

CENSORSHIP AND REVISIONS: QUEVEDO'S PROLOGUES TO THE SUEÑOS¹

There is increasing evidence that it was possible for a sixteenth or seventeenth century reader to arrive at a subversive position after having read books that seemed to espouse an orthodox ideology. The case of the miller Menocchio, as recently recovered by the historian Carlo Ginzberg, is one such account. Menocchio arrived at heretical beliefs by reading books that had not aroused official suspicion. In his article "Invisible Bullets: Renaissance Authority and Its Subversion" Stephen Greenblatt concludes from Menocchio's case "...the identification of the orthodox ideology that informs a particular text by no means obviates the possible presence of genuinely subversive elements-- that is, elements that can be understood to be subversive either by ourselves or by a reader who lived surrounded by the institutional expressions of that ideology."² Greenblatt is adamantly not on the track of specific conspiracies, rather he aspires to expose the orthodoxy's powers of containment, and in so doing revalidate the significance of subversive or threatening elements, both for the Renaissance and for ourselves. Although far-reaching in his theoretical model, Greenblatt loses sight of censored books that were rewritten and then officially approved. Like Freud's discussion of "secondary revision,"³ these censored/rewritten books raise a question: When a writer rewrites a work to gain the approval of the censors, by either avoiding or confirming their power, to what extent are the subversive elements strengthened in the very process of being reformed? And, to whom do they answer, to the demands of an external force or to the laws of a genre?

¹ An earlier, briefer version of this essay was presented at the Special Session on "Censorship and Subversion in Spanish Golden Age Prose" at the 1982 MLA Convention in Los Angeles under the title "Avoiding the Censors: Quevedo's Prologues to the 'Sueños.'" "

² *Glyph*, 8, 42. In the growing body of literature concerned with the relationship between text, institutions and the resulting culture, see also Michel Foucault or Pierre Legendre.

³ Rewriting has a certain affinity to the process of "secondary revision" (*die sekundäre Bearbeitung*) as described by Freud. As part of the dreamwork the unconscious reelaborates or produces a story that will appear coherent to conscious thought inasmuch as it fulfills the latter's expectations. The story's intelligibility, however, is deceptive and designed to hide its own mechanism of concealment. Freud, moreover, sees this effect working in conscious thought as well.

It is the nature of our waking thought to establish order in material of that kind, to set up relations in it and to make it conform to our expectations of an intelligible whole. In fact, we go too far in that direction. An adept in sleight of hand can trick us by relying upon this intellectual habit of ours. (*Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works*, 449)

While the writer becomes a trickster, a new more positive role of the censor becomes apparent here - that of reelaborating rather than merely limiting or omitting.

In this article I shall attempt to sketch an answer by focusing on the relationship between rewriting and censorship and the effects of this relationship upon a genre in the *Sueños (Dreams)* of Francisco de Quevedo.⁴

The first edition of the collection *Sueños y discursos de verdades descubridoras de abusos, vicios y engaños de todos los oficios y estados del mundo* consisting of five prose satires was published in 1627. Each of the five discourses had been composed a number of years before and had circulated independently in manuscript form before their joint publication. During this time these extremely popular manuscripts were copied, sometimes pirated, by friends and professional copiers. By and by the cumulative errors, omissions and additions began to take on a life of their own.

Apart from the complicated history of manuscript corruption, whose study J.O. Crosby has made one of his life projects, the collection *Sueños y discursos* has yet another fascinating history, namely that of the published revisions. Several factors -- public demand and overzealous publishers, the Inquisition and possibly vengeful enemies -- played a role. Since *Sueños y discursos* proved a phenomenal "best-seller," various editors added to, abridged or otherwise altered the texts to distinguish their offerings and further cash in on the current taste.

Yet, even compared to this burgeoning demand and subsequent adjustments in the marketplace, no other factor influenced the textual history of *Sueños* as much as the intervention of the Inquisition. Although no denunciations have yet been documented, critics have surmised that Quevedo's enemies caused the Inquisition to intervene.⁵ Sometime during a shortly after 1628 *Sueños y discursos* were censored; Quevedo was forbidden to publish them until they were rewritten. Around 1629 Quevedo revised the collection. He now made light of the potentially scandalous import of these satires both in the new title, *Juguetes de la niñez y travesuras del ingenio*, and in the new prologue that he gave this edition published in 1631. Undoubtedly these disclaimers, which put the blame on "youthful impetuosity," were intended at least in part to avoid a repeat of the censoring. Nevertheless, Quevedo's enemies -- Pacheco de Narvaez, Padre Niseno, and Montalbán -- in 1634 denounced his work in detail in a book entitled *Tribunal de la justa venganza*, which is written in simulate the presentation of accusations before an Inquisitorial panel.

