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ABSTRACT

Cervantes' *Ocho comedias y ocho entremeses nuevos, nunca representados:*
A Theater of Tradition and Innovation

by

Michael Kleinhempel Predmore

Advisor: Dr. Lía Schwartz

This study closely examines the eight interludes and eight full-length plays that Cervantes published in a collection on the thirteenth of September, 1615. Although these theatrical works were published together, the collection has seldom been examined in its entirety as a coherent unit. The purpose of this study, therefore, will be to re-cast a critical focus upon these theatrical works as a whole, in order to provide insight into Cervantes as both a playwright and as an inquisitive and unconventional thinker of his day. Typically, Cervantes was seen as a fairly conventional dramatist until around 1950, when a significant number of scholars began to point out his great innovative tendencies and departure from the conventional theatrical traditions of his day. In this regard, I wish to re-examine the theatrical compilation he published in his later years, in order to demonstrate what he learned from other *pre-teatro nuevo* playwrights like Lope de Rueda, as well as to indicate some of the major dramatic innovations he brought to light. I consider Cervantes' particular interpretation of the Horatian dictum *aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae* as a guiding principle in crafting his unique brand of theater. I argue that rather than providing an explicit moral message, Cervantes chooses instead to present a focused theme and subject matter for the consideration of his audience, inviting them to participate actively in drawing a moral, rather than having his characters explicitly articulate how the public is supposed to think and feel.
about the events just witnessed. This technique was not common in Cervantes' time period, and indeed represents a major stylistic innovation. Furthermore, I have classified each of the eight plays and eight interludes according to the subgenre to which it pertains, in order to explore in depth his particular variations within each genre. I also consider the ways in which his meta-theatrical tendencies shape both his reflection on the nature of theater as well as his stagecraft itself. I conclude with an analysis of Cervantes' deliberate resistance to specific dramatic tropes, such as the "happy-ending" in marriage, or the anticipated conflict and pairings of certain stock characters within the comedia de enredos genre. I demonstrate that Cervantes was always looking for ways to surprise his audience and defy convention, and was never content to simply accept established paradigms. While he is very critical of innovation for its own sake, he is also deeply invested in employing intricately crafted and novel techniques in order to awaken the consciousness of his audience to consider fundamental moral, political, and religious conflicts of his day. He defends the role of dramatic art in illuminating these conflicts, indirectly countering the religious polemic against theaters prevalent in late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century Spain.
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INTRODUCTION

There has been a growing interest in both the drama of Cervantes and in Cervantes as a dramatist in recent years. There still exists, nevertheless, a certain overgeneralization of specific tendencies in his theater that has pervaded the field and complicated the reading of his dramas for modern scholars. For the purposes of simplicity, I think it is fair to say that the view of Cervantes' theater for the first fifty or so years of the twentieth century differs significantly from the view of Cervantes from Joaquín Casalduero's Sentido y forma del teatro de Cervantes (1951) onward. For the first half of the twentieth century, Cervantes was largely regarded as a minor dramatist, whose plays were relatively accomplished, but nevertheless still rough around the edges, lacking in the professional and technical expertise necessary to elevate them to the same standing as his towering narrative works. It was not until Casalduero's first, more contemporary, assessment of the theater of Cervantes that he began to be appreciated as a great dramatist of his day. Casalduero, nevertheless, still regarded Cervantes as a relatively conventional dramatist, drawing heavily on the theatrical tradition that preceded him. On the other hand, ever since the 1977 publication of Jean Canavaggio's masterful study of the complete theatrical works of Cervantes, Cervantès dramaturge. Un théâtre à naître, it seems that the tendency for many modern critics is to regard Cervantes as a thoroughly innovative dramatist, who wasn't afraid to radically alter many of the established conventions of the theater of his day and who broke sharply with tradition, while still deliberately resisting the techniques that became in vogue with the teatro nuevo school of theater made popular by his rival and contemporary, Lope de Vega.

To be fair to both Casalduero and Canavaggio, neither of them regard Cervantes as wholly traditional nor wholly innovative in his theatrical production, and both acknowledge that he was indebted to traditional theater and yet crafted unique techniques, while still being indebted to the
established paradigms prevalent in his era. In fact, while Canavaggio proposed that Cervantes was deliberately seeking to craft his own formula for the stage, it is thanks in large part to his comprehensive and profound study that we are also aware of the diverse range of influences upon which he drew, which include not only the Spanish tradition prior to Lope de Vega, but also the Italian *commedia dell'arte*, the Italian *novella*, the Carolingian tradition elaborated by Boccaccio and Ariosto, the picaresque, the chivalric, and the pastoral literary traditions, popular folklore and fables, as well as real historical incidents. But the reason I have chosen as part of the title for this study "a theater of tradition and innovation" is because I think that, typically, criticism of the past has been overly concerned with emphasizing one or the other side of this dichotomy in its discussion of Cervantes as dramatist. Beginning with the ancients, *Imitatio* and *innovatio* were both part of the paradigmatic formula for artistic composition that continued to be dominant in the Iberian Peninsula in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Like many of his contemporaries, Cervantes followed this tradition in many ways and in many more ways departed from it. But what is it about Cervantes' theater in particular that seems so modern and so contemporary to so many of us? What aspects are present in his particular style that set him apart from his contemporaries? To better understand these and other aspects of his theater, it is instructive to examine precisely the theater that was never performed in his day, and that subsequently was compiled and arranged for publication by Cervantes himself in 1615, the same year as the publication of *Don Quixote Part II*.

Curiously, there are relatively few modern studies that consider the *Ocho comedias y ocho entremeses nuevos, nunca representados* as a coherent whole. Most scholars either examine the plays in isolation from one another, or consider the *genres* of the *entremés* (interlude) and the *comedia* (full-length drama or comedy) separately. While this is certainly understandable, as it
allows for a more detailed understanding of each individual work, it also limits the depth and scope of our understanding of why Cervantes chose to publish precisely these plays at the end of his life. Clearly he sought to preserve them for posterity, conscious that he would not live to see them represented on the stage. But beyond this, Cervantes himself shows us a clear intentionality behind the release of this compendium as well in its often quoted Prólogo al lector. In it, he not only expresses his frustration with being eclipsed by the "monarquía cómica" of the great Lope de Vega, he also expresses his deep appreciation for the tradition of theater in Spain prior to him and his contemporary, and in my view attempts to situate himself within the paragon of the great dramatists of his day, using the topical authorial humility of his era. His expected humility aside, Cervantes pays tribute to the dramatists from which he learned and who inspired him, and in particular, to Lope de Rueda, whom he credits in large part with the older paradigms that preceded the Teatro nuevo. Much of our early knowledge of many of the Spanish dramatists Cervantes names comes from this prologue, in which he also credits and briefly critiques the works of Navarro (?), Fray Alonso Ramón (1561-1632), Miguel Sánchez (1560-1620), Mira de Amescua (1574-1644), Francisco Agustín Tárrega (1554-1602), Guillén de Castro (1569-1631), Gaspar de Ávila (?), Gaspar Aguilar (1561-1623), Luis Vélez de Guevara (1579-1644), and Antonio de Galarza.¹ In this sense, it becomes evident that Cervantes was attempting to contextualize for his readers both the nature and the quality of the writers that had come before him, so as to situate himself and his contributions within that tradition. Keeping this factor in mind, the time has come to reexamine

¹ See the excellent editions by Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas (1998) and Baras Escolá (2012) of the Entremeses for more information about these authors and their respective dates; to date, we know almost nothing about Antonio de Galarza and Gaspar de Ávila and their respective works, and we are uncertain as to the identity of Navarro as well.
this compendium as a whole, in order to better understand where Cervantes can be situated within this older paradigm of Spanish theater and where he lies outside of it.

Central to my analysis of the various plays will be Horace's pronouncement "aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae, / aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae," (Ars Poetica, vv. 333-4) which was still a dominant principle for the composition of dramatic, narrative and poetic works throughout the Spanish Golden Age. This maxim of course was common to both Cervantes and his contemporaries, but it is his particular interpretation and employment of it which is of interest here. As I will attempt to demonstrate, Cervantes' use of this guiding principle differs substantially from that of his contemporaries, many of whom articulate much more explicitly a moral or a message at the end of their dramas. As we explore the situations evoked by Cervantes in many of his plays and interludes, we will see that he generally allows the characters, situations and dramatic development to reveal their significance on their own. That is, rather than didactically instructing his audience in how to think or feel about a particular dramatic denouement, he opts in some cases to avoid an explicit resolution altogether. Rather, Cervantes presents a focused subject matter for the attention of the audience, inviting them to participate actively in drawing a moral, without having his characters explicitly articulate how we are supposed to think and feel about the events just witnessed. This particular dramatic technique was not common in the time period, and very well might have been introduced to the Spanish theater by Cervantes. The value and virtue of this method of presentation is that it not only allows Cervantes to hold his audience's attention in a distinctive way, but also obliges them to engage more actively with the material of the drama in order to come to their own conclusions about the meaning of the play.

In the course of my investigation, I have classified the interludes and plays according to their respective subgenres, as I have indicated in my division of chapters in the table of contents.
This division enables us to better understand how Cervantes' composition and dramatic techniques in each respective genre evolved over the course of his life, and what he was most likely trying to achieve with each play. The aim of this study, therefore, is to explore what Cervantes’ writing in each individual play, as representative of a broader theatrical genre, says both about Cervantes the dramatist, as well as Cervantes the political and humanist thinker. By comparing theatrical works of the same genre contained within this compendium, we not only gain a greater sense of his stagecraft, dramatic techniques, linguistic techniques, and timing, we also gain a greater sense of who Cervantes was as a thinker, and the “message” he sought to impart with each individual drama. Cervantes is a kind of thinker rarely seen in his day. Unlike Quevedo, who often makes explicit how his readers or audience are to feel about each character, or Lope de Vega, who skillfully manipulates his public's emotions, but who doesn’t vary significantly in general from his established formula, Cervantes presents subject matter for the audience’s consideration, and, as we have mentioned, allows them to draw their own conclusions. We shall see over the course of this investigation that the lack of a definite conclusion in many of Cervantes' works allows him to present a situation that brings about reflection on a particular problem or concern of his day. This is especially true of his short one-act interludes, where his contributions to the development of the genre are perhaps most notable.

In most of Cervantes' full-length plays, the conclusion is considerably more definite, but nevertheless less conventional, and more "reflective." His dramas have a certain "specular" quality about them that casts a critical eye back on the audience and society at large. This aspect of his

---

2 There are rare exceptions, which are often his greatest masterpieces, such as *Fuenteovejuna*, *El caballero de Olmedo*, or *El castigo sin venganza*. 
drama is due to multiple factors, including the metatheatrical elements present in numerous plays, Cervantes' masterful control of complex dramatic entanglements (*enredos*), the unexpected or unresolved conclusion, and finally, the contrast between several works of the same subgenre. As we will attempt to demonstrate, each of the captivity plays in the collection, *Los baños de Argel, La gran sultana,* and *El gallardo español,* are all written in a different mode (tragic, comic, and heroic, respectively), and hence, each serves a different dramatic function, although they are all part of the same subgenre. Likewise, the *comedias de enredos,* *La casa de los celos,* *El laberinto del amor,* and *La entretenida,* all demonstrate aspects of Cervantes' stagecraft at different points in his career, culminating in the brilliant parody of the *teatro nuevo* style of *comedia de capa y espada* that is *La entretenida.* What I have classified as the *picaresque* plays are in fact extremely unconventional dramas: one, *El rufián dichoso,* is a hagiographic comedy, that is part picaresque and part tale of transformation in a journey towards sainthood, and the other, *Pedro de Urdemalas,* is a deep meditation on the nature of theater and the transformative power of acting.

With respect to the interludes, in which Cervantes arguably contributed even more to the theatrical genre than he did with his full-length *comedias,* the classification by genre is likewise helpful. We have two plays which deal with legal themes in a comedic light. Although the divorce court is a fiction of Cervantes' making in the sixteenth century, *El juez de los divorcios* is, in part, a parody of the bureaucracy of the time period, and of the constant obstructionism of the legal system. *La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo* pokes fun at the impossibility of having a legitimate, democratic election when none of the candidates that present themselves for office is truly qualified to serve. The two plays dealing with a cuckolded husband, *El viejo celoso* and *La

---

3 Perhaps most notably in *Pedro de Urdemalas,* which is, in large part, a reflection upon the transformative power of theater to reveal greater truths.
cueva de Salamanca, contrast two models of excessive folly. The former interlude presents us with an old man who is so overzealous in his attempt to prevent his wife from cheating, even when he has no reason to suspect her, that he invites his own undoing, whereas the latter depicts a husband who is so foolishly gullible that he would rather believe nonsensical superstition than accept the obvious truth that is right before his eyes. In La guardia cuidadosa, we have a romantic rivalry that is not only comical, but subtly explores truths of the economic circumstances of the time period, and of the folly of pursuing an unrequited love. Finally, in each of the picaresque interludes, Cervantes examines a distinct dimension of his society utilizing a burlesque mode of representation. In El rufián viudo, he contrasts the "higher" and "lower" cultural and linguistic registers to express in grandiose terms an elegy to a deceased prostitute. He also appropriates and recasts another literary character, Quevedo's Escarramán, as the guest of honor and master of ceremonies for the pimp Trampagos' prompt remarriage ceremony after his wife's death. In el vizcaíno fingido, two rogues swindle a street-savvy prostitute out of some money in a play that fundamentally demonstrates the folly of presuming to know more than one does. Finally, El retablo de las maravillas depicts not only a fierce critique of the obsession with blood purity and with being a cristiano viejo prevalent in Cervantes' day, but also presents a deep reflection on the nature of representation, power, and willful self-deception.

I hope that, with this summary, I have awakened the reader's interest in the chapters to follow. I have modeled my investigation in part upon the aforementioned work of Casalduero in the format of my discussion. My intention has been to render a scene-by-scene close reading analysis of all eight plays and eight interludes written by Cervantes in this compendium. In the interests of examining what each play tells us about Cervantes' theatrical style, composition, and intention more closely, I have opted to minimize comparative analysis with his prose works, except
when necessary, since an extensive amount of work has already been done in this area, and I wish to consider each individual play on its own merits. Additionally, because I wish to limit this study to the compendium that Cervantes published towards the end of his life, I also minimize references to and comparisons with the other three dramas, *Tragedia de Numancia*, *El trato de Argel*, and *La conquista de Jerusalén por Godofre de Bullón*. I should also note that, while I might be criticized for excessive plot summary at certain junctures, I have felt that rendering this kind of close analysis is necessary to elucidate original points I wish to make about specific dramas. The virtue of this kind of close reading is that there are select scenes (which will be evident later) that have typically been neglected or passed over as unimportant by most critics. I hope that, by providing a more detailed commentary on a scene-by-scene basis, I will be able to present a greater sense of the overall coherence of each dramatic work, and show how each individual scene fits into the overall framework. For example, as we will see, I question and problematize the conventional reading of the false accusation in *El laberinto del amor*, I present a unique perspective on the dynamic of power, deception and manipulation in *El retablo de las maravillas*. I also demonstrate that there is no inherent contradiction in Cervantes denouncing the obsession with blood purity and the excessive preoccupation with being a *cristiano viejo* while at the same time being a fervent patriot, catholic, and occasionally, showing elements of antisemitism himself. For these and other reasons, I have felt it appropriate to utilize the model of close reading, while minimizing both theoretical and comparative analysis paradigms, to explain clearly my interpretation of these works without the need to utilize much specialized terminology. Finally, I avoid an extensive discussion of the
biography of Cervantes and of the dating of the individual works, because these areas of discussion have already been addressed in far more detail and with greater rigor than I could here.4

Before we begin our study, a brief summary of the major contributions to the field in the twentieth century that consider the entire corpus of Cervantes' theater is in order. The 1915-1922 Obras completas by Rudolph Schevill and Adolfo Bonilla is in my view the first major modern effort to standardize the text and to offer helpful interpretive annotation. As excellent as this edition is, however, it still lacks the methodological rigor of more modern critical editions. Schevill and Bonilla do an excellent job of classifying the main theme of each play, as well as analyzing the verse and meter when appropriate. Cotarelo y Valledor's 1915 study represents the first major twentieth-century study of Cervantes' theater, in which the critic examines the context of Cervantes' dramatic production and divides his theater into two major "moments," that roughly correspond with different chronological periods of his production. He also considers each play individually with particular emphasis on potential sources and comparative analysis with his other theatrical and prose works. These early efforts considered Cervantes' theater of a quality inferior to his other works, a view that is becoming less clear with contemporary scholarship. Beginning with Robert Marrast's Cervantès dramaturge (1957), modern scholars begin to take seriously the quality of Cervantes' dramatic composition. Although Marrast's study is principally focused on La Numancia, El rufián dichoso and Pedro de Urdemalas, it nevertheless marks a major turning point in the modern critical approach to Cervantes' dramas. Francisco Ynduráin built upon this line of inquiry in his 1962 edition of Cervantes' Obras dramáticas, where he not only analyzes each work in depth, but also offers new insights into some of the stagecraft and metatheatrical elements of

---

Cervantes' dramatic production. Alborg, in his 1966 study of the life and works of Cervantes, expands upon these concepts, and connects Cervantes' earlier period of theater with some of Spain's renaissance dramatists such as Cristóbal de Virués, Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola, Gil Vicente, Juan de la Cueva, and Andrés Rey de Artieda in his discussion of Cervantes' dramatic innovations.

As I suggested earlier, Casalduero's 1951 work on the form and significance of Cervantes' theater represents in my view the first real modern look at his drama. In it, Casalduero endeavors to contextualize Cervantes as a dramatist who marks a transitional period between the late renaissance and early baroque theatrical movements in Spain of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, and whose theater is indeed very unified stylistically and thematically. As I have also indicated previously, Canavaggio's 1977 book, which still represents the hallmark for a single modern critical work dedicated exclusively to Cervantes' theatrical production, presents his theater largely as an alternative to the teatro nuevo school of theater advanced by Lope de Vega. In establishing a contrast between Cervantes' theater and that of his contemporaries, Canavaggio expertly contextualizes and classifies each individual work, and shows both how Cervantes draws from tradition and departs from it. If there is any criticism that can be made of this monumental step forward in the contemporary study of Cervantes' drama, it is perhaps that the book is at times difficult to follow, since it is arranged thematically rather than by analysis of each individual play.

Friedman's 1981 book, The Unifying Concept establishes a contrast between Cervantes' and Lope de Vega's compositional styles. Friedman argues that while Cervantes' full-length plays might at first glance seem to be merely a collection of disparate episodes that are not always clearly related, upon closer inspection, all of the material the author presents in each instance is centered on a single, coherent, unifying theme. Freidman further argues that Lope de Vega's comedia is
based on "the principle of unity of action through development of events to form a single action. Each event has among its functions a part in the movement towards completion of the action" (138). By contrast, Cervantes' works "[offer] a major structural innovation, a means of achieving unity through analogic episodes based on a single concept. This unifying concept allows for multiple visions of man and of the world around and beyond him" (139). Friedman's argument is compelling, and emphasizes the fact that Cervantes' dramas are more unified by their central, underlying theme, whereas Lope de Vega's dramas are unified by their dramatic action.

Zimic's *El teatro de Cervantes* (1992) unifies and expands upon essays he had written on Cervantes' theater throughout his career. Zimic builds upon the work of Casalduero and Canavaggio by emphasizing the literary context of each play, as well as the experimental novelty offered by the author's compositions, which present an alternative to the stylistic innovations of Lope de Vega. Zimic also offers his unique interpretation of each of the Cervantine dramas and interludes. González Maestro's *Calipso Eclipsada. El teatro de Cervantes más allá del Siglo de Oro* (2013) offers an illuminating comparative analysis between Cervantes' dramatic techniques, and the works of Shakespeare, Milton, Alfieri, and Büchner, and also offers insight into the performance of Cervantes' dramas in the modern era and his impact upon many twentieth-century dramatists. Of course, I would be remiss if I did not mention the outstanding modern critical editions of Cervantes' theater published by the *Real Academia Española*. I have found Alfredo Baras Escolá's edition of the *entremeses* and its many insights invaluable for this my work. Unfortunately, I have not yet been able to consult in detail the collaborative edition of the *Comedias y tragedias* presided over by Luis Gómez Canseco, since there were delays in its publication, and because it was only released earlier this month in the midst of my writing this
introduction. I anticipate nevertheless that it will be recognized as an outstanding contemporary edition.

In my own analysis of the Ocho comedias y ocho entremeses, I have divided my study into two basic sections: one dealing with the interludes, and the other dealing with the full-length plays. Since the specific genre of the entremés is not quite as well known to the English-speaking world, I first attempt to contextualize the genre and its development in seventeenth-century Spain for the contemporary reader. In so doing, I analyze a myriad of techniques Cervantes likely learned from the sixteenth-century dramatist and actor, Lope de Rueda (c. 1510-1565), whom Cervantes greatly admired. What follows is an analysis of each individual play, grouped by the respective subgenre into which I have classified it. The interludes are divided into three separate chapters, one dealing with each subgenre. The reader will forgive the lengthy nature of this study, as I felt it imperative to devote a full chapter to each full-length drama in the interest of a full consideration of the major details of the plot. The full-length plays are not explicitly grouped by their respective genre, except as I have indicated by the subdivisions in the Table of Contents. It is my hope that by the end of my investigation, it will be clear that Cervantes was an innovator not only in form and content, but perhaps, more significantly, with his approach to teaching his audience though the presentation of his subject matter. Cervantes both recognizes his debt to the tradition that preceded him and seeks to situate himself within that tradition, while always casting his characteristic, critical gaze upon the world around him, upon his theater, and even upon the very nature of theatrical composition itself.
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES AND ABBREVIATIONS

For the purposes of clarity and consistency, I cite always with respect to the excellent *Obra Completa* numbered editions of Cervantes' works by Florencio Sevilla Arroyo and Antonio Rey Hazas published by Alianza (1995-1999). For the sake of brevity, I have not listed all of the editions of Cervantes' non-theatrical works consulted for this study in the bibliography, since they do not form a part of my citations, and I do not want to extend the bibliographical section with the countless articles and editions concerning *Don Quixote* and Cervantes' other prose works that are not immediately pertinent. Additionally, the reader will find that my bibliography is divided into three separate sections: 1) a list of reference books (dictionaries, lexicons, verse manuals, and repertories of popular refrains), with the abbreviation used for each listed on the left-hand margin, 5 2) the critical editions of Cervantes' works consulted for this study, listed in alphabetical order by editor, 3) books, articles, and critical editions of other author's works consulted. Other than these abbreviations, *DQI* and *DQII*, R.A.E. for *Real Academia Española*, and the usage of ed. for "edition," have have tried to minimize abbreviating the titles of the dramas with letter abbreviations, opting instead to use a single word or a few words to stand in for the title, which should be clear from context, so as to avoid the need for flipping back-and-forth to the abbreviations page. Unlike the plays of Shakespeare, many of these plays still lack a conventional abbreviation, although the latest editions published by the R.A.E. may remedy this problem. Finally, I also avoid the abbreviations "p." and "pp." for page and pages (respectively), except where necessary for disambiguation with verse, note, or chapter numbers.

---

5 I should note that I largely follow the abbreviations employed by Florencio Sevilla Arroyo and Antonio Rey Hazas in their editions (with a few additions), for the sake of consistency.
1. CERVANTES, LOPE DE RUEDA, AND THE WORLD OF THE ENTREMÉS

In order to better appreciate Cervantes' innovations within the genre of the entremés, it is necessary to understand the tradition of this genre prior to Cervantes. Lope de Rueda is often credited as being the first Spanish playwright to pen these shorter, one-act theatrical interludes. Although he was not, in fact, the first Spanish dramatist to write one-act plays of this style, he was almost certainly the first to elaborate the form so completely, and in a style so close to what would become its most common incarnation. Cervantes himself had a great deal of respect for Lope de Rueda's theater, as he informs us in the oft-quoted prologue to his own Ocho comedias y ocho entremeses nuevos, nunca representados. In spite of the frequency with which this particular passage is cited, it is worth reviewing in part here, since it reveals Cervantes' sense of the history of Spanish theater, and demonstrates his clear penchant for the literary genre:

[D]ije que me acordaba de haber visto representar al gran Lope de Rueda, varón insigne en la representación y en el entendimiento. Fue natural de Sevilla y de oficio batihoja, que quiere decir de los que hacen panes de oro; fue admirable en la poesía pastoril, y en este modo, ni entonces ni después acá ninguno le ha llevado ventaja...

En el tiempo de este célebre español, todos los aparatos de un autor de comedias se encerraban en un costal y se cifraban en cuatro pellicos blancos guarnecidos de guadamecí dorado y en cuatro barbas y cabelleras y cuatro cayados, poco más o menos. Las comedias eran unos coloquios como églogas, entre dos o tres pastores y alguna pastora; aderezábannlas y dilatábanlas con dos o tres entremeses, ya de negra, ya de rufián, ya de bobo y ya de vizcaíno: que todas estas cuatro figuras y otras muchas hacía el tal Lope con la mayor excelencia y propiedad que pudiera imaginarse. No había en aquel tiempo tramoyas, ni desafíos de moros y cristianos, a pie ni a caballo; no había figura que saliese o pareciese salir del centro de la tierra por lo hueco del teatro, al cual componían cuatro bancos en cuadro y cuatro o seis tablas encima, con que se levantaba del suelo cuatro palmos; ni menos bajaban del cielo nubes con ángeles o con almas. El adorno del teatro era una manta vieja, tirada con dos cordeles de una parte a otra, que hacía lo que llaman vestuario, detrás de la cual estaban los músicos, cantando sin guitarra algún romance antiguo. (10-11)

For the sake of clarity and consistency, I cite always with reference to the Florenico Sevilla Arroyo y Antonio Rey Hazas editions published by Alianza.
Most of our knowledge of the biography of Rueda is fragmented at best; in fact, a good portion of it comes from the material quoted above. Jean Canavaggio, in his classic biographical study of Cervantes, informs us that Cervantes probably would have had the opportunity to meet Lope de Rueda in the summer of 1564, when Lope de Rueda would have been his neighbor, and his father, Rodrigo de Cervantes, was working for Rueda's brother. Miguel de Cervantes would have been seventeen at the time, but if he was not with his father in Andalusia, he still would have had the opportunity to see Rueda perform two years later in Madrid or in Alcalá.\(^7\) Whatever the case, what is clear from the citation above is that Rueda wrote during a time period when the Spanish theater was still substantially less elaborate in its stagecraft and devices than the time in which Cervantes published his own plays.\(^8\) Nevertheless, we get the sense even in this passage of the great respect and admiration that Cervantes felt towards Rueda's theater. It should therefore come as no surprise to us that there were many aspects of the Sevillian's *pasos* that would influence Cervantes in writing his own *entremeses*.

It is necessary to clarify at this juncture that the terms *entremés*, *paso*, and *sainete* are all often translated into English as "interlude," which tells us nothing of the difference between the three. All three are short, comedic interludes, usually used to provide a bit of levity in an otherwise serious genre, or to prolong dramatic suspense between scenes, or in some cases, merely to give the principal actors time to rest and make costume changes. The *sainete* is the natural successor to the *entremés*, and is normally associated more with the Spanish opera and included music. While the *sainete* shares with the *entremés* and *paso* similar themes of the low-life, and is also

---

\(^7\) *Cervantes*, 36 (with reference to the English translation by JR Jones).

\(^8\) It should be noted, however, that the stagecraft of this period was still probably a little more elaborate than Cervantes leads us to believe in the above citation.
presented in a vernacular linguistic style, the *entremés* and *paso* need not include any music or dance, although they did on occasion.\(^9\)

As to the difference between the *entremés* and the *paso*, this is a subject of some debate. The term *paso*, used as a designation for Lope de Rueda's short, one-act comedic interludes comes to us not from Rueda himself, but from Juan de Timoneda, a lesser Spanish playwright who was responsible for the publication of many of Lope de Rueda's plays in 1567 (one or two years after Rueda's death).\(^10\) Seven of Rueda's *pasos* are found in a compendium entitled *El Deleitoso*, published by Timoneda during that same year, in which he also published and edited many of Rueda's full-length comedies. In this compendium, Timoneda himself oscillates between the use of the terms *entremés* and *paso*, which has led some scholars to try to determine if there is, in effect, a significant difference between the use of these two terms. I agree with the conclusions of Fernando González Ollé, who, in his introduction to the *Pasos*, states that he can find no real difference between the designation *paso* and *entremés* when it comes to the subject matter and style of the plays in question. While it is true that the final *paso* in this compendium, later given the title *Las aceitunas*,\(^11\) is indeed quite different in style from the preceding ones (due to its more allegorical nature), this is not the distinction that Timoneda was aiming at, for he refers to other interludes as *pasos* as well. Indeed, the terms for the theatrical genre were not as rigidly defined in

\(^9\) According to *Autoridades*, "SAINETE. s. m. En la comedia es una obra, o representacion menos seria, en que se canta y bâila, regularmente acabada la segunda jornada de la comedia. Lat. *Mímica scena intercalaris.*" and "ENTREMÉS. s. m. Representación breve, jocosa y burlesca, la qual se entremete de ordinario entre una jornada y otra de la comédia, para mayor variedad, o para divertir y alegrar al auditório. Viene del Latino *Intermedium*, y por esso algunos yá le llaman Intermedio. Latín. *Ludicum inter actus intermedium.*" Interestingly, there is no corresponding entry for "paso," which never became standard in its usage for designating this kind of short comedic work.

\(^10\) ed. González Ollé & Tusón, 14.

\(^11\) The *pasos* remained without title until their 1830 publication by Moratín, which brought about the later rediscovery of Rueda's theater.
Timoneda's day, and it seems that he uses the two terms synonymously, but preferred the term *paso* itself, even though *entremés* was the more established term for the genre in his own day, and is the technical term for this theatrical genre that has been passed down to us today. I use the term *paso* only when referring to Lope de Rueda's short plays. When referring to the genre to which these plays pertain more generally, and in reference to Cervantes' short plays of the same literary genre, I use the term *entremés*.

Eugenio Asensio\(^\text{12}\) informs us that the *entremés* was initially a contingent genre, that is to say, a particular *entremés* was written to be inserted into a particular larger comedic work, of which it formed an inseparable part. Later on, however, Rueda and others came to realize that such works could in principal be cut and pasted into another comedy of the stage company's choosing. Hence, *entremeses* gained their autonomy from the larger work, and were written independently of the comedies into which they were inserted. Asensio also informs us that this tendency is reflected in the three volumes of Timoneda, in which he published for the first time Rueda's *Pasos*. In the first volume, the interludes are inserted into comedies or colloquia; in the second volume, they are disconnected from the larger whole, allowing for the possibility of intercalating them into larger works. In the third volume, there is no mention of the possibility of incorporating them into the body of the larger comedy.\(^\text{13}\) Asensio explains the effects that this gradual process of autonomy had upon the evolution of the *entremés* as a distinct genre:

> Una vez desgajada, esta rama creció pujante y adquirió una morfología especial explicable por su situación de contraste y prolongación de la comedia. El contraste le empuja a contemplar el mundo no como el gran teatro de nobles acciones, sino como la selva de instintos en que el fuerte y el astuto triunfan, o como una vasta jaula de locos. La prolongación le anima de un lado a suplementaria mostrando cuadros que desbordan de la comedia, de otro a remedar sus recursos de estilo y versificación, a veces a parodiar sus temas y personajes. (36)

\(^{12}\) *Itinerario del entremés*, 43.
\(^{13}\) *Itinerario*..., 43.
The characterization that Asensio gives in this passage mostly concerns the subject matter and the style of the *entremés*. As we can see, the *entremés* is, or at least was in its inception, a much less serious style than the *comedia*, focusing on the lower stratum of society, the world of fools, pimps, prostitutes, gamblers, braggart soldiers, and other figures depicted as the subject of general ridicule.\(^\text{14}\) Unlike the *comedia*, where, in spite of their flaws, the characters were often meant to be relatable or morally on par with the audience, almost all the characters in the *entremés* were supposed to be beneath the dignity of the audience, serving as examples of human folly. It is due to this question of being a deliberately "low" genre that situations, normally not appropriate for the stage, such as that of a cuckolded husband or thieves discussing their lives and cavorting with prostitutes, could be depicted so openly and reveled in. It is for this reason also that there were no *entremeses* concerning kings or members of the higher court or religious order. The *entremés* itself was a genre of folly, parody, or ridicule. Hence, figures that were supposed to be characterized by higher dignity would never appear in this particular dramatic form. As José Luis Canet Vallés astutely informs us in his introduction to his compendium of Rueda's *Pasos*, the *entremés* as a genre responds thematically to an earlier mold of Spanish morality theater, condemning the vices and defects of society, filtered through the lens of the popular form of Italian comedic theater.\(^\text{15}\)

\(^{14}\) Often, this included people who spoke with accents that were regarded as comic figures, such as moors, blacks, biscayans, gypsies, etc. While the comedic depictions of these figures might offend our modern sensibilities, they nevertheless form an important place in the history of Spanish theater, and in enabling us to understand the way different communities were regarded and stereotyped in the Spain of the day.

\(^{15}\) Ed. Canet Vallés, 67.
In any proper discussion of the *entremés*, it is necessary to talk about the principal figure of the genre, that is, the *bobo* or *simple*.\(^{16}\) This figure was initially a transplant from the *autos* and *comedias*, but is the principal actor in the *entremés*. The *bobo*, maintains a lot of remnants of primitive theater, and is quite lacking in sophistication. J.W.P. Crawford looks to the *juglares*, and to shorter Latin comedic works in the figure of the *stupidus* as the origins of this particular comedic figure.\(^{17}\) It is important to note in this discussion that in the *entremés* proper, at least in its inception, the *bobo* or *simple* never reaches the sophistication of the *gracioso*. The principal difference between these comedic figures has to do with their relationship to the audience, and to the world they occupy. The *gracioso* serves as a foil for the main hero of a *comedia*. He interprets for the hero the dangers and obstacles they face while trying to live up to their heroic goals, and he interprets for the audience the discrepancies between himself and his more pragmatic mindset and the ideals of the hero. His actions enable the audience to cast a critical gaze upon the dramatic plot that is transpiring on the stage, while also creating a more human and less idealized figure than the main protagonists of the work. He is, as Asensio puts it, a benevolent satirist, that reveals the comedic side of people and their actions.\(^{18}\)

By contrast, the *bobo* or *simple* is completely lacking in these tendencies. Rather than serving as a more human foil (flawed, but ultimately forgivable and redeemable) to the main hero, the *bobo* is a subject of pure ridicule for the audience, beneath them, and beyond redemption. Controlled by his appetites, principally for food but sometimes for sex, as well as his laziness, he is constantly on the receiving end of pranks, misunderstandings, and misfortunes, the proverbial

---

\(^{16}\) I use these two terms interchangeably, in contrast to the *gracioso*, which is a more developed version of this archetypal character.

\(^{17}\) Crawford, 14-15.

\(^{18}\) Asensio, 38. Asensio eloquently describes the differences between these two comedic figures in more detail. I have tried to summarize his description as succinctly as possible here.
butt of the joke, that is often subjected to physical punishments in the form of slapstick humor. Generally speaking, these misfortunes are the result either of the stupidity or the moral weakness of the *bobo*.

The *bobo* is still somewhat more complex than it would initially appear. As a result of his lower level of intelligence and lack of dignity, he is also a figure who is constantly taken advantage of, and who has a kind of quiet innocence about him (or credulousness, depending on the interlude in question). As Asensio once again informs us, he represents in this way both a weak and defenseless being subjugated by the strong and unjust, as well as a repressed (and occasionally triumphant) innocence, in which an innocent is unable to adjust to the social situation (given his or her own ignorance).\(^{19}\) This second function of the *bobo* is almost entirely absent from the *pasos* of Rueda, where the *bobo* is principally the subject of ridicule.

But what of Cervantes' *entremeses*? Numerous critics\(^{20}\) have already remarked on the significant differences between the relative complexity of Cervantes' characters when compared with those of his predecessors. The characters in the Cervantine *entremés*, as we shall see later, are considerably more sophisticated than those appearing in Rueda’s one-acts, both in their demeanor as well as in the way the make us as the audience come to terms with the subject matter of the plays. Even the buffoonish characters are not simply *bobos*, but are substantially more nuanced, although they never quite reach the level of a Cervantine *gracioso* either. Additionally, Cervantes tends to employ a far greater cast of characters in his *entremeses* than Rueda, whose cast for these short plays was generally between two and five characters. What then is the

---

\(^{19}\) Asensio, 54.

\(^{20}\) To name a few of the more prominent scholars in this discussion, Marcelino Menéndez Pelayo, Joaquín Casalduero, Eugenio Ascensio, Jean Canavaggio, Stanislav Zimic and Nicholas Spadaccini.
relationship between Cervantes' *entremeses* and Rueda's plays of the same genre, called *pasos* by Timoneda? What is it that Cervantes learned from this playwright and actor for whom he clearly had the highest admiration, and what innovations did he bring to the page, if not finally to the stage?

Perhaps the most obvious innovation of Rueda over his predecessors, indeed, the innovation that cemented the early *entremés* form, was their composition in prose as opposed to verse. Six of the eight Cervantine *entermeses* share this characteristic with Rueda's *pasos*. But the linguistic and stylistic elements borrowed from Rueda are hardly limited to this most obvious similarity. As we will see, Cervantes utilizes many aspects of Rueda's language in crafting the characterization of his own comic figures. Cervantes is in fact quite indebted to Rueda's style in crafting his own "verisimilar" dialogue.

Before we begin our discussion, I should also note that I deliberately use the term *verisimilitude* rather than the more modern *realism* not just to avoid issues of anachronism, but also because we must not confuse Rueda or Cervantes' stagecraft with anything representative of what actually occurred in the lower stratum of society. While much of the older scholarship on the subject has tended to characterize the *pasos* as "costumbrista," it is important not to confuse this term with a realistic depiction of what was going on in the everyday life of Spain at the time. While the dialogues of the characters are noteworthy for their fluidity and conversational tone, it should by no means be assumed that they are representative of how people actually talked or, more

---

21 Only *El rufián viudo* and *La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo* are written in verse. Specifically, in *endecasílabo libre* (free-form or unrhymed hendecasyllable), for the most part. See Domínguez Caparrós' *Métrica* for a more detailed analysis of some of Cervantes' less conventional verse forms.

22 Not to say anything of the anachronism of the term "costumbrismo" in the strictest sense; typically, I think this term is best applied only to a specific sub-genre of literature in the late 18th and early to mid 19th centuries.
to the point, what they actually talked about. Even though the literary attempt to mimic the accents of people of different races and regional backgrounds (such as the *negras* or the *vizcaínos*) was intended to reflect something of the associations that people had with these figures, these characterizations were deliberately stereotyped, and hence grossly exaggerated salient dialectical markers for comedic effect. In our previous discussion of the *bobo*, for example, it is clear that very few people in real life would lack such basic common sense. Even in their time, these comedic *figures* were never intended to reflect reality, merely a hyperbolic, distorted and often grotesque, but also very funny, portrait of life of the lower stratum of society. In Lope de Rueda's plays, the comedic figures are just that: *figures*, and not fully developed *characters* with their own complex internal motivations and conflicting inner tensions. They are, as I have stated earlier, the logical successor to the archetypal figures of the morality plays, popular in Spain throughout its medieval theatrical tradition.  

Returning to the primary issue at hand, it is readily apparent to anyone who has carefully read both Cervantes and Lope de Rueda that Cervantes was indeed quite influenced by the language and techniques employed by Rueda both in his *pasos* and in his *comedias*. One of the primary characteristics of Rueda's theatrical language Cervantes incorporates into his own theater is how natural it sounds and how well the conversations flow. Rueda deliberately cultivates a more conversational tone in his *pasos*, utilizing a language that is at least apparently free from artifice, rhyme, or excessive ornamentation, accomplished through a variety of devices, some of them rhetorical, others morphological, and still others concerning the timing and disposition of the select phrases. Ernesto Veres D'Ocon has studied in detail the language games and verbal conceits in

---

23 See Lázaro Carreter, Criado de Val, or Donovan for more information about the allegorical figures of Spain's medieval theatrical tradition.  
24 “Juegos idiomáticos....,” 195-237.
Rueda's plays. Before him, Amado Alonso\textsuperscript{25} had already pointed out how Cervantes was influenced by Lope de Rueda's \textit{pasos} in crafting the language of Sancho in his \textit{Don Quijote}. Curiously, while many have observed the influence of Rueda's writing on the development of Sancho specifically as a character, nobody has gone into much detail regarding how many of these same artistic techniques are utilized by Cervantes in crafting the characters of his \textit{entremeses}.\textsuperscript{26}

Both the Cardona de Gibert edition of the complete theater of Lope de Rueda as well as the Fernando González Ollé and Vicente Tusón editon of the \textit{Pasos} do a very good job of reviewing many of the techniques used by Rueda in crafting his comedic stagecraft. I would like to examine some of the most prevalent techniques Cervantes shares with Rueda here, while providing specific examples from Rueda's \textit{Pasos}, and contrasting them with similar examples from Cervantes' \textit{entremeses}, in order to better demonstrate how Cervantes learns from and appropriates some of the techniques of his predecessor in crafting the language of his characters in his own minor dramas.

1. The use of conversational error and correction:

   In his \textit{pasos} (as well as his \textit{comedias}), Rueda will frequently have a character of lower social or intellectual standing mispronounce a word or phrase, or use the wrong sense of the word, only to be immediately corrected by a character of a higher social category. The foolishness of

\textsuperscript{25} See Alonso, 19. Veres D'Ocon credits Amado Alonso as being the first scholar to make this connection.

\textsuperscript{26} I should note that Veres D'Ocon does indeed point out in many instances the similarities between the way that Rueda and Cervantes both use these techniques and language games, but his focus is mainly on Rueda. He does, however, pay particular attention to the way in which the conversational error and correction is tied to the Renaissance ethos of the time period, but doesn't reach full fruition until Cervantes and later, Gracián, Quevedo and Calderón, with the more complex Baroque \textit{concepto}. 
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the less-educated character in his butchering a term generally provokes laughter. Of course, it is extremely well known how Cervantes makes use of this same technique with his Sancho character being corrected by his master, Don Quixote.\(^{27}\) Significantly less attention has been paid to how this technique is utilized by other of his characters, and the similarity it bears with some of Lope de Rueda's characters' verbal exchanges. Let us look at a few examples:

ALAMEDA. Pardiez, si tú no te detuvieras tanto en casa de aquella, que buen siglo haya el álima que tan buen oficio l'enseñó, allí me tuvieras de mi propia voluntad, con una cuerda de lana más amarrado que si estuviera por fuerça en el cepo de la Casa fosca de Valencia.

LUQUITAS. En casa de la buñolera querrás dezir.

ALAMEDA. ¿Buñolera se llama aquélla? ¡Oh, qué autorizado nombre, bendito Dios! (El Deleytoso, Paso 1, "Los criados," 112)\(^{28}\)

In this first example, the correction corresponds not so much with a difference in social category, but with a difference in linguistic markers of the two interlocutors. It isn't really a correction per se as much as a change of the conversation topic at hand, back to the main subject of food. Alameda uses the Catalan word "fosca" meaning dark; a "casa fosca" was another term for a prison.\(^{29}\) But since the two are speaking about pilfering what for them are food delicacies, the humor in this passage resides in Alameda's treatment of "buñuelos"\(^{30}\) with such deference, as though they were some sacred delicacy, further emphasizing his appetite and the humor of the "low" situation in this paso. Another example:

ALAMEDA. A no creerme, dixera que no estávades en vuestro juizio. Pues a fe que vengo a tratar con vuessa merced un negocio que me va mucho en mi consciencia, si acaso me tiene cilicio.

SALZEDO. Silencio querrás dezir.

---

\(^{27}\) There are too many examples to list here, but the reader may wish to consult the aforementioned article of Amado Alonso for a general idea of how this device is employed in the *Quixote*.

\(^{28}\) I cite always from José Luis Canet Vallés' edition of the *Pasos*.

\(^{29}\) Cf. n. 12 in the González Ollé and Tuscón edition.

\(^{30}\) A "buñelo" is a small ball of fried dough eaten with honey. *Covarrubias* defines it as "cierta fruta de masa, frita con azeite, que se come caliente, y con miel: y en España es más usada que en otra ninguna parte en tiempo de Invierno."
ALAMEDA. Sí, silencio será. Pienso que...
SALZEDO. Pues di lo que quieres, qu'el lugar harto apartado es, si ha de haver silencio o cosa de secreto.

(El Deleytoso, Paso 2, "Las carátulas," 121-22)

This second citation is a much more classic example of the usual form that this sort of correction takes. Here, Alameda\(^{31}\) is asking for Salzedo's attention in a matter that is of great importance to him, but he ends the request asking for *cilicio*\(^{32}\), which was a short, terse garment, generally made of stiff horsehair, worn by penitents, when he really wanted Salzedo's silence. The humor here (as is usually the case with these corrections) resides in the complete non-sequitur and utter nonsense of Alameda's original word choice. Another example:

CAMINANTE. Que no, señor. ¿No se le acuerda a vuessa merced que mi madre y la suya vendían rávanos y coles allá en el arraval de Sanctiago?

LICENCIADO. ¿Rávanos y coles? Rasos y colchones quiso dezir vuessa merced.

CAMINANTE. Sea lo que mandare. Mas, ¿a fe que no me conosce?

(El Deleytoso, Paso Cuarto, "El convidado," 142)

This third example, very similar in form to the second, once again illustrates the correction of a simple "mistake", except that here, the original sentence was correct, and the "correction" has another purpose. The Licentiate, unhappy with public proclamation of the relatively low social status of their mothers, seeks to replace the "radishes and cabbages" that they sold with "fine silk and bed cushions," far more exquisite fairs. This "correction" is more a way of hiding the truth from anyone who might happen to overhear the conversation between the two interlocutors than anything else.

Contrast these three examples with the use of the same technique in Cervantes. In *La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo*, we have the character Panduro, who's name incidentally

---

\(^{31}\) This is not the same Alameda as in the previous play; Alameda was merely a common name that Rueda used for his *simple* figures.

\(^{32}\) Cf. *Autoridades*. 
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bears similarity with Rueda's *simple* Pancorvo,\textsuperscript{33} being corrected by Algarroba. Although both are of the same social category, and are the town *regidores* (magistrates), Cervantes is clearly poking fun here at provincial, small town administrators and their individual quirks:

PANDURO. Aviso es que podrá servir de arbitrio
Para su Jamestad; que, como en corte
Hay potra-médicos, haya potra-alcaldes.

ALGARROBA. Prota, señor Panduro, que no potra.

PANDURO. Como vos no hay friscal en todo el mundo.

ALGARROBA. ¡Fiscal, pese a mis males!

ESCRIBANO. ¡Por Dios santo
Que es Algarroba impertinente!

(Elección..., vv. 99-104.)

The humor in this little excerpt resides in Algarroba's irritation with Panduro's rustic mispronunciations of the titles, reflected by his metathesis (re-arranging of sounds within the word). Note that Algarroba does not correct his pronunciation of Majestad as Jamestad. There is a similar instance of this kind of correction, wherein a town official shows his false erudition in the *Retablo de las maravillas*, when the magistrate Benito comments on something that Chirinos says, declaring it a *Sentencia ciceronianca*:

CHIRINOS. Honrados días viva vuestra merced, que así nos honra. En fin, la encina da bellotas; el pero, peras; la parra, uvas, y el honrado, honra, sin poder hacer otra cosa.

BENITO. Sentencia ciceronianca, sin quitar ni poner un punto.

CAPACHO. *Ciceroniana*, quiso decir el señor alcalde Benito Repollo.

BENITO. Siempre quiero decir lo que es mejor, sino que las más veces no acierto. En fin, buen hombre, ¿qué queréis?

(Retablo..., 135-6)

We can already see here that while Cervantes utilizes many of the same techniques as Rueda, the humor is substantially more complex. Here, Chirinos' statement itself is poking fun at

\textsuperscript{33} Canet Vallés informs us in a footnote in his edition (185, n. 208) that denominating a *bobo* or a *simple* character with the prefix "pan" was very common in the Spanish theater prior to Cervantes.
the notion of honor (*el honor*) in seventeenth century society. Chirinos suggests that just as the acorn tree gives acorns and the pear tree, pears, the honoralbe person cannot help but show honor or respect. It is a fairly trite platitude, with most of the humor deriving from the non-sequiteur and the clash of registers between the mundane description of trees yielding specific fruits, and particular kinds of people "producing" honor, as though the two things were of the same category. Benito, nevertheless, regards it as a profound reflection, calling it a Ciceronian dictum (only he also mispronounces the word Ciceronian). It is worth noting after Capacho corrects his pronunciation, Benito assures everyone that he always tries to say what is best, but that he often fails to do so. Unlike in Rueda's *pasos*, the correction here has less to do with a difference of category, and everything to do with a difference in education. Although Chirinos is of a lower social standing than Benito, she still shows herself to be cleverer than the magistrate of this provincial town. Indeed, she is a con man, a thief, and a trickster. With this passage, Cervantes pokes fun at the notion of *el honor*, understood by the common folk as residing in noble titles and in being a *cristiano viejo*, a pure-blooded Christian, as opposed to the descendant of a convert. True honor, as Cervantes often observes in both in *Don Quixote* and his other entremeses as well, resides in erudition and in one’s internal character. The magistrate Benito, although he is in fact of a higher social standing than Chirinos, falls prey to Chirinos and Chanfalla's simple ruse, along with the rest of the townsfolk, because of the village's excessive preoccupation with being of pure-blooded Christian descent. This passage subtly reflects one more instance of the play’s main theme by portraying the magistrate's lack of true quality, his lack of erudition, and his inability to detect a couple of two-bit tricksters. Later on, in the same play, there is a similar correction that once again reflects the magistrate's ignorance in failing to understand a Latin phrase that would have been extremely common at the time:
CHIRINOS. [...] No, señores; no, señores; ante omnia nos han de pagar lo que fuere justo.

BENITO. Señora Autora, aquí no os ha de pagar ninguna Antona ni ningún Antoño; el señor regidor Juan Castrado os pagará más que honradamente, y si no, el Concejo. ¡Bien conocéis el lugar, por cierto! Aquí, hermana, no aguardamos a que ninguna Antona pague por nosotros.

CAPACHO. ¡Pecador de mí, señor Benito Repollo, y qué lejos da del blanco! No dice la señora Autora que pague ninguna Antona, sino que le paguen adelantado y ante todas cosas, que eso quiere decir ante omnia.

BENITO. Mirad, escribano Pedro Capacho, haced vos que me hablen a derechas, que yo entenderé a pie llano. Vos, que sois leído y escribido, podéis entender esas algarabías de allende, que yo no. (137-8)

This passage is revealing as well. Although the humor in the correction is much the same as in the preceding example, here, Benito implies that he is illiterate. While this would not have been uncommon for a minor official in a small town in the day, it shows us once again Cervantes poking fun at the pomp and circumstance of the titles and authority granted to the underprepared and little educated. One can imagine this same magistrate signing other contracts and agreements without a very sophisticated understanding, if any at all, of the terms of the agreement.

