



Re-legitimizing the Unfaithful Bastard Traitor: Re-productive and Contestatory Intertextuality in Andrés Bello's *Gramática* and *Orlando*

Angela DeLutis-Eichenberger

Conceived prior to his parents' matrimony in Venezuela, Andrés Bello (1781-1865) was later accused of fathering an illegitimate child from an adulterous liaison in Chile. By then, some had also considered him a traitor of the patriots for his supposed deviant behavior at the onset of the revolution in Caracas in 1810. Following his departure from Venezuela that year, Bello had begun an unforeseen nineteen-year residency in England (1810-1829) that ended with his relocation to Chile (1829-1865). These "exiles" were marked by impressive strides in politics and scholarship. His grammatical studies advanced in London persisted in Santiago, and culminated in *Gramática de la lengua castellana destinada al uso de los americanos* (1847). Interpolating and examining quotes from various intertexts in the grammar book, Bello continued a previous propensity to dialog with Cervantes's *Don Quijote*; however, he did so with a remarkable deviation in the typical citation pattern that Pedro Grases has observed in some of Bello's other works.¹ This divergent translanguistic order aids in an attempted re-legitimization of "Bello" to counter possible signifieds linked to his signifier as an unfaithful bastard traitor.

Approximately 280 passages in *Gramática* are recited from Cervantine works, with more than 200 drawn from the polyphonic *Quijote*. Notably, few citations in *Gramática* derive from Bello's normally cited Chapter 11 of the *Quijote*, with only one appropriated from the hidalgo's discourse to the goatherds. In its place, Chapter 25 is among the most quoted (Bello, *Obras* 4: 92, 97, 98, 123, 125, 181, 203, 327, 341). Chapter 25 explicitly references and parodies Ludovico Ariosto's (1474-1533) *Orlando furioso* (1516, 1521, 1532), whose themes of illicit affairs, questionable lineage, and self-imposed exile are somewhat analogously featured in the same Cervantine chapter.² This is important because Ariosto's *Orlando* had served as a "continuation" of Matteo Maria Boiardo's (1440-1494) unfinished "lombarda" edition of *L'Orlando innamorato* (1483, 1495). Boiardo's edition had also inspired Francesco Berni's (1497?-1535) "toscanizada" version (1541), whose first book Bello sought to "translate" during his exiles in London and Santiago as his own—*El Orlando enamorado del Conde Mateo María Boyardo, escrito de nuevo por Berni y traducido al castellano por Don Andrés Bello* (1862)—a lengthy title that clearly evokes a kinship and presence of some of the text's predecessors.

Understood as Kristevian ideologemes (as intertextualities within a text of society and history), Bello's *Gramática* and, to a greater extent, his lesser-studied *Orlando* engage the sociohistorical and cultural "problematics" of illegitimates and their fathers in the nineteenth century (Kristeva 37). They likewise address the injustice of printed defamatory accounts unbacked by "official" documents, in an advocacy for "factual" historical writing. More specifically, the re-presentation and silencing—or excision—of anticipated passages from Orlandian intertexts in Bello's *Orlando*, to which *Gramática* also points, constitute a permutation of texts that involves both uniquely re-productive and contestatory intertextualities: reproductive, in that these metatextually re-produce the contents of the Chilean Civil Code and Bello's articulated position on historiography; and contestatory, in that those recognized re-productions help to contest negative interpretations of the marginalized.³ Primarily written by Bello, the Civil Code outlined the legal rights of children and their parents. It clarified who constituted legitimate offspring, and how, or to what extent, some of the categorized illegitimates could be lawfully re-legitimized. Reputation-wise, the stipulations would have benefitted Bello and his endorsed Code, since Bello as its acknowledged author had been legitimized by his parents' Catholic union before his birth.⁴ Put into effect in the years after Bello supposedly fathered an illegitimate child in Santiago, the Code created new regulations, or perhaps better said, legal "protections," for those biological fathers of illegitimate offspring who refused to recognize them. Similarly, Bello's promoted narrative methodology for historiography sought to ensure the circulation of "historical truths" based on firm documentation. The renovation of historiographical methods to affect what would endure as historical archive of (inter)national value could re-legitimize those (wrongfully) accused of distasteful actions (like Bello) as part of the construction of a social order. The inter-related texts of *Gramática* and *Orlando*, read alongside other marginal ones like private letters, can be understood as re-legitimizing propaganda built from relativized sources. The study of the intertextualities in play through them stitches together yet another, more contemporary "text" in process for who or what is "Bello," by bringing these margins—to include the so-called bastard, the alleged father of illegitimate offspring, the accused traitor—to the center for re-evaluation.

Bello resided in Francisco Miranda's (1750-1816) home on Grafton Street in London from 1810 until at least 1813, where he had access to Miranda's copious library (Jaksić, *Andrés Bello: Scholarship* 33). In addition to a five-volume set of Cervantes's *Quijote* (Pellicer; Madrid, 1797) and another 4-volume set by the Real Academia (Madrid, 1780), Miranda owned a copy of Ariosto's *Orlando furioso en romance castellano* (Urrea; Lyon, Rovil, 1550), a five-volume edition of Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* (Par., 1788), and Berni's rendition of Boiardo's *Orlando innamorato* (Venetian Giunta edition, 1545) (Uslar Pietri 2, 9, 20).⁵ Using Berni's version, Bello began to draft his Cantos 1 through 3, and a portion of Canto 4 (Bello, *Obras* 2: 139). At the same time, he started to collect materials and frame his position on grammar that he would later refine in *Gramática* (Jaksić, *Andrés Bello: Scholarship* 149). While he revised the grammar book in 1853, 1854, 1857, and 1860, he continued to translate and polish Cantos 1 through 14 of his *Orlando*, that had also found its way into *Gramática* (151).⁶ Three years before he perished, Bello allowed his *Orlando* to run in installments in the *Correo del Domingo*, and to be published as a volume (Bello, *Obras* 1: 361-62).

