

Staging compassion, practicing citizenship: *Los patriotas de Lima en la noche feliz*

Kent L. Dickson

The literary record leaves little doubt that pro-social sentiments such as sympathy and compassion were key elements in the performance of citizenship for the Peruvian elites throughout the guano boom and the period of *civilismo* that followed the War of the Pacific. The sentimental novel in Peru, for instance, abounds with affective transactions in which bourgeois characters such as Clorinda Matto de Turner's Lucía or Narciso Aréstegui's Angélica, confronted with suffering, often racialized others, awaken to "la simpatía que brota sin sentirlo en los corazones nobles" or to "el ardiente deseo de emplearse siquiera en beneficio de un individuo" (Matto de Turner 55; Aréstegui 28). Scholars such as Ana Peluffo and Francesca Denegri have contextualized these developments in sentimental fiction compellingly within a feminist frame.¹ But what of earlier periods? Similar elite performances of pro-social sentiment were a topic of hot debate and careful political maneuvering already by the 1790s, if we are to judge by evidence from the *Mercurio Peruano*. With some notable degree of caution, the *mercuristas* advanced an affective philosophy in which the social passions (emotions such as compassion and pity that were seen as innate) and the social virtues (practices based on these emotions such as charity, beneficence, philanthropy and particularly *humanidad*) became the primary agents guaranteeing a free citizen's modernity vis-à-vis the royal subject of the *ancien régime*. As a force of cohesion tying the powerful to the weak and binding the members of a political body into a union, they were the civic emotions *par excellence*, curtailing the excesses of self-interest (*amor propio*, *egoísmo*, economic self-seeking) to which the powerful were prone, and guaranteeing the smooth circulation of goods—spoken of in explicitly economic terms, "tan maravillosa economía"—to the lower strata of society (Calatayud y Borda 127). The bodily performance of pro-social sentiment activated modernity and republicanism through a practice, and this practice was what came to be called citizenship.

The play I discuss here comes three decades after the *Mercurio Peruano* ceased publication but well before the vogue for sentimental fiction, of which Aréstegui's 1848 *El padre Horán* was the first Peruvian exemplar. It comes, in fact, at the exact moment of independence, and as such provides a privileged window onto the ways pro-social feelings were discussed, theorized and experienced in civic contexts during the transition to the Republic. Written and performed in the summer of 1821 in celebration of Lima's

liberation, *Los patriotas de Lima en la noche feliz* actually helped establish independent Peru in the sense that it was part of the political pageantry through which José de San Martín assumed power in the wake of the viceroy's departure. Not surprisingly, it is a text of unbridled pro-independence fervor, essentially a propaganda piece. The reading I present here teases out strands of affective thinking from the play's more overtly patriotic stances—i.e., from its flag-waving enthusiasm and its rehashing of ideas from Enlightenment political economy. I attempt to show how organic intellectuals such as this playwright, who channeled emancipatory and independence discourses, placed pro-social feelings at the center of their thinking about citizenship. Along with a change in thinking, the transition from subject to citizen required a change in the way one felt about one's fellows, this reading suggests. The play argues for developing a more generous, less self-serving, more beneficent and moral ethos with regard to others. It pushes explicitly for a new kind of intimate, interior code of comportment based on pro-social sentiment that citizens and patriots should adopt for themselves. In this sense it suggests that, as much as a set of standardized arguments or opinions, what characterized the modern over against the archaic, the progressive over against the retrograde, and the republican over against the royalist for patriots was a set of emotional practices.

Los patriotas de Lima en la noche feliz is a fascinating object in and of itself, aside from what it has to tell us about affect and patriotism. Written in 1821 for performance in Lima's main municipal theater, known at the time as the Coliseo de Comedias, it was never revived. Very much tied to the political moment of independence, it could not have appealed to later audiences whose taste ran to *costumbrista* and romantic stylings. With only a few extant copies held by private collectors or in national libraries, it remained essentially a bibliographic curiosity until 1960, when the scholar Guillermo Ugarte Chamorro published an account of it. Both the play's dating and its authorship presented problems, the undated edition bearing only the author's initials M.C. In his 1960 article, Ugarte Chamorro was able to fix the date of play's premier, establishing it as the celebratory play performed on August 1, 1821 for the Proclamation of Independence (*Los patriotas* 5). At the time, he attributed the piece to Miguel del Carpio, following the lead of an important early bibliographer, Gabriel René Moreno (Moreno 337). However, by 1974, when he published the piece in its entirety as part of his *El teatro en la independencia*, Ugarte Chamorro had made new discoveries that led him to revise his opinion on its authorship. Specifically, he presented evidence from a newspaper article written by the actor and playwright Francisco Martínez in 1827 that identifies the author as the Chilean-born journalist, playwright and patriot Manuel de Santiago Concha or Manuel Concha, a mainstay of the Lima stage during the period and prolific playwright, though largely of adaptations ("Estudio preliminar" LXXII). On the strength of this evidence, Ugarte Chamorro built a case for considering the play as the first piece of national theater. Furthermore, he suggested that it must have been written and rehearsed in the relatively slim lapse of time between early July 1821 and its August 1 performance date—that is, between the moment when it became known that José de San Martín would take possession of the city and the cycle of celebratory happenings planned to accompany the official Proclamation of Independence some three weeks later. The quick production timeline perhaps explains why the play has two acts rather than the customary three.