As can be seen from all these examples in both Rueda and Cervantes, the use of the emendation of one character by another is one humorous technique in which these two playwrights invite their audiences to laugh at the foolishness of a character. However, Cervantes often subverts the original use of the technique, making the audience question which of the two interlocutors is, in fact, in a greater position of authority. I have devoted an extensive amount of time to this technique principally because I am relatively certain that Cervantes acquired it from Rueda and the early tradition of Spanish theater (as Amado Alonso surmised many decades ago), but as we can see, Cervantes appropriates the technique and innovates within its use, broadening both its comedic and situational possibilities.
2. Los refranes

Cervantes' Sancho is quite well known for his tendency to use an excessive amount of popular refrains or adages, often corrupted or confused, to great comic effect. This distortion of refrains is usually achieved either by the accidental and unexpected combination of two or more refrains, or simply by switching around a word or two, creating a new meaning or an absurd one, as opposed to the traditional meaning of the saying. His choice of refrain, however, is usually extremely apt for the situation. This technique was not unique to Cervantes, nor does he use it exclusively with his Sancho character. In fact, several of the Cervantine entremeses use this same technique in their depiction of the more foolish characters. But popular refrains inserted into the dialogue of a play were a tendency that was brought to fruition in Rueda's pasos, used both straightforwardly, and for comic effect, and was certainly one of the many elements that influence Cervantes in his own writing.

In the third paso of El Deleytoso, later entitled "Cornudo y contento," Rueda has his simple, Martín (the titular cuckold of the play) make use of his version of the popular saying, "A la col, tocino; y a la carne, vino." The context of the situation is that the doctor is asking Martín about his wife's health, and whether or not she took the medicine she had been prescribed, and Martín responds that she had no intention of taking it, and then proceeds to provide the following absurd commentary:

Dixome: "mirad, Martín de Villalba, vuestra muger está de mala gana y es imposible qu'elle beva nada d'esto. Vos dezis que querëys bien a vuestra muger." Dixe yo: "¡A, mi madre! No estéys en esso, que juro a mí que la quiero como las coles al tozino." Dixo él entuences: "Pues tanto monta. Bien os acordáys que quando os casaro con ella dixo el crego ser unidos en una misma carne." Dixe yo: "Assí es verdad." Dixo él: "Pues siendo verdad lo qu'el crego dixo, y siendo todo una misma carne, tomando vos essa purga, tanto provecho le hará a vuestra muger como si ella la tomasse."

(El Deleytoso, Paso 3, "Cornudo y contento," 133)
The meaning of this refrain here is clear and straightforward, in expressing how he and his wife go together, just as cabbage and bacon or meat and wine at the dinner table. The refrain is particularly comical considering the absurd situation Martín presents here, wherein he is made to drink medicine that his wife refuses to drink, the logic being that since they are "of the same flesh," it will benefit her all the same. Bárbara's cousin persuades Martín that, as the cleric (crego, here, making use of the invented "sayagues" dialect) declared them of the same flesh on their wedding day, any medicine that he takes will also benefit his wife. Martín is also made to fast, fearing that anything he eats might make Bárbara more ill. Being a natural fool he goes along with all of these absurd demands for the sake of his wife.

In the sixth Paso of El Deleytoso, "Pagar y no pagar," the thief Samadel makes clever use of the refrain "lo bien ganado se pierde, y lo malo él y su amo" (159). The saying is supposed to condemn ill-gotten gains, but here Samadel distorts its meaning to emphasize the fact that he has already spent the money on booze and gambling, and in this sense, he too has "lost" his ill-gotten gains.

Rueda's use of refrains is fairly sporadic and infrequent with most of his characters in El Deleytoso. However, he employed many adages, and particularly deformed or distorted versions of these popular sayings, in the voices of marginalized characters that spoke in a particular accent, for example, his negras. These stereotyped black women were a subject of ridicule in his plays, and for a contemporary audience their racist depiction is indeed in conflict with our modern sensibilities, to say the very least. Nevertheless, they are an interesting point of study both in terms of racial relations and conceptions held during the time period, as well as for their elaborate, albeit stereotyped and ridiculed, language. Eulalla the negra is a wealth of refrains and adages in "El

34 Autoridades. cf. Refranes.
passo de polo, y Olalla Negra,\textsuperscript{35} such as the following, which I have re-rendered in slightly more standard Spanish below according to the interpretation of Canet Vallés in his edition of these plays:

\begin{quote}
"o na força ne va, nerrechos se pierde" = "Do fuerza no va, derecho se pierde"
"honra y berbechos no caben los sacos." = "honra y berbechos no caben en el saco"
"A otro guesso con aquesse perro." = "A otro hueso con ese perro."
"[Q]uien tenga l'oficio, tenga la maleficio." = "Quien tiene el oficio, tiene el maleficio."
"Marinas busca tome lo que bayla." = "A Marina Buscó, tome lo que bailó."
\end{quote}

(208-215)\textsuperscript{36}

As we can clearly see, not only are these refrains spoken in Eulalla's own Spanish dialect, but even within that dialect, they are corruptions of popular refrains. Rueda makes use of various techniques for this distortion. Sometimes, he likes to have Eulalla invert the meaning of some of the words in the saying, as in the first and third example here, which come from the adages "Do fuerza viene derecho se pierde" and "Quien tiene oficio tiene beneficio." Other times, the inversion is not in meaning, but simply in word order, such as in the third example with "A otro perro con ese hueso." In other instances, we simply have Eulalla making the wrong choice of word, as in the second and final example, from the refrains, "Honra y provecho no caben en el saco" and "Pues que Marina Bailó, tome lo que ganó." Utilizing these techniques, Rueda causes the popular adages to take on an unexpectedly absurd character, no doubt provoking great laughter of the crowd during the time period.

Lope de Rueda's use of the refrain is for the most part substantially less complex than that of Cervantes. For instance, whereas Rueda generally confines the use of refrains to the "popular" domain, Cervantes often puts these colloquial sayings in the mouths of officials, as opposed to simply the lowest stratum of society. For example in \textit{El Juez de los divorcios}, when Mariana

\textsuperscript{35} This is an embedded \textit{paso}, which constitutes the seventh scene of Rueda's comedy \textit{Eufemia}.

\textsuperscript{36} See \textit{Refranes} and \textit{Refranes III} for the more conventional forms of these popular sayings and their respective meanings.
complains of her husband, "Cedacico nuevo, tres dias en estaca," the judge responds with another refrain, "comiste las maduras, gustad de las duras" (24). The first refrain, uttered by Mariana, indicates the fleeting goodness of something new. The second adage, spoken by the judge, is somewhat analogous to the modern English saying "take the bitter with the sweet," although it implies already having enjoyed the sweet, and therefore being expected to make do with the bitterness afterwards. The use of these two refrains here reinforces the judge's unwillingness to do anything about the dysfunctional relationship between Mariana and her much older husband.

En La guardia cuidadosa, the soldier employs a refrain in trying to win Cristina's affection: "Niña, échame el ojo; mira mi garbo; soldado soy, castellano pienso ser; brío tengo de corazón; soy más galán hombre del mundo; y por el hilo deste vestidillo, podrás sacar el ovillo de mi gentileza" (104). Spadaccini explains the humor in making use of this refrain in this situation in his footnote to this passage (189). The refrain is a comedic gloss on the popular saying "por el hilo se saca el ovillo," meaning that from the small beginnings of something, you can gain knowledge of the rest of it. In this case, the refrain is used in a particularly ironic fashion, considering the soldier is dressed in old torn-up clothes reduced practically to rags. Hence, the refrain further calls attention to the distance between his pretensions and the reality of his humbled situation.

As we can already see from these two examples, Cervantes' humorous use of popular adages has more to do with the situation in which they appear, in contrast with Rueda's use that was somewhat more independent from context. However, towards the end of El Vizcaíno fingido, Solózcano launches into a series of refrains that are somewhat reminiscent of Rueda's usage.

---

37 See *Refranes*; cf. *Refanes II.*
38 See also A. A. Parker's "The Humor of Spanish Proverbs."
Solórzano: "Señora Cristina, al perro viejo nunca tus tus; estas tretas, con los de las galleruzas, y con este perro a otro hueso" (125). All three of these popular refrains have roughly the same meaning in this context, which is that Solórzano has too much experience to be tricked. Is we shall see later in our analysis of this play, the irony is that Solórzano is in fact tricking Cristina, but he feigns indignation, and accuses her of trying to trick him. The third of these refrains is a reversal of "a otro perro con ese hueso," used almost identically as it was in the Rueda citation we saw earlier, to similar comedic effect. Solórzano continues to bombard Cristina with more refrains:

Para que entienda vuestra merced que la codicia rompe el saco. ¿Tan presto se desconfió de mi palabra, que quiso vuestra merced curarse en salud y salir al lobo al camino, como la gansa de Cantipalos [sic]? Señora Cristina, lo bien ganado se pierde, y lo malo, ello y su dueño. (125-6)

The impact of all of these refrains in sequence is cumulative, giving seemingly greater veracity to Solórzano's bogus claims that the gold chain Cristina is returning to him is a false replica of the one he had given her earlier. The proverbial phrase "greed breaks the sack," is fairly straightforward in its meaning (if you try to take more than you can carry, the sack will break, and you wind up losing it all). As for the other two proverbial phrases, "curarse en salud" and "salir al lobo al camino, como la gansa de Cantimpalos," they both have the meaning of trying to prevent something unnecessarily or prematurely.³⁹ Cervantes here brilliantly combines multiple refrains in rapid-fire succession, and the primary humor in this passage is derived from the situational irony of the popular adages reinforcing each other's meaning, particularly when the audience knows that, in reality, Solórzano is the swindler, and Cristina is the one being tricked.

There are a few other uses of refrains in Cervantes' entremeses, most of which are a little more conventional in their situational use and more like Rueda's employment of this device. For

³⁹ Cf. Refranes.
example, the barber in *La cueva de Salamanca* says at one point "Eso tengo yo bueno, que hablo más llano que una suela de zapato; pan por vino y vino por pan, o como suele decirse." (244) The barber reverses the elements of the popular saying "Al pan, pan, y al vino, vino," which is a saying still used today to encourage speaking straightforwardly and in a simple manner. The refrain is funny in context not just because he confuses the elements, but also because he does so in response to being asked to speak straightforwardly and simply about the situation at hand, to which he replies that he will have no trouble doing so, since this is his custom. Yet he clearly isn't being very articulate. Even this simple use of the refrain is much more contingent upon the situation in than it was in Rueda, although the form and deliberate distortion of refrains is indeed quite similar. There is no doubt that Cervantes learned this technique from dramatists like Rueda, and expanded upon its dramatic possibilities in his own works.

3. Latinisms, especially the frequent use of the superlative:

Both Rueda and Cervantes frequently employ words or phrases of Latinate origin. Often, these words or phrases are used to poke fun at the clergy, or at phases of the church that are being misused or misinterpreted by characters of the lower stratum of society. Other times, the Latin superlative is used, particularly in situations where one of the characters is agitated, and is employing the superlative in an ironic, mocking, or derisive fashion. For example, the Licienciate says at the end of the fourth paso, "Juro a diez que ha sido muy *vellaquissimamente* hecho." and "No ha estado sino de muy *grandissimos* vellacos." Using the Latinate superlative in an ironic or mocking fashion is hardly unique to Cervantes, but it is something he employs with great frequency in his comic writings and drama.

---

40 Deleytoso, paso quarto, 145 (the emphasis is mine).
With respect to other uses of Latin words or phrases, let us look at a few examples. In the first paso of *El Deleytoso*, Alameda inquires at one point, "¿A quánto llegó el gaudeamos de hoy?" His use of "gaudeamos" here was frequent in the day, and signified rejoicing, party, and general merriment with abundant food and drink.\(^{41}\) Alameda is simply trying to determine how much money he and Luquitas have spent on food and drink for the day.

Occasionally a less educated character will slip in a commonly used Latin phrase in Rueda's plays, often of a religious nature, as all were at least familiar with the Latin of the sermons, whether or not they understood it. The other very common use of Latin phrases in both Rueda and Cervantes is to ridicule the pretense of relatively more educated characters. For example, the doctor in the third *paso* of *El Deleytoso*, Lucio, constantly employs Latin phrases, without particularly good cause for doing so. Some examples:

\begin{quote}
¡O miserabelis Doctor, quanta pena paciuntur propter miseriam!
(Oh wretched Doctor! How much pain must he suffer because of this misery!)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Salus adque vita in qua Nestoreos superetis dias.
([I wish you] health and also [long] life in which you might surpass Nestor in days.)\(^{42}\)
\end{quote}

The first of these quotes is meant to express the doctor's stress at not having prescribed anything in the whole day, as he immediately clarifies. The second, a simple statement wishing his patient good health and long life.\(^{43}\) Both statements in Latin are, however, completely

---

\(^{41}\) See *Autoridades* for this specific usage. Even today, the famous *De Brevitate Vitae*, which begins "Gaudeamus igitur. Iuvenes dum sumus." ("Therefore let us rejoice, while we are [yet] young") is still a popular commencement song at many universities and in Latin classes, so it shouldn't be surprising that the term "gaudeamus" came to be used as a term for a raucous party in the day.

\(^{42}\) This is meant as a greeting in the form of a blessing, something to the effect of "may you have a long, healthy life."

\(^{43}\) Canes Vallés reminds us in his edition that in the classical tradition, Apollo granted Nestor three lifetimes of life on earth (132, n. 68).
superfluous and simply reflect the doctor's desire to display his erudition. It is unlikely that his patient, the simple Martín de Villalba, would understand the best wishes for good health bestowed upon him in Latin by the doctor. In this way, Rueda ridicules the pretentious erudition of physicians of the day.

Cervantes, on the other hand, seems to be more critical still in his critique not just of false erudition, but in general of the out of touch officials of his time period. When Cervantes utilizes Latin in the mouth of a lower official, it often has a certain ironic double meaning, when one knows the context. For example, in *El Juez de los Divorcios*, the judge asserts, "Pues yo no puedo hacer este divorcio, *quia nullam invenio causam*" (25). As many editors have noted already, the words are from John, 19:4-5, and belong to Pontius Pilate, when he refuses to sentence Jesus Christ. While Cervantes' actual stance on divorce is a subject of some debate, what is clear is that he doesn't fully approve of the sentence of his detached Judge either. The play on the whole, as we shall see in the next chapter, is a parody of the bureaucracy and impotence of lesser legal institutions of the day.

In *El rufián viudo*, Juan also uses blasphemously a phrase from mass:

```
JUAN.  Yo soy de parecer que el gran Trampagos
       Ponga silencio a su contino llanto
       Y vuelva al *sicut erat in principio*,
       Digo a sus olvidadas alegrías;
       Y tome prenda que las suyas quite
       Que es bien que el vivo vaya a la hogaza,
       Como el muerto se va a la sepultura. (vv. 171-177)
```

---

44 See the excellent annotation of Baras Escolá (ed., 279) on the subject; the quote has been attributed by Sevilla Arroyo to similar passages in Luke, 23:4 or John, 18:38, but probably comes from John, 19:5, "ut cognoscatis *quia in eo nullam causam invenio*" (emphasis added).
In this passage, Juan encourages Trampagos to stop his mourning the death of his best prostitute and return to how things were in the beginning. The phrase "as it was in the beginning" is clearly used to grotesque comedic effect here, merging a phrase from mass with the idea that Trampagos should just put aside his grief and find himself a new consort/prostitute.

I should note that Cervantes does also use Latin words and phrases more innocently, such as the Bachiller's exhortation to return to the matter at hand in La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo, when he says "redeamus ad rem," (v. 29; meaning "let us return to the subject at hand") or when he later says "sufficit" (v. 272, meaning "enough") to try to restore order. These are procedural uses of Latin and are somewhat more unremarkable than Cervantes' other uses of such phrases.

Of course, I would be remiss in this discussion if I failed to point out the most notorious use of a Latin phrase in Cervantes' Entremeses, which comes in El retablo de las maravillas, when Capacho accuses the Furrier of being one of them, that is to say, a Jew or a bastard, when he says "de ex il[l]is es," and the Governor immediately repeats the same accusation. We will discuss the social ramifications of this play in the next chapter, but this phrase, a vulgarization of the Latin meaning "he's one of them," is actually the same phrase that Caiaphas' servant uses in his accusation of St. Peter, when Peter denies knowing Jesus.\textsuperscript{45} The terrible irony of the situation is that the villagers use the same words to accuse the Furrier of being a Jew as the Jews used in their accusation of Saint Peter. As is quite evident here, Cervantes liked to exploit the subtext of many Latin phrases, that much of his audience would recognize from the Bible or from sermons, in order to make a subtle political point. This sets him apart from Rueda, who was never quite as thought-

\textsuperscript{45} The original phrase, \textit{ex illis es}, appears in Matthew 26:73. See Molho, 189-190.
provoking with his use of Latin. His plays were clearly intended to be much more straightforwardly comical.

In summary, it is not the fact that Rueda and Cervantes make use of Latin in their short, one-act comedic works that is remarkable, but the way in which they make use of Latin phrases to ridicule figures in position of relative authority, or to denigrate a phrase that would otherwise have much loftier connotations, or, in the case of Cervantes, to hint at a subtle situational irony.

4. Regional dialects; race and/or class specific dialects; *lenguaje de germanía*

Certainly one of the most notable features of both Rueda's and Cervantes' drama is their uncanny ability to emulate regional idioms, race, or class specific dialects, and to make use of terminology and coded language features of the underworld. Cervantes was no doubt influenced by Rueda in this, and there have already been numerous studies on the language employed by each author. I have already made note of the classic studies by Alonso and Veres D'Ocon earlier. Veres D'Ocon's "Juegos idiomáticos en las obras de Lope de Rueda" is truly excellent in its analysis of the various language features of Rueda's plays, and in explaining how these features are inextricably linked to the Spanish Renaissance ethos of the time period. Specifically, Veres D'Ocon analyzes how Rueda constructs the language of the Moors, and of his *negras*, and briefly traces the use of the language of these characters from Rueda to Gil Vicente, Diego Sánchez de Badajoz, and Micael de Carvajal y Hurtado de Toledo. The most important aspect of this study, in my view, is the excellent observation that some of the phonetic changes correspond with those actually used by Moors and black individuals of the day in the Iberian peninsula, whereas others are invented by Rueda for greater comedic effect, such as the often exaggerated use of the article "al." Although Cervantes also depicts many characters of Moorish descent, interestingly, he tends
to present them with a greater dignity, or at the very least, a more nuanced complexity, than Rueda. Perhaps it is in part for this reason that no such character appears in any of his *entremeses*.

Also of great interest is Rueda's depiction of the *negra*, a traditional type or figure (more than an actual character in the modern sense) of dramatic works of the XVI century. Frida Weber de Kurlat explores the ways in which Rueda's *negras* are more complex than those of Sánchez de Badajoz, because the credulity of the black woman and her pretensions of nobility, her ability to excite others with her beauty, and her interaction with other characters are much more developed. Since we have already seen a little of the speech of the *negra* with Eulalla's comedic distortion of refrains earlier, and since Cervantes does not make use of this particular comedic type in his *entremeses*, I would refer the interested reader to the studies I have noted below for a much more detailed analysis of this topic. To generalize about their language use, Rueda's *negras* employ a dialect that is even more corrupted than that of his Moors. It is hard to tease out how much of their speech corresponds to an actual linguistic reality of the time period and how much is pure invention on Rueda's part. As Veres D'Ocon notes in his aforementioned study, Rueda's *negras* tend to employ a manner of speaking that is an amalgam of various speech characteristics of the lower stratum of rural society and has a very rustic sound to it (207). We have already seen some of these characteristics earlier in the section on Rueda's refrains, such as the dropping of the "d" at the beginning of words, the hue>gue transformation, no>ne, the inconsistent dropping or addition of the final "s" from many words, as well as others, but I defer once again to Veres D'Ocon's article for a complete analysis of these characteristics.

---

Another instance of regional dialects in Lope de Rueda's *Pasos*, which has been the subject of some debate, is his use of *valencianismos* and *catalanismos*.\(^{47}\) It has been argued that some of these are due to the intervention of Joan Timoneda in editing Rueda's plays for publication. Many of these dialectical markers are placed in the mouths of the *simples, negras* and *lacayos*, in other words, the very characters whose speech Timoneda would have had to modify somewhat due to the censorship of the time period. Fernando González Ollé makes note of a few in his introduction, which I reproduce here:

- *fosca* (Paso 1.\(^{o}\)), 'oscura'
- *gelosía* (Paso 3.\(^{o}\)), 'celosía'
- *plantufos* (Paso 4.\(^{o}\)), 'pantuflos'
- *plumallos* (Paso 4.\(^{o}\)) 'plumajes' o 'desplumarlos.'
- *sacar burla* (Paso 4.\(^{o}\)), calco semántico de *sortir burla*, 'burlar'.
- *braços* (Paso 5.\(^{o}\)), 'brazo eclesiástico'.
- *engulo* (Paso 5.\(^{o}\)), 'engullo'.
- *com a* (Paso 9.\(^{a}\)), 'como'.
- *justa* (Paso 10), 'según'.
- *engoliste* (Paso 10), 'engulliste'.

(Ed. González Ollé and Vicente Tusón, 22)

González Ollé makes a convincing case that these are, in fact, probably due to minor alterations of the original text on the part of Timoneda, since most of the Valencianisms do not contribute much to the text from a dramatic standpoint. There are some exceptions, however, such as the first usage of the "casa fosca" for prison, which seems appropriate given the dramatic situation of the correction by the other character. Hence, it seems probable that some of the use of the Valencian Spanish dialect was already present in Rueda, and in other cases, it had more to do with Timoneda's intervention. While no one can state with perfect certainty where Timoneda may have made additions to the text, González Ollé's efforts to look at which uses of *valencianismos* contribute to

---

\(^{47}\) For more details on this subject, see González Olle (1980 & 1982).
the dramatic situation and which do not is commendable, and one of the best efforts to tease out the interventions from the original text to date.

Another aspect of dialectical speech present in both authors is their fascination with the criminal underworld. They both ably depict the world of thieves, prostitutes, gamblers and swindlers, and both show a great degree of awareness of the underworld slang of their time period. Indeed, Rueda's profession as a traveling actor and Cervantes' known affinity for games of chance would have presented both with ample opportunities for encountering this element of society in bars and taverns during their travels.

The fifth Paso of El Deleytoso, known as la tierra de Juaja, deals with two thieves poking fun at a particularly credulous and hungry simple named Mendugo. The play is about them convincing him that there exists a land where everything is food. Honzigera the thief begins, "Anda, Anda, hermano Panriso, no te quedes reçagado, que agora es tiempo de tender nuestras redes, que la burullada está en grandísimo sosiego y pausa, y las sicas descuydadas" (147). Autoridades informs us that gurullada means a troop of judges or ministers in charge of transporting criminals in lenguaje de germanía (underworld slang). Sicas o cicas, is also criminal slang for a money purse or small bag. A few lines later, Panarizo, his accomplice, states, "Mira, hermano Honzigera, provee que comamos, que yo vengo candido de hambre." Candido, as Juan Hidalgo's vocabulario to his Romances de Germanía informs us, means in this underworld context, "famished." There are probably more uses of this lenguaje de germanía in this play than any other found in Rueda, although his thieves often speak of grotesque subject matter concerning their way of life, such as the fact that they are missing ears (the amputation of the ear was a common punishment for thieves that were caught). Also, there are a lot of double-entendres and puns involving scissors or "bleeding" (slang for robbing). Scissors were the common emblematic tool
For barbers and tailors, but the term was also slang for the main fingers of the thief.\textsuperscript{48} For example, when the Alguazil denounces the thieves in \textit{Los Lacayos Ladrones}, this usage of the term becomes clear, and is indeed quite humorous:

\begin{quote}
\textsc{Molina [lee].} "Señor Madrigal, hágame merced de venirse hazia l'Antigua, porque hagamos partición de aquella bolsa que sangramos a la frutera. \\
\textsc{Alguazil.} ¿Barbero soys de bolsas? ¡Tenedlo bien! Y a essotro mirad lo que lleva debaxo la capa. \\
\end{quote}

(Registro de Representantes, Paso Cuarto, "Los lacayos ladrones," 176)

In the sixth Paso of \textit{El Deleytoso}, known as "Pagar y no pagar," the thief Samadel doesn't use many terms that are exclusive to the underworld register. However, he does alter his speech so as to try to avoid capture when Cevadón and Breçano come looking for him after he has stolen their money:

\begin{quote}
\textsc{Cevadón.} ¡Hombre de bien...!
\textsc{Samadel.} ¡La gran bagasa qui'us parí!
\textsc{Cevadón.} No habla christianamente, señor.
\textsc{Breçano.} Sepamos, pues, en qué lengua habla.
\textsc{Samadel.} Yuta drame a roquido dotos los durbeles.
\textsc{Breçano.} ¿Qué dixo?
\textsc{Cevadón.} Que se los comió de pasteles.
\textsc{Samadel.} No he fet yo tan gran llegea.
\textsc{Breçano.} ¿Qué's lo que dize?
\textsc{Cevadón.} Qu'el los pagará, aunque se pea.
\textsc{Samadel.} ¿Qué he de pagar?
\textsc{Cevadón.} Los dineros que me quisistes hurtar.
\textsc{Samadel.} Toma una higa para vos, don villano.
\textsc{Cevadón.} Pero tomad vos esto, don ladrón tacaño.
\textsc{Breçano.} ¡Esso, sí, dale!
\textsc{Cevadón.} ¡Aguardá, aguardá! \\
\end{quote}

\textit{(Deleytoso, Paso Sexto, "Pagar y no pagar," 161).}

\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Germania}. cf. Hidalgo.
Much of the comedy in this scene lies in the simple Cevadón misunderstanding Samadel's language, a language that he deliberately employs to obfuscate his meaning from the others. Samadel speaks in Catalan here, and the words are clearly apt to the scene, and obviously written by Rueda, but they have added meaning for those who understand the language. The first sentence uttered by Samadel means "the great bitch that bore you," "la gran puta que le parió," a common insult in Spanish as well. The second insult he dishes out, "Yuta drome a roquido dotos los durbeles," means, "your mother has been around all the brothels," which Cevadón misinterprets as him confessing to having eaten all the breaded meat goods. Next, Samadel says "I have not done such a great filthy thing" (no he hecho yo tan gran fealdad). Samadel, finally switching back to Spanish, asks what he owes them, and they tell him to give back the money he has stolen, which he has already spent. He then responds by flipping them off. Finally, the play ends with characteristic slapstick humor typical of these light plays, with Cevadón beating Samadel for tricking him, while Samadel attempts to flee. As we can clearly see from this example, a lot of the humor in this scene is greatly augmented if the audience knows Catalan, and understands what Samadel is actually saying. Whether or not the audience could fully understand this dialect, the fact that Samadel is mocking and insulting both Cevadón and Breçano would have been fairly clear to any person in attendance during the time period.

This comedic attempt to pull off a scam by switching dialects or adopting a fake accent is not unlike the premise for Cervantes' Vizcaíno Fingido, in which two scoundrels conspire to trick...
a prostitute out of some money. The titular fake Biscayan, unsurprisingly, "imitates" the unusual syntax of the variant of Spanish spoken by someone of Basque descent during the time period:

QUIÑONES. Vizcaíno, manos bésame vuestra merced, que mándeme.
SOLÓRZANO. Dice el señor vizcaíno que besa las manos de vuestra merced y que le mande.
BRÍGADA. ¡Ay, qué linda lengua! Yo no la entiendo a lo menos, pero paréceseme muy linda.
CRISTINA. Yo beso las del mi señor vizcaíno, y más adelante.
QUIÑONES. Pareces buena, hermosa; también noche esta cenamos; cadena quedas, duermes nunca, basta que doyla.
SOLÓRZANO. Dice mi compañero que vuestra merced le parece buena y hermosa; que separeje la cena; que él da la cadena, aunque no duerma acá, que basta que una vez la haya dado.
BRÍGADA. ¿Hay tal Alejandro en el mundo? Venturón, venturón y cien mil veces venturón. (121-2)

Cervantes plays around not only with the credulousness of the two prostitutes here, but also with the situation of their profession. The "y más adelante" that Cristina says here basically implies that she would not only kiss the Biscayan's hands, but would kiss "a whole lot further" if he desired, thereby reversing his "cordial" gesture, and turning it into an obscene proposition. He "cordially" flirts back with her, knowing that she will soon be the butt of their trick, as we will discuss in our third chapter. The interesting thing to notice about this scene in Cervantes is that, unlike Rueda, Cervantes cues the audience in to the meaning of the coded language employed by the characters. The false Biscayan dialect is used not to conceal any meaning, but rather to assume a new identity. In fact, Cervantes seldom uses a phrase in another language without revealing its meaning to the audience/reader, by means of an intermediary explaining to another character who doesn't understand. One need only think of the numerous times that Don Quixote clarifies a phrase in

52 The quotation marks here are to indicate that this language, from what I understand, has little to do with what the actual syntax of a Basque Spaniard would have resembled at the time period. I believe that this is deliberate on Cervantes' part, and that a portion of the humor of this play comes from the fact that Cristina and her fellow prostitute, Brigada, being quite ignorant, buy into the phony dialect.
Latin or a word of Arabic to Sancho to see this tendency. Cervantes does on occasion, however, employ lenguaje de germanía without clarification, either because his audience/readers would probably have picked up its meaning, or because it dealt with a double entendre of some sort, as illustrated by numerous examples from El rufián viudo.

El rufián viudo llamado Trampagos is a particularly interesting entremés, in that it blends together two completely disparate worlds: el mundo del hampa, that is, the world of underground prostitution, and the world of Garcilaso's Eglogas, and pastoral/courtly love. It is in fact a brilliant parody of themes of courtly love, wherein the system of values is completely flipped upside down, and the value of the woman as a subject of beauty is interwoven with her commercial value as an object for consumption. As Trampagos mourns the loss of his best prostitute, her exploits as a prostitute are fondly remembered, in a fashion that is both comic and grotesque (the details of her final moments, suffering from venereal diseases are recounted in poetic detail). Cervantes also draws upon the double meaning of the word ninfa, which signifies both a nymph in the sense of a minor female deity of nature, as well as a slang term for prostitute in the era. The deceased whore Pericona has her praises sung as though she were a deceased nymph of the other kind, or a figure of great importance. Part of what works extremely well in this play is the fusion of highly loquacious, "elegant" language with much more vulgar and plebeian language of the underworld. A quick example:

RUFÍÁN [Chiquiznaque].

Me so Trampagos, ¿es posible sea
Voacé tan enemigo suyo,
Que se entumbe, se encubra y se trasponga
Debajo desa sombra bayetuna
El sol hampesco? So Trampagos, basta
Tanto gemir, tantos suspiros bastan;
Trueque voacé las lágrimas corrientes
En limosnas y en misas y oraciones

53 In the original text, the stage directions refer to Chiquiznaque as simply "RUFÍÁN."
Por la gran Pericona, que Dios haya;
Que importan más que llantos y sollozos.
Voacé ha garlado como un tólogo,
Mi señor Chiquiznaque; pero en tanto
Que encarrilo mis cosas de otro modo,
Tome vuestra merced, y platiquemos
Una levada nueva. (vv. 25-39)

In this excerpt, Chiquiznaque encourages Trampagos to put away his tears and laments, and instead give prayers and alms and attend masses for Pericona, as it will do her soul more good. Trampagos responds to this request, stating (in an extremely rustic and vulgar way, and employing some slang, such as garlado for hablado) that Chiquiznaque has spoken like a true theologian, but that until he can arrange his affairs again, he would prefer to start fencing again, as is their custom.

Another passage of this play, of much more grotesque intrigue, is where Chiquiznaque and Trampagos discuss how Pericona died:

RUFIÁN [Chiquiznaque]. ¡Oh hembra benemérita
De griegas y romanas alabanzas!
¿De qué murió?

TRAMPAGOS. ¿De qué? Casi de nada:
Los médicos dieron que tenía
Malos los hipocondrios, y los hígados,
Y que con agua de taray pudiera
Vivir, si la bebiera, setenta años.

RUFIÁN [Chiquiznaque]. ¿No la bebió?
TRAMPAGOS. Murióse.

RUFIÁN. [Chiquiznaque]. ¡Bebiérela hasta el día del júicio,
Que hasta entonces viviera!
El yerro estuvo
En no hacerla sudar.

TRAMPAGOS. Sudó once veces. (vv. 85-95)

Chiquiznaque is singing the praises of Pericona, and lamenting how she died. He inquires of Trampagos how it came to pass, and Trampagos replies that she died of an infection of the hypogastic region, and that they tried to get her to drink tamarisk, or bayberry water (a common remedy of the day for this affliction), but she didn't drink in time. Chiquiznaque declares that the
fault was in not having made her sweat it out earlier. Eugenio Asensio explains in a footnote\(^{54}\) that the eleven times she was made to sweat were provoked by cures of the time period used to treat syphilis and other venereal diseases. The passage gets progressively more grotesque in its detail:

(Entra Vademécum con los asientos referidos).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUFIÁN [Chiquiznaque].</th>
<th>¿Y aprovechóla alguna?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRAMPAGOS.</td>
<td>Casi todas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siempre quedaba como un ginjo verde,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sana como un peruétano o manzana.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUFIÁN [Chiquiznaque].</th>
<th>Dicenme que tenía ciertas fuentes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>En las piernas y brazos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAMPAGOS.</th>
<th>La sin dicha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Era un Aranjúez; pero, con todo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoy come en ella la que llaman tierra,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De las más blancas y hermosas carnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Que jamás encerraron sus entrañas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y, si no fuera porque habrá dos años</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Que comenzó a dañarsele el aliento,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Era abrazarla como quien abraza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un tiesto de albahaca o clavellinas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUFIÁN [Chiquiznaque].</th>
<th>Neguijón debió ser, o corrimiento,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El que dañó las perlas de su boca,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quiero decir, sus dientes y sus muelas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TRAMPAGOS. | Una mañana amaneció sin ellos. (vv. 96-112) |

In this fragment, the pair of rogues continue to give disgusting details about the death of Pericona, all while mourning her. Trampagos states that Pericona did benefit from all the sweating, being left in a happy and gorgeous state, looking very healthy. In the following lines, Chiquiznaque speaks of her "fuentes" and compares her to Aranjuez, a place known for its sumptuous gardens and fountains. However, as Spadaccini informs us,\(^{55}\) the "fuentes" here refers to her puss-filled sores that form as a result of her venereal diseases, so this comparison is of the most vulgar and grotesque kind, deforming an image of beauty. They then speak of her former beauty and clean

---

\(^{54}\) 80, n. 9.

\(^{55}\) 118, n. 26-27.
smell, stating that hugging her was like hugging basil and sweet-smelling flowers. This image is immediately contrasted with the image of her teeth being blackened and rotted by another affliction, completely turning the Petrarchian image of teeth as white pearls on its head, which Cervantes makes very explicit here, culminating with Trampagos' comment that "one morning, she woke up without them [her teeth]."

As we can see from these examples, both Cervantes and Rueda manipulate a series of different linguistic codes when dealing with themes of the criminal underworld, all of which are used with great success to provoke hilarity. Both authors are able to integrate masterfully the kind of vocabulary used by the lower stratum of society to paint a picture that is believable for the kind of grotesque, degraded world in which their low characters operate. While Rueda's characters often use different linguistic codes that provoke misunderstanding that even the audience wouldn't fully understand, Cervantes blends his criminal slang with a much more "elevated" register, and it is the contrast between the worlds of high poetry and criminal lowlifes that provokes laughter.

To conclude this section, I should perhaps also note that I do not mean to imply that the four language techniques illustrated above are exclusive to Rueda and Cervantes, or that Cervantes necessarily learned them from Rueda and not another source. Gil Vicente, Juan de Encina, Bartolomé de Torres Naharro, and Lucas Fernández, among others, also make use of many of the same or similar techniques. My primary aim was to show that Cervantes is indeed deeply linked to the Spanish tradition of theater that preceeded him and the rhetorical devices used during the time period. This fact, however, in no way diminishes his originality and ability to innovate within the confines of this older mode of theater. Cervantes' entremeses were generally speaking far subtler and more complex in terms of language, the creation of characters, and the exploration of social relations of the time period than the vast majority of the farces of his predecessors. As such,
while Cervantes was not commercially successful as a playwright during his day, he, without a doubt, expanded the possibilities for this "minor" genre, which would later be further exploited and expanded upon by Antonio Hurtado de Mendoza, Luis Quiñones de Benavente, and Francisco de Quevedo.
2. THE ENTREMESES PART I – THE LEGAL FARCES

It is a matter of historical curiosity that in spite of the similarities between several of the techniques utilized by Lope de Rueda and Cervantes in their respective interludes, the plays of Cervantes were not well regarded in their day, whereas those of Lope de Rueda were. Cervantes' interludes are, nevertheless, extremely well regarded by most modern critics, as well as modern theatrical companies. What is it about Cervantes' short plays, then, that made them so unpalatable to audiences of his day, yet still enables them to be considered at least minor classics in the modern era? One of the recurring responses to this question modern critics have mentioned is the style in which the theater was written.

In particular, Cervantes' interludes seem to have much more detailed and explanatory stage directions, considerably more characters, and to have less dramatic action than those of his contemporaries (as we shall see later in our analysis of the individual plays). These factors and others have led some modern critics, such as Jenaro Talens and Nicholas Spadaccini, to propose that Cervantes may have intended the plays to be read rather than performed. I cannot agree with this suggestion, both because of Cervantes' own affirmations about his dramatic works and because of the circumstances under which he published his plays. As Cervantes himself informs us in his introduction:

[...]compuse en este tiempo hasta veinte comedias o treinta, que todas ellas se recitaron sin que se les ofreciese ofrenda de pepinos ni de otra cosa arrojadiza; corrieron su carrera sin silbos, gritas ni barahúndas. Tuve otras cosas en que ocuparme; dejé la pluma y las comedias, y entró luego el monstruo de naturaleza, el gran Lope de Vega, y alzóse con la monarquía cómica.

("Prólogo" a las Ocho comedias..., 12-13)

56 See García Lorenzo (1999) and González Puché for some specific examples of modern representations of the entremeses.
57 See, for example, Talens & Spadaccini (1993), or Spadaccini (1986).
This paragraph does not reflect the writing of a man who intended his plays to be read; rather, of a man who, knowing the brilliance of his own works, and embittered by their relative lack of commercial success, especially when compared with his contemporary and rival, Lope de Vega, decided to publish them of his own accord, so as to save them from being lost to future generations forever. And, as I previously noted, Cervantes' plays appear to have been considerably ahead of their time, and have enjoyed a relative degree of both commercial success and excellent critical reception in the modern era. What is it, then, about their composition that makes them much more appealing to us as moderns than they probably were to Cervantes' contemporaries?

In his provocative study, *The Novelist as Playwright: Cervantes and the Entremés Nuevo*, Cory A. Reed explores the ways in which Cervantes' interludes present themselves as a kind of "novelized drama" (4) in that they use a more polyvalent language, as well as irony and satirical criticism not typical of the genre prior to Cervantes' arrival on the scene. Reed prudently accepts that Cervantes intended his theater to be performed upon the stage, but points to some of the reasons why it might not have been as successful in its day. Reed contrasts Cervantes' theater with the more conventional Quiñones de Benavente (26), pointing out the ways in which Cervantes radically departs from conventions of the genre. Specifically, Reed points out that there is a synthesis of literary discourse and dramatic performance in Cervantes' interludes (37), which blend elements of "official" as well as "popular" culture (39-50). As he puts it, "The novelized

---

58 This discussion is a bit lengthy to summarize here. The gist of his argument is that Cervantes' interludes are more "heady" and require much more contemplation than those of his predecessors, because they don't give us a clean, comfortable, clear-cut resolution, and because they incorporate elements from both the more everyday world of the street as well as from the classical literature. In reality, I think that some of what Reed characterizes here as uniquely Cervantine could in fact be demonstrated for many playwrights of the time, included Lope de Vega (though perhaps not as much in the case of Rueda), but it is nevertheless a compelling argument, that demonstrates many of the virtues and innovations of Cervantes' dramatic technique.
Cervantine interlude outwardly exhibits elements of parody, satire, irony, suspense, literary polyphony, and metatheatrical structure atypical of the traditional interlude." (3)

In his exposition, Cory Reed gives particular attention to the more "open-ended conclusions" of most of Cervantes' interludes (4), which invite contemplation on the part of the audience, and, in fact, almost require the audience to participate mentally and to try to resolve for themselves the difficult questions posed by the drama, as we shall see in more detail. As Reed states, all but two of the Cervantine interludes conclude in a way that is far from traditional. Rather than ending with the typical slapstick found in most of Rueda's plays, Cervantes often chooses to have the main dramatic action of the play interrupted by musicians who come on the stage and prevent the final decision of the arbiters of the play from taking place. This leaves the audience with a sense of indeterminacy with regard to the ultimate conclusion of the play, and requires "the collaboration of the theatrical audience or reading public in order to resolve the open-ended presentation of such ideas." (4) According to Reed, this "thematic indeterminacy" interferes with the short plays' ability to function within the framework of a larger dramatic work, because it causes them to resist becoming subordinate to the other work.

I find Reed's discussion particularly salient with regard to this last point. As we have seen in the preceding chapter, the interlude was typically thought of as a lighter, less involved comic work, used to prolong the length of a comedy, as well as to provide some levity and respite for the audience between its acts. As such, the interlude as a "contingent" or "dependent" genre was deliberately written in such as way so as not to demand too much deep contemplation or "serious" attention on the part of the audience. Cervantes, in outright rejecting this kind of "escapist" interlude, crafts a kind of interlude that demands a greater degree of reflection and intellectual participation from his audience. Cervantes' interludes become more substantial in their content
than those of his predecessors, but, in the process, they not only become more autonomous from
the larger work into which they would have been inserted, but, in fact, resist such a subordination
altogether. As Reed points out, after witnessing a work such as *El retablo de las maravillas*, it
could prove difficult for the audience to keep in mind all the previous actions of another, longer
work. The audience would likely still be contemplating the ideas and themes presented by the
interlude and this, in turn, would interfere with the dramatic action and impact of the larger work.
It is perhaps for this reason that Cervantes' interludes enjoyed less success in their own time, where
one-act plays were common only as short comedic episodes or in religious festivals. In the modern
era, we as audience members are far more accustomed to "weighty" plays (comic or otherwise)
that take place in a single-act.

In contrast with later writers such as Quevedo, who outright rejected the common man, and
embraced Horaces' doctrine of "odi profanum vulgus et arceo," Cervantes seems to have taken a
different Horatian principle to heart, namely, *placere et docere*, to delight and to teach
simultaneously. However, unlike Quevedo, Cervantes doesn't outright reject the uninitiated into
the worlds of "higher" culture. Rather, he seems to embrace a more humanistic idea that all walks
of life should in principle, if they are willing to listen, be able to benefit from the questions posed
by his works. Cervantes' *Entremeses*, in keeping with the tradition of the genre, poke fun at human
folly in various forms. But unlike the drama of his predecessors, Cervantes writes his short comic
interludes almost as fables, with no explicit moral message stated, but with an ending that seems
to invite the reflection of the audience, and a concluding edifying sentiment to be drawn from the
work. Cervantes' *Entremeses*, unlike the *Pasos* of Lope de Rueda, seem to be aimed less at simply

---

59 Odes (III, 1).
60 This form represents the popularization of the phrase from the original text, "Aut prodesse volunt
aut delectare poetae aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae" (*Ars Poetica*, vv. 333-334).
having a laugh at the expense of their characters, and more at trying to draw some kind of lesson from the folly of their actions. This attempt to "edify" is seemingly made more explicit in some of the plays by the appearance of musicians, who, with popular forms of verse and song and dance, give a conclusion to the dramatic action. Yet, this conclusion is often deceptive, and, as we shall see, doesn't always concord completely with what we have observed in the play. To illustrate how this functions within the individual works more clearly, it will be useful to classify Cervantes' short plays by the major prevailing themes he addresses.

Although there is some overlap between the recurring themes and motifs of these works, for our purposes it will be sufficient to classify these Entremeses into three thematic categories: Those that deal with legal issues (El juez de los divorcios, La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo), those that deal with cuckoldry and the ineptitude of men trying to control "their" women (La guarda cuidadosa, La cueva de Salamanca, El viejo celoso) and finally, those that deal with picaresque themes or the criminal underworld (El rufián viudo llamado Trampagos, El vizcaíno fingido, El retablo de las maravillas). Each of these plays addresses some aspect of the society in which Cervantes lived, and, even if not explicitly stated, suggests an alternative for a more humanistic society, less governed by human capriciousness and the dangerous, irrational extremes of social conformity.

It is interesting to note as well that in several of his entremeses, Cervantes tends to present us with female characters that are considerably more individuated and well defined than their male counterparts. Indeed, in the first entremés of the collection, El juez de los divorcios, the male characters involved in the marital disputes are not even given names, but are referred to only by

---

61 In particular, I am thinking of El juez de los divorcios, La guarda cuidadosa, and La cueva de Salamanca.
their most salient characteristic (Vejeté, Soldado, Cirujano, Ganapán). In this sense, they are still closer to the "figuras" we saw in Lope de Rueda's *Pasos* than to fully defined characters. Nevertheless, in the dialogue of this play, they are given a greater degree of characterization than many of Lope de Rueda's character types.

The play begins with Mariana and El Vejeté, her husband, demanding a divorce before the Judge in a (at the time completely fictitious) divorce court setting. Mariana, a woman much younger than her husband, laments how the age disparity in their relationship makes their marriage completely impossible. In her words:

*MARIANA.* El invierno [sic] de mi marido y la primavera de mi edad; el quitarle el sueño, por levantarme a media noche a calentar paños y saquillos de salvado para ponerle en la ijada; el ponerle, ora questa, ora aquella ligadura, que ligado le vea yo a un palo por justicia; el cuidado que tengo de ponerle de noche alta, cabecera de la cama, jarabes lenitivos, porque no se ahogue del pecho, y el estar obligada a sufrirle el mal olor de la boca, que le güele mal a tres tiros de arcabuz. (21-2)

Essentially, Mariana's complaint is that El Vejeté is so old in comparison with her that she is more his nurse and personal attendant than his wife. The above cited passage lists her complaints both with his poor, sickly physical condition (bad breath, trouble breathing, inflammations, etc.), and with all the treatments that she must administer to him as a result of said condition. She makes herself out to be the self-sacrificing wife that does nothing but toil over and take care of her "husband," who may as well be her patient. But the Vejeté husband refuses to take her complaints without rejoinders of his own:

*VEJETE.* En verdad, señores, que el mal aliento que ella dice que tengo no se engendra de mis podridas muelas, pues no las tengo, ni menos procede de mi estómago, que está sanísimo, sino desa mala intención de su pecho. Mal conocen vuesas mercedes a esta señora. Pues a fe que, si la conociesen, que la ayunarían o la santiguarían. Veinte y dos años ha que vivo con ella mártir, sin haber sido jamás confesor de sus insolencias, de sus voces y de sus fantasías, y ya va para dos años que cada día me va dando vaivenes y empujones hacia la sepultura; a cuyas voces me tiene medio sordo, y a puro reñir, sin juicio. Si me cura, como ella dice, cúrame a regañadientes, habiendo de ser suave la mano y la condición del médico. En resolución, señores, yo soy el que muero en su poder y ella es
The Vejete implies here that his wife is of a diabolical demeanor in her treatment towards him, going so far as to describe himself as a "martyr." He accuses her of being so brusque and harsh in her treatment of him as to deliberately try to send him to the grave before his time. He concludes by stating that he is the one dying in her power and she is the one living in his, sharing in his estate. I believe that it is at this moment that the play truly begins to show its most humorous, but also somewhat saddening characteristics. What is funny is the "dialogue" (if indeed they are truly addressing one another) between the bickering members of the various married couples in this play. While the play is lacking for much "action" on the stage, it nevertheless draws us in with its vivid dialogue, that perfectly captures the essence of each of the four marital disputes presented. The dialogue is structured in such a way that the couples begin by making their complaints about one another addressing the Judge, but increasingly interrupt one another, and wind up for all intents and purposes bickering with each other more than actually addressing the judge. It is the perfect portrayal of an absolutely disharmonious marital arrangement. In the scene we are examining, the wife continues by furiously accusing her husband of not really having an "estate" to speak of at all, and instead benefiting from her dowry:

MARIANA. ¿Hacienda vuestra? Y ¿qué hacienda tenéis vos, que no la hayáis ganado con la que llevastes en mi dote? Y son míos la mitad de los bienes gananciales, mal que os pese; y dellos y de la dote, si me muriese agora, no os dejaría valor de un maravedí, porque veáis el amor que os tengo. (23)

The couple continues to bicker back and forth, but eventually the judge has had enough, and dismisses their case, at least for the time being:

JUEZ. Callad, callad, nora en tal, mujer de bien, y andad con Dios, que yo no hallo causa para descasaros. Y pues comistes las maduras, gustad de las duras; que no está obligado ningún marido a tener la velocidad y corrida del tiempo, que no pase por su puerta y por
sus días; y descontad los malos que ahora os da, con los buenos, que os dio cuando pudo; y no repliquéis más palabra. (24)

The Judge simply dismisses Mariana's claims, stating that no husband is required to stay young forever, and that he can find no legitimate reason to divorce the two of them. The Vejete then implores the Judge to divorce them for his sake, and Mariana and her husband continue to beseech the Judge to let them separate. Even the court scribe and the attorney agree with the couple, and see their reasoning, but the Judge simply repeats his sentence, "Pues yo no puedo hacer este divorcio, quia nullam invenio causam." (25) The language utilized by the judge here is particularly significant. As other scholars have already observed\textsuperscript{62}, the phrase used by the judge here is very close to the language of Pontius Pilate in the gospel of John when Pilate announces to the Jews that he refuses to condemn Jesus, because he doesn't find cause to do so. The use of this language, which is legal in tone, but which clearly evokes the echoes of the Biblical passage as well, would have been very daring and out-of-place language for the Judge to use in this context. But the Judge doesn't seem to be deliberately making any kind of transgression. The question becomes then, what is Cervantes saying about the Judge here, and indeed, about legal officials of lesser courts in general? It seems to me that in addition to the issue of divorce itself, Cervantes also subtly pokes fun at the legal system throughout this play, and at lesser local-level legal officials of this sort, who, rather than getting anything done, put up obstacles at every opportunity, constantly delaying a final verdict, a verdict which, when it comes, is seldom satisfactory. We will see this trend continue throughout the rest of the play as we continue our analysis.

The second couple that comes before the Judge are a Soldier and his wife, Doña Guiomar. Once again, it is the wife who speaks first as to the reasons why she should be divorced from her

\textsuperscript{62} I refer the reader once again to the excellent annotation of Baras Escolá (279) on the subject; and to p. 36 of the first chapter of the present study.
husband. She alleges that he is "un leño" (8), a log or a piece of wood, which metaphorically can mean in this context either that he is incapable of working or that he is impotent. In the context of the play, it is almost certainly a pun, meaning both, as Mariana remarks in an aside, "Esta y yo nos quejamos sin duda de un mismo agravio," implying that both of their husbands are impotent, in both senses of the word. In addition to being inadequate or incapable of working, Doña Guiomar also alleges that her husband wastes his days gossiping after the morning mass, and gambling at the game house, sometimes helping others cheat. Finally, she accuses him of wasting his time mentally composing poetry when he should be working, "Respóndeme que está haciendo un soneto en la memoria para un amigo que se le ha pedido; y da en ser poeta, como si fuese oficio con quien no estuviese vinculada la necesidad del mundo" (27).

