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Anecdotes of Bastardy in Andrés Bello’s *Gesta de Mio Cid* and Regulations for Illegitimacy in His *Código Civil*: Authorial Correlations

ANGELA N. DELUTIS-EICHENBERGER
DICKINSON COLLEGE

Amidst the rumbles of an impending revolution in Venezuela, on July 10, 1810, the H.M.S. Wellington docked in Portsmouth and Andrés Bello, alongside Luis López Méndez and Simón Bolívar, proceeded to London as part of a commission representing the Caracas Junta. For Bello, the anticipated brief visit to the English capital extended into a prolonged nineteen-year residency that left an indelible mark on his literary studies in medieval literature and his jurisprudence that he would more fully cultivate in Chile in the post-independence era. An encounter with Thomas Antonio Sánchez’s edition of the Poema de Mío Cid (PMC) inspired the creation of Bello’s own edition of the gest that curiously skirted tales of illegitimacy surrounding the Cid’s birth and the contested status of his daughters. Fostering his acquaintance with Roman law practices that had previously informed Alfonso X el Sabio’s *Siete Partidas*, Bello’s Cidian studies also facilitated his erudition on the Castilian law code that would come to serve as a primary source for the *Código Civil de la República de Chile*. The Civil Code, forged largely under Bello’s direction in Santiago, notably instituted voluntary parental recognition of illegitimate offspring and abolished paternity suits, thus strengthening the legal weight of the fathers’ will through contract regarding their desire to establish or reject ties to illegitimate kin.1 As it is well known that Bello himself was conceived prior to his parents’ marital union and since it has been speculated that he fathered at least one illegitimate child, Bello’s treatment of the anecdotes of the Cid’s bastardy in his posthumous edition of the medieval gest and the regulations stipulated for illegitimate children in the Civil Code gain rather insightful significance when read concomitantly with the related aspects of Bello’s own alleged biography. The thematic dialogue between Bello’s Cidian studies and the Code, gleaned through the rereading of Bello’s birth, his supposed illicit affairs and related progeny (be these latter biographical points fabricated or not), contributes to the analysis of both bodies of work and the

1 On the influence of London on Bello’s legal thought, see Ávila Martel, “Londres.” Regarding Roman law, see Ávila Martel, “Bello y el Derecho Romano” and Schipani. On the Civil Code, see Urquieta. In Santiago, Bello owned a copy of Sánchez’s edition of the *PMC* and López de Tovar’s edition of the *Siete Partidas* (Velleman 209, 254).
interpretation of Bello as an introspective literary and legal scholar beset by private concerns.

From 1810 until at least 1813, Bello resided in Francisco de Miranda’s home on Grafton Street, which afforded him access to Miranda’s substantial library of some six thousand works (Jaksic 33; Grases, “Estudio preliminar” xxx; “Prólogo” 6). As the second catalogue from an auction of Miranda’s books conducted in 1833 suggests, the library was equipped with the four-volume Colección de poesías castellanas anteriores al siglo XV (1779) by Sánchez, whose first volume contained the only edition of the PMC in existence at that time (Deyermond, “Sánchez’s Colección” 175–76; Grases, “Estudio preliminar” xxi; Uslar Pietri 25). It also held a three-volume set of Alfonso X’s Siete Partidas, glossed by Gregorio López and published in Madrid in 1611 (Uslar Pietri 41).2 Having presumably examined Sánchez’s text first in Miranda’s library, Bello continued to expound upon his early medieval scholarship through research conducted in the British Museum, as is evidenced by his first known “Reader’s Tickets” dated from 1814 (Grases, “Estudio preliminar” xxxii, xxxiv; Jaksic 48–50). The Museum provided Bello with ready access to additional sources: the Historia Roderici (printed by Risco in 1792), the Crónica del Cid (also known as the Crónica particular, published in 1512 by Juan de Velorado), several manuscripts of French chansons de geste, fueros, and legal codes (Smith, “Los trabajos” 62–63).

Bello considered Sánchez’s text to be in a “lastimoso estado de corrupción” and sought to create a new edition of the PMC by revising the content of Sánchez’s work (Bello 7: 5). He reverted to the only chronicle that he knew in its entirety in London, Velorado’s Crónica del Cid, since he believed that the poem, among other compositions, had previously formed part of the chronicle. As Bello reasoned that the poem had originally traced the Cid’s complete life, he concluded that the Crónica embodied substantial material that could be utilized to resupply the gest with additional sections about the Cid until his exile that had been lost or omitted, while glossing others that had been preserved (Bello 7: 28–29).3 Although Bello never completed or published a finalized edition of the poem during his lifetime despite various attempts, his work on the Cid continued sporadically until his death in Santiago in 1865. A posthumous edition

---

2 In “La urgente presencia de Las Siete Partidas,” Jesús D. Rodríguez-Velasco considers Alfonso’s Siete Partidas as subject to processes of rewriting, emission, and promulgation, which were affected by modes of limitation, during critical moments of political urgency. As the author points out, the Partidas, capable of generating a metonym of the monarch and in turn, his government and power, were glossed by the President of the Consejo de Indias, Gregorio López, in 1555, during a significant moment in the stabilization of monarchical power. For Rodríguez-Velasco, López’s edition stemmed from a specific, political objective: “la edición se ha configurado para poder ser leída y usada por todas las posesiones imperiales en Europa y para exponer las tesis sobre el imperio español en el resto del mundo” (123). With this legal and political aim in place, through his utilization of the text, López formed a link between the ideas of war and conquest in the Christian regions of Castile during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and the rationalizations used to juridically justify the conquest in Spanish America (125).

3 Sánchez noted a relationship between the chronicles and the PMC before Bello, but he appeared uncertain of his assertions and did not exploit the association to reconstruct missing portions of the gest (Grases, “Estudio preliminar” cii–ciii).
edited by Baldomero Pizarro appeared as volume II of Bello’s *Obras completas* in 1881, marking the centenary of his birth. It commenced with an introductory note written by Pizarro (“El Corrector de Pruebas”), and it proceeded with a prologue, selections that Bello extracted from the *Crónica* (“Relación de los hechos del Cid anteriores a su destierro, sacada de la Crónica del Cid”), Bello’s notes to the chronicle, “La Gesta de Mio Cid, poema castellano del siglo XIII. Nueva edición corregida e ilustrada por Don Andrés Bello,” his notes to the poem, two appendices (“Apuntes sobre el estado de la lengua castellana en el siglo XIII” and “Origen de la epopeya romancesca”), and a glossary. According to Pizarro, the selections from the *Crónica*, which Bello had encountered as he worked in the British Museum, and his associated notes were the only portions of the volume that Bello had definitively completed. He had purportedly redacted those sections in 1857 with the intention of publishing them as a monograph, and he altered them once more in 1862 in hopes that they would be published as part of his edition (viii).

