

The Spanish Inquisition and the Battle for *Lazarillo*: 1554–1555–1573

Reyes Coll-Tellechea

LITERARY TEXTS ARE SOCIAL ARTIFACTS EMBEDDED IN A WEB OF DYNAMIC relations, which are subjected to the vagaries of history. These include, but are not limited to, the manifold relations established between the author, the text, the editor, and the readers. Individuals and institutions are intimately involved and linked to a book's history, and thus are a fundamental part of that history. In the case of the longest living books, classic literary texts, a book's destiny often depends on the relations it establishes over time with individuals and institutions responsible for literary, commercial, and ideological matters. The history of *Lazarillo de Tormes* is a splendid example of this.

It is well known that the life of Lázaro de Tormes was not an ordinary story. It managed to attract the attention of powerful readers, printers, booksellers, and writers, as well as inquisitors and even one of the king's secretaries. It was their combined reactions to the 1554 text that shaped the rather peculiar history of the book. However, this part of the story is yet to be told.

As this volume's first essay points out, *Lazarillo* studies have mainly focused on issues of textual production, such as authorship, or on matters of textual reception, such as the development of the so-called Spanish picaresque novel. Therefore, we lack a study of the novel's circulation and transmission capable of answering some of the questions that still linger regarding this book and its times. It is time, as Roger Chartier has stated, “to bring together what Western tradition has long kept apart: on the one side interpretation and commentary on works of literature, and on the other, analysis of the technical and social conditions of their publication, circulation, and appropriation.”¹

We know that in 1559, *Lazarillo* was one of the first Castilian literary texts to be banned by the Spanish Inquisition, yet we are still wondering

what could have motivated that prohibition. Moreover, why did the Inquisition permit its renewed circulation in 1573? Who were the individuals involved in the novel's banishment and reappearance? What were the consequences of their interventions in this case? How long was *Lazarillo* a prisoner of the Spanish Inquisition? I believe that the answers to these questions will transcend the individual history of this text and will help illuminate its contexts of production and reception over time. Furthermore, by unraveling *Lazarillo*'s complex history, we will encounter a web of political relations, social tensions, and cultural practices populated by some of the most intriguing—and dark—historical figures, such as Fernando de Valdés, the man responsible for *Lazarillo*'s prohibition, and Juan López de Velasco, the man responsible for its resurrection of sorts.

In order to carry out this project, I will venture into the borderland of several critical territories. Donald F. McKenzie calls this borderland *the sociology of texts* and defines it as “the border between bibliography and textual criticism on the one hand and literary criticism and literary history on the other.”²

The starting point of this study is the acknowledgment that the *Lazarillo* that we read today came to us only after undergoing a number of significant material (textual) and ideological (political) transformations. I propose to study two versions of *Lazarillo* that are often ignored because they do not qualify as *the original text* and therefore, according to textual critics, do not convey *the original author's intention*. We owe much of our understanding of *Lazarillo* to traditional textual criticism. Yet this approach imposes such strict material limitations that it inevitably fails to provide insight into some of the most important literary phenomena such as, ironically, the transmission of texts.³

In spite of the claims of traditional textual critics, some facts are rather clear. First, *Lazarillo* is an anonymous work and, therefore, the intentions of its author remain unknown to us, and second, we do not have the first *original version* of *Lazarillo* and therefore must work with the four 1554 secondary editions that have been preserved.

Yet, at a different level, one has to agree with textual critics regarding *Lazarillo*'s sequels. Indeed, the two *Lazarillos* that I propose to study do not share the ideology that appears to be behind the 1554 editions. Nonetheless, I differ from most textual critics in their consideration of this discrepancy as a shortcoming or a sign of textual or literary *degeneration*. Instead, I will argue that the sequels played a crucial role in the survival of their older brother, which would have otherwise disappeared forever in the hands of the Spanish Inquisition as was the fate of other, less fortunate books. The *other*

Lazarillos are an excellent window into our cultural past and an essential tool for scholars interested in *Lazarillo* studies.

The texts I propose to study are all readings of the 1554 *Lazarillo*. The first is the anonymous sequel, known as the *Segunda Parte de Lazarillo de Tormes* (Antwerp 1555), and the second is Juan López de Velasco's censored version, known as *Lazarillo Castigado* (Madrid 1573). I will argue that the *Segunda Parte de Lazarillo de Tormes* was based on a political reading of the text published in 1554, and that its political slant was the cause of the Inquisition's banishment of the first part. In turn, López de Velasco's (1573) text was also a political reading of the first part (1554), motivated directly by the existence of the *Segunda Parte* (1555).

From the perspective of the sociology of texts, the three *Lazarillos* are directly connected and, in fact, interdependent. They constitute politically opposite approaches to the same life story. While the *Segunda Parte* (1555) seized upon the antiestablishment discourse found in the 1554 text, the *Castigado* (1573) tried to eliminate all traces of such ideology. In other words, what we have here is a superb example of two novels (1555 vs. 1573) engaged in a battle to control and redirect the story of Lázaro de Tormes as it had been previously told in 1554. This cultural and political battle for *Lazarillo* has not been studied before.

Let us start with the irruption of the Spanish Inquisition in the life of this apparently innocent novel. The year 1559 was a crucial one in the trajectory of the Spanish Inquisition. It was marked by the publication of Fernando de Valdés' *Index* of forbidden books and by the trial of a group of "heretics" in the city of Valladolid.⁴ By then, the so-called Protestant heresy had displaced the so-called *converso* problem as the main obsession of the Inquisition. Even Catholic reformist thought such as that of Erasmus of Rotterdam was eclipsed by suspicions of heresy. Indeed, Valdés' *Index* made it clear that the spread of Protestantism had become the center of attention of the Spanish Inquisition.⁵ If this was so, what exactly was a novel like *Lazarillo de Tormes* doing in an *Index* aimed at fighting religious reform?

We have been asking that question for a long time, but I believe we have been looking for answers in the wrong place. Scholars sought to understand the Inquisition's prohibition of *Lazarillo* as a function of its author's unorthodox religious beliefs.⁶ They also focused their attention on the first known editions of the book (1554) and assumed that the causes for the Inquisition's prohibition had to be found within that particular text. But the question cannot be answered by using the 1554 version of the novel or by trying to identify the religious identity of its author. For it was not the anticlerical tones of the 1554 *Lazarillo*, so prevalent in the literature of the

time, that motivated the intervention of the Inquisition. The cause of the prohibition, I believe, was political and can be found in the direct dialogue established, within the Antwerp edition, between the 1554 *Lazarillo* and its 1555 sequel.⁷

LAZARILLO DE TORMES, PRIMERA (1554)
y SEGUNDA (1555) PARTE: A DANGEROUS LIAISON

In the Antwerp edition, composed of the 1554 text plus the 1555 *Segunda Parte*, the story of Lázaro had taken a turn toward political criticism of the court, which the Spanish authorities could not tolerate. The inquisitors realized that the circulation of the two parts of the novel highlighted certain antinobiliary tones already present in the 1554 text. That is to say, reading the *Segunda Parte* alerted the inquisitors to the political heterodoxies present already in the popular first part of the novel.⁸

The sequel was the key factor for the Inquisition's intervention in the case. Of this, there is ample evidence. First, the *Segunda Parte* was banned in the *Index* of 1559 along with the first part. The entry simply reads "*Lazarillo de Tormes, primera y segunda parte.*"⁹ Second, the Inquisition never lifted the ban on the 1555 sequel; and third, Juan López de Velasco used the Antwerp edition to produce his *Lazarillo Castigado*.¹⁰

Only if we transcend the issues of *originality* and *aesthetic* value so often invoked by textual critics to marginalize that *Segunda Parte* will we be able to understand the first round in the battle for *Lazarillo*.¹¹ This *Segunda parte* is anonymous as well. It is composed of eighteen chapters, and it starts with the last sentence of the 1554 text: "en este tiempo estaba en mi prosperidad y en la cumbre de toda buena fortuna" [At that time I was at the height of my good fortune].¹² The plot develops by narrating Lázaro's transformation into a fish and his deep-sea adventures. It ends with his return to human form followed by new adventures.