Although Bello was plausibly well-versed in Boiardo and Berni's versions, Edoardo Crema has suggested that it was "el caos lingüístico" abounding in Boiardo's that prompted Bello to choose Berni's more comprehensible adaptation as his base text for translation (175-76). Regardless, the "evasion" of Boiardo's version and its relation to a specific sociohistorical system of meaning tied to bastardy that critics have generally acknowledged, allow for a re-signification of sexual issues of broader implications for "Bello." Bastard heirs uniquely marked the long-standing historical succession pattern of the House of Este under which Boiardo wrote *Orlando*. As Jane Fair Bestor explains in "Marriage and Succession in the House of Este: A Literary Perspective," illegitimates ruled the Italian branch of the House for nearly 150 years, beginning with the election of Obizzo II (r. 1264-1293) as lord of Ferrara, and ending with the legitimate succession of Ercole d'Este in 1471. Amidst growing sociopolitical and ecclesiastical concerns for the promotion of marriage and lawful procreation, Ercole I had used his position as Niccolò III's eldest legitimate son to defend his accession to rule in 1471, which he earned by force over Niccolò di Leonello (the legitimate son of Niccolò III's illegitimate son, Leonello). After inciting a rebellion against Ercole, Niccolò di Leonello was beheaded in 1476. This was around the time that Boiardo began to write his poem that emphasized the importance of true love and marriage for dynastic succession. It arguably legitimized, from the literary sphere, Ercole's acquisition of power (Bestor 52, 66-70, 82). Alongside this con-text and circulating Carolingian and Arthurian traditions, in which the theme of illegitimacy prominently figured, Boiardo assumed Orlando's illegitimacy and critiqued his surrender to Eros (49-51, 63, 82-83). In this sense, the epic can be read, as Bestor does, to re-valorize matters of illegitimacy and re-evaluate the tensions related to the very nature of the Este line and future ruling class.

With Bello's discourse understood as bound to his readings, and his expressions to those of others, he builds his "translated" text through that of another (others) that is (are) repositioned, and alongside a "social text" whose literary transformation could re-assert itself in different ways into other historical and social ones (Kristeva 45-46). The "evaded" text of Boiardo that informs Berni's (and Ariosto's) is very present in its supposed silence, in the "mosaic of quotations," absorptions, and transformation of texts, in Bello's edition (Block de Behar 4-5; Kristeva 66). With these relationships recognized, the seemingly distinct representations of the theme of bastardy in Canto 2 in Boiardo, Berni, and Bello's renditions merit attention.

In all three, Charlemagne decries the separation of some of his most powerful knights, when the emperor's men begin to lose against attacking Saracens. Orlando had left his court to pursue Angélica of Cathay. In Boiardo's verses depicting Charlemagne's wrath, there is a clear indication of Orlando's illegitimacy that does not readily appear in the other editions: "- Ove son quei che me dièn fare omaggio, / Che m'hanno abandonato in questo giorno? / Ov'è Gan da Pontieri? Ove è Rainaldo? / Ove è Orlando, traditor bastardo? / Figliol de una puttana, rinegato! -" (Bestor 63-64; Boiardo 51) ["Where are those men who owe me fealty? / Have they abandoned me today? / Rainaldo? Gano of Pontieri? / And where's Orlando?-that base traitor! / Son of a whore! You renegade!"] (Ross 22-23)]. For Bestor, readers from Boiardo's era would have likely recognized the "whore" mentioned as Charlemagne's sister, Berta. According to tradition, she had conceived Orlando out of wedlock with Milone d'Anglante, a man of inferior social status. Nevertheless, there were

various iterations of the story. In Andrea da Barberino's *Reali di Francia*, Berta and Milone secretly marry. In another, they do not wed prior to Orlando's birth. Still in others, Orlando is the product of an incestual relationship between Berta and Charlemagne. Frequently, Charlemagne adopts Orlando as a son (Bestor 64-65; Crema 29). Nonetheless, in Boiardo's poem, Charlemagne, and later Reinaldos both describe him as a bastard (Bestor 64).⁷ However, for Bestor, it is Charlemagne's "adoption" of Orlando that explains the degree of anger that the emperor displays in Orlando's absence: "Orlando is not only a vassal who owes fealty by virtue of a feudal contract; he is also a nephew and son, statuses that oblige him to show steadfast loyalty" (65). Accordingly, Charlemagne does not doubt Orlando's worth until his conduct warrants it, which suggests a transferability of morally flawed behavior from his biological parents to their illegitimate offspring. This is supported by Orlando's quest for illicit love over his submission to reason (63, 65, 82).

Until its publication in an era when an underestimated twenty-four percent of Chilean children were born out of wedlock, Bello continued to temper this "flaw" related to Orlando's bastardy through omissions and revisions of the lending texts in his edition (Milanich 15). As Nara Milanich describes this social phenomenon for nineteenth-century Chile, "illegitimacy was simultaneously 'unorthodox' and [. . .] endemic," which indicates the social significance that re-presentations of bastardy in Bello's work could have held (33). In the rough drafts of his translation of Berni's version written in London, and in his definitive one refined in Santiago, Bello followed Berni and stripped Charlemagne's bastard comment that had appeared in Boiardo's text. Reflecting Berni's version ("Dov' è quel traditor del Conte Gano? / Dov' è (dicea) quell' altro Senatore? / Dov' è quel ghiotto, che sta a Montalbano?" (Berni 56) ["Where is that traitor, Count Gano? / Where is the other one, said Charlemagne, the Senator? / Where is that gluttonous one from Montalbano?" (my translation)], in London Bello wrote: "¿Dónde anda, dice [Carlomano], aquel bribón de Gano? / ¿Dónde ha ido Orlando el Senador? / ¿Qué es del otro poltrón de Montalbano?" (*Obras* 2: 200). In additional London drafts, he proposed other descriptions of Gano ("aquel traidor" or "el picarón") and Montalbano/Reinaldos ("el bellacón" or "aquel perillán"), but he did not modify his description of Orlando as a senator (200). In the definitive version arranged in Santiago, Bello altered the same verses with other discarded ones included in his Santiago drafts, yet there is still no insinuation of Orlando's bastardy (1: 395; 2: 306-07). Instead, in a note to verse 1067 of the definitive version, Bello listed Milone as Orlando's father. Although he fails to offer detailed insight on Orlando's legitimacy status, he explains that Orlando was given the title, "el señor de Anglante," for his tie to the city of Anglante that he inherited from Milone (1: 386). Given this inclusion, that insinuates the property rights of recognized heirs, coupled with Bello's omission of Charlemagne's comment related to Orlando's bastardy found in Boiardo's version, Orlando's illegitimacy is countered or at least de-emphasized. Nevertheless, the differentiation between Bello and Boiardo's versions foregrounds the topic of illegitimacy and moral flaws that other re-presented passages in Bello's rendition continue to flesh out.

