



It is the East and Zulima is the Sin: Shifting Representations of Muslim Spain in Hartzenbusch's *Los amantes de Teruel*

Christine L. Blackshaw

While *Los amantes de Teruel* was not Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch's most widely-performed drama during his lifetime, it is, nonetheless, the one for which he is best remembered today. From its first performance on January 19, 1837, many sensed that the play would become part of the Spanish literary canon, as is evidenced by the praise from the critic for the *Semanario Pintoresco Español*, who boldly proclaimed, "el Señor Hartzenbusch se ha colocado en este punto a la altura de los grandes modelos, y en casi todo el drama parece revelar un alma del temple de Rojas y Calderones" (5 February 1837). Despite the enormous success of *Los amantes's* initial debut (which was followed by eight subsequent performances), Hartzenbusch, ever the perfectionist at heart, revised the drama several times after its first performance. He eventually changed it from a five-act drama to a four-act one by 1849, with the latter version also enjoying considerable critical acclaim. Salvador García, Carmen Iranzo, and, most especially, Jean Louis Picoche, have detailed many of these changes in their respective editions of *Los amantes*. All three of them acknowledge a tendency amongst scholars of Spanish Romanticism to favor one version of the drama over another, with García and Iranzo defending their preference for the 1837 version and the 1849 version, respectively.

Because critics often base their analyses of *Los amantes* on their preferred version of the drama, one might assume that the two versions of the drama are interchangeable, save for the fact that the 1849 version is more concise and contains fewer references to the character Margarita's adultery.¹ In particular, when one examines the current scholarship about Zulima, the lustful and vengeful Moorish Queen whose actions are instrumental in separating the lovers, one is left to assume that little changes were made to her character over the years. In her studies of the 1837 version, for example, Jo Labanyi notes that as an Oriental woman, Zulima "illustrates a powerful, primitive, femininity from which Marsilla must extricate himself to become a free individual" ("Liberal Individualism" 15) and that Zulima and Muslim Spain are used in a stereotypically Orientalist way "to define an 'other' against which the Aragonese Romantic hero and heroine are measured" ("Love, Politics" 238). Similarly, Linda Materna reads the 1849 Zulima as an embodiment of Hartzenbusch's unconscious "miedo romántico a [. . .] lo femenino

autónomo emergente de la sociedad” (194) as well as the Romantic fear of, and fascination with, the Oriental Other, both of which occupy the same psychological space in Romantic literature since “ambos son una sujeción de una alteridad seductora pero peligrosa para el orden patriarcal del Occidente” (195).

Labanyi’s focus on the 1837 version of the drama is a logical one, given the fact that she focuses on *Los amantes* within the context of liberal romanticism’s apogee in Spain during the mid-to-late 1830s. However, the fact that Materna appears to situate her study within the same context—she makes a note of mentioning Martínez de la Rosa’s *Aben Humaya* (1830) and Rivas’s *El moro expósito* (1834), for example, but then inexplicably selects the 1849 version of *Los amantes*, purporting it to be the “versión definitiva” of the drama (192)—makes little or no sense in light of the fact that Zulima underwent several changes between 1837 and 1849, not the least of which was her transition from a condemned woman in 1837 to one whom her rival Isabel forgives a dozen years later.² Because Materna does not make any references to these changes, she fails to address the implications, if any, that these changes might have for Zulima’s symbolic function in the drama and current interpretations of Hartzenbusch’s Orientalism. As I hope to make evident in my comparative analysis of the two Zulimas, several changes made to Zulima between 1837 and 1849 have implications for the interpretation of both her symbolic function in the drama as well as her death. To date, this aspect of Zulima’s character has been left unexplored.

“Tres tópicos del oriente”: Zulima as Christian Spain’s antithesis

Before comparing the two Zulimas, it is worthwhile to provide some detailed description of their similarities, to which Labanyi and Materna have alluded in their studies, Zulima underwent in the dozen years between revisions. Both versions of *Los amantes de Teruel* take place in thirteenth-century Spain where the hero Diego Marsilla is fighting in the Christian reconquest of Spain in order to gain enough wealth and prestige to be worthy of his lover, Isabel de Segura. Her father Pedro has given Diego six years to achieve this task and to return to their homeland of Teruel, Aragon. Otherwise, Isabel will be married to a wealthy suitor named Rodrigo de Azagra. The drama begins days before Diego’s deadline, and he has just been taken prisoner by the sultan of Valencia, whose lusty wife Zulima hopes to take Diego as her lover. As a chaste Christian devoted to his beloved Isabel, however, Diego abruptly rejects Zulima. Infuriated by Diego’s rejection, Zulima vows to take revenge on the lovers; disguised as a man, she travels to Teruel where she recounts to Isabel a false tale of Diego’s infidelity with the Moorish queen and his subsequent death at the hands of her jealous husband. Isabel’s devastation at this alleged news, along with the fact that Rodrigo Azagra is blackmailing her adulterous mother Margarita, hastens Isabel’s marriage to Diego’s rival. Diego eventually arrives in Teruel immediately after Isabel’s wedding and, unable to convince the devoted Christian Isabel to abandon her marital vows, dies once he realizes that his beloved has become forever bound to his rival. Isabel, distraught by Diego’s death, dies soon after.

As Jo Labanyi has noted, the fact that *Los amantes*, like other Spanish Romantic drama, takes place during a frontier war can be read as a Romantic need for boundaries between the Self and the Other (“Liberal Individualism” 15). In this case, the self is defined against

an alien culture that represents, in Edward Said's words, a "lasting trauma" for Europe (59) but one which the West needs in order to define itself (5). Indeed, as Materna notes in her analysis of *Zulima*, in the first act of the play one can find all of the nineteenth-century clichés about the Orient: "primero el erotismo lujurioso [. . .] en segundo lugar, astucia, perfidia, y rebelión anárquica [. . .] tercero, al hablar ella del cautivo Diego, surgen a flor de piel la pasión y la venganza" (197). All three of these clichés create a character who embodies, in Materna's words, "una sexualidad desenfadada que impide la terminación de la narrativa cristiana de salvación" (196) as well as "lo femenino peligroso que es al final silenciado y reprimido" through violent death (198). Taking Materna's analysis even further, and bearing in mind Said's observation that the two geographical entities of the Orient and the West "support and to an extent reflect each other" (5), one notes that many of *Zulima*'s actions and characteristics find a virtuous antithesis in the actions and characteristics of the two Christian Spanish characters Isabel and Margarita.