Let us briefly review the story. We find Lázaro in Toledo. He is still working for the archpriest of San Salvador, and he is still married. His wife's name is Elvira. They have a daughter. Lázaro seems to be rather popular in Toledo. He has many friends. They encourage him to enroll in the army. His wife does not seem to mind. In fact, the sexual relationship between Elvira and the archpriest, who is now called Rodrigo de Yepes, is textually transparent in the sequel: "Díselo a mi mujer, y ella con gana de volverse con mi señor arcipreste, me dixo" [When I told this to my wife, she, desiring to get back together with my master, said to me].¹³

The expedition in which Lázaro enrolls fails. His ship sinks. A school of fish attacks the passengers. There is panic. Then, suddenly, Lázaro is thirsty. He starts drinking wine from the ship's cellar and is attacked by the fish. Then, he sinks until he reaches a large rock and undergoes a fantastic transformation: he becomes a fish. Now he can understand what his fish-attackers are saying. They are planning to kill him. But this Lázaro-fish tricks them into believing that the man they are looking for has escaped. Then, he joins the fish army, befriends its captain—Licio—and succeeds in becoming indispensable in this new society.

One day the king, badly advised, imprisons Licio. Lázaro gets ready to free his friend. Leading ten thousand male fish along with one hundred females he arrives at court and asks to see the king. The king refuses to see Lázaro. Finally, Licio's wife manages to bribe one of the court gatekeepers. Through him, they send an explanatory letter to the king. Licio's enemies try to block the maneuver, and they insist on carrying out the king's orders to kill Licio as soon as possible. At the very last minute, Licio's friends rescue him. Lázaro and his fish take revenge on their enemies. Finally, the monarch accepts Licio's innocence, but denies him permission to leave the court. Days go by. Licio's wife visits the king every day. The king falls in love with one of the one hundred beautiful females, whose name is Luna. She ends up “pagando con su inocente sangre gentil y no tocado cuerpo” (209) [paying with her virgin blood and innocent body]. The king finally extends his royal pardon to all in exchange for a sexual relationship with Luna. Finally, impressed by Lázaro's knowledge and courage, the king makes him his “favorite” (*privado*) and Lázaro takes advantage of his newfound power to take revenge against his own enemies. Then, following the king's wishes, Lázaro marries Luna, “la ya no tan hermosa ni tan entera Luna” [no longer as lovely or as untouched as before]. The ironic twist does not escape him: “maldito el voleo alcanço, sino de segundo bote, y aún plega a Dios no sea de más; con todo, a subir acierto: razón es de arcipreste a rey haber salto” (222–23) [It is a damnable thing to have gotten her on the bounce, at second hand, and I pray to God it is no more than second; but for all that, I have risen from the leftovers of an archpriest to those of a king]. After this, Lázaro continues rising socially and he eventually becomes a viscount.

Lázaro is explicit in attributing his success at surviving in his new social position to the lessons learned from his old master the squire (a direct reference to the 1554 text). But unlike the squire Lázaro becomes rich and powerful. His ambition is limitless. He plans to attack a ship carrying gold and escape to Toledo with it. But before he can carry out his plan, he is caught in the net of some fishermen. When the fishermen see this strange creature—

he is half man and half fish—they decide that they can make some money parading around such a monster. Lázaro becomes an attraction. For months, he must endure this fate.

One day Lázaro recovers his human form and manages to escape from his captors. When he finally reaches Toledo, he finds his house empty. His wife is living openly with the archpriest. No one seems to recognize Lázaro. He is taken into custody and tortured. Finally his wife recognizes him. Upon leaving jail, Lázaro goes to Salamanca with the intention of proving to the university's professors that knowledge can be acquired by experience and not only through study. Having done this, Lázaro returns home and closes his narration: "Lo demás, con el tiempo lo sabrá Vuestra Merced, quedando muy a su servicio Lázaro de Tormes (259) [And what remains to be told, your Honour shall learn in good time. Respectfully yours, your humble servant, Lázaro de Tormes].

The plot is well constructed and rather carefully linked to the 1554 story. There are abundant references to masters, episodes, and lessons learned by Lázaro in the 1554 text; there are also some anticlerical tones and a good dose of humor and irony. This is an interesting and curious novel whose core content is an invective against the court. In fact, it seems to ridicule all aspects of court life, king, nobles, and soldiers included. Political, economic, and military abuses are rampant in the fish court, as are envy, hypocrisy, greed, and corruption.

The cornerstone of the *Segunda Parte* is Lázaro's rise from servant of an archpriest to the *privado* of a king. This did not escape the vigilant eye of the readers of the Inquisition. This *Segunda Parte* went far beyond ridiculing some clerics and impoverished noblemen. In 1555, Lázaro's strategies, learned directly from the squire of 1554, had taken him to the highest social echelon. In the first round of the battle for *Lazarillo* the anonymous author of the sequel had appropriated Lazaro's life and had successfully adapted it as a weapon with political aims. The protagonist now served to showcase the corruption of the Spanish court. Not surprisingly the novel was read as a political provocation. For the Inquisition the *Segunda Parte* was a politically heterodox novel based on a political interpretation of the popular 1554 text.

*LAZARILLO, FERNANDO DE VALDÉS
AND THE INDEX OF FORBIDDEN BOOKS*

Several scholars have noticed the strong political slant and mysterious references of this *Segunda Parte de Lazarillo de Tormes*.¹⁴ Those observations

notwithstanding, critics have failed to make the connection between the 1555 novel's political undertones and the Inquisition's prohibition of the 1554 *Lazarillo*. In order to understand why, we must consider first that the actions of Spanish inquisitors transcended doctrinal matters and that they reached much further, well into the political and social issues of the times.

Censorship of books, that is to say, of ideas, was one of the main tools used by the highest authorities to control society in early modern Spain. As Martínez Millán notes,

El Estado utilizó la institución inquisitorial para difundir su propia ideología y controlar aquellas que le resultaban inconvenientes. De ahí que la función de la censura sea doble: por una parte dejar libre e impulsar la ideología que toda la sociedad debía asumir; por otra—en sentido negativo—perseguir las lecturas, imágenes, pinturas, etc., que resultaban heterodoxas.

