Negative microfilm 63-6006
received from university

CAIA, Frank Paul, 1933-

THE DRAMATIC CRAFTSMANSHIP OF MOLIÈRE.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1963
Language and Literature, modern

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE DRAMATIC CRAFTSMANSHIP OF MORETO

by
Frank Paul Casa

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan
1962

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Edward Glaser, Chairman
Associate Professor Floyd F. Gray
Assistant Professor William C. McCrary
Professor Kenneth T. Rowe
Professor Charles N. Staubach

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank the members of my doctoral committee, Professors Floyd F. Gray, William C. McCrary, Kenneth T. Rowe, and Charles N. Staubach for the many suggestions and corrections which have improved immeasurably the presentation of my material.

To my thesis director, Professor Edward Glaser, I owe an immense debt of gratitude. He has guided me through the many difficulties I have encountered with kindness and, above all, with patience. I thank him not only for the many hours spent with me during the past years, but also for the time he has taken away from his sabbatical leave to help me in the completion of the dissertation. I am grateful to him for giving me the benefit of his knowledge of the field, for making available his library, and for introducing me to many aspects of Golden Age drama which were unknown to me.

Finally, I wish to thank my wife, Julia, whose hard work and good humor is, in no small measure, responsible for the termination of the thesis and the Rackham School of Graduate Studies for awarding me a pre-doctoral fellowship which allowed me to work uninterruptedly during the summer.

CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		ii
Chapter		
I	INTRODUCTION	1
II	SAN FRANCO DE SENA	13
III	EL LICENCIADO VIDPIERA	52
IV	ANTIOCO Y SELEUCO	90
V	EL VALIENTE JUSTICIERO	137
VI	EL LINDO DON DIEGO	183
CONCLUSION		225
BIBLIOGRAPHY		233

I

INTRODUCTION

The theatre of Agustín Moreto y Cabaña (1618-1669) has long been recognized as one of the most important manifestations of the Spanish Golden Age drama. His plays, as attested by numerous editions, have always been favorably received and have aroused continued critical interest which shows a growing appreciation of his dramatic talents.

The following survey of critical opinions on Moreto seeks to document this development. Jeronimo Cáncer y Velasco (? - 1655) amicably satirized Moreto's borrowing but an evaluation of his plays is found only in the following century which, while praising the dramatist's restrained style, chose to use his <u>comedias</u> as examples of what they approved or disapproved on grounds of propriety. Typical of this attitude is Ignacio de Luzán. He objects to some of Moreto's plays for being "una escuela de crueldad, de venganza y de falso valor";[2] he labels Moreto's comedies vulgar, compares him to Plautus (p. 121) and laments the use of the <u>enredo</u> when the action could have been evolved without any complications (p. 127). He does, nevertheless, compliment the playwright on his ability to choose well from his models (p. 311). Despite this realization, he is prevented from achieving an

understanding of Moreto's work by the prejudices of his time. He does not read the plays to see what they have to say, but searches them to find support for his own theories on the theatre and on human behavior.

The initial appreciation of the playwright's talents by Luzán is broadened by Francisco Martínez de la Rosa. His critical formation had its roots in the eighteenth century, so it is not surprising that he expresses his dismay at Moreto's carelessness with the "rules".[3] In his evaluation, Martínez de la Rosa considers only individual features of his art: he praises the simplicity of Moreto's comedias, the evenness of his style and the vivacity of his wit, the ability to paint characters and the lightness of his verses (p. 193). When he comes to the task of reviewing Moreto's reworkings, Martínez de la Rosa is brief and yet manages to stress a very important point: " . . .tenía mucho talento para aprovecharse diestramente de argumentos y situaciones inventadas por otros dramáticos, vaciando los materiales agenos en sus proprios moldes, y sacando obras tan superiores en mérito a las que le habían servido . . ." (p. 193). He is the first to underscore the difference between indiscriminate borrowing and the successful integration of source material. In so doing, he takes an important step toward a proper understanding of the writer because he emphasizes presentation and treatment.[4]

August Wilhelm Schlegel and Eugenio de Ochoa offer two sharply contrasting views on the merits of Moreto's work.

For Schlegel, Moreto is one of the more successful imitators of Calderón,[5] while for Ochoa, Moreto is the author of the best comedia ever written in Spanish, El desdén con el desdén.[6] Despite his admiration for this play and for the "clear exposition" of El lindo don Diego (p. 308), Ochoa is forceful in his condemnation of Moreto's use of borrowed material and labels El valiente justiciero "un plagio escandaloso" (p. 279). These contrasting views indicate that Ochoa never assessed carefully the use that Moreto made of his source material.

The same unwillingness or incapacity to understand Moreto's art is seen in the work of Adolf Friedrich von Schack who dwells on mere borrowing and only hesitantly gives Moreto any credit for his ability: "Many of his best comedias are imitations or plagiarisms of thoughts and isolated scenes taken from others; they can be compared to mosaics done with ability and neatness."[7] Schack, then, reduces Moreto to a clever plagiarist who excells in organizing heterogeneous material. This assertion contradicts Schack's later statement that the playwright was a "poet of rare gifts and impeccable taste" (p. 98). Essentially, Schack makes two points: one, that knowing his own limitations as an original poet, Moreto was discreet enough to dedicate himself to the betterment or polishing of dramatic works of other poets; the other, that he possessed the ability to trace characters and to paint customs truthfully while showing his "vis comica" in criticizing and censuring the

foolishness of man (p. 124).

Unlike Schack, the romantic playwright, Franz Grillparzer focuses his attention on the mechanics of Moreto's theatre. Grillparzer gives his views in a series of short analyses of the plays. He rejects the extravagantly violent action of La fuerza de la ley;[8] praises the smooth and well-paced psychological movement of El desdén con el desdén, and censures the third act of El licenciado Vidriera which he finds not in consonance with the excellence of the firt two acts (p. 265). The limitations of Grillparzer's criticism are evident: he was primarily interested in Lope de Vega and never intended to study Moreto systematically, contenting himself with mentioning parts which he found to be commendable or objectionable.

In contrast to the sketchy remarks of previous writers there is the work of Luis Fernández-Guerra y Orbe who undertook, in 1865, to edit thirty-nine plays of Moreto for the Biblioteca de Autores Españoles series. The editor insists that a sharp distinction should be made between the so-called plagiarism of Moreto and his creative work.[9] Fernández-Guerra stresses the fact that Moreto introduces into the comedia extreme sensibility, deep observation of human passions, and the exquisite nuances of human impulses (p. xiv). He finds that Moreto had few peers in the structure of the drama and that his ability to introduce, develop and resolve the action gives great effectiveness to his works (p. xxi).

Fernández-Guerra's judgment affords the most sympathe-

tic appreciation of Moreto's theatre. He rejects all external and unimportant considerations. Fernández-Guerra recognizes that Moreto had not simply copied from his predecessors but had injected into his work something typically his which was not present before. He sees clearly that although Moreto may have drawn material from other works, an understanding of his plays lies not in the sterile consideration of "originality", but in the appreciation of the final product of the writer (p. xiii).

In the patch-work pattern that is Moretian criticism, Adolf Schaeffer represents a regression to less thoughtful evaluation. Under the impact of the statement in Gil Blas de Santillana (Book VII, Chap. 13), that Moreto was a fop, Schaeffer ascribes to the historical Moreto a vapid personality which allegedly found reflection in the playwright's works.[10] Schaeffer regards Moreto's works essentially conventional and devoid of feeling. He grants him technical excellence but decries his lack of color and charm which, he says, was present in the model plays (p. 186). He therefore concludes that: "Moreto ist der Hauptrepresentant einer Phase des Niedergangs des altspanischen Dramatik: er zehrt von den Gedanken seiner Vorgänger, er reproduziert das in sich Aufgenommene in mehr oder minder gelungener Weise" (p. 187).

Equally unenthusiastic about Moreto's talents is Narciso Alonso Cortés, who edited several plays of the author for the Clásicos Castellanos series. He finds Moreto's habit of borrowing material deserving of censure while trying

to put the question in a historical perspective: "Ni Moreto ni los demás lo hicieron por falta de inventiva; lo hicieron por hallar más expedito y seguro el camino del plagio que el de la originalidad. Y como talento no les faltaba para utilizar lo bueno y mejorar lo mediano, se explica que en la mayor parte de los casos superasen al modelo."[11] Alonso Cortés on the one hand, recognizes the talent of the playwright, and on the other, labels his work plagiarism.

The first effort to study in detail the possible sources of a Moreto play is that of Mabel Harlan. Following earlier suggestions, she consulted all those plays which were allegedly connected to El desdén con el desdén and compared them to Moreto's play.[12] Unfortunately, her work is limited to a summary discussion of the differences in plot and does not attempt to give a more exhaustive comparison.

Angel Valbuena Prat has maintained, during the last thirty years, that the most significant characteristics of Moreto's theatre are musicality and psychological analysis: "En un ambiente refinado de danza se desenvuelve la fina trama de la obra, que como hemos dicho evoca involuntariamente al compositor de La flauta encantada y los paisajes de jardines de Aranjuez, de Mazo precedentes de 'Minuetto pictorico' de Watteau."[13] In more recent works he has called Moreto a "fino analizador de caracteres"[14] and while praising his modernity, has referred to him as a "perfeccionador hasta los primores."[15] His criticism suffers from a vagueness of terms: one cannot determine if the word "musi-

cality" refers to the use of songs in his plays or if it pertains to Moreto's poetry. The constant parallels to music and painting, helpful to recall a mood, are not reliable indicators of the dramatist's talents.

The most comprehensive study on Moreto is Ruth Lee Kennedy's The Dramatic Art of Moreto. Although the work is not primarily concerned with the use of source material, Miss Kennedy, realizing its importance in Moreto's theatre, comes to grips with the problem. While pointing out the correspondence between the original and the derivative plays, she does not discuss the impact of the dramatist's alterations. She is more concerned with the reasons for his borrowing and arrives at the following conclusions: 1) that he followed the customs of the time; 2) that he lacked creative talent; 3) that he possessed an instinct for perfection that led him to revise rather than create and 4) that because of his dilettantism; the author found it easier to take the plots of others than to create them himself.[16] Miss Kennedy's views are only partially convincing. The alleged lack of creativity is belied by the numerous instances in which Moreto demonstrates this faculty; the instinct for perfection is a psychological explanation which can be helpful but is hardly reliable, and his supposed dilettantism is disproved by the excellence of Moreto's plays.

Bruce Wardropper has recently given a provocative analysis of Moreto's most famous work, El desdén con el desdén. Mr. Wardropper sees in the celebrated comedia a presentation

of the question of the freedom of the will conducted completely on secular terms. He maintains that in so doing, Moreto stabilized the comedia secularizada which had begun with Lope de Vega. This effort was responsible for the creation of an art form that was disciplined and coherent and reflected the ideas and beliefs of the period.[17] It is true that Moreto's theatre mirrors the ideas of the period, but this characteristic was shared by all the playwrights. Moreover, Mr. Wardropper's conclusion that Moreto created a new art form is a doubtful assertion which is not borne out by the nature of the play.

Finally, Ermanno Caldera has discussed the theatre of Moreto along historic-social-cultural lines.[18] He finds in our dramatist a passion for logic and equilibrium that was prevalent in his time (p. 33). He feels that Moreto's plays are characterized by a rationality which pervades personages, plot, and life itself. While not dealing directly with the problem of refundición, he concludes that, "la rielaborazione, eliminate le incertezze strutturali, viene a sopprimere la freschezza originaria" (p. 63).

This historical survey of Moretian criticism shows the need for a more thorough evaluation of the dramatic craftsmanship of Moreto which I propose to undertake in my dissertation. I have selected five plays whose subject is not original, and which have a known written source. My work will be divided into five main divisions, each dedicated to one of the plays. In order to gain a more comprehensive view of

Moreto's art, the plays are to represent various types of comedias and different degrees of indebtedness. The studies will include a hagiographic play, San Franco de Sena, a drama taken from the works of Cervantes, El licenciado Vidriera, a historical-legendary play based on classical sources, Antioco y Seleuco, a refundición of a Lope comedia, El valiente justiciero, and a comedy, El lindo don Diego.

I shall deal principally with these five but I will use pertinent material from other plays to corroborate statements and conclusions that I may draw. I shall relate the five comedias of Moreto to their sources, compare source and derivative as to variations, differences, additions, structure and meaning in an attempt to understand how Moreto molded this material into an effective drama.

I feel that this study, which takes into consideration the cultural background of the dramatist, may be of some aid in the further understanding of Moreto and his technique. While it is not intended to defend him against the frequent charges of plagiarism levelled against him, a more detailed presentation of the problem will show that in following the dramatic customs of his age, he was able to attain not only technical skill but also a high degree of individuality.

N O T E S

[1] Vejamen, ed. Adolfo Bonilla y San Martín in Oro viejo (Madrid, 1909), p. 34. This much quoted passage from Moreto's collaborator is undoubtedly responsible for much of the dramatist's reputation as a plagiarist, although it was originally meant as a good-natured satire of his friend. In the middle of a mock battle to defend Mt. Parnassus from the Latins and the Italians, Cáncer y Velasco finds Moreto looking through old manuscripts. To Cáncer's question Moreto answers that "estoy minando al enemigo" and concludes with the following copla:

> Que estoy minando imagina,
> cuando tu de mí te quejas
> que en estas comedias viejas
> he hallado una brava mina.

[2] La poética, ed. Luigi de Filippo (Barcelona, 1954), p. 85. All subsequent quotations will refer to this edition and will be incorporated in the text.

[3] Obras completas in Colección de Autores Españoles (Paris, 1845), XXVIII, 195.

[4] Other critics who have pointed out Moreto's ability to transform mediocre material into an artistic presentation include: Ramón de Mesonero Romanos, Trabajos no colecciona - dos (Madrid, 1905), II, 435; George Ticknor, History of

Spanish Literature (New York, 1849), II, 406.

5 Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Literatur, (Heidelberg, 1809). I am using the English translation of London, 1892, p. 497.

6 Tesoro del teatro español (Paris, 1898), p. 249. All subsequent quotations will refer to this edition and will be incorporated in the text.

7 Historia de la literatura y del arte dramático en España, trad. E. de Muir (Madrid, 1887), V, 97. All subsequent quotations will refer to this edition and will be incorporated in the text. Essentially in agreement with this opinion is that of Narciso Díaz de Escovar and Francisco de Paulo Lasso de la Vega, Historia del teatro español (Barcelona, 1924), p. 175.

8 Werke (Leipzig, 1911), XIII, 270. Subsequent quotations will refer to this edition and will be incorporated in the text.

9 "Discurso preliminar" in B.A.E., XXXIX (Madrid, 1950), xxi. All subsequent references to Fernández-Guerra or Moreto's comedias will refer to this edition and will be incorporated in the text.

10 Geschichte des spanischen Nationaldramas (Leipzig, 1890), p. 186. All subsequent references will be incorporated in the text.

11 "Prólogo" in Teatro de Moreto (Madrid, 1916), p. 17. All subsequent references will be incorporated in the text.

12 "The Relation of Moreto's El desdén con el desdén to Suggested Sources," University of Indiana Studies, XI (1924), 1-109.

13 Literatura dramática española (Barcelona, 1939), p. 264.

14 Historia de la literatura española (Madrid, 1956), II, 603.

15 Historia del teatro español (Madrid, 1956), p. 72.

16 Philadelphia, 1932, p. 75. All subsequent references to this book will be included in the text.

17 "El desdén con el desdén: The 'Comedia' Secularized," Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, XXXIV (1957), 1-9.

18 Il teatro di Moreto (Pisa, 1960). Further references to this book will be included in the text.

II

SAN FRANCO DE SENA

Agustín Moreto's San Franco de Sena was first published in 1652,[1] one year after the establishment of the cult of the saint in Madrid,[2] and it seems fairly certain that the play was written on that occasion as part of the celebration in honor of San Franco.

The comedia, which deals with Franco's sinful life and his eventual repentance, has caused critics to reverse their traditional position regarding Moreto's art. It is usually maintained that while unable to breathe spirit into the material he borrowed, Moreto, nevertheless, regularized the action and developed the work along logical and reasonable lines.[3] Here, instead, the detractors of the drama severely score his "wild" imagination. There are two contrasting opinions on the merits of the play: those who dislike it hold that it is the worst work of the playwright; those who admire it, eulogize it as the finest example of the genre. The harshest judgment is that of Adolf von Schack who finds it "una comedia de santos tan rara y desatinada, como las que más lo fueron algunas de las llevadas a la escena" (V, 119). This opinion is wholeheartedly shared by James Fitzmaurice-Kelly, who finds the work "extravagantly and almost ludicrously devout."[4] Narciso Alonso Cortés joins the others in censuring the work which he finds to be an unfortunate

extravagance (p. 15).

These views, so alike in tenor and in language, find an echo in Ruth Lee Kennedy, who decries the lack of taste Moreto displayed in his religious plays and ascribes the failure to the dramatist's personality: "His works show clearly that he had not that appreciation of the mystical, that understanding of the sublime, nor that comprehension of the tragic depths of life which enabled his great contemporary to transform pictures of the commonplace into scenes of moving beauty and grandeur" (p. 40). But, if the strictures are stern, the acclaims are not the less notable. Marcel Dieulafoy is the first to judge the religious comedia according to its own standards. In his book on the religious theatre he remarks that San Franco de Sena " . . .présente une situation dramatique qui lui assigne une place privilégiée dans le théâtre religieux."[5] While Ludwig Pfandl lists it among those plays that give " . . .una grandiosa glorificación de la concepción contemporánea del catolicismo, un cántico a los dogmas y a los preceptos de la divina gracia, de la perfección interior y del amor al prójimo" (p. 129).

Angel Valbuena Prat goes even further. For him, Moreto achieved in this work the height of his art: "En San Franco de Sena, reveló lo más profundo de su genio dramático. La belleza formal, la riqueza de caracteres, la lógica en la evolución de los personajes . . .la fusión de matonismo y piedad, de brío y ternura, de escenas de campamento y tajures, con la ironía en torno al milagro, y la humanización

del plano sobrenatural, se logran en una obra perfectamente equilibrada y de una riqueza de situaciones, como lo mejor de lo mejor."[6]

These diametrically opposed views tend to confuse the reader. Moreover, those who maintain that the play is a religious extravagance, show, because of their training, little sympathy with religious themes and aspirations; while those who find the play flawless do so because they have a different bias. In view of such partisan opinions, I feel that a less committed approach which attempts to explore the true merits of the comedia is needed. I propose, therefore, to undertake an analysis of all the material that contributed substantially to Moreto's play and of the play itself, to explore not only the author's indebtedness to his sources, but also the aims he sought to achieve.

Father Gregorio Lombardello, a prolific writer of saintly vitae, is the principal source regarding the sinful life and exemplary repentance of San Franco de Sena.[7] All the later books on the saint, are derived in greater or lesser measure from his work;[8] they vary only in details and in the numbers of moral lessons they see in the events of the sinner's life. Although the later work of Simone Grassi is of considerable help on several less important points, the Spanish translation by the Carmelitan apologist, F. Diego de Coria Maldonado[9] is indispensable for our purpose. We may assume that this work, published in Barcelona in 1613, rather than the earlier Italian edition of Lombardello was

used by Moreto as the basis of his play. In any event, although it is more a rewording than a faithful translation, it does not depart appreciably from the information given in the original.

The biography maintains the traditional structure of the hagiographic legends and, moreover, emphasizes Carmelite concepts. It is divided into three parts: 1) youth and sinful life of Francc; 2) repentance after divine intervention; 3) exemplary life of contemplation and penitences rewarded by miracles during and after his life. In the first part, his incapacity to learn, his libertine life, and the death of his parents, which is considered the one single incident that contributed heavily to the perdition of the youth, are elaborately presented (p. 1r-3r). Beset by debts, Francc joins the army in the war against Orvieto and it is at this time that he becomes a bandit. In a game of dice, he renounces God and gambles away his eyes. This sacrilege is immediately punished with the loss of his vision. While there are some suggestions that he lost his sight at a later age because of natural causes,[10] most of the pious biographers prefer to repeat the legend. Since he is no longer able to perform his duties, he is released from the army. He first tries to take care of himself, but when he finds he cannot, he realizes his errors and turns to God for help (5v-6r).[11] It is thus that Franco begins the long road toward conversion and sanctity. He vows to visit Santiago at Compostela to beg for the saint's intercession. After many difficulties caused

by the loss of his guide, Dato, and the efforts of the devil to dissuade him, he arrives at the shrine where his eyesight is restored. Upon reflection, he decides to spend the rest of his life in constant pilgrimage and embarks on long trips to visit holy places. During his stay at Loreto, which he visits to atone for an old blasphemy against the Virgin, he sees Mary in a vision and is told by her to become a hermit. Despite his natural disinclination toward solitude he goes to a hermitage and fasts there; because he severely punishes his body he is able to resist the temptations of the devil. A second vision of Mary directs him to join the Carmelite Order. He is at first rejected because his sincerity is doubted, then because he lacks education, and, finally, because he is too old for life in a monastery. However, his unrelenting efforts to be accepted are finally successful. Because of the poverty of the institution he cannot be provided with a habit, but miraculously a youth arrives with a resplendent one. With this sign of divine favor, the second part of the biography ends.

The last section of the book does not touch directly on the play under discussion. It deals with the life of stricter penance which Franco imposes on himself, his miracles and eventual death at the age of eighty. Moreto had promised a second part for his play (III, xvi), presumably to treat the monastic phase of the saint's life, but he never wrote it. The <u>comedia</u>, as we have it, ends with the entrance of Franco into the Order.

Moreto's play is not simply a dramatization of the biography. The latter supplies only the general lines of the drama which falls within the limits of the comedia de santos. In keeping within the genre, the playwright develops a hero-heroine theme, adds graciosos, a father-son relationship, and includes the bandit theme which is nearly always present in such works; I shall discuss these additions in the analysis of the play.

Before proceeding to the study of the comedia, it may be profitable to review in some detail a few elements of the comedia de santos and attempt to place Moreto's work within this tradition.

The Spanish religious drama has, like the profane theatre,[12] a basic pattern which is followed in varying degrees by the individual playwrights. This practice is bolstered by the chronicles and legends of saints on which the plays were often based. It is well known that the holy legends had not only a uniformity of expression and development but also a similarity in the events narrated. Since the chronicler sought to write the edifying life of the Saint, he wove his story in conformity with models of sanctity and borrowed whenever and wherever he saw an opportunity to enhance his preseatation.[13] Running parallel to the question of similarity of contents is the role of the bandit within the genre. He is chosen as the vehicle to show dramatically the force of evil and the power of grace. Thus, thievery, deceit, murder and rape become indispensable ele-

ments of the play. These actions cannot be judged on the grounds of probability, but must be viewed as symbolic incidents, as the obstacles that encumber man on his way to salvation. A. A. Parker sees in the use of the bandit theme the realization of the concept expressed by the phrase, "the greatest sinners make the greatest saints."[14] The movement from sinner to saint and vice-versa was present in the mind of the dramatists of the seventeenth century, as evidenced by such plays as El condenado por desconfiado and O el fraile ha de ser ladrón o el ladrón ha de ser fraile.[15] The boldness and valor shown by the protagonists of the comedia de santos is always viewed as a necessity to emphasize the intensity of passion which will lead to future sanctity. Parker remarks that "estos bandidos pueden llegar a ser santos porque son hombres valientes" (p. 400), and quotes a famous dictum of Juan de Zabaleta: "Cierto que aun para ser santo/ el coraje es provechoso;/ que los tibios nunca aciertan/ ni a ser santos ni demonios" (p. 401).[16]

Moreto's play, like many others of the same type, traces the movement from evil to repentance to holiness. The success of the comedia is due to the felicitious reshaping and expansion of the diverse components inherent in the genre. Basing himself on a few descriptive adjectives (lascivo, gallardo) present in his source, Moreto gives Franco a multi-faceted personality and almost simultaneous presentation: he is shown within the same scene to be courageous,

cruel and pious. While following a woman who has captured his interest, he is attacked by a band of men which he easily overcomes. Before he is able to strike one of them down, the man begs for pardon and invokes the Virgin of the Carmel.[17] The invocation deeply stirs Franco, who although leading a life of sin, has always been devoted to the Virgin. While it is true that the Saint later became a follower of the Blessed Mother, there is no evidence in the original that he had always been attached to her. Indeed, the first time she enters the life of Franco is when he remembers the blasphemy he uttered against her as a youth and this occurs after his repentance. The change that Moreto brings about while showing his independence from the source, is utilized to create a new characterization of the youth. In granting the plea, he reveals in his answer that he is engaged in a struggle between evil, to which he is inclined, and goodness. This conflict finds amplification in the next scene when his father, Mansto, tries to curb him. The presence of the father is another happy addition by the dramatist. Historically, he had died when Franco was still very young, in the play he is kept alive because it affords Moreto the opportunity to develop the character of the son in the manner he has shown.

Franco's reaction to his father's pleadings is a mixture of annoyance, embarrassment, and finally, filial respect. The father-son relationship shows the influence of Tirso's El condenado por desconfiado.[18] While it is unde-

niable that the connection between the two plays exists, there are significant differences that bear discussion. Critical opinion generally holds that the exemplary love Enrico has for his father, together with a faith in God, is the cause of his salvation.[19] One cannot deny that Anareto brings about the final conversion of his son, but the notion that Enrico really loves his father has been attacked recently by T. E. May.[20] This critic holds that far from being a touching example of filial devotion and parental affection, the relationship is one of irony and deceit. He argues that Anareto is not only aware of his son's crimes (contrary to Enrico's belief), but that he is in a large measure responsible for the young man's degeneration. May insists that the indulgence Anareto has shown toward his son during the latter's formative years accounts in part for Enrico's misdeeds. Since he realizes his fault, the father hides the knowledge of Enrico's crimes. The son, in his turn, is also guilty of deception, for he continues his evil life while professing obedience and an immeasurate love for Anareto. The scenes of seemingly mutual affection are then to be interpreted as highly ironic episodes representative of the wit of the Spanish <u>comedia</u> in which what is said is only an allusion to the events that really matter. Enrico, therefore, represents no longer a man saved through faith and a single act of love, but a man who, despite his folly, is able to accept, through the intercession of his father, the great sacrifice that Christ made for him.

The father-son relationship has none of these complications in Moreto's play. Mansto is completely aware of Franco's crimes; like Anareto he has suffered the loss of money and standing in society, but unlike the former, he does not tolerate his son's evil. He has nothing to reproach himself for; he has always tried to guide his son although he has failed to change him. For this reason, Mansto never hesitates to reprimand his son. He has not spoiled him and the evil that Franco does cannot be attributed to him. While the relationship between Franco and his father is ambiguous, like that of Enrico and Anareto, the equivocation is due to a different cause. Franco never professes to cherish his father, he never attempts to hide his actions. Both of them know exactly their respective positions. The discordance in their relationship is due to Franco's feelings for his father. The young man is set in his life of crimes, but at the same time has a latent affection for Mansto. Since he has not been able to affirm his love conclusively he alternates between respect and rudeness:

> Haz más corta la oración,
> Padre, para corregirme;
> Que, por Dios, que en mi atención
> Iba tan largo el sermón,
> Que he estado para dormirme. (I, iii)

This fluctuation gives the character a movement and a sense of growing not present in that portion of the Tirso play.

When Franco decides to defy the authorities to save his father (II, ii), the incident is more meaningful than the similar episode in El condenado por desconfiado (II, xvii) because it marks a further step toward reformation and not another proof of a "filial devotion" that had already been amply developed.

Moreto continues the change from dutiful son to irrepentent sinner: when Mansto is about to invoke a malediction,[21] Franco fearfully begs him not to continue, but immediately after, he undertakes the abduction of a woman. This duality in Franco, the dormant goodness and the dominant violence, is the essence of his character and Moreto masterfully emphasizes this idea by ending the scenes dealing with it and introducing another personage.

Lucrecia is developed entirely from a brief mention in the original which simply says that there was a woman called "Lucrecia que no biuía bien y honestamente, por lo qual toda la ciudad ponía lengua en ella . . ." (29r). The rest of the characterization is a variation on the woman in the comedias de santos. The classic example of the heroine in this type of play is an innocent woman, who deceived by her lover or an unscrupulous man, turns to bandolera to avenge herself of the affront.[22] Her crimes are then mitigated by the circumstances which require a defense of one's honor. Typical are Julia in La devoción de la Cruz; Lisarda of El esclavo del demonio, and Ninfa in La ninfa del cielo.[23] Moreto has changed the blameless girl into a woman whose

temperament is substantially responsible for her downfall: Lucrecia is sorry that she didn't get to see the fight between Franco and the others: "Me muero/ Por ver unas cuchilladas,/ Y más cuando son de celos" (I, vi). And when she finds herself dishonored the conclusion of her long speech is that it is better to enjoy what destiny wills:

> Esta es mi resolución
> Mi postrer razón es esta,
> Permítalo o no el decoro,
> Súfralo o no la modestia,
> Condénelo o no el respeto;
> Que estoy a tomar resuelta
> Por elección el deleite
> Que trae el daño por fuerza. (II, vi)

By making her so evidently indisposed toward repentance, Moreto is able to explore another aspect of the multisided mercy of God, the guidance of the guardian angel. But, while her desire for violent emotions and the ready condescension to follow the free life are the cause of her downfall, she is not entirely devoid of laudable qualities. In her refusal to marry a dandy, she ridicules him and elaborates on a well known topic: "Que las aguas y los peines/ Me gaste, y si no tenemos/ Más de uno, que cada día/ Riñamos por el espejo" (I, vi). She sees nothing wrong when a plebeian looks at her or even falls in love with her; she refuses to accept responsibility for other people's actions

in this respect: she maintains that anyone can love another but cannot expect the affection to be returned. Characteristically, she enjoys the compliments and the attention:

> Cuando voy por una calle,
> Y algunos mozos encuentro
> Que pasan muy mesurados,
> Sin decir malo ni bueno,
> Les arrancara los ojos;
> Que pues callando me vieron,
> Por no tenerme por fea,
> Me holgara de verlos ciegos
> Si hallo algunos que me digan
> Donaires o atrevimientos,
> Aunque se enoje la cara,
> Nunca me ha entrado dentro.
> Y cuando no hay quien me hable,
> Con tan grande desconsuelo
> Vuelvo a casa, que no soy
> Todo el día de provecho. (I, vi)

Lucrecia is a woman of striking qualities: she admires courage, initiative, brashness. However, these same traits are potentially dangerous because they imply too great a dependence on herself. Her brother's wish that she marry a rich old man precipitates a reaction that falls within the bounds of rebellion against family authority. She violently refuses to agree to a marriage that would bring her unhappi-

ness. She accuses Federico of arranging this union for his own benefit and is determined to resist his attempts to rule her life:

> Y en fin, no he de sufrir que hagas,
> Siendo para mí de hierro,
> Y en fin, no he de sufrir que hagas,
> De encomienda para tí
> La cruz de mi casamiento.
> Sobre esto jura, amenaza,
> Hiere o mata; que a mi pecho
> No le turban tiranías,
> Si para todo hay remedio. (I, vii)

Lucrecia is a resolute woman who intends to do everything she can to thwart her brother's designs; she even receives her lover in her room. This action, so representative of her character, gives the spectator an opportunity to guage Federico's accusation that her behavior is socially unacceptable and harmful to their reputation:

> Que está mi honor muy a riesgo
> Con una hermana tan libre,
> Que no la quitan mis ruegos
> De noche de los balcones,
> De día de los paseos;
> Y acaso me lo murmura
> Toda Sena . . . (I, vii)

Despite the possibility that Federico is forcing his sister into an unwanted marriage for his own benefit, his words are no mere excuse. The free spirit of Lucrecia and her actions have given rise to talk and gossip and, although she has not lost her honor, she has compromised herself even in the eyes of her lover. When Lucrecia suggests that she run away with him, Aurelio is willing but inwardly has no desire to marry her:

> (Ap. Eso es lo que yo no acepto,
> Que con su opinión, Lucrecia
> No es para mujer; mas esto
> Callaré, que si es engaño
> No habré sido yo el primero.) (I, ix)

Aurelio's statement shows his lack of moral sense and his weakness. While he allows his love to ebb in the face of adverse public opinion, he willingly takes advantage of the situation to dishonor Lucrecia. It is Lucrecia's bad fortune that she who has a sense of her own dignity should be surrounded by such unworthy men who cannot channel her haughtiness; on the contrary their actions and her own fiery personality conspire to bring about her perdition. In any event, it is clear that Lucrecia's actions are prejudicial to her reputation and her insistence on them will result in greater danger for her.

Moreto has divided the first act into three parts: the presentation of Franco, the characterization of Lucrecia, and

the prelude to disaster caused by the incontinence of the first and the lack of restraint of the other. While Aurelio waits with the musicians, who are to give the signal for the girl to leave the house,[24] Franco comes in looking for the woman he has been searching for. Moreto effectively uses the same music to underscore the danger inherent in Franco's actions, and clothes the admonition in a pun on the word franco:

> Niña, la feria te acuerde
> Que ya está el franco con llave,
> Porque cualquier hombre sabe
> Que el franco agora se pierde. (I, x)

Neither man is able to act until Aurelio approaches the intruder and requests his leave. The irascible Franco refuses to move and a fight ensues during which Aurelio is killed. Meanwhile, Lucrecia and Lesbia, her maid, leave the house and fall into the arms of the waiting criminals. The act is admirably constructed; Moreto achieves his purpose with economy and directness. The effective manner in which it ends is due to the careful characterization of the protagonists: he does not need to state what will happen to Lucrecia because the personalities of his characters have been described in such a way as to make her fall a natural consequence of their actions.

Where the first act introduces the personages, the second treats the sinful life of Franco. A substantial amount

of the action deals with the attempt of Franco to rescue his father. The episodes are nearly all the creation of Moreto; however, he does make use of two significant parts of the biography. Father Coria had written that Franco continued his life of vice while in the army and that he joined a group of bandits who terrorized the countryside (4v-5v). Moreto takes this information and integrates it into his theme while changing the staging considerably.

