

A STUDY OF CERTAIN EARLY PLAYS

BY LOPE DE VEGA

by

Carole Adams

(Girton College)



Dissertation submitted for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy
at the University of Cambridge

1972

CONTENTS

| | | |
|---------------|--|-----|
| Abbreviations | | 4 |
| | The plays | 4 |
| | Other abbreviations | 6 |
| Preface | | 9 |
| Chapter I | A bibliographical introduction | 14 |
| Chapter II | <u>El mármol de Felisardo</u> | 23 |
| Chapter III | The pattern of the <u>comedia</u> | 33 |
| | The love story | 34 |
| | The success story | 51 |
| | The success of a scheme | 75 |
| Chapter IV | The characters | 101 |
| | The <u>dama</u> | 107 |
| | The <u>galán</u> | 132 |
| | The <u>barba</u> | 141 |
| | The mother | 147 |
| | The <u>gracioso</u> | 151 |
| | Belardo | 158 |
| Chapter V | The structure of the play | 167 |
| | Elements in the play as a spectacle | 167 |
| | (a) Song and dance scenes | 168 |
| | (b) Wedding and christening scenes | 169 |
| | (c) Night scenes | 172 |
| | (d) Scenes of deception and misunderstanding | 176 |
| | (e) Scenes involving children | 180 |
| | (f) Scenes involving appeals to the king and judgements | 182 |
| | (g) Other recurrent scenes | 186 |
| | Stylistic and metrical elements | 189 |
| | (a) Lope's theory and practice | 189 |
| | (b) Narrations and tirades | 191 |
| | (c) Sonnets | 191 |
| | (d) Paronomasia | 194 |
| | (e) Stichomythia | 196 |
| | (f) Literary reminiscences | 197 |
| | (g) The ' <u>cortejo rústico</u> ' | 199 |
| | (h) ' <u>Beatus Ille</u> ...' | 201 |
| | General considerations on structural elements | 202 |

| | | |
|--------------|--|-----|
| Chapter VI | Conclusion | 226 |
| | Predestination | 226 |
| | The happy ending | 236 |
| | <u>Le chant qu'elles sont devenues</u> | 241 |
| Bibliography | | 246 |
| | The plays | 246 |
| | Other works consulted | 250 |

ABBREVIATIONS

The plays

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| <u>Albanio</u> | <u>Los amores de Albanio y Ismenia</u> |
| <u>Alcaide</u> | <u>El alcaide de Madrid</u> |
| <u>Alfreda</u> | <u>La Hermosa Alfreda</u> |
| <u>Amigo</u> | <u>El amigo por fuerza</u> |
| <u>Amor</u> | <u>El amor desatinado</u> |
| <u>Argel</u> | <u>El Argel fingido y renegado de amor</u> |
| <u>Bamba</u> | <u>La vida y muerte del rey Bamba</u> |
| <u>Belardo</u> | <u>Belardo el furioso</u> |
| <u>Bella</u> | <u>La Bella malmaridada</u> |
| <u>Benavides</u> | <u>Los Benavides</u> |
| <u>Benito</u> | <u>Las burlas y enredos de Benito</u> |
| <u>Burlas</u> | <u>Las burlas de amor</u> |
| <u>Caballero</u> | <u>El caballero del milagro</u> |
| <u>Carlos</u> | <u>Carlos el perseguido</u> |
| <u>Casamiento</u> | <u>El casamiento en la muerte</u> |
| <u>Castrucho</u> | <u>El galán Castrucho</u> |
| <u>Cautivos</u> | <u>Los cautivos de Argel</u> |
| <u>Celauro</u> | <u>Los embustes de Celauro</u> |
| <u>Cerco</u> | <u>El cerco de Santa Fe y ilustre hazaña de Garcilaso de la Vega</u> |
| <u>Comendadores</u> | <u>Los comendadores de Córdoba</u> |
| <u>Chaves</u> | <u>El blasón de los Chaves de Villalba</u> |
| <u>Diego García</u> | <u>La contienda de Diego García de Paredes y el capitán Juan de Urbina</u> |

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| <u>Difunta</u> | <u>La difunta pleiteada</u> |
| <u>Enemigo</u> | <u>El enemigo engañado</u> |
| <u>Engaño</u> | <u>El hijo por engaño y toma de Toledo</u> |
| <u>Fabia</u> | <u>Los embustes de Fabia</u> |
| <u>Favor</u> | <u>El favor agradecido</u> |
| <u>Felisardo</u> | <u>El mármol de Felisardo</u> |
| <u>Ferías</u> | <u>Las ferías de Madrid</u> |
| <u>Francesilla</u> | <u>La francesilla</u> |
| <u>GalánE</u> | <u>El galán escarmentado</u> |
| <u>Ganso</u> | <u>El ganso de oro</u> |
| <u>Garcilaso</u> | <u>Los hechos de Garcilaso de la Vega y moro Tarfe</u> |
| <u>Grao</u> | <u>El Grao de Valencia</u> |
| <u>Indicios</u> | <u>En los indicios la culpa</u> |
| <u>Infanta</u> | <u>La infanta desesperada</u> |
| <u>Ingratitud</u> | <u>La ingratitud vengada</u> |
| <u>Ingrato</u> | <u>El ingrato arrepentido</u> |
| <u>Jacinto</u> | <u>La pastoral de Jacinto</u> |
| <u>Jorge</u> | <u>Jorge toledano</u> |
| <u>Justas</u> | <u>Las justas de Tebas y reina de las Amazonas</u> |
| <u>Laura</u> | <u>Laura perseguida</u> |
| <u>Leal</u> | <u>El leal criado</u> |
| <u>Locos</u> | <u>Los locos de Valencia</u> |
| <u>Lucas</u> | <u>El dómene Lucas</u> |
| <u>Maestro</u> | <u>El maestro de danzar</u> |
| <u>Marqués</u> | <u>El marqués de Mantua</u> |
| <u>Matico</u> | <u>Los donaires de Matico</u> |
| <u>Mesón</u> | <u>El mesón de la corte</u> |
| <u>Molino</u> | <u>El molino</u> |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| <u>Otón</u> | <u>La imperial de Otón</u> |
| <u>Padrino</u> | <u>El padrino desposado</u> |
| <u>PríncipeI</u> | <u>El príncipe inocente</u> |
| <u>PríncipeM</u> | <u>El príncipe melancólico</u> |
| <u>Reduán</u> | <u>El hijo de Reduán</u> |
| <u>Reinaldos</u> | <u>Las pobrezaas de Reinaldos</u> |
| <u>Remedio</u> | <u>El remedio en la desdicha</u> |
| <u>Rodamonte</u> | <u>Los celos de Rodamonte</u> |
| <u>Segundo</u> | <u>San Segundo de Avila</u> |
| <u>SerranaT</u> | <u>La serrana de Tormes</u> |
| <u>SerranaV</u> | <u>La serrana de la Vera</u> |
| <u>Soldado</u> | <u>El soldado amante</u> |
| <u>Tirano</u> | <u>El tirano castigado</u> |
| <u>Torneos</u> | <u>Los torneos de Aragón</u> |
| <u>Traición</u> | <u>La traición bien acertada</u> |
| <u>Ursón</u> | <u>El nacimiento de Ursón y Valentín, príncipes de Francia</u> |
| <u>Varona</u> | <u>La varona castellana</u> |
| <u>Venturoso</u> | <u>El hijo Venturoso</u> |
| <u>Verdadero</u> | <u>El verdadero amante</u> |
| <u>Viuda</u> | <u>Viuda, casada y doncella</u> |

Other abbreviations

| | |
|---------------|---|
| <u>Acad</u> | <u>Obras de Lope de Vega publicadas por la Real Academia Española, 15 vols, 1890-1913</u> |
| <u>Acad N</u> | <u>Obras de Lope de Vega publicadas por la Real Academia Española (nueva edición), 13 vols, 1916-30</u> |
| <u>BAE</u> | <u>Biblioteca de autores españoles</u> |
| <u>BBMP</u> | <u>Boletín de la Biblioteca Menéndez Pelayo</u> |
| <u>BH</u> | <u>Bulletin hispanique</u> |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| <u>BHS</u> | <u>Bulletin of Hispanic Studies</u> |
| BM | British Museum |
| BMM | Biblioteca Municipal (Madrid) |
| BN | Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid) |
| BPN | Biblioteca del Palacio Nacional (Madrid) |
| Bruerton | C. Bruerton, ' <u>Las ferias de Madrid de Lope de Vega</u> ' |
| EJM | Lope de Vega, <u>Obras dramáticas escogidas</u> , edited by E. Juliá Martínez, 6 vols, Madrid, 1934-6. |
| <u>Fichter</u> | <u>Homenaje a William L. Fichter</u> , Madrid, 1971 |
| Gálvez | <u>Comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio</u> , copied from the autograph Mss by Ignacio de Gálvez, 4 vols, 1762 |
| <u>His</u> | <u>Hispania</u> (Baltimore) |
| <u>HR</u> | <u>Hispanic Review</u> |
| <u>LNL</u> | <u>Les Langues néo-latines</u> |
| MB | S.G. Morley and C. Bruerton, <u>Cronología de las comedias de Lope de Vega</u> |
| <u>MLR</u> | <u>Modern Language Review</u> |
| Montesinos | J.F. Montesinos, <u>Estudios sobre Lope de Vega</u> |
| <u>NRFH</u> | <u>Nueva revista de filología hispánica</u> |
| <u>Obras escogidas</u> | Lope de Vega, <u>Obras escogidas</u> , edited by F.C. Sainz de Robles, 3 vols, Madrid, 1958 |
| P | In the list of plays in the first edition of <u>El peregrino en su patria</u> (1604) |
| P(2) | In the new list of plays in the sixth edition of <u>El peregrino en su patria</u> (1618) |
| <u>Pseudonyms</u> | S.G. Morley, <u>The pseudonyms and literary disguises of Lope de Vega</u> |
| <u>RDTP</u> | <u>Revista de dialectología y tradiciones populares</u> |
| <u>RFE</u> | <u>Revista de filología española</u> |
| <u>RLit</u> | <u>Revista de literatura</u> |
| <u>RPh</u> | <u>Romance Philology</u> |

Wilder T. Wilder, 'New aids towards dating the early plays of
Lope de Vega'

Wilder, 'Pinedo' T. Wilder, 'Lope, Pinedo, some child-actors and a lion'

Wilder T. Wilder, 'New aids towards dating the early plays of
Lope de Vega'

Wilder, 'Pinedo' T. Wilder, 'Lope, Pinedo, some child-actors and a lion'

PREFACE

This was originally planned as a study of the plays written by Lope de Vega before 1601. I had hoped to produce a short-list of fifty plays on which to base the thesis, but this left unread a number which may have been written before the end of the century. Consequently my short-list grew; when it numbered seventy plays I called a halt. It still omits plays which may have been written before 1601 and, conversely, includes one or two which may have been written later, and it was for this reason that the subject was re-defined. The plays were selected largely on the basis of the Morley and Bruerton Cronología, and a handful of plays classified in that work as doubtful have also been considered.

Lope's early plays are generally unknown and unregarded. There have been some articles on aspects of individual plays, especially within the last few years. However the only full length work on the subject which I know is Hämel's Jugenddramen, which compares an early and a late play on the same subject, that is El hijo Venturoso and La esclava de su hijo. It is unfortunate that the latter play is probably not by Lope, but even if it had been his it is unlikely that general observations could usefully have been derived from so limited a comparison.

My intention has been not to write literary history nor to discuss the origins and evolution of Lope's drama, but to identify the typical and essential features of Lope's dramatic craftsmanship at this stage, the formative period of the author. The plays are discussed in terms of the kind of experience they are likely to have been for the audience, and how the relationship between dramatist and audience created a dramatic style.

The view is taken that Lope's plays are, as a whole, uniform in structure, characterisation and treatment of subject: they all tend to a happy ending, the characters are types, and the subject is a pretext rather than a motive for action. Within this general uniformity each play is individual, but this individuality consists essentially of a rearrangement of elements which recur from play to play. The starting point of the thesis is a detailed analysis of one play which seems representative of virtually all seventy, that is of El mármol de Felisardo. Other plays are considered in some detail as occasion requires, but although every one of the plays has been borne in mind and is referred to when necessary, the thesis does not aim at being an introduction to them all, in the manner of a handbook. However I was aware that the reader would be making his only acquaintance with most of these plays through my account of them; for that reason I have quoted from them freely, and to an extent which was sometimes strictly speaking unnecessary, anxious to let the plays speak for themselves as much as possible.

The thesis was begun in Cambridge, where I was in residence from October 1966 until December 1968; during this time I made use of the University Library and the Modern Languages Faculty Library. The next six months were spent in Madrid, at the Biblioteca Nacional. Since October 1969 I have lived in London and Richmond. During this time I have used the British Museum Library, and I have also been allowed to work in the University of London Library. I have an especial debt to my employer for the last three years, Mr. R.F. Cutler, for having done his best to make my pursuit of two professions less wearisome; in particular for allowing me to work part-time for a year, at some inconvenience to himself, so that I could finish in time.

The opinions expressed in this thesis are all my own, and so too is the framework in which I have expressed them. However I have not worked in isolation. My subject was suggested by Professor E.M. Wilson, who was

my supervisor during my first two years at Cambridge. Although my ideas and approach have changed a great deal since then, much of the work I did while I was under his direction suggested lines of development I have since followed, especially in Chapter IV. During the writing of the thesis my supervisor was Dr Colin Smith. I owe him a great deal, maybe more than he realises himself. Not only because of his help and advice, his encouragement and hospitality but, above all, because he did not lose faith in me. For less tangible help I am also grateful to Dr Lewis Clein, Dr Gareth Davies, Mr Peter Evans, Mrs Helen Grant and Mrs Jane Whetnall. Finally I must acknowledge a debt of long standing to Professor Ken Garrad, who first interested me in Lope; he also gave me the germ of an idea which, many years later, has developed - probably beyond his recognition - into my fifth chapter.

The length of this thesis does not exceed
80,000 words

Carole Adams

C'est seulement ces sortes de vérités, celles qui ne sont pas démontrables et même qui sont 'fausses', celles que l'on ne peut conduire sans absurdité jusqu'à leur extrémité sans aller à la négation d'elles et de soi, c'est celles-là qui doivent être exaltées par l'oeuvre d'art. Elles n'auront jamais la chance ni la malchance d'être un jour appliquées. Qu'elles vivent par le chant qu'elles sont devenues et qu'elles suscitent.

Genet, 'Ce qui est resté d'un Rembrandt déchiré en petits carrés'

I

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION

Most of our information about the date and authenticity of Lope's plays is contained in the Chronology published by Morley and Bruerton in 1940. Lope generally put the date and place of composition at the beginning and end of each of his plays and about thirty autograph or partly autograph manuscripts have survived which give us this information; other dates have been established with near certainty by such details as references within the plays to identifiable people or events, or the publication date of source material. Within this framework of known facts Morley and Bruerton developed the correlation between date and versification which had already been established by earlier investigators, in particular by Milton Buchanan, and were able to suggest for each play termini a quo and ad quem between which it was almost certain to have been written. Most subsequent information on the subject is incorporated into the Spanish translation published in 1968; this edition was brought up to date by Morley but the forbidding task of a fundamental revision was not attempted, although the considerable amount of new information which has now been discovered would make it possible to chart the plays' chronology with an even greater probability of accuracy.

The most exciting post-1940 contribution to our knowledge of the chronology was contained in five volumes of manuscripts which came to light as a result of the upheavals of the Civil War. Four of these volumes comprise copies made in 1762, by Ignacio de Gálvez or under his supervision, of autograph manuscripts by Lope, eight plays in each volume. The whole

collection was given to Amezúa, who published a description of it in 1945.¹ Two of the plays concerned were completely unknown except for their titles (which had been included in the Peregrino lists): These were Amor and Príncipe. Of the thirty remaining plays the autographs of ten were already available, which meant that Gálvez's copies of the remaining twenty presumably constitute the most correct editions.² Of these twenty the dates of fifteen were previously unknown and were hence supplied by Gálvez's copies for the first time; all of them but one, Marqués, agreed with the dates suggested by MB and with Marqués the error was slight (it is 1596 and MB's dates were 1598-1603, probably 1600-1602). The Gálvez volumes are at present in the Biblioteca Nacional with the exception of Volumes I and V: these are held by Amezúa's descendants.³

Another significant contribution to chronology was made by Thornton Wilder, after very close examination of the list of his plays which Lope published at the front of the first edition of El peregrino en su patria (1604).⁴ It has usually been held that Lope listed the plays in no particular order. For this reason Morley felt justified, when he edited this list and the one included in the sixth edition (1618), in arranging

¹ Agustín G. de Amezúa, Una colección manuscrita y desconocida de comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio. References are given in full in the bibliography.

² Except in the cases of Benavides and Carlos V en Francia, of which the autographs have now been discovered.

³ See J. García Morales' introduction to his edition of Amor, p. xxxviii. Vol. V contains miscellaneous eighteenth-century plays and entremeses which seem not to have been investigated by anyone.

⁴ In 'New aids towards dating the early plays of Lope de Vega'. See also his article 'Lope, Pinedo, some child-actors and a lion'. The revised edition of MB includes these two articles in the bibliography but scarcely takes them into account in the text.

them in alphabetical order.¹ Wilder established that some at least of the plays are grouped according to the autor de comedias to whom they were sold. He has supplemented this with his knowledge of the periods during which Lope was writing for the autores in question, the structure of their companies, and the way in which Lope wrote for the requirements of specific actors. Wilder's investigations are of particular relevance to a study of Lope's early theatre, since all the plays listed were of course written before 1604. The two companies which he has studied most closely are those of Gaspar de Porras and Baltasar de Pinedo, and Lope wrote for these from 1596 to 1603, and from 1599-1606 respectively.²

The editions which we possess of Lope's early plays are in general very poor. The principal reason for this is that we lack autograph manuscripts or reliable transcripts of them, or that these were not available when the standard editions were made. The autograph manuscript is known of only one, Benavides, and a critical edition of this has just been published.³ The autograph manuscript of the first act of Favor is in the Biblioteca Nacional and was followed for the Academy edition. There are two important collections of manuscript copies of holographs. The larger of the two has already been mentioned; it is that made by Gálvez, probably from manuscripts which had been collected by the Duque de Sessa, Lope's employer and patron in later

¹ 'In the Peregrino the order is quite haphazard': Lope de Vega's Peregrino lists, edited by S. Griswold Morley, p.347. The lists are printed in the correct order in M.A. Peyton's edition of the Peregrino, Chapel Hill (University of North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures), 1971.