[The state made use of the Inquisition as an institution to spread its own ideology and to control other ideologies it found inappropriate. The censorship had a double function: on the one hand, to allow and promote the ideology that all of society was supposed to adopt; on the other hand, in a negative sense, to persecute heterodoxical texts, images, paintings, etc.]¹⁵

What is not so well known is the extent of such relationship. The symbiotic relationship between the interests of the Spanish Church and State was such that, according to the same historian, “toda idea escrita contra el Estado será tachada de herética y, viceversa, todo libro publicado contra la Inquisición será considerado prejudicial por el Estado.” [any idea written in opposition to the state would be labeled heretical, and similarly, any book published in opposition to the Inquisition would be seen by the state as prejudicial to its interests].¹⁶

It is precisely at this crossroads that Lázaro de Tormes fell victim to Fernando de Valdés. The 1555 Antwerp edition was read as a political provocation. Thus, the second round of the battle began with the radical reaction of the Inquisition: the prohibition in the 1559 *Index* of the 1554 precursor text and its sequel.

In order to understand the presence of these and other literary texts in the *Index*, we must consider the motivations behind the *Index* itself. In sixteenth century Spain, political and ecclesiastical power went hand in hand. In exchange for the many political services rendered by the Inquisition, the crown extended all kinds of privileges to the Inquisition and its representatives. Those benefits ranged from tax exemptions, to official salaries, judicial privileges, and all kinds of social benefits, such as paid housing. Moreover,

there is ample historical evidence to prove that the Inquisition became a direct path to social and political success.¹⁷ In fact, according to Stanford Poole, the Inquisition became a training ground for royal civil servants. It was one of the ways that a *letrado* could advance in the royal service or become a bishop. For that reason, inquisitorial posts, especially on the *Suprema*, were prizes to be coveted and pursued.¹⁸

The Inquisition had become a way of life as well as a way into the royal court for those born outside its walls. And if we are to understand *Lazarillo's* presence in the *Index*, then we must read the text against this background and study the text's dynamic connections to the historical context of its production and of its transmission.

Let us then look a little closer into the principal author of the *Index*, the inquisitor General Fernando de Valdés. He was the man responsible for *Lazarillo's* prohibition. It has been known for some time now that Valdés was more a political than a religious man, and that his ambition was limitless. He was a clever schemer, a ferocious enemy, and a loyal friend. He was also a close collaborator of Charles V and Philip II. Vengeance and nepotism constituted his modus operandi.¹⁹ This is how historian Henar Pizarro portrays Valdés:

utilizó la intransigencia religiosa como medio para no poder ser desplazado del poder, e instrumentalizó el peligro que suponía la existencia de elementos luteranos dentro de la península para afianzarse en el mantenimiento de sus cargos y funciones, persiguiendo, a través de la actividad desplegada, una finalidad sociopolítica.

[He used religious intransigence as a means to retain power. He took the danger implied by the presence of Lutheran elements on the Peninsula and made it an instrument for holding on his governmental posts and functions; all the actions he unleashed had a socio-political end in view.]²⁰

Even a revisionist historian such as Henry Kamen must accept that among the many malicious inquisitors “none put his personal ambition to greater use than the Inquisitor General Fernando de Valdés, who undermined the career of Juan de Vergara and destroyed that of Bartolomé Carranza.”²¹

Fernando de Valdés was, without a doubt, one of the most important political figures of his times. He was a member of the most important branches of government: the Council of the Inquisition, the Council of Finance, the Council of Castile, the Council of State, as well as a member of the Royal Chamber. From those positions he could reach anywhere and do almost anything.²² And he did so, placing family and friends in official posts and implacably trying to destroy his enemies as well as the enemies of his friends

and allies. Valdés was not of noble descent. This meant that he had to enter the Royal court as a *letrado* through favors and political maneuvers. Lázaro de Tormes happened to be one of Valdés' most humble victims.

Valdés' *Index* was compiled in less than one year²³ and it contained six hundred and sixty six prohibitions. A total of one hundred and seventy books in Castilian were banned. The majority of those works were of religious interest.²⁴ It is important to note that among those hundreds of books only a handful of Spanish novels (6) were listed. The fact that two of those were *Lazarillos* (1554 and 1555) reveals a very strong reaction against this novel. But even more revealing is the fact that these two *Lazarillos* happened to be the only novels banned for the first time; the other four novels had been banned previously.²⁵ Thus, in terms of fictional narrative, the only novelties in the 1559 *Index* were precisely the two *Lazarillos*. Why would a man like Valdés take these two novels so seriously?

The motivations behind Valdés' reactions were not only doctrinal but, as was always true in his case, also political. The clever double edition from Antwerp had to mortify this inquisitor-courtier. The political criticism present in the sequel would have alerted him to the possible political undertones also present in the first part, and the two texts together attacked Valdés' own sources of power: the Church and the court. Beneath the appearance of these two modest fictional works, Valdés must have suspected or even identified some 'perverse' intention to expose the political status quo. Both novels seemed to point their weapons against a court devoid of virtuous men and filled with impostors. That is, a court filled with *aspiring* courtiers, such as Fernando de Valdés who were regarded by their enemies as being impostors among the *natural* courtiers—that is, the aristocrats.²⁶

Fernando de Valdés' intervention in the history of *Lazarillo* is as much an example of the political employment of inquisitorial censorship as it is of the importance of a book's relations over time with individuals and institutions other than its author and editors. A less significant novel would have died at the hands of the Spanish Inquisition. This, however, would not be the end of the *Lazarillo*. For the Inquisition's role in the control of ideas transcended its ability to impede their transmission through censorship. If the objective of the *Index*—and that of the machinery of censorship that it helped create—had been to eradicate heterodox ideas completely, the prohibition of the *Lazarillos* would have led to their complete elimination. Eventually the story of Lázaro would have been forgotten, as was the case of other books. It is essential to notice, however, that book censorship was not limited to the elimination of heterodox ideas, but included *the production and transmission of a new orthodox mentality* as well. That is to say, the Inquisition's role was

not limited to extirpating ideas. In fact, one of its most important functions was to support the circulation of the new hegemonic ideology. The history of *Lazarillo* is, again, a magnificent example of this process. As Martínez Millán has explained, the Inquisition's goal was “la creación de una mentalidad nueva, de una cosmovisión de estructuras simples, referenciales, donde todo está perfectamente colocado, lo que es bueno y provechoso, y lo que es malo, dañoso.” [the creation of a new mentality, a simply structured worldview in which everything had its place; that which was good and beneficial, that which was bad and prejudicial.]²⁷

The life story of Lázaro de Tormes constituted a perfect vehicle to redirect political and social criticism. First, it had been an editorial success in Spain and abroad. It had attracted readers, writers, and publishers. Second, Lázaro had become a popular figure.²⁸ Third, the text was anonymous and therefore perfectly susceptible to being co-opted and circulated again, under different (orthodox) ideological premises and with new objectives. That could be easily done, especially if the 1555 sequel remained banned ad infinitum and the 1554 text underwent certain changes. This is exactly what happened in the next round of the battle for *Lazarillo*.