While addressing the power of Eros, Bello emphasizes Orlando's purity in his first note to his definitive edition. In a clarification of verse 98 of Canto 1, he likens Orlando to Amadís de Gaula for his chastity (the latter described in Cervantes's Chapter 25, and also quoted in Bello's *Gramática* as "el norte, el lucero, el sol de los valientes"): "Orlando era tan famoso

en las leyendas de la Edad Media, por su castidad como por su valor. En esta parte fué el modelo de Amadís de Gaula” (*Obras* 1: 364; 4: 98; Cervantes 237).⁸ However, as per verse 273 of the same edition, and in a note included in Bello’s London drafts, Orlando is portrayed as the husband of Alda. Despite that recognized union during which, according to legend, Orlando seeks to maintain his virginity, Orlando yearns for Angélica (*Obras* 1: 368-69; 2: 146; Crema 29). His lusty faltering prompts him to contemplate the spiritual ramifications of his carnal desires in Bello’s edition: “¿Consientes que una torpe fantasía / que ofende a Dios, te turbe y te embelese?”; “¿Qué espera el alma en desigual pelea / contra un tirano irresistible afeto?”; “miro mi perdición en mi extravío” (*Obras* 1: 369-70). Despite the commendation of Orlando’s purity that could presumably “erase” his identification as a bastard and the automatically transferred moral flaw if admitted, Orlando’s adulterous contemplations threaten the stability of political and domestic order, and jeopardize the acquisition of personal salvation.

This reading of Orlando as “pure,” yet chastised for his adulterous ponderings re-produces aspects of illegitimacy and illicit behavior that are more fully nuanced in the Chilean Civil Code and in dialog with the Constitution of 1833. Writing under Portalian order, Bello and Mariano Egaña (1793-1846) were among the Constitution’s architects. The year after the Constitution’s promulgation, Bello began to draft the Code. Promulgated in 1855, the Code promoted the continuation of an empowered elite, and demarcated the “insiders” from the “outsiders” in a reinforcement of hierarchical positions based on recognized genealogies (Milanich 10-12). To this end, it defined marriage, and leant particular attention to filiation, which was divided into three main categories: “legítima, natural o simplemente ilegítima” (Bello, *Obras* 14: 6). Legitimate offspring referred to those conceived during matrimony (of which Bello came to have three documented children with Mary Ann Boyland (1794-1821), and twelve with Elizabeth Dunn (1804-1873)), or children legitimized by a marriage following conception (as would have been the case for Bello). These children were granted rights to support and inheritance. All others were considered illegitimate progeny (Bello was accused of fathering at least one in Chile) (6, 48). Branching off the latter category of illegitimates, there were additional classifications: “[los] naturales” (those that received voluntary recognition through public instrument from their mother, father, or both, and acquired important rights); “[los] de dañado ayuntamiento” (those conceived in adultery, through incestuous or sacrilegious unions, and ineligible for recognition as naturals); or “[los] simplemente ilegítimos” (those whose parents recognized their biological ties before a court or notary, but elected not to provide them the status of naturals) (*Obras* 14: 6-9, 49, 205; Milanich 60-61). To a certain extent, eligible filiation status fell in line with the perceived morality of relationships under Catholic tradition, which was legally preserved in the conservative Constitution. It is enough to recall that Article 5 made the Roman Apostolic Catholic religion the official and only permissible faith in the Republic, and by Article 80, the president pledged his sworn commitment to observe and protect it (*Constitución* 4-5, 24-25). Alongside Orlando’s ability to inherit and his possible condition as an “adopted child” of Charlemagne, his re-devised purity insinuates the favorable character enjoyed by those illegitimately conceived, and later re-legitimized without overt stigmas (like Bello) under these articulations of legitimacy in Chile. At the same time, Orlando’s preoccupation regarding his soul’s salvation in Bello’s edition reflects the predominance of Catholic ideals largely upheld in the Constitution and Code.⁹

Ariosto's portrayal of Angélica (the daughter of the Emperor of Cathay) and a lower-class Medoro that Bello references through the *Quijote* in *Gramática* reinforces elements of the moral code at hand—in this case, against fornication. Bello uses the Cervantine quote to indicate the employment of the imperfect or “co-pretérito,” to present, in his words, “la decoración del drama;” however, the re-appropriated citation highlights Don Quijote and Sancho's arrival to a mountain, where the errant knight contemplates the Orlando maddened by the elucidation of Angélica and Medoro's affair as a potential model for his impending penitential behavior (*Obras* 4: 181; Cervantes 240). As Jo Ann Cavallo has indicated, Angélica appears in naked poses, and is seen as a possible victim of rape or sexual assault in the early cantos of Ariosto's edition; yet, despite such portrayals, Angélica stresses the importance of her chastity in accordance with the behavioral code designed for Italian court women at that time (28-31). After she maintained that her virginity was preserved, she allows herself to be deflowered as she begins the love affair with Medoro (31). As in the Code, where marriage has a purifying effect (for select children), in Ariosto's version, the marriage of Angélica and Medoro restores the integrity of her lost virginity and her honor. It “clothe[d] what they had done in the trappings of virtue” (Cavallo 32).