² Lope also wrote for Porras very early in his career; Ferías and Rodamonte both date from this period. When he was tried for libels against Elena Osorio and her family in 1588, he claimed the action had been brought against him out of spite, caused partly by his no longer giving plays to Jerónimo Vázquez (Elena's father) but to Porras. Wilder has not yet studied any plays written before 1596.

³ Edited by Arnold G. Reichenberger and A. Espantoso-Foley.

years. Of the thirty-two plays copied twenty-two were written before 1601, and Amezúa included in his study most of the variants of twelve of these.¹ The two previously unknown plays have been edited by J. García Morales, PríncipeI in 1962 and Amor in 1968. No edition has yet been made of any of the other plays on the basis of the variants offered by the collection, although García Morales is at present preparing an edition of Bella based on Gálvez's copy of it, which offered so many variants from the Academy edition that Amezúa did not print them. (He omitted the variants of Francesilla for the same reason). In 1781 more copies were made by Miguel Sanz de Pliegos; the autographs copied had quite definitely been collected by the Duque de Sessa, and the fact that six of these were also copied by Gálvez is a point in favour of Amezúa's suggestion that the Gálvez manuscripts had also been collected by Sessa.² Four of the Sanz de Pliegos plays are early: Contienda, Chaves, Laura and Leal. These have all been published in Academy editions, and it is to be presumed that Sanz de Pliegos' copies were used. There are also manuscript copies of the autographs of Maestro and Segundo, used for the Academy editions.

There is of course the question of how accurate the manuscript copies are. For his edition of Carlos V en Francia Reichenberger was able to compare the autograph with copies made by both Sanz de Pliegos and Gálvez.

¹ These twelve are: Amigo, Benavides, Caballero, Carlos, Chaves, Favor, Laura, Otón, Tirano, Torneos, Varona, Viuda. The other ten early plays copied by Gálvez are: Amor, Bella, Celauro, Diego García, Francesilla, Ingrato, Leal, Marqués, PríncipeI, Remedio.

² See Amezúa, Colección, pp.14-15. Sanz de Pliegos was an archivist in the service of the Conde de Altamira, a descendant of the Duque de Sessa. Nothing is known about Gálvez. Amezúa refers to Sessa's original ownership of the Gálvez plays as an established fact rather than a hypothesis, but it is surely possible that they were copied from more than one source. These six plays copied by Sanz de Pliegos are the last four in Gálvez's first volume, and the last two in his second.

He describes Sanz de Pliegos as 'quite accurate within the principles he adopted' and his slips as 'relatively few in number'.¹ In an Appendix he lists the discrepancies between Gálvez's manuscript and the autograph; he appears not to have seen the former since he says of the discrepancies 'we do not know whether they are to be ascribed to Gálvez or to Amezúa' (p.20). The discrepancies in question are twenty-nine alternative readings, the omission of four passages, and one difference between the autograph and Acad not noted by Amezúa and presumably not registered by Gálvez. Others of Gálvez's inaccuracies that have been noticed in the preparation of this study could be mentioned. He attempted to reproduce Lope's signature as closely as possible, and has therefore copied his habit of preceding it with the letter M, a reference to Micaela de Luján. It is generally accepted that Lope's affair with Micaela began in 1599, but we find the M incorporated into the signature in three plays written before that date. Amezúa has noticed this with regard to Caballero (1593) and concludes 'esta vez me parece puesta caprichosamente por éste [Gálvez] a imitación de otras auténticas'.² The other plays are Bella (1596) and Amor (1597).³ Another inaccuracy concerns Caballero and Favor. On the title page of the former Lope wrote 'En Alva, a 30 de noviembre de 1593', and at the end 'En Alva, a 30 de diciembre de 1593'. He also added a note to this effect: 'Esta comedia del Cavallero del Milagro escriví para Luis de Bergara y porque es verdad lo firmé de mi nombre a 30 a diciembre de 1593'. At the end of Favor

¹ Lope de Vega, Carlos V en Francia, edited from the Autograph Manuscript with Introduction and Notes by Arnold G. Reichenberger, Philadelphia, 1962, p.20. The Appendix is on pp.245-6.

² Colección, p.33.

³ García Morales' edition of Amor reproduces the manuscript photographically and the signature can be seen there.

Lope wrote 'En Alba, a 19 de diciembre de 1593'.¹ There is also this note: 'Esta comedia escribí para Luis de Vergara y porque es verdad lo firmé de mi nombre, a 30 de diciembre de 1608'. These two notes are incompatible; it seems likely that 1608 is a misreading for 1593. These are relatively small matters. More unfortunate is a misreading on f.3 r^o of Act I of Amor in which the line 'Paso que viene Fabricio' is attributed to 'Un paje'. In fact it is spoken by Rosimunda and the note 'Un paje' means that the page (who is the Fabricio referred to) has entered, not that he has spoken. This might be unimportant if it were not for the fact that García Morales has not noticed the error, assumes that Fabricio is the name of the Duke of Cleves (whose approach is announced by the page), and refers to him as Fabricio throughout the introduction. The Reparto for Act I says quite clearly 'Fabricio Paje'.

The only other manuscripts which are worth mentioning are those found by Cotarelo in the Biblioteca del Palacio Nacional and published by him in the first volume of the second Academy edition; only one of the plays had been published before. The copies were made in the seventeenth century but Cotarelo does not say how many copyists were involved. Nine of the sixteen plays copied are early;² the others are all described in MB as being of

¹ He must also have written the date on the title page, a detail omitted either by Gálvez or by Amezúa, since the date of the play was already known on the evidence of the autograph manuscript of Act I only. The dates and notes are quoted from Amezúa's transcriptions, Colección, p.33, pp.43-4.

² Albanio, Burlas, GalánE, Ganso, Grao, Infanta, Justas, Mesón, Venturoso. According to MB all but GalánE (1595-1598) were written in 1595 or earlier. Ganso, Infanta and Venturoso are 'Belardo-Belisa' plays, that is they refer to Lope's first wife (Belisa is an anagram of her name, Isabel), who probably died in the autumn of 1594, and not in May 1595 as was assumed when MB was first published. See C. Salazar, 'Nuevos documentos sobre Lope de Vega'; also M. Goyri de Menéndez Pidal, 'Con motivo del reajuste de unas fechas', reprinted in De Lope de Vega y del romancero, pp.89-101.

doubtful authenticity or else entirely spurious.

Our other main source for texts of the plays are the twenty-five volumes known as the Partes, the first twenty of which were published during Lope's lifetime. Lope himself was responsible for Volumes IX to XX. It was claimed that the Partes were printed from Lope's autographs; in fact actors' copies were sometimes used. Lope himself said in the prefaces of several of these volumes that the manuscripts he was working from were in a deplorable condition. This is because they went out of his possession entirely as soon he wrote them; they were sold to an autor, to whom they were valuable but not sacred, and thus they accumulated alterations, additions and deletions. As Lope prepared a play for the press he naturally attempted to restore the original text as far as this was possible (he claimed that sometimes it could not be done). At the same time he made his own improvements, as they occurred to him. This means that the Partes may in some cases offer a more correct edition than the autograph, and in other cases quite the reverse; these variations naturally may occur not only from play to play but also, within a play, almost from one line to the next. With regard to the authenticity of the other Partes, it is now generally thought that some at least of the first eight were published with Lope's consent and possibly even with his collaboration, and that they are not so much less reliable than the volumes published by Lope himself as has sometimes been assumed.¹ Volumes XXI and XXII were published by Lope's daughter Feliciana and her husband in 1635 and are almost certainly authentic. Of the seventy plays taken into account here, forty-four of them appeared in Partes which are usually described as reliable, eighteen of them in volumes published by Lope

¹ See H.A. Rennert, 'Sobre Lope de Vega'.

himself.¹ Finally, a few plays were published in other seventeenth century collections. These include Rodamonte and Enemigo, and the possibly spurious Benito, Engaño and Difunta.

The unreliability of the early editions of Lope's plays, whether or not they are in 'authentic' volumes, is only to be expected, especially since the magic of Lope's name attracted hasty publishing and optimistic attribution. Less defensible are the faulty editions offered by the modern printed texts, in which Lope's plays are most frequently read. These are the four volumes edited by Hartzenbusch in the BAE (1853-1860), the fifteen volumes in the first Academy series edited by Menéndez Pelayo (1890-1913), and the thirteen volumes in the second Academy series edited by Cotarelo and, in the later volumes, his collaborators (1916-1930). The BAE and second Academy series are still in print, and most of the first Academy series has by now been reprinted, also in the BAE. Reviewing the state of Lope scholarship in 1937, Fichter said of these editions:

Even though it appears that most of Lope's extant writings, except the correspondence, have been made available, it must be admitted that the editing has for the most part been poorly done. The three modern collections of Lope's comedias, those of Hartzenbusch, Menéndez y Pelayo and Cotarelo, do not offer trustworthy copies of the older printed or manuscript texts. In many cases they fail to consider variant texts, some of which, moreover, were not even known to the editors. (2)

¹ In Vol. I: Bamba, Carlos, Casamiento, Cerco, Matico, Molino, Reduán, Traición, Ursón; II: Bella, Benavides, Comendadores, Ferías, Padrino; IV: Amigo, Castrucho, Celauro, Laura, Tirano, Torneos; VI: Felisardo; VII: Reinaldos, SerranaV, Viuda; VIII: Argel, Otón; IX: Alfreda, Varona; X: Chaves; XII: Marqués; XIII: Francesilla, Locos, Remedio; XIV: Ingratitud, Verdadero; XV: Caballero, Favor, Ingrato, Leal; XVI: SerranaT; XVII: Jorge, Lucas, Soldado; XVIII: Jacinto, Cautivos and Fabia were published in Vol. XXV: Zaragoza, 1647.

² W.F. Fichter, 'Present state of Lope de Vega studies', p.333. In a note he adds that 'the inexactness of Cotarelo's texts ... is well known' (p.334). Sainz de Robles' Obras selectas in general follows the Academy editions. Lope's correspondence has of course now been published, by Amezáa, but even this is not complete; excisions were made for the sake of propriety.

In a way the position now is even worse, since although material for making more correct editions is in some cases now available (for example, in the Gálvez copies) it is more than likely that much of this will never be utilised; there are understandably few scholars who feel called to devote their time to establishing the correct text of a second or third rate play, and so the Academy edition will stand. Few of the editions that are being produced at present, especially within Spain, could really be described as critical; many attempt to make Lope available at modest prices, and inevitably sacrifice exactness to expediency. In fact this applies relatively little to the early plays, since so few of them have been edited singly. Benavides, Amor and Príncipe are available in critical editions; Locos, Celauro, Ferías, Molino and Remedio are available in editions which range from plain texts with no critical apparatus at all to editions whose approach is neither critical nor literary, but explanatory.¹ Earlier this century there have been editions of Remedio, Celauro, Molino and Locos. Remedio has also been edited in England.

¹ As an example:- Aguirre's edition of Locos (1960), which reproduces Hartzenbusch's text, devotes thirty-eight pages to 'Lope de Vega y su tiempo', 'Culteranismo, conceptismo y popularismo', 'Lope en Valencia', 'El hospital de Inocentes', 'Lope y el Hospital de Inocentes de Valencia' and seven pages not even to a study of the play itself but to a somewhat depreciatory summary of the plot: 'todo queda en un puro divertimento' (p.53).

II

EL MARMOL DE FELISARDO

It is understandable that when we undertake the description and comprehension of a large number of plays, our first reaction should be to subdivide, and to look for a basis on which to build a valid structure of classifications. Menéndez Pelayo intended to arrange the first Academy edition of Lope's plays according to fifteen categories which were to include: comedias fundadas en asuntos del Antiguo Testamento, comedias de la historia patria, comedias pastoriles, románticas, de malas costumbres, palatinas, etc.¹ A number of similar categorisations, more considered than these or less, could be mentioned; some of the more current are 'the honour play' or 'the peasant theme'. All these schemes accept without question, and often without comment, the need to label the trees in the interests of a more informed and balanced view of the wood. And it is true that a body of four or five hundred plays, and even of the seventy plays which are our present concern, is so emphatically large that it seems to demand some kind of sign-posting.

A system of classification has, however, failed in its object if it obscures the true relationship between the plays for the sake of an apparent clarification, and this is in fact what happens when they are arranged according to what individual commentators take to be their genre or their theme. The reason for this is that the plays possess simultaneously and in extreme measure the two qualities of uniformity and diversity. The nature

¹ See M. Menéndez Pelayo, Estudios sobre el teatro de Lope de Vega, I, 3-10, for his own criteria and an account of other classifications of Lope's theatre. Menéndez Pelayo's death in 1912 prevented his carrying this project out in full.

of the uniformity leaps to the eye: in virtually every play we find the same kind of person, often bearing the same names, from the same class of society, in the same kind of situation. The diversity is less apparent and arises from the arrangement of all these features: no two plays are identical, even two which have exactly the same subject, because from all the range of characteristics and actions which are possible for a certain type of person, or from all the ways of realising a certain type of situation in dramatic terms, Lope makes a selection to fit the individual case. The effect may be compared to that of the successive images of a kaleidoscope each time it is moved. As the kaleidoscope is composed of shapes and colours endlessly rearranged, so a comedia consists of scenes and characters continually presented in a fresh relationship to each other, sometimes with startling success and, failing this, usually with a pleasing effect. The most meaningful way in which to examine the plays is to take one and break it down into its component parts, since it is in terms of its parts rather than as a whole that one play resembles another. The play which has been chosen for this purpose is Felisardo. Although it is not an outstanding work, it has the recommendation of being not only representative but also entertaining.

The action of Felisardo begins in medias res, with a struggle between Elisa and Jacinto over a letter she has just received from Felisardo. Elisa is the daughter of Doristeo, the village alcalde, and Jacinto is her social equal; they are thus village gentry with no great claims to breeding or education:

Jacinto: Y aunque hidalgo en esta aldea,
con padre rico y honrado,
no estoy tan bien doctrinado
que algo rústico no sea. (1)

¹ 226 b. The editions of the plays from which quotations have been taken are indicated in the bibliography. Acad reads 'Yo aunque ...' but the Parte reading has been preferred.

Felisardo differs from them on both counts. He is a student, and declares his love for Elisa in terms of the various subjects of his study:

Mas pues la Filosofía
de la admiración nació,
la que el veros me causó
llamaré la ciencia mía;
que si Astrología fuera,
mejor hubiera acertado,
pues sois el cielo cifrado
donde sus estrellas viera.
Viera el sol, viera su lumbre.
sus polos, norte y luceros,
y de todo el cielo, en veros,
la celestial pesadumbre.
Si estudiara Teología,
por vos a Dios conociera;
que en vuestra hermosura viera
rayos del sol que la cría.
Pues Música, que, en efeto,
es un arte liberal,
la armonía celestial
se cifra en vuestro sujeto. (229 b)

He is also thought to be the illegitimate son of the King, or more popularly the Admiral, a rumour which is supported by the nobility of his person:

Finea: Es de tan buena presencia,
en duda de esta verdad,
que muestra la majestad
que pasa de la excelencia. (227 b)

A marriage has been arranged between Elisa and Jacinto by their respective fathers, but the recent arrival in the village of Felisardo and the attentions he has paid to Elisa have made Jacinto jealous. At first Elisa refuses to commit herself, answering Jacinto's charges with generalisations:

Jacinto: ¿Verte pudo?
Elisa: ¿Qué te debo
de que me haya visto un hombre?
Jacinto: No más de ser este nombre
en esos labios tan nuevo.
Elisa: Antes si los hombres son
de nuestra materia y forma,
si su ser el mío informa
y es quien nos da perfección,
nombre de tanto provecho
a ser escrito provoca
en los ojos y en la boca,
en el alma y en el pecho. (226 a-b)

Later, in conversation with Felisardo himself, she is again cautious, though scarcely off-putting:

Felisardo: ¿Qué responderéis si os diere
palabra y fe de marido?

Elisa: Parece que me mentís
con la boca cuando habláis,
pero en los ojos mostráis
que alguna verdad decís;
y no me quiero agraviar
que no merezco ese amor;
mas que os justo mi temor,
¿cómo lo podéis negar?
Si amanecéis algún día
hijo de un Rey o Almirante,
¿no véis, señor estudiante,
que vendré a quedar muy fría? (230 a)

But finally, at night and with her father and ^{Jacinto} Doristéo as concealed witnesses, she answers his impassioned sonnet with one of her own and the two promise to marry each other. Jacinto has brought Doristéo to see this so that the latter, believing his honour to be in danger, will chase Felisardo away. This is what Doristéo, who has seen but not heard the conversation and who has mistaken its general tenor, is determined to do, but he is mollified when Felisardo talks of marriage and, although he too is afraid that Felisardo might suddenly be promoted to the aristocracy and consequently abandon Elisa, gives his permission for them to marry. Felisardo is not content with this and decides to take possession of her there and then; in the face of Doristéo's renewed protests he goes off with the unprotesting Elisa. Prompted to action by Jacinto, Doristéo decides to appeal to the King. The act thus shows a relationship being formed between Felisardo and Elisa, with their mutual consent, but threatened by several factors: her initial caution, rumours of his noble birth which he alone appears to disregard, Jacinto's jealousy and the opposition from Doristéo which, since he is easily persuaded to let them marry, is more conventional than real and has to be provoked artificially by Felisardo's unnecessary insistence on taking Elisa away with him.

Still in the setting of Elisa's village, there are other scenes which do not directly concern any of the four principal figures. Some involve Tristán and Finea, who are the servants of Felisardo and Elisa respectively. Their pursuit of the game of courtship is a parody of the main love story, although here there is no opposing factor other than an assumed coyness on Finea's part: when Elisa allows Felisardo to come to her window at night Finea permits Tristán to do the same, and the vows between Elisa and Felisardo are followed by an exchange of vows between the servants delivered likewise in sonnet form but whose imagery is culinary rather than Petrarchan. There is also a scene which conveys the quintessence of the village atmosphere. As the stage direction says: 'Salen dos o tres labradores, y algunas aldeanas con cantarillas, como que van por agua, cantando ...' Between each repetition of the song the villagers dance; the song itself is very brief:

No corráis, ventecillos,
 con tanta prisa,
 porque al son de las aguas
 duerme mi niña. (227-8)

Felisardo and Elisa are present during this scene, standing each with his servant at different sides of the stage, observing each other but not daring to approach. For the time being the most important figures are Ergasto and Flérida, making their only appearance in the play: at the beginning of the scene Ergasto is jealous and by the end he has been mollified. This gives us in miniature the pattern of disharmony and harmony which is basic to the play's structure. Inserted into the village setting are two scenes which are distinguished from it not only because completely different characters appear in them, but also by being written largely in octavas reales (whereas most of the rest of the act is in redondillas). In the first of these scenes the King of Gelandia and the Admiral discuss the question of who should lead an army against Scotland. The question is settled by Primislao who, it is emphasised, is the King's only son, and who insists on being given the

appointment; despite reservations on the grounds of his youth, inexperience and impetuosity, they are forced to let him go. The scene concludes with a disagreement about the future of the King's illegitimate son who is, not unexpectedly, Felisardo; the King wants him to take holy orders immediately, since he has already arranged for him to be a cardinal, while the Admiral thinks they should wait until Primislao has provided the kingdom with an heir before they make it impossible for Felisardo to inherit and produce an heir of his own. This happens immediately before the night scene. The wisdom of the Admiral's words is proved by the last scene in the act in which the circumstances of Primislao's heroic death in battle are related. As his body is brought onto stage and paraded round it, the Admiral tells the sorrowing King that he will now have to summon Felisardo from the village. These court scenes not only confirm the rumours about Felisardo's birth but suggest also that although differences of opinion between Felisardo and Elisa's connections have until now received most attention his principal difficulties are to come from the court: from the position he is soon to assume there, and from the new relationship which, in the eyes of the world, will exist between him and Elisa.