Despite the personal danger involved in entering the city, Franco decides to rescue his sick father who by now is at the mercy of the local police. This action clearly demonstrates the growing concern for his father which, to a degree, attenuates his cruelty. The tension that exists within Franco, the conflict between an undeveloped goodness and a manifest wickedness is shown once again, for in performing such a pious deed he has to rely on further violence. Another example of his lawlessness, which verges on the sacrilegious and hence a revolt against God, is provided when he tries to put out the light from a cross that marks the place where Aurelio was slain. In spite of a warning by a sepulchral voice, Franco insists on carrying out his action because it disturbs his plans. In the face of such impudence an arm appears mysteriously and stops him. The incident is similar to many others present in Golden Age theatre. The supernatural admonition has nearly always the same purpose: it is a sign of divine displeasure, an attempt to curb the excesses of man, but one that goes unheeded. The rejection of the celestial warning has also the aim of

showing the hardness of the offender and his unwillingness to change his ways. In Franco, it has the effect that one might expect, it frightens him, which is a salutary indication, but just as quickly, he dismisses the incident from his mind.

The violent and incontrollable spirit of Franco is given full opportunity to reveal itself in the scenes that deal with the rescue of his father. He finds that the police are maltreating the old man who is wrongly accused of having given aid to his son. Despite the illness and the advanced age which prohibit him from moving, Mansto is being arrested and, to make matters worse, a neighbor is falsely accusing both Franco and his father. This spurs the young man to take revenge on his accuser. He quietly asks the police the reason for their inquest; but while looking at the arrest order he slowly tears it. When the alguaciles protest he kills them all with the help of Dato. While he has ample reasons to be incensed, the arguments he gives for his annoyance expose his character, the defects of his being, the real cause of his ruin. He recognizes no authority, he is a law unto himself:

> Que junto a mí no hay quien pare,
> Que esta es mi ley y mi fe,
> Y sobre esto mataré
> Todo cuanto ucé mandare.

He tramples on other people's rights if they do not coincide with his wishes and his response to a challenge is always

violence and defiance:

> Con los que son ricos como,
> Mi dinero es mi delito;
> Si me lo dan, lo permito,
> Y cuando no, se lo tomo
> Y pisando este camino,
> Si hay quien no lo quiere así,
> Van puñaladas de mí
> Como sangre de un tocino. (II, iv)

The mixture of arrogance and filial concern help to keep Franco a fluid personality and prevent him from freezing into a pattern of evil behavior.

Moreto always tries to place scenes where they are most effective. He had ended the first act with Lucrecia and Lesbia leaving the house only to be met by Franco. The two women will be whisked away by him and there is no doubt as to their fate. Lucrecia's own forwardness and the consequent rebellion against her brother have brought about her fall. Since her precipitous action carries within itself the seed of self-destruction, Moreto delays her entrance. When he finally re-introduces her, she has no longer a freedom of choice. The most decisive moment for her has taken place and now she can only lament her bad fortune. That her dishonor is a punishment for her misconduct is not clear to Lucrecia. This inability to connect sin to castigation prevents her from making any amends. The events are simply <u>desdichas</u>

and since she has no place to turn she chooses to follow him who has dishonored her. In this resolve she is seconded enthusiastically by Lesbia who possesses in a greater degree all the lamentable qualities of the mistress.

It is evident that the only check on the exhuberant nature of the two sinners will not come from within them but from outside; neither Franco nor Lucrecia has learned from experience. Franco had been forwarned by the voice of the dead Aurelio before going to rescue his father. On the way back, after his ferocious attack on the police, he receives a second warning:

> La misma voz que en mi afrenta
> Me dió antes horror, me dijo:
> 'Franco, en el juego te emplea;
> Que hoy perdiendo has de ganar'. (II, viii)

Moreto takes the oxymoron from love poetry and gives it greater vitality by applying it to a concrete event. The conceit not only foreshadows the central episode of the play but also serves to characterize Franco. His behavior differs greatly from that of Enrico in Tirso's play. The latter has no fear of death nor is he worried about his salvation when he is about to be killed (II, xvi, xvii); the former, on the other hand, is very apprehensive; he is tormented by the ambiguity of the sign and wonders why this man, of all the persons he has killed, should persecute him. Of course, after the initial bewilderment he forgets about the warning

and continues his libertine life. Instead of using the incidents mentioned in the biography, Moreto invents some episodes to indicate the unrepentance and evil ways of Franco. A series of scenes with Federico, who is seeking to avenge himself of his sister who has brought dishonor to the household, is employed for the purpose. Federico has come to Franco because of his reputation and is unaware that he is the one who is the cause of his shame:

> Fed. (Ap.) Si las noticias son ciertas,
> Valiéndome deste hombre,
> He de averiguar mi afrenta
> Y asegurar mi venganza. (II, x)

Franco willingly accepts the task of killing Federico's enemy until the entrance of Lucrecia reveals the facts of the situation and the brother is driven out of the camp.

A further evidence of his lack of contrition is the sacriligious conduct in the card game. All the pious legends narrate how Franco lost his eyes in a dice game. Moreto chooses this incident as the pivotal episode of his drama. He rejects the more prosaic truth of natural blindness after many years, to seize upon the legend whose dramatic exemplariness the playwright needed to climax the wickedness of the young man. This reason and not an unwillingness to deviate from the source material guides Moreto's choice.[25] In the game, which the dramatist has changed into a card game, Franco first loses his gold, then his clothing, and finally, when he

has nothing else of value to bet, and to show his rebellion he bets his eyes:

> Tengo los ojos,
> Y los juego en lo mismo; que descreo
> De quien los hizo para tal empleo. (II, xiv)

The sacrilege horrifies even his fellow criminals; it is obvious that Franco has lost control of himself. He sins not only against himself, but against nature and against God. He has given himself over to vice to such a degree that he is deprived of his rationality.[26] His folly is the greater because he is using the most precious gift of man not for his salvation, but for his damnation. This perversion of St. Mathew's words: "Quod si oculus tuus dexter facit ut tu offendas, erue eum, & abiice abs te, expedit enim tibi ut pereat vnum ex membris tuis, ac non totum corpus tuum coniiciatur in gehennam" (5: 29), rings in the ears of the spectator with force and renders the insane act of Franco more frightening. Moreto makes this central episode, of the life of the saint, the axis of his play. Having reached the abyss of his sinful life, Franco begins now the long climb toward sanctity. Like Paul of Tarsus, the blindness causes him to see the light immediately.[27] His plea for forgiveness shows the extent of his contrition. He realizes that the punishment is a consequence of his impiety:

> ¡Ay de mí, cielos! Ya yo estoy rendido;
> Ya conozco, Señor, que yerro en todo,

Y no he levantarme deste modo.
A Dios indigné, yo, y su providencia
Le ha quitado a mi error la resistencia.

He admits the enormity of his sins but he is also aware of the infinite mercy of God: "Perdón para tanto yerro,/ Mi Dios; que si mucho os pido,/ Vos sois Dios y yo soy hombre." However, while confiding in the compassion of the Lord, he feels the weight of his error and requests the help of Mary, the great intercessor, to obtain grace:

María, abogada nuestra,
La fe que en vos he tenido
Me valga ahora; al sagrado
De vuestro amor me retiro.

The charge that Moreto slavishly follows his source is belied once again. Mary's appearance to inform Franco that his sins are forgiven does not occur in the biography until he has spent many years as a hermit and several as a monk (25v). Moreto chooses to have it now because he wants to show that a great repentance brings about immediate fruit. His prayer to Mary is answered, a chorus of voices orders Franco to get up and follow it. Just as Paul was led away to receive the gift of light, so Franco, led by the voice, walks toward his salvation:

Ya la sigo
Porque en mi pena, en mi llanto,

En mi corazón contrito,
En mi dura penitencia,
Vea el mundo, admire el siglo,
Que estuvo ciego con ojos
El que sin ojos ha visto. (II, xv)

Moreto intends the character to have a much wider significance than mere personal experience. Franco in uttering the words that mark the return to God makes it clear that he is an exemplum and not an individual.[28] It is this general application of the man's actions that tends to blur out his individuality. His life, like that of other saints, has one purpose, to inspire, to elevate, to exalt, and to edify. However, in the dramatization, the fusion of particular characteristics into a type, the sinful man who returns to God, must be minimized. Such a situation is theatrically unsuitable and therefore the playwright needs to transfer the moral teaching into dramatic tension, and his play will succeed only if he can recast the type into human experience. It is this need that makes the use of "accessories" inevitable. States of mind must be made clear, spiritual sensations must be conveyed, divine inspiration becomes visible occurances, abstractions turn into substances. It is perhaps these difficulties that have given rise to charges of extravagance, although the devices were used before and after Moreto. One of these expedients is the presence of Lucrecia's Guardian Angel. Theologically, there is nothing new about a robber having a guardian. The noted contemporary theologian, Fran-

cisco Suárez maintains that every individual is protected by one,[29] and that the Angel Guardian should try to help his ward out of difficulties is also very normal.[30] In other plays there are frequent requests for help from the angel; here, he becomes a character within the action.[31] His physical presence changes his role from an abstraction to an actuality and shows vividly the length to which God will go to protect his children. Moreto foregoes the dramatization of Franco's penitence; instead, he has Lucrecia's angel, Custodio, relate what has happened to him. Franco has left the world and has retired into a cave. His behavior follows the Carmelite tradition set, according to legend, by the prophet Elijah. Franco has chosen Mary as his guide, he is devoted to the scapulary, he has imitated Elijah in his search for solitude. This interior movement toward God is revealed by an exterior manifestation of repentance, the carrying of heavy chains.[32] The total transformation of Franco as told by Custodio sharpens the difference between him and the still recusant woman. But, just as Franco rejected all signs before the intervention of God, so does Lucrecia refuse to abandon her life; indeed, she has become worse, for she is now a bandolera. The Angel has joined her physically to free her from error and to direct her toward salvation. Custodio tries to prevent her from killing and seeks to avoid a meeting with her brother, whom she holds responsible for her misfortune.[33] The Angel has promised her a bigger victory, which is the conquest over herself, but which she can only understand as

a physical conquest.

Despite some scenes which deal with the gracioso and which provide not only relief from the action, but also ridicule the popular acceptance of milagrería, the movement of the third act is toward the contrition of Lucrecia. The presence of the Angel, his admonitions, and his actions which prevent her from committing crimes, have had their effect. The Angel remarks that it is the heart's anticipation of a change that makes her fretful. But, the final conversion is carried out through a miracle. Here we see Moreto's ability to adapt material to fit his purpose. In the biography, there is an episode in which Franco, invited to a banquet in honor of a saint, is offended by a drunkard who does not believe that the hermit has really repented of his licentious life. He exclaims that Franco's salvation is as much possible as for the capons on the table to fly (17v-18r). Thereupon the holy man utters a prayer and the birds fly away. Moreto's play does not need this proof of sanctity since he developed the repentance of Franco adequately. The dramatist then utilizes this dramatic episode for another purpose. Instead of a banquet, there is a meal in the bandit camp; Franco is not present although the conversation is about him. One of the criminals utters words similar to those in the original:

> ¿Franco en tan santos cuidados?
> Esta es de las que echar suelen;
> Más posible es el que vuelen
> Estos pájaros asados. (III, viii)

The Angel, to prove that the transformation of a sinner is possible, allows them to fly away. The use of birds to do the bidding of holy men is very common; they are usually live birds who bring food to the hermit or take it away from sinners.[34] Here we have a slight variation on the topos. What is more important is that the episode is used to convert Lucrecia; she is now convinced that Franco is a saint ("Absorta lo he conocido"). The recognition of the sanctity of the erstwhile bandit is important for the contrition of Lucrecia; she realizes the possibility of repentance and forgiveness; that she too can achieve it and need not despair.[35] The theme of universal mercy for the contrite sinner had earlier been suggested by the Angel:

> Pecadores, vivid con esperanza;
> No desconfie vuestro error, mortales
> Por sus cumbres buscad la penitencia; (III, i)

It is aid from heaven that brings about a change for the second time. In giving a qualified approval to the play, Ermanno Caldera stresses the fact that Franco "diviene santo per intervento superiore, non per forza propria" (p. 117). There is an implied criticism of the event which is not proper in this case. Caldera's censure would be more fitting if Moreto were tracing the development of a character. The dramatist is here portraying instead divine mercy and the episode is well within the Carmelite concept of grace as a dynamic force, enlightening and cleansing the soul.[36]

The final step of the conversion of Lucrecia takes place within the cave of Franco where the Angel leads the troubled woman.[37] The presence of the cave satisfies not only a tradition of this type of drama, but is also a symbol of a state of being. Solitude is an almost indispensable requisite for the contemplation of God. Indeed, the hermit has always been considered the most eloquent witness of the Risen Christ;[38] he is looked upon as the true follower of Christ because more than any one else he personifies the complete apatheia, the renunciation of all for the sake of the Savior.[39] In the Christian tradition the hermit's cave is regarded as the most propitious atmosphere for reaching God.[40] There is another significant object in the presentation of Franco's solitude. Since his greatest sin was pride in himself and in his authority, loneliness serves to expiate it. Merton sees the purpose of the solitary life as the bringing together of the soul into the "center of her humility."[41] Franco, in seeking this humility that he never possessed, gains his salvation.

The scene of reconciliation between the two ex-lovers is staged to show the general application of repentance; it transcends the particular sinner and makes her a human being in search of God. Her first words do not convey the full expression of her sorrow and to indicate this, Moreto has the crucifix turn its back to her[42] while the chorus intones Tibi soli peccavi. Only then does Lucrecia understand that remorse must come from the soul and be the expression of a

passionate grief:

La espalda me ha vuelto el Cristo,
Y el rostro a la muerte he visto;
Justo es, pues yo le ofendí.
Pues agora, llanto mío,
Agora, agora, pesar,
Agora es tiempo de dar
Calor a pecho tan frío.
Sean mis ojos un río,
Ciéguense a tanto dolor.
Y pues les niega el favor
Del rostro vuestra piedad,
No les quede claridad
Para ver vuestro rigor.

In her anguish, she turns to the man in the cave whom she does not yet recognize and begs his help like a person who is drowning: "Qué me anego! ¡Qué me anego!" The words of praise that Lucrecia directs to Franco have a pathetic quality when one realizes that she seeks aid from the man who drove her into sin. At this point, the hermit joins his pleadings to those of Lucrecia and reminds God that she is the lost sheep that wants to come back to the fold. As the chorus sings, the Crucifix turns around and faces the woman. While the device used by Moreto to indicate forgiveness may be somewhat obvious, it must be remembered that he was following a long Christian tradition of objectifying moral ideas,

of concretizing supernatural forces to show the designs of God. The turning of Christ is a metaphor for the pardon of God and must be valued for its profound representative meaning and not as an extravagance.

The grace of God having descended upon them, Franco reveals himself to Lucrecia who readily forgives him, indeed, she finds in him the guide to her salvation:

> Cáiga sobre mí tu llanto
> Para que mis culpas lave,
> Y a tus pies, oh santo, pido
> Como deuda de tus piedades
> Pues a enfermar me trajiste,
> Que me lleves donde sane. (III, xi)

It remains for Franco to join the Carmelite Order formally because the Virgin has requested it.[43] Moreto, skirting the difficulties and long trials that the historical Franco had, allows him to be admitted after only a slight hesitation that is due not to the reluctance of the Order to admit such a great sinner, but to the fact that the monastery is very poor. The installation of Franco as a Carmelite takes place while Lucrecia, in an apotheosis of the repentant sinner, is borne to heaven by angels. It is the Guardian Angel who frames these events within their proper Christian context:

> Honrad a Dios, pecadores,
> La fe imitando constantes

De Lucrecia, a quien miráis,
Pues fue su dolor tan grande,
Que después de haber lavado
Con la contrición más grave,
En la confesión sus culpas,
Al que le dió ausílios tales
Ya el santo espíritu entrega. (III, xvi)

Moreto's San Franco de Sena is a profoundly religious play. While basing his work on the life of Franco Lippi as translated by Father Coria, he employs the traditional material of the comedia de santos to mold his theme of Christian repentance. He does not hesitate to alter events to maintain the exemplarity of his play. He telescopes time, rejects history in favor of the more meaningful legenda and introduces other characters to intensify the force of his subject. He leans heavily on Christian vitae and chronicles to capture the spirit of contrition. He borrows some episodes from the play of Tirso de Molina to develop the character of his protagonist. He reworks the theme of the hermit to reflect the triumphant mercy of God; he balances the personality of Franco on a thin line of cruelty and goodness which gives the play its tension. While he does not deal with a complex theological problem, as Tirso does in El condenado por desconfiado, he is able to treat with interest and deep feeling the theme of contrition and forgiveness.

N O T E S

[1] It was first published in the Parte primera de varios (Madrid) and then in the Parte primera of Moreto (Madrid, 1654). It also appears in a suelta dated Valencia, 1765 under the title El lego de Carmen.

[2] "La divozione verso il B. Franco ebbe principio nella Spagna l'anno 1651, allorchè nel convento del Carmine di Madrid i religiosi conversi ne incominciarono a celebrare la festa." See Simone Grassi, Vita del B. Franco Lippi, Carmelitano (Firenze, 1680). I used the Monza edition of 1878, p. 183.

[3] Ruth Lee Kennedy's remark is representative of this opinion: "With him [Alarcón] he shares a tendency to moralize, a talent for plot construction and for logical characterization, a predilection for straightforward dialogue" p. 121.

[4] A History of Spanish Literature (New York, 1898), p. 335.

[5] Le théâtre édifiant (Paris, 1907), p. 45

[6] Historia del teatro español (Madrid, 1956), p. 249.

[7] La vita del Beato Franco, Sanese da Grotti (Firenze, 1611).

[8] Gregorio Lombardello, Vida y milagros de San Franco de Sena, Carmelita, trans. P. F. Diego de Coria Maldonado (Barcelona, 1613); Evasio Leone, Carmelitano, Il cantico dei cantici, vols I, II, III (Fermo, 1803); P. Luis María Llop, El hijo de la Gracia o San Franco de Sena (Jérez, 1911).

[9] Father Coria's work is part of his lifelong effort to explain and establish the Carmelite tradition. See T. S. R. Boase, "A Seventeenth Century Carmelite Legend based on Tacitus," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, III (1939-40), 107.

[10] Butler's Lives of Saints, ed. Thurston, Attwater, vol. IV (London, 1956), 543.

[11] Father Coria stresses that only after he felt abandoned by everyone did he turn to God.

[12] For a discussion of the basic form of the comedia see A. G. Reichenberger, "The Uniqueness of the Comedia," Hispanic Review, XXVII (1959), 107-119.

[13] For this aspect of the saints' legends see Charles W. Jones, Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England (Ithaca, N. Y., 1947), pp. 58-59; Hippolyte Delehaye, Cinq leçons sur la méthode hagiographique (Bruxelles, 1934), p. 11 and Les légendes hagiographiques (Bruxelles, 1934), p. 27: "Au portrait vivant et nettement caractérisé que nous a legué l'histoire, se substitue un être idéal qui n'est que la personnification d'une abstraction; au lieu de l'individu, la

multitude ne connaît que le type."

[14] "Santos y bandoleros en el teatro español del Siglo de Oro," Arbor, XIII (1949), 400.

[15] For a discussion of the integration of the bandit theme into a religious subject see Edward Glaser, "La comedia de Felipe Godinez O el fraile ha de ser ladrón o el ladrón ha de ser fraile," Revista de literatura, XII (1957), 91-107. For a social-historical interpretation of the comedia de santos see Charles Aubrun, "La comedia doctrinale et ses histoires de brigands," Bulletin Hispanique, LIX (1957), 137-51.

[16] The connection between strength and sanctity is also underlined by F. Coria: " . . .le llamaron Franco, significando por este nombre que assí como auía de ser franco y poderoso en las maldades, con la gracia de Dios con mayor franqueza y fortaleza auía de vencer al demonio, y ser gran sieruo de Dios . . ." p. 2v.

[17] A similar episode is present in Calderón's La devoción de la Cruz, ed. A. Valbuena Prat (Madrid, 1930), vs. 375-79.

[18] See Kennedy, p. 194.

[19] See Ramón Menéndez Pidal, "El condenado por desconfiado," in Estudios literarios, Madrid, 1922, pp. 9-100 and Karl Vossler, "Alredador del Condenado por desconfiado de

Tirso de Molina," Revista Cubana, XIV (1940), 19-37. For a further discussion of the play, see Leo Spitzer, "Una variante italiana del tema del Condenado por desconfiado," Revista de filología hispánica, I (1939), 361-68.

[20] "El condenado por desconfiado: 1. The Enigmas, 2. Anareto," Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, XXXV (1958), 138-156.

[21] Compare to the scene in Mira de Amescua's El esclavo del demonio, ed. A. Valbuena Prat (Madrid, 1926), vs. 110-32.

[22] See Parker, p. 398.

[23] For discussions of this last play, see Courtney Bruerton, "La ninfa del cielo, La serrana de la vera, and Related Plays," in Estudios hispánicos. Homenaje a Archer M. Huntington (Wellsley, Mass., 1952), pp. 61-97. For a psychological interpretation of the events see Everett W. Hesse, "¿Es La ninfa del cielo, atribuída a Tirso, una 'comedia desatinada'?" Filología Romanza, III (1956), 141-61.

[24] Music as a signal is also used in the play Caer para levantar for which Moreto collaborated with Matos Fragoso and Cáncer Velasco, I, iv. This play is very close to Mira's El esclavo del demonio. See Valbuena Prat's edition of Mira's comedia for a collation of the two plays.

[25] Kennedy thinks that Moreto failed in his religious theatre because: "He has not used the poet's prerogative

of selection, and as a result the unpoetic and the ludicrous are indiscriminately patched together into a wearisome chronicle" p. 37.

[26] Sin, as a consequence of loss of understanding, is expressed more explicitly in El condenado por desconfiado, II, xv: "Decidle que yo quisiera,/ Cuando comienzo a gozar/ Entendimiento y razón,/ Pasar mil muertes y mas,/ Antes que haberle ofendido." Simone Grassi echoes the same thought: "La lussuria . . .accieca altresì l'intelletto e giunge a separare totalmente l'uomo da Dio" p. 83.

[27] The similarity between Franco's case and Paul's has not escaped the attention of his biographers, Grassi, p. 22, Llup, p. 61.

[28] The exemplarity of Franco's life was also pointed out by Grassi: " . . .conoscendo che la lettura di questo libro poteva facilmente svellere dai cuori dei più scellerati peccatori la disperazione ed inservire la confidenza nella misericordia e bontà del loro pietosissimo Redentore" p. 8.

[29] Opera Omnia (Madrid, 1620). I am using the Paris edition of 1855, vol. II, libri VI, cap. XVII, no. 14, p. 751.

[30] The Dictionnaire de Spiritualité II (Paris, 1953), 590 notes: "Il n'est pas rare que les esprits tutélaires se mettent au service de leurs protegés pour les soulager ou les tirer d'embarras."

[31] The Angel as well as the devil also appear in Caer para levantar, III, xi and in La ninfa del cielo, III, x.

[32] The use of chains as penance is frequent among hermits. See Walter Nigg, Warriors of God, trans. Mary Ilford (New York, 1959), p. 42. Penance is also a common practice among Carmelites. See E. Allison Peers, Spirit of Flame (London, 1944), pp. 122-23.

[33] The woman who rebels against her family and then seeks vengeance against them also appears in El esclavo del demonio, vs. 681-91.

[34] The connection between hermits and birds is frequent in hagiography perhaps following the pattern set by Elijah who was fed by ravens, Kings, 17:6. See also Jean Canu, Religious Orders of Men (New York, 1960), p. 14; Charles P. Weaver, The Hermit in English Literature from the Beginning to 1660 (Nashville, Tenn., 1924), p. 63.

[35] The effect of the miracles of the birds on Lucrecia is a parallel development of the reaction of the King Ahab in Tirso's La mujer que manda en casa, II, iv. He too recognizes the power of God in the miracle of the birds, but unlike Lucrecia his conversion does not take place because of the machinations of Jezebel. For a study of this play see, Edward Glaser, "Tirso de Molinas' La mujer que manda en casa," Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale, Sezione Romanza, II, 1 (1960), 25-42.

[36] Dom David Knowles in the prologue to J. P. De Caussade's Self-Abandonment to Divine Providence (London, 1952), p. xi.

[37] The symbolism of the cave in Carmelitan tradition has been studied by Helmut Hatzfeld in "Las profundas cavernas. The Structure of a Symbol of San Juan de la Cruz," Quaderni Iberoamericani, XI (1951), 171-74. He finds that the soul can best meet Christ in a cave which represents both a removal from the world and a penetration into one's interior.

[38] Thomas Merton, Disputed Questions (New York, 1960), p. 165.

[39] For the importance of the hermit in the Christian Church see George R. Coffman, "A Note on Saints' Legends," Royster Memorial Studies (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1931), p. 48; Edward Malone, O.S.B., The Monk and the Martyr (Washington, D.C., 1950), p. 15; Pierre Sage, Le 'Bon Prêtre' dans la littérature française d'Amadis de Gaule au Génie du Christianisme. (Geneva, 1951), pp. 19-39, 66-74.

[40] Thomas Merton, The Silent Life (New York, 1957), p. 149.

[41] Disputed Questions, p. 173.

[42] Moreto uses the same device in La milagrosa elección de San Pío Quinto, II, xxi. Miracles of the moving Christ

have been frequently noted. See Dom Louis Gaugaud, Dévotions et pratiques du Moyen Age (Paris, 1925, p. 77.

[43] T. S. R. Boase reports that one of the landscapes of Gaspar Dughet in S. Silvestro and S. Martino ai Monti in Rome shows the Virgin appearing to St. Simon Stock and ordering him to assume the Carmelite Habit, p. 109-110.

III

EL LICENCIADO VIDRIERA

Cervantes' El licenciado Vidriera, first published in Madrid, 1613,[1] occupies a particular place among his other novelas because of the use of Märchen and Wandernovelle elements and the subdivision of its structure into exterior and interior movement. It is precisely this variety of techniques, coupled with the difficulty of fitting the role of the witticisms within the short story that has made it a bone of contention among critics.

The following brief discussion of the major aspects of the short story will point out the elements from which Moreto fashioned his play. The attention of those who have dealt with it has rightly been focused on the three significant aspects of the work: the source, the structure, and the meaning. The question of the source has given rise to proposals and counterproposals since Martín Fernández de Navarrete suggested that the German Humanist Caspar Barth was the model for Tomás Rodaja.[2] The similarities between Barth and Rodaja seemed to support the contention: the German was a scholar and a prodigious reader, interested in Spanish literature and a translator of La Celestina and the Diana Enamorada of Gil Polo.[3] In his later years he came to believe that he was made of glass and avoided people for fear of breaking. The suggestion was accepted as valid until R. Foulché-Delbosc,

in his edition of the short-story,[4] proved that there were serious chronological discrepancies in the story. To begin with, Barth never went to Spain so Cervantes could not have met him, as it is suggested; secondly, Barth is reputed to have lost his mind as an old man after a lifetime of deep studies and Cervantes' novela was written before 1612 when Barth was only 25 years old. Marcel Bataillon suggests that Barth's remark on La Celestina ("liber plane divinus") is so intriguingly close to Cervantes' dictum on the same book, that the idea joined the two people in the minds of later critics.[5] Although the specific source mentioned by Navarrete proved to be erroneous, the suggestion that Cervantes based his character on the idea of the "melancholic" scholar, is, I think, correct. Previous attempts at finding a historical model have revealed an unwielding plethora of examples which further little our understanding.[6] Rather than search for a specific individual we must look into the ideas of the time to find the source of Cervantes' hero.

The madness of Tomás which is the central portion of the novela is a clear case of melancholia. This becomes evident if we compare the descriptions of Tomas' illness and behavior to the writings on psychic disorders of the 17th century. The ideas of the period were, of course, derived from classical sources and in particular from Aristotle and Galen. That these opinions were shared by all Europeans can be seen by the great similarities between the views of English and Spanish writers. To begin with, Tomás, after

taking the potion, is sick for six months "en los cuales se secó y se puso, como suele decirse en los huesos." This drying up or "adustion" is then followed by his new-found wisdom. One of the most renowned works of the time is that of Juan Huarte de San Juan whose influence on Cervantes has been noted before.[7] Speaking about this facet of the illness he supports his statement with the authority of a classical author: "Heraclito dijo: 'splendor siccus, animus sapientissimus' por la cual sentencia nos da a entender que la sequedad es causa de ser el hombre muy sabio" (p. 139). And Levinus Lemnius, as quoted in an English translation of the Elizabethan period, maintains that melancholy men are "leane, dry, lank."[8] The behavior of Rodaja during his madness reflects faithfully the opinions on melancholy held by contemporary writers and reported by Babb: "Many melancholy men have absurd anxieties regarding their own persons. Some think that they are earthen pots and are continually afraid of being broken . . . Another is afraid to sit because he thinks that his buttocks are made of glass" (p. 43). Like Rodaja, the melancholy man is "very obstinate and intractable. Any attempt to persuade him that his fancy is groundless only makes him cling to it more stubbornly, and anyone who tries to reason with him becomes the object of his sullen suspicion" (p. 46).

Other than these parallels[9] in behavior there are specific examples of Cervantes' indebtedness to contemporary medicine and specifically to Huarte de San Juan. It has been

pointed out before that the story of Tomás has striking similarities to the example of the paje whose madness also makes him perceptive and able to give witty answers (pp. 119-120). Another possible clue that has not been noted before, is the answer that Vidriera gives to a question on the climate of various cities. His reply, "De Madrid, cielo y suelo" is very much like that of the doctor in Huarte who says that Toledo: "Tiene el mejor cielo y suelo que lugar tiene en España" (p. 316).

It is clear that Cervantes needed no historical model to fashion his Tomás Rodaja, but simply created him from the prevalent ideas on the nature of the melancholy scholar. The Renaissance had two conflicting ideas on the nature of melancholia: The Aristotelian conception that it increases the intellectual and imaginative capabilities of man (Babb, p.97), and Galen's position that the disease was a miserable state and a source of suffering (p. 69). The Renaissance scholar, of course, did not choose one over the other but sought to reconcile the two theories. In Cervantes' Rodaja, we have the personification of this attempt. He is acute, perceptive and imaginative and, at the same time, a sufferer from anxieties and fears. The balance, however, is struck in favor of the Aristotelian position. Following Erasmus' Encomium Moriae and Jeronimo de Mondragón's Censura de la locura humana.[10] Cervantes emphasizes the benefits of his hero's madness. In the consideration of the source of the madness, one cannot disregard the intense interest of Cervantes for

mental disorders: from Don Quijote to Vidriera the list is a long one.[11]

The structure of the work has been attacked as simply a series of remembrances of youthful voyages and an unconnected string of witty sayings.[12] This judgment fails not only to consider the relationship of the various parts to the whole, but it seeks to impose upon the work a unity which the 17th century did not necessarily desire. The word novela as inherited from the Italians had no definite limits[13] and its synonym, cuento, was equally devoid of connotation and could include anything the author wished to include.[14]

The structure of the novela cannot be discussed separately from its meaning. The work does include a number of personal opinions, among which one finds his ideas on poetry and the theatre, but one should not see, as it has been suggested, that the apothegms are the sole purpose of the short-story.[15] Whatever the scope of the sayings they could not support the other segments of the novel. The first part in which the university days and travels of Rodaja are narrated does resemble a Wandernovelle and it is, of course, a reflection of Cervantes' own Italian voyage. The scarcity of data and the lack of description of the cities, however, prevent us from thinking that the purpose of this section is simply a travelogue, and the sudden shift from physical movement to a static condition followed by an exploration of human motives and actions cannot be considered merely a break in the narration but a necessary development of the theme the writer

wishes to present. The short-story has four parts: studies, travels, criticism of society and the bitter failure of Tomás. Each one contributes to the theme of the novela and represents in varying degrees the basic tenets of Cervantes. At first, we see how a poor young man can, through his own resources, acquire an education, exemplifying thus the writer's conviction that "cada uno es hijo de su obra." However, in Cervantes' view of the world, formal studies cannot achieve in themselves the acquisition of the greatest of all virtues, discreción, which can be gained only through experience and travel. Discussing this problem in Cervantes, William Atkinson states: "Discretion was the science, or the art, or simply the doctrine, of the relativity of all criteria of human conduct, and is not to be learnt from the copy-book: it is to be learnt by living. And the novelist can only help others to learn by depicting his characters as they severally learn to live."[16] This idea is shared by the character himself, who when offered the opportunity to travel, accepts "pues las luengas peregrinaciones hazen a los hombres discretos" (II, p. 76). The travels then are the practical side of his theoretical education and an indispensable concomitant to the development of Tomás' knowledge. That these travels are part of the learning process is evident in the careful attention of Rodaja in all that he sees ("Todo lo miró y notó, y puso en su punto" II, p. 81). Thus the many things he notices during his trips offer an anticipation of his encyclopedic criticism when he acquires, with his madness, the

liberty and the ability to say what he pleases.

The madness-inducing potion is a device from the Märchen or the late Greek romances which also finds a correspondence in the medical books I have cited. The purpose of the potion is to give the young man that supersensitivity, perception, and lucidity of thought that sufferers of melancholia were reputed to have. Moreover, by releasing him from any social responsibility, Cervantes could present a man absolutely free to say what he wished. What Rodaja does with this liberty is to criticize society mercilessly and this is achieved through the apothegms.[17]

The goal of this far-reaching enterprise by a wise man, learned in theoretical knowledge, tempered by experience and rendered more sensitive by his melancholia, is to achieve that inner harmony of men with one another and with Nature that is one of the major tenets of Cervantes' philosophy. But this harmony cannot be achieved until man, through the understanding of his limitations, can achieve self-knowledge.[18] The role of Vidriera is to awaken such a consciousness in society. It is not surprising that Vidriera fails in his attempt. The rejection of Rodaja, when he regains his sanity, is characteristic of the inability of society to recognize worth and talent. Viewed in this manner, the novela acquires not only a unified meaning but joins the other parts into a continuous development of the bitter destiny of a wise man.

Moreto's play,[19] with the same title as the novela,[20] has had a rather cool reception. Since the work invites comparison with the Cervantine novel, the judgment is always adverse to the dramatist although partial successes are attributed to him.