Bello had once indicated that the most important laws were those in which one's person and property were safeguarded. These were understood to include one's well-being, the fate of family, life, and honor (*Obras* 18: 615; Milanich 43-44). In this regard, it is important to note that the Code's measures on a “purified” birth status would have not only reinforced Bello's legitimacy at birth. They would have protected his legitimate heirs and his second lawful wife in the event that he fathered an illegitimate child through an adulterous relationship in Chile, as is purported. Despite a lack of concrete evidence on the matter, there is a generally recognized tradition that Bello enjoyed frequent extra-marital relations. Some of these encounters allegedly took place in Peñalolén or la Hermita, which was an estate neighboring Santiago that Egaña owned (Jaksić, *Andrés Bello: La pasión* 230). However, as Ricardo Donoso has reported, a book containing the suspected handwritten notes of *jurisconsulto* Leopoldo Urrutia indicated that Urrutia had met Bello's illegitimate son in 1878. The child's existence was confirmed by Domingo Amunátegui, the son of Bello's principal nineteenth-century biographer, Miguel Luis Amunátegui. According to Donoso, the child would have been born around 1839, sixteen years before the Code's promulgation (11).

Although in the pre-Code era, the child would have been considered illegitimate, “de dañado y punible ayuntamiento,” and ineligible for inheritance, at that time courts frequently allowed stigmatized children of incestuous and adulterous unions to be granted natural rights to “a minimal level of parental support” (Milanich 49). Under the Code designed by Bello, the child would have been similarly considered illegitimate “de dañado ayuntamiento,” and barred from intestate succession (Bello, *Obras* 14: 49; DeLutis-Eichenberger 29-31). In all cases, under the Code, biological fathers could control the terms of their identity, and adulterous ones could be somewhat socially re-legitimized through their ignorance, shunning, and intentional silencing that would legally “uphold” their decisions regarding their recognition of illegitimate progeny. That is, the Code outlawed paternity investigations to prove kinship. As Bello insisted in his “Exposición de motivos [del Código Civil]” (1855), the law or courts had no authority to penetrate into the supposed shadows of one's private life, of one's clandestine connections, in an attempt to prove paternity through potentially

fraudulent testimonies (*Obras* 14: 7). Furthermore, the Code removed ecclesiastical authority from filiation decisions regarding illegitimates, as baptismal records were no longer adequate to “prove” kinship. Those born prior to the Code could retroactively file a suit, though they nearly always lost. This was a drastic shift from the pre-Code era, when mothers and illegitimate children frequently won filiation suits, gaining support (“alimentos”) or some form of inheritance for the then legally recognized children. Under the Code, unrecognized illegitimates could only request support, and their father’s admission of biological filiation was required to attain it, “[y] sólo en cuanto [los alimentos] fueren necesarios para su precisa subsistencia” (Bello, *Obras* 14: 8, 217-19; Milanich 42-61). This patriarchal system granted significant freedom for men to craft their families as they desired, independent from biological realities (DeLutis-Eichenberger 27; Milanich 25, 44, 57-69).¹⁰

Other “original” verses in Bello’s *Orlando* that amplify the intertexts flirt with sexual ideas that recall biographical anecdotes of Bello’s supposed adulterous behavior and the power afforded to men under the Code to accept or reject the truth of their liaisons. A notable inclusion in the prologue to Canto 13 of Bello’s edition forges a cheeky representation of the poetic *yo* that critics like Crema have considered indicative of Bello’s voice, as a pseudo-recuperated subject of utterance. Dialoging with Berni’s Canto 12, Bello suggests what Berni did not—that Flordelís and Reinaldos enjoyed an illicit sexual encounter in route to the Río de Olvido (Crema 188). Bello’s “added” verses allow for the critique of Flordelís’s actions that place her in precarious situations. They also permit a comment regarding the uncertainty of their “purity”: “que, aunque pasara / la cosa en el más limpio y el más llano / y honesto modo que posible sea, / no sé si encontrará quién se lo crea” (*Obras* 1: 549). Echoing Sancho’s proclaimed lack of knowledge regarding Elisabat and Madásima’s possible union in Cervantes’s Chapter 25, the poetic *yo*, also like Turpin, finds himself unable to defend Flordelís. Rather, he satirically declares his innocence on the matter: “Yo, por mí, ni lo afirmo, ni lo niego; / de mi aldehuela vengo; no sé nada” (549).¹¹ As Crema bluntly puts it, “[Bello] no venía de ninguna aldehuela: y lo sabía todo” (253, 310-11). For Crema, the poetic *yo* continues his auto-construction with the wink of an eye: “Siempre en tu escuela, Amor, he sido un bolo, / y llevé (tú lo sabes, ¡ay!), bien raras / veces votivos dones a tus aras” (Bello, *Obras* 1: 549; Crema 252-53). This is to say the twice-married Bello suspected of extramarital relationships that plausibly led to unrecognized illegitimate progeny would have been much more versed on such “affairs” than the poetic *yo* wittingly admits; yet, an irrefutable ignorance could simply contest such assumptions.

Bello’s legitimacy at birth and the weight of a man’s word on filiation issues are further emphasized through Bello’s curious treatment of Cantos 12 and 8. While Bello opted to omit the majority of Canto 12 that would have contradicted the contents of the Code given its unequivocal condonation of adulterous behavior, he elected to translate the more disturbing Canto 8 that accentuates the lurid consequences of adulterous contemplations that lead to perverse actions (*Obras* 1: 493-94; Crema 179, 203-04). The encouragement and toleration of adulterous actions that question the degree of love between spouses distinguishes Boiardo and Berni’s Chapter 12 from Bello’s treatment of Orlando’s self-reprimanded sinfulness following his immoral contemplations. Boiardo and Berni’s Canto 12 present a disingenuous husband (Iroldo), who, despite his amorous declarations for his wife (Tisbina), facilitates their separation through a promoted adulterous arrangement

between Tisbina and another man, Prasildo. In short, the canto excused pandering and adultery in the name of pity for Prasildo (Crema 189-91). Its overt inclusion could have challenged Article 131 of the Code, which stipulated that, “los cónyuges están obligados a guardarse fe, a socorrerse y ayudarse mutuamente en todas las circunstancias de la vida” (Bello, *Obras* 14: 123). Snubbing the majority of the canto, Bello primarily translated Cantos 13, 14, and 15 of Berni’s as his Cantos 12, 13, and 14, which allowed for an avoidance of the discrepancy.

