyer and father of Inés's suitor Carlos, has had to lend don Canuto money on

many occasions (I: 5). Don Canuto does not know how much money he has or how much he owes. His wife was rich when they married, but they have since spent all of their money. Consequently, doña Guiomar decides she will not leave her fortune to them.

Inés, the innocent victim of her parents' misconduct, is nothing more than their property before her aunt arrives. Initially, living at the convent, she is depicted as angelic, passive and obedient and thus goes unnoticed by all —until doña Guiomar arrives (Díaz Marcos 336). Doña Guiomar knows her money would free her niece and allow her to marry whomever she wishes. She justifies her decision as follows: "Sabes que Inés nada espera, / y que yo la he de dotar. /Pues, ¿por qué me ha de estorbar / que la case con quien quiera?" (II: 9) Guiomar is a woman who exercises her free will. Her money could help Inés do the same.

Doña Guiomar's approach to the family's problems includes not only revising her will, but also imposing a new order on her relatives:

DOÑA GUIOMAR. ...mis caudales
llegan a un millón de reales...
Yo, según mi voluntad,
dejarlos puedo a quien quiera;
mas que a tus hijos prefiera
me aconseja la equidad.
Tu mayorazgo a Faustino
le toca por ser varón
y mejorar es razón
de Inés su hermana el destino;
pero antes quiero saber

de tus bienes el estado,

para con más acertado

juicio en todo proceder. (I: 8)

Doña Guiomar emphasizes her right to choose her heir in a rational way. Her intention is to be as prudent as possible in making her decision. She insists on knowing the status of her brother's finances before committing her fortune to one of his children.

By ordering her brother and sister-in-law to itemize their expenditures, doña Guiomar makes clear that she will pay only the debts she deems worthy:

DOÑA GUIOMAR. En cuanto a deudas, haréis

los dos de ellas una lista,

porque sepa yo a su vista

a quién y cuánto debéis;

si justas se manifiestan

algunas, las pagaré,

mas no a usureros, que a fe

han de saber a quién prestan. (II: 11)

Prior to the aunt's arrival, the family is disorderly and careless. Doña Guiomar forces her brother and sister-in-law to keep records of their finances. She examines these documents carefully, punishing her relatives for frivolous expenditures. They have never been under such scrutiny or discipline.

Doña Guiomar is not alone in being a creditor or a voice of reason to her family. Don Carlos's father don Facundo, a lawyer, is also a model of economic prudence. He provides doña Guiomar with information crucial to drawing up her will. He informs her that don Canuto has

borrowed from him to cover some of his gambling debts over the years. Additionally, he refuses Madama's request for a loan with interest:

> DON FACUNDO. Yo de usurero
> no ejerzo el manejo impuro.
> Mientras que pude os lo di,
> los mismo que a vuestro esposo;
> y el proceder generoso
> por poco me pierde a mí. (III: 3)

By refusing to collect interest from Madama, don Facundo is showing honor.

The family dispute over doña Guiomar's will reflects anxieties about constantly shifting lines between the classes, parents not raising good citizens, the moral bankruptcy of the nouveau riche and the ascendancy of the common people. Guiomar's skill in handling money, superior to the men's in this play, comes as a surprise to her family, who initially sees her as backwards because she comes from the country. The family's reaction to her takeover of the household finances speaks to fears about the socioeconomic and political ascendancy of the rural people and of women.

Doña Guiomar's financial autonomy owes largely to her special legal status as a widow. Unlike the other women in the house, she is free to administer her own property because her husband is deceased:

> Upon marriage she [a woman] automatically lost most of her legal rights and became an appendage of her husband. She required his permission to be in business and he had the authority to administer her property; she could not sell or mortgage the property she brought to the marriage without his approval, nor could

> she accept or reject an inheritance by herself. The Civil Code told wives that they should obey their husbands and punished disobedience with jail terms of five to fifteen days. This legal subordination remained in effect until 1931. Wives had to live where their husbands did and could not leave without permission ... Only with the death of her husband or through legal separation could a woman recover her legal rights. (Shubert 32-33)

Since she is free of the legal constraints on married women, doña Guiomar has considerable latitude to make financial decisions, in contrast to Madama, for example.

Further evidence of doña Guiomar's mastery of business is her inclusion of a clause in her will that orders Inés to be allowed to marry Carlos. Madama protests, unaware the will has been signed by don Facundo to ensure that the marriage take place. Here a woman with an education, money to which she has unfettered access, knowledge of contractual language –doña Guiomar— is in control. By paying selected debts for the family and granting Inés an inheritance, she is giving a member of the younger generation a chance to afford to live adequately.

Another instance in which women act as creditors to their family is in Juan de Alba's *El porvenir de las familias* (1865), where a mother learns to make money and a father compulsively wastes it. Matilde attempts to safeguard the future of her family by investing in an institution named "El Porvenir de las Familias." Her husband Carlos gambles, but her father, Fernando, comes to the aid of the family with a set of older and more prudent values.

Their daughter Angelita's stories metaphorically detail the impact of the abuse of money on the family's life. Most illustrative of the family's plight is her retelling of the Aesop fable of the ant and the grasshopper (I: 13). The grasshopper that sings all summer instead of storing food

is represented by Carlos, the man of leisure, who lives for the instant gratification of gambling. The ant is represented by Matilde, Angelita and the grandfather Fernando, who represent the delayed gratification of saving for the future. Here, an older woman teaches a member of the next generation of women financial responsibility. As Matilde instructs her daughter, "Los hombres, en general, / se olvidan que vendrá un día / de privación, de agonía, de achaques... de todo mal. / Por eso desde pequeña / quiero que pienses, bien mío, / en el porvenir sombrío: / aprende de quien te enseña" (I: 10). In this mother's fatalistic view, men cannot be relied upon, so women must take action to prepare for a potentially more difficult tomorrow.

Father and daughter reverse roles when Angelita cautions him on the need to save money, "Perdona, papá.../Ya que oro has adquirido, la idea no te ha ocurrido / de guardarlo?..." (I: 13) Carlos's dismissal of Angelita's warning is a rejection of the idea that women can be rational. Here is a young woman who, as a voice of reason, might well represent the economic future of her nation.

While Carlos assumes he will double his money at gambling, Matilde manages to triple her own: "... junté una suma, y jugando a la lotería yo, fortuna me sonrió mi capital triplicando" (III: 10). To the extent that Matilde has played the lottery, then saved her winnings and tripled her initial investment, she has shown mastery of finances superior to her husband's and is raising their daughter to follow her example. In this way, Matilde is a model of modern motherhood, in contrast to doña Rufina of *Tanto vales cuanto tienes*, who threatens the future of her family by buying on credit.

When Carlos finally admits to bankrupting and dishonoring his family, he throws himself at his father-in-law's feet, "con el llanto de mis ojos" (III: 8), which suggests a feminization of men due to greed and gambling. Fernando urges his son-in-law to cry, for "las lágrimas son

bálsamo del corazón" (III: 8). Normally, the heart and tears are associated with women, but here Carlos is acting, and being pressured to continue acting, like one. This feminization of Carlos echoes Fernando's childish behavior in *La victoria por castig*o, which we explored in Chapter One, "The Banker, the Stockbroker." In both instances, it appears that the love of money makes a man less of a man. We will also witness this phenomenon in the next chapter, in *Barro y cristal*, where a young newcomer to the city is no longer willing or able to defend himself after living in luxury and debt.

Old and new values clash. Moral gaps widen. The grandfather Fernando earned his fortune by fighting for the nation, which his generation considers the respectable way to accumulate wealth. With regard to his gold, he confronts his son-in-law: "Lo he ganado siendo jefe / honrado y buen caballero. / ¿Cómo ganó usted el dinero, / despreciable mequetrefe?" (III: 11). Being a *buen caballero* and honest leader is apparently of no importance to Carlos, however, who gambles away his family's funds at the casino. His desire for easy money represents the abandonment of work, an attraction to leisure and a rejection of the values of the prior generation.

In an attempt to resolve the crisis, the grandfather Fernando suggests that his daughter leave her husband and move to the countryside to start anew (III: 5). While challenging the institution of marriage, he demonstrates concern for safeguarding family –in this case, urging Matilde to choose her father over her husband. His proposed solution also privileges a simpler life in the country over life in the city. Matilde's refusal to leave her bankrupt husband reinforces the religious teaching that calls for a wife to stay with her husband until death, and therefore reaffirms the institution of marriage (III: 5). Although she contributes to Matilde's savings, Angelita wants her parents to stay together, as her story about the family of birds illustrates: "...y

un día tentó el demonio a aquel palomo altanero [the father] ... En lugar de amonestar / al esposo y de mediar... / zás...separa el matrimonio. / La paloma, aunque sufría, / amaba a su compañero" (III: 6). In spite of her father's missteps, Angelita favors the continuation of her parents' marriage.

It is a combination of Fernando, Matilde and Angelita's savings that bails the family out of debt. Matilde and Angelita's limited economic agency in this situation —that is, Fernando's contribution and Matilde's decision to stay with her husband— could reflect ambivalence towards new ways of acquiring wealth and women's participation in them. The women help save the family from financial ruin, but seem worse off, insofar as they have expended their life savings. In contrast, in *La familia a la moda*, doña Guiomar is not necessarily worse off for having been a creditor to her family, for she is nearer to the end of her life than Matilde and Angelita. Whatever the outcome for the women as creditors, nevertheless, throughout the two texts it is clear that the role of a woman is to ensure the economic well-being of her family and to raise her children to act prudently.

I now turn to discuss a less benevolent moneylender. In Chapter Two, "The Nouveau Riche," we looked at the Duque de Rivas's *Tanto vales cuanto tienes* (1828), in which a wealthy *indiano*, don Blas, returns to Spain to his greedy, financially irresponsible siblings. Here I explore the role of don Simeón, who has lent money to the family, and don Blas's response to the problems the loan has caused.

Don Blas's sister, doña Rufina, has fallen into debt due to her extravagant purchases. In an attempt to find money to pay her creditors, she consults don Simeón for a loan. Soon after don Blas's return home, don Simeón is one of several creditors who knock on the family's door. He demands to be paid the sum of 6,000 reales immediately.

In borrowing from don Simeón, doña Rufina has demonstrated a lack of understanding of interest rates. The amount she asked to borrow was 3,000 reales. However, in fact, she owes principal plus one hundred per cent interest, over a period of three or four days (I: 21).

In addition to demanding one hundred percent interest, don Simeón has obtained a guarantee from don Miguel, the brother of don Blas and doña Rufina:

> DON MIGUEL. Pero, señores..., mis sueldos...
>
> ¡Pues como andan tan corrientes!
>
> En fin...
>
> (*Tomo el recibo y dice a don Simeón*):
>
> ¿No es más que firmar?
>
> DON SIMEÓN. Escriba antes lo siguiente:
>
> (*Escribe don Miguel*.)
>
> "Yo aseguro el pago de la expresada cantidad con mis sueldos devengados o corrientes, para lo cual, en caso necesario, se me descontarán las dos terceras partes de mi haber mensual. Fecha y firma."" (I: 21)
>
> (*Acaba don Miguel de escribir, y da el recibo a don Simeón*.)

The price to be paid for borrowing money thus increases, due to the family's inexperience with such transactions. No negotiation takes place. Don Simeón, with his knowledge of contractual language, appears to be in complete control of the proceedings.

Unfamiliar with contractual language, don Blas's siblings all too quickly agree to don Simeón's rigid terms:

> DON ALBERTO. (*Toma el recibo y lee*):

> " ... Los que abajo firmamos hemos recibido de don Simeón Algarrapacoechea y Bajols la cantidad de seis mil reales de vellón que nos ha prestado por hacernos merced, y la cual le devolveremos en metálico sonante, con exclusión de todo papel, en el momento que la reclame presentándonos éste nuestro recibo, a cuyo pago comprometemos todos nuestros bienes muebles e inmuebles habidos y por haber, siendo este documento suficiente para, en su vista, proceder judicialmente a apremios, ejecuciones y embargos, renunciando nosotros, como renunciamos, en todo caso, las leyes y privilegios que pudieran favorecernos...". (I: 21)

In effect, they sign away rights that they are likely unaware they even have. They have also signed away all of their assets. Thus they are vulnerable to legal action and the loss of everything they own. Their powerlessness may also be linked with the fact that don Simeón's family names sound Basque and Catalán. Indeed, during this period, the Basque and Catalan regions were particularly known for their entrepreneurship. As economic historian David Ringrose observes, nineteenth-century Spanish society, while largely agrarian, was governed by a narrow oligarchy backed by wealthy Catalan industrialists (*Spain* 22). Furthermore, as of 1830, half of all the bankers and financial brokers in Madrid had Basque surnames or were born in the Basque provinces (Ringrose, *Spain* 246). Thus don Simeón is associated with a small, highly powerful elite that controls much of the nation's finances.

Don Simeón is accustomed to taking advantage of people in financial emergencies, as his first meeting with doña Rufina and her brothers illustrates. As we saw in Chapter Two, "The Nouveau Riche," doña Rufina blames circumstances for her financial irresponsibility:

> DOÑA RUFINA. Como están cuantos de rentas

y de mayorazgos viven,

porque con tantas revueltas,

invasiones y mudanzas,

cambios de Gobierno y guerras,

ni pagan nuestros renteros

ni se pueden tomar cuentas

a los administradores,

ni los productos nos llegan

de nuestros estados, ni...

DON SIMEÓN. Tiempo ha, señora marquesa,

que los que piden dinero

tales trabajos alegan;

pero es lo malo, señora,

que en el mundo una peseta...,

¿qué digo?, un solo real,

ni un maravedí se encuentra.

DOÑA RUFINA. Que recurran es forzoso

las gentes de nuestra esfera

a honrados capitalistas...

DON SIMEÓN. Que son necios y se dejan... (I: 19)

In the naïve belief that moneylenders are "honrados capitalistas," doña Rufina is unaware of don Simeón's true methods. However, don Simeón knows his clients quite well and is prepared to

exploit their imprudence and lack of experience in contractual matters. They need his services so badly that they allow him to insult them.

Attempting to collect payment from don Blas, don Simeón presents himself, rather than doña Rufina and her family, as the victim in the loan transaction: "Muy justo es nuestro furor /... Robar es esto, / y con engaños muy viles" (II: 26). He poses as an honest businessman who has been wronged: "Y quien con buen deseo, / sin prenda ni interés, seis mil reales, / ganados con fatigas y sudores, / de buena fe ha prestado a estos señores, / en momentos tan críticos y tales, / ¿qué deberá decir?" (II: 26). In quoting to don Blas the amount due, don Simeón has combined the interest with the principal, as he initially did when presenting the contract to the siblings. He shows a receipt, which he claims proves that the family owes him 6,000 reales. Facing doña Rufina's refusal to pay and don Blas's cold response, don Simeón takes on a menacing tone: "Si seguridad bastante / no me dan, me será fuerza / acudir a la Justicia... / Pues yo sabré de esta estafa / vengarme, y con las setenas / hacerme pagar" (II: 29). Again, he portrays himself as a victim of fraud and invokes the law to bully the family into paying him.

Don Simeón possesses values at odds with those of his clients. When don Alberto insists that don Simeón forgive the family's debt as an act of charity, don Simeón refuses:

> DON ALBERTO. Amigo,
>
> buena caridad es ésa.
>
> DON SIMEÓN. No entiendo de caridades
>
> cuando al dinero me llegan.
>
> Yo haré que todos ustedes
>
> de la burla se arrepientan. (II: 29)

His lack of understanding of charity seems to demonstrate that he is a businessman who rejects the values of Christianity. Indeed, Don Simeón is thus portrayed as an outsider who profits from the financial hardship of others.

Although doña Rufina, don Alberto and don Miguel are intimidated when dealing with don Simeón, don Blas is not. He challenges don Simeón's claims by tearing up the receipt and threatening him with imprisonment. He resolves the dispute by paying the principal amount only. It is the member of the family with superior understanding of contractual language and finance who strips the moneylender of power. In this situation, don Blas is acting similarly to doña Guiomar in *La familia a la moda*, where she uses her knowledge of the law and finance to address and correct the financial chaos surrounding her family.

Another harsh moneylender appears in the anonymously published *El usurero* (1860) Simón is a widowed moneylender who lives in la Algaba, on a farm belonging to his brother Luis. Luis and his wife Beatriz have an adopted daughter, Carlota. Luis has employed Simón's son, León, as a work foreman.

Brothers Luis and Simón represent vastly differing values regarding money and work. Farmer Luis is dedicated to working the land. He reminds his brother of the history of flooding in the region and its impact on their family:

> En 1822 me hizo perder la inundación toda la cosecha y la mitad del ganado, y la de fines del siglo anterior arruinó completamente a nuestro padre. Tú tenías entonces dos años, yo estaba mamando, y si vivimos, fue porque nuestra virtuosa madre nos cogió a los dos a brazos y huyó con nosotros al cerro de los Morales... (I: 3).

In spite of the difficulties of living in the region, Luis believes his efforts and expenditures will pay off. He is proud to own a farm:

> LUIS. ... para mayor seguridad hago elevar y reforzar el dique ... he enviado a tu hijo León a Sevilla, para que me traiga jornaleros, pues no hay desocupados en la Algaba tantos como necesito. Voy a gastar diez o doce mil reales; pero conservaré mi cortijo, mi ganado, mis cosechas.... en fin, el pedazo de pan que poseo.
>
> SIMÓN. ¡Diez o doce mil reales!.... Es decir que vas a regalárselos al río.... ¡Estás loco!....¡Cuánto más te valdría darlos a réditos!
>
> LUIS. ¿A réditos?
>
> SIMÓN. Sí. Yo te los pondría donde te produjeran bastante, y no te costaría más que una comisión pequeña. (I: 3)

The shortage of available labor that Luis seeks to remedy by sending his nephew to Sevilla was a harsh reality for farmers during the period. Several factors account for the absence of workers in the country. Prior to 1900, the Spanish population grew slowly, compared with populations of neighboring countries, largely due to high mortality (Tortella, *Development* 71). There were numerous deadly epidemics. In addition, rural dwellers suffered from a poor diet, low standard of living and government neglect (Tortella, *Development* 71). Mass migration from the country to the cities had yet to happen. This movement did not begin in earnest until the 1880s (Tortella, *Development* 71). However, during the years 1830-1880, approximately 400,000 persons emigrated from Spain (Fusi Aizpurúa 66). As Luis works to improve the land and protect his crops and cattle, Simón believes his brother is wasting his money. However, profitability is not a motivation for Luis, who is content with his "pedazo de pan." He is puzzled by the concept of

returns on investment with which Simón is familiar. By offering to invest Luis's money for a return, Simón would not necessarily be acting selflessly. As he is eager to charge his own brother, already struggling financially, a fee for his services, Simón is, in fact, disloyal towards his family.