One of the first favorable opinions is that of the Austrian romantic poet and dramatist, Franz Grillparzer. He considers the first two acts excellent and wholly worthy of the author of Doña Diana (El desdén con el desdén), but he finds the last act not in keeping with the serious treatment of the preceding two. For Grillparzer, the play is distinguished because it develops a theme which has within it the possibilities for suffering and eventual triumph. He remarks on the play: "Auch das was die deutschen Ästhetiker die Idee nennen: das einer, der alles Löbliche, ja Grosse verrichtet, in Armut und Elend gerät und endlich zu Beachtung und Reichtum kommt dadurch, das er sich für einen Narren gibt, der glaubt von Glas zu sein, was die Leute unterhält, so dass sie sich ihn aus den Händen reissen" (p. 265). In contrast to Grillparzer, Adolf Schaeffer finds the play entertaining but belittles the dramatic possibilities of the material: "Dass der Carlos des Moreto durch angebliche Tollheit dasjenige erreicht, was seinen glanzenden Thäten mit der Feder und dem Schwerte versagt blieb, ist mehr ein satirischer, als ein dramatischer Gedanke" (p. 174).

A less well documented objection is that of Narciso Alonso Cortés, who while finding the work "notable", calls

it "ligero" and not worthy of its source, but does not discuss the play (p. 11). Ludwig Pfandl, in echoeing the commonly held view that Moreto was distinguished as a comedian but lacked the necessary talent and temperament for serious drama, labels the play "una comedia superficial" whose main fault seems to lie in the fact that Carlos is not really mad but feigns his illness (p. 463). Ruth Lee Kennedy sees in the happy ending of the play an unnecessary development which weakens greatly the thesis of human ingratitude. She feels that this is due to a lack of "courage", which I assume to mean the inability of the author to face the hard reality of human shortcomings. (p. 113).

There is a reluctance to accept the influence of the Cervantine short-story because of what seems a proclamation of independence by the dramatist: "Y aquí, discreto Senado./ Se da, con vitores vuestros,/ Fin dichoso el Licenciado/ Vidriera, sin novela,/ Y las fortunas de Carlos."[21] However, the most superficial analysis reveals that there are constant references and comparisons with the work of Cervantes which cannot be ignored. Moreto's work is derived from the Cervantine novel: the title, the madness (even if feigned), the fact that both protagonists are students and both are engaged in letters and arms are convincing similarities. I think that the reluctance of critics to accept this obvious truth is due to a preconceived notion that Moreto is a plagiarist or, at best, a person capable only of slavish imitations; since the play under discussion is not a mere re-

working of the original there is a tendency to minimize the influence of the short-story. The most important borrowing from it is the theme of human ingratitude. The fact that Moreto saw this topic in El licendiado Vidriera is helpful in determining the meaning which he read into the tale.

Whereas Cervantes treated the impossibility to show humanity its shortcomings, Moreto was forced to abandon much of his source material and limit himself to a consideration of human ingratitude. To begin with, he needed to find a situation which could be used as the scaffolding upon which the theme could be based. It is not surprising that he chose a love complication for it. The comedias that use this device as the conveyor of other ideas are too numerous to mention; indeed, it is the favorite situation of the Golden Age dramatist. Since the play does not offer the possibilities of development of a short-story, the Wandernovelle section of Cervantes' work had to be eliminated and pertinent information carried in an expository speech. Neither could the apothegms of Rodaja be included except within limits. I think that a close analysis of the play can show that the restrictions imposed by the topic and the necessity to give it a dramatic vehicle, prevented Moreto from using more material from the novela.

Although Moreto makes the Cervantine hero a nobleman instead of a poor boy who by dint of his own ability acquires an education and finally wisdom, he has not transformed him completely. Even if a member of the aristocracy,

he is poor and without resources: as a matter of fact, it is the very poverty of the character that provides the motive force of the drama. He, like Tomás, must work his way up and by his own efforts try to achieve success in an unsympathetic and self-centered court. The change from a man of the lower class to nobility is common in Moreto's adaptations. Moreto's conviction that the use of reason and sense could bring about a resolution of any conflict is held responsible for such a change, for the application of these virtues, according to the beliefs of the period, could be exercised only by men of culture and breeding. In this Moreto differs from Cervantes. The latter stresses the equality of the potential in every man, while the former sees the embodiment of all the desirable virtues in the nobility. There is also a shift in locale from Spain, where the madness scenes of the short-story take place, to Italy. That the city in question is Urbino, the cradle of the idea of the perfect gentleman, may be only a coincidence and not an attempt to stress Moreto's contention.

As is customary with Moreto, the antecedents of the play are given in long expository speeches. From the gracioso we learn that Carlos has left his studies at Bologna to press the suit for the hand of Laura and in the subsequent speech by Carlos, we find out that Laura's father had given his consent provided that he would overcome his poverty. Pompeyo's request seems reasonable; he stresses the youth of both and suggests that love without money is not enough: "Mas en la

joya de amor/ Tiene hoy día parte tanta/ El caudal y la riqueza." The young man, eager to succeed, applies himself to the study of law and later helps the Duke of Urbino to document his claim to the throne which is being contested by Federico and Cassandra, who are now waging war against the Duke. While the device of the relación gives a static quality to the first scene, Moreto is able to make clear the circumstances: Carlos' situation, his love for Laura, Pompeyo's attitude, and the relationship between Carlos and the Duke. Above all, there are intimations that the naive expectation of the young man is ill-founded. This is done mostly through the gracioso Gerundio. He is singularly integrated into the play since he supplies not only the usual contrast to the master, but also represents the opposite of Carlos' complete faith in mankind. Gerundio typifies the person who has learned the bitter lesson that men are not to be trusted and tries to imbue his master with the same pessimism. He vigorously rejects Carlos' optimism:

> ¿Qué logro ni que logrero?
> ¿Tu estrella a tí ha de premiarte?
> Si premios lloviera aquí,
> No se viniera una a tí
> Sino es a descalabrarte. (I, i)

And he is so convinced that their fate is inextricably tied to perennial hunger that he talks about "hambre infusa" (I, v). By using the religious term infusa, a word connected

with God-given grace and knowledge, he implies that they are destined to live in hunger. His comicity is increased by the frequent use of macaronic Latin that often has no relevance to the situation. While Carlos is trying to find a way out of his dilemma, Gerundio exclaims:

> Domine, si vado tecum,
> Y ad praeliandum ha de ser.
> Carlos. ¿Qué es lo que quieres hacer?
> Ger. Vender este vademecum.
> Carlos. ¿Para qué?
> Ger. Tu juicio es corto:
> Por comprar, por si o por no,
> Una mochila, que yo
> Omnia mea mecum porto. (II, viii)

The proper manner to view the drama is to follow Carlos through his hopes and final <u>desengaño</u>. It is in this way that Moreto defines the character of the young man. Analysts of Moreto's technique of characterization have noted that Moreto's personages tend to be static, that is, that they follow linearly a pattern that is established from the beginning. They do not grow because they are frozen within their role, be it that of the <u>discreto</u> or the <u>grosero</u>. When the change occurs it is usually at the end, and only to bring about a resolution of the conflict.[22] Although this is true with many characters, it is patently not applicable to Carlos. There is a definite development

from naïvete to ultimate realization that to be ungrateful is the nature of man. This evolution is achieved through a series of confrontations with the persons who are indebted to him. The first of these is the meeting between the young man and the Duke. After reminding him of his efforts on his behalf, the ruler seems to be willing enough to repay him, but, at this moment, Lisardo comes in to announce that the city is about to be attacked and the Duke has to rush off. Thus, Carlos is left unrewarded because of an accident in timing which could be a reflection of the "mala estrella" that his servant was talking about, or a shortcoming in the structure of the drama which greatly disturbs the presentation of the theme, as Kennedy maintains (p. 113). It is true that the use of chance does not contribute to the establishment of behavior necessary to fix responsibility, and in this Miss Kennedy is right. A closer look at the situation, however, will reveal if not the desirability, at least the necessity for such a choice. Moreto cannot charge the Duke with outright ingratitude because he is the only person who can finally re-establish the harmony within the group. If in the first meeting with Carlos the Duke rejects his claims, there will be no eventual righting of the wrong. It will be seen that the Duke is to be charged not with ingratitude but with unconscious failure to do his duty, brought about by his excessive love for Casandra.

The conversation with Pompeyo is both consequent and important to set up the feeling of tension under which Carlos

must act. When the young man turns to him after his unsuccessful meeting with the Duke, Laura's father states his position clearly:

> Vos habéis hecho por vos
> Cuanto un noble pecho alcanza;
> Ya el mérito está adquirido
> Mas sin fortuna no basta. (I, iv)

It is true that Pompeyo is not shifting from his original proposal, but this constancy in a basically immoral viewpoint does him no credit. He will maintain the same attitude throughout the play, although there is one point at which he hesitates momentarily in his resolve and sees that he is not right. This persistence in one's own position is the form that the ingratitude of the personages will take. Pompeyo will insist on the necessity of achieving economic success, Laura on the need to obey her father, Lisardo will choose his own interest above his duty, and the Duke will allow love to cloud his judgment. Pompeyo creates a more pressing situation when he reminds Carlos that the time limit he had imposed is about to expire and that soon he will have to marry Laura.

A third avenue of escape is closed to Carlos through his conversation with Laura. The meeting between the two is a typical Moretian confrontation of two lovers: it consists of a statement of his position by each person and is followed by short questions and answers when the statements do not

resolve their difficulties. Carlos reminds her that he has left his country and friends for her, he has braved obstacles, and buried himself in studies. In order better to convey Carlos' sentiments, Moreto makes use of a stylistic device, the anaphora, which through its constant repetition illustrates his desire to persuade the listener. Indeed, he uses it whenever a similar situation occurs:[23]

> Por mí, por vos y por él
> Por vos mi patria dejé,
> Por vos amigos perdí,
> Por vos méritos busqué
> Por vos, Señora, estudié,
> Y por vos los adquirí. (I, v)

She answers that she has cried for him and spent her time in fear of losing him but is unwilling to disobey her father. Above all she places a line of demarcation between her love and her <u>decoro</u>, preferring to stay within the latter: "Mi amor no puede pasar/ La línea de mi decoro" (I, v). Caldera maintains that her position is not in consonance with other heroines of the Moretian theatre: people in Moreto's works do not accept an unjust love situation but rather they fight against it.[24] The assertion is somewhat sweeping (v. <u>El lindo don Diego</u>, I, x), but whatever the degree of rebellion, Laura's decision is necessary within the development of the drama.

Moreto's technique is to build a series of disillusion-

ments which lead to the final desengaño. Carlos, trusting in the ducal protection and generosity, fails to receive his reward; depending on the good-will of Pompeyo, he is denied what he deserves because of his lack of wealth; turning to the woman he loves, he is rejected because she chooses decoro over love. The dramatist now explores another type of relationship: friendship. To stress his point he presents a case of almost brotherly love, the extent of which we see in Lisardo's protestations:

> ¿Qué decís? Pues ¿no sabéis
> Que por vos vivo me veo?
> ¿Qué la hacienda que poseo
> Asegurado me habéis?
> Que desde niños, tras eso,
> Juntos nos hemos criado? (I, vii)

But, in spite of these protestations, when he discovers that his friend needs help to marry Laura, he is not ready to sacrifice his self-interest. He is caught between duty and selfishness and he chooses the latter:

> Ingratitud es, debiendo
> A Carlos vida y honor;
> Pero primero es mi amor.[9] (I, vii)

The choice he makes is the opposite of Laura's but, where she fails in choosing duty over love, he errs in taking love over duty. It is symptomatic of the naïvete of Carlos

that in spite of these setbacks and demonstrations of egotism, he persists in his hope that he will be duly rewarded if he renders enough services. For this reason he decides to join the Duke in his struggle against the other pretenders.

The shift of scene and of action of the second part of the act is not a divergence from the main story but the setting up of another situation in which Carlos can prove his worth.[25] Federico and Cassandra are waiting to battle the Duke. She is promising to marry Federico when their goal has been achieved and retells how the Duke fell in love with her.[26]

The next six scenes are employed to show the bravery of Carlos who, single-handedly, stems the retreat of the Duke's soldiers and captures both Casandra and Federico. Besides showing once again how much the Duke is indebted to him, the scenes are a change in the momentum of the play. With their shortness, cries, and confusion, Moreto attempts to give the atmosphere of a battle. These scenes also show the cowardice of Gerundio, used for comic effect, and the desperation of Carlos who sees in the situation the opportunity to prove himself. The fantastic deed is admired by all, but the recognition which should go to Carlos is at first blunted by Lisardo's scheming, which permits the Duke to believe that he is responsible for the capture of Casandra. However, when Carlos drags in the captured Federico, there is no way of depriving him of his due. The effort has been too much for Carlos, whose wounds cause him to faint while

the Duke, realizing his valor, charges Lisardo with his care.

Carlos' great expectations contrast sharply with the utter poverty of both master and servant when they first appear in the following act. He is still unable to understand the reason for such neglect and needs the acid remarks of Gerundio to make him see that the fault for their immediate misfortune lies with Lisardo, who forsook them in a dirty inn instead of seeing to their needs. Important for the fortunes of Carlos, is the indifference of the Duke. We have seen, as early as the second scene of the play, that he had fallen in love with a portrait of Casandra and that he is completely captured by the girl. As Carlos' case proves, his love makes him so unconcerned about his responsibilities that he becomes remiss in his duties as a monarch. To succeed, Carlos has to overcome not only the materialism of Pompeyo and the intrigues of his rival, but also has to shake an infatuated Duke from his obsession:

> Duke. Pompeyo, nada me habléis
> Que de Casandra no sea;
> Lo que mi atención desea
> Con nada me embaracéis.
> Casandra es todo mi empleo;
> Solo hablar della deseo;
> Y el que intenta mi favor,
> Solo llegue a hablarme della; (II, vii)

The possibilities of confrontations having been exhaust-

ed, Moreto returns immediately to the same pattern. He begins anew the meetings between Carlos and his opponents, but this time, instead of the naïve reaction to the rebuffs, there builds in him a realization that the people are ungrateful. It is after going through this second experience that he sees the necessity for a more vigorous pursuit of his rights.

He first meets Lisardo, who after a vain attempt to ignore him, angrily rejects Carlos' claims and asserts : " . . . nadie debe al amigo/ Lo que quiere para si" (II, ii). While waiting for the Duke he has the opportunity to talk to Laura and Casandra. The former, ashamed of Carlos' appearance and unable to face him, avoids him completely, while the latter orders that alms be given to him. By now the young man is beginning to realize that there is something wrong with the world:

> Este el modo afrentoso
> Del mundo desconcertado:
> Vence el riesgo el desdichado,
> Y premian al venturoso. (II, vii)

In the interview with the Duke there is a repetition of the chance occurrance of the first act. Before he is able to tell the ruler about himself, Lisardo comes to take the Duke away. However, where in the first act it was coincidence, here it is design. The Duke's failure to do his duty is once again seen when he chooses the company of Casandra

over the interest of his subject. Meanwhile Pompeyo refuses to accept any responsibility for his part in the affair by announcing that " . . . de su poco fortuna/ No tengo la culpa yo" (II, vii).

These rebuffs which repeat themselves with greater intensity are beginning to dent the naïvete of Carlos. However, he is still convinced that if he can make his claims known he will be justly treated. His plan of action is predicated on this assumption. He wants to take more direct action by going to the palace, where a feast is in process, to make his demands on Laura. The scenes in the ducal home are set to show a contrast. In the first group there is the love dialogue of the Duke and Casandra in which he successfully presses his suit; in the second, there is the meeting between Carlos and Laura in which the recriminations between the lovers lead to another impasse. In both cases the music is used as the springboard for their speeches.[27] The position of the young girl does not change during the interview. She is willing to admit her ingratitude but insists that her sense of honor compels her to follow the course she has chosen:

Ya veo
Que contra tí se conjura
Tu estrella y también la mía,
Pues conocer lo que triunfa
Tu mérito de mi amor,
Y no pagarlo, es injusta

Ingratitud, y aún tiranía;
Pero mi honor lo repugna; (II, xiii)

When Carlos, unable to contain himself, begins to shout to let the world know how he is being treated, Casandra, forgetting her previous admiration for his valor, berates him for daring to speak in such a manner. He is also reprimanded by Pompeyo and Lisardo, and while the shock of realization falls upon him he receives the final indignity: he is thrown out of the palace. It would seem that this systematic piling on of disappointments is sufficient, but Moreto wants to make the desengaño complete. His own servant wants to leave him. Carlos has finally understood that no one will listen to him and that his hopes are all in vain. He can hold his servant only by promising a change in fortune. Poor, forgotten, and even scorned he takes stock of his situation:

¡Qué me deba el Duque, cielos,
La corona que gobierna,
Lisardo tanta amistad
Como la vida y la hacienda,
Todo Urbino su sosiego,
Y Laura tantas finezas;
Y en ninguno hallo favor,
Todos perecer me dejan!
. . . . . .
Cuando tantos que aquí entran
Arrastran triunfos y aplausos,

Unos porque lisonjean,
Otros porque se despejan,
Siendo asunto de la risa;
Y ingenio, valor y ciencia
Estén en tanto desprecio! (II, xvi)

This bitter denunciation not only marks the full appreciation of his situation but is also an echo of the source. Tomás Rodaja, in talking about the court said: "Vuesa merced me excuse con esse señor, que yo no soy bueno para palacio, porque tengo vergüença y no se lisongear" (II, 91).[28] And in his final remarks before leaving Salamanca for Flanders, Rodaja utters words of disappointment that are much the same as those of Carlos: " O corte, ¡qué alargas las esperanças de los atrevidos pretendientes, y acortas las de los virtuosos encogidos! ¡Sustentas abundantemente a los truhanes desuergonçados, y matas de hambre a los discretos vergonçosos!" (II, 113).

Having become convinced that a deserving man is not rewarded, he devises a way of avenging himself; he feigns that he has become mad and thinks himself to be made of glass.

Critics have seen in the difference between the real madness of Rodaja and the simulated one of Carlos a basic divergence. I see no need to interpret it in such a manner. The real disease in the novela is used to give the young man the freedom to criticize which would not be tolerated were he sane. In Moreto's play, the feigned illness of Carlos is employed for exactly the same purpose. Moreto was, we presume,

as aware as Cervantes of the theories on melancholia. The following passage from Mondragón (Ch. XXXIII) supports this assumption and at the same time further unites the work of Moreto to that of Cervantes: "¡O qué vena de eloquencia huviera menester aora, para decir cumplidamente, las innumerables i grandes virtudes de la Locura, las quales son tantas, que el solamente fingirla, dió infinitas veces ocasion, no solo para librarse de grandisimos trabajos, como se ha dicho, pero aun para vengarse de las afrentas, o injurias recebidas!" (p. 172). Rejected by all, ignored as a man of merit, he realizes that only fools are listened to and he chooses this way out. Where in Cervantes it is a novelistic device imposed from the outside, in Moreto it is the final conclusion of the character and hence it grows out of the action itself.

The same ironical contrast that was apparent in the last scene of the first act and the beginning one of the second is seen between the second and last act. In the initial act, when the viewer expected to see Carlos rewarded, he comes out in dire poverty; in the final one, when the previous action shows his complete failure, he is presented as a successful man.[29] To explain this success, Gerundio talks of the extraordinary good-luck of his master since his madness and ironically remarks:

> ¡Qué hay hombre que sea cuerdo,
> Valiendo tanto el ser loco! (III, 1)

Moreto uses the beginning of the last act to relieve the action of its tension. In a series of scenes designed to show the popularity of Vidriera, we are also shown the self-importance of Gerundio, who goes under the name of Licenciado Gerundio. In these scenes we find another parallel to the Cervantine work. Anti-Semitic sallies were frequent in the literature of the Golden Age and both Cervantes and Moreto made use of them. In the novela, Cervantes employs the occupation of tailor, then very common among Jews, to accuse a woman of being a new Christian.[30] Moreto makes use of two words that were connected with Jews to bring about his joke, tocino, bacon, prohibited by the dietary laws, and esperar which refers to the waiting of the Jews for the Messiah:

> Criado. Y envía un jamón y este vino,
> Que os acuerde al salir fuera
> Que os espera.
> Ger. Hombre que espera,
> Harto es que envíe tocino. (III, iv)[31]

After a general exposition of events there follow the scenes in which the newly-acquired popularity of Carlos is dramatized by means of invitations to the Licenciado from prominent citizens. A further similarity with the source can be noted in the reasons for such invitations. As in the short-story, Vidriera is sought not for his incisive reasoning, but to supply entertainment. Finally, the dramatist's indebtedness to the novelist can be seen in the characterization

of Carlos' madness. Like the original Licenciado, he is worried about stumbling, he fears that people may break him, and attempts to soften the danger with straw.

Another group of scenes is used to recapitulate and emphasize the position of the other characters. In a conversation with Celia, Laura admits her responsibility and is aware that her attitude has made her "esquiva al sentimiento" and "ingrata al beneficio". The adjective esquiva is a recurring description of Laura. The best image is the one that employs her name and refers to the myth of Daphne and Apollo in the Metamorphoses:

> Laura hermosa, mas ¿qué digo?
> Laura cruel, Laura ingrata;
> Laura no, laurel esquivo,
> Que el sol de mi amor huyendo,
> En tronco te has convertido.
> Tronco eres ya a mis finezas,
> Tronco a mis tiernos cariños; (III, xi)[32]

Laura's awareness is a necessary preparation for the eventual confrontation of father and daughter and another proof of the meticulous care that Moreto takes to justify the motives of his personages.

Carlos' arrival is greeted with amusement by the courtiers. Here we find a further parallel with the Cervantine story. As I have indicated, Moreto is bound to stay within the limits of the drama and although Gerundio exclaims:

"El os sacará aformismos", the only witticisms come from the gracioso himself. Instead, because of the exigencies of the drama, Carlos makes his remonstrances against the people who have offended him. He reprimands the Duke for not remembering to repay his debts and points out the unkindness of Laura, the indifference of Casandra, and the betrayal of Lisardo. In each case he uses metaphors that are connected with glass or breaking, thus giving it greater poetic cohesion:

> Si, Señor, en el olvido;
> Pues cuando mi noble aliento
> Fue para vos vaso rico,
> Por donde a beber llegastéis
> Mil aplausos en Urbino,
> Le quebrastéis, olvidando
> Su decoro cristalino;
> Que los duques, sin memoria
> De los honrados servicios,
> No son duques, sino piedras.
> Mirad si duro habéis sido. (III, ix)

His protestations are ineffective; the planned marriage between Lisardo and Laura is about to take place and the Licenciado is once again rebuffed. This is the final link in the education of Carlos. He harbors no more false hopes and desires only to avenge himself:

> Comience ahora mi venganza, cielos
> Ya la experiencia que intenté he logrado,

Ya ciertos han salido mis recelos;
Pues vea el mundo, ya desconcertado,
El ciego y torpe error de su mudanza,
Y de su afrenta nazca mi venganza. (III, xi)

With the preparations for revenge, we come to a divergence from the source story. Where Cervantes chose to end the action with Rodaja's failure, Moreto does not terminate his play in similar manner. The desengaño in Moreto is not based on the contrast between illusion and reality, as it is in other dramatists, but on the final comprehension of the situation. This rational approach, seen to be the prevalent characteristic of the dramatist,[33] is what differentiates the novela from the comedia. If Carlos has lost hope in the virtues of his opponents, Moreto has not lost faith in the power of reason.

Before ending the play, however, Moreto characteristically prepares the audience. Laura, although still willing to obey her father, denounces the need to do so when it means the sacrifice of love. She tells her father that obdience in such a case does not mean whole-hearted approval or agreement:

La inclinación, padre mío,
Es efecto natural,
Que no manda el albedrío; (III, xii)

She blames her father for insisting on his resolve after Carlos has proven his worth and Pompeyo somewhat belatedly

admits that "verdad ha sido."

When Carlos arrives it is noted immediately that he is no longer mad. He has dropped this useless pretense and now talks like an offended man. The manner in which the denouement is brought about is not particularly dramatic, but it is Moretian in its use of a simple and logical exposition of the grievences. The long speech by Carlos which recounts his adventures and ill-fortune is the vehicle with which Moreto amplifies his theme. That Carlos is addressing himself to a larger audience than the personages in the drama can be deduced by his use of the common metaphor of "teatro del mundo"[34] when he makes his final accusation:

De Pompeyo despreciado,
Sin favor de Laura bella
Y ofendido de Lisardo,
Me fingí loco por dar
A los hombres desengaño,
A la ingratitud afrenta,
Y venganza a mis agravios.
Pues siendo así que por docto,
Por valiente, por bizarro,
Por discreto, noble y fino,
Y en fin por méritos tantos
Ní de vos merecí premio,
Ní de mi dama agasajo,
Ní lealtades de mi amigo,
Ní de la piedad amparo;

. . . . . .

Por loco os hable, y no pude
Por noble, valiente y sabio;

. . . . . .

Y pues es el mundo tal
Y los que tienen su aplauso,
Que dan el favor a un loco
Que dan el favor a un loco
Que niegan a un hombre honrado,
No quiero mas premio del
Ni dellos que el desengaño.[35] (III, xiv)

The long harangue is, of course, successful in bringing the Duke's authority to bear on the situation and Carlos is not only recognized but is also awarded Laura. The Duke tries to blame Lisardo for all the difficulties; this, although technically correct, does not diminish the fact that all of them are guilty of the injustice in varying degrees and for various reasons.

The analysis of the novela and the play by Moreto show that the latter made some radical structural alterations to fit the broader Cervantine topic and its secondary themes into a dramatic situation. To achieve this Moreto depends heavily on the love enredo. Moreto's indebtedness to Cervantes consists principally in the use of the title, the theme, and the device of madness. However, several situations, such as the anti-Semitic sally and the bitter speeches

of denunciation are, at least, inspired by similar happenings in the original work. There is, of course, a noticeable difference in the way the major theme is handled. Whereas Cervantes shows the repudiation of talent, when not clothed in insanity, in a short, pessimistic ending, Moreto makes use of a series of rejections which build to an unbearable point before being resolved. The harmonious ending of the drama which is in keeping with a basic tenet of Moreto, the triumph of reason, softens, but does not eliminate the impact of the ingratitude.

N O T E S

[1] The novela appears fifth in the original edition. I use the ed. of R. Schevill and A. Bonilla, vols. II and III (Madrid, 1923). Further references to the work will be included in the text.

[2] Vida de Cervantes (Madrid, 1819), pp. 130-31.

[3] I have had access to the translation of the second work: Erotodidascolus, sive Memoralium, libri V (Honoviae, 1625).

[4] Paris, 1892. James Fitzmaurice Kelly in "Phantasio Cratuminos sive Homo Vitreus. A note on El licenciado Vidriera," Revue Hispanique, IV (1897), 46-60 agrees with Foulché-Delbosc on the improbability of the assertion by Navarrete.

[5] "Gaspar von Barth interprète de La Celestina," Revue de littérature comparée (1957), pp. 321-340. Incorporated in La Celestina selon Fernando de Rojas (Paris, 1961), pp. 251-68.

[6] See Armand Singer's three articles in the West Virginia University Bulletin, Philological Papers: "The Sources, Meaning, and Use of the Madness Themem in Cervantes' Licenciado Vidriera," VI (1949), 31-53; "The Literary Progeny of

Cervantes' Licenciado Vidriera," V (1948), 59-72; "Cervantes' Licenciado Vidriera: Its Form and Substance," VII (1951), 13-31.

[7] Examen de ingenios para las ciencias (Madrid, 1575). I am using the edition of Rodrigo Sanz, Madrid, 1930. For Huarte's influence on Cervantes see: Rafel Salilla, Un gran inspirador de Cervantes, el doctor Juan Huarte de San Juan y su examen de ingenios (Madrid, 1905); M. de Iriarte, El doctor Huarte de San Juan y su Examen de ingenios (Madrid, 1948), pp. 311-332. On the ingenio in Cervantes see Otis H. Green, "El ingenioso hidalgo," Hispanic Review, XXV (1957), 175-193.

[8] Quoted in Lawrence Babb's The Elizabethan Malady East Lansing, Mich., 1951), pp. 9-10. Further references to this work will be included in the text. See also E. S. Morby, "Levinus Lemnius and Leo Suabius in La Dorotea," Hispanic Review, XX (1952), 108-22.

[9] Babb also mentions that drinks and strong wines could induce melancholia, p. 23.

[10] Lérida, 1598. I use the edition of Antonio Vilanova, Barcelona, 1953.

[11] For an exhaustive review of the many instances of mental disturbances in Cervantes see Singer, "Sources . . .," p. 53.

[12] Among those who share this view are: Francisco Icaza, Las novelas ejemplares de Cervantes (Madrid, 1901), p. 150; N. Alonso Cortés, ed. El licenciado Vidriera (Valladolid, 1916), p. vii; G. Hainsworth, "Les Novelas ejemplares en France," Bibliothèque de la Revue de littérature comparée (1933), no. 95, p. 13; Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, Orígenes de la novela, III (Madrid, 1943), 13; William C. Atkinson, "Cervantes, El Pinciano and the Novelas ejemplares," Hispanic Review, XVI (1948), 203; Armand Singer "Sources . . .," p. 44.

[13] For a history of the connotation of the word novela see Werner Krauss, Studien und Aufsätze (Berlin, 1959), pp. 125-138.

[14] Walter Pabst, Novellentheorie und Novellen Dichtung. Zur Geschichte ihrer Antinomie in den romanischen Literaturen (Hamburg, 1935), p. 135: "Die cuento-Theorie legt der Vokabel cuento keinerlei Qualitätsnuance bei, grenzt stofflichen Inhalt nicht ab, sagt kein Wort von der darin enthalten Möglichkeit des Unwahrscheinlichen von den Märchen, die auch cuentos heissen, nichts von ihrer Verwandtschaft mit den Erzählungen des Cervantes." Caroline B. Bourland in The Short-Story in Spain in the Seventeenth Century (Northhampton, Mass., 1927) never draws a distinction between the word novela and the word cuento.

[15] Joaquín Casalduero, Sentido y forma de las Novelas

ejemplares (Buenos Aires, 1943), pp. 109-119, views the sayings as the expression of the intelligence of Rodaja and the short-story as an allegory of "el pecado de la inteligencia."

[16] Atkinson, p. 199. See also Margaret Bates, Discreción in the Works of Cervantes (Washington, D. C., 1945).

[17] There is general agreement that the purpose of the sayings is the criticism of society: Rudolph Schevill, Cervantes (New York, 1919), p. 322; Antonio Oliver, " La filosofía en el Licenciado Vidriera," Anales Cervantinos, IV (1954), p. 229; Agustín de Amezúa, Cervantes, creador de la novela corta española, II (Madrid, 1956), 185; F. Meregalli, "Le Novelas ejemplares nello svolgimento della personalità di Cervantes," Letterature Moderne, X (1959), 334-35.

[18] Atkinson, pp. 198-99.

[19] First appeared in Parte quinta de varios (Madrid, 1653) and later in the Segunda parte of Moreto's plays (Valencia, 1676).

[20] Moreto is one among a distinguished group of dramatists who made use of Cervantine short-stories: Lope de Vega, La ilustre fregona; Antonio de Solís, La gitanilla de Madrid; Antonio Coello, El celoso estremeño; Guillén de Castro, La fuerza de la sangre and El curioso impertinente.

[21] Singer in the "Literary Progeny . . .," note 5, p. 60, basing himself on a marginal meaning of the phrase

"sin novela" suggests that it might mean "without lying" and therefore reduce the strength of the disavowal.

[22] For a discussion of Moreto's characters see Ermanno Caldera, Il teatro di Moreto (Pisa, 1960), pp. 163-64.

[23] For other examples of anaphora see I, v; II, xiv; III, xi.

[24] " . . .e non ha luogo la rinunzia ad un amore puro, sopratutto perchè la priorità nell'amore, è un vero diritto di precedenza; ed inoltre il recato della fanciulla non è mai supina obbedienza (sono invece assai frequenti le ribellioni), p. 232.

[25] Fernández-Guerra labels the use of these scenes a "fatal ocurrencia", p. xxxvi. I think that he viewed them as an interpolation rather than a means of further defining the character of Carlos.

[26] The falling in love by means of a portrait is a device also used in Antioco y Seleuco, I, i.

[27] Caldera maintains that music in Moreto is never a mere adornment, but is used to underline the sentiments of of the characters and thus it tends to solidify the unity of the work, p. 218.

[28] The situation of the person who fails in court because he refuses to become a sychophant is common in Golden

Age literature. The most well-known is Tirso's El vergonzoso en palacio, II, x.

[29] Kennedy is of the opinion that the act division of El licenciado Vidriera is typical of all of Moreto's comedias, p. 44.

[30] E. L. King, "A Note on El licenciado Vidriera," Modern Language Notes, LXIX (1954), 99-102.

[31] For a discussion of this passage and for a consideration of other anti-Semitic references see, Edward Glaser, "Referencias anti-semitas en la literatura peninsular de la Edad de Oro," Nueva revista de filología hispánica, VIII (1954), 39-62.

[32] The use of the Daphne theme to express one's own feelings goes back to Garcilaso's famous sonnet XIII.

[33] For this aspect of the Moretian characters, see Caldera, pp. 165-68.

[34] On the origen and diffusion of this topos see Ernst Robert Curtius, Literatura europea y Edad Media latina, trans. M. Frank Alatorre y Antonio Alatorre, I (México, 1955), 203-209; Jean Jacquot, "Le théâtre du monde, de Shakespeare à Calderón," Revue de littérature comparée, XXI (1957), 341-72. For a discussion of the application of the metaphor to a play see A. A. Parker, The Allegorical Dramas of Calderón (London, 1943), pp. 110-55.

[35] The speech is a close parallel to Rodaja's final remarks before leaving Spain for Flanders in Cervantes' novela.

IV

ANTIOCO Y SELEUCO

The story of Antiochus' love for his step-mother Stratonice and Seleucus' personal sacrifice to spare his son is a very popular one within the classical tradition and Romance literature. From the earliest full treatment, that of Valerius Maximus, the tale has been recast in the form of a moral example, a short story, a novel, and a play.[1] But despite the staggering number of versions which attest to its popularity,[2] only two principal themes have been exploited: generosity and love.

Valerius Maximus' Factorum et dictorum memorabilium, libri novem[3] had been intended as a "vade mecum" for speakers or teachers and as such it was a compendium of noteworthy incidents and moral anecdotes. The didactic nature of the work is shown by the neat division of its content into chapters, each dealing with different topics. The stories, which illustrate various virtues, are separated into Roman and foreign examples; the story of Antiochus appears in Chapter 7, "De patrum amore et indulgentia in liberos." As the title indicates, it is used as an illustration of paternal love. The events are as follows: Antiochus is in love with Stratonice but realizing the impossibility of this love he seeks to hide his feelings. However, the force of his love undermines his health and brings him near death. The father,

deeply grieved, enlists the help of the physician, Erisitratus, who, by observing the violence of the young man's pulse beat when his step-mother approaches, discovers the true cause of the illness. The doctor reports his findings to the King who, although passionately in love with his wife, is willing to give her to his son who so valiantly tried to hide his feelings.