⁴ The English translations, through which Quevedo's prose works are known to a wider audience, illustrate some of the theoretical issues I am discussing. Roger L'Estrange's 1667 translation, which rendered the title *Sueños* into English as *Visions*, has consistently been the most influential to date. His translation of the title, however, deemphasizes their originality by promoting it as a medieval moral text. Quevedo himself plays with both the notion of a vision and that of a dream. The most recent translation of the *Sueños* by Wallace Woolsey carries the title *Dreams* and includes Quevedo's introductory material, absent from L'Estrange.

⁵ Felipe Maldonado in his introduction to the Spanish text theorizes "Los enemigos de Quevedo, quizá a causa del extraordinario éxito que obtenía la obra y explotando el escándalo que produjo entre las gentes miopes y timoratas, acabaron por forzar la intervención del Santo Oficio." (40)

Quevedo's enemies clearly responded to something in the text that historical scholarship, which can be characterized as monological, and formalist criticism, which tends to see the literary works as an iconic object, have put partially voiced.⁶ Their reaction forces one to see more than the text if one is to substantiate the richness of Quevedo's *Sueños*. It is their "full situation": the circumstances of their publication, the imaginings of their readers, and the genre they embody -- that governs the *Sueños* shifting meaning.⁷ I would like to trace now the generic concept of a "Sueño" as presented by the author and taken up by other critics in order to better gauge the forces at play surrounding and in the discourse signed Quevedo.

Only three of the five satires in the book *Sueños y discursos* are entitled "Sueños." This led some seventeenth century publishers to casually drop the two "errant" texts. In the expurgated edition *Juguetes*, of course, all but one title was changed and none was called a "Sueño." If we were to go by Quevedo's general title to the first edition alone, then the only genre we would have to deal with would be the discourse, which had its own extensive history in medieval and Renaissance Spanish literature. Hence, the traditional basis for the discussion of a genre "Sueño" is not the titles, but the other introductory material written by Quevedo -- dedications, prologues, and initial paragraphs -- that appears in *Sueños* (1627). The concept of a "Sueño" is based on a narrative strategy which is presented in the introductions. These introductions are captivating in their complexities. On the one hand they undermine the conventions of the prologue while simultaneously using this subversion to clear a space for themselves.⁸ The three principal conventions at

⁶ The exemplar of historical criticism of Quevedo is Ettinghausen's *Francisco de Quevedo and the Neostoic Movement*. It assumes a stable trans-European current in which Quevedo is subsumed. Of formalist criticism Fernando Lázaro Carreter's influential essay "Originalidad del Buscón" has been criticized for its lack of understanding of satire and censorship. See Ilse Nolting-Hauff, *Visión, sátira y agudeza*, 112-3.

⁷ By echoing Greenblatt's terminology. I acknowledge my indebtedness to the methodological position he outlines for a "new historicism" in his preface to the recent Renaissance issue of *Genre*. Jonathan Golberg cogently traces and elucidates the "return of historicism" in "The Politics of Renaissance Literature".

⁸ Following A. Porqueras Mayo's work *El prólogo como género literario*, Doris Baum called these prologue "implicit and explicit commentaries on the nature and validity of the prologue itself or what amounts to a critical appraisal of the genre and its tradition" (234). While Baum's title covers all of Quevedo's satiric prologues, the article focuses mainly on the prologues to the seven "Sueños". Baum discusses four characteristics of these prologues "brevety," "presentational aspects," "contact with the reader," and 'permeabilidad.'