The insinuation of the Cid’s bastardy, which Bello frequently evaded in his commentary of the chronicle and the gest, may be perceived in the slur issued by a legal opponent of the Cid in the poem, Ansür González, in his defense of the wayward infantes de Carrión. Following the betrothal and marriage of the Cid’s daughters to the infantes as recommended by Alfonso VI, the infantes beat and dishonored their wives in Corpes as though they were concubines (*barraganas*). By injuring doña Elvira and doña Sol, the infantes violated their vow pledged in court and in the marriage ceremonies to accept the Cid’s daughters as legitimate spouses (Duggan, *The Cantar* 45). In accordance with the *Siete Partidas* that labeled a breaker of promises as *enfamado*, the infantes were subject to the Cid’s accusations of *menosvaler* during the court scene in Toledo (verses 3314–26) (Bello 7: 175). If found guilty, the infantes would tumble to the societal level of *juglares*, pimps, bastards and usurers, and they would consequently lose the privileges associated with their birth status. On the other hand, should the relationship between the Cid’s daughters and the infantes be deemed one of *barraganía*, the infantes’ conduct could be somewhat exonerated since a man could terminate such a union without the need of a formal ceremony (Duggan, *The Cantar* 45).

---

1 For more on Bello and the Cid, see Amunátegui (149–76). For a more contemporary study, see Grases, “Estudio preliminar,” where he discusses Bello’s failed attempts to publish his edition, as well as the successful publication of the 1881 edition.

2 Bello’s posthumous edition of the poem, which consists of 3795 verses, is cited throughout this study unless otherwise specified.

3 According to the *Partidas* 7.6.4, “otro son enfamados los usureros, e todos aquellos q(ue) quebrantan pleyto, o postura que ouiessen jurado de guardar. E todos los que fazen pecado con(n)tra natura.” On the Cid’s right to issue *rieptos*, see “A Reappraisal of the Closing Scenes of the Poema de Mio Cid I: The Rieptos” by Pavlović and Walker.

4 As illustrated by the *Partidas* 7.5.1, “e menos valer es cosa, q(ue) el ome q(ue) cae en ello, non es par de otro en corte de señor, nin en juyzio: e tiene grand daño alos que caen en tal yerro. Ca non pueden dende en adelante ser pares de otros en lid, nin fazer acusamiento, nin en testimonio, nin en las otra ho(n)tras en q(ue) buenos omes deue(n) ser escogidos.”
of the Cid’s daughters, Elvira and Sol had not been worthy to serve as the infantes’ legitimate wives nor as their concubines (3332–33).8 Although his allegations were not admissible because García Ordoñez was enfamado over a separate affair and therefore unable to issue accusations in court under the Siete Partidas, Fernando and Diego continued to emphasize their own social predominance over Elvira and Sol by criticizing the Cid’s status and exalting their own (3353–57; 3411–19).9 Fernando’s comments ignited a response from Pero Bermúdez in support of his cousins (3363–410), while Martín Antolínez similarly sought to vindicate the women, decrying the infantes’ cowardly behavior to counter arguments presented by Diego (3420–30).10 A subsequent slight uttered by the infantes’ older brother Ansur González (3436–40) disputed the Cid’s legitimacy:

«Hia varones! ¿quién vío nunca tal mal?
«¿Quién nos daríe nuevas de Mio Cid el de Bivar?
«¿Fúese a Rio d’ Ovrina los molinos picar,
«E prender maquilas, como lo suele far?
«¿Qui 1’ daríe con los de Carrion a casar?». (3436–40)11

As Joseph J. Duggan and Stephen B. Raulston have argued, Ansur González’s rhetorical questions cast the Cid as a bastard through the Cid’s alleged genealogical association with a miller—a grievous insult of infamy that would have rendered the Cid’s daughters unworthy by inheritance (Duggan, The Cantar 47–49).12 This explanation of Ansur González’s interrogations resonates with anecdotes of the Cid’s bastardy included in other texts. Building on the accounts of the Cid’s illegitimacy mentioned, albeit negated, in previous chronicles such as the Crónica geral de España de 1344 (sic) and the Tercera crónica general, the second chapter of the Crónica del Cid explained that a peasant fell pregnant after Diego Lainez had raped her (“E travó d ella, e yogy con ella por fuerça”), and she was impregnated once more after having intercourse with her husband on the same day (Huber 9). She begot two sons. As the Crónica clarified, the first, the son of Diego Lainez, was named Fernando Díaz, not Rodrigo: “quando vino al tiempo del acaescimiento nascio primero el fijo del cavallero, e bautizaronlo, e pusieronle por nombre Fernando Diez. Los que non saben la historia, dizen que este fue´ mio Cid Ruy Diez, mas en esto yerran” (Duggan, The Cantar 50; Huber 9).

8 See Bello 7: 175; Duggan, The Cantar 45; Alfonso X 4.14.3.
9 Bello 7: 176–77.
10 Bello 7: 176–78; Duggan, The Cantar 46–47.
11 Bello 7: 178.
12 For other interpretations of this passage, see the note to verse 3379 of Michael (292), and the notes to verses 3377–80 of Montaner (299, 663–65). See also Zaderenko, “Psicología,” where the author aligns herself with Montaner’s position (143), and Lacarra, “Reflexiones,” where the author reviews Duggan’s book and offers divergent insights on the matter. Despite the varying rationalizations of Ansur González’s questions, their possible reading as an insult of illegitimacy is pertinent to this study, since Bello was familiar with the Crónica del Cid that alluded to the Cid’s questionable lineage on multiple occasions.
Another version of the Cid’s lineage was refuted at the end of the same chronicle, this time dispelling accounts that the Cid’s mother was the wife of a miller. After reiterating components of the genealogy described in the second chapter and expounding upon certain branches, the rumor was contested: “E por que algunos que no han leydo la cronica del Cid: piensan que este don Diego laynez ovo al Cid ruydiaz en una molinera. sepan que no es assi: antes es como en este capitulo se ha dicho, y la declaracion desto mas cumplida hallar la han en el j. capitulo desta cronica del Cid” (Duggan, The Cantar 50; López de Velorado ciíii). Despite such refutations, if the Cid’s birth had resulted from a rape or from an adulterous union—and, therefore, if Ansur González’s insult in the poem was to be believed as interpreted by Duggan and Raulston—, the Cid would have been deemed illegitimate (specifically an hijo fornezino) in accordance with the forms of illegitimacy outlined in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Spanish law codes (Duggan, The Cantar 52–53). He could not have acquired a status of nobility, under the Partidas he would have been enfamado and barred from participating in the court sessions or judicial battles, and his daughters, as descendants of an illegitimate father, would have been considered undeserving of the infantes (53).15