***Patriotas* Contextualized**

Several scholars have remarked on the Peruvian theater's vital function as a sounding board—"conmovida caja de resonancia ciudadana"—for independence and revolutionary ideology (Ugarte Chamorro, "Estudio preliminar" XI). Original *loas*, dramas, comedies, allegories, marches, and patriotic hymns and songs composed for the purpose, performed by Peruvian actors, registered the heightened emotional timbre of the times for elite theatergoers. *Patriotas* certainly conforms to this model. Its characters, stated Vargas Ugarte, "no hacen sino hacerse eco de los sentimientos que agitaban a los limeños a la vista de los primeros soldados de la patria" (295). Understanding the play as a reflection of certain elements of public discourse can be fruitful. It reproduces, albeit in an interested and selective way, the intellectually loose revolutionary talk that circulated through the cafés, newspapers, and dinner tables that comprised the bourgeois public sphere. We must contextualize this phenomenon, also, within the function of the Coliseo itself as a public space of communication between Lima's principal citizen's and San Martín and his government. From his box, the general often addressed the audience, informing them, for example, of his determination to fight the Spanish forces that were approaching to retake the city on September 2, 1821. Because it had such a vital function as space of communication, there was a push to reform the theater, to "dignificar el arte dramático" by curtailing tobacco use and discouraging extra-marital assignations in the Coliseo, rehabilitating the reputations of actors, and generally making the theater into a respectable organ for pro-independence ideas (Balta Campbell 63).

A refresher in the immediate historical background may be in order before delving into the play proper. José de San Martín, when he finally entered Lima after encamping for some months in nearby towns, did so not in the guise of a conqueror but rather a protector. The Spanish viceroy José de la Serna had abandoned the city unexpectedly without a battle (a temporary relinquishment, as it turned out: his forces would recapture it later). Only the liberator could fill the resulting power vacuum and keep order in a city starkly divided into political factions largely along class lines. San Martín therefore negotiated a deal with the municipal officials whereby they would deliver the city to him through a sworn vote for independence, a document signed on July 15 by members of the *Cabildo*, nobility and other principal citizens of Lima. The official proclamation of independence was programmed for July 28, two weeks later. In the interim the municipal government planned a three-day cycle of ceremonies and celebrations to mark the independence proclamation. The main streets and squares surrounding the central plaza were decorated with bunting, flags, flowers and triumphal arches (including one crowned by an equestrian statue of San Martín). At 7 p.m. on Friday, July 27 Lima's church bells tolled, followed by fireworks and a concert by an orchestra playing from the balcony of city hall. On the 28th the liberator rode on horseback from the Viceroy's Palace through the city accompanied by officials from the university, church, nobility, royal and municipal governments, and his high command. At stages set up expressly for that purpose in Lima's main squares, he made the official proclamation of independence in four brief, identical ceremonies. Celebrations redoubled that night with the *Cabildo* ball (a tradition during viceregal welcome ceremonies) mirrored outside in the plaza by an orchestra, dances, and more fireworks. Women wore ribbons, feathers and sashes in the

new red and white national colors. The following day, Sunday the 29th, San Martín attended a mass in the cathedral at which the religious authorities consecrated the new government (masses were likewise a central aspect of viceregal transitions and royal proclamations). That afternoon individual members of the municipal councils, from the Cabildo on down, swore oaths of allegiance to independent Peru—in writing, signed in triplicate, and delivered to royal authorities. The celebrations did not end after three days, but continued for some time with bullfights and other events. On August 1, for instance, San Martín signed a *decreto de indultos* pardoning minor criminals, a customary gesture of enlightened humanitarianism when a new king was crowned. That same evening he went to the theater.

Though the military government was newly constituted, the ceremonial aspects of the proclamation of independence were old and familiar. Pablo Ortemberg has emphasized that the political pageantry owed a great deal to viceregal ritual, and in fact that it closely mirrored processions marking viceregal transitions and royal proclamations throughout the eighteenth century and before.² These ceremonies tracked the kind of political ritual Foucault characterizes as “the power of spectacle,” an “excessive, yet regulated manifestation of power... a spectacular expression of potency, an ‘expenditure,’ exaggerated and coded, in which power renewed its vigour” (187-88). Ortemberg cites a kind of political literacy not only among the elites but among non-elites accustomed to visually identifying shades of power and influence from such details as physical positioning in parades and processions. These rituals thus became exercises in the continuity of power or, as Ortemberg states it, “dispositivos de continuidad del poder, donde los discursos de sus patrocinadores buscan legitimarse y legitimarse un proyecto político por medio de otro pacto retórico entre el presente y el pasado” (73). San Martín made shrewd use of a well-established ritual language of rulership, in other words, to establish his legitimacy. The ceremonies constituted a series of regulated and choreographed exchanges of political sentiment between San Martín and different segments of Lima’s populace: fealty and sovereignty, need and paternal care, gratitude and graciousness, enthusiasm and heroism. For instance, the tossing of commemorative coins to the crowds suggested the extension of paternal care, reciprocated with gratitude and loyalty. Such links of public feeling—carefully prescribed, familiar and comforting—were central aspects of political communication.