At the beginning of the second act friendly relations have been restored between Felisardo and Doristeo, and a petition to the King will therefore be unnecessary. Tristán is sent to fetch a priest who will perform the marriage ceremony and returns with the news that the Admiral is in the village and is asking for Felisardo. The general if not the precise nature of the approaching encounter is clear to everyone, and Elisa and Doristeo are full of anticipatory dismay. The actual announcement is passed over very quickly, and Felisardo is more concerned about reassuring Doristeo and telling him to follow him to court and bring Elisa with him than by any speculation about his new position in the world, which he assumes naturally

and with no sense of strangeness. The first meeting between Felisardo and his father is also very brief, and is essentially a public occasion celebrated by oaths of allegiance from the assembled nobles. Doristeco and Elisa follow him to court but Elisa is disguised as a boy, claiming to be her own brother Celio and refusing to admit to her identity. Felisardo and Tristán are puzzled and confused but scarcely deceived. Despite her pretence she is unable to prevent herself fainting when the Admiral tells Felisardo, in her presence, that it has been arranged that he is to marry his own daughter Drusila. A short space of time is understood to have passed before the next scene in which the King and Admiral are seen discussing Felisardo's refusal to marry Drusila; he has virtually admitted that the only excuse he has put forward, a vow of celibacy made previously in connection with his expectations of a church career, is not one that weighs heavily with him. Jacinto informs them that Elisa is responsible for this refusal and she is arrested, despite Felisardo's protests at the loss of his 'page'. Tristán tells Felisardo that his problems will be solved if he pretends to be in love with the marble statue of a nymph which adorns a fountain in the palace gardens, although for the time being he does not explain exactly how this could help. The act closes with a direct reference to the title of the play:

Felisardo: Ahora bien, el fin aguardo,
que el fin todo lo declara.

Tristán: Ven y verás en qué para
el mármol de Felisardo. (252 b)

Opposition to a marriage between Elisa and Felisardo is now coming from several directions: from Jacinto, on a simple representational level, by means of an argument he has with Elisa and, on a more functional level, by his betrayal of her presence at court; from the combined forces of the King and the Admiral to whom the prospect of a marriage between the heir to the throne and a village girl is unthinkable; surprisingly enough also from Elisa, whom Lope dresses as a man primarily to give the play more conflict

than he feels the other incidents in the play provide (but who may also be unwilling to commit herself until she has seen how Felisardo reacts to his changed circumstances); and lastly from Felisardo himself, who is inactive or at best only passively resistant in the face of the proposed match with Drusila. It is by now clear that the key to the solution of the drama is in Tristán's hands. Perhaps because of his growing importance, and possibly too because Lope feels that a parallel development is, if continued, eventually monotonous, Finea disappears from the play after a scene at the beginning of the act. In this scene she and Tristán speculate on the effect which Felisardo's accession will have on them; Tristán imagines himself a count and sees no reason why Finea should not be his countess, an anticipation of the end of the play only in so far as it is a reference to the eventual marriage between Elisa and Felisardo. The subsequent absence of Finea does not mean that Tristán loses his function as a parodist; his reactions to court life form a clear contrast to Felisardo's ease in his new surroundings:

Tristán: ¿Estoy derecho?
 Criado: Sí, señor.
 Tristán: ¿Voy bien trazado?
 Criado: ¿Quién como Vueseñoría?....
 Tristán: ¿Preguntan damas por mí?
 ¿Qué dicen, por vida mía?
 Criado: Que eres, señor, un Narciso.
 Tristán: ¡Bueno!
 Criado: Y que les lledes allá.
 Tristán: ¿Quién más lastimada está? (247 b)

Other scenes interspersed among the main events of the act are the brief scene, in tercets as opposed to the surrounding redondillas, in which the King tells his Secretary that he wishes Felisardo to marry Drusila and the Secretary describes her merits, Tristán's first appearance at court in which his behaviour threatens to put Felisardo to shame, the scene in which Jacinto gives Tristán news of their village, and a verbal battle between Elisa and Jacinto. It is noticeable that although this act is about Felisardo's arrival at court and the repercussions which this might be expected to

provoke, he and the King scarcely meet, and their two worlds are juxtaposed rather than brought into conflict. When the King threatens Felisardo with the consequences of his refusal to marry Brusila, he leaves the stage before Felisardo has had time to reply, so that we never see them discuss this important matter. Felisardo, for his part, registers very little reaction to court life. What he is aware of is not a change in environment but a change in circumstances, a physical rather than a spiritual upheaval, as though the various pieces in a game had been rearranged so as to vary his problems while leaving him essentially unaltered in himself.

Act III is devoted to the trick with the marble statue; the diversions from this are relatively few. The King is distracted by Felisardo's melancholy and eccentric behaviour and Tristán tells him that, since the King had forbidden Felisardo the society of the woman he loved, Felisardo has taken refuge in the garden and in the course of time has fallen in love with a marble statue there which he now insists on marrying. Tristán claims that the various entertainments arranged for him by the King and Admiral could not possibly have a beneficial effect, and that what is needed is that he should be allowed to see Elisa again. However, the meeting which the King accordingly permits between the lovers has no such result at first. Felisardo pretends that he does not recognise Elisa, in order to pay her back for her former behaviour to him, and she breaks through her page-boy disguise and passionately accuses him of infidelity; this speech is the raison d'être of the scene and, for the actress, probably Elisa's most important speech of the play. Tristán brings them to a reconciliation and together they plan the final stage of the plot. Doristeo's connivance is needed for this, and he tells the King that he means to take Elisa back to the country where she will marry Jacinto; in fact she stays hidden at court. Tristán meanwhile persuades the King that the only way to cure Felisardo is

by following his humour and allowing him to go through a marriage ceremony with the statue, which will be arrayed with finery for the occasion. The statue is of course Elisa, veiled; Felisardo takes her hand in his, the King and assembled court sanction the match, and to everyone's confusion Elisa comes to life. Drusila is married to Celio, who suddenly materialises. Honour is satisfied all round and, for lack of evidence to the contrary, it is to be assumed that everyone lives happily ever after. Tristán's importance is now such that his actions almost entirely cease to parody those of his master; he has forgotten his ambition to be a count, and Finea does not enter the action at all. Although this act concentrates on advancing the dramatic action more than the other two, there are nevertheless scenes which are developed so as to be entertaining on their own account and which the action easily accommodates: Felisardo's mock-madness, the attempts of musicians, actors and beautiful women to bring him back to sanity, Elisa's passionate reproach for his imagined infidelity, and Doristeco's account, in romance metre, of Elisa's birth.

III

THE PATTERN OF THE COMEDIA

Reichenberger has proposed the following description of the comedia: 'a Spanish play follows the pattern from order disturbed to order restored'.¹ This is not unlike the description made by Torres Naharro of an earlier form of the genre in his Prohemio (1517): 'un artificio ingenioso de notables y finalmente alegres acontecimientos'.² The difference in viewpoint between critic and practitioner is obvious, but both have detected the way in which the comedia moves inexorably forward and upwards, meeting and surmounting what the former sees as obstacles and the latter more placidly thinks of as remarkable events. In Lope's plays this forward movement is exemplified in terms of two distinct but interrelated kinds of plot: the love story, and the story of how an individual improves his fortunes in some way. Either one of these or the other is present in all Lope's early plays; in a large number they co-exist and are complementary to each other, although when this happens one or other of the two is clearly dominant. This is the case with Felisardo in which the love story, with its succession of disagreements, reconciliations, and difficulties overcome, forms the substance of the play, while at the same time Felisardo, at the beginning of the play a student of uncertain parentage, advances towards an established identity and position as the acknowledged heir to the throne. At the end of the play he is

¹ See A.G. Reichenberger, 'The uniqueness of the comedia', p.307.

² This sentence, and the rest of the description, are studied very thoroughly by J.E. Gillet in Vol. IV of his edition of the Propalladia, 'Torres Naharro and the drama of the Renaissance', Philadelphia, 1961, pp.427-69.

actually in a stronger position than the King his father since not only does he conspire successfully to outwit him, but he also follows up this act of self-assertion by summoning an army of ten thousand to support him.

The love story

The love story, dominant in many early plays besides Felisardo, is so pervasive as to be absent from none except Bamba, in which the central figure is happily married and where none of the subsidiary intrigues introduces a love situation in even the most rudimentary form. The reason for this is not to be found (where it is nevertheless frequently discovered) in any extra-literary interest which the topic might be presumed to have had for Lope himself. He was too complete a professional to allow his private concerns any considerable sway over a work intended for public entertainment. Except in those few plays which refer clearly to his love affair with Elena Osorio and which may be very early (such as Belardo and Verdadero), personal allusions are found only at the surface of his plays. Instead Lope takes love as a theme not only because he could hardly do otherwise, since it is a traditional topic of imaginative literature, but also because it has the particular advantage that its end is generally marriage, and marriage is a satisfactory and universally accepted image of harmony (or, in Reichenberger's definition, 'order'). But before order can be restored in the final scene it must first be disturbed. Hence love is necessarily a matter for dissent: when two people love each other spontaneously in any of Lope's plays it is invariably against the advice, wishes or commands of other interested parties. Accordingly Lope's treatment of love is characterised by episodes to which Torres Naharro's word 'notables' could be applied. There are plots and counter-plots which delay and threaten to frustrate the lovers' union;

there are also scenes of rage, of complaint, of dismay, or jealousy which, though they may have a less tangible influence on events, constitute an equally powerful threat to the lovers' peace of mind. Merely by setting themselves against their community in this way the lovers invite retaliation, which comes most frequently and inevitably from the rival and the father.

True to the concept that a love story is to be presented in terms of the obstacles in the way of its fruition, the first person to speak in Felisardo is the rival, Jacinto. He is seen quarrelling with Elisa about a letter she has received from Felisardo, and in this way is succinctly brought before the audience as a source of opposition. It is in fact quite frequent for a love story to begin on a note of discord. Thus the action of Belardo begins with the simultaneous but separate entrances of two shepherds who lament their fruitless love for Jacinta, and who then hide as Jacinta and her lover Belardo come on stage together. In the first scene of Molino a conversation between the Prince and his attendant makes it clear not only that he loves Celia in vain, but that she prefers the Count to him. Serrana begins with a quarrel between the two young men in love with Diana, the heroine. In countless other plays the triangle of love is, if not the first situation to be put before the audience, certainly one of the first.

Jacinto considers Elisa to be promised to him in marriage by the mutual consent of their parents. Felisardo is therefore an outsider who must be routed by any means, and to this end he brings Doristeo, Elisa's father, to see a nocturnal meeting between her and Felisardo. He has incidentally been given no way of knowing that such a meeting will take place; his guess is as accurate as the event itself is inevitable. During this scene he acts as a restraining influence on Doristeo, twice preventing him from attacking Felisardo. But at the same time he ensures that Doristeo knows the extent to which his honour is at risk:

Doristeo: ¿Quién es el hombre?

Jacinto: ¿Estás ciego?

Felisardo el estudiante,
que a poner a tu honor fuego
nos trujo aquí el Almirante. (234 b)

He is also the first to suggest that Doristeo should appeal to the King (236 b). He is absent from the scene at the beginning of Act II during which Felisardo is told that he is heir to the throne; when dynasties are at stake, a mere rival would be out of place. But once the action of the play has moved to the royal court and the wishes of the King and the Admiral with regard to Drusila have been stated, Lope feels the time has come for further complications and Jacinto duly arrives in pursuit of Elisa, who has already established herself there as Felisardo's 'page'. Lope marks his reappearance in the action by giving him his longest speech of the play, which brings him before us almost as forcefully as did the explosive first scene; the audience is also sensibly reminded of what has happened so far (in case some minor twist in the plot should have obscured the major issue). His first encounter, with Tristán, is not hostile but as soon as Elisa enters he reassumes his antagonistic role. He is not deceived by her male disguise and in what is virtually a formal set-piece they accuse each other of the defects of their respective sexes. Elisa's refusal to listen to his protestations so incenses Jacinto that he tells the King and the Admiral that it is her presence at court which prevents Felisardo from marrying Drusila; here again Lope credits him with information he did not actually possess since he has not hitherto had any knowledge of this frustrated match (his original intention in going to the King is merely to tell him that Elisa is concealed at court). Elisa is now arrested, and this is the end of Jacinto as an active force, although he makes several subsequent appearances.

If Jacinto's role in the play were to be assessed in terms of what he

achieves, there would be no option but to describe him as ineffectual. Despite the engagement which originally existed between him and Elisa, there is never any possibility of his marrying her, so much so that the engagement only exists as a thing which has been broken; he is essentially alien to her however much he may claim to be her equal. Neither is there any likelihood that he will prevent her from marrying Felisardo. His knowledge of the understanding between the two lovers twice enables him to betray them: when he takes Doristeco to witness the nocturnal meeting between Elisa and Felisardo, and when he tells the King that Elisa is at court. On both occasions the initial tumult caused by what he says quickly dies down, and has no lasting effect on subsequent events. But it must be remembered that in the nature of things the rival can never be successful. Certainly Jacinto is not the most resourceful or dangerous of rivals; in these respects he is outdone by Celauro in Celauro or Teodoro in Tirano. But his function in the play is exactly the same as theirs: to threaten happiness but not to destroy it, and hence to introduce the concept of 'order disturbed' so that the restoration of order may be all the more forcibly demonstrated. Inevitably this limits the rival's effectiveness as an agent of harm, and explains why his coups must always fail. However, if the deeds of even the most potent of rivals are ritually neutralised for the sake of the happy ending, it is also the case that the appearance of the least potent is ritually enhanced. Any rival is an obstacle by means of his very presence in a play: his sentiments, his bearing, his lack of generosity all make him a perpetual image of disharmony. Although Jacinto is nominally in competition with Felisardo the two of them rarely meet; there is indeed only one verbal exchange between them (236 a). He is more often seen in conflict with Elisa, which is hardly likely to promote his courtship of her. This suggests that the reasons for his hostility (love for Elisa and

resentment at Felisardo's success with her) have been transcended by his function as a source of disturbance. His role is to represent danger rather than to enact it; to excite apprehension but not to justify it. This is shown in Felisardo when Jacinto comes on stage very near the end of the play. His intention is to complain to the King against Doristeco who, having said that he would withdraw Elisa from court so that she should marry Jacinto, has not in fact done so. But he appears during the transformation scene, just as the King and his court are about to sanction what they take to be Felisardo's sham marriage to the statue. The audience can scarcely fail to react as if Jacinto were about to frustrate this plan by revealing that the statue is Elisa; although this is one secret it is not in his power to betray, it would not be the first occasion on which he has somehow acquired knowledge during the transition from one scene to the next. At the same time the point is made that the rival must fail; since Jacinto is on stage while the woman he intends to marry is conclusively placed beyond his reach, the impression is given that Tristán intended him to be defeated at this juncture, whereas the scene was actually conceived with no reference to his reaction, and he is instead the victim of Lope's sense of occasion.

Whenever a father enters the action of a play it is taken for granted that he is opposed to his child's marriage plans. As a source of opposition he is potentially much more dangerous than the rival. No-one is obliged to attend to the menaces of the latter. Except in those few cases where he inflicts real harm (for example in Marqués, in which the jealous Carloto succeeds in killing Valdovinos) his danger value is in general ascribed to him by Lope's timing and sense of occasion, which exploit the apprehensions both of the other characters in the play and, beyond them, of the audience. These apprehensions do not arise from any actual experience of love but are fostered by literary convention. In real life though men -

or women - may in some sense compete for the favours of the beloved they are very rarely so directly opposed as fiction would have us believe. 'The rival' is not so much a real being as the personification of a lover's doubt and sense of insecurity. (Alternatively he may be an idealisation of a kind of figure who did come within Lope's own experience: the cuckolded husband, or the wealthier successor to the favours of a mercenary actress). On the other hand a father's power was not only granted to him by tradition but was part of the actual experience of the audience; in life as well as on the stage a father could dispose of his child's happiness, a child was bound to obey his father, and the blood tie between them made the affairs of one vitally and completely the concern of the other. All this explains why it is that in Felisardo Jacinto should threaten the happiness of the lovers not as a free agent, but on the two occasions when he succeeds in joining a father's hostility to his own.

It is not necessary for Lope to account for a rival's hostility to a marriage between the lovers. Such a marriage frustrates his wishes for his own future and any reasons which he might produce to support his superior claim are no more than contributory factors; they give an edge to his hostility but cannot be said to cause it. However a father's hostility to his child's marriage does seem to require some explanation, and accordingly there are a number of objections which are typically brought forward. With few exceptions these are connected with the relative social status or wealth of the two lovers. Most frequently a father objects to his child's marrying someone of a different class of society. At his least sympathetic he objects to a proposed son-in-law's inferior wealth (Belardo, Viuda); at his most admirable he is unwilling for his child to marry superior wealth or social status, because this might imply that he is

bargaining with his family's honour for material gain.¹ He may also have a candidate of his own, more obviously suitable in terms of wealth or class than his child's spontaneous choice. There are few plays in which the objection to a marriage is not made on such grounds as the above. Exceptions occur in Serrana^T, in which Alejandro is thought to be too young to know his own mind, and in Benavides, where Sancho and Sol are brother and sister. It has to be said however that although these questions of status or wealth are advanced as reasons why a father will not let his child marry, they are also accepted as valid obstacles by the lovers themselves. A lover may allow a consciousness of his own inadequacy in one respect or the other to hold him back, or at least to trouble him, even when there is no more eligible rival or forbidding parent in his way. Lope himself accepts equality of status to be the sine qua non of a successful marriage and never allows anyone to marry out of his class.

