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PROLOGUE:

This paper is the project narrative for a grant proposal submitted in February 2019, that resulted in funding from two different sources to cover travel expenses in support of archival work in Spain (summer 2019): (1) an internal funding source from Baylor University’s Arts and Humanities Faculty Research Program (AHFRP); and (2) South Central Modern Language Association’s (SCMLA) Faculty Research Grant. I would like to express my gratitude to both granting entities. I should also like to thank the Department of Modern Languages and Cultures, whose generous (mini-sabbatical) travel funding covered the remainder of expenses and allowed me to bookend my stay in Spain with two conferences, where I presented some of my research on Antonio Enríquez Gómez. I hope this project narrative will help others who are considering similar proposals, or who may be thinking about the scholarly labor of love that is the “critical edition” of any early modern text existing in multiple versions. I include an updated bibliography of versions of the play consulted as of fall 2019. The sections of the Project Narrative correspond to the sections required in the AHFRP grant proposal process. Normally a section titled “methods” would elicit groans from the humanities scholar, but it helped me clarify why we need critical editions, and how many of these works will remain the purview of specialists until we can make them more legible for a modern audience.
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PROJECT NARRATIVE

1. Background and Rationale

This book project is a critical/annotated edition of a Spanish play, Antonio Enríquez Gómez’s *El noble siempre es valiente* (“The noble is always brave,” also known by the title *El Cid Campeador*). Enríquez Gómez was a crypto-Jewish writer who narrowly escaped the Inquisition in the mid-1630s, fleeing to France to live among the
Spanish and Portuguese merchant enclaves of Bourdeaux and Rouen.\textsuperscript{1} By the 1650s he had returned clandestinely from France and established himself in Seville, living and writing under the pseudonym of Fernando de Zárate. The manuscript of the play I am editing for publication was penned about a year and a half before the Inquisition arrested him in Seville (September 1661). Enríquez Gómez would never again emerge from the secret cells of the Inquisition, dying there of a mysterious illness in March, 1663. The play exists in an autograph manuscript, dated April 5, 1660, and in a number of sueltas, or chapbooks (cheap, early printed editions dating from 1715 to 1822), attributed to his pseudonym, Fernando de Zárate. The work has not been published or staged since the early nineteenth century, and thus represents an important “lost” chapter in the history of Spanish theater. Moreover, it is an overlooked work in the lore that has evolved around Spain’s famous medieval hero, El Cid, Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar (d. 1099). Though practically unstudied by modern scholarship and unknown today to the wider public, scholars have identified over 100 stagings of the play in the eighteenth century alone.\textsuperscript{2} Due to its popularity on the stage, this Zárate/Enríquez play is an invaluable document for understanding the role of El Cid in the imagination of Spain’s theater-going public between 1660 and 1830. Until scholars in the nineteenth century uncovered Zárate’s identity as Enríquez Gómez, however, no one knew of the work’s "crypto-Jewish" connections; the play had simply been hailed as a patriotic celebration of Spain’s most recognizable Medieval hero. It is possible that the play’s disappearance from the Spanish stage after the 1830s was due in part to the shock of this discovery about its author. Moreover, this revelation opens up new possibilities for interpretation (a more nuanced reading of the figure of the Cid than the merely triumphalist version applauded up to that point), though the de facto censorship it has received since the 1830s has prevented discerning readers from arriving at their own conclusions about the play. A modern critical edition of \textit{El Cid Campeador} would go a long way toward generating just such critical interest, since it is currently available only to those willing to leaf through the poorly printed 18th- and 19th-century chapbooks. The original manuscript, though available digitally through the Spanish National Library (Biblioteca Nacional Española), is all but illegible to the non-expert in 17th-century paleography (see, for example, my screenshot of folio 37r below).

\begin{itemize}
\item[] The definitive account to date of Enríquez Gómez’s life and family history is Révah (2003), whose 600+ page biography includes over 100 pages of Inquisition documents transcribed in appendix, so it is rich in primary sources. The biographies by Dille (1988) and Cid (1978, 2011), along with articles by McGaha (1992), Wilke (2006, 2015), Dille (1978), Domínguez de la Paz (2014), Díez (2001), and Brown (1996), as well as introductory materials in Oelman (1986), McGaha (1991), and Artigas (1999) all provide additional contributions to our understanding of the author’s life and times.