When Luis offers his workers as much wine as they wish to drink, Simón scolds him for wasting money (I: 4). Luis's nurturing attitude towards his workers contrasts sharply with Simón's disregard for them. It would appear that this moneylender has no sympathy towards the working class. He is also parasitical, in that he lives at his hardworking brother's house when he could likely afford to live on his own.

In addition to taking care of his workers, Luis has a sense of pride in his work and his nation. Despite his brother's insistence that he use his money differently —"Empleado en tierras, el dinero no produce ni el dos por ciento, y trabajais como negros..." (I: 3)– he muses:

> ¿Qué sería de la nación, si los labradores, como yo, fuesen reemplazados todos por usureros.... como algunos que conozco?.... ¿Si en lugar de hacer que produzca la tierra, no se pensase sino en hacer que produzca el dinero?.... Los ricos tendrían oro; pero los pobres no tendrían pan. Hermano, Dios le da a cada hombre su tarea en la tierra, y protege a la España, puesto que al lado de los holgazanes, que se la comen, ha puesto, ha puesto a los trabajadores, que la alimentan. (I: 3)

This description of the division of labor strikes a nerve in Simón, to whom Luis also happens to be providing food. As a moneylender, Simón produces nothing that can nourish the nation. Quite to the contrary, he is symbolically devouring the nation. That is, while many in the community are poor and cannot afford to eat or feed their families, he lends them money and demands

repayment under harsh terms. Moreover, he hoards money that would benefit many if he chose to share it. He has hidden money in an abandoned building and is certain no one will guess the truth (I: 6).

Luis and Simón's discussion of agriculture as unprofitable reflects historical and cultural realities faced by farmers throughout Spain in the nineteenth century. The vulnerability of Luis's farm to repeated flooding and his neighbors' inability to feed their families echo historical events of the period. Spanish agriculture during the nineteenth century was unable to fulfill vital economic functions: producing a food supply to feed the cities, spurring demographic growth and serving as an extensive market for the industrial production occurring in the cities (Tortella, *Development* 50). As mentioned in earlier chapters, throughout the nineteenth century, the sector stagnated due to a lack of technological innovation and manpower, as well as other factors. In all there were twelve major food crises in the nineteenth century, including most notably those in 1847, 1857, and 1867-68 (Tortella, *Development* 33) —hence the repeated mentions of "pan" in *El usurero*.

As a struggling farmer, Luis bears similarities to the character of Guzmán in *La bolsa* in Chapter One, "The Banker, the Stockbroker". Each travels to a city, or sends a representative to a city, to ask the government for assistance or to look for laborers because local resources are insufficient. The creditors in each situation —be it the large banks, or a farmer's own brother— are unwilling or unable to provide assistance. These encounters with creditors emphasize the wide gap between the countryside and the cities. Indeed, Spain under Isabel II seemed to have an economy with two speeds: a stagnating rural subsistence economy, but a modern, capitalistic urban economy (Fusi Aizpurúa 66). We will examine some issues facing rural populations in the next chapter, "The Have-Nots."

In addition to criticizing his brother's occupation and the way in which he spends his money, Simón disapproves of Luis's guardianship of Carlota, referring to her as a "mendiga...que se ignora de donde ha salido" (I: 3). He resents Luis's plans to marry Carlota off and give her a dowry since she is not a blood relative. In truth, Carlota's origins are less humble than the moneylender assumes. She and her brother Teodoro are the children of a prominent manufacturer whose struggle to save his business ultimately resulted in destitution, according to Teodoro:

> ... En 1838 ... mi padre, para que no pereciesen de hambre sus numerosos obreros, continuó ocupándolos, a pesar de que una crisis comercial detuvo la venta de los productos de la fábrica. Muy pronto tuvo que recurrir a empréstitos onerosos, y muy pronto...lo diré de una vez, se vio arruinado. Después de pagar cuanto debía, abandonó a Sevilla, decidido a no volver a ella, ni usar su verdadero apellido hasta que hubiese rehecho un caudal, que ávidos usureros habían cruelmente usurpado; y para lograrlo, no fue valor lo que le faltó, fueron fuerzas: retirado a la Algaba mi pobre padre, murió en ella de pena. Ustedes saben por qué tuve que sentar plaza en la marina, y de qué manera Carlota, que se había quedado huérfana, vio que un incendio le arrebataba lo poco que le dejó nuestra madre. (II: 3)

Simón's startled response to hearing Lorenzo Coronado's name suggests that he was one of the greedy moneylenders who preyed upon Lorenzo (II: 3). Indeed, Simón did lend to Lorenzo (II: 4). As with other clients, Simón showed Lorenzo no mercy, even under desperate circumstances. Indeed, it was Simón who eventually bought Lorenzo's factory and resold it for five times the price (II: 4). Therefore, he has been profiting from the suffering of others.

When Teodoro reveals to Simón that León has fathered Carlota's child and urges that León honor his obligations by marrying Carlota, Simón refuses on the basis of class differences, still calling Carlota "una descamisada" (II: 3). Luis intervenes, revealing his awareness of Simón's identity as Lorenzo's creditor (II: 3). Still, Simón is unwilling to give back the money he obtained after bankrupting Lorenzo. Defiantly he insists, "Que acudan a los tribunales, y si salgo condenado a dotar a Carlota, me estrecharé, para poder darle un centenar de duros, y todo quedará concluido" (II: 3). He has not spoken of his son's happiness, for he thinks of marriage as merely another financial transaction. To Simón's shock, Luis demonstrates familiarity with joint assets by pointing out León's legal claim to half of Simón's holdings: " ... León ha entrado en la mayor edad, y ... mañana te pedirá cuentas de la legítima materna ... Lo que posees son bienes gananciales, y la mitad era de tu mujer, y por consiguiente es de tu hijo" (II: 4). As Simón's money is now under threat, he rushes to consult his law books (II: 3). His continued refusal to believe he must pay his son reflects his selfishness and disloyalty towards his family (III: 1).

Simón has lent money to and cheated persons representing every social class, including; his own brother Luis, the Vizconde, and the poor ferryman Juan. Juan needs more money to repair his ferry boat, upon which his livelihood depends. In spite of the circumstances, which Juan explains earnestly, as well as Juan's offer to repay him with interest the following spring, Simón refuses to grant him an extension on his outstanding loan (I: 5). For this reason, Juan has no choice but to go to Sevilla to pawn his mother's jewelry: "...la lancha es antes que todo... como que sin ella no tiene pan mi familia..." (I: 5). Juan is one of several poor characters who, when describing their needs to Simón, mention the importance of "pan" for their families. Simón is unable to relate to the necessity of "pan," since he does not need to provide for himself or anyone else, and since money is most important to him: "No hay nada tan agradable como el

sonido del dinero, a no ser la vista del oro" (I: 6). Juan agrees to see Simón's contact, don Pedro López, who is purportedly a pawnbroker in Sevilla (I: 5). However, Juan is unaware that "don Pedro López" is a front man for Simón's business.

When the Vizconde requests an extension to repay a loan, Simón calls him and his father irresponsible and refuses: "Su firma al pie de los pagarés de usted es una aprobación tácita a sus desórdenes" (I: 11). Not only does Simón look down upon the poor, but he also scorns those who give to charity or provide for their employees. Like Torquemada in *Torquemada en la hoguera* (Galdós 71), Simón refers to charity as a waste of money. Just as he scolds his brother for wasting money in this manner, he criticizes the late Lorenzo Coronado for having done so (II: 4).

Simón assumes his living arrangement will deflect public suspicion of his occupation (I: 6). In his own defense, he often insists, "Soy pobre," or, "No soy rico." This façade is similar to Torquemada's in *Torquemada en la hoguera*, in which the moneylender has feigned poverty in the past:

> ... se sentía, con la buena ropa, más persona que antes; hasta le salían mejores negocios, más amigos útiles y explotables. Pisaba más fuerte, tosía más recio, hablaba más alto y atrevíase a levantar el gallo en la tertulia del café, notándose con bríos para sustentar una opinión cualquiera, cuando antes, por efecto, sin duda, del mal pelaje y de su rutinaria afectación de pobreza, siempre era de la opinión de los demás. (Galdós 14-15)

Unlike Torquemada, Simón does not display his wealth. When his son's carriage is feared lost in the floods, Simón declares, " ... al que me traiga al hijo de mi alma, le daré cuanto poseo... todo... y soy rico" (III: 7). Only in a situation of dire need does Simón finally admit he has money.

His disdain for the needy has limits. When the Vizconde saves León's life, Simón resolves to give him as much time as he needs to repay his loan (III: 8). Still, he does not forgive the debt altogether.

Simón receives his comeuppance when Teodoro shows him an old letter, proof of the moneylender's dishonesty:

> TEODORO. (*Enseñándole el papel medio quemado*.)
>
> ¿Conoce usted esta letra?... Vamos, corramos ambos, si usted se atreve, a llamar en nuestra ayuda esa ley, que Dios y los hombres han hecho igual para todos.
>
> SIMÓN. (*Después de una pausa*.)
>
> Mañana tendrá usted su dinero.
>
> TEODORO. No es dinero lo que le pido a usted. Si yo puedo echar a presidio a Simón Robira, Simón Robira puede infamar a un general, modelo de virtudes. Honra por honra: estos documentos son inseparables, y ambos serán quemados, o ambos irán a poder de la justicia.
>
> SIMÓN. (*Vivamente*.) Destruyámoslos.
>
> TEODORO. Antes me va usted a entregar los dos pagarés, firmados por el conde de la Espesura.
>
> SIMÓN. Pero...
>
> TEODORO. Su hijo reconoce la deuda, y usted tiene además otros documentos de garantía. No transijo sino a ese precio. (III: 2)

Using this evidence, and phrasing his ultimatum in financial terms, Teodoro restores honor to the Vizconde's family name and forces Simón to agree to the marriage of León and Carlota (III: 2).

Although Simón assumes he can resolve the issue with a mere payment, the outcome of the confrontation between Teodoro and Simón privileges honor over money.

The flood that threatens the town forces Simón to retrieve the safe containing his money. Although he tells others he is going to look for supplies, he again demonstrates selfishness by going to the place where his treasure is hidden (III: 10). Rescuing Simón in his ferry boat, Juan insists that Simón throw overboard the safe he has taken pains to carry on board, for it is too heavy (IV: 3). Simón stubbornly, selfishly clings to his money. The ferry boat that ultimately saves the lives of the family members nearly capsizes due to the weight of Simón's hoarded treasure. With members of various classes in it, the boat might well represent the nation. If the boat represents the ship of state, then Simón's heavy safe represents a threat to its security. Simón might represent a government that misallocated or squandered money, instead of investing it in agriculture, where it was badly needed. Ultimately, the men in the boat throw the safe overboard in order to save the lives of its passengers. This act of discarding Simón's ill-gotten gain could symbolize a rejection of government corruption.

Although they have power over debtors, creditors and moneylenders do not escape risk, as they might not be paid. In this regard, I compare José María Huici's *Pagar sus deudas sin un ochavo* (1837) and a likely *refundición* of that work, *Un buen pagador* (1873), in order to explore the obstacles facing the creditors of Benito, a womanizer who is adept at dodging them. In Benito, they have met a formidable match.

In *Pagar sus deudas sin un ochavo* (1837), Jaime, the cafe owner, attempts to exact six months' worth of payment from Benito, who has been nervously dodging him and other creditors. Although Jaime presents Benito with an itemized bill, he is surprised by Benito's scheme to cover the debt:

BENITO. ... Usted no puede ignorar que tengo muchos amigos.

JAIME. Yo lo creo: usted es el que siempre convida.

BENITO. ... Precisamente yo seré siempre el último en elegir el licor. Una vez elegido, siempre que yo diga, "mozo, traiga usted ginebra," no pediré sino ginebra...

JAIME. Y bien.

BENITO. Usted con gravedad, y sin darse por entendido, me traerá agua.

JAIME. ¿Agua? No entiendo.

BENITO. Sin embargo, nada más claro. Yo aparento beber ginebra, mi amigo lo paga como tal, trago el agua, y a cada copa usted apunta en la cuenta—"recibido media peseta."

JAIME. Ah, entiendo, entiendo; pero ochocientos reales...

BENITO. Son cuatrocientas copas de agua que yo despacharé para liquidarme. (I: 4)

Jaime agrees to the scheme. Additionally, Benito manages to convince Jaime to tell others, if asked, that Benito owes nothing.

Benito's uncle, el señor Durán, has threatened to disown Benito if he discovers that the young man has gone into debt (I: 1). Concerned with his nephew's financial well-being, Durán investigates by calling on Benito's alleged creditors. When Durán suggests that they go to Jaime's cafe, Benito carries out the scheme he has described to Jaime. The conversation between Durán and Jaime illustrates the precarious position of creditors:

DURÁN. Y, diga usted señor Jaime, ¿cómo van los negocios, el despacho, y...

JAIME. ¡Ay! señor, si no fuese por el crédito, tantos deudores...

DURÁN. ¡Ah! Ya principia. (*Aparte*.) Sí, el crédito nos arruina a los negociantes.

JAIME. Hay muchos que gastan siempre, y luego...

DURÁN. ¿Y que no pagan nunca? no puedo sufrir eso; y como decía a mi sobrino hace un momento; si debes alguna cosa, estoy pronto a satisfacerla. (I: 6)

When asked how much Benito owes, Jaime claims, " ... me debía, pero nos hemos arreglado... ya he recibido algo a buena cuenta, y solo tengo que pedirle continúe..." (I: 6). Benito's scheme ensures that Jaime will receive payment, but Benito has managed to avoid any expenditure of his own. His friends will pay the debt incurred in his name.

Lucía, the washerwoman, is the most direct and assertive of Benito's creditors, interrupting his flattery by asking for his overdue payment:

LUCÍA. Ya ve usted, cuando no se tiene otra renta...

BENITO. Qué más renta que esos lindos ojuelos ...

LUCÍA. ...Calle, ¿pensaría darme dinero? (*Aparte*.) ¿Qué quiere usted, señor don Benito? (I: 9)

Lucía immediately suspects that there is an ulterior motive behind Benito's flirtation. She recalls the advice of her aunt: " ... me decía siempre, 'Sobre todo, Lucía, no dejes amontonar muchas deudas'" (I: 9). Her aunt's successful communication of this message to Lucía contrasts with the elder Durán's apparent failure to convey it to Benito.

However, for all Lucía's bluntness, she has a weak spot for Benito. She recalls the day Benito took her and her cousin home in his carriage: " ... a pesar de la risa y mofa de sus amigos, nos condujo hasta mi casa ... ¡Cuántos jóvenes que figuran hacen pasear a sus acreedores por las calles de Madrid, y a fe mía que no es en coche!" (II: 10) In this way, Benito has caused Lucía

to owe him. He thus takes advantage of Lucía's fondness for him by having her deliver a note to Juan, the painter.

Once Lucía decides that she wants to marry Benito, she becomes relentless in her quest to obtain the money he owes:

> LUCÍA. ... señor Benito ... necesito dinero, y lo quiero al instante. ... porque... quiero establecerme; quiero casarme ...
>
> BENITO. ¡Tonta! con una cara tan linda, con esos (*tomándola de la mano*) ojuelos... quién será el mortal tan exhausto de gusto y de sensibilidad que te exija una dote.
>
> LUCÍA. Yo no digo... pero hay tantos ambiciosos... y como yo quiero un marido, necesito. Si usted no está en disposición, acudiré al señor Durán. (I: 20)

By bluffing that she has other suitors, as well as threatening to go to Durán, Lucía has gained a significant advantage over Benito. She does not react to his flattery. With his offer to marry her, she erases his debt. With her prudent approach to money, Lucía could be helpful to Benito. However, their marriage and his penchant for creative ways to cover debt, rather than avoid debt altogether, leave open the question of whether he will be helpful to her.

Just as Simón in *El usurero* exploited debtors of various social classes and occupations, Benito takes advantage of creditors of all ranks. Initially dodging the painter Juan's request for the payment he owes, Benito eventually admits he has no money. Juan's situation is urgent, since he plans to marry soon. Although bankrupt, Benito offers a solution

> BENITO. ... Es verdad que yo no tengo dinero, pero tengo crédito... y puedo muy bien pagar la deuda, proporcionando a usted lo que necesite comprar.
>
> JUAN. ¡Qué idea!

BENITO. ¿Qué le importa a usted que yo pague en dinero o en efectos? ... (I: 13)

Since Juan would have liked to use the money to hire a servant, Benito offers to pretend to be Juan's servant for several hours each day (I: 13). This arrangement fits their needs. When questioned by Durán about Benito's debt to him, Juan insists, "Es una calumnia; mi amigo Benito nada me debe; si alguna vez le he prestado, ha correspondido como caballero" (I: 16). Although Benito has devised creative solutions to address his debt, his creditors have not genuinely been repaid. Rather, he has charmed them all into agreeing to non-monetary arrangements. This outcome reflects concerns about the increase in the use of credit during the period. As Jesús Cruz indicates:

> The main problem of both bankers and merchants [...] was the persistent scarcity of circulating capital that characterized the economy of those years. Most commercial transactions were based on credit, but there were never any clear guarantees for collection. Many times debt redemption spanned several generations, so that many of their commercial loans came to be regarded as uncollectible. Besides having to deal with war, primitive communications, and lack of legal protection, the banker and the merchant had to maintain a large enough flow of incoming capital so as to service his large operating debts [...] The success of a firm depended to a great degree on the good reputation of its owners and on their careful selection of debtors. This is why the commercial and financial economy of the era was based on a complex system of mutual trust. (*Gentlemen* 69)

For a small family business such as those that appear in *Pagar sus deudas*, bad debt would be particularly crippling. Indeed, the author of the play, José María Huici, a journalist, certainly had

grounds for such concerns. He managed the newspaper, *El Eco de Aragón*, in Zaragoza in the 1860s and was part of the editorial staff of many other newspapers ("Huici"). His interest in economic problems may have stemmed in part from his experience a as lottery administrator, when he became involved an embezzlement scandal in which one of his servants was required to pay a fine (Huici, José María").