An interesting case occurs in Leal. Leonardo has travelled from Paris to Rouen, attracted by the report of Serafina's beauty, and with the lover's usual good fortune immediately manages to engage her affections, although we gather he is not the first man to have courted her. Her father, Galerio, is clearly unwilling for her to marry; Lope establishes this early in the play by a scene in which Serafina professes indifference to her many suitors as the surest way of charming the gift of a silk dress out of her father. At their first meeting Serafina warns Leonardo that there will be difficulty in getting Galerio's consent to their marriage. In another play

¹ This is distinct from a very prudent reluctance to see one's daughter being courted by someone of superior class, where the chances are that he will not marry her. Despite the praises lavished on Felisardo, no-one does him the credit of believing that he will marry Elisa, and the general view of the case seems to be that implied by Jacinto when he follows Elisa to court: 'por ver si quiere querer / ser de un hidalgo mujer, / más que de un príncipe amiga' (247 a).

they might have tried to force this consent from Galerio by some device or other, but here they do not; instead they become lovers, Serafina has a child and eventually it is the loyalty of Uberto, Galerio's servant, rather than any effort of the two lovers, which makes it possible for them to marry. Galerio's objection to Serafina's marriage is never explained. We may guess that he is unwilling to bear the expense of Serafina's dowry, but in fact there is evidence to suggest that he has always been a difficult person to deal with and that his resistance to Serafina's marriage is merely the latest of a number of acts of contrariness (one of the very few occasions on which Lope refers to a character's past behaviour to account for his present conduct). One might just as well attribute the violence of Galerio's resistance to the idea of his daughter's marrying to a suppressed incestuous desire for her: there is evidence for all these views and proof of none. What we are required to accept is that his refusal is absolute; if it were not, Leonardo's passive acceptance of a love affair fraught with concealment, disguise and privation would be inexplicable. On this very inadequate reasoning early in Act II rests the subsequent development of the situation:

Julio: te solicito
 que la pidas por mujer.
 Leonardo: ¿Para qué me he de cansar
 si no la quiere casar? (170 b)

Many of the oddities of Leal can be accounted for by a certain insecurity of technique. The insecurity is not so much that of an inexperienced dramatist - the play is not exceptionally early (1594) - as of one making an unproductive experiment. Lope seems to have tried to tell an exemplary story, which has a medieval simplicity of purpose, in the language of the new comedy with its dependance on artifice and complication; the two styles do not mix, maybe because there is in general very little that is exemplary about the participants in a love story (however decorous they may manage to be). The play seems undecided in purpose, since interest is invited by

two very different kinds of situation, the spectacle of Uberto's loyalty and the question of how the two lovers are to reconcile Galerio to their liaison. For our present purposes the significant thing about the play is not so much the question of technique as that Lope has, almost by accident, let slip the real reason for a father's opposition to his child's marriage. 'No la quiere casar': in comparison with this questions of status or wealth are merely pretexts.

The case of Doristeco shows how fundamental is this assumption that father and child should be quite opposed in their interests, for Doristeco is not hostile to his daughter's marriage and yet the assumption is still made. We have already seen how Jacinto brings him to witness the night-scene between Elisa and Felisardo. Doristeco cannot hear the two sonnets which indicate the depth of their mutual love and the solemnity of the moment; to the lovers themselves this is the equivalent of a marriage ceremony, and they refer to each other immediately after as husband and wife (236 b). He sees only a clandestine meeting between the being who most publicly incarnates his honour, and a man he has been led to believe has no serious intentions towards her; accordingly he explodes onto the stage in the manner characteristic of outraged fathers. His objections are overcome with unexpected ease:

Felisardo: De esposo le doy
a Elisa palabra y fe.
Doristeco: ¿De esposo?
Felisardo: De esposo digo.
Doristeco: ¿Y si eres mi desigual?
Felisardo: Digo que a serlo me obligo
aunque la sangre real
me desiguale contigo.
Doristeco: Templado me has, si no es eso
engaño.
Felisardo: Verdad confieso.
Doristeco: ¿Es esto así?
Elisa: Sí, señor,
y que ha guardado mi honor.
Doristeco: ¿Tu honor? ¡Extraño suceso!...

Felisardo: ¿Ese [Jacinto] es tu yerno, o soy yo?
 Doristeo: Tú eres. (235-6)

On the face of it Doristeo is now the lovers' ally; not only does he take Elisa to court on Felisardo's instructions, but he also leaves her to her own devices once she is there. Again, in the last act he willingly conspires with Tristán, and tells the King that he is taking Elisa away from court. But despite his real complicity, Lope not infrequently creates the illusion of opposition between him and the two young people. We see this first at the end of Act I, after the passage quoted above in which Doristeo acknowledges Felisardo as his future son-in-law. Felisardo now refuses to let Elisa stay in her father's house and takes her to his own (it is understood that the relationship is not consummated); Doristeo is naturally enraged and talks of appealing to the King for justice. As a step towards ultimate felicity Felisardo's action at this point is counter-productive, but Lope does not mean it to be regarded in this light. His purpose is rather to exploit the apprehensions aroused in the audience by the intervention of a father in a love-story. The same thing happens in the last scene of the play. When Jacinto bursts on stage during the mock-marriage he is accompanied by Doristeo: as Jacinto seems to threaten danger at this point despite his actual ignorance of the truth about the marble statue, so also does Doristeo even when he is one of the authors of the plot. Thus he too seems to share in Jacinto's defeat; so suggestive of opposition is the figure of the father that he must seem to submit to the will of his child even if he is not in fact an enemy. Doristeo's intervention in this scene is as gratuitous as Jacinto's but not quite in the same way. For Jacinto to be beaten at this point is no more than the confirmation of a fate marked out for him from the beginning of the play. But for Doristeo to be beaten is an absurdity, and shows how ready Lope was to be inconsistent in his characterisation of an individual for the sake of consistency in his

characterisation of a class of being. It is because he does not require the suggestion of Doristeco's opposition in the early court scenes that Lope allows him to fade out of the action after he has brought Elisa there. There is an adequate volume of opposition coming from other quarters - from the King, from Elisa herself, and then from Jacinto - and Doristeco becomes dispensable.

The King's opposition is less equivocal than Doristeco's; his position is that he has selected a wife for his son and no disinclination, and no previous vows, are to stand in his way. It is not only Elisa's unsuitability which is at issue between him and Felisardo. His first plans for him would in fact have made any kind of marriage impossible:

Cartas del Papa tengo, en que me envía
para mi natural hijo el capelo,
y que fuese a besarle el pie querría,
en obediencia de mi justo celo. (233 a)

Since we already know that Felisardo is in love with Elisa, the King has been characterised as an obstacle before he has even begun to think of Felisardo in terms of marriage, and long before he knows that Elisa exists. What enrages him is that Felisardo should not obey him; in his opinion nothing justifies disobedience. It has already been said in the summary of the play that the two never come into direct opposition with each other. It might be added that by the time Felisardo finally forces his father to let him marry Elisa some of the heat has gone out of their disagreement. In Act III the issue is no longer Felisardo's marriage but his sanity, which Felisardo - assisted by Tristán - pretends to have lost as a result of his father's cruelty. The tone of the play changes and becomes almost farcical, as the King and courtiers desperately try to divert the Prince from his madness. The King even permits what one would earlier have said was impossible, which is a meeting between Elisa and Felisardo. The King himself does not suspect that the statue scene has any relevance to Felisardo's

marriage; as far as he is concerned it is a last-ditch attempt to bring Felisardo back to sanity by following his humour.

An occasional variation on the theme of the father's opposition to his child's falling in love occurs when the father is himself one of his son's rivals. It is very rarely implied that the father is a serious suitor; instead he intends an easy conquest. In Francesilla the final and most grotesque of the many hazards which befall Clavelia occurs when she is promised by the servant of her lover, Feliciano, to his father Alberto when the latter eventually realises that the 'page' serving his son is a woman. In these scenes of the play Alberto inevitably lacks much of the dignity and self-righteousness which stage fathers usually possess. In fact this very triviality of purpose means that he is never a serious threat to his son's happiness. Not only is he not a serious rival, he is also not a serious father, never acting as such in the sense in which the figure has so far appeared in this account, that is as someone able to use his authority to prevent a marriage. The dangers which Clavelia and Feliciano chiefly face come from other directions; Alberto enters the play late, and is no more than the centre of a humorous interlude which keeps the action of the play alive while the lovers are settling their more important problems. A more serious treatment of the topic occurs in Soldado. Dinacreonte, King of Scotland, sends his son to persuade Rodiana, Queen of Holland, to marry him; the son Clarinarte falls in love with her himself and eventually induces her to love him. Father and son come into open conflict at the end of the play, when Dinacreonte besieges Rodiana's kingdom. Clarinarte wins the army over to his side by claiming that he is the better ruler, having taken Holland peacefully rather than by war:

Clarinarte: ¿Por qué no se ha de entrar, fuertes soldados,
si no hay aquí defensa más famosa,
si os aguardan los muros derribados,

mis brazos, mis deseos y mi esposa?
 Vuestros son estos reinos conquistados,
 más que con sangre con la paz dichosa ...
 Si junta Escocia aqueste reino entero,
 sin sangre vuestra y sin deshonra mía;
 si he buscado mujer que al Rey amaba
 ¿adónde os lleva aquesta furia brava?
 ¿No veis que si el Rey tiene mal intento
 ha sido justo darle tan desvío,
 y que fuera acetar el casamiento
 en daño vuestro y en notable mío?
 Yo os doy, señor, en paz, Reina a contento,
 de cuanto cerca el mar helado y frío,
 casada con su igual, y Rey tan vuestro.

Soldado: ¡Rey nuestro es Clarinarte! (589 a-b)

Lope accepts that a monarch may sin in his private life or abuse his power for private ends, but rarely shows a lawful king who is accused of acting wrongly as a king. (The only other early play in which the situation occurs is Favor). Such untypical reasoning seems to have been forced upon Lope by the special circumstances of the play; the passage quoted above is probably intended to reconcile the spectators to the shocking sight of the overthrow of a king.

Lope shows the importance he gives to there being continued opposition to a love affair, from whatever source, when he makes the lovers themselves threaten their own future together. A lover who makes difficulties for himself has everything to lose; and he gains no more than the spectacle of a trial of the other's constancy such as no constant heart should be expected to bear, and a satisfaction of that instinct for jealousy which is inseparable from love in Lope's plays. In Felisardo it is Elisa who most complicates matters when she appears at court claiming to be her own brother. Before this point Felisardo has indeed sinned by omission. At court he is far from being the eager lover of Act I. When the marriage with Drusila is first proposed to him he claims he had made a vow against marriage:

pensé de la Iglesia ser,
y de no admitir mujer
hice voto; estoy impedido. (1)

If this argument were followed through to its logical conclusion he would of course be equally unable to marry Elisa. The inconsistency is not Felisardo's so much as Lope's; he often obliges his characters to talk their way out of an unexpected difficulty but rarely requires them to stand by the consequences of whatever lie was manufactured for the occasion. Accordingly we hear later that Felisardo has admitted that this is not what really dissuades him from the marriage:

Rey: No es posible, Almirante, que pretenda más alto casamiento Felisardo, si no es que de otra causa más secreta nace el disgusto que le da el casarle; si está impedido, el encubriero yerra, porque ya la dispensa del Pontífice ha dicho que no importa. (249 b - 250 a)

Lope's concern here is to accumulate difficulties for his hero which are to be resolved graphically by the transformation scene; it would be inconvenient if Felisardo were to act too heartily on his own behalf at this point. Logically Elisa's refusal to admit to her own identity need have been no problem, since Felisardo is in no doubt as to who she is. One could put forward a number of explanations for Elisa's curious behaviour at court: that she will feel disgraced if the impropriety of her male disguise is made public, that she is cautiously trying to assess the effect on Felisardo of his changed circumstances, that she feels out of place at court and cannot allow herself to make a natural avowal of love. This is all conjecture, and we are on safer ground if we assess her behaviour in terms of its result, which is conflict between her and Felisardo. It comes to a head in Act III when Tristán has persuaded the King to let Elisa and Felisardo meet;

¹ 246 b. Acad has 'hay voto' but the reading of the Parte has been preferred.

Felisardo, in playful revenge, pretends not to recognise her and provokes Elisa into this impassioned speech:

¿Es posible, ingrato mío,
que este galardón me des,
que me muestres tal desvío,
que con tal rigor estés?
¿Es esto lo que he sufrido
por ti? ... (258 a)

It is the simple truth that Felisardo deserves none of this bitter reproach. His pretence not to recognise her is clearly a parody of her own refusal to do likewise; it is also a brief acknowledgement of his own right to make difficulties.

More serious than this trial of the other's constancy is something not found in Felisardo, that is, the possibility of an actual betrayal. A very elementary statement of this situation, with motivation reduced to a minimum, occurs in Belardo when Jacinta, having first made vows of love to Belardo, is then very easily persuaded by her uncle Pinardo to love the richer Nemoroso. She feels no remorse and the only judgement made on her actions is an external one: Belardo goes mad. In fact this is no real judgement, since the plot requires him to go mad and Jacinta is merely the handmaid of dramatic necessity. Eventually she returns him to sanity by promising to marry him, not because she has repented or has now come to prefer Belardo to Nemoroso but because Belardo's friend Siralbo has asked her to. Condemnation of a lover's betrayal is more explicit in Serrana^T and Laura. In the former Alejandro is sent by his father to Salamanca so that he shall no longer be able to court Diana; he succeeds only too well since when Diana follows Alejandro there she finds him already the acknowledged lover of Narcisa. In Laura Oranteo lets himself be convinced that the woman who has been secretly married to him for seven years has now taken a lover. Laura is imprisoned for a year; during this interval Oranteo indulges himself in

tears for her sake but does nothing to alleviate her sufferings, and at their first meeting after she has left prison he reviles her. The heroine's sufferings are not the accidental result of Alejandro's inconstancy or of Oranteo's ill-use, but the end to which these are directed. A persecuted heroine is good dramatic material, whether she is the subject of a scene (in Serrana where Diana's glimpse of Narcisa makes her burst into a moving tirade of grief and despair) or of a whole play (in Laura, which is explicitly the story of its heroine's trials). Therefore both Alejandro and Oranteo are, in dramatic terms, agents of opposition and should only with many provisos be judged as one might judge a fellow human being. Lope goes further in Matico in which 'Sancho' pays for having broken his promises of absolute fidelity to 'Matico' (they are a count and princess in disguise) by seeing her marry someone else, although he is still in love with her. In Burlas and Galán we find what is probably Lope's most extreme statement on the subject. In the former play Ricardo promises to marry Jacinta with no intention of keeping his word. Believing her to be a princess he does begin to make serious preparations for the marriage, but when he receives proof she is a goose-girl and immediately afterwards is courted by Camila, a queen, he readily forgets Jacinta. Later he is imprisoned by Camila. The symbolism of the prison scene is clear; Ricardo is first stripped of all his fine clothes and then reproached by Jacinta for his falseness to her. In Galán it is the heroine who betrays the hero and who suffers for it. The equivalent of the prison episode is a very fine scene set by the Manzanares. Ricarda has jilted a penniless lover so as to win a rich husband, has seen that husband killed by her own father, and has had to go into hiding. Her pride is now so humbled that when she is advised to dress as a laundry-girl she accepts the status as a symbol of her repentance. While she is in this disguise she meets Celio again; he does not reproach her, but she is

distressed by the memory of his love for her and the fear of having lost it.

The difficulties introduced into a play by a principal character therefore relate to his function as an agent of the plot, and are not the result of any but the most conventional notions of how a person might be expected to react in his particular circumstances. It follows that this is even more true of the numerous minor characters. Such characters are, for example, the less potent of the rivals for the dama's hand. Elisa is relatively deprived in having only two suitors; in several plays the heroine may be sought after by three or four men, or even more. The galán also attracts several admirers, though not in quite the same quantity. The hero and his agents are not expected to overcome so many would-be lovers themselves; these usually acknowledge defeat or simply disappear from the action. Such supernumerary rivals are in fact not rivals at all; they do not seriously compete for the heroine's hand and frequently she and the galán are not aware of their aspirations. They are at most reminders to the audience of the possibility of danger to the lovers, if not from this source then from some other. In Felisardo a minor character of this kind is Drusila, the Admiral's daughter. She scarcely appears, but through the agency of her father and the King she is a bigger obstacle than Jacinto to the lovers' marriage, and on a personal level a greater irritant. It can hardly be said that Jacinto troubles Felisardo and Elisa; the former indeed scarcely ever has any dealings with him, and though Elisa is involved in two quarrels with him she is clearly able to hold her own. Against this there is the curious scene at court in which Elisa enters carrying a letter from Felisardo, addressed to Drusila:

Mi esperanza ha sido un dueño.
¡Ay de mi corta ventura! ... (248 b)

There is no reason why Felisardo should wish to communicate with Drusila, and for him to make Elisa the bearer of the letter is an act of gratuitous

cruelty. The function of the scene is simply that Elisa should be upset, and that the danger which Drusila represents should be made more real. Drusila only comes on stage in the transformation scene, in which she is the madrina at what she takes to be a fake ceremony. Up to this point she has been effective without appearing in person; her appearance now has the same function as those of Jacinto and Doristeo. Thus the effects of a dramatic coup, which is nominally directed at the King, are experienced by every person who has any interest in the matter. It was never seriously supposed that Drusila was likely to marry Felisardo, but Lope further demands that she be seen not to marry him.

The success story

There are two ways in which a man may rise in the world. He may achieve success by conquering an enemy, winning his arms or even by becoming king. Or he may discover who he is; this implies a social ascent since the classic pattern is for the hero to have been separated from his parents at birth and brought up as a peasant. These two forms of ascent may be linked, though this is not always the case: thus at the beginning of Felisardo the hero does not know who he is, and at the end he not only knows who he is but knows that he is a king's son. It must be conceded that in plays of this type Reichenberger's description is not totally applicable and 'order' is often restored at best by implication. We could say that in Felisardo order was disturbed at Felisardo's birth, when his illegitimacy deprived him of his identity and of the possibility of figuring in the world. However, when the hero is not a foundling but merely a young man who has before him a notable future or - in the specific context of the play - a notable deed, he does not find himself so much as fulfil himself.

In this kind of situation the first part of the play shows us a dramatic cosmos that is not disturbed, but incomplete.