Under "presentational aspects" (which concern us the most in trying to define a "Sueños") she merely notes Quevedo's "humorous, and often sarcastic" tone, which "intentionally echoes the mood of the body of the work," and she points out, "The force of his [Quevedo's] 'yo' is communicated in each prologue," which means, as she goes on to explain, that a "sueño" "... is actually the conscious and voluntary product of the author's personal experience and its content is not to be taken lightly." (239)

There is one major difficulty with her approach. The problem stems from Porqueras Mayo's ambiguous notion of 'permeabilidad,' which Baum applies to Quevedo. On the one hand they isolate the prologue as an independent genre, exclusive of the works introduced; and on the other hand, they claim literary osmosis -- "permeabilidad" -- a process which by their own description occurs only through contact between the

stake are the author's profession of humility, his deference to appropriate authorities, and last, the praise of the text's merits.⁹

Quevedo's own expression of unworthiness, for example, is always linked to his perception of the reader, whom he alternately flatters and insults. He starts off the prologue to the whole edition with a joke about a sick soldier. Finding himself at death's door, this gentleman-soldier prayed a lot. He always ended his prayers entreating God to save him from the clutches of "Señor Diablo."¹⁰ When someone challenged his unusual form of address, the soldier responded that courtesy never hurt, since one never knows who one's next keeper will be. Now, just when Quevedo has the reader feeling smug over the soldier's stupidity, Quevedo proceeds to address the reader as "Señor Lector". Like this soldier's prayer the address is a profession of humility on Quevedo's part, but it also subtly puts the reader in the same league as the Devil. Similar games are found in all the individual prologues.

The second convention of the prologue, the deference to appropriate authorities, is most clearly inverted in the introduction of the first satire *Sueño del juicio final*. It is obvious from the title that *Juicio final* refers to Christian eschatology. Hence, it would ordinarily be preferred by quotes from biblical sources or doctors of the Church. Yet, Quevedo cites almost solely classical, and hence pagan, writers in his introduction and thereby sidesteps the traditional convention.

Of all the expected strategies of the prologue and introduction the last principal convention, the praise of the text, is most frequently treated in a straightforward manner. Following Horatian precepts, Quevedo recommends the texts for moral edifications, specifically to correct social vices, and for personal enjoyment. A less conventional variation on the purpose (and praise) of the text is the prologue to *El mundo por dentro*. Tongue in cheek, Quevedo acknowledges the material usefulness of his craft and product. The paper gives bookstore owners and publishers something to live off of and spice dealers something to wrap with.

If we examine each individual text in order, they create a sense of a series. When Quevedo first introduces *Sueño del juicio final*, he assumes a rhetorical

prologue and the work. As Baum writes, "The prologue is not an independent entity because, in its introductory capacity, it is affected by the style and content of the main work and it commonly *absorbs* the same to a varying degree." (248, underlining mine) Baum's perception of the "varying degree", however, is not particularly enlightening to a reading of the "Sueños". From Quevedo's prologue she draws a hackneyed conclusion that they "reflect the restive spirit of the Baroque era" and "reaffirm the sincerity and constancy of his critical nature." (253)

⁹ Although there was no written code for prologues at the time, a rhetoric of prologues was developed over the centuries. The major characteristics which I have named can be found in the prologues to most medieval and Golden Age Spanish works, such as *Lazarrillo de Tormes*, *Cárcel de amor*, or *El héroe*, to name only a few.

¹⁰ Any single translation ("Mr. Devil", "Mr. Reader") would be misleading here: in "Señor Dios," "Señor Diablo", "Señor Lector" there is a semantic range from "Lord" to something more than "Mr."

stance in his choice of authorities which works against the conventions of the prologue/introduction. This rhetorical stance is important to the concept of a "Sueño" in general. Although the dream may hide a moral truth, the dreamer, particularly a poet/dreamer, is not responsible for the dream, which in the case of *Juicio final* is a dream of the second coming.

Dígolo a propósito que tengo por caído del cielo uno que yo tuve en estas noches pasadas, habiendo cerrado los ojos con el libro del Beato Hipólito de la fin del mundo y segunda venida de Christo, lo cual fue causa del soñar que veía el juicio final. Y aunque en casa de un poeta es cosa dificultosa creer que haya juicio, aunque por sueños, le hubo en mí por la razón que de Claudiano en la prefación al libro 2 del *Rapto*, diciendo que todos los animales sueñan de noche como sombras de lo que trataron de día. (72)

The idea of a "Sueño," a dream/text, then, emerges as a device to avoid censorship while professing a moral purpose. If the poet/dreamer is not responsible for his dreams, the same general prologue does make it clear, however, who is responsible for dreams, and therefore, who must be receptive to them:

"Los sueños dice Homero que son de Júpiter y que él los envía; y en otro lugar que se han de creer, es así cuando tocan en cosas importantes y piadosas o las sueñan reyes y grandes señores..." (71)

God is the source of truth, but kings and important nobles are responsible, are the authorities, on earth.