LAZARILLO CASTIGADO, JUAN LÓPEZ DE VELASCO, AND THE POLITICAL FUNCTION OF INQUISITORIAL CENSORSHIP

While in the custody of the Inquisition, *Lazarillo* underwent its second political metamorphosis. At some point Valdés lifted his prohibition of the first part of the novel, and in 1573 the Inquisition allowed a new edition of that part to be published under the supervision of Juan López de Velasco.²⁹ Of course, it had been first expurgated and was published along with other texts, a perfect example of the Inquisition's capabilities as producer and transmitter of a new mentality.

This time Lázaro was transformed into an agent of the opposite political camp and, in the process, became his own worst enemy. In a successful attempt to blame the victim, the Inquisition-approved new edition of the novel managed to retell the story while exposing Lázaro's own shortcomings and assigning him full responsibility for his troubled life.

How was this accomplished? We know that the censors of the Inquisition received a copy of the volume they were to expurgate along with the Inquisition's *dictamen, censura* or *delación* concerning the work in question. That is, before the censors began their work, they were informed of exactly which passages and ideas had been declared dangerous, inappropriate, in-

convenient, or irreverent by the Inquisition.³⁰ Thus, we must assume that the censor-editor in charge of cleaning up and publishing the new *Lazarillo*, Juan López de Velasco, targeted precisely those sections of the text deemed inappropriate enough by the Spanish Inquisition to warrant its prohibition in 1559.

What did Juan López de Velasco do to the 1554 text? What strategies did he apply to produce a clean version of Lázaro's story? Until now, literary scholars have repeated that the inquisitorial censor's role was restricted to the deletion of the anticlerical or doctrinally heterodox passages and references from the 1554 text. Yet textual evidence contradicts such a claim. In fact, the vast majority of López de Velasco's textual interventions did not adhere to such criteria. To understand López de Velasco's work, we must first reject the inherited clichés regarding the censor's "limited" and "benign" intervention in the text. As we shall see, Juan López de Velasco's intervention in the history of *Lazarillo* was extensive, conspicuous, and surprisingly long lasting.

Recent scholarship has shown that inquisitorial censors were as concerned with possible *heterodox readings* as they were with heterodox writings. This meant that texts were judged not only on what they said, but also on how they could be interpreted by readers.³¹ López de Velasco knew what he had to do. And in his *Nota al Lector* he explained why he had "cleaned up" the first part and completely eliminated its sequel.

Por lo cual con licencia del Consejo de la Santa Inquisición, y de su Majestad, se enmendó de algunas cosas porque se había prohibido, y se quitó toda la segunda parte, que por no ser del autor de la primera, era muy impertinente y desgraciada.

[Therefore, with the approval of the Council of the Holy Inquisition and of His Majesty, certain things have been changed because they had been the cause of the prohibition, and the whole second part has been removed because, not being the work of the same author, it was insolent and clumsy.]³²

First, López de Velasco created a rather altered version of Lazaró's life story. Second, his became the only available text of the Vida de *Lazarillo* de Tormes in Spain for almost three hundred years. Indeed, from 1573 until the middle of the nineteenth century, Spanish readers only knew López de Velasco's *Lazarillo Castigado*. Which meant that certain parts of the 1554 text and the complete 1555 sequel were forgotten for at least three hundred years, while the *Castigado* usurped the identity of what textual critics would call the "original" text.

Perhaps this curious case of literary identity theft explains the rather scarce attention paid in modern times to *Lazarillo Castigado*.³³ Overall this text has served textual critics only as a minor tool in the *collatio* that precedes the production of critical editions. In fact, from the point of view of traditional textual criticism, *Lazarillo Castigado* is but an aberration.³⁴ That might be true for textual critics, but it should not be so for literary scholars in general. For those interested in the literary text as a social artifact, López de Velasco's text constitutes an important source of knowledge that can give us a deeper understanding of the 1554 text.

What exactly did López de Velasco excise and what were the textual and ideological consequences of his actions? For instance, why did López de Velasco cut the episode of the Mercedarian friar but not that of the archpriest when it was clear that both characters exhibited reproachable sexual conduct? Why did the episode of the Maqueda's cleric stay almost untouched while that of the seller of papal bulls was eliminated even though both took advantage of the Church to make money? Why was the episode of the squire partly censored when it did not deal with religious matters at all?

Let's turn our attention to the text of *Lazarillo Castigado*. The censor did not touch the prologue. In 1573, we can still hear the voice of the protagonist addressing Your Honour and acknowledging that he is not "más santo que los demás" [I'm no better than my neighbour], though he is of humble origins and, therefore, his social success is more meritorious than that of those who are born with privileges. The first episode was also allowed to stand. Thus, the reader is informed about Lázaro's ancestors as well as the lamentable economic conditions of his childhood. López de Velasco only used his scissors in one occasion: right at the point where Lázaro justifies his stepfather's thievery with an anticlerical blow: "No nos maravillemos de un clérigo ni fraile, porque el uno hurtá de los pobres y el otro de casa para sus devotas, y para ayuda de otro tanto, cuando a un pobre esclavo el amor le animaba a esto (80). [Seeing that love forces a poor slave to do this we ought not to be surprised that a priest robs his flock and a friar his convent for the benefit of his female devotees and others.] (26)

The censor also allowed Lázaro's adventures with the blind man. He made only one cut, when the master swears, "Lázaro, engañado me has. *Juraré yo a Dios* que tu has comido las uvas tres a tres (87). [Lázaro, you've been doing me. *By God I swear* you've been taking three grapes at a time.] (33) The reference to God was extirpated. Little more was eliminated from the next episode, Lázaro's misadventures with Maqueda's priest. In spite of the very well documented anticlerical tones found in this chapter, they only concerned the censor on two occasions. First, when Lázaro summarizes his master's char-

acter as “No digo más, sino que toda la lacería del mundo estaba encerrada en éste. *No sé si de su cosecha era, o lo había anexado con el hábito de clerecía*” (92) [All I can say is that all the money grubbing meanness in the world had been collected into this single reverend gentleman. *Mind you, I don't know if it was natural to him or whether he had assumed it when he first put on his clerical robes.*] (38) The section marked in italics was removed. Then, a little later, López de Velasco eliminated a reference to the Holy Spirit and replaced “alumbrado por el Espíritu Santo” (95) [enlightened as I was by the Holy Ghost] (41) with “alumbrado por no sé quién” [enlightened by who knows whom].

So far it is not difficult to see the reasons behind the cuts. Many scholars have pointed out that those expressions had, at the time, certain heterodox resonances perhaps related to Erasmian or Lutheran doctrines. However, it is important to note that the inquisitorial censor did not delete *all* irreverent and suspicious expressions from the text. In fact, it can be said that up to this point, the censor let stand certain totally reproachable forms of behavior by major characters—such as greed, lack of compassion, selfishness, and the commercial use of religious practices. Instead, what López de Velasco seems to have gone after are the instances in which Lázaro *dares to judge* such conducts as representative of entire institutions. Moreover, López de Velasco twice used his scissors to extirpate the subjective opinion of the narrator.