Before we actually meet the soldier husband, it might be somewhat tempting to think that Cervantes will present us with a *miles gloriosus*, the character type common for the era, and based on the eponymous protagonist of Plautus, who is the swaggering, braggart soldier, who frequented taverns, gambled away his earnings, and regaled whoever would listen with exaggerated tales of their bravery and heroics in battle. In reality, the soldier Cervantes presents us with here, while not a fully realized character, is still more than a mere "figure," and is even slightly tragic as he is presented. The soldier actually acknowledges that his wife isn't maligning him with lies, "Mi señora doña Guiomar, en todo cuanto ha dicho, no ha salido de los límites de la razón" (27), but that his idleness comes not from laziness or inability, but from being unable to procure a job for himself:

> SOLDADO. [Y]o, que ni tengo oficio ni beneficio, no sé qué hacerme, porque no hay señor que quiera servirse de mí, porque soy casado. Así que me será forzoso suplicar a vuestra merced, señor juez, pues ya por pobres son tan enfadosos los hidalgos, y mi mujer lo pide, que nos divida y aparte. (28)
In this brief excerpt, Cervantes gives us a brief look into a problem that was common in the time, and one with which he was probably quite familiar himself. That is, the problem of the unemployed soldier. In sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain, the dominant economic model in place (prior to the emerging proto-capitalist burger economy) relied upon a remnant of the feudal concept of vassalage. In order to make a living for themselves, lower-ranked members of society needed to find a lord into whose service they would enter. In exchange for their services, the lord would then give them a small salary that would take care of their basic necessities. However, during the Spanish Golden Age, this traditional model was largely falling apart, as a combination of inflation (due to the influx of gold from Latin America ironically driving down the value of currency) and overspending had led to the impoverishment of the nation on the whole. Many formerly wealthy and powerful families no longer had the money to back up their titles. Thus, they were unable to take on vassals, and their vassals were unable to take on lower-ranked vassals and so on and so forth, such that people in the lower ranks of society were finding themselves increasingly unemployed. To make matters worse, soldiers returning from war were therefore often unable to make a living upon their return home. With this character, Cervantes gives us a brief glimpse at one such pathetic (in the sense of inspiring pathos) example of this class of individuals. The soldier here is having difficulty finding work because no lord can spare the money to take on a married ex-soldier as his criado. The soldier, therefore, asks for a divorce both in hopes that it will help him to find work, as well as because he is discontent with his wife.

---

63 For an extensive discussion of Spain's rise and fall as a major imperial power, see Elliot's *Imperial Spain* and Zorita Bayón's *Breve historia del Siglo de Oro*. I am also deeply indebted to my professors Eugenio Suarez Galbán Guerra and Ottavio DiCamillo for my understanding of the decline of feudal relations in Golden Age Spain, and the increasing problem of unemployment among the soldier class.
The soldier's wife states that she cannot help her husband or their economic situation at all, because she refuses to become a prostitute, "en resolución, soy mujer de bien, y no tengo de hacer vileza" (29). This is another tragic social reality that Cervantes puts on display in this play. Having very few opportunities for employment, often, women in the position of Doña Guiomar would have little other recourse for financial gains. Nevertheless, the soldier counters that her only virtue resides in her refusal to do this, and that she is otherwise a completely insufferable woman:

SOLDADO. Por esto solo merecía ser querida esta mujer. Pero debajo deste pundenor tiene encubierta la más mala condición de la tierra: pide celos sin causa, grita sin porqué, presume sin hacienda y, como me ve pobre, no me estima en el baile del rey Perico. Y es lo peor, señor juez, que quiere que, a trueco de la fidelidad que me guarda, le sufra y disimule millares de millares de impertinencias y desabrimientos que tiene. (29)

Once again, we have a very plausible (verosímil) depiction of a married couple quarreling with one another in front of the divorce court judge, but in this case, the man readily admits his faults, merely arguing that the woman is just as insufferable as he is, but in different ways. In fact, the nameless Soldado attempts to use his faults, and acknowledge his wife's grievances against him, in hopes that it will be sufficient cause for the divorce of the two:

SOLDADO. ¿Qué se me da a mí que seáis casta con vos misma, puesto que se me da mucho, si os descuidáis de que lo sea vuestra criada, y si andáis siempre rostrituerta, enojada, celosa, pensativa, manirrota, dormilona, perezosa, pendenciera, gruñidora, con otras insolencias deste jaez, que bastan a consumir las vidas de docientos maridos? Pero con todo esto, digo, señor juez, que ninguna cosa destas tiene mi señora doña Guiomar; y confieso que yo soy el leño, el inhábil, el dejado y el perezoso, y que por ley de buen gobierno, aunque no sea por otra cosa, está vuesa merced obligado a descasarnos. (29-30)

Thus, the Soldier's strategy is to acknowledge everything his wife says in order to get them divorced, but not before making a point about how insufferable she is (although he would deny it if this denial got him divorced, as he states in the above excerpt). Nevertheless, the Judge once again does not divorce the couple, this time because he is interrupted by the court scribe, who informs him (and the audience) of the arrival of new plaintiffs.
This third couple seeking divorce consists of a surgeon dressed as a doctor, and his wife, Aldonza de Minjaca. It should be mentioned here for the sake of the non-specialist that the term "surgeon" in the Spanish "Golden Age" was not used in the same way it is today. A surgeon was not a trained medical professional, but was rather equivalent to someone in the modern era who had received a basic first-aid course today, and little more. The surgeon was equipped to suture lacerations, open tumors, cauterize wounds and perform amputations. By modern medical standards, the surgeon of Cervantes' time was little more than a non-medical professional who knew how to sow and suture wounds. In fact, this function was often performed by barbers as documented by numerous older dictionaries.\footnote{Covarrubias defines the term: "CIRUJANO, El médico que cura de heridas o llagas. Antiguamente, y en tiempo de Galeno, el barbero, en cuanto sangraba, y el boticario en cuanto aparejaba las medicinas, y el cirujano en cuanto curaba las heridas, y el médico en curar universalmente todo género de enfermedades estaba reducido a una persona; de manera, que el médico era barbero, boticario, herbolario, anatomista, algebrista, cirujano, y con nombre universal de médico: y es cierto, que el buen médico debe estar diestro en la teórica de todas estas artes, ya que no las ejecute con sus manos lavadas, y llenas de anillos, el obrar con ellas se remite al cirujano, de donde tomó el nombre Chirurgus, Medicus vulnerarius a manuum operatione sic dictus cheros; manus, & ergazomai, operor..." (I have modernized the spelling, and provided only the first portion of the otherwise very lengthy entry). Although Covarrubias makes the ancient médico of Rome sound rather sophisticated, it should be noted that in the Spain of the day, the profession had become considerably more compartmentalized, and required much less training than becoming a proper doctor.\footnote{Pera, 153-157 & 182-183. See also Pedro Lain Entralgo, 87, for commentary on the differences between a doctor and a cirujano.}}

Not surprisingly the function of the surgeon was not highly regarded in the society of the day (indeed, with no anesthetics, their quick patching-up of patients must have been excruciating). Cristóbal Pera has documented the pejorative attitudes towards surgery for being regarded as lowly manual labor.\footnote{Pera, 153-157 & 182-183. See also Pedro Lain Entralgo, 87, for commentary on the differences between a doctor and a cirujano.} It was, however, not uncommon for surgeons to put on airs of having actual medical titles and degrees, as the comic figure in this play does.
Unlike the other two trials, in this case, it is the husband who speaks up first, demanding a divorce from his wife for the following four reasons: "La primera, porque no la puedo ver más que a todos los diablos; la segunda, por lo que ella se sabe; la tercera, por lo que yo me callo; la cuarta, porque no me lleven los demonios, cuando desta vida vaya, si ha de durar en su compañía hasta mi muerte" (30). The Surgeon's complaints really don't give us any legitimate reason for a divorce so far, and merely sound like the irritated comments of someone who is in a marital spat. Nevertheless, the attorney interjects, "Bastantísimamente ha probado su intención" (31).

Although the Surgeon's wife speaks second, she seems to have a much stronger case, stating actual reasons for her grievances with him rather than simply spouting out her contempt for him:

MINJACA. Señor juez, vuesa merced me oiga, y advierta que, si mi marido pide por cuatro causas divorcio, yo le pido por cuatrocientas. La primera, porque, cada vez que le veo, hago cuenta que veo al mismo Lucifer; la segunda, porque fui engañada cuando con él me casé, porque él dijo que era médico de pulso, y remaneci cirujano y hombre que hace ligaduras y cura otras enfermedades, que va a decir esto a médico la mitad del justo precio; la tercera, porque tiene celos del sol que me toca; la cuarta, que como no le puedo ver, querría estar apartada del dos millones de leguas. (31)

While some of Aldonza's reasons for her scorn towards her husband are just as petty as his reasons, her second complaint is, in fact, legitimate. Apparently she entered into a marriage with him under the false pretense that he was a man of letters and a doctor, when in reality he was a lowly surgeon. This would have meant a huge difference both in income and social status, and given the reality of marriage as a financial contract in the time period, this would actually have been a significant reason for Aldonza to be upset with her husband, and possibly would have been a legitimate reason for a divorce, if divorce had actually been legal and not a literary fiction presented here by Cervantes.
As Aldonza de Minjaca is going to continue giving reasons for why she and her husband should be separated, the Judge has heard enough, and interjects, "Señora, señora, si pensáis decir aquí todas las cuatrocientas causas, yo no estoy para escuchallas ni hay lugar para ello. Vuestro negocio se reciba a prueba; y andad con Dios, que hay otros negocios que despachar" (31). Once again, the obstructionist judge doesn't feel like hearing out their grievances (in his defense, the number of grievances Minjaca listed was clearly absurd and hyperbolic), and instead says that the couple's case must be subjected to further tests and scrutiny later on, "vuestro negocio se recibe a prueba" (31). The then husband responds, "¿Qué más pruebas, sino que yo no quiero morir con ella, ni ella gusta de vivir conmigo?" (31). The judge, with some irritation, replies, "Si eso bastase para descasarse los casados, infinitísimos sacudirían de sus hombros el yugo del matrimonio" (32). It is clear from this situation that the judge has no intention of really hearing out the couple's complaints or divorcing them. Nevertheless, rather than give them a definitive verdict in the negative, he once again uses legal language in order to delay final judgment, and keeps the couple waiting in suspense, feeling trapped by their hopeless marriage.

The final complaint that comes before the judge now takes place in the courtroom, as the Ganapán enters on the scene. This episode follows a different pattern than the preceding three, as the Ganapán is not accompanied by his wife. We quickly learn the reason why as the Ganapán begins to speak:

GANAPÁN. Señor juez, ganapán soy, no lo niego, pero cristiano viejo y hombre de bien a las derechas. Y si no fuese que alguna vez me tomo del vino, o él me toma a mí, que es lo más cierto, ya hubiera sido prioste en la cofradía de los hermanos de la carga. Pero dejando esto aparte, porque hay mucho que decir en ello, quiero que sepa el señor juez [sic] que, estando una vez muy enfermo de los vaguidos de Baco, prometí de casarme con una mujer errada. Volví en mí, sané y cumplí mi promesa, y caséme con una mujer que saqué

---

The ganapán is the archetypal unskilled laborer who takes on odd-jobs and small tasks for others in order to earn a living. This position is somewhat equivalent to a modern-day handyman or odd-job man. Cf. Autoridades.
de pecado. Púsela a ser placera; ha salido tan soberbia y de tan mala condición que nadie llega a su tabla con quien no riña, ora sobre el peso faltó, ora sobre que le llegan a la fruta, y a dos por tres les da con una pesa en la cabeza o adonde topa, y los deshonra hasta la cuarta generación, sin tener hora de paz con todas sus vecinas y apartadas. Y yo tengo de tener todo el día la espada más lista que un sacabuche para defendella, y no ganamos para pagar penas de pesos no maduros ni condenaciones de pendencias. (32-33)

The Ganapán's complaint, as we see here, is that in a drunken stupor, he married a prostitute, and tried to get her to emend her ways. She, however, is of such an ill-temper and bad character that no one in the market place can tolerate her, and she is always attempting to rip off her customers, such that he is always forced to defend her, and they aren't making ends meet. As a consequence, he seeks a divorce. To add insult to injury, once he has spoken his peace, the Cirujano remarks, "Ya conozco yo a la mujer deste buen hombre, y es tan mala como mi Aldonza, que no lo puedo más encarecer" (33). Given The unnamed wife's former profession here, we might have cause to consider in exactly what capacity the Cirujano met the Ganapán's wife in the past, particularly in view of his own marital woes.

In spite of all of this, the Judge merely responds, "Mirad, señores, aunque algunos de los que aquí estáis habéis dado algunas causas que traen aparejada sentencia de divorcio, con todo eso, es menester que conste por escrito y que lo digan testigos; y así, a todos os recibo a prueba" (33). Once again, the Judge delays any kind of a verdict. While he at least acknowledges that some of the grievances are legitimate, he nevertheless insists that he will require written testimonies from each of the parties involved, and witnesses to corroborate their claims. Before this can come to pass, musicians enter into the courtroom, interrupting the proceedings, and giving the play an ironic anti-climax, in which the lyrics of their jovial song and dance seem to contradict the cases we have just seen in the courtroom, concluding with the famous line and chorus of the song, "que vale el peor concierto/más que el divorcio mejor" (34). This closing refrain has been the principal subject of debate among scholars of this play.
As many scholars have already observed, the setting and themes of a divorce court established in this play were a complete fiction in the time period of Cervantes. Pablo Restrepo-Gautier\(^67\) notes that Erasmus of Rotterdam, in his annotations to Paul, I Corinthians VII:10-12, had proposed changing Catholic marriage laws, so as to allow for the possibility of divorce and remarriage in the event that valid reasons were presented for seeking an annulment of marriage. Nevertheless, the 24th session of the Council of Trent (held the 11th of November, 1563) saw to it that this would not come to pass, and that *divorce* according to ecclesiastical law would not annul the covenant of marriage, considered unbreakable by the church. A tribunal could grant only two types of divorce: *a mensa et thoro*, or separation, or a *vinculo matrimonii*. The *a mensa et thoro* or "divorce from bed-and-board" is a legal separation in which a couple is still considered legally married (and may not remarry), but are not legally obligated to live together, The *a vinculo matrimonii* is a form of divorce wherein the marriage bond was completely annulled due to extreme circumstances, such as the accusation of sodomy, heresy, bestiality, incest, or any other extreme taboo (where one of the spouses was deemed not to be Catholic in the first place, and hence the marriage was invalidated), or the impotence of the spouse before the marriage was even consummated.\(^68\) In the case of this play, however, the participants are clearly seeking the second kind of marriage annulment, wherein they would have no legal obligation to their spouse whatsoever. In the reality of the time period, even the first kind of divorce was only permitted in severe circumstances (and wasn't always conceded legally), and there certainly didn't exist "divorce court judges" of this type specifically assigned to preside over these cases. This kind of marriage annulment was never granted to a marriage deemed legitimate that had been

\(^{67}\) Restrepo-Gautier, 223-224.

\(^{68}\) See the annotation in ed. Baras Escolá, p. 3 and the corresponding note on p. 252-253.
consummated. Only in extreme circumstances could tribunals convene to determine that the marriage was never valid in the first place, and hence the marriage could be deemed null and void.

In other words, by Catholic law, divorce was never legal or socially permissible in this era. The only thing remotely resembling a divorce that did exist was a legal separation, wherein neither spouse could legally remarry. There are, however, legal aspects both of the time period and of the play that are well worth considering. As Atienzo has noted, the play, while not realistic in the strictest sense of the world, points towards something real. That is to say, the fictitious situation reflects underlying social tensions of the time period. In examining each of the individual character types, the old man mismatched with a wife who is way too young for him, the unemployed soldier, frequenting gambling houses and struggling to get by, the surgeon who pretends to be a doctor for social prestige and economic benefit, and finally, the alcoholic odd-job man, Cervantes paints a very vivid and compelling portrait of a society in financial decline. All of the couples in the play entered into their respective marriages under false pretenses of one sort or another, and they all feel suffocated by the stranglehold of the marriage bond. In fact, save for the first couple, the others that come before the judge all speak of financial woes that are complicated in one sense or another by their marriage situation, as we have seen.

Although there isn't much dramatic "action" in El juez de los divorcios in the traditional sense (that is, actions occurring on or off stage that further the plot), the dynamism of the play comes from the lively and hilarious dialogue in the disputes between the various married couples seeking divorce. At its most basic level, this play is about four married couples that are discontent with their marriages for various reasons, coming to court in order to seek a divorce. The final verdict of the play is, ironically, never displayed on the stage, and the judge postpones his final

69 Atienza, 216.
verdict until another time, alleging that, while some of the couples seem to have presented legitimate reasons for seeking a divorce, he will need written testimonies and witnesses for all accounts before he can proceed further.

Beginning with the ending seems to be how most scholarship has addressed this play up until now. They have looked at its climax and asked themselves, what are we, as the audience, to make of this ambiguous ending for the play? A lot of ink has been spilled debating Cervantes' true message with this dramatic work. Most early scholarship of the play, such as the work of Cotarelo y Valledor, later followed by Agostini, seemed to take the closing refrain at face value, arguing that Cervantes was trying to defined Christian matrimony with this play. Most more contemporary scholarship from Casalduero to Ynduráin to Canavaggio and into the present, has tended to view the closing refrain ironically, and has suggested that it leaves us, the audience, with a feeling of incompleteness or uncertainty at the drama's "conclusion." Zimic argues that the only way to reconcile the cases we have just seen with the final refrain is as an obvious absurdity. It seems clear that in the cases presented, whether or not a divorce should be granted, there is no happiness in these marriages.

In light of all the varying perspectives on this cryptic ending, what, then, are we to make of the final refrain? Could Cervantes really have meant the refrain that concludes the play, laughing at the folly of people seeking divorce? Or is he rather cleverly pointing out the dangers of entering into a marriage lightly, either for convenience or monetary gain, and admonishing both

---

70 Cotarelo y Valledor (1915).
71 Agostini, 223-307.
72 Casalduero (1951), 198.
73 Ynduráin, "Estudio preliminar" a Obras, II, 87-112.
74 Canavaggio (1977), 165.
75 Zimic (1979), 3-27.
the individuals and the legal system involved for allowing these inadequate marriages, which any
fool could see were incredibly mismatched, to go forward in the first place? Typically, when
analyzing this play, scholars have tended to focus on the divorce aspect of the play more than
anything else. Was Cervantes for or against the idea that perhaps, in cases of horribly mismatched
marriages, divorce could be an option? Asking these questions seems inevitable given the primary
theme and title of the play, as well as Cervantes' own well-known marital woes with Catalina de
Salazar, detailed extensively in Canavaggio's biography.\footnote{Canavaggio (1986), 138-143.}

I propose, nevertheless that leaving aside the question of divorce for a moment, the play is
also driving at is a subtle critique of a society in decline, and of a dysfunctional legal system, with
minor court officials who put up obstacles at every turn, never coming to a final verdict on
anything. What is most notable about this play is the incredible ineptitude of the judge, the
supposed "titular protagonist" of the work, and the legal system, to accomplish anything. Indeed,
much of the humor of this play is derived from this very situation. No matter how much it might
seem like the couples warrant divorces from one another, the judge keeps postponing his decisions,
until, in the end, he allows a group of musicians to disrupt the entire proceedings, waiting perhaps
indefinitely to come to a final verdict. The message of the play, it seems to me, in addition to
being about marital woes, is about the woefully inadequate functioning of the legal system at the
local level, and of a society that allows people to enter into a social contract as serious as marriage
so lightly. In a way, the story could be seen as a kind of cautionary tale about entering into
marriage for the wrong reasons, but it could also be seen as an admonishment of the legal
proceedings themselves. Cervantes suggests here that, even in the hypothetical scenario where
divorce were legal, it would make absolutely no difference, since the legal machinery is so dysfunctional that no one would be permitted to be divorced regardless due to the constant obstructionism of the court.

As we have seen, Cervantes carefully creates highly individuated character types that, while they aren't full "characters" yet, still have a great deal more complexity than their counterparts in Lope de Rueda, and aim not so much at having the audience merely laugh at them and their circumstances, but also at provoking reflection in the audience through a kind of empathetic response to the characters. Cervantes doesn't tell us directly what to conclude at the end of this play, but with a seemingly bitterly ironic resolve, he invites us to consider a wide range of clearly problematic marriages, and cautions us against entering into marriage too lightly, or for the wrong reasons.

Moving on to the second short play dealing with legal issues, \textit{La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo} was apparently lightly based on the real-life election of officials in the town of the same name.\textsuperscript{77} We may question how much the real event plays into Cervantes' version in the play, but what is clear is that the larger sociological and political point he is making is very pertinent not only to the society of his time period, but indeed, to any society that goes about electing their officials based simply on the criterion of "appealing to the masses." While this play has often been thought of as one of Cervantes' lighter interludes, its subject matter and the broader points Cervantes is trying to make about the society in which he lives are no frivolous matter, especially when considered together with the other interludes presented in this collection (and in particular, together with \textit{El juez de los divorcios} and \textit{El retablo de las maravillas}).

\textsuperscript{77} Salomon, 199.
The play revolves around a Bachelor of Letters, Pesuña, a scribe, Pedro Estornudo, and two municipal councilmen, Panduro and Alonso Algarroba, presiding over the election of the new town magistrate. Four candidates, all of them laborers, present themselves and their "qualifications" for the office. The entirety of the play concerns itself with the election of the best candidate for the office, and is deceptively simple from a structural point of view. As Patricia Kenworthy has observed, however, the structure of the play is characterized by "a tension between haste and delay, between progress and interruption" (16). These interruptions are centered on three main actions in the play: the entrance of the gypsies, the sacristan's arrival, and the final postponement of the election. In addition, the electors seem to oscillate back and forth between candidates, and their opinion is quite easily swayed, right up until they ultimately seem unanimous in their support of Rana after his interaction with the sacristan. This play is fundamentally about the trivial debates the electors have with one another over who would make the best candidate for the position of magistrate, and about the irrelevance both of their arguments and of the qualifications they consider in electing said official. The play is also marked by the rustic and colloquial language of the interlocutors,\(^7\) and by being one of the two interludes written in unrhymed hendecasyllable verse (the other being the interlude that immediately precedes it in the collection, *El rufián viudo*).

We open with Panduro reproaching Algarroba for his linguistic style, and for whether or not his invocation of heaven is appropriate to the conversation. Panduro correctly accused Algarroba of a certain arrogance in his know-it-all demeanor, but without realizing that he himself

\(^7\) This language is known as *sayagués*, which was a constructed, literary language based on some real characteristics of specific regional dialects of the era, used to characterize rustic characters in these sorts of plays. According to *Academia*, "sayagués, sa. 4. M. Habla arrusticada que se finge dialecto leonés de la comarca de Sayago, utilizada por personajes villanescos en el teatro español de los siglos XV al XVII."
is guilty of many of the same faults of which he accuses Algarroba. In his own defense, Algarroba declares, "Cristiano viejo soy a todo ruedo, /y creo en Dios a pies jontillas" (66). This declaration is rather comical and ironic coming from Algarroba, whose name is clearly of Arabic or Hebrew origins. Zimic notes that in another scene, Algarroba and Estornudo jokingly censure one another, mutually accusing each of Jewish ancestry:

```
ALGARROBA. ¡No más, so escriba!
ESCRIBANO. ¿Qué escriba, Fariseo?"
BACHILLER ¿Por san Pedro,
que son muy demasiadas demasiás estas!
ALGARROBA. Yo me burla.
ESCRIBANO. Y yo me burlo. (vv. 222-225)
```

While independently, these scenes merely foment the atmosphere of the characters browbeating one another to comic effect, together, they also suggest, as Zimic observes, an atmosphere of constant suspicion and recrimination. The themes of the obsession with lineage and "blood purity" are taken up more aggressively by Cervantes in _El retablo de las maravillas_, as we shall later see, but it is highly significant that all four of the candidates list being a "cristiano viejo" as one of their major attributes that qualifies them to be town magistrate. Here, Cervantes takes up one of his many recurring themes, in ridiculing his society's excessive preoccupation with a person's blood ancestry, and demonstrating its pernicious effects. In the case of this play, it is simply one more completely irrelevant criterion that all the candidates put forth as to why they are most qualified to be town magistrate, or to preside over the election itself.

Once Pesuña the Bachiller is finally able to get the proceedings back on track, the officials discuss the qualifications of each candidate:

```
ALGARROBA. Por lo menos,
```

---

79 See the etymology in _DCECH_; his name refers to an herb-bearing plant with edible seeds.
80 Zimic (1991), 333.
yo sé que Berrocal tiene el más lindo distintos.

ESTORNUDO. ¿Para qué?
ALGARROBA. Para ser sacre en esto de mojón y catavinos.
En mi casa probé los días pasados una tinaja, y dijo que sabía el claro vino a palo, a cuero y hierro; acabó la tinaja su camino, y hallose en el asiento ella un palo pequeño, y del pendía una correa de cordobán y una pequeña llave.

ESCRIBANO. ¡Oh rara habilidad! ¡Oh raro ingenio! Bien puede gobernar el que tal sabe a Alanís y a Cazalla, y aun a Esquivias. (vv. 62-73)

This portion of the dramatic work is marked by this same pattern, of listing the dubious and largely irrelevant qualifications of each candidate, followed by hyperbolic praise and admiration on the part of the officials presiding over the election. We learn that Miguel Jarrete is quite a marksman with a bow and arrow, that Francisco de Humillos is a great mender of shoes, and that Pedro de la Rana has a phenomenal memory. Of these qualifications, Rana's memory seems the only one that is actually somewhat relevant as far as having the capacity to be town magistrate, except that the proof they give of his memory is that he is able to recite the entirety of *Perro de Alba*, "sin que letra falte," as Algarroba informs us (v. 87). This composition is a very famous series of anti-Semitic rhymed couplets of the era, and was known, even in its day, for being very vulgar and generally lacking in literary quality. In other words, being able to recite these couplets by heart is no great accomplishment, and praising such "ability" would be roughly equivalent to praising someone today for being able to recite numerous indecent or racist limericks by heart. In spite of

---

81 The couplets tell the tale of a dog from Alba de Tormes that could distinguish between Jews and Christians, and would only bite people of Jewish descent. The dog is condemned to death in a lawsuit by the Jews, but escapes, and continues to torment them. See *Refranes* (648a), as well as the editions of the entremeses by Asensio (108), Spadaccini (71), and in particular, Alfredo Baras Escolá (6-37 & 354, n. 36.86-87) for more information on this subject.
this, Panduro proclaims, "Este lleva mi voto," and the scribe Pedro Estornudo, "y aun el mío" (v. 88). Algarroba is still more persuaded by Berrocal's wine-tasting ability, and the only one of these officials that seems to have any degree of common sense is the Bachiller Pesuña, who remarks, "Yo [me atengo] a ninguno, / si es que no dan más pruebas de su ingenio / a la jurisprudencia encaminadas" (vv. 89-91). In order to satisfy the Bachiller's sensible request, Algarroba proclaims:

\begin{quote}
Yo daré un buen remedio, y es aqueste:
hagan entrar los cuatro pretendientes,
y el señor bachiller Pesuña puede
examinarlos, pues del arte sabe,
y conforme a su ciencia, así veremos
quién podrá ser nombrado para el cargo. (vv. 92-97)
\end{quote}

Even though examining the qualifications of each candidate more closely and attempting to ascertain their knowledge of the law, their general intelligence, wisdom, and capacity for governance would seem to be a completely normal and expected part of the electoral process, Estornudo the scribe and Panduro react as though it is a completely brilliant and unheard-of test:

\begin{quote}
ESCRIBANO. ¡Vive Dios que es rarísima advertencia!
PANDURO. Aviso es que podrá servir de arbitrio
para Su Jamestad: que como en Corte
hay potra-médicos, haya potra-alcaldes. (vv. 98-101)
\end{quote}

Once again, just as we think we are about to begin the actual proceedings, we have another false start, as Panduro and Algarroba once again begin bickering with one another about language usage. Algarroba corrects Panduro, "Prota, señor Panduro, que no potra" (v. 102). Although his correction of Panduro's rustic metathesis is in order, the correct form (even in the time period) would have been\textit{ proтомédicos}: "médicos del rey que formaban el tribunal para dar licencia a los aspirantes a médicos,"\textsuperscript{82} so they are in fact both mistaken. The scribe, the two town councilmen and the Bachellor are nevertheless all in agreement that the examination of the candidates should

\textsuperscript{82} Ed. Baras Escolá, p. 37, n. 101.
take place, and so the four candidates are brought in. Before the proceedings can commence, Humillos not-so-subtly suggests that the candidates should offer them bribes. Pesuña, once again acting as the voice of reason, proclaims, "No hay sobornos aquí. Todos estamos de un común parecer, y es que el que fuere más habil para alcalde, ese se tenga por escogido y por llamado" (vv. 137-39). We begin to see the trend in this play that the most sensible person out of the four officials is the only one with a formal education. In fact, when it comes to the candidates themselves, the shoemaker, Francisco de Humillos, foolishly prides himself here on his inability to read:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACHILLER.</th>
<th>¿Sabéis leer, Humillos?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUMILLOS.</td>
<td>No, por cierto,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ni tal se probabrá que en mi linaje,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>haya persona tan de poco asiento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>que se ponga a aprender esas quimeras,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>que llevan a los hombres al brasero,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y a las mujeres, a la casa llana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leer no sé, mas sé otras cosas tales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>que llevan al leer ventajas muchas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BACHILLER.</th>
<th>Y ¿cuáles cosas son?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUMILLOS.</td>
<td>Sé de memoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>todas cuatro oraciones, y las rezo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cada semana cuatro y cinco veces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANA.</th>
<th>Y ¿con eso pensáis de ser alcalde?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUMILLOS.</td>
<td>Con esto, y con ser yo cristiano viejo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>me atrevo a ser un senador romano. (vv. 143-157)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this passage, we see Humillos' general distrust of writing in general, as he goes so far as to suggest that writings lead men towards heresy and their inevitable burning at the stake, and women towards a life of prostitution. He suggests instead that what he knows is "much more advantageous," as he is able to recite the same four prayers four or five times every week. When Rana inquires if this is sufficient to be town magistrate, Humillos replies that with this, and the fact that he is a "cristiano viejo," he is qualified even to be a Roman senator. Of course, the expression is a frequent colloquial hyperbole, but in this context, its discordant irony seems lost on Humillos, given that Roman senators were of course not at all Christian, and in fact would have
persecuted the Christians of their era. This passage illustrates Humillos’ provincial distrust of reading and formal education, the excessive emphasis on "purity" of the bloodlines, and the folly of both these value systems. It seems clear already that Humillos is hardly qualified to be the magistrate, but the councilmen have not yet made up their minds. They proceed with their examination of the candidates, and we learn all of their "qualifications." Jarrete is next in line to list his virtues and abilities:

JARRETE.
Yo, señor Pesuña,
sé leer, aunque poco; deletreo,
y ando en el be-a-ba bien ha tres meses,
y en cinco más daré con ello a un cabo.
Y además desta ciencia que ya aprendo,
sé calzar un arado bravamente
y herrar, casi en tres horas, cuatro pares
de novillos briosos y cerreros.
Soy sano de mis miembros, y no tengo
sordez ni cataratas, tos ni reumas,
y soy cristiano viejo como todos,
y tiro con un arco como un Tulio. (vv.159-170)

What Jarrete truly reveals here is that he is scarcely more qualified to be magistrate than Humillos. He is able to sound out words, and has been studying his syllable charts for three months. In other words, he is basically illiterate, though slightly less so than his fellow candidates. He also mentions his ability to outfit oxen for plowing to perfection, the general good health of his members, his lack of deafness, cataracts or rheumatism, the fact that he too is a "cristiano viejo," and his skill at archery. In addition to the general irrelevance of these qualifications, it is also comical to note that he compares his ability with a bow to that of Tully, another nonsensical comparison with classical antiquity, since we have no record of the famous orator's archery skills.

---

83 Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 BCE), more commonly referred to simply as Cicero, the most famous Roman orator, consul, and constitutionalist, and father of many modern theories of memory.
Once again, Cervantes mocks these rustic invocations of classical antiquity by the candidates who attempt to confer status upon themselves, but who instead merely illustrate their complete ignorance and lack of preparation for the position of magistrate. Not to be left out, Berrocal also has to make a reference to Rome when he speaks of his virtues as a great wine taster, when he responds to Algarroba:

ALGARROBA.  Y ¿quiere ser alcalde?
BERROCAL.  Y lo requiero.
Pues cuando estoy armado a lo de Baco,
así se me aderezan los sentidos
que me parece a mí que, en aquel punto,
podría prestar leyes a Licurgo
y limpiarme con Bártulo. (vv. 178-83)

Although Baras Escolá informs us here that "armado a lo de Baco" means "inspired by wine" as opposed to "drunk," in this context, it seems to me that part of the humor of this character is indeed derived from the fact that, while he takes pride in being a great "wine taster," he is, in fact, an alcoholic, a fact reinforced by his rude affirmation that after drinking a little wine, he can lend laws to Lycurgus and wipe himself with Bartulo. Baras Escolá informs us that Lycurgus (c. 820-730 BCE) was a mythical Spartan legislator typically invoked in this fashion to praise someone else's abilities, and "Bártulo" refers to Bartolus de Saxoferrato (Sassoferrato in Italian) (1313-1357 CE), the Italian continental jurist of medieval Roman law, whose writings were used for centuries as textbooks for European Law schools of the day. At least in Berrocal's case, his comparisons are not as out of place as those of his compatriots, but his ill-mannered demeanor is not well received. When he is reproached for his rudeness by Panduro, Berrocal retorts, "No soy nada / melindroso ni puerco.  Solo digo / que no se me malogre mi justicia, / que echaré el bodegón por la ventana" (vv. 184-187). Berrocal's affirmation that he isn't at all crude is clearly ironic here, and

84 Ed., 41, n. 182-183.
his reaction suggests that he may, in fact, be a little bit drunk even at this presentation. The Bachiller, once again acting as the voice of reason, quickly dismisses Berrocal's threats, and moves on to the final candidate, Pedro Rana, who's presentation is clearly the only one of any merit:

Como Rana,
Habré de cantar mal. Pero con todo,
diré mi condición, y no mi ingenio.
Yo, señores, si acaso fuese alcalde,
mí vara no sería tan delgada
cómo las que se usan de ordinario:
de una encina o de un roble la haría,
y gruesa de dos dedos, temeroso
que no me la encorbese el dulce peso
de un bolsón de ducados, ni otras dávidas
o ruegos o promesas o favores,
que pesan como plomo, y no se sienten
hasta que os han brumado las costillas
del cuerpo y alma. Y junto con esto,
sería bien criado y comedido,
parte severo y nada riguroso.
Nunca deshonraría al miserable
que ante mí le trujesen sus delitos,
que suele lastimar una palabra
de un juez arrojado, de afrentosa,
muchó más que lastima su sentencia,
aunque en ella se intime cruel castigo.
No es bien que el poder quite la crianza,
ni que la sumisión de un delincuente
haga al juez soberbio y arrogante. (vv. 190-214)

Rana begins his brief speech by proclaiming that he would make his magistate's staff out of oak, and as thick as two fingers, so that the heavy weight of bribes, pleas, promises and favors, which weigh like lead might not bend it. He then goes on to say that he would be very even-tempered and moderate, fair-minded and not excessively strict. He also promises never to dishonor or disrespect the wretched, brought into his courtroom, and that a judge must never become arrogant or full of pride merely because another person is made to submit to his authority. Of all the candidate's speeches about their merits, it is worth noting that Rana's is the only one to actually
talk about how he would govern, and what he would if elected, rather than listing irrelevant qualifications for the office. Moreover, in his speech, Rana's words are quite similar to Don Quixote's, when he teaches Sancho about the ideal judge.\textsuperscript{85} Although Zimic has interpreted these words as hollow campaign promises that are likely to be broken by Rana,\textsuperscript{86} it seems more likely that he is giving his own version of a "regimiento de principes," or general guidelines for the conduct of an elected official, in this case. While it is perhaps true that we cannot be certain whether or not Rana will actually live up to his words in this play, there doesn't seem to be anything internal to the play to suggest that Rana is somehow duplicitous, or intends secretly to abuse his power. Moreover, he is clearly the most qualified of the candidates who present themselves, even though all of their qualifications are quite inadequate.

Although the councilmen all praise Rana's proclamations here, it isn't until later in the play that they actually decide that he would be the best candidate for the office. This is partly the doing of Humillos, who proclaims that Rana may quickly change completely once he is in office: "Esos ofrecimientos que ha hecho Rana / son de lejos. A fe que si él empuña / vara, que él se trueque y sea otro hombre del que ahora parece" (vv. 230-32). As Cory Reed observes, "Ironically, it is Humillos who is being deceptive, unjustly claiming Rana will change his opinions in office, while hypocritically asserting that he himself will not."\textsuperscript{87} After making this proclamation, the councilmen almost give the staff (and indeed, the office) to Humillos, but Humillos is interrupted by Algarroba, who claims they are handing him a left-handed staff, to which Humillos replies, "¿Cómo, pues, si me dan zurda la vara, quieren que juzgue yo derecho?" (vv. 241-42). Humillos

\textsuperscript{85} DQ II, XLII, 1024-1028. (With reference to the Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas edition, as with all subsequent citations of the Quixote).
\textsuperscript{86} Zimic, 332.
\textsuperscript{87} Reed, 111.
doesn't believe he can judge what is right with a left-handed staff, playing off the double-meaning of the word "derecho," and the general fear of left-handedness and anything left as being wrong or evil in the time period. But Humillos has been tricked, as the scribe informs us, "El diablo / tiene en el cuerpo este Algarroba. ¡Miren / dónde jamás se han visto varas zurdas!" (vv. 242-44). Since a staff of this sort had no formed grip, there was no such thing as a left-handed version of it. Algarroba has successfully confused Humillos, and tricked him temporarily into rejecting the very office he sought, on the grounds that he was given the wrong staff.

At this point, the election is interrupted as a band of gypsies enters with song and dance and sings a romance about the proceedings, which pleases the arbiters, and provokes a rather absurd exchange between them. Everyone is so caught up in rejoicing and in praising the verses of the gypsies that they almost seem to forget the proceedings, with Berrocal in particular proclaiming that the verses ought to be written down, so that they all might be remembered for all ages "estas se han de imprimir, / para que quede memoria de nosotros en los siglos / de los siglos, amén" (vv. 284-86). Berrocal here is clearly motivated by his own vainglory and desire to be remembered, rather than by any sense of the legal or historical importance that some records of the election might have. The Bachiller, who has been more or less reasonable up to this point in the play, seems to try to intervene, declaring, "Callen, si pueden" (vv. 287). But it quickly becomes clear that he too has fallen under the spell of the gypsies' song and dance, and is merely trying to silence the other councilmembers and candidates so that he might hear their verses, as in his next intervention, he remarks, "El estribillo en parte me desplace, /pero, con todo, es bueno" (vv. 301-302).
Finally when the song and dance is interrupted by a Sotosacristán who tries to get things back in order, he is not welcomed by anyone, and things go poorly for him rather quickly, as he is *manteado* (tossed about in a blanket) by those present:

**SACRISTÁN.** Señores regidores, ¡voto a dico, que es de bellacos tanto pasatiempo!
¡Así se rige el pueblo, noramala, entre guitarras, bailes y bureos?

**BACHILLER.** ¡Agarradle, Jarrete!

**JARRETE.** Ya le agarro.

**BACHILLER.** Traigan aquí una manta, que por Cristo que se ha de mantear este bellaco, necio, desvergonzado e insolente, y atrevido además. (vv. 323-331)

It is seldom emphasized by critics that although his views are unpopular with the participants in the play, who are reveling in the song and dance, the Sacristán is, in fact, absolutely correct. The councilmen and the candidates have completely lost track of the official matters at hand, and even the Bachiller himself, who up until this point in the play had shown himself to be perhaps the most sensible of the lot (along with Rana) has gotten caught up in the festivities. When the Sacristán comes in as a stranger, and official authority figure who tries to restore order to the proceedings, he is met with insults and ridicule by the other participants, who do not appreciate being told what to do by an outside authority. In the end, it is Rana who restores order at the end of the play, and who is met with the admiration and praise of all the other participants. It should be noted, however, that he does so at the expense of the Sacristán, who is presented deliberately as the straight-laced spoilsport in this play, and who is the subject of ridicule due to his attempts to impose his own authority. The participants proceed:

**RANA.** Dime, desventurado, ¿qué demonio se revistió en tu lengua? ¿Quién te mete a ti en reprehender a la justicia?
¿Has tú de gobernar a la república?
Métete en tus campanas y en tu oficio.
Deja a los que gobiernan, que ellos saben lo que han de hacer mejor que nosotros. Si fueren malos, ruega por su enmienda; si buenos, por que Dios no nos los quite.

BACHILLER. Nuestro Rana es un santo y un bendito. (vv. 339-348)

It is particularly significant that the Bachiller calls Rana a "santo y un bendito" in this context: he is, in fact, undermining a minor religious authority. The argument of Rana in this passage is that the Sacristán has no right to administer justice in this matter, and that he should leave the proceedings to those who have been put in charge of dealing with them, as he has no legal authority here. Rana states that if they govern badly, he should plea for them to right their errors, and that if they do a good job, he should pray that God not take them away. Although Rana's words are universally praised by the other candidates, and the play ends with Jarrete declaring of Rana "No solamente canta, sino encanta" (vv. 367), Rana nevertheless wins over the others at the expense of the unpopular Sacristan. The candidates who have presented themselves are clearly all under-qualified for the position of magistrate to say the least, and the council members have continuously squabbled amongst themselves over petty disputes and matters of linguistic style and expression throughout the proceedings, as well as allowed themselves to be totally distracted by the gypsies' festivities. The Sacristan's complaints, it would seem, are in fact justified. Yet, Rana is able to win everyone's support in the end by taking up a populist position and berating the Sacristan for trying to impose his authority. Although the election never takes place in the end, and is once again postponed at the end of the play, it is clear that the participants favor Rana, as the Bachiller remarks, "Quedarse ha la elección para mañana, / y desde luego doy mi voto a Rana" (vv. 362-363).

It is true that Pedro Rana does indeed seem to be the most qualified of the severely underqualified candidates, as we have seen throughout the play. He gives a good campaign speech,
and seems to at least be imbued with a good deal of popular common sense, and to understand what is required for good governance. In these respects, he reminds us slightly of Sancho Panza in his stint as "governor" in the second part of the Quixote. We must not forget, though, that he is favored in the end not because of this, but because of his statements against the Sacristán's authority. As Cory Reed notes:

[W]hat seems to have convinced the electors of Rana's competence is not his lengthy speech on ethics in government, but his tirade against the sacristan, whom he attacks during the scene of humiliation and carnivalesque uncrowning. The electors thus allow themselves to be convinced by Rana's unnecessarily violent criticism of the sacristan (against the sacristan's rightful complaint that the electors were neglecting their duties), and not by his earlier, more rational campaign speech. The councilmen may have decided to choose the right candidate, but they have selected him for the wrong reasons. (112)

While this might superficially appear to be one of Cervantes' less weighty interludes, it nevertheless has very serious repercussions for its satire of his contemporary society, and indeed, might even be applied to elections today. Cervantes ridicules the provincial nature of this election, and the complete lack of proper preparation both of the council members presiding over the election, as well as of the candidates themselves. The candidates almost universally, with the exception of Rana, pride themselves on irrelevant qualifications, such as being pure-blooded "Cristianos viejos," and none of the candidates are well-educated or properly prepared for the position whatsoever. Although Rana gives a great campaign speech, in the end, it is not these words, but rather his berating of an outside authority figure that more-or-less ensures his victory at the end of the play.

Cervantes' legal plays paint a picture of a society whose values are severely misplaced. Education and humanistic values are undervalued and downplayed in favor of purity of birth, irrelevant skills and crafts, and ability to please a crowd. Together with El juez de los divorcios, Cervantes gives us an image of a society where the legal system is highly dysfunctional, where
education and proper preparation of an elected officer are not valued, where there is an obsession with purity of the bloodline, where people are easily swayed by populist appeals and, finally, where nothing gets done. In both Juez and Elección, we conclude our plays with a postponement of the proceedings until a future time, which we, the audience, are not privy to. With these open-endings, Cervantes invites us to make our own conclusions about what we have just observed, to see if we feel that the elected officials have judged correctly, in each case. Although Cervantes does not moralize directly, it seems fairly clear that he had a particular interpretation in mind. But the power of these short one-act plays lies precisely in their ability to invite the audience to discuss the subject matter they present, and draw their own conclusions. This invitation to thoughtful contemplation at the conclusion of the Cervantine interlude already marks a clear departure from the purely comedic and considerably more simplistic interludes of Rueda that we briefly discussed in our first chapter. In the following chapter, we will provide a closer examination of how this phenomenon functions in another genre of interludes, which deals with infidelity, relationship woes, and general human folly.
Moving on to the second major genre of interlude that I defined earlier, interludes about infidelity, cuckoldry, and the inaptitude of men trying to control "their" women, we come to a genre of play extremely common in the time period. In contrast with their more serious counterparts, the honor plays or dramas de honor, here, the subject of infidelity was taken lightly, and the audience was intended to laugh at the foolish husbands for their folly. It is purposefully difficult to empathize with the husbands in these plays, who are either too old, too jealous, or simply too stupid to be a good match for their wives. While this is indeed perhaps the "lightest" genre of theater that Cervantes deals with in terms of the gravity of its subject matter as it is presented, it nevertheless provided him with an opportunity to explore relationships of power and control in a way that was both insightful and entertaining, as we shall see.

In La cueva de Salamanca, Cervantes presents us with a tale reminiscent of what we might find in the Italian novella tradition, such as something of Boccaccio, Machiavelli or Bandello. Emilio Cotarelo y Mori saw its origins in Gil Vicente's Auto da India (1519), whereas Eugenio Asensio associates the play with Hans Sachs' farce, Der fahrende Schüler mit dem Teufelbannen (The vagabond student and the conjuring of the Devil; 1551), which bares the same basic plot, and even shares the names of the protagonists. As for Cervantes' version of the drama, it points to something that the others do not, which is the limitless human capacity for self-deception. Of particular interest in this play is the unbelievable credulousness of the husband, whose name Pancracio means all-powers or all-abilities, even though he doesn't seem particularly capacitated in anything in the play. Indeed, his complete lack of awareness of his wife's true nature is quite

---

88 Cotarelo y Mori, "Estudio preliminar" a Colección de entremeses, 1911: I, pp. LXb-LXia.
astounding. In the opening of the play, Pancracio bids his Leonarda farewell, as he must attend his sister's wedding. Leonarda, with unbelievable drama, and assisted in her ruse by her servant/accomplice Cristina, expresses her woe at her husband's departure, but states that she will make due somehow:

LEONARDA. No quiero yo, mi Pancracio y mi señor, que por respeto mio vos parezcáis descortés. Id en hora buena y cumplid con vuestras obligaciones, pues las que os llevan son precisas, que yo me apretaré con mi llaga y pasaré mi soledad lo menos mal que pudiere. Solo os encargo la vuelta y que no paséis del término que habéis puesto.

Tenme, Cristina, que se me aprieta el corazón. (153)

Leonarda ably depicts her part as "the loyal wife," expressing that she must reluctantly make due as best as she can in her husband's absence, as he must fulfill his obligation, but this feigned love at her husband's absence is quickly cast off as soon as he is out the door, as she says, "¡Allá darás, rayo, en casa de Ana Díaz! Vayas y no vuelvas; la ida del humo. Por Dios, que esta vez no os han de valer vuestras valentías ni vuestrós recatos" (155). Showing her true colors, Leonarda uses several popular refrains to express her sentiments of "good riddance" towards her husband's departure, and prepares with Cristina for the arrival of the Sacristán and the Barber:

LEONARDA. Es muy cumplido, y lo fue siempre, mi Riponce, sacristán de las telas de mis entrañas.

CRISTINA. Pues ¿qué le falta a mi maese Nicolás, barbero de mis hígados y navaja de mis pesadumbres, que así me las rapa y quita cuando le veo como si nunca las hubiera tenido? (156)

Both Leonarda and Cristina's words here express a sexual double-entendre, hinting at the sexual escapades they both intend to engage in upon their respective lovers' arrival. But before their engaño can commence, the Student from the University of Salamanca, the true protagonist of the play, arrives.

There is much to say of this Student, conjurer of false demons, and his magical ability. Although Cervantes quite clearly ridicules the idea of any kind of magic being "real" with this
play, as well as in many of his *Novelas Ejemplares* and *Don Quijote*, the Student indeed does possess a kind of magical ability: that is, his ability to persuade. The Student, upon asking for food and lodgings on his journey, begins with a typical sob story:

ESTUDIANTE. Salmantino soy, señora mía; quiero decir que soy de Salamanca. Iba a Roma con un tío mío, el cual murió en el camino, en el corazón de Francia. Vime solo, determiné volverme a mi tierra. Robáronme los lacayos o compañeros de Roque Guinarde, en Cataluña, porque él estaba ausente, que a estar allí, no consintiera que se me hiciera agravio, porque es muy cortés y comedido, y además limosnero. Hame tomado a estas santas puertas la noche, que por tales las juzgo, y busco mi remedio. (157)

While there is nothing internal to the text that would lead us to question the Student's word at this juncture, it is quite possible that the entire story is merely another fabrication of his in order to gain the sympathy of the women, especially given the farce he concocts later to fool Leonarda's credulous husband. Since at this time, the University of Salamanca was a highly regarded and prestigious center of learning, it is not surprising that many roguish, dilettante students would falsely claim to be graduates of this institution.90 Though the Student is indeed quite clever throughout the play, it is uncertain whether we, the audience, can take him at his word here when he claims to have been stripped of his possessions by the men of Roque Guinarde, the bandit of almost mythical notoriety who had a creed of "honor even among thieves," and who also famously makes an appearance in *Don Quijote*.91 The Student himself is somewhat of a roguish character,
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90 See ed. Baras Escolá, 107, n. 48.
91 Roque Ginarte (or Guinart) refers to the famous historical figure and bandit Perot Roca Guinarda, contemporary of Cervantes, who makes a direct appearance in *Don Quijote II*. Guinarda himself was 33 years old at the time of publication of *DQ II* in 1615, and had become the captain of his respective band of rogues, the *Nyerros*, in Catalonia. He became a kind of folk hero due to his daring escapades, charm, sense of honor, and most importantly, the fact that he and his rogues would only steal from the rich. He even managed to gain the support of some of the nobility and the *Santo Oficio*, and is probably the closest equivalent to Robin Hood in the Iberian Peninsula. See *DQ II*, LX-LXI, 1182, n. 19.
leading the women to ever-so-briefly suspect his motives as well, as he responds to Cristina's inquiry:

**CRISTINA.** Así tiene él talle de hablar por el colodrillo, como por la boca.
– Venga acá, amigo, ¿sabe pelar?
**ESTUDIANTE.** ¿Cómo sí sé pelar? No entiendo eso de saber pelar, si no es que quiere vuesa merced motejarme de pelón, que no hay para qué, pues yo me confieso por el mayor pelón del mundo.
**CRISTINA.** No lo digo yo por eso, en mi ánima, sino por saber si sabía pelar dos o tres pares de capones. (157-58)

Cervantes plays here with the double-meaning of the word "pelar" literally to peel (in this case, the chicken), but also "to rob, steal, or strip one of their possessions." The student immediately becomes defensive at the suggestion that he is in any way a thief, or that he is trying to con the ladies out of money, before Cristina reassures him that they merely require his help in the kitchen to prepare the meal for the arrival of the other guests. There is, however, another double meaning of the word "pelar" that comes up in the next fragment of dialogue, after the Student informs them that he has his Bachellors' from the University of Salamanca.