Although Huici's *Un buen pagador* (1873) involves a similar plot and characters of the same names as in *Pagar sus deudas sin un ochavo* (1837), the plays' representations of creditors differ. In the later play, when Lucía first demands payment from Benito, she is presented first and foremost as a respectable woman. Money —that is, solvency— and honor are linked:

> BENITO. ... Eres en la villa y corte
>
> modelo de planchadoras,
>
> honrada...
>
> LUCÍA. Cuando es la sola renta que una tiene...
>
> BENITO. (*Volviendo a escribir*.) Vaya,
>
> ¿y esa te parece poca,
>
> hoy que la honradez es ya
>
> *rara avis en terra.*
>
> LUCÍA. La honra
>
> es tan combatida! (I: 9)

Lucía associates the difficulty of obtaining payment with the difficulty of maintaining a reputation for integrity, perhaps an indication of changing times between the publication of the 1837 play and the 1873 one. At the same time, however, she is represented in this later play as less assertive. Instead of demanding payment from Benito, as she does in the 1837 play, here she

does not. Rather, she mutters, in an aside, "(¿Si querrá ahora darme algún dinero?)" (I: 9) Furthermore, she does not give a reason why she admires him, as she does in the 1837 play. Here, she is depicted as less rational: "Siento aquí (*Al corazón*.) cuando lo veo, cuando me habla... Soy yo loca! Yo pienso en él, y él en tanto, de seguro, piensa en otra" (I: 10). The 1873 Lucía reflects that by late in the nineteenth century, women's increased participation in financial matters was apparently contested. Alternatively, perhaps there was a less optimistic outlook for the working classes Lucía represents.

Some continuity between the 1837 and 1873 plays is evident in Juan and Lucía's discussion of the poverty of artists. In both texts, Lucía attempts to convey to Juan that he must dress to impress the elder Durán, so as to obtain the money he needs (I: 11).

Just as Lucía strives to maintain *honra* in the 1873 play, so does Juan. In asking Benito to repay him, he adds, "Soy honrado..." (I: 13). In the 1837 play, Benito blames another creditor for rendering him unable to repay Juan (I: 13). Here, however, he apologizes for his inability to pay, without naming any culprit or scapegoat: " ... me han dejado sin un duro" (I: 13). While in the earlier text, Benito offers to use his "crédito" to provide for Juan, in the later text, he does not make explicit reference to it (I: 13). Instead, he alludes to their friendship: "Al amigo no abandono: a ver si yo proporciono todo lo que usted desea" (I: 13). Here, in the context of the late-nineteenth century, honor and friendship take precedence over the use of credit. Indeed, Juan resists Benito's repayment scheme more stubbornly in the 1873 play than in the 1837 one: "No consiente mi amistad" (I: 13). This may reflect diminished confidence in the use of credit by this later date.

It is not until the end of the 1873 play that Lucía explicitly demands payment from Benito (I: 19). Shouting, she announces that she is to be married, just as in the 1837 play. However, unlike in the earlier play, she does not bluff:

BENITO. (*Procurando distraerla*.) Y tu novio
supongo que será guapo.
LUCÍA. Aún no tengo novio.
BENITO. Entonces...
LUCÍA. Pero acudirá al reclamo
así que huela dinero.
BENITO. Pues aguarda...
LUCÍA. Que no aguardo.
Me paga usted o me voy a su tío. (I: 19)

Thus, although she threatens to go to Durán, she seems more vulnerable to Benito's games. This more submissive Lucía is more tentative than the earlier one:

BENITO. Vamos a ver; en el caso
de casarte, tú querrías
un novio... bien arreglado,
jóven, instruido...
LUCÍA. Cabal.
BENITO. Y, sobre todo, así... guapo.
LUCÍA. Toma, lo mejor posible.
BENITO. Es natural. Yo, que tanto
por tí me intereso...

LUCÍA. (*Con desconfianza*.) Gracias. (I: 19)

Once she and Benito have agreed to marry, she gives "un suspiro de satisfacción" (I: 19). In contrast, the earlier Lucía does not sigh. Rather, she simply declares, "Estoy muy satisfecha" (I: 19). This comment is less emotional than the sigh and could just as likely apply to the payment of the debt as it could to the marriage proposal. The portrayal of Lucía in the 1873 play as less assertive, more emotional and diffident may indicate increased skepticism regarding the position of creditors by that time, in comparison to in 1837 when the earlier play was published.

The figure of the creditor in José María Gutiérrez de Alba's *La dote de Patricia* (1865) has a negative impact on the life of a young woman who might well represent her nation as a whole. Patricia is in court, surrounded by creditors. As the notary reads the inventory of her assets and the list of creditors, the judge is surprised that there are so many creditors. He believes such debt is out of character for Patricia:

ESCRIBANO. ¡Si tiene doña Patricia
por cada pelo una trampa!
JUEZ. No puede ser. Ella es rica
y vive modestamente.
Que al punto aquí se presente
y oigamos cómo se explica. (I: 1)

The judge is sympathetic to Patricia. In light of the presence of the many creditors, he weighs the following possibilities: "que es mala su conducta ... / o que no fueron buenos sus tutores" (I: 1) Indeed, her guardians shed light on the causes of her financial problems.

Patricia's own story includes memories of happier times:

Yo nací en hidalga cuna,

y a mi familia, oriunda de este suelo,
plugo desde el principio al alto cielo
dotar de gran fortuna.
Allá, en tiempos remotos,
brilló mi estirpe en cuanto el sol abarca;
de oro y gloria y poder tuvo un tesoro;
juzgó que aquel estado duraría... (I: 1)

Patricia has noble origins. Her family once enjoyed prosperity, power and glory. However, those circumstances changed. Her story could stand for the history of a nation. The inventory of her assets, which the notary reads aloud, reflects an estate in decline. These assets include broken items unable to fulfill their intended purposes, animals with no fur or teeth, and images of disease or devastation:

ESCRIBANO. (*Leyendo*.) Bienes... (De estos no hay apenas,
ni muebles ni semovientes.)
Un león, de yeso, sin dientes,
un castillo sin almenas
... una tinaja sin agua,
y una botella sin vino.
... y un cuadro, el cuadro del Hambre.
Otro cuadro: en él están
todas las plagas de Egipto ...
... y un reloj sin minutero
dentro de un baúl sin fondo. (I: 1)

The list of assets reflects a transition from abundance to scarcity, from power to powerlessness and from safety to vulnerability. They are of no use to Patricia. Their condition suggests that the resources once available to Spain are no longer. The painting depicting Hunger may symbolize the country's poverty and food shortages.

Although the early history of Patricia's family was marked by glory and riches, later times brought destruction through war:

> ... en las luchas de fieras
>
> mi ya escasa fortuna vi empleada ...
>
> Solo cuadros de horror por todas partes
>
> vislumbraban mis ojos;
>
> olvidadas las ciencias y las artes,
>
> y provocando enojos
>
> los más santos deseos,
>
> vi confundidos en nublado oscuro
>
> lo que en el corazón hay de más puro
>
> con los vicios más torpes y más feos.... (I: 1)

War caused economic ruin. Violence became commonplace. Society began to destroy the best of itself. As a result, creativity and intelligence, as once seen in the arts and sciences, were stifled.

Patricia's creditors played a crucial role in her downfall. If Patricia's story is that of the Spanish nation, then the creditors represent governments in power, or economic forces. The creditors are similar to don Simón in *El usurero*: selfish and uncaring, responsible for the ruin of persons who depended on them for help. One of the creditors is a tobacco seller whose contract has been revoked for selling an expensive product of poor quality (I: 3). Given the addictive

nature of tobacco, this individual could stand for vice in general, or dishonest businessmen. It is also possible that the creditor represents the *bandoleros*, smugglers of tobacco in Spain at the time of the French armies' invasions, beginning in the early nineteenth century (Gately 149). Indeed, because the French occupation led to shortages, extensive smuggling chains were established to transport tobacco and other goods throughout Spain (Gately 149). Another creditor claims to have been involved in a dispute against Patricia and is appealing the outcome, which favored Patricia (I: 3). This creditor is an echo of domestic infighting.

A third creditor, a moneylender, claims that Patricia owes him payment on several loans. However, she reveals that she has never seen the money. The funds have been disbursed to her guardians, with her belongings as collateral (I: 3). According to Patricia, this moneylender and others have become rich, ignoring her suffering:

JUEZ. ¿Y cuánto habrá usted ganado?

ACREEDOR 3º. Poco.

PATRICIA. Un trescientos por ciento
lo menos en cada un año.

JUEZ. De veras!

PATRICIA. Como lo digo.
El señor, y aun otros varios,
que no nombro, sin recursos
no ha mucho que aquí llegaron,
y hoy como príncipes viven,
mientras yo la vida arrastro
entre fatigas y penas

y amarguras y quebrantos. (I: 3)

The moneylender and others of his kind have abused their power, becoming rich while Patricia is destitute. They have given the money to guardians instead of directly to Patricia. The guardians have misused the funds allocated to them by the moneylender.

Another of the creditors is referred to as, "Un inglés," which could mean, "un natural de Inglaterra" ("inglés," def. 1) and/or "un acreedor de dinero" ("inglés," def. 5). He enters the court carrying two chickens and claims Patricia owes him money for some chickens she has eaten.

PATRICIA. Es extraño
que a mí vengan a exigirme...
Le juro por más santo
que yo capones ingleses
no he visto nunca en mi plato.
Yo, que estoy a media dieta
la mayor parte del año,
que solo como patatas,
lentejas o bacalao,
había de comer capones,
y a más de eso no pagarlos!

INGLÉS. Mi no equivocar; mi tiene
documentas; mi estar cauto,
mi estar tenaza; mi espera,
e mi no quiere más trato
con hispanis.

(*Volviendo la espalda y marchándose*.) (I: 3)

The Englishman's/moneylender's error-filled Spanish marks him as an outsider. Furthermore, his charges are false. Patricia has eaten only domestic foods, such as *bacalao*, and goes hungry half the year —also a likely scenario for Spanish rural populations that we looked at in *El usurero*. The dispute between El inglés and Patricia suggests an agricultural crisis aggravated by the influx of foreign products. As Pierre Vilar has argued, Spain at this time was attempting to "reconstituir el papel de Inglaterra en el distanciamiento de las colonias, en el control de los yacimientos mineros, en los esfuerzos de Cobden contra el proteccionismo textil..." (Vilar 103). Competition against Great Britain in mining, textiles and relations with the now-former colonies was a preoccupation of Spain's in the mid-nineteenth century. Still another possible explanation for the disagreement could be tension in the economic relationship between Spain and Great Britain in the mid-nineteenth century. For example, as one economic historian reports:

> La desfavorable "conversión" de Bravo Murillo de la Deuda Nacional en 1851 cerró la Bolsa londinense a toda nueva emisión de bonos del Gobierno. Gabriel Tortella lo describe como una bancarrota encubierta (20). En adelante, dejando aparte la actividad de los especuladores, Londres abandonó totalmente a su suerte los empréstitos del Gobierno español. La Bolsa de Londres no volvería a abrirse a los empréstitos españoles hasta mayo de 1868. (Platt 124)

El inglés's frustration and abrupt departure reflect the interruption in British investment in Spanish debt. It could also reveal the shifting relationship between the two nations due to economic factors.

Each of Patricia's guardians explains how he fell into debt in her name. The series of guardians appears to represent the change of Spanish governments in the mid-nineteenth century.

Their continuing failure to provide for Patricia may symbolize the failure of political leaders to provide for the nation. The year *La dote de Patricia* was published, 1865, was a time of growing economic insecurity. Early in the preceding year, there had been optimism about the economy. There had recently been a good harvest. Economic indicators looked promising (Tortella, *Orígenes* 254). New banks and credit-granting institutions sprang up throughout the country, "como setas en el bosque tras una tormenta" (Tortella, *Orígenes* 254). This growth may be reflected in the abundance of creditors in court with Patricia in the play. However, not all was well with the economy. The state budget deficit was significant (Tortella, *Orígenes* 254). Government policies played a key role in Spain's economic problems. Specifically, in 1864, railroad companies' pressure for increased subsidies, as well as expenditures for servicing the public debt, placed the government in an impossible position (Tortella, *Orígenes* 255). The servicing of the public debt was complicated by a change in government. Prior to 1856, the government sold Church lands in order to pay the public debt, but afterward, under Isabel II, the new government ended this practice and allocated funds towards military expeditions overseas instead of the public debt (Tortella, *Orígenes* 255).

The first guardian was a sacristan who neglected his duty towards Patricia:

JUEZ. ¿Y qué cuentas dará usted
de la dote de Patricia?
TUTOR 1º. ¿Yo? Que gasté sin malicia cuánto dinero encontré.
JUEZ. ¿Y tan crecidos tesoros gastó usted?...
TUTOR 1º. En diversiones,
en bromas y reuniones,
principalmente en los toros.

Y porque no se perdiera,

(Señalando a Patricia.)

que era lo que interesaba,

lo único que procuraba

es que a leer no aprendiera. (I: 3)

The first guardian wasted all of Patricia's money and left her illiterate. He likely represents the Catholic Church which, in the eyes of many, left Spain's population poor and backwards. In this regard, Gabriel Tortella has pointed out that literacy rates tend to decline as one moves from north to south within the European Continent (*Development* 16). One explanation for this phenomenon is that in Protestant countries, the faithful are encouraged to read the Bible, whereas in Catholic countries, where the monopoly of scriptural interpretation belongs to those in ecclesiastical authority, the oral tradition tends to prevail and literacy is de-emphasized (Tortella, *Development* 17). The first guardian's term with Patricia ended in 1834, "...vino el año treinta y cuatro, / y como cambió el teatro, / cambió la decoración" (I: 3). The year 1834 refers to a change in government and the creation of a new political system (Fusi Aizpurúa 42). In similar fashion, each subsequent guardian sends Patricia further into debt and abandons her as soon as opportunity beckons. They began by living on streets named, "calle de la Unión" (I: 4) and "plaza de Progreso," but their decadence has led them to destitution. Asked where they now live, each of the guardians provides a dismal-sounding address: "Plazuela de Afligidos...Al final de la calle del Desengaño..." (I: 3). The progression of guardians could represent a series of governments that have led the nation into economic and cultural ruin.

Some of the guardians took Patricia's money overseas:

JUEZ. ¿Y usted en qué gastó el dinero?

TUTOR 3º. Yo... cogí el poco que había

y lo gasté en Berbería ...

Allí buscaba mi afán

laureles.

JUEZ. ¿Para estofado?

Pues debiera haber buscado,

antes que laureles, pan.

TUTOR 3º. En busca de otra corona luego a la América fui...

JUEZ. Y también le salió allí

la criada respondona! (I: 3)

The judge's remarks to the third guardian seem to be a critique of foreign military expeditions to the detriment of a poor domestic population. The guardian's mention of "Berbería" could be a reference to Spain's expedition to Morocco in 1859 (Vilar 103). During this period, the Spanish government undertook military expeditions to Indochina, Mexico and Peru as well, in an attempt to recover some of the glory of its past as a world power (Tortella, *Orígenes* 255)

The fourth guardian nominates a candidate to be Patricia's next guardian, but he is less than ideal. Barrigallena (Barriga llena) turns out even greedier than his predecessors: "Oid: yo prometo hacer / esa dicha que os encanta, / si cada uno me adelanta / solo un año de alquiler" (I: 5). The chorus of residents therefore rejects him. Barrigallena's name suggests a large powerful entity, such as the government, which symbolically eats everything in sight. He may represent a leader or set of leaders who consumed resources that should have been used to feed the populace.

Music signals the arrival of a new guardian for Patricia (I: 6):

CABALLERO. Estad atentos.
Mis palabras escuchad.
La madrina de Patricia,
señora muy principal,
sabedora de su suerte
y queriéndola aliviar,
gran parte de su fortuna
le envía con noble afán;
y si ha menester de toda,
gustosa se la dará. (I: 6)

Patricia's godmother, who goes unnamed in the text and does not appear in person, is to pay her debt. Since the music that plays is a royal march, Patricia's godmother might represent royalty. The optimistic tone of this ending seems to reflect the people's hope for national renewal when political leadership changes. However, we as the audience do not see Patricia meet her godmother, nor do we learn how she fares under her guardianship. In spite of her offer to cover Patricia's debt, the absence of Patricia's godmother on stage might symbolize a lack of engagement between the people and royalty.

In this chapter we have encountered benevolent creditors, women who lend money to or pay debts for their families and improve their living conditions. At the opposite extreme, we have also examined opportunistic or parasitic moneylenders who would prey on their own families or leave their nation in decline. In the next chapter, we will look at those who have not benefited from the material wealth experienced by some of the bankers, stockbrokers, nouveaux riches and moneylenders. Figures that we will study in Chapter Four, "The Have-Nots," include

servants, the poor, the rural people and the urban working class. We will investigate the conditions and policies that have prevented them from prospering, their attempts to improve their lot and the consequences for them and for society as a whole.

Chapter 4 The Have-Nots

In this chapter, I examine the figure of the have-not. Have-nots include the poor, the rural populations, the urban working class and other groups or individuals who have not benefited from the prosperity of the bankers, stockbrokers, nouveaux riches, moneylenders or creditors profiled in preceding chapters. The works I analyze span from the middle to the end of the nineteenth century —with publication dates from 1842 to 1894— and touch upon themes of poverty, social mobility and class conflict. As a point of reference for the first play I explore, Charles Dickens' *Oliver Twist*, an English social novel published in 1838 that highlights issues of the urban poor and of street children in particular. Later in this chapter, I will examine the circumstances of a poor child driven to crime as Dickens's characters have been. According to David T. Gies, social and socialist drama began to make its appearance in Spanish theater as early as the 1850s, with the advent of *literatura obrerista* (310). The German philosopher Karl Marx published the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848 and *Das Kapital: Kritik der politischen Ökonomie* in 1867. A close look at *El pan del pobre* (1894), the last play I study, reveals the likely influence of these seminal works. By this time, the ideas of Marx had spread throughout Europe. Among these ideas was his critique of capitalism. In addition, Marx pursued the transformation of society through his agitation and organization of the working class, as a leader of the First International Workingmen's Association (1864-1876) (Fine and Saad-Filho 1). Through his writings and activism, Marx attempted to capture the spirit of the times, insofar as the functioning of modern economies was concerned. Specifically, his arguments on the

oppression of the working class by the owners of the means of production relate to some of the anxieties reflected in *El pan del pobre*. During the Sexenio (1868-1874), the workers' movement grew and spread in Spain —following the creation of the First International Workingmen's Association in London in 1864 (Bahamonde Magro and Martínez 567).