The simplest kind of success story is that of a well-known hero. The play which is said to be Lope's earliest, Garcilaso, is of this kind; there is also a later reworking of the same subject, Cerco. Both plays are set during the final stages of the siege of Granada. The decisive event in both is the desecration of the Ave María by Tarfe, the most important of the Moorish soldiers, who writes it out on parchment which he then ties to his horse's tail and flaunts before the Christians. (In Cerco it is one of the Christian soldiers who writes it out in the first place, affixing it to the door of the mosque and so giving Tarfe an opportunity to misappropriate it). The Christians themselves are gathered in the adjacent town of Santa Fe, which was built in 1491 for the express purpose of besieging Granada. Garcilaso de la Vega kills Tarfe in a duel, thereby asserting the supremacy of the Catholic faith and cause.¹ In both plays about half the action takes place in Granada, and these scenes are dominated by Tarfe, while the scenes in Santa Fe are dominated not by Garcilaso but by the Reyes Católicos, Ferdinand alone in Garcilaso and in Cerco principally Isabella, although Ferdinand arrives towards the end. The first two acts of Garcilaso (Lope's only extant four-act play) are about Tarfe entirely: the Christians are not even mentioned until the end of Act II and finally appear in Act III, from which point the Moors are overshadowed (although there are still scenes set in Granada). The Moorish scenes are novelesque rather than military, and describe Tarfe's love for Fátima, the King's decision that she should marry

¹ This Garcilaso is probably a confusion between a soldier of that name who killed a Moor in single combat in 1455 and his nephew (father of the poet) who served the Reyes Católicos both in battle and as ambassador to the Papal court. See E. Buceta, 'Notas acerca de la historicidad del romance "Cercada está Santa Fe"'.

not Tarfe but the man whom she really prefers, and the circumstances which lead Tarfe to marry Alhama whom he had abandoned some time before. The Christian scenes are far more direct: several soldiers discuss the war against the Moors, Tarfe challenges the Christians, Garcilaso kills him (off stage) and is rewarded. The only connection between the two halves of the play is that Tarfe figures in both, in one as hero and in the other as villain; Lope has decided that a description of the events leading up to Garcilaso's victory is not sufficient in itself to make a play and, choosing not to elaborate on the figure of Garcilaso, has instead preferred to draw on the possibilities for decoration offered by Tarfe. To look for a thematic connection is perhaps to burden the play with more significance than its structure can stand, but it is probable that by exalting the positive qualities of the vanquished Lope sought indirectly to give further praise to the victor, thus continuing the attitude of many of the romances fronterizos and moriscos.

Cerco is better planned than Garcilaso: the opposing armies are made acutely aware of each other by means of alternating scenes which describe attacks and counter-attacks of ever-increasing daring. The Ave Maria incident, focussed on two individuals rather than on two armies, is the natural climax to all this. Tarfe is still seen in an amorous context, but to the decorative function of such scenes is added the suggestion that the Moors are inferior, being less high-minded than the Christians. Tarfe's vow to bring back the heads of three Christians to Alifa is capped by Hurtado's vow to bring back ten Moorish heads not to a lady-love but to the Queen. Moreover, the prophecy that he will die on account of the most beautiful woman in the world, which Tarfe himself interprets in an amorous sense, is at last discovered to refer to the Virgin, in defence of whom he is killed. (Although Tarfe is evidently inferior to the Christians he is

the noblest of the Moors and therefore a worthy opponent). But although the amount of extraneous material on the Moorish side is greatly reduced, on the Christian side it is increased, and to some purpose. In the first scene of the play Isabella intervenes in several small incidents, establishing harmony among the soldiers and righting their wrongs. Lope thus depicts the functioning of a successful Christian monarchy; there is no King, and very little sense of a corporate state, in the Moorish scenes. In addition Garcilaso's personality is developed, although not in a military context. He takes no part in the skirmishing between the two sides, and is thought to be too young for such manly activity; in effect he is little more than a page, flirting with Isabella's ladies in waiting, watching events and commenting upon them, but remaining on the edge of the play's action until the beginning of Act III. At this point he is allowed to hold the stage while he describes to the newly arrived King Ferdinand what has happened so far, and is for the first time associated with the military action; immediately afterwards Tarfe's profanation of the Ave Maria involves him in it directly. The final episode brings together all three elements of the play: the prophecy concerning Tarfe's fate is fulfilled, Garcilaso is finally recognised by the other soldiers as an equal and Spain's invincibility is satisfyingly demonstrated. Tarfe's death is a symbol of the reconquest of Granada which was shortly to be accomplished; the sense of climax effectively conceals the fact that the defeat of one man, whoever he may be, is not the defeat of an army.

In both plays Garcilaso is awarded his arms. There are three other plays of this type, which could be described as genealogical; these are Benavides, Chaves and Varona. All three plays are apparently fictitious; Lope was conceivably working from traditions within the various families concerned, but otherwise no source has been identified. There are references

to Chaves de Villalba and to Doña María Pérez (the varona) in other works by Lope.¹ In El blasón de los Chaves de Villalba the blasón is not actually conferred; a copy of the autograph manuscript is known, so we are not dealing with a cut made later in the play's history. According to the other version of Chaves's story which Lope wrote a year earlier in the novel Arcadia (1598), the arms were bestowed by Ferdinand V when Chaves returned to Spain after the duel which takes place at the end of the play, and in fact the most significant respect in which this play differs from the others of its type is in the absence of the ruling king at all stages of the play. Chaves's deed is witnessed by the Spanish ambassador in Rome and this gives him public recognition, which was sufficient for the play's purposes. Noble families were preoccupied with the question of their genealogy at this time. There is no evidence that any of these plays was commissioned, but it is an interesting speculation.

The action of Chaves is set at the time of the uneasy military alliance between France and Spain in Italy, and the rupture between them after the capture of Naples in 1503; these public events are described in detail as they occur. As in Cerco part of the play relates primarily to the hero and is non-military in character; it describes the relationship between Chaves de Villalba and his faithless friend Don Juan de Guzmán, who abducts the woman whom Chaves loves. There is also a third element in the form of an account of the relationships between the soldiers of various nations. These three elements, national events, the relationships between the soldiers, and Chaves's own story, are given a thematic connection in Act III. Having overtaken Don Juan and recovered Doña Bárbara, Chaves refuses to take

¹ See Menéndez Pelayo's introductory studies, reprinted in Estudios, III, pp. 397-405 (Varona), and V, pp. 335-8 (Chaves).

revenge on his friend and instead, finding him wounded and in need of protection, takes him into his house. Having thus won a victory over his passions he is convinced that he will triumph in single combat over the German soldier Aspramonte:

Chaves: Si ese hombre [Aspramonte] es elefante
seré ratón que le rompa
por lo hueco de la trompa,
y otro David, si es gigante.
Yo le venceré.

Toledo: Eso sí.

Chaves: Y haré poco, que hoy ha sido
mucho más lo que he vencido.

Toledo: ¿A quién has vencido?

Chaves: A mí.

Toledo: Esa es victoria mayor. (455 b)

This victory is in turn related to international politics since their fight is to determine whether Louis XII or Ferdinand V is the greatest king in the world; it is because Chaves defends Spain's reputation in this way that he is given his coat of arms. Of course it is only to the already convinced that Chaves's victory over Aspramonte proves its point; it has the same symbolic force as Garcilaso's victory over Tarfe.

In Varona it has been prophesied that María will be a conqueror of men. Her brothers have assumed that she is a danger to men in general, and have kept her hidden in their country estate. In fact it is her destiny to defeat the King of Aragón in single combat after a fight which lasts all night. As a reward for this the King of Castile gives her the ambiguous surname of Varona, which is supposed to be the origin of the family name of Barahona. At the same time María discovers her femininity; she is courted by Don Vela and against her will falls in love with him. Lope thus makes her the equal of men, and at the same time shows that in certain circumstances she will react as other women do. These two attitudes are connected only because they are both inspired by the notion of a masculine heroine; in all other ways they are contradictory and are kept apart by the plot. This

produces an episodic play, in which events follow one another but are not consequent upon each other.

A steady progress towards a triumphant ending is apparent in the three Carolingian plays: Marqués, Casamiento and Reinaldos. These are among the best of Lope's early plays, probably because he had, in the ballads, such excellent source material. For Casamiento, which is about Bernardo del Carpio, Lope also drew on the Ocampo chronicle (1541) and for Reinaldos on the Italian poem La trabisonda (1518) by Francesco Tromba, which itself derives from a popular late twelfth or early thirteenth century poem Renaud de Montaubon.¹ There is a fourth play in which several of the Carolingian characters appear, but which has none of the vigour of the other three. This is Rodamonte, which derives from the Orlando Furioso (1510) of Ariosto and from Berni's rifacimento (1541) of Boiardo's Orlando Innamorato. Elements of the success story are not lacking, but this is really a love story; in the other three Carolingian plays the love-interest is subordinated to an account of how the Marqués de Mantua avenges his nephew's death, how Bernardo legitimises himself by arranging a tardy marriage between his mother and his already dead father, and how Reinaldos de Montalbán eventually triumphs over the men who have slandered him. In Reinaldos the plot is unusually simple, with the inevitable subsidiary material occupying very little performance time. It relates how the hero, who has been exiled by Charlemagne because of false information brought against him by Galalón, eventually rehabilitates himself on the strength of virtues which are essentially those of a Christian knight: patience in adversity, lack of malice, humility, and loyalty to the ungrateful and somewhat gullible Emperor who, despite his injustices,

¹ See Menéndez Pelayo's introductions to all three plays reprinted in Estudios, III, pp. 195-214 (Casamiento), VI, pp. 316-34 (Reinaldos), and VI, pp. 335-56 (Marqués).

nevertheless represents divine authority. The play has a convincing final scene, whose climax is a splendid speech in which Reinaldos finally vindicates himself. Marqués falls into two parts, the first leading naturally into the second. In the first act Carloto, Charlemagne's son, falls in love with Sevilla who has become a Christian for love of Valdovinos and is about to marry him. She rejects him and, urged by Galalón, Carloto decides to kill Valdovinos. What principally differentiates this part of the play from any number of other love stories in which a rejected rival's love turns to malice and hatred is not the nature of the events themselves but the fact that they involve well-known people; not only does this in itself bestow a kind of glamour on the play but, since the spectators know that the play will turn to tragedy, it is impossible for them to regard it as just another love story. In Act II Valdovinos sets out on his last journey but only after his servant has done his best to dissuade him by a recital of evil omens which further intensifies the play. The Marqués is brought to his dying nephew, who describes all that has happened to him, and the act concludes with a version of the Marqués' famous vow. In the third act the Marqués, and Sevilla, finally have the satisfaction of seeing the now repentant Carloto justly executed. The central character now is not the Marqués but Charlemagne; the decision to submit Carloto to the processes of law rests with him, and the love he naturally feels for his son makes the decision a difficult one. Carloto acted as he did assuming that the son of the Emperor enjoys impunity and that his error is in any case a venial one. The play is more than the simple story of how Valdovinos' death is avenged, since both Charlemagne and Carloto, in their different ways, have advanced in moral stature and the triumph which we witness is a spiritual one.

Casamiento has two subjects. One is the quarrel between Bernardo and Alfonso el Casto which arises from the latter's refusal to allow his sister,

Bernardo's mother, to marry her former lover and the father of her son. This personal dispute is embittered by Alfonso's proposal that Charlemagne be appointed heir to his throne and continue the battle against the Moors in Spain, a suggestion which offends against Bernardo's pride as a Castilian and impels him to join cause with the Moors against France.

Si a mi padre te pedía,
que tienes preso en cadena,
mi madre te pido agora
con más razón y más fuerza.
No entiendas digo tu hermana
la infanta doña Jimena:
Castilla te digo, Rey,
que también la tienes presa.
Dame a mi madre Castilla,
que me han dicho que la entregas
a Carlomagno de Francia. (260 b)

On the face of it this is also an alliance against Alfonso, but Lope departs from his sources by bringing the Castilian king into an alliance with Bernardo and Marsilio, King of the Moors. Lope makes this alteration principally because he was concerned to present devotion to country and to king as inextricable emotions. Lope so arranges matters that at Roncesvalles, although Christian fights Christian, Spaniard does not fight Spaniard, and still less does the most prominent of the Spanish knights, who in Lope's view must by definition base his virtue on his service to his king, fight against that king. The disposal of armies and the alliance between Marsilio and Alfonso means that the traditional hatred between Moor and Christian is temporarily and of necessity overlooked, and that Marsilio is a figure of some dignity. Bernardo treats him with respect, occasionally with more respect than he gives to his natural king, and takes into his full confidence Bravonel, Marsilio's chief warrior and the equivalent in the Moorish state of Bernardo in the Castilian. This moral rehabilitation is not consistently carried out: Marsilio takes no part in the post-victory celebrations, while his soldiers are prominent in the business of eliminating stray French

survivors. That this mopping-up operation should have been thought of as degrading, and something therefore to be spared the Castilians, leads us to consider the characterisation of the French enemy. In the first two acts we see about as much of the French court, and later the French army, as of the Castilian. While Alfonso, Bernardo and the Castilian knights are acting out the roles assigned them both by tradition and by the expectations of the audience - that is, in their double conflict, personal and political - Charlemagne, Roland, the Peers and their ladies are doing exactly the same with equal brilliance and vigour. The celebrated lovers, Belerma and Durandarte, and the latter's equally famous friend, Montesinos, say and do what is expected of them - and more, since Lope gives the lovers an interesting experience of jealousy and reconciliation through the agency of Flordelis, who claims that Durandarte loves her. Lope's addition to the story may or may not be considered an improvement; it does show that he was interested enough in the French not merely to establish their presence and identity, but also to exploit their appeal to the popular imagination as fully as he did that of Bernardo. We see the other Peers when half a dozen of them, including Montesinos and Durandarte and, most conspicuously, Roland, fight together about an internal quarrel until interrupted first by Charlemagne and then by Bernardo, who introduces the fresh topic of the forthcoming battle with the Spanish. It could possibly be argued that this internal fighting, potentially self-destructive, is evidence of a moral inferiority to the Castilians, thus marking them out for defeat and death. But it seems more likely that when the audience saw six gallant young men in elegant and well-practised swordplay it should have been impressed by their glamorous and dashing appearance, rather than by their presumed moral decadence. The intention seems to be not to exalt the Castilians by disparaging the enemy, but to exalt the Castilians still more by praising the enemy, whom

everyone knows they are about to overcome: the effect is made cumulatively and visually, by superimposing scenes and letting them combine to make a total effect. The brief contact between Bernardo and Roland at the end of Act I, which brings out the inevitable hostility between the two, shows them drawn to and involved in each other with a force irresistibly produced by their similarity: a similarity in courage and achievement, in the role of each as second in fame within his respective nation only to his monarch, and in the interest and admiration they arouse in the spectator, to whom they are both equally real. The battle scene brings to their highest pitch these various interests, which both conflict and harmonise. It contains moments calculated to move us strongly in favour of the French: Durandarte's death and the fulfilment of the promise which Montesinos made him, and then the account of Charlemagne's grief. But its climax exploits the strong feelings excited by both the French and the Castilians, when Bernardo squeezes Roland to death in his arms: a spectacle of simultaneous pathos and triumph. The juxtaposition of pathos and triumph is continued into Act III, which begins with a description of the few surviving French, their exemplary fortitude and piety, and their inevitable suppression, heightened by the compassionate exclamations of two Spanish shepherds, whose political leaders were congratulating themselves on the victory immediately afterwards. This reconciliation of conflicting interests, of opposing claims on our sympathy and imagination, constitutes an extraordinary achievement: its success has nothing to do with logic. Bernardo's own story is taken up again in Act III in which the King finally grants the permission for which he has so long sought: that his parents be allowed to marry. In fact he finds that his father has been dead for three days. He brings his mother before her former lover, and an extraordinary marriage scene is enacted; Doña Jimena gives her verbal assent to the marriage and Bernardo bends his father's

head forward, thus obtaining his tacit assent.¹

Of the four plays which show a man becoming a king, only one is based on fact, that is, Bamba. The other three plays are Ganso, Reduán and Favor. The theme of a commoner rising to be king is potentially so inflammatory that it is a little surprising to find it more often in a fictional context. This is exactly the point that Du Perron de Castera takes up with regard to the invented scene in Bamba in which an angel tells Bamba that Ervigio will be both his assassin and his successor:

Au surplus ce n'est pas là [he is referring to the lack of love-interest] le grand défaut de cette Comédie, elle en a tant d'autres qu'on perdrait son tems à vouloir les relever tous ... L'Auteur n'a-t-il pas dégradé la Divinité, quand il s'est avisé d'employer le ministère d'un Ange pour ordonner qu'on plaçât Ervizio sur le Trône? Dieu, pour des raisons impénétrables à l'esprit humain, souffre quelquefois l'exaltation des méchants, mais on ne scauroit penser sans impiété qu'il les élève lui-même par un décret positif: ces sortes de fictions peuvent avoir des suites pernicieuses; elles flatent les criminels, pendant que le Spectacle doit toujours les épouvanter par le châtement du crime. (2)

What makes the topic acceptable in Ganso and Reduán is that both heroes were born to their position, but were not aware of this and only discover their identity during the play. It is not therefore a case of a commoner's becoming a king, but of a king's coming into his own. In Favor a duke becomes king by marrying the Queen of Sardinia. The Queen, Rosaura, is in

¹ This is incidentally another genealogical play after a fashion, since Alfonso gives Bernardo his arms, but the incident is not given emphasis. These arms were the nineteen castles which Lope made an attempt to annex for himself, claiming descent from Bernardo, by reproducing them on the title page of La Arcadia (1598). Gongora has made this famous: 'Por tu vida, Lopillo, que me borres / las diez y nueve torres de el escudo...' In the Millé edition of the Obras completas this is No. L of the sonetos atribuíbles.

² See the 'Reflexions' which are prefaced to his translations in Extraits de plusieurs pièces du Théâtre espagnol, 3 vols, Amsterdam and Paris, 1738, II, 128, 130.

a somewhat ambiguous position; she has come to the throne by virtue of her father's recent death, but there seems to be some reluctance to accepting her as the actual ruler of her kingdom. Lope even permits her subjects to criticise her sharply as a ruler: her refusal to marry the heir to the throne of Sicily has led that country to beseige Sardinia, the inhabitants suffer great hardship in consequence, and there is nearly a revolt in the army:

Rodolfo: Hoy morirá la Reina loca y bárbara
 si no se rinde al príncipe Tiberio.
 Soldado: Cerrada está en su cámara.
 Rodolfo: ¿Qué importa?
 ¿Es su cámara el muro de Semíramis?
 Pues no ha salido a vuestras justas voces,
 romped las puertas, caigan en el suelo.
 Soldado: Abre aquí, Reina injusta, Reina loca,
 alma del gran Nerón, que ves ardiendo
 tu isla desdichada en guerra y hambre
 y estás alegre entre sus llamas. (499 b)¹

This suggests that Lope did not in fact think of Rosaura as a monarch - possibly because she is a woman, in which case even the promotion of a duke (who is scarcely a commoner) is to be preferred. The anomaly may be the responsibility of the source, in which the heroine is also a queen.²

The protagonist of Bamba is the Visigothic king Wamba, a peasant elected to the throne after a divine command received by the Pope.³ The play describes the whole of Wamba's exemplary reign, and since he is crowned king in Act II differs again from the other plays of this type, in which the king ascends to the throne at the end of the play. Bamba concludes with a more

¹ Compare the passage from Soldado quoted earlier in the chapter.