The idea of denying responsibility for the text reappears in the dedication to the second satire in *Sueños, El aguacil endemoniado*. Quevedo offers the text to the Conde de Lemos with the following apology:

Bien sé que a los ojos de vuestra excelencia es más endemoniado el autor que el sujeto, si lo fuere también el discurso, habré dado lo que se esperaba de mis pocas letras, que amparadas, como dueño, de vuestra excelencia y su grandeza, despreciarán cualquier temor. (87)

Only a person, here the writer, can be possessed by the devil. Yet, according to the dedication this discourse is possessed, too, which makes it fearless of its consequences. Like the dream *Sueño del juicio final*, then, the nature of this discourse (the possessed state) enables it to avoid direct responsibility also.

In the prologue to the reader of *Alguacil*, entitled "Al pío lector," Quevedo takes his usual ironic humble stances. Moreover, he claims that the responsibility for the text does not lie with the author, but with the reader. Given this situation, the writer should not fear "malas lenguas," calumny, and should publish his discourse. Quevedo expresses progressively more concern, and a certain impatience with the apparently uncontrollable effects of all his discourse when he concludes the dedicatory "Carta a un amigo suyo" to the third satire in *Sueños, Sueño del infierno*:

V.m en Zaragoza, comuniqué este papel, haciéndole la acogida a todas mis cosas, mientras yo, acá, esfuerzo la paciencia a maliciosas calumnias que al parto de mis obras --sea aborto-- suelen anticipar mis enemigos. (105)

Thus far we have seen how each of the texts referred to the previous ones. The beginning of *Sueño del Infierno* is no exception. The first paragraph defines *Infierno* and the others as dreams, which are presented here as visions or revelations. Different forms of "ver" are repeated several times,

emphasizing not only the visual but also the visionary aspect of all the "Sueños". As to the "Sueño" 's function here as a revelation, Quevedo claims that because of his guardian angel's help, he attains a higher level of consciousness in *Infierno* than in previous dream/texts. They were limited to single aspects of human perception -- sight or hearing. *Infierno* represents the attainment of "la verdadera paz," which can be understood as a heavenly state.

The prologue to the fourth satire, *El mundo por de dentro*, returns with even greater force to the narrative strategy of professed (false) humility. Quevedo places himself among those who know nothing but who dare publish their dreams.

Otros hay, y en éstos, que son los peores, entro yo, que no saben nada ni siquiera saber nada ni creen que se sepa nada, y dicen de todos que no saben nada y todos dicen de ellos lo mismo y nadie miente. Y como gente que en cosas de letras y ciencias no tiene qué perder tampoco, se atreven a imprimir y sacar a luz todo cuanto sueñan... Yo, pues, como uno de éstos, y no de los peores ignorantes, no contento con haber soñado el *Juicio* ni haber endemoniado un alguacil, y últimamente, escrito el *Infierno*, ahora salgo sin ton y sin son (pero no importa, que esto no es bailar) con el *Mundo por de dentro*. (162)

This clever strategy again emphasizes the author's abdication of responsibility for his dreams and ranks *Mundo* as the most frivolous one of the series written to that point. Quevedo's self-effacing mask in this prologue exploits the elitism and contradictions of the censor's discourse. His language echoes Alvar Gómez de Castro's commentary on the censorship of vernacular text. In his re-examination of this document P.E. Russell posits that it was commissioned by the Holy Office in the late 1570's (219, 222). Writing in a tone which Russell has termed "elitist," Gómez de Castro, a scholar, is not concerned with and ready to control books accessible to "la gente ordinaria" (219), which is the class in which Quevedo places himself in this prologue. Yet, in a contradictory move Gómez de Castro also suggests that letting people circumvent censorship may not be such a bad thing, since they don't know enough to aspire to better things: "no sabiendo ocuparse en cosas más altas" (220, 224). By feigning ignorance, Quevedo likewise aligns himself with these lots cases whom Gómez de Castro feels the censors should overlook.

The prologue to the fifth satire, *Sueño de la muerte*, leaves non room for doubt that *Muerte* is also a "Sueño" in a series. It list the titles of all the previous discourses and refers repeatedly to the idea of a dream. Traditionally, this preface has been read to mean that the text *Muerte* ends both the collection *Sueños* and the series of "Sueños". From the perspective of this preface most critics conclude that there are only five "Sueños". Ilse Nolting-Hauff calls the preface Quevedo's "confesión" to "el cierre del ciclo de sus sátiras." (39) However, this is not the only possible reading of the prologue given the strategy of diffused responsibility that all the other prologues develop.