\item[] See González Cañal (2013), who has tracked down references to the theatrical appearances of the play; brief mentions of the play can be found in Dille (1980, 1988), McGaha (1991). The only book-length treatment of the play is Porras Landeo’s unpublished dissertation (1976), which limits itself mostly to the 1660 manuscript (only considering three of the many suelta editions of the play) and a study of the play’s sources. Porras Landeo expends a lot of ink “proving” that Zárate and Enríquez Gómez are completely different people and that the play could not possibly have been written by Enríquez--he wrote this before the documentation provided by Révah and others, which would definitively prove the contrary, was widely available.
\end{itemize}
To date, I have transcribed the 1660 Manuscript, which is currently in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid (BNE ms. 17229), from a digitized facsimile (3158 lines plus dedicatory letter and title pages--85 pages, single-spaced). I have also collated that transcription with three chapbooks: Madrid 1792 (a digital version of the Biblioteca Menéndez Pelayo’s copy), Valencia 1813, and another from Salamanca c.1800 (both of which can be found in Texas Tech’s Southwest Collection--Rare Books). I have documented 33 pages of textual notes (single-spaced, 12-pt font)--this is a critical apparatus which includes notes on the variants observed, as well as other notes on the peculiarities of the manuscript itself (self-corrections, non-standard spellings, marginalia, the intervention of at least two separate scribes in production of the MS, possible intervention of a censor). The finished edition will also include an introduction (in Spanish) and content notes in addition to the critical apparatus. To complete the book I still need to collate my edition with an eighteenth-century manuscript, also in Madrid’s Biblioteca Nacional (Ms. 15995), chapbook editions published in Barcelona (1807), Valencia (1774, 1822), Lisbon (1715), Seville (c. 1750, no date), along with short printed extracts (pasillos) from Madrid and Seville, also published in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. I have access to a digitized facsimile of the eighteenth-century manuscript and the Valencia 1822 chapbook, which I hope to collate between now and spring break. The Barcelona 1807 chapbook is digitized, but also held in the Harry Ransom HRC in Austin, so I will be able to compare it with my edition over spring break. The remaining chapbooks and printed extracts, not available digitally, are held in Madrid’s Biblioteca Nacional, the Museo Nacional del Teatro (in Almagro, a short day-trip from Madrid), and the Universidad de Sevilla.
2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this grant project are to collate my edition with at least three additional chapbooks and a handful of extracts, only available in Madrid, Almagro, and Seville. As it stands right now my edition reflects the 1660 manuscript and three chapbooks (Madrid 1792, Valencia 1813, Salamanca c.1800), and with the progress I plan to make this spring, collating the second manuscript and two more chapbooks (Barcelona 1807, Valencia 1822), the text of the play and the critical apparatus will be complete by the end of my two weeks in Madrid-Seville. When I get back I will then attach my content notes and introduction, do final formatting to send it off to the publisher for peer review (see section 4 below).

3. Potential Significance

This project is significant for several reasons, some of which have already been alluded to above. First of all, the works of Antonio Enríquez Gómez remain largely unpublished in modern critical editions. In the last thirty or forty years there has been a move to correct that gap, but most of the efforts have focused on editing his lyric and epic poetry or his imaginative prose--Oelman (1986), Artigas (1997, 1999), Rodríguez Cáceres and Pedraza Jiménez (2015), for example. Only a handful of critics work with his plays because so few of them are available. As Díez (2015) notes, the lack of modern critical editions constitutes a real “falta,” or gap, in this field, which marginalizes Enríquez’s work for all but a few specialists who have the patience to mine the archive. “It is not the same,” he claims, “to read a nicely polished and annotated text in a good modern edition, with ample bibliographical scope, as it is to read it in one of those antique editions preserved in the libraries, or sometimes uploaded to the internet in PDF.” The reasons for this will be clearer when I describe my methodology in section 5 of the project narrative (below), but this lack of modern editions has had serious implications for the field that my edition hopes to begin to address.