Edward Said has observed that in their accounts of the Orient, Westerners almost always associate it with "sexual promise (and threat), untiring sensuality, unlimited desire, [and] deep generative energies" (188). Indeed, throughout the opening scenes of both versions of *Los amantes*, *Zulima* encourages this association between the East and its eroticism, or "erotismo lujurioso" as Materna describes it, both directly and indirectly. After all, as she herself reminds Diego, the Muslim woman's heart is a *brasa* or burning ember, while the Christian woman's heart is made of cold *nieve* (53; 97). This ember is so powerful that a mere vision of her prospective lover ignites *Zulima*'s fiery passion for him. As she describes it in 1837:

Veíale yo en el jardín del serrallo cargado de pesados hierros, tal vez
insuficientes a sujetar sus brazos indómitos; al pasar delante de mis
celosías, notaba yo la palidez de su noble rostro; oía sus suspiros. (53)

Seeing Diego for the first time has a similar affect on *Zulima* in 1849, although the vision arouses more compassion than erotic passion:

puso los ojos
en el esclavo *Zulima*,
y férvido amor en breve
nació de la compasión. (97)

Zulima's desire is awakened by merely seeing Diego, suggesting an erotic desire for him, something she herself reinforces when she calls her room a harem in 1837 (52), and when she tells Diego "mira este albergue despacio, y abre el corazón al gozo" (92) in 1849. Likewise, *Zulima* is willing to abandon her marital vows for these erotic pleasures—telling Diego that it is perfectly fine for a man to have a wife and mistress in 1837—reinforcing Rana Kabbani's observations that "the Orient of the Western imagination provided respite from Victorian sexual repressiveness . . . [and] was used to express for the age of erotic longings that would have otherwise remained suppressed" (36).

Zulima's description of her desire for Diego contrasts sharply with the tale that the latter recounts about his and Isabel's love when he awakens in Zulima's palace, emphasizing the contact between the Muslim world, "peopled by nations who were content to achieve on the erotic domain alone," and the Christian world, "where men exerted themselves to produce and excel" (Kabbani 54). For while Zulima's passion for Diego is erotic and, in Kay Engler's words, "de origen personal, creado por [. . .] motivos exclusivamente egoístas" (13), the love that Diego and Isabel share is described in 1837 as "un amor fino" (60), and one of divine origin, since God orchestrated this love when he gave the lovers human form, according to Diego (60). This sentiment is reiterated in 1849, when Diego states "el amor principió a enardecer nuestras almas al contacto de las palmas de Dios cuando nos crió" (95). Moreover, while a vision of Diego ignites Zulima's erotic passion, Diego proclaims that his first vision of Isabel reaffirmed the love he already felt for his soul mate, and reminded him "de otro cariño antes de nacer" (60) in 1837, making them "amantes finos" in 1849 (94). Consequently, Diego does not find it difficult to resist the lure of the beautiful Eastern woman. For, as he states in 1849, "Ni en desgracia ni en ventura cupo en mi lenguaje dolo. Este corazón es sólo para Isabel de Segura" (97).

When the lovers reunite in the final scenes of the drama, the contrast between the lusty and selfish Muslim woman and her Christian counterpart is once again highlighted through Isabel's virtuous and self-sacrificing behavior. The audience is well aware that Isabel has married Rodrigo Azagra, a man she does not love, in order to preserve her family honor (her mother has revealed the secret of her adulterous affair several years ago, which Rodrigo threatens to reveal; in addition, Isabel's father Pedro has confessed that he is indebted to Rodrigo for saving his life). Despite the fact that she still loves Diego, Isabel cites her husband's honor as a primary motivation for not acting on her adulterous desires to run away with him. In both versions, she informs Diego that "soy de un hombre que me hace de su honor depositaria" and that her Christian faith obliges her to be faithful to him, despite her desires (149; 162). Furthermore, Isabel believes that giving into their desires would taint their love by making it adulterous; as she reminds Diego in 1837, "la pasión que nos inflama es una virtud más: ¿por qué pretendes en la última prueba profanarla?" (149). Indeed, as Derek Flitter has noted about the 1837 version of *Los amantes*, Isabel's measured responses to her fate suggest that in the Christian world, passion is not a justification for adulterous behavior; rather, it is an opportunity to practice virtue (32). The same could be said about the 1849 version, when Isabel reminds Diego "nuestros amores mantuvo la virtud libres de mancha: su pureza de armiño conservemos" and that their virtue in the face of suffering will be rewarded in heaven, for "aquí hay espinas, en el cielo palmas" (162).

In contrast to Isabel, who views her time on earth as preparation for the afterlife, Zulima appears only to be focused on the pleasures of this life. She justifies her adulterous behavior in 1837 by asking Diego "¿qué importa injusto desprecio si es el corazón dichoso?" (64), and in 1849 by citing her husband's own infidelity as justification for her behavior (88). While Isabel is restrained when expressing emotions, Zulima is also quick to warn Diego that her passionate nature is also a reason for Diego to be wary of her, should he reject her advances. "Méditalo bien" she warns Diego in 1837, "y sabe que frenético, mi amor, será el frenesí mayor de mi venganza, si cabe" (65). In 1849, Zulima attributes her frenetic and vengeful nature to her ethnicity, warning Diego that "es poco

prudente burlar a tu soberana, que tiene sangre africana, y ama y odia fácilmente” (98), notably collapsing the distinctions between “africana,” “árabe,” and “musulmana.” Indeed, both Zulima’s violent reaction to Diego’s rejection and her own violent death support Kabbani’s argument that the eroticism that the East promised was often tinged with hints of violence (68), as well as Materna’s argument that the East was perceived as a place of passion and vengeance in nineteenth-century Orientalist literature, the third cliché that she mentions in her study (197).