On the other hand, in Canto 8, Bello chose to adapt portions of Boiardo and Berni’s story of Marquino, which was a profane tale of adulterous considerations, treachery, murder, filicide, desecration, cannibalism, vengeance, rape, and necrophilia. He omits the initial violation of Estela. In Bello’s edition, she commits suicide. Likewise, there is only an allusion to the subsequent improper sexual acts that precede the demonic engendering of a monstrous byproduct that Boiardo and Berni more explicitly develop. In their version, there is greater emphasis on the female body to underscore its defilement in the creation of the monster-illegitimate. In Bello’s edition, this “mother figure” is essentially removed, but the disgusting abandoned byproduct remains—like an alienated *huacho* (*Obras* 1: 496; Berni 226).¹² As a warning, the bastard in the re-written tale of Marquino dramatizes the perversion and danger tied to those illegitimates “de dañado ayuntamiento,” born through “the work of the devil” that cannot be recognized as naturals. This distinguishes Bello’s birth condition from those illegitimates, while it “justifies” the possible shunning of such problematic byproducts of poor physical unions that the Code “permitted.”

Beyond matters of illicit sexual occurrences and their possible repercussions, Bello’s citation of Chapter 25 of the *Quijote* in *Gramática* that indirectly references Angélica and Medoro’s affair from *Orlando furioso* also ushers in a leitmotif of self-imposed exile. Cast through the exiles of Sancho and Don Quijote as El Caballero de la Triste Figura (with the maddened Orlando as an archetype) in the grammar book, the theme develops under different circumstances in Bello’s *Orlando* through Reinaldos. The notable play or doubling with the “nondisjunctive” pair of terms traitor/loyalist in Bello’s edition, becomes entangled with the question of self-imposed exile and, ultimately, historiography (Kristeva 48). That is, Bello’s *Orlando* re-produces elements of his historiographical stance expressed in other articles, and contests the charges of treason against him through the re-constructed mirror of Reinaldos.

Bello never returned to Venezuela after he left Caracas in 1810. Some have speculated that he intentionally avoided his homeland, due to accusations of treason swirling against him. He had supposedly revealed the subversive plans of creoles from la Conspiración de la Casa de Misericordia against Capitán General Vicente Emparán (1747-1820). This thwarted their plot to depose Emparán between April 1 and 2, 1810. Bello’s portrayal as a political traitor endured in various texts that spanned decades, as the following list of publications attests: “Defensa que hizo en Madrid el señor don Esteban Fernández de León de su hermano Antonio, Marqués de Casa León” (1815) by Spaniard Esteban Fernández de León; *Relación documentada del oríjen i progresos del trastorno de las provincias de Venezuela hasta la exoneración del Capitán General don Domingo de Monteverde, hecha en el mes de diciembre de 1813 por la guarnición de la plaza de Puerto Cabello* (1820) by Colombian Pedro de Urquinaona; *Recuerdos sobre la rebelión de Caracas* (1829) by Venezuelan José

Domingo Díaz; *Historia de la revolución hispano-americana* (1829) by Spaniard Mariano Torrente; and *Compendio de la historia de Venezuela* (1840) by Cuban-born Francisco Javier Yanes. Four years before the publication of *Gramática*, the accusations were reignited in Chile. Federalist José Miguel Infante (1778-1844) used it in his attack against Bello for political reasons in “NOTABLE: TORRENTE,” published in *El Valdiviano Federal*. In accordance with statements found in Torrente’s book, Infante re-fashioned Bello as a monarchist and traitor of the independence movement. In turn, Bello refuted Torrente’s (and Díaz’s) accounts in a private letter directed to Argentine Juan María Gutiérrez (1809-1878)—this was in response to Gutiérrez, who had requested that Bello provide biographical information to be included in his anthology of Spanish American poetry (*Obras* 26: 113-16). Bello appears to also counter his critics in his *Orlando*.

Similar to Bello’s “A Olimpio” (1842) or “La oración por todos” (1843)—both imitations of Victor Hugo’s work that include possible allusions and retorts to his accusers, as many critics have shown—, Bello’s *Orlando* includes “original” verses that coincide with his presumed condition as an exile afflicted by defamatory accusations. Following Crema, the act of re-writing the deeds of heroes that sought to aid those in need, defend the weak, and correct injustices helped to forge a pseudo-contestation to Bello’s critics in a somewhat “objective” format (170-71). Several verses included in Bello’s Canto 1 plausibly reinforce that reading, as the *poetic yo* describes the cathartic suppression of his present in his submersion in the fantastic (*Obras* 1: 363; Crema 171).

Through the resumed dialogue with Chapter 11 of the *Quijote* with which the same canto begins, Bello reinforces his historiographical position. The verses that commence his published edition lament the Quijote’s inability to reinstitute a golden age for which he longs: “Yo siento a par del alma que no hubiera / el gran cabalgador de Rocinante / resucitado la dichosa era / de la caballerisca orden andante; / que a ser él venturoso, no se viera, / como se ve, la iniquidad triunfante, / ni viciara la sórdida codicia / la humana sociedad, como la vicia” (*Obras* 1: 361). Akin to the Quijote’s exposition of the flawed present in his discourse to the goatherds, there is a critique of an adulterated era marred by vice and personal gain: “¿Qué es de aquellos valientes paladines / que en el campo, en el yermo, en regia corte, / daban contra alevosos malandrines / al débil sexo y la *orfandad* conhorté, / llevando hasta los últimos confines / del mundo en su *tizona* el pasaporte, / y una dama gentil tal vez al anca, / y todo sin costarles una blanca?” (362).¹³ Signaling the literary importance of the evocation of the idyllic past, in Canto 2 Bello critiques the Aristarcos opposed to entering into the world of the fantastic. He indicates that their preferred historical works may not portray truths, as supposed: “Y si te place por veraz la historia, / sepas que cuelli-erguida y cari-seria, / como la ves, su parla es ilusoria, / y las mentiras por verdades feria” (*Obras* 1: 383; Crema 306-07). This critique of the “historical” re-produces Bello’s call for the “narrative method” of historiography, as opposed to the “philosophical” approach.