San Martín’s trip to the theater on the night of August 1 must be understood in this context. Throughout the eighteenth century, theater productions had been used to celebrate royal transitions. Thus Francisco del Castillo penned a *loa* to Fernando VI, performed on the occasion of his coronation in 1746 (Pasquariello 11). By the end of the century they had also been integrated into viceregal welcome ceremonies, as witnessed by the anonymous *loa* performed for Ambrosio O’Higgins in 1796, also published in *El teatro en la independencia* by Ugarte Chamorro (215). Taking his seat before Lima’s principal stage, therefore, San Martín enacted a bit of political theater designed to institute a triangular exchange between himself, the company of actors, and the “hombres y mujeres decentes” of the audience (Concha 35). The salutes, applause, bows, flourishes, body language, and so forth were where the real action lay. The play itself served as a catalyst to the more immediate, more compelling signs of embodied political affect exchanged between San Martín and the audience (which were as likely to have been cynically ironic

as sincere, of course). For this purpose, probably, the text of the play refers continually to San Martín from the introductory *loa* through to the final toasts and anthem, affording ample opportunity for both players and audience to gesturally address the general, to hail him through this kind of particular body hexis associated with political ritual. The text of the play is conjoined to its occasion.

A Comforting Creole Activism

As a group, the sizeable cast of characters gives the impression of a patriotic groundswell occurring in Lima in support of San Martín and independence. Because they are almost all proto-bourgeois creoles, however, it is a comforting groundswell in the sense that it is limited to polite society, the society of the play's audience. The three main characters and opinion-makers are don Manuel, namesake of the author, an active conspirator; don Lorenzo, a pharmacist representing the professions; and don Hipólito, a wealthy clockmaker. Together they present a reassuring image of stability, reasonableness, enlightened ideas, and moral decency. The brewing change, insists Manuel, "solo muda de gobierno, no de sistema" (Concha 12). Only slightly less important are two embodiments of ardent female patriotism in the form of doña Pepa and doña Rosa, unmarried and childless women who seek both husbands and national independence. A handful of secondary characters fill out the cast, including a pair of young *galanes*, don José and don Tomás, and the only non-creole or non-gentlemanly character Pancho, Manuel's co-conspirator.

In the first act, the principal characters gather at Lorenzo's pharmacy, a space marked by the emblems of knowledge, science, industriousness, professionalism. This is the public-private sphere in which the values of the emerging bourgeoisie dominate, the sphere *par excellence* of resistance to the crown. The action occurs after the viceroy's troops have quit the city but before San Martín's army arrives. During the initial scenes Manuel, Lorenzo and Hipólito sketch the situation in the city (rumors of troop movements, food shortages, royalist propaganda, and so forth). Other characters drop by, beginning with Pepa and Rosa, who with the three gentlemen give a series of blatantly propagandistic speeches on aspects of the pro-independence case. Lorenzo complains of the prejudice against American-born citizens in the awarding of royal offices and benefits; Rosa of the nepotism of Spanish officials and merchants; Lorenzo again of the stacked justice system; Pepa of aristocratic titles. All these were standard complaints of creole patriotism leading up to independence. Perhaps Hipólito presents the most hard-hitting economic case when he describes Spanish Ministers, "unos lobos carniboros" who, not content with stripping the colonies of valuable metals and other products, appoint rapacious administrators to line their pockets (19). In the same vein, Hipólito attacks monopolistic economic practices. Conversation then turns to the chaotic and insecure state of the city: Spanish wives and children sheltering in monasteries, people moving to safe quarters, merchants who have either fled with de la Serna or are taking refuge with the Spanish garrison at Callao, and *limeños* of all stripes (but especially known royalists) trying desperately to secure their wealth and persons. As Lorenzo comments, "[t]oda la Ciudad es un continuo trafico de muebles que se conducen de una parte á otra, de aquellas personas que no tienen sus conciencias muy limpias" (16). Near the end of the act Manuel returns from an

errand to confirm that San Martín's troops have entered the city. Bells peal, and the characters exit toward the street, and toward intermission, with a chorus of vivas.