In Chapter One, in Juan Lombía and Juan de la Cruz Tirado's *Lo de arriba abajo, O, La bolsa y el rastro* (1842), we explored the portrayal of stockbroker don Anselmo and his relationships with the secondhand clothing dealers who lived below him in the same building. It was don Gabriel, one of the sellers downstairs, who made possible the marriage of his godson and don Anselmo's daughter, members of different socioeconomic groups. We now examine in greater detail the representation of don Gabriel and others who live downstairs with him.

As the downstairs family member best able to communicate with the family upstairs, don Gabriel is represented as an ambassador between the two families, a bridge between rich and poor. He helps other have-nots, including Lino and his daughter Ildefonsa, to improve their social and professional skills. He manages money more effectively than Lino. Their household is in debt, so much so that the family has not eaten in over 24 hours. Don Gabriel is able to address this problem effectively, as he has a good grasp of accounting and corrects Lino for not monitoring the household expenses (I: 4). He also sets a positive example in business by explaining to the family his purchase and sale for profit of a coat, thanks to his adeptness at bargaining (I: 8). He argues that the household is a business: "Un balance es operación comercial muy sabia..." (I: 2). Of his family, don Gabriel is best prepared to manage this business, particularly since Lino does not understand the concept of household budgets. Lino also is less receptive than don Gabriel to Fernando's pursuit of wealthy don Anselmo's daughter –in part, perhaps, due to his inability to communicate with the family upstairs. He scolds his son, "Anda,

anda a pavonearte con esos ricachos de arriba....anda a reírte con ellos de los que te han criao, de los que te han dao de comer, ni más ni menos que como si fueras su hijo" (I: 13). Lino's speech, unlike that of don Gabriel or Fernando, reveals that he is a member of the lower classes.

Don Gabriel seems to understand that language is crucial to understanding between classes. When he speaks, he sounds like the family upstairs. However, this does not mean he rejects members of his own class. In fact, he is in love with Lino's niece Ildefonsa who, despite her "rústica educación" and coarse speech, is a hardworking woman who stays up late at night to iron (I: 11). Although she does not understand the "failosofía" [sic] to which don Gabriel constantly alludes, she does respect and admire him for having served his country as a soldier. She remembers how he looked in uniform:

> DON GABRIEL. ...¿ de veras es con el uniforme como más te gusto?
>
> ILDEFONSA. Sí, señor, porque me acuerdo de cuando era chiquilla y estaba mi tío tan malo y me paece verlo a ud. en toavía con la ropa que trajo del regimiento, trabajando a escrebir memoriales y cuentas día y noche pa manternos a toos... los probes siempre nos acordamos de esas cosas. (I: 11)

Love of one's nation through military service is a value shared by Ildefonsa and don Gabriel, as well as Pascual in *El pan del pobre* (1894), which we will examine at the end of this chapter.

Just as he corrects Lino's faulty accounting, don Gabriel also corrects Ildefonsa's speech:

> ILDEFONSA. Pa eso ud. con ese leviton paece el Deleitor de los probes del Espicio!
>
> DON GABRIEL. ¡Ildefonsa! ¡Ildefonsa! Mientras coses mi levita me desgarras las entrañas con ese lenguaje. En cinco palabras has dicho cuatro barbaridades.

ILDEFONSA. ¡Déjeme ud. en paz! Yo hablo como too el mundo.

DON GABRIEL. Sí, como todo el mundo del Rastro y su comarca. (I: 4)

Don Gabriel's assumption of the role of teacher pre-dates by 70 years Eliza Doolittle's transformation under the supervision of Professor Henry Higgins in George Bernard Shaw's *Pygmalion*, published in 1912.

In Chapter One, we met don Gabriel's godson and Lino's son Fernando. Don Gabriel sent him away to obtain a formal education because he wished to prevent Fernando from becoming a servant. Having been a theology student and soldier, don Gabriel makes sure his godson follows a specific path:

> DON GABRIEL. ... viendo que ibas a ser criado en la más abyecta estupidez me dediqué a instruirte: te enseñé a leer, a escribir, latín y la filosofía del peripato Aristóteles, única verdadera. Te serví de padrino ... te hice poner en un colegio para perfeccionar tu educación, te busqué un buen empleo en Cádiz y mi solicitud no te ha abandonado nunca. (I: 3)

Don Gabriel wanted a better life for his godson. Since don Gabriel has strayed from his original goals and become a secondhand clothing dealer, he likely hopes Fernando will struggle less than he has in his working life.

While urging his godson to obtain formal schooling, don Gabriel wants overnight wealth for himself, in part so that he can marry Ildefonsa and pay the family's debts. Secretly, he has played the lottery:

> DON GABRIEL. ... ¡Ah! si la suerte quisiera.... (*sacando un billete de lotería*.) La suerte, sí, porque se trata de que el párvulo inocente que mete su mano en el globo *loterial* saque estos tres números que a terno seco he jugado a medias

> con la tía Nicolasa la tendera. Ocultemos este cédula no venga alguien que vea en ella una prueba de que las verdes esperanzas y las ilusiones alcanzan hasta a los filósofos más consumados. (I: 3).

He calls himself a philosopher, but there are limits to his use of philosophy. Above all, he is determined for the family to be solvent:

> DON GABRIEL. ¡Jugar, jugar! ¡no parece sino que no hay más medio de adquirir riquezas lícitamente que la lotería! ¿No soy yo de la misma madera que otros muchos que se han enriquecido en un abrir y cerrar de ojos?
>
> LINO. ¡Si me querrá ud. hacer creer que apalea la plata y el oro!
>
> DON GABRIEL. Yo no apalearé nunca objetos inanimados; pero dispondré a mi arbitrio de miles de duros. (II: 4)

While at first it might seem contradictory for someone as pragmatic as don Gabriel to play the lottery, the risk he takes is not unusual for an individual of relatively low income. As Georg Simmel noted with regard to the apparent irrationality of the lottery:

> The objective factors which otherwise determine the reasonableness of risk are totally irrelevant here. The money form of values easily tempts one to misjudge this economic dictate because it subdivides values into very small portions and so tempts the person with slender means to take a risk that, in principle, he ought to avoid. (262)

Thus the tendency is for have-nots such as don Gabriel to risk a higher proportion of their funds on the lottery than individuals with higher incomes. Don Gabriel's gamble proves worthwhile, as he eventually wins half of 17,000 reales (I: 13). Since he has pooled his money with that of Nicolasa, the shopkeeper, they split the winnings. Again, as we saw in Chapter Two in *El amor y*

la lotería, individuals with low incomes have tended to use a lottery strategy that sociologist Roberto Garvía calls syndicate play, or *juego en compañía*, to maximize potential winnings (18). Syndicate play, most commonly observed among friends, relatives and coworkers, is largely responsible for raising the degree of participation in lotteries, as well as for increasing the probability of winning (Garvía Soto 17). Moreover, in the present day, this strategy, which comprises 25% of total lottery consumption in Spain, helps to reduce the impact of taxes on lottery winnings (Garvía Soto 67).

First, don Gabriel uses his share of the lottery winnings to pay the family's creditors (II: 3). In this sense, he is depicted as responsible, in spite of his enthusiasm for quick riches: "Lo primero es pagar" (II: 4). The balance, he tries to persuade Lino, ought to be allocated toward helping Fernando marry wealthy Carolina (II: 4).

Don Gabriel's success reflects the democratization of the opportunity to become wealthy, to make or lose a fortune overnight. His lottery win, debt payment and skillful management of the household's finances are testament to the growing financial knowledge of the have-nots. Furthermore, he is not the only have-not in the house to become adept at finances. Don Anselmo's *portero* and *aguadero* stay apprised of the daily stock quotes and know their master has gone bankrupt before he discovers it himself (II: 1).

As we saw in Chapter One, don Gabriel uses his superior knowledge of contract law and finance to prove that Fernando is an heir and therefore can afford to marry Carolina (II: 16). Thanks to their lottery winnings, the secondhand clothing dealers win the house auction when don Anselmo is bankrupted. They move upstairs, while don Anselmo moves downstairs (II: 16). This reversal of roles demonstrates the ephemeral character of wealth, as we will also see later in this chapter in José María Gutiérrez de Alba's *Vanidad y pobreza* (1860).

In contrast to don Gabriel, some have-nots are deceived, due to their inexperience with financial markets, in Ramón Valladares y Saavedra's *Santi, boniti, barati: Grande y soberbia especulación industrial, escrita para la felicidad española, para que se represente en todos los teatros donde el público quiera nadar en oro* (1850). Singer Perico Rodríguez would like to marry Antonia, a servant at an inn in Vicálvaro, outside Madrid. However, Antonia is reluctant to introduce him to her family, as she has had suitors with potentially better offers:

> ANTONIA. ¡Que quieres! Hasta que yo hable a mi madrina, no te puedes presentar... aunque mucho temo que nos envíe a paseo con nuestro cariño, porque como ya me han pedido varios... de esos que tienen dinero... varios... capi... ¡capitalistas!
>
> RODRÍGUEZ. Pues qué, ¿hay capitalistas en Vicálvaro? (I: 1)

As a rural dweller, Antonia is unfamiliar with capitalists. She and the other locals are about to face a difficult lesson about the pitfalls of investing in the stock market.

In order to marry Antonia, Rodríguez needs to overcome several problems. He has not been able to eat for some time, as he has no money. He has had difficulty holding a job:

> RODRÍGUEZ. ... ¡no desenvuelvas la página más negra de mi vida! A pesar de esta belleza de formas, a pesar de esta garganta que tiene más extensión que un clarinete, me han echado de los coros del Circo (cuando lo había) y me han puesto a la puerta de los coros de la Cruz, después de haberme despedido de los coros de Variedades, y del instituto, donde sostenían las zarzuelas. (I: 1)

From his statement, it is unclear whether the firings were due to his vocal performance or some other factor. However, he is portrayed as somewhat cocky, which suggests his character may be to blame. In addition to being fired from job after job, Rodríguez needs to collect money from

his uncle Palomo, whom he has never met, in payment of a debt Palomo owes to Rodríguez's mother (I: 1).

Rodríguez's inability to hold a theater job, as well as the methods he employs to obtain the money he wants, point to a neglect of the arts, just as we saw in Chapter One in *Achaques del siglo actual*, where a young banker is forced to give up his aspirations to study art once he marries into wealth. In Vicálvaro, there is now less emphasis on the arts due to increased public interest in making money. Not only are the arts in decline, but also Spanish arts are in decline, as one local property owner observes:

> SEÑORA MARMOTA. No saben en este pueblo más que beber vino. ¿Es posible que sólo os ocupéis del comercio y de la Bolsa? ¿Y las artes, las bellas artes? ¿Las dejaréis dormir en un culpable abandono? ¿No es horroroso el que no tengamos teatro? ¿No es espantoso el que ningún cantor de Madrid haya venido a Vicálvaro, y sólo sepamos de música *el Coradino, el Turco en Italia* y últimamente *el Tango americano*? (I: 5)

The absence of a theater in Vicálvaro suggests that Rodríguez does not intend to seek work while there. It also points to a pattern in the diffusion of cultural products such as from urban centers to rural areas: evidently, as Señora Marmota notes, foreign, not domestic, cultural products tend to reach Vicálvaro.

The arrival of don Manuel Romero from Madrid appears to bring a solution for Rodríguez's problems. The urban stockbroker and the poor artist quickly agree on a scheme purportedly to help Rodríguez obtain the funds he desires:

> ROMERO. ¿Por qué lloras, hombre?
>
> RODRÍGUEZ. ¡Porque me hacen falta ochenta mil reales!

ROMERO. Procede sin detención a enjugar esas lágrimas. (*saca una cartera*.) ¡Aquí tienes ya cuarenta mil reales! La mitad.

RODRÍGUEZ. ¿Será usted tan bueno, tan rico?

ROMERO. Orden... ¡y procedamos por él! Mediante esta suma que nos salva a los dos, voy a realizarte, a utilizarte... y por decirlo de una voz... a capitalizarte...

RODRÍGUEZ. ¡No entiendo una palabra!

...

ROMERO. ... escucha, Rodríguez; desde este momento no te llamas Rodríguez, sino el señor Pietro Rodriguini, nacido en Nápoles, cuna y emporio de los más célebres cantantes... (I: 8)

Since Rodríguez does not understand financial jargon, he is unaware that Romero plans to use him to get rich. Romero's suggestion is that they promote Rodríguez as an Italian singer and have locals invest in his (invented) performances and training.

Although originally bound for Algeria, Romero decides he will start to make his fortune in Vicálvaro instead and use the proceeds to pay for an eventual trip to Algeria (I: 3). To this end, he is encouraged by the inexperience of the town's citizens with stock market language and transactions. Using deliberately vague language, Romero also takes advantage of the locals' unfamiliarity with stock transactions in order to dupe them into investing their life savings. Romero's plan to use his ill-gotten gain to travel to an overseas destination parallels leaders' misuse of public funds in order to conduct military adventures overseas, as we saw in the preceding chapter, in *La dote de Patricia*.

Romero easily convinces locals that their investment in the fictional Rodriguini is important and profitable. They hand over their savings without resistance:

> ROMERO. ...explotar una voz soberbia... extraer el oro de un torrente de voz... (*bajo a Rodríguez, y da dos o tres berridos*.) (¡Canta ahora!) he aquí lo sublime, lo aereo, lo vaporoso... ¡He aquí, por último, la más productiva de todas las operaciones financieras!
>
> PALOMO. ¡Qué hombre! ¡Vamos a nadar en oro!
>
> TODOS. ¡Bien! ¡bien! ¡bien! (I: 10)

Other locals are also portrayed as naïve and gullible. In order to find more funds to invest in Romero's scheme, local property owner Señor Moriano suggests digging in search of a mine (I: 6). In this regard, Palomo recalls accidentally finding an ancient copper coin on his land, then digging up sown fields in a vain attempt to find more buried treasure (I: 6). This waste of crops reflects the stagnation in the agricultural sector that contributed to the relative backwardness of the Spanish economy during the nineteenth century (Tortella, *Development* 72).

Although exploited by Romero due to his ignorance of financial markets, Rodríguez betrays his own uncle and the other villagers for the sake of becoming rich. Thus he becomes an accomplice to Romero, who exploits the villagers' ignorance. His disloyalty toward his family is summed up in his aside, "¡Qué feo es mi tío!" (I: 10) as Romero introduces him as Rodriguini. The loss of the villagers' money to Romero sounds a warning to rural dwellers not to follow newcomers blindly. More broadly, it could be a call for loyalty towards one's fellow citizens and family.

The angry response of Vicálvaro's residents upon their discovery of Romero's true intentions is prophetic of events to come. In June 1854 (several years after the publication of

Santi, boniti, barati), Vicálvaro was the site of a coup, led by General Leopoldo O'Donnell and his troops, against the government regime (Bahamonde Magro and Martínez 309).

Much like rural have-nots who seek riches naively, have-nots who move to the city are advised to proceed with caution. As we saw in Chapter One in Manuel Angelón's *La bolsa* (1858), several men from the countryside —Mendoza, Macario, and before them, Santillán— come to Madrid and attempt to make a fortune in the stock market or, like Guzmán, to ask wealthy urban investors for funds to bolster the stagnating agricultural sector. Here we will take a closer look at the portrayal of Macario. Since his arrival in Madrid, Macario calls himself "el Sr. D. Macario, agente de cambio," to the surprise of his hometown friend, Perico (I: 1). They are both from the country, but Perico soon observes that Macario has changed.

At first, Perico has difficulty understanding Macario's terminology, as if they no longer speak the same language:

> MACARIO. ... Tú ¿nunca has visto la Bolsa?
>
> PERICO. La mía, que siempre está
>
> Como granero sin trigo. (I: 1)

For Perico, "bolsa" refers to his empty purse, not to La Bolsa, the stock exchange. Depicted as naïve and hungry, he does not understand the concept of the Bolsa de Madrid. He believes Macario has won the lottery or become an *indiano*. His "granero sin trigo" refers not only to his status as a have-not, but also to the shortage of wheat in the rural areas from which he and Macario come. I highlighted this agricultural phenomenon in Chapter One, where I discuss Guzmán.

Perico marvels at how Macario has changed since leaving their village and begins to wish for the same lifestyle for himself:

PERICO. Fortuna ¿cómo tan loca?

¿Es posible ¡voto a San!

Que este sea aquel Macario?

Nacimos por un igual

En un villorrio de nada,

De muchachos a la par

Juntábamos los ganados,

Y los dos en buena paz

Partíamos el pan negro

De nuestro almuerzo frugal.

Los dos a un tiempo empuñamos

La larga reja de arar... (I: 1)

It does not seem as though Perico was aware of the possibilities for sudden wealth before he left the countryside. He likely left for other reasons. As noted in Chapter One, urbanization at this time was less about an attraction towards the urban job market and more about the rejection of country life.

Perico wonders whether the Bolsa de Madrid accepts "patanes" like himself (I: 1). Assured that it does, he entrusts to Macario the 200 ducados his dying uncle bequeathed to him, "Si tú quisieras jugarle / de mi cuenta" (I: 1). His willingness to risk the little income he has is in some ways similar to don Gabriel's participation in the lottery.