In a commentary on an essay by José Victorino Lastarria (1817-1888) prefaced by Jacinto Chacón (1820-1893), Bello emphasized in 1848 that facts must be clearly researched, established, and stated, before they can be analyzed “philosophically” (*Obras* 23: 223). He reiterated the message in “Modo de estudiar la historia”: “¿Por cuál de los dos métodos deberá principiarse para escribir nuestra historia? ¿Por el que suministra los antecedentes o

por el que deduce las consecuencias? ¿Por el que aclara los hechos, o por el que los comenta y resume?” (246). He opted for the first.¹⁴ Theoretically, this *ad narrandum* method resting on the objective re-presentation of “facts” based on reputable documents could help to build an accurate archive of the nation and its founding fathers. In this sense, it would essentially contest the defamatory accounts against Bello (in terms of both treason, and perhaps any tied to adultery or illegitimate progeny), since no “official” document supported the claim of his role as a defector of Simón Bolívar (or as a father to an illegitimate child, for that matter). The “fact” of his loyalty or faithfulness in both regards could be clarified through present absences. Since Bello had his hands in fundamental documents and institutions—including the Chilean Constitution of 1833, the Senate, the University of Chile, and the Civil Code—an absolution of political treason (and illegitimate progeny) would help to reinforce the envisioned social order and its terms that Bello was helping to establish.

This reading that entails Bello’s perfidy is strengthened by a convergence between Bello and the Reinaldos of his *Orlando* that takes shape through portrayals of similar fears of discourse or “misinterpretation.” The trepidation that characterizes Bello’s depiction of Reinaldos in his Canto 5 written in Santiago parallels the expressed distress evinced in the more marginal space of his private letters. Reinaldos’s lament in Bello’s definitive version captures the realization of the enduring debasement and emotional torment that will result from circulating misconstrued events that are difficult to squash: “para siempre seré vituperado, / y si llego a contar mi desventura, / ¿cómo encontrar podré quien me la crea, / y una mancha lavar tan torpe y fea?” (*Obras* 1: 443; 2: 399). In an additional rendition, Reinaldos similarly complains that it will be impossible to rectify his tarnished name: “para siempre seré vituperado, / y no hallará [piedad] mi desventura / (¡oh de mi nombre horrible mancha y fea!) / diciendo la verdad, ¿quién me la crea?” (2: 399). Insinuations of Bello’s comparable preoccupations for his perceived identity appear in the fragmentary letter attained from Venezuelan José Ángel Álamo (1774-1831) toward the end of Bello’s London residency in 1826. After Bello requested that his friend investigate the origin of the calumny launched against him, Álamo instructed Bello to shed his sensitivity, since calumny is the preferred weapon used by the Spanish to divide and dishonor the patriots (25: 163).¹⁵ The political lean that Álamo attaches to the accusations is emulated in Reinaldos’s affirmation that Gradaso and his opponents will propagate his marred reputation for political gain: “la fábula será de esos paganos. / Pregonarán que de temor me ausento, / y que mi religión, mi patria afrento” (1: 444; 2: 400). The thought of written accounts preserving fabricated representations of such betrayals continued to plague Reinaldos. In a rendition of line 3543 that Bello later discarded, Reinaldos demonstrates his anguish provoked by the idea that sustained erroneous publications would speculate on the nature of his absence from his homeland: “Publicarán que de temor me ausento” (2: 400). In the final version, Reinaldos wonders what France will think, and he ponders the fate of the infamy associated with his printed name (1: 444; 2: 400). In other discarded renditions of verses 3545-46, the possible justification of his flight from Paris is also contemplated (2: 400). In any case, Reinaldos’s return appears to be hindered by his belief that “falsified significeds” will dishonor him.

Following Álamo’s letter and another dated on 1827 from Bello’s brother, the topic of Bello’s accused treason does not reappear in his private correspondence until 1846, when he directed the aforementioned letter to Gutiérrez. Similar to Reinaldos who doubted the

effectiveness of his potential refutations of the accusations, Bello contended that his political positions would more readily exonerate him amidst his perceived verbal silence (26: 114). Some of his subsequent appointments and actions could be read favorably, as “counter texts.” However, Bello rhetorically asked how he could possibly renounce his *patria* and install himself in Chile. Skirting the response, he stated that the answer would require lengthy explanations that he would rather supply verbally (114). As Crema has suggested, a possible reply may be found in Reinaldos’s apostrophe directed to the personified sea—Reinaldos implores to be carried to a foreign land, in the hopes that no one there would be privy to his disgrace (*Obras* 1: 444; 2: 401; Crema 216).

In this regard, Bello’s similar flight to Chile would have been rendered in vain. With the arrival of copies of Torrente’s work and the reiteration of his claims in Santiago driven by Infante, Bello’s repute was again threatened. Following the publication of *Orlando*, Bello drafted his last private letter treating the accusations in 1864. It was directed to Neogranadino Manuel Ancízar (1812-1882). Ancízar had publicly defended Bello’s honor in response to the publication of the second edition of Colombian José Manuel Restrepo’s (1781-1863) *Historia de la revolución de Colombia* (1858) that had reasserted the imputations. Acknowledging Ancízar for his “honrosa defensa,” Bello concluded by relinquishing the fate of the allegations to the passage of time: “Es probable que después de todo pasará a la historia, y me resigno a ello sin el menor sentimiento” (26: 439). As with his issues tied to illegitimacy that were seemingly “erased” through the Civil Code, the problem of his supposed treason could be suppressed in future historical accounts if the narrative method was embraced. Many times this was the case, especially in the accounts written by his disciples. Perhaps for that reason, this was a resignation to a historical fate that was almost self-assured.