Later that evening as Act II begins they reconvene at doña Rosa's house. The stage features a table that will be set for dinner by servants (unnamed and non-speaking characters, to be sure) by the act's end. Like the *botica* of Act I, this space too is significant, a place of order and tradition with clear rules of exclusion and inclusion (in contrast to the carnivalesque street celebrations taking place outside). It is a space of bourgeois sociality. Here too, as in the first act, the protagonists (Manuel, Hipólito, Rosa) give lengthy harangues on the future of independent Peru. They describe an economy in which, with the barriers and hurdles of empire removed, agriculture, mining, timber, and shipbuilding will flourish. Peru's wealth will attract European migrants, who will contribute to nation-building with their expertise and know-how. A notable aspect of these speeches is their rhetoric of the care and cultivation of human capital. The "pueblos" will be civilized and educated, the population will grow, patriots will have large families, and a new generation of hardworking, educated creoles will direct the work of national construction. Trading partners will line up eagerly, attracted by the natural riches, and the nation will protect its growing wealth from foreign incursion with a strong army and navy. Young men, presented for the first time with unimpeded fields of activity, will not fear marriage. Children will no longer be felt as economic burdens, but as assets. Women will benefit. Their work, both childrearing and gender-specific activities such as seamstressing, will be valued at its true worth. The act concludes when a patriotic throng arrives backstage. Doña Rosa attends to everybody, serving food and wine to both her gathered guests and those backstage in a horizontal show of generosity, love, and national unity (though of course the crowd never invades the sanctuary of the dining room). Before eating, she commands a round of toasts, proposed in turn by our five main protagonists, and the play goes out to a patriotic anthem and the waving of the flag.

Fervors and Intensities of Patriotism

I would like now to touch on the proliferating manifestations of pro-social emotion in the piece not obvious from its outline, above. Pro-social feelings bubble up at every turn. Though he may have been unsure of exactly how to integrate them into his independence rhetoric, the author nevertheless felt them as essential, just as he felt patriotism itself to be essential. Here, though, we find a strange lacuna. While the enthusiasms of patriotism are plentifully evoked, love of country proper never forms an object of discussion or analysis for the playwright. Other documents from the pre-independence period do show a concern to define patriotism, with Juan Pablo Viscardo y Guzmán something of a touchstone in this regard. Viscardo describes the love of country as an "entusiasmo ciego," a natural inclination to our native ground, the country where we were born and that provides "el alimento necesario para nosotros y nuestros hijos" (Escudero 329, 330). For Viscardo, patriotism is a natural affection for and loyalty to one's birthplace, to which one feels phenomenologically connected. Later definitions of patriotism hewed closely to a similar line. Carolina Freyre de Jaimes, for example, read a piece to Lima's Club Literario in 1876 in which she argued that "el amor patrio . . . es el amor oculto, sincero, profundo que profesamos á la tierra que nos vió nacer con todas sus bellezas y con todos sus defectos, es la aspiracion desinteresada que sentimos por verla rica, libre, envidiada y feliz, es ese aguijon que nos lleva á las grandes empresas para decir con orgullo á los

demas, ‘he aquí una nacion poderosa y digna del respeto universal’” (18-19). By contrast, the *Patriotas* author does not dwell on patriotism in a way that would suggest its meaning was at all contested.

What he does dwell on and describe with some eloquence and at some length are the transports of joy provoked by the initial news of liberation—the “conmocion alagüeña,” to use Hipólito’s phrase (Concha 28). The emotions that overcome the characters when they hear the city has been liberated have a kind of inchoate quality upon which they themselves remark. Even in Hipólito’s word “conmoción” we catch a glimpse of something less direct than defined joy. “Conmoción,” according to the 1780 Dictionary of the Real Academia, describes a “movimiento, ó perturbación violenta del ánimo, ó del cuerpo” (Instituto Rafael Lapesa de la RAE, *Mapa de diccionarios*). The dominant notion is that of embodied dynamisms. Manuel asks, “¿Pero quien podrá describir la entrada de la Tropa, el recibimiento que ha hecho el Pueblo, y las diferentes sensaciones que ha originado en los patriotas tan dichosa nueva?” (Concha 28). Paula describes a nuanced cascade of reactions: “A mi me pilló esta noticia tan desprevenida, que los primeros transportes fueron de susto, degenerando despues en un placer extraordinario, y del modo que estaba, sin pararme ni aun á tomar sombrero, sali de mi casa à compañar al Pueblo en su festiva aclamacion” (34). Sentiments gush in several directions at once. Especially notable in this regard is Rosa’s description: “Las diferentes conmociones de las almas sensibles; de las almas de los verdaderos patriotas, si pudieran pintarse, ofrecerian al mundo el cuadro mas interesante: lagrimas, sustos, jubilo, delirios. . . de todo fuimos acometidos en los primeros momentos, con la fauxta noticia de esta noche” (39). Like Hipólito, Rosa uses “conmoción” to denote a raw capacity to be moved, though hers takes the form of tears, fright, jubilation, delirium—contradictory yet simultaneous affective states.