² See Giraldi, Gli Ecatomitti, II, 1.

³ This appearance of an angel was authenticated by Lope's sources, but the same is not true of the announcement of Ervigio's succession to which Du Perron so much objected. This last scene must have been a direct imitation of the earlier one, and meant to give unity to the play.

thorough-going apotheosis, however; it is not enough that his virtues are acknowledged by his people, they are also praised by the angel:

Dios quiere que para él
 hoy sin falta alguna partas,
 y el cuerpo en la tierra dejes
 y al cielo se suba el alma. (71 b)

In Reduán Gomel is told quite early in Act I that he is the illegitimate son of Reduán, the alcaide of the Moorish King Baudeles. Until this point he has lived in the countryside, and most of the play draws its incidents from the contrast between his barbaric but straightforward manners and what Lope evidently takes to be the depraved customs of upper-class Moorish Granada. At the end of the play Gomel kills Baudeles, seduced by the lies of the treacherous Queen, and then discovers that his victim is his real father. This murder comes near to causing a rebellion among his new subjects, who are naturally angered by the death of a king whom they had respected and the accession of one whom they despise. Lope's resolution of the problem is to show Gomel being found asleep in a chair with a lion, which had escaped from the royal zoo, lying beneath his feet (Gomel and the lion had in earlier days been friends):

Entran Jafer, Benalme, Arfilo, Fatimán y Alboyn con espadas desnudas

Jafer: Pues que no ha salido afuera,
 aquí estará.

Todos: ¡Muera, muera!

Benalme: ¡Santo Alá!

Fatimán: ¡Mahoma santo!

Retíranse unos detrás de otros de miedo del león

Fatimán: Teneos; ninguno huya.

Alboyn: Que es ingamia y cobardía.

Jafer: Aquesa gran valentía,
 deste invencible se arguya.

Arfilo: ¿Hay espectáculo igual?

Jafer: ¿No es bueno que está durmiendo
 en la mitad del estruendo
 de su peligro mortal?

Benalme: Tal guardia tiene a los pies.

Jafer: Yo no llegaré a matalle.
 Fatimán: ¡Bravo rostro!
 Jafer: ¡Bravo talle!
 Alboyn: Digno del imperio es.
 Arfilo: ¿Adónde podréis hallar
 rey como éste a toda ley,
 e hijo de vuestro rey,
 a quien él quiso heredar?
 ¡Qué hombre más valeroso
 ni más valiente soldado,
 domador, y no domado,
 envidiado, y no envidioso!
 Caballeros granadinos,
 vayan las envidias fuera;
 no muera Gomel.
 Todos: No muera.
 Arfilo: Sois de fama eterna dinos.
 ¡Viva Gomel, Gomel viva! (123 b - 124 a)

This scene is too much for Menéndez Pelayo:

Gomel se queda beatíficamente dormido con el león a las plantas; y en tal reposo le sorprende el pueblo alborotado, que admirando, y no era para menos, tanta serenidad, le proclama rey de Granada. Tal es este absurdo embrollo. (1)

A masterpiece it may not be, but the scene's ingenuousness is surely endearing rather than disgusting. What cannot be denied is that it shows Lope's interest in the spectacular rather than the rational.

In Segundo Lope describes not a king but a saint. San Segundo was one of St. James' first converts in Spain and the first bishop to be appointed there. Possibly this play was written in response to a commission; at any rate it was first performed in Avila on the occasion of the removal of the saint's body to a new resting place in 1595 (the play itself being written in August 1594).² Like Bamba the saint also dies in an exemplary fashion, refusing to lie on a bed and claiming that it is most fitting that he should die on the ground.

Comendadores, which is Lope's only early surviving honour play, must

¹ See Estudios, V, p. 206.

² See F. Delgado Mesonero, Avila en la vida de Lope de Vega, p. 133.

also be classed as a play about a man who rises in the world.¹ It is the story of how Don Fernando, described as one of the most distinguished soldiers in the service of the Reyes Católicos, and a Veinticuatro of Córdoba, kills his wife and niece when he learns that they are the mistresses of the two comendadores Don Jorge and Don Fernando, cousins of his wife. This is part of the account which the Veinticuatro gives the King and assembled court:

Entré por unas paredes
no muy altas, de la huerta,
que fue desde mi deshonra
toda la casa bajeza.
Hallé los Comendadores
que comían a mi mesa,
acostados en mi cama,
holgando en sus brazos de ellas....
Desmayóse mi mujer;
dejéla para más pena,
y discurriendo la casa,
maté cuantos hubo en ella:
a don Fernando, a doña Ana,
dos dueñas, cuatro doncellas,
pajes, escuderos, mozas,
lacayos, negros y negras;
los perros, gatos y monas,
hasta un papagayo, que era
también traidor, pues hablaba
y no me dijo mi afrenta.
Volvió del sueño Beatriz,
pidióme con voces tiernas
que la diese confesión;
quísela bien y otorguéla.
Trújola mi esclavo un fraile,
y ya de su culpa absuelta,
la misma espada que ciño
y que desnudo, que es ésta,
pasó su pecho seis veces;
y ahora a tus manos llega
desnuda como la ves,
a que cortes mi cabeza. (298 b - 299 a)

The note of triumph is unmistakable. That the play is to be regarded as a story of personal success, not barbaric or shocking but actually exemplary,

¹ The topic of honour is touched on slightly here and there, but nowhere dominates except perhaps in Indicios which is a very tame treatment of the subject, conspicuously lacking in blood and thunder. Its authenticity has been doubted but it is probably genuine (See MB, p.457).

is shown by the King's words when the Veinticuatro has finished his tale:

Hecho famoso y notable,
 tan digno de eterna fama,
 que de un Rey, noble te llama,
 y de un reino memorable.
 Sois, don Fernando, tan dino
 de premio por tal venganza,
 que hasta un Rey parte le alcanza
 del honor que a vos os vino.
 Hónrase Córdoba más
 que por Séneca y Lucano,
 de tener tal ciudadano. (299 a)

However Ferdinand's role goes beyond his vouching for the honour of his distinguished subject. He appears several times in the play (which is set immediately after the taking of Granada in 1492) in a number of scenes which almost amount to a sub-plot. First he is involved in the congratulatory aftermath of the victory, rewarding those who have served him; later his attention is taken up with arranging the marriage between his daughter Juana and Philip the Handsome. But his role in the play goes beyond the sub-plot's limited terms of reference because the Veinticuatro also appears in these scenes and, although he plays no part in Ferdinand's plans, Ferdinand - almost casually but nevertheless to great effect - intervenes in his personal tragedy: first by giving the Veinticuatro a diamond ring (which he then gives to his wife Beatriz), and later by recognising the ring on the finger of Don Jorge, Beatriz's lover. Until the end Ferdinand can have only a slight awareness (if that) of the Veinticuatro's misfortunes and his own part in them. This does not diminish the effect created by his presence at critical moments of Don Fernando's life.

Besides Felisardo there are nine more plays in which the galán, or very occasionally the dama, discovers who he is.¹ It is never a simple case of the foundling being recognised and returned to his parents, and of the

¹ Benavides, Burlas, Ganso, Engaño, Jorge, Príncipe I, Reduán, Ursón and Venturoso.

mysteries which originally separated him from himself being penetrated. It is the child's drama rather than the parents'; the parents do not seek their child, instead the child feels impelled to find out who he is, or at least makes it clear that he cannot be what he appears to be. The pattern is observed at its clearest in Venturoso, which (with Ursón) is exceptional in showing the first stage of the story, that is, the circumstances which caused the baby boy to be abandoned. Clara is a Milanese lady who has been seduced by Mauricio under promise of marriage and is now pregnant by him; he has the prospect of a richer wife and therefore abandons her. She gives birth to her son in the countryside and then leaves him there; the baby is found by Belardo and is brought up by him and his wife Belisa. Act II shows that the boy, though brought up as a peasant, nevertheless has all the instincts and accomplishments of a gentleman. He is therefore able to win promotion in the army and lead the capture of Milan, where both his parents still live; when circumstances bring him to them and he realises who they are he now has sufficient honour, in his own right, to be able to impel Mauricio to marry Clara and give their son the honour of a family name.

In Felisardo, Doristeco says of Felisardo:

Si el hombre
por sí no merece honor,
el heredado valor
no le dará fama y nombre....
El que es bueno, de sí nace,
la virtud es la nobleza;
que la heredada grandeza
no es la que a los hombres hace. (238 b)

These words could with some justice be applied to Venturoso, whom we see win his honour in what is indeed the most authentic way, on the field of battle:

Siempre toda la nobleza
de las armas comenzó. (Venturoso, 211 a)

They could also be applied to the hero of Jorge who, by faithful service to a king - albeit the King of Morocco - wins a fortune for himself and the

release of the father of the woman he loves, though at the beginning of the play he is only a servant and has never thought of himself in any other light. They apply also to Sancho in Benavides, to Valentín in Ursón and to Gomel in Reduán: we see all these young men win by some act of valour the place in the world which they should have occupied by birth. We are in greater difficulty if we attempt to fit the words to Felisardo himself, or to Ricardo in Burlas or Torcato in Príncipe I. In these three cases the hero's position at the end of the play is his because circumstances have restored it to him, and not because he has won it by force of arms or even by force of personality. Felisardo does nothing to discover who he is, and in fact professes indifference on this subject; Ricardo, though he is pleasing enough to win the love of the heroine, treats her very shabbily when he believes her to be a goose-girl; Torcato is a simpleton and has no curiosity about himself. It is conversely the case that none of the more active of the heroes could have won the positions they eventually occupy if they had not first been born to them. We can see this if we compare them with Luzmán in Caballero; he, like Venturoso, thinks he must be nobler than he appears:

Yo para rey nació, sino que ha sido
 contraria estrella la que no ha querido,
 y no es posible, aunque a maldad responde
 sino que un duque o conde,
 perdóneme mi padre,
 amores tuvo con mi hermosa madre;
 que de esta inclinación autor no fuera
 quien oficio mecánico tuviera. (165 b)

He differs from Venturoso in the way in which he chooses to make his fortune; whereas the latter takes up what was considered one of the noblest of professions, Luzmán relies on his charm, on deception and on his gift of talking his way both into people's confidence and out of trouble. He differs also in his fate; he is beaten, stripped, almost killed and finally rejected by all the women he had abused. This play was recently adapted for the modern Spanish stage; it seems that a contemporary audience found Luzmán

attractive in spite of his selfishness and lack of scruples, probably because of his undoubted vigour. It is unlikely that this was Lope's intention, although it is not inconceivable that Luzmán should be a more potent figure than his creator had planned. What is certain is that he is almost unique; in the early plays only the heroine of Fabia and the hero of Castrucho bear any resemblance to him. Either way, it does not alter the fact that in Lope's view anyone whose behaviour did not fit his class must either be temporarily displaced from his real position in life, or else a transgressor.

The young men who discover their identity are not inspired merely by the conviction that they must be nobler than they seem; usually this is not even their primary motive. To return to Venturoso: the love of books, the pride in his appearance, and the ability to wield a sword have grown upon the hero over the years and are a familiar irritant for his foster-father. But the specific cause of the quarrel with which they open Act II, in the course of which it is made clear how out of place Venturoso feels, is his love for Florinda, the daughter of the landowner on whose property Belardo lives. It is moreover his love for her, rather than a more general ambition to better himself, that sends Venturoso away into the wide world. In Lope's plays love is essentially a matter of like calling to like; although Venturoso does not reason it out in this way, he can only love Florinda because instinct tells him that he deserves her. Florinda herself thinks Venturoso may be noble, but she does not go one step further and conclude that they are equals; she is unaffected by him. In Lope's plays women are not always passive objects of adoration, loving only in moderation and where propriety bids them love; often they love with more courage and fidelity than men, once they have been aroused. But they seem to lack the ability to make the bold leap of the imagination which Lope sometimes attributes to

men. It is even possible that in the scene in which she finds Venturoso asleep and, examining him, finds him attractive, Lope is more anxious to bring Venturoso's excellencies before the audience than he is to attribute emotion to her:

¡Por mi vida, que me agrado
 agora despacio en velle!
 Que tiene buen parecer
 y de hombre noble la cara.
 ¿Si es noble? Mas cosa es clara
 que noble debe de ser. (200 b)

It is not merely love, but rejected love, which leads Venturoso to join the army; he leaves home when Florinda's father marries her to Leonardo, a Milanese gentleman. But in other plays love alone can inspire a man to better himself. Jorge, a servant at the beginning of the play, falls in love with Laudomia, whom his master is to marry; when her father is captured by the Moors he goes to his rescue in the hope of winning the daughter as a reward. Jorge lacks Venturoso's sense of self, and in fact he wins favour with the Moorish king because he is able temporarily to overcome his private desires and render absolute fidelity to his master. Falling in love gives him the hope of deserving Laudomia; it does not instruct him that he is her equal, but by implication it does so instruct the audience.

The relationship between falling in love and discovering one's destiny is less direct in Príncipe and Ursón. In these two plays love does not teach Torcato and Ursón who they are, but gives them the faculty of reason. In Príncipe Torcato has been brought up in the country and is not only a rustic but a simpleton. In the first act he is even the inferior of other peasants:

Liseno: ¿Cuál es la cosa que enfada
 con ser señal de buen año;
 no es oro, plata, ni estaño
 mas antes frisa con nada?
 De dos elementos hecho
 y al tiempo que se resuelve,
 en un elemento vuelve,
 aunque parece deshecho.

Torcato: ¡Verá el Diablo! ¿Dis que enfada
con ser señal de buen año?
Rosino: A fe que es enigma extraño
que dis que frisa con nada,
hecho de dos elementos
y de buen año señal.
¿Ella es la nieve?
Liseno: No hay tal.
Torcato: Ello es andar por los vientos.
¿Es el queso? (12)

Rosimunda's beauty gives him the wit to win her, by out-plotting her other admirers and by gaining admittance to her bed when she had been expecting someone else.

In Ursón Lope describes a man's spiritual rather than intellectual growth. Ursón has been brought up by a bear and although Luciano has attempted to give him the rudiments of a moral and religious education the lessons have not been learned. Now for the first time he sees a young and beautiful woman:

Villana: ¡Oh, cielo santo!
Ursón: ¡Por el Dios que vive en él,
que a no saber que lo es,
yo me humillara a tus pies
y te adorara por él!
¡Que hermosos ojos tienes!
¡Qué bien miran, qué bien lloran!
¡Cómo encienden y enamoran
con esos bellos desdenes!
¡Cómo es hermosa tu boca,
bello y brioso tu cuello!
¡Dichoso aquese cabello
que agora le cubre y toca!
Por ti conozco que quien
te hizo ese rostro hermoso,
es Dios todopoderoso,
señor del mal y del bien.
¡Quién le viera, para dalle
eternas gracias por él!
Dime, ¿dónde está? ¿Qué es dél?
para que vaya adoralle. (507 a-b)

He does not see her again; in this case love is an instrument rather than an end in itself. This is also true of the role of love in Jorge, in which it transpires that Laudomia is Jorge's sister. Lope has here carried the

notion of affinity to its natural conclusion by making Jorge recognise in Laudomia not only his class but his blood. This very innocent kind of incestuous passion is also described in Benavides, though less forcefully. Sancho and Sol have been brought up as peasants, unaware both that they are brother and sister and that the man in whose house they serve is their grandfather. Not only are they descended from a good family on their mother's side; their father is a former King of León. Their love for each other is an instinctive recognition of the relationship between them, and we may also be meant to infer that such a pure and constant love - it has lasted for six years - is not within the scope of the peasants they appear to be, although this is not proven. The actual connection between their love for each other and Sancho's finally showing himself to be worthy of the family name is a more remote one; when he learns that Sol is his sister he leaves home, and it is only after this point that he begins to accomplish great things, rescuing the young King Alfonso from the Moors and at one time even being proclaimed king himself.

It is remarkable that when Lope is writing specifically about men who seem to impose themselves upon their destiny, impelled by love or by some inner emotion, he should nevertheless contrive to deny them the capacity to act for themselves. This applies both to those who discover who they are and to anyone else who is the protagonist of a success story: Garcilaso de la Vega is not a free agent, neither is the Veinticuatro of Córdoba, nor Bernardo del Carpio (although Bernardo and Venturoso, whose stories are very similar, come quite close to seeming self-determining). It has already been suggested that Jorge, Venturoso and Torcato discover their identity after falling in love, but not as a direct result. The feelings which Florinda inspires in Venturoso are indeed closely related to his feelings about himself, but they do not of their own accord enable him to win her;

although he does eventually marry her after the death of her first husband, the marriage is by now purely symbolic of his restoration to his proper position in society. With Torcato and Jorge there is not even this connection between love and self-knowledge. For all three, and for Sancho and Ursón, the act of falling in love sets in motion a succession of events which eventually restore the hero to his family. Lope associates the cause with the result without establishing a causal relationship between them; the connection is no more than suggested, but suggested so powerfully that it can exist in the spectator's imagination even when it has not been, and could not be, demonstrated by logic. So it is that in Felisardo a student becomes a prince without any sense of strangeness. Tristán notes that Felisardo immediately catches the correct manner and tone of voice:

Almirante: Honrad vuestros vasallos.
 Felisardo: Vos, primo, honrarme podéis.
 Tristán: "Vos, primo, honrarme podéis."
 ¡Qué presto se le encajó
 el ser rey! ¡Qué presto habló
 con la gravedad que veis!
 Apenas al Almirante
 oyó decir el suceso,
 cuando se quedó más tieso
 que si comiera el montante. (241 a)

The audience was prepared for this not only because the scenes interpolated into Act I explicitly told it who Felisardo was, but by other hints.

Doristeo and Jacinto, angry with Felisardo for having taken Elisa from her father's house and planning to circumvent him, nevertheless cannot refrain from praising him:

Doristeo: Ir al Rey es lo mejor,
 pues del Rey justicia espero,
 aunque me agradó el valor
 de aquel noble caballero.
 Jacinto: ¿Por qué?
 Doristeo: Porque la llevó
 consigo, y no la dejó,
 ya que le tocó su amparo.
 Jacinto: Cuanto dices, está claro
 que es de malicia.

trick is explicitly directed towards the happy ending. This kind of play is in fact a celebration of the notion of harmony restored, emphasising the restoration itself and minimising the cause of disharmony which is merely a necessary preliminary.