Except for that, the textual purge up to this point was rather limited and did not introduce radical changes in the story. Nonetheless, López de Velasco's strategies had the effect of diluting Lázaro's character and certainly limited the capacity of the protagonist to reveal his individual social conscience. That is to say, the censor allowed Lázaro to tell his story, but not to come to certain conclusions about it. Above all, Lázaro was not allowed to express his personal opinion of others and use it as an excuse for his own (bad) behavior as he had done throughout the first and second parts of the novel. Thus, it can be said that one of López de Velasco's main strategies was to expurgate the text in such a manner as to counteract Lázaro's original exculpatory strategy.

Few critics have stopped to reflect on López de Velasco's reaction to the episode of the squire. Yet I believe that the expurgation of this chapter is fundamental to understanding the Inquisition's tools and objectives regarding *Lazarillo*.

After living with the squire for a while, and starving, Lázaro listens to his master's dream. The squire aspires to serve in court. Once there, he says, he knows exactly how to relate to the aristocrats in order to be successful. Here is the squire's plan: “decirle bien lo que bien estuviese, y por lo contrario ser malicioso, mofador, malsinar a los de casa y a los de afuera, pesquisar y

procurar de saber vidas ajenas para contárselas y otras muchas galas de esta calidad que (122). [I could speak pleasantly if he liked that and make inquiries and find out about other people. I could give him a full account of them, and lots of other fine things] At this point, López de Velasco intervened, and gone was the rest of the 1554 passage.

[galas de esta calidad que] hoy día se usan en palacio y a los señores dél parecen bien. Y no quieren ver en sus casas hombres virtuosos, antes los aborrecen y tienen en poco, y llaman necios, y que no son personas de negocios, ni con quien el señor se pueda descuidar. Y con estos los astutos usan, como digo, el día de hoy, de lo que yo usaría. (122)

[fine things that go on in rich men's houses these days. Rich men like this and they don't want honest men in their houses; in fact they hate and despise them and call them stupid and say they are not men of the world and that a gentleman can't relax when he is in their company. So, as I've told you, clever men these days make the best out of their masters and that's what I would do if I could find somebody.]

The effect of López de Velasco's strategy in this episode is clear. The squire was allowed the chance to reveal his own weakness of character (he would willingly lie, gossip, denounce, attack, etc.) but by eliminating the character's alibi (because this is how things are done nowadays in the court) the censor also cut out the squire's opinion of and judgment against the court and the nobility. In *Lazarillo Castigado*, gone is the image of a court ruled by mediocrity, hypocrisy, and a total lack of virtues; a court where in fact, virtuous men had no place at all. Instead, thanks to the editing of López de Velasco, what we are left with is a case of individual "deviant" social behavior.³⁵

There were no religious suspicions or anticlerical expressions in this episode, yet López de Velasco's reaction was quite strong, stronger in fact than in previous episodes. As a result of the purge, the squire's character was curiously deformed. If in 1554 the squire was a presumptuous yet somehow ingenuous man, López de Velasco transformed him into a mere thug. And to do so, he used the same strategy he had previously applied to Lázaro. That is to say, the inquisitor eliminated the character's alibi vis-à-vis immoral behavior (virtuous men were not even wanted in the Royal court) and assigned him full responsibility for his unethical plan to succeed in court. The elimination of the character's alibi revealed his true bad intentions and, thus, his total responsibility for any misfortunes he might experience.

The censor eliminated the next two episodes—that of the Mercedarian friar and that of seller of false papal bulls. In each case the reasons for his

actions seem self-evident. Lázaro's Mercedarian master worked as a sexual middleman and possibly was a pederast; his next master was a con man, a seller of false bulls. The complete elimination of these two episodes had profound consequences for the story, for with them disappeared two fundamental lessons learned by Lázaro—two lessons that in 1554 had served to justify his final behavior as a willing cuckold.

In the 1554 text the friar was judged as an “enemigo del coro y de comer en el convento, perdido por andar fuera, amiguísimo de negocios seglares y visitar” (126). [He wasn't interested in singing in the choir and he wouldn't eat at the monastery. He loved going out and worldly affairs and visiting people] (66). Moreover, as scholars have pointed out, the abundant sexual euphemisms of this short chapter indicated that all sorts of sexual transactions and possibilities took place during Lázaro's stay with the friar. It was at this point that Lázaro understood how to instrumentalize sexuality.

The episode dedicated to the seller of bulls would have been even harder to swallow for Spanish Inquisitors. In addition to the sale of false bulls, this chapter included other blows, such as the bribing of religious and civil authorities—and their willful implication in the scam—the ignorance of many clerics, the commercialization of miracles, prayers, and sermons as well as their use to terrorize people, the sale of religious posts, and the people's strong resistance to buying papal bulls. Indeed, to say that this episode displayed strong anticlerical tones would be an understatement. Yet, once again, that was not its only function in the novel, and thus its elimination had effects beyond the anticlerical aspect.

What Lázaro learned from the seller of bulls in 1554 was a critical lesson: how to lie by using the truth. This was in fact the lesson that made it possible for a man like Lázaro to tell his story publicly and not feel ashamed. It was the core strategy employed by the narrator in order to expose the vicious behaviors of others and to hide his own problematic “case” at the same time. With the elimination of this chapter Juan López de Velasco had indeed removed the foundation for Lázaro's narrative strategy: how to deceive while telling the truth.

Textually, the elimination of these two episodes had the effect of connecting the innocent young man abandoned by the squire in Toledo with the shrewd servant of the archpriest whose wife he shared. As for the final episode, once it had been separated from the keys to interpret Lázaro's behavior, it hardly needed to be excised. Just two sections were cut. The first one is, again, a blow directed against the court. Lázaro says that he finally manages to get an official post: “viendo que no hay nadie que medre sino los que le tienen” (138). [I realized that you can't get on unless you are in a

government job] (77). Once again the censor eliminated an invective that previously functioned as a justification (social success required an official post). Finally, the last intervention was directed at an irreverent expression; Lázaro swore “sobre la hostia consagrada” (142) [I swear in the Sacred Host itself] (79) that his wife was not what the people of Toledo said she was (and what Lázaro himself had come to suspect) but a good woman and a good wife. It is not difficult to understand the reasons behind this last cut, yet its effect is rather intense. In *Lazarillo Castigado*, Lázaro is not as forceful in defending his wife’s reputation and his own honor. Lázaro has already been exposed, and this is simply the last blow against the protagonist.

A close reading of López de Velasco’s *Lazarillo Castigado* reveals that he followed a clear textual-ideological strategy. Episodes were allowed to remain provided that they accepted certain alterations of content and form. Those amendments intended to transform Lázaro from a ‘victim’ of (social) circumstances or a mere imitator of the patterns of his society (1554) into an agent of his own social destiny (1573). In other words, the censor’s actions served to redirect the story of 1554 and to infuse it with an alternate ideology in order to make the story work in favor of the status quo as controlled by the royal court and the Church.

Since 1573 the life story of Lázaro de Tormes was no longer an astute critique of poverty, greed, and inequitable social relations. Lázaro was indeed punished, and the new version of the story was forced to wear its own *sambenito* printed on its title in the form of the word *Castigado*. Since 1573 *Lazarillo* had a new master, the Spanish Inquisition no less. For the next three hundred years Spanish readers (including Mateo Alemán, Cervantes, and Quevedo) could only read López de Velasco’s version of the novel.