The *letrado* that is “Bello” has been recognized in his youth as a valued “[niño de] incontestable talento,” and in his adulthood as “[una] víctima fácil de afrentosa calumnia,” “un excelente i tierno padre,” “un hombre tranquilo y modesto,” “[de] carácter introvertido y tímido” (Amunátegui 6, 595; Grases, *Andrés* 15; Jaksić, *Andrés Bello: La pasión* 69; Jaksić, “El significado” 11). However, Bello’s predominant shift away from the Quijote’s discourse to the goatherds in *Gramática* toward Chapter 25 in dialog with Orlandian texts prompts a re-reading of the web of re-productions and contestations that provides another look at Bello/“Bello” (as signified and signifier). What results through this re-mapping for the plurality of “Bello” is a humanist who used incessant scholarship to support a consistent agenda for (trans)national projects. These entailed the re-legitimization of those select *others* who could be cast on the periphery—bastards eligible for legitimization, men accused of fathering illegitimates born from adulterous relationships, and those defamed in “historical” texts and estranged in a social one. One must wonder if these are some of the “modern ideas” found in the drafts of Bello’s *Orlando* to which he referred in a letter sent to Gutiérrez in 1845: “[mi *Orlando* es una] traducción muy libre, y en que las introducciones de los cantos son casi todas originales, acomodadas a las ideas modernas” (*Obras* 26: 110).¹⁶ The traced re-productive and contestatory intertextualities can be therefore understood as contributions to an aspired or imagined sociopolitical order for a nation where kinship and loyalty were to reign. And yet, more self-centeredly, they can also be understood as part of an attempt to arrest meaning, to rectify the marginalizations possibly associated with “Bello.” In this way,

his signifier could be theoretically re-centered amongst the “privileged,” to better coincide with the historical, sociopolitical hierarchy that Bello, as “patriarch” and “(re)legitimate(d) kin” of the nation, helped to re-author(ize).

Dickinson College

Notes

¹ As Grases has convincingly shown, re-presentations of Don Quijote's discourse to the goatherds from Chapter 11 of Cervantes's masterpiece appear in two of Bello's juvenile texts and in three of his poems written in London: "Venezuela consolada" (dated circa 1804), and *Resumen de la Historia de Venezuela* (1809-10); "Alocución a la Poesía" (1823), "A la agricultura de la zona tórrida" (1826), and "Carta escrita de Londres a París por un americano a otro" (1827), respectively. See Grases's "Andrés Bello y la cultura colonial," and "Cervantes y Bello."

² David Quint has examined the influence of Ariosto's text in Cervantes's, in terms of their narrative technique of "interlace," and the juxtaposition and combination of different narrative genres. Thomas R. Hart has also explored Cervantes's "debt to Ariosto," regarding form and themes (16-54).

³ The Civil Code and Bello's articles on historiography are not directly quoted or named in Bello's *Orlando*, but may be understood as united to it, commented upon, and thus "re-produced."

⁴ According to Miguel Luis (1828-1888) and Gregorio Víctor Amunátegui (1830-1899) in *Biografías de Americanos* (1854), Bello was born to Bartolomé Bello and Ana López in Caracas on November 30, 1780 (7). Nearly thirty years later, Miguel Luis Amunátegui amended that information in *Vida de Don Andrés Bello* (1882), although he emphasized that Bello had provided the aforementioned birthdate, "no una, sino repetidas veces" (2). Amunátegui was obliged to follow Venezuelan Arístides Rojas (1826-1894), who had rectified the matter after his perusal of Bello's baptismal records (15-16). Although Amunátegui adjusted Bello's birthdate to November 29, 1781, he admitted that he could not rationalize Bello's error (2). The preliminary date that Bello provided in 1854, one year prior to the promulgation of the Civil Code, further distanced his birth from his parents' marriage (September 8, 1781), which would have legitimized him *ipso jure* upon his birth in their union under the Chilean Civil Code. As a result, the repetition of a more distanced birthdate appears to promote the Code's contents, since Bello (as a legitimized illegitimate firmly integrated into the Chilean social fabric) had been recognized for his widespread contributions by the time of the Code's promulgation (DeLutis-Eichenberger 29).

⁵ Jerónimo de Urrea published the first Spanish translation of *Orlando furioso* in Antwerp in 1549. Eleven other editions appeared in Spanish by the end of the sixteenth century (Hart 16).

⁶ In the "paratext" of note 695, under the subsection, "Significado metafórico de los tiempos" of *Gramática*, Bello cited a portion of the drafts of his translation that he would later revise from a quatrain to a couplet in his *Orlando*. Divorcing himself from the passage as its author in *Gramática*, he accredits it to an anonymous subject (*Obras* 4: 202; Genette 3).

⁷ Reinaldos's remark appears in Canto 27, whose corresponding chapter in Berni's edition Bello did not translate.

⁸ Another reference to Chapter 25 of the *Quijote* that appears in *Gramática* stems from a possible incident of illicit sexual activity derived from *Amadís de Gaula*. The love triangle in the *Quijote* (among Cardenio, Don Fernando, Luscinda), Luscinda's request for a copy of Montalvo's *Amadís*, and Cardenio's claim that an affair had transpired between Madásima and Elisabet (that Don Quijote considers blasphemous) are insinuated in Bello's citation of Sancho's remark regarding the errant knight's defense of Madásima's honor: "Digo, que qué

le iba a vuesa merced en volver tanto por aquella reina Majimasa o como se llama” (Bello, *Obras* 4: 327). Despite formally serving to underscore Cervantes’s grammatical use of “que,” the inclusion of Sancho’s comment points to the theme of sexual conduct.

⁹ It is worth mentioning that Bello also began his work on a version of the *Poema de Mio Cid* in London after an encounter with Thomás (sic) Antonio Sánchez’s edition in Miranda’s library. Bello continued his Cidian studies sporadically until his death in Santiago, where his edition was published posthumously in 1881. Bello frequently avoided insinuations or accounts of the Cid’s bastardy in his selections of the *Crónica del Cid* and in his commentary to the chronicle and gest; yet he emphasized the legitimacy of the Cid’s daughters, despite their potentially questionable filiation status (DeLutis-Eichenberger 17-23).