Given Bello’s extensive knowledge of the Crónica del Cid, he was undoubtedly familiar with the accounts of bastardy that surrounded the hero’s life, despite not having fully addressed the subject.14 In fact, in his edition of the abbreviated form of the Crónica the omission of the episode related to the legitimacy question is quite blatant. The majority of the fragments that he transcribed to represent the chronicle’s first two chapters were lifted from the second chapter of Velorado’s text, which described the birth of Fernando Díaz as the result of Diego Lañez’s violation of a married peasant woman and emphasized that the Cid should not be confused with Fernando Díaz in that regard. Bello maintained the opening fragment from the second chapter that stated that the Cid’s ancestry should be known,15 yet he omitted the other portions of that chapter that would have clarified the identity of the Cid’s mother, as well as the others that suggested, albeit subsequently negated, the Cid’s possible bastardy—as stated in the chronicle.16 In his selection of the chronicle, Bello merely restated that the Cid

15 As stated in the Partidas 4.13, “entre todos los bienes que diximos enlos titulos ante deste que son enel matrimonio: es uno dellos: q(ue) los fijos q(ue) nascen del son derechureros, e fechos segund ley”; while, on the contrary and in accordance with the Partidas 7.6.2, “enfamado es de fecho aquel que non nasce de casamiento derecho, segund manda santa Eglesia.” For more on the Cid’s supposed illegitimacy, see Duggan, “A False Sentencia” and Armistead.

14 From 1857 forward, Bello was clearly knowledgeable of the 1844 edition of Huber’s Chronica, which he cited in his first note to the chronicle (Bello 7: 55). According to Pizarro: “este ejemplar de la Crónica del Cid [el de Huber] es probablemente el único que existe en Chile. Por lo que toca a la Crónica General, . . . no existe en nuestro país ejemplar alguno, según creo” (viii).

16 “[D]espues que Diego Laynez se embraçó con la villana, casó con doña Teresa Nuñez, fíja del Conde Nuño Alvarez de Amaya, e ovo en ella a este Rodrigo” (Huber 9).
was a descendent of Lain Calvo and Fernán Laínez; that is, there was no mention of Diego Laínez. However, the latter did appear in Bello’s note to verse 70 of the poem that primarily discussed the lineage of Martín Antolínez and addressed his relationship to the Cid. There, Bello reiterated key portions of the chronicle’s second chapter that he did not copy in his selections extracted from that chapter, signaling that according to the chronicle Fernando Díaz was born from the encounter between Diego Laínez and a labradora from Burgos. He explained that Fernando Díaz married a daughter of Antón Antolínez, and she bore Martín Antolínez, establishing the latter as the Cid’s nephew. Although Bello challenged the veracity of that representation, pointing out that in eleventh-century Castile the last names derived from the paternal line instead of the maternal one, and contested the portrayal of Alvar Salvadórez’s lineage in the same note, he did not explicitly delve into the claims of illegitimacy surrounding the birth of the Cid (Bello 7: 83, 196). Similarly, in his note to the chronicle’s second chapter, which Bello subtitled “Genealogía del Cid,” he again made no mention of the Cid’s possible illegitimacy, although he confessed that the precise year of the Cid’s birth was uncertain. He copied the description of the Cid’s lineage as presented by Risco in the Appendices of his Castilla, having consulted also Sandoval’s Cinco Reyes, Berganza’s Antiguidades and Flórez’s Reinas Católicas (tomo I), and affirmed that “acerca de su genealogía no puede suscitarse duda razonable” (61). Citing Risco, Bello followed the Cid’s lineage from Lain Calvo to Diego Laínez without discussing the birth of Fernando Díaz and his confusion with the Cid that the chronicle took measures to clarify: “Lain Nueñez ovo fillo a Diego Laínez, el padre de Rodric Diaz el Campiador. Diac Laínez priso muller filla de Roy Alvarez de Asturias” (61). Rather, Bello continued to explain that the Cid was linked to Fernán González, another hero of the romanceros, and Diego Porcelos, the founder of Burgos, and he mentioned that poets often connected the Cid’s genealogy with that of the imaginary siete infantes de Lara (61–62). Furthermore, in the note to chapter 19 of the chronicle, in which he analyzed the phrase, “e estonce mando el Rey que le dixesen ruy diez mio cid,” Bello again failed to address the possibility of the Cid as Diego Laínez’s illegitimate offspring and simply explained that Rodrigo did not have to be armed a knight to acquire the name “Diez”—being the son of Diego Laínez was sufficient (65). With respect to Ansur González’s slur that bore so much importance for Duggan and Raulston, Bello opted not to analyze the potential affront in his note to verse 3438 of the poem, and rather averred that according to the chronicles and the “antiguos cantares,” the Cid’s family, “como pobres infanzones que eran,” relied on farming near the Ovierna river for sustenance (178, 256). The account of the miller’s wife mentioned in the Crónica was also omitted from Bello’s selections of the chronicle and ignored in his notes.