Whereas Zulima’s passionate and vengeful nature is associated with her identity as a Muslim woman, Isabel’s restraint in the face of adversity is inherently tied to hers as a Christian woman. In both versions of the drama, Zulima is the first to point out the differences between herself and Isabel by observing that while her Christian rival knows how to love, “yo sé más, sé vengarme” (102;125). Even after Isabel learns that Zulima’s deception of her has led her to marry a man she does not love, she eschews thoughts of violence against her enemy. In 1837, this rejection of vengeance takes the form of turning to God for consolation, asking Him: “¿No es cierto, Dios mío, que ya satisfecha con tantos afanes tu justicia queda?” (142). In 1849, Isabel is even more magnanimous than her 1837 forbearer, forbidding the sultan’s servant Adel from murdering Zulima by stating “yo la defiendo, la perdono” (157), causing Adel to comment “suele tener esta gente acciones, que de un creyente propias en justicia son” (158).

In addition to being a place where the women are of tremendous virtue, Christian Spain is also presented as a place where the roles of the sexes are clearly defined and where the limitations placed on the women’s freedom are deemed as limitations placed by God Himself. Isabel’s father Pedro cites the lovers’ failed reunion as something that “no lo quiso Dios” in both versions of the drama (75; 113), an argument with which Diego’s father Martín fully agrees: “yo su nombre santo bendigo, mas lloro por lo que perdí” (75; 113). In like manner, Margarita informs her daughter in 1837 that, despite the desires of her heart, it is her father who has the ultimate authority in deciding whom she will marry: “a él le toca la elección de esposo para su hija, y a ella a quien su padre elija darle mano y corazón” (79), and in 1849: “no es lícito a una doncella, ni hay más voluntad en ella que la que tenga su padre” (114).

Although transvestism is traditionally read as a usurpation of the male identity (Garber 121), even Margarita’s transvestism, traditionally read as a usurpation of the male identity (Garber 121), reaffirms the woman’s object status in Christian Spain when it is read very closely. In both versions of the drama, Diego’s father Martín reveals how Margarita’s cross-dressing saved his life: deathly ill, Martín refused Margarita’s ministering to him because he held a grudge against Pedro for not allowing Isabel to marry his son Diego. Nonetheless, Margarita disguised herself as a Christian pilgrim and appeared at his bedside for several evenings in a row, the whole time refusing to reveal her true identity. Martín eventually regains his health and, one evening he followed the mysterious pilgrim back to the Segura’s garden, where he witnessed Margarita’s unveiling and discovered his nurse’s true identity. Moved by Margarita’s altruism, Martín forgives Pedro and reestablishes their friendship.

Both men interpret Margarita's transvestism as a selfless act which reconciles the two men; as Pedro tells his friend, "ella servirá desde hoy más preciosa si ya vuestro amigo queréisme llamar" (75; 112). In like manner, Margarita's ability to check the mark of death—in both versions, Martín tells Pedro that he was at death's door when Margarita appeared to him—likens her to the Virgin Mary, who acts as an intercessor between the human and the divine realms. Martín further reinforces the notion of Margarita's celestial nature when, in both versions of the drama, he refers to his friend's wife as an "ángel [. . .] de salud y paz" (74; 111). As Bridget Aldaraca has shown, this association between the wife and the divine, a common motif in nineteenth-century Spain, "takes as its starting point the negation of the woman's existence as an individual; that is, as an autonomous individual" (60). In Margarita's case, her angelic behavior and demeanor belie the fact that she had an adulterous affair several years earlier and is performing penance for her sins. Moreover, the fact that Margarita cross-dresses while concealing her true identity—Martín notes in both versions that she was "cubierta la faz" (74; 11)—further underscores the fact that her transvestism should be read not as the usurpation of the male identity, but rather as the complete effacement of any identity.

Isabel mirrors her mother's self-effacing behavior. Rather than rebel against the rigid code of honor that separates her from Diego, Isabel echoes her parents' attitude, repeatedly referring to it as something that is God's will and therefore immutable: "estaba escrito en el cielo que este hombre había de ser mi esposo," Isabel tells her father in 1837 upon agreeing to marry Rodrigo de Azagra (123). Likewise, in 1849 she tells her mother "mi vida es vuestra: dárselo me manda Dios" (128), again upon agreeing to marry Rodrigo de Azagra in order to guard her mother's secret of her adulterous affair. Even the fact that Isabel does not appear on stage until Diego has presented her through his eyes suggests that Isabel is innately aware of the fact that in Romantic literature, women are not seen as active, creative subjects. Rather, as Margaret Homans has noted, they are passive objects, "objectified as the other . . . [and made] property by the male subject" (37).

In stark contrast to her submissive Christian counterparts, Zulima readily asserts her authority in the drama, an authority that she appears to have usurped in her husband's absence. As the drama opens, the audience immediately notices that the sultan is markedly absent and his servant Adel is forced to obey Zulima in his absence, as she herself reminds him in 1837 (52). This absence of a male authority figure, coupled with the fact that both versions of *Los amantes* open with Diego in a physically submissive position to Zulima—he is sleeping off a dose of narcotics that Adel has administered to him at the queen's request—immediately suggests that what Materna calls "astucia, perfidia y rebelión anárquica" is associated with unchecked female power that is to be perceived as unnatural since it can only be attained through artificial means such as narcotics (197).

In addition to asserting physical authority, Zulima asserts "textual" authority in the opening scenes by uttering the first words of the drama: "tú eres el único depositario de este secreto" in 1837 and "no vuelve en sí" in 1849 (51, 87). Through uttering the first words, Zulima literally and figuratively sets the drama into motion; she also thereby manifests to the verbal power she is able to maintain in her husband's absence, since most

Spanish Romantic heroines, including Isabel, are presented through a male character's eyes before appearing on stage themselves. Zulima not only asserts verbal power, but she completely inverts the ascribed gender roles by presenting her prospective lover Diego through her own eyes, and an extension of her own fantasies, before he appears on stage. She creates a new story about him by giving him a new name, Ramiro, and inventing a story of his origins as well as his willingness to be her lover.