First, Quevedo says that he wants *Muerte* to end his discourse (the "Sueños") as it does everything else, God willing. ["He querido que la muerte acabe mis discursos como las demás cosas; quiera Dios que tenga buena suerte."] Second, Quevedo states that he has nothing left to dream -- that is,

nothing left to add to the series of "Sueños." ["No me queda ya que soñar..."] Third, he assures the reader that if he (Quevedo) does not wake up from the moment of death -- that is, if he does not begin writing after Muerte ["... si en la visita de la muerte no despierto..."] that there is no need to wait for him--that is, there is no reason to expect any more "Sueños," ["... no hay que aguardarme."] Finally, he concludes even if it does not seem to the reader that he has written too many "Sueños," to let him sleep anyway -- that is, stretching it, not to bother him for more texts ["... si no, guárdame el sueño..."] since he has always won the title "sietedurmiente" of the afterlife. ["... que yo seré sietedurmiente de las postrimerías."] "Sietedurmientes," literally a "seven-sleeper," refers to the folk motif of someone who sleeps a lot, a sleepyhead. Maldonado quotes two popular sayings from Correa's *Vocabulario* to illustrate Quevedo's derivation. 'Duerme más que los siete durmientes,' and 'Parecéis a los siete durmientes. El que duerme mucho' (186) However, Maldonado misses the more important legend of the seven Christian brothers of Ephesus, who took refuge in a cave during the persecution of Emperor Decius and awakened about two centuries later. So popular in medieval times, it was even depicted on church windows.¹¹ On reemerging one of them was arrested for passing real, ancient gold coins. The suspicious authorities were eventually convinced of the coins' authenticity, and the revindicated brother was made a bishop. This mechanism of revindication and upholding of old values adds another dimension to Quevedo's self-definition and textual project. When he calls himself one of the seven-sleepers for having dreamt so many "Sueños," he underlines not only the mechanism of several, but also the expectations of a reversal embedded in his work and in this "Sueño" in particular. As we shall see, the rest of the introductory material makes the jostling of orthodox and subversive motives its subject. These motives cannot be readily distinguished as pertaining to purely literary or political concerns. On the one hand, they expose the range of aesthetic possibilities within a given type of discourse, the "Sueños", and on the other, link the "Sueño" to a complex network of institutions, practices and beliefs that constitute Spanish culture in the first half of the seventeenth century.

Muerte's preface dwells upon the praise of the text. We have seen this convention developed from the third "Sueño" on. Each prologue argued that the text at hand surpassed the previous one (s) in some form. *Infierno* was the perfect revelation; *Mundo* was the wildest game, and now *Muerte* is the perfection of jokes and *frases hechas*. There is an obvious connection between the *frases hechas* in the prologue and the nature of *Sueño de la muerte*, which in *Juguetes* was called *Visita de los chistes*. In the prologue Quevedo foregrounds numerous cliché expressions concerning death and dreams, such as "Death ends everything" and "I have nothing left to dream". Hence, as a

¹¹ The Pitcairn Collection of medieval art, recently on view at The Cloisters in New York City, contains a series of stained glass windowpanes from a church in Rouen depicting the story of the Ephesian young man. The legend, recorded by St. Gregory of Tours, was well disseminated across Europe. See *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 1265. Donne, Quevedo's contemporary, opens the poem "The good-morrow", "I wonder by my troth, what thou, and I/Did, till we lov'd? were we not wean'd till then? / But suck'd on countrey pleasures, childishly? / Or snorted we in the 'seven sleepers den?"

catalog of clichés the prologue praises the text by ingenuous imitation. Inasmuch as its praise is a joke, *Muerte* can be read as an *ironic* “end”, to, or perfection of, the series of “Sueños.” the prologue introduces technical perfection. Also, in this prologue as in those of all the “Sueños” the problem of responsibility for the text(s) -- and here the responsibility for ending them as well -- assumes a paradoxical form. As Quevedo writes, death (the author’s demise *or* the text *Muerte*) and the curse of sleepiness (a lethargy, the “modorra que padezco) are neither the responsibility nor the providence of the dreamer/text as Quevedo presents it ultimately questions Quevedo’s authority to end it. Although it is possible to read the prologue to *Muerte* to mean that at that moment Quevedo authorized only five “Sueños” and *Muerte* as the last, there is likewise a convincing longer view -- that is, that Quevedo saw his death; whenever it might come, not the text *Muerte*, as the terminus for the series. This equivocation opens up the question, a digression for us here, of whether *Discursos de todos los diablos* and *La hora de todos* could not be considered “Sueños” as well.