One implication: the shortage of reliable editions of Enríquez Gómez’s theatrical works has resulted in a fault-line between historians on the one hand and literary scholars on the other. Historians of the Inquisition and of Crypto-Judaism in Spain have long taken an interest in the “case” of Antonio Enríquez Gómez and his oft-persecuted family. Literary scholars, however, are much more interested in the literary works themselves and what they might mean; but, without reliable critical editions of this literature, interest in Enríquez Gómez as a poet and dramatist will remain the purview of only a few historically-minded scholars. This has created an enormous gap in the literary histories. A dramatist of the popularity of Zárate/Enríquez Gómez in 1650s and

---

3 My translation of Díez (2015, p. 4): “...no es lo mismo leer un texto depurado y anotado en una buena edición moderna, con un amplio despliegue bibliográfico, que en una de las ediciones antiguas custodiadas en bibliotecas o, a veces, colgadas en la red en formato pdf.”

4 See, for example, Caro Baroja (1947), Cid (1978), Kamen (1985, 2007), Alpert (2001), Révah (2003; but also several articles not mentioned in my bibliography that he published in the 1960s and which informed the sections on AEG in Kamen and Alpert), Wilke (2006, 2015). On Crypto-Judaism, in general, the standard reference is Gitlitz (1996).
1660s Seville, barely rates a mention in an account of “minor” seventeenth-century dramatists, for example, much less in the standard histories and companions to Golden Age theater.\(^5\) Moreover, since his plays have not been reprinted since the 1800s, the work’s importance on the stage and in the popular culture of the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries has been obscured. Thus, literary scholars of both the Spanish Golden Age (16th-17th centuries) and the Enlightenment (18th to early-19th centuries in Spain) are generally unaware of his importance or popularity when they are aware of him at all.\(^6\)

Jonathan Thacker (2007) notes about the paucity of critical editions of “minor” Golden Age dramatists: “The vast majority of extant works by these artists . . . remain unavailable in modern, scholarly editions, leaving a large number of unanswered questions about dates of composition and performance, authorship, influences and the relationships between them” (p. 87). Even where the specialists, especially those who do pay attention to the historians, have answered some of these questions about Enríquez Gómez over the last few decades, a good many more questions that have only recently been formulated remain: (1) What does the fact that Zárate and Enríquez Gómez were the same person mean for how we should be interpreting the “Zárate” plays? (2) Will a more in depth study of the plays answer lingering questions about the playwright’s religious beliefs/attitudes in the final decade of his life?\(^7\) (3) Why were the late “Zárate” plays, and specifically El Cid Campeador, so popular on the stage in the eighteenth century? (4) What are some of the differences between the original works as conceived by Enríquez Gómez in the seventeenth century and the popular chapbooks or theatrical performances of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries? (5) What accounts for the abrupt disappearance from the Spanish stage of these works? (6) Is the critical reaction to these plays in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries more ideological than aesthetic (i.e., do the works themselves stand the test of time, in spite

\(^5\) Williamsen (1982), for example, mentions him only twice in his entire book (pp. 34, 82) and does not analyze a single play. In Bass and Greer (2006), Zárate is mentioned twice without reference to the name as a pseudonym for Enríquez Gómez (as if AEG did not even exist). Castillejo (2011) has a brief account of AEG, but claims that our author “has unfortunately been confused by some scholars with Fernando Zárate” (p. 237); after a biographical account riddled with errors Castillejo only mentions eight plays (of the 40+ composed by AEG). Valbuena Prat (1969, p. 377) also believes Zárate to be a separate playwright (and superior to AEG), a line of thinking that led Porras Landeo (1976) astray. What all these authors have in common in reaching their conclusions is that they only have access to the Mesonero Romanos anthology from 1858 (faulty texts, partial selection, and dated biographical materials in the introductions to Zárate-Enríquez Gómez). Wilson and Moir (1971, p. 138), Ziomek (1984, p. 182), and Thacker (2007, pp. 86-87) consider AEG “worthy of study” but only mention the plays in Mesonero Romanos (1858), with no analysis. AEG’s early play A lo que obliga el honor is the only one that even merits a brief footnote in Kallendorf (2014, p. 99).

\(^6\) In Pedraza and Rodríguez (2000), for example, AEG is not even mentioned with relation to the stage; he is briefly mentioned only as the author of a short picaresque novel (p. 250) and the largely forgotten epic poem Sansón nazareno (p. 278).