Later on, Zulima will continue her creative endeavors as she disguises herself as an Aragonese gentleman and travels to Teruel to tell Isabel the false news of Diego's infidelity and subsequent death. The fact that this second creative act is coupled with her cross-dressing as a man ensures that both acts are read as appropriations of the male identity. Moreover, in both versions Isabel's servant offers the mysterious visitor wine and the pork, both of which are forbidden by Islam (97; 122), calling attention to Zulima's appropriation of the Christian identity as well. This makes her narrative doubly threatening since, as Kabbani has noted, when Westerners wrote about the Orient there was an unconscious assertion that "*he* is not vulnerable; he is male[...]European, rational[...]and armed with language—*he* narrates the encounter in a reflective, post-facto narrative; *he* creates the Orient" (73). Accordingly, like Homans's female in Romantic literature, the inhabitant of the Orient is supposed to be an object, a passive, non-creative agent, who is waiting to be created, but never an active agent that creates (12). In Zulima's case, however, it is she who creates Diego and, in turn, the Orient is creating the Westerner.

Notably, Zulima's appearance on stage as a man immediately follows the revelation of Margarita's own transvestism, calling greater attention to the differences between Zulima and her Spanish counterpart. First, whereas Margarita's motives are noble ones, Zulima's cross-dressing only serves to further her selfish agenda of taking revenge on the lovers. Second, while Margarita effaces her identity through her cross-dressing, making her cross-dressing less threatening and indeed affirming to the Christian patriarchy, Zulima's transvestism is read as a usurpation of the Christian male identity and poses an imminent threat and destabilizes the Christian patriarchy, for as Kabanni notes:

In order for the [Westerner's] journey [to the Orient] to be heroic, the traveler must return home having seen and overcome the alien world he passed through, with the precepts of his culture intact, his moral vision unaltered, and his personality strengthened and confirmed by his trials."
(86)

Finally, while Margarita's actions sought to bring her husband's former enemy back to life, Zulima sought to bring death and destruction to the lovers by narrating the story of Diego's (and her own) death.

Once she crosses over into Christian Teruel, Zulima becomes, in Gilbert and Gubar's words, "the character who refuses to stay within her textually ordained 'place' and thus generates a story that 'gets away' from its author" (29). Moreover, Zulima is not merely threatening because of her "monster woman" status; rather, as a Moor, Zulima's presence in Christian Teruel, in Karen Rauch's words, "underscores the cultural crisis

which she embodies along with her gender” (63). Her presence in Teruel symbolizes the fluidity of the boundaries between the Self and the Other which are so essential for the Romantic definition of the Self, according to Labbanyi (*Liberal Individualism* 16). Consequently, if Zulima, as a Moor, is crossing into the Christian part of Spain, the Other is not only refusing to be subjugated. It also is threatening to subjugate the Romantic Self by preventing the Spanish hero from reuniting with, and marrying, or subjecting, his beloved.

As a result, it appears that Zulima has left her author with no other choice other than to kill her off, both to contain her power and to restore order by the end of the drama. On the surface, such an interpretation fits easily into both versions of the drama; in both versions Zulima dies a violent death with Adel reminding audiences of her husband’s authority. Contrastingly, Isabel dies peacefully, turning her gaze toward the heavens and declaring that she and Diego, while parted in life, will be united in heaven. However, such a reading does not account for the fact that Zulima transforms from a condemned woman outside of Teruel in 1837 to one who dies in Teruel, forgiven by her rival, in 1849. The closer comparative analysis that follows hopes to account for Zulima’s change in fate.

Authority or Autonomy? Zulima’s Monstrosity and Motives in 1837 and 1849

Perhaps the first difference one will notice when comparing the two Zulimas is that the Zulima of 1837 has considerably more lines and stage time than her 1849 counterpart. In 1837 the opening act of the drama, in which one finds the majority of Zulima’s lines, is comprised of over 450 lines of verse and four scenes of prose. Contrastingly, the opening act of the 1849 version consists of only 450 verses and no prose. While this reflects a desire on Hartzenbusch’s part to give the drama “una versificación más abundante” and “eliminar todo lo pintoresco, lo truculento, [y] el colorido local,” according to Picoche (66), this also has implications for Zulima’s “textual power” in the drama. While in both versions of the drama Zulima utters the first words, literally and figuratively setting the actions into motion, it is the Zulima of 1837 who is considerably more assertive in asserting her verbal power, reminding Adel twice about his obligation to obey her in her husband’s absence (52-3) and by informing Diego, “aunque soy mujer, mi voz el valor disfruta de ley” (57). Zulima also dedicates considerable attention to narrating Diego’s story in 1837, first by being adamant about Diego’s not having had lovers in his Christian homeland:

Ramiro no suspira por una querida; Ramiro no ha tenido amores en su patria; aquel pecho altivo no es capaz de rendirse a un amor ordinario, un amor de cristiana; sólo un amor de África, ardiente como el sol, que hace carbón el cutis, pudiera inflamarle. (53)

In addition to being confident that Ramiro has not had any lovers, Zulima purports to tell the story of his origins, believing him to be noble and wealthy, the perfect match for a lonely queen:

Ramiro es un caballero de ilustre cuna: bien lo prueba la joya que ocultaba en el seno. Criado en la opulencia, habituado al poder [. . .] Segura estoy de que cuando me lean ese lienzo que le hemos hallado, escrito en español con su sangre, o cuando consienta en declarar su cuna, oiremos uno de los apellidos más ilustres de España. (53)

Zulima's forcefulness in the 1837 version appears to belie her desire to move beyond the limitations imposed on her by her gender. As the drama opens, Adel expresses reluctance at holding the key to the harem where Zulima resides; Zulima replies by asking "¿No es llave también a una cárcel?" calling attention to her own lack of mobility within her husband's palace (52). As several scholars have demonstrated, the prison was a recurrent image in Romantic literature, symbolizing the social, economic, political, or psychological barriers against which the hero must contend to attain subjectivity.³ In this case, however, the word *cárcel* is not merely a metaphor, but a literal prison since, unlike Diego, Zulima can never hope to escape. Adel's response, ironically, proves this point when he reminds her "en la cárcel, dónde se gime, puede el carcelero recibir mil huéspedes sin peligro; pero en la cárcel donde se goza, si da entrada a más de uno, ya puede despedirse de su cabeza" (51).