Quevedo’s dedication of *Muerte* to Olivares’s wife also ironically relates these conventions to the “ending” of *Muerte*. It defines the process of ending directly in terms of perfecting, or revising, the text. The topic of an ending emerges from the very beginning: “Harto es que me haya quedado algún discurso después que vi a vuesa merced...” Quevedo finds it incredible that he still has something left to say. Although this discourse may well be the last, the idea of ending them has occurred to him before.¹² The principal convention this dedication stresses is the author’s profession of humility. The convention displaces Quevedo’s responsibility with the text. Quevedo does not claim authorship, but a passive relationship for the text. The discourse has somehow left him -- “creo que me dejó éste por ser de la muerte.” To emphasize humility Quevedo foregoes the benefits and privileges of the patronage relationship which a dedication traditionally engenders and describes. He dedicates the text to Olivares’s wife not so that she may protect or safeguard it, but instead simply so that she may *correct* any thoughtless errors or unfelicitous expressions. [“No se lo dedico porque me lo ampare; llevóslo yo, ..., para la enmienda de lo que puede estar escrito con poca felicidad.”] He claims that his motives are completely unselfish. [“... porque el mayor designio desinteresado es el mío...”]

¹² At first reading we are immediately struck by the commonplaces of courtly love literature which abound in this dedication. Thus, the initial lines can also be read in terms of courtly love *topoi*. The unrequited lover is left speechless by the sight of his loved one and finds that the only adequate expression for his turbulent state is that love is death. Later, the author’s prefatory prose of humility (“No me atrevo...”) echoes the topos of the unworthiness of the lover. Correspondingly, the obsequious appeal to doña Mirena (“... si llega a merecer que le miren...”) places her on a pedestal. Cf. Otis H. Green, *Courtly Love* and Amédée Mas, *La caricature de la femme, du mariage et de l’amour*.

Yet, our recognition of the commonplace, which pervades the dedication, can unnecessarily limit our reading. Far from being merely a prison of love, the prison at the dedication’s close is an actual jail. Although the dedication apparently begins with a smitten and inarticulate love poet, the comments on revisions are more generally applicable to the writing of the series “Sueños.”

There are many possible reasons why he does not expect the usual favors of patronage; he may be incapable of receiving them (he is in prison); she may have none to give; or the "disinterest" may be a quality of the text itself. The latter, likely possibility is another way of pointing out that the responsibility for the dream/text has not been fixed and perhaps can never be.

Quevedo continues to profess his humility -- his lack of claims for/on the text. He hesitates to praise a certain rhetorical aspect of the text ("inversión") in order not to be called a liar ("invencionero"). He points out that he has tried to polish the style and make it appealing, while never forgetting doctrinal concerns. Finally he turns the text over for her censure with supreme obeisance: if she will take charge, if she deems it worthy to glance at, then maybe he can claim some good luck because of these text/"sueños", or have some fame in dreams -- that is, derive some ephemeral pleasure. ["... he remitido a la censura, que vuesa merced hiciera de él, si llega a merecer que le mire; y podré yo decir entonces que soy dichoso por sueños."] The last line of the dedication shifts from the conventions of humility and responsibility for the text to another convention -- the praise of the text, its future status. These hopes for fame, however, already imply a good dose of infamy.

Quevedo's profession of humility here has an ironic ring to it, for as he speaks of what he dare not do or claim, he signs the text from prison, exile. His humility, like his confinement, is forced. When he relates his exaggerated humility to his fear of possible censure, that censure echoes a censure which has occurred before, and which probably led to his confinement. Practically every line of the dedication deals with revisions, censorship. It is a catalog of "anonymous" charge -- negligence, lying, forgetting doctrine. By her acting as censor (rather than someone else), Olivares's wife may serve to displace and ward off the charges. The relationship of patron (reader)/text here is that of censor/censured. Given the context of punishment (imprisonment), the problem of authority, of fixing (stabilizing or revising) the dream/text becomes a matter of political concern.