In spite of these omissions, Bello still lent attention to the question of illegitimate offspring. In his examination of the representations of the infantes de Carrion and the Cid’s daughters, Bello’s cognizance of Elvira and Sol’s potentially
questionable status in the gest appears evident, as he emphasized their legitimacy in his commentary. In Bello’s note to the chronicle’s fourth chapter, Bello claimed that the infantes’ treatment of the Cid’s daughters in the poem not as legitimate spouses but as barraganas would seem illogical if Jimena’s possible noble descent (as the daughter of the conde de Asturias, for example), ignored by the poet, was taken into account (62–64). In this way, Jimena’s background could have helped to justify that Rodrigo was not a mere illegitimate son without honor. Likewise, Bello concluded his study of verse 2119 of the poem with the assertion that “Elvira, pues, y Sol son, propiamente hablando, las hijas de doña Jimena Gómez, las verdaderas y legítimas esposas de los Infantes de Carrión: Illi habeant secum, serventque sepulcro,” which would insinuate that their lineage, and presumably that of the Cid, was uncontaminated (240; my emphasis). Additionally, as Alberto Montaner has pointed out in his commentary to verses 2759–60 of his more contemporary edition of the PMC, the two verses, “non las deviemos tomar por varraganas / si non fuéssemos rogados,” appeared separate in the manuscript, which left the first without rhyme and the second without caesura (267, 362–363; my emphasis). Bello combined the two by eliminating the phrase, “por varraganas.”19 In a note accompanying the corresponding verse numbered 2807 in Bello’s edition, Bello explained his reasoning for the omission: “Por barraganas es, a mi parecer, interpolación, porque nadie pudo rogar a los Infantes que tomasen a las hijas del Cid por barraganas” (7: 162, 248). Despite deeming the inclusion of the phrase as mere interpolation, the consideration of barraganía implied that the Cid’s daughters were at least eligible to be the infantes’ concubines, also defined as mancebas in Bello’s glossary (273).20 This interpretation, reinforced by Bello’s commentary of the chronicle’s fourth chapter, would render faulty the insinuation tied to García Ordóñez’s remarks in the poem that regarded Elvira and Sol as unworthy of a concubinage with the infantes due to their social status. Bello did not specifically comment upon those remarks in his notes to the poem, focusing instead on verses 3329 and 3345, and skipping verses 3332 and 3333 where the remarks occurred (175, 254).

Bello’s study of the Cortes de Toledo scene in the PMC not only raises questions regarding his handling of the protagonist’s possible illegitimacy and the status of his daughters, but also serves as Bello’s first recognized encounter with Roman law, an area that he would explore more explicitly and firmly endorse during his Chilean years (Jaksic 52).21 Bearing his copious notes on the Cid that

19 Michael also cited the suppression. See the note to verses 2759–60 of his edition (371).
20 For the historicity surrounding the infantes de Carrión, the Cid’s daughters, and the infantes de Navarra y Aragón, see Bello’s prologue and his notes to verses 1395, 2119, 3501, 3773, and 3784 (7: 18, 233–34, 239–40, 257–63). As Pizarro noted, Bello addressed the Cid’s daughters and their relationships in articles published in El Araucano in 1834, in El Crepusculo in 1843, and in the Anales de la Universidad de Chile in 1852 (xxiii).
21 Many scholars have analyzed the legal facets present in the poem as well as the influence of Roman law. See Zahareas; Pavlović and Roger M. Walker, “Roman Forensic Procedure,” “Money, Marriage and the Law,” “A Reappraisal of the Closing Scenes of the Poema de Mio Cid I,” and “A Reappraisal of the Closing Scenes of the Poema de Mio Cid II”; Zaderenko, “El procedimiento judicial de riepto.” Smith’s deductions, supported by Pavlović and Walker, that posit the poet who devised the afrenta de Corpes as a practicing lawyer would lend credence to the claims of Roman law influence in the gest, since the poet under that
he had maintained in England, Bello departed from London in 1829 after securing an appointment at the level of Oficial Mayor to one of the ministries in Santiago (Amunátegui 324–25; Jaksić 91). Among other tasks fulfilled in his adopted country, Bello instructed students on Roman law and debated such naysayers as outspoken federalist José Miguel Infante on its importance. He participated in the revision of the curriculum of the Instituto Nacional to emphasize the significance of Roman law, and he sought to secure its prominence through the support of the University of Chile. He received a degree in canon and civil law from the University of San Felipe (1836) and penned Instituciones de Derecho Romano, published in 1843 with a revised edition in 1849. Finally, he worked to develop the country’s Código Civil (Amunátegui 344–48, 452–64, 638–48; Ávila Martel, “Bello y el Derecho Romano” 86–92; Jaksić 110–14, 128–29, 156–57, 162–63).

Shortly after his arrival to Santiago, Bello became directly involved in the massive task of the codification of civil legislation, an undertaking that he came to view as a modification of the existing Spanish and colonial legislation in Chile, rather than a complete renovation of the prevailing system and the implementation of a new one. Although the need for legal reform had been widely acknowledged since the early 1820s, the manner in which the feat would be achieved did not enjoy a consensus and the divergent opinions consequently stalled the process (Jaksić 156–57). In 1831, under the Portalian regime, the Chamber of Deputies recommended the reform of the laws to benefit the administration of the state. In response, a memorandum to the Senate signed by Fernando Errázuriz proposed a total reorganization of the laws, petitioning Congress to allow the government to select one person to create the plan for reform (Amunátegui 638; Jaksić 158). Two years later, in an effort to hasten Congress’s decision, President Prieto offered a speech, written by Bello, that recognized the value of a compilation of existing laws instead of their complete reformulation (Jaksić 158–59). Congress approved the request but indicated that a committee would be responsible for the compilation of the laws currently in use instead of an individual—a position that Bello also supported (Amunátegui 639–40; Jaksić 159). After the Chamber of Deputies directed the approved bill to the Senate in 1834, where action on the matter had halted, Bello began to craft portions of the Civil Code at the request of Diego Portales. As he addressed the articles on wills and intestate succession, he realized that a more extensive reform beyond compilation was necessary (Jaksić 162–63). Having already completed a substantial portion of the Code, in August 1840 Bello wrote a bill seeking to create a profession would have been trained in Roman law (Pavlović and Walker, “Roman Forensic Procedure” 97, 104; Smith, Estudios 65–85). On the author’s legal knowledge, see also Deyermond, A Literary History of Spain (45), and Lacarra, “El Poema de Mío Cid” (92) and El Poema de Mío Cid (96–102). Not all scholars concur on the author’s background (Hook). For an opposing view that challenges the representation of the poet as particularly skilled in law, see Duggan, “Formulaic Diction.”

Bello had studied philosophy and earned a Bachelor of Arts degree from the Royal and Pontifical University of Caracas in 1800. He also studied law and medicine but did not complete the formal training in those fields from that institution (Jaksić 5–6).