If there is any value to the longstanding claim that the so-called Spanish picaresque genre started with *Lazarillo*, such statement should be appropriately corrected for accuracy. The only available text for readers, writers, booksellers, and printers of the time was the *Lazarillo Castigado*. Yet this would seem to lead us toward the rather provocative suspicion that the origins of the so-called picaresque novel were political in nature—the result of political censorship as applied by López de Velasco—and its even more provocative corollary: that the origins of the “picaresque” are rooted in the intervention of an institution, the Spanish Inquisition, in the circulation of a novel: *Lazarillo de Tormes*.³⁶

These admittedly disturbing dimensions of the case could and should be studied further. I submit that they could be studied at the intersection of bibliography, textual criticism, literary criticism, literary history, and cultural history. For as has been shown, the story of Lázaro de Tormes, like its

protagonist, underwent a series of very important material and ideological adaptations and manipulations that lasted well into the nineteenth century, perhaps even longer.

To conclude, approached from the point of view of the sociology of texts, the history of *Lazarillo* shows enormous potential to help us answer some important questions about early modern Spanish society and culture. It helps to illuminate the intricate web of political and cultural practices within which the production and transmission of ideas was embedded at the time; and it contributes to the understanding of the role of the Spanish Inquisition as producer of a new (hegemonic) mentality. Finally, *Lazarillo* is a magnificent example of how a literary text could become a battleground where antagonistic ideological forces fought a particular battle for control over the means of symbolic interpretation of reality.

NOTES

1. Roger Chartier, *Inscription and Erasure. Literature and Written Culture from the Eleventh to the Eighteenth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), viii. Cultural history as practiced by Roger Chartier, investigates the importance of individual and collective reading practices applied synchronically and diachronically to a given text.

2. Donald McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (London: The British Library, 1986), 14. The sociology of text, as defined by McKenzie, studies the effects produced on the status, classification, and reception of texts by their formal transformation in manuscript or print.

3. For an initial approach to the limitations of textual criticism, see Jerome Jerome McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1992).

4. *Catalogus librorum*, qui prohibentur mandato Ilustrissimi & Reverend, D. D. Fernandi de Valdes Hispalen, Arciepis, Inquisitoris Generalis Hispaniae, Hoc anno M.D.L.IX editus, Sebastianus Martinez Excudebat, Pinciae. There is a facsimile, *Tres Indices Expurgatorios de la Inquisición Española en el Siglo XVI* (Madrid: Real Academia, 1952). See also Jesús Martínez Bujanda. *Index de l’Inquisition espagnole 1551, 1554, 1559* (Sherbrooke, Québec: Centre d’Études de la Renaissance, 1984).

5. For the trajectory of the Spanish Inquisition, see Bartolomé Escandell Bonet, “Sobre las adaptaciones de la Inquisición al contexto ideológico del siglo XVI,” in *Política, Religión e Inquisición en la España Moderna: Homenaje a Joaquín Pérez Villanueva*, ed. J. Fernández Albadalejo, José Martínez Millán, and Virgilio Pinto Crespo (Madrid: Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1996), 253–66.

6. Americo Castro believed that the author of the 1554 *Lazarillo* was a *converso* who filled the novel with his criticism of Christian society. Francisco Márquez Villanueva believed that the novel was deeply inspired by Erasmian thought. Marcel Bataillon thought that the novel’s anticlericalism could not have been a reason for its inclusion in Valdés’ *Index*, given

that most anticlerical literary works were not targeted in it. Bataillon also believed that there were no traces of Erasmian thought in *Lazarillo*. See Américo Castro, *Hacia Cervantes* (Madrid: Taurus, 1957); Marcel Bataillon, *El Sentido del Lazarillo de Tormes* (Paris-Toulouse: Librairie des Editions Espagnoles, 1954), and *Lazarillo de Tormes* (Salamanca: Anaya, 1968); Francisco Márquez Villanueva, “La actitud espiritual del *Lazarillo de Tormes*” in *Espiritualidad y Literatura* (Madrid: Alfaguara, 1968), 70–137.

7. I have consulted the volume kept by the Hispanic Society of America in New York (Antwerp: Martin Nucio: 1554–55).

8. See note 30.

9. *Catalogus librorum*, in *Tres Indices Expurgatorios de la Inquisición Española en el Siglo XVI* (Madrid: Real Academia, 1952), 44.

10. See Aldo Ruffinatto, “Algo más sobre el *Lazarillo* castigado de López de Velasco,” *Incipit*, 25–26 (2006–2006): 523–36, and *Las dos caras del Lazarillo. Texto y Mensaje* (Madrid: Castalia, 2000); Harry Sieber “Literary continuity, social order, and the picaresque” in Marina Brownlee and G. Gumbrecht, ed., *Cultural Authority in Golden Age Spain* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 148 agrees as well.

11. Hundreds of studies mention the *Segunda Parte*, yet very few really go further than that. Among the few, see Aristide Rumeau, “Notes au ‘Lazarillo’: les éditions d’Anvers, 1554–1555 de *La vida de Lazarillo et de La Segunda Parte*,” *Bulletin Hispanique*, 66 (1964): 272–93; Richard Zwez, *Hacia la revalorización de la Segunda parte del Lazarillo (1555)* (Valencia: Ediciones Albatros, 1970); Pierina Beckman, *El valor literario del Lázaro de 1555: género, evolución y metamorfosis* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991); Marina Scordilis Brownlee, “Generic Expansion and Generis Subversion: The Two Continuations of *Lazarillo de Tormes*,” *Philological Quarterly*, 61(1982): 317–27. There are two critical editions: *Segunda Parte del Lazarillo*. (1555), edited by Pedro Piñero (Madrid: Cátedra, 1998), and *La Segunda Parte del Lazarillo de Tormes y de sus fortunas y adversidades (1555)*, edited by Manuel Ferrer-Chivite (Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1993).

12. All Spanish quotes of the 1554 text are from *La Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes y de sus fortunas y adversidades*, ed. Reyes Coll-Tellechea and Anthony Zahareas (Madrid: Akal, 2000), 142. Subsequent quotations will be from this same edition, and page numbers will be included parenthetically in the text. All English translations of *Lazarillo de Tormes* (1554) are from Michael Alpert, *Two Spanish Picaresque Novels* (London: Penguin, 1969), 79. Subsequent English quotations will be from this same translation, and page numbers will be included parenthetically in the text.

13. *Segunda Parte del Lazarillo* (1555), ed. Pedro Piñero (Madrid: Cátedra, 1998), 131. All subsequent quotations from this text will be from the same edition, and page numbers will be parenthetically included in the text. I would like to express my gratitude to my colleague Dick Cluster, who helped me with the English translations of this and all subsequent English translations of the *Segunda parte* (1555), the *Lazarillo Castigado* (1573), and modern texts.