**LEONARDA.** Desa manera, ¿quién duda sino que sabrá pelar no solo capones, sino gansos y avutardas? Y en esto del guardar secreto, ¿cómo le va? Y a dicha, ¿es tentado de decir todo lo que vee, imagina o siente?
**ESTUDIANTE.** Así pueden matar delante de mí más hombres que carneros en el Rastro, que yo desplegue mis labios para decir palabra alguna.
**CRISTINA.** Pues atúrese esa boca, y cósase esa lengua con una agujeta de dos cabos, y amuélese esos dientes, y éntrese con nosotras, y verá misterios y cenará maravillas, y podrá medir en un pajar los pies que quisiere para su cama.
**ESTUDIANTE.** Con siete tendré demasiado, que no soy nada codicioso ni regalado. (158)

This passage of dialogue is important, because it tacitly establishes an agreement between the Student and the two women. The Student agrees to keep quiet about their marital infidelity in exchange for receiving food and a place to sleep. When they talk about peeling the various fowl,
there is a double meaning of pelar in the sense of castrate. *Capones*92 were castrated chickens, and *avutardas* or "great bustards" was also a term used to designate men who lacked initiative, just as *capones* often referred to impotent men.93 Ganso perhaps alludes to the phrase "hablar por boca de ganso,"94 which means to repeat what others have said, which makes sense in this context, given that the women are asking for the Student's silence with regard to their trickery of Pancracio. The women begin here by subtly requesting his complicity in this matter with clever double-meanings, and then quickly make their meaning explicit, when they ask if he is able to keep a secret. In exchange for doing so, Cristina suggests that the Student will "see mysteries and dine miracles." Ironically, the only person in the play who will see mysteries will be Pancracio, thanks to the Student's cleverness and Pancracio's own willingness to believe in absurdities.

Upon the arrival of the Sacristán Reponce and the Barber shortly thereafter, it quickly becomes clear that they suspect his motives, and want to get rid of him as quickly as possible:

SACRISTÁN. ¿Quién es este buen hombre?
LEONARDA. Un pobre estudiante salamanqueso que pide albergue para esta noche.
SACRISTÁN. Yo le daré un par de reales para cena y para lecho, y váyase con Dios.
ESTUDIANTE. Señor sacristán Reponce, recibo y agradezco la merced y la limosna. Pero yo soy mudo y pelón además, como lo ha menester esta señora doncella, que me tiene convidado, y voto a...de no irme esta noche desta casa, si todo el mundo me lo manda. Confiese vuestra merced mucho de enhoramala de un hombre de mis prendas, que se contenta de dormir en un pajar. Y si lo han por sus capones, péleselos el Turco, y cómanselos ellos y nunca del cuero que salgan.
BARBERO. Éste más parece rufián que pobre. Talle tiene de alzarse con toda la casa. (159-60)

---

92 According to Autoridades, "CAPON. s.m. El que es castrado. Lo que se entiende así de los hombres, como de los animales; si bien entre estos con especialidad del gallo. Latín. Eunuchus. Spado," and "AVUTARDA. s. f. Ave corpulenta, y de cortas piernas y plumas, por lo que es pesáda, y de corto vuelo."
94 The explanations for the refrain given in Refranes and Refranes III are a little convoluted, but the basic meaning of the saying has remained unaltered for centuries, and is similar to the English expression "parrotting."
The Sacristan then offers the Student a little money for lodging and food, and tries to send him on his way. The Student actually takes the money and then refuses to leave. He states that he will be mute about all of this, and assist in the skinning of the food (with the same polyvalent meanings of "pelar" as discussed earlier), and finally curses them if they refuse to let him stay. The Barber astutely observes that the Student seems to be more of a rogue than a truly poor man, and that he seems to be trying to make off with the entire house. From this point on in the play, the Student is in complete control of both the dramatic action, as well as most of the dialogue, and the festivities of the house. The Sacristan himself remarks, "Puesto me ha miedo el pobre estudiante. Yo apostaré que sabe más latín que yo" (160). In other words, the Sacristan is a little intimidated by the Student, and actually fears that he rivals his own intelligence. When Pancracio returns unexpectedly, however, all the houseguests immediately rely upon the Student's astuteness, even though he is, ironically, the only person in the household who was not invited.

We learn in a quick aside between Pancracio and his friend Leoniso that Pancracio's stagecoach has lost a wheel, forcing him to return unexpectedly. There is an instance of dramatic irony wherein, while the two of them are praising the virtues of their own wives, we witness a minor transition back to Leonarda and her friends, who we see rejoicing and celebrating with her lover Reponce, with food, drink and song. Reponce twice says, "¡Linda noche, lindo rato, linda cena y lindo amor!" (161). Reponce and the Barber's ease with the situation suggests that this is far from the first time they have had such amorous encounters with Leonarda and Cristina in Pancracio's absence. When Pancracio returns unexpectedly, however, it is the Student who takes control of the situation, but not before inverting the Sacristán's words of enthusiasm in a comical way "¡Fea noche, amargo rato, mala cena y peor amor!" (162). The Student is well aware that if Pancracio catches him and the others there in this fashion, even though he himself had nothing to
do with the infidelity, he will be kicked out of the house, and will hence lose his meal ticket and lodgings for the night. Thinking quickly, he tells the others to hide, while he will go to the loft, so as to diminish any suspicions of adultery on his part. The Student proclaims, "Es el toque que yo no quiero correr la suerte destos hombres. Escóndanse ellos donde quisieren y llévenme a mí al pajar, que si allí me hallan, antes pareceré pobre que adúltero" (162).

It isn't only the Student who is astute with his persuasive deceptions. Leonarda, feigns uncertainty about whether or not it is Pancracio knocking at the door, stating that she won't open it unless she is certain it is him. Instead of being the slightest bit suspicious, Pancracio once again shows us his almost pathological credulousness, when he extols the virtues of her prudence and precautions, exclaiming, "¡Oh recato inaudito de mujer prudente! Que yo soy, vida mía, tu marido Pancracio. Ábreme con toda seguridad" (162). Before Leonarda will open the door for him, she stalls for more time by requiring Pancracio to tell her details about herself, Cristina and the household, so as to ensure that it's really him. When Pancracio finally is allowed to enter into his own house, and he sees the Student, he expresses some concern for the first and only time in the entire play:

PANCRAÇIO. ¿Estudiante encerrado en mi casa, y en mi ausencia? ¡Malo! En verdad, señora que si no me tuviera segurado vuestra mucha bondad, que me causara algún recelo este encerramiento. Pero ve, Cristina, y ábrele que se le debe de haber caído toda la paja a cuestas. (163)

Although Pancracio initially is a little concerned about the Student's presence in his home during his absence, he quickly talks himself out of any fears. The Student and Leonarda didn't have to do anything at all to convince him of the Student's innocence. Nevertheless, just to insure his well-being, and to keep his promise of maintaining silence about the infidelity and helping out the others, the Student begins his games of persuasion. When the Student complains of the dangers of sleeping in the hay loft, Pancracio asks him who would give him a better bed and better dinner,
to which the Student replies, "Mi habilidad, sino que el temor de la justicia me tiene atadas las manos" (113). With this statement, he deliberately arouses Pancracio's curiosity, prompting the following exchange:

PANCRACIO.  ¡Peligrosa habilidad debe ser la vuestra, pues os teméis de la justicia!
ESTUDIANTE.  La ciencia que aprendí en la Cueva de Salamanca, de donde yo soy natural, si se dejara usar sin miedo de la Santa Inquisición, yo sé que cenaría y recenaría a costa de mis herederos. Y aun quizás no estoy muy fuera de usalla, siquiera por esta vez, donde la necesidad me fuerza y me disculpa. Pero no sé yo si estas señoras serán tan secretas como yo lo he sido.

PANCRACIO.  No se cure dellas, amigo, sino haga lo que quisiere, que yo les haré que callen. Y ya deseo en todo estremo ver alguna destas cosas que dicen que se aprenden en la Cueva de Salamanca.

ESTUDIANTE.  ¿No se contentará vuesa merced con que le saque aquí dos demonios en figuras humanas, que traigan a cuestas una canasta llena de cosas fiambreras y comederas? (164)

A lot of critics have focused their attention on the title of the play, and on the origin of the titular cave, which was a semi-mythical cave allegedly located near the church of San Cebrián, in which a student would teach the dark arts in secret. While Cervantes clearly mocks the belief in such superstition, I think there is a relation to magic as a performance art in this play. As any good magician knows, the art of illusion lies in the viewer's willingness to submit to the illusion, to convince themselves that what appears to be true is in fact true. In the brilliant Retablo de las Maravillas, Cervantes inverts the typical operation of magical illusion, and presents us with a verbal illusion, in which the participants willingly disbelieve their eyes in favor of the collective

---

95 For an excellent summary of the work that has already been done in this area, see Baras Escolá's notes on the title of the play (511) in his edition. He reviews in great detail the literary tradition of this cave, and explains that there was a local legend that at the beginning of the fourteenth century, either the sacristan of the church or a bachiller or the Devil himself would teach necromancy in secret to seven students for seven years, and if they didn't pay their teacher, they would remain prisoner in the cave for the rest of their days. As a matter of historical curiosity, it was also believed in the fifteenth century that the future marqués de Villena was one of the students that refused to pay, and that he had remained trapped in the confines of the cave for years. Cf. Refranes, where Correas explains that the myth of the cave was probably contrived by students at the University of Salamanca as a story to amaze the underclassmen and uninitiated.
fantasy they are invited to participate in by the words of the trickster. This fact is particularly poignant in the above passage. Pancracio is so caught up in his own curiosity about the magical arts that he doesn't even think to question that the reality he is being presented with is actually much simpler. What he is observing is exactly what it seems to be and not at all what the student claims it is. But since Pancracio is seeing the food and the Sacristan and Barber emerge just as the Student describes, he is so caught up in the fantasy the Student has invented that it does not even occur to him that the simpler and mundane possibility is in fact the reality. A lot of the humor from this play is derived from Pancracio's willingness to believe anything that others tell him rather than that which is right in front of his eyes. It is almost an inversion of the infamous phrase "Who are you going to believe? Me or your lying eyes?" Here, Pancracio has chosen to completely ignore the obvious empirical reality in favor of a fantasy that others have concocted for him, because the alternate reality they present is much more interesting to him. He would much rather believe in magic and silly superstition than to begin to entertain the possibility that his wife had been unfaithful to him, so he sees only what he wishes to perceive.

In the lines that follow, Cristina and Leonarda join in with the Student's ruse, and begin to ask him questions about the conjuring. There is constant hinting at the reality of the situation, such as when Cristina names the Sacristan and the Barber, and then asks whether the demons that the Student is conjuring will also be baptized with their names. After a phony incantation, the Student continues to refer to the Sacristan and the Barber as "estos demonicos humanos." But Pancracio continues to be so caught up in the fantasy of the ruse that he doesn't pay attention to the fact that it isn't even a very good one, instead suggesting that if the conjuring goes according to the plan, it will truly be a marvel to behold. Pancracio exclaims, "Yo digo que si este sale con lo que ha dicho, que será la cosa más nueva y más rara que se haya visto en el mundo" (166). As Reponce and
Roque emerge from their hiding place with the food, they all get so absorbed by their desire to continue the feast that they once again almost ruin the ruse, when Cristina asks if the devils are to eat with them, and Pancracio proclaims, "Sí, que los diablos no comen." But he is once again quickly put at ease by the Barber's assurance that there are some devils that do eat, and that he and the Sacristan are of that variety (167). Thus, not only does Pancracio distrust empirical reality in favor of absurd superstition, but he doesn't even remain consistent within the rules of the superstition that he believes in. Rather, he allows himself to be persuaded by the new "rules" for the functioning of demons that the participants in the ruse put forth to him. At this point, the practical joke has almost concluded, as Leonarda invites the "demons" to remain and eat with them (pending her gullible husband's approval, of course):

LEONARDA. Como no nos espanten, y si mi marido gusta, quedense en buena hora.
PANCRACIO. Queden, que quiero ver lo que nunca he visto.
BARBERO. Nuestro Señor pague a vuesas mercedes la buena obra, señores míos.
CRISTINA. Ay, qué bien criados, qué corteses! Nunca medre yo, si todos los diablos son como estos, si no han de ser mis amigos de aquí adelante.
SACRISTÁN. Oigan, pues, para que se enamoren de veras. (167)

The prank has reached its culmination, as the gullible husband actually invites the adulterers to dine with him and his wife, completely deceiving himself into believing the fantastical tale the Student has played so well for him. As with so many lines of the play, there are a lot of ironies and double-meanings in this passage. First of all, Pancracio invites the adulterers to stay and dine with him, as he wishes to see what he has never seen, even though in reality, he isn't seeing anything remotely supernatural or out of the ordinary. Next, the Barbero, presumed a demon by Pancracio, invokes the Lord to thank Pancracio for his generosity. Finally, when the Sacristán brings out the guitar and starts his singing, intending to charm, his words are diabolical, as he knows he has already won the heart of Leonarda, and is now adding insult to injury by serenading
her right in front of her husband. At this point, the play is basically over, and the remaining lines serve as a little afterthought in which we are permitted to see a little more of how the dinner plays out. What follows is the Sacristan's serenade, in which he tells the tale of the cave of Salamanca, and its mysterious school of conjurers. The play then concludes with a few more comical lines about the demonic origin of various dances and poetry, with the barbero remarking "todos los poetas son diablos" (118), with the clear double-meaning this phrase entails. The play culminates with Pancracio anxiously awaiting to see if the "demons" will really eat, and begging the Student to teach him his mystical arts.

Although the comic tale of the cuckoldry of a fool is nothing new, Cervantes masterfully re-imagines the subject matter in this play to present his audience with something that is both entertaining, as well as instructive. While some scholars have considered Pancracio little more than a personification of gullibility, I see him as somewhat more complex than this. Certainly, Cervantes uses the character to show the faults of blindly believing in superstition over empirical knowledge, but, in addition, he also shows us the boundless human capacity for self-deception, given the proper motivation. This comedy is fundamentally about the power of self-deception, and human folly in the willingness to accept a convenient lie (no matter how implausible) rather than to see the truth that is right in front of you. In fact, this play could easily have turned into a tragedy, were Pancracio not so predisposed to believing the farce. If he instead rejected the lie, and accepted the cold, hard truth that his wife was not the faithful, prudent woman he believed, he would indeed have reasons for serious grievances, perhaps even seeking bloody revenge. But as we have seen, this cannot occur given the character type that Cervantes presents us with in Pancracio, a man who is so fascinated with magic and the occult that he never questions the story the Student has crafted

96 See for example, Reed, 146.
for him. Although Pancracio himself is a fool, and a subject of ridicule for the audience as well as
the other characters in the play, who among us can say that we have never accepted an implausible
lie rather than look at the ugly truth right in front of us? Cervantes forces us as an audience to
realize that if we allow this to occur, then we become Pancracio. And, indeed, in this case,
ignorance may be bliss, but it is also folly, to be met with a universal lack of respect, as this play
reveals.

The second of Cervantes' plays dealing with the theme of cuckoldry, *El viejo celoso*, is of
a considerably more traditional flavor. It seems probable that part of the basic inspiration for the
play comes to Cervantes through Aesop, with the story of the blinded husband, in which an
adulterer is able to conceal his escape with the aid of two other characters sustaining a blanket in
front of him. Carmen Navarro and Jean Canavaggio have both noted that Aesop was frequently
used by students of the day, and that Cervantes himself cites Aesop. In all original variations of
that story, the blanket is used to conceal the adulterer's escape rather than his entrance. Moreover,
no single story contains all the relevant plot details of Cervantes' version, which leads
Canavaggio to think that it is more probable that Cervantes' creation stems from an amalgam of
various sources, including possibly some oral retellings of the story that have been lost to us.

97 See Baras Escolá (ed.), 542-43 for details about the many possible sources for the play. These
sources are extremely abundant. Among them, Escolá makes note of Aristophanes' *Tesmorfías*, v.
497, the *Gesta romanorum*, *Disciplina clericalis*, or various folkloric legends from the French
*fabliau* and the Italian *fábulas* circulating in the sixteenth century. Canavaggio (2005) also
mentions "Exemplum X: De lintheo" from Pedro Alfonso's *Disciplina clericalis* as a possible
Spanish antecedant. Whatever the actual source, the Aesop's fable is the oldest recorded version
of the story that is still preserved.
98 Navarro, 156-164.
99 Canavaggio (2005), 587-598.
100 Canavaggio (1977), 153-154.
Whatever the case, it seems clear, as many scholars have suggested that there is a strong relation between *El viejo celoso* and *La novela del celoso extremeño*. Indeed, the two Cervantine works both deal with almost identical subject matter, and it seems quite possible that one was a kind of "rehearsal" for the other work. While it is tempting to consider *El viejo celoso* as a less accomplished, more traditional version of *El celoso extremeño*, doing so tends to obfuscate some of the dramatic complexities of the work as presented on the stage.

To begin with, the characters in this short farce are considerably more individuated than their traditional counterparts. Doña Lorenza is the victim of circumstance, a woman coerced into a mismatched marriage at a young age, and now trapped in a sexless, disharmonious relationship. The neighbor, Hortigosa, is the clever, conniving go-between that facilitates the amorous encounter between Lorenza and her lover. Cristina is Lorenza's faithful niece and servant, with a number of witty double-entendres of her own, that helps the deception to proceed without a hitch. Finally, Cañizares himself, while in many ways the traditional vejete archetype, is still a slightly more complex character. As we shall see, he seems aware of his flaws as a husband, such as his impotence and his immeasurable jealousy, and appears to lament his inability to do anything to change them.

At the outset of our play, Cervantes goes to great pains to incline the audience to sympathize with Lorenza's plight, and to present her as a sympathetic character, in spite of the immoral act she is about to commit. This is interesting considering that in the domain of farce, such a moral justification would hardly have been necessary. As we discussed in the previous chapter, these short *entremeses* were a much more permissive genre than their longer, more serious counterparts, and tended to present human folly and foolishness merely as a subject for the audience's amusement. Here, on the other hand, Cervantes clearly wants us to sympathize with
Lorenza, and to understand her as a woman who was either tricked or coerced into marrying a man far too old and cantankerous for her.

We open with Lorenza discussing her situation with her neighbor and accomplice, Hortigosa:

D.ª LORENZA. Milagro ha sido este, señora Hortigosa, el no haber dado la vuelta a la llave mi duelo, mi yugo y mi desesperación. Este es el primero día, después que me casé con él, que hablo con persona de fuera de casa, que fuera le vea yo desta vida a él y a quien con él me casó.

HORTIGOSA. Ande, mi señora doña Lorenza, no se queje tanto, que con una caldera vieja se compra otra nueva.

D.ª LORENZA. Y aun con esos y otros semejantes villancicos o refranes me engañaron a mí. Que malditas sus galas, y maldo todo cuanto me da y promete. ¿De qué me sirve a mí todo aquesto, si en mitad de la riqueza estoy pobre, y en medio de la abundancia, con hambre?

(173)

In this exchange, Lorenza expresses her great distress at her situation, and her amazement that her jealous husband has, for the first time in his life, forgotten to lock the front entrance to the house. Lorenza refers to her husband as "mi duelo, mi yugo y mi desesperación," "Duelo" here carries the connotation of "dolor, lástima, aflicción o sentimiento," and so this is typical Cervantine pleonastic, semantic repetition to reinforce her negative feelings of despair towards her husband. Nevertheless, it is significant that she avoids even calling him by name here, perhaps reinforcing her frustration towards him. Hortigosa, in an effort to console Lorenza, seeks to persuade her of the virtues having married the much older Cañizares, for, when he passes away, she will be able to remarry, enriched by the inheritance he has left her. This is little consolation for Lorenza, who explains that these and other such refrains and bits of colloquial wisdom tricked her into marrying Cañizares in the first place. She curses his wealth and the trinkets he buys her, and asks what

---

101 See Autoridades' second entry, "DUELO. s.m. Vale también dolor, lástima, aflicción o sentimiento. Latin. Luctus. Aerumna. vel Miseratio. Misericordia."
possible good can come from all of this if she still feels so wretched amidst so much wealth. The *riqueza/pobre* and *abundancia/hambre* dichotomies here clearly allude to her feelings of sexual and emotional dissatisfaction, rather than any material need.

At this point in the conversation, Cristina chimes in, stating that she would much rather be extremely poor than married to the wrinkled old prune of a man that Lorenza has taken for a husband. Lorenza retorts:

**D.ª LORENZA.** ¿Yo le tomé, sobrina? A la fe, diómele quien pudo, y yo, como muchacha, fui más presta al obedecer que al contradecir. Pero si yo tuviera tanta experiencia destas cosas, antes me tarazara la lengua con los dientes que se pronuncia con dos letras y da que llorar dos mil años. Pero yo imagino que no fue otra cosa, sino que había de ser esta, y que las que han de suceder forzosamente no hay prevención ni diligencia humana que las prevenga. (174)

In this way, Lorenza argues that she really didn't have any say in the matter of whether or not she would marry Cañizares. She was coerced into it at an age when she was too young to know any better, and was more given to obeying than to contradicting her elders. She states that if she had the experience then that she has now, she would sooner cut her tongue to ribbons than to pronounce that fatal "yes" in her marriage vows. She imagines that she could not have prevented the marriage from taking place regardless. These words enlist our empathy for Lorenza, who was given away too young to make her own decisions about who her spouse should be, and who feels condemned by a cruel fate to this loveless existence.

At this point, Cristina herself curses Cañizares, feeling that she has become little more than his bedside nurse, "¡Jesus y del mal viejo! Toda la noche 'daca el orinal, toma el orinal; levántate, Cristinica, y caliéntame unos paños, que me muero de la ijada; dame aquellos juncos, que me fatiga la piedra.' Con más ungüentos y medicinas en el aposento que si fuera una botica. Y yo, que apenas sé vestirme, tengo de servirle de enfermera" (174). We might wish to pause for a second and
consider once again Mariana and her Vejete husband from *El juez de los divorcios*, and wonder if indeed Cervantes did think that such mismatched marriages merited the possibility of being undone. Although the situation is somewhat different here, given that it is Cristina and not Lorenza herself that is acting as the nurse to the old man, what is certainly clear is that Cervantes doesn't feel that these kinds of marriages were fair to the younger woman, who had almost no say in the matter. We are clearly meant to sympathize with Lorenza's plight, particularly given her husband's relentless jealousy of her even though up to this point, she has given him no cause for such suspicions. In fact, it is Lorenza herself that first protests, when Hortigosa suggests a plan to set Lorenza up with a young gallant man behind her husband's back. Lorenza proclaims, "Como soy primeriza, estoy temerosa, y no querría, a trueco del gusto, poner a riesgo la honor" (175). This prompts the following dialogue between her and Cristina:

**CRISTINA.** Yo no sé quien habla; pero yo sé que haría todo aquello que la señora Hortigosa ha dicho, sin faltar punto.

**D.ª LORENZA.** ¿Y la honra, sobrina?

**CRISTINA.** ¿Y el holgarnos, tía?

**D.ª LORENZA.** ¿Y si se sabe?

**CRISTINA.** ¿Y si no se sabe?

**D.ª LORENZA.** ¿Y quién me asegurará a mí que no se sepa?

**HORTIGOSA.** ¿Quien? La buena diligencia, la sagacidad, la industria, y sobre todo, el buen ánimo y mis trazas.

**CRISTINA.** Mire, señora Hortigosa, tráyanosle galán, limpio, desenvuelto, un poco atrevido, y sobre todo, mozo.

**HORTIGOSA.** Todas esas partes tiene el que he propuesto, y otras dos más: que es rico y liberal. (175)

This exchange demonstrates that the whole idea and execution were initially much more Hortigosa's and Cristina's idea. Lorenza is in fact reluctant to participate in the plot at first, fearing that it will leave a permanent stain on her honor. It is only after a lot of coaxing and reassurance from Cristina and Hortigosa that she finally agrees to go along with their plan. Thus, once again, we are given more reasons to like her and to respect her as a character. She had no intention of
deceiving her husband initially, but upon realizing how absolutely miserable she was, and after much insistence from her friends and neighbors, she finally agrees to the scheme.

The trio then discuss extensively just how cruel and jealous Cañizares really is, enclosing Lorenza like a prisoner in her own home and hiding away the master key in his loincloths. The key is a recurring motif throughout the play and is a clear symbol for Cañizares' impotence. This becomes abundantly clear in the discussion of where he might keep the key hidden, when Cristina proclaims, "Tía, la llave de loba creo que se la pone entre las faldas de la camisa," to which Lorenza replies, "No lo creas, sobrina, que yo duermo con él, y jamás le he visto ni sentido que tenga llave alguna" (177). As Lorenza is finally persuaded, she remarks, "Señora Hortigosa, vámase, no venga el gruñidor y la halle conmigo, que sería echarlo a perder todo, y lo que ha de hacer, hágalo luego. Que estoy tan aburrida, que no me falta sino echarme una soga al cuello, por salir de tan mala vida" (177). It is actually somewhat daring on the part of Cervantes for his character to suggest the possibility of suicide to escape from her captive life (although the poetic topic of despair was not uncommon), and it effectively builds the sympathy of the audience. We understand why she finally decides to deceive her husband in this way. In fact, it is really more Cristina than Lorenza who seems to show any sort of deliberate desire to see Cañizares tricked at the beginning of the play. As she remarks, "Pues no sea el viejo celoso, y déjenos vivir en paz, pues no le hacemos mal alguno y vivimos como unas santas" (178). Indeed, Cañizares has his house so much under lock and key that Lorenza and Cristina are living like saints, in the sense that the house may as well be a convent rather than a residence.

When Cañizares first appears on the stage, we encounter him in dialogue with a comrade of his, expressing his jealous fears:

COMPADRE. ¿Tienes celos, señor compadre?
CAÑIZARES. Del sol que mira a Lorencita, del aire que le toca, de las faldas que la
vapulan.
COMPADRE. ¿Dale ocasión?
CAÑIZARES. Ni por pienso, ni tiene por qué, ni cómo, ni cuándo, ni adónde: las ventanas, amén de estar con llave, las guarnecen rejas y celosías; las puertas jamás se abren; vecina no atraviesa mis umbrales, ni los atravesará mientras Dios me diere vida. Mirad, compadre, no les vienen los malos aires a las mujeres de ir a los jubileos ni a las procesiones, ni a todos los actos de regocijos públicos. Donde ellas se mancan, donde ellas se estropean y adonde ellas se dañan es en casa de las vecinas y de las amigas. Más maldades encubre una mala amiga que la capa de la noche, más conciertos se hacen en su casa y más se concluyen que en una semblea. (179)

From the perspective of the male protagonist of this play, we see him as somewhat more nuanced than simply the stereotypical vejete. Cañizares readily admits that Leonarda has given him no cause for his jealousy, and yet he can't help but feel jealous even of the very sun that looks on her and the air that touches her. Passages like this give us more perspective into his frame of mind and his own doubts and insecurities. He is presented as a kind of a pathetic character, so obsessed with Leonarda cheating on him that it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. He kept her so locked up that she practically had no choice but to rebel against his tyrannical enclosure. This passage gives a sense of Cañizares' overwhelming desire to confine his wife, and, indeed, to isolate her not only from contact with other males, but from her female community as well. Cañizares refuses to let her meet with the neighbors, for fear that they will lead her astray. As we already know at this point in the play, his worst fears are coming true as he speaks these words. Cañizares' friend even remarks at the end of this exchange, "En mi vida he visto hombre más recatado, ni más celoso, ni más impertinente. Pero este es de aquellos que traen la soga arrastrando, y de los que siempre vienen a morir del mal que temen" (126). These words once again reinforce, for the audience of the play, the self-fulfilling prophecy of Cañizares' fears.
The dialogue between Cañizares and his Compadre reveals too that a lot of Cañizares' fear has to do with his own impotence, for although Leonarda hasn't given him any due cause for jealousy, he is fully aware that he is not meeting her physical and emotional needs:

CAÑIZARES. De que no pasará mucho tiempo en que no caya Lorencica en lo que le falta, que será un mal caso, y tan malo que en solo pensallo le temo, y de temerle me desespero, y desesperarme vivo con disgusto.

COMPADRE. Y con razón se puede tener ese temer, porque las mujeres querrían gozar enteros los frutos del matrimonio.

CAÑIZARES. La mía los goza doblados.

COMPADRE. Allí está el daño, señor compadre.

CAÑIZARES. No, no, ni por pienso, porque es más simple Lorenica que una paloma, y hasta agora no entiende nada desas filaterías. Y a Dios, señor compadre, que me quiero entrar en casa. (179-80)

Cañizares' insecurities may stem from his impotence, but he nevertheless feels secure in his position of dominance over his wife. He believes that her simple nature, combined with his strict enclosure of her, will prevent her from straying from him. In addition to his jealousy, it would seem Cañizares also suffers from the flaw of not giving his wife enough credit for her intelligence and worldliness, and in effect, denying her agency. We already know at this point in the play that she is not quite as simple as he seems to think she is, but the extent of her cunning deception remains to be seen.

Once Cañizares returns home, he is immediately suspicious of Lorenza, and demands to know with whom she has been speaking, even though she was merely conversing with Cristina. But he is interrupted in his conversation by Hortigosa's arrival, and her subsequent distraction of him with the guadamecí, a leather tapestry painted with the four characters of Ariosto's *Orlando furioso*. The tapestry itself is significant, when we recall that Rodamonte's fiancée Doralice cheated on him with Mandricardo in Ariosto's work, just as Lorenza is planning to do.\(^{102}\)

\(^{102}\) Ed. Baras Escolá, p. 127, n. 75.
Moreover, as the stage directions inform us, "Rodamonte venga pintado como arrebozado" (182). The fact that Rodamonte is painted ensconced in his cape leads Cañizares to ask questions about his characters, with the dramatic irony of the Galán entering the house at the same time. Cañizares exclaims, "¡Oh, qué lindo Rodamonte! ¿Y qué quiere el señor rebozadito en mi casa? Aun si supiese que tan amigo soy yo destas cosas y destos rebocitos, espantarse ía" (183). Not realizing that he is referring to the painting at first, Cristina almost blows the whole scam, remarking that she knows nothing of cloaked men, and that Hortigosa is to blame. But Cañizares is caught up in Hortigosa's ruse, so he merely gives her the money she needed to pay her son's bail, and tells her he won't be taking the guadamecí after all.

There is a humorous exchange that takes place between Hortigosa and Cañizares, built around double entendres. One of the major underlying motifs of the play, and a favorite of Cervantes in general, is that of the deceiving by means of the truth. Here, Hortigosa subtly hints by means of double-entendres at what is about to take place between the Galán and Lorenza, without Cañizares catching on:

**HORTIGOSA.** Si vuesa merced hubiere menester algún pegadillo para la madre, téngolos milagrosos; y, si para mal de muelas, sé unas palabras que quitan el dolor como con la mano.

**CAÑIZARES.** Abrevie, señora Hortigosa, que doña Lorenza ni tiene madre ni dolor de muelas, que todas las tiene sanas y enteras, que en su vida se ha sacado muela alguna.

**HORTIGOSA.** Ella se las sacará, placiendo al Cielo, porque le dará muchos años de vida, y la vejez es la total destrucción de la dentadura.

**CAÑIZARES.** ¡Aquí de Dios! ¿Que no será posible que me deje esta vecina? ¡Hortigosa, o diablo, o vecina, o lo que eres, vete con Dios y déjame en mi casa! (184)

E. Martínez-López\(^{103}\) explains that the phrase "pegadillo de mal de madre" in colloquial language means that someone annoyingly introduces themselves into a conversation or a house.

\(^{103}\) Martínez Lopez, 337.
and refuses to depart, just as the sticky ointments used to cure the "mal de madre" (wandering womb)\(^{104}\) were often unctuous and annoying to those they were used to treat because of their stickiness. Thus, the Galán, who will "treat" Lorenza's "malady," is sticky and irritating to Cañizares in this way, although he is unaware that this is transpiring. Furthermore, in the time period "dolor de muelas" had the double meaning of "consummating the sexual act."\(^{105}\) If my reading of this passage is correct, Hortigosa is maliciously taunting Cañizares with this double-meaning without his knowing, telling him that Lorenza will pull out her molars, or, metaphorically, have sex, and that this will give her many more years of life. She also mocks Cañizares' old-age once again when she says "la vejez es la total destrucción de la dentadura." Moreover, she gets Cañizares himself to state "en su vida se ha sacado muela alguna" about his wife, thereby taunting him with the double-meaning of his own words, implying that Lorenza has never lost her virginity, due to his impotence.

Although Cañizares doesn't pick up on these double-meanings, his suspicious nature nevertheless causes him to suspect some malice on her part, leading him to remark, "¡Oh vecinas, vecinas! Escaldado quedo aun de las buenas palabras desta vecina, por haber salido por boca de vecina" (184). The irony is that he has no idea just how true his words are. But Lorenza pipes up in defense of Hortigosa, much to Cañizares' irritation, prompting Cristina to maliciously add, "Señora tía, éntrese allá dentro y desenójese, y deje a tío, que parece que está enojado" (185). Again, Cervantes plays with a double-meaning, as "desenójese" can also mean to relieve one's

\(^{104}\) The "mal de la madre" or "wandering womb" was an affliction with symptoms such as shortness of breath, aphonia, pain, paralysis, choking, suffocation and violent seizure. At the time, the womb was believed to be a kind of wandering animal, that could move about the body, as accepted by Plato and Hippocrates. In reality, these symptoms were probably the result of a variety of venereal diseases and other unrelated conditions. See Burke, 111-128.

\(^{105}\) Ed. Baras Escolá, p. 130, n. 95.
sexual tension. While she is literally telling Lorenza to enter into the bed chamber to calm herself, she is actually telling her to go into the bed chamber and carry out her affair, while leaving Cañizares both angry and sexually frustrated. Once Lorenza has entered into the chamber, adding that Cañizares won't see her face for the next two hours, Cristina maliciously adds "Tío, ¿no ve como ha cerrado de golpe? Y creo que va a buscar una tranca para asegurar la puerta" (131). Of course, this "plank to block the door" also has an obvious sexual double meaning. Up to this point, the women have been already been quite daring in their mocking of Cañizares, but this is where the most audacious scene of the entire play begins. Here is the true "deceit by means of the truth," in which Lorenza taunts her husband by narrating her activities:

D.ª LORENZA. ¿Cristinica? ¿Cristinica?
CRISTINA. ¿Qué quiere, tía?
D.ª LORENZA. ¡Si supieses qué galán me ha deparado la buena suerte! Mozo, bien dispuesto, pelíñegro y que le huele la boca a mil azahares.
CRISITINA. ¡Jesús, y qué locuras y qué niñerías! ¿Está loca, tía?
D.ª LORENZA. No estoy sino en todo mi juicio, y en verdad que, si le vieses, que se te alegrase el alma.
CRISTINA. ¡Jesús, y qué locuras y qué niñerías! ¡Niñera, tío, porque no se atrevía a decir deshonistidades.
CAÑIZARES. ¿Bobear, Lorenza? Pues a fe que no estoy yo de gracia para sufrir esas burlas.
D.ª LORENZA. Que no son sino veras, y tan veras que en este género no pueden ser mayores.
CRISTINA. ¡Jesús, y qué locuras y qué niñerías! Y dígame, tía, ¿está ahí también mi frailecito?
D.ª LORENZA. No, sobrina. Pero otra vez vendrá, si quiere Hortigosa, la vecina. Lorenza, di lo que quisieres, pero no tomes en tu boca el nombre de vecina, que me tiemblan las carnes de oírle.
CAÑIZARES. También me tiemblan a mí por amor de la vecina.
D.ª LORENZA. Ahora echo de ver quién eres, viejo maldito, que hasta aquí he vivido engañada contigo.
CRISTINA. ¡Jesús, y qué locuras y qué niñerías!
D.ª LORENZA. ¿Cómo? ¿Y qué hacemos? ¿Qué hacer?
llena de agua de ángeles, porque su cara es como la de un ángel pintado.

CRISTINA. ¡Jesús, y qué locuras y qué niñerías! Despedázala, tío.
CAÑIZARES. No la despedazaré yo a ella, sino a la puerta que la encubre.
D.ª LORENZA. No hay para qué, vela aquí abierta. Entre, y verá como es verdad cuanto le he dicho.
CAÑIZARES. Aunque sé que te burlas, sí entraré para desenojarte. (185-86)

The affront to Cañizares in this scene is so outrageous that he of course cannot believe that everything Lorenza is telling him is actually true, choosing to believe instead that everything she is saying is merely to make him jealous. Thus, he remains deceived throughout the scene, much to the women's delight. Lorenza's incredibly strong agency, her mockery of Cañizares, and her casting off of his tyrannical prohibitive enclosure, contrasts sharply with Cañizares' own words earlier in the play about her simplicity and innocence. His worst fears have been fulfilled, but he can't believe that she is actually telling him the truth about all this, in part because he can't conceive of her being so devious and so rebellious against him. Much of the humor of the scene is derived from the double-entendres of certain phrases, such as when Lorenza remarks that what she is saying is "tan veras que en este género no pueden ser mayores," she is in fact playing on the double meaning of "género," and speaking about the size of the male member of the Galán.

When Cañizares becomes irritated with her for naming Hortigosa, stating that the name makes his skin crawl, she replies that her skin is also trembling for the love of her neighbor (in other words, the physical love her neighbor has brought her, in addition to the affection she has for her neighbor). She also proclaims that she sees the old man for who he truly is, and that she has been tricked by him up to this point in her life. In this sense, Cañizares becomes the burlador burlado: he tricked Lorenza into marrying him for his worldly goods, when in reality, he couldn't provide her

108 See also Presberg, 265-284.
with anything in the way of physical or emotional love, and was more a jailer to her than a husband. Now, she cruelly extracts her revenge by mocking him in this outrageous fashion.

Cristina's constant repetition of the phrase "¡Jesús, y qué locuras y qué niñerías!" would seem to suggest her own surprise at Lorenza's boldness. It appears that Cristina herself, who has been the most derisive towards Cañizares up to this point in the play, can scarcely believe Lorenza's tenaciousness in this affront, but plays along by egging Cañizares on, telling him that he must scold Lorenza for her disrespect. This prompts Cañizares to burst through the door, at which point he is immediately blinded by the women, who throw water in his face so that the galán can make his escape. After this occurs, Lorenza defiantly exclaims:

D.a LORENZA. ¡Mirad con quién me casó mi suerte, sino con el hombre más malicioso del mundo! ¡Mirad como dio crédito a mis mentiras, por su[...],\textsuperscript{109} fundadas en materia de celos, que menoscabada y asendereada sea mi ventura! Pagad vosotros, cabellos, las deudas deste viejo; llorad vosotros, ojos, las culpas deste maldito; mirad en lo que tiene mi honra y mi crédito, pues de las sospechas hace certezas, de las mentiras verdades, de las burlas veras y de los entretenimientos maldiciones. ¡Ay que se me arranca e alma! (187)

In this passage, in addition to accusing Cañizares of being the most malicious man in the world, Lorenza ironically allays his fears by feigning indignation, and by showing signs of her desperation, threatening to tear out her hair and cry inconsolably. Not only that, but Lorenza also manages to subtly accuse her husband of fulfilling his own fears, without him realizing her implications. He has indeed made his suspicions reality, and converted lies into truths, although he still believes her truths to be lies.

\textsuperscript{109} The original is obviously missing some phrases here, leading most modern editors to simply render the passage in this fashion with an elipsis to indicate the missing text.
Lorenza's ruckus calls the attention of the neighbors, and the police, the town *alguaicil*, as well as Hortigosa, and some musicians and dancers arrive to bring the play to its conclusion. Cañizares proceeds to state that all that transpired was little more than a minor marital dispute, and he forgives Lorenza. But to add insult to injury, Lorenza makes Cañizares apologize for his "malicious words" towards Hortigosa, which he does. Finally, after the musicians play their song, also against Cañizares' will, Lorenza and Cristina conclude the play by singing the praises of "vecinas," forcing Cañizares to hear this word, which is odious to him, another five times before the play's culmination.

Although this play of Cervantes is particularly lighthearted in nature, and doesn't seem to admonish the characters whatsoever for their moral transgressions, we are nevertheless given pause to wonder: would this have come to pass had Cañizares not been so exaggeratedly restrictive with his wife? Cañizares is an interesting character as well because he is almost the exact opposite of Anselmo from "The Tale of the Curious Impertinent" in *Quixote I* (XXXIII-XXXV). Whereas Anselmo wanted to put his wife's virtue to the ultimate, impossible test, Cañizares doesn't want to take any chances whatsoever. He is so paranoid, so distrustful, and so jealous, that he has his wife locked up in a virtual prison within his own home. In this sense, *El viejo celoso* is also perfectly situated in the compendium of *Entre meses* after *La cueva de Salamanca*. Whereas Cueva

---

10 The reader will recall that in Cervantes' famous intercalated novel, Anselmo asks his best friend, Lothario, to attempt to seduce his wife, Camila, in order to put her virtue and steadfast love for him to the ultimate test. Although Lothario is initially resistant to the idea, he eventually accepts, reluctantly, for the sake of their friendship. But Anselmo is not content with a single trial, and has Lothario attempt to seduce Camila repeatedly while he is away. Eventually, Lothario starts to fall in love with Camila for real, and in her husband's absence, she for him as well. Finally, they wind up consummating a sexual relationship, permanently damaging the otherwise healthy relationship between Anselmo, his wife, and his best friend. Ultimately, it is Anselmo's desire to prove to himself that his wife is perfectly virtuous that ironically destroys her virtue, as well as his friendship. He acknowledges that he has been the architect of his own undoing before dying of grief.
presented us with a character that was absurdly trusting and credulous, this play presents us with the exact opposite: a character that is so paranoid of his wife being unfaithful that he drives her towards these actions. In each case, Cervantes presents us with a case of human folly where an extreme attitude (excessive trust or excessive distrust) drives the main male character towards his inevitable cuckolding. It would seem that Cervantes embraces the Horatian (or Aristotelian) notion of the *aureas mediocritas*, a balanced position between extremes. It is prudent neither to tempt fate, nor to be overly cautious in matters of love, as each extreme can have disastrous consequences.

The final play concerning jealousy in the collection of entremeses, *La guarda cuidadosa*, is not a tale of cuckoldry. It is, rather, the story of two jealous rivals fighting over the affection of the same woman. I think it is worth considering together with the two stories of cuckoldry because all three plays share similar ideas about jealousy, and also demonstrate ways in which Cervantes addresses the changing tendencies of his time period. *La guarda cuidadosa* presents us with a Sacristán or sotasacristán and an old soldier, competing for the affection of Cristina, a kitchen maid. Although the Soldado and the Sacristán initially appear to be stock characters of this genre, similar to Cervantes' other plays we have been considering thus far, they hide a subtler complexity under the surface. The braggart soldier tradition goes back at least as far as Plautus' *miles gloriosus*, and underwent several transformations along the way in the Italian and Spanish traditions, and the sacristan was often used as a stand-in to criticize the less-than-pious members of the clergy. While higher church officials obviously could not be criticized publically without fear of severe repercussions, the traditional sacristan was often the subject of ridicule for his excessive interest in earthly pleasures.\footnote{Reed, 116-117.} In this comic work, however, neither character fully

\footnote{Reed, 116-117.}
embodies what we would expect from the traditional stock characters they superficially seem to represent. Both are more intelligent and more nuanced than their typical character types, and both show a greater degree of complexity as far as their desires, fears, motivations, and insecurities. Additionally, they seem invested not only in winning the affection of Cristina, but in one-upping each other in the process or in showing that their way of viewing the world is superior.

In particular, they seem to present the typical debate between armas y letras, about whether being a soldier or a learned man of letters is nobler. As Cory Reed has observed in his study, however, the two characters also reflect an entirely different conflict of values taking place in seventeenth-century Spain:

The two alternative perspectives represented by the soldier and the sacristan do not differ only in regard to love and marriage. The two characters, both representative of the popular tradition, exhibit additional complexity, and personify entirely different views of seventeenth-century society and its values. Through Cervantes' careful characterization, the central conflict of the work becomes a battle between militarism and mercantilism, between medieval attitudes and capitalist values, between an antiquated past and a problematic, but promising, future. (115)

With La guarda cuidadosa, Cervantes keenly observes the dispositional change in attitudes surrounding marriage, economics, and concepts of virtue and value in his time period. He presents these issues to us as a debate between two individuals who thoroughly despise one another, and who are fixated on the same woman, each trying to prove to her that he is nobler and better suited to her than the other.

The play begins with the solder and the sacristan running into each other outside the town Parish and unabashedly hurling insults and witticisms one another's way:

SOLDADO. ¿Qué me quieres, sombre vana?
SACRISTÁN. No soy sombre vana, sino cuerpo macizo.
SOLDADO. Pues con todo eso, por la fuerza de mi desgracia te conjuro que me digas quién eres y qué es lo que buscas por esta calle.
SACRISTÁN. A eso te respondo, por la fuerza de mi dicha, que soy Lorenzo Pasillas, sotasacristán desta parroquia, y busco en esta calle lo que hallo y tú buscas y no hallas.

SOLDADO. ¿Buscas por ventura a Cristinica, la fregona desta casa?

SACRISTÁN. Tu dixisti.

SOLDADO. Pues ven acá, sotasacristán de Satanás.

SACRISTÁN. Pues voy allá, caballo de Ginebra.

SOLDADO. Bueno: sota y caballo; no falta sino el rey para tomar las manos. Ven acá, digo otra vez, ¿y tú no sabes, Pasillas, que pasado te vea yo con un chuzo, que Cristinica es prenda mía?

SACRISTÁN. ¿Y tú no sabes, pulpo vestido, que esa prenda la tengo yo rematada, que está por sus cables y por mía?

SOLDADO. ¡Vive Dios, que te dé mil cuchilladas y que te haga la cabeza pedazos!

SACRISTÁN. Con que le cuelgan desas calzas y con los dese vestido se podrá entretener, sin que se meta con los de mi cabeza. (87-88)

In this initial exchange, we learn several things about the two protagonists. First of all, that they did not know each other prior to this encounter. They are immediately possessed by a mutual hatred at first sight, and clearly have no respect whatsoever for one another. The Sacristán mocks the Soldier's rather poetic initial address of him as a "vain shadow," assuring him that he is a "massive [physical] body." After the soldier demands to know what the sacristan is up to, the sacristan further mocks him by stating that what he is looking for on this street is what he has already found, and what the soldier seeks but cannot find. When the soldier realizes what the sacristan is implying, and directly confronts him about it, the sacristan once again derides him, using the phrase that Jesus directed at Judas and Caiaphas, to respond "you said it, not I." Bandying about a few more insults, they argue over who has "laid claim" to Cristina. These insults indicate the poor nature of the soldier, whose clothes are torn-up old rags (hence, pulpo vestido). As we see in the above exchange, the Sacristan is quite able to surpass the Soldier in a battle of

\[112\] Ed. Baras Escolá, p. 51, n. 6. "Ve autem homini illi per quem Filius hominis tradetur," Jesus; and Judas, "Numquid ego sum, Rabi?" to which Jesus responds, "Tu dixisti." (Matthew 26:24-25).
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wits. The Soldier, it seems, would almost rather come to blows with the Sacristan, but this doesn't come to pass.

As they continue their conversation, it comes to light that the Sacristán makes small gifts to Cristina, which consist of the leftovers from mass. "Dile unas destas cajas de carne de membrillo, muy grande, llena de cercenaduras de hostias blancas como la misma nieve, y de añadidura, cuatro cabos de velas de cera asimismo blancas como un armiño" (88-89). As much as the Sacristán tries to make his gifts sound lavish and expensive, it is clear that it is really quite a humble offering, and that it really wasn't his to give in the first place, since the quince paste, communion wafers and candles are the property of the church. Nevertheless, Cristina seems to respond positively to the Sacristan's desire to marry her. The Soldier, for his part, states that he had given her a love note, written on the back of a petition to the king, on very fine paper that could have been worth between four and six reales. We learn further here of the Soldier's poverty, as he remarks, "Y sin atender a que, sin duda alguna, me podía valer cuatro o seis reales, con liberalidad increíble y con desenfado notable, escribí en el revés dél, como he dicho, mi billete, y sé que de mis manos pecadoras llegó a las suyas casi santas" (89-90). The soldier makes a big deal of the sacrifice he has made in giving up this "valuable" piece of paper in view of his lowly economic situation. In this way, Cervantes gives us a depiction of a rather pathetic character in the Soldier who has fallen on economic hard times. Much as in El juez de los divorcios, this soldier evokes a bit of pathos with his poverty, in spite of the fact that he is a subject of ridicule throughout the play.