Along with demonstrating a strong desire to transcend the physical, verbal, and moral boundaries imposed on her by her gender, Zulima also aspires to gain economic freedom and power through Diego's jewel, which he carries on his person as he sleeps. From the outset, the jewel tantalizes Zulima, for she believes it to be a sign of her prospective lover's privileged social standing: "Ramiro es un caballero de ilustre cuna: bien lo prueba la joya que ocultaba en el seno" (53). When Diego awakes, Zulima asks about the jewel, referring to it as a *talismán*, belying her unconscious belief that it is an object that produces magical effects. In this case, it will have the "magical effect" of giving validity to her story about Diego. Moreover, the word's Greek origin, *telein*, which means to complete or fulfill, suggests that she has unconsciously fetishized the jewel, hoping that it will "complete" her by covering her lack.

Diego's explanation of the jewel's significance further suggests the jewel's phallic connotations. Upon awakening, he immediately offers the jewel in exchange for his freedom, signifying both its commercial value and the mobility it can offer its owner, a mobility that a woman would normally not have in thirteenth-century Spain. Later in the drama during Zulima's conversation with Isabel, the jewel becomes tied to the truthfulness of Zulima's fictional account of Diego's infidelity, first through mere hints of the jewel's significance:

ZULIMA. Podéis creer que sólo le movería a esto el ansia de recobrar su libertad: no le quedaba otro medio. Yo me disponía entonces a salir de Valencia. Vuestro paisano hubiera podido acompañarme; pero su destino mudó de aspecto. Sólo ha venido conmigo una joya suya.
ISABEL ¡Una joya! (*Aparte*) ¡Si fuera . . . !—Pero después . . . (101)

The mention of Diego's jewel hastens Isabel's realization that Diego has not only been unfaithful (allegedly), but has died because of it, causing her to faint moments after

Zulima first mentions its existence. During the scuffle that ensues, as Isabel's servant Mari Gómez attempts to revive her, Zulima tactfully places the jewel on a nearby table. When Isabel awakens, Mari Gómez attempts to comfort Isabel by questioning the truthfulness of the visitor's story. Once again, the jewel gives validity to Zulima's story of Diego's alleged infidelity and death:

ISABEL No, nunca las nuevas del mal son falsas. Él habló además de una
joya . . .
MARGARITA Aquí la ha dejado. (*Dásela.*)
ISABEL ¿La veis, querida madre? ¿La conocéis? [. . .] aquí está. ¿Y he de
dudar de su muerte? (104)

The jewel, consequently, is intrinsically linked to the veracity of Zulima's story, giving her control over the narrative, despite Isabel's persistent disbelief. It is the jewel, consequently, that leads Isabel to hasten her marriage to Diego's rival Rodrigo, permanently separating the lovers. Zulima's possession of the jewel, moreover, renders her powerful while Diego remains powerless. Without it, Diego has no voice on stage. Therefore, her usurpation of the jewel cannot only be read as a castration of Diego; it can be read, alongside her cross-dressing, as an appropriation of the male identity which allows her both mobility and a voice in a male-dominated environment.

Curiously, while Diego's jewel appears to perform such an important symbolic function in 1837, it does not make a single appearance in the 1849 version of *Los amantes*. In fact, as the drama opens, there are no outward signs of Diego's wealth. Instead, it is Zulima who appears to be independently wealthy, as she informs Adel:

El renegado Zaén . . .
llamado por mí ha venido,
y tiene ya en su poder
casi todo lo que yo
de mis padres heredé,
que es demás para vivir
con opulencia los tres. (88)

The jewel's disappearance from the 1849 version, along with the large part of Zulima's lines, suggests that Zulima lost a lot of her "unnatural thirst" for male power during her rewriting. For she does not want to take what is not hers; rather, she seeks only to take what she has inherited and, consequently, is rightly hers. In addition, the Zulima of 1849 is much less assertive about expressing her authority, never once reminding Adel of his obligation to obey her in her husband's absence. Instead, the drama opens with Adel trying to convince Zulima to stay in the palace and wait for her husband, which she refuses to do. Moreover, the Zulima of 1849 dedicates considerably less time to her creative endeavors. When Adel poses questions about Diego's origins, Zulima responds simply, "es noble, es valiente" (88). As to whether or not her prospective lover will return her affections, Zulima simply states "yo le doy la libertad, riquezas, mi mano; ¿quién rehúsa esos dones?" (88), implying that she hopes her kindness will be reason enough for him to want her as a lover.

Likewise, Zulima's conversation with Isabel is much less elaborate, more direct and, in the absence of the jewel, is one that Isabel only half believes. Moments after Zulima leaves, Isabel tells her mother that while she believes Diego to be dead, she does not believe that he was unfaithful. Rather, she believes that he was a martyr for their love and that the Moorish Queen must have deceived herself if she believed otherwise (126). Notably, Isabel's refusal to believe the entire story told to her comes immediately after her servant comments about how the visitor did not partake of the wine and pork, both of which are forbidden by Muslim law (124), suggesting that Isabel's doubt stems from the fact that her visitor might have been a foreigner who has not been overly successful in posing as a Christian.