Disguise is a frequent form of deception, but may be a cause of dissent as often as it is a contribution towards eventual harmony. Thus in Felisardo Elisa's pretence to be a statue promotes her marriage to Felisardo, but her male disguise tends on the contrary to separate her from her lover. Lope put his heroines into breeches almost by reflex; it was part of the breath of scandal which characterised the public appearance of an actress, and cannot always have been thought of as a concealment (especially when even the other characters in the play are not fooled). The most noteworthy cases of disguise are not these relatively casual changes of costume, which are simply a contribution towards the spectacle, but those which demand that an alien role be maintained through a major part of the play and where the resolution of the plot depends largely on this. Such plays are Maestro, Lucas, Molino, Ingrato, Favor, Serrana and Torneos. In these plays the hero or heroine is disguised as a means of winning the person they love: either because there is no other way of gaining access to the beloved, or because disguise averts the menace of a rival. As a general rule the dress of a person of lower rank is adopted when the comic possibilities of the device are to be exploited, as in Maestro or Lucas where gentlemen enter the household of their ladies as an instructor of some kind. When the role of a person of higher rank is adopted Lope's intention is not primarily comic, although this does not mean that incidental humour does not occur. But the use made of such a disguise in Burlas and Favor is more characteristic; in both plays people claim to be members of royal families, and this is in fact an anticipation of the position they will hold at the end of the play. Disguise

as someone of the opposite sex usually leads to comic situations. It is rare for men to disguise themselves as women: in Serrana Alejandro dresses as a serrana and is courted by his own father, but this is exceptional.

Maestro contains a very sustained case of disguise.¹ Aldemaro falls in love with Florela and gains entry into her house by capitalising on his greatest talent, which is for dancing. Florela's sister Feliciana has just married a rich man, and during the wedding celebrations both sisters have had reason to regret not knowing how to dance; their father, having refused all earlier requests to let them learn, now opportunely yields and Aldemaro is employed. As far as Florela is concerned the deception is soon over; her dancing teacher makes an immediate impression on her, and at the beginning of Act II he tells her who he is in the course of a lesson. Although Florela's father is in evidence throughout the play, it is not as a force overtly hostile to the marriage; it is true that when he finally consents to their marriage he does so under some duress, but this is partly because Lope had a penchant for showing us fathers who are forced into consenting to their children's choice of marriage-partner. What interrupts the courtship is instead the fact that Florela has another suitor, Bandalino, and that Bandalino is in turn loved by the recently married Feliciana. Bandalino twice causes jealousy between Florela and Aldemaro; the first time is early in the play when Aldemaro learns of his existence and is at once made apprehensive, and again very near the end when Florela is forced to appear to agree to marry Bandalino so as to save her sister's reputation. But apart from these occasions he is an obstacle because of his persistence and the perpetual need which this creates to outwit him spectacularly, and because

¹ The play was imitated by Calderón in his play of the same title, and by Wycherley in The Gallant Dancing Master. T.B. Barclay has compared Lope's and Calderón's versions in 'Dos Maestros de danzar'.

Gentleman

he is very nearly the innocent cause of the dishonour of both Feliciana and, by extension, of the heroine and her family. This is certainly not a play about honour, but the use of the honour element here helps to distinguish Maestro from some other domestic comedies. Aldemaro acquires dignity during the play. At first he impresses us as a gallant but spoiled young man, who upsets his father and other connections by plunging into the courtship of a woman he has never met; by the end he is more sober, having had to consider other things than his own inclinations, and having had the chastening experience of thinking Florela is to marry Bandalino when he had been sure she loved himself. Moreover the two lovers have had in common not merely a mutual passion but also a shared concern for their honour.

Aldemaro's disguise obliges him to assume other roles, the principal being that of go-between, which would of course only be seemly in someone of the low rank he is thought to possess. Both Bandolino and Feliciana think that he is serving their ends, and it is their placing so much trust in him that enables him to circumvent them. But the fact that he is meant to be a teacher and, specifically, of dancing is seldom forgotten. On several occasions people communicate, often in the presence of a third person, by using imagery taken from dancing. When Aldemaro suspects Florela of having spoken to someone the night before he says:

Anoche danzó [otro]
 por su bien, y por mi mal.
 Y mirad si tendré queja
 de aquella mudanza sola,
 pues que de una cabriola
 alcanzó un sí de una reja. (490 a)

Moreover most of Aldemaro's meetings with Florela, especially early in the play, take the form of dancing lessons, and it follows that in their actions as well as in their speech they glide repeatedly from the amorous to the terpsichorean, according to whether there is someone in the room with them or not:

Aldemaro: Ya de rodillas estoy,
y no me alzaré del suelo
sin tu perdón, claro cielo.
Florella: Alzate, ya te le doy;
mas para alzarte no más.
Aldemaro: Bien te engañé.
Florella: No me aprietes,
basta que así me sujetes.
Aldemaro: Agora en mi pecho estás.

Sale Feliciana

Feliciana: ¡Bien, por mi fe! ¿Así lo abrazas?
Florella: Visto nos han.
Aldemaro: No hayas pena.
También esta vuelta es buena
cuando los brazos enlazas,
y el saltillo en ocasión
da al abrazo buen donaire.
Florella: ¿Hícelo yo con buen aire?
Aldemaro: Muy bien tomas la lición.
Feliciana: ¿Qué es aquesto?
Florella: ¡Ah, Feliciana!
Aldemaro: ¡Oh, sí antes venido hubieras,
que danzar enseñar me vieras! (500 a-b)

There is a scene in Act III which takes this particular feature almost to excess. Aldemaro teaches a dance to both sisters, and claims that one sister must wait outside the room while the other dances with him; whereas earlier the lovers were subject to the accidental arrival of a third person, they now invite interruptions.

A method of deception more verbal than visual is the taking of someone at his word with a literalness untrue to the spirit in which that word was first given. It is this which clinches the transformation scene in Felisardo; both King and court explicitly say that Felisardo may marry Elisa while they still think she is a statue, and having done so have no choice but to accept the situation when the statue becomes flesh. Today such a method of exacting a promise from someone would probably be considered unfair, and the promise itself not binding. Possibly the private standards of Lope's contemporaries were not unlike our own, but certainly they were more disposed than we are to accept this kind of quibbling on-stage. We

are intended to admire Felisardo for his cleverness, and his discreción, rather than condemn him for false dealing. Another example is found in Engaño, which celebrates the trickery that Alfonso VI practised so as to capture Toledo from the Moors.¹ The King takes refuge in Toledo and is received generously by the Moorish King, who is endowed by Lope with many qualities proper to any Christian king. Alfonso is put under no restraint but that of not leaving unless the Moorish King says to him, three times, 'Vete'. He does in fact say this on a later occasion, but meaning that Alfonso should leave his presence rather than the kingdom; however Alfonso is by now ready to leave, and chooses to regard this as the necessary permission. He betrays his consciousness that he is acting with guile by leaving at night, rather than openly, and by shoeing his horse in reverse so that it looks as if someone has arrived rather than left. His knowledge of Toledo later helps him to take it. This shabby abuse of hospitality could be justified by the host's being merely a Moor, but only if such deception were never practised between Christians or if Moors were uniformly treated in this fashion. Lope's characterisation of Moors is in fact uneven; generally he ridicules them, but there are striking cases of his idealising them or at least according them some respect. Examples are found in Remedio and Casamiento, and in the second act of Engaño we have another case. Alfonso's conduct cannot be explained away merely by reference to the race of his adversary; instead this capacity for deception is indicative of Alfonso's fitness for rule.

We see verbal deception practised again in Traición, where it is certain that no shabbiness is implied. Don Antonio and Count Otavio are in

¹ The authenticity of this play is open to doubt. MB classify it as a 'comedia dudosa', but are not dogmatic. See p.479.

love with Policena; Otavio is favoured by the lady's father (to whom Antonio is a stranger) and admitted to his house, and so that he may also be admitted Antonio professes friendship to Otavio. Otavio immediately admits the unknown young man into his confidence, later saves his life, and then when he learns that Antonio is in love with Policena he gladly renounces her to him. By this time Antonio's feigned friendship has become real and he also renounces Policena, resolving, in a moving exchange of vows, to accompany Otavio and live with him in eternal friendship. Meanwhile Policena has been kidnapped and her father has offered four thousand ducados and her hand in marriage to the man who finds her. Antonio is discovered on-stage reflecting on his friendship for Otavio and vowing that he would resign Policena to him if it were only in his power to do so. He is interrupted by the arrival of another friend, who was in fact responsible for taking Policena away, and who says that he knows where she is and will allow Antonio the credit of retrieving her. Antonio tells Otavio the news and takes advantage of his incredulity to persuade him not only to repeat his renunciation of Policena but also to make a formal acknowledgement of Antonio's having offered her to him. But this time he is careful to make no corresponding promise, and when Policena reappears he claims her with a clear conscience. This does not argue lack of friendship, just as the earlier renunciation of Policena by both men did not argue lack of love. Lope is characteristically capable of using one theme to develop another, yet within the same work - although at a different moment of it - of exploiting both without reference to each other. On the one hand friendship is proved by a readiness to renounce love; in these circumstances friendship is not an indulgence (as love might be described) but an obligation created by Antonio's sense, as a man of honour, of what is owing to Otavio. If Lope had known

Lovelace's words on the relationship between love and honour,¹ he might well have thought them appropriate to this situation. On the other hand the strength of Antonio's love is demonstrated by its inspiring him to new heights of resourcefulness and discreción; to this end he is obliged to get the better of his friend but, he it noted, he does not lose his friendship. Lope does not put this into words, but he would probably have felt that a life devoted to friendship would have been as fruitless as a love affair unconsecrated by marriage. He permits such things to arise but not to endure. Always by the end of the play matters have been institutionalised: lovers not only marry but are permitted by their elders to do so. A real Platonic friendship, being eternal and unlimited, is too transcendental to be comprehended within a world view so committed to the institutions and values of society.

There is another, rather limited, way in which a play rests on a deception, and that is when it demonstrates a paradox. The essential characteristic of a paradoxical play is that it confronts the audience with an apparent impossibility, and by skilful manipulation of the facts contrives to prove that it is possible. As far as subject matter is concerned there is little that these plays have in common among themselves. El príncipe inocente, if it belongs to a type at all, is a 'foundling play' and in that respect resembles Reduán, Ursón and Venturoso. But it is given a special twist by the exploitation of the conventional impossibility that a prince could be an idiot. Lope has exaggerated the two classic features of the type, the foundling's noble birth and his rustic upbringing, and has made the hero a prince endowed not only with anonymity and poverty but also an ignorance so extreme as to make him a simpleton. This is deception for the

¹ See the last lines of 'To Lucasta, on going to the wars'.

sake of deception; Lope, rather than anyone within the play, has created a situation which subjects the people involved to strange misapprehensions about each other.

The exposition of a paradox is probably more suited to the short story, which lends itself to compression; the concentration on and examination of a topic is foreign to the comedia. Virtually all plays of this period contain incidents and characters which are not germane to the plot; moreover there were in performance separate entertainments, unconnected with the events or theme of the play, between the acts. El padrino desposado is in fact adapted from one of Bandello's short stories.¹ The story describes how King 'Giovanni di Ragona' honours one of his subjects not only by promising to attend his wedding but also by going to greet the bride on her arrival from Castile; he falls in love with her and marries her himself. 'Di questo amoroso matrimonio nacque quel glorioso re Ferrando di Ragona' (p.527); but there seems to be historical foundation for the tale. The Aragonese King, and with him all that part of the play taken from Bandello, does not enter Lope's version until Act III. The first two acts, replete with rivals both Moorish and Christian, are typical of the comedia but there is no authority in Bandello for anything that happens in them. The same kind of padding material is found in Viuda, casada y doncella although here it is more evenly distributed. The first act describes how it is that the bride, Clavela, is deserted before her marriage is consummated, and the beginning of Act II brings news of a shipwreck which is thought to have made her a widow. It is now Lope's task to maintain his heroine in her contradictory situation until her husband can be returned safely to her. The husband is meanwhile embroiled with Moors, escapes with the help of a

¹ See Tutte le opere, Milan, 1934-5, pp.523-7.

Moorish girl who is in love with him, and returns in a manner borrowed from the legend of the amantes de Teruel, after Clavela's second wedding but fortunately before its consummation.

In El amigo por fuerza we have a play whose entire framework is the development of a paradoxical situation. Friendship is essentially a voluntary affair. It is true that in Lope's plays we see it surrounded by conditions and duties so formalised as to seem to deprive it of the sweetness of spontaneity: friendship is only between equals in class, friends must have no secrets from each other, an offer of friendship exacts a response in kind. But in the context of the theatre these social obligations constitute a form of morality so instinctive as to make friendship, conditioned though we know it to be, truly spontaneous. Thus the yoking together of the concepts of 'friendship' and 'force' is indeed slightly shocking. Lope has devised a plot, drawing its incidents from the familiar situations of love and honour, which shows a man befriending another against his will. Turbino discovers by chance that his sister Lucinda has received Astolfo as her lover. His first impulse is to kill Astolfo, and later he is determined that the lovers should marry, but whatever the nature of his private intentions towards Astolfo and Lucinda it is always necessary that in public he should defend them from the intentions of others, since whatever is done must be done by himself. The progress of the enforced friendship is carefully calculated. At first Turbino has to speak on Astolfo's behalf; later he has to abduct his sister from the party taking her from Hungary to an arranged marriage in Bohemia; then he vows to release Astolfo from imprisonment and a probable execution, though this is actually accomplished by others; finally he and Astolfo fight together in a joust against two champions from Bohemia and, by winning, end the war between the two countries.

The execution is not so happy, because the change in the relationship

is positional rather than personal. It is for example a pity that the burden of the change should be placed entirely upon Turbino: Astolfo does not know Turbino is aware of his relationship with Lucinda and consequently has no attitude towards him at all, so that there is no real tension between the two young men. There is also the fact that Turbino sees himself under an obligation to pretend friendship to Astolfo before the obligation actually exists. His first reactions to the discovery of his sister's dishonour are very confused, and naturally enough; conflicting with his impulse to kill Astolfo are both a fear of the publicity this would give his sister and the fact that he himself loves Astolfo's sister, Lisaura, and is reluctant to act against her kin. Yet even at this stage he is in a position to propound the paradox:

Mas crea el Conde [Astolfo] traidor
 que un punto más no viviera
 si a su hermana no tuviera
 este incomparable amor.
 Lisaura a callar me esfuerza,
 disimulando el castigo;
 así, que él es mi enemigo
 y yo su Amigo por fuerza.
 Matar en público efeto
 es mi deshonor, y crueldad
 contra mi padre, y piedad
 darle la muerte en secreto.
 ¡Morirá en secreto el Conde!
 ¡Ay, Lisaura! ¿Yo podré
 verter tu sangre? No haré,
 que el Conde tu sangre asconde. (249 b)

It is not that the knack of making antithetical statements argues for a cooler mind than the situation calls for; on the contrary, antitheses abound in declamatory passages, and denote an intensification of emotion. But as yet he has no plans; he has not yet decided what to do, far less how to do it, and the phrase 'amigo por fuerza' refers essentially to the manner in which he executes his plans rather than to the plans themselves. It should be noticed that the declaration that he will be Astolfo's 'amigo por fuerza', though certainly not the only positive statement in the passage, is the only

one which goes uncontradicted. This slightly premature mention of the paradox is an unmistakable hint to the audience as to the particular development to be given a play that has opened on familiar lines - night scenes, the contrasting dialogues of nobles and servants, love, honour and rage. The hint is all the more useful precisely because Turbino has not yet embarked upon the pretended friendship which the audience, forewarned by the title, knows that it is to expect. However the greatest flaw in the execution comes at the end of the play, when Turbino and Astolfo are manifestly friends. They behave exactly as friends do in all Lope's plays; they accompany each other, their interests coincide and they act in concert. There is no sign at all that they have not always been friends, or that there is anything unusual in their relationship; circumstances have united them and they act accordingly. It is not that Lope has lost sight of the play's motif. Turbino is now 'el amigo por fuerza' par excellence; when he fights with Astolfo against the Bohemians it is the name he adopts, but by now it is a label which he uses with only the slightest of references to his situation vis à vis Astolfo:

Yo, el caballero sin nombre,
que solamente me llama
Amor 'Amigo por fuerza',
aunque ya lo soy por gracia. (286 a)

It was already a label at the beginning of Act III. Turbino comes on stage in disguise, intending to release Astolfo. He mentions his immediate circumstances - the facts that he is in the prison and that he has ingratiated himself with the alcaide - but there is no direct deference to Astolfo.

However he does mention Lisaura:

Metiόμε el Alcaide aquí ...
Trátame con amistad ...
Yo le pienso de descubrir,
en viendo buena ocasión,
la verdad de mi intención,
y hala de hacer o morir.

¡Oh, Amor! ¡Con qué fuerza esfuerza
 tu piedad a mi valor!
 ¿Cómo no adviertes, Amor,
 que soy Amigo por fuerza?
 Mira el hábito en que vengo
 si es que por amor disfama,
 y mira la pobre cama
 que sobre este suelo tengo.
 Mira las muchas bordadas
 y los doseles que dejo;
 mas ¡ay, Dios! ¿de qué me quejo?
 que éstas son más regaladas.
 Recíbeme, duro suelo,
 que basta volverte en gloria
 de Lisaura la memoria,
 porque es de mi gloria cielo.
 Pon esta cárcel y tierra
 a tu cuenta, esposa mía. (275 a)

In other words Turbino is impelled not by his honour but by his love for Astolfo's sister. Love is so pervasive an influence that when, as in this case, it is inappropriate as a motive, its invocation produces no very striking discord. Lisaura has no real connection with Lucinda's honour, with the necessity for Astolfo to marry her, and with Turbino's obligation to protect them both. She is introduced as the principal figure of a subsidiary action, but is given an exaggerated share of Turbino's attention because in the comedia love does tend to have this kind of importance. That this should happen suggests also how reluctant Lope is to concentrate on one subject, for this is not the only incidental material which he introduces. Lucinda is a princess, in danger of being married for reasons of state; Astolfo has killed a Bohemian noble before the play begins, and is a wanted criminal in that country, though something of a hero in his own. All this adds extra dimensions to the question of a marriage between Astolfo and Lucinda, and takes us still further away from the paradox of an enforced friendship. Thus, though this paradox provides an excellent plot structure, it does not of itself supply the content of the play.