The story has four elements: the Prince's love and illness, the father's sorrow, the doctor's cleverness, and the final generous action of the King. In contrast to the mechanical role of the physician we have the well delineated characters of the father and son. The young Prince is not only dutiful, ("knowing that his love was evil he tried to hide it in his heart"), but capable of dying rather than reveal his secret, ("his great love and his great respect reduced his body to an extreme state.") The King, for his part, is an exemplary man: he loves his son dearly, is grief stricken by the imminent death of his son, and does not hesitate to give up his wife to save his son. The final statement of the story indicates clearly that Valerius Maximus uses it to commend the King's action: "One must consider [this action] of an old man, a King, and a man in love to realize the powerful obstacles his love was able to surmount."

The tale appears in a longer and more elaborate rendition in Plutarch's Parallel Lives, in the chapter on Demetrius.[4] Although it remains basically the same, there

are various significant changes. Antiochus' love is now a deep burning passion and his reluctance to speak up is no longer due to consideration for his father, but to the belief that "his desires were wholly unlawful." The approaching death of Antiochus is not the consequence of his inner struggle but a predetermined plan. The elaboration evident in other points in the story is striking in the incident of the discovery of the true nature of the Prince's illness. Where Valerius Maximus makes use of the simple pulse beat, Plutarch includes the faltering of the voice, the flushing of the face, sudden perspiration, uneven respiration and other symptoms. A more important change is evident in the relationship between father and son. In the earlier version Erisitratus tells the King frankly and quickly the results of his observations, implying confidence in the father's feelings toward his son. Plutarch talks of Seleucus' tenderness for his son and the physician has to evolve an elaborate story with which to trick and commit the King. It is to be inferred that the doctor is not too sure of the father's concern for his son and has to prepare him. The emotional response of Stratonice to the proposed change of husbands is brought out and her reluctance is such that she needs the prodding of her friends to acquiesce.

Later in the second century, Appianus of Alexandria reworks the tale in his Roman History, Book XI.[5] In his version, Erisistratus acquires even more importance and considerable attention is given to his observation of the

young man and his speculations on the nature of love. Finally, the telltale pulse beat which had changed to a long list of symptoms in Plutarch, becomes the alternation of the body from prostration to vigor. Seleucus is aware that his action would forever be considered an illustrious example of paternal kindness and is pleased to save his son by giving up Stratonice. Since the author does not emphasize the King's love for his young wife, the sacrifice looses some of its impact. The reluctance of Stratonice merely suggested in Plutarch is here such that it is overcome only after a long struggle.

Lucian of Samosata (125 A.D.) in the Syrian Goddess[6] neglects the father's generosity and reworks the story to bring into relief the cleverness of the doctor. Substantial changes are made in the personality of the King: he is no longer prostrated with grief but merely anxious for his son's health and his final decision is based upon the idea that, "losing one's wife was a less misfortune than losing one's son."

Among the classical authors prominently mentioned in connection with the tale is Flavius Claudius Julianus, (Julian the Apostate 331 ? - 363). In the Misopogon,[7] Antiochus has become a young man of excessive sensuality given to card playing and lovemaking and his passion no longer causes him any sense of guilt. The King willingly gives up his wife, but such generosity is completely ignored by the author who gives full credit to the son for his refusal to

accept Stratonice until the death of Seleucus.

The classical writers, by forsaking the moral point of the story, deprived it of its vitality. It was Petrarch who rescued it by changing its direction and giving it new vigor. I Trionfi, written very late in the poet's life (begun 1352) represents a distillation of the poet's vision of the world. He recognized the power that love has over all mortals but he knows that it can, in turn, be conquered by chastity.[8] The inclusion of the Antiochus episode in the Trionfi affirms the author's belief that the story was an outstanding example of love.

Petrarch's verses clearly present the triumph of love but it is important to note that Petrarch has a much broader concept of this emotion, for it includes the love of a father for his son and that of a son for his father. The tercet in which Seleucus explains the strength of their mutual devotion is essential for an understanding of the poet's conception of the story:

> Ch'è contenta costei lasciarme il regno,
> io il mio diletto, e questi la sua vita,
> per far, vie più che sé, l'un l'altro degno;

It is this sense of abnegation and self-sacrifice that makes them worthy of each other: "donar altrui la sua diletta sposa . . ./ o sommo amore e nova cortesia." Equally important is the inseparableness of the three which the poet stresses time and again. Indeed, they are almost always men-

tioned together:

E givansi per via
parlando insieme de' lor dolci affetti
e sospirando il regno di Soria

and

trassimi a qu' tre spirti che ristretti
eran già per seguir altro cammino,

and finally, more emphatically:

Stratonica è il suo nome, e nostra sorte,
come vedi, indivisa, e per tal segno
se vede il nostro amor tenace e forte:

This coherence is then the very symbol of their love. Fittingly, Petrarch abandons the idea of a reluctant Stratonice advanced by some of the classical writers and presents her as willing to marry Antiochus.

Petrarch's work was often read in connection with Bernardo Illicino's commentary.[9] Illicino's work is divided into two parts, a prose version of the passage by Petrarch, with some explanations, and the retelling of the story according to Appian, as Illicino himself affirms. From the commentary three things emerge: the liberality of Seleucus in giving up his wife, the virtue of Antiochus in resisting his passion, and the power of love which overwhelms the Prince.

Illicino underscores not only Petrarch's praise of the King's generosity but also the latter's love " . . .accomodatamente exclama il summo amore e nova cortesia di Seleuco essendo lui stato liberale la donde meritava essere commoso totalmente a grande ira." At the same time he finds Antiochus' attempt to withstand the power of love most commendable: "E adduce in conclusione il pietoso padre Seleuco la scusa dello amato filiolo dicendo che lui corse quasi alla morte amando e tacendo lo amore; unde lo amare gli fu forza stimando quello da Cupido venire si come da numine, ma tacere questo amore fu ben sua propria e singular virtù e la sua fu vera paterna pietà che lo soccorse concedendoli in sposa la sua diletta e gentile Stratonice."[10] It is clear that the theme which Petrarch launches and which Illicino amplifies is that of the unselfishness of the father and the virtue of the son.

It is this concept on which Matteo Bandello (1480 - 1562) seizes for his version of the story. Although the elaboration for his novella is taken mostly from Appian, the influence of Petrarch cannot be doubted in spite of critical opinion to the contrary.[11] The charge is unfounded because there are important elements which can be traced only to I Trionfi. The King's love for his son and for his wife when coupled with the emphasis on the overpowering strength of love are strong evidence of Petrarchan influence. As a Renaissance writer, Bandello focuses his attention on values treasured by that period: the restraint of Antiochus, already

hinted at by the classical writers, and a discussion on the wisdom of marrying a young girl. Antiochus, in lamenting his father's error, says: "Non è stato ne la sua vecchiaia disdicevole inamorarsi di costei, io giovane sono e tutto sotto-posto a le fiamme de l'amore, per quale cagione debbo, amandola, esser biasimato?"[12]

In any discussion of the theme in the Spanish Peninsula special attention must be paid to Luis de Camoens' Auto del Rey Seleuco, published in 1645 but reputed to have been written in 1550.[13] It is chronologically after Bandello's novella but directly descended from Petrarch's and Illicino's works. The auto is composed of a prologue which has no integral connection with the play,[14] the play itself, and an epilogue.[15] Eugenio Asensio, in rejecting the ideas of previous scholars, established that Petrarch's Trionfo di amore is the source of Camoens' theme. Asensio bases his proposition on the admiration of the Portuguese poet for the Italian and on the more telling observation that only Petrarch's work could give a satisfactory antecedent to the auto.[16] He insists that the meaning of the work is summarized by the following tercet from Petrarch's work:

> tacendo, amando, quasi a morte corse
> e l'amar forza, e'l tacer fu virtute?
> la mia, vera pietà, che a lui soccorse.

Asensio holds that to fill in the short narrative of the poem, Camoens made use of Illicino's commentary and need not have

gone to any of the classical authors. Both the emphasis on the power of love and the last speech of the King, which is an adaptation of the following tercet of the Italian poet, give added weight to the theory:

> ch'è contenta costei lasciarme il regno,
> io il mio diletto, e questi la sua vita,
> per far vie più che sé, l'un l'altro degno;

Valuable as Asensio's essay is, some additional observations may be called for. Petrarch's work and the commentary by Illicino are not the only sources of Camoens' play nor is the auto a faithful reworking of the Italian's theme. Whereas in the Trionfo Petrarch stresses the inseparableness of the three characters and their mutual love, there is no such element in Camoens' play. The characterization of Seleucus as an old man, the forced marriage of Stratonice to the King, and the Prince's other loves are neither in the Italian poem or its commentary. Seleucus as an old man is present only in Bandello, the accusation of being a woman-chaser is found in Julian, and the forced marriage is a new point introduced by Camoens himself. Finally, the reason that the King gives in turning over his wife to his son, "poussa mais o amor do filho/ Do que pode o da mulher" (235) echoes the reason given by Lucian ("losing one's wife was a less misfortune than losing one's son") and is in contrast to Petrarch's theme of equal affection and mutual esteem. These additions or changes force us to view the theme of Camoens' play in a

different light: the triumph of love over the obstacles set by the presence of an old man.

In Spain, there is no full treatment of the theme prior to that of Moreto. Lope de Vega made use of it as an episode within El castigo sin venganza.[17] but the contribution of the work to Moreto's play lies principally in the many structural and textual borrowings which will be treated in the discussion of the play itself.

In Agustín Moreto's Antioco y Seleuco, first published in the Primera Parte of his works, in 1654,[18] one finds some of the themes already discussed: paternal generosity, filial affection and triumph of love. Critics, on the whole, have been cool toward it. Ruth Lee Kennedy's views are representative of this indifference; she tries to place the play within a historical and social context: " . . .the courtly Moreto has peopled his stage with poetic and languid young courtiers who are evidently a reflection of the elegant but devitalized and emasculated atmosphere of the court that lay about him" (1026). And in discussing Moreto's conception of the story she states that, "In recasting Lope's play, Moreto worked in a thoroughly characteristic fashion; he has . . .eliminated all the characters that are not dramatically essential and rationalized the action of those that remain. Needless to say, he has lost much of the poetic beauty of the original" (1025).

These judgments are subject to a review for it is a debatable assertion that Moreto's work is a recasting of Lo-

pe's play. The story of Stratonice is not the central plot of El castigo sin venganza but merely the tool with which Casandra seduces Federico.[19] In view of these contradictions, I feel justified in undertaking a thorough re-examination of his indebtedness to Lope and to other source material.

Moreto's comedia draws on two different concepts of the theme: the moral-didactic one of the classical tradition and the idealistic one of Romance literature. It is impossible to state to which of the major interpreters of the tale Moreto is indebted for his material. All of the works were available to him and most of them in Spanish translations.[20] The sub-title of the play, A mejor padre, mejor hijo, for example, could be a descriptive title taken from the theme of the story (it also appears in the play itself, III, vii), or an adaptation of Appian's phrases: "Then Seleucus swore . . .that he would . . .make himself an illustrious example of the kindness of a good father to a chaste son." And "When he had thus spoken the army shouted that he was the greatest King . . .and the best father." Although the basic plot is common to all the writers who made use of it, there are some elements which can be traced to a given source and which attest not only to Moreto's knowledge of the classics and contemporary literature but also to his power of selectivity.

From Pliny he borrowed the idea of the connection between the physician Erisistratus and Aristotle to give the doctor more dignity and the weight of knowledge.[21] Lucian

or Julian may be the source for the episode in which Erisistratus calls in the women of the court to determine which of them is the woman the Prince loves. From Leonardi Bruni Aretino's novella, (1370-1444)[22] comes the idea of travel to cure Antioco's melancholy. In Aretino and then Bandello, the young man does embark on such a voyage but with no effect; in Moreto, Antioco's trip to meet Estratónica is explained as an attempt by his father to provide diversion for his son. Another classical echo is the suggestion that Seleuco may be marrying Estratónica for reasons of state, a notion which, originating in Plutarch, comes to Moreto through Luca Assorino whose novel Stratonica[23] supplies various elements to our dramatist. The indirect borrowing is obvious because Assorino misinterpreted Plutarch and Moreto followed the Italian (I, 1). Assorino says: "O come vuole Plutarcho, per mantenersi amico un re potentissimo di chiedergliela in moglie" (p. 26). On the contrary, Plutarch states that Demetrius viewed the opportunity for the marriage as a godsend: "Demetrius, who looked upon the offer an an unexpected piece of good fortune, presently embarked with his daughter, and with his whole fleet sailed for Syria" (p. 77). From the same Assorino, Moreto may have borrowed the device of the portrait. In the novel, Appele, a Greek painter travels from his native Corinth to Mount Olimpo where he sees the beautiful Stratonica and there paints her portrait. After a series of adventures, Seleuco hears of the portrait, sees it, falls in love with the girl, and asks her in marriage

(p. 18). Antioco, in Moreto's play, comes into possession of Estratónica's portrait in similar adventurous circumstances:

> Hasta que un día a mi mano
> Acaso un retrato vino,
> Que guardó por su hermosura
> Curioso un criado mío.
> Hallóle entre los despojos
> De una batalla perdido. (I, iii)

Finally, the scene in which the musicians try to console Antioco (ii, iii) is derived from Camoens' auto. Although Moreto made extensive use of music in his works, the similarity of circumstances in the two plays is such that its indebtedness cannot be doubted.[24]

However, Lope de Vega's El castigo sin venganza (1636)[25] is the single most influential source for Moreto's work. Time and again the latter dramatist bases an episode or a scene on his predecessor's comedia. Indeed, the structure of Moreto's first act is taken from it.

Lope's drama, based on a novella by Bandello,[26] has the following plot: The Duke of Ferrara, a libertine, is pressured by his subjects into marrying Cassandra because he has no legitimate heir. He sends his natural son, Federico to meet the prospective bride who, unhappy about the proposed union, is immediately attracted to the young man. The Duke neglects his wife and continues his licentious conduct.

Cassandra takes the opportunity offered by the absence of her husband to seduce Federico. Upon his return, the Duke, informed of the adultery of his wife, avenges himself by tricking Federico into killing Cassandra and then has him executed on the grounds that he killed the Duchess to preserve his right of succession.

The play is a work in which adultery is punished in Cassandra and Federico but not in the Duke, who ironically, is the dispenser of justice; it presents a castigo but the victims are unaware of its causes. Finally, it is an attempt by the Duke to hide his dishonor when it is already known by all. The tension of the play hinges on the description of the Duke's character at the beginning of the play which foreshadows his reaction to the adultery of his wife. All three principals are guilty but not equally so: Federico is almost innocent, Cassandra is more obviously at fault, the Duke, whose neglect of his wife and dominance over his son set in motion the events, is the most culpable. The principle sin of the Duke is his overwhelming pride which leads him to the murder of his wife and son in order to preserve the honor he has lost. His actions are the more reprehensible because of their futility: his disgrace is already commonly known and the foul lie to hide the true reason for Federico's death will not cover his ignominy.

El castigo sin venganza begins with a block of scenes designed to introduce the Duke and his vices to the spectator and then shifts to Federico and Batín who are awaiting

Cassandra. The two discuss both the upcoming marriage of the Duke and his libertinage. The young bride finally arrives but has to be rescued by Federico when she is unable to cross a river. Lope used these scenes to present the awakening interest of the two young people for each other and Cassandra's imprudence in favoring Federico with too much attention.[27]

Another shift of scenes presents Aurora to us; she reveals the love between her and Federico and asks the Duke to arrange their marriage. While they talk Batín enters to announce the arrival of the bridal party. At the reception for the new Duchess Federico pays homage to her and swears obedience, thus allaying the fears of the Duke who expected a clash of interest between the two. The act ends with seeming harmony but with intimations of conflict:

Fed. Dichoso es el Duque.
Bat. Y mucho.
Fed. Con ser ymposible, llego
a estar enuidioso del.
Bat. Bien puedes, con presupuesto
de que era mexor Casandra
para tí.
Fed. Con eso puedo
morir de ymposible amor
y tener posibles zelos. (vv986-994)

The importance of Lope's play to Moreto declines after

the first act. There are only two major scenes which find a parallel in Moreto's work. Aurora tells Cassandra of Federico's lack of interest in her and she contrasts this indifference to their previous happiness:

> ¿En qué jardín, en qué fuente
> no me dixo el conde amores?
> ¿Qué jazmines o que flores
> no fueron mi boca y frente?
> ¿Quando de mí se apartó,
> que instante vivió sin mí?
> ¿O como viviera en si,
> si no le animara yo? (1268-1275)

She then exits leaving Cassandra alone with Federico. What follows is a masterful scene in which Cassandra seduces Federico. She slowly evolves her careful plan while the innocent Federico, who is falling in love, listens and gains courage. Her remarks are obvious:

> Toma mi consejo, Conde;
> que el edificio más casto
> tiene la puerta de cera (1498-1500)

Federico feels the pressure of this brazen invitation and expresses his thoughts with an image of pursuit in which he compares himself to a hunted bird:

> El cazador con yndustria
> pone al pelicano yndiano

fuego alrededor del nido:
y el deçendiendo de un arbol,
Para librar a sus hijos
bate las alas turbado,
con que más enciende el fuego
que piensa que está matando.
Finalmente se le queman,
y sin alas, en el campo
se dexa coger, no viendo
que era ymposible bolando.
Mis pensamientos, que son
hijos de mi amor, que guardo
en el nido del silencio,
se están señora, abrasando:
bate las alas amor,
y enciéndolos por librarlos. (1502-1519)

Moreto not only fuses the two conceptions of the tale, but also introduces a very personal expression of the theme. In characterization he is close to the spirit of the Petrarchan interpretation. He enhances the nobility of both the King and the son and gives Estratónica a vital role instead of presenting her simply as a causa amoris.

Moreto adapts the borrowed material from Lope to the needs of his story. Where El castigo sin venganza had properly begun with the characterization of the Duke to establish the nature of the individual who both engenders and decides the outcome of the main action, Moreto opens

his play with Antioco. The decision is based not only on the dramatist's predeliction for the classical division of the play into exposition, development and resolution, but also on the exigencies of his work. Lope needed to establish the causality between the Duke's libertinage and the rest of the events. In Moreto the reverse takes place: it is the behavior of Antioco which will elicit a reaction from his father.

The competence of Moreto in the preparation of future events and the entrance of a key figure is evident in this first scene. A storm separates Antioco and Luquete from the rest of the party and while they seek refuge for the night they discuss the King's impending marriage. Luquete's speech censures Seleuco for this in a way which brings to mind the Duke in the source play:

> ¿Qué ha dado
> Tu padre en ser marido?
> Porque ya cincuenta años que ha vivido
> De tres mujeres ha arrastrado el luto,
> Y aún no de la tercera el llanto enjuto,
> Se casa con la cuarta;
> Y si como a las otras esta ensarta,
> Lo ha de hacer con la quinta y la requinta.
>
> (I, i)

Luquete's reproach is unjust: Seleuco's repeated marriages are not to be interpreted as licentiousness but as a mis-

fortune which will be compounded by the loss of the woman he is about to marry. The reply is put on the lips of Antioco:

> En ninguna elección mi padre ha sido
> Más atento que en esta, pues ha unido
> Con su poder el de Demetrio al grande
> Para que el Asia mande; (I, i)

This is a clear indication that Seleuco is about to make Estratónica his Queen for reasons of state. Luquete refuses to accept the explanation; he sees the dangers inherent in such a situation and while disapproving of the indiscretion of Seleuco in wedding a young girl, he points out the alternative that the King could have chosen:

> ¿Pues más glorioso,
> Casándote con ella, no quedaba,
> Pues el mismo trofeo en tí lograba,
> Sin la desproporción de su edad vieja,
> Habiendo un mozo con que hacer pareja?
> (I, i)

The rebuke and the defense of Seleuco leave us undecided as to his motives; if he had merely wanted a political alliance he could have done as Luquete suggested. The reason, however, is that he loves Estratónica and Moreto foregoes, at this time, the opportunity to emphasize it. We are left, nevertheless, with the implication that his

action is imprudent and the suggestion that Antioco should have become her husband prepares the audience for a development along these lines. It is at this point that Moreto departs from the exposition pattern of Lope to strengthen the awareness of the spectator and to provide more information. The discussion shifts from the King to the Prince. We are told that Seleuco desires a union of his son with Astrea and that Antioco is in love with someone else whose portrait he once saw. The painting is an essential, if complicated, element. There are two of them, the one owned by Seleuco and the one Antioco got from one of the soldiers. He falls in love with the woman of his portrait while refusing to look at the other because he would rather see in person how beautiful his father's bride really is. This makes it possible for him to go to meet Estratónica without knowing that she is also the woman he loves. The preparation for the encounter of the two young people is thus complete. The spectator is informed of all the elements which will be the cause of the conflict: the imprudent marriage of the King, the unwanted union between cousins and the overpowering love that rules Antioco. It is the tension created by this knowledge that distinguishes Moreto's play from Lope's. In the latter's drama the suspense is not immediately felt because it depends on the viewer's ability to understand the character of the Duke and to anticipate his reaction to the slowly developing affair between his son and his wife, while in Moreto, the makings of the conflict are clearly

seen and frequently alluded to.

Moreto's independence from his source material comes to the fore in the handling of the meeting between Antioco and Estratónica. In El castigo sin venganza, the river crossing episode serves to present Federico to Cassandra in a heroic situation which engenders the young girl's interest in him; in Moreto's play, Antioco rescues Estratónica in the storm. This not only gives them an opportunity to meet but it brings about a separation of the bride from her retinue, thus allowing the Prince to engage in a somewhat premature, but essential, exposition of his feelings. The prevailing darkness prevents Antioco from recognizing in her the woman he loves.

The structural similarities between the two plays continue with the arrival of the Queen and the light conversation between the gracioso and the criada. Moreto chooses to delay the recognition of the two people, thus forestalling the resolution of the suspense he has created in the first scene. To be sure, Antioco knows that the woman is Estratónica, but because of the storm and the darkness he has not connected her with the woman of the portrait. Servants are dispatched to find help and while they await their return the Queen asks about the Prince's health. The dramatist has facilitated the confessions of Antioco by giving him a sympathetic person upon whom to unburden his soul and in whom to find consolation. The situation, reminiscent of similar circumstances in other comedias,[28] is

ironic for the very relationship which prompts him to seek help is what will prevent any relief for his troubles.

One of the characteristics of Moreto's theatre is the use of the long relación for exposition. Although the technique is successful in that it provides a clear presentation of the events which lead to the present circumstances, the play normally suffers from a suspension of the action. In Antioco y Seleuco, it is also employed but with several modifications: it is relatively short, it is varied, and above all, it is dramatically effective. The alternation from background information to a discussion of the young man's feelings to general considerations on the nature of love give the relación balance and purpose. Antioco tells her that the origin of his plight is his father's desire to have him marry Astrea. The marriage is against his wishes for, although he likes his cousin, he is not in love with her. He distinguishes between cariño and love, which is a giving up of the self. It is in this state of indecision that he had come upon the portrait that changed his life. The extraordinary beauty of the woman captured him and he fell desperately in love:

> Tomaba el retrato a solas,
> Y hablando con el sin juicio,
> Del no responderme ingrato
> Le argüía en el delito.
> "Ojos hermosos, decía,

Para matarme tan vivos,
¿Cómo no veis lo que lloro,
Si estáis mirando los míos?
Si mi fineza os merece
Piedad, ¿por qué estáis esquivos?
Si no veis, ¿por que miráis?
Si miráis, ¿cómo sois tibios? (I, iii)

His inability to find out who the woman is increases his dejection. He hopes that the arrival of the Queen will cause a delay in the proposed wedding with Astrea and ends his confession with a desperate cry for relief from his anguish, even if it be death:

O halle yo el dueño que adoro,
O se enmiende mi delirio,
O se acabe la esperanza,
O me remedie el olvido,
O mi ceguedad conozca;
Y a no tener otro alivio.
O muera yo de infeliz
Que es el remedio mas fijo. (I, iii)

Antioco, like Federico in Lope's play, is young and inexperienced, but unlike him he is emotionally committed and is ready to die for his love. The speech is well-paced: it begins with a calm narration of events followed by reflective observations on the nature of love and succeeded by an intense description of the development of a passion.

The fire of the exposition ebbs into more factual information before exploding into a cry of desperation.

Despite its obvious climactic nature, Antioco's confession does not plunge the rest of the scene into disinterest for it is only an undulation within the larger unit of suspense, which is the recognition of the Queen as the woman he loves. Moreto increases the tension by having Estratónica ask for the portrait, a request to which Antioco acceeds. The darkness prevents her from looking at it, thus more time elapses between the expectation of the audience and the much-awaited discovery. Finally, servants arrive with torches and both the Queen and the Prince become aware of the situation. Moreto chooses to depict their reaction not with words or exclamations on the part of the protagonists, but with silence. The stupefaction is such that it immobilizes them, as the servants are quick to perceive. Antioco realizes the danger of his position but he has neither the resourcefulness nor the persistence to get the portrait back. It is in connection with this incident that the character of Estratónica begins to emerge. The portrayal of the Queen will be based on the conflict between interest in Antioco and her dignity and propriety, reinforced by a sense of duty toward her future husband. She views her attraction toward the young man as an unfortuanate occurance and when she discovers that she is the woman he loves she becomes apprehensive:

El Principe es muy galán;

Mas, cielos, ¡qué es lo que miro!
Mi retrato es el que veo;
Ya es más terrible el peligro (I, iv)

To avoid a further intensification of his passion, she prudently tries to remove its cause by refusing to give back the portrait. Estratónica defends her action by pointing out that it is proper that a woman's picture be returned to her husband. Antioco begs her not to do it; he wishes to spare his father's feelings, thus foreshadowing his future behavior.

Moreto preserves the scene division from Lope's drama to end his first act. In both plays there is a shift to the conversation between the King and Astrea (the Duke and Aurora), followed by the entrance of the gracioso and, finally, the arrival of the wedding party with the ensuing reception. Although the parallel is complete, down to the borrowing of incidents and even verses, the purpose is different. Lope sought to introduce certain elements necessary to the exposition of the action: Aurora's interest in Federico and the Marqués - Aurora sub-plot. In his play Moreto has a double goal, the presentation of the other protagonists, Seleuco and Erisistrato, and a complex unfolding of the motivations and personalities of his characters in a manner that duplicates the form of Antioco's long relación. The Prince's speech had three main divisions: the proposed marriage to Astrea, the falling in love with the

portrait and subsequent passion, and the final despair of any relief. The last three scenes of the act follow the same pattern. The conversation between Astrea and the King is a restatement of the unfulfilled love of the young woman for Antioco. Like the Prince, her response is both emotional and rational. She feels the lack of correspondence in Antioco and is also capable of analyzing minutely the reasons for his disinterest in a manner reminiscent of Antioco's confessions to the Queen:

> Que aunque fuera obligación
> El quererme con lealtad
> Por la sangre y por la unión,
> Lo que es solo voluntad
> Nunca nace de razón.
> Cuando no hay oposición,
> La razón hará su empleo;
> Mas si falta inclinación
> El que quiere por razón,
> Quiere contra su deseo; (I, v)

In echoing the Prince's own ideas on the difference between voluntad and razón, Astrea is renouncing him. She will henceforth serve only as a contrast to Antioco's unconquerable passion for Estratónica.

In scenes vi and vii we have a restatement of the love that Antioco expressed for the unknown woman. No clearer example of Moreto's careful workmanship can be of-

fered than his reworking of Federico's speech to Cassandra. The two incidents occur under the very same circumstances; Federico is to make obeisance to the Queen as a signal that he bears no ill will toward her despite the possible loss of inheritance. His speech is an eloquent and perhaps sincere expression of friendship and acceptance of the situation which he has no power to alter. Moreto transforms it into a reflection of Antioco's emotions; he conveys the strenuous effort of the Prince to retain his composure although he is confused by the sudden finding of the woman he loves and her equally abrupt loss. The dramatist makes the young man go through the first two sections of the tripartite homage, but when he comes to the third, the accumulation of these startling events proves too much for him and he cannot go on. Properly enough the point at which he stops is when he is about to swear allegiance as an individual:[29]

> Tres veces la mano os beso:
> Primero por reina mía,
> A quien juro el vasallaje
> Que mi lealtad acredita;
> Otra por esposa y dueño
> De mi padre, en quien se cifra;
> Y la tercera es por ser . . .
> Mas ¡ay de mí! en vano anima
> Mi esfuerzo la voz, yo muero.
> Señor, señor, mi desdicha
> Me mata. (I, vii)

The third restatement, the desperation of Antioco, is reflected not only in his near-collapse and the exclamatory apartes of the others but also in the grief of Seleuco over his son's condition:

Mas no digas
¡Ay de mí! ¡qué infeliz soy
Pues la mayor alegría
Me turba el mayor pesar!

These scenes are not only a repetition and therefore an intensification which leads to a further development of emotions, but also serve to introduce the King and the physician to us. It has already been poiated out that the motive for the wedding of Seleuco could not be explained in terms of a political union and that Moreto postponed the revelation of the real reason while inferring that it was a love marriage. Here, in his first speech, Seleuco dispels any doubts:

De mi esposa enamorado
Estoy por la celestial
Imagen que me ha enviado;
Mira si esto hizo el traslado
¿Qué hará hoy el original? (I, v)

The character of Seleuco will be developed along two distinct paths, love for his bride and love for his son. It is the eventual forced choice between the two that will

be the cause of the conflict within him. It is proper of Moreto, then, to affirm at this moment the other side that compliments his character, paternal love. Luquete provides Seleuco with an opportunity to show his affection when he comes with the news of the arrival of the Queen and the deepening melancholy of Antioco:

> Tu, Eristrato, has de ser
> Quien esto ha de remediar,
> Porque no viviré yo,
> Si el principe a morir llega. (I, vi)

The appeal is an ironic foreshadowing of the resolution of the dilemma; Erisistrato will save his son, but it will be at the cost of the King's happiness. The physician has no counterpart in Lope's play; he is developed from the classical sources and tailored to the exigencies of Moreto's comedia. Instead of being merely clever, he is presented as a wise man whose knowledge stems from a deep understanding of the works of the great teacher Aristotle:

> Tu, Erisistrato, fuiste
> Más sabio que la experiencia,
> Pues sus efectos venciste
> Y a Aristóteles bebiste
> El espíritu y la ciencia,9 (I, v)

Wisdom is a necessary element in the characterization of the doctor, for he is also the trusted counselor of Seleuco

and the person who tries to warn the King of the uncertainty of life, thus foreshadowing again the denouement of the play:

> Todo en el mundo es mortal;
> Y el que algún bien llega a amar,
> Aunque le juzgue por cierto,
> Siempre es fuerza que ha de estar
> Temiendo aquel fin incierto,
> Que se le puede quitar. (I, v)

With the beginning of the second act Moreto makes use of the traditional story. The reduction of the tale to the development section of his play indicates a radical departure in execution and a shift in emphasis from the mere act of generosity to a deep analysis of the protagonist's feelings.

The illness of Antioco has thrown the palace into a state of confusion. Although he suspects love to be the cause of the young man's malady, Erisistrato, to make sure of it, orders all the women in the palace to go to Antioco's room. His caution is in keeping with the personality the dramatist is developing, that of a wise man who is aware of both the fickleness of fortune and the complexities of the human heart. Erisistrato himself had been madly in love and had refused a city to marry his wife (I, vi) and he is aware that such depression of the soul must be due to an unfulfillable desire: "Algún antojo imposible/ O algún deseo inhumano;" (II, ii).

Moreto shifts the action from the doctor's preparations to Antioco in order to stress his despondency and thus give more credibility to the Prince's reaction to the Queen in the next scene. He borrowed the idea of the episode of the musician from Camoens' auto, not to satisfy the spectator's love for music, as has been suggested,[30] but because he thought the scene dramatically compatible with his conception of the character. Again, Moreto changes the material: the song and the treatment are different; they are more integrated in the play and serve as an echo to Antioco's emotions:

Música. Corazón osado mío,
Ya no se que hacer con vos,
Que vos quereis que yo quiera
Y no quiero querer yo.
Antioco. Corazón osado mío,
Yo no sé que hacer con vos,
Pues siendo uno, somos dos
Entre vos y mi albedrío.[31] (II, iii)

Moreto returns to the structure of Lope's play for scenes iv, v and vi but there is a great change in both content and purpose. In the source play, the scene between Federico and Batín is an important link in the growth of the Count's love for his step-mother, in Moreto it is merely an announcement of the Queen's arrival and a preparation for the next scene. Although there is a greater correspondence

in scene v to the original, it is different in execution. In both, the authors establish the young man's lack of interest in Aurora and Astrea; Lope presents it by making Aurora remember nostalgically the happy and exhilarating past with Antioco. Moreto has a less lyrical but more dramatic approach. The two women enter Antioco's room and he, overwhelmed by the presence of Estratónica, doesn't even notice Astrea. In both plays the rejected woman leaves while the step-mother stays behind. In El castigo sin venganza we have a masterful scene of seduction, in Moreto, the Queen stays behind because she is falling in love with Antioco and is unable to control herself. The scene is not one of attempted seduction, but on the contrary, a pathetic request by Antioco for some words of consolation since nothing else is possible. It is Estratónica, here, who is being pursued. Moreto borrows the first line of the Lopean image, takes it from Federico, gives it to Estratónica and changes its direction:

> El cazador con industria
> Para coger sin defensa
> A los simples pajarillos
> Finge un arbol, y le llena,
> De la liga que los prende;
> Luego otros pajaros lleva,
> Que allí junto están cantando.
> Los que descuidados vuelan
> Oyen la voz conocida,

Y al tierno silbo se acercan,
Pensando hallar compañía,
Y en triste prisión se quedan.
Vos sois como el cazador
. . . . . .
Yo soy la simple avecilla,
Que ignorando la cautela,
Oigo su voz, muevo el vuelo,
Y ellos tristes se lamentan. (II, vi)

Although the image is couched in the traditional language of pastoral poetry it is effective in describing the feelings of the Queen. It has also been changed from Federico's preoccupation with his growing desires to Estratónica's conflicting emotions: the sweetness of attraction and the realisation of danger. It is a brilliant expression of the complex feelings of the Queen who finally rejects the temptation because she realistically sees the futility of it:

No hay más remedio que huir,
Porque cuando yo esté presa,
Ni vuestro dolor alivio
Ni en mi decoro hay enmienda. (II, vi)

The Queen's decision is in keeping with the prudence she showed in the first act, but it is a severe blow to the hopes of Antioco who, unable to resist this final rebuff, relapses into deep melancholy. The illness of the young man forces the attention of the spectator on Seleuco, who readily

agrees to Erisistrato's plan to discover the cause of the malady. The dramatist had taken great pains to emphasize the father's deep love for his son:

> Hijo mío, considera
> Que en tu amor está mi vida,
> De tus alientos compuesta,
> Y que no habrá medio alguno
> Tan difícil, que no sea
> Ejecutado de mí,
> Si es remedio a tu dolencia. (II, vii)

These words of Seleuco restate the significant point of the play. The posing of the problem is quickly followed by the necessity for a decision. Moreto thus fixes the attention on Seleuco's reactions. According to Erisistratus's plan, the women of the palace are all brought in and by the sudden change in the complexion of Antioco, the doctor confirms his suspicion that the Prince is in love with Estratónica. The physician is hesitant to tell the news to the King but he does so out of obedience. It is important to note that the famous trick in which Erisistrato is able to make Seleuco commit himself before revealing his discovery, is not used. This exclusion proves that Moreto, far from being an indiscriminate borrower of successful material, was capable of sacrificing a highly dramatic episode to his own moral vision of the world. By making Estratónica a fiancee instead of a wife, the dramatist shows that he is not the first Christian

writer to be preoccupied with the ticklish problem of a change of husbands. Petrarch had felt the need to declare that such a practice was allowed among the Seleucide Greeks. Ruth Lee Kennedy has called this change in relationship a "contraversion of history" which makes Antioco's pining away unnecessary (1029). It is hardly worth pointing out that the writers of the time felt no obligation to follow history in a literary work.[32] Finally, we have to consider whether the alteration fundamentally affects the play. The theme does not suffer at all by the absence of the marriage and the young man's longing is not affected by the marital status of the woman he loves. In both cases she is out of his reach, especially when one considers that the man involved is both the King and his father.