\(^7\) The religious question has been a source of constant debate in the last thirty years; cf. Oelman (1983), Dille (1987), McGaha (1992), Warshawsky (2005), Salomon (2011), Wilke (2015), in addition to the many works by I.S. Révah, Constance Rose, Kenneth Brown, and others I have not included in the basic references to this project narrative.
None of these questions can be fairly answered as long as the philological foundation on which we base our answers is shaky. Until we have reliable critical editions of the Zárate-Enríquez plays, only a small number of scholars will be in a position to begin answering these questions, and their answers will be subject to the fate of which chapbooks they happen to have at hand.

Having worked with this play for four years, and having compared it with many of the so-called masterpieces of the Golden Age canon, I happen to think *El Cid Campeador* deserves to be revived in literary and performance traditions. The play has the hallmarks of a masterpiece; reading it provokes the kinds of questions that we struggle with universally, generation after generation: what is heroism? what is love? to what extent are we destined by birth to perform certain roles? are religion and intolerance inevitable? are faith and tolerance compatible? is true conversion possible and upon what is it contingent? are there limits to the state’s authority and the subject’s obedience? The work deserves to be reconsidered within the canon of Spanish classical theater.

4. Publication/Dissemination of Results:

I plan to publish this critical edition in Spanish with a press that specializes in publishing critical editions of Spanish works from the middle ages through the twentieth century. Juan de la Cuesta’s Hispanic Monographs series, which publishes a great many critical editions of lesser-known (today) works, responded favorably to my book proposal in January 2016 and would like to evaluate the completed project as soon as I can get it to them. I also hope to publish a series of journal articles on the play and some of the interesting aspects of its textual history and potential for interpretation. I
have already been presenting conference papers on my research findings about Antonio Enríquez Gómez and this play, as well as others by him, for four years now.

5. Methods/Plan of Work

To demonstrate how a critical edition comes together and why it is so important I have chosen to describe just a few of the textual variants and peculiarities I have observed in the first twenty-five lines. But first a few words on the condition of these texts. I have already referred (above) to the legibility issue of the original 1660 manuscript for modern readers. The chapbooks of the 1700-1800s present their own issues. The figure on the previous page is from the British Museum’s copy of Barcelona 1807 (the chapbook published by printer Juan Serra y Centené in Barcelona, 1807). It is not in particularly good condition (one of the reasons I am going back to Austin in a few weeks, to compare their copy of this edition). Even before the ravages of time take their toll on a copy, a single print run is capable of producing varied results: ink thins, for example, and comes out darker in some sections or lighter in others; the type in the press can wear down and degrade, making letters such as “c,” “o,” and “e” indistinguishable from one another. After printing, any number of interventions can affect the legibility of a chapbook. For example, once an owner (or library) decides to bind the chapbook, they may trim the margins to even it out, and often trim print in the process (this happened to the copy of Valencia 1813 now in the Southwest Collection at Texas Tech). And, of course, it is no small miracle that many of these chapbooks survive at all—since they were part of the early popular/mass culture, sold on the streets and treated as we might treat a cheap comic book or magazine nowadays. A truly “critical” edition requires the editor to see as many of the manuscripts and printed editions as possible to establish a record of the text at different stages. Moreover, this often requires seeing more than one copy of a single chapbook edition, since a single copy might be defective and additional copies must be sought to fill in the gaps caused by these defects (e.g., what is difficult to read in the British Museum’s copy of Barcelona 1807, might be more legible in the Harry Ransom HRC copy; or the text trimmed off at the margin of Texas Tech’s copy of Valencia 1813, might not be cut off in the Harry Ransom copy).

Additionally, because the chapbooks were popular and not “critical” editions, they often present substantive variants instead of just incidental ones. An incidental variant might be a different spelling, but one that does not affect the meaning of the text: spelling the word for “flag” or “banner” as “vandera” (Barcelona 1807, line 23) instead of “bandera” (Valencia 1813), for example. Substantive variants are much more interesting from a critical perspective. For instance, the chapbooks that I have consulted to date replace the word fuerte (“strong”) in line 7 of both manuscripts (the 1660 is enlarged and reproduced to the right) with the word bella (“beautiful”--see the 1813 edition of lines 6-7 below). The lines compare the Valencian princess-warrior to the

Rey. Hoy ha de entrar triunfante, qual Semiramis bella en Babilonia.
biblical Semiramis, but the effect of the “revision” is to reduce her strength, to diminish her as a warrior by insisting on a characteristically feminine adjective. A reader who only consults a single eighteenth-century chapbook would not know this. So a critical edition is important because it “recovers” or “reconstructs” the original manuscript for the reader, while also providing notes about the substantive variants in other editions. Those variants are not just “errors,” but are often a record of the changing tastes and preferences of audiences and editors of the past. Again, modern critical editions provide readers access, through their text and notes, to just such a record of all the many variations the play has undergone, while reconstructing for them a text closer to the author’s original vision in legible modern print.