14. Marcel Bataillon saw an enigmatic intention in it. He believed that there might be a connection with the Spanish *marranos* exiled in Turkish territory. For Zwez the sequel contained high doses of allegory (16) and the author “muestra su disgusto sobre el abuso de poder militar y la corrupción de la corte” [Shows his annoyance regarding the abuse of military power and rampant corruption in the court.] Pedro Piñero (48) observed that the novel resembled “novelita de caballerías cifrada” [a little chivalry romance a clef] and “un breve manual de cortesanos donde se pueden oír los ecos del ideario erasmiano en esta

doctrina, al tiempo que Lázaro aprovecha las reflexiones que había escuchado al escudero toledano” [A short courtly manual where we can perceive traces of Erasmian thought, and at the same time Lázaro profits from the advise received from the squire.] (51) For his part, Ferrer-Chivite detected many enigmatic clues in the novel. He believed that they were related to a double conversion, from Christianity to Islam to Christianity, and from Christianity to Judaism to Christianity again. Finally, more recently, for Angel Alcalá (108) the 1555 *Segunda Parte de Lazarillo* is a novel “de extrañas alusiones políticas sugeridas en clave” [full of mysterious political allusions written in code.]

15. José Martínez Millán, “Las fuentes impresas para el estudio de la censura inquisitorial” in Joaquín Pérez Villanueva and Bartolomé Escandell Bonet, ed., *Historia de la Inquisición en España y América* (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Inquisitoriales, 1984), 156–57.

16. José Martínez Millán, “El catálogo de libros prohibidos de 1559,” *Miscelánea Comillas*, 1979: 207.

17. Stanford Poole describes the situation as follows: “Relations between church and state were governed by the *patronato real*, a complex series of concessions from the papacy and intrusions by the state that gave the crown sleeping control over the life and administration of the church. Without doubt, the strongest element of royal control was the right to nominate, that is, virtually to appoint, bishops and higher ecclesiastical officers.” Stanford Poole, *Juan de Ovando. Governing the Spanish Empire in the Reign of Philip II* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004), 14.

18. Poole, 85.

19. Juan de Valdés was Bishop of Oviedo, President of the Chancillería de Valladolid, Bishop of Sigüenza, President of the Royal Council, Archbishop of Seville, Inquisitor General and he owed every single position to Charles V and Philip II. See José Luis González Novalín, *El inquisidor general Fernando de Valdés (1483–1568)*, (Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, 1968).

20. Henar Pizarro Llorente. “Las relaciones de patronazgo a través de los inquisidores de Valladolid durante el siglo XVI,” in *Instituciones*, ed. Martínez Millán, 226.

21. Henry Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 122.

22. For a study of nepotism in the Castilian court see José Martínez Millán, ed., *Instituciones y Elites de Poder en la Monarquía Hispana durante el Siglo XVI* (Madrid: Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1992). See also José Martínez Millán, *La hacienda de la Inquisición, 1478–1700* (Madrid: Centro Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1984), 185–211.

23. See an excellent introduction to this *Index* in Martínez Millán, “El catálogo,” 179–217.

24. The *Index* was divided in six parts, each part corresponding to a language: Latin, Castilian, Flemish, German, French, and Portuguese. The vast majority of works banned were Books of Hours, Bibles, catechisms, prayers, etc. Four of the banned books were history texts: there was also one book of medicine, one of botany, and nineteen literary texts, only five of which were in prose. The literary genre most impacted by the *Index* was theater, specifically those plays that displayed an openly critical view of society. The complete plays of Bartolomé Torres Naharro were banned, along with some by Juan del Encina, Gil Vicente, Jaime Huete, Feliciano da Silva, Francisco de las Natas and Bartolomé Palau. For the study of literary texts in the *Index*, see J. M. Bujanda, “La literatura castillana dans L’*Index Espagnol*

de 1559," in Agustín Redondo, ed., *L'Humanisme dans les lettres Espagnoles*. (París: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1979), 205–15; See also his edition of the *Index* (1984). In addition, see Ángel Alcalá, *Literatura y Ciencia ante la Inquisición Española* (Madrid: Ediciones Laberinto, 2001). For the study of the Inquisition's impact on Spanish culture see the excellent work of Manuel Peña Díez, "Inquisición y cultura en la España Moderna (Siglos XVI y XVII) in *Historia Social*, 32 (1998): 117–32. Finally, for an example of historical revisionism see H. Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition. A Historical Revision* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997). I profoundly disagree with Kamen's revisionist approach.

25. *Gamaliel and Caballería Celestial* had been publicly banned and declared heretic during an *auto de fe* in Valladolid (January 2nd, 1558) by order of the Inquisition. The list of books burned at this auto can be found in Martínez Millán, "El catálogo," 200–2, as well as in Martínez Bujanda *Index*, 102–3. For the impact of the Inquisition on Spanish theater see Antonio Márquez, "La Censura Inquisitorial del Teatro Renacentista" in Joaquín Pérez Villanueva (dir.), *La Inquisición Española. Nueva visión, nuevos horizontes* (Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1980), 593–603.

26. For a most interesting analysis of this social process in the context of the book and manuscript circulation, see Fernando Bouza, *Corre manuscrito. Una historia cultural del Siglo de Oro* (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2001), 215–39.

27. Millán "El catálogo," 208.

28. See Julio Cejador y Frauca's "Introduction" to his edition of *La Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1914).

29. I have worked directly with the volume of *Lazarillo Castigado* housed in the Hispanic Society of America. *Lazarillo* starts on page 373. The volume, from the library of the Marqués de Jerez de los Caballeros, also includes a censored version of *Propalladia*, the complete dramatic work by Bartolomé de Torres Naharro also banned in 1559. Although the Licencia and the Privilegio mention the works of Cristóbal de Castillejo, these are not included in the volume.

30. See Virgilio Pinto Crespo, *Inquisición y control ideológico en la España del siglo XVI* (Madrid: Taurus, 1983), 46.

31. "no era solo lo que los censores creían que decía el texto sino, lo que estos censores suponían que iban a interpretar los lectores." [it was not only a matter of what the censors thought that the text meant, but also a matter of what the readers might interpret.] Manuel Peña Díez, "Inquisición y Cultura en la España Moderna," *Historia Social* 32 (2002): 101.

32. *Lazarillo Castigado* (1573), 374. Note that López de Velasco referred to the two novels as 'primera' and 'segunda parte,' using exactly the same expression we found in Valdés' *Index*.

33. There are some exceptions. Gonzalo Santonja has recently published a modern edition entitled *Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes Castigado o Lazarillo de la Inquisición* (Madrid: España Nuevo Milenio, 2000). See also Harry Sieber, "Literary continuity," 143–65. Also Agustín Redondo, "Censura, literatura y transgresión en la época de Felipe II: *El Lazarillo Castigado* de 1573," in *Edad de Oro*, 18, (1999): 135–49. I have found differences between Santonja's text and the 1573 edition that I have used. I have also found important discrepancies between the *Castigado* described by Harry Sieber and the 1573 volume kept in the Hispanic Society of America. Interestingly, while Redondo and Santonja state that López de Velasco's censorship was of a moderate and benign nature, Sieber stresses the importance of López de Velasco's textual interventions. I suspect that Redondo, Santonja, and Sieber worked with

different editions of the *Lazarillo Castigado*. Furthermore, as stated in note 34, the three critics seem to have overlooked one of the most interesting features of López de Velasco's "editing job."