The Soldier himself is forced to acknowledge in his exchange with the sacristan that his love is un amor no correspondido:

SACRISTÁN. ¿Y de qué manera ha correspondido Cristina a la infinidad de tantos servicios como le has hecho?
SOLDADO. Con no verme, con no hablarme, con maldecirme cuando me encuentra por la calle, con derramar sobre mí las lavazas cuando jabona y el agua de fregar cuando friega. Y esto es cada día, porque todos los días estoy en esta calle y a su puerta, porque soy su guarda cuidadosa; soy, en fin, el perro del hortelano, etc. Yo no la gozo, ni ha de gozarla ninguno mientras yo viviere. Por eso, váyase de aquí el señor sotasacristán; que por haber tenido y tener respeto a las órdenes que tiene, no le tengo ya rompidos los cascos. (90-91)

Not only does Cristina have no love for the poor Soldier, she refuses to speak to him, to look upon him, she curses his name, and she douses him with the soapy water she uses for cleaning. Thus we learn whence the work gets its title, in the obsessive personality of the Soldier. Apparently, he has taken the phrase "if I can't have her, then no one will!" to heart, as he perpetually stands guard outside her house, in an effort to prevent her cavorting with another suitor. Of course, we know at the outset of the play that his plan is doomed, given the nature of the farce. The folly of the Soldier is to be so obsessed with his own desires that he disregards entirely the wishes of Cristina. In a sense, the Soldier of this play is not all that dissimilar from Cañizares in El viejo celoso, but is perhaps even less rational. Cristina has given him no indication whatsoever that she would ever cede to his desires, yet he is so jealous at the thought of her giving her love to another that he feels compelled to keep watch outside her house to prevent this from occurring. His mad jealousy isn't exclusively directed towards the Sacristan either. When a young man named Andrés, for example, comes asking for oil for his lamp as an offering for St. Lucia, the Soldier gives him four times his typical offering, and tells him not to return in four days, or suffer a severe beating. "…[Y] séale aviso que por cuatro días no vuelva a llegar a esta puerta ni por lumbre, que le romperé las costillas a coces" (93). He also sends away Manuel, a man selling threads to adorn shirts, in similar fashion. In both cases, the men incited further jealousy in the Soldier by affirming Cristina's beauty. These encounters merely serve to further show the inordinate jealousy of the Soldier to the audience, as well as to exemplify how angry he can become over nothing.
Things change slightly with the arrival of a shoemaker, from whom the Soldier seeks to buy shoes, both to offer as a gift to Cristina, as well as to prevent any contact between the shoemaker and Cristina. This scene once again reinforces the Soldier's jealousy, but also shows us how much he is willing to sacrifice for his beloved Cristina. In spite of his poverty, he attempts to offer the shoemaker his toothpick in exchange for the shoes. Since the toothpick is of little or no value, the shoemaker initially refuses, prompting the following words from the Soldier:

SOLDADO. ¡Oh, pecador de mí! No la doy yo sino para recuerdo de mí mismo, porque cuando vaya a echar mano a la faldriquera y no halle la biznaga, me venga a la memoria que la tiene vuestra mereced y vaya luego a quitallla. Sí, a fe de soldado, que no la doy por otra cosa. Pero si no está contento con ella, añadiré esta banda y este antojo, que al buen pagador no le duelen prendas. (95)

These words reveal more about the Soldier than they initially appear to. Though he is extremely poor, the Soldier is still bound by an archaic honor code that no longer really applies. He gives his word as a soldier that he wasn't trying to make a bad deal with Juan Juncos the shoemaker, but rather that the toothpick would serve as a reminder of his debts to Juan. He then offers him a few more trinkets and a refrain to reassure the shoemaker that he wasn't trying to cheat him. We see from this passage that the Soldier still very much values the concept of his word as his bond, and that he still considers himself to be a man of a certain category and standing in spite of his lack of wealth. In this entremés, Cervantes takes up one of his favorite themes, seen also in Don Quixote: titles and concepts of nobility mean almost nothing without the financial capital to back them up.

Upon seeing the Soldiers' poverty, Juan Juncos eventually comes to an agreement with him. He will hold the shoes for him for a couple of days, without selling them to anyone else or making contact with Cristina. Before this agreement is established, however, the Soldier shows that he is more than just a figure representing the braggart soldier. This Soldier is also a poet, albeit
a rather poor one at that. He recites for the shoemaker a gloss on the phrase "chinelas de mis entrañas," stating that he is a famous poet:

Chinelas de mis entrañas.

GLOSA

Es Amor tan gran tirano,
que, olvidado de la fe
que le guardo siempre en vano,
hoy, con la funda de un pie,
da a mi esperanza de mano.

Estas son vuestras hazañas,
fundas pequeñas y hurañas
que ya mi alma imagina
que sois, por ser de Cristina
chinelas de mis entrañas. (96-97)

This deliberately bad poem plays on the double meaning of the word "calzar" at that time, meaning "to consummate the sexual act." He is fixated on the shoes as objects of his love, for belonging to Cristina, but is also reminded of love's great tyranny that always rejects his hope of love with her, in both senses. In spite of the poverty of these octosyllabic verses, the shoemaker remarks, "A mí poco se me entiende de trovas, pero estas me han sonado tan bien que me parecen de Lope, como son todas las cosas que son o parecen buenas" (97). Cervantes takes a stab at his great rival, Lope de Vega. Although the shoemaker speaks innocently, Cervantes clearly does not, in having his character remark that all verses that are or that seem good are by Lope. As we already know, one of Cervantes' favorite literary themes is the difference between el ser y el parecer or appearance and reality. Moreover, to attribute such deliberately bad verse to Lope is clearly a minor affront to him.

113 Chinela: "Calzado de dos o tres suelas, sin talón, que con facilidad se entra y se saca el pie dél" (Covarrubias).

114 In this context, "famoso" probably means meriting of fame rather than actually famous.
It is worth noting that several scholars\textsuperscript{115} have tended to identify the soldier himself with Cervantes because of his own experiences as a poor soldier. Stanislav Zimic,\textsuperscript{116} on the other hand, believes the soldier to be a satire of Lope de Vega's amorous passion for Elena Osorio, rather than a self-portrait. Although there may be some elements of autobiographical details or parody present in the soldier, I don't feel the soldier is meant to be a satire of anyone in particular. Rather, he is a stock character to whom Cervantes adds nuance and complexity by showing both a man whose unrequited love leads to an absurd kind of jealousy, as well as a man who is still bound by principles of honor and military glory that no longer apply in a world increasingly driven by the emergence of new economic forces. This becomes even more apparent in the next scene, where, even after hearing Cristina literally sing the praises of the Sacristan as she does the dishes, the Soldier is still convinced that he has a chance with her. Consequently, he petitions Cristina's amo for her hand in marriage, listing the following qualifications:

\textbf{SOLDADO}. Pues llégrese vuestra merced a esta parte, y tome este envoltorio de papeles, y advierta que ahí dentro van las informaciones de mis servicios, con veinte y dos feos de veinte y dos generales, debajo de cuyos estandartes he servido, amén de otras treinta y cuatro de otros tantos maestres de campo que se han dignado de honrarme con ellas. (98)

The Soldier lists all of his qualifications as a highly decorated combatant to persuade the Amo to favor him, with his numerous votes of confidence from generals. But Cristina's Amo doesn't understand what all these honors mean, and they are more or less meaningless to him. He remarks, "¿[D]e qué sirve darme cuenta desto?" and later, "Hasta agora, ninguna cosa me importa a mí estas relaciones que vuestra merced me da" (99). The Soldier is in complete disbelief that none of his honors or accolades are of any particular worth to the head of household:

\textsuperscript{115} See for example Cotarelo y Valledor, 635-6 or more recently, García Lorenzo, 171-180.
\textsuperscript{116} Zimic (1992), 337-353.
SOLDADO. Pues yo sé que le han de importar, siendo Dios servido.
AMO. ¿En qué manera?
SOLDADO. En que, por fuerza, si no se cae el cielo, tengo de salir proveído en una destas plazas, y quiero casarme agora con Cristinica. Y siendo yo su marido, puede vuesa merced hacer de mi persona y de mi mucha hacienda como de cosa propia [sic], que no tengo de mostrarme desagradecido a la crianza que vuesa merced ha hecho a mi querida y amada consorte.
AMO. Vuesa merced lo ha de los cascos más que de otra parte.
SOLDADO. Pues, ¿sabe cuánto le va, señor dulce? Que me la ha de entregar luego luego, o no ha de atravesar los umbrales de su casa.
AMO. ¿Hay tal disparate? ¿Y quién ha de ser bastante para quitarme que no entre en mi casa? (99-100)

The Soldier continues to insist that his honors should be of sufficient merit to ask for Cristina's hand in marriage, stating that a man of his category would be an asset to the head of household's estate. But the Amo cares nothing for his petitions, stating that he can clearly see he is dealing with a madman. This then prompts the Soldier to declare that he will not allow the man to enter into his own house until he gives Cristina over to him. Fortunately for the head of household, the Sotacristán Pasillas returns at this juncture, accompanied by Grajales, another sacristan, marking the next major transition of the short play.

Pasillas returns armed with un tapador de tinaja y una espada muy mohosa and Grajales comes bearing un morrón y una vara o palo, atado a él un rabo de zorra (100), according to the stage direction. This lid of this clay pot or urn is meant to be a mock shield, and the moss covering the swords shows that it hasn't been used in ages. The old military helmet with a visor and the stick with a fox tail attached are meant to be the "weapons" for the soldier, for him to engage in his duel with the sacristan. Clearly Pasillas and Grajales are mocking the Soldier's notion of "honor" and the Quixotic notion that he is ready to fight for his love. The Soldier takes great offense at their mockery, exclaiming, "¡Cobarde!, ¿a mí con rabo de zorra? ¿Es notarme de Autoridades. Cf. ed. Baras Escolá, p. 62, n. 93 and the corresponding note on p. 395.
borracho, o piensas que estás quitando el polvo a alguna imagen de bulto?" (100). As Baras Escolá explains, the female foxtail was used to clean statues, but could also be used to allude to someone being a drunk. Grajales maliciously responds to the soldier, "No pienso sino que estoy ojeando los mosquitos de una tinaja de vino," implying that the soldier is indeed a drunk (he is the wine jug).

As the Soldier is once again about to come to blows with the Sacristan, with the Amo mitigating the dispute and trying to separate them, the women make an entrance on the scene. Indeed, although the female characters of this play are not as sophisticated as those in several of Cervantes' other works, they nevertheless show a greater degree of agency than might be expected from characters of this genre. As the Amo and his wife discuss what the dispute was all about, he makes it clear to her that all the fuss was over Cristina. The Master's wife, simply named "Ella" in the cast listing, asks Cristina if either of the two men has dishonored her. Cristina, being relatively naïve, misinterprets the word "dishonor" in an overly literal sense meaning simply "insult or injury" whereas Cristina's Señora was actually asking if either of the two had deflowered her. This leads to a comic misunderstanding and some scandalous dialogue between the two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRISTINA</th>
<th>El sacristán me deshonró el otro día cuando fui al Rastro.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELLA.</td>
<td>¿Cuántas veces te he dicho yo, señor, que no saliese esta muchacha fuera de casa, que ya era grande y no convenía apartarla de nuestra vista? ¿Qué dirá ahora su padre, que nos la entregó limpia de polvo y de paja? – Y ¿dónde te llevó, traidora, para deshonnarte?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRISTINA.</td>
<td>A ninguna parte, sino allí, en mitad de la calle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLA.</td>
<td>¿Cómo en mitad de la calle?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRISTINA.</td>
<td>Allí, en mitad de la calle de Toledo, a vista de Dios y de todo el mundo, me llamó de sucia y de deshonesto, de poca vergüenza y menos miramiento, y otros muchos baldones deste jaez. Y todo por estar celoso de aquel soldado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMO.</td>
<td>Luego, ¿no ha pasado otra cosa entre ti ni él, sino esa deshonor que en la calle te hizo?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

118 Ed. Baras Escolá, p. 63, n. 97 & p. 395-6; The stick with a foxtail did have legitimate military uses as a crop for a horse, but that is not how it is being used here.
The misunderstanding between Cristina and her Ama leads the latter to believe that the Sacristan had his way with Cristina in the middle of the very crowded butcher district, right in plain view. Cristina clarifies that she merely meant that the Sacristan verbally insulted her for giving any hope to the Soldier, before giving her a written formal declaration of his intention to marry her. These "cédulas", as Baras Escolá's footnote explains,\(^{119}\) were quite important prior to the Council of Trent's prohibition of marriage in secret, since they were the only way to prove that a man had indeed given his word of intention to marry a woman. Thus, by giving her this formal written promise, the Sacristan is trying to do right by Cristina, and make his intentions of marrying her formal. This scene is also very important in the context of the play. Cervantes focuses a lot of attention even in this short comic work upon the importance of human agency, and of a marriage only being proper and good when the two individuals in question agree to the covenant of marriage of their own volition, and free from coercion. We have already seen what Cervantes thinks of mismatched marriages, or marriages forged upon an initial deceit in both *El juez de los divorcios* and *El viejo celoso*. In this play, Cervantes makes it abundantly clear that both Cristina and the Sacristan enter into the decision to marry one another of their own free will. Hence, at the end of this play, we have every reason to believe their union will be a happy one (for everyone involved except the Soldier, that is).

The idea of marriage for love between two well-matched individuals was somewhat of a literary fiction in the time period, in the sense that marriage was still predominantly a financial

\(^{119}\) Ed., p. 65, n. 112.
arrangement, as far as the law of the day was concerned. But Erasmus and other humanistic thinkers had started to question severely the ideas of arranged marriages, proposing instead the possibility of marriage for love, and stressing the importance of individuals being well suited to one another in order to achieve a harmonious union. Indeed, Cervantes' *Entremeses* examined collectively would almost seem to suggest that he didn't consider a marriage truly legitimate unless entered into with equal agreement of both parties involved, without coercion from their parents or families.

The Sacristan's actual *cédula de matrimonio* shows his clear intentions to marry Cristina, as the Amo reads: "Digo yo, Lorenzo Pasillas, sotasacristán desta parroquia, que quiero bien, y muy bien, a la señora Cristina de Parraces. Y en fee desta verdad, le di esta, firmada de mi nombre, deste presente año de mil y seiscientos y once. Testigos, mi corazón, mi entendimiento, mi voluntad y mi memoria" (103). Of course, this was a secret marriage oath, hence his listing his heart, understanding, will, and memory as his witnesses. To add to his sincerity, the Sacristán also assures the *Amo* that he would very willingly marry her, even if it meant losing the three thousand maravedís of rent that his grandmother would have given him had he continued to pursue his religious studies to become a *capellán de iglesias*. After this declaration, the *Amo* asks Cristina if she wishes to marry, and she confirms that she does, at which point he asks her to choose between these two suitors. Although she is initially embarrassed, her Ama tells her not to be, "porque el comer y el casar ha de ser a gusto propio, y no a voluntad ajena" (104). Cervantes reiterates here a central theme throughout this play of choice and free will when it comes to marriage.

At this juncture, both parties give their final pleas to Cristina, before she makes her decision.

*SOLDADO.* Niña, échame el ojo, mira mi garbo. Soldado soy, castellano pienso ser;
brío tengo de corazón; soy el más galán hombre del mundo. Y por el hilo deste vestidillo, podrás sacar ovillo de mi gentileza.

SACRISTÁN. Cristina, yo soy músico, aunque de campanas; porque adornar una tumba y colgar una iglesia para fiestas solenes, ningún sacristán me puede llevar ventaja. Y estos oficios bien los puedo ejercitar casado y ganar de comer como un príncipe. (104-105)

The Soldier and the Sacristan stay relatively consistent with what they have stated as their virtues before. The soldier relies upon his honor, his elegance, and his firm resolve, whereas the Sacristan reassures Cristina that although he may not go into the religious order, he can continue to earn quite a bit of money by playing the bells, and by adorning the tombs and the church for religious festivals and solemn occasions. In other words, the Soldier still relies upon his "honor" and the fact that he is, in his mind, a man of category and distinction. But these are immaterial things, and as the Sacristan is more aware, being able to provide for Cristina is more important. Hence, he relies on the financial aspect, providing assurance that he will be able to maintain a comfortable source of income. Although it was not uncommon in entremeses for criadas and fregonas to prefer sacristanes, it is nevertheless significant how each of the two men defend their virtues, and that in the end, Cristina goes for the one who's economic situation is more stable. Of course, this is not, by any means, the only reason she chose him. As we saw earlier, she fancied the Sacristan in the first place, and was quite irritated with the Soldier for his intrusive behavior.

The play ends with the expected arrival of musicians, and a song and dance celebrating the news of the union of Cristina and the Sacristan. The song centers on the chorus, "Que donde hay fuerza de hecho, se pierde cualquier derecho." Baras Escolá notes that "es refrán escasamente conocido;"¹²⁰ this affirmation notwithstanding, the meaning of this "might does not make right" refrain seems clear from context in this play. The central theme that has been repeated time and

¹²⁰ Ed., 67, n. 123.
time again is that of free will in the compact of marriage, entered into without coercion. Earlier, we saw how the Soldier, completely ignoring Cristina's disdain for him, attempted to win the favor of her Amo, hoping that this Amo might give Cristina over to him. The Sacristán, on the other hand, made a petition directly to Cristina in the first place, and although he was irritated with her for even acknowledging the Soldier, he ultimately left the choice up to her from the beginning. The Soldier, with his cautious vigilance, attempted to prevent Cristina from coming into contact with other suitors. But in the end, he merely alienated her by trying to impose his own will by force, rather than actually caring about her own thoughts in the matter.

It is also noteworthy that in this play, the Soldier and the Sacristan sing the closing verses, each getting an equal amount of lines:

SOLDADO. Siempre escogen las mujeres aquello que vale menos, porque excede su mal gusto a cualquier merecimien
to. Ya no se estima el valor, porque se estima el dinero, pues un sacristán prefieren a un roto soldado lego. Mas no es mucho que ¿quién vio que fue su voto tan necio que a sagrado se acogiese, que es de delincuentes puerto? Que donde hay fuerza de hecho, etc.

SACRISTÁN. Como es propio [sic] de un soldado (que es solo en los años viejo y se halla sin un cuarto porque ha dejado su tercio) imaginar que se puede pretendiente de Gaiferos, conquistado por lo bravo lo que yo por manso adquiero, no me afrentan tus razones, pues has perdido en el juego. Que siempre un picado tiene licencia para hacer fieros. Que donde hay fuerza de hecho, etc. (105-106)
These final verses not only clarify the central conclusion of the play, that we have been suggesting all along, but also serve to reinforce the differences between the perspectives of the two protagonists. Whereas the Soldier shows a misogynistic disdain for the decision-making powers of women, and laments that valor is no longer valued, accusing Cristina of making her decision purely based on money, the Sacristan laughs at the antiquated values of the impoverished Soldier. He accuses the Soldier of being without money for having abandoned his services using a play on words "se halla sin cuarto porque ha dejado su tercio," and also mocks his quixotic conception of winning over a woman's heart through heroic acts of bravery (Gaiferos was a hero of the Romancero Carolingio that saves his wife Melisendra from the moors). He contrasts the Soldier's brashness and bravado with his own, more gentle demeanor, "conquistado por lo bravo, /lo que yo por manso adquiero." The Sacristan has won the game without the need to resort to force or violence, by using his wits and his economic advantage, he has won the hand of Cristina. He remarks, finally, that he doesn't take the Soldier's final declarations as an affront to his person, and that it is the Soldier's right to be angry, as he has lost.

As we have seen, there are two prevailing themes at play within this short farce. One is the idea that free choice is essential in the covenant of marriage, and the other, that in the end, money and finances matter more than abstract concepts of honor, status and elegance with nothing material to back them up. Both male protagonists fall victim to their feelings of jealousy, but it is the way they handle these feelings that matters. The soldier, using brute force, seeks to coerce Cristina to marry him, irrespective of her feelings in the matter, by preventing any other potential suitors from reaching her, and by asking her master for his favor in seeking her hand in marriage.

In contrast, while the Sacristan's jealousy prompts him to hurl insults at Cristina at first, he is nevertheless more rational than the soldier: he formally proclaims his love to her, and attempts to persuade her that he is the better choice, but ultimately leaves the choice up to her.

What we see here, and what Cory Reed has observed along similar lines, is a difference not only in attitudes towards marriage, but also in attitudes about society at large between the two male protagonists of this play. The Soldier, who is consumed by his bravado, and by medieval notions of military honor, rank, and arranged marriage, is unable to fathom that his rejection by Cristina might not have to do with money alone. In contrast, the Sacristan shows greater concern for Cristina's feelings, and clearly understands better how to operate within a newly emerging economic order. In this sense, the play is also about brain vs. brawn in the quest to win Cristina's heart, and brains win decisively.

Considering this farce in the light of the two stories of cuckoldry we examined previously, it becomes apparent there that both kinds of character flaws are at play here, that is to say, both overweening jealousy and self-deception. On the one hand, the soldier is so jealous that he doesn't wish to permit anyone to enter the house, for fear that Cristina might be stolen away from him. In this regard, he is like Cañizares from El viejo celoso. But on the other hand, even though Cristina makes it abundantly clear to him throughout the entremés that she has absolutely no interest in him, the Soldier continues to believe he has a chance with her. In this sense, he is like Pancracio, with his boundless capacity for self-deception. With the surprisingly nuanced Soldier of this play, Cervantes shows us a character that is driven by an all-consuming jealousy, and at the same time has a remarkable capacity to deceive himself, hoping against all hope that he will prevail, in his choice for marriage. Both of these character flaws ultimately make the Sacristan a better choice, even though he himself is far from perfect.
4. THE ENTREMESIS PART III - THE WORLD OF ROGUES

The remaining three Cervantine interludes deal with elements and themes from another major literary genre: the picaresque. It is worth noting that this is the only popular narrative genre of Cervantes' time that he never cultivated in its traditional form, although its influence is clearly felt in some of his Novelas Ejemplares like "La Gitanilla" and "Rinconete y Cortadillo," as well as in aspects of the Quijote (the Ginés de Pasamonte/ Maese Pedro and Roque Guinarte episodes), and finally, in theatrical works such as El rufián dichoso, Pedro de Urdemalas, and the three entremeses addressed in this chapter. Two of these three plays (El vizcaíno fingido and El retablo de las maravillas), center on a deception, a trick played by a pair of rogues on one or more of the other characters, whereas El rufián viudo llamado Trampagos is another kind of affair altogether, in which Cervantes utilizes elements of elegiac poetry, completely inverting the register, the world, and the intended audience. In these plays of tricksters living by their wits, hustling and surviving at other people's expense, Cervantes not only gives us a glimpse of the criminal underworld of his era, but also enters into a social critique not common in the works of his contemporaries. In order to study this aspect of these plays, it will be instructive to begin with the least thematically complex and the most conventional of them, El vizcaíno fingido, to give a better sense of what the standard expected form for this kind of interlude would have been, and then to contrast it with Cervantes' other two entries in this genre, which much more radically depart from the expected format.

122 Ginés de Pasamonte is the famous thief who appears in DQ I, XXII, and in DQ II, XXVI-XXVII disguised as the puppeteer Maese Pedro. There has been some speculation that Ginés de Pasamonte might be inspired by the real-life rogue Jerónimo de Pasamonte, who, like Cervantes, was a soldier that fought in Lepanto, and whom Cervantes may have met while captive in Algiers from 1575-1580. See DQI, XXII, 264, n. 46. As we discussed in the preceding chapter (p. 86, n. 91), the robin-hood-like Catalan outlaw Perot Roqueguinarda, appears as Roque Guinart appears in DQ II, LX-LXI.
*El vizcaíno fingido* is fundamentally a play about the folly in presuming to know more than you in fact do. Two hustlers, Solórzano and Quiñones, scheme to trick Cristina, a local know-it-all prostitute, and expose the folly of her self-importance:

**SOLÓRZANO.** Estas son las bolsas, y a lo que parecen, son bien parecidas, y las cadenas que van dentro, ni más ni menos. No hay sino que vos acudáis con mi intento. Que a pesar de la taimería desta sevillana, ha de quedar esta vez burlada.

**QUIÑONES.** ¿Tanta honra se adquiere o tanta habilidad se muestra en engañar a una mujer, que lo tomáis con tanto ahínco y ponéis tanta solicitud en ello?

**SOLÓRZANO.** Cuando las mujeres son como estas, es gusto el burlallas; cuanto más, que esta burla no ha de pasar de los tejados arriba; quiero decir que ni ha de ser con ofensa de Dios ni con daño de la burlada; que no son burlas las que redundan en desprecio ajeno. (109)

These opening lines are very significant, as we the audience are, in a certain sense, just as blind to the exact moment when the deception takes place as Cristina herself. We know simply that the tricksters plan to swap a gold chain of value that they will place in Cristina's custody with a near worthless one plated with gold or false gold, and then accuse her of stealing the original chain. The exact moment when the switch takes place, however, isn't entirely clear. Were it not for this opening conversation between Solórzano and Quiñones, the audience would be almost as much in the dark about the intended trick as Cristina herself. Additionally, this introduction makes clear that the nature of the trick played by Solórzano and Quiñones has no malice behind it. As Solórzano states, their trick should neither offend God nor do harm to their intended target. Their purpose is not to humiliate, but rather, to instill humility in this prideful woman. Thus, from the outset of this interlude, Cervantes handles what would certainly be misogynistic subject matter in the hand of his contemporaries much more delicately, and without the characteristic violence and ridicule we might expect in this kind of play. Even his theatrical agents, the characters Solórzano
and Quiñones, seek to instruct with their prank, rather than simply to have a laugh at someone else's expense. Cervantes surely sought to do the same with his audience.

The next entrance presents us with the characters of Cristina and Brígada, the two female "protagonists." It is perhaps worth noting that although the characters in question are prostitutes, this interaction curiously does pass the famous Bechdel-Wallace test well known amongst contemporary feminist critics: there are two female characters, speaking to one another about something other than a man. Brígada makes her entrance in a panic, seeking Cristina's council, as something awful has happened. In enumerating the misfortunes that have NOT befallen her, Brígada reassures Cristina that her husband (who we later learn has not yet married her) has NOT returned to town, nor has she had her jewels stolen, nor has her mother died, nor has she had a terrible vision. What has happened is "worse," as Brigada explains:

BRÍGADA. Has de saber, hermana, que, viniendo agora a verte, al pasar por la puerta de Guadalajara, oí que, en medio de infinita justicia y gente, estaba un pregonero pregonando que quitaban los coches y que las mujeres descubriesen los rostros por las calles.

CRISTINA. ¿Y esa es la mala nueva?

BRÍGADA. Pues para nosotras, ¿puede ser peor en el mundo?

CRISTINA. Yo creo, hermana, que debe de ser alguna reformación de los coches, que no es posible que los quiten de todo punto. Y será cosa muy acertada, porque, según he oído decir, andaba muy de caída la caballería en España, porque se empanaban diez o doce caballeros mozos en un coche y azotaban las calles de noche y de día, sin acordarseles que había caballos y jineta en el mundo. Y como les falte la comodidad de las galeras de la tierra, que son los coches, volverán al ejercicio de la caballería con quien sus antepasados se honraron. (110-111)

---

123 In the annotation to the play in his edition of the Entremeses, Alfredo Baras Escolá comments extensively on the significance of the names of the prostitutes here, taken from Santa Brígada, the widow and Santa Cristina, the virgin, celebrated the 23rd and 24th of July, respectively, and after the day of Mary Magdalene. See ed. Baras Escolá, 413.

124 This test for the active presence of women in literature, films and other media is credited to American cartoonist Alison Bechdel and her close friend and associate Liz Wallace.
In his edition, Jean Canavaggio explains that Brígada is alluding to the *Premática acerca de las personas que se prohiben andar en coche* of the 3rd of January, 1611. He clarifies that this law stipulated that "ninguna mujer que públicamente fuera mala de su cuerpo y ganare por ello" pudiera andar en coche, "ni carroza, ni en litera ni silla." Spadaccini clarifies, following Schevill & Bonilla, that Phillip III reiterated in 1610 the prohibition of women having their faces covered in public, first implemented by his father, Philip II in 1586. Essentially, what Brígada is complaining about is that this prohibition of women having their faces covered and being forbidden from riding in carriages was very detrimental to women of her profession. Typically, carriages were used by prostitutes both because of their mobility and because riding with their faces covered afforded them anonymity, so that they might dissimulate their true profession better in public (people passing by might simply think that the carriage belonged to some lesser noblewoman and not take notice). The humor in this scene derives from the fact that Brígada has a very simple, but yet practical complaint against this new law, because it will hurt their financial gains. Cristina, on the other hand, rather than simply agreeing with Brígada, is determined to show her "erudition" by making an elaborate case in favor of this law. Cristina argues instead that driving carriages was causing men to get too comfortable, and to lose their skill in horseback riding with short reins. Therefore, the prohibition of the carriages will be beneficial, she argues, to restoring Spaniard's prowess in equestrianism. Brígada tries twice more to persuade Cristina that the prohibition is a negative thing (once with rational argument and once with an emotional appeal to the joy of riding in a carriage), and twice more Cristina rebuffs her with pseudo learned arguments. First, when Brígada admits that some carriages will be permitted, but only those that aren't rented or borrowed

---

125 Ed. Jean Canavaggio, 168.
126 Ed. Nicholas Spadaccini, p. 195, n. 11.
and those that don't contain women of their profession, Cristina retorts with an argument about the
prowess of the Spanish infantry over its mounted forces (implying that they are better off on foot),
and that with their faces uncovered, they are more free to show off their natural gifts, and their
"clients" won't be able to complain about having been tricked, since they have already seen their
faces:

CRISTINA. Ese mal nos hagan; porque has de saber, hermana, que está en
opinión, entre los que siguen la guerra, cuál es mejor, la caballería o la
infantería, y hase averiguado que la infantería española lleva la gala a todas
las naciones. Y agora podremos las alegres mostrar a pie nuestra gallardía,
nuestro garbo y nuestra bizarría, y más, yendo descubiertos los rostros,
quitando la ocasión de que ninguno se llame a engaño si nos sirviese, pues
nos ha visto. (111)

Brigada's third appeal to Cristina consists of a declaration that carriage riding is a wonderful thing,
and makes her feel like a principal woman, to which Cristina admonishes her, pointing out that it
is a good thing that they are banning coaches, since it is important for women such as themselves
to know their place in society, and not to be overtaken by vainglory:

CRISTINA. ¿Veis, doña Brigada, como tengo yo razón en decir que ha sido bien quitar
los coches, siqueira por quitarnos a nosotras el pecado de la vanagloria? Y
más, que no era bien que un coche igualase a las no tales con las tales. Pues
viendo los ojos estranjeros a una persona en un coche pomposa por galas,
reluciente por joyas, echaría a perder la cortesía, haciéndosela a ella como
si fuera a una principal señora. (112)

Cristina speaks here of the fact that not only could prostitutes be mistaken for principal
women, but the reverse as well. In this way, the carriages had a kind of equalizing effect in
disguising the social class and category of their occupants. Cervantes, with his typical irony,
juxtaposes both kinds of women (those of the court and the other kind of courtesan). Although the
scene is on the surface fairly simplistic, there are slightly deeper subtleties at play. It becomes
evident in this scene that Cristina fancies herself a higher class of prostitute. Because of her
intelligence, keeping up with current events, and understanding the society of her time, Cristina
thinks that she is ahead of the curve, and attempts to show her superiority in argumentation to Brigada. Leaving aside the comedy involved in having a prostitute lecture to another about what is "proper" or "right" in their society, there is another curious juxtaposition. We have the two prostitutes contrasted with noble women in this passage, as well as with each other. At first glance, Cristina not only appears to be more sophisticated than Brígada, but she believes herself to be so as well. She lectures Brígada about the vainglory of riding in carriages, when ironically, her own vainglory will be her undoing.

When Solórzano bursts on the scene, he presents Cristina with his "scheme" to con a credulous Biscayan friend of his out of a valuable gold chain. The audience already knows his "Biscayan" friend to be none other than Quiñones, his partner in crime, and that the real trick is about to befall Cristina. Solórzano tries to persuade Cristina that the "Biscayan" is incredibly generous when drunk, and is particularly fond of women, such that it will be easy to persuade him to give them whatever they desire. Solórzano begins by tempting her with the valuable gold chain (the real one):

SOLÓZANO. Y para principio, traigo aquí a vuesa merced esta cadena en este bolsillo, que pesa ciento y veinte escudos de oro, la cual tomará vuesa merced y me dará diez escudos agora, que yo he menester para ciertas cosillas, y gastará otros veinte en una cena esta noche, que vendrá acá nuestro burro o nuestro búfalo, que le llevo yo por el naso, como dicen. Y a dos idas y venidas, se quedará vuesa merced con toda la cadena, que yo no quiero más de los diez escudos de ahora. (114)

Cristina, not being a fool, is naturally suspicious of the generosity of this man whom she has just met, stating "si he de decir lo que siento, tanta liberalidad me tiene algo confusa y algún tanto sospechosa" and "[P]odrá ser esta cadena de alquimia. Que se suele decir que no es oro todo lo que reluce" (115). Once again, Cristina shows some wisdom here, but nevertheless allows herself to be fooled. Although the chain she is handed is, in fact, the real one, the possibility of the chain
being switched on her later doesn't occur to her. To gain her confidence, Solórzano allows her to take the chain to a neighbor, who is a silversmith, to confirm its value. After the silversmith confirms that the gold chain is indeed worth "ciento cincuenta escudos de oro," Cristina's confidence has been won over. No longer wary of treachery, she lets her guard down, and allows herself to be blinded by the desire for profit.

Upon Solórzano's return, the audience is privy to a scene in which Brígada and Solórzano discuss the possibility of him serving as an intermediary, to find a "client" who might be interested in her services:

BRÍGADA. Señor don Solórzano, ¿no tendrá vuesa merced por ahí algún mondadientes para mí? Que en verdad no soy para desechar, y que tengo yo tan buenas entradas y salidas en mi casa como la señora doña Cristina. Que a no temer que nos oyera alguna, le dijera yo al señor Solórzano más de cuatro tachas suyas: que sepa que tiene las tetas como dos alforjas vacías, y que no le huele muy bien el aliento, porque se afeita mucho. Y con todo eso, la buscan, solicitan y quieren. Que estoy por arañarme esta cara, más de rabia que de envidia, porque no hay quien me dé la mano, entre tantos que me dan del pie. En fin, la ventura de las feas. (119)

Brígada complains that in spite of Cristina's bad breath and saggy breasts, she is solicited far more often. This aside to Solórzano in the absence of Cristina serves two purposes in the play: on the one hand, it highlights the apparent differences in category between Cristina and Brígada, and on the other hand, it sets up Brígada's hypocrisy slightly later, when she tells Cristina that she was praising her to Solórzano, when in reality, she was doing just the opposite. Although Brígada claims she is not jealous of Cristina, it seems clear from this and the earlier scene that she does resent her. She feels that Cristina is afforded a more privileged position as a result of her wit and
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127 Solórzano earlier stated its value at "ciento y veinte escudos de oro" (114). This has led some critics to wonder if it is an error on the part of Cervantes, or another slight of hand. See Cotarelo y Valledor, p. 628. I suspect that it is merely an indication that the platero is overcharging for his wares, since he states "esta cadena he tenido yo en mis manos muchas veces, y sé que pesa ciento y cincuenta escudos de oro de a veinte y dos quilates" (117-18).
charm, but that it is a position that isn't entirely deserved, and is irritated that, in spite of being better looking than Cristina, she doesn't have as good fortune.\footnote{128}{Pérez de León (222-224) has already commented extensively on the rivalry between these two women.}

Solórzano departs, and returns shortly thereafter with Quiñones in the guise of the titular false Biscayan.\footnote{129}{Jean Canavaggio remarks on Cervantes inheriting the Biscayan as a credulous, easily fooled archetypal figure from Lope de Rueda. Here, however, Cervantes completely inverts this archetype, as Quiñones is not a Biscayan, and it is he who is tricking the ordinarily not-so-credulous Cristina. Unfortunately, we have no direct basis for comparison with Rueda's Biscayan figures, as none of his entremeses about vizcaínos have been preserved. See Canavaggio (1977), 202.} Even in the script, Cervantes alternates between referring to the character as "Vizcaíno" and "Quiñones," thereby reinforcing his dual role in this scene, that isn't completely disguised by his mannerisms and made-up speech. In chapter 1 of this study, the language that Quiñones uses here was addressed briefly. Suffice it to say, his "Biscayan" dialect is so transparently false that no one who heard him speak in that time period would have believed unquestioningly that he was from the Basque country, so that part of the comedy of the scene derives from the ignorance of the two prostitutes, who are completely incapable of detecting the falseness of his manner of speech, and who understand him only with great pains. It seems fairly clear that Cervantes deliberately cultivated a speech style for this character that would have been transparently false to the audience of his day, but in order to ensure that his audience follow the dialogue with ease, he nevertheless has Solórzano "translate" the false Biscayan's tongue.\footnote{130}{See chapter 1, pp. 32-33 of this study for the opening lines of their dialogue and an analysis.} The "Biscayan" promises the gold chain will be Cristina's so long as they provide him with their company and a good meal. During their brief meal, a lot of the comedy has to do with double-entendres, and poking fun at the hypocrisy and ignorance of the two prostitutes:

CRISTINA. Bien puede comer el señor vizcaíno, y sin asco; que todo cuanto hay en esta casa es la quintaesencia de la limpieza.
Cristina's remark that "everything in the house is the quintessence of cleanliness" is quite ironic, considering that she and Brígada are prostitutes. This is the third time in the play where the prostitutes have prided themselves on their cleanliness, as earlier, Cristina had advised Brígada, "no debes congojarte, sino acomoda tu brío y tu limpieza..." (112) and later, Brígada (falsely) told Cristina about what she had said to Solórzano, "También le dije como vas muy limpia, muy linda, y muy agraciada, y que toda eras ámbar, almizcle y algalia entre algodones" (121). In addition to the ridiculousness of two prostitutes priding themselves on their cleanliness (particularly in the time period), Brígada once again shows how impressed she is with the way in which the "Biscayan" speaks, even though she has no idea what he is saying. Although these remarks on her part show her ignorance, they also reinforce the general idea of appearances being deceptive, and that what matters is not how something sounds but what it actually means. Something can have all the pretense and appearance of being "high class," but what really matters is its actual nature. This could be said of both the prostitutes in their carriage (who might be mistaken for nobles) as well as of Solórzano and Quiñones (in presenting themselves as men of distinction). Solórzano and Quiñones are well aware of what Cristina and Brígada truly are, but the reverse cannot be said. Indeed, there is a terrible irony in Cristina and Brígada's lack of self-awareness as well, which ultimately results in the hubris that allows Cristina to believe herself the trickster, when she is in fact the one being tricked.
After Solórzano takes the false Biscayan home, claiming that he has had much to drink and that he must now sleep off his drunkeness, Cristina and Brígada are left alone to discuss their plans. Once again, Brígada shows a little resentment towards Cristina for her seemingly constant good fortune:

BRÍGADA. Amiga Cristina, muéstrame esa cadena y déjame dar con ella dos filos al deseo. ¡Ay, qué linda, qué nueva, qué reluciente y qué barata! Digo, Cristina, que, sin saber cómo ni cómo no, llueven los bienes sobre ti y se te entra la ventura por las puertas sin solicitarla. En efeto, eres venturosa sobre las venturosas. Pero todo lo merece tu desenfado, tu limpieza y tu magnífico término, hechizos bastantes a rendir las más descuidadas y esentas voluntades. Y no como yo, que no soy para dar migas a un gato. Toma tu cadena, hermana, que estoy para reventar en lágrimas, y no de envidia que a ti te tengo, sino de lástima que me tengo a mi. (124)

This is the second time in the play when Brígada has made this kind of declaration to Cristina. Much like the first time, her denial that she is the slightest bit jealous only seems to reinforce the fact that she is, in fact, quite jealous of Cristina's luck, and that she doesn't entirely believe Cristina deserves it (as we already saw when she was talking to Solórzano alone earlier). Brígada's praise of all of Cristina's attributes here, therefore, is entirely false and hypocritical, and makes us wonder if she hopes that she might gain something out of it by flattering Cristina, putting herself down, and in the process get Cristina to take pity on her and share some of her financial gains. But no sooner does Brígada employ this tactic than the tricksters return, ready to spring their trap, to prove that the apparent differences between Brígada and Cristina aren't perhaps so great as they initially appear.

Solórzano returns, informing Cristina of a great difficulty that requires him to ask for the chain to be returned to him:

131 In reality, Quiñones has not had much to drink at all, prompting Brígada to remark with deliberate irony, "¡Pues monta que ha bebido mucho! La mayor lástima es ésta que he visto en mi vida. ¡Miren qué mocedad y qué borrachera!" (123).
SOLÓRZANO. A la vuelta desta calle, yendo a la casa, encontramos con un criado del padre de nuestro vizcaínio, el cual trae cartas y nuevas de que su padre queda a punto de espirar, y le manda que al momento se parta, si quiere hallarle vivo. Trae dinero para la partida, que sin duda ha de ser luego. Yo le he tomado diez escudos para vuesa merced, y velos aquí, con los diez que vuesa merced me dio denantes, y vuélvase la cadena. Que si el padre vive, el hijo volverá a darla o yo no seré don Esteban de Solórzano. (124-25)

Since the ailing father of the "Biscayan" requires the chain returned to him before he departs, Cristina understands that she has no choice but to return the valuable item. The audience is of course aware that there is no relative, and that the entire story is a fabrication. But Solórzano's apparent desperation is enough to catch Cristina off guard, and she immediately returns the chain, prompting the following exchange:

SOLÓRZANO. Señora Cristina, al perro viejo nunca tus, tus; estas tretas, con los de las galleruzas, y con este perro a otro hueso.
CRISTINA. ¿Para qué son tantos refranes, señor Solórzano?
SOLÓRZANO. Para que entienda vuesa merced que la codicia rompe el saco. ¿Tan presto se desconfió de mi palabra, que quiso vuesa merced curarse en salud y salir al lobo al camino como la gansa de Cantipalos [sic]? Señora Cristina, señora Cristina, lo bien ganado se pierde, y lo malo, ello y su dueño. Venga mi cadena verdadera, y tómese vuesa merced su falsa, que no ha de haber conmigo transformaciones de Ovidio en tan pequeño espacio. ¡Oh hideputa, y qué bien que la amoldaron, y qué presto!
CRISTINA. ¿Qué dice vuesa merced, señor mío, que no le entiendo?
SOLÓRZANO. Digo que no es esta la cadena que yo dejé a vuesa merced, aunque le parece, que esta es de alquimia, y la otro de oro de a veinte y dos quilates. (125-26)

Cervantes has Solórzano muddle and distort various refrains, throwing in allusions to high-culture (such as Ovid's *Metamorphosis*) and the most common folk wisdom alike. The irony of course is that the trickster deviously accuses his victim of trying to trick him, catching Cristina completely off guard. What we have here is a complete inversion of the seemingly wise, suspicious Cristina
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132 See chapter 1, pp. 43-44 of the present study for a more detailed analysis of the language of this scene.
earlier in the play, when she herself remarked that not all that glitters is gold, and wanted proof of the authenticity of the gold chain.

In Cristina's ensuing panic, she cries out for divine justice to free her from the false testimony brought against her, "¡Justicia de Dios, si tal testimonio se me levantase!" (126), but Solórzano would rather deal with the actual authorities, knowing they will take his side, as Cristina promptly confirms "Si a las manos del Corregidor llega este negocio, yo me doy por condenada. Que tiene de mí tan mal concepto, que ha de tener mi verdad por mentira y mi virtud por vicio" (127). When the Alguacil shows up to resolve the conflict, Cristina knows she has no hope of getting out of this affair unscathed, given her reputation and her profession, even though she is innocent of the crime of which Solórzano has accused her:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALGUACIL.</th>
<th>SOLÓRZANO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿Que voces son estas, qué gritos, qué lagrimas y qué maldiciones?</td>
<td>Vuesa merced, señor alguacil, ha venido aquí como de molde. A esta señora del rumbo sevillano le empeñé una cadena, habrá una hora, en diez ducados, para cierto efecto. Vuelvo agora a desempeñarla y, en lugar de una que le di, que pesaba ciento y cincuenta ducados de oro de veinte y dos quilates, me vuelve esta de alquimia, que no vale dos ducados. Y quere poner mi justicia a la venta de la zarza, a voces y a gritos, sabiendo que será testgo desta verdad esta misma señora, ante quien ha pasado todo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BRÍGADA.  ¡Y ¿cómo si ha pasado, y aun repasado! Y en Dios y en mi ánima, que estoy por decir que este señor tiene razón. Aunque no puedo imaginar dónde se pueda haber hecho el trueco, porque la cadena no ha salido de aquesta sala. (127)

Curiously, Cervantes doesn't make explicit in this scene either to the audience or the performers the exact moment when the switch is supposed to take place, or indeed, who performs the swap of the two gold chains, so in a certain sense, we are just as much in the dark as to how the real gold chain could have left the house as Cristina is.133 Brigada gives us a clue, however, that the swap
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133 Manuel José García, in his edition of the play, remarks "no es fácil averiguar cómo y cuándo se da semejante cambio" (166-167; n. to p. 74). While it could potentially be seen as a flaw that the play doesn't specify the exact moment the switch takes place, it also highlights Solórzano's
had to have been done very recently (indeed, even after she herself examined the chain), because the chain probably didn't leave the room, but in fact, is still in Solórzano's grasp. In all probability, he pocketed the chain the minute Cristina returned it to him, pretended to examine it (really examining the false chain), and then returned the false chain to Cristina, feigning anger. Whatever the exact circumstances of the swap may be, the ruse is extremely effective, and Cristina is so panicked that in order to avoid incarceration, she is willing to do whatever it takes to make amends. Knowing this, Solórzano ably pretends to have mercy on her and offers her a deal: since the "Biscayan" is a drunk and somewhat of a fool, Solórzano will give him the false chain, leading him to believe that it is the real one, so long as Cristina agrees to pay for their dinner and pay off the alguacil. Cristina doesn't hesitate to accept his offer, and further declares herself perpetually in his service:

SOLÓRZANO. Ahora bien, yo quiero hacer una cosa por vuesa merced, señora Cristina, siquiera porque no la chupen brujas o, por lo menos, se ahorque. Esta cadena se parece mucho a la fina del vizcaíno; él es mentecapto y algo borrachuelo; yo se la quiero llevar y darle a entender que es la suya, y vuesa merced contente aquí al señor alguacil; y gaste la cena desta noche, y sosiegue su espíritu, pues la pérdida no es mucha.

CRISTINA. Págueselo a vuesa merced todo el Cielo. Al señor alguacil daré media docena de escudos, y en la cena gastaré uno, y quedaré por esclava perpetua del señor Solórzano. (128)

Once Cristina has repaid her "debt," the musicians enter to wrap up the farce and provide the moral, while Quiñones returns to reveal the plot to Cristina, so that all might laugh and rejoice at her folly, and so that she might learn a valuable lesson. The musicians perform their role, singing the final estribillos, concluding with the message, "La mujer más avisada o sabe poco o no nada" (129).

Curiously Cristina isn't angry at the end of the play, declaring simply "Ahora bien, yo quedo skillful slight-of-hand technique, and also provides a greater degree of freedom to the performers. I suggest, therefore, that it was probably deliberate, rather than an oversight on the part of Cervantes.
burlada y, con todo esto, convido a vuesas mercedes para esta noche" (128). She accepts the joke with relative grace, which perhaps isn't so difficult, considering it hasn't been a huge financial loss to her.

What are we to make of this ending? On the one hand and as we have discussed, it is easily the most conventional of all of Cervantes' interludes, and on the surface seems to be based on a concept of women's intellectual inferiority to men. On closer examination, however, it becomes clear that Cervantes does not wish to denigrate women so much as he wants to instruct the audience in a lesson about hubris and humility. It seems to me that Canavaggio has given us a great insight into the play when he suggests that the moment of "desengaño" is not experienced by Cristina so much as it is by the audience, in getting them to see the reality of life in the Madrid of the era.\(^\text{134}\)

This play is fundamentally about not only deception (\textit{engaño}) as some scholars have already suggested,\(^\text{135}\) but it is also about hubris or vainglory, true perception, and seeming vs. being. At the outset of the play, it appears that Cristina is quite a clever prostitute, very skilled in argumentation, and quite successful at obtaining money when she needs to. Brígada, on the other hand, seems to be her less refined, more boorish counterpart, irritated with her ill fortune. Although Brígada fancies herself more beautiful than Cristina, she is less successful in obtaining clients and less lucky when it comes to making money; at least, so she initially believes. Nevertheless, over the course of the play, we see that Cristina falls victim to Solórzano's deception, making the audience question her true "wisdom," or indeed, if she truly is of a higher "category" than Brígada (they are both prostitutes, after all). As Baras Escolá has already noted,\(^\text{136}\) the trick

\(^{134}\) Canavaggio (1977), 366 & 407.

\(^{135}\) See in particular Johnson, 7-20.

\(^{136}\) "[A]l tratarse de una burla más que conocida, sorprende que la burlada caiga en la trampa" (ed., 404). He also cites an episode in \textit{La Picara Justina} (II, 2, 2, 2, "De la vergonzosa engañadora)
of swapping one precious object for another of no value is hardly anything new, so for a supposedly street-wise hustler like Cristina to fall for it says something about her lack of true insight. Thus, appearances are once again deceptive, and like the two gold chains that look so similar to the eye, the two prostitutes, who seem different in wisdom, are in fact both just as easily fooled. There is also perhaps a subtle critique on the part of Cervantes of the aristocracy, when he suggests (through Cristina) that prostitutes riding in carriages might be mistaken for noble women (and vice-versa). Implicitly, we are to understand that the distance in category between some of these "noble" women and Brígada and Cristina is not as great as it appears either.

One of the most important aspects of the ruse in this play is that after Solórzano and Quiñones have had their fun and revealed their trick, Cristina is not angry with them, realizing that it is her own fault that she fell for their deception. Indeed, as Quiñones promised, she is not harmed by their ruse, for although it costs her a bit of money (seven escudos, in total), it doesn't significantly affect her living situation. She has been humbled by the two tricksters rather than humiliated. She has seen the error in her ways of presuming to know so much, and presuming to be the best in her trade, when she is merely a prostitute and a hustler. Although the message of this play could easily be made misogynistic in the hands of another playwright, Cervantes concerns himself greatly with preserving all the characters' human dignity in the play, in spite of their low social standing. Just as Cristina has learned her lesson, so too (Cervantes hopes) has the audience, about presuming to be more than one is or presuming to know more than one does. Moreover, he has given us a glimpse into a society of decadence, in which prostitutes are easily confused with women of the court, and vice-versa, because of their similar modes of travel, used for unseemly

and from Guzmán de alfarache (II, 2, 6 & 8) as possible antecedents for the engaño in this play (402).
courtships. Although this entremés is, on the surface, much more traditional than many of the other interludes we have examined thus far, it is not quite as simple as it initially seems, as we have just seen that the play also deals with some of Cervantes' favorite themes of appearances and reality, of seeming and being, and of the trickster being tricked, and presents the characters in a way in which they aren't mere subjects of ridicule, as they would have been in similar plays of his contemporaries. Thus, even in his more conventional interludes, Cervantes stands as a singular innovator within the genre.

Perhaps the most difficult and least conventional of Cervantes' plays for contemporary critics to decipher is El rufián viudo llamado Trampagos, an interlude that departs considerably from the traditional entremés structure upon which it is based. To begin with, it is one of only two of Cervantes' interludes written in unrhymed hendecasyllable verse (the other being La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo). Furthermore, it takes a lot of liberties with the treatment of the characters (and characterization) it presents. Traditionally (as in the plays of Lope de Rueda, as discussed in the first chapter of this study, to provide one example), interludes dealing with picaresque themes involved only a few characters, generally not more than three or four, discussing aspects of their everyday life as rogues, hustlers and pimps, and some money making scheme or engaño they were concocting. In the end, either they or their bobo victims were made the subject of ridicule in the play, illustrating the folly and foolishness of this lower stratum of society. In El rufián viudo, we are presented with no fewer than twelve characters (nine main characters) dialoguing in a manner that is considerably more complex. The humor of this play is more indirect. It is not so much that we are laughing at the characters for their folly and hearing them talk about

---

137 Both Casalduero and Canavaggio have previously attributed the role of burladora burlada to Cristina in this play. See Casalduero, 204 & Canavaggio (1977), 203 & 225.
their world. Rather, through a combination of parody of images from pastoral poetry, elegies, and other works of a much "higher" register, Cervantes completely immerses his audience in a topsyturvy, carnivalesque mundodelhampa, in which the humor derives primarily from the unexpected clash of two registers. This kind of grotesque, satirical presentation of characters of the lowest stratum of society, utilizing both colloquial "corruptions" of language as well as classical allusions reminiscent of the highest class of denizens, lends this play to a wide variety of interpretations.