On Diego Portales and his political involvement in the “Conservative settlement” of the 1830s, see Collier and Sater (51–69).
bicameral committee tasked with the Code’s continued redaction. By the following month both chambers of Congress approved the bill and Prieto signed it into law. Bello, who was elected senator in 1837, was designated as one of the committee’s members and maintained a decisive role in the project’s fruition, especially as, over time, committee members began to meet inconsistently, if at all. Twelve years later, under President Manuel Montt’s administration, Bello presented a comprehensive draft of the Civil Code to the government that was subsequently analyzed by a new committee including the Supreme Court President, court justices, law and political science faculty members, and Bello. The draft was amended by Bello under the guidance of the committee according to a series of recommendations received during the twenty-seven month review process (Amunátegui 641, 644; Jaksić 163–65; Urquieta xxvi). On November 22, 1855, the revised Civil Code proposal was sent to Congress along with a presidential message penned by Bello, “Exposición de motivos,” that included several references to the Partidas, and whose contents were further developed in the body of the Civil Code. The Code was comprised of a “Título Preliminar” and a body of additional articles divided among four books: I: “De las personas”; II: “De los bienes, y de su dominio, posesión, uso y goce”; III: “De la sucesión por causa de muerte, y de las donaciones entre vivos”; and IV: “De las obligaciones en general y de los contratos.” Interestingly, one of the most complete portions of the Code was I.8.202–18, entitled “De los hijos legitimados por matrimonio posterior a la concepción” (Bello 14: 162–73). The Code was promulgated as law in 1855, revised again by Bello in 1856, and implemented in Chile in 1857 (Amunátegui 644–48; Jaksić 168; Urquieta xxvii). In the post-independence era, when most Spanish American nations still followed the inherited prevailing Spanish legislation, the new republics struggled to encounter a better resolution
for their legal affairs. With a foundation in Roman law, however, the Chilean Civil Code would come to be deemed by many as a source worthy of adoption, adaptation or, in the very least, consideration for the writing of the other Spanish American codes (Jaksic 174–76; Milanich 43; Urquieta xliii–xliv).26

Written in a decade when over twenty percent of children in Chile were born out of wedlock, the “Exposición de motivos” recapitulated the determined classification of children that was primarily based on birth status, thus reflecting the general social significance of legitimation issues.27 It explained that there were specific categories: legitimate, natural, or simply illegitimate children (Bello 14: 6; Milanich 15–16). Referring to Roman law regulations, Bello recalled that under that legal system, a written document was required of a man who married his concubine to legitimize specific children that she had borne to him and to characterize the woman as a legitimate wife. As a result, the father could voluntarily legitimize a designated child of his concubine, though reciprocally, the child was required to consent to the legitimization (Bello 14: 6). In “Exposición,” Bello confirmed that these conditions of legitimation established by public instrument and legitimation, willingly offered and accepted, were implemented in the Civil Code and were applicable except in two cases: the child conceived prior to a marriage and born within the union (as, incidentally, would have been the case for Bello) and the natural child (a status gained by legal contract for an illegitimate child formally and voluntarily recognized by the father or mother) were legitimized *ipso jure* by the subsequent marriage (Bello 14: 6; Milanich 60).28

Bello then declared that “la calidad de hijo legítimo es una de las más importantes que el derecho civil ha creado” and he included a series of rhetorical questions to illustrate its relevance:

¿Cómo, pues, dejarla a la merced de pruebas testimoniales, tan fáciles de frauguar, sino en la vida de los padres, a lo menos después de sus días? ¿Penetrará la ley en las tinieblas de esas conexiones clandestinas, y les conferirá el derecho de constituir por sí solas la presunción de paternidad, que es el privilegio del matrimonio? Un comercio carnal, vago, incierto, en que nada garantiza la fidelidad de una mujer que se ha degradado, ¿será un principio de legitimidad, aunque no lo corrobore el juicio del padre? Y suponiendo que éste cree suya la prole ilegítima, ¿será obligado a legitimar un hijo o hija de malas costumbres, y se le pondrá en la alternativa, de no casarse o

---

26 For more on the influence of Chile’s Civil Code on the codes of other Spanish American nations, see Bravo Lira. For an idea of the “laberinto legal” that characterized the laws in play in the post-independence era in Spanish America before codification, see also Urquieta (xiii–xv).

27 Several prominent men of the nineteenth century have been known to have fathered illegitimate children, including Diego Portales and Bernardo O’Higgins, who was an illegitimate child himself (Milanich 20; 251). As Nara B. Milanich has confirmed, “the impact of the new legal regime [the Civil Code] was far-reaching because out-of-wedlock birth was endemic, and people of all social classes—from statesmen and merchants to cooks and seamstresses—were potentially affected” (44).

28 See, for example, Articles 206 through 210 and Article 212 (Bello 14: 164–71).
de introducir en su familia un germen de inmoralidad y depravación? Y el hijo, por su parte, ¿irá contra su voluntad a participar del envilecimiento ajeno, y a poner la administración de sus bienes, en manos de un hombre perdido? (6–7)

As Bello’s interrogatory remarks suggest, the Civil Code outlawed paternity investigations that threatened to affect men both economically and socially by defaming them and their families for publicly revealing their supposed illicit behavior, especially since witness testimony was deemed unreliable in such affairs. The Code instead rested on voluntary parental recognition, particularly that of the father, to decide the fate of extramarital children (Milanich 53, 58). Such legal requirements reversed previous practices of pre-Code courts that ruled on paternity issues based on presented “evidence” of filiation undoubtedly tailored by cultural beliefs and practices and on the presumptions and patriarchal conscience and sympathies of the judge (45, 51–52, 64–65). Before the Code was approved and its contents were known, the alleged father’s testimony in paternity suits was considered a mere piece of evidence that could be countermanded. Mothers or their children frequently won the suits, typically gaining support or some form of inheritance if the children were legally deemed offspring of the defendant, or else they were able to settle (46–48). Under the new Code, paternity could not be proven in court. Parental recognition was voluntary, and the father’s word formally accepting or rejecting progeny in court was fully endorsed by the legal system, making further legal recourse for the mother to overturn a decision impossible (58). Although the shift in regulations in the Code era that discarded the mother’s witnesses, repressed the subjectivity of the judge, and empowered the alleged father’s voice might have negatively impacted unwed mothers, it aided married mothers in that they and their legitimate children were safeguarded from potential legal repercussions of their husbands’ extramarital offspring (64, 67). However, at the same time, the Code clearly granted remarkable liberty for men to establish their families as they pleased (67).