In conclusion, the introductory material established a generic concept which reconfirms that these satires form a series called "Sueños". To argue more -- that is, that these texts initiate a genre "Sueño" requires study of the entirety of *Sueños* as well as *Diablos*, *La hora de todos*, and subsequent versions by Vélez de Guevara, Larra, and others. While a good case can be made for an *aposteriori* genre "Sueño", the prologues do not shadow such a development in conventional rhetorical terms. Instead a rhetoric for reading the series is developed. This rhetoric anticipates and consequently brackets the possibility of turning a subversive text into an orthodox one. Ironically, the place where this conceptualization is carried out escaped the censors. Although the prologues were written before the first printed editions, they continued to be published even after the censorship of 1628/9. The prologues' strategy of shifting responsibility for the text determines the nature of a "Sueño", a dream/text; and this strategy is related to the process of revising the text, which is not only a writerly but also a political process. The dream

strategy questions the possibility of ending the series. This strategy undermines the traditional moral ground from which the satirist writes. In these prologues Quevedo does not assume the air of satirical truth-telling, of honesty, as he does in *Buscón*. Rather, he exposes and exploits the lack of integrity of his own writing. While he recognizes the power the censors have, his conceptualization of the dream/text not only anticipates but also works against their dictates. Likewise, the disclaiming prologue to *Juguetes*, which is the most overt attempt to rewrite and appease the censors only makes the other prologues more pointed in their arguments. The prologues invite the reader to see his "Sueños" as a battlefield where the power of different censors, both internal and external, clash.

Dona M. Kercher
University of Maine-Orono

WORKS CITED

1. Baum, Doris. "Quevedo's Satiric Prologues." *REH* 7 (1973) 233-53.
2. Donne, John. *The Complete Poetry of John Donne*. New York: Doubleday, 1967.
3. Ettinghausen, Henry. *Francisco de Quevedo and the Neostoic Movement*. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972.
4. Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
5. . *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison*. Paris: Gaillimard, 1975.
6. Freud, Sigmund. *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Trans. James Strachey. London: Hogarth Press, 1953.
7. Ginzburg, Carlo. *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*. Trans. John and Ann Tedeschi. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1980.
7. Goldberg, Jonathan. "The Politics of Renaissance Literature: A Review Essay." *ELN* 49, no. 2 (1982): 514-42.
8. Green, Otis H. *Courtly Love in Quevedo*. Boulder: Univ. of Colorado Press, 1952.
9. Greenblatt, Stephen, Ed. *The Forms of Power and the Power of Forms in the Renaissance*. *Genre* 15, nos 1 + 2 (1982).
10. . "Invisible Bullets: Renaissance Authority and Its Subversion." *Glyph* 8 (1981): 40-61.
11. Howard, Jane and Cahn, Walter. *Radiance and Reflection: Medieval Art from the Raymond Pitcairn Collection*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1982.
12. Lázaro Carreter, Fernando. "Originalidad del *Buscón*." In *Studia Philologica: Homenaje ofrecido a Dámaso Alonso*, II. Madrid, 1961, 319-38. Collected in *Estilo barroco. Personalidad creadora*. Salamanca: Anaya, 1966, 109-41.
13. Legendre, Pierre. *L'amour du censeur: Essai sur l'ordre dogmatique*. Paris: Du Seuil, 1974.
14. Mas, Amédée. *La caricature de la femme, du mariage et de l'amour dans l'oeuvre de Quevedo*. Paris: Ediciones Hispano-americanas, 1957.
15. Nolting-Hauff, Ilse. *Visión, sátira y agudeza en los "Sueños" de Quevedo*. Madrid: Gredos, 1974.
16. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1974.
17. Porqueras Mayo, Alberto. *El prólogo como género literario*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1957.
18. Quevedo y Villegas, Francisco de. *Dreams*. Trans. Wallace Woolsey. New York: Barron's Educational Series, 1976.
19. . *Sueños y discursos de verdades descubridoras de abusos, vicios y engaños de todos los oficios y estados del mundo*. Ed. Felipe Maldonado. Madrid: Castalia, 1972.
20. . *The Visions of Dom Francisco de Quevedo Villegas, Knight of the Order of St. James*. Trans. Roger L'Estrange. London: Methuen, 1904.
21. Russell, P.E. "Secular literature and the censors: a sixteenth-century document re-examined." *BHS* 59 (1982): 219-25.