Rosa’s statement is particularly interesting since it suggests that true patriots are those capable of being moved. Implicit is the idea of a divide between those not capable of being moved, who inhabit a temporal/moral space imagined as archaic and self-interested (the space of empire, tyranny, *egoísmo*), and those capable of being moved, who inhabit a temporal/moral space imagined as modern and marked by pro-social dispositions. Rosa’s statement therefore defines not only patriotism but modernity itself in affective terms. Patriots and republicans marked out a space of social distinction through such rhetoric of affect: the new, the modern was associated with the ability to be moved or touched emotionally, while the archaic and anti-modern was associated with its opposites, self-interestedness, cruelty, the lack of sensibility and pro-social sentiment. Manuel underscores the way emotional qualities characterize the modern/archaic divide through the image of electric current:

[E]n el momento que meditamos sobre nuestra actual suerte; cuando despertamos del penoso letargo en que yaciamos; cuando nos vemos elevados á la alta dignidad de hombres libres; de hombres que pertenecen á si mismos; *un noble fuego electriza nuestras almas*: buscamos nuestro corazon, y embriagado de gratitud lo vemos correr á los pies del origen de tanto bien; del heroe del acierto [San Martín]. Si, tu nos haz salvado, le

decimos; tu haz sido el redentor de tantos males como agoviaban á los miseros Peruanos. (39 emphasis added)

Through these kinds of rhetorical flourishes pro-social affect in the play takes on qualities of the modern.

In a similar vein, the playwright invests certain aspects of the rhetoric of politics with pro-social emotion. For instance, pro-social feelings characterize the morally “good” in the play (i.e. Americans and patriots), while the lack of them characterizes the morally “bad” (i.e. Spaniards). Americans are labeled with epithets such as *generoso*, *benigno*, *benéfico*, *suave*, *amigo*, *piedad*, *afabilidad* and their equivalents—terms denoting the ability to suffer with others, be affected by them. Conversely, Spaniards get painted with the negative terms *egoísta*, *bárbaro*, *soberbio*, *cruel*, *tirano*, *déspota*, *inhumano* and so forth, implying that they are impervious to the transmission or contagion of feeling. Pepa relates the anecdote of a royalist doctor who goes so far as to advocate the genocidal destruction of the Indians (23). San Martín especially is held up as a model of sensibility contrasting with Spanish cruelty: “¡Ah! Si tu le hubieras visto familiarizarse con los mas infelices, hablarles con un cariño, con una dulzura encantadora, dejandolos tan pagados de su trato, que salian dando gracias al Cielo que les habia enviado un hombre tan extraordinario, en quien resplandecen todo genero de virtudes, y bendiciendo sin cesar al heroe Americano” (42). San Martín can be touched literally as he mingles with Lima’s poor and touched emotionally in the sense of moved.

Then too, these emotions characterize the classic metaphors of enslavement and tyranny which, borrowing from earlier pro-independence voices, the playwright uses to define Peru’s political status under the king. Viscardo y Guzmán in his *Carta* had depicted the creole condition as a creeping enslavement, ignored until it reached unsustainable levels (Escudero 330). Slavery for Viscardo referred to a political circumstance, the circumstance of the captured polis. People are enslaved when as a nation they are subject to laws not in their interest; a ruler is a tyrant, conversely, when he imposes laws not in his people’s interest. Yet by 1821 affective resonances had been layered onto the notions of tyranny and slavery as a result of the British-led anti-slavery campaigns then beginning to affect the Atlantic world as a whole. The play’s rhetoric moves into affective territory when dealing with slaves and tyrants. “¿Con que ya concluyó la tiranía? / ¿Con que esas almas de perfidia llenas / Huyen de aqui por siempre?” the opening *loa* asks (Concha 5). If tyrants are perfidious (i.e. self-interested, unfeeling, not susceptible to being moved by the plight of those they rule), slaves become signs of human misery and abjection, useful not only for defining a political condition but for activating the affective aspects of modernity through emotional contagion and identification.³ Peru, says Manuel, is “[u]na Nacion, que por treientos años / La escalvisò con barbaras cadenas; / Cansada de sufrir yuyo tan triste, / Libertad dice” (Concha 46). The slave here becomes an object of elite sympathizing allowing the audience to prove its modernity through sensibility.

Finally, pro-social feelings are at the root of political union and thus the nation since they are responsible for joining disparate individuals into a social body. Here the *mercuristas* had led the way in the Peruvian context, arguing for instance that the affective practice denoted by the verb “compadecerse” ensures that “todo pais sea patria comun: que toda nacion deponga sus rivalidades: y que todos los mortales se miren reciprocamente como

hermanos” (“Noticia histórica” 294). Pro-social sentiments compel one to identify with socially different others as fellow citizens: “Fraternidad y union es lo que gusta / Ea pues, olvidemos dicensiones / Y hagamos uno nuestros corazones” (Concha 6). Anyone who throws in his lot with us has a right to consider himself “nuestro compatriota, nuestro hermano, y de consiguiente acrehedor á todo nuestro cariño,” says Manuel (11). Brotherhood (*fraternité*) with its ardors of love and identification, its gratifying affection and pleasure, is never far distant: “Todo inspira placer, todo alegría, / Solo sé vén ya amigos, solo hermanos” (44). The act of national union is essentially an act of the heart.