Moreto dedicates the rest of the play to the analysis of his three characters under the double pressure of love and duty. Particular attention is paid to the dilemma of the father. The first reaction of the King to Erisistrato's revelation is not a sudden agreement to give up his wife but disbelief followed by anger:

> Calla, calla,
> Hombre; ¿qué has dicho? ¿qué has hecho?
> Que el corazón me has pasado
> Con un puñal. (II, xi)

The news is doubly painful for Seleuco because he feels betrayed by his son whom he considers also friend:

Hijo traidor, torpe y ciego;
Más que como hijo, de tí
Como de amigo me ofendo.

The vigorous reaction of the King belies the criticism that Moreto presents languid men. Seleuco feels his deception as violently as any other man. The only difference is that he really loves his son and, unlike the Duke, in the source play, he wrestles with his problem and refuses to sacrifice the life of his son to his own pride or happiness:

Mas cielos, ¿qué es lo que digo?
¿A mi hijo? A quien yo tengo
Para mi segunda vida,
Por alma de mis alientos
¿Yo a mi hijo he de matar?

There is, however, no quick decision toward a sentimental solution; he vacillates between love and anger and is unable to reach a conclusion:

Yo he de estrenar el delito
Mas en tan torpe suceso
No mata el padre a su hijo,
Sino a un enemigo fiero;
Pues muera el traidor mil veces.

To explore fully the dramatic possibilities of the situation, Moreto confronts Seleuco with Estratónica and his son. These situations permit the dramatist to examine Seleuco under the

most tense and most difficult circumstances. The King adopts two very different attitudes towards the young people; he is gentle and understanding with Estratónica and severe with Antioco. This duality is a reflection of his own sentiments which present him with a harsh choice:

> Padre, esposo, amante y fiel
> Pues entre mí, vos y él
> Hoy he de faltar a uno.
> Faltarme a mí es tiranía;
> Faltarle a él impiedad;
> Faltarle a vos grosería; (III, iv)

The decision is rendered more difficult by the attitude of his son which is exemplary and therefore deserving of praise more than punishment. The Petrarchan theme of an exterior force impossible to resist reappears:

> Y pues es cierto que no
> Fue elección, sino violento
> Destino que le arrastro
> De su pena debo yo
> Premiar el merecimiento.

Seleuco has come to a reluctant conclusion: give up Estratonica. It is the only solution which will enable him to retain the love of his son and be true to himself. The climactic moment of the play is the confrontation of father and son. It is clear that it is viewed by the King as an

obstacle that he must surmount: "Eso falta/ Por vencer en mi pasión" (III, v). Seleuco emerges from this scene with dignity by dint of a speech that is both moving and powerful. He approaches his son with coolness and with a bitterness which he barely contains. His long speech thunders with anger and disappointment:

> Como padre, como amigo
> Y como rey, hoy se halla
> De vuestro error ofendida
> Mi majestad soberana.
> Como hijo, vuestra culpa
> Sacrilegamente osada,
> Fue contra Dios, contra mí
> Y contra si misma ingrata. (III, vii)

When he brings to a close his harangue it is not with any sign of forgiveness but great and increasing irritation. Only the plaintive cries of his son who begs to pay with his life for the error he has committed, can mollify the King's anger. Seleuco has won the great battle over himself in sacrificing his own happiness for that of his son. The extreme generosity of the father strikes a similar chord in Antioco who, recognizing the King's virtue and his selfishness, pretends that he does not love Estratónica. Moreto is not interested in presenting Seleuco in a super-human or heroic manner; he wants to show his humanity as well. The King is eager to believe Antioco despite the evidence

to the contrary and is beside himself with joy:

> Hijo, arrojarme a tus plantas
> Para pedirte perdón
> De injuria tan mal pensada
> El alma, que ya en suspiros
> Y en sentimientos te daba,
> Te la dare en alegrías,
> Pues me la vuelves con tantas. (III, vii)

The great sense of relief with which he rushes out to arrange his marriage with Estratónica, as if fearing a change of mind in Antioco, rather than weakening his generous act, stresses the weight of his sacrifice. The narrow victory of the father over himself cannot be duplicated by the son who, feeling the enormity of his renunciation, is overwhelmed. In vain does he try to reason that what he has done is for the best. His bitter conclusion is that although razón rules the mind and the body, it is voluntad which really directs the human being. Once again, Moreto manages to maintain the suspense that he uses so effectively throughout the play. He has brought together the main characters, revealed their potential behavior and returned the story to the same point that preceded the confrontations while indicating the possible resolution.

Estratónica maintains to the end her conflict between love and dignity. She protests that she has lost her albedrío but tries to influence Antioco to accept the King's

offer. Moreto views human responsibility as an individual decision, thus when the Prince asks Estratónica's support to continue in his refusal she cannot help him. She, herself is fighting her own battle between propriety and desire and under the presure of love her strength has almost vanished She feels betrayed by Antioco who awoke love in her and now seems to desert her; she wants to give vent to her feelings but once again is stopped by her sense of dignity. Her monologue indicates both hesitation and frustration; she cannot control her sentiments but she is unwilling to affirm herself. Given the weakness of both Antioco and Estratónica, only the King can make the decision that has been anticipated.

Seleuco emerges as the protagonist of the story, clothed with dignity, generosity and humanity. Moreto saw in him an extraordinary human being whose virtues of love, renunciation and understanding made him a worthy example.[33]

In presenting the first full dramatization of the classical tale in Spain Moreto places himself within the Greco-Roman and Romance traditions. From the theme of paternal generosity and triumph of love presented by his predecessors, he develops a powerful story of a man's conquest over himself and the struggle between love and duty in Antioco and Estratónica. He has chosen carefully from a wide variety of sources and integrated this material in a totally different conception of the theme. The clarity

of the exposition, the effectiveness of the plotting, the motivation of the characters and its poetic language make this comedia one of Moreto's most appealing works.

N O T E S

[1] Treatments of the theme which fall outside of our discussion and which represent other literary genres are those of Aristaenetus, Lettres d'amour, trans. J. Brenous (Paris, 1938), Book I, letter XIII and Juan de Cueva's poem which can be found in vol. X of the Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, 338-39.

[2] For the development of the story in classical literature see Pauly, Wissowa and Kroll, Real Encyclopädie der Altertumswissenschaft (Stuttgart, 1931), Zweite Reihe, vol. IV, 319. For its use in Romance literature, especially in Peninsular drama see Ruth Lee Kennedy, "The Theme of 'Stratonice' in the Drama of the Spanish Peninsula," Publications of the Modern Language Association, LX (1940), 1012-29. All subsequent references to this article will be included in the text.

[3] Ed. Carolus Halm (Lipsiae, 1865), pp. 261-63.

[4] Ed. E. Capps, trans. Bernadotte Perring, Loeb Classical Library (New York, 1920), IX, 93-97.

[5] Ed. E. Capps, trans. Horace White, Loeb Classical Library (London, 1912), II, 217-23.

[6] Ed. E. Capps, trans. A. M. Harmon, Loeb Classical Library (London, 1925), IV, 361-64.

[7] Ed. T. E. Page, trans. Wilmer Cave Wright, Loeb Classical Library (New York, 1913), II, 447-49.

[8] For an analysis of Petrarch's Trionfi see Renato Serra, Dei Trionfi di Francesco Petrarca (Bologna, 1929).

[9] For a discussion of the popularity of the Trionfi in Peninsular literature see Giuseppe Carlo Rossi, "Una traduzione cinquecentesca spagnuola del Trionfo d'amore," Convivium, n.s. I (1959), 44; Arturo Farinelli, Italia e Spagna (Torino, 1929), I, 40.

[10] Petraca con doi commenti sopra li sonetti et canzone . . .(Venezia, 1522), p. xxxiii. This is the commentary by Bernardo Illicino or Lapini wrongly attributed to Nicola Peranzone who was the editor.

[11] For the critics who doubt Bandello's debt to Petrarch see T. Gwynfor Griffith, Bandello's Fiction, an Examination of the Novella (Oxford, 1955), p. 101; Letterio Di Francia, "Alla scoperta del vero Bandello," Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, LXXX (1922), 39.

[12] Opere, ed. Francesco Flora (Milano, 1935), II, 215.

[13] The first publication is that of the Primeira Parte of the Rimas de Luis de [illegible] by Paulo Craesbeck in Lisbon, 1645.

[14] For a full discussion of the prologue see Vieira de Almeida, "O prologo do Rei Seleuco," Ocidente, XXXI (1943),

341-43.

15 The auto has been the subject of a long controversy regarding the relevance of some of its material to Camoens' life. For this topic and for partial interpretations of the play, see Wilhelm Storck, Vida e obras de Luis de Camões, trans. C. M. de Vasconcellos (Lisboa, 1897), p. 384; J. M. Rodrigues,"O vilancete de Camões a senhora dos olhos Gonçalves," Academia das Ciencias de Lisboa, Classe de Ciencias moraes, politicas e bellas lettras, Boletim, X (1915-16), 914-929. In the same journal see the article by C. M. de Vasconcellos, "O vilancete de Luis de Camões aos olhos-Gonçalves," XII (1918), 289-311; Visconde de Juromenha, Obras Complétas de Luis de Camões (Lisboa, 1865), IV, 473-81; Hernani Cidade, Luis de Camões, os autos e o teatro do seu tempo (Lisboa, 1956), p. 91.

16 "Sobre el Rey Seleuco de Camões," Boletim de Filologia, XI (1950), 304-19.

17 For a discussion of the sources of Lope's play see the edition of Adolf Van Dam, Groninga, 1928. All subsequent references to Lope's play will refer to this edition and will be included in the text.

18 Barrera y Leirado quotes the Primera Parte of the year 1654 while Cotarelo y Mori gives as the earliest "authentic" Primera Parte that of Colonia, 1697.

[19]Van Dam views the use of the Stratonice episode similarly: "Recurre a la sabida anecdota del rey Seleuco y de su hijo Antioco para ocasionar la caída de este Adán" p. 107.

[20] Valerius Maximus, trans. by Hugo de Urríes (Zaragoza, 1495); Plutarch, trans. by Alfonso de Palencia (Sevilla, 1491); Appian, translation attributed to Diego de Salazar (Alcalá, 1536); Lucian, trans. by Agustín Frisio (1551); Julian, princeps edition (Paris, 1566).

[21] Natural History, trans. John Bostock (London, 1892), III, 100. See also note 9 in Vol. V, 372 where it is suggested that Erisistratus was the son of Pythias, daughter of Aristotle.

[22] Novella di Seleuco. I have used the edition of 1817.

[23] Macerata, 1635.

[24] The Visconde de Juromenha maintains " . . .conheceu o auctor hespanhol a do nosso Poeta, como se ve da scena dos musicos . . ." (IV, 480-81).

[25] For an analysis of this play see T. E. May, "El castigo sin venganza: The Idolatry of the Duke of Ferrara," Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, XXXVII (1960), 154-82.

[26] The source of Lope's play is the novella XLIV of

Bandello, I, 516-24 of the Flora edition.

[27] T. E. May suspects that "her thoughtlessness has an obvious drift" from the moment they meet, p. 156.

[28] For example in Tirso's La venganza de Tamar, II, vi.

[29] Similarly, Nabot in Tirso's La mujer que manda en casa refrains from giving his personal allegiance to the queen, I, viii.

[30] Ruth Lee Kennedy in her article on the Stratonice theme holds that the music in Moreto's play was used to satisfy the plublic's interest (p. 1026).

[31] The connection between music and theme of the play has been discussed in an article by Leo Spitzer, "A Central Theme and Its Structural Equivalent in Lope's Fuenteovejuna," Hispanic Review, XXXIII (1955), 274-92.

[32] On this problem see A. A. Parker, "History and Poetry. The Cariolanus Theme in Calderón," in Hispanic Studies in Honour of I. González Llubera (Oxford, 1959), pp. 211-24.

[33] Moreto was intrigued by the imposing personality of Seleuco and used him again in another play, La fuerza de la ley, in which his respect for the law takes precedence over his own feelings. Moreto's comedia is intringuingly similar to a play by De Brosse, La Stratonice ou la malade d'amour (Paris, 1645). The French dramatist treats the relationship between father and son in the same manner. Although his play

was published ten years before Moreto's, there is no translation of it into Spanish nor is there any evidence that Moreto read French; it is, therefore, impossible to determine if the Spanish playwright was influenced by it.

V

El VALIENTE JUSTICIERO

Among the recurring figures of the Spanish comedia none can rival that of Don Pedro el Cruel in the number of treatments he has been accorded; although in many plays he is a secondary character, in some of the most significant works of the Golden Age theatre he has a central, if not predominant, role. The impact of the personality of Don Pedro on the Spanish stage has been studied with considerable care by José Lomba y Pedraja[1] and augmented by Emily Schons.[2]

The character of the Castilian monarch as presented first in the chronicle of the Canciller Pero López de Ayala[3] and later in the ballads[4] has served as the basis of a long standing controversy. Judged cruel by some and just by others, Pedro has remained an enigmatic personage who has found both bitter attackers and vehement defenders. This dispute has been reviewed at length by Antonio Ferrer del Río in an attempt to substantiate his own conclusions and needs no retelling here.[5] However, a brief summary of the historical facts and legends which have served as a point of departure for the dramatic character of the King might prove useful.

Born in 1334 of Alfonso XI and Doña María of Portugal, Pedro was brought up in an atmosphere of hate and resentment

against his father's mistress, Doña Leonor de Guzmán, and her sons. At the death of Alfonso he became king under the tutelage of Juan Alfonso de Alburquerque. The enmity against Enrique, his step-brother, began early with the bastard's secret marriage to a niece of Juan Manuel who had been destined to marry the young monarch. Pedro had to contend not only with the hostilities of the bastard princes but also with the opposition of the nobles to Alburquerque. Every time he managed to quell one or the other revolt he followed it with summary executions of the people involved and their families. Each campaign against his enemies gave the young King more independence, which the privado tried to check by interesting him in María de Padilla while he negotiated for the hand of Blanca de Borbón of France. The relationship which Alburquerque had hoped would help him retain his control contributed instead to his downfall and the ascendency of the Padilla faction.

The bastard brothers took advantage of the friction between the favorite and the minister to ally themselves simultaneously with both sides. The marriage to Blanca de Borbón was celebrated following a formal reconciliation between the King and his half-brothers; but immediately after Pedro abandoned his bride to join his mistress. Alburquerque trailed him to Toledo but, warned of the King's plans for his death, fled to Portugal. A short return of the monarch to his rightful wife was quickly followed by another desertion, the imprisonment of the young girl, and a request

to annul the marriage (granted by two bishops but not recognized by the Church) in order to marry Juana de Castro. The infatuation with this lady lasted one night and on the succeeding day the King repudiated his new wife. The action aligned another powerful bloc with the growing list of his enemies, which also included many cities, notably Toledo. A league against Pedro was established under the symbolic leadership of Alburquerque, who had died, and whose body was carried about by his followers. At Toro, the King had to capitulate, and the influential members of the league banned the Padillas from court while keeping Pedro a virtual prisoner. The rights of Blanca were never pressed and soon friction among the heterogeneous groups caused the dissolution of the league and the eventual escape of Pedro. Upon regaining control, he makes his vengeance felt everywhere: the bishop of Aguilar, friends of the bastard brother, his cousin Juan and his wife, the spouse of another half-brother are all killed; Fadrique is murdered after a reconciliation with his step-brother; Simuel Levi is executed and his wealth confiscated; a Dominican monk who had warned him against Enrique is burned; Bermejo, a Moorish king, and his escort are treacherously ambushed; finally, he has Blanca poisoned and attempts to change the line of succession. Enrique, meanwhile, is acclaimed by every city and Pedro has to flee to Bayonne where he enlists the aid of the British. With their help he defeats his brother at Najera and reestablishes his reign of terror. The Prince, who had fled to Languedoc, re-

turns with French help and is once again received in triumph in every city. Hated by all and surrounded by soothsayers and magicians, Pedro asks help from the Moors. On March 14, 1369 he is defeated in battle at Montiel and takes refuge in a nearby castle. After prolonged negotiations he goes to Enrique's tent to discuss their differences; a fight ensues and Enrique stabs the King to death.[6]

Francisco Ferrer del Río and others have noted that with the exception of Gratia Dei historians,[7] from Ayala to Mariana agree on the evil character of Pedro; the romances written at the time support their views. However, as Menéndez Pidal has pointed out, ballads were often used as effective means of propaganda and therefore absolute credence cannot be given to them.[8] The attempt to rehabilitate the reputation of Don Pedro, and hence the beginning of the controversy, commences in the seventeenth century and specifically in the theatre. Although Ferrer del Río insists that even in the comedias he is painted as a man of excesses, José Lomba y Pedraja, in his detailed study, proves that Don Pedro was looked upon with admiration and was given many qualities of a just king who defended the people against the tyranny of the nobles. Milá y Fontanals ascribes this change to the affection of people for energetic characters and the reluctance of subsequent kings to have one of their predecessors so badly named.[9] And Prosper Mérimée, although agreeing to a large extent with Ayala's judgment, continues the apology with the following statement: "Afable con los

pequeños, frecuentemente duro y altanero con los poderosos, de todo quería estar el corriente: todo quería verlo por si mismo . . .. La justicia de D. Pedro ha quedado en proverbio; fue la de los soberanos musulmanes: pronta, terrible, apasionada casi siempre, y a menudo, en la forma extravagante."[10] We must not, however, accept completely the assertion that all dramatists saw Pedro as justiciero. The King in Calderón's El medico de su honra and again in Lope's Los Ramirez de Arellano emerges as a thoroughly reprehensible man.[11]

The most important comedia in which this controversial personage appears is El Rey Don Pedro en Madrid, which is the source play for Moreto's work. It presents us with a difficult problem of authorship; it has been attributed to Lope, Tirso and Claramonte, the latter having been eliminated from serious consideration. But the dispute concerning Lope and Tirso has not been resolved.[12] Since Moreto's El Valiente justiciero follows the source closely in so many instances, it is necessary to analyze the Lope-Tirso comedia in great detail so that the many and subtle changes that Moreto wrought can be assessed.

El Rey don Pedro en Madrid cannot be understood unless viewed in the light of Pedro's own historical character, his struggle against his brother Enrique, and the rehabilitation and the struggle themes. However, the purpose of its author is not the dramatization of history but the representation

of the strife between a King beset by personal and political problems and a nobleman whose defiance of the King's authority represents not only a rejection of Pedro's personal worth but is also symbolic of the larger battle that the monarch is waging against his brothers.

Critical opinions have differed somewhat on what the author sought to achieve. Pedro Muñoz Peña saw in the play an attempt to "reunir y condensar los sentimientos de adoración mayestática que se le concedió en tiempo de los Felipes al representante de la monarquía" and thought that the importance of the comedia lay in the "pintura de los caracteres del Rey y del Infanzón" (p. 391). Menéndez Pelayo is of the opinion that the purpose is to bring to the theatre the sinister and fatal personality of D. Pedro, which is due to a fusion of the Chronicle of Ayala and the popular tradition (p. CLI). I. L. McClelland, however, insists that the cumulative effect of nervous indecision seen in the last act, and not the revelation of the ghost or Pedro's duel with Tello, is the truly dramatic point of the play.[13]

The disagreement is understandable, for the play presents a complex network of conflicting situations which cannot always be integrated in what A. A. Parker likes to call the "unity of action".[14] There is a conflict between Tello and Pedro, as there is between Enrique and Pedro, the supernatural and Pedro; Tello and the two women, Cordero and Ginesa, Elvira and Busto. I propose to analyze these themes to show their interrelationship and connection to the central

theme of the work.

Lope[15] begins his play with a lyrical lament that falsely creates the atmosphere of a pastorale. The spectator is led to imagine, by the girl's words, that he is about to witness a play of amorous disdain:

> Elvira. Verdes campos de Madrid,
> Almas desta soledad,
> Mis suspiros animad
> Y mis lagrimas sentid.
> Oíd mis quejas, oíd
> El más bárbaro rigor
> De los desprecios de amor: (p. 477)

In echoing her, Ginesa does not dispel this notion, and the entrance of Elvira's galán, Busto, and his subsequent speech give further support to this impression. It is Ginesa's attack on men that finally reveals the cause of the girls' grief:

> Ginesa. No puede tratar verdad
> El hombre, aunque más te asombre
> Pues tiene en el primer hombre
> El mentir su antigüedad. (p. 478)

The consternation of the young women is revealed when they unburden themselves to King Pedro. There is no explanation for the royal presence among the fields of Leganés; he erupts upon the scene violently and without a purpose. The drama-

tist chooses this manner to begin the characterization of his vehement hero. Pedro's preoccupation with courage and his scorn for weakness or cowardice, a major theme of the work, is at once made known and is vividly expressed in his retelling of the incident that caused his stop:

> No hay cosa en mí
> Que darme fatiga pueda.
> Temió el caballo bajar
> Esa cumbre, y yo arriméle
> La espuela para que vuelva:
> Quísome precipitar:
> Y no dándole lugar
> A que otro Faetón me hiciese
> Le hice que a mis pies muriese. (p. 479)

With the violent personality of Pedro, Lope introduces the question of the justice or cruelty of the King. The defense is put on the lips of the monarch himself who vigorously excuses himself of the accusation of cruelty. He charges the vulgo with falsity and insists that it is confusing justice with ferocity. The King seems to be deeply affected by this and in an aside he bitterly reprimands his countrymen for it.

A short exchange between Elvira and Busto in which they bemoan their fate prompts the King to ask the cause of their sorrow. In a lengthy speech of great poetic intensity, Elvira narrates how the lasciviousness of Tello robbed her of her happiness:

Elvira. Turbó el sosiego a la aldea,
Robó a la noche el descanso,
Siendo de mis pajas fuego,
Siendo de mis puertas Argos.
Fuese al fin, y muchas veces,
En su amor perseverando
Volvió a la aldea a dar lenguas
A la envidia y al agravio;
Hasta que soberbio y loco,
Poderoso, temerario,
Cruel, sangriento, lascivo,
Resuelto, determinado,
Llegó . . . (p. 482)

Elvira is unable to finish the most painful part of her narration. Her maid has to tell how Tello and his servant invaded their house and raped them and how their pleas for justice were ignored by the authorities because of the great power of the nobleman For some unexplainable reason, Busto had been made to exit just before Elvira's revelation and thus he still does not know the reason for her refusal to marry him. This ignorance is somewhat unexplicable when we consider that the town has been disturbed by Tello's advances, that there was a fight between the aldeanos and the nobleman's servants and that formal request for judicial help was made.

Pedro's reaction to her narration is significant for

the comprehension of the play. He does not see in it a case of flagrant disregard for human dignity and a miscarriage of justice, but an example of usurpation of power by the nobles and a threat to his authority:

> Rey. ¿Quién infanzones son? ¿Quién ricoshombres?
> Caiga tanta cabeza
> Solo un cetro ha de haber, solo una alteza;
> Que en los reinos del día,
> Solo gobierna un sol la monarquía; (p. 483)

Violent as this reaction is, Pedro becomes almost uncontrollable when he is told that Tello is just then trying to marry a young lady he kidnapped from the "tálamo de su esposo." It is under the effects of this excitement that Don Pedro sees the sombra for the first time. I. L. McClelland views the use of the ghost as a dramatically effective device to show Pedro's incapacity to understand the forces against which he is striving (p. 34). However, these pressures are not solely brought about by the King's preoccupation with the rebellion of his brothers, as Pedro himself maintains:

> Todos son miedos vanos,
> Ilusiones de Blanca y de mis hermanos.
> (p. 484)

but also with the personal problem of the ruler. The presence of the ghost, as will be seen in its last appearance,

is to punish the King for having murdered him when he, in life, tried to defend a woman from the lust of the monarch. The reaction of Pedro to the rape of Elvira is both a natural dislike for disobedience in a vassal and irritation in being reminded of his own faults. This parallel between the action of the King and his rebellious nobleman is one of the motifs of the play. But in his confrontation with the ghost itself, Pedro maintains the same aggressiveness and lack of fear he has displayed before. He faces the apparition and even defies it: "Yo alterarme de un hombre,/ ¡Cuándo no hay imposible que me asombre!" This pride in his courage anticipates his willingness to measure himself against Tello while, at the same time, he defies the supernatural to make him respectful of its powers.

But, by now, the King is obsessed with the idea of a nobleman who challenges his authority and he therefore decides to seek him out. The last words of the scene serve as an introduction to Don Tello: "Ya me muero/ por ver este infanzón bárbaro y fiero." Lope uses gay wedding music as a contrast to the conflict that follows immediately. Doña Leonor, kidnapped from her wedding to Rodrigo, refuses to marry Tello. As in the case of Pedro, whose violent entrance is characteristic of his personality, Tello is presented, with his first words, as an unfeeling and discourteous individual. He calls Leonor enfadosa and necia and considers her fiancé an escudero unworthy of offering him competition. These sentiments find amplification in an im-

pressive speech by Tello, set appropriately in imposing octaves to reflect the importance of the nobleman, in which he informs Leonor and her father of the full extent of his wealth, his nobility and his personal valor:

> Tello. Yo, don Fernando, soy Tello García
> De Fuenmayor, yo el Infanzón de Illescas:
> Cuanta campiña veis, se nombra mía,
> . . . . . .
> Cuanto toca a la sangre, mi nobleza
> Se deriva a los reyes de Castilla:
> Mía es su majestad, mía es su alteza,
> Que en mí Pelayo restauró su silla;
> Que antes que el coronara su cabeza, . . .
> Ya era mi casa alcuna de infanzones.
> . . . . . .
> Fuera desto, por mí y por esta espada,
> Soy la primera casa desta tierra . . .
> Mi voz es como el cielo venerada;
> Dueño soy de la paz y de la guerra, (p. 485)

There are marked similarities between Tello's assertions and the King's estimation of his own merits which render the two adversaries more worthy of each other.

Having established the personalities of the two antagonists, the dramatist arranges a meeting between the two; Pedro comes to see Tello under an assumed name. The nobleman receives him in the most ungentlemanly way possible: he

refuses to get up or to offer his guest a chair. The connection between his personal discourtesy and refusal to recognize the royal authority is never allowed to go unnoticed. Tello boasts that kings come to see him, that Don Pedro is a disgrace to the good name of his father, Alfonso; he makes malicious references to María de Padilla, affirms that the King is obeyed only when he, Tello, allows it, and, finally, states that although the King may command him he has no obligation to obey. Pedro barely controls himself while he plans to make the infanzón's punishment an example for the other rebellious nobles. A feature related to Tello's revolt is his scorn for the King's personal courage. He makes a contemptuous reference to the murder by Pedro of the clérigo and other helpless individuals and affirms his own superiority:

> Tello. El Rey podrá, por lo excelso
> De la majestad, mandallo;
> Pero yo no obedecello.
> Y cuando me lo mandara,
> En el campo cuerpo a cuerpo
> Sin majestad, yo le hiciera
> Que lo heroico de mi pecho
> Conociera a cuchilladas. (p. 489)

A final proof of the impudence of Tello is shown in his acknowledgement of the rape of Elvira and his unconcern with the threat to seek royal justice. The challenge to royal

authority cannot be greater; and as the King swears vengeance, the act is brought to an end.

With the beginning of the second act, the theme of rehabilitation is further developed. In a series of audiences, the King's generosity, concern for his subjects, admiration for personal courage, and scorn for cowardice are shown. The most important is that of Don Rodrigo, Doña Leonor's intended husband, not only because it is more integrated into the play but also because it introduces a theme that is later amplified. Don Rodrigo has come to ask vengeance for Tello's act but the King gives him an ambiguous reply; as a man he suggests daring but as a monarch he demands obedience to the law. To the understandable confusion of Rodrigo he answers: "don Pedro os dice que sí/ Y el rey don Pedro que no." This dichotomy between King and man foreshadowed by Tello's distinction between monarch and individual is developed not only in the duel scene at the end of the second act, but also in Pedro's forgiveness of Tello.

Apart from a few scenes at the end, the entire act serves to create an atmosphere of expectancy that is not dissipated until the King makes up his mind about the fate of his opponents. Miss McClelland views the action as an interval in which every character is waiting, consciously and tensely, for something to happen (p. 210). There is, however, an important development of the situation. Through a series of well calculated moves the King is beginning to break down the arrogance of the nobleman. The humiliation of

Tello starts with the withdrawing of his fueros and proceeds to his arrest, but the culminating point is the eventual confrontation of the two in a physical combat. Tello is first insulted when he is made to enter the palace through the postigo instead of the main door, he is then separated from his retinue and prohibited to leave the palace. Despite these obvious signs of royal displeasure, he is still confident of his personal valor and worth as an infanzón:

> Mi espada es esta
> De quien aun tiembla Castilla
> Y de quien los reyes tiemblan.
> Ricohombre soy e infanzón
> Y a la par de si me asienta
> El conde de Trastamara,
> Que es su hermano. (p. 495)

The reference to Enrique of Trastamara, whom Don Pedro considers a traitor is an important reinforcement of the idea that Tello is representative of the rebellious nobility. The infanzon himself, is aware of this connection when he remarks that the King is punishing all the other nobles through him.

Meanwhile Don Tello is made to wait impatiently for the King who, for greater effectiveness, has the nobleman and his servant led from room to room, each progressively smaller and increasingly darker. The manoeuver is effectual, for the rebel begins to lose some of his confidence. First he admits that the authority of the King is awe-inspiring,

then he shows concern, and finally confesses that the King is too powerful to challenge in his own house. It is at this point that he is finally permitted to see Don Pedro. But the series of events designed to humble his arrogance does not end: he is shocked by the discovery that the very man he had insulted and patronized and to whom he had revealed his contempt for the monarch is the King himself. He falls on his knees only to find that Pedro ignores him completely. The startled infanzón protests his loyalty but Pedro is no longer willing to tolerate him. In a long speech, the monarch reminds Tello of all his remarks and concludes with an assertion of his power:

> Que si sois Tello García,
> Soy el Rey don Pedro yo.
> Yo el Rey soy, porque nací
> De tan soberana esfera,
> Que cuando rey no naciera,
> Lo pudiera ser por mí.
> Yo en la campaña y aquí
> Si medimos las espadas,
> Os daré las cuchilladas
> Que darme ese brazo intenta;
> Y recibid, para en cuenta,
> Agora estas cabezadas. (p. 499)

The violence with which Pedro acts continues the parallel between the King and Tello. They are both fierce and vehe-

ment; they are both struggling against a higher power (Tello with his King and Pedro with the ghost); they admire physical courage in others; they disregard the rights of others. Even the King himself comes to realize that he shares one trait with his nobleman:

> Rey. Vos la fama y la opinión
> De cuantas mujeres veis,
> En las manos la tenéis;
> Pero disculpado estáis
> Si decís que me imitáis,
> Y que de mí lo aprendéis. (p. 499)

The juxtaposition of significant events lends further support to this idea. Immediately after the King defeats Tello and the latter accepts the full authority of the monarch, the sombra is able to break down the spirit of Pedro. The most dramatic example of the closeness between the two men is provided by Elvira. In a long harangue against the unfeeling nobleman she utters words that should really apply to Pedro and not to Tello:

> Y ansí te previene
> Leyes que te ofusquen,
> Iras que te espanten,
> Muertes que te turben,
> Sombras que te cerquen,
> Ansias que te apuren,

Sierpes que te muerdan,
Hombres que te acusen,
Culpas que te venzan
Varas que te juzguen
Y almas ofendidas
Que tu muerte anuncien. (p. 500)

Seemingly, Tello does not share Pedro's sense of duty toward his subjects. But even in the King this feeling of obligation is not too developed; he intervenes in favor of Elvira not because he disapproves of the injustice but because he sees in her case a threat to his authority. In the audiences, he admires the spirit of the soldier and he dismisses the contador because he likes to deal directly with his people. Only in the episode of the arbitrista is the reason for his judgment the well-being of the nation.

The careful plan to disconcert the nobleman continues with the arrival of the two women he has offended. They remonstrate against his overbearance, his falsity, his insults and his discourtesy. It is after this barrage of hostility that Tello is led off to jail.