Although Mendoza has not heeded his stockbroker friend Santillán's warning against playing the stock market, as we saw in Chapter One, he is infuriated to discover that Perico is also doing so—and all the more so when he finds out that Macario, Santillán's servant, is

managing Perico's money (II: 4). In his own defense, Perico insists that he is simply following a trend: "Señor, son tantos que juegan...." (II: 4). He is undeterred, even when Mendoza threatens to tell Santillán everything:

MENDOZA. Buena pieza,
Lo he de contar a su amo
Y le dejará sin muelas.
Exponer en sólo un día
El fruto de sus tareas
En diez años.... ¡Vicioso! (II: 4)

Perico is too naive to absorb the significance of his actions or their likely consequences. Furthermore, he insists on staying in the stock market just long enough to save for a carriage (II: 5). His denial persists. When his girlfriend arrives unannounced in Madrid, he lies to her, claiming that business is going well and that he is rich (III: 3). Within less than two months, Perico has gone bankrupt. Like so many others in *La bolsa*, this have-not has become yet another casualty of the stock market.

Haves and have-nots switch places overnight in José María Gutiérrez de Alba's *Vanidad y pobreza* (1860). Don Miguel, an *indiano*, has experienced cycles of financial losses and gains in the past. For this reason, he constantly cautions others about the transitory nature of wealth:

MIGUEL. Las cosas andan revueltas,
y el que hoy gran posición tiene,
mañana a perderla viene;
que el mundo da muchas vueltas.
Veinte años va a hacer ahora

que aquí un golpe me asestaron...

y hubo muchos que ayudaron

aquella mano traidora. (I: 2)

However, they disregard his advice. Excluded from the dinner table by his newly married niece Isabel and her husband Eduardo, don Miguel attempts to reclaim his fortune. This is not possible, as Eduardo's uncle, the Barón, warns don Miguel of the contract he signed in which he relinquished control of his funds. Don Miguel again becomes a have-not— in material terms.

Differing values contribute to the conflict between don Miguel on one hand and Isabel and Eduardo on the other. Eduardo has already spent his inheritance. He became rich again only through his marriage to Isabel. Eduardo's friends, Enrique and Teodoro, share his values regarding money. However, an encounter with the hardworking carpenter Tomás shifts Teodoro's perspective on work and money. Although the Barón chides Teodoro for associating with working people, Teodoro becomes increasingly critical of the Barón and his class:

BARÓN. ¿Quién alterna con tal gente?

TEODORO. ... A nadie cedo en nobleza

ni en posición; pero hay casos

en que alternaré gustoso

con el más pobre artesano,

si a mis ojos se presenta,

como ese, digno y honrado.

...

¿Qué bien hemos hecho al mundo?

¿Qué tenemos? ¿Qué esperamos?

El Barón, que por su edad
ha podido aventajarnos,
entre plácemes y orgías,
su patrimonio ha gastado,
y hoy se encuentra viejo y pobre. (I: 4)

Teodoro has become weary of material wealth, as he now perceives his privileged life as without purpose. He admires Tomás the carpenter, who is now a more appealing role model to him than the Barón, who has spent all his money and is deeply in debt. Teodoro's change of heart reflects a newer concept of honor, much like that expressed by Irene in *Los tres banqueros* (Chapter One). While in Golden Age drama, honor tended to be based on a woman's sexual purity, as noted in Chapter One, now it is linked to money. In this case, honor is tied to an individual's willingness to give to the needy, as Teodoro's question, "¿Qué bien hemos hecho al mundo?" illustrates. Later we will see that the honor of the dressmaker Luisa is connected to charity as well. Initially Eduardo tries to follow Teodoro's advice to be kind to the poor. However, he ultimately bows to pressure from his uncle, the Barón, to stop associating with Luisa and other working class people.

Cynical and snobbish, the Barón is dismissive toward the working classes. He tends to want to believe the worst about don Miguel, thus he advises Isabel and Eduardo to shun him:

BARÓN. Sobre todo gran firmeza
con él. No hay que vacilar,
si no queréis acabar
donde el ridículo empieza.
...

> Nada, nada, hablarle en plata,
>
> si de indirectas no entiende ... (II: 7).

By assuming that don Miguel can relate to conversation only in monetary terms, the Barón demonstrates his own lack of understanding of don Miguel's values.

While don Miguel becomes a have-not in material terms, he is rich in character. In contrast, the Barón is a have-not in terms of character. His jaded outlook and inability to retain his fortune reflect the nobility's loss of political and economic power relative to the rest of Spanish society (Bahamonde Magro and Martínez 447). The values the Barón espouses are out of touch with the socioeconomic changes in progress— although this phenomenon was not unusual for any class during this period:

> Hasta finales del siglo la nobleza de cuna tendió a infraestimar, por omisión, los nuevos valores inherentes a una sociedad en proceso de industrialización, pero en esta actitud coincidió de pleno con otros sectores sociales igualmente remisos a la hora de incorporar a su escala de valores las nuevas pautas de comportamiento... La clave explicativa reside en ... el *gigantismo* patrimonial, la inadecuada y anacrónica estructura del gasto, y, como trasfondo, la espiral de endeudamiento a que están sometidos los patrimonios nobiliarios, por lo menos hasta el último tercio del siglo XIX. (Bahamonde Magro and Martínez 450)

Indeed, the Barón, as well as Eduardo, have fallen into the debt spiral described above. The Barón's eventual suicide suggests the fading of the nobility and of the values it represents.

Like the Barón, Isabel and Eduardo are unfamiliar with the problems of the poor. In contrast, the dressmaker, Luisa, who has grown up with Isabel, expresses empathy towards don

Miguel when he loses his home. Although Isabel and Luisa were poor as children, Isabel is now blind to the problems with which Luisa is familiar:

LUISA. ...Tú no tienes experiencia,
y yo, aunque joven, la tengo:
mi ocupación me la enseña.
...
Tú sueñas con un palacio,
joyas, trenes y libreas,
porque no sabes que hay muchos
que en una buhardilla estrecha
lloran sin pan, sin abrigo
ni tener de dónde venga... (II: 6)

Luisa's constant sadness stems in part from her uncertain familial status, as she was abandoned as a newborn. Despite being poor, she is kind and generous. Although the same age as Isabel, Luisa has known years of hardship, while Isabel has been away in the Americas and enjoyed her uncle's newfound prosperity. As Isabel excitedly prepares for her wedding, Luisa advises her:

LUISA. ... Ya que Dios te ha hecho tan rica,
emplea bien tus riquezas.
En Madrid hay muchos pobres
que mueren de hambre y miseria.
Búscalos; sé para ellos,
Isabel, la providencia;
que el bien que a un pobre se hace

Dios como suyo lo cuenta. (I: 6)

As a model of charity, Luisa predates the character of doña Guillermina in Galdós's *Fortunata y Jacinta* (1887). Theater is addressing such economic issues in ways that the novel does not until years later. Now surrounded by luxury, thanks to her *indiano* father's fortune, Isabel has come to expect the lavish gifts Eduardo gives her. When even the Barón questions the cost of such frivolous goods, Isabel responds, "Pues entonces, ¿para qué sirve el dinero?" (II: 6). She remains blissfully ignorant of the suffering of others like Luisa.

Upon don Miguel's separation from his family, the dressmaker Luisa and her husband Tomás sympathetically offer him shelter, even though they can hardly afford to pay the bills. Grateful, don Miguel admires Luisa and Tomás, even as he expresses anger toward his own family:

MIGUEL. ¡Dios mío, a su ingratitud
esta noble acción iguala!
¡La humanidad no es tan mala!
¡Aun en la tierra hay virtud!
(*A Luisa y Tomás, abrazándolos*.)
Hijos, vuestra caridad
me infunde tal fortaleza,
que en medio de la pobreza
bendigo mi adversidad. (II: 8)

The charity Luisa and Tomás show don Miguel reinspires his confidence in humanity, in spite of the lack of money in his adoptive household. In addition, Tomás demonstrates loyalty to don

Miguel by warning him of servants' gossip about the family dispute. He is protective of don Miguel, as though he were family.

Luisa and Tomás care for don Miguel when he becomes ill. Over his protests regarding the expense involved, Luisa insists, "el dinero—¿en qué mejor podemos emplearlo?" (III: 1) Her comment contrasts sharply with Isabel's attempt to justify the excessive cost of her gifts.

In demonstrating charity towards don Miguel, Luisa is represented as a good Christian, for whom "honra" is crucial:

> LUISA. (*Tomando a Miguel de la mano y colocándolo entre ella y Tomás*.)
>
> ¡Nunca, nunca lo verán!
>
> MIGUEL. ¡Dios mío!
>
> LUISA. Aunque pobre gente,
>
> corazón y honra tenemos,
>
> y para él lo ganaremos
>
> con el sudor de la frente. (II: 8)

Compassion for others, charity and the love of God –as opposed to the love of money— guide Luisa and Tomás. Indeed, Luisa's honor consists of her willingness to give to those even needier than she. She is willing to work hard for the promise of "un bien eterno" (III: 6). This is why she deflects talk of money whenever others bring up the subject.

Luisa performs many selfless acts. When they were poor children, Isabel did not have enough to eat. Luisa offered her own share of food to her:

> ISABEL. ... y mi madre, enferma
>
> y viuda, apenas tenía
>
> pan que darme. Di, ¿te acuerdas

cuántas veces me llevaste

para comer a tu mesa? (I: 6)

Luisa's charity extends beyond their childhood spent in poverty. When Isabel comes begging because she and Eduardo have spent all their money, Luisa offers to give up her locket, the only memento she has of her biological mother, so that Isabel might have money for food (III: 7).

In spite of class differences, Luisa, Eduardo and don Miguel form a closer family bond than don Miguel was able to with Isabel and Eduardo. Luisa goes to great lengths to hide from don Miguel the fact that she and Tomás are struggling to pay the bills. She has faith that God will provide for them in any case:

LUISA. Con usted hemos partido

nuestros bienes, sin temor

de que mañana nos falte

del cielo la protección.

Si al pajarillo en el campo

nunca en su sustento faltó;

si el pez vive en su elemento,

como en el campo la flor,

¿cómo ha de olvidar el hombre

la providencia de Dios?

¿Qué son las penas del mundo,

si tan pasajeras son,

cuando después de esta vida

hay otra vida mejor?

Con qué ánimo y no se apure
usted; tenga, como yo,
para sufrir los azares
paciencia y resignación. (II: 1)

Facing the threat of eviction, Luisa tries to conceal her meeting with the landlord don Judás (III: 2). Although she explains that Tomás has been injured, don Judás is inflexible in his demands for payment of the late rent:

LUISA. Mi marido no ha podido
trabajar en más de un mes.
JUDÁS. (*Encogiéndose de hombros*.)
Ps... cuenta mía no es;
lo será de su marido... (III: 2)

Callously, he threatens to go to a judge in order to obtain the payment. Again, here we see a negative depiction of a creditor. The landlord's name coincides with that of Judas Iscariot who, according to the New Testament, was one of the original twelve apostles of Jesus Christ and betrayed him in exchange for thirty pieces of silver.

Although Tomás is temporarily unable to work, he and Luisa sell their belongings one by one in order to be able to continue to care for don Miguel. Don Miguel, reluctant to be "una planta parásita en su árbol de amor," resolves to ask Isabel and Eduardo for money (II: 1). This he does only as a last resort because he feels sorry for Luisa and Tomás. Concerned, Luisa secretly follows the weakened, convalescing don Miguel out into the street (III: 10). She does so even after he has assured her he will be all right on his own.

The rapid reversals of fortune throughout the play illustrate don Miguel's point that fortunes can be made or lost overnight. Luisa's unselfish response to don Miguel's crisis demonstrates that charity, although absent in many of the haves, is a virtue of have-nots. Given penitent Isabel's return and the discovery that Luisa is don Miguel's biological daughter, the tearful family reunion that ultimately occurs promotes compassion towards the needy, regardless of who they are, once were or might be.

Hard work and integrity are also rewarded in Juan de Alba's *Los hijos del trabajo* (1873). Anselmo, an artist, and his daughter Juana work hard and save their earnings: "Acuérdense los humanos / del ejemplo de la hormiga, / que quien no guarda en verano, / en invierno de hambre expira" (I: 4). The use of this fable of the ant and the grasshopper, as we have seen in Chapter Three, also occurs in *El porvenir de las familias* (1865), in which Angelita attempts to teach her father to save money instead of gamble.

Anselmo has taught his daughter not to beg if times become difficult: "Mendigar no necesita / el que como yo trabaja / y a lo superfluo no aspira" (I: 4). As Christians, they have faith that if they were both to fall ill and be unable to work, "tendremos la caridad," much as Luisa of *Vanidad y pobreza* firmly believes. Strongly principled Anselmo asks would-be boarder Marta to leave his home because she has admitted to begging in the past (I: 2). His concern is that Marta has set a bad example for her son Marcelino, who is an idler.

Marcelino wishes to marry Juana. However, Juana is reluctant to agree to the union because Marcelino does not share her values of hard work and savings:

> JUANA. ... Detesto a la hipocresía
>
> amo a mi padre y a Dios;

el trabajo es mi alegría,
y así la conciencia mía
de la ventura va en pos.
No piense que entre en mi plan
unirme al que no trabaje
con placer y con afán,
que a mi honor hiciera ultraje
al unirme a un holgazán. (I: 5)

Just as we also saw in *Vanidad y pobreza*, the hardworking poor, represented by Anselmo and Juana in *Los hijos del trabajo*, embody virtuousness.

Even in the face of hardship and temptation, Juana steadfastly upholds the values her father has instilled in her. When Marcelino seeks revenge for being jilted, Juana stands firm, refusing to abandon her principles. He and the craftsmen come to lock her in and throw a party, but instead of expressing fear, she is concerned with the significance of his action for the future of the nation:

MARCELINO. Recuerda tu posición, teme...
JUANA. Teman los malvados;
los al crimen afiliados,
secuaces de la traición;
los que aquí el infierno trajo
para hacer trizas, arteros,
la honra de los jornaleros
que vivimos del trabajo.

Sí: vosotros que en reyertas
gastáis ociosos la vida,
y a la patria empobrecida
cerráis del órden la puertas. (I: 13)

To her, Marcelino and his allies are robbing the nation and dishonoring hard workers like herself.

She loves and is proud of her nation. Her values comprise the spirit of the nation as a whole:

JUANA. ... El pueblo no se rebaja
vendiéndose como esclavo;
pueblo noble, ardiente y bravo
es el que sufre y trabaja.
Y aunque empañe su crisol
quien de holgar tan sólo entiende,
no se infama, no se vende
jamás el pueblo español. (I: 13)

Not even temptation from the Conde, a potential customer of Anselmo, can sway Juana from her values. Juana holds love of God and family unity most dear:

CONDE. ¿Conque es decir que un tesoro
de ese modo despreciáis?
¿tan poco el oro estimáis?
JUANA. ¿Se encierra la honra en el oro?
Oh! maldito ese metal,
que devora vuestra tierra;

por él el mundo arde en guerra
y en lucha fiera, infernal,
Él mata vuestra existencia,
mata nobles sentimientos:
por él ruedan los cimientos
del honor y la conciencia. (I: 10)

Juana's rejection of material wealth underscores the contrast of values between the Conde and her family. The Conde assumes that all parents want their children to be rich. He equates parental love with a desire for money:

CONDE. ...Quien mucho a sus hijos quiere
desea muy ricos verlos.
ANSELMO. Verlos sanos y virtuosos
es de un padre el gran deseo.
CONDE. (Fue sublime la respuesta,
pero ¿explorarle más debo?)
¿Es decir que usted no tiene ambición?
ANSELMO. Nunca la tengo.
CONDE. ¿Ni para su hija?
ANSELMO. Tampoco.
Tiene un caudal verdadero.
Su trabajo. (I: 9)

Although Anselmo insists he does not want money, the Conde is skeptical. Undeterred by Anselmo's apparent lack of interest in material wealth, the Conde offers him a large sum of money, if he is willing to do him a favor:

CONDE. ...Yo pensando que erais pobre,
riqueza vine a ofreceros...
...
Yo le necesito a usted...
pues con la gente del pueblo
tiene ascendiente. Yo ansío
que usted procure a lo menos
inculcar en sus amigos
las ideas que profeso. (*Con recelo*.)
Tal vez... necesario sea...
conspirar contra el gobierno...
mas si usted se encarga de esta
comisión, yo le prometo
que será usted en pocos días
rico, más rico que Creso.

ANSELMO. ¿Qué dice usted? (I: 9)

Anselmo is unreceptive to this offer, as he is not motivated by money. The Conde's allusion to conspiracy against the government reflects a pattern of social unrest, riots and rebellions throughout the Sexenio (1868-1874), around the time when *Los hijos del trabajo* was published. There were many popular uprisings during this period, sparked by food crises and general

popular malaise (Bahamonde Magro and Martínez 565). Furthermore, the Conde's invitation to Anselmo to participate in an anti-government plot echoes the conspiracy of the Conde and his supporters against the Queen in Botella y Andrés's *El rico y el pobre*, which we explored in Chapter One. In both instances, the impoverished protagonists choose their own values over the money offered by the noblemen.

At first glance, the Conde's tempting offer to Anselmo would seem to reflect a desperate measure taken by the nobility on the wane. Indeed, as noted above in the discussion of the Barón's social views and economic situation in *Vanidad y pobreza*, the nobility, having lost much of its inherited land, was turning almost exclusively to money to define its worth. However, it comes to light that the Conde tricked the artisans and Marcelino, who gave in to the temptation to make easy money. In fact, the Conde was testing everyone by offering money in exchange for dishonest acts. The Conde reminds the citizens:

> CONDE. Sí, artesanos, trabajad,
> y así seréis virtuosos;
> y vosotros, poderosos,
> a los pobres amparad.
> Que cada cual su misión
> ejerza sobre la tierra,
> y así cesará la guerra
> de esta abatida nación.
> ...
> el pueblo del Dos de Mayo
> inmortalice a la España! (I: 14)

Like Juana, the Conde is concerned with the future of the nation. To him, the craftsmen must work hard and be honest. Having tested the craftsmen and workers, the Conde turns out to be a positive force in promoting the ideals of hard work and virtuousness among the poor. He also exemplifies the powerful looking after the poor. The allusion to the "Dos de Mayo" is part of "an attempt to create a ritual or set of symbols which might have stimulated a strong national feeling" (Shubert 203). The date was a national holiday appropriated by liberals and reactionaries alike throughout the century in order to commemorate those martyred for a cause and to evoke patriotic sentiments (Shubert 203).