I close this section with a final example taken from the opening scene. As the play begins, the Muslim king of Valencia and his advisor Ali are eagerly awaiting the arrival of the princess, who has been commanding the troops against rebellious neighboring city-states. In lines 21-25, Ali tells the king that the army has so much respect for the princess-warrior, and is as pleased fighting under her banner as if the war-god Mars himself were their general. A modern edition of these lines would like this:

\[
\begin{align*}
Y \text{ tanto amor tu ejército le tiene} \\
y \text{ tan gustoso viene} \\
militando en su bélica bandera, \\
como si Marte fuera \\
su mismo general.
\end{align*}
\]

These lines correspond to lines 5 to 9 in this segment of the manuscript below (without the orthography standardized/modernized as in the lines above, obviously):

But these same lines in the chapbooks all introduce a confusing variant. If in the 1660 manuscript (and the early eighteenth-century manuscript) the army “comes as pleased (tan gustoso viene) . . . as if Mars himself were their general,” the printed versions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have revised the original so that the princess-
warrior, not her army, is “gustosa” (pleased). By changing one letter, the later chapbooks have again softened this otherwise strong female character (see the last five lines of Valencia 1813 to the right).

This baroque retelling of the story of El Cid is full of unexpected gender roles, all of which seem to undermine the toxic masculinity that is at the heart of religious intolerance and cultural conflict on the medieval border between Christianity and Islam. Indeed, it must have been so shocking to audiences that eighteenth- and nineteenth-century chapbooks (and probably also the hundred or so theatrical productions of the play documented before 1840), modify the author’s original manuscript a great deal. The reader today, who might only have access to a digitized suelta from c.1800, would find that she is a “Semíramis bella” (beautiful Semiramis) rather than a strong one, and that she is pleased with her army rather than the other way around. Printers of the eighteenth and nineteenth century were, perhaps unconsciously, trying to tame the virile energy of the gender-bending princess, and did so by creating confusion with grammatical gender. The author’s original intent is obscured, highlighting the need for critical editions which restore the original sense and yet preserve the variants in the textual notes (so that modern critics can trace the changing preferences of printers and audiences over the centuries).

6. Bibliographical References


NOTICIA BIBLIOGRÁFICA:

As an addendum to the project narrative (February 2019), I include here a “noticia bibliográfica” including all the versions of the text that I have consulted to date (June 2020) and notes in Spanish, along with abbreviations (siglas) I am using as I prepare the “aparato crítico” for this edition.

SIGLAS USADAS:

MS  El noble siempre es valiente, Manuscrito autógrafo (Sevilla: 5 April 1660); Biblioteca Nacional Española [BNE] (Madrid), Sig. Mss. 17229. También lo consultamos en la versión facsímil de la Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes o por la Biblioteca Digital Hispánica (Madrid: Biblioteca Nacional, 2009). Intervienen en este manuscrito, firmado por “Fernando de Zárate,” por lo menos tres manos: la del autor y las de un copista y de un corrector (¿censor?).


S1 El Cid Campeador y el noble siempre es valiente. Suelta. Lisboa: Oficina de Bernardo da Costa de Carvalho, 1715. BNE, T/3979.

S2 Comedia Famosa. Vida y muerte de El Cid Campeador y noble Martin Pelaez de un ingenio de esta corte. Suelta. Barcelona: Imprenta de Francisco Suriá, 1770. El colofón añade “A costas de la Compañía” (¿referencia a los Jesuitas expulsados de los territorios castellanos en 1767?). Consultamos el ejemplar de la Universidad de Sevilla, edición digital disponible en línea por el catálogo del Fondo Antiguo.