It is clear that the King has proven his point to his adversary, but the gnawing doubt he has about his personal courage still is with him, and so are the taunts of cowardice hurled by Tello. He feels restless and seeks to relieve his tension. He dismisses his customary ronda because the night is clear and therefore not to his liking. This attraction toward dark and threatening nights is a mean-

ingful addition to the characterization of the King as a man of violent emotions and is a reflection of the historically accepted personality of Pedro. To consume this nervous energy and to test his courage he wishes to fight with his courtiers, who naturally refuse. The only man who dares to fight is defeated quickly and the monarch is left alone in anger and frustration. It is at this moment of confusion that the sombra appears for the second time and challenges him to fight. Pedro continues in his defiance of the ghost which repeats its threat: "Has de ser piedra en Madrid" and then disappears.

The penalty of death decreed against Tello is announced in the play indirectly in a curious incident that has no preparation in the previous action. The very same two women who a moment before had vented their anger on the irrepentant infanzón are now consulting each other on how to save Tello. The role of the two women in this attempt needs some clarification. Leonor has been insulted but not dishonored, hence her willingness to beg for mercy is plausible. Elvira, however, has been grievously disgraced and, although her only chance of redress lies with Tello, her ready agreement to intervene in his favor strikes the spectator as strange. Although lacking motivation, the actions of the women can be integrated into the play by viewing them as an opportunity to establish a contrast. They, who have been offended, find it in their hearts to forgive him, while Pedro not only insists on punishing Tello, but is so annoyed by the women,

that he orders that they be put in jail.

At the same time that Tello is beginning to lose some of his confidence, Don Pedro is becoming more and more disturbed about the appearances of the ghost. He continues to ascribe them to his political difficulties, but does not connect it to his own failings. Indeed, he equates his visions with the pressure that his enemies are bringing upon him:

> Rey. Mas ¿cuándo mi heroico pecho
> Advertió ilusiones locas,
> Ni admitió quimeras vanas?
> Estas son fingidas copias,
> Fantasmas de mis hermanos,
> Hechizas, engaño todas. (p. 506)

Vehemently, he decides that he must curb the power of his step-brothers and in so doing rid himself of the visions that haunt him:

> Rey. Mas, ¡vive Dios!, que he de hacer
> Que mi majestad conozcan
> Tantos hermanos que altivos
> Mis pretensiones estorban,
> Y acabando estos encantos
> Prostraré esta Babilonia. (p. 506)

The King's resolve to measure his sword against the nobleman has a twofold purpose: to answer the taunt of the <u>infanzón</u>

and to begin the offensive against his enemies, hoping thereby to regain his peace of mind. It is the necessity of implementing his decision that makes him refuse the request of the two women, while he impatiently waits to fight Tello.

The King's plan is to free the rebellious nobleman and to fight him in the dark without letting the other know who he is. There is a break in the continuity of the action with the presentation of Enrique. His presence in the play serves to point out the instability of the King. In all his actions, Enrique proves that he is a loyal brother yet Pedro continues to treat him like a traitor. Another external reason may be the unwillingness of Golden Age dramatists to forgo an opportunity to bring to the scene the conflict between the brothers.

The struggle between the King and his adversary resumes with the admission of the infanzón that he fears the authority of Pedro; however, he still maintains that he is not afraid of the man. Aided by the darkness, the monarch tricks the nobleman into fighting and throughly defeats him. How much the victory means to Pedro can be gathered by his words:

> Rey. Hombre soy . . .
> (Y he deseado sabello),
> Hombre soy que por diez valgo,

The importance that the King attaches to being respected as a man is reiterated:

Rey. Confiesa que por mi solo
Ser respetado merezco
Tanto como el Rey por ser
Rey; y confiesa que puedo
Por mi bizarría más
Que el Rey por su nacimiento. (p. 512)

The total victory of the King forces the once proud nobleman to admit his insignificance and to beg humbly for the monarch's forgiveness. The duality between King and man, so many times observed finds further and more explicit expression in Pedro's speech as he frees Tello:

Rey. Aquí la espada te libra,
Y allí te amenaza el cetro.
Aquí soy tu amigo; allí
Soy tu Rey; aquí te absuelvo
De los delitos, y allí
Te he de castigar por ellos;
Allí ha de obrar la justicia;
Y la piedad que te muestro
Obra aquí: aquí soy piadoso,
Y allí he de ser Rey severo. (p. 512)[16]

It is at this moment of fulfillment that the shade makes its third appearance. Menéndez y Pelayo, although defending the use of three supernatural visits as an example of cumulative horror finds that the ghost is somewhat verbose and "abusa un poco de las tradiciones locales y monásticas;"

(p. CLVI).[17] I. L. McClelland finds the use of the device effective: "That don Pedro, for his sins, should be required to found a convent in Madrid may be very just and proper, but its pious mission to tell him so by no means accounts for the ghost's existence (p. 55)". The main purpose of the specter is not simply to tell Pedro that "has de ser piedra en Madrid" means that to expiate his sins he has to build a convent, but also to objectify the fears of the monarch. What is more important, however, is that the King is finally "escarmentado" and that he, as Tello just before, has given in to a superior power and admitted his impotence. A secondary objective is to foretell the eventual victory of Enrique over Pedro.

The final scenes of the play deal with the conflict between the King and his brother. In a series of auguries the defeat of Pedro is foretold and the appearance of the monarch on his throne with the legend Deposuit potentes (Luke 1:52) is an ironic reminder of the historical reality. It is true that Pedro has managed to humiliate his opponents, but the eventual victory, as exemplified by the pardon to both Enrique and Tello, belongs to his enemies.

Two other plays, Los novios de Hornachuelos and De esta agua no beberé[18] have been mentioned as possible sources of Moreto's El valiente justiciero because they treat the same theme of the rebellious knight disconfited by the King. However, since El Rey don Pedro en Madrid is the oldest of these plays and the others do not contribute anything to

Moreto's work,[19] I see little value in taking them into consideration.

Moreto's El valiente justiciero, first published in the Parte Nueva de Varios, 1657,[20] is a play, that, like the subject it treats, has found vehement defenders and detractors. Among the latter are Menéndez Pelayo and Ochoa who think the play is not a "rifacimento sino plagio" and "un plagio escandaloso", respectively.[21] Adolf von Schack (p. 98) and Louis de Viel Castel find it an outstanding comedia.

Typical of their opinion is the latter's enthusiastic remark: "Lope de Vega avait composé un Seigneur d'Illescas (El Infanzón de Illescas), dont Moreto a complètement imité l'idée première et même les détails principaux. Ici, l'imitation est poussée tellement loin qu'il ne fallait rien moins, pour la justifier, que l'incomparable supériorité de la copie et l'oubli absolu dans lequel elle a fait tomber l'original."[29] A more moderate course is followed by Muñoz Peña, Lomba y Pedraja, Valbuena Prat and Ruth Lee Kennedy. They see Moreto's play more technically perfect but without the strength and power of the original.[22]

I believe that this idea is more nearly correct: Moreto has reshaped the play but has kept substantially within the limits set by his predecessor. The following comparison between the comedias seeks to support this statement.

Moreto has retained all of the important characters, dropping a few of the secondary personages that have no part

in the development of the action. There has been only one primary change, the Doña Elvira of the original, a peasant girl raped by Tello, has been changed into Doña Leonor, a noblewoman. The change is necessary because of the modification in the character of Tello, as will be seen in the discussion.

El Rey don Pedro en Madrid began with a block of scenes which left the spectator in doubt as to the nature of the play; Moreto avoids this ambiguity and plunges the viewer into the action. He manages to give relevant indications of the character of Tello immediately:

> Leonor. ¿No me escuchas?
> D. Tello. ¡Qué molesta
> Y qué cansada mujer!

The answer plainly indicates Tello's discourtesy, a defect that is characteristic of his reprehensible nature. This first impression is strengthened with each successive remark that Tello makes in refusing to fulfill his promise of marriage to Lucrecia. In connection with this personal problem, Moreto is able to introduce one of the key motifs of the comedia: Tello's opposition to the King and the slight regard in which he holds him. In the original, the conflict was presented toward the end of the act when Pedro visits Tello at his house. Here, it appears within the first few moments:

D. Tello. Pues ¿quién ha de poner ley
En un hombre como yo,
Que, ya que rey no nació,
Tampoco es menos que el Rey?
Mi gusto, aunque en otro daño,
He de cumplir y seguir. (I, i)

Evident in the same speech is the little respect he has for other human beings in society. The social aspect of the work, nearly absent in Lope, is here prominent. The dramatist has chosen Doña Leonor to voice his opinions on the relationships between man and man, man and the King and man and God. Time and time again, whether it be remonstrating against Tello or begging for help from the King, she sprinkles her speeches with sententious remarks. What she does, in effect, is to provide a commentary on the moral consequences of the others' actions. For example, when Tello refuses to listen to her protests, although he acknowledges his responsibility, she says:

Leonor. No pagar la obligación,
Delito es común y necio,
Mas, es afrenta y desprecio
Negarla sin atención. (I, i)

In the model play, Tello recognized divine authority, in Moreto's work the nobleman if not a non-believer is at least in rebellion against God:

Leonor. ¿No hallaré justicia yo?
D. Tello. En la tierra, dudo-lo
En el cielo, puede ser.
Perejil. Y aun me espanta
Que hoy la confiese tan presto.
No le he visto tan modesto
En una Semana santa. (I, i)

It is apparent that the writer is charging his exposition to give full definition to the character. This he does with another incident that in the source play was merely mentioned in passing, the kidnapping of Doña Leonor (in Moreto's play, María). Moreto instead of referring to it, stages the entire abduction scene. Ironically framed within the happy music of the singers, the incident occurs with surprising rapidity. It also facilitates the introduction of Rodrigo who, in Lope's play, doesn't enter until the second act. The ineffectuality of the groom, inferred in the source play, is here easily seen. These changes produce a different and more striking presentation of the nobleman. Where the other work merely described, this presents; what is hearsay there, is witnessed here, making Tello more menacingly alive. When the King finally confronts him, the viewer knows from experience and not from narration the nature of his opponent.

The care with which Moreto handles his plots and the independence of thought he exercises in the direction of his plays is evident in the use of the Enrique sub-plot. Where in El Rey don Pedro en Madrid the prince makes his initial

appearance in the last act to further characterize the King, in El valiente justiciero he is introduced in the opening scenes of the first act and has a different and more important role. In Lope's play he defends the King as the rightful ruler of Castille whose laws must be obeyed, and as a loyal brother. In Moreto's there is a closer connection to the historical reality and the enmity between the two brothers is kept:

> Enrique. Mendoza, el Rey nos alcanza
> Y si en sus manos me veo
> No está segura mi vida. (II, vi)

This change in the sub-plot also serves to render more feasible another incident, the entrance of the King. In the source play, Pedro appears out of nowhere, forcing his horse to descend an impossible hill, thus causing the death of his mount. In El valiente justiciero, the monarch is chasing Enrique and the fall of the horse is not due to the violent nature of Pedro but to an accident in his hurry to overtake his brother. It is in this way that the King meets Da. Leonor and Rodrigo who inform him of Tello's excesses. They bring up the cruelty of the King while affirming at the same time the similarity between the sovereign and the infanzón:

> Ines. Porque es cruel y sangriento,
> Y no nos hará justicia;
> Que antes se holgará, al saberlo,
> De ver que haya quien le imite. (I, ix)

The monarch protests against this undeserved reputation but listens to Doña Leonor's long expository speech. As it has been indicated, the harm that Tello has done to Leonor is less violent but of equally serious consequences, he has seduced her instead of raping her. The speech is structurally similar to the one by Elvira; it includes a short biography, Tello's interest in her, her acceptance of his courtship, her own passion, her surrender, his complete scorn once he has seduced her, and the kidnapping of María. Leonor's complaint is followed by Rodrigo's lament about his bride which compels Pedro to promise his help.

There is a shift of scenes to the house of Don Tello where Doña María is resisting his efforts to face a marriage. From here on the play develops in the same manner as in the original but with changes in the attitudes of the characters. Tello's speech, in which he affirms his worth as a nobleman and as a man, is changed from the majestic and gongoristic octaves of the original to the plainer and less imposing quintillas. There is, however, one assertion by the infanzón, not present in the source, which is developed later on and forms part of the eventual humiliation of Tello:

> Tello. Y estas grandezas, no dadas
> Por merced de ningún rey,
> Son con sangre ganadas, (I, x)

Tello's conception of his role as an infanzón is at variance with Pedro's concept of the role of the nobles and their re-

lationship to their King:

> Rey. Los nobles
> Deben hablar con decencia
> De los reyes, porque son
> Las deidades de la tierra, (I, xii)

There are two new incidents which serve to further define the personality of Tello. In one, Tello angrily refuses any help from his servants because he is man enough to defend himself; in the other, he gratuitously refuses food to Pedro, thus showing himself to be discourteous and lacking in hospitality. The rest of the act develops the infanzón's scorn for Pedro as a King and as a man.

A prominent change in the character of Tello is his relationship to Leonor. He had been interested in her, had courted and finally seduced her: later on he admits that he was under "una pasión ciega" and is willing to pay in money for his misdeed. We must, in spite of the similarity in the state of Elvira and Leonor, notice a softer attitude in Tello and this lends more credibility to the infanzón's eventual reconciliation with Leonor; and their marriage, instead of being a punishment as in the source play, is here the natural consequence of the nobleman's accomodation with his lord and of his love for the woman.

With the second act, Moreto begins the development and the connection to the main plot of the Enrique sub-plot. The King's preoccupation with the revolt, evident in the Lope

play with the first mention of the rebellious nobleman, is handled with considerable difference. In El Rey don Pedro en Madrid, we see it as an ever present thought of the monarch which finds its expression in the appearance of the ghost. In the derivative play, it is embodied in the actions of Enrique. Toledo, the city which historically supported the enemies of Pedro, has taken the prince prisoner in order to regain the King's good will. A letter from Enrique has arrived but Pedro, worried by the rebellion of the other bastards and angered by the mention of Tello, who has been ordered to the palace, postpones its reading.

The audiencias of the King,[24] present in both plays, achieve a different effect. In the first play, they stress the King's obsession with courage, with the immediate dispensing of justice, and the protection of his subjects; in Moreto's play, the stress is on fairness and justice. The duality of the character of Pedro as a man and as a King is restated in the audience with Rodrigo. The offended young man comes to seek justice for the kidnapping of his bride and the monarch asks him why he didn't fight against Tello. Rodrigo answers that fear of the nobleman's position and authority prevented him from doing so. The King suggests that he should have fought nevertheless but is ambiguous in his advice. The request for justice by Leonor analyzes the implications of Tello's actions. There are in her speech significant passages that are closely connected to the main action: Lucrecia mentions Tello's disrespect for the honor

of his vassals:

Que el que el honor tiraniza
De los humildes vasallos,
Desprecia en vuestra justicia
El poder que los ampara
Y el brazo que los castiga. (II, iv)

And his scorn for royal authority:

Caiga esta soberbia planta,
Que ya crece tan altiva,
Que subiendo como trono,
Ya como nube os eclipsa.

This serves to tie together the rebellion of Tello and that of Enrique. Finally, while it foretells the historical resolution of the conflict, there is a foreshadowing of the change that will come over Tello:

Pero por mi honor os pido
Que templeis la medicina,
Sin usar de la violenta
Hasta provar la benigna.
Córtese el brazo, Señor,
Si todo el cuerpo peligra,
Mas no quede manco y feo,
Si a su sanidad no implica. (II, iv)

The King promises a just punishment for his vassal's crimes.

The penalty does come, but unlike Lope's psychological wearing down as represented by the interminable waiting in smaller and darker rooms, we have a gradual withdrawing of his prerogatives coupled with personal humiliations. Thus, he is deprived of the fuero to have his vassals with him, he is made to wait, is locked in a room, is ignored, is made to pick up a glove, is hit, arrested and finally condemned to death. In the process of this degradation we notice that the slowly-developing connection between Tello and Enrique is strengthened. The nobleman exclaims when he is made to wait, that he is equal to Enrique and therefore should not be subjected to such treatment. It is strange that he should compare himself to the most dangerous of the King's enemies and still expect consideration. A much more telling episode is the one in which Pedro is reading his brother's letter from Toledo while Tello, in vain, tries to attract his attention. The connection between the two is established in a clever scenic device by which Tello says and does what the repentant Enrique writes in the letter which the King is reading aloud:

D. Tello. A vuestros pies, gran Señor,
Está Tello García.
. . . . . .
Rey (leye) "Y para demonstración de mi
"obediencia, espero licencia de vues-
"tra alteza para ponerme a sus pies . . ."

Following the source play, D. Pedro delivers a long lecture to Tello. There is in his speech a significant difference; where Lope merely expressed the King's scorn in a series of ironic remarks, Moreto connects the previous reference to Tello's disbelief in God to his revolt against the King. In so doing he removes Tello's actions from a mere insubordination to rebellion against divine authority and its representative on earth:

> Rey. Vos sois aquel que imagina
> Que cualquiera ley es vana?
> Solo la de Dios es dina;
> Mas quien no guarda la humana,
> No obedece la divina. (II, x)

And where the source play stressed the monarch's impatience to duel personally with the overbearing Tello, here, there seeems to be a reticence or perhaps a regret that such an action is not possible:

> Soy el rey don Pedro yo.
> Y si la alteza pudiera
> Quitar el violento efeto,
> Cuyo respeto os altera,
> Mi persona en vos hiciera
> Lo mismo que mi respeto. (II, x)

The arrest of Don Tello, although appearing in both plays, is handled differently. In El rey don Pedro en Madrid, he

is arrested presumably because of his impudence and disrespect toward the King, little mention being made of his disregard for the law and his previous crimes. In El valiente justiciero, the arrest is immediately due to his fighting with swords in the royal palace for which the death penalty was possible.[25]

The transformation of Tello from a completely intractable individual, who can be convinced only by complete personal defeat, to an over bearing nobleman who refuses to accept the authority of a particular man as King, is reflected in his relation to Leonor. After suffering at the hands of Pedro and realizing the awesome power of the King, Tello has softened considerably. He now talks about " . . . enmendar el yerro" and is willing to marry Leonor although reluctantly: "No lo querrá el albedrío;/ mas querrálo la violencia." He is also worried about the monarch: "Téngole muy ofendido," and eventually comes to reconcile himself to Leonor: "Ah, Leonor, ¡qué tarde vuelvo/ A mi olvidado cariño!"

This careful preparation of the denouement tends to lend greater plausability to future happenings and, in any event, render more credible the actions of Leonor. It will be remembered that in the source play, Leonor, unexpectedly, tries to convince Elvira that they should ask the King to forgive Tello while the people also rise in his favor. In the original the connection is analogical, that is, rather than contributing directly to the action, it illuminates it

by setting up a contrast. In Moreto, it is very clear why Leonor wants to persuade María to ask the King's forgiveness. At the end of the second act she had already been prepared for Leonor's action by her words: "Yo a solicitar tu alivio [voy]". In the third act she puts into effect what she has told her lover she would do. And Doña María, reasonably, does not worry about Tello but about Rodrigo. It is their own interest that unites the two women and not some unexpected generosity on the part of an offended woman.

With scene two of the last act, Moreto introduces the ghost. A notable change has occured in his handling of the supernatural: the appearances of the sombra have been reduced from three to one, thus less attention is paid to that segment of the original. Instead of unidentified fear, he has definitely established a troubled conscience for the murder of the monk. This change, showing the timor Dei of the monarch, is an effective contrast to the lack of faith of his adversary. The warnings have been manifested to him not in the form of apparitions but as a constant and unbearable inner voice. Meanwhile the identification between Tello and Enrique's rebellion is continued.

> Rey. No quiero que se publique
> Que espero a mi hermano Enrique
> Hasta que el haya venido;
> Que en él y en Tello han de ver
> Mi castigo y mi perdón
> Juntos. (III,ii)

It is significant that in the middle of his conflict with both his adversaries he should be considering forgiveness. Indeed, Pedro has also been changed by Moreto. He no longer feels the need to prove his valor; he doesn't consider the rebellion to be due to his weakness. He has been made more conscious of his duties as a monarch and so are the other characters of the play. Leonor, for example, voices some opinions on the role of the monarch which echo the ideas of the 17th century:

> Pues lo mismo viene a ser.
> Señor, lo que agora pido;
> Pues, según de vos se indicia,
> Por ser imagen de Dios
> Lo mismo ha de ser en vos
> La piedad que la justicia (III, ii)

The King, arguing in the same vein, reminds her that although compassion must temper justice, both must be present and neither at the expense of the other (p. 203). The refusal of pardon is connected to his desire to teach Tello a lesson personally.

Although still rebellious and unwilling to concede the superiority of Pedro as a man, Tello is becoming more and more resigned and is even disposed to marry Leonor. He cloaks this inclination under the supposed order of the King, but there is no such command. The monarch had granted him freedom in this matter:

Rey. Cumplidlo
Dándola luego la mano.
Tello. Vos, Señor, de mi albedrío
No sois dueño.
Rey. Así es verdad. (II, xiv)

It is undeniable that the infanzón has already been badly beaten and cannot find any grounds on which to prop his feelings except personal valor. His boast that he owed his position not "por merced de ningún rey" but to his own valor and that of his ancestors has been proven false. During the humiliating incident when he protested against the insults of the monarch and his death sentence, there is the following exchange between them:

Tello. Los ricos-hombres no pueden
Morir por esos delitos.
Rey. ¿Quién estableció esa ley?
Tello. Privilegios concedidos
De reyes, abuelos vuestros,
A los que grandes nacimos.
Rey. ¿Serán mas reyes que yo?
Tello. No, señor.
Rey. Pues si lo mismo
Soy yo que ellos, de la ley
Es arbitro quien la hizo,
Y yo la sabré guardar
Cuando importe a mis motivos. (II, xiv)

It is obvious that what was for Tello an incontestable right has now vanished. The very reasons which made him rebel against the King no longer exist because of the will of the man he scorns. Under such circumstances, the nobleman's contentions have no base and his slow retreat into submission is symptomatic of his awareness of the situation. This basic logical background is missing in El rey don Pedro en Madrid; there the conflict truly remains on the elemental plane that the strongest is the most worthy and until the King defeats Tello with his own sword he has not gained his respect. In Moreto instead, the King feels no compulsion to prove his strength as a man; indeed, we have seen that Pedro regrets the necessity of having to do it and it is often mentioned as a second thought rather than as an obsession. While in prison the vanquished infanzón takes long steps along the road of repentence. He wants to commend his soul to God and above all, he begins to see the propriety of the King's actions:

> Tello. Perejil, esto es violencia,
> Pero es justicia también;
> Y con Dios ponernos bien
> Es la mejor diligencia (III, vi)

Several of the episodes of the original play are retained by Moreto with only slight modifications: the fight scene between the two adversaries, in which Tello recognizes the superiority of the King, is kept. The later dramatist

also utilizes the scene of the apparition of the shade. A more significant change, not in the events, but in attitude, is present here: Pedro while defying the ghost seems less vehement in his reaction; he does not scorn the fire of the specter's hand, but admits quickly the power of the supernatural visitor.

The final scenes are shortened in the derivative play. Lope uses several scenes to develop the prophecy that Enrique will kill Pedro and the King oscillates between terror and suspicion before uneasily reconciling himself to Enrique and, therefore to Tello. Moreto's Pedro, although realizing the importance of the auguries, has a more resigned and Christian attitude toward the occurence:

> Rey. Alza, Enrique, de mis pies;
> Que en los decretos del cielo
> Nada es el hombre, y las obras
> Ejecutan sus decretos.

The final pardon of Tello is, of course, quite expected not only because as a parallel to Enrique he will get the same treatment, but also because as a man he has learned his lesson.

The changes that Moreto brought to the source are many, and give the play a different direction, although keeping a substantial amount of the original action. He has reshaped act one to give the spectator a first hand view of Tello, dramatizing those elements inferred but not presented

in the Lope play. He has changed the personality of Leonor, omitted many secondary characters, streamlined the action to avoid ambiguity, reshaped Tello from an unreconstructed rebel to a more reasonable human being, freed the King from his obsessions therefore limiting the role of the ghost, enlarged Enrique's part to render the parallel with Tello's rebellion more plausible and motivated the actions of several characters to give it more credibility. The moralistic tone of Moreto's work and his emphasis on the role of Pedro as a monarch, rather than as a troubled man, may be the reason for the feeling of some critics that the derivative play has lost some of the power of the model, but a detailed analysis of the <u>comedia</u> shows that the changes have not detracted from its effectiveness.

N O T E S

[1] "El rey don Pedro en el teatro," in Homenaje a Menéndez y Pelayo (Madrid, 1899), II, 257-339. Further references to this work will be included in the text.

[2] New Material on the Dramatic Treatment of Peter the Cruel of Castile and the Diffusion of the Legend in France, Germany and England (Chicago, 1936).

[3] Crónica del rey don Pedro in the Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, LXVI.

[4] Antonio Pérez Gómez, ed. Romancero de don Pedro (Valencia, 1954).

[5] Examen histórico-crítico del reinado de don Pedro de Castilla (Madrid, 1863), pp. 242-314.

[6] The same facts are present in Juan de Mariana's Historia de España, Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, XXX, XXXI.

[7] Crónica del Rey don Pedro in Semanario Erudito, XVIII, XIX (Madrid, 1790).

[8] Romancero hispánico (Madrid, 1953), I, 303.

[9] De la poesía heroico popular castellana (Barcelona, 1959), p. 390, note 4.

[10] Historia de don Pedro I (Paris, 1874), p. 109.

[11] See A. E. Sloman, The Dramatic Craftsmanship of Calderón (Oxford, 1958), pp. 18-58 and Diana Ramírez de Arellano, "Estudio crítico" in Los Ramírez de Arellano (Madrid, 1954), pp. 11-124, for a discussion of these plays.

[12] For a review of the controversy see the following authors: J. E. de Hartzenbusch's introduction to the Comedias escogidas de F. Gabriel Téllez in the Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, V, xliii-xliv; A. C. Barrera y Leirado, Catálogo bibliográfico y biográfico del teatro antiguo español (Madrid, 1860), p. 369; Pedro Muñoz Peña, El teatro de Tirso de Molina (Valladolid, 1889), pp. 93-193; E. Cotarelo y Mori, Investigaciones bio-bibliográficas (Madrid, 1893), p. 121; José Sánchez Arjona, Noticias referentes a los anales del teatro en Sevilla (Sevilla, 1898), p. 214; M. Menéndez y Pelayo, ed. Obras de Lope de Vega (Madrid, 1899), IX, 142-176 and in Estudios de crítica literaria (Madrid, 1912), II, 192; A. Restori, "Obras de Lope de Vega," Zeitschrift für romanische philologie, XXIX (1905), 105-28; S. E. Leavitt, The Estrella de Sevilla and Claramonte (Cambridge, Mass., 1931), p. 76; S. Griswold Morley and C. Bruerton, The Chronology of Lope de Vega's Comedias (New York, 1940), pp. 294-95; Blanca de los Ríos, ed. Obras dramáticas completas de Tirso de Molina (Madrid, 1958), III, 89-113.

[13] Studies in Dramatic Realism (Liverpool, 1948), p. 223.

[14] "An Approach to the Spanish Drama of the Golden Age," Tulane Drama Review (Autumn, 1959), p. 42.

[15] All quotations will refer to the edition by Menéndez y Pelayo of the works of Lope de Vega IX (Madrid, 1899). I shall use this edition which is similar to the ms. of 1626 to discuss the changes that Moreto made. Although the five mss. extant show great differences they do not affect our discussion with one exception. In both the version reproduced in the Quinta parte of Calderón (Barcelona, 1677) and a suelta now at the library of Munich, also attributed to Calderón, there are only two ghost scenes instead of the three present in the M. y Pelayo edition. Another version attributed to Lope, dated 1621, omits the first two ghost scenes.

[16] For a comprehensive view of royal attributes and privileges in the comedia see Miguel Herrero García, "La monarquía teorética de Lope de Vega," Fénix (1935), pp. 179-224 and 305-362. The dual personality of the King is not simply a distinction drawn by Lope. The subject has been extensively studied by Ernst H. Kantorowicz in The King's Two Bodies (Princeton, 1957). The author explores from the Middle Ages onward the following problem: "The King has two Capacities, for he has two Bodies, the one whereof is a Body natural, consisting of natural Members as every other Man has, and in this he is subject to Passions and Death as other Men are; the other is a Body politic, and the Members thereof

are his Subjects, and he and his Subjects together compose the Corporation, . . ." p. 13.

[17] Menéndez y Pelayo refers to the bust of D. Pedro which was kept in the Monasterio de S. Domingo el Real de Madrid. See Lomba y Pedraja, p. 335.

[18] The first of these plays, once attributed to Lope has more recently been ascribed to Luis Vélez de Guevara. See the edition of John M. Hill and Frank O'Reed (New York, 1929). The other is by Andrés de Claramonte published in Dramáticos contemporáneos de Lope de Vega, Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, I.

[19] However, Fernández-Guerra thinks that the scene wherein Pedro humiliates his opponent is taken from Los novios de Hornachuelos, p. xliv.

[20] Barrera y Leirado quotes the Segunda parte of Valencia, 1676.

[21] Menéndez y Pelayo, p. clxxv; Eugenio de Ochoa, Tesoro del teatro español (Paris, 1898), p. 279.

[22] Essai sur le théâtre espagnol (Paris, 1882), p. 43

[23] Muñoz Peña, p. 26; Lomba y Pedraja, p. 195; A. Valbuena Prat, Historia de la literatura española (Barcelona, 1950), II, 602; Kennedy, p. 199.

[24] For a discussion of the use of the audience as a

technique of characterization see Edward Glaser, "Lope de Vega's La hermosa Ester," Sefarad, XX (1960), 123.

[25] Fighting before a King was considered a crime of lèse-majesté and had been codified as early as the Siete Partidas of Alfonso el Sabio: " . . .los antiguos de Espana tovieron que facie aleve el que sacaba arma ante el rey para ferir a otro, maguer non le feriese, o si le dixiesse palabra de denuesto de guisa que el otro obiese de pelear con él . . ." (II, xvi, 11).

VI

EL LINDO DON DIEGO

El Narciso en su opinión[1] is considered one of Guillén de Castro's lesser works, not only because of its own unsure development, but also because it is overshadowed by the author's heroic plays. Generally ignored, it is remembered only as the source for Moreto's El lindo don Diego and to provide a vivid contrast between the virile warriors Castro has made famous and the weak character he is here criticizing. E. Julíá Martínez reflects this widespread attitude: "El hombre siempre es atrevido, valiente, intrepido en las composiciones de Guillén de Castro. Reniega éste de los afeminados, y cuando eligió un protagonista débil, atildado, elegante, fué para burlarse de él y ponerlo en ridículo: El Narciso en su opinión resulta un azote contra los petimetres de todos los tiempos y lugares."[2]

While the criticism of the fops cannot be denied, it is unwise to see in the play a vehicle for chastizing vain young men. The work is a comedy and as such, the interest of the spectator lies in the buffoonery and impertinence of the main character and the sheer pleasure of watching the complications of the plot. Both this play and Moreto's must, I think, be judged on the grounds of plot, dialogue and character development. However, Castro's talents are best

put to use when treating dignified personages and audacious deeds; this is quite evident when he deals with Don Pedro, the old soldier. The lightness of touch, the breezy remark, the careful building of words to exploit a situation seem to lie outside his ability. We need not go as far as Ludwig Pfandl who maintains that Castro was devoid of any knowledge "del temperamento masculino y del corazón femenino" and therefore compensates it with violent actions (p. 465), but it can be asserted that he lacked the skill to sustain a work such as El Marqués en su opinión which is based almost completely on characterization.

Castro boldly begins his play with the presentation of the protagonist. The difficulty in such a device is that he appears without a background: we do not know who he is, what he is doing nor toward what his actions are directed. This isolation from the plot does, nevertheless, produce the effect of concentrating the entire attention of the public on the personality of the young man, Gutierre, and without needing to make references to other events the scene can be enjoyed per se. From a viewpoint of comicity, these first scenes are among the most successful parts of the play. It is precisely the inability to sustain this pace that makes the play defective.