Echoing the code of the Partidas that “confiere la legitimación ipso jure, pero sólo al hijo de barragana, al hijo natural,” Bello also confirmed in “Exposición” that the stated stipulation was respected in the Civil Code (14: 7). As explained in 4.13.1, if a man married his concubine (or his female slave) who previously bore him a son, the child would become legitimate given the prodigious power of marriage. In the Civil Code, as defined in Article 35 of the Preliminary Title, legitimate children referred to those conceived in marriage or those legitimated by the union of their parents following conception. All other children were considered illegitimate and by Article 36 were classified as either natural, “de dañado ayuntamiento” or simply illegitimate (Bello 14: 48–49). Here the distinction between the usage of the term hijo natural in the Code and its employment in previous Iberian codes should be recognized. While medieval Spanish law

---

29 The abolition of paternity investigations was not unusual in the international scene. The 1804 French Napoleonic Code, the 1852 Spanish draft code, and other additional European codes outlawed them (Milanich 55).
viewed an *hijo natural* as “the offspring of an extramarital union by marriageable partners,” the Chilean Civil Code considered an *hijo natural* one who acquired legal recognition for that status (Milanich 60; Bello 14: 49). As explained by Nara B. Milanich, the factor of marriageability under the Civil Code was a slippery concept despite the fact that it was technically required to recognize a child as natural (261–62). For example, Article 272 allowed for the concealment of identity if only one parent recognized the child. In the case that one parent’s identity was concealed, the court was prohibited from investigating if both progenitors were eligible for marriage. In this way, the Code contradicted the espoused marriageability prerequisite, since the recognizing parent was not obligated to name the other parent (Bello 14: 205–06). Despite its illegality, wills also occasionally treated children born of adulterous unions as though they were natural ones (Milanich 262).

In “Exposición” Bello likewise emphasized the need for the formal announcement and acceptance of legitimation and indicated that similar conventions governed the voluntary recognition of children born outside of wedlock, earning them the classification of natural children and thus providing them with important rights (14: 7–8). Article 271 of the Code stipulated that the recognition was a free and voluntary act of the mother or father, and according to Article 272, the recognition must be declared by public instrument or by a testamentary act (205). Article 273 required that the recognition of the natural child be notified, accepted or rejected in the same manner as legitimation (206). Children classified as “de dañado ayuntamiento” were not eligible for recognition as natural children as per Article 270 (205). For illegitimate children that were not fortunate enough to receive recognition from their father or mother, Bello indicated that they could only request support (“alimentos”), as exemplified by Article 280 (8, 217). By Article 282, the supposed father could be summoned before a judge to declare under oath if he believed himself to be the progenitor (217).

As explained in Article 283, “si el demandado no compareciere pudiendo, y se hubiere repetido una vez la citación, expresándose el objeto, se mirará como reconocida la paternidad” (218). According to Article 284, the investigation or presumption of paternity by other measures than those presented in Articles 282 and 283 were not permissible (218). Furthermore, as demonstrated in Article 285, “alimentos” were to be provided to the child if the father’s admission was received or if his paternity was recognized under Article 283, “pero sólo en cuanto fueren necesarios para su precisa subsistencia” (8, 219).

The implications of Bello’s treatment of the bastardy question surrounding Rodrigo in the aforementioned Cidian texts and the illegitimacy and patriarchalism evident in the Civil Code become particularly striking when Bello’s own illegitimacy and the supposed fruit of his alleged amorous affairs are considered. In *Biografías de americanos* (1854), Bello’s principal Chilean biographer, Miguel Luis Amunátegui, and his brother Gregorio Víctor Amunátegui stated that Bello was born on November 30, 1780 in Caracas, a date that was commonly believed to be correct and thus subsequently perpetuated in other texts (7). After Venezuelan Aristides Rojas provided evidence disputing that claim through the verification of Bello’s baptismal certificate in the archives of the parish of Altagracia and the University of Caracas, Miguel Luis Amunátegui later rectified Bello’s
biographical information in *Vida de don Andrés Bello* (1882), though he did not fail to emphasize that it was Bello himself who had repeatedly provided him the erroneous information that was included in *Biografías* (2). Following Rojas, Amunátegui explained that Bello was born nearly one year later, on November 29, 1781 (2). The transcription of Bello’s baptismal certificate, confirming Bello’s attainment of the sacrament on December 8, 1781 and authenticating his birthdate as November 29, 1781, had appeared in Rojas’ introduction to *Colección de poesías originales de Andrés Bello* (1881) and described Bello as the “hijo legítimo” of Bartolomé Bello and Ana Antonia López (15–16). Based on parish records, his parents’ wedding ceremony took place at Ana Antonia López’s home on September 8, 1781, when Ana was a mere seventeen years of age and Bartolomé was twenty-three (Jaksic 1–2). Given these dates, Bello was conceived out of wedlock but born within his parents’ marriage (1).30 Interestingly, the birthdate that Bello had originally provided to the Amunátegui brothers in 1854, one year prior to the promulgation of the Civil Code, would have only further distanced his birth from his parents’ Church-sanctioned union. Somewhat indirectly promoting the contents of the Civil Code, the diffusion of this date through the biography illustrated, in a more emphatic manner, how an illegitimate child, specifically one legitimimized from the subsequent marriage of the child’s parents, could be, like Bello, successfully integrated into the social fabric and even into the political sphere.

What is more, anecdotes have surfaced suggesting that Bello had fathered an illegitimate child during his second marriage to Elizabeth Dunn after residing in Chile for some ten years, while others have suggested that he had fathered one during his early years in London prior to his first marriage to Mary Ann Boyland. Supported by statements issued by *jurisconsulto* Leopoldo Urrutia, who supposedly met Bello’s illegitimate son in 1878, and reaffirmed by Domingo Amunátegui, who was the son of Miguel Luis Amunátegui, Ricardo Donoso asserted in “Un hijo de Bello” (1949) that the child, bearing the same name as his father, was born around 1839, sixteen years before the promulgation of the Civil Code. According to Donoso it was believed that the child attended the Instituto Nacional, received his *bachillerato* in *leyes* in 1862, and was subsequently authorized to complete la práctica forense in the *Juzgado de Letras* of San Fernando (11). Donoso questioned the motive behind such a decision: “¿Había en esto el propósito de mantenerlo alejado del hogar del ilustre Rector de la Universidad, cargado ya de años, de merecimientos y agobiado por el general respeto público?” (11). Nevertheless, in 1866, at the age of twenty-seven, Bello’s alleged son earned his law degree. He served as a judge and successfully established himself in Valparaíso before presumably dying during the War of the Pacific (11).