The interlude starts with Trampagos demanding that his criado Vademécum bring him the training foils for fencing, a curious request for someone who has so recently lost his wife. After inviting Vademécum to have a seat and join him, Trampagos beings to lament the death of his wife and best prostitute, Pericona:

TRAMPAGOS. ¡Ah, Pericona, Pericona mía,
y aun de todo el concejo! En fin, llegose el tuyo. Yo quedé, tú te has partido,
y es lo peor que no imagino adónde;
aunque, según fue el curso de tu vida bien se puede creer piadosamente que estás en parte... Aún no me determino de señalarle asiento en la otra vida. Tendrela yo, sin ti, como de muerte. ¡Que no me hallara yo a tu cabecera cuando diste el espíritu a los aires, para que le acogiera entre mis labios y en mi estómago limpio le envasara! ¡Miseria humana! ¿Quién de ti confía? Ayer fui Pericona, hoy tierra fría, como dijo un poeta celeberrimo. (vv. 9-24)

While some critics have found it opportune to bring Bakhtin's famous articulation of carnival to bear on this dramatic work, I feel there are significant differences between the world of carnival in Rabalais and seventeenth-century Spain's literary mundo del hampa. See p. 157, n. 165 of this chapter of the present study.
We see Trampagos giving what appears to be a truly heartfelt lament at the death of his beloved Pericona. The language he uses immediately causes a kind of cognitive dissonance in the audience, as it is much more ornate language than we would expect from a pimp to describe the death of his wife and favorite prostitute. Trampagos does his best to pay some poetic tribute to his diseased spouse, commenting on his difficulty carrying on after her departure from this world, and his regret that he was not there in her final moments to swallow up her spirits and save them in his stomach (his poetic way of describing a final kiss to her). The line "Ayer fui Pericona, hoy tierra fría" which Trampagos comments alludes to "un poeta celibérrimo." Although there have been many different interpretations as to which specific poet Cervantes might be alluding, Baras Escolá observes that there is a sonnet by Góngora commemorating the duchess of Lerma that shares both the context (Catalina de la Cerda leaving the Duque widowed, just as Pericona has left Trampagos) as well as the structure of the first verse "¡Ayer deidad humana, hoy poca tierra!" (s. 207, n. 132, v. 1). Regardless of which poet is being referenced specifically, it is clear that Cervantes is referring to the high literary poetic trope of the brevity of life, and of how we are all reduced to mere dust in the end, regardless of our station in life. This being the case, it is humorous and discordant to hear a pimp use such flowery language, originally employed to commemorate the death of a noble woman, in the description of the death of a prostitute. Although Trampagos'

---

139 Baras Escolá points out in his edition (306) that most editors merely repeat Schevill-Bonilla's note about the romance concerning king don Rodrigo, but that the only similarity is the antithesis "ayer/hoy" in the verses. See ed. R. Schevill y A. Bonilla, (22-16). Zimic (1981, 141-2 & 150) notes that it possibly alludes to the first Eclongue of Garcilaso. Finally, Fernández García (151-158) notes that there is a much more direct source for the verse: a poem entitled "A la muerte del serenísimo príncipe don Carlos, hijo de Felipe II: "¡Oh suerte humana!, ¿quién de ti confía?/ Ayer fui Carlos de Austria, hoy tierra fría." Additionally, Baras Escolá (ed., 307) cites one of Góngora's funerary sonnets from 1603 to the duchess of Lerma, that shares both the context and the structure of the verse: "¡Ayer deidad humana, hoy poca tierra!" (Góngora, Sonetos, 207, num. 132) Cf. Carreira, (321-342).

140 Baras Escolá (2009), 33-62.
lament appears to be sincere, the reasons for his sadness will become more clear to the audience later on in the play.

At this juncture, Chiquiznaque (simple referred to as "rufián" in the script margins), a lesser pimp, a friend and pupil of Trampagos, tries to lift his spirits, and urges him not to become consumed by excessive grief, stating that outward manifestations of respect, such as alms, masses and prayers are more apt for the occasion than tears:

RUFIÁN. Mi so Trampagos, ¿es posible sea voacé tan enemigo mortal suyo que se entumbe, se encubra y se trasponga debajo desa sombra bayetuna el sol hampesco? So Trampagos, basta tanto gemir, tantos suspiros bastan; trueque voacé las lágrimas corrientes en limosnas y en misas y oraciones por la gran Pericona, que Dios haya; que importan más que llantos y sollozos. (vv. 25-32)

In the earlier cited passage, Trampagos also feared that Pericona's soul would go to hell, though he dared not pronounce the words aloud. Here, Chiquiznaque wisely urges him to set aside his tears and convert them into donations, masses and prayers, in hopes that her soul might yet be saved. Trampagos replies "Voacé ha garlado como un tólogo [hablado como teólogo]" (v. 35), but he insists that he will put his affairs in order another way, and proposes to Chiquiznaque that they begin fencing, choosing instead to divert himself to take his mind off the tragedy of her passing. Chiquiznaque objects, stating that it is not the time for such pastimes. Trampagos then sends Vademecum off to prepare for the arrival of some guests later on. After preparing their humble surroundings for this get-together, the three further discuss Pericona's passing:

RUFIÁN. ¿De qué edad acabó la mal lograda?
TRAMPAGOS. Para con sus amigas y vecinas, treinta y dos años tuvo.
RUFIÁN. ¡Edad lozana!
TRAMPAGOS. Si va a decir verdad, ella tenía
cincuenta y seis; pero de tal manera
supo encubrir los años, que me admiro.
¡Oh, qué teñir de canas! ¡Oh qué rizos,
vueltos de plata en oro los cabellos!
A seis del mes que viene hará quince años
que fue mi tributaria, sin que en ellos
me pusiese en pendencia ni en peligro
de verme palmeadas las espaldas.
Quince cuaresmas, si en la cuenta acierto,
pasaron por la pobre desde el día
que fue mi cara agradecida prenda;
en las cuales sin duda susurraron
a sus oídos treinta y más sermones,
y en todos ellos, por respeto mío,
estuvo firme, cual está a las olas
del mar movible la inmovible roca. (vv. 53-72)

It is worth noting the difference between Cervantes' satirical technique in such passages as
this contrasted with the writing of Quevedo, for example\(^{141}\). Whereas Quevedo is often more
partial to a Juvenalian style of satire, and is overt in critiquing, ridiculing and attacking his target
directly with his satirical writing, Cervantes employs a greater degree of subtlety, allowing his
character to speak with candor about the subject. In this play, the critique comes not in what the
pimp is saying in and of itself, but in the audience's reaction to his words, in the reception of what
is said. Criticizing the falseness of the world of appearances was already very much a trope in
Cervantes' day, and a large portion of the burlesque poetry about this subject took the form of an
(often misogynistic) reproach to women who concerned themselves excessively with their
appearance, through makeup, hair dyes, and the like, to make themselves appear younger. Here,
Cervantes simply presents us the pimp, very sincerely praising Pericona's ability to use makeup
and to dye her hair to appear younger. This praise would have been quite comical and absurd to

\(^{141}\) Reed (172) expresses a similar view regarding Cervantes' style of satirical criticism vs. that of
Quevedo.
an educated audience of Cervantes' day. Additionally, Trampagos praises Pericona for never getting him in trouble with the law ("verme palmeadas las espaldas" refers to the whip of the executioner, evidently a common punishment for pimps, as Baras Escolá informs us in his edition). Finally, he praises her firm resolve in sticking to her life as a prostitute for his benefit, no matter how many times people tried to dissuade her otherwise. Canavaggio explains in his edition, "por la cuaresma se solía reunir en alguna iglesia a las prostitutas, para predicarles 'los sermones de arrepentidas,' como el de la conversión de la Magdalena, y animarlas a que dejasen su mala vida." Following this praise, Chiquiznaque also lauds Pericona as an "Ejemplo raro de inmortal firmeza!" (v. 80). Cervantes, rather than have another character reproach Trampagos for such dubious praise, has the other characters agree with Trampagos. In so doing, he paints a picture of the "mundo hampesco" that feels more genuine, even if the language is deliberately embellished from a literary standpoint, while leaving it to the audience to draw their own conclusions about this topsy-turvy underworld.

The first chapter of this study already examined the language employed in the next portion of this play. We saw how in the quoted passage describing Pericona's death, Cervantes presents us with the grotesque image of the consequences of prostitution, particularly in that time period. Pericona died from complications with her liver (implying a lifestyle of excessive drinking), hypochondrium, and from syphilis, with her skin covered in boils, and her teeth rotting. This is all described, however, in oddly poetic terms, which invert a lot of the Petrarchian imagery of beauty. Instead of teeth white as pearls, we have blackened, rotten teeth, covered with plaque and cavities,

---

143 See chapter 1, pp. 45-48 of this study.
until, as Vademécum informs us, her teeth rotted away completely, and she was forced to replace most of them with fake ones.

No sooner has Trampagos "finished" lamenting the death of his wife than three more prostitutes, la Repulida, la Pizpita, and la Mostrenca, enter with Juan Claros, another pimp. One of the three is to become Trampagos' new wife, as well as his primary source of income, as we soon learn. As the three women make their entrance, they all remark on the depressed state in which they find Trampagos, prompting him to remark that he would rather be a half-man, half-savage creature than suffer the ill fortune that has befallen him:

TRAMPAGOS. Fuera yo un Polifemo, un antropófago, un troglodita, un bárbaro Zoilo, un caimán, un caribe, un comevivos si de otra suerte me adornara en tiempo de tamaña desgracia.

JUAN. Razón tiene.

TRAMPAGOS. ¡He perdido una mina potosisca, un muro de la yedra de mis faltas, un árbol de la sombra de mis ansias!

JUAN. Era la Pericona un pozo de oro. (vv. 134-142)

This scene is important in the play, because it drives at the heart of the reason for Trampagos' lament. He is genuinely saddened by Pericona's death, but more than anything, because of the loss of income it will cause him. At all moments in the play, Trampagos is completely motivated by selfish interest. In spite of the elegant language he employs to mourn her loss, it is not so much she that he will miss, but her diligence in bringing him money she has earned through her profession. Calling her a "mina potosisca," a Cervantine neologism with reference to the mines of Potosí in the virreinato of Peru, as well as a "pozo de oro" shows how she is in fact valued by both Trampagos and Juan as a source for financial gain. The three other prostitutes

---

144 Located in present-day Bolivia. For information about socio-economic situation of the Potosí region in the time period, see Vilar, 163-182.
show deference to Pericona for her skill in this regard as well, lamenting their own inability to make similar gains. At this point, Juan decides that it would be best for Trampagos to stop grieving and take a new wife from among the three prostitutes now in their company, so as to ease his sorrow (as well as his financial woes) and return to his habitual happy state. The three women make their claims as to why they would be the best choice for him, but in all cases, it is based on their "dowry" (probably earned through their profession):

**PIZPITA.** Pequeña soy, Trampagos, pero grande tengo la voluntad para servirte. No tengo cuyo, y tengo ochenta cobas.

**REPUilda.** Yo ciento, y soy dispuesta y nada lerda.

**MOSTRENCA.** Veinte y dos tengo yo, y aun venticuatro, y no soy mema. (vv. 179-183)

The three prostitutes are immediately at one another's throats, and the pimps have to intervene to separate them. But before Trampagos can make his choice, a nameless character enters and informs everyone that the *alguacil* is coming. Trampagos reassures everyone, stating "Ténganse todos / ninguno se alborote, que es mi amigo / el alguacil; no hay que tenerle miedo" (vv. 211-13). Cervantes pokes fun at the corruption of legal officials here, implying that the *alguacil* takes bribes from Trampagos. As Trampagos himself informs us, "Aunque viniera, / no nos hiciera mal, yo lo sé cierto; / que no puede chillar, porque está untado" (vv. 216-18). By "untado," Trampagos means that the alguacil cannot speak out against them, as he is tied to them him by having accepted his bribes.\(^{145}\)

This interruption is fortuitous, because it grants Vademécum the chance to intervene, and ask that Trampagos choose his new bride to be. He selects Repulida (presumably because she

---

\(^{145}\) See Covarrubias for this use of the word: "Untarle mano al juez, o a otra persona de quien pretendemos algún emolumento, o favor, es sobornarle con dineros o dádivas."
comes with a greater dowry), and she proclaims herself his slave,\textsuperscript{146} "Tuya soy. Ponme un clavo y una S /en estas dos mejillas" (vv. 231-32). Pizpita is irritated with Trampagos' decision, and jealous of Repulida, but Mostrenca puts her at ease:

PIZPITA. ¡Oh hechicera!
MOSTRENCA. No es sino venturosa. No la envidies, porque no es muy católico Trampagos, pues ayer enterró a la Pericona y hoy la tiene olvidada. (vv. 232-236)

These lines sum up the reality of the situation perfectly. Trampagos does genuinely lament the death of his "beloved" Pericona, but not because he loved her in the context of a traditional Catholic marriage. Rather, he was devastated by the loss of his primary source of income. But in the grotesque, humorous, upside down world Cervantes presents us with in this play, Trampagos is able to instantly set aside his grief for celebration once he has selected a new bride. Knowing that he will have a steady flow of income with la Repulida by his side, he is able to once again rejoice, and indeed, shows himself to be quite generous with the additional money he is about to receive, instructing Vademécum, "…trae seis azumbres de lo caro; /alas pon en los pies" (vv. 241-42). An azumbre\textsuperscript{147} is a measure of wine a little more than 2 liters, and Trampagos demands the expensive kind to celebrate such an occasion. As Trampagos and his guests all sit down to drink and celebrate, the smell of the wine draws in two musicians, who join in to partake of the festivities, and one very special final guest.

\textsuperscript{146} In the amorous sense of the term, not the sense of forced labor against her will.

\textsuperscript{147} See Autoridades, "AZUMBRE: s. m. Cierta medida de las cosas líquidas, como agua, vino, vinagre, ò leche, que es la octava parte de una arróba: y promiscuamente se llama azumbre la medida, y lo que se contiene en ella: y así se dice comunemente que Fulano se bebió una azumbre de vino, esto es la cantidad de vino que se contiene en la medida dicha azumbre. Es voz Arabe, que viene de Zumbri, que significa esto mismo, y añadida la partícula 'a' se dixo azumbre."
Before Escarramán's actual arrival on the scene, Repulida, Trampagos, and Pizpita all welcome him with open arms, astonished to see this mythical figure of their world made flesh. In his typical fashion, Cervantes blurs the lines of fantasy and reality here, introducing a fictional character from another author into his own fictional world of the same genre. The characters express their surprise and delight at having this legendary figure in their midst, thereby enabling the audience to get a better sense of the kind of status that Escarramán carries in this underworld, as well as bringing an additional element of verisimilitude to the entire work. Repulida, upon recognizing Escarramán exclaims "Escarramán, del alma, dame, amores, / esos brazos, coluna de la hampa!" (vv. 269-70). Trampagos likewise welcomes him to break his silence and join them, and Pizpita, still incredulous at the vision, proclaims "¿Eres fantasma, a dicha? Yo te toco, / y eres de carne y hueso" (vv. 275-76).

Escarramán appears on the scene, and we are presented with a Cervantine appropriation of one of Quevedo's celebrated characters. The folkloric character Escarramán is a tough, roguish sort who cohabited with la Méndez, a prostitute. He is referred to several times in Quevedo's bailes y jácaras and burlesque satirical poetry, and he even appears as an actual character on three separate occasions.\textsuperscript{148} The most significant of these appearances is a letter that he writes to La Méndez, explaining how he came to be apprehended by the authorities and condemned to row to the Americas as a galley slave. La Méndez is unsympathetic, and reproaches him for his folly.\textsuperscript{149}

\textsuperscript{148} Escarramán is mentioned by name in the satirical poems numbered 694, 757 and 763, as well as numerous Jácaras (849, 850, 856, 865, 869, and 870). The most celebrated of these are 849 and 850, Escarramán's famous letter to La Méndez, his consort, and her humorous reproach, but he also appears as a character, dialoguing with La Méndez, in "Cortes de los Bailes, Baile V" (the jácara numbered 869); all numbers with reference to Francisco de Quevedo, Poesía original completa, ed. José Manuel Blecua, Barcelona, Planeta, 1981.

\textsuperscript{149} In the original poem, Escarramán is apprehended in a tavern, after having too much to drink. He is arrested and sentenced to be a galley slave, and to receive one hundred lashings. He tells of the fate of his fellow prisoners and their crimes, some of whom are executed. Escarramán explains
Cervantes' play catches up with Escarramán shortly after these episodes, when he regales the other rogues with his account of how he came to reclaim his freedom:

ESCARRAMÁN. Yo soy Escarramán, y estén atentos al cuento breve de mi larga historia.

(Vuelve el BARBERO con dos guitarras y da la una al compañero)

«Dio la galera al traste en Berbería, donde la furia de un juez me puso por espaldar de la siniestra banda; mudé de cautiverio y de ventura; quedé en poder de turcos por esclavo; de allí a dos meses, como el cielo plugo, me levanté con una galeota; cobré mi libertad y ya soy mío. Hice voto y promesa inviolable de no mudar de ropa ni de cargo hasta colgarla de los muros santos de una devota ermita, que en mi tierra llaman de San Millán de la Cogolla.»

Y este es el cuento de mi extraña historia, digna de atesorarla en mi memoria. La Méndez no estará ya de provecho; ¿vive? (vv. 279-295)

Escarramán succinctly sums up his misadventures, being condemned to sail to the Americas, marking the rhythm at the rear of the galley ship, having the ship captured and being taken prisoner by Turks, and finally, stealing a small sailing vessel himself and embarking towards

that he got into a financial dispute with a Perotudo, a fellow criminal, who douses Escarramán with the contents of a urinal urn, inciting Escarramán to cut him violently across the jawline with a small knife, probably killing him. This is what gets Escarramán in trouble with the law, and prompts him to plead with La Méndez for some financial assistance. La Méndez responds by rebuking him for his alcoholism, and stating that although she wishes she could help him, her poverty and suffering from venereal disease prevent her from doing so, and that she has nothing to offer him but her advice. Additionally, she tells him of the ill fortune of all of their friends and acquaintances in their band of rogues.
freedom. The curious thing about Escarramán's tale is not the story itself, but the reaction of the other characters to it. Escarramán enquires about himself, and how the news of his fortunes and misfortunes have travelled. The other characters respond by telling him how he has been recorded in poetry, theater, and songs. In a similar fashion as in the Quijote, Cervantes lightheartedly introduces a meta-narrative dimension to the work, granting the character a kind of self-awareness, and in so doing, adds a greater degree of verisimilitude to both the character and his exploits:

ESCARRAMÁN.   Qué se ha dicho de mí en aqueste mundo, en tanto que en el otro me han tenido mis desgracias y gracia?
MOSTRENCA.    Cien mil cosas; ya te han puesto en la horca los farsantes.
PIZPITA.       Los muchachos han hecho pepitoria de tus médulas y tus huesos.
REPULIDA.      Hante vuelto divino: ¿qué más quieres?
RUFÍÁN.        Cántante por las plazas, por las calles; báilante en los teatros y en las casas; has dado que hacer a los poetas, más que dio Troya al mantuano Títiro. (vv. 298-308)

When Mostrenca informs Escarramán that he has been hung in the gallows, she is referring to several play adaptations of the life story of Escarramán, one of which is to be found in Salas Barbadillo's El gallardo Escarramán. Pizpita informs him that they have cut his bones and sinews to ribbons (metaforically), meaning that they have retold his story so many times, there is nothing left of him. When Repulida remarks "hante vuelto divino, ¿qué más quieres?" she is alluding to the fact that Escarramán and la Méndez's tale had become so well known that it had been reinterpreted in light of the story of Christ redeeming the soul of the sinner, and dignified in

Oddly enough, when Escarramán speaks of returning home, this is the only known reference to him being from La Rioja as opposed to Sevilla, as he was in Quevedo's poetry.

This is a work of theater inserted at the end of his novel El subtil cordobés Pedro de Urdemalas (Madrid, 1620). See ed. Baras Escolá pp. 28 n. 301 & the corresponding note on p. 330.
this way, within the sub-genre of poetry known as *poesía a lo divino.* Finally, Chiquiznaque proclaims that Escarramán has given the poets more to write about than Troy did Virgil (Virgil depicts himself as the shepherd Tityrus in the first Eclogue). As Eugenio Asensio notes, it is odd to hear such a high-culture reference come from the mouths of a low-class ruffian. However, this sort of allusion conforms to the burlesque tones of the rest of the play, so it is not at all surprising in this context. The band of rogues continue singing the praises of Escarramán, and speaking of how the tale of his misadventures have travelled far and wide:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{JUAN.} & \quad \text{Óyente resonar en los establos.} \\
\text{REPULIDA.} & \quad \text{Las fregonas te lavan en el río; los mozos de caballos te almohazan.} \\
\text{RUFÍAN.} & \quad \text{Túndete el tundidor con sus tijeras; muy más que el potro rucio eres famoso.} \\
\text{MOSTRENCA.} & \quad \text{Han pasado a las Indias tus palmeos, en Roma se han sentido tus desgracias, y hante dado botines *sine numero*.} \\
\text{VADEMÉCUM.} & \quad \text{Por Dios, que te han molido como alheña y te han desmenuzado como flores, y que eres más sonado y más mocoso que un reloj y que un niño de dotrina. De ti han dado querella todos cuantos bailes pasaron en la edad del gusto, con apretada y dura residencia; pero llevose el tuyo la excelencia.} \\
\text{ESCARRAMÁN.} & \quad \text{Tenga yo fama, y háganme pedazos; de Efeso el templo abrasaré por ella. (vv. 309-326)}
\end{align*}
\]

Part of the humor of these verses resides in the fact that Escarramán is celebrated in all places, primarily by the lower stratum of society. Cervantes also makes great use of the double-meanings or implications of certain words, employing the homophony of the words "lavar" and "alabar" by stating that the washer-women wash/praise him in the river, or that the stable boys brush him and

---

152 See the note by Astrana Marín, 229-232 for the *poemas a lo divino* that celebrate Escarramán written before 1612, the probable year this play was finished.  
the cloth-cutters even out his edges with their scissors. All are ways of saying that they tell his tale, but it also gives the impression that Escarramán is so filthy, ragged, and messed-up that all of these people can't help but clean him up a bit in singing his accolades. Finally, instead of comparing him to a famous historical figure, Chiquiznaque animalizes Escarramán in praising him, comparing him to "el potro rucio." This is a reference to one of the most parodied so called "new romances" attributed to Lope de Vega that begins "Ensíllenme el potro rucio/ del alcaide de los Vélez.\textsuperscript{154}

When Chiquiznaque states that his fame and misfortune have travelled to the Indies and Rome, he isn't referring to any literary work, but rather to the \textit{bailes escarramanescos} that came to be danced with his various jácaras (Quevedo's, and eventually, imitations of popular origin)\textsuperscript{155}. Hence the \textit{botines sine numero} refers to the countless leather slippers worn out by the dance.\textsuperscript{156} In this case, the \textit{botines} are used as a metonymy for the women of lower social classes that celebrate Escarramán in these dances. Vademecum continues to speak of how ground up and chopped up Escarramán's tale is (just as aromatic flowers used for dyes and perfumes) to get the most out of it. He also states that Escarramán's dances have become the favorite of these series of popular dances. Finally, when Escarramán gives the imperative "háganme pedazos," it is both a follow-up to these lines, a reminder of the lines "Los muchachos han hecho pepitoria /de tus medulas y tus huesos," as well as a much more cultured allusion to the shepherd Herostratus, the man who set fire to the temple of Artemis in Ephesus in order to immortalize his own name, and was

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{154} See ed. Baras Escolá, p. 29, n. to v. 313.  
\textsuperscript{155} This "baile de escarramán" was probably still relatively new in the time period. See Cotarello y Valledor, 330.  
\textsuperscript{156} See \textit{Autoridades}, "BOTÍN. s. m. Calzado de cuero, que cubre el pié y parte de la pierna, hasta donde se abrocha con un cordón, para dexarle ajustado. Usaban de él las mugères, y aun le conservaban en algunas partes. Viene del nombre 'bota,' de que es como diminutivo."
subsequently tortured and executed by the Ephesian authorities. This high-brow reference, also in keeping with the burlesque tone of the play, is doubly appropriate here, since Escarramán has effectively immortalized his own name by committing criminal acts (Herostratus was a recurring trope in the time period used to represent someone willing to do anything, no matter how vile, for notoriety).

This whole sequence of references to Escarramán's fame enters metatextual territory, as it makes reference to the contemporary representation of this character in various mediums during the time period. Although Escarramán's self-awareness in this play is still not quite as great as that of Don Quixóte and Sancho's in *DQII*, III, it still shows a far greater degree of autonomy and consciousness than we would typically expect from a character in an *entremés*, and demonstrates Cervantes' willingness to experiment within this genre, as well as his constant fascination with examining the relationship between fiction and reality.

Appropriately enough, the work ends with a short dance solicited by and about Escarramán, sung by the musicians and Chiquiznaque. The *rufián* Juan Claros remarks, "Él honrará las bodas de Trampagos," (v. 337) reminding us of the primary action of the play. This final dance is a celebration of all the participants, with Chiquiznaque singing their names in sequence, and declaring "No se pueden alabar / otras ninfas y otros rufos / que nos puedan igualar," (vv. 373-75) thereby proclaiming them the best of their ill-famed profession. After naming various dances, the proceedings finally end with Escarramán requesting to dance alone to the "el canario" style, and

---

157 See also Frederick A. de Armas, 41–55, for the reference to Herostratus in Book II, Chapter 8 of *Don Quijote*.
158 Kenworthy comments that this Escarramán, like Don Quixote, knows of his literary existence as such and wants to know how his legends have spread in his absence (39). There is, nevertheless, a clear difference in my view between their degree of awareness, since Escarramán never makes any effort to correct the legends about himself in this play, unlike Don Quijote and Sancho.
then asking the others to join in for one final dance. Trampagos proclaims, "Mis bodas se han celebrado / mejor que las de Roldán. Todos digan, como digo: ¡Viva, viva Escarramán!" (vv. 396-400). These lines are curious, considering the epic hero Roland never married. While most modern editors make no note of this fact, Baras Escolá, in commenting on this, states, "Ya que el héroe épico nunca llegó a casarse, cabe pensar que el nombre de Roldán alude en este contexto al de algún valentón así llamado." Nevertheless, Canavaggio comments that Cervantes himself does depict the marriage of Roland and Angélica la Bella in *La Casa de los celos y selvas de Ardenia*. It seems most probable that Cervantes is either alluding to his own work, or making a deliberately ironic comparison that misses the mark, as he often does with less cultured characters.

What are we to make, finally, of Cervantes' intentions in this play? On the surface, one might be tempted to view the play as a set of different episodes, namely, (1) Trampagos' lament of Pericona's passing, (2) the competition between the three prostitutes to be Pericona's successor and Trampagos' selection of his new bride, (3) Escarramán's arrival on the scene, the recounting of his exploits, and finally (4) the dance(s) at the conclusion. In reality, the play is much more unified than it initially appears. Cannavaggio has perhaps done the best job thus far of showing how Cervantes manages to integrate a popular character and a popular genre of dance into his festive interlude. The interlude initially appears to be building to a climax with the election of Repulida as Pericona's successor, but with the unexpected arrival of Escarramán, a new element is

---

159 The immediate referent here is probably either Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* or Boiardo's *Orlando innamorato*, both of which depict Roland's love for the beautiful Angelica, rather than the twelfth century epic poem *La Chanson de Roland*.  
160 ed. Baras Escolá, 32.  
161 See ed. Jean Canavaggio, p. 165, note to p. 68.  
162 Various critics have divided the play into three or four or four shorter scenes. See in particular Asensio (1973), 178, and Casalduero, 199. The division and categorization above is my own interpretation of the division of action.
introduced, and Escarramán's misadventures serve as a counterpoint to the tale of Pericona.\textsuperscript{163} In essence, the arrival of Escarramán serves to bridge the emotional gap between the mourning experienced at the beginning, and the celebration of the "good" life (and all its excesses) at the end of the play. Although it initially might seem superfluous or tacked-on, it provides the transition (along with Escarramán's selection of a new bride) from a climate of morning to one of jubilation, and prepares the emotional tone for the celebration and song-and-dance at the end of the interlude. As Canavaggio explains:

...[L]a séquence final ne constitue pas pour autant un scène postiche; elle se justifie, au-delà même de sa valeur spectaculaire, dans la mesure où le deuil de Trampagos et la résurrection d'Escarramán dessinent une opposition de la mort et de la vie qui communique sa dynamique à l'intermède. (271)

This is a particularly poignant insight. In fact, as far as any of the characters in the play knew prior to his arrival, Escarramán was dead. His arrival on the scene in effect marks a kind of resurrection, which in turn re-animates the festive spirits of the underworld characters of the play. It is his character, rather than the selection of Repulida as Trampagos' new wife, that allows for the change in the emotional climate of the interlude, and for the transition between mourning and the celebration of life renewed.

In his analysis of the interlude, Canavaggio also makes detailed note of the following stylistic elements utilized parodically or in a burlesque fashion by Cervantes throughout the play: pastoral metaphors from both classical and popular culture, emphatic allusions to myths and glories from antiquity, Latinate epithets, exultation of the deceased using neostoic elements. (pp. 303-304). In addition, Casalduero has seen in the play a parody of the famous judgment of Paris (the mythological episode of Eris, goddess of discord, and the golden apple), in which Paris was

\textsuperscript{163} See Canavaggio (1977), 213, 262, 270-271 & 279.
forced to select the fairest among the goddesses Athena, Hera and Aphrodite. If this parody is true, it is indeed an incredibly degraded version of the myth we are presented with here, with the role of Paris reduced to a pimp, and the three most beautiful goddesses being reduced to mere prostitutes. It is the accumulation of all of these elements that adds to the feeling of a misplaced clash of registers, between high and low culture, all occurring simultaneously.

Beyond the expected topsy-turvydom resulting from the carnivalesque mourning of death and celebration of life that this play presents us with, the clash of "higher" and "lower" vocabulary in this play has led to a wide variety of interpretations about what Cervantes may have been attempting to achieve with El rufián viudo. While it cannot be doubted that the play has a very festive tone to it, it is also undeniably a critique of aspects of the decadence of the society in which Cervantes lived. The question remains: what aspects of society in particular is he criticizing? This play is subtler than some of Cervantes' other interludes, in that the presentation of the exultation of vice, sin and filth, as though they were virtues on the part of the characters of the play is presented completely straight, without cynicism or sarcasm. Unlike Quevedo, Cervantes successfully depicts these rogues from their own perspective in this regard, and leaves the audience, it is hoped, to draw a different conclusion. But he doesn't preach or moralize with this work. He merely expects the audience to be able to see the absurdity of these characters and their

164 The episode has many incarnations, but appears in the Illiad, Ovid's Heroides and Lucian's Dialogue of the Gods. For more details about its possible use here, see Casalduero, 1966, 192-193.

165 Although some scholars have been tempted to apply Mikhail Bakhtin's conception of carnival to this work, there seems to me a marked difference between the Spanish mundo del hampa and Rabalais' carnival. The principal difference resides in the fact that the Rabalais indeed presents us with a world where the topsy-turvy carnivalesque seems an unequivocally positive and regenerative force, whereas the Spanish hampa tends to be much more brutal and satirical. For a Bakhtinian analysis of the play, see Checa (1986, 247-69). See also Reed (37-73), who utilizes a Bakhtinian framework for much of his analysis, while still recognizing some important differences between the two conceptions of carnival (Bahktin's and Cervantes').
comments, and the grotesqueness of the world they inhabit. This last element of the play has led scholars to see a less obvious criticism of something specific within the parody, either literary or actual. Nishida\textsuperscript{166} has seen Trampagos as perhaps alluding to Avellaneda, whereas Baras Escolá\textsuperscript{167} views the play as a possible political satire against the Duque de Lerma. Whereas all of these interpretations are possible, Baras Escolá's seems somewhat more plausible, as it is well substantiated both from the correspondences he notes in the nomenclatures of the characters of the play, as well as the dates. Of course, some combination of these interpretations is also certainly possible. Whatever the case, it seems clear that while Cervantes focuses on a very specific group of underworld characters in \textit{Rufián}, his actual satirical criticism has a far greater reach, whether or not it is directed at specific individuals. Cervantes' brand of satire is far more discrete in this play than that of many of his contemporaries, since it is difficult to know with certainty at whom (if anyone in particular) his criticisms are directed.

As we have seen, with \textit{El Rufián viudo}, Cervantes has given us a thoroughly unconventional interlude based on an amalgam of several conventional genres (the picaresque, pastoral elegy, and \textit{jácaras escarramaneado}). It contains grotesque elements, a mournful lament (rendered superficial and ridiculous by the flagrant lack of gravity of those pronouncing it), as well as a kind of rebirth and celebration of life. It is informed by everything from references to classical antiquity, to contemporary writings of other authors concerning the \textit{mundo del hampa}. It presents us with a clash between high culture and low culture, between the world of the court and the underworld. It exhibits characters that are much more developed and even self-aware than any of their counterparts in interludes written by Cervantes' predecessors and contemporaries, and it is

\textsuperscript{166} Nishida, 591-599.
\textsuperscript{167} Baras Escolá, (2009), 33-62.
capable of satirizing a society in decline without the need for any direct vituperous attacks. In this sense, in spite of some of the flagrantly disgusting imagery it displays, and the grotesque language it employs, it is perhaps one of Cervantes' more surprisingly complex little plays, in which he steps well outside the expectations for any of the sub-genres he combines within it.

Finally, we come to El retablo de las maravillas, arguably Cervantes’ greatest theatrical achievement, and probably the most complex of his interludes. Not only is this his most frequently performed play today, but it is also the one that “feels” the most contemporary, owing no doubt to the subject matter that it addresses. With Retablo, Cervantes provides us with a poignant critique of a largely undereducated society, obsessed with the purity of its bloodlines, and terrified of the accusation of not being of "legitimate" birth, descended from a long line of Christians (cristianos viejos). But far from being a piece that merely deals with a problem contemporary to Cervantes' time period, Retablo has a far greater reaching message about the pernicious nature of a xenophobic culture, in which the mere accusation of being part of something "alien" is enough to discredit someone and destroy his or her reputation. Additionally, the short play addresses issues concerning the nature of illusion, power, and truth.

As far as the source material for the play, there are many different suggestions and possibilities. It is well known that the basic source for Retablo comes from an old folk story, the most famous iteration of which at the time was found in don Juan Manuel's El Conde Lucanor (cuento XXXII, "De lo que contesció a un rey con burladores que fizieron un paño"). This story of collective public deception fearing the retaliation of either a group of people or a single

---

168 Emilio Cotarelo y Mori first made this observation in his, "Estudio preliminar" a Colección de entremeses..., I, p. LXVIb. Today, at least in the English-speaking world, the translation of Hans Christian Anderson's version of the story, "The Emperor's New Clothes," is by far the best known, as Cory Reed has already observed as well (151). Molho attributes this story to a folkloric topos, classified as type K 445 according to the Aarne-Thompson classification system.
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individual with a lot of power is generally accepted to be of Hindu origin and Arabic transmission. Isaías Lerner has studied in detail the transmission and evolution of the story in Italy and Spain, and the various incarnations of it with which Cervantes was probably familiar. In addition to the version found in *El Conde Lucanor*, other versions include works by Timoneda, an *entremés* entitled *Los tejedores*, and numerous stories recited by *cuentistas* from the oral folkloric tradition.\(^{169}\) This is all very important to note, because Cervantes' re-elaboration of the story is more than a simple retelling. There are several marked differences from its original form, beyond what one would normally come to expect from a simple retelling in the oral tradition. As Cory Reed observes, following Molho:\(^{170}\)

> Cervantes did more than merely imitate in dramatic form a widely-used motif from the popular folk tale tradition. His play transforms the folk tale's noble victim (usually a solitary king or authority figure) into a collective protagonist which reflects the composition of the theatrical public itself, specifically the *vulgo*—the unenlightened and unsophisticated of every social class. (Reed, 151)

It might appear initially that Cervantes was taking less of a risk by not introducing a noble into the cast of characters, in this way adhering to the unwritten rules of the *entremés* genre, and merely poking fun at the folly of the *vulgo*. But the structure of this interlude forces the real-world audience to cast a critical eye back at themselves, coming to the realization that we are *all* the *vulgo* when we chose to ignore truth either out of fear of the consequences, or because it is a more expedient way to safeguard our own reputations, or to discredit others. We will see how this mechanism functions in more detail in examining the particulars of the play.

*Retablo* opens with Chanfalla and Chirinos, two swindlers, a man and a woman, plotting to con the villagers out of some money, and discussing the recent enlistment of a young boy,

---

\(^{169}\) See Lerner, 37-55.

\(^{170}\) Molho, 133.
Rabelín, a musician, to help them in their enterprise:

CHANFALLA. No se te pasen de la memoria, Chirinos, mis advertimientos, principalmente los que te he dado para este nuevo embuste que ha de salir tan a luz como el pasado del *Llovista*.

CHIRINOS. Chanfalla ilustre, lo que en mí fuere tenlo como de molde; que tanta memoria tengo como entendimiento, a quien se junta una voluntad de acertar a satisfacerte que excede a las demás potencias. Pero dime: ¿de qué sirve este Rabelín que hemos tomado? Nosotros dos solos, ¿no pudiéramos salir con esta empresa?

CHANFALLA. Habíamosle menester como el pan de la boca, para tocar en los espacios que tardaren en salir las figuras del *Retablo de las Maravillas*.

CHIRINOS. Maravilla será si no nos apedrean por solo el Rabelín; porque tan desventurada criaturilla no la he visto en todos los días de mi vida. (133-34)

Although these lines appear to be mere exposition, introducing the idea that there will be some trick involving the use of a puppet show (or at least the stage/tableau for a puppet show), this opening does quite a bit to establish the characters of the two swindlers in just a few brief lines. From this opening, we already know that they are practiced con-artists, and that they have worked together before, probably on more than one occasion. As Canavaggio explains of the phrase "el pasado del llovista" in his edition:

[Esta embeleco es tema de un cuentecillo tradicional ("Conciértense, pues, y lloverá"), transcríptos por Luis Galindo y descubierto hace poco por Maxime Chevalier. En él se refiere el ardid de que se vale un estudiante pícaro para embauar a los campesinos de un lugar de vecinos y salirse de paso, acreditando la virtud que dice tener de hacer llover (p. 169, n. to p. 115).]

This folkloric story of a roguish student who makes people believe he has the power to make it rain or shine, declaring that it will rain when the townspeople come to a consensus about what they want, was quite commonly known in the time period. Having practiced this trick themselves in

---

171 ed. Jean Canavaggio (1981); see also Maxime Chevalier (1976), 97-98.
172 Baras Escolá makes note in his edition that the *Sentencias filosóficas* of Luis Galindo from 1660-1668 cited by Chevalier are obviously too late to be the source for this reference, although it is probable that Cervantes knew the original folk story (which far predates that transcription) with
the past, it is reasonable to assume that Chanfalla and la Chirinos are a cohabiting couple that habitually swindle people out of their money, and make a living on their gains. Chirinos states that she is possessed of the three "powers" or "faculties": memory, understanding and will, demonstrating that she is probably quite an adept swindler. Chanfalla, however, is clearly the ringleader of their group, and Chirinos does rely on him for the plan, although she initially objects to his inclusion of the kid Rabelín in their trick, fearing that it will complicate things unnecessarily, and stating that they do not require him for this endeavor. Chirinos is correctly concerned that Rabelín's diminutive size and unfortunate appearance will cause problems with the spectators.  

After Chanfalla exchanges a few words with Rabelin about how he ought to perform, the governor, magistrate, alderman, and scribe enter, and the play begins in earnest. Although there is no true noble or royal figure appearing in this play (as mentioned earlier; this is a marked difference from the original folkloric source material), these four characters serve as the local authority figures of the town, and are the general subject of ridicule throughout the play, as was already discussed briefly in the first chapter of the present study. The first lines of Chanfalla's and la Chirinos' dialogue with the Governor establish a tone in which they treat him with an almost excessive degree of respect, all the while secretly mocking him. Benito Repollo, the magistrate, constantly shows his ignorance praising the rhetoric of Chirinos and Chanfalla. Chanfalla introduces himself to the crowd as "Montiel," an assumed name that is a toponym for la Mancha,
and which frequently connotes deception and magic in Cervantes. He also declares that he is the one and only purveyor of the miraculous pageant, inciting the curiosity of the Governor:

GOBERNADOR. ¿Y qué quiere decir Retablo de las Maravillas?
CHANFALLA. Por las maravillosas cosas que en él se enseñan y muestran, viene a ser llamado Retablo de las Maravillas, el cual fabricó y compuso el sabio Tontonelo debajo de tales paralelos, rumbos, astros y estrellas, con tales puntos, caracteres y observaciones, que ninguno puede ver las cosas que en él se muestran, que tenga alguna raza de confeso o no sea habido y procreado de sus padres de legítimo matrimonio. Y el que fuere contagiado destas dos tan usadas enfermedades, despídase de ver las cosas jamás vistas ni oídas de mi Retablo.
BENITO. Ahora echo de ver que cada día se ven en el mundo cosas nuevas. ¿Y que se llamaba Tontonelo el sabio que el retablo compuso?
CHIRINOS. Tontonelo se llamaba, nacido en la ciudad de Tontonela, hombre de quien hay fama que le llegaba la barba a la cintura.
BENITO. Por la mayor parte, los hombres de grandes barbas son sabiondos.

(136-37)

In this excerpt, Chanfalla introduces the "magic" of the pageant: only non-converts to Christianity, born of a legitimate marriage can behold the wonders that appear on the stage. Chanfalla cannot resist adding insult to injury, it seems, by giving the alleged wise man that created the alleged marvel the name of Tontonelo. Much of the comic effect in this scene derives from Benito's incredible lack of perspicacity and complete credulousness in his inquiry about Tontonelo, a name that has "stupid" or "foolish" embedded in it yet he praises anyway, believing Chirinos' ridiculously transparent lie, that was clearly concocted on the spot, without much thought put into it. The other members of the town don't show any suspicions either, and the Governor immediately wants the play to be represented in the house of Teresa Castrada, his god-daughter and the daughter of Juan Castrado, the Alderman. It is unclear at this juncture whether the Governor is actually intrigued by the marvelous retablo, or if he simply feels he has no choice but to feign interest. We

175 See ed. Baras Escolá, p. 89, n. 28 & the corresponding endnote on p. 876. See also Reed, p. 152, n. 27.
later learn, however, that the Governor is a minor poet himself, and is quite curious about what comic poets are popular in the court of his day (139). This perhaps explains his initial interest in the production, which results in everyone's collective misfortune. The other characters have no choice but to acquiesce to the request, and partake in the collective social deception, lest they be accused of being *conversos* or bastards. Of course, the tricksters demand payment up front, and the magistrate once again shows his complete lack of erudition, and indeed, illiteracy, misunderstanding *ante omnia* as the name "Antonia." Juan Castrado reassures Chanfalla that he will be paid six ducats, a gold coin of substantial value, with more to come later from the audience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUAN</td>
<td>Pues véngete conmigo. Recibirá el dinero, y verá mi casa y la comodidad que hay en ella para mostrar ese retablo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANFALLA</td>
<td>Vamos; y no se les pase de las mientes [sic] las calidades que han de tener los que se atrevieren a mirar el maravilloso retablo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENITO</td>
<td>A mi cargo queda eso, y séle decir que, por mi parte, puedo ir seguro a juicio, pues tengo el padre alcalde; cuatro dedos de enjundia de cristiano viejo rancioso tengo sobre los cuatro costados de mi linaje; ¡Miren si veré el tal Retablo!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACHO</td>
<td>Todos le pensamos ver, señor Benito Repollo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUAN</td>
<td>No nacimos acá en las malvas, señor Pedro Capacho.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOBERNADOR</td>
<td>Todo será menester, según voy viendo, señores Alcalde, Regidor y Escribano.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This passage shows the only "magic" of the *retablo*: a collective illusion based on racial-ethnic heritage and bigotry, and the fear of being accused of being an outsider, or an inauthentic member of the community. Benito Repollo, the most foolish of the lot, is naturally the first to fall for the

---

176 For an alternate reading of this play and in particular, the Governor Gomecillos' ill-fated career as a minor poet, see Reed's chapter, "El retablo de las maravillas: Uncrowning the Comedia," in *The Novelist as Playwright*..., 150-172. Reed views the entire play as an open attack on Lope de Vega's *comedia nueva*, in addition to the widely-accepted view of the play as a critique of the obsession with blood-purity and honor in the Spain of the day.

177 See ch. 1, p. 28 of the present study.
ploy, declaring himself to be descended from generations upon generations of pork-fat-eating
Christians. By making this declaration, he forces the others into an awkward position of having
to make similar declarations, a social situation which is augmented once the "play-with-a-play"
commences. As Cory Reed states in his study of the play:

The villagers agree to commission the retablo because they have no choice. Since rejecting
the offer would arouse suspicions of their being cristianos nuevos, the entire town is caught
in a catch-22 which places their personal and collective honor in jeopardy. The trap
becomes even more treacherous once the show commences and the imaginary figures begin
to "appear." Alarmed at not being able to see the spectacle and worried about being labeled
conversos, the townspeople must pretend that they see everything; each villager
conspicuously overreacts to the pageant, at once clearing his own name and inspiring
further doubt in his neighbors. All of the deceived spectators want to be seen seeing the
pageant; they put themselves on display for their neighbors (and also for the reader or
theatre-going audience), in effect transforming themselves into the theatrical spectacle.
Such overtly ridiculous actions reflect a willful rejection of the truth committed for the
sake of honor. (154)

One of the most valuable insights about the way Cory Reed frames the problem here in my view
is that he draws particular attention to the cumulative effect of the villager's reactions to the retablo.
As each villager claims to perceive increasingly wilder and more elaborate images on the stage,
the other villagers come to doubt themselves more and more, and become increasingly convinced
that something is actually taking place. Although they cannot be certain of this, they would rather
not take the chance than admit they see nothing. I would add to this analysis by stating that
Cervantes draws a greater attention to the group dynamic at play than was possible in the original
framing of the story. In this case, it is the collective complicity of the spectators that allows the
ruse to function. To better understand this, it will be instructive to examine some specific scenes.

The "play" on the puppet-theater stage commences with Chanfalla giving a lengthy opening
narration. This is all that is necessary to incite the villagers to do most of the work:

CHANFALLA. ¡Oh tú, quienquiera que fuiste, que fabricaste este Retablo con tan
maravilloso artificio que alcanzó renombre de las Maravillas, por la virtud que en él se
encierra, te conjuro, apremio y mando que luego incontinentemente muestres a estos señores
algunas de las tus maravillosas maravillas, para que se regocijen y tomen placer sin escándalo alguno! Ea, que ya veo que has otorgado mi petición, pues por aquella parte asoma la figura del valentísimo Sansón, abrazado con las colunas del templo, para derriballe por el suelo y tomar venganza de sus enemigos. ¡Tente, valeroso caballero; tente, por la gracia de Dios Padre! ¡No hagas tal desaguisado, porque no cojas debajo y hagas tortilla tanta y tan noble gente como aquí se ha juntado! (142)

Chanfalla begins with the typical formulas of a lesser magician or petty showman, conjuring up the "terrifying power" of the retablo. He then describes the biblical scene of the death of Samson and the Philistines (Judges 16:25-30), with dramatic narration. He even attempts to give a kind-of holographic, three-dimensional realism to the non-play by saying "no cojas debajo y hagas tortilla tanta y tan noble gente como aquí se ha juntado," as though the spectators were in danger from the temple walls Samson was collapsing. Ever the fool, Benito pleads with Samson to stop, lest they all be crushed. "¡Téngase, señor Sansón, pesia a mis males, que se lo ruegan buenos!" (143). The others, not being much wiser, immediately chime in, proclaiming that they too behold the miraculous sights. There is even a degree of malicious intent towards Juan Castrado which prompts the scribe to ask, "¿Veislo vos, Castrado?," prompting Juan's indignant response, "Pues, ¿no le había de ver? ¿Tengo yo los ojos en el colodrillo?" (143). Without saying too much of anything, and even giving a bad verbal performance in the "representation" of the events allegedly transpiring on the stage, Chanfalla has still been successful in turning the villages suspicions against one another. Chirinos then maliciously chimes in, making the participants "witness" a charging bull and later a pack of rats, prompting everyone in the audience, particularly the recently arrived Juana Castrada and Teresa Repolla, to feign violent reactions of fear and repulsion.

While these and other "visions" are taking place, the Governor is the only one to acknowledge (at least to himself) that he sees nothing, declaring in parenthetical asides, "(Basta: que todos ven lo que yo no veo; pero al fin habré de decir que lo veo, por la negra honrilla)" (144), and "(¿Qué diablos puede ser esto, que aún no me ha tocado una gota donde todos se ahogan? Mas
¿si viniera yo a ser bastardo entre tantos legítimos?) (145). The function of these asides is both to communicate to the real-world audience that the spectators are in fact not witnessing anything at all upon the stage, as well as to help us understand the psychological climate of mistrust that prevents anyone from speaking the truth.

In *El retablo de las maravillas*, the characters become active participants in the elaboration of the events "taking place" on the stage. The *retablo* itself is a curious reversal of the play-within-a-play dynamic: here, what we have is the ultimate non-play. There is, in fact, no dramatic action whatsoever, as nothing is taking place upon the stage. The townspeople merely allow their imaginations to fill in the exotic events that the tricksters would have them perceive, providing the subject matter and material of the "play" for each other's benefit, which we perceive one level further removed from the action, as the real-world audience.\(^{178}\) The question remains, however, are the townsfolk ever really deceived, in the truest sense of the word? That is, do they actually believe that anything is taking place on the stage, and that the other townspeople are actually seeing something happen, or is it merely that they are too afraid to state what they plainly know to be the truth for fear of the social repercussions of admitting that they see nothing?