Founding a Practice of Pro-Social Sentiment

With independence, affect became an imperative in the emerging discourse of citizenship; at the very least, with independence it took a central role in discussions of political modernity. And yet there is a very real sense in which pro-social sentiment nests uneasily within the more practiced and comfortable economic and political arguments the play makes in favor of emancipation. When Manuel states why he has been a patriot, it is “por ver [la patria] independiente de un Gobierno despotico y tirano; por ver á todos los americanos en el goze de sus derechos; por ver establecido un Codigo suave y benefico dirigido por un recto tribunal de justicia en el que todos seamos juzgados con igualdad; por ver florecer la industria, en su vigor la agricultura, las artes las ciencias y el comercio” (41-42). Affect does not carry the weight of the argument. Rather, intruding through multiple fissures and at every point, it produces the effect of what we might call an “anxiety of affect” associated with modernity and patriotism. Pro-social feelings do not yet constitute practices capable of enacting and embodying the philosophical and economic ideas of Enlightenment, though the playwright anticipates and encourages this end.

I adopt the term “practice” from Pierre Bourdieu’s explanation of the habitus and the practices and strategies by which it generates action. Emotions, facets of the habitus, are actions we do and repeat in social space. They are rehearsed, intuitive movements of sociality and engagement rooted in the body which a lifetime of banal repetition has made. They are “calculated” (though without conscious calculation) to produce certain outcomes. Practical sense, which Bourdieu spoke of as “social necessity turned into nature, converted into motor schemes and body automatisms,” guides these practices (Bourdieu 69). We can conceive of agents “doing emotions,” in Monica Scheer’s phrase, as they do other things that would fall under Bourdieu’s rubric of practices. Just as the habitus specifies appropriate bodily movement, it specifies “what is ‘feelable’ in a specific setting, orients the mind/body in a certain direction without making the outcome fully predictable” (Scheer 205). Bourdieu never himself went so far as to qualify emotions as practices. However, we “do” emotions in the sense that we repeat them, we practice them, we instrumentalize and perform them with our bodies according to patterns of perception, thought and action in the habitus, just as we do other things. *Patriotas*, I suggest, shows a snapshot of a moment in which pro-social emotions were becoming instituted as practices through which elite citizenship was enacted and embodied.⁴

The most direct treatment of pro-social sentiment in the play comes in the form of an exhortation or argument for adopting a rigorous code of emotional comportment—a kind

of emotional duty for the embryonic citizen. Implying a kind of moral vigilance over the self, a regulation of the bad passions and cultivation of the good, the code of emotional comportment put forward in *Patriotas* prescribes how elite subjects should practice patriotism and liberalism at the level of embodied affect. Manuel takes the lead in this line of argument. Under the new government, he says, “[t]odos trabajarán entonces por hacerse utiles, reglando del mejor modo su conducta” (11). “Reglar,” ruling or regulating one’s conduct, suggests that these discourses of emotion constitute a kind of self-vigilance. Several passages show how patriots do control their passions and regulate their conduct. San Martín’s troops occupy Lima in an orderly way (29). The patriotic throng likewise does not loot or vandalize, merely going into the *pulperías* and drinking “algún licor, sin ocasionar otro mal á los dueños” (31). When describing San Martín’s troops, the playwright praises their self-control: “[E]stremece la humanidad al recordarlas, ellos superiores á sus pasiones, y sugetos voluntariamente á una disciplina que hasta ahora no tiene exemplo” (28). Though “disciplina” clearly has a military sense, San Martín’s volunteer soldiers are subject voluntarily to a disciplinary regime that they impose upon themselves. The playwright contrasts them with the King’s mercenaries, who plunder and give free reign to their violent and egotistical impulses. San Martín’s troops voluntarily control their passions in a way that patriots generally should also do: “[D]ebemos estudiar sobre la sobriedad de costumbres, tan precisa para sostener el orden,” Manuel asserts, for “un hombre libre, debe serlo en todo, y no esclavizarse por caprichos ò debiles pasiones” (40).

Liberation’s intimate dimensions are as important to Manuel as its public, civic dimensions—more important (more basic or prior) if we believe his assertion that the first duty of a free American is to acquire the patriotic virtues. The interior, private sphere of the passions translates into virtues, or dispositions toward desirable actions. Though intimate, the sphere of these virtues and the good passions fuelling them is neither unobserved nor pre-discursive. Indeed, it should be monitored vigilantly:

Sin [las virtudes sociales] nada adelantariamos: el primer deber de un americano libre es procurar adornarse de todas las virtudes patrias: desterrar todo orgullo, toda altanería. La afabilidad, el trato suave, son los mas gloriosos distintivos que nos deben caracterizar. Hasta hoy (confesemos la verdad) hemos sido bajos lisongeros con los que han tenido superior fortuna, y soberbios, altivos, con los que hemos juzgado inferiores. Nuestro trato con los Xefes y autoridades, debe ser sumiso, respetuoso, pero de ninguna manera bajo, y con los demas fraternal, cortés. Empecemos á exercitar la moderacion en el trato familiar de nuestras Casas, no expresandonos con nuestras mugeres, hijos, y dependientes, con palabras groseras y mucho menos indecentes: no por que la suerte los haya hecho nuestros subditos, debemos abusar de la autoridad que tenemos sobre ellos. De este modo nos acostumbraremos insensiblemente à ser templados, una de las virtudes mas dignas en el hombre. El despotismo, el despotismo que tanto censuramos en los demas y no lo conocemos en nosotros, se debe arrancar de raíz del suelo americano, si aspiramos á vivir felices. (40)

The patriot must curtail the sociality of tyrants and slaves, and cultivate the sociality of free citizens, which is marked above all by a quality of forbearance, a “trato suave” especially vis-à-vis those over whom the freshly minted citizen exercises authority (children, wives, servants, slaves). More than a code of comportment, it is a code of moral vigilance in the service of defeating despotism/tyranny at the most intimate level, extirpating it, pulling it out by the roots from the American soil and the American soul. Here again, the ideal of moderation comes into play. Patriots must “exercitar la moderacion en el trato familiar,” they must “ser templados, una de las virtudes mas dignas en el hombre,” they must temper or restrain the passions in the best Enlightenment (and classical) style:

En el siglo de las luces, cuando tenemos tantos modelos antiguos y modernos de lo que puede el amor à la Patria, cuando entre nosotros mismos há resplandecido con hechos tan gloriosos que exceden à cuantos presenta la historia ¿no seremos capaces de dominar de algún modo nuestras pasiones si queremos vivir perpetuamente dichosos? Yo quisiera que todos los americanos poseyesen en tan alto grado las virtudes patrias, que si hasta hoy presentò la historia à Griegos y Romanos por modelos de patriotismo, los sobstituyesen los americanos en todo, ya que en mucho los hán excedido: que no hubiesen jamàs motivos de queja ni enemistades entre los naturales del nuevo mundo, no distinguiendose los paises sino para emularse en virtudes; que un amor reciproco se alvergase en las almas de todos ¿habria entonces alguno extremadamente infeliz? ¿no seria la nuestra una sociedad envidiable? (40-41)

Love of country may be a prime motivation, but the playwright again places the heaviest burden on other emotional facets of liberty: cultivating a new interiority characterized by cordial dispositions and patriotic virtues, dominating the bad passions, living in moderation, living a tempered life. Virtue founded in pro-social affect thus becomes the center of the ethos of citizenship projected by this play at the moment of liberation (as we see in the image of the nations of America outdoing one another in the exercise of virtue). The patriot must discipline his emotions and live according to an affective code that promotes union.

By placing his argument for a code of emotional comportment in the heart of the discussions of the post-independence political and economic order in Act II, the playwright suggests that with independence one must *feel* differently now, that being modern and assuming the ethical dimension of one’s newly invested political status meant fostering a new kind of emotional substrate. It seems logical, given this state of affairs, that civic life in the century following *Patriotas*, particularly beginning about 1850, should maximize opportunities for the performance of these emotions. In fact we do find a concentration of humanitarian feeling and other related affective stances shooting through Peruvian literature of the latter half of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth. Though Enlightenment political economy may have offered philosophical justifications for independence and the new order, citizenship was performed and enacted in the day-to-day through the continued rehearsal of pro-social emotion, which constituted one of the essential civic practices of Peruvian elites. We find a double aspect

to the rhetoric of political modernity in the play. Its reasoned side incorporates many of the features associated with Enlightenment political thought: natural law, individual sovereignty and rights, assuming the responsibilities of free citizens (including military service and fostering a feeling of national union among classes and regions), individual enterprise and the free exchange of goods, basic fairness in the distribution of offices, access and resources, and equality before the law. Its affective side deals with passions and virtues, social linkages, sympathy, philanthropy, love and other proofs of one's ability to identify oneself with others and to form bonds of fellow citizenship through feeling. One implies the other. Affect embodies and performs political economy. By practicing the right register of emotions, the liberal elites of Peru's republican period embodied political modernity and performed citizenship.

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Notes

- ¹ Peluffo's *Lágrimas andinas* and Denegri's *El abanico y la cigarrera* both treat women novelists of the 1870-1900 period, and both compellingly situate the use of sentimentalism and sentimental tropes as strategies within the literary field.
- ² I owe my reconstruction of the events of San Martín's proclamation primarily to Ortemberg's excellent article, which addresses the essential role of ritual in the transference of power. I have also consulted Fernando Gamio Palacio, *La municipalidad de Lima en la emancipación, 1821*.
- ³ In his excellent *The Rule of Sympathy*, Amit Rai chronicles the dual emergence of anti-slavery campaigns and the vogue for sympathy in Britain. On how depictions of suffering slaves were meant to provoke tears and other signs of the contagion of affect in the elite reader, who must display her sensibility in her body, see Rai 118.
- ⁴ Placing the emphasis on Bourdieusian practices rather than Foucauldian discipline or Deluzian intensities has the advantages of emphasizing 1) the continuities of elite dominance through the political rupture of emancipation, and 2) the ways the elites of the nineteenth century came to use these emotions as a shorthand for a set of political ideals.