34. Aldo Ruffinato is an exception.

35. This important textual intervention has gone curiously unnoticed by critics, including those who have focused their attention in the *Castigado* such as Sieber and Santonja. See note 32.

36. Alemán's *Guzmán de Alfarache* and Quevedo's *Buscón* are good examples of the political use of the 'picaresque' in its most conservative vein. A rather different understanding of the right use of the means of symbolic interpretation of reality might help explain Cervantes's curious treatment of Ginés de Pasamonte (author of his own *Life*) in *Don Quixote*. For a preliminary approach of the tensions between Cervantes and the picaresque, see Reyes Coll-Tellechea. "El Quijote de Avellaneda. Espacio para un libro," *Anuario de Estudios Cervantinos*, 5 (2009): 233–44.

WORKS CITED

- Alcalá, Angel. *Literatura y Ciencia ante la Inquisición Española*. Madrid: Ediciones Laberinto, 2001.
- Bataillon, Marcel. *El Sentido de Lazarillo de Tormes*. Paris-Toulouse: Librerie des Editions Espagnoles, 1954.
- . *Lazarillo de Tormes*. Salamanca: Anaya, 1968.
- Beckman, Pierina. *El valor literario del Lázaro de 1555: género, evolución y metamorfosis*. New York: Peter Lang, 1991.
- Bouza, Fernando. *Corre Manuscrito. Una Historia Cultural del Siglo de Oro*. Madrid: Siglo XXI, 2001.
- Brownlee, Marina. "Generic Expansion and Generic Subversion: The two continuations of *Lazarillo de Tormes*." *Philological Quarterly* 61 (1982): 317–27.
- Castro, Américo. *Hacia Cervantes*. Madrid: Taurus, 1957.
- Catalogus Librorum. Facsimile edition, in *Tres Indices Expurgatorios de la Inquisición Española en el Siglo XVI*. 1952. Madrid: Real Academia, 1559.
- Chartier, Roger. *Inscription and Erasure. Literature and Written Culture from the Eleventh to the Eighteenth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Coll-Tellechea, Reyes. "El Quijote de Avellaneda. Espacio para un libro." In *Anuario de Estudios Cervantinos* 5 (2009): 233–44.
- Escanell Bonet, Bartolomé. "Sobre las adaptaciones de la Inquisición al contexto ideológico del siglo XVI." In *Política, Religión e Inquisición en la España Moderna*, edited by J. Fernández Albadalejo, José Martínez Millán, and Virgilio Pinto Crespo, 253–66. Madrid: Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1996.
- Ferrer-Chivite, Manuel. *La Segunda Parte del Lazarillo de Tormes y de sus fortunas y adversidades* (1555). Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1993.
- Gonzalez Novalín, José Luis. *El Inquisidor General Fernando de Valdés (1483–1568)*. Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo, 1968.

- Kamen, Henry. *The Spanish Inquisition. A Historical Revision*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997.
- La Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes y de sus fortunas y adversidades* (1554). Edited by Reyes Coll-Tellechea and Anthony Zahareas. Madrid: Akal, 2000.
- La Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes y de sus fortunas y adversidades*. Primera y Segunda parte. Antwerp: Martín Nucio, 1554–55.
- Lazarillo de Tormes Castigado*. Edited by Juan López de Velasco. Madrid: Pierres Cosin, 1573.
- Lazarillo de Tormes*. Translated from Spanish by Michael Alpert in *Two Spanish Picaresque Novels*. London: Penguin, 1969, 7–79.
- Márquez, Antonio. “La censura inquisitorial del teatro renacentista.” In *La Inquisición Española. Nueva visión, nuevos horizontes*, edited by Joaquín Pérez Villanueva Madrid: Siglo XXI, 1980.
- Márquez Villanueva, Francisco. “La actitud espiritual en el *Lazarillo de Tormes*.” In *Espiritualidad y Literatura*, 70–137. Madrid: Alfaguara, 1968.
- Martínez Bujanda, Jesús. “La literature castellaine dan L’Index Espagnol de 1559.” In *L’Humanisme dans les lettres Espagnoles*, 205–15, edited by Agustín Redondo. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1979.
- . *Index de l’Inquisition Espagnole 1551, 1554, 1559*. Sherbrooke: Center d’Etudes de la Renaissance, 1984.
- Martínez Millán, José, ed., *Instituciones y Elites de Poder en la Monarquía Hispana durante el siglo XVI*. Madrid: Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1992.
- . *La hacienda de la Inquisición. 1478–1700*. Madrid: Centro Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1984.
- . “Las Fuentes impresas para el estudio de la censura inquisitorial.” In *Historia de la Inquisición en España y América*, 156–57, edited by Pérez Villanueva and Bartolomé Escandel, 1984.
- . 1979. “El catálogo de libros prohibidos de 1559.” *Miscelánea Comillas*: 179–217.
- McGann, Jerome. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 1992.
- McKenzie, Donald Francis. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. London: The British Library, 1986.
- Peña Díez, Manuel. “Inquisición y Cultura en la España Moderna (siglos XVI y XVII).” *Historia Social* 32 (2002): 117–32.
- Pérez Villanueva, Joaquín and Bartolomé Escandel Bonet, eds. *Historia de la Inquisición en España y América*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Inquisitoriales, 1984.
- Pizarro Llorente, Henar. “Las relaciones de patronazgo a través de los inquisidores de Valladolid durante el siglo XVI.” In Martínez Millán, 226.
- Piñero, Pedro. *Segunda parte del Lazarillo* (1555) Madrid: Cátedra, 1998.
- Pinto Crespo, Virgilio. *Inquisición y control ideológico en la España del siglo XVI*. Madrid: Taurus, 1983.
- Poole, Standford. *Juan de Ovando. Governing the Spanish Empire in the Reign of Philip II*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004.

- Redondo, Agustín. 1999. “Censura, literatura y transgresión en la época de Felipe II: *El Lazarillo Castigado* de 1573.” *Edad de Oro* 18 (1999): 135–49.
- Ruffinatto, Aldo. “Algo más sobre el *Lazarillo Castigado* de López de Velasco.” *Incipit* 25–26 (2006): 523–36.
- . *Las dos caras del Lazarillo. Texto y Mensaje*. Madrid: Castalia, 2000.
- Rumeau, Aristide. “Notes au ‘Lazarillo’: les éditions d’Anvers, 1554–1555 de *La Vida de Lazarillo et de la Segunda Parte*” *Bulletin Hispanique* 66 (1964): 272–93.
- Santonja, Gonzalo. *Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes Castigado o Lazarillo de la Inquisición*. Madrid: España Nuevo Milenio, 2000.
- Sieber, Harry. “Literary Continuity, Social Order, and the Invention of the Picaresque.” In *Cultural Authority in Golden Age Spain*, edited by Marina Brownlee and G. Gumbrecht, 143–65. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.
- Zwez, Richard. *Hacia la revalorización de la Segunda Parte del Lazarillo (1555)*. Valencia: Ediciones Albatros, 1970.