In addition to the disappearance of Zulima's lines and Diego's jewel, one also notices that the references to Zulima's heightened sexuality are more frequent in 1837 than they are in 1849. Both versions of the drama open in Zulima's lavish palace room; in 1837 this palace room is described as the "real harem" (52) referring to one of the most recurrent images associated with the Orient and her untiring sensuality (Ahmed 524). Adel reinforces the harem's sensual meaning when, as he leaves Zulima alone with Diego, muses that eventually the latter "se rendirá a sus halagos" and that "todos los placers serán para ellos" (54). Even Zulima's first words can be construed sexually: Adel is not the "guardián" of the secret but the "depositario" of it; she reminds him that "ausente el rey, nadie *penetra* esta habitación" (51, emphasis mine) calling attention to the fact that the sultan is the only man with whom she is allowed sexual contact. Finally, in response to Diego's story of his unrealized passion for Isabel, Zulima offers the possibility of an erotic love without consequences, or the need for marital fidelity:

Quiere a tu dama, exclamé,
no exijo que me ames sola
pero al menos te daba
piedad mi amor . . .
¿qué importa injusto desprecio
si es al corazón dichoso?⁽⁶⁴⁾

Upon Diego's rejection of her, however, Zulima draws attention to the dangers of her sexuality. As the first act of the 1837 version ends, the audience witnesses Zulima taking into her hands "un frasquito prolongado, cuyo tapón es un mango como de puñal y tiene por hoja una aguja o punzón delgado" (69). In this obvious symbol of copulation, Zulima is again asserting her sexuality. However, she is also drawing attention to its danger when she reminds the audience that while "el hierro es sutil, violencia tiene el veneno terrible" (69). Indeed it is not the phallic part "el hierro" but "el veneno terrible," what lies inside, that is fatal. Before embarking on her mission, moreover, Zulima quells the more compassionate element of her personality in order to carry out her vengeful mission: "calle la piedad / sangre mi seguridad, sangre me piden mi celos" (70).

While Zulima still exhibits adulterous desires for Diego in 1849, her sensuality is more subtle in later years than she was during *Los amantes's* debut. Firstly, while in 1837 both Adel and Zulima refer to her palace room as a harem, in the 1849 version of the drama none of the characters explicitly defines her room as such. In fact, the closest Zulima

comes to referring to her room as a harem is when she tells Diego “mira este albergue despacio, y abre el corazón al gozo” (92). Secondly, the Zulima of the 1837 version appears to have no motivation to run away with Diego, other than a desire to fulfill her erotic fantasies. While she does allude to her husband’s mistreatment of her in the opening act when she calls her harem a metaphorical prison, her primary motivation for wanting Diego appears to be her own erotic desire for him. Contrastingly, as *Los amantes* opens in 1849, the servant Adel expresses disbelief that Zulima would abandon her husband, a wealthy sultan, for someone who appears to have nothing to offer her in terms of wealth or prestige. Zulima responds by pointing out that her husband’s noble social status does not necessarily reflect noble behavior:

Ese rey, al ser mi esposo,
me prometió no tener
otra consorte que yo.
¿Lo ha cumplido? Ya lo ves.
A traerme una rival
marchó de Valencia ayer. (88)

While Materna alleges that the above-cited passage is indicative of Oriental Spain’s “astucia, perfidia y rebelión anárquica” (197), when this passage is read within a comparative context, one notes that Zulima’s values have shifted dramatically from 1837 to 1849. After all, Zulima describes marital infidelity in a fairly nonchalant manner in 1837, asking Diego “¿No dispuso entre vosotros el uso tener esposa y manceba?” (64). This desire to fulfill her own needs, despite the social boundaries placed upon her, likens the Zulima of 1837 to her male contemporaries on stage (don Álvaro, Manrique, and Rugiero); like them, she believes that human love should transcend all religious, social, and political boundaries that stand in its way. However, her symbolic castration of Diego when she steals his jewel, along with her desire for revenge when Diego rejects her, underscores the danger and destructiveness of liberal romanticism, particularly when the freedoms exalted in liberal romanticism are extended to women.

Contrastingly, the Zulima of 1849 reacts angrily to the notion of men having mistresses. Zulima decides to take Diego as a lover only days after her husband has left the palace to be with his mistress, suggesting that her desire for Diego has been spurred by her husband’s infidelity. Thus, while the Zulima of 1837 is an erotic victimizer, the Zulima of 1849 is an erotic victim of a husband who cannot remain faithful to her, as opposed to her Spanish counterpart, Isabel, whose lover has remained faithful to her throughout their six-year separation.

Hartzenbusch’s presentation of a Muslim woman as an erotic victim, while representing a dramatic shift in Zulima’s symbolic function, was not an original move on his part. As Lou Charnon Deutsch’s *Fictions of the Feminine in the Nineteenth-Century Spanish Press* has shown, the preponderance of exotic women in the nineteenth century not only reflected the Spanish man’s fascination with the exotic; it also served as a powerful reminder to the reader that

the poor Arab women are passionate and neglected slaves. Arab men are cruel and indifferent to their (many) wives. European men offer women a sincere (monogamous) relationship that any woman would want. Spanish women are queens who should be thankful they are not Arab women. (Charnon Deutsch 186)

Although Charnon-Deutsch's study focuses largely on images of women from the late nineteenth century, these ideas appear to have been present as early as 1836, when what appears to be five articles on women, appropriately called "De las mujeres," appeared in the popular magazine *El Español*. In the first of these articles, the author pontificates about how well European women are treated in comparison to their non-European counterparts:

La esclavitud de la mujer se halla entronizada en la mayor parte del globo que habitamos, y esta esclavitud es tan antigua como la existencia del género humano Desde *la Turquía* hasta las *playas orientales de la China*, las mujeres están destinadas a satisfacer en silencio los brutales caprichos del *tirano* que les cabe en suerte Allí la mujer no es la compañera del hombre, es un *hermoso animal destinado a su uso y su recreo* ("De las mujeres")

These stereotypes about Eastern men's treatment of women exacerbate the East's perceived otherness by using its treatment of women as a sign of its backwardness since, according to the aforementioned article, "la primera conquista de la civilización ha sido de la libertad del bello sexo" ("De las mujeres"). Several additions to the final act of the 1849 version further exemplify this contrast between the Eastern world, where women were allegedly mistreated, and the Christian world, where women were said to be revered, suggesting that Zulima's shift in motivation might be what causes the Christian world to be more forgiving of her. For example, as the final act opens, Martín and Pedro are told that Zulima is hiding in Rodrigo de Azagra's palace and that the sultan's men are surrounding the palace in the hopes of finding her. Both men are aware of the fact that once Zulima is found, she is certain to meet her death since, as Pedro notes, "los moros reclaman su entrega con mucho empeño" (150). While both men agree that Zulima has caused their children much harm, Pedro reminds his friend Martín that Zulima still "es mujer, y nosotros cristianos y caballeros" (151). Accordingly, as Christian men they are obligated to protect her. Reminded of his Christian obligation, Martín reluctantly agrees to help Zulima, stating "págueme Dios el esfuerzo que me cuesta no vengarme. Disponed" (151).