Works Cited

- Aréstegui, Narciso. *El padre Horán*. Tomo 1. Lima: Universo, 1969. Print.
- Balta Campbell, Aída. *Historia general del teatro en el Perú*. Lima: U de San Martín de Porres, 2001. Print.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Logic of Practice*. Trans. Richard Nice. Redwood City, CA: Stanford UP, 1990. Print.
- Calatayud y Borda, Fr. Cipriano Jerónimo de. "Disertación Histórico-Ética sobre el real Hospicio general de Pobres de esta Ciudad, y la necesidad de sus socorros." *Mercurio Peruano* 4.119-25 (1792): 124-82. Web. 26 June 2015.
- Concha, Manuel. "Los patriotas de Lima en la noche feliz." *El teatro en la independencia*. Ed. Guillermo Ugarte Chamorro. Tomo 2. Lima: Comisión Nacional del Sesquicentenario de la Independencia del Perú, 1974. 7-50. Print.
- Denegri, Francesca. *El abanico y la cigarrera: la primera generación de mujeres ilustradas en el Perú*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1996. Print.
- Escudero, Antonio Gutiérrez. "Juan Pablo Viscardo y su 'Carta dirigida a los Españoles Americanos.'" *Araucaria. Revista Iberoamericana de Filosofía, Política y Humanidades* 9.17 (2007): 323-44. Web. 7 Feb 2014.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Vintage Books, 1995. Print.
- Freyre de Jaimes, Carolina. "'Flora Tristan' Apuntes sobre su vida y sus obras. (Conferencia leída en la sesión del 15 de Julio de 1875 por D.^a Carolina de Jaimes)." *Anales del Club Literario de Lima* 2 (1876): 14-46. Print.
- Gamio Palacio, Fernando. *La municipalidad de Lima en la emancipación, 1821*. Lima: Municipalidad Metropolitana de Lima, Dirección Municipal de Educación y Cultura, 2005 (1944). Web. 10 Feb 2014.
- Instituto de Investigación Rafael Lapesa de la Real Academia Española. *Mapa de diccionarios académicos*. Versión 1.0. Real Academia Española, 2013. Web. 18 Sep 2015.
- Matto de Turner, Clorinda. *Aves sin nido*. Ciudad de México: Colofón, 2006. Print.
- Moreno, Gabriel René. *Biblioteca Peruana. Apuntes para un catálogo de impresos. I Libros y folletos peruanos de la Biblioteca del Instituto Nacional*. Santiago de Chile: Biblioteca del Instituto Nacional, 1896. Web. 17 July 2015.
- "Noticia histórica de la fundación, progresos y actual estado de la Real Casa Hospital de niños expósitos de Nuestra Señora de Atocha." *Mercurio Peruano* 2.66-67 (1791): 294-308. Web. 26 June 2015.
- Ortemberg, Pablo. "La entrada de José de San Martín en Lima y la proclamación del 28 de julio: la negociación simbólica de la transición." *Histórica* XXXIII.2 (2009): 65-108. Web. 31 Jan 2014.
- Pasquariello, Anthony M. "The Evolution of the *Loa* in Spanish America." *Latin American Theatre Review* 3.2 (1970): 5-19. Web. 28 Feb 2014.
- Peluffo, Ana. *Lágrimas andinas: Sentimentalismo, género y virtud republicana en Clorinda Matto de Turner*. Pittsburgh: Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana, 2005. Print.
- Rai, Amit. *Rule of Sympathy: Sentiment, Race, and Power, 1750-1850*. New York: Palgrave, 2002. Print.

-
- Scheer, Monica. "Are Emotions a Kind of Practice (And Is That What Makes Them Have a History)? A Bourdieuan Approach to Understanding Emotion." *History and Theory* 51 (2012): 193-220. Web. 5 July 2013.
- Ugarte Chamorro, Guillermo. Estudio Preliminar. *El teatro en la independencia*. Ed. Guillermo Ugarte Chamorro. Tomo 1. Colección documental de la independencia del Perú. Lima: Comisión Nacional del Sesquicentenario de la Independencia del Perú, 1974. Print.
- . *'Los patriotas de Lima en la noche feliz,' la primera comedia del Perú independiente*. Lima: Servicio de Publicaciones del Teatro Universitario de San Marcos, 1960. Print.
- Vargas Ugarte, Rubén. *Historia del Perú. Emancipación (1809-1825)*. Tomo 5. Buenos Aires: López, 1958. Print.