A young have-not's desire for social mobility leads him to Madrid, where he experiences financial ruin. In César Gginacoi's *Barro y cristal* (1883), Antón comes to Madrid from Almunia to see his son Juan, who does not welcome the surprise visit. In fact, Juan has pretended that his father is a brigadier, so as to be able to marry the daughter of a marquis and gain access to the nobleman's fortune (I: 6).

Although Juan appears to live in luxury, the reality is that he is in debt. He owes 6,000 duros to a creditor who has threatened to inform the Marquis (I: 3). In order to appear wealthier than he is, Juan has not only spent a great deal of money, but also assumed a false name. Until now, his deception has been working:

JUAN. ¿Quién, quién hoy convencería
al presuntuoso Marqués
y a su orgullosa familia
de que don Juan de Santurce,
al que muy presto su hija
ha de unirse, el que de rico

tiene fama muy cumplida,

y gasta coche y brillantes,

y juega y derrocha y tira,

es... sí, lo diré: un farsante

hijo de humilde familia

de Aragón, que vive sólo

del crédito y de la intriga? (I: 5)

Juan has taken great pains indeed to prevent the truth from coming out. As his father observes:

ANTÓN. ...*me ha costao guën trabajo*

y *pataas* el *poer*

dar con él! Como en sus cartas

venía *pusiendomé*

las señas *entivocaas*

yo, en *cuantico* que *allegué*

a Madrid me eché a buscarlo,

y ¡*quia*! *Denguno* de él

me dio razón; ya por últimas

jui al correo, *pergunté*

y *d'alli* me *encamiraron*

aquí. (I: 9)

Antón has been unable to locate Juan, due to incorrect addresses in his letters home. Antón's speech, unlike his son's, reveals that he is an outsider to Madrid, with less formal education than those he meets in the city. In a similar manner, Ildefonsa and Lino's speech in *Lo de arriba*

abajo, O, la Bolsa y el Rastro also marks them as members of a class apart from those upstairs. Similarly to don Gabriel of *Lo de arriba abajo, O, la Bolsa y el Rastro*, Juan has learned to speak like members of a higher class. Both characters view language as a point of entry to the socioeconomic strata to which they aspire.

In addition to supplying his father with the incorrect address in Madrid, Juan asks his friend Enrique to take Antón away so that the marriage may proceed:

> JUAN. ... Muchas veces, chico, las
> formas y farsas sociales
> obligan al hombre a...
> a mentir, sí! (I: 11)

When Enrique appears instead of Juan, Antón wonders why his son has not come:

> ANTÓN. ... ¿Qué negocios puede un hijo
> tener, señor, que le obliguen
> a *dispreciar* el cariño
> del *probe* que le dio el ser,
> y a *privale* del *gustico*
> de darle un abrazo? (I: 13)

Juan's attempt to send his father away echoes Fernando's refusal to meet Teresa at the train station when she visits him in *La victoria por castigo*. Generational conflict between parent and child and the tension between urban and rural values are factors in both confrontations.

Like the poor Luisa in *Vanidad y pobreza* and Pascual in *El pan del pobre*, the poor Antón holds dear the value of "honra y corazón":

> ANTÓN. ...*Probe* soy, *probe* he *nacío*:

pero guardo aquí un tesoro

(*Señala al corazón*).

que aún cuando no tiene el brillo

del oro ni del diamante,

es un tesoro bendito....

(*Con creciente energía hasta el final del parlamento*.)

Alhaja que no se compra;

nace con el *endeviduo*,

estorbo es para el villano,

honra para el hombre digno

y se llama... la vergüenza,

¡lo que mi hijo ha perdido!

...

¡Dígale que aunque soy *probe*

limosna infame no *almito*;

dígale que yo buscaba

las caricias de un buen hijo...

y que desprecio ese oro

cual desprecia él mi cariño! (I: 13)

When he finally does see his son Antón demands, "¡Di! ¿Qué has hecho de la honra que *trujiste* de Aragón?" (I: 16) Like Perico and others in *La bolsa*, Juan has rejected the country in favor of the city and lost the values associated with rural life.

In spite of his son's betrayal, Antón offers to defend Juan in a physical brawl with Daniel García, the creditor (I: 17). Juan's failure to defend himself suggests that city life and/or the love of money make a man less of a man. This phenomenon was also evident in Fernando's childish behavior in *La victoria por castigo,* which we saw in Chapter One, "The Banker, the Stockbroker," and in Carlos's tears in *El porvenir de las familias* in Chapter Three, "The Moneylender, the Creditor."

To everyone's surprise, Antón offers to pay the young man's debt —in cash. He has saved money to buy Juan a farm in the countryside and plans to use the funds to bail Juan out (I: 17). With the marriage cancelled, Antón expresses his intention to bring Juan back to the countryside. Here again, we see the values of the countryside privileged over those of the city of Madrid, like in *La familia a la moda* and in *La bolsa*, where Santillán pleads with Mendoza, and Mendoza with Perico, to return to the countryside to a simpler lifestyle. Antón's reminder, " ... ten presente, hijo mío, que Dios en su Santa ley, dijo: 'Honrarás padre y madre,'" (I: 18) links the love of God with country life or, in Juan's case, a return to the countryside.

Also in the countryside, condition of a community of have-nots as a contributing factor to social unrest, with tragic consequences, in Félix González Llana and José Francos Rodríguez's *El pan del pobre* (1894). An adaptation of the German Gerhart Hauptmann's social drama *Die Weber* (1892) (known as *Los Tejedores* in Spain), a dramatization of the Silesian weavers' revolt of 1844, *El pan del pobre* is a cautionary tale on social inequality. In the foreword, addressed to their friend José Echegaray[4], González Llana and Francos Rodríguez frame their play as "un aviso que deben tener muy en cuenta las clases pudientes, los gobiernos, y todos cuantos deseen

[4] José Echegaray (1832-1916), the playwright, was also an engineer, mathematician and administrator. He served in the Spanish government as Minister of Public Works and as Finance Minister. His plays dealt largely with conflicts involving duty, and for his achievements, he, along with France's Frédéric Mistral, received the 1904 Nobel Prize in Literature (see "José Echegaray—Biographical").

evitar que el problema social se resuelva entre los horrores de una lucha espantosa." This deadly struggle unfolds as a consequence of the actions of Don Jenaro, owner of a foundry, and his manager Peláez. They are about to announce a reduction in wages but are troubled by unrest among the workers. The ensuing struggle between don Jenaro and the workers parallels the struggle Marx wrote of, between the capitalist plant owners and the oppressed laborers (Fine and Saad-Filho 23-24).

The disagreement between don Jenaro and Peláez regarding the causes of the unrest and the appropriate course of action to take expose the existence of factions within classes and between generations:

> PELÁEZ. ¿Mayor desdicha que el hambre?... No conozco ninguna.
>
> JENARO. Pues yo sí. ¿No ve usted a nuestros jornaleros, antes humildes y serviciales, cómo se han vuelto ahora soberbios, iracundos y cómo murmuran contra el amo, contra el explotador, como ellos dicen?
>
> PELÁEZ. Achaques de necesitados es el malhumor. La miseria, como el vino, se sube a la cabeza.
>
> JENARO. No es la miseria, porque la miseria ha existido en todas las épocas. Es que se han perdido las buenas costumbres, los respetos, la obediencia, la educación... Cada obrero se cree hoy un señor absoluto y se irrita como un tirano cuando alguien resiste a sus caprichos.
>
> PELÁEZ. Si el obrero se enfurece algunas veces consiste en que tiene hambre. Es preciso darle de comer, y entonces se aplacará su furia. ¡Créame usted, señor don Jenaro, mientras no se resuelva este problema, no habrá paz en el mundo. (I: 1)

Don Jenaro believes the unrest is due to a lack of respect for authority and tradition, whereas Peláez maintains that poverty and hunger are the causes. Indeed, some of the workers and their families refer to the need for "pan" as we witnessed in previous chapters, where Guzmán in *La bolsa* and the farmers in *El usurero* also noted the shortage of wheat.

Peláez notes that prior to this period of unrest, the workers and the owner were more like a family, with "los obreros de la fábrica como los hijos del amo... Ahora la paz ha disminuido porque todos quieren aumentar el tanto por ciento de los productos" (I: 1). The deterioration in the relationship came about due to the owner's emerging profit motive. In Peláez's view, if there has been a loss of tradition, it is on the part of the owner, who no longer treats his workers kindly, as though they were family. Don Jenaro disagrees, pointing out, "Pero, ¿negará usted que nuestra industria decae? Yo, que he quintuplicado en otras épocas el capital de mi padre, veo hoy en merma mis ingresos" (I: 1). Peláez does concede, "Justo. El filón se agota..." (I: 1). Since he derives decreasing returns on his investment, don Jenaro feels he has no choice but to cut wages.

In response to the unrest, Don Jenaro favors more forceful treatment of the workers, whereas Peláez advocates a more empathetic approach. Indeed, Peláez suggests that they postpone the announcement of the wage reduction for the sake of peace:

> PELÁEZ. ¿No podríamos dilatar?... Los obreros andan ahora muy soliviantados y no es conveniente llevarlos hasta la desesperación.
>
> JENARO. Al contrario. Hoy no tienen fondos de resistencia y se someterán forzosamente. Ceder ahora sería tanto como confesar el miedo. (I: 1)

As the unrest grows, Don Jenaro's rigid approach becomes even more so, with tragic consequences. The workers assert their right to receive their wages:

> GREGORIO. Pues pasa que se me ha rebajado el jornal y que esto es un robo.

JENARO. ¡Esas palabras!

GREGORIO. Yo hablo en castellano, a Dios gracias.

JENARO. (¡Tú habías de ser el autor del escándalo!)

GREGORIO. Yo pido lo que es mío, lo que he ganado con el sudor de mi rostro, y no consiento que nadie me lo escamotee.

JENARO. ¿Faltas respeto a tu amo?

GREGORIO. Y usted falta al respeto a mi salario. (I: 7)

By disregarding such complaints, Don Jenaro tries to maintain a hierarchy between himself and his workers, rather than the family structure Peláez admired in the past. Even as the conflict intensifies, turning violent, don Jenaro thinks only of his property and himself, rather than consider the workers' concerns:

DON JENARO. (*mirando desde el balcón.*) Ya empiezan a agruparse en la plaza; y miran hacia aquí. ¡Infames! ¿Qué desean? ¿Qué quieren? Mi ruina, la destrucción de mi capital, de mi fortuna, que envidian. Sí, es la envidia que alienta sus odios, y la que produce sus enojos... Quieren que seamos todos iguales, pero iguales a ras de tierra. Que yo baje a sus miserias, porque ellos no pueden subir a mi opulencia... (III: 6)

He is able to see the conflict only in terms of the implications for him. He refuses to consider his workers' needs.

Don Jenaro is particularly preoccupied with the actions of one young worker who has been known to give fiery speeches daily to his peers: " ... está bien que Miguel, ese muchachuelo desconocido que vive con la familia de Pascual, predique ideas disolventes; está bien que todo se descomponga y destruya..." (I: 1). Peláez urges him not to think of conflict with the workers in

terms of "us versus them": "¡No, eso no!... ¡Dios me libre de semejantes desatinos, ni de fomentar el odio de clases! Pero, don Jenaro, ¡no echemos leña a la hoguera; no avivemos el incendio; tengamos prudencia!" (I: 1) Don Jenaro and Peláez's argument reflects concerns by business owners over the possibility of worker uprisings. Their concerns are valid, given the proliferation of riots in the late nineteenth century. For example, in 1866 and even more so in 1869, 1871 and 1873, subsistence crises (threats to the food supply and to the survival prospects of a large segment of the population) as well as economic crises occurred, followed promptly by riots in villages and cities (Bahamonde Magro and Martínez 565).

Unlike don Jenaro, Peláez admits to his own wrongdoing towards the workers:

> PELÁEZ. Hemos tratado muy mal a esos infelices trabajadores, que ahora nos amenazan; los tratamos muy mal, y son muchos para oprimidos.
>
> JENARO. ¿Tiene usted miedo?
>
> PELÁEZ. Miedo, sí. Y no por mí, seguramente. Tengo miedo a los furores de esa multitud. (III: 5).

Additionally, in contrast to don Jenaro, Peláez has considered the likely consequences of taking a hard line towards the workers.

Not all the workers favor participation in the uprising, however. Miguel's adoptive father, Pascual, is moderate in his approach to the withheld wages because his past as a soldier has shaped his view of society:

> PASCUAL. ... Cuando allá en las tierras de África, a pesar de estar casado y con hijos, ingresé en el batallón de provinciales y vertí mi sangre y expuse cien veces mi vida, no pensé nunca, al obedecer a mis jefes, en que eran únicamente mis superiores, sino en que eran además mis compatriotas; cuando

> peleaba con saña enfrente del enemigo no se me ocurría jamás que en mi nación hubiese pobres y ricos, señores y esclavos; sólo pensaba en que había españoles, y en que yo, aunque humilde soldado, era uno de ellos. (II: 6)

Brotherhood and unity of the nation are more important to Pascual than hierarchy and class differences felt so acutely by his son. When his son and other workers go to don Jenaro for their withheld wages, Pascual urges, "Pero al menos, pedid con moderación, con templanza" (II: 6). However, they ignore his advice. When his daughter urges him to join the workers in the fight against don Jenaro, he pleads with her, "No, dejemos al cielo que le castigue" (II: 9). His faith in God is stronger than any desire to confront don Jenaro.

Miguel is young, full of hate and more impulsive than his adoptive father:

> PASCUAL. ¿Dónde aprendiste a aborrecer?
>
> MIGUEL. ¿Dónde?... En el taller, viendo yo que rindiéndome de fatiga gano una peseta, y el amo, descansado, gana un millar. En la casa, viendo que yo como poco y mal por ser trabajador y otros comen mucho y bien por ser holgazanes... En la calle, recogiendo desprecios e insultos de aquellos mismos que se elevan por mis fuerzas. ¡Pues si el odio se respira, está en la atmósfera, se mete en nuestras venas, circula con nuestra sangre! ¡Odio, sí; un odio inacabable, mortal, eterno! ... (II: 6)

The harsh working conditions have embittered Miguel. Like don Jenaro, he views the worker-owner relationship in terms of "us versus them." He blames the inequality in income for his hatred towards don Jenaro and others like him. When Miguel and his coworkers approach don Jenaro to ask for their wages, they are rebuffed. From this point on, they take an increasingly defiant tone:

JENARO. ¡Fuera! ¡A estos ingratos hay que domarlos!

MIGUEL. ¡A estos hay que vencerlos!

GREGORIO. ¡A estos hay que destruirlos! (I: 9)

Don Jenaro refers to the workers as though they were wild animals in need of being tamed. He vows to punish them severely, believing that they will submit. His niece begs for him to reconsider, but in vain.

As troops are summoned to bring order to the village, a native son returns, but very much changed. Indalecio left the village for the military. Upon his return, he insists he is glad to have left:

INDALECIO. Cuando salí del pueblo estaba harto de trabajar en el campo, escuálido, entontecido; pero a los cuatro meses de llegar a Madrid y de haber ingresado en un regimiento, era otro hombre ... Por el mundo a ver tierras. Yo he servido a la patria, y ya no quiero doblar de nuevo el espinazo. Antes de volver otra vez al campo, prefiero hacerme contrabandista... ¡qué sé yo! cualquier cosa. Vengo al pueblo a dar una vuelta, a ver a mis padres, y a lucir mi persona y mi uniforme. (II: 4)

His journey is representative of the pattern of migration documented in Chapter One, where I discuss the rejection of rural life for a move to the cities, as occurs in *La bolsa*. The conditions of rural life caused Indalecio to leave. Under no circumstances does he wish to return to the country, where he would need to perform backbreaking labor and yet go hungry, as his former neighbors now do. He is only visiting.

Indalecio no longer shows loyalty to his former neighbors:

SINFOROSO. ... Tú eres de los míos.

INDALECIO. ¿De los suyos? Se engaña usted, tío Sinforoso. Yo soy, o por lo menos, yo fui de los que pegan...

SINFOROSO. Pero tú eres hijo del pueblo, como nosotros.

INDALECIO. Antes de ingresar en las filas. Después somos esclavos de la ordenanza, y si los jefes nos dan la orden, hacemos fuego contra nuestra propia familia. (II: 4)

So as to avoid being a victim again, Indalecio has become a bully. His enjoyment of power contrasts with the pacifistic attitude of Pascual, who was once a soldier but has chosen to promote cooperation with don Jenaro instead of protest. By denying his identity as a native of the village, Indalecio demonstrates he is willing to betray his own family and neighbors.

Another problem Indalecio left behind when he moved to Madrid was illiteracy. When Sinforoso appears in front of don Jenaro and Pelaez, he admits he is unable to sign the form regarding the reduction in his wages:

PELÁEZ. ¡Firma!

SINFOROSO. No sé firmar.

RAFAELA. Pon una cruz.

SINFOROSO. ¡Qué mayor cruz que tú!

GREGORIO. Y debajo, *requiescat in pace*. (I: 7)

Gregorio's dark joke about the crossed document's resemblance to a grave marker reflects the harsh, often deadly conditions in which Sinforoso and his peers work. In the preceding chapter, in the analysis of *La dote de Patricia*, we explored the phenomenon of illiteracy in Spain and some of its probable causes. Sinforoso's inability to sign his name reflects the failure of the liberal state throughout the nineteenth century to establish an efficient system of schooling, one

that would reach all social strata rather than a select few (Bahamonde Magro and Martínez 484). Indeed, as of 1857, 75% of the Spanish population was illiterate (Bahamonde Magro and Martínez 485). By 1899, 64% of the Spanish population was illiterate —a much higher proportion than in other European countries, such as France, where 20% of the population was illiterate (Bahamonde Magro and Martínez 486). The state had neglected elementary education, particularly in "frágiles economías locales" (Bahamonde Magro and Martínez 487), such as that in which *El pan del pobre* is set. As Gabriel Tortella has indicated, a vicious circle shapes educational demand, such that poverty limits the potential for investment in education, and the lack of education makes economic growth difficult, thereby perpetuating poverty (*Development* 19). Additionally, a poor, ill-informed population in a technologically backward country is less likely to appreciate the importance of education, beginning with the ability to read (Tortella, *Development* 19).