¹⁰ Bello began to draft the Code at the request of Diego Portales (1793-1837), who had fathered illegitimate children (Milanich 20). The measures would have “protected” Portales as well. What is more, the Code abolished the “*lejitimación por rescripto*,” in which the State had been able to grant extraordinary legitimation to benefit “wealthy,” “well-connected,” or “publicly esteemed individuals.” Three of Portales’s extramarital children were beneficiaries of that measure, and were legitimized in the months following his assassination in 1837. Portales’s family members would later seek to annul that legitimation during an inheritance dispute (Milanich 261).

¹¹ Sancho similarly confesses, “de mis viñas vengo, no sé nada; no soy amigo de saber vidas ajenas” (Cervantes 235). In his section on definite articles in *Gramática*, Bello quotes Don Quijote’s response (*Obras* 4: 92).

¹² In addition to the possible meaning of “huacho” as orphan, bastard, etc., contemporary etymologies define this term as “‘an animal that is not reared by its mother’ or ‘a plant that is born by itself’ without human intervention” (Milanich 16).

¹³ My emphasis. At one point, Bello had begun his Canto 2 with similar verses in London; however, there was no mention of orphanhood (*Obras* 2: 175-76). Given Bello’s treatment of illegitimacy in his Cidian work, the use of “tizona” here that creates an allusion to the Cid’s sword is also noteworthy.

¹⁴ These articles originally appeared in *El Araucano* in 1848. Two years later, Bello included them as part of his compilation, *Opúsculos literarios y críticos, publicados en diversos periódicos desde 1834 hasta 1849*.

¹⁵ A similar idea on perceived reality/illusion appears in Cervantes’s Chapter 25 that Bello quotes in his section on “el género neutro” in *Gramática*. In the lifted citation, Don Quijote explains to Sancho that enchanterers often alter their affairs, in order to favor or destroy them (*Obras* 4: 97).

¹⁶ Cantos 1, 2, 9, 12, 13, and 14 begin with “original” octaves that do correspond to Berni’s (Bello, *Obras* 1: 361).

Works Cited

- Amunátegui, Miguel Luis. *Vida de Don Andrés Bello*. Pedro G. Ramírez, 1882.
- Amunátegui, Miguel Luis, and Gregorio Víctor Amunátegui. *Biografías de Americanos*. Imprenta Nacional, 1854.
- Bello, Andrés. *Obras completas*. La Casa de Bello, 2002, DVD-ROM. 26 vols.
- Berni, Francesco. *Orlando innamorato di Matteo M. Bojardo, Rifatto da Francesco Berni*. Vol. 1, Molini, 1768.
- Bestor, Jane Fair. "Marriage and Succession in the House of Este: A Literary Perspective." *Phaethon's Children: The Este Court and Its Culture in Early Modern Ferrara*, edited by Dennis Looney and Deanna Shemek, Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005, pp. 49-85.
- Block de Behar, Lisa. *A Rhetoric of Silence and Other Selected Writings*. Mouton de Gruyter, 1995.
- Boiardo, Matteo Maria. *Orlando innamorato*. Vol. 1, Einaudo, 1995.
- Cavallo, Jo Ann. *The World beyond Europe in the Romance Epics of Boiardo and Ariosto*. U of Toronto P, 2013.
- Cervantes, Miguel de. *Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Edited by Martín de Riquer, Editorial Juventud, 2000.
- Constitución de la República de Chile jurada y promulgada el 25 de mayo de 1833*. Imprenta de la Opinión, 1833.
- Crema, Edoardo. *El prodigio del "Orlando enamorado" de Andrés Bello*. Talleres de Artegrafía, 1971.
- DeLutis-Eichenberger, Angela N. "Anecdotes of Bastardy in Andrés Bello's *Gesta de Mio Cid* and Regulations for Illegitimacy in His *Código Civil*: Authorial Correlations." *Revista Hispánica Moderna*, vol. 69, no. 1, 2016, pp. 17-35.
- Donoso, Ricardo. "Un hijo de Bello." *Nuevo Zig-Zag*, no. 2317, 1949, p. 11.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Translated by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky, U of Nebraska P, 1997.
- Grases, Pedro. *Andrés Bello: el primer humanista de América*. Tridente, 1946.
- . "Andrés Bello y la cultura colonial." *Thesaurus*, vol. 4, no. 3, 1948, pp. 538-50.
- . "Cervantes y Bello." *Doce estudios sobre Andrés Bello*. Editorial Nova, 1950, pp. 59-73.
- Hart, Thomas R. *Cervantes and Ariosto: Renewing Fiction*. Princeton UP, 1989.
- Jaksić, Iván. *Andrés Bello: La pasión por el orden*. Editorial Universitaria, S.A., 2001.
- . *Andrés Bello: Scholarship and Nation-Building in Nineteenth-Century Latin America*. Cambridge UP, 2001.
- . "El significado histórico de la obra de Andrés Bello." *Andrés Bello y la gramática de un nuevo mundo: memorias V Jornadas de Historia y Religión*. U. Católica Andrés, 2006, pp. 11-36.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Edited by Leon S. Roudiez, translated by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez, Columbia UP, 1980.
- Milanich, Nara B. *Children of Fate: Childhood, Class, and the State in Chile, 1850-1930*. Duke UP, 2009.
- "NOTABLE: TORRENTE." *El Valdiviano Federal*, March 19, 1843, p. 4. Archivo Central Andrés Bello, Universidad de Chile.

-
- Quint, David. "Narrative Interlace and Narrative Genres in *Don Quijote* and the *Orlando Furioso*." *Modern Language Quarterly*, vol. 58, no. 3, 1997, pp. 241-68.
- Rojas, Arístides. *Colección de poesías originales de Andrés Bello*. Rojas Hermanos, 1881.
- Ross, Charles Stanley, translator. *Orlando Innamorato: Orlando in Love*. By Matteo Maria Boiardo, Parlor Press, 2004.
- Uslar Pietri, Arturo. *Los libros de Miranda*. Cuatricentenario de Caracas, 1966.