In general the motive behind a play is not to prove a point, nor even to tell a story, but to entertain. Nevertheless there has to be something which starts the dramatist off, giving him a pretext for calling into action the familiar characters and situations. At times the pretext may be no more than that, having little importance in itself and sometimes lost sight of. At other times it is more dominant, especially if Lope's starting point has been a story borrowed from some other source complete with principal characters and episodes. The process by which Lope found his starting point has been conjectured by Azorín with a high degree of probability:

Lope es un gran periodista... Y lo curioso sería ver ... cómo la realidad cotidiana se impone a Lope y le da motivos para redactar un artículo, esto es una comedia. Una escena callejera, el párrafo de un libro, un paseo por el campo, el cruce del arroyo Abroñigal, una moza de cántaro vista en la fuente, las palabras de un predicador, el perro de un hortelano, los locos de un manicomio, un ramo de flores, un molino, un puente, cualquier cosa, en fin, de la vida diaria, entra en el cerebro de Lope y rápidamente logra ir asociando en su torno escenas, situaciones, actos, toda una obra que horas antes, tal vez minutos antes, no existía. (1)

The process need not always have been quite so casual; it is to be presumed that Lope not only waited for the idea for a play to present itself to him, but also went in search of it. He read very widely and the quest for material must have been one reason for this, although subsidiary to a simple love of reading and appetite for information.

The starting point, or motive, is among the most external and striking of the differences between the plays. This is because the motive is single. The complex of scenes and characters which comprises a play is multiple, and in a form of art which gives so little importance to formal structure as the comedia it is remembered not as a whole but by virtue of its parts. One may retain vivid memories of an individual scene, but then have difficulty in assigning it to a play. The nature of the starting point is often indicated

¹ From 'Contorno' in Lope en silueta, p.16.

by the title, either as it is found in the manuscript or in the Parte (or any other early printed edition), as Lope remembered it in one of the Peregrino lists, or as he sometimes paraphrased it in the last line or two of the play itself.

In Felisardo the motive is the transformation of a marble statue into a living person. It was to create precisely this dramatic moment that Lope wrote the entire play. He may have found the original idea for it in the Metamorphoses, when Pygmalion kisses the statue of Galatea, which he had carved and grown to love, and Venus breathes life into the piece of marble:

Corpus erat! saliant temptatae pollice venae.
 tum vero Paphius plenissima concipit heros
 verba, quibus Veneri grates agat, oraque tandem
 ore suo non falsa premit, dataque oscula virgo
 sensit et erubuit timidumque ad lumina lumen
 attollens pariter cum caelo vidit amantem.
 (Book X, 289-94) (1)

A fair proportion of the audience would have been familiar with this passage, either directly or by hearsay, and in fact Lope himself makes a passing reference to it during the play when the Admiral produces from mythology examples of strange loves:

Semiramis, siendo tal,
 a un caballo se rindió;
 Pasife a otro animal,
 Jerjes una planta amó,
 y el cónsul Crispo un moral; ...
 Juno, Alcides, Pigmaleón,
 a tres mármoles amaron. (260 a-b)

But familiarity with what is after all only a conjectural source is not a

¹ The corresponding scene in Felisardo has none of this intimacy:

Felisardo: ¿Juras que me la darás
 por mujer?

Rey: Digo que juro
 que es tu mujer ...

Felisardo: Tú, señora, di
 si has de ser mi esposa.

Elisa: Sí.

Almirante: ¡Gran prodigio! (264 b - 265 a)

prerequisite for the enjoyment and understanding of the scene. There are many precedents for a story about an image or a corpse which comes to life. The topic would have been most familiar to its original audience within Christian mythology, although there is no question of that kind of reference here. But there is also the story of the difunta pleiteada about which there is a play that may possibly be by Lope and which was written, if it is his, in this early period.¹ In Lope's play a woman is offered a good marriage by her father and gives her consent to it although she realises she has attracted the attentions of a strange young man. He later declares his love for her but, though she prefers him, she feels obliged to proceed with the marriage which has been arranged for her. Immediately after this has taken place she faints and is thought to have died. Her lover visits her supposed corpse and finds that she is still warm; he revives her and then claims that by so doing he has won the right to marry her himself.² In addition to this there is the story of the Sleeping Beauty, which apparently symbolises the awakening of winter into spring. English readers are familiar with two very similar scenes in Much Ado about Nothing and The Winter's Tale.

It is certainly not the case that Felisardo is about the transformation of a marble statue into a woman. The transformation itself occupies the last scene of the play, rather more than one hundred lines of verse. Most of the last act is a preparation for it, with the exception of the scene between Felisardo and Elisa in which they quarrel and are reunited: this

¹ See MB which, although classifying it with the plays 'de dudosa o incierta autenticidad' has this comment: 'Creemos ... que la comedia, tal y como se conserva, es la de Lope..' (p.446). It is listed in P.

² See M. Goyri de Menéndez Pidal, 'La difunta pleiteada', reprinted in De Lope de Vega y del romancero, pp.7-59. She gives many other versions of the story, in which it is more common for the girl to be dead, and revived by the Virgin out of compassion for the two lovers.

resolves their discord of the second act, and it also heralds a happy ending, but it is embraced by the statue scene rather than relevant to it. It is also open to question whether Doristeco's speech about Elisa's birth is directly relevant, since it is not essential to the removal of Elisa from court. The false transformation also occupies the last thirty lines of the second act, where it is sprung just before the interval upon an audience conditioned by the title to react to any mention of marble. The exact end to which the statue trick is directed is the defeat of the King's opposition to a marriage between Elisa and Felisardo and, secondarily, the release of Elisa from prison. The first two acts bring us to a point at which the King's refusal to consider the marriage has become Felisardo's major problem. The relative social position of the couple, Jacinto's rivalry, Doristeco's occasional distrust of Felisardo, Elisa's obstinate refusal to confess to her identity, even the otherwise unconnected lovers' quarrel between Flérida and Ergasto: all these are not subsidiary to the question of the King's opposition but are, like it, alternative statements of the disharmony-harmony concept. Lope selects the issue of the King's opposition for a key position in the plotting of the play, but in the texture of the play it is only one issue among many. That this is so is borne out by Lope's insistence on seeming to resolve Jacinto's rivalry and Doristeco's pretended opposition by the statue scene, in the manner already described. Likewise Elisa's distrustful behaviour and the question of whether or not she is Felisardo's social inferior are disposed of during the preliminaries of the final scene. They are implicated in Tristán's machinations and, like the all-important trick with the statue, originate from him; however it cannot be said that they are vital to the deception. If the transformation of the marble statue is not the subject of the play it is nevertheless one of its most distinctive features. It is important not only as a spectacle in its own right, but

because it is such a positive way of ending the play, so much so that a spectator might well not notice its inadequacies as the conclusion of an argument or, noticing them, might feel too benign to object. As conclusions go, it is illogical but not unsatisfactory.

In Locos the starting point of the play is ostensibly the madhouse for which Valencia was evidently famous. Reinero describes it in these terms:

De las cosas, Leonato, más notables
que en aquesta ciudad insigne he visto
depués que ando por ella rebozado,
es aqueste hospital, obra famosa
entre las más que aqueste nombre tienen;
que aunque el de Zaragoza lo sea tanto,
que pienso que con él competir puede,
este puede a su lado alzar la frente
por una de las siete maravillas
que la piedad en este mundo ha hecho. (197-8)

On the evidence of the play it was on the itinerary of every diligent sightseer, and presumably Lope himself visited it during the two years he lived in that town (1588-1590). If Morley and Bruerton are correct, the play was written after he had left Valencia,¹ and it is true that it has the air of presenting Valencia to outsiders rather than to its own inhabitants.

A brief description is also given of the other sights:

Leonato: Esta, Erifila, es Valencia;
la puerta es ésta de Cuarte;
aquí dio Venus y Marte
una divina influencia.
Estos son sus altos muros,
y aquesta el Turia, que al mar
le paga en agua de azar
tribute en cristales puros.
Aquel es el sacro Seo,
y este el alto Micalete.

¹ MB, 248-249. They date it 1590-1595, during most of which time Lope was living at Alba de Tormes.

Erífila: Ella es tal cual la promete
su grande fama al deseo.
¡Qué fértil!

Leonato: Por grande extremo.

Erífila: El es un bello lugar.

Leonato: Yo no le he visto mejor. (68-9)

Lope's depiction of the madhouse is hardly likely to be documentarily accurate; the mixture of mirth and compassion which the hospital must have provoked is here prompted by conventional literary factors (such as mistaken identity, puns, and distressed heroines) and not by the spectacle of anything resembling actual madness. Neither is there any portrayal of Valencian life in general: Leonato's dry summary quoted above hardly fulfills this function. The only exception is that we see how the least unmanageable of the lunatics were allowed to beg outside the hospital on the feast-day of the Holy Innocents, which is described as being a custom peculiar to Valencia:

Hoy, día de los Santos Inocentes,
hace fiesta Valencia en esta casa,
que se llama 'porrate' en nuestra lengua. (179)

The play consists rather of an amazing series of variations on the theme of madness.

The factual basis for this is of course the existence of the hospital itself, and a medical amplification of the theme is supplied by the descriptions, especially those given by the doctor in Act III, of ways of curing various types of madness. More fantastic than this are the actual madmen. In the first place these are Martín and Tomás, who appear intermittently throughout the play; they are students whose wits have been turned by love. They occupy within the community the position of 'trusties', and apart from the continual amusement provided by the irrelevance of all they say Tomás also has a vital part in the plot when, unconscious of the effect he is creating, he tells Floriano that efforts are being made to arrest him and that copies of his portrait have been distributed. There are also the madmen who appear in the begging scene and later at the mock-wedding in

Act III. These are Calandrio, who fell in love above his station and - to make matters even funnier - is Portuguese:

Coimbra me matou e deu vida.
 ¡Oh montes de Coimbra, fermoseados
 de la inmortal belleza de aquel corpo,
 em que vive hum espirito taõ grave! (201)

Mordacho, who lost his wits through music:

La música es divina concordancia
 deste mundo inferior y del angélico.
 Toco quanto hay en todo, todo es música:
 música el hombre, el cielo, el sol, la luna,
 los planetas, los signos, las estrellas;
 música la hermosura de las cosas.
 Ut, sol, fa, sol, re, mi, fa, sol, re, ut. (196)

and Belardo, a poet, who is amusing less by virtue of what he says than because he is a depiction of Lope himself:

Belardo fue su nombre:
 escribe versos, y es del mundo fábula
 con los varios sucesos de su vida,
 aunque algunos le miran que merecen
 este mismo lugar con mejor título. (199)

(This is probably a reference to the case brought against him for libels against Elena Osorio and her family, which was the cause of his being exiled from Madrid in 1588). These madmen are real only in the sense that their madness is not deliberately assumed during the play; they are obviously satirical portraits of a conventional kind.

Next there are those characters who assume madness for some reason or other. The principal amongst these is Floriano, who has killed a prince in a fight outside a lady's window in Zaragoza and has sought protection from his friend Valerio in Valencia. Valerio suggests the madhouse as a refuge and presents him to its administrator as a patient in need of attention. The refuge turns out to be less secure than might have been expected since Liberto, who has come in Floriano's pursuit, actually visits the hospital: such is its fame as a tourist attraction. If the hero assumes madness voluntarily, the heroine does ~~no~~ involuntarily. Erifila comes to Valencia

both to avoid a marriage her father has arranged for her and because she believes herself in love with her father's servant Leonato. But Leonato, incensed that she will not let him become her lover, strips her not only of her jewels but also of her clothes and abandons her, most opportunely, outside the madhouse. Here she is seen by the doorkeeper who refuses to believe her story and assumes she is raving; he therefore obliges her to enter the madhouse. Once she has been admitted she pretends to be mad, in part because she can think of no alternative:

Ya soy de seso incapaz;
 que en lugar donde no hay seso
 es la opinión pertinaz.
 Alto; yo quiero ser loca,
 pues ya no hay otro remedio,
 aunque la cosa no es poca,
 y este furor vive en medio
 del daño que me provoca. (107)

But the main reason is so that Lope can bring her into a direct relationship with Floriano. At their first meeting both, in their capacity as sane people, are struck by the physical beauty of the other and moved to compassion by the spectacle of one who lacks the spiritual perfection which should accompany it:

Floriano: El mundo asombre
 ver la hermosura del suelo
 abatida con tal nombre.
 ¡Qué de tal alta hermosura
 fuese pensión tu locura!
 Erffila: ¡Qué a tan perfecto edificio
 falte el más divino oficio
 que adornó su compostura! (110)

When, having contemplated each other at length, they finally speak it is in terms of the Orlando furioso. Both, in equal measure, maintain a pretence of madness and test the other's reactions; eventually they break through the other's facade, each by telling his own story as if it were yet another fiction but in a manner which the other realises to be authentic. The extended conversations between them occupy a significant part of the first

two acts; the audience is fully in the secret, and delights in seeing the two lovers' uncertainty and confusion.

There are two other people who pretend to be mad; these are Fedra, the niece of the hospital administrator, and her maid Laida. They assume madness because they are in love with the disguised Floriano, now known as Beltrán, and see this as the best way of being allowed contact with him; they also hope to prevent the relationship which is clearly developing between 'Beltrán' and 'Elvira'. It is Laida who takes the initiative in this; her mistress discovers her pretending to be a queen and, quickly seeing the advantages of the pretence, assumes the role of her dueña. The humour of the situation is increased by the fact that, although each plays up to the other, neither knows whether her companion is really mad or only pretending to be so. Despite the fact that she merely followed Laida's example, Fedra has the advantage of being mistress rather than maid and persuades her uncle that she be allowed to marry 'Beltrán', avowing that this will restore her to sanity. Gerardo, her uncle, agrees to this although he intends the marriage to be a mock ceremony only. It is this wedding scene which brings about the dénouement of the play (in which it is discovered that Floriano did not kill the prince but only his page, and is thus free from all taint of crime).

But the use which Lope makes of the theme of madness goes far beyond the comic juxtaposition of false and genuine lunatics. He draws very heavily on the fact that the highly emotional and wrought-up condition of all the characters in the play makes them appear mad, and in particular he relies on the convention that love itself is a form of madness. Thus when Valerio first suggests that Floriano enter the hospital his friend, who is in a state of shock as a result of having killed the prince and fled to Valencia, sees no difficulty in carrying out the pretence:

Valerio: ¿Sabréis haceros loco y disfrazaros?
 Floriano: ¿Y qué me importa cuando loco sea? (67)

Very soon afterwards this idea is repeated with specific reference to Floriano's being at that time in love with one Celia:

Floriano: Pues dadme que una vez furioso quede,
 que yo lo haré de suerte que os espante,
 si el fingimiento a la verdad excede.
 Valerio: Para fingir os basta ser amante. (68)

Later, when Valerio first sees and is attracted to Erífila, he becomes convinced that he must himself be mad for having fallen so suddenly in love, and moreover with an irrational being:

Ya veo mi seso poco,
 pues que mi alma no toca
 en que es loca; mas si es loca,
 ¿Qué mucho que yo sea loco?
 Si el amante se transforma
 en lo amado, loco soy,
 pues a una loca le doy
 el alma en que está su forma. (95-6)

Later still Floriano and Erífila find themselves in a similar position, unable to think that the overwhelming attraction which they feel for each other can be anything other than insanity:

Erífila: ¿Como este loco me agrada?
 O está en su seso, o estoy yo
 de mi seso enajenada. (116)

Floriano: ... no es razón tampoco
 perder el seso por quien no lo tiene. (119)

In the exaggeration of Laida's and Fedra's manoeuvres to win Floriano there is a touch of genuine madness, as there is also in Valerio's plan to remove Erífila from the hospital by pretending to be her relation, which puts her in his power but cannot in itself gain her affection.

It is not simply that love is said to be equivalent to or motivated by madness: the word loco itself obsesses everyone and recurs constantly, together with its opposite, cuerto:

Floriano: ¡Oh loca a quien cuerdo adoro,
que solo es loco el tormento!
Si a mi me estuviera bien
que supieras que soy cuerdo,
quizá me quisieras bien. (112)

Valerio: Yo soy, Floriano, el loco; yo soy loco;
que tú, con solo el hábito que tienes,
haces oficio de sagaz y cuerdo. (119)

Floriano: Valerio, que es de todo mi secreto
archivo, amparo, defensor y asilo,
por esta loca, por el mismo efeto,
sigue de amor el amoroso estilo,
y dice que le pone en tanto aprieto,
que su curso vital cuelga de un hilo,
y que la ha de gozar, o cuerda o loca;
que amor ha menester cordura poca. (121)

Perhaps the most brilliant example of this conceptual juggling occurs early in the play when Erífila and Leonato have just arrived in Valencia and Leonato is looking for a pretext upon which to abandon her. He finds it in this exchange:

Erífila: ¿Qué hará mi padre cruel? ...
Leonato: Llamárate hija infame,
y a mí criado traidor.
Erífila: Loca, si sabe de amor,
te aseguro que me llame. (70)

To Erífila this is a natural part of the language of love, but Leonato chooses to take it as an insult:

Leonato: No tienes por qué negar
que no me tienes en poco.
Erífila: ¿Estás loco?
Leonato: Estuve loco;
mas no lo pude excusar.
Erífila: ¿Qué tiene aqueso que ver
con decir que por amarte
estoy loca? ¿Es agraviarte,
por quererte, enloquecer? (72)

The effect of this scene relies on the fact that, guided by the title and by the mention which has already been made of the madhouse, the audience is in exactly the right frame of mind to appreciate the irony of the situation to the full, even before there is in fact any formal connection between Erífila and the madhouse.

The pretence of madness also gives Lope a splendid excuse to deploy the technique of engañar con la verdad, that is, to delight the audience by having characters on stage make statements which the audience knows to be the literal truth but which the other characters assume to be lies. They may make this assumption for any of a number of reasons: because they believe the other is trying to deceive them, because the truth seems too incredible, because it suits Lope to make them incredulous or - as here - because they believe they are talking to madmen who have no perception of the difference between truth and falsehood. A minor example occurs when Erifila is found virtually naked outside the madhouse by its doorkeeper and two inmates who, accustomed to hearing nothing but fantastic tales, do not believe her when she describes what we have just seen happen to her, and assume she must therefore be mad. But the best example is the scene in which Liberto, who has come to Valencia to look for Floriano, is in effect told by both Floriano and Erifila that the man he seeks stands before him:

Erifila: ¿Quién sois vos? ¿A quién buscáis?
 Liberto: Yo, hermana, vengo a buscar
 un famoso delincuente.
 Floriano: Sospecho que está presente
 y que no le habéis de hallar.
 Liberto: Lo postrero puede ser.
 Erifila: ¿Qué ha hecho?
 Liberto: Mató el tirano
 a un rey.
 Erifila: ¿Y el nombre?
 Liberto: Es Floriano.
 Erifila: Pues veis aquí su mujer.
 Liberto: Graciosa loca y hermosa. (153-4)

This scene is a tour de force; the audacity of the two lovers reaches the height of Floriano's making this comment on his own portrait:

Pardiez, que está parecido,
 aunque no os parece a vos.
 Pues yo conozco a su dueño
 y sé muy bien dónde está. (159)

When Liberto eventually leaves, and Erifila is alone with Floriano, she makes the only possible comment:

Ahora os digo que estás loco. (159)¹

¹ 'os' seems ungrammatical, and is not found in Acad.