The condition of women in the village is even more desperate than that of the men. Pascual's daughter, Micaela, is a widow who believes that her husband worked himself to death serving Jenaro's household: " ... hay varios modos de buscar la muerte. Unos se levantan la tapa de los sesos de un tiro, y otros se engolfan en el trabajo y pierden la vida" (I: 3). It is the latter that happened to Micaela's husband. Don Jenaro's niece, Julia, who witnessed the gruesome death of Micaela's husband on the job, expresses sympathy towards Micaela (I: 2). Against her uncle's wishes, she tries to help Micaela's children:

> JULIA. ... siempre que puedo, voy a ver a los hijos de aquel hombre, de aquella víctima anónima de esta guerra que los pobres tienen contra la miseria... ¡Sí, por los hijitos!... ¡Si tú los vieras!... ¡Son tan simpáticos y tan agradecidos!... El mayor me vio entrar, ya te dije que se llama Paquito, me vio entrar y me

saludó muy fino. Llevaba yo en la mano este bolsillo con dinero y una flor en el pecho; pues, ¿qué dirás que me pidió el pilluelo?

JENARO. Dinero.

JULIA. Me pidió la flor. Ya ves si es bueno: codicia más las rosas que las monedas. (I: 3)

Don Jenaro is willing to believe the worst about the poor Paquito. Although hungry, the boy refuses to beg (II: 5). Only when shopkeeper Antonia offers does Paquito accept a roll to share at home with his siblings, but he quietly resolves, "Pero yo me como la mitad en el camino" (II: 5). His hunger will eventually turn into desperation, however.

Julia's moderate approach is not shared by her uncle: " ... No entiendo una palabra de estas cosas que llaman cuestiones sociales, conflictos entre el capital y el trabajo... ¡qué sé yo! Pero creo que si los ricos cediesen, un poco, se arreglarían fácilmente... ¡Es tan hermoso ceder ante el necesitado!" (III: 1). Unlike her uncle, she espouses Christian values such as charity and forgiveness. When she begs him to forgive the workers, he stubbornly refuses (III: 3). Moreover, she offers to sacrifice herself when Miguel threatens don Jenaro, but because she has shown him and other poor people kindness, Miguel spares her (III: 9). Indeed, Miguel's radicalism has its limits. He warns his confederates not to harm women or elderly people. Softening his stance somewhat, he explains, "... Es preciso redimir al pueblo, esclavizado, embrutecido, hambriento, agonizante, por todos los medios. Pero no se redime matando a los seres indefensos" (IV: 8). He is prepared to kill and to die if necessary, but he is humane towards those who, in his view, have not done anything wrong.

In addition to the risk of being killed in the uprising, the locals face the danger of dying from disease or starvation. One of Micaela's children is ill with tuberculosis (IV: 1). This disease

is common in crowded, unsanitary conditions among people who are undernourished and weak (Tortella, *Development* 36). Indeed, epidemics such as tuberculosis spread rapidly during or shortly after subsistence crises or food shortages, of which Spain experienced many throughout the nineteenth century. In the preceding chapter I have listed the dates of 12 such crises. Micaela's poor health leaves her unable to nurse her youngest child (IV: 1). Another woman, Leandra, begs don Jenaro and Peláez for help obtaining medicine for her ill husband, but to no avail (I: 5). The resulting high mortality rates, particularly among the rural poor as depicted in *El pan del pobre*, were a key factor hampering the overall economic development of Spain until very late in the nineteenth century (Tortella, *Development* 36).

Another disease affecting the poor community is alcoholism. Rafaela's husband Sinforoso drinks, even as the uprising unfolds around him. He has surrendered to vice instead of fighting injustice. One reason why the poor take refuge in alcohol is "because the world they inhabit provides no other relaxation than that offered by a bottle and a deck of cards" (Shubert 203). For some, it is like a religion, as a worker greets the wine with, "¡Bendita sea su nombre!" (II: 1). Additionally, poor men were drawn to the taverns because they were meeting places, the prevalent form of working class leisure (Shubert 202).

Sinforoso's drinking habit has cost his family money needed to pay bills:

> TODOS. Buenas tardes.
>
> SINFOROSO. Yo convido.
>
> OBRERO. ¿Tú?
>
> SINFOROSO. Yo, sí. Mi mujer dudaba entre si había de pagar al tendero o al panadero. Yo he resuelto la cuestión dejando a los dos iguales. No se paga a nadie y *laus Deo*. Cuando el jornal no alcanza para comer, se bebe. La he

> quitado los cuartos, y aquí están. (*Sonando las monedas en el bolsillo del pantalón*.) ¡Para vino! ¡Y viva la clase obrera! (II: 3)

By taking this money to pay for wine, Sinforoso is dishonoring his family.

Rafaela, like Pascual, foresees trouble for the workers and community of the poor as a result of the violent acts they are committing in response to the wage cuts. She disagrees with Micaela that arson and pillage are justifiable acts of protest:

> MICAELA. ...El fuego es bueno; no respeto a nadie. Lo mismo arde hoy el palacio lujoso de don Jenaro que ardieron hace unos días las casuchas del muelle, las chozas de aquellos infelices pescadores... No, así no, las cosas ricas arden mejor...
>
> RAFAELA. ¿Estás loca?
>
> MICAELA. ¿Por qué? ¿Porque deseo que las víctimas se hagan justicia por su mano?
>
> RAFAELA. Será justicia, no lo niego... pero lo malo es que mañana no habrá trabajo, y sin trabajo no hay pan, y lo que es sin pan nos vamos a ver malísimamente.
>
> MICAELA. ¿Peor de lo que estamos?
>
> RAFAELA. Peor. Yo creo que nuestros hombres se han propasado mucho. Darle su merecido al fabricante, bueno; pero eso de quedarnos *per istam* va a tener malas consecuencias. (IV: 1)

For Rafaela, the violence will not solve what she believes to be the root of the problem — hunger. In this way she takes a stance similar to Peláez and Pascual's. Pascual also believes the workers' actions will only make matters worse: "Estoy triste, sí, triste y avergonzado. Triste,

porque nuestra desgracia se hace aun mayor. Avergonzado, porque yo no nací para facineroso..." (IV: 4). He wanted to be an honorable person, yet he has been dragged into the conflict.

Conditions deteriorate so much that Micaela wishes aloud for an early death, even though her children would be left orphaned:

> MICAELA. ... Para el pobre no hay más descanso ni más felicidad que los de reposar eternamente sobre la tierra húmeda del camposanto ... ¡Si yo fuera hombre!... ¡Si yo fuera como esos! Mírelos usted (*Señalando a los bebedores*) tan satisfechos, tan tranquilos, gastando en copas los pocos cuartos que les quedan, mientras sus familias apenas si tienen pan que llevarse a la boca.

With their child-rearing and housekeeping duties, women suffer from a lack of freedom, while men can escape to drink. Only death would free Micaela from her troubles. By pointing out the irresponsible behavior of the men, Micaela suggests that poverty and the vices it brings –like sudden wealth and the risk of slothfulness associated with it, which we saw in Chapter One in *La victoria por castigo*— make a man less of a man.

Other poor women who have suffered include the late Leonor, who came into the care of Pascual after being abandoned by a seducer (II: 8). Leonor had turned to prostitution (II: 8). Poor and uneducated, she had no other way to obtain money for food. The illegitimate child born of this affair with don Jenaro turns out to be Miguel, whom Pascual adopted (II: 8). The seduction and abandonment of Leonor is another way in which don Jenaro exploited the town's poor.

Don Jenaro's inflexibility towards his workers has tragic consequences as he unwittingly causes his own son Miguel's death. When people in power like don Jenaro exploit and turn against their own, weaker compatriots, the results may be deadly for all. As the conflict becomes violent and townspeople die, we witness the radicalization of characters who previously held

moderate positions. For example, Micaela attempts to convince her father that they must join the fight against don Jenaro: "¿Se unirá a los obreros? ¡Sangre, fuego, todo es justo contra el que nos ha robado la honra!" (II: 9) Although he previously insisted that the workers be prudent in their approach to don Jenaro, Pascual is passionate about maintaining "honra." For this reason, he angrily confronts don Jenaro as being "el egoista que sólo piensa en sí propio, que explota a los demás para su medro, y deshonra por placer..." (III: 7). Furthermore, Pascual reveals that Miguel is the child don Jenaro fathered, dishonoring Leonor:

> PASCUAL. ... Tú hiciste que mi hija olvidase los deberes de la honradez que inspiré yo siempre. ¡Con que no te quejes de que esos jornaleros, ignorantes, pobres, entristecidos, sin pan que llevarse a la boca, mediten inicuas venganzas, cuando tú, hombre de luces, rico, has sido capaz de realizar el mayor mal de la tierra! ¡Sí, tú eres mucho más villano que los que predican el exterminio de la riqueza, porque practicas el exterminio de la honra! (III: 7)

This confrontation illustrates that "honra" is defined differently by various characters. For don Jenaro, "honra" is tied to socioeconomic status. That is why Jenaro and his niece differ on the meaning of the term:

> JENARO. ... Ese obrero revoltoso, ese retórico de *meeting* te ha trastornado el cerebro como a todos los pobres diablos de este pueblo, que la oyen con un palmo de boca abierta. Las mujeres dotadas de una sensibilidad tan exquisita como la tuya, juzgáis siempre con el corazón y os equivocáis casi siempre; pero yo sé a qué atenerme sobre la bondad de esos reformadores que hablan de transformar la sociedad en una nueva Arcadia, cuando lo que realmente quieren es satisfacer sus propios apetitos.

JULIA. Te equivocas, tío; Miguel es honrado.

JENARO. No puede ser honrado quien no se resigna con su suerte. (I: 3)

By condemning Miguel's behavior at the rallies, don Jenaro is linking "honra" with his ideal of an individual who knows his place in society and remains submissive —not someone who fights for reform.

Pascual's dedication to "honra" has influenced Miguel, in spite of their differences. When Julia again begs Miguel not to confront the troops who take aim at the workers, he declares, "Por usted sacrificaría hasta mi vida, pero no la honra" (IV: 9). To Pascual, "honra" is forgotten, however, as the conflict becomes deadly. Pascual becomes enraged upon witnessing Miguel's death and plunges headlong into the battle: "¡Hijos del pueblo, defendeos; matad sin compasión! ¡No huyais; vengad a Miguel! ... ¡No me intimida el silbido de las balas!" (IV: 10) His own death in the crossfire suggests that the moderates like him will ultimately fall. Micaela, too, vows revenge in the wake of Miguel's and Pascual's deaths (IV: 10). Women become more involved in the mobilization of the lower classes. As time goes on and social inequality continues, unrest will spread. With Pascual's death, it is likely that the generation of his grandchild Paco will tend to be radical, instead of moderate as Pascual was. Not only do women like Micaela enter the fray, but also children like her son Paco, who ultimately gives in to desperation —much to Pascual's sorrow:

PACO (*Saca un objeto del bolsillo, lo mira un momento y lo guarda, y después se acerca poco a poco a Pascual, que continúa ensimismado*.) ¡Abuelo! (*Más alto.*) ¡Abuelito! ¡Anda, y qué jaleo! No para de ir y venir los obreros... Unos dan voces; otros siguen alrededor de la casa... Pero el tío Miguel no deja

entrar a nadie para que no roben... Dice que así se deshonra la causa del pueblo.

PASCUAL. Ya se ha deshonrado.

PACO. Pero, ¿no es nuestro todo lo que hay en la fábrica?... Andrés, el hijo del tío Pantaleón, el fogonero, me dijo que todo aquello era de los pobres... (IV: 5).

Once reluctant to beg, Paco has stolen a potato, which he offers to his grandfather. Pascual is horrified that a member of his family has turned to theft (IV: 5). Paco's transformation into a lawless youth willing to steal is an echo of Fagin's band of street urchins in Dickens' *Oliver Twist*, which I mentioned as a point of reference at the beginning of this chapter.

Upon discovering that he is don Jenaro's biological son, Miguel rejects him. This reaction, as well as don Jenaro's half-hearted approach in calling out to his son, suggest a continuation of the class struggle:

JENARO. (*Yendo hacia él*) ¡Miguel! (*Muy bajo*) ¡Hijo mío!

MIGUEL. (*Abrazando a Pascual*.) ¡Mi único padre es este! ¡No me engendró, per me ha querido y me quiere! ¡Su clase es mi clase!... ¡La de usted es la clase que odio, la que fomentó la desesperación en mi pecho, la que hizo germinar en mi cerebro estos pensamientos de venganza que me enloquecen y en mi corazón estos rencores que me ciegan! (IV: 7)

Miguel's reference to the thoughts of vengeance he has had is reminiscent of *Germinal*, Émile Zola's 1885 novel about a French coalminers' strike. Seeds of rebellion are sown among the people, particularly the young.

With its references to hunger and constant struggle against those who would enslave the worker, the song heard outside the tavern in *El pan del pobre* is similar in meaning to *The*

Internationale, the anthem of the International Communist and Socialist Movements, which had been translated into Spanish by the time *El pan del pobre* was written. The song heard in *El pan del pobre* goes as follows:

(*En este momento se escucha la siguiente canción.)*

Los hombres del trabajo
tienen que conquistar
en lucha decidida,
en lucha atroz el pan.
Cansado de martirios,
cansado de aguantar,
odiosos privilegios
el pueblo ha de borrar. (II: 6)

The lyrics of *La Internacional* also depict the workers as soldiers in battle who are to fight to change the world:

¡En pie! ¡condenados de la tierra!
¡En pie! ¡esclavos del hambre!
La razón atruena en su cráter:
Es la erupción final.
¡Del pasado hagamos tabla rasa,
Muchedumbre esclava, ¡en pie! ¡en pie!
El mundo va a cambiar de base:
¡No somos nada, seámoslo todo! (“La Internacional”)

The idea behind the phrase, "hagamos tabla rasa," echoes in Miguel's argument with Julia about the future of the struggle between the workers and don Jenaro. As she pleads with him to be prudent, Miguel insists:

> MIGUEL. Ya le he dicho que a veces sueño que deseo subir, ser algo, cambiar mis miserias por desahogos, pero eso es imposible.
>
> JULIA. ¿Imposible? ¿Por qué? Esos sueños...
>
> MIGUEL. No pueden realizarse, no deben realizarse. Porque ha oído usted decir a nuestros enemigos que aspiramos a la nivelación de clases, a la igualdad absoluta, ¿supone que yo creo en semejantes tonterías? Se comunican unas clases con otras como unas comarcas con otras, por puentes que salvan abismos, por túneles que taladran montañas. La verdadera nivelación consiste en dejarlo todo raso como la palma de la mano... (*Con mucha vehemencia*.) (III: 2)

Miguel believes that only total destruction, such as in the fires set by his coworkers, will change the situation. With so many like Micaela vowing revenge for the deaths of their loved ones, and with moderates like Pascual killed, their voices silenced, the struggle is to continue for generations to come.

Conclusion

Over the course of this project, I have studied ways in which nineteenth-century playwrights observed, critiqued, and exalted economic characters. Against a background of economic history, sociology and political economy, as well as gender relations, I have attempted to determine what anxieties and economic insecurities were reflected in the behavior of such

figures, what ideologies were being embraced or rejected and what solutions were being proposed. A close examination of these nineteenth-century plays illustrates that government corruption, foreign influence or intervention, the neglect of some sectors of the economy and the degeneration of society due to the love of money, were pressing concerns for playwrights and public alike. My investigation also demonstrates that the reallocation of national wealth towards neglected sectors, regions and groups, reflected in a return to the countryside or donations to the needy in a number of plays, is one possible solution that the playwrights propose.

Among the models of behavior rejected in the plays are those associated with speculation, gambling and moneylending (when such moneylending does not benefit a family or community as a whole). The plays I analyzed contain critiques not only of the practices themselves, as those figures who utilize them are punished, but also of corrupt governments. Such governments concentrated resources on urban commerce, foreign military expeditions and wasteful infrastructure projects, to the neglect of domestic agriculture, workers and the poor.

Other negative models of behavior in the plays illustrate the wide range of problems stemming from sudden wealth, just as the physically unhealthy bankers and stockbrokers profiled in Chapter One reflect the ill health of society. First, the obsession with money separates and alienates families (those of Simón in *El usurero*, don Aniceto in *¡Si yo tuviera dinero!*, Luisa and Arturo in *La bolsa y el bolsillo*, Juan in *Barro y cristal*, and Fernando in *La victoria por castigo*). It encourages immature or unmanly behavior (Mendoza in *La bolsa* and Fernando in *La victoria por castigo*). Additionally, the newly wealthy are compelled to buy political office in order to maintain their family business or social position (Olmedo in *Achaques del siglo actual* and don Aniceto in *¡Si yo tuviera dinero!*). Moreover, a preoccupation with money tends to be incompatible with the fostering of the arts (Estevez in *Achaques del siglo actual* and Rodríguez

in *Santi, boniti, barati*). Furthermore, the love of money runs counter to values cherished by prior generations such as: religion (don Canuto and Madama in *La familia a la moda,* Fernando in *La victoria por castigo*), military service (Carlos in *El porvenir de las familias*) and national pride (Madama *in La familia a la moda*, the guardians in *La dote de Patricia*). These old values turn out to be unstable in the new economy.

Among the privileged ideologies are those embodied by economic man or woman, who demonstrates superior mastery of business practices and language. This individual saves money, lives simply, and gives to those needier than himself or herself. He or she (doña Guiomar in *La familia a la moda*, don Blas in *Tanto vales cuanto tienes*, don Aniceto's uncle in *¡Si yo tuviera dinero!* and Matilde in *El porvenir de las familias*) takes over the family finances and restores order to the household, thereby demonstrating that women and *indianos* may play a crucial role in national renewal. In addition, the economic man or woman exalted in these plays illustrates that a new concept of honor was emerging during the nineteenth century: one associated more with solvency than with a man's protection of his wife (Irene in *Los tres banqueros*, who refuses a loan from the corrupt Leyva).