Reinforcing these claims in the introduction to the first volume of *Estudios sobre Andrés Bello* (1966), entitled “Recuerdos de Andrés Bello,” Guillermo Feliú Cruz alluded to the conception of the illegitimate child mentioned by Donoso

30 See Leal for a copy of Bello’s baptismal certificate and documentation regarding his parents’ marriage that appeared as part of the paperwork required to award his university degree (13–15).
while describing several of Bello’s legitimate sons, and Carlos in particular, as quite charming: “Carlos Bello fue un afortunado de las mujeres y el padre vio en él algo de su imagen. En el mayor recato, en el sigilo más profundo, Bello fue también gustador del bello sexo, y se recuerda un hijo suyo nacido en una aventura amorosa” (xv). Feliú Cruz likewise insinuated that Bello could have fathered a child while residing in Miranda’s house in London prior to his marriage to his first wife, Mary Ann Boyland: “Una hija del General, al cuidado de esa casa y de la cual fue Bello amigo muy íntimo, hizo agradable la vida londinense al poeta. ¿Hubo algún hijo de esta amistad?” (xi). The possibility of an illegitimate child in London had also been considered by Miriam Blanco-Fombona de Hood, as seen in her correspondence with Pedro Grases from 1950. In a letter directed to Grases on June 2, she speculated on the existence of a daughter born to Bello and Mary Ann Boyland in 1811, three years prior to their wedding and during the time when Bello likely became acquainted with the PMC in Miranda’s library. After imploring that “la próxima información debe de ser tratada confidencialmente y con circunspección,” she explained that amidst the entries of the records examined in St. Aloysius, Somers Town, she located one that included the following information: “2 de julio 1811 bautizada sin ceremonia ninguna en peligro de muerte ‘fuit anonima (cognita nomina Mary Anne) Belly, filiae Ana Belly’” (143). There were no additional entries under the name “Belly,” although a consulted priest believed that the surname undoubtedly referred to Bello (143). Blanco-Fombona de Hood deduced that the phrase “cognita nomina María Ana” mentioned in the entry only referred to the mother, and that “fuit anonima” implied that the father was unknown, establishing the child as illegitimate (143). However, in a separate letter directed to Grases on June 29, she had arrived at other potential conclusions that involved Miranda’s wife: “confidencialmente es tal vez posible que Sarah Andrews haya podido ser la madre de esta niña ya que Bello en esos meses vivía en Grafton St. Esto es simplemente una idea personal, sin valor” (146). After visiting St. Aloysius again to inspect the records further, she was unable to solve the enigma surrounding María Ana Belly as indicated in a letter to Grases dated on September 11 (153). Finally, on December 10, she admitted that the identity of Mary Belly still had not been ascertained (157–58).

Other scholars have not accepted as valid the deductions of illegitimacy pertaining to Bello’s hypothetical offspring. On the anecdote propagated by Donoso, Iván Jakić has cited a lack of “conclusive evidence” on the matter (194–95). In notes accompanying the edition of Feliú Cruz’s Recuerdos de Andrés Bello published in 1980, Blanco-Fombona de Hood’s correspondent, Pedro Grases, sought to amend the inexactitudes of Feliú Cruz’s text that had initially appeared as the prologue accompanying the first volume of Estudios in 1966. Among those, Grases addressed several accounts of Bello’s suspected illegitimate offspring. Of the one supposedly fathered in Chile, he found the child’s silence and that of his descendants regarding filiation as evidence against the claim: “Parece difícil que un hijo de Andrés Bello y sus descendientes no hubieran hecho empeño —de ser cierta— en acreditar su filiación, si no jurídicamente —lo que estaba vedado— al menos socialmente” (“Notas” 49). In terms
of legal recognition, in the pre-Code era, when Bello’s son would have been born, the child would have been deemed illegitimate and “de dañado y punible ayuntamiento,” meaning he would have been ineligible for inheritance. However, the courts at that time did frequently rule that those stigmatized children could be granted natural rights to “‘a minimal level of parental support’” (Milanich 45, 49). Under Article 36 of the Preliminary Title of the Code, the child would have been classified in a similar manner—children born from adulterous relationships, along with those of incestuous and sacrilegious unions, were considered “de dañado ayuntamiento” and were barred from intestate succession (Bello 14: 49; Urquieta xxx).31 Furthermore, despite the kindred relationships that Bello plausibly nurtured with his legitimate children, Bello’s own youth was plagued by the absence of his father, prompting one to question what ramifications, if any, this might have had on his willingness to acknowledge an illegitimate child in an era when paternal investigations became prohibited under the prescriptions of the Civil Code.32 Bello’s upbringing was markedly defined by his relationship with his mother amidst his father’s frequent, extended absences beginning in 1790, when Bello was a mere nine-year-old, and by his later efforts as the eldest child to financially maintain the family upon his father’s death in 1804 (Jaksić 1–2). As Jaksić has confirmed, Bartolomé Bello maintained a minor influence on his son’s life; in fact, unlike his treatment of his mother, “Andrés Bello scarcely left mention of him [Bartolomé Bello] or their relationship” (1). Concerning the possible illegitimate child fathered in London by Bello with Miranda’s supposed daughter, Grases vehemently dismantled the claim launched by Feliú Cruz and referred to Miranda’s known biographical information as proof of the ill inference: “Es una hipótesis muy peregrina la que formula con tal pregunta, pues es bien sabido que el general Francisco de Miranda no tuvo hija alguna en su vida. Quien cuidaba la Casa de Miranda en el 27, Grafton Street, era Sarah Andrews, quien fue la esposa de Miranda y madre de Leandro y Francisco, hijos del matrimonio” (“Notas” 49). He did not, however, explicitly address Blanco-Fombona de Hood’s private speculations that the mother of the illegitimate child could have been Sarah Andrews.33

In his inaugural address for the installation of the University of Chile on September 17, 1843, Bello reflected upon his London years and transition to Chile, plainly articulating his affinity to seek refuge in literary works, particularly in moments of personal trial:

31 In 1857, the year that Bello polished the chronicle portions of his Cidian studies and the year that the Civil Code went into effect, Bello’s alleged son would have been approximately eighteen years of age. As expressed in “Exposición” and seen in such Articles as 26 and 266, under the Code the age of majority was established at twenty-five years, emancipating a child from his family at that time (Bello 14: 8, 45, 200).