S3 Vida y muerte del Cid y noble Martín Peláez. Suelta. Valencia: José y Tomás de Orga, 1774. Biblioteca Nacional Española, Madrid (T/14975 [11]).

S4 Comedia. Vida, y muerte De El Cid Campeador, y noble Martin Peláez, de un ingenio de esta corte. Suelta. Madrid: Librería de Quiroga, 1792. Ejemplares utilizados: Biblioteca

S5 Comedia famosa. Vida y muerte de el Cid, y noble Martín Peláez, de un ingenio de la corte. Suelta. Salamanca: Imprenta de la Santa Cruz, sin año [c.1770]. Texas Tech University, Southwest Collection (PQ 6500 .V65); Biblioteca Nacional Española (T/20701) aunque falta la última hoja (con el colofón) de este ejemplar; Santander: Biblioteca Menéndez Pelayo, ed. digital; Oviedo: Biblioteca Universitaria, ed. digital; el catálogo de la biblioteca universitaria la fecha al año 1750—sospecho que sea por lo menos un poco anterior a S3, por la calidad del papel.

S6 Comedia famosa. Vida, y muerte de El Cid Campeador, y noble Martín Peláez, de un ingenio de esta corte. Suelta. Barcelona: Juan Serra y Centené, 1807. Ejemplares utilizados: Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center--Texas Sueltas Collection; The British Library (ed. digital Google, 2013); La Universidad de Sevilla, Biblioteca Humanidades, Sala Central--Fondo Antiguo (HAZ/3814 [14]).

S7 Vida y muerte del Cid, y noble Martín Pelaez, de un Ingenio. Suelta. Valencia: José Ferrer de Orga, 1813. Ejemplares utilizados: Texas Tech University, Southwest Collection; Biblioteca Nacional de Austria (ed. digital Google, 2015); Biblioteca Estatal de Bavaria (ed. digital Google, 2011); La Universidad de Sevilla, Biblioteca Humanidades, Sala Central--Fondo Antiguo (HAZ/3816 [10]).

S8 Vida y muerte del Cid, y noble Martín Pelaez, de un Ingenio. Suelta. Valencia: Ildefonso Mompié, 1822. The British Library (ed. digital Google, 2017); La Universidad de Sevilla, Biblioteca Humanidades, Sala Central--Fondo Antiguo (An/0322 [37]).

S9 Vida y muerte del Cid y noble Martín Peláez. Suelta. Madrid: Casimiro Martínez, sin año. BNE T/19751. La calidad del papel y la tipografía indican una fecha relativamente temprana. Esta suelta tiene otras peculiaridades. Por ejemplo, consta de 43 páginas (32-36 es típico en las otras sueltas) y lleva el siguiente título en la primera hoja: Comedia / Nueva. / La Vida, Y Muerte / Del Zid / Y Noble Martin Pelaez.

S10 Vida y muerte del Cid y noble Martín Peláez. Suelta. Sin lugar, año. Esta edición lleva el “Núm. 122” en el rincón superior a la izquierda de la primera hoja. La tipografía sugiere una fecha muy tardía, por lo menos 1800. Contamos con dos ejemplares digitales de esta suelta: University of Minnesota (su catálogo y la HathiTrust conjeturan, equivocadamente, que se deberá identificar como S7) y la Biblioteca Universitaria de Oviedo.

S12  *Vida y muerte del Cid y noble Martín Peláez*. Suelta. Burgos: Imprenta de la Santa Iglesia, sin año [¿1740?]. Hemos consultado la versión digitalizada por la Biblioteca Universitaria de Oviedo, cuyo catálogo la fecha al año 1740; podemos decir con certeza que se publicó antes de 1800, por la tipografía que emplea.


P2  *Pasillo del Cid Campeador*. Pliego suelto. Córdoba: Imprenta de Don Rafael García Rodríguez, sin año [1805-1844]. La Biblioteca de La Universidad de Sevilla, (Biblioteca Humanidades, Sala Central--Fondo Antiguo) posee tres ejemplares bajo la signatura H ca. 104/025.

P3  *Pasillo del Cid Campeador*. Pliego suelto. Sevilla: Viuda de Vazquez y Compañía, 1816. La Biblioteca de La Universidad de Sevilla, (Biblioteca Humanidades, Sala Central--Fondo Antiguo) tiene un ejemplar recogido con P2.