When women in the plays I studied provide the solutions to men's financial difficulties, they tend to reinforce the bonds of marriage and family. For example, Petra in *Don Trifón* and Matilde in *El porvenir de las familias* act in this manner. They do not leave their husbands or force other male relatives to leave the home. Instead, they give their entire life savings to solve the problems caused by the men. In doing so, they worsen their own financial condition in order to benefit others. In contrast, when men, such as don Blas in *Tanto vales cuanto tienes*, solve financial problems caused by women, their condition tends to remain the same. Therefore,

although women are expected to play an expanded role in finding solutions to economic problems, they are expected to do so within limits set by men.

In addition to women and *indianos*, a further source of the revitalization of the nation is the have-not who acquires knowledge of financial and business practices and employs it to benefit his/her household and family. Don Gabriel in *Lo de arriba abajo, O, La bolsa y el rastro*, does exactly this. This figure is rewarded with social mobility, as the downstairs family's move to the upstairs residence in that play reflects.

Another fundamental change in values reflected in the plays is that nobility of character is privileged over nobility of title or newfound wealth. Figures such as the Barón in *Vanidad y pobreza* and the Conde in *El rico y el pobre* prove to be corrupt individuals who struggle to find their place in the new economy as their inherited fortunes dwindle. The have-not with nobility of character, exemplified by Luisa in *Vanidad y pobreza*, is an exalted figure. She is endowed with honor, now associated less with female sexual purity and more with charity and philanthropy.

At the opposite extreme, the absence of charity, and a failure to embrace philanthropy, lead to tragedy. As seen in *El pan del pobre*, one of the haves, foundry owner don Jenaro, refuses to take care of his workers, who live in squalid conditions. The resulting uprising mirrors elites' fears of social upheaval.

Some of my findings have raised new questions for future study. Chief among them is the recurring theme of a growing obsession with money at the expense of the arts. This preoccupation with profit-making to the detriment of the arts manifests itself in the speculator as well as in the struggling poet, singer or craftsperson. Furthermore, my discoveries on the *indiano* have stimulated my interest in conducting a more in-depth study on this figure, particularly insofar as his travel between Spain, England and the Caribbean is concerned. Both the figure of

the *indiano* and the question of money at the expense of art have led me to consider the extension of my research to a trans-Atlantic framework, to include Cuba and Puerto Rico.

As I have found, the Caribbean has been a particularly prolific region for nineteenth-century plays on capitalism, perhaps owing to its status as the site of greatest economic growth among Spain's holdings through the end of the nineteenth century. Some of the research questions I would pose would be the same as in this project. However, since Cuban and Puerto Rican societies and economies functioned differently from the peninsular and from each other, some new issues and questions, unique to the Caribbean or trans-Atlantic contexts, would require my consideration. Therefore, I would need to draw from historians such as Christopher Schmidt Nowara, and economists such as Victor Bulmer-Thomas and John Coatsworth, among others. Questions of race and slavery, with which I have not dealt in this study, would figure prominently in a study of nineteenth-century Caribbean theater. For this reason, I would likely need to investigate and employ as background the work of critical race theorists and the influence of intellectuals on both sides of the Atlantic who were making public statements and shaping policies and practices based on race.

In the Caribbean, a booming sugar industry helped to fund the first railroad in Latin America. Transatlantic economic and political links, embodied in the figure of the *indiano*, remained strong late into the nineteenth century. Here, as in the peninsula, late nineteenth-century industrial production techniques eliminated many jobs and began to threaten the artisanal, or crafts-based, way of life.

The plays I would like to examine from this region reflect differing ideologies based on social class and race, as demonstrated by tensions between the dominant, capitalist *hacendados* (mostly whites) and the craftspersons (principally black and *mulato*). Among the latter group,

from which Puerto Rican playwrights Manuel Alonso Pizarro and Eleuterio Derkes hailed, there was considerable solidarity. Their works give voice to the exploited lower classes, but also point out their shortcomings and call them to action. The Cuban plays I would like to explore focus on the effects of nascent capitalism on *criollo* society, in particular materialism and vulnerability to swindles. Tensions between sugar barons and relative newcomers to society are part of the search for national identity. José Agustín Millán's *Una mina de oro* (1847) and *Un californiano* (1851), for example, examine gold rush fever and the relationship between Cuba and the United States. In *Un californiano*, a father's preoccupation with the future of the sugar industry and his family's wealth leads him to welcome the return of a local who has traveled north to California in hopes of making a fortune. He is determined to arrange a marriage between his daughter and this adventurer, but the arrival of yankees from the gold mining territories complicates his plans. Texts such as this one reflect anxiety about the degradation of Cuban values by the influx of foreign capital and groups.

Works Cited

Alba, Juan de. *Los hijos del trabajo: drama en un acto y en verso*. Madrid: Impr. de J. Rodríguez, 1873. Internet resource.

---. *El porvenir de las familias: drama de costumbres en tres actos y en verso*. Madrid: Impr. de José Rodríguez, 1865. Print.

Alcalde y Valladares, Antonio. *Quiero dinero: pieza en un acto y en verso*. Córdoba: Impr. de La Alborada, 1860. Internet resource.

Álvarez Nogal, Carlos. "La estrategia del Estado para vender lotería en España: la organización de venta y sus incentivos." Garvía Soto, Roberto. *Fortuna y virtud: historia de las loterías públicas en España*. Madrid: Sílex, 2009. Internet resource.

Ambros Atance, Laura. *Ponton de la Oliva Dam-Project Management*. Escuela de Organización Industrial. Internet resource. http://www.eoi.es/blogs/lauraambros/ 6 November 2013.

Angelón, Manuel. *La bolsa: drama en cuatro actos y en verso*. Barcelona: N. Ramirez, 1858. Print.

Bahamonde Magro, Ángel. *Hacer las Américas: las élites coloniales españolas en el siglo XIX*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1992. Print.

Bahamonde Magro, Ángel, and Jesús A. Martínez. *Historia de España: Siglo XIX*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1994. Print.

Bahamonde Magro, Ángel, and Julián Toro Mérida. *Burguesía, especulación y cuestión social en el Madrid del siglo XIX*. Estudios de Historia Contemporánea Siglo XXI. Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno de España Editores, 1978. Print.

Blanco García, Francisco. "Triunfo del Romanticismo. El duque de Rivas." *La literatura española en el siglo XIX. Parte primera. Romanticismo y literatura del Siglo XIX*. Madrid: Sáenz de Jubera Hermanos, 1909. 129-53. Alicante : Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 2007. Internet resource.

Blasco, Eusebio. *¡Si yo tuviera dinero!: comedia en tres actos*. Madrid: Impr. de J. Rodríguez, 1880. Internet resource.

Botella y Andrés, Francisco, and Vicente Lalama. *La muger de medio siglo: comedia original, en un acto y en prosa*. Madrid: Impr. de V. de Lalama, 1858. Print.

---. *El rico y el pobre: drama en cuatro actos*. Madrid: Impr. de J. Rodríguez, 1855. Print.

"carpanta." Def. 1. *Diccionario de la lengua española*. Madrid: Real Academia Española, 2001. Internet resource.

Copeland, Eva M. "Empire, Nation, and the *indiano* in Galdós's *Tormento* and *La loca de la casa*." *Hispanic Review*. 80.2 (2012): 221-242. Print.

"Creditor." Butler, Brian, David Butler, and Alan Isaacs. *A Dictionary of Finance and Banking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. Internet resource.

Cruz, Jesús. *Gentlemen, Bourgeois, and Revolutionaries. Political Change and Cultural Persistence among the Spanish Dominant Groups 1750-1850*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1996. Print.

---. *The Rise of Middle-Class Culture in Nineteenth-Century Spain*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 2011. Print.

Davies, Catherine. *Women in Context, Volume 5: Spanish Women's Writing, 1849-1996*. London: Continuum International Publishing, 2000. Internet resource.

Delamarre, Théodore. "Don Angel de Saavedra, Duc de Rivas, sa vie, ses oeuvres." *Revue espagnole et portugaise* 4 (1857): 475-81. Alicante : Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 2007. Internet resource.

Delgado, Maria M, and David T. Gies. *A History of Theatre in Spain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. Print.

Díaz, José María. *Los tres banqueros: drama en tres actos*. Madrid: Impr. de A. Sta. Coloma, 1860. Print.

Díaz Marcos, Ana María. "Viejas ladinas, petimetras finas: (des)obediencia y trasgresión en *La familia a la moda* de María Rosa Gálvez." Dieciocho 32.2 (2009): 333-50. Print.

"Echegaray, José - Biographical". *Nobelprize.org.* Nobel Media AB 2013. Internet resource. 27 Apr 2014. <http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1904/eizaguirre-bio.html>

Ferber, Marianne A, and Julie A. Nelson. *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993. Print.

---. *Feminist Economics Today: Beyond Economic Man*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. Print.

Fine, Ben, and Alfredo Saad-Filho. *Marx's Capital*. London: Pluto Press, 2010. Internet resource.

Font de Villanueva, Cecilia. "La aparición de la lotería en España, ¿qué reacciones generó?" Garvía Soto, Roberto. *Fortuna y virtud: historia de las loterías públicas en España*. Madrid: Sílex, 2009. Internet resource.

Fontana, Josep. *Cambio económico y actitudes políticas en la España del siglo XIX*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel, 1973. Print.

Frost, Daniel. *Cultivating Madrid: Public Space and Middle-Class Culture in the Spanish Capital, 1833-1890*. Lewisburg: Backnell University Press, 2008. Print.

Fusi Aizpurúa, Juan Pablo, and Gámir J. Palafox. *España, 1808-1996: el desafío de la modernidad*. Madrid: Espasa, 1997. Print.

Gálvez, María R, and René Andioc. *La familia a la moda: comedia en tres actos y en verso*. Salamanca: Grupo de Estudios del Siglo XVIII, Universidad de Salamanca, 2001. Print.

García Parreño, Joaquín. *El dinero y la nobleza: comedia en cuatro actos y en prosa*. Barcelona: Impr. de Espasa Hnos. y Salvat, 1873. Print.

Garvía Soto, Roberto. *Fortuna y virtud: historia de las loterías públicas en España*. Madrid: Sílex, 2009. Internet resource.

Gately, Iain. *Tobacco: A Cultural History of How an Exotic Plant Seduced Civilization*. New York: Grove Press, 2002. Print.

Gginacoi, César. *Barro y cristal: : comedia en un acto y en verso*. Madrid: s.n., 1883. Print.

Gies, David T. *The Theatre in Nineteenth-Century Spain*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. Print.

Gil y Zárate, Antonio. *Don Trifon, o Todo por el dinero, comedia en 4 actos.* Madrid: impr. de Repullés, 1841. Print.

González-Allende, Iker. "De la romántica a la mujer nueva : La representación de la mujer en la literatura española del siglo XIX." *Letras de Deusto* 39 (2009): 51-76. Print.

González Llana, Félix, and José Francos Rodríguez. *El pan del pobre: drama en cuatro actos y en prosa, inspirado en la lectura de una obra alemana*. Madrid: R. Velasco, 1894. Print.

Guerra Bosch, Teresa. *El usurero Torquemada: de tipo a personaje*. Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. Biblioteca Universitaria, 1992. Internet resource.

Gutiérrez de Alba, José María. *La dote de Patricia: fábula lírico-dramática en un acto y en verso*. Madrid: Impr. de J. Rodríguez, 1865. Print.

---. *Vanidad y pobreza: comedia original en tres actos y en verso*. Madrid: Impr. de J. Rodríguez, 1860. Print.

Haidt, Rebecca. "A Well-Dressed Woman Who Will Not Work: Petimetras, Economics and Eighteenth-Century Fashion Plates." *Revista canadiense de estudios hispánicos* 28.1 (2003): 137-57. Print.

Huici, José María. *Un buen pagador: pieza en un acto y en verso*. Madrid: Impr. de J. Rodríguez, 1873. Print.

---. *Pagar sus deudas sin un ochavo: comedia en un acto*. Zaragoza: s.n., 1837. Print.

"Huici." Ossorio y Bernard, Manuel. *Ensayo de un catálogo de periodistas españoles del siglo XIX*. Madrid: Imprenta y litografía de J. Palacios, 1903. Print.

"Huici, José María." Duce, González A. *Gran enciclopedia aragonesa, 2000*. Zaragoza: Prensa Diaria Aragonesa, 2000. Print.

"La Internacional de Eugène Pottier (traducción realizada al castellano por el Grupo Germinal)." Foro Comunista. Internet resource. http://www.forocomunista.com/

"inglés." Defs. 1,5. *Diccionario de la lengua española*. Madrid: Real Academia Española, 2001. Internet resource.

"Jugadas de Bolsa." *La Iberia* 17 Oct. 1860. Hemeroteca Digital. Internet resource. 6 November 2013.

"ladrón." Def. 1. *Diccionario de la lengua española*. Madrid: Real Academia Española, 2001. Internet resource.

Larra, Luis Mariano de. *La bolsa y el bolsillo: comedia en tres actos y en prosa*. Madrid: Imprenta de J. Rodriguez, 1859. Print.

Lewis, Elisabeth Franklin. "Economía doméstica: caridad y trabajo femenino." *Género y modernidad en España: de la Ilustración al liberalismo*. Ayer 78. .Madrid: Asociación de Historia Contemporánea Marcial Pons, Ediciones de Historia 2010. 93-115. Print.

Lías y Rey, Ramón. *Achaques del siglo actual: comedia en cinco actos*. Madrid: Impr. de T. Fortanet M. Ruano, 1849. Print.

Lombía, Juan, and Tirado, Juan de la Cruz. *Lo de arriba abajo, O, La bolsa y el rastro: drama de costumbres populares en dos jornadas*. Madrid: Estab. Tipocráfico, 1842. Print.

López-Morell, Miguel A. *The House of Rothschild in Spain, 1812 - 1941*. Farnham [u.a.: Ashgate, 2013. Print.

Mariscal, George. "The Figure of the Indiano in Early Modern Spanish Culture." *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*. 2.1 (2001): 55-68. Internet resource.

Martín y Santiago, José. *El amor y la lotería: juguete cómico en un acto y en verso*. Madrid: Pedro Abienzo, 1871. Print.

Matilla Quizá, María Jesús. "Debates parlamentarios y leyes sobre la Asociación de Capitales (1810-1874)." *Revista de estudios políticos* 93 (1996): 377-99. Internet resource.

Mesonero Romanos, Ramón, and Carlos Seco Serrano. *Obras de don Ramón de Mesonero Romanos*. Vol. 200. Madrid: Ediciones Atlas, 1967. Print.

Mill, John Stuart. *Essays on Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy*. Kitchener, Ontario, CAN: Batoche Books, 2000. Print.

Ortiz de Pinedo, Manuel. *La victoria por castigo.* Madrid: Imprenta de José Rodríguez, 1885. Print.

Moreno, Redondo A. *El Banco de España. Una historia económica. (Co-Ordinador: Alfonso Moreno Redondo.)*. Madrid, 1970. Print.

Platt, D C. M. "Las finanzas extranjeras en España, 1820–1870 (1)." *Revista de historia económica / Journal of Iberian and Latin American Economic History*. 1.1 (1983): 121-150. Print.

"Rent-seeking." Butler, Brian, David Butler, and Alan Isaacs. *A Dictionary of Finance and Banking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997. Internet resource.

Ringrose, David R. *Madrid and the Spanish Economy, 1560-1850*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983. Print.

---. *Spain, Europe, and the "Spanish Miracle", 1700-1900*. New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Internet resource.

---. *Transportation and Economic Stagnation in Spain, 1750-1850*. Durham, N.C: Duke University Press, 1970. Print.

Rivas, Duque de (Ángel de Saavedra). *Obras completas*. Madrid: M. Aguilar, 1945. Print.

Rodríguez, Gabriel. "Influencia de las ciencias económicas y sociales en la educación de la mujer." Madrid: Imp. y Est. de M. Rivadeneyra, 1869. Internet resource.

Rosell, Cayetano. *Crónica de la provincia de Madrid*. Madrid: Comunidad de Madrid, 1983. Print.

---. *El dinero y la opinión. Comedia en tres actos*. Madrid: Imprenta de C. González, 1857. Print.

Ruigómez, Andrés. "La bolsa." Blasco, Eusebio, and María A. Ayala. *Madrid por dentro y por fuera: guía de forasteros incautos*. Madrid: Universidad de Alicante, 2008. Print.

Sánchez-Albornoz, Nicolás. *La modernización económica de España, 1830-1930*. Madrid: Alianza, 1985. Print.

Schmidt-Nowara, Christopher. *Empire and Antislavery: Spain, Cuba, and Puerto Rico, 1833-1874*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1999. Print.

Shubert, Adrian. *A Social History of Modern Spain*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1990. Print.

Simmel, Georg. *The Philosophy of Money*. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Taylor, Scott K. *Honor and Violence in Golden Age Spain*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008. Internet resource.

Torrente Fortuño, José Antonio. *Historia de la Bolsa de Madrid*. Vol. 2. Madrid: Ilustre Colegio de Cambio y Bolsa de Madrid, 1974. Print.

Tortella Casares, Gabriel. *Banking, Railroads, and Industry in Spain, 1829-1874*. New York: Arno Press, 1977. Print.

---. *The Development of Modern Spain: An Economic History of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Trans. Valerie Herr. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2000. Print.

---.*Los orígenes del capitalismo en España; banca, industria y ferrocarriles en el siglo XIX*. Madrid: Tecnos, 1973. Print.

El usurero: drama en cinco actos. Madrid: Impr. de C. González, 1860. Print.

Valladares y Saavedra, Ramón. *Santi, boniti, barati : Grande y soberbia especulación industrial, escrita para la felicidad española, para que se represente en todos los teatros donde el público quiera nadar en oro, por solo el precio de una localidad, en un acto*. Imprenta de Vicente de Lalama, 1850. Internet resource.

Vázquez, Oscar E. *Inventing the Art Collection: Patrons, Markets, and the State in Nineteenth-Century Spain*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001. Print.

Vega, Ventura de la, and Claudio de la Torre. *El hombre de mundo: comedia en cuatro actos, en verso. Original de Ventura de la Vega, refundición de Claudio de la Torre*. Madrid: Ediciones Alfil, 1961. Print.

Vilar, Pierre. *Historia de España*. Barcelona: Editorial Critica, Grupo editorial Grijalbo, 1981. Print.

Visser, Wayne A. M, and Alastair Macintosh. "A Short Review of the Historical Critique of Usury." *Accounting, Business & Financial History*. 8.2 (1998): 175-189. Print.