In another scene which does not appear in the 1837 version, Adel informs Isabel that her enemy Zulima is hiding in Rodrigo's house. With Isabel's permission, Adel hopes to find and murder Zulima, avenging both her disobedience to her husband and her crimes against Diego and Isabel. Isabel, however, cannot bring herself to allow Zulima to be murdered. After all, she understands all too well her enemy's passions:

¡Es mi amante
tan digno de ser amado!

Le vio, le debió querer
 en viéndole [. . .]
 Ella con feroz encono
 mi corazón desgarró . . .
 me asesina el alma . . .
 yo la defiendo, la perdono. (157)

In her criticism of the 1849 version of *Los amantes* Carmen Iranzo states that Isabel's willingness to forgive Zulima is one of the many "absurdities [. . .] left intact" (76) in the 1849 version, even after extensive revisions on Hartzbusch's part. After all, "if Isabel really loves Diego, what kind of revenge is it to defend and forgive Zulima?" (76). In other words, because Isabel expresses her desire to "darle a sufrir castigo mayor que el fuego," her subsequent statement of "yo la defiendo, la perdono" indicates that her act of forgiveness is how she plans to carry out her vengeance (157). Iranzo's criticisms would be valid if *Los amantes* were a Realist drama. However, because the drama is a Romantic one, Isabel's actions must be read not for their realistic meaning, but rather for their symbolic meaning. Read in this light, Isabel's momentary desire for revenge can be read as something that makes her human, with natural human desires. However, because her Christian virtues call her to be better than human, she knows that she must forgo this instinctual desire for revenge, a desire that allegedly comes so naturally for her Muslim counterpart, because it is inconsistent with her Christian values of forgiveness and love for one's enemies.

Adel's monologue following Isabel's exit calls further attention to the difference between the Christian and Muslim world, with an exaltation of the former, and a lament that he must obey the latter:

Suele tener esta gente
 acciones, que de un creyente
 propias en justicia son.
 Yo dejara con placer
 este empeño abandonado;
 pero el amir lo ha mandado,
 y es forzoso obedecer. (158)

Unfortunately for Zulima, she is never made aware of her rival's benevolence; nor is Isabel's forgiveness of her enough to save Zulima's life. Moments after Diego dies, devastated by Isabel's rejection of him, Adel enters Isabel's room to inform her and the witnesses that have gathered that he has carried out the sultan's orders and has murdered Zulima (166). For Materna, Zulima's violent death in 1849—Adel informs them that he has stabbed Zulima with her own poisonous sword—suggests that the dangerous, feminine Other has finally been silenced, "pero no antes de provocar la trágica muerte de los amantes" (198). However, if we are to bear in mind the other changes made to Zulima between 1837 and 1849, it becomes increasingly difficult to simply categorize her death as a simple punishment for her misdeeds.

What is most striking about the Zulima of 1837 is the fact that, despite being a female and a moor, or perhaps because of it, she defends the values of the subversive or liberal Romantic Movement. Like her male contemporaries on stage (don Álvaro, Manrique, and Rugiero), she believes human love, whatever its consequences, should be elevated to an absolute value. Mariano José de Larra was the first to recognize this when, in his review of *Los amantes*, he reminds his readers “si Isabel y Marsilla, sólo porque aman, tienen derecho a conseguir el objeto de su pasión ante los ojos del espectador, el mismo derecho tienen Azagra y la mora, porque también aman” (573). However, because Zulima is the principle cause of the lovers’ separation in the 1837 version, her character also demonstrates the danger and potential destructiveness of the liberal Romantic Movement. Moreover, as Derek Flitter has argued, through Zulima’s counterpart Isabel, it seemed that Hartzenbusch hoped to offer providence as a challenge to, and a displacement of, the worldview that prevailed in *Don Álvaro, El trovador*, and several other dramas that were staged in previous years (32). Accordingly, Isabel is allowed the final words of her death scene (and the drama itself) by declaring the two lovers united in heaven. Zulima, however, is violently silenced during the fourth act of the drama when Adel stabs her and informs her “Tu esposo y rey te condenó en Valencia, y a ejecutar me envía la sentencia” (137). There is little, if any, sympathy for Zulima and her actions, suggesting that her rebellion is both unjustified, unforgivable, and must be contained at all costs.

Contrastingly, the Zulima of 1849 is not as rebellious as her 1837 counterpart. While still flouting social convention in some respects—she is still selfish, lustful, and vengeful when Diego rejects her—the dramatic shift in Zulima’s motivation allows for some sympathy on the part of the audience. At the very least, the motivations she expresses in the first act of the 1849 version provide some explanation for her behavior, even though ultimately Isabel demonstrates that virtue in the face of disappointment and betrayal is what is to be strived for and revered. Notably, when Zulima’s motivations are expressed, they place the sultan’s treatment of his wife in direct opposition to the Christian men’s treatment of their wives or lovers in Teruel. Diego has remained faithful to Isabel, despite six years of separation, Isabel’s father worships her mother Margarita, and even Rodrigo Azagra is sensitive to Isabel when he offers her a marriage in name only and tells her that she can marry Diego if he returns before their pending nuptials. In addition, the added scenes which allow for Pedro, Martín, and Isabel to forgive and defend Zulima further underscores the alleged virtue of the Christians in this drama, who are willing to forgive, and even defend, their enemies. They contrast sharply with their Muslim counterparts (Adel and the sultan), who seem incapable of such magnanimity. After all, Zulima dies in the 1849 version not because the Christians wish her to, but because Adel feels compelled to carry out her Muslim husband’s orders.