Gutierre is dressing before a mirror with the help of his servant, Tadeo. As he does so, he comments on his figure and on his clothes. Castro's humor is based on the pattern of a preposterous remark by the fop and a sharply

critical comment by Tadeo. Although we are used to the tart tongue of the gracioso in the comedia, Tadeo seems to be particularly biting in the asides which he directs to the audience:

Gut. Dame, dame esa rodilla
¡Qué bien me sienta el zapato!
Tadeo. Es famoso encubridor
de los juanetes lo romo.
¡Bella usanza!
Gut. No, señor;
¿téngolos yo?
Tadeo. No, señor;
tieneslos como la palma.
Y tiene, grandes y tiesos, (Ap.)
en los pies más sobrehuesos
que un mal casado en el alma. (p. 77)

It can be seen that this type of wit, which is repeated throughout the scene, is rather limited in its effectiveness. The taunts of the gracioso usually reserved for heavy humor cannot hold our interest too long. It is more interesting when the vain and over-confident Gutierre himself utters words of unbelievable self-praise:

Oh, Madrid, tierra del cielo;
¡y qué bien logrado es
en tí el talle y gentileza
que dió la naturaleza

de la cabeza a los pies!
¿Bien puesto el cabello va? (p. 78)

In the course of the scene, Castro attempts to give depth to the mania of the young man: he is not only taken with his figure, he is also sure that no woman worthy of him is to be found (p. 78); loves jewelry (p. 78-79); and he is unable to resist new clothing for which he has little taste (p. 79). The total effect is one of a garishly dressed and stupidly vain young man. To put in [illegible] relief the idiosyncracies, Castro contrasts him to his cousin, Gonzalo, who is the opposite in every respect: he is considerate, modest, and generous.[3] However, in delineating his personality, Castro introduces an element which detracts from the good sense of Gonzalo. He has the two cousins engage in a competition:

Y según con ese os veo
de cortesano y galán,
cesará la competencia,
en la corte, entre mí y vos,
que, aunque tan primos los dos,
teníamos en Valencia (p. 79)

This willingness to rival a man whose sense of proportion has been badly warped by his self-love is somewhat incongruous in a man of measure such as Gonzalo. And further damage is done to him when he espouses a cynical attitude toward the women of the court saying that they are to be

conquered by money and not love. To be sure, the venality of the court is a time-honored topos which is rivaled in popularity only by the criticism of women,[4] but given the characterization of Gonzalo these sentiments are not in consonance with his passionate nature. What the situation does is give support to the contention of critics that Castro was an anti-feminist and it affords Tadeo an opportunity to deliver an eloquently cynical harangue on the power of money:

> En Madrid oro, y potable,
> desde la mano a la boca,
> los estados califica,
> los corazones granjea,
> los animos lisonjea
> y las sangres purifica.
> . . . . . .
> es refulgente, es hermoso,
> es hidalgo, es bien nacido,
> es pujante, es atrevido,
> es valiente, es poderoso . . . (pp. 79-80)

The reason for the presence of the two cousins at court is revealed in the meetings between Brianda and her novio, the Marqués. While the lovers bewail the danger to their love, we are told that Brianda's father, Pedro, is seeking a husband for his daughter among his relatives to prevent the disappearance of his line. Thus, the Marqués, coming from

a nobler family, is to be refused because he would absorb Pedro's mayorazgo. While the scene reveals the direction of the future complications of the plot it makes no further statement on Gutierre and his vanity. A typically brash conversation between Tadeo and a servant-girl is followed by a long discussion in which the gracioso tries to cheer up the downcast Marquis. The meeting has a two-fold aim: a further indirect definition of the character of the fop and an intimation of the course the events will follow when Tadeo offers his services to the Marquis. The failure of Castro to render the personality of his main personage more alive is seen here once again. Instead of dramatizing Gutierre's nature, Tadeo is given the task of talking about his master and however pleasantly zany the dandy's actions are, they lose their spontaneity in being reported by a second person. The episode of the mules is a case in point:

Tadeo. Escucha un cuento galano.
En Valencia, yendo un día
por una calle, encontramos
una mula de un dotor
a la puerta de un letrado,
la cual volvió la cabeza
a la que los dos pasamos,
mascando freno y espuma,
gruñendo y orejeando;
y el dijo, muy en su seso;

"¡Ah, Tadeo! ¿No has notado?
¡Hasta las mulas, por Dios,
me miran con ojos claros!" (p. 83)

Tadeo, who has come to Tello's house to announce the arrival of his two nephews, meets the servant-girl and this affords the gracioso the traditional opportunity to imitate his master's conceit. The two are interrupted by the old gentleman who inveighs against the injustice done to old soldiers whose petitions are often ignored.[5] The reception scene that follows is one of the most important in the play, not only because it is intended to set the tenor of the relationship between Gutierre and his next of kin but also because it is to be a significant link in the characterization of the fop. The situation offers a contrast between the two cousins and their crusty old uncle. The complaints and immodest remarks of Gutierre are set against the reasonableness of Gonzalo and the indomitable spirit of the uncle:

Pedro. ¿Cómo venis?
Gut. Los caminos
nos han tratado muy mal;
con fríos.
Pedro. ¿Quién dice tal?
En tales años, sobrinos,
cuando se anima la edad
con el juvenil valor,
tiene frío ni calor

los hombres?

Gonz. Así es verdad;
y mi primo por si habló,
porque yo no lo sentí. (p. 84)

This felicitous beginning is never developed: there are just too many other elements which vie for the attention of the spectator. There is an unduly long presentation scene in which pleasantries are exchanged and immediately after that an equally long speech by Pedro. The oration in which he talks of his life, the battles he fought, and the honors he has received, is well-written and dignified, but only the ending which deals with the marriage of the two cousins has any bearing on the plot. We can see a good opportunity has been wasted. The characterization of Gutierre is given little play. There is a persistence in the technique of having Tadeo deliver judgments on Gutierre: "Sin duda mi amo piensa/ que ya es suya, y atribuye/ lo que es desgaire a terneza" (p. 85). The vanity and discourtesy of Gutierre are shown in only two instances.

The failure of this scene is heightened by the subsequent events which, while attempting to complicate the plot, merely create confusion. Castro crowds the stage with no less than eight people and is determined to give speaking parts to each one of them. Besides, there is a proliferation of topics: the entrance of the Marquis, the introductions and greetings, the criticism of their masters by a page and Tadeo, the jealousy of Gutierre, Gonzalo's pro-

fession of love for Mencía, the revelation of the existence of a sister of the Marquis, Pedro's announcement of his plans for the marriage of his daughter, a long series of asides in which each suspects the motives of the other, and finally, observations of the page and Tadeo on the foolishness of Gutierre. It is clear then that such a plethora of subjects and people, when not kept tightly in check, will dilute itself into meaningless banter which does not contribute to the development of the play. It is much more regrettable in that the confusion does not create the necessary plot complication. The relationship between the people is exactly the same as it was before; the only new element, the mention of the Marquis' sister, which is to become important later on, adds nothing at this point.

One of the most meaningful scenes of the play is the confrontation of father and daughter which opens the second act. Its significance is due to the distillation of the two contrasting positions, present in numerous plays of the Golden Age, regarding the choosing of a husband. Pedro, who embodies all traditional values, is convinced that a loving father rarely errs in his choice of husband and tries to make his daughter see his point:[6]

No es justo
para quien echa de ver
que en elección de mujer
las más veces yerra el gusto;
y así, esposos escogidos

entre amorosos cuidados,
padecen arrepentidos;
pero cuando elige esposos
la paternal providencia,
en premio de su obedencia,
las más veces son dichosos;

Brianda, while perfectly willing to obey her father in everything else, is convinced that the choice of a husband is a matter of personal taste and no one should pretend to be able to select one for another. Moreover, it is the woman who has to live with her husband in indissoluble bond for life and it is she who suffers from his vices:

. . .señor
a tí no te ha de tocar,
si es flemático, el pesar;
si es colérico, el temor;
si es importuno, el enfado;
si es vicioso, la costumbre;
si es necio, la pesadumbre;
la afrenta, si no es honrado;
y si el pecho le desama,
tu, señor . . . (p, 89)

Pedro, who was willing to speak with her as long as she only listened, is now angered by her defense and cuts short the interview by ordering her to choose or marry whomever he selects. There is a well handled progression of events

in the following scenes. A sonnet in which Brianda bewails the fact that every little animal has liberty but a woman "tiene sin libertad el albedrío", is followed by the inevitable meeting of the unfortunate lovers, who contemplate their unhappy fate.[7] It is at this critical moment that they find help in an unexpected place. Tadeo, who knows his master very well, suggests a way out. Tadeo's deviation from strict loyalty is a cause for concern. While it is true that the gracioso is often the conscience of his master and is quick to deflate him, he is usually faithful to him. To be sure, Gutierre is not the most pleasant of masters, but such a betrayal is an unlikely development.[8] In any event, Tadeo suggests that Lucia take the place of the Marquis' sister to captivate Gutierre and thus free Brianda. Castro successfully brings about the conversation between the clever Tadeo and his over receptive master. Gutierre is congratulating himself for having won the hand of his cousin. To his servant's question as to how he is sure of victory, he patronizingly exclaims that his cousin's competition is not to be taken seriously. Even while he is anticipating victory he cannot resist the temptation that Tadeo cleverly offers him:

> Alegre estás . . .
> que algunas que van saliendo
> muy alto, al olor no más,
> van picando y van cayendo?

Fuí en casa del Marques y hable . . .
Gut. ¿Con su hermana? Yo he caído
en la cuenta. (p. 93)

It is this heady feeling of conquest that brings about one of the more humorous situations in the play. Da. Mencia, Gutierre's sister, praises his elegance and beauty in an effort to gain his good will but Gutierre, with characteristic egotism, warns his sister:

Yo lo agradezco y lo estimo;
pero hermana, bueno está,
voyme, que si al alma das
con los ojos ocasiones,
tu con más culpa errarás,
si en el peligro te pones
que se han puesto las demás. (p. 94)

Da. Mencia, of course, is worried about the possibility that Brianda might choose her own D. Gonzalo and she voices this worry to her fiancé. It is clear that both their good fortune and that of the Marquis and Brianda depend on the cleverness of Tadeo and Lucía.

The interview between the supposed Marquesa and the unsuspecting dandy is obviously planned to further the plot and to create a humorous situation. The comic effect rests largely on the fact that the pretentious Gutierre is completely taken in by a maid. Except for this principal idea

we are surprised to find that Gutierre, out of character, handles himself well. His statements are reasonable and with the exception of his foolish belief that the woman is in love with him, he is able to carry off his part with gallantry. That Castro makes Gutierre step out of his self-delusion is evident in the final speech of the interview, which is identical in nature to those uttered by the most admirable galán in any comedia:

> En un bien me das
> tan grandes obligaciones,
> cielo divino, que al vellas,
> como me miro al gozallas
> sin caudal para pagallas,
> vengo a sentir el debellas; (p. 98)

This lapse is somewhat attenuated by the fact that such high thoughts are directed to a person "unworthy" of them and hence have a comic value. Meanwhile the Marquis, to throw off any suspicion, has indicated that he is interested in Gutierre's sister, Mancía. When the young man, infatuated by his new conquest, tells Gonzalo of his happiness and the betrothal of the Marquis to his sister, there is the expected reaction from Gonzalo, who feels betrayed. At the same time Pedro comes in to announce that Brianda has chosen Gutierre. The young girl hopes that her father will recognize the unworthiness of Gutierre and change his mind. The old man is certainly aware that his nephew is not the best

party for his daughter. This was evident in the occasional critical remarks about Gutierre ("Si este mozo es confiado/ y no es loco, será necio" p. 85) and is frankly expressed in talking directly to him:

> Me parece
> que Brianda es mujer,
> y ha de escoger lo peor;
> a vos os elegirá,
> y no a don Gonzalo. (p. 100)

The play, of course, moves toward a disaster for the conceited young man and since Pedro is the one who will administer the coup, the preparation of his feelings is a dramatic necessity. It is typical of the stupidity of Gutierre that in refusing Brianda he does it in an extremely bad manner which enrages the old gentleman. As one might expect, Pedro insists that his daughter change her mind and choose Gonzalo. Brianda is willing to obey her father, especially since the situation is taking the bend she had hoped for. However, the text presents some ambiguities which cloud the true intent of the young girl. In answering her father she says:

> De don Gonzalo sin miedo (Ap.)
> siempre estuve, y pues soy
> tan dichosa, que lo estoy
> de don Gutierre, bien puedo
> elegirle, y desde modo

a mi padre y a mi gusto
satisfaré, porque es justo
el obedecerle en todo
El sí te ofrezco empleado
en don Gonzalo. (Alto)(p. 101)

If the answer is to be considered an aside, as it is indicated and as the verb obedecerle implies, then the speech expresses the true feelings of the girl, since an aside is always employed for this purpose. We know that this is an obvious contradiction to Brianda's desire because she is in love with the Marquis. More evidence is obtained from the scene between Brianda and Gonzalo. The young man asks: " . . .tu elección no me nombro/ por tuyo?" She answers:

Sí, pero yo
confié de tu firmeza,
sabiendo tus pensamientos,
en nuestra prima empleados. (p. 102)

It is evident that the speech should not be marked an aside and that the obedecerle which the editor has chosen over obedecerte is the wrong choice. Brianda, clearly, feigns accepting Gonzalo hoping in such a manner to be rid of both pretenders. Gonzalo, she is sure, will refuse because he is in love with Mencia. The unexpected quarrel between Gonzalo and his fiancée, however, has now created a new embroilment. When the Marquis arrives at the house instead of the clarification of the situation there occurs a further

troubling of the waters. The Marquis and Gonzalo nearly engage in a duel. The subsequent entrances of Gutierre and don Pedro exacerbate matters and while the poor old uncle wonders what is going on, every one threateningly or dispairingly leaves the stage.

The third act begins the traditional disentanglement of the plot. Gutierre goes to see Inés only to find the real Marquesa. The unfortunate man is at first flabbergasted but once he regains his composure, he irrepressibly tries to woo the lady. The Marquis rushes in to save a delicate situation, claiming that the girl is a cousin of his. Inés understands quickly but Gutierre, while willing to let things go, suspects something. The beginning of the resolution comes about with the arrival of Gonzalo, who is convinced that the Marquis and Mencía are in love. After much arguing, the Marquis is able to persuade him that the confusion is all due to Gutierre. Lucia meanwhile has returned to Pedro's house, where she is discovered by a surprised Gutierre. The quick-witted servant assures him that she is there to beg Brianda to realease him. Happy to have fooled him, she embraces Tadeo but she is surprised by Gutierre who has just returned. The dandy in sonorous octavas reales that mock him declaims his astonishment and grief:

> Pues ¿cómo una mujer, otra Lucrecia,
> al parecer, en casta y bien nacida,
> cuando tan bien mis partes mide y precia,
> que se arroja tras mí ciega y perdida,

con un lacayo así, lasciva y necia,
mi amor ofende y de quien es se olvida?
¿Si fué todo ficción? Mas ¡cielo santo!,
¿cómo es posible que me engañe tanto?(p. 110)

Tadeo is about to pay dearly for his thoughtlessness but his wit saves him. He assures the master that he had to embrace her because the girl was about to be discovered by her dueña. The arrival of Pedro puts Gutierre in an embarrassing position because he is under the impression that he is harboring a girl in someone else's house. The young man begs his uncle to be discreet and not force the woman out of hiding. The old man intones a long lecture on the decadent morals of the younger generation, their lack of discreción, and their willingness to betray their friends. The sonnet that conveys these ideas emphasizes the traditionalism of Pedro and its seriousness, in contrast to the bizarre situation, adds some comic touches. In quick succession, the young men declare their love for the girls. The Marquis swears to continue don Pedro's mayorazgo while Gutierre watches impassively, feeling sure of the love of the Marquesa. When the supposed Inés comes out, curiously enough, Gutierre is able to maintain a dignified silence while revealing his disappointment in an aside.

Castro's play is a genial presentation of a contemporary type. Its virtue lies in the attempt made. The work, however, is too loose, the conversations often unchecked,

the elements too varied, the characterizations unsure or somewhat unconnected with the rest of the play. Despite these obvious faults the comedy has some moments of real comic sparkle while in other situations it reveals the talent that Castro possessed to handle the dignified language that made his heroic plays famous.

El Lindo don Diego[9] is one of the two masterpieces on which the fame of Moreto rests.[10] Together with El desdén con el desdén, it marks the high point of Spanish classical comedy. The number of editions vie with the applauses of critics as proof of the popularity and merit of the work. Strikingly enough, despite such general recognition, there is no study dedicated exclusively to it.[11] All references to the play are to be found in manuals of literature or in works of wider scope. While it is impossible to quote all or even a substantial number of the praises heaped on the comedia, we can give a representative judgment which includes most of the virtues seen in the work. In comparing it to its source, Narciso Alonso Cortés says: "Como se ve, Moreto siguió a Guillén de Castro punto por punto; pero ¡qué diferencia entre la fresca animación de aquél y la premiosidad lánguida de éste! ¡Qué distanta maestría en el desarrollo del plan y manejo del diálogo! Los personajes de Guillén de Castro están borrosos y desdibujados; los de Moreto resaltan en líneas vigorosas!" (p. 19). Alonso Cortés rightly points out the relevant dif-

ferences between the two plays, but his failure to support his insights with specific examples weakens his presentation.

It is commonly held that El lindo don Diego follows in the tradition of the comedias de figurón. These plays, according to Luzán's definition, "pintan y ridiculizan los vicios o sandeces de alguna persona."[12] The description is vague enough to encompass Moreto's work but does not distinguish farce from comedy of character. The difference between the two is one of approach, intent, and execution; the critic who neglects this is led to the following conclusion: "The protagonist of El lindo don Diego is a figurón, a caricature painted with such bold strokes and in such vivid colors that he fills the center of the picture and throws into shadow every other character in the play."[13] This difinition may need to be revised: Moreto's personage is not a caricature, that is, a ludicrously distorted presentation of characteristics, but a character in which there are certain necessary exaggerations; he is not painted in bold strokes but is minutely developed; he does not overshadow every other person in the play, but is aided and complemented by others.[14] Moreto's work fits any description of comedy but not the type of farce which the figurón play represents.[15] However, the work should be viewed not as a part of a genre, but as an individual comedy.

In adapting Castro's play for his comedia, Moreto took all the principal events and some of the characterization present in the original. The arrangement of the episodes

and hence the structure of the new work is different. The change is most significant in the first act. Where Castro had plunged into the presentation of the protagonist, Moreto begins more cautiously. The opening scene has two friends, the older Don Tello and a young man, Juan, taking leave of each other. While observing the amenities of the occasion, Tello reveals that he has arranged for the marriage of his two daughters. We notice here the technique of telling an important event by degrees, each statement affecting the interested listener more and more. Thus Tello begins talking about un empeño which changes into bodas and finally " . . .mis hijas quiero casar." It will be remembered that in the source play the young girl informs her fiancé of her father's decision. Here the scene has more tension because Juan cannot give vent to his emotions in the presence of Tello. He has to follow the conversation as pleasantly as the circumstances require, giving his congratulations while inwardly suffering. Moreto's penchant for streamlining and improving the action is seen in another respect. From the source play he had inherited the confusing situation of having both cousins eligible for Brianda's hand, while the other girl was the fop's sister in love with her cousin. Moreto rejected this and the eventual complication of the third act and chose to make the two young ladies sisters for whom the father had already chosen the proper husbands. It will be also seen that Diego is chosen for the older girl because he is Tello's brother's son:

Y a Inés, en quien yo pretendo
Fundar de mi honor la basa,
Para don Diego la elijo,
Porque de mi hermano es hijo,
Y cabeza de mi casa.
Su gala y su bizarría
Es cosa de admiración;
De Burgos es el blasón. (I, i)

In so doing the playwright avoids the equivocation caused by the different name of the other cousin. Diego is chosen because of his name, the other will not do. This speech not only gives the necessary exposition (note the economy with which Moreto handles it in comparison to Castro, Act I, p. 85), but is also an important preparation for the entrance of the protagonist. Since Diego is chosen as the head of the family and since his elegance and bravery are the glory of Burgos one is led to anticipate a man of spirit. The contrast between expectation and reality adds immensely to the comic representation. The monologue by Juan which follows corroborates the suspicion, raised by his apartes, on the nature of his relationship to Inés. Since Moreto is interested in the exposition of the action, he avoids the usual method of having the hero suspect betrayal by the woman without checking into the facts. The scene between the lovers is, however, an animated exchange of recriminations and protestations of innocence. The purpose of the scene is two-fold, to increase the suspense before the pre-

sentation of Diego and to show the position of the two daughters regarding the decision of their father. The first is achieved by the praise of the dandy which increases our curiosity:

> Don Diego, Inés, es tu dueño;
> Claro está que será digno,
> Tanto como por tu sangre,
> Por haberte merecido. (I, iii)

The second is revealed in a conversation in which Leonor, the other sister, participates. It deals not only with the responsibility of the daughters but also with the duties of the father:

> Y esto no es darte a entender
> Que podrá nuestro albedrío
> Oponerse a su precepto,
> Porque si el lo ha concedido
> No hay resistencia en nosotras;
> Pero cuando sabe el mismo
> Que nuestras dos voluntades
> Penden solo de su arbitrio,
> No es posible que una acción,
> Que es tan de nuestro albedrío,
> La resuelva su decreto
> Sin lograrnos el aviso. (I, iv)

The resistence of the two girls is then based on the assump-

tion that paternal authority will give way to love and that he will consult those who are affected by his decisions before putting them into effect. The words of Leonor are but a prelude to the full scale discussion of the subject between Ines and her father.

The interview between Juan and Inés marks a natural break after which it would have been conceivable for Moreto to introduce Diego. However, since the playwright wishes to create a sense of expectancy he further delays his entrance. Instead, he presents Mosquito who, together with Polilla from El desdén con el desdén, is perhaps the most famous gracioso in Golden Age comedy. First of all, it will be noticed that Moreto has changed him from the fop's lackey to a servant of the Tello household. This avoids the doubtful situation of the betrayal of the master while retaining the same role. Moreto's contribution to the personality of the gracioso is the total integration of what had been a mere appendage, to the plot.[16] Mosquito and Polilla are the best example of this; they originate and direct the action that will bring about the final happy resolution of the play.

The scene in which Mosquito gives his mistresses his impressions of Diego is seemingly identical to those in which Tadeo criticizes his master. Here, however, it serves to create the tension that contradictory reports produce. The spectator hesitates between what he has heard so far and the witticisms of Mosquito. The liveliness of Mosquito is contrasted to Tadeo's interminable detraction of his master;

his language is plain and witty. In a few strokes he is able to give us a favorable picture of Mendo, the other cousin:

> El don Mendo (que es el tuyo),
> Galán, discreto, advertido,
> Cortés, modesto y afable;
> Menos algun revoltillo
> Que se le irá descubriendo
> Con el uso de marido. (I, v)

This ability is made more evident when contrasted to the gracioso of Castro's play. Compare the manner in which the two servants begin their reports on the dandies:

> Tadeo. Aunque gastara mil años
> en decir lo que hay en eso,
> me sobrarán cuentos largos:
> un Narciso en su opinión
> es tan tierno enamorado
> de si mismo que a su sombra
> suele alargalle los brazos. (I, p. 83)

Tadeo stresses the impossibility of telling all about his master and his self-love. Notice that Castro makes use of a classical allusion on which he expatiates. Here is Mosquito:

> Es un cuento
> Sin fin, pero con principio;

Que es lindo el don Diego, y tiene
Más que de Diego, de lindo,
El es tan rara persona,
Que como se anda vestido,
Puede en una mogiganga
Ser figura de capricho. (I, v)

Mosquito too stresses the difficulty of describing Diego, but forsakes the mythological allusion to Narciso and bases himself on a more popular figure, "el lindo don Diego." This immediately conjures to the minds of the spectators a well-known type thus obviating the clarifying phrase needed in Castro. To finish the picture, Mosquito makes him so ridiculous in dress that he would be a strange figure even at a masquerade.[17] Don Diego's preoccupation with clothing is such that he is forgetful of his religious duties and remembers the Mass only in the afternoon.

Moreto unfailingly prepares his characters before they show their nature by their actions. While in the source play Lucia is recruited by Tadeo to impersonate the Marqués' sister, Beatriz is given careful introduction. Mosquito begs Inés to rehire Beatriz who had been dismissed:

Inés. Espero hoy otra criada.
Mosq. No la llegará al tobillo
Ninguna de cuantas vengan.
Inés. ¿Por qué no?
Mosq. ¿Eso no está visto?

Ella es golosa, chismosa,
Respondona, y alza el grito:
Pues ¿dónde has de hallar criada
Que cumpla más con su oficio? (I, vi)

While the qualities enumerated are the usual attributes of the maid in the comedia the mention serves to emphasize them and thus make her future impersonation more credible.

Only after having laid the groundwork for the situation does Moreto introduce the main character. Typically enough he is before a mirror dressing. At no time during the long scene is there any remark similar to those of Tadeo. From time to time Mendo calls his cousin stupid or crazy but never delivers long speeches designed to ridicule Diego. The characterization of the young man is brought about exclusively through the words that Diego speaks. Even a cursory comparison of the two fops will reveal the greater care taken by Moreto to make his personage funnier. If comedy is essentially the intensification and distortion of some characteristic,[18] Moreto fulfills this requisite eminently. The lines given to Diego at this point are all directed toward one aspect of his mania, the belief that he embodies the idea of beauty:

Porque siempre que me veo
Me admiro y alabo a Dios.
Al mirarme todo entero,
Tan bien labrado y pulido

Mil veces he presumido
Que era mi padre tornero.

When he claims that all women fall in love with him, he is challenged by Mendo who demands to know what woman ever sought him. The answer is both imaginative and preposterous:

Eso consiste en mis tretas,
Que yo a las necias no miro;
Y en las que yo logro el tiro,
Sufren, como son discretas.
Y aunque las mueva su fuego
A hablar, callarán también,
Porque ven que mi desdén
Ha de despreciar su ruego.

His self-love knows no bounds and his delusions are equally enormous:

No paso yo por balcón
Donde no haga batería;
Pues al pasar por las rejas
Donde voy logrando tiros,
Sordo estoy de los suspiros
Que me dan por las orejas.

The remarks follow each other in an unbelievable series of exaggeration and self-aggrandizement and culminate in a ridiculous assertion:

Los bigotes son dos motes;
Diera su belleza espanto,
Si hiciera una dama un manto
De punta destos bigotes.
. . . . . .
¡Que airosa pierna es la mía! (I, viii)

At no time does Castro's play have anything similar to this. The success of Moreto is due to a large extent to these felicitous remarks. The difference between Mosquito and his counterpart in the source play is to be seen in their relationship to the fop. Where Tadeo's purpose was to show the foolishness of Gutierre with his comments, Mosquito is content with feeding Diego's unquencheable vanity and letting him define himself:

Diego. Mi estrella mala
Que venga toda esta gala
A parar en una prima.
Mosq. Cierto que tienes razón;
A mi también me lastima.
Diego. ¿No me malogro en mi prima? (I, ix)

This exchange provides more delightful remarks by the young man and supplies another motive for Diego's eagerness to seek the adventure with the countess later on.

One of Moreto's favorite subjects is the problem of obedience versus freedom of will.[19] The topic is very much

related to the action of the play and the writer takes great delight in exploring it. He introduces it early in the play, and returns to it before staging the climactic scene of the act and the most memorable of the comedy. The general lines had been drawn in a previous conversation and are here restated. Although daughters must obey their fathers, it is their duty to consult their desires, otherwise he risks being obeyed without voluntad. Inés stresses the fact that although her father's will controls her, it still has its own existence:

> Debieras a mi albedrío
> Proponerlo; no por suyo,
> Sino porque aunque él es tuyo
> Tiene el titulo de mío.

The conflict is resolved differently from the one in the original comedia. D. Pedro had suggested that the care of the father and the blessings of providence, as a reward for obedience, assure a better match than love. Tello's answer is that the paternal choice is made only after taking into consideration all the factors and hence is the best possible selection. Tello is much more reasonable and avoids the threats of his model; he wished to convince, not to force. Inés, on her part, does not paint a vivid portrait of matrimonial unhappiness; she argues on the grounds of duty and responsibility. Finally, the position of the scenes in the two plays points to a different role in the

development of the action. In Castro, it takes place after the introduction of Gutierre to the family and hence it is an attempt by Inés to persuade her father to change his mind now that he knows what his nephew is like. In Moreto, it contributes directly to the following scene by closing the best avenue of escape before the danger. When the young girl has a chance to see the foolish dandy, she knows that there is no way of avoiding the marriage. This renders her position more hopeless and poignant while it creates uncertainty in the spectator.

Castro had missed the opportunity for a clear definition of Gutierre when he allowed the scene of his arrival to end in confusion; the weakness of the presentation, the profusion of topics discussed, the excessive number of people on the stage undermined the structure of the act. In contrast to this lack of control, Moreto carefully builds the character of Don Diego and limits the elements to the essential. From the very first word he utters to the last one, Diego shows his reprehensible nature. The playwright no longer limits himself to one or two traits but parades a long series of vices. Diego is patronizing (Buen lugarcillo es Madrid); conceited (Ya por mí perderá el seso); insulting (Mi primo con lo modesto/ Vence el no ser muy galán); overconfident (También cayó la Leonor); ill-mannered: (Tello. Tomad, sobrinos asiento . . ./ Diego. Yo por mí, ya estoy sentado); ludicrous (Por Dios, que también/ Se me ha enamorado el viejo); gaudy (Pero ya es todo mi anhelo/

Un color de pepino). But above all, he is foolish; he prefers being elegant to being discreto:

> Diego. ¿Qué se murmura, señoras?
> Leonor. Alabaros de discreto.
> Diego. ¿Y no de galán?

Only once is he presented favorably and that is when he makes one of the frequent remarks against Góngora present in Golden Age literature.[20] But perhaps even this is supposed to show his lack of wit. When he finally exits, Leonor notices that her sister is completely stunned and does not dare to speak.

Inés, however, is not completely defeated. To the panic of Juan she answers with calm. She coldly calculates that her father has not given his word yet and that being a just and reasonable man he will change his mind. But if he should persist it is her duty, like Laura in El licenciado Vidriera, to choose decoro over love even if it means unhappiness. Thus, instead of ending the act on a tone of confusion, Moreto quietly returns to what he considers the principal dilemma of Inés. In so doing he amplifies the situation from a specific case to a general consideration of filial duty and thus justifies in some measure the argument of critics that he tends to moralize.[21]

Only when matters have reached this seeming impasse, does the author bring in Mosquito's plot which is exactly that proposed by Tadeo. A few differences in approach must

be taken into consideration. Moreto dislikes the equivocal situation of a brother compromising his sister; Castro had felt a similar misgiving but his Marqués, after wondering if he could rightly involve his sister, readily agrees and seems very eager to have Tadeo arrange the meeting: "De ti fía/ no menos que todo el alma/ quien parte agora sin vida/" In Moreto, the girl is changed from sister to cousin, thus weakening somewhat Juan's responsibility. Secondly, he does not acquiesce readily to Mosquito's plan. At first he is insulted: " ¿No me había de atrever/ Con mi prima a esa indecencia?" He relents a little and finally accepts on condition that he be not implicated in the plot.

Meanwhile don Tello, having realized his nephew's shortcomings, tries valiantly to change him. Don Diego, of course, rejects any advice; for him, his beauty and elegance are God-given gifts and it would be lack of sincerity and even gratitude toward the Lord, not to praise his own virtues. In such a frame of mind Diego readily assents when Mosquito suggests his plan to conquer the countess. It is a technique of Moreto to confront the antagonists in his plays and make them reason with each other. The failure to come to an agreement is usually due to the inability or the unwillingness of one or the other to understand. In this play, the carefully explained reasons of Inés fail because they crash against the unbreakable wall of Diego's vanity. The girl attempts to tell him in the most courteous manner possible that she does not love him:

Siendo así, cuando yo os diga
Que mi inclinación no es vuestra,
No os ofendo en la razón,
Aunque en el gusto os ofenda

When this fails, she begs him to have pity on a defenseless woman, she asks him to leave her alone as a favor, and finally she requests the pardon of a defeated enemy. All the supplications are in vain. Diego, closed within his delusion, sees only what he wants to see:

¡Pudo el diablo haber pensado
Más graciosísima arenga,
Para disfrazar los celos,
Y ésta de ellos que revienta? (II, iv)

The reply exasperates Inés and in her anger she insults him: "Sois hombre indigno de honor." These words, which would lead immediately to a duel among men and cause great consternation in any circumstance, do not even prick the fop whose comment on the entire episode is simply that this revolt of Inés is due to her sister who is madly in love with him.

Moreto breaks up the continuity of Diego's characterization to provide relief and to prepare the following set of episodes. This respite from the dandy implies not a departure from comedy but a new direction. The path he takes is one much traveled by writers and dramatists of the Golden Age, the censure of the "hablar culto." Thus, Mosquito ad-

vises Beatriz to speak culto to confuse Diego. To a simple question such as "¿cómo estáis?", the answer should be: "Lividinosa, crégula y obtusa." The banter between the two servants is interrupted by the arrival of Diego. Here, Moreto uses another technique to ridicule the young man; immediately after an insulting remark, Diego praises himself in a preposterous manner:

> Criada. Jesus, ¡qué extraña figura!
> Diego. Ya ha caído la criada.

and

> Beatriz. De risa me estoy muriendo
> Diego. También me parece que
> Va la Condesa cayendo. (II, viii)

The humor of the interview between the supposed countess and Diego is based on the same assumption as Castro's. But, where the earlier playwright barely developed the comic possibilities of the situation, Moreto takes full advantage of them. Diego is not reasonable and gallant like Gutierre, he is vain, stupid, and absurd. In the middle of a bombastic compliment to Beatriz he stops to admire his eloquence: "¡Bravo pedazo de prosa!" He is ably assisted in the buffoonery by Mosquito whose puns are sometimes risqué:

> Diego. Hablarla importa con frases
> De un estilo levantado.

Mosq. Sí; que el estilo acostado
Es para cuando te cases.

The successful characterization of Diego and the popularity of the play are due in a large part to the many-sided nature of the analysis. Up to now, Moreto has explored his boorishness and vanity, now he exploits another facet implicit in such a person, cowardice. The situation presents itself when Juan finds Diego in his house. Fearing himself trapped, the fop first reacts with bravado: "Voto a Dios, si me habla en nada/ Que a la primer cuchillada/ Le rebane como queso" (II, ix). Of course, when the time comes to act, he is at first speechless; he recovers enough to temporize but cannot control either his fear his words:

Ya voy al caso
La memoria es quebradiza.
Desde Burgos a Madrid
Hay cuarenta leguas chicas;

Soon he realizes that there is no way out and to placate Juan promises to withdraw his suit for Inés' hand. When Juan refuses to make any comments he concludes that it is Leonor whom Juan loves.

A shift of scene takes us to the house of don Tello where Beatriz and Mosquito are celebrating their success. They are discovered in the act of embracing by Diego. Moreto omits the mocking octavas of the original and shows by the

handling of the episode a different attitude toward the dandy. In Castro's play, it was necessary to concoct a fairly plausible story to persuade Gutierre that the embrace was not what he thought. Here, Beatriz, without answering, berates Diego for betraying her to Inés while promising marriage; in such a manner he is put on the defensive. The episode follows the general lines of the original work. However, where Castro employed it as the situation which leads to the denouement, Moreto uses it to create the complication before the end of the second act. He reduces the Leonor-Mendo relationship which is developed fully in the original to a sub-plot because it offers no possibility for comedy. Mendo is to be used only as a foil for the pandemondium of the last act. Another important difference is the reaction of the uncle. In the source play, Pedro delivers a harangue in which he decries the moderns' lack of discreción, in the derivative play, don Tello, less traditional and more practical, does all he can to prevent Juan from discovering the hidden woman whom Diego, to protect himself, called Juan's fiancée. In such a manner the dandy unleashes the jealousy of Inés, which cannot be placated despite Juan's attempt at explanation.

The third act owes very little to El Marcias en su opinión. It is somewhat repetitive in that there is a weaving in and out of conversations, all attempting to clarify the muddled situation. There are, however, two long and good scenes strategically located within the act to avoid monotony.