The traditional "emperor's new clothes" story is fundamentally about three things: power, social conformity, and truth. In almost all variations of the story, the people themselves aren't, in fact, *completely* deceived in this way. Nobody believes the Emperor is *really* wearing anything, although they may suspect he has gone mad. Here, nobody believes that the illusions that they themselves describe are *actually* taking place upon the stage; they themselves see nothing, and are

---

\(^{178}\) Reed has made similar observations about the play (159). My interpretation of the exact mechanism of deception differs significantly from his from this point forward, because unlike Reed, I don't believe the villagers are ever *fully* deceived. Rather, they are complicit in the collective lie, due to their fears of persecution if they contradict what others claim to see.
merely pretending to see, lest they be accused of being part of the "out" group. That is, nobody actually mistakes the fiction or illusion for the truth completely. It is merely the fear that someone else might actually be seeing something, indeed, the possibility that the whole situation could be real, and the lack of desire to be excluded from the social group, singled out as someone who doesn't belong, that motivates the townspeople not to admit that everything they claim to be witnessing is utter falsehood. This becomes most evident with the arrival of the *furrier*,\(^\text{179}\) when the townspeople seize upon the "illusion" of the tableu in a way that is convenient for their own purposes. Since they have no desire for this billeting officer's presence, or to provide lodging for him and his soldiers (as was required of them), they grasp the opportunity to use the very means of their deception to discredit him. Chanfalla's and Chirinos' ruse is so powerful that they themselves actually lose control of it. Benito Repollo refuses to acknowledge the reality of the billeting officer's existence, declaring him and his soldiers to be merely another illusion of the retablo, stating "Digo que los envía Tontonelo, como ha enviado las otras sabandijas que yo he visto" (148).\(^\text{180}\) Although the other characters are very foolish, they are not quite the fools that Benito is, and recognize that the *furrier* poses a real threat if they disobey him, prompting the Governor to declare, "Yo para mí tengo que verdaderamente estos hombres de armas no deben de ser de burlas" (148). Benito Repollo, still playing along with the "illusion" (but also clearly desiring to get rid of the *furrier*) suggests that Chanfalla make the biblical figure Herodías reappear on the stage, so as to scare off the *furrier* with this mystical power. Chanfalla obliges with his rhetoric

\(^{179}\) The *furrier* was a military official charged with finding lodging and provision for the soldiers under his charge, similar to a billeting officer. Cf. ed. Baras Escolá, p. 99, n. 106.  
\(^{180}\) The mechanism employed by Cervantes here is an inversion of the "enchantment" in the *Quixote*. Whereas in the *Quixote*, "enchantment" serves as a way for Don Quixote to explain illusion as reality, in this play, Benito Repollo uses the "magic" of the *retablo* to explain away something real as mere illusion.
and the whole town pretends to see Herod's niece, prompting the billeting officer's confusion and irritation:

FURRIER. ¿Está loca esta gente? ¿Qué diablos de doncella es esta, y qué baile, y qué Tontonelo?
CAPACHO. Luego ¿no vee la doncella Herodiana el señor furrier?
FURRIER. ¿Qué diablos de doncella tengo de ver?
CAPACHO. Basta. ¡De ex il[li]is es!
GOBERNADOR. ¡De ex il[li]is es!
JUAN. ¡Dellos es, dellos el señor furrier, dellos es!
FURRIER. ¡Soy de la mala puta que los parió! ¡Y por Dios vivo, que si echo mano a la espada, que los haga salir por las ventanas, que no por la puerta!
CAPACHO. Basta. ¡De ex il[li]is es!
BENITO. Basta. ¡Dellos es, pues no vee nada!
FURRIER. ¡Canalla barretina! ¡Si otra vez me dicen que soy dellos, no les dejaré hueso sano! (149)

By accepting what they “see” on the stage as “real,” the villagers are able to denounce the billeting officer as an outsider, a Jew or a Bastard, as one of "the others." Hence, they no longer recognize any social contract they have with him, much less any authority he might have exerted over the town. Their reasons for doing this are purely selfish, as they have no desire to provide his troops lodging in their homes. Comically, he returns their insults in kind, calling Benito a "canalla berretina,"181 using a metonymy to accuse Benito of being Jewish. To add further irony, the language the town uses in accusing the furrier is the same language used against St. Peter by the Jews in the New Testament,182 so the whole scene is a complete raucous debacle of accusations being hurled by the town against the furrier and vice-versa, with the two tricksters getting away scot-free.

What is often lost in the analysis of this masterwork is that in giving in to the illusory power

---

181 Spadaccini explains in his edition (p. 101, n. 119) that barretina derives from barrete, which was a kind of hat worn by Jewish people (already in disuse in the time period).
182 See Ch. 1, p. 37 of the present study.
of the retablo, the villagers may be made fools, but they are also able to use that “power” themselves to make others appear foolish. Indeed, the mere accusation of being a Jew completely strips the Furrier of any power or influence, forcing him to retaliate in the only way he can: with physical violence, the only power he has remaining to him. Viewed in this way, the operation of the tableau is far more complex than it initially appears. Although the townspeople are held captive, compelled to acquiesce to the illusion lest they lose their social standing, in a strange way, it also empowers them to deny social standing from an outsider they do not desire in their midst. In this fashion, Cervantes problematizes the whole question of the honor code based on “pure” bloodlines and hereditary privilege. He shows that any power we associate with this honor code rests upon nothing more than our willingness to acquiesce to this system of values, both out of fear, as well as for our own gain. As most studies have commented, Cervantes criticizes the folly of the townspeople for not simply banding together and denouncing Chanfalla and Chirinos as the frauds they are. But the play also shows that even social status, based upon a hollow illusion plainly false to everyone, still translates to real social status and political power. In effect, you can fool all of the people all of the time, so long as they allow themselves to be fooled because it is a more expedient solution to their immediate problem or social situation.

It is no coincidence that Cervantes chose four distinct officials that preside over the district and town as the butt of the satire in this play. Although replacing the prince, king or emperor of the original tale with lesser town officials could have diminished the power of the story in the hands of a less capable writer, Cervantes actually manages to enrich the work by means of this necessary adaptation to the entremés genre.¹⁸³ Each of these four characters represents a different

¹⁸³ The nobility was never to be depicted in these lighthearted interludes, as it was considered improper for the royal court to appear in farces. See the first chapter of this study for details about the entremes genre and its conventions.
way of grappling with the awkward and dangerous social situation they are presented with, and all of them come out losers in the end. The magistrate Benito Repollo, probably the biggest fool of all and certainly the most ignorant, is the most determined to give in to the ruse, in order to make himself appear the least suspicious of any of them. Pedro Capacho, the scribe, seems to be the most malicious of the lot, always inquiring as to whether or not the others can see the scenes on display, and in particular attacking Juan Castrado, and later, the Furrier.\textsuperscript{184} Juan Castrado, as his last name would suggest, is the most powerless, timid and subservient of the lot, only really speaking out to defend himself from accusations, and to comfort his family from the terrifying "visions" they all "witness." Finally, the Governor seems the most sensible of the lot, but for this same reason, is in many ways the most reproachable. He at least acknowledges the truth to himself, but even though he has the most political power of any of the officials assembled, he still refuses to take action and expose the tricksters for what they truly are, knowing that it could backfire and result in the town turning against him. With each of these functionaries, Cervantes gives us glimpses into different aspects of the way foolish people in positions of power give in to the group mentality, rather than risk losing their authority and social standing.

As we have seen with each of the three plays that borrow elements from the picaresque genre, Cervantes constantly problematizes his works and innovates within the established paradigms of each sub-genre. Even with a fairly conventional work like \textit{El vizcaíno fingido}, Cervantes is able to make marked departures from the expectations of the traditional interlude, introducing more nuanced characters, while also seeking to instruct rather than merely to have a laugh at his characters' expense. With \textit{El rufian viudo}, we saw how Cervantes can seamlessly

\footnote{It is possible that with the character of the scribe, Pedro Capacho, Cervantes was indirectly making fun of the inquisitorial process itself and its pernicious and often baseless accusations, of which he himself had been the victim during his lifetime.}
combine elements from radically different genres, as well as utilize characters from other authors, to create a unique brand of satirical burlesque all his own. Finally, with *Retablo*, Cervantes presents us with a scathing indictment of a xenophobic society that is more concerned with preconceived notions of blood-purity and honor than what it truly means to be a good Christian. Rather than serving truth and taking care of their fellow man, all of the townspeople in *retablo* are more concerned with protecting their own reputation, and tarnishing the reputation of people they dislike. Even those who seem to object to what is taking place, like the Governor, are too cowardly to speak up and expose the ruse of the tricksters, for fear that the others will turn against them. In this way, Cervantes defends the importance of seeking truth as a higher virtue than the mere preservation of one's reputation or personal honor. With all three of his plays, Cervantes hopes to instill in his audience humanistic values, and a sense of responsibility to the truth.
5. LOS BAÑOS DE ARGEL

Three of Cervantes’ eight full-length plays in his compendium, *Ocho entremeses y ocho comedias nuevos, nunca representados*, are deeply concerned with the clash between Christian, Moorish, and Jewish cultures in the Iberian Peninsula of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Cervantes’ interest in these themes is not surprising, given the five years of captivity he spent in Argel between 1575-1580. What is surprising is Cervantes’ unusual ability to empathize with “the enemy” and to give nuance to characters and situations on both sides of the battle lines, even after having endured many hardships at the hands of his captors, and after having attempted unsuccessfully to escape from his prison in Argel on no less than four separate occasions.\(^{185}\) In *Los baños de Argel*, Cervantes complicates and enriches themes that he had previously elaborated for the stage in an earlier play, *El trato de Argel*, depicting the harshness of the lives of the Christian captives in Algiers. In *El gallardo español*, Cervantes presents us with a rousing tale of heroism, daring escapes, and the triumph of Christian courage in the face of adversity. The play features the romantic intrigues straight out of the Byzantine novel tradition, but is also loosely based on historical incidents. In *La gran sultana*, Cervantes confronts the topic of hybrid identities, in crafting a rich and varied fictionalized account of portions of the real-life Catalina de Oviedo, a Christian monarch who was the wife of a Sultan. Each of these three plays presents the audience with various aspects of the conflict between Christian and Moorish worlds and ideologies, and each of them demonstrates Cervantes’ great capacity to empathize with “the other.” Although all three of the plays are highly patriotic and clearly intended to support the Christian cause of the

\(^{185}\) For some of the best biographical information on this period of Cervantes’ life to date, see Canavaggio (1996), 48-96.
time period, Cervantes also creates characters that show much more than a simple black-and-white picture of the ideological conflict of his time period.

*Los baños de Argel* is a play undoubtedly born in part out of the lived experience of Cervantes as a captive in Algiers, but it is nevertheless a fictionalized and poetic account of what transpired in captivity. *Baños* is a play characterized by fewer elements that we might deem “escapist” than those encountered in the other two Moorish plays of this compendium. Here, Cervantes depicts a more verisimilar, tragic tale of imprisonment at the hands of the enemy, and finally, a heroic escape, achieved at great pains and costs, and with the faith of the captives tested in numerous ways. Although the play has a “happy ending,” it is nevertheless a tragicomedy, in which many good Christians fall victim to the cruel tyranny of their captors. But Cervantes does not depict all believers in Islam in a negative light, nor does he depict all Christians in a heroic light. On the contrary, there are hypocritical Christians who “sell out” their compatriots for personal gain, and there are Moors who show themselves capable of great humanity, as we shall see.

During the course of this chapter, I will provide a summary of many of the scenes in this play with the intent to demonstrate the ways in which these seemingly disparate vignettes reveal repeated patterns of concealment and revelation, sacrifice and salvation, all of which are interconnected with the central themes of *Baños*. The scenes of the play all serve a specific dramatic function, and are deliberately interwoven in a particular order, alternating between scenes of great suffering and sacrifice, scenes of comedy, and scenes of romantic intrigue. This play with
thirty-two characters in the opening *reparto*186 is certainly one of Cervantes’ more ambitious dramatic undertakings.

*Baños* opens with the renegade Yzuf, leading a raid on the Spanish port town where he was born. The traitorous Yzuf is very familiar with the town, and hence is able to help the Barbary pirates circumvent its defenses with ease:

CAURALÍ. ¿Por dó tienes, Yzuf, determinado que demos el asalto?
YZUF. Por la sierra, lugar que, por ser fuerte, no es guardado. Nací y crecí, cual dije, en esta tierra, y sé bien sus entradas y salidas y la parte mejor de hacerle guerra. (I, vv. 7-12)

The assault by the pirates is extremely successful, and they manage to seize various riches and spoils, as well as many captives. Among their prisoners is Costanza, Don Fernando’s love. Thus, the primary action of this play is initiated by D. Fernando’s rescue mission to save his damsel in distress. In the typical flowery language of the Byzantine novel tradition, he laments her loss, offering all the riches of the world if the pirates would simply come back and return his stolen love:

D. FERNANDO. De Arabia todo el oro, del Sur todas las perlas, la púrpura de Tiro más preciosa, con liberal decoro ofrezco, aunque el tenerlas os venga a parecer dificultosa. Si me volvéis mi esposa, un nuevo mundo ofrezco, con todo cuanto encierra todo el cielo y la tierra. Locuras digo; mas, pues no merezco alcanzar esta palma,

---

186 It should be noted that Ambrioso and La Señora Catalina are the same character, and that Julio (a captive) and the owner of the boat are never mentioned in the cast of characters.
llevad mi cuerpo, pues lleveis mi alma. (I, vv. 214-226)

Don Fernando, declaring his intention quite clearly here, would be willing to relinquish any amount of earthly possessions in order to recover Costanza. Indeed, as he anticipates here, he is even willing to let himself be taken prisoner in hopes of being reunited with Costanza, and ultimately setting her free. This initial raid and Don Fernando’s perilous decision to let himself be taken captive and search for Costanza is the primary catalyst that initiates the main action of the play, but he is nevertheless not the main focus of the dramatic action, as we shall see. One wonders whether Cervantes had at one point intended to make Costanza and Fernando the primary protagonists, later realizing that the other captives and Zahara were in fact more interesting characters.

Meanwhile, in Algiers, we encounter Don Lope and Vivanco, two Christian captives. Vivanco serves as a way for the play to communicate the conditions, fears, trials and tribulations of the prisoners, as well as to show the solidarity between the good Christian captives. In their first exchange of the play, Don Lope and Vivanco discuss the physical labor to which they are subjected, and the demoralizing nature of losing one’s freedom, particularly when forced into a confined enclosure:

D. LOPE. Ventura, y no poca, ha sido haber escapado hoy del trabajo prevenido.
VIVANCO. Para mí es grave tormento este estrecho encerramiento, y es alivio a mi pesar ver el campo o ver la mar.
D. LOPE. Pues yo en verlo me atormento, porque la melancolía que el no tener libertad encierra en el alma mía, quiere triste soledad más que alegre compañía. Trabajar y no comer,
One detects in this passage and those that follow the personal dimension of captivity that Cervantes no doubt draws from his own lived experience during his five years in Argel. Shortly after these remarks, Don Lope and Vivanco complain about the conditions that their captors inflict upon them and their fellow Christian captives, as a man who is ill is beaten by the Moorish watchman. Don Lope remarks that the man is a good soldier and honorable, and is not feigning illness out of laziness. (I, vv. 292-6). Caught up in their anger at the situation, Don Lope fortuitously notices a white cloth tied to a long pole. He remarks, “Alza los ojos y atiende /a aquella parte, Vivanco, y mira si comprende tu vista que un paño blanco de una luenga caña pende” (I, vv. 312-316). They bring down the cloth, untie it, and find twelve gold escudos. At this point in the play, they don’t realize that the money is a gift from Zahara (sometimes called Zara), the heroine of the story, who is herself very comparable to Zoraida in the Captive’s tale of *DQI* (XXXIX-XLI). Zahara’s situation is explained in a note accompanying a later package of monetary aid, not typically included among the numbered verses, but clearly intended to be read aloud by Don Lope, as indicated by a stage direction, between vv. 576-577. This note is very similar to Zoraida’s note in *DQI* (XL, 502) as most editors have already observed. Zahara feels the Christian spirit in her heart and, seeking to convert to Christianity herself, vows to aid the Christian captives.

Interestingly, without knowing who left them the monetary aid, Don Lope declares that it is prudent for him and Vivanco to demonstrate their gratitude through outward manifestations of respect:

D. LOPE. Mas, quienquiera que ella sea, es bien que las apariencias de agradecidos nos vea hazle dos mil reverencias, porque nuestro intento crea;
yo a lo morisco haré
ceremonias, por si fue
mora la que hizo el bien. (I, vv. 362-369)

In their edition (p. 38, n. 70), Florencio Sevilla Arroyo and Antono Rey Hazas note that *ceremonias* in this context undoubtedly refers to the *zalemas*, which were a gestural display of courtesy and humility that one shows to a person in a position of greater authority in Moorish culture, as Cervantes describes himself in Don Quixote “en señal de que lo agradecíamos, hecimos *zalemas* a uso de moros, inclinando la cabeza, doblando el cuerpo y poniendo los brazos sobre el pecho” (I-XL, 500, n. 20). Thus, the Christian captives show respect and courtesy conforming to the customs of their captors, even though they are under no obligation to do so. The respect and courtesy manifested by all Christians in the play (save for the scoundrel of a Sacristan and the traitor Yzuf) is another recurring motif in the play.

This outward display of respect is immediately followed by the arrival of Hazén, a character who shows great compassion towards the captives, explaining that he was forced to become a Turk at a young age, but that he is, in fact, a good Christian in secret. Upon giving them a document which explains his situation, he exposit for the sake of the audience:

HAZÉN. Aquí va cómo es verdad que he tratado a los cristianos con mucha afabilidad,
sin tener en lengua o manos
la turquesa cruéldad;
cómo he a muchos socorrido;
cómo, niño, fui oprimido
a ser turco; cómo voy
en corso, pero que soy
buen cristiano en lo escondido,
y quizá hallaré ocasión
para quedarme en la tierra,
para mí, de promisión. (I, vv. 387-399).
Hazén intends to help Don Lope and Vivanco procure a ship to escape, so that he too may make it to the Christian territory. He is the principal tragic character of the play, whose courage and noble sacrifice enables the other main characters to escape, as we shall see at the end of the first act.

Before we arrive at the final tragic confrontation between Hazén and Yzuf, Cervantes presents his audience with a portrait of the defiant captive, who, in spite of having both of his ears cut off as punishment for his three escape attempts, vows to continue trying to escape until he is no longer physically able to do so. He proclaims defiantly, “Si no me cortas los pies, /al huirme no hay reparo” (I, vv. 547-8). We know as a matter of historical fact that Cervantes himself attempted to escape from Argel on no less than four occasions, and that he probably would have been punished more severely had the Moors not believed him to be a captive of greater status (they were evidently not aware of his poverty and relative lower-standing). But beyond the lived experience that Cervantes may have infused into this character, el desorejado functions in the play both as a reminder of the brutal repercussions for attempted escape, and of the Christian’s collective strength and defiance even when threatened with such severe forms of punishment.

In contrast to the courage and steadfastness of the good Christian captives, and of those sympathetic to their cause, we have Yzuf, the cruel renegade who was willing to sell out his own people. Yzuf serves as a foil to the noble Hazén, and it is the confrontation between these two characters and the tragic demise of the latter that concludes the first act of this play. The Yzuf character in this play is substantially more deplorable in his conduct than the character by the same name in El trato de Argel, since he is a traitor to his own birth, guiding the Barbary corsairs into battle even against members of his own family, as he remarks, when surveying the captives, “Pues

---

187 Canavaggio informs us in his biography, “The corsair, convinced that he is dealing with an important personage, will demand as the price of ransom the considerable sum of five hundred gold escudos [for Cervantes’ release]” (78).
désto[s] te admirarás. / Y son, a lo que imagino, / uno y otro mi sobrino” (I, vv. 671-673). Thus, Yzuf is willing not only to betray his own land, but his own blood as well. In his confrontation with Hazén towards the end of the first act, he remarks that “Mi pueblo se saqueó, / y, aunque poca, en él se hallo / ganacia y algún cautivo” (I, vv. 652-654). To this remark, Hazén compares him to Nero, who allegedly started the great fire of Rome of July 19, 64 A.D.¹⁸⁸, and who was a common figure symbolizing evil and betrayal, an archetypal character of the time. Yzuf is also notably accused of “sinning against nature.” Although it may surprise us as moderns, one of the most common accusations made by Christians against their Moorish adversaries of the day was that of being sodomites, and of taking pleasure in subjecting their captives to sexual humiliation. We see the accusation of homosexuality when Hazén remarks, “¡Tu llevas Buena esperanza /a los lagos de Sodoma!” (I, 815-16). These charges of betrayal and treachery (betraying his family, his country, and his religion) against Yzuf are enumerated and clearly laid out by Hazén in the following invective:

HAZÉN.

Dejo aparte que no tengas
ley con quien tu alma avengas,
ni la de gracia ni escrita,
ni en iglesia ni en mezquita
a encomendarte a Dios vengas.
Con todo, de tu fiera
no pudiera imaginar
cosa de tanta extrañeza
como es venirte a faltar
la ley de naturaleza.
Con sólo que la tuvieras,
fácilmente conocieras
la maldad que cometías

¹⁸⁸ Modern historians have determined that, although he was indeed an inadequate ruler, Nero probably did not start the fire of Rome, although he may have instigated it as a political/ theatrical act, and he invested a lot of money trying to extinguish it. For an interesting study of this historical perspective, see Champlin.
las esp[a]ñolas riberas.
¿Qué Falaris agraviado,
qué Dionisio embravecido,
o qué Catalina airado,
contra su sangre ha querido
mostrar su rigor sobrado?
¿Contra tu patria levantas
la espada? ¿Contra las plantas
que con tu sangre crecieron
tus hoces agudas fueron?

YZUF. ¡Por Dios, Hazén, que me espantas!

HAZÉN ¿No te espanta haber vendido
a tu tío y tus sobrinos
y a tu patria, descreído,
y espápate…? (I, vv. 777-804)

The indictment of Yzuf here makes it fairly clear that he is set up in this text as the ultimate
traitor, as a man who would literally sell out his own country and even his own family for personal
gain. Hazén accuses him of being a man without any true religion, who can find redemption for
his soul neither in Churches nor Mosques. He is neither truly Christian nor Moor, but merely a
mercenary, willing to do anything for money. In the context of this quote, “ley de naturaleza”
refers to the impulse that he should have been imbued with by nature (but which he clearly lacks)
not to turn against his own kind. When Hazén compares Yzuf to a number of famously cruel and
treacherous historical figures, Yzuf responds that such words frighten him. Hazén replies with
indignation, that he should have been frightened by his own treacherous actions not only against
his country, but against his very family.

---

189 Falaris was a corsair known for his unusual cruelty, Dionysius was the tyrant ruler of Syracuse
in the IV century BCE, and while Lucius Sergius Catalina has been slightly vindicated by modern
historians, he was at the time known for being a ruthless, treacherous and treasonous individual as
a result of Cicero’s *In Catilinam*, where his conspiratorial plot against the Roman senate is
exposed. See also ed. Rey Hazas & Sevilla Arroyo, 57, n. 118-120.
Yzuf is reminiscent of the paradigmatic traitor, Judas, while Hazén, who confesses his love for Christ, reminds us of St. Peter, as Joaquín Casalduero has already astutely observed.190 This contrast of characters is deeply significant within the context of the play as a whole. It is very probable that this work was originally conceived of as a devotional play, to be performed around Easter. Though we do not know this for a fact, portions of the play’s third act make explicit reference to the dramatic action occurring on these dates, “Hoy dicen que tornó a vivir su Cristo” (III, vv. 2058). This, coupled with the fact that the underlying theme of the piece is the triumph of the Christian faith over the most adverse of circumstances, gives plausibility to the idea that Cervantes composed the drama as a devotional play to be performed during semana santa.191

This first act gives us one of the miracles of this play, Hazén’s public confession accepting Jesus Christ as his lord and savior, even in the face of certain death. Outraged and appalled with Yzuf’s lack of compassion and treasonous behavior and complete lack of remorse, Hazén exacts his vengeance for the Christian prisoners, stabbing him to death.

When he is brought before the Cadi192 and asked why he killed Yzuf, Hazén exclaims “No porque éste fue de caza /de la vida le destierro, /sino porque fue de raza /que siempre cazó por yerro” (I, vv. 823-826). In other words, Hazén kills Yzuf not because he was a mercenary, but because he betrayed his own family and embraced the Muslim faith. Although Cervantes is known to us today as an extremely tolerant and forward-thinking individual for his time period, we must remember that this is a deeply patriotic, deeply Christian play about the triumph of the Christian

---

190 Casalduero, 85.
191 See also Rey Hazas & Sevilla Arroyo, XXVIII-XXIX & Casalduero, 103.
192 The Cadi or Qadi is a judge ruling in accordance with Islamic law, appointed by the ruler of a territory. See Autoridades, “ALCALDE. s. m. La persona constituida en la Dignidad de Juez, para administrar justicia en el Pueblo en que tiene la jurisdicción. Voz Arabe de Cadi, que vale Juez, ó Gobernador, añadido el artículo Al, y otra l antes de la d, con la corrupción de mudar la i en e.”
captives over terrible adversity in the face of their cruel Muslim captors. Hazén’s conversion to Christianity and public confession of his faith should be viewed as one of the miracles of this play. Cervantes was not given to the depiction of the supernatural. Hence, the “miracles” of the play do not involve anything outside the realm of normal human understanding, but are rather great acts of faith in the face of terrible circumstances. Hazén’s defiant proclamation is one such act, as we see in his final exchange with the Cadi:

**CADÍ.** ¿Eres cristiano?  
**HAZÉN.** Sí, soy;  
Y en serlo tan firme estoy  
que deseo, como has visto,  
deshacerme y ser con Cristo,  
si fuese posible, hoy.  
¡Buen Dios, perdona el exceso  
de haber faltado en la fe,  
pues, al cerrar del proceso,  
si en público te negué,  
en público te confieso! (I, vv. 827-836)

With these words, Hazén shows that not only is he unafraid to die for his Christian faith, that this is what he desires. He laments only that he was unable to confess his true religion publically before this moment, and now proudly proclaims his Christianity, and looks forward to joining Christ in the afterlife. His final words are “Cristianos, a morir voy, / no moro, sino Cristiano; / que aqueste descuento doy / del vivir torpe y profano / en que he vivido hasta hoy. //  
En España lo diréis / a mis padres, si es que os veis / fuera de aqueste destierro” (I, vv. 862-869). Parallel with and opposite to Yzuf, Hazén claims his original country, his faith, and his family as he is put to death. Yzuf explicitly betrays all three for financial gains, while Hazén reclaims them, losing his own life in the process, and assuring his salvation in death. Hazén’s sacrifice will eventually pave the way for the other Christians to escape at the play’s end, and his public
proclamation of faith, country and family is a testament to his miraculous ability to stay true to his Christian identity, even living among his captors for so many years.

The second act of *Baños* opens with Costanza and Halima, the wife of the corsair Cauralí, discussing their current situation and Costanza’s marital status. Costanza is now Halima’s slave, though Halima does not mistreat her, but due to the power dynamic between them, Costanza is careful not to disclose too much detail about her amorous situation. Additionally, Costanza and Don Fernando are finally reunited, when Cauralí brings Don Fernando in as his captive and servant. Don Fernando and Costanza immediately recognize one another, but are cautious not to disclose their joy to their captors. Cervantes does a masterful job here of incorporating brief asides into the dramatic action of the play. Both Fernando and Costanza have asides upon recognizing their lost lover, clearly intended for the benefit of the audience to make sure they understand the central intrigue. In both cases, Cauralí hears the protagonists muttering under their breath, and asks with whom they are speaking, thereby indicating that the characters are muttering to themselves in disbelief rather than addressing the audience directly. Realizing, however, that it might be dangerous for them to reveal themselves and their true intentions, Don Fernando pretends that he has never laid eyes on Costanza before:

D. [FERNANDO]. ¿Cómo os llamáis?  
COSTANZA. ¿Yo? Costanza. 
D. [FERNANDO]. ¿Sois soltera o sois casada?  
COSTANZA. De serlo tuve esperanza. 
D. [FERNANDO]. ¿Y estáis ya desesperada?  
COSTANZA. Aún vive la confianza: que, mientras dura la vida, es necesidad conocida desesperarse del bien. 
D. [FERNANDO]. ¿Quién fue vuestro padre?  
COSTANZA. ¿Quién? Un Diego de la Bastida. 
D. [FERNANDO]. ¿No estábades concertada con un cierto don Fernando
COSTANZA. de sobrenombre de Andrada?
Así es; mas nunca el cuándo
llegó desa suerte honrada:
que mi señor Cauralí
del bien que en fe poseí,
merced a Yzuf el traidor,
trujo de su borrador
el original aquí. (II, vv. 957-976)

This scene presents us with some wonderful dramatic irony, in which Don Fernando and Costanza are well aware of each other’s past, but must make their tale explicit in order to dissimulate their true feelings for one another from their captors. Additionally, the dialogue connects the two Christian characters with their family background and name. Although not initially of great importance, we shall see throughout the course of the play that in this dramatic work, Cervantes is less interested in the relationships of the characters for the sake of romantic intrigue than he is for the sake of showing the nature of good Christian conduct through love, even in adverse circumstances. Time and time again in this play, the concepts of family, nation and religion are deeply intertwined, and the dramatic work looks at the relationships of its characters (whether in a comic, tragic or romantic mode) at all three levels.

It might initially strike the audience as odd that almost immediately after this exchange, Zahara enters the scene, and she and Halima discuss Hazén’s redemptive sacrifice, recapping the finale of the previous act. But the purpose of summarizing events we have just seen is to connect Hazén’s sacrifice with those of the other Christian protagonists of the play. Like Hazén, Don Fernando and Costanza must conceal the fact that they know each other intimately, just as Zahara must conceal her true Christian heart, and her desire to convert to Christianity. In this way, the play foreshadows that, just as Hazén was finally free in death to proclaim his true faith, casting off the false appearances he was forced to maintain, so too will the other protagonists of the play be
able to express their true devotion in life. When Cauralí asks Zahara if Hazén died as a Moor, she replies:

\begin{verbatim}
ZHARA.  Dicen que guardó un decoro
que entre cristianos se advierte
que es el morir confesando
al Cristo que ellos adoran.
Y estúvemele mirando,
y, entre otros muchos que lloran,
también estuve llorando,
porque soy naturalmente
de pecho humano y clemente;
en fin, pecho de mujer. (II, vv. 995-1004)
\end{verbatim}

This fragment, replete with more dramatic irony, not only recaps the finale of the previous act, but also helps connect Hazén’s Christian death with Zahara’s own longing to be able to publically proclaim her true faith. Zahara proceeds to ask Don Fernando about the ways in which people fulfill promises and show their loyalty in Christian territories, but she must be careful not to reveal her true intentions to Halima. As Don Fernando and the three women continue to talk, there is a strange game of concealing intentions being played, in which only Halima, who is true to her Islamic faith, is able to speak frankly. The scene ends with both Zahara and Halima quite impressed with their Christian captives' intelligence and discretion, and with a typical Cervantine binary opposition, as Don Fernando happily proclaims, “¡Oh, por mi bien, prenda hallada!” overjoyed at having found Costanza, where Costanza laments, “Oh, por mi mal, bien perdido!” at the thought of having to part ways with Don Fernando again (II, vv. 1155-1156).

The next scene adds a bit of levity, reintroducing an old man and a Sacristan named Tristán that were taken prisoners in the first act. The Sacristan is a character borrowed from the entremés genre, and is really more of a roguish, picaresque sort, intended primarily for comedic effect. Even in the relatively humorous conversation between the Sacristan and the old man, though, there are
serious moments that remind us of their dire circumstances, such as the old man expressing his fears that his boys, also taken captive, may be raped by their ruthless captors:

VIEJO. Más cautiverio y más duelos
cupieron a mis dos niños,
por crecer mis desconsuelos.
Conservad a estos armiños
en limpieza, ¡oh limpios cielos!
Y si veis que se endereza
De Mahoma la torpeza
a procurar su caída,
quitadles antes la vida
que ellos pierdan su limpieza. (II, vv. 1207-1216)

Thus, the old man would rather see his own children killed than suffer this horrible violation and dishonor at the hands of their captors. In this way, the play looks at the situation of the captives from a much more particular and familiar angle, as opposed to the more collective approach seen in Cervantes’ earlier take on the same theme in his *El trato de Argel*.

To further show the distance between the three major religions in conflict (Christianity, Judaism and Islam), Cervantes introduces a comic, stereotyped Jewish character into the play, who is the butt of the Sacristan’s mischievous jests. Although Zimic has made the argument that Cervantes was criticizing the public ridicule of Jews through the cruel jokes of the Sacristan, this hypothesis seems highly unlikely given the subject matter of the play. As other scholars have remarked, this is Cervantes at his most Christian and patriotic, writing a play in which the historical salvation of the prisoners at Algiers occurs during the days that Christ was saved and resurrected. Through this genre of patriotic, devotional play, Cervantes is invested in showing the

---

193 Zimic, 143.
194 I believe Américo Castro addressed the issue of Cervantes’ tolerance of other cultures excellently in his *El pensamiento de cervantes*, 292-307, in which he argues that, while Cervantes was undoubtedly more tolerant than many of his contemporaries, there is no reason to see any irony in his stereotypical depiction of the Jewish characters in this and *La gran sultana*.
195 Casalduero, 105 and ed. Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas, p. XXVI.
superiority of Christianity over the other dominant, monotheistic religions of the peninsula. What makes Cervantes different from his contemporaries, as we have seen, is that he doesn’t try to hide the fact that there were extremely cruel individuals of Christian birth, traitors to their own heritage, nor does he depict all people of Moorish descent as inherently cruel. While there is considerable nuance to his characters in this regard, the Jewish character comes across as little more than a concession to the popular tastes of the time period, a way to add levity to an otherwise very serious play. This drama attempts to emphasize humorously the fact that the Jewish people don’t recognize Jesus as their savior, and hence are still waiting for a savior that has already arrived (according to Christian beliefs).  

This notion obviously has little place in our more contemporary conception of tolerance, but neither should we fault Cervantes for apparently having some beliefs that were more conventional and reflective of the prejudices of his time.

The rather lazy Sacristan taunts the Jewish man by insisting that he carry a barrel to his master. The Jewish man replies that he cannot, as it is the Sabbath, and hence, he is unable to perform any work this day, proclaiming, “¡Ay, ay, mísero y triste! / Por el Dío bendito, / que si hoy no fuera sábado, / que lo llevara. ¡Buen cristiano, basta!” (II, vv. 1286-1289). In the play’s third act, it becomes clear that Cervantes is contrasting the major days of worship and prayer of three religions, that is, the Islamic Friday (Salaat-ul-Jumma), the Jewish Shabbat and finally, the Christian Sunday. Through the character of the stereotyped Jew here, he mocks the idea of reliance on the Laws as a sign of true devotion, as opposed to helping out one's fellow man and accepting Jesus as the savior. Although these scenes of the play may offend our modern sensibilities, they are understandable given the occasion for which this play was likely composed,

---

196 Compare with Casalduero’s similar remarks, 90-91.
197 Cf. Casalduero, 105.
and they do fit in with the overall themes of the dramatic structure. This scene also contrasts with the ways in which the young boys, Juanico and Francisquito, do not bow to the temptation to convert to Islam to spare themselves pain, and show their defiant devotion to Christianity as though they were full-grown men.

In the next scenes of this act, the old man, his two sons, and many other of the Christian captives, as well as Señora Catalina, disguised as a young man named Ambrosio, gather and sing patriotic songs that describe their plight as captives. The Cadí and Cauralí arrive, and once again separate the old man from his two sons, with the Cadí proclaiming, “Perro, ¿vos estáis aquí? / No te he dicho yo, malvado, / que te quites del cuidado / del ver tus hijos?” (II, vv. 1455-1458). This scene strengthens our sense of the plight of not only being separated from one’s friends and family back home, but also from those among one’s family members who were also taken captive. In spite of the protestations of the old man and his children, the Cadí is unrelenting in his desire to separate them. Indeed, the Cadí has taken a liking to Francisco, and intends to adopt him as his own son, after converting him to Islam. Francisco does not receive this news warmly:

**CADÍ.**

¿Veisle? Sabei que le adoro,  
y que pienso prohijalle  
después que le vuelva moro.

**FRANCISCO.**

Pues sepa que he de burlalle,  
Auque me dé montes de oro;  
Y aunque me dé tres reales  
justos, enteros, cabales,  
y más dos maravedís. (II, vv. 1482-1489)

Francisco shows great courage in standing up to the Cadí, and although he is merely a boy, still shows an unshakable resolve in his faith. Unlike Yzuf, he refuses to betray his faith for money. His show of defiance will have consequences which parallel Hazén’s.

After this, we learn that Vivanco and Don Lope have been able to buy their freedom, in exchange for helping Zahara with her own escape and conversion, with money she has been
secretly giving them. In the following scene, the four women (Halima, Zahara, Costanza and Catalina) cross paths with Don Lope and Vivanco. Zahara pretends that a wasp has gotten under her almalafa (head scarf) in order to reveal herself briefly to Don Lope. He is taken with her poise and grace, and in a conversation that follows shortly thereafter, Don Lope explains to Costanza that he is to marry a Christian moor, much to Zahara’s delight. Like Don Fernando and Costanza earlier, Zahara must conceal her true feelings of overwhelming happiness, lest her plans be discovered by Halima.

In stark contrast to this poetic courting scene, we have another comical scene with the Jew and the Sacristan, in which the Sacristan has taken a cooking pot with food prepared the previous day from the Jew. Since the Jewish man is unable to prepare new food (being that it is his Sabbath), and since he cannot handle money, the Sacristan once again torments the poor fellow. As trivial as the scene is, there is a point to it, which is that the Sacristan foreshadows the fact that he will later kidnap the Jewish man’s infant son (intending to return him eventually), which results in his obtaining his own freedom, as will later become apparent. But the line “Vive Dios, /que os tengo de hurtar un niño” (II, vv. 1722) has a dual significance. Casalduero explains:

En el primer episodio se ha dicho que el Mesías ya había venido, en este se dice que se hurtará un niño. Es el Niño Jesús que los cristianos han quitado a los judíos. En la tercera jornada, la nueva gracia consistirá en robar a un niño judío; por medio de este niño alcanzará el sacristán su rescate—es la jornada del domingo de Resurrección. (93)

Following this, we return to Costanza and Don Fernando, who are finally able to speak candidly with one another once again. Don Fernando tells Costanza of his misadventures, and the two lament the fact that their captors have a romantic interest in them. Halima is enamored with Don Fernando, and her husband with Costanza, and when Cauralí and Halima discover their slaves embracing, they are outraged both with the Christian captives, as well as one another. Costanza and Fernando manage to ameliorate their anger before being separated again. The scene is
simultaneously full of dramatic tension and comedic bickering, as Halima and Caurali seek to betray one another, without the other catching on. The jealous, argumentative, and clearly unbalanced nature of Halima and Caurali’s relationship is contrasted with the idealized nature of the Christian pairs later in the play.

Finally, we return once again to Francisquito and Juanico, who discuss their situation. Juanico is initially afraid of the punishment they will receive if they refuse to give in to the Cadi’s will, but Francisquito, just as defiantly as before reiterates, “no pienses que he de ser moro, / por más que aqueste inhumano / me prometa plata y oro, / que soy español cristiano” (II, vv. 1865-1870). Before discussing what prayers they know and should recite to deal with this situation, Francisquito states, “que he de ser un nuevo Justo / y tú otro nuevo Pastor”198 (II, vv. 1883-4), declaring his intention that they should become Martyrs before they cave into the Cadi’s desires and renounce their Christianity. At the conclusion of the act, they continue to resist by reciting fragments of Christian prayers, infuriating the Cadi, who finally proclaims, “¡Esto es cansarnos en balde! Éste, a mi instancia llevadle, y estotro, que han de morir” (II, vv. 1989-1991). Nevertheless, when Francisquito asks his younger brother, “¿No le temes?,” Juanico responds, “no le temo” (II, 2020-21).

The defiant attitude of the children not only parallels the bravery and devotion of Hazén in the first act, but it also shows the strength of good Christian family ties in this second act. Their father has raised them as good Christians, and they, unlike Yzuf, understand the importance of never selling out your true character. In this way, though they are but boys, they show the strength

198 St. Justus and St. Pastor are two Christian schoolboys, aged 13 and 9, who were flogged and beheaded on the order of the Roman Emperor Diocletian in 304 CE in Complutum (present-day Alcalá de Henares). Canavaggio also mentions that when their remains were moved from Huesca to Alcalá in 1568, there was a play dramatizing their martyrdom which Cervantes may have witnessed in his youth.
of their instruction and belief in God, and once again connect the units of family, country and religion that are ever-present in this play.

The third act introduces an element of metatheatricality. We begin with the Guardián Bají and another Moor discussing the play that the captive Spaniards are about to perform for Easter. They comment that the Spaniards are all Satans and devils, but nevertheless don’t stop the proceedings. This was apparently common practice in real life as well. The characters of the play itself comment on how interesting it is that they be allowed to perform (the play-within-the-play) in accordance with their own traditions and customs without persecution on their holy Easter day. Vivanco remarks, “Y aun otra cosa, si adviertes, / que es de más admiración, / y es que estos perros sin fe / nos dejen, como se ve, guardar nuestra religion” (III, vv. 2069-2073). Cervantes also chooses to interject a bit of dramatic criticism in his usual fashion, praising the works of Lope de Rueda, before the play begins, with Osorio introducing the play by stating, “Antes que más gente acuda, / el coloquio se comience, / que es del gran Lope de Rueda, / impreso por Timoneda, / que en vejez al tiempo vence” (III, vv. 2097-2101). The character goes on to praise its elegant pastoral language, in a fashion that quite evidently reflects Cervantes’ own judgments.

The play-within-a-play itself is never presented in earnest, as the acting is terrible. Tristán the Sacristán takes the opportunity to make a mockery of the whole situation, interjecting lines of his own invention, alluding to the presence of Cauralí, mocking him, and having a laugh at the Moors’ expense. When Cauralí has had enough and has Tristán ejected, the play is once again interrupted, as two Spaniards enter the scene, one of the wounded, explaining that the drunken genizaros are killing Christians out of fear of a massive Spanish fleet that has just arrived. After lengthy exposition by the prison Guard, who explains the proceedings of the battle and the casualties on both sides, the grand, national scale of the battle is looked at on a smaller scale, as
Osorio and an unnamed Christian discuss the tragic fate of Francisco, left pending in the previous act. This Christian explains, “Atado está a una coluna, / hecho retrato de Cristo, / de la cabeza a los pies / en su misma sangre tinto” (III, vv. 2373-2376). Cervantes at this point of his career has learned the impact that particularizing tragedy through the experience of individual characters can be more effective at times than the collectivization of suffering seen in some of his earlier works, *La Numancia* and *El trato de Argel*. In presenting us with this ghastly image of the martyred boy, Cervantes more successfully personalizes the tragedy experienced by the Christians in this conflict. Although it occurs in the third act, this scene concludes the second tragic phase of the play, with Don Fernando remarking, “Acábense nuestras fiestas, / cesen nuestros regocijos, / que siempre en tragedia acaban/ las comedias de cautivos” (III, vv. 2393-96).

We join later Francisquito, condemned to his terrible fate, and his father, attempting to console him and give him strength in his final moments. As he holds his dying son close, in tears, he exclaims, “¡Vete en paz, alma Hermosa, / y al que te hizo dichosa, / pues ya le ves, pídele / que nos sustente en su fe / pura, santa, alegre, honrosa!” (III, vv. 2575-2579) This is one of the most gruesome scenes of the play, and in it, we see the father consoled only by the knowledge that his son will certainly make it into heaven with his true devotion to his faith. This scene concludes the tragic segment of the play, but there is still considerable conflict and tension that needs to be resolved before the captives can achieve their freedom.

In the following scene, the romantic intrigue of the play comes to its point of maximum tension, as Zahara’s father, Hazán Bají, King of Algiers, has found her a suitor to whom to be married. Zahara expresses her distress to Halima and Costanza, initially claiming that, although she is to be married to Muley Maluco, a handsome suitor of great wealth, power and erudition, she
is unprepared to be wed. When she is alone with Costanza, the latter is also confused and in disbelief, prompting the following exchange:

COSTANZA. ¿De dónde el enfado mana
Que muestras tan importuno?
ZAHARA. Pasito, no escuche alguno.
¡Soy Cristiana, soy cristiana!
COSTANZA. ¡Válame Santa María!
ZAHARA. Esa Señora es aquella
que ha de ser mi luz y estrella
en el mar de mi agonía.
COSTANZA. ¿Quién te enseñó nuestra ley?
No hay lugar en que lo diga.
Cristana soy; mira, amiga,
qué me sirve el moro rey. (III, vv. 2437-2448)

Zahara is finally able to reveal the truth to Costanza, though she is still frustrated in her intentions to escape and make her conversion complete.

At this point, Hazán Bají, the Cadí and a Guard discuss the recent, almost miraculous appearance of the Spanish fleet, that materialized overnight and fought their soldiers with great fury. The King of Algiers also expresses his lack of surprise at Francisco’s refusal to convert, indicating that the faith of the Spaniards is seemingly unbreakable. We are also greeted by another moment of comedy with the Sacristan and the Jew, in which the Sacristán has kidnapped the Jew’s baby, alleging that he is going to teach the child the Padrenuestro and raise him as a Catholic unless he is paid to return the child. This scene once again is not funny from a modern perspective, but it does serve a purpose at a later time in the dramatic action, and also ties back in with the Sacristán’s earlier remark, “Vive Dios, / que os tengo de hurtar un niño” (II, vv. 1722) that we have already examined.

In the next scene, the wedding processional begins, with Halima filling in for Zahara. The protagonists comment on the opulence of the wedding, and on how Zara/Zahara is their Moses, having procured for them a way to escape their lot. Osorio, another Spaniard in their number,
remarks, “Gasta en Pascua el judío / su hacienda; en bodas, el moro; / el cristiano a su albedrío, / sigue en esto otro decoro, / de todo gasto vacío” (III, vv. 2615-2619). Once again, the three monotheistic religions are contrasted, with the Christian faith clearly viewed as the most authentically spiritual. Za(ha)ra appears from a window above, and is reunited with Don Lope, confusing all the Spaniards present. It is for them a miraculous apparition, as she appears to be in two places at once. They remark on her beauty and majesty before she and Don Lope converse at length about their plans. It is extremely noteworthy in this scene that Cervantes plays less to the romantic angle of their relationship, and much more so to the religious angle. Zahara has become enamored with Don Lope, but her marriage is about more than love: it is a total spiritual transformation. Thus, when Don Lope wishes to kiss her, she replies:

ZAHARA. No es bien que se descompongan
Con moras labios cristianos.
Por mil señales han visto
Cómo yo toda soy tuya,
No por ti, sino por Cristo,
y así, en fe de que soy tuya,
estas caricias resisto;
para otro tiempo las guarda,
que ahora, que se acobarda
el alma con mil temores,
condimientos y amores
mal los atiende y aguarda. (III, vv. 2683-2694)

Cervantes indirectly contrasts the spiritual, Christian marriage that Zahara hopes to attain with the relationship between Cauralí and Halima and their jealousy seen earlier. Zahara seeks to keep the nature of their relationship as pure as possible. Thus, she doesn’t want any amorous contact between herself and Don Lope until her conversion to Christianity is complete. Zahara manages to postpone her betrothal to Muley, in order to buy time to escape with the Christians, as Don Lope, now a free man, is leaving for six days (initially stated as eight in the text), but swears on the virgin mother and her son that he will return for Zahara.
In the next scene, we finally get the conclusion to Tristán’s antics, as the sacristan’s freedom has been paid for by the Jews. Apparently, Tristan was so incredibly insufferable that, in order to avoid him pilfering things from them and tormenting them any further, they paid for his freedom. He remarks, “dicen que desta suerte / aseguran sus niños, / sus trastos y cazuelas, y, finalmente, su hacienda toda. / Yo he dado mi palabra / de no hurtarles cosa / mientras me fuere a España, / y por Dios que no sé si he de cumplirla” (III, vv. 2828-2835). This concludes the “comedic” element of salvation in the text, as a scoundrel is saved by making his own vices into a virtue.

Returning to the more serious subject matter, a group of friars arrive to pay the ransom of the remaining Christians, and they are finally granted their freedom. Meanwhile, Halima discovers the truth of Zahara’s faith, as Zahara accidentally drops her cross. Zahara feigns ignorance, and Costanza tries to pretend the cross belongs to her, but to no avail. Halima, however, is sympathetic to her desires and merely advises Zahara to keep the cross hidden, declaring, “Con todo, quítala, hermana; /que si algún moro la vee, /dirá que guardas la fe, /en secreto, de cristiana” (III, vv. 2907-2911). Halima then reveals that she has fallen in love with Don Fernando, in spite of his Christian faith. Halima comes to an agreement with Don Fernando, who has served her faithfully as her slave. He asks merely for a leave of three days, after which time, he will come to find her in the garden (a promise he never keeps). In the final scene of the play, the Christians are reunited. In spite of everything that has transpired, Cauralí and especially Halima show themselves to be much less cruel and much more forgiving than the other Moors. The play ends with Zahara

199 Florencio Sevilla Arroyo and Antonio Rey Hazas explain in their edition that these members of the orders of Merced or Trinidad would often collect alms to pay for the ransom of prisoners, as is the case in this play (135, n. 77).
adopting the new name María, and with Don Lope declaring that the events that have transpired on the stage were inspired by true events, rather than imagination.

Throughout the play, the repeated pattern we encounter is that of good Christians forced to conceal some aspect of their true being, until a critical moment in which they are free to express their true Christian beliefs. Hazén had to conceal his true Christian beliefs just as Zahara would later have to do, just as later Don Fernando and Costanza had to conceal their love for one another from their captors. At each moment when the Christians are able to affirm their true belief in Jesus and the Christian God, there is a moment of profound redemption in the play, that twice provides salvation following a horrific execution, and finally allows the surviving Christian captives and the convert Zahara to return home to Spain. Even the Sacristan, with his entremés-like character, displays a comedic reversal of the themes of the play, turning his vices into a virtue, and achieving salvation as a result. In concert with one another, all the episodes of the play serve to demonstrate various minor miracles that show the greatness of the Christian faith directly contrasted with the other two major monotheistic religions of the peninsula.

As Florencio Sevilla Arroyo and Antonio Rey Hazas point out in their edition, Baños is a very different play from Cervantes’ earlier grappling with the same themes in El trato de Argel, which was performed in its day (unlike Baños). In Baños, the collective dimension of the protagonist is substantially diminished. Cervantes perhaps realized in composing this undoubtedly later play that a great deal of the dramatic success of a work such as this comes not from focusing on the collective dimension of suffering, but rather, in personalizing it by showing the particular experience of a few individuals. Additionally, Don Lope affirms at the end of the play that “es bien que verdad y historia alegre al entendimiento” (vv. 3088-89). Indeed, it is quite clear that Cervantes takes many liberties and poetic license with the historical subjects of the play. Thanks in large
part to Diego de Haedo’s *Topografía*200, we have information about several of the play’s main characters. Yzuf was the name of an actual corsair who became quite wealthy as a result of his exploits, and married a woman named Zahara (fol 19r). Cauralí was apparently a renegade corsair of Greek origin (fol. 18r & fol. 139). Muley Maluco, the man to whom Zahara’s marriage was arranged in the text, is a reference to Abd-el-Malek, a pretender to the Marrocan throne, who was married to Agi Morato’s real-life daughter in 1574.201 Thus, the names of the characters are based on real-life individuals, but bear only a superficial relationship with their counterparts.

As we have seen in this play, Cervantes’ preoccupation with verisimilitude is still fundamentally a literary construction, that, while not implausible, is nevertheless replete with elements of the poetic traditions and the byzantine novel, from which elements of the play also draw their inspiration. Within this literary tradition, Cervantes shows remarkable restraint for not depicting things in Manichean terms of good vs. evil, in spite of his own situation of captivity. It is perhaps appropriate that we conclude our analysis by citing Canavaggio’s biography of Cervantes once again, where he sums up perfectly the primary thrust of *Baños*:

…[I]n contact with these Moors and renegades, Miguel learned to go beyond prejudices, to renounce ill-considered opinions. In his works, he castigates those who renounce the Faith of Christ out of weakness or inertia; and he exalts, in contrast, the heroism of martyrs true to their convictions, like Miguel de Aranda, the Valencian priest who was stoned and burned, doubtless under Cervantes’ very eyes. (82)

In his exultation of true conviction of faith, however, Cervantes seeks to present his audience with an intricately woven tapestry of different interlocking scenes that portray the unity of family, country, and religion within the uniquely Spanish variety of the Catholic faith.