Zulima’s symbolic function in 1849, accordingly, does not appear to be one which warns against the dangers of the liberal romantic movement. Rather, her motivations, and subsequent treatment by Moorish and Christian characters in the drama, appear to highlight the virtues of medieval Christian Spain by placing it in opposition to its opposing culture at the time, Muslim Spain. This opposing culture, however, is different from the one presented in 1837. While certain scenes still suggest that Muslim Spain is a place of unchecked female power and eroticism, the overwhelming idea of Muslim Spain

presented here is one in which women are the victims and neglected slaves of the men who are governed entirely by carnal instincts, violence, and vengeance. Rather than pose a threat to the Christian world, the Muslim Spain presented in the 1849 version of *Los amantes* is one that is presented as a primitive world that must ultimately be conquered, and left behind, by the Christian world.

Although there is enough evidence to suggest that Hartzzenbusch changed his view of Muslim-Christian relations during the dozen years following *Los amantes*'s triumphant debut, to date there is little indication of *why* he did so. We can speculate that these changes might have been related to requests from Larra and others to “eliminar algunas repeticiones inútiles de la palabra «adulterio»” in reference to the drama's other adulteress Margarita (574). Further study of Hartzzenbusch's biography and the contemporary criticism about *Los amantes* might shed light on the various social, political, or biographical context for these changes. Nonetheless, one cannot help but wonder if Larra's review of *Los amantes* had something to do with it. For despite his moralistic reactions to Margarita's adultery, he reminded his readers that, like Isabel and Diego, Zulima was also a victim of love and, for that reason, “su pasión disculpa sus acciones” (573). Twelve years later, Isabel would echo Larra's sentiments in her conversation with Adel about Zulima when she exclaims: “¡Su amor! ¡Amor desastrado! Pero es amor . . .” (157). So perchance, in the true spirit of Romanticism, love *is* the only answer to the mystery of Zulima.

MOUNT ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY

Notes

- ¹ In the introduction to the Cátedra edition of *Los amantes de Teruel* and in her study of Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch, Carmen Iranzo provides a detailed account of the criticism Hartzenbusch received from both Mariano José de Larra and Esteban Garbada for his constant references to Margarita's adultery in the first edition. Moreover, throughout this edition, Iranzo provides helpful footnotes that indicate when Hartzenbusch has eliminated some of the references in the later version of the drama.
- ² Iranzo also argues that the 1849 version is the "definitive" version. According to Iranzo, Hartzenbusch preferred the later versions of the drama ("Introducción" 77). However, the author's own preference cannot account for the fact that both versions were extremely popular and staged throughout the nineteenth century. Moreover, several notable scholars of Romanticism (Derek Flitter, David Gies, and Donald Shaw) have cited the 1837 version of the drama. Consequently, it would be difficult to classify either version as "definitive."
- ³ See, for example, Gies, David T., Cardwell, Richard, and Shaw, Donald.

Works Cited

- Ahmed, Leila. "Western Ethnocentrism and Perceptions of the Harem." *Feminist Studies* 8 (1982): 521-534.
- Aldaraca, Bridget. *El ángel del hogar: Galdós and the Ideology of Domesticity in Spain*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1991.
- Cardwell, Richard. "Don Álvaro and the Force of Cosmic Injustice." *Studies in Romanticism*, 12 (1973): 559-79.
- Charnon Deutsch, Lou. *Fictions of the Feminine in Nineteenth Century Spanish Press*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2000.
- "De las mujeres: Primer artículo" *El Español* 18 June. 1836.
- Flitter, Derek. "The Romantic Theology of *Los amantes de Teruel*." *Crítica Hispánica* 18 (1996): 25-34.
- Garber, Marjorie. *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Gies, David T. "Nota preliminar." *El Romanticismo*. Ed. David T. Gies. Madrid: Taurus, 1989. 11-17.
- Gilbert, Sandra, and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.
- Hartzenbusch, Juan Eugenio. *Los amantes de Teruel*. Ed. Salvador García. Madrid: Castalia, 1971.
- . *Los amantes de Teruel*. Ed. Carmen Iranzo. Madrid: Cátedra, 1981.
- Homans, Margaret. *Women Writers and Poetic Identity: Dorothy Wordsworth, Emily Brontë, and Emily Dickinson*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980.
- Iranzo, Carmen. *Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch*. Boston: Twayne, 1978.
- . "Introducción." *Los amantes de Teruel*. By Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch. Ed. Carmen Iranzo. Madrid: Cátedra, 1981.
- Kabbani, Rana. *Europe's Myths of the Orient*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1986.
- Labanyi, Jo. "Liberal Individualism and the Fear of the Feminine in the Spanish Romantic Drama." *Culture and Gender in Nineteenth Century Spain*. Eds. Lou Charnon-Deutsch and Jo Labanyi. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. 8-26.
- . "Love, Politics, and the Making of the Modern European Subject: Spanish Romanticism and the Arab World." *Hispanic Research Journal* 5.3 (2004): 229-243.
- Larra, Mariano José de. "Los amantes de Teruel: drama en cinco actos, en prosa y en verso, por Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch." *Artículos*. Ed. Carlos Seco Serrano. Barcelona: Planeta, 1990. 569-575.
- Materna, Linda. "Lo femenino peligroso y el orientalismo en *Los amantes de Teruel* de Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch." *Actos del XII Congreso de la Asociación de Hispanistas. IV*. Ed. Derek W. Flitter. Birmingham: Department of Hispanic Studies, 1998. 193-201.
- Picoche, Jean-Louis. "Estudio Preliminar." *Los amantes de Teruel*. By Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch. Madrid: Editorial Alhambra, 1980.
- Rauch, Karen L. "Mothers and Other Strangers: Representations of The Maternal in Spanish Romantic Discourse." Diss. University of Virginia, 1996.
- Said, Edward S. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Semanario Pintoresco Español*. 5 February 1837.
- Shaw, Donald. "Towards the Understanding of Spanish Romanticism." *Modern Language Review* 58 (1963): 190-105.