32 Regarding the abolition of paternity suits, it should be noted that children born before the Code were able to retroactively initiate suits; however, it appears that they generally lost their cases (Milanich 58).

33 In “Vida de Bello,” Salvat Monguillot stated that Bello had fifteen legitimate children, and in a corresponding footnote, before citing Donoso, he explained that Bello had also fathered “algunos hijos naturales” (58). On this matter, see also Villalobos (21–22, 37–38).
Ellas [las letras] son . . . el mejor preparativo para la hora de la desgracia. Ellas llevan el consuelo al lecho del enfermo, al asilo del pros-crito, al calabozo, al cadalso. . . . Tales son las recompensas de las letras; tales son sus consuelos. Yo mismo, aun siguiendo de tan lejos a sus favorecidos adoradores, yo mismo he podido participar de sus beneficios, y saborearme con sus goces. Adornaron de celajes alegres la mañana de mi vida, y conservan todavía algunos matices al alma, como la flor que hermosea las ruinas. Ellas han hecho aún más por mí; me alimentaron en mi larga peregrinación, y encaminaron mis pasos a este suelo de libertad y de paz, a esta patria adoptiva, que me ha dispensado una hospitalidad tan benévola. (21: 8–9)

As Bello insinuated in his address, for many reasons—some of which may have been deeply personal—, the PMC can be read as a source that feasibly afforded him a sense of restitution, from his residency in London to his final years in Santiago, especially given the close association that may be perceived between aspects of Bello’s chronicled life and those of the medieval protagonist. For one, Rodrigo’s complicated political standing as a redeemed exile under Alfonso VI clearly resonated with Bello’s early uncertain political condition in the English capital. It is enough to recall that in 1812 the Captain General of Venezuela officially discharged Bello from his previously held political position during the colonial era in response to his revolutionary sympathies, and in 1813 Bello did not receive inclusion in the general amnesty offered by the Spanish Council of Regency that he had solicited. Following this analogous trajectory, one can only conjecture as to the personal value that the PMC could have held for Bello for more private matters: had Bello, who was illegitimately conceived, fathered an illegitimate child in London during his difficult years of impoverishment, could not the questions surrounding the Cid’s birth and the legal status of his daughters into which he would have delved around the same time have rightfully garnered his particular interest and plausibly provoked the curious treatment of the potentially sensitive topic in his Cidian studies? As has been shown, Bello’s writings on the Cid that comprised his posthumous edition did not overtly explore the Cid’s rumored bastardy. To reiterate, in his selections from the Crónica del Cid, Bello did not reproduce the specific portions of the chronicle in which the topic of the Cid’s alleged illegitimate conception was raised, yet refuted. Even in his note to verse 70 of the poem, where Bello referred to portions of the chronicle’s second chapter that he did not transcribe in his abbreviated edition of the text, he still did not address the claims of the Cid’s bastardy. Despite Bello’s attention to the theme of legitimacy, which is apparent, for example, in his study of the status of the Cid’s daughters and his exclusion of their description as “varraganas” in verse 2807, the absence of an explicit treatment of the Cid’s questioned birth status persists in his other notes to the chronicle and in those to the poem. With the depth of Bello’s scholarship on the Cid clearly recognized, these conspicuous omissions gain particular significance when the rumored accounts of the Cid’s bastardy that would have borne negative ramifications on the legal status of his daughters are read in tandem with the accounts of Bello’s illegitimate conception (and legitimization) as well as those suggesting the existence of
Bello’s illegitimate offspring allegedly fathered in England and in Chile. They arguably posit Bello as a critic whose pen, particularly on the issues of the Cid’s bastardy, was seemingly censored by a plausible intimate connection with the matter. As the theme of illegitimacy remained a relevant part of various biographical sketches of Bello’s life in Venezuela (where he was conceived outside of his parents’ union), in England (where various accounts constructed him as a father to illegitimate progeny during the time when he resided in Miranda’s home), and in Chile (where he supposedly engendered an illegitimate child during his second marriage), it is important to note that Bello’s work on the PMC did not end in London. Bello died in 1865, three years after he again revised the portions related to the chronicle and just two years after he offered his work to the Real Academia Española upon realizing that the completion and publication of his edition during his lifetime were not possible. Given his predilection to dialog, at times, with his own concerns in his work, Bello’s continued association and perceived preoccupation with matters of illegitimacy raise questions regarding his persistence to study the PMC in Chile and, for that matter, the Siete Partidas, and more clearly treat filiation matters in the Civil Code, thus affecting how each can be read in response to their thematic entanglements.34 Such considerations therefore contribute to the psychological and autobiographical cypher through which his Cidian studies and other work, including the Civil Code, can be understood, while further resignifying Bello as a more subjective literary critic and legal theorist beleaguered by his own affairs.

34 Other scholars, including Miguel Luis Amunátegui, have interpreted several other works by Bello in accordance with aspects of his biography. Illustrating Bello’s propensity to treat personal affairs or include autobiographical references in his writing, Amunátegui attested that a note accompanying “A Olimpio” (1842) could be interpreted as a possible retort to defamatory accusations of treason reiterated against Bello in Chile that had stemmed from his earlier years in Venezuela (475). In a similar vein, “La oración por todos” (1843), which has been read as Bello’s poetic and personal response to the death of his nine-year-old daughter Dolores, also contains several verses that Amunátegui considered a form of “venganza” launched against his slanderers (323). These examples that forged part of Amunátegui’s biography of Bello arguably reflect the latter’s reported use of letters as a space of refuge, as he similarly espoused in the inaugural address, which was pronounced around the same time that he penned both poems. Additionally, in 1852, as Bello was entrenched in his work on the Civil Code, he wrote an essay in which he confirmed his attachment to the PMC. “Siempre he mirado con particular predilección esta antigua reliquia, de que hice un estudio especial en mi juventud, y de que aún no he abandonado el pensamiento de dar a luz una edición más completa y correcta que la de Sánchez” (Bello 7: 591). As for Bello’s reported favorable view of the Siete Partidas, in Amunátegui’s biography of Bello, the author recalled that the latter humorously deemed the text “‘el mejor digestivo que he encontrado hasta la fecha,’ ‘un excelente digestivo,’” following the consumption of a substantial evening meal (Amunátegui 25, 393; Jaksic 181).
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