The first of these is a scene in the streets with Diego, Mosquito, and Beatriz. The young man is following Beatriz because he still thinks she is the countess. The two servants are trying desperately to get rid of him with no success. Diego's position is that it would be ungentlemanly of him to let her go home unescorted. After these protestations the reason why he refuses to pay for some sweets is humorously contradictory: "Hermano, si ella es golosa./ ¿Téngolo yo de pagar?" The gracioso and Beatriz are able to make their escape only when they meet Juan. The young man demands that Diego reveal the truth to everyone. Diego, in an exhibition of tortuous logic, refuses to lose face but at the same time assures Juan that public opinion is not important. When Juan demands satisfaction he implicates Leonor in the matter and leaves Mendo, who has just arrived, to deal with the count while he leaves to evade the duel.

The other comic highlight of the act deals with the attempt of Mosquito to avoid telling what he knows to his master. In a remarkable exhibition of doubletalk during which Inés is about to understand the innocence of Juan while Tello is completely baffled, the complication moves toward its resolution. Here is Mosquito explaining to don Tello:

> Pues vuélvetelo a explicar.
> El buscó a quien le buscaba;
> Porque ella buscando vino;
> Y buscando camino,

El buscó lo que allí estaba,
Y el probe que los buscó,
No buscó duelos ajenos. (III, xii)

The play is quickly brought to its conclusion. Once again, Moreto is less kind to his character. Castro had allowed him to hide his feelings and therefore spared him embarrassment, the later playwright makes him reveal his thoughts, thus fully exposing him. Since, during the third act, the resources of everyone concerned are directed toward the exposure of Diego, its realization is not only a dramatic necessity but also the fitting culmination of the action.

The success of El lindo don Diego since its first performance is due to its carefully controlled presentation of the comic material. In adapting Castro's play, Moreto reduced the parallel plot of Gonzalo and Mencía to a subplot, thus giving the play greater tightness; he reshaped the tradition-bound Pedro and his inevitable dignified speeches to a more practical Tello; he reformed the heavy, critical Tadeo into the wittier Mosquito; he reorganized the plot to create more dramatic tension. But his greatest achievement is the characterization of the protagonist: he has intensified the vanity of the original; he has kept him constantly comic rather than making him step out of character; he has given Diego's personality a range not to be found in Castro; finally, the lines in his play have the wit and grace seldom encountered in the earlier comedia.

NOTES

[1] First published in the Segunda parte of Castro's works, Valencia, 1625.

[2] See his edition of Castro's works, Madrid, 1925, I, xxxviii. All quotations from El Marqués en su opinión refer to the third volume of this edition.

[3] The opposition of normal and abnormal is an essential requisite of comedy to heighten the comic effect by contrast. See Willard Smith, The Nature of Comedy (Boston, 1930), pp. 153, 175.

[4] For an example which combines both criticism of the court and of women see Alarcón's La verdad sospechosa, I, iii. For a refutal of the anti-feminist theory regarding Castro see Henri Mérimée, L'art dramatique à Valencia (Toulouse, 1913), p. 563.

[5] A seemingly common subject at the time. Caroline B. Bourland in The Short-Story in Spain in the Seventeenth Century (Northhampton, Mass., 1927) mentions several short-stories that exploit the topic, note 154.

[6] Cervantes, the greatest exponent of the "libre albedrío", rejects any attempt of relatives to arrange marriages for their children. The most famous example of this tenet is the episode of Marcela in the first part of

the Quijote. Marcela's uncle refuses to force the girl to marry "porque decía el, y decía muy bien, que no habían de dar los padres a sus hijos estado contra su voluntad." See the edition of Francisco Rodríguez-Marín (Madrid, 1947), I, 342.

[7] The sonnet is a well-chosen poetic form for this point of the play. Peter N. Dunn in "Some Uses of Sonnets in the Plays of Lope de Vega," Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, XXXIV, 213-22, holds that the sonnet is used to reveal character motives and tensions of all kinds. It is best suited when the sources of irony and ambivalence have to be brought sharply into focus.

[8] The unusual behavior of Tadeo contrasts strongly with the traditional gracioso whose traits always include faithfulness. For studies on the gracioso see José F. Montesinos, "Algunas observaciones sobre la figura del donaire en el teatro de Lope de Vega," Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal (Madrid) I, 472; Miguel Herrero García, "Génesis de la figura del donaire," Revista de filología española, XXV (1941), 47.

[9] The phrase had been common currency for a long time before Moreto made use of it. Castro himself in El Mariscо en su opinión employed it:

D. Pedro. Dejadme, callad,
no repliques, que estoy ciego
de enojo; gentil don Diego,

andad, salíos, caminad. (p. 100)

It also appears in Alonso Castillo Solórzano, Tardes entretenidas (Madrid, 1625). I am quoting from the ed. of Cotarelo y Mori, Madrid, 10[illegible], p. 166: "Era el Maestresala un hombre de los que llaman lindos la Corte, personas cuya compostura cansa, y cuyo afecto ofende, muy presumidos de andar puntual en el uso, de traer gran cuidado con sus manos, de hacer todos los actos positivos que le pudiesen poner en el astillero de la caballería; y sobre todo, confiadísimo (como muchos necios), de que no había dama que mirando su talle y gala no se le quedase sumamente aficionada."

[10] The play first appeared in the Parte V de escogidas (Madrid, 1653) according to Cotarelo y Mori. Fernández-Guerra mentions the Parte diez y ocho de varios (Madrid, 1662)

[11] There is a short forward in the Ebro edition of the play by E. Julia Martínez (Zaragoza, 1941).

[12] La Poética, ed. Luigi de Filippo (Barcelona, 1954), p. 313.

[13] Kennedy, p. 80.

[14] E. B. Place rejects the assertion that the work is a figurón play. See "Note on the Grotesque: The 'Comedia de figuron' at Home and Abroad," Publications of the Modern Language Association, LIV (1939), pp. 419-421.

[15] A near contemporary of Luzán, Francisco Milizia in his book Dal teatro (Venezia, 1793), p. 19, defines a comedy of character in the following terms: " . . .la commedia lo riguarda il ridicolo. Il ridicolo consiste ne' difetti che cagionano vergogna senza cagionare dolore: è una deformità nei costumi, che offende la convenienza, gli usi ricevuti, ed anche la Morale del Mondo polito."

[16] See Charles David Ley, El gracioso en el teatro de la península (Madrid, 1954), p. 233.

[17] The term compañía which originally meant a company of actors had changed meaning by the time of Moreto to "una especie de mascarada o cabalgada carnavalesca." See J. Corominas, Diccionario crítico etimológico de la lengua castellana (Madrid, 1954), II, 412.

[18] Athene Seyler and Stephen Haggard, The Craft of Comedy (New York, 1946), p. 16.

[19] See El licenciado Vidriera, III, xii and Antioco y Seleuco, III, viii, ix.

[20] For a famous example of a paradoy on Góngora see La Dorotea of Lope de Vega, ed. E. S. Morby (Berkeley, Cal., 1958), IV, ii.

[21] E. Julió Martínez, III, xiii.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of these works was undertaken not only with an eye toward the further appreciation of the individual plays, but also to help us understand the dramatic craftsmanship of Moreto. While these studies cannot give a total comprehension of the dramatist's art, I hope that they contribute somewhat to the understanding of an important facet of his theatre. The fame of Moreto has been somewhat clouded by the particular aesthetic prejudices of a given period. The nineteenth century, which shaped our appreciation of the prominent figures of the Golden Age, did not take into consideration the artistic concepts of the times; indeed, they often found themselves at odds with the very tenets of the seventeenth century. The imitation of worthy sources is one of the most cherished practices of the classical tradition.[1] The poet who makes use of earlier material could not be, and indeed was not, censured for his efforts as long as he integrated the borrowed material into his own work. The primary object of the dramatist was to express and transmit to his audience a knowledge which not only he but others possessed. What counted was not the originality of the subject, but the subject itself, its meaning and its spiritual relevance for the audience. For one of the most significant aspects of the comedia is its moral tone: a play deals with man and God,

man and society which represents the natural order, and man and himself. Many of the themes of the serious plays are based on unshakeable truths and truth bears repeating time and again; the manner of expression is the personal property of the individual writer, the subject matter belongs to all. It can be seen that to force upon the seventeenth century a concept so alien to it as originality in our sense of the word is a mistake for the critic and an injustice to the writer. Professor A. Reichenberger has stated that "the originality of the dramatists, including the founder Lope himself, consists entirely in varying, shading, combining and refining the basic themes."[2]

In transposing previous works, Moreto did not set upon a mechanical task; he studied his sources carefully and deliberately chose what he wanted. In so doing he brought about significant modifications in the comedia: there is in Moreto an unmistakeable predilection for order. This has been variously described as spiritual affinity to Gracián (by Caldera) or a rationalistic disposition akin to the eighteenth century (by Kennedy and Valbuena Prat). While the reason for such preference is difficult to assess, we can judge its results. The comedia of Moreto rejects unnecessary complications, that is, any element which does not have a role in the plot. It must not be understood by this that one can start at the end of the play and "unravel" it by accounting for every incident. It is a looser structure than that, but one that does not diminish the difference between

Moreto and his predecessors. The graciosos and all the events connected with them are still there, but they are no longer irrelevant, they are integrated into the action so that their contribution supports or amplifies the theme. Their jokes are related to the action, their behavior is complementary or supplementary, the incidents in which they are involved help in the development of the plot. Similarly, music, a frequent device of the comedia from its inception, is not the personal whim of a music lover, but, as Leo Spitzer has shown, it has definite functions in the development of the play. It may be a signal for lovers, or be some supernatural warning (San Franco de Sena); frequently it is an amplification of the sentiments of the characters (Antioco y Seleuco) or the basis for a glosa which deals with the emotions of the protagonists (El licenciado Vidriera). The most characteristic element in Moreto is the long expository speech; it often appears in the first or second scene and narrates the events that lead to the present actions (El desdén con el desdén, Antioco y Seleuco). This gives his first scenes a static quality that is dispelled the moment he develops the action. The rest of the play tends to move linearly without any digressions into sub-plots. The motivations of the characters are kept in check; the acts end at the logical break of the action; scenes punctuate the meaning by ending at crucial moments; the conclusions of his plays are always derived from the action and never imposed. One can see that despite the somewhat imaginative comparison

to other writers, Moreto's theatre is indeed both logical and rational. It is this inclination for the orderly, the well-planned plot, the relevant, the appropriate, the meaningful, that produces another significant result, the lack of poetic flights. The poetry of Moreto, while correct in every respect, is seldom lyrical. Where Lope makes use of some magnificent octavas reales to indicate the overbearing pride of Tello in El valiente justiciero, Moreto prefers an eight syllable verse devoid of the gongoristic imagery of the original, but much closer to conversation. He then chooses naturalness over effect, a more realistic language over a symbolic one. This does not mean that he scorns lyrical outpourings; the hunting image in the last act of Antioco y Seleuco is representative of his ability to sustain an image and develop it with grace and feeling. Finally, Moreto tends to choose subjects which deal with man and society rather than explore the problems of the human condition. With the exception of his religious plays, his works deal with themes such as paternal affection (Antioco y Seleuco); obedience to royalty (El valiente justiciero); ingratitude (El licenciado Vidriera); foppishness and conceit (El lindo don Diego); the immutability of the law (La fuerza de la ley).

The plays we have studied show the imprint of these general attitudes. In San Franco de Sena, he draws from hagiographic sources, from the comedias de santos and his own imagination and transmutes this material into a powerful pre-

sentation of sin and repentance while working within the classical form of the genre. Despite the use of these traditional elements he manages to instill into the play a strong characterization of the protagonist and to express in deeply religious tones the themes of contrition and divine forgiveness.

From Cervantes' El licenciado Vidriera, he extracts the topic of human ingratitude and, while keeping many aspects of the original main character, reworks it completely into a tale of illusions and desengaños which reveal in measured steps the weaknesses of man.

In Antioco y Seleuco, he remolds a well known tale of paternal generosity into a contest of affection between father and son. To do so he has enlarged the roles of the father and the doctor; he has rendered the former more human in his weakness and hence more admirable in his final decision. Seleuco, who had appeared in previous works merely as a man capable of giving away a prized possession, is in Moreto a person who makes a deep personal sacrifice for the sake of his son.

El valiente justiciero is the closest to his source and one of the plays that has contributed heavily to his reputation as a plagiarist. Here the changes are more subtle and are nearly all of a technical nature. He has lengthened the role of the prince and made his presence less perfunctory; he has given motivations to certain actions that had none; he has changed the personality of the nobleman to

make his final reunion with authority more plausible and, he has transformed the King from a guilt-ridden and obsessed man to a person surer of himself and of his position. He has also modified the theme from a conflict of personalities to the imposition of royal and hence divine authority on an individual who had forgotten the existence of a superior power.

The last play, El lindo don Diego, has long been recognized as his most successful work. Derived from a spotty comedy by Guillén de Castro, Moreto intensifies its characterization of the dandy, reworks the role of the gracioso to make him more a part of the play, gives him wittier lines, perfects certain scenes that showed promise in the original but that were not fully developed, and reduces the importance of the sub-plot to give a fuller presentation of the main character.

This reconsideration of Moreto's dramatic craftsmanship reveals that the playwright had one overwhelming interest, the best possible expression of his themes. For Moreto, provenience of the source material was of little importance. He was able to get out of the original those parts which could best serve him and rework them into something that was wholly his. Although, at times his passion for an orderly exposition caused him to re-do a turbulent play into a less spirited drama, his comedias are not less worthy. The fire admired by some, is replaced by a more balanced art: his plays have a surer direction, a dramatic ten-

sion that is carried on with skill, and a conclusion which does not leave the spectator with a number of undeveloped situations.

He worked within his own artistic and cultural milieu and with a genre that had well established boundaries and conventions. If he did not treat those themes with a wider application to mankind, it was because he saw in the Catholic system the answers to every human problem. If viewed within his historical context, with its limitations imposed by the time and beliefs, he emerges as one of the greatest exponents of an era whose monolithic ideas found a faithful expression in his theatre.

N O T E S

[1] Essential for the understanding of the ideas prevalent in the seventeenth century is Margarete Newels, Dramatischen Gattungen in den Poetiken des Siglo de Oro (Wiesbaden, 1959).

[2] See A. G. Reichenberger's review of C. Artigoza Vieyra Las [illegible] de la comedia in Hispanic Review, XXV (1957), 140.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alonso Cortés, Narciso, ed. El licenciado Vidriera. Valladolid, 1916.

_____. "Prólogo" in Teatro de Moreto. Madrid, 1916.

Amezúa, Agustín de. Cervantes, creador de la novela corta española. 2 vols. Madrid, 1956.

Appianus of Alexandria. Roman History, ed. John D. Denniston and Edgar I. Robson. Loeb Classical Library. 4 vols. London, 1912.

Aristaenetus. Lettres d'amour, trans. J. Brenous. Paris, 1938.

Asensio, Eugenio de. "Sobre el Rei Seleuco de [illegible]," Boletin de filologia, XI (1950), 304-19.

Assorino, Luca. Stratonica. Macerata, 1635.

Atkinson, William C. "Cervantes, El Pinciano and the Novelas ejemplares," Hispanic Review, XVI (1948), 189-208.

Aubrun, Charles. "La comedia doctrinale et ses histoires de brigands," Bulletin Hispanique, LIX (1957), 137-51.

Babb, Lawrence. The Elizabethan Malady. East Lansing, Mich., 1951

Bandello, Matteo. Opere, ed. Francesco Flora 2 vols.

Milano, 1935.

Barrera y Leirado, Alberto Cayetano de. Catálogo bibliográfico y biográfico del teatro antiguo español. Madrid, 1860.

Bataillon, Marcel. La Celestina selon Fernando de Rojas. Paris, 1961.

Bates, Margaret. Disreción in the Works of Cervantes. Washington, D. C., 1945.

Bertrand, J. J. Cervantes et le romanisme allemand. Paris, 1914.

Boase, T. S. R. "A Seventeenth Century Carmelite Legend Based on Tacitus," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, II (1939-40), 107-118.

Bourland, Caroline B. The Short-Story in Spain in the Seventeenth Century. Northhampton, Mass., 1927.

Brosse, . La Stratonice ou la malade d'amour. Paris, 1645.

Bruerton, Courtney, "La ninfa del cielo, La serrana de la vara, and Related Plays," in Estudios Hispánicos. Homenaje a Archer M. Huntington. Wellesley, Mass., 1952, pp. 61-97.

Bruni, Lionardi. Novella di Seleuco. Verona, 1817.

Butler's Lives of the Saints, ed., re,. and supp. H. J. Thurs-

ton, S. J. and Donald Attwater. 4 vols. New York, 1956.

Calcaro, Ermanno. Il teatro di Manzoni. Pisa, 1950.

Calderón de la Barca, Pedro. La devoción de la Cruz, ed. Angel Valbuena Prat. Madrid, 1930.

Camoens, Luis de. Obras Completas, ed. Visconde de Juromenha. 7 vols. Lisboa, 1860-1924.

Cánovas y Velasco, Jerónimo de. "Vejámenes literarios," in Obras Inéditas, ed. Adolfo Bonilla y San Martín. Madrid 1909.

Cano, Juan. Religious Orders of Man. New York, 1960.

Casalduero, Joaquín. Sentido y forma de las Novelas ejemplares. Buenos Aires, 1943.

Castillo Solórzano, Alonso. Tardes entretenidas, ed. E. Cotarelo y Mori. Madrid, 1908.

Castro, Guillén de. Obras, ed. Eduardo Julia Martínez. 3 vols. Madrid, 1927.

Cervantes, Miguel de. Novelas ejemplares, ed. Rodolfo Schevill and Adolfo Bonilla. 3 vols. Madrid, 1925.

Cidade, Hernani. Luís de [redacted], as autos e o teatro do seu tempo. Lisboa, 1946.

Coffman, George R. "A Note on Saints' Legends," Romanic

[illegible] Studies. Chapel Hill, N. C., 1931, pp. 48-54.

Covarrubias, Juan. [illegible] en la lengua castellana. 4 vols. Madrid, 1954.

Cotarelo y Mori, Emilio. La bibliografía de Moreto. Madrid 1907.

Curtius, Ernst Robert. Literatura europea y Edad Media latina, trans. M. Frank Alatorre and Antonio Alatorre. 2 vols. México, 1955.

Delehaye, Hippolyte. Les légendes hagiographiques. Bruxelles, 1906.

_____. [illegible]legenda sur la méthode hagiographique. Bruxelles, 1934.

De los Ríos, Blanca, ed. Obras dramáticas completas de Tirso de Molina. 3 vols. Madrid, 1946-1958.

Díaz de Escovar, Narciso and Francisco de Paulo Lasso de la Vega. Historia del teatro español. Barcelona, 1924.

Dictionnaire de Spiritualité, ed. M. Viller, S. J. 2 vols. Paris, 1937.

Dieulafoy, Marcel. Le théâtre édifiant. Paris, 1907.

Di Francia, Letterio. "Alla scoperta del vero Bandello," Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, LXXX

(1922), 1-94; LXXXI (1923), 1-75.

Duff, T. Wight. A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age. London, 1960.

Dunn, Peter N. "Some Uses of Sonnets in the Plays of Lope de Vega," Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, XXXIV (1957), 213-22.

Entwistle, W. J. "The Romancero del Rey don Pedro en Ayala and the Cuenta crónica general," Modern Language Review, XXV (1930), 306-26.

Escudero Ortuño, Alberto. El concepto de la melancolía en el siglo XVII. Murcia, 1950.

Evasio, Leone. Il cantico dei cantici. 3 vols. Parma, 1803.

Farinelli, Arturo. Italia e Spagna. Torino, 1929.

Fernández de Navarrete, Martín. Vida de Cervantes. Madrid, 1819.

Ferrer del Río, Francisco. Examen histórico-crítico del reinado de Don Pedro de Castilla. Madrid, 1863.

Festugière, A. J. "Lieux communs littéraires et thèmes de folk-lore dans l'hagiographie primitive," Wiener Studien, LXXIII (1960), 123-52.

Fitzmaurice Kelly, James. "Phantasio Cratuminos sive Homo Vitreus. A Note on El licenciado Vidriera," Revue

[illegible], IV (1897), 46-60.

_____. A History of Spanish Literature. New York, 1898.

Foulché-Delbosc, R., ed. and trans. La Dorotea. Paris, 1892.

Fox, Mary Florence. Spanish Ballad Treatment of Don Pedro al Cruel. (Unpublished Thesis, University of Illinois, 1946).

Frank, Rachel. "Deceit in Cervantes' Novelas ejemplares," Hispanic Review, XIII (1946), 244-52.

Garcilaso de la Vega. Obras, ed. T. Navarro Tomás. Madrid, 1958.

Glaser, Edward. "Referencias anti-semitas en la literatura peninsular de la Edad de Oro," Nueva revista de filología hispánica, VII (1954), 39-62.

_____. "La comedia de Felipe Godínez, O el fraile ha de ser ladrón o el ladrón ha de ser fraile," Revista de literatura, XII (1957), 91-107.

_____. "Lope de Vega's La bizarra Isabel," [illegible] XX (1960), 110-35.

_____. "Tirso de Molina's La mujer que manda en casa," Annali dell'istituto universitario orientale, Sezione romanza, II, 1 (1960), 25-42.

Gougaud, Dom Louis. Dévotions et pratiques du Moyen Age. Paris, 1925.

Grossi, Simone. Vita del B. Franco Lippi, carmelitano, ed. Paolo Bodiani. Monza, 1878.

Green, Otis H. "El ingenioso hidalgo," Hispanic Review, XXV (1957), 175-193.

Griffith, T. Gwynfor. Bandello's Fiction. An Examination of the Novelle. Oxford, 1955.

Grillparzer, Franz. Werke. 16 vols. Leipzig, 1911.

Hainsworth, George. "La source du Licenciado Vidriera," Bulletin Hispanique, XXXII (1930), 70-72.

_____. "Les Novelas ejemplares en France," Bibliothèque de la Revue de littérature comparée, 1933, no. 95.

Harlan, Mabel. "The Relation of Moreto's El desdén con el desdén to Suggested Sources," Indiana University Studies, XI (1924), 1-109.

Hatzfeld, Helmut. "Las profundas cavernas. The Structure of a Symbol of San Juan de la Cruz," Quaderni Iberoamericani XI (1951), 171-74.

Herrero García, Miguel. "La monarquía teorética de Lope de Vega," Fénix (April, 1935), pp. 179-224.

_____. "Génesis de la figura del donaire," Revista de

filología española, XXV (1941), 46-79.

Hesseler, Maria. *Studien zur Figur des Gracioso bei Lope de Vega und Vorgängern*. Hildesheim, 1933.

Hesse, Everett W. "¿Es *La ninfa del cielo*, atribuída a Tirso, una 'comedia desatinada'?" *Filología Romanza*, III (1956), 141-61.

Huarte de San Juan, Juan. *Examen de ingenios para las ciencias*, ed. Rodrigo Sanz. 2 vols. Madrid, 1930.

Hurtado y Jiménez and A. González Palencia. *Historia de la literatura española*. Madrid, 1925.

Icaza, Francisco. *Las novelas ejemplares de Cervantes*. Madrid, 1901.

Illicino, Bernardo. *Petrarca con doi commenti sopra li sonetti et canzone* . . . Venezia, 1522.

Iriarte, M. de. *El doctor Huarte de San Juan y su Examen de ingenios*. Madrid, 1948.

Jacquot, Jean. "Le théâtre du monde, de Shakespeare à Calderón," *Revue de littérature comparée*, XXI (1957), 341-72.

Jones, Charles W. *Saints' Lives and Chronicles in Early England*. Ithaca, New York, 1947.

Julianus, Flavius Claudius. *Works*, ed. T. E. Page and W. H.

H. Rouse, trans. Wilmer Cave Wright. Loeb Classical Library. 3 vols. New York, 1913.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. The King's Two Bodies. Princeton, N. J., 1957.

Kennedy, Ruth Lee. The Dramatic Art of Moreto. Philadelphia, 1932.

_____. "The Theme of 'Stratonice' in the Drama of the Spanish Peninsula," Publications of the Modern Language Association, LV (1940), 1010-32.

King, E. L. "A Note on El licenciado Vidriera," Modern Language Notes, LXIX (1954), 99-102.

Knowles, Dom David. "Prologue" to Self-Abandonment to Divine Providence by J. P. De Caussade. London, 1952.

Krauss, Werner. Studien und Aufsätze. Berlin, 1959.

Leavitt, Sturgis E. The Estrella de Sevilla and Claramonte. Cambridge, Mass., 1931.

Ley, C. D. El gracioso en el teatro de la Península. Siglos XVI-XVII. Madrid, 1954.

Llop, P. Luis María. El hijo de la gracia o San Franco de Asís. Jérez, 1911.

Lomba y Pedraja, José R. "El Rey don Pedro en el teatro," in Homenaje a Menéndez y Pelayo. Madrid, 1899, II, 257-339.

Lombardello, Gregorio. La Vita del B. Franco, Romano. Firenze, 1611.

_____. Vida y milagros de San Franco de Sena, santalita, trans. F. Diego de Coria Maldonado. Barcelona, 1613.

Lopez de Ayala, Pero. Crónica del rey don Pedro in Crónicas de los Reyes de Castilla, ed. Cayetano Rosell. Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, LXVI. Madrid, 1875.

Lucianus of Samosata. Works, ed. E. Capps, T. E. Page, and W. H. D. Rouse, trans. A. M. Harmon. Loeb Classical Library. 5 vols. London, 1925.

Luzán, Ignacio de. La Poética, ed. Luigi de Filippo. Barcelona, 1974.

Malone, Edward. The Monk and the Martyr. Washington, D. C., 1950.

Martínez de la Rosa, Francisco. Obras Completas. Colección de los Mejores Autores Españoles, XXVIII. Paris, 1845.

May, T. E. "El castigo sin venganza: The Idolatry of the Duke of Ferrara," Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, XXXVII (1960), 154-82.

_____. "El condenado por desconfiado: 1. The Enigmas, 2. Anareto," Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, XXXV (1958), 138-56.

McClelland, I. L. Tirso de Molina, Studies in Dramatic Realism. Liverpool, 1948.

Melodia, Giovanni. Studio su I trionfi del Petrarca. Palermo, 1958.

Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino, ed. Obras de Lope de Vega. 15 vols. Madrid, 1890-1913

_____. Estudios y discursos de crítica histórica y literaria. 2 vols. Santander, 1941.

_____. Orígenes de la novela. 5 vols. Madrid, 1943.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón. Romancero Hispánico. 2 vols. Madrid, 1953.

Meregalli, Franco. "Le Novelas ejemplares nello svolgimento della personalità di Cervantes," Letterature moderne, X (1960), 334-51.

Merimée, Henri. L'art dramatique à Valencia. Toulouse, 1913.

Merimée, Prosper. Historia de don Pedro I. Paris, 1874.

Merton, Thomas. The Silent Life. New York, 1957.

_____. Disputed Questions. New York, 1960.

Michaelis de Vasconcellos, Carolina. "O vilancete de Luis de [redacted] nos olhos-Gonçalves," Academia das Ciencias de Lisboa. Boletim da Segunda classe, XII (1918), 289-311.

Milá y Fontanals, Manuel. De la poesía heroico-popular castellana. Barcelona, 1959.

Milizia, Francesco. Del teatro. Venezia, 1793.

Mira de Amescua, Antonio. El esclavo del demonio, ed. Ángel Valbuena Prat. Madrid, 1926.

Möller, Wilhelm. Die christliche Bekehrten-Comedie. Hamburg, 1936.

Mondragón, Jerónimo de. Censura de la locura humana, ed. Antonio Vilanova. Barcelona, 1953.

Montesinos, José F. "Algunas observaciones sobre la figura del donaire en el teatro de Lope de Vega," Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal. Madrid, 1925, I, 469-504.

Morby, Edwin S. "Levinus Lemnius and Leo Suabius in La Dorotea," Hispanic Review, XX (1952), 108-122.

Moreto y Cabaña, Agustín. Obras, ed. Luis Fernández-Guerra y Orbe. Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, XXXIX. Madrid, 1856; rep. 1950.

Muñoz Peña, Pedro. El teatro del Maestro Tirso de Molina. Valladolid, 1899.

Newels, Margarete. Dramatischen Gattungen in den Poetiken des Siglo de Oro. Wiesbaden, 1959.

Nigg, Walter. Warriors of God, trans. Mary Ilford.

New York, 1959.

Ochoa, Eugenio de. Tesoro del teatro español. Paris, 1838.

Oliver, Antonio. "La filosofía en El licenciado Vidriera," Anales Cervantinos, IV (1954), 225-38.

Pabst, Walter. Novellentheorie und Novellen Dichtung. Zur Geschichte ihrer Antinomie in den romanischen Literaturen. Hamburg, 1953.

Parker, Alexander A. The Allegorical Dramas of Calderón. London, 1943.

_____. "Santos y bandoleros en el teatro español del Siglo de Oro," Arbor, XII (1949), 339-416.

_____. "An Approach to the Spanish Drama of the Golden Age," Tulane Drama Review (Autumn, 1959), 42-59.

_____. "History and Poetry: The Coriolanus Theme in Calderón," Hispanic Studies in Honor of I. González Llubera. Oxford, 1959.

Pauly, Agust, Georg Kroll, and Wilhelm Kroll. Real Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. 2nd ed. 1. Reihe, 23 vols. Stuttgart, 1894-1959; 2. Reihe, 17 vols. Stuttgart, 1894-1961.

Peers, E. Allison. Spirit of Flame. London, 1944.

Péres Gómez, Antonio. Romancero de don Pedro. Valencia, 1954.

Petrarca, Francesco. I Trionfi, ed. Carl Appel. Halle, 1901.

Pfandl, Ludwig. Historia de la literatura nacional española en la Edad de Oro. Barcelona, 1933.

Pietri, François. Pierre le cruel, le vrai et le faux. Paris, 1961.

Place, Edwin B. "A Note on the Grotesque: the 'Comedia de figurón' at Home and Abroad," Publications of the Modern Language Association, LIV (1939), 412-21.

Plinius Secundus, Caius. Natural History, trans. by John Bostock and H. T. Riley. 3 vols. London, 1892.

Plutarchus. Lives, ed. A. Capps, T. E. Page, and W. H. D. Rouse, trans. Bernadotte Perring. Loeb Classical Library. 11 vols. London, 1914-1926.

Ramírez de Arellano, Diana, ed. Los Ramírez de Arellano. Madrid, 1954.

Reichenberger, Arnold G. Review of Los móviles de la comedia by C. Ortigosa Vieyra, Hispanic Review, XXV (1957), 140-1.

_____. "The Uniqueness of the Comedia," Hispanic Review, XXVII (1959), 303-316.

Rennert, Hugo. The Spanish Stage in the Time of Lope de Vega. New York, 1909.

Rodrigues, José Maria. "O vilancete de [redacted] e Sembera dos olhos Gonçalves," Academia das Ciencias de Lisboa. Boletim de segunda classe, X (1915-16), 914-59.

Romancero General, ed. Agustín Duran. Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, X. Madrid, 1857.

Rossi, Giuseppe Carlo. "Una tradizione cinquecentesca spagnuola del Trionfo d'amore," Convivium, n. s. I (1959), 40-50.

Sage, Pierre. Le "Bon Prêtre" dans la littérature française d'Amadis de Gaule au Génie du Christianisme. Genève, 1951

Salilla, Rafael. Un gran inspirador de Cervantes, el doctor Juan Huarte de San Juan y su Examen de ingenios. Madrid, 1905.

Schack, [redacted]. Historia de la literatura del arte dramático en España, trans. Eduardo de Mier. 5 vols. Madrid, 1887.

Schaeffer, [redacted]. Geschichte des spanischen Nationaldramas. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1890.

Schevill, Rudolph. Cervantes. New York, 1919.

Schlegel, August Wilhelm. Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature, trans. John Black. 2nd ed. revised by A. J. Morrison. London, 1892.

Bohnen, Emily. [illegible] on the Dramatic Treatment of Love: the Novel of Courtly and the Middle Ages in Spain, Germany and England. Chicago, 1926.

Borre, Renato. [illegible] [illegible] 1929.

Boyer, Athens, Stephen Haggard. The Craft of Comedy. New York, 1946.

Singer, Armand. "The Literary Progeny of Cervantes' El licenciado Vidriera." West Virginia University Bulletin. Philological Papers, V, (1948), 59-72.

_____: "The Sources, Meaning and Use of the Madness Theme in Cervantes' El licenciado Vidriera," West Virginia University Bulletin. Philological Papers, VI (1949), 31-53.

_____. "Cervantes' El licenciado Vidriera: Its Form and Substance," West Virginia University Bulletin. Philological Papers, VII (1951), 13-31.

Sloman, Albert E. The Dramatic Craftsmanship of Calderón. Oxford, 1958.

Smith, Willard. The Nature of Comedy. Boston, 1930.

Sordo, E. "Notas al margen. Realidad y ficción de las Novelas ejemplares," Cuadernos de literatura, XIX (1948), 271-83.

Spitzer, Leo. "Una variante italiana del tema del Condenado por desconfiado," Revista de filología hispánica, I (1939), 361-68.

_____. "A Central Theme and Its Structural Equivalent in Lope's Peribañez," Hispanic Review. XXXIII (1955), 274-92.

Storck, Wilhelm. Vida e obras de Luis de Camoens, trans. C. M. de Vasconcellos. Lisboa, 1897.

Suárez, Francisco. Opera Omnia, ed. Michel André. 13 vols. Paris, 1856-1878.

Ticknor, George. History of Spanish Literature. 2nd. ed. 3 vols. New York, 1854.

Torres Naharro, Bartolomé de. Propalladia and Other Works, ed. Joseph H. Gillet. 3 vols. Bryn Mawr, Penn., 1946.

Valbuena Prat, Angel. Literatura dramática española. Barcelona, 1930.

_____. Historia de la literatura española. 3rd ed. 3 vols. Barcelona, 1950.

_____. Historia del teatro español. Madrid, 1956.

Valerius Maximus. Factorum et dictorum memorabilium, libri [illegible], ed. Carolus Halm. Leipzig, 1865.

Van Dam, Adolf, ed. El castigo sin venganza. Groninga, 1928.

Vega y Carpio, Lope Félix de. La Dorotea, ed. Edwin S. Morby. Berkeley, Calif., 1958.

Véles de Guevara, Luis. Los novios de Hornachuelos, ed. John M. Hill and Frank O'Reed. New York, 1929.

Vieyra de Almeida, Francisco. "O prologo do Rei Seleuco," Ocidente, XXXI (1943), 341-43.

Viel Castel, Louis de. Essai sur le théâtre espagnol. Paris, 1882.