---

201 See Rey Hazas & Sevilla Arroyo, p. 41, n. 77.
6. LA GRAN SULTANA

*La gran sultana* is a radically different kind of captives’ tale from what we have just seen with *Los baños de Argel*. Although both plays have a semi-historical basis, neither drama is what we would call “historical drama” in the stricter, modern sense of the term. As we have seen, *Los baños de Argel* is basically a devotional play about how the steadfast religious attitude of the Spaniards in captivity leads to their eventual salvation. *La gran sultana*, on the other hand, is a much more farcical take on similar subject matter. It is worth noting that Cervantes’ plays dealing with themes of captivity in a less serious (and arguably more escapist) light, namely, this play and *El gallardo español*, do not take place in Algiers. Given his own experiences, Cervantes surely did not wish to diminish the harsh realities of living as a captive in Moorish territory. Hence, his comedias dealing with captivity in Algiers have a generally much more serious subject matter, whereas plays occurring elsewhere dealing with the same subject matter may be of a radically different genre.

Cervantes was fortunate enough never to have been taken to Constantinople, where the action of this play occurs, and where he was to be transferred and doubtless would have lived out the remainder of his days were it not for the intervention at the last minute of the friar Juan Gil. Cervantes’ ransom of 500 escudos (quite a considerable sum for the day) was paid on September 19, 1580 by Fray Juan Gil, and Cervantes was finally granted his freedom from his prison in Algiers. Having no first-hand knowledge of Constantinople, Cervantes probably gleans most of the historical details he puts into the text from various treatises about Turkey.

---

202 Canavaggio (1996), 95.
203 Among these, Canavaggio makes mention of Cristóbal de Villalón’s *Viaje de Turquía* (1557), Vicente Roca’s *Historia en la cual se trata de la origen y guerras que han tenido los turcos desde su comienzo hasta nuestros tiempos* (Valencia, 1556), and the four Italian documents, *Commentarii* by Teodoro Spandugino (Rome, 1519), the *Trattato dei costume e vita dei Turchi* by
In the case of *La gran sultana*, Cervantes chooses to examine an incident of historical curiosity, the case of a Christian woman who was taken captive by pirates, and then sold into the custody of a Sultan, whom she married, thereby becoming a Christian Sultana. The play is presumably based loosely on the marriage of the Sultan Murad III (known in Spain as Amurates III), son of Selim II to a woman by the name of Safiye, a Christian woman of the Venetian Basso family. There are other versions of the story circulating of a Greek woman from the isle of Corfu named Hasachi. As far as we know, there was no marriage of a woman of Spanish origin to a Sultan at the time period, but Cervantes was clearly inspired by stories of the marriage between a Christian woman and a Sultan well known during his era, and used this subject matter to craft his own fiction. He was likely also influenced by the Byzantine novels of Achilles Tacitus and Heliodorus. Finally, the Italian novellas of Bandello and Cinthio (Giovanni Batista Girardi) featured a similar story of the Great Turk (another name for the Sultan) enamored of a Christian captive.  

What is perhaps most curious about *La gran sultana* is the extremely wide-range of interpretations by different critics, even though they all more-or-less agree on its fundamental plot and structure. This play has been analyzed from the perspective of different disciplines and theoretical approaches, including psychoanalysis, notions of social, cultural, and religious identity and tolerance, master/slave power relations, and even transgender politics. As a general rule,

---

Giovanni Antonio Menavino (Florence, 1548), Lodovico Bassano’s *I costume e I modi particolari de la vita de’ Turchi* (Rome, 1545) and most importantly given several details about the dress and customs of the Turkish characters in the play, the *Historia universal dell’origine e impero dei Turchi* by Francesco Sansovino (Venice, 1560). See Jean Canavaggio (1977), 62-63.

For more details about the historical and literary sources for the play, see Albert Mas, *Les turcs dan la literature espagnole du Siècle d’Or*, Paris, 1967, vol. II, pp. 341-53 and Jean Canavaggio (1977), 58-65, the source of most of the information I provide in this brief summary.

See, for example, Jurado Santos, 53-72; Weimer, 50; and Friedman (1990).
Spanish scholars have opted for a much more conservative reading of the play, and North American critics have tended towards a view that emphasizes elements of modernity found therein, though this is by no means a universal or absolute tendency. I should also note that I do not intend to diminish the value of such modern interpretations for our present-day appreciation of the dramatic work, but it is my observation that scrutinizing works of Golden Age poetry and literature under the modern lens of tolerance, gender politics, and psychoanalysis is often interesting, but can potentially obfuscate the original intention of the work and how it doubtless would have been received in its own time period. As moderns, the work may speak to us differently and acquire a new significance, but for the remainder of this study, I will focus on attempting to reconstruct the historical meaning Cervantes was trying to impart into the play for its day, and the way it likely would have been received by audiences had it ever been seen on the Spanish stage.

I think perhaps one of the most accurate modern assessments of the play is that of the British scholar, Edwin Williamson, who describes the play as a kind of dream-like fable that expresses the deepest aspirations and desires of Imperial Spain. While acknowledging that the play is primarily humorous in nature, he argues that it also advances a view of the superiority of Spain and its Christianity over the Islam of their Turkish adversaries. Sevilla Arroyo, and António Rey-Hazas share this reading of the play, and the most extensive and scholarly modern edition of the text to date by Luis Gómez Canseco also acknowledges this article as being one of the few modern studies that has devoted itself exclusively to analyzing the underlying political message of the text. I accept the views of these four critics, in particular, as probably the most complete
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206 See, for example, the excellent rebuttal of the hypothesis that the play shows a theme of religious tolerance by Díaz Fernández, 301-322.
207 Williamson, pp. 52-54.
208 Ed. Florencio Sevilla Arroyo y Antonio Rey Hazas, pp. XXX-XXXI.
209 Ed. Luis Gómez Canseco, p. 115.
modern interpretations of the play, and, for my part, view the *comedia* as a farce celebrating the
wit, intelligence and ingenuity of Spanish culture as superior to the more carnal, violent,
superstitious, and ultimately less humanistic, more impulsive behavior of the Turkish Empire.
Through her beauty, wit and ingenuity, Catalina, though captive herself, is able to captivate the
heart-and-soul of her Turkish Sultan, and transform him into a gentler, more level-headed ruler. I
would add to what other critics have already said, by stating emphatically that it is more than
simply Catalina’s physical beauty that allows her to triumph, but also her *astucia*, and above all
else, her submission to the will of God and her plea for His guidance.

*La gran sultana* opens with two renegades, one of Turkish origin (Salec) and the other a
Spaniard concealed in Greek attire (Roberto), discussing how the Great Turk (the Sultan) wields
his power. From their description, we learn that the Great Turk is an individual who likes to display
his power lavishly and in an almost theatrical fashion, and who also wields this authority in a
seemingly arbitrary fashion, in accordance with his own whims and interests. Salec remarks,
“Tienen aquí los pobres esta usanza: / cuando alguno a pedir justicia viene / (que sólo el interés es
quien la alcanza): / de una caña y de estopas se previene, / y, cuando el Turco pasa enciende fuego,
a cuyo resplandor él se detiene” (I, vv. 6-12). When someone approaches the Sultan with a petition
for justice, he makes them meet him on their knees, while torches are lit in ritualistic fashion in a
display of his majesty. When commenting on how the Turk generally receives the written requests
he receives, Salec observes, “[P]ero jamás el término se llega / del buen despacho destos
miserables, / que el interés le turba y se le niega” (I, vv. 22-24). In other words, the Sultan’s
judgment in petitions for his favor is often clouded by his own selfish desires. Salec also remarks
that the Sultan is not perturbed by Christians who look him directly in the face, but he doesn’t
allow his Moorish or Turkish subordinates to do so, as a display of his majesty and superior station
over them (I, vv. 27-33). In these opening lines, we have the image of a man who is more concerned with displaying his absolute sovereignty than with governing itself. As we will see, these characteristics will change over the course of the play.

Later, in a lengthy soliloquy, Roberto explains the tragic backstory of a young man he mentored from a young age, Lamberto, and Clara, his ladylove. Lamberto is a young and impetuous man who fell in love with Clara (coincidentally and confusingly, the daughter of a completely different and totally unrelated man also named Lamberto). The young Lamberto asked for Clara’s hand in marriage, but was denied by her parents, due to his lower social standing. As the two lovers consummated their love and ran off together in the middle of the night, they had the misfortune of running into some Turks, who took Clara prisoner. Lamberto, disgusted with himself for running off out of fear and leaving Clara in the custody of the Turks, vowed to rescue her. As Roberto and Lamberto set off together with a group of men to track down Clara’s captors, they became separated, and Roberto and the others lose sight of Lamberto. Roberto explains to Salec that he has come in search of Lamberto, to which Salec responds with a promise to assist him in his search (I, vv. 70-185). The function of these two characters (Roberto and Salec) in the play is primarily to provide some much needed exposition to the audience in this opening act. As we shall see, they are not featured very prominently in the rest of the play, and are not central to the main dramatic action. It could be argued that their function here is borrowed from characters of the Byzantine novel, and that they are not employed to their maximum dramatic potential. The explanation they provide is necessary, nevertheless, for the audience to understand the misadventures the couple will endure together later in the play.

In the next scene, we are introduced to the two eunuchs, Mamí and Rustán. The former is the loyal servant of the Great Turk, but is also self-interested and treacherous, whereas the latter is
his opposite. Rustán, a Christian in secret, has kept Catalina, the Christian captive and protagonist of the play, safe from the Sultan’s appetites for the past seven years. But all that changes when Mami discovers Rustán’s true intentions, explicitly letting him know what he himself plans to do:

MAMÍ. Has quitado al Gran Señor
de gozar la hermosura
que tiene el mundo mayor,
siento mal darle madura
fruta, que verde es mejor.
Seis años ha que la celas
y la encubres con cautelas
que ya no pueden durar,
y agora por desvelar
esta verdad te desvelas. (I, vv. 216-225)

Mamí delights at the prospect of getting Rustán in trouble for his potentially treasonous behavior, and resolves to tell the Sultan about Catalina’s beauty, and how Rustán has hidden her from him. Rustán goes to Catalina’s side to warn her of what is to come, and together, the two attempt to figure out what to do. Once again, Cervantes tells us explicitly of the Great Turk’s irrationality and cruelty, as Catalina asks, “¿Es críuel el Gran Señor?,” prompting Rustán to respond, “Nombre de blando le dan; / pero, en efecto, es tirano” (I, vv. 269-271). Catalina, attempting to come to grips with the situation, reconciles herself in Christian terms, praying to God for His strength and wisdom. She concludes her supplications by declaring, “No triunfará el inhumano / del alma; del cuerpo, sí, / caduco, frágil y vano” (I, vv. 280-282). Catalina is fearful of having her virginity taken by force, but resolves that even if the Turk breaks her body, he will never break her spirit, for he can’t touch her immortal soul. Expecting this horrible fate or even death, Rustán and Catalina resolve to die as Christians, come what might, and in the course of her prayers, Catalina exclaims in exasperation, “¡Vuélvame fea, Señor; / que no es bien que lleve palma / de la hermosura del alma / la del cuerpo!” (I, vv. 325-328). This line bears further consideration, given the conventional interpretation of the play.
As others have seen, perhaps most notably Florencio Sevilla Arroyo and Antonio Rey Hazas, as well as Luis Gómez Canseco in their editions of the text, the budding love between the Sultan and Catalina and her eventual triumph over his will can be seen as a take on the familiar trope of the day, *amor omnia vincit* (love conquers all). In the beginning of the play, however, theirs is definitely *un amor no correspondido*, and Catalina resolves not to allow her will to be broken at any costs. Upon meeting Catalina, the Great Turk is so captivated by her that he almost miraculously begins to treat her in accordance with the customs of courtly love, stating that he has no desire to take her by force, for he wants to win her affection. I wish to focus more, however, on some of these early lines of the play because most editors have seen Catalina’s beauty as the primary tool with which she is able to captivate the Sultan’s heart. While this is true, they often fail to note that Catalina’s *physical* beauty is a double-edged sword, initially working against her, as it is this quality which awakens the strong sexual appetites of the Sultan, and makes her a potential target for his unrestrained desire. While it is true that it is primarily due to Catalina’s divine physical beauty that the Sultan makes several concessions to her, it is her wit and ingenuity, as well as divine grace, that allow Catalina to persevere throughout the play. At the risk of overstating my case, I hope the reader will indulge my view of Catalina’s initial prayer. One could certainly interpret this plea at the play’s outset in this way: Catalina asks God to make her ugly in order to free herself from the Sultan’s appetites. But God, in His infinite wisdom, knows better. Acknowledging the correctness of her words, He has already granted immense beauty to her soul (which is to say her mind, her intellect) to match or exceed that of her body. By virtue of this, Catalina is not only able to free herself from her terrible predicament, but in the process, the combined beauty of her body and soul are able to assuage and soften the appetites of the Sultan, causing him to behave in a manner more in accord with customs of courtly love in Spain. Through
these virtues, she is then able to save not only herself, but her fellow Spaniards and Christians as well. And it is this miraculous event, as well as the fake and humorous “miracle” promised to the Turks by the trickster Madrigal later in the play, that comprise the primary subject matter of our drama.

Returning for a moment to the subject of Catalina’s physical beauty, it is worth noting that it is described in terms that are reminiscent both of biblical discourse (in particularly, the Song of Songs) as well as comparable to Garcilaso’s first eclogue. Mami proclaims:

Robó la naturaleza  
lo mejor de cada cosa  
para forma esta pieza  
y así, la sacó hermosa  
sobre la humana belleza.

Quitó al cielo dos estrellas,  
que puso en las luces bellas  
de sus bellísimos ojos,  
con que de amor los despojos  
se aumentan, pues vive en ellas.

El todo y sus partes son  
correspondientes de modo,  
que me muestra la razón  
que en las partes y en el todo  
asiste la perfección. (I, vv. 361-375)

Although this description of Catalina's beauty is indeed quite topical, replete with all the clichés of beauty at the time period, all of her features are described as being in perfect proportion with one another, and also perfect unto themselves. The idea of this kind of celestial symmetry in her physical attributes is significant, as Luis Gómez Canseco notes, "En la fórmula se busca un intento de conciliación entre los planteamientos aristotélicos y platónicos, que ya está presente en Baltasar de Castiglione, cuando señala el origen del amor." What is significant in the language employed

210 See Ed. Gómez Canseco, p. 204, n. 74 & 76.
211 Ed. Gómez Canseco’s, p. 205, n. 77. Gómez Canseco also lists similar examples in Juan Boscán and Fernando de Herrera.
here is the response of the Great Turk to Mami's description of Catalina's beauty. He observes, "Tú me la harás adorar / por cosa divina y santa" (I, vv. 384-385). Unbeknownst to him, these words will wind up being a kind-of self-fulfilling prophecy, as he will eventually submit to her will, and learn to respect not only her physical beauty, but her interior beauty as well. Upon learning that this Christian woman of immense allure has been living in his palace right under his nose, the Sultan is angered, and resolves to see her for himself that very afternoon.

In the next scene, we are introduced to another of the play's central figures. Though clearly of lesser importance than Catalina, the Sultan, Lamberto and Clara, he is the comedic crowd-pleaser, and undoubtedly the most memorable "hero" of the play. Whereas in Baños de Argel, the entremesíl Sacristan was a relatively minor protagonist, utilized primarily to inject some much-needed levity into an otherwise bleak scenario, in La gran sultana, we have an analogous gracioso, Madrigal, a scoundrel and a rogue, who not only provides the majority of the comic relief in the play, but is undoubtedly one of the most important characters. His tricks and deceits at the expense of the Turks are one of the primary vehicles of action that moves along the central plot. Unfortunately, he also shares with the Sacristan character of Baños the anti-semitic "humor" that we discussed in the previous play. Although his jibes at the expense of the Jewish community in the play would doubtless have been very funny to the Spanish, Catholic audience of the day for which the play was intended, they once again offend our modern sensibilities. It is important to acknowledge, nevertheless, that Cervantes, brilliant author that he was, is not above such lowbrow jests. Based on what we have already seen in the other plays examined so far, a more complete portrait of Cervantes emerges. Though he was highly critical of the Spanish obsession with blood-purity (limpieza de la sangre) as we have already seen in his interludes, and in
particular, in *El retablo de las maravillas*, he was nevertheless not the modern, ultra-tolerant individual that some might have us believe.\textsuperscript{212}

There is a very important philosophical distinction to be made between the modern notion of *tolerance* and the idea of religious *toleration*, which pre-dates modern concept of the term. Our more contemporary understanding involves coexistence with people of other cultures and belief systems to the point of accepting some of their customs and trying to better understand them as a people. The older notion of religious *toleration* did not extend beyond the courtesy of not actively persecuting or forcing conversion upon those who did not share one's religion. Hence, the older concept of toleration is far less inclusive, and can be used to describe people that live together in relative peace, but who nevertheless refuse to acknowledge the legitimacy of one another's beliefs, religious ideas, or philosophical traditions. What becomes clear in a careful analysis of Cervantes' drama is that he was a man heavily influenced by more humanistic ideas of Christianity, such as the teaching of Desiderius Erasmus.\textsuperscript{213} Erasmus indeed believed that Christianity was the superior faith and that, ideally, all people of the world should embrace it, but he nevertheless did not believe in forcing conversion upon others. In *Los baños de Argel*, we already witnessed Cervantes' clear objections to the Moors' attempts to force some Christians to convert by promising them wealth, or by threatening them with bodily harm. Having probably experienced these forced attempts at

\textsuperscript{212} Américo Castro has already illustrated this point in great detail in a section of his *El pensamiento de Cervantes* entitled "¿Tolerancia o intolerancia?" See Castro (1925), 292-307. In arguing against an ironic reading of such passages as we will examine with Madrigal, Castro remarks, "No creo posible, a menos de forzar los textos, ver ataques a la Inquisición" (306).

\textsuperscript{213} Cervantes was probably greatly influenced in this regard by the writings of Erasmus, either directly or indirectly. See in particular Vilanova, Villanueva, Forcione, Castro (1931), and of Taboada Terán.
conversion himself, it is quite possible that he objected to Christians attempting to convert people of other faiths under duress as well. It would appear that for him, as for many Catholics of his era, conversion had to be a genuine undertaking, born of one's true inner spirit. It is also no coincidence that the Moors who were praised in Baños were actually crypto-Christians or seeking to convert, and that their public proclamation of their Christian faith was of the utmost importance to Cervantes. Thus, I would argue that it is entirely probable that Cervantes' primary objections to the obsession with blood purity and with being a cristiano viejo that were prevalent in his day had to do with the fact that people who were fellow Christians were likely to be persecuted. For Cervantes, the question of one's ancestry and heritage was clearly of much lesser importance than the faith they openly embraced. Hence, the question of whether one's ancestors were or were not Jewish would have seemed largely trivial and unimportant to him, that is, so long as that individual openly embraced Christianity. After all, we see in his theater that he had no qualms about poking fun at people of different faiths, nor did he object to the Crusades against the Moors. On the contrary: he lets us know numerous times throughout his oeuvre how proud he was to have served the Spanish Catholic cause.

Returning to the matter at hand, the next scene of the play is a farcical one in which the roguish Madrigal and the spy Andrea have some fun at the expense of a Jew. Much like Tristán in Baños, Madrigal has decided to irritate a Jewish man by preventing him from eating, only this time, instead of stealing his food, he has laced it with ham. As he explains, "en una gran cazuela que tenían / de un guisado que llaman boronia / les eché de tocino un gran pedazo" (I, vv. 431-433). The Jewish man hurls all manner of insults and curses at Madrigal, and is soon joined by another Jew, both of whom are understandably furious at Madrigal and his cruel jest. Madrigal, in turn, hurls the insults right back at the Jews, and is joined by Andrea, who proclaims:
ANDREA. ¡Oh gente aniquilada! ¡Oh infame, oh sucia raza, y a qué miseria os ha traído vuestra vano esperar, vuestra locura y vuestra incomparable pertinacia, a quien llamáis firmeza y fe inmutable contra toda verdad y buen discurso! (I, vv. 468-474)

Cervantes introduces once again the idea we saw in Baños of the Jewish people deserving ridicule for their failure to recognize that the Messiah had already arrived in Jesus (according to the Catholic world view of the time). Although this scene lacks humor to us with our presumably more modern, pluralistic worldviews, it nevertheless serves a dramatic functional purpose. In addition to providing comic relief, it is consistent with Madrigal's role in the play. Just as in Baños, Cervantes attempts to show in this play the superiority of Christianity to its two major competitors. Here, we have Madrigal mocking the Jews for their overly rigid, rule-adherent belief system, just as he will later make fun of the Islamic Turks for their superstitious, credulous culture. Although he functions as a rogue and a scoundrel, he is supposed to delight the audience by ridiculing "the bad guys" (namely, non-Christians) throughout the play. It must be observed that, while Cervantes does in general give us richly developed characters, and is not given to a simple, Manichean presentation of the world, we must also be careful not to fall into the trap of thinking that he was "tolerant" in the way we are as moderns. The whole purpose of this play is not to show the peaceful coexistence between cultures. Rather, it is to show the way in which Christianity triumphs over the other religions because of its intellectual and moral superiority. It is Catalina's steadfast determination to cling to her Christian faith at all costs, and not her beauty alone, that ultimately saves her from the tyrannical appetites of the Sultan, as we shall soon see.

In the remainder of the scene, Andrea the spy, having recognized her comrade Madrigal, begins to converse with him, and reveals to the audience that Madrigal has fallen in love and had
amorous relations with an Alárabe woman. According to the writings of Diego de Haedo the Alárabes were among the lowest ranking members of Turkish and Barbary society. Haedo himself interjects his own pejorative evaluations of this lower stratum of society, which Cervantes shows no evidence of sharing in this play, but it is worth mentioning that in falling in love with a woman of this social class, Madrigal is clearly identified in the play as belonging to the lowest social class of Spanish society as well. Indeed, he is a low-ranked soldier, but also a self-proclaimed thief, in addition to being a liar. Yet, later in the play, Madrigal is able to outwit even the upper echelons of the Turkish society presented in the play. Of vital importance is the fact that he is, in fact, a Spaniard, as when asked about whether or not he is Spanish, he responds triumphantly, "Y soylo, y soylo, / lo he sido y lo seré mientras que viva, / y aun despúes de ser muerto ochenta siglos" (I, vv. 522-524). His insistent assertion of his Spanish nationality once again drives home the patriotic message of the dramatic work, though it is played for comedy here. Finally, Andrea and Madrigal discuss the coming of a Persian ambassador to Constantinople, and express their hopes and prayers that a peace accord is not signed between the two nations, as it would surely spell disaster for the Spanish forces.

In the following scene, Rustán must defend himself from the wrath of the Great Turk. Rustán tries to persuade him that he only hid Catalina away because she was melancholic, and excessively pale as a result, but that she has since been cured not three days ago. The Sultan can no longer contain his desires, and demands that Catalina be brought before him, giving the imperative, "¡vé por ella, y por el dios ciego, que me tiene asombrado, / que a no ser cual la has pintado, / que te he de entregar al fuego!" (I, vv. 590-593). This passage is significant, since, at this point in the play, the Great Turk is still characterized by his appetite and his wrath. Thus, he
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invokes not a monotheistic god, but Cupid here, acknowledging that he is driven by love and showing equal potential for fury should Catalina's beauty not live up to his expectations. Not only does Catalina's beauty live up to the Sultan's hopes, it far exceeds them. At first, he is furious at his two eunuchs, not because they have exaggerated her beauty, but because their descriptions are inadequate to match it. He proclaims:

TURCO. ¿Cuán a lo humano hablasteis
de una hermosura divina,
y esta beldad peregrina
cuán vulgarmente pintastes!
¿No fuera mejor ponella
al par de Alá en sus asientos,
hollando los elementos,
y una y otra clara estrella,
dando leyes desde allá,
que con reverencia y celo
guardaremos los del suelo,
como Mahoma las da? (I, vv. 644-655)

Editors have noted of this passage that the image of the beloved woman walking on the stars and descending from the heavens to the earth was popularized in Spain by Garcilaso's First Eclogue. Nevertheless, the Sultan actually goes one step further, quite literally deifying her. In both Christianity and Islam, a direct comparison of a woman to God was blasphemous. Yet here, the Sultan explicitly puts her on equal footing with Allah. It is for this reason that he is so submissive to her throughout the remainder of the play and yields to her many whims and requests. It may be instructive to compare the transformation of the Sultan in this play to that of Segismundo in Calderón’s *La vida es sueño*, which first saw the stage in 1635, some 20 odd years later. Although the plays are very distinct from one another both in terms of their tone and philosophical content, I believe the transformation to be quite analogous. Indeed, the neoplatonic underpinnings of the subject matter are quite similar, even though here the transformation is played for comedy. I would say that the overall theme of this play is the metamorphosis of the carnal, appetitive Sultan.
from an impulsive man driven by his whims to someone who learns to respect the conventions of courtly love, which has the subsequent beneficial effect of transforming him into a more even-tempered and level-headed ruler all around. Just as Segismundo's first glimpse of Rosaura's beauty is what awakens his intellect to the possibility of the divine, the Great Turk of this play is similarly influenced by Catalina's beauty. Thus, it is not Catalina's great beauty in and of itself that conquers his will, but the awakening of the realization of divinity. To make this point clearer, we need only consider the following exchange that occurs shortly thereafter, in which Rustán attempts to justify how he described Catalina to the Sultan:

RUSTÁN. Cielo te la hice yo, con pies humanos, señor.
TURCO. A hacerla su Hacedor acertarás.
RUSTÁN. Eso no, que esos grandes atributos cuadran solamente a Dios. (I, vv. 664-669)

Being a Christian-in-secret, Rustán refuses to allow such a blasphemous comparison between the beauty of a woman and the beauty of God to go unchallenged, presumably once again showing the greater strength of the Christian faith here. It may also be significant that when Rustán fabricated Catalina's melancholic state earlier, he comments that she was cured by Sedequías, the Turk's Jewish doctor, three days prior. He places a lot of emphasis and repetition on the three days, remarking, "No ha tres días que el sereno / cielo de su rostro hermoso / mostró de hermosura lleno; / no ha tres días que un ansioso / dolor salió de su seno" (I, 564-569). After Rustán interjects that the Sultan should not compare her beauty directly with God, the Sultan reiterates:

Tres días has detenido
el curso de mi ventura;
tres días en mal segura
vida y penosa he vivido;
    tres días me has defraudado
del mayor bien que se encierra
en el cerco de la tierra
y en cuanto ve el sol dorado.
Morirás, sin duda alguna,
hooy, en este mismo día:
que, a do comienza la mía,
ha de acabar tu fortuna. (I, vv. 680-691)

In addition to reiterating the Sultan's irrational wrath, it is worth considering if the repetition of the three days is significant in this passage. Three is the Biblical sign of divine perfection. In the symbolic language of the Bible, a three-day period indicates either a divine trial or an act of divine intervention that impacts Salvation history.²¹⁵ The Bible tells us that Jesus was dead for three days and three nights. Speaking from a strictly forensic perspective, rigor mortis and decay sets in within seventy-two hours, so it is not surprising that people of ancient times believed that the soul remained within the body for up to three days after a person was deceased and could conceivably be revived. The fact that Jesus' resurrection occurred on the fourth day was therefore significant, because it was meant to serve as God's demonstration of a true miracle. Hence, the fact that Catalina's alleged "melancholy" is said to have been cured by the Jewish doctor, and the fact that Rustán is actually saved by Catalina's "divine grace" in this play is perhaps not coincidental, but rather an effort by Cervantes to interject divine numerology in a humorous tone, while also indicating subtly that, through Catalina, the Great Turk is affected by the Christian God.

The Sultan wishes to take Catalina for his wife, her Christian faith notwithstanding. But Catalina here shows her great faith as well as her powers of discretion, remarking, "Cristiana soy, y de suerte / que de la fe que profeso / no me ha de mudar exceso / de promesas ni aun de muerte" (I, vv. 732-735). In spite of her much lower social standing, she refuses to convert to Islam despite

²¹⁵ See, for example, Mat 12:40, Mat 15:32, Mat 26:61, Mat 27:63, Luke 2:46, among numerous other examples.
the promises of wealth, or under duress of pain of death. She tries to reason with the Sultan, remarking that the world has not seen a marriage of these two faiths before, and that it is surely madness. But the Great Turk, undeterred and impressed by her reasoning, declares that they will be equals, and the he is at her disposal to serve her needs. In fact, he bows at her feet, submitting to her will. Catalina, overwhelmed and unsure of how to act, asks, "Sólo te pido tres días, / Gran Señor, para pensar... " (I, vv. 788-789). Once again, the mystical three days resurface. In addition, the first act ends with Catalina appealing once again to God's divine grace to guide her. She proclaims, "cuando a mi daño tu favor no acuda, / me ha de alcanzar esta infernal serpiente!" (I, vv. 823-825).

It is lines such as these which cause me to doubt the traditional interpretations of the play as an example of *amor omnia vincit*. For one thing, the typical notion of love conquers all, as it appears in Virgil's Eclogue X, has to do with the power of love to overcome any obstacle. It is tempting upon a first reading of the play to see Catalina and the Great Turk united by love, in spite of their religious differences. But as we see in this first act, Catalina is less than enthusiastic about the idea of marrying the Great Turk. His is *un amor no correspondido*, an unrequited love. The very notion strikes me as incompatible with the idea of love conquering all. In fact, it is his mad obsession with her that gradually breaks her down not to a point of loving him unconditionally, but rather of accepting and tolerating him, with a great many stipulations and conditions. If anything, this play is an example of the power of the true grace of God conquering and submitting the Turk to his will through Catalina, who is not only a vision of beauty, but serves in the play as the divine instrument of His will. This is why the Great Turk is seemingly powerless in the face of Catalina. It is not so much about love conquering adversity. Rather, it is about God granting
Catalina and the other Christian captives salvation through the power of her beauty, and through their collective strength and wit.

The first act of *La gran sultana* engages in considerable exposition, and one can argue that although it succeeds from a literary perspective, it can be somewhat tedious from a dramatic standpoint. It is almost as though Cervantes, aware of this fault, compensates in the second act by giving us the major subplot of the play, which will also be the vehicle for most of the play's comedy. Madrigal, now in the custody of Moorish soldiers, faces the court of the Cadi,\textsuperscript{216} having been caught for the crime of fornicating with the Alárabe girl with whom he is enamored. Outraged, the Cadi instantly sentences Madrigal to death by drowning. Madrigal's hands and feet are to be bound, and he is to be weighted-down, unless he agrees to emend his crime by converting to Islam. According to Diego de Haedo's treatise on the customs of the Moors of Argel,\textsuperscript{217} these practices were not uncommon, because it was viewed as a serious crime for unwed Christians and Muslim women to engage in intercourse. Madrigal remarks that he is between a rock and a hard place, as all is death. He remarks, "...[C]asarme y ser moro / son dos muertes, de tal suerte / que atado corro a la muerte / y suelto mi ley adoro" (II, vv. 850-853). Madrigal comments in a comedic fashion on the act of marriage being a kind of living death in and of itself,\textsuperscript{218} and of forced conversion to Islam being an even worse death. Once again, Cervantes comments on the forced conversions often imposed by the Moors on their Christian captives, with Madrigal stating here that he would rather die once drowned than have this double-death (marriage and religious conversion) thrust upon him.

\textsuperscript{216} The reader will recall that a Cadi was a judge of civil and religious Islamic law.

\textsuperscript{217} Haedo, f. 35v.

\textsuperscript{218} We have already examined some of the Cervantes' views on the subject in our analysis of *El juez de los divorcios*. 
Madrigal's subplot may initially seem disconnected from the main action of this drama, but from this point onward, the events surrounding Madrigal's amorous affair mirror the main plot of the play, but with a more overtly farcical tone. Thinking quickly and determined to save his life, Madrigal utilizes the credulous and superstitious nature of the Cadi to his advantage. He reminds the Cadi of the noted Neopythagorean philosopher Apollonius of Tyana (approx. 3 B.C.E.- 97 C.E.), who, according to legend, was able to communicate with birds and, in so doing, read omens of the future. Madrigal tells the Cadi a ridiculous tale, in which he makes himself out to be the direct descendent of Apollonius, and hence also possessed of his gifts of prophecy. He relates to the Cadi the incredible story (in the most literal sense of the word) that he heard a nightingale call out to him by the house of a Jew. The nightingale told Madrigal that he would die that very day after the trial unless he relayed the following to the Cadi: to perform the *wudu*, an Islamic cleansing ritual prior to prayer, with a specific water, and that if the Cadi did this, and emended the wrongs he committed against two Moors and a widow in the past, he would be healthy and favored by the Great Turk (II, vv. 874-949).

Madrigal has a laugh at the expense of Moorish custom without the Cadi catching on, but to add insult to injury, he invents the following ploy: he offers to teach an elephant to speak fluent Turkish within ten years, declaring that, should he be unable to achieve such a feat, he would willingly submit to being burned alive. The idea of this ploy, as Cervantes later has Madrigal

---

219 It is only thanks to the writings of Philostratus in his *Life of Apollonius* that we are aware of this semi-mythic figure, known for sparking a polarizing debate between pagans and Christians. See Philostratus (ed. C.P. Jones). Luis Gómez Canseco also informs us that the anecdotes about Apollonius were fairly well known in the time period, and that he is also mentioned by Alonso López (el Pinciano) in his *Coloquios*. See ed. Gómez Canseco, 243.

220 Luis Gómez Canseco notes that the mention of the Jew here likely has little to do with the first scene of the play, and more to do with the connection between the Hebraic tribes and magic in the belief systems of the day. See Gómez Canseco, 244, n. 175.
explain, is that in ten years, keeping in mind the shorter life expectancy of the period, either the Judge, the convicted man, or the elephant would likely be dead, and hence the convict would never have to make good on his promise, and even if he did, he would still get to enjoy ten years of freedom beforehand. 221

The Cadí grants Madrigal his (provisional) freedom, but seems perplexed as to the identity of the Moors and widows he has wronged, affirming, "que veo que son sin cuento / los moros de mí ofendidos, / y viudas pasan de ciento" (II, vv. 963-965). Cervantes pokes fun at the corruption of the legal system, but in this case, the Moorish one. If there is indeed a cross-cultural similarity and understanding shown in Cervantes' plays, it is that corrupt scoundrels exist in every society, but they will always lose out to the more astute corrupt scoundrels.

After this scene, in which the gullible and superstitious Cadí is completely taken in by Madrigal's ruse, the Persian Ambassador arrives at the court of the Great Turk, and is greeted coldly by the four Bajás. 222  Cervantes here paints a caricature but nevertheless not entirely inaccurate picture of the internal divisions and differences between different factions of Islam of the day. The Bajá's are extremely distrustful of the Persian Sultan's desire for a peace accord, presented to them by the Ambassador, remarking that he now seeks peace with them only because he could not secure a treaty with the Spaniards, "Su mendiguez sabemos y sus mañas, / por quien con él de nuevo me enemisto, / viendo que el grande rey de las Españas / muchos persianos en su

---

221 The fable of a man using this clever ploy to escape certain death was widespread in the era, with most modern editors of the play citing Lope de Vega's El príncipe perfecto (II, Act III, sc. 15), which came out the following year, as another contemporary example of this tale. Luis Gómez Canseco includes an extensive and most informative footnote about the Italian versions of the fable that circulated at the time as well. See ed. Canseco, 246, n. 181.

222 It should be noted that only two of the Bajás actually speak in this scene, even though four are listed in the cast of characters. The Bajás or Pachas are officials presiding over a province or territory, with a rank and title roughly equivalent to Viceroy or Governor (see Academia).
Corte ha visto" (II, 1034-1037). In the Ambassador's response, he expresses high praise of the court of Felipe III, while still attempting to obtain the Bajás' favor. We note perhaps a bit of ironic criticism on the part of Cervantes, when the Ambassador remarks, "Aquella majestad que tiene al mundo / admirado y suspenso; el verdadero / retrato de Filipo, aquel segundo, / que solo pudo darse a sí tercero" (II, vv. 1041-1045). He is literally declaring that Felipe III is the worthy successor to his father, but it may also be that Cervantes here is subtly criticizing the government of both Felipe's and their desire to expand the Spanish empire beyond its means to support itself, suggesting that Felipe III is little more (or less) than a mere clone of his father. Although this is doubtless a highly patriotic play, Cervantes can certainly be proud of his military service and of Spain and Catholicism generally, while still remaining highly critical of the decisions of the crown.

The Bajás reject the Ambassador, but due to the privileges of diplomatic immunity, he is granted impunity, and not executed for his insolence. As the Great Turk debates with his council whether the peace accord would be to their benefit or not, the second Bajá comments:

A lo que yo descubro y veo,
que sosegar las armas del Oriente,
no te puede pedir más el deseo,
con tanto que el persiano no alce frente
contra ti. Triste historia es la que leo;
que a nosotros la Persia así nos daña,
que es lo mismo que Flandes para España. (II, vv. 1075-1081)

Cervantes explicitly compares the tenuous relations between the Persians and the Turks to Spain's situation with Flanders. As Luis Gómez Canseco notes in his edition, Cervantes already dealt with the mutinous nature of Spain's Army of Flanders and the numerous problems they had caused the Spanish crown in the third jornada of his earlier play, El trato de Argel. Cervantes clearly understood that the Spanish military was overextending itself at great distances and great cost,
with poor discipline and multiple revolts, and takes the opportunity to criticize the policies of the Spanish expansionist agenda here. In the context of the play, the two Bajás disagree about whether they should sign the peace accord with the Persians.

In the next scene, Catalina and the eunuch Rustán are once again free to speak alone. Rustán remarks that now that she is in the palace, Catalina is at much greater risk for losing her virginity to the Great Turk. Catalina resolves that she would rather die than give in to the Sultan's carnal desires, stating, "La viva fe de mi intento, /a toda su fuerza excede: /resuelta estoy a morir/ antes que darle gusto" (II, vv. 1100-1104). But Rustán advises Catalina that the Great Turk is neither forcing her to become Muslim, nor is he taking her by physical force. Since she cannot escape her predicament, she should not despair, for as long as her faith is true and she does not consent, she is not at fault. Rustán remarks, "no está el pecado en el hecho, / si en la voluntad no está; / condénanos la intención / o nos salva en cuanto hacemos" (II, vv. 1116-1119). This is a radically progressive view for the time, in which Cervantes expresses the idea that even if the Turk were to take Catalina by force, she would not be at fault for the carnal sin, since it is in the will of the individual and in the intention rather than the act itself that the sin or virtue resides.

Catalina resolves to be a martyr rather than give in to the Turk, but Rustán gives counsel that she could well die and not be a martyr, for to be such requires an act of exemplary virtue. Rustán shows himself quite able minded in the religious and philosophical discourse of the day, and gives Catalina his best advice, but is interrupted by the arrival of Mamí and the Great Turk. When the Sultan declares that Catalina shall henceforth be known as Catalina the Ottoman, she is

---

223 Perhaps most notably, the Sack of Antwerp in 1576. See Parker; Rodríguez Alonso & Ruíz Marín's extensive collaborative study on the subject.
insistent that she is a Christian, and from Oviedo, and so her name shall remain Catalina de Oviedo, and that it remain as such not because it is a lesser or greater name than his, but rather because it announces her as a Christian woman, as is proper. In this scene, we see the Great Turk begin to be conquered not only by Catalina's beauty, but also by her intellect and reasoning. He remarks:

Tus libertades me asombran,
que son más que de mujer;
    pero bien puedes tenellas
con quien solamente puede
aquello que le concede
el valor que vive en ellas.
    Dél conozco que te estimas
en todo aquello que vales,
y con arrogancias tales
me alegras y me lastimas. (II, vv. 1184-1193)

Although readers have remarked that the opening lines are parallel with the strong women of the Bible, and that the devotional language was common in the time period, I think the transitional point in the play has been insufficiently emphasized. Earlier, the Turk was aware of divine beauty in Catalina's appearance. Now, he remarks that her virtues and liberties surpass that of an ordinary woman, a fact that is only possible through God's will. Though her arrogance and defiant attitude distresses him, he can't help but realize that they are indeed the attitudes of one who is truly his equal, or even surpasses him in majesty. In other words, Cervantes is having the Turk slowly become aware of the power and grace of the Christian God though the visage of beauty and grace that is Catalina. It is for this reason that he increasingly treats her more and more in accordance with the customs of courtly love throughout the remainder of the play, and never attempts to take her by force, no matter how much he might so desire. It is the divinity in her that he has no choice but to respect.

At this point in the play, the Turk has not yet fully undergone his transformation, as he still remarks:
TURCO.  Daréte la posesión
de mi alma aquesta tarde,
y la de mi cuerpo, que arde
en llamas de tu afición;
afición, de amor interno,
que, con poderoso brío,
de mi alma y mi albedrío
tiene el mando y el gobierno.

SULTANA.  He de ser cristiana.

TURCO.  Sélo;
que a tu cuerpo, por agora,
es el que mi alma adora
como si fuese su cielo. (II, vv. 1230-1241)

One might initially regard these lines as nothing more than the language of courtly love. But they also reveal the conflict between the Turk's appetitive, carnal desires and his higher faculties of reason, both of which are tamed and subjugated by Catalina's grace. He remarks that it is still Catalina's body that his soul pines for, but nevertheless, he begins to acknowledge that the internal love he is feeling for her is something different, something stronger. It is not the affliction, the madness of lust seizing his body; it is a higher respect for the divinity within her soul that makes her his true equal. Thus, he concedes, and allows Catalina to keep her Christian faith, on the condition that she agrees to consummate their marriage.

Just a few lines later, we already see how the presence of Catalina is positively transforming the Turk. A man who was described at the outset of the play as "a tyrant" here states, "No quiero gustos por fuerza / de gran poder conquistados: / que nunca son bien logrados / los que se toman por fuerza" (II, vv. 1277-1281). The Great Turk goes on to acknowledge that he could take Catalina as his slave and have his way with her, but that he wants instead to make her his wife, and that her willing consent to consummate their marriage will not only be sweeter, but is also more just and right. It is difficult to imagine the Turk at the opening act making a proclamation of this kind, indicating the transformation he has already begun to undergo.
The Sultan then has Zaida and Zelinda brought in by Mami to pay their respects and begin the preparations for the celebration of his wedding. As all the other characters exit from the stage, Zaida and Zelinda are left alone to discuss their situation. We learn that they are, in fact, the Christian captive Clara (renamed Zaida), and Lamberto, who has infiltrated the palace in the guise of a woman. The two now find themselves as courtesans in the harem of the Great Turk. To make matters more complicated, Clara is pregnant with Lamberto's child, and fears for the safety of their unborn child as well. Much as in *Los Baños de Argel*, whenever Christian characters find themselves in great peril, they resolve to die a good Christian death, and are consoled by thoughts of the afterlife. In this play, however, none of the captives in the central intrigue actually comes to harm, which is the principal element separating the two comedias. Cervantes nonetheless attempts to keep the dramatic tension high with the Byzantine novel-like labyrinthine plot.

In the next scene, Madrigal and Andrea pick up where they last left off. As the pair laugh about Madrigal's curious fate as master of the elephant, Madrigal makes explicit the solution to his riddle-like ruse for the benefit of the audience:

**ANDREA.** 
Al cabo, ¿no has de morir cuando caigan en el caso de la burla?

**MADRIGAL.** 
No hace al caso. Déjame agora vivir, que, en término de diez años, o morirá el elefante, o yo, o el Turco, bastante causa a reparar mis daños. (II, vv. 1470-1477)

As we have already seen, Madrigal is unconcerned with his ruse being discovered, because he has given himself such a long time frame that he will never have to make good on his promise of teaching an elephant to speak. Madrigal simply cannot help himself, and to add insult to injury, he has demanded that a silver trumpet be brought to him, through which to speak to the elephant
(II, vv. 1510-1515). He also remarks that he is actually being paid one hundred aspers (or the equivalent of two escudos, as Andrea quickly informs us; II, v. 1520) to perform his "miraculous" service. Andrea slinks away, as the Cadí arrives on the scene, and the audience is treated to more farcical dialogue.

Madrigal affirms that not only has he begun to teach the elephant to speak Basque, but that he also is going to teach it the gravest and most elegant of languages, such that it can speak in whichever language it likes most. In enumerating the languages, Madrigal names many different dialects, languages, and registers, which range from the slang dialect of blind people (la jerigonza de ciegos), to the bergamesca from the commedia dell'arte tradition, to the Gascon dialect, to Attic Greek, deliberately mixing linguistic registers that have little in common with one another for maximum comedic effect (II, vv. 1546-1557). The credulous Cadí, intrigued, asks Madrigal to explain to him the "news" he has learned from the various birds with which he communicates. Madrigal further taunts the Cadí, making outrageously hilarious statements, such as when the Cadí asks what the colorín told him yesterday, he responds that he isn't sure, as the bird is Hungarian, and he doesn't speak Hungarian (II, vv.1600-1601). In response to the Cadí's requests for gossip overheard by the birds, Madrigal remarks that a Calandria bird told him of the Cadí's infatuation with a young boy. Just as in Baños, Cervantes makes use of the alleged permissiveness regarding homosexuality in the Islamic culture of the day as a subject of ridicule. Madrigal just happens to guess at one of the Cadí's desires, which in fact does perturb him (II, vv. 1610-1619). The Cadí is quite upset that none of the birds have anything nice to say about him, to which Madrigal replies that he will personally silence them should they ever speak against him again (II, vv. 1636-7).

---

224 For an outstanding explanation of all the dialects, I refer the reader once again to the excellent edition of Luis Gómez Canséco, p. 281, n. 244-247.

225 The bird is another name for the Jilguero, or the Carduelis carduelis. (See Autoridades).
Although the Cadi is stereotypically, unbelievably gullible, the absurdity of the scene is nevertheless a tribute to Cervantes' characteristic wit, and indeed, the comedy of this exchange holds up quite well today.

At this juncture, the various threads of the story begin to come together. The comical subplot now gets crossed with the two more serious plots of the lovers, and the characters come together for the first time. Madrigal, pretending to be a tailor, is recruited by Rustán to help weave the dress of Catalina for her wedding. A lot of humor in this scene derives from the double-meaning of several terms of underworld slang that corresponded with the tools of tailors.\textsuperscript{226} Madrigal manages to enter the palace, along with a real tailor, all the while scheming to make off with as many fine silks and fabrics as he can. When the two tailors arrive in the court, we find the Great Turk completely at ease with Catalina's Christian prayer:

\begin{verbatim}
TURCO. Reza, reza, Catalina que sin la ayuda divina duran pocos humanos bienes; y llama, que no me espanta, antes me parece bien, a tu Lela Marién, que entre nosotros es santa. (II, vv. 1738-1744)
\end{verbatim}

Cervantes doubtless learned during his time as a captive in Algiers of some of the shared beliefs of the Islamic and Christian faiths. Indeed, the \textit{sura} 19 of the Qur'an is devoted to Mary, and also speaks of the virgin birth of Jesus.\textsuperscript{227} In this sense, Catalina is a kind of analogue for the Virgin Mary in this play, in that they both represent a point of confluence between Islamic and Christian cultures.

\textsuperscript{226} One need only recall Quevedo's \textit{Sueño del infierno} to be reminded of the bad reputation that \textit{sastres} had in the Golden Age. For the specific slang terms, and the metonymy common in the Lenguaje de Germania, the work of J. L. Alonso Herñández, as well as César Hernández Alonso, (\textit{Léxico} and \textit{Germania}, respectively, in the bibliographical section), are indispensable.  

\textsuperscript{227} Cf. ed. Gómez Canseco, p. 295, n. 274.
Cervantes presents his audience with one final twist at the conclusion of the second act: the second tailor, as it turns out, is actually Catalina's father. Overwhelmed by the realization that he has come for her, and will no doubt be furious that she has agreed to marry the Great Turk, she faints. The Great Turk, upon seeing this, and not knowing who the tailor is, believes he has harmed her in some way, and orders Mamí and Rustán to seize the two treacherous tailors, concluding our second act.

The "cliffhanger" left pending from the preceding act is resolved in an anticlimactic fashion, as none of this mini conclusion is presented on-stage, but is rather merely described by Madrigal, since he is grateful that Catalina awoke in time, and all was explained and resolved amicably. Catalina's father is now a guest of the Great Turk. As he prepares to bring the rest of the Spaniards to court to witness the marriage celebration. Mamí and Rustán obediently plan the proceedings together. One observes that the hostilities between the two eunuchs seem to diminish as Catalina and the Sultan are brought closer and closer to marriage.

In the next scene, one of great consequence, Catalina's father confronts her about her marriage to the Sultan. At first, he is very upset with Catalina, since he can see no signs of physical duress, and cannot believe she would willingly submit to the Sultan's will. He asks the rhetorical question, "¿Qué ataduras o qué lazos / fueron para ti crueles? / De tu propia voluntad / te has rendido, convencida / desta licenciosa vida, desta pompa y majestad" (III, vv. 1978-84). For her part, Catalina tries to explain her predicament, and her constant resistance to the Sultan's will, which the audience has seen to be true throughout the play. She finally admits to her father that she allowed the marriage to go through out of fear, believing it was the best chance she had to preserve her Christian identity, stating, "Finalmente, por quedarme / con el nombre de cristiana, / antes que por ser sultana, / medrosa vine a entregarme" (III, vv. 2005-2008). Catalina's father
warns that she has done wrong, and is now about to live in mortal sin, but after Catalina asks if her father would have her kill herself as penance, he finally relents a little bit, observing, "Es la desesperación / pecado tan malo y feo, / que ninguno, según creo, / le hace comparación" (III, vv. 2025-2028). Once again, Catalina has prayed for guidance and once again, she receives it, this time from her father, just as Rustán had advised her before. In both cases, they dissuade her from despair, her father even insisting here that Judas' suicide was a worse crime than his very betrayal of Christ (III, vv. 2035-36). Her father simply advises her to have faith in God once again, and allow Him to find the way out of this labyrinthine complication.

In the next major scene of the play, Madrigal has joined the ranks of several musicians, who have gathered to play the wedding festivity music. They play all manner of music and dance that was considered "lascivious" in the time period, and are elements of the same fringe underworld culture to which Madrigal belongs. As the Turk approaches the men and inquires about their profession, there is a series of comedic double-entendres involving underworld slang.228 Madrigal describes the men as "oficiales" which, in addition to its conventional meaning, meant "thieves" in the language of the underworld. He describes himself a "pregonero," which in addition to town-crier, had the less savory meaning of prisoner who dealt in contraband clothing. The humor of the scene resides in the fact that, not catching the double-meaning of the terms, the Great Turk thinks that he is among men of distinction (when quite the opposite is true), and remarks "¡Por cierto, los oficios son de estima!" (III, v. 2166). Things seem to be going well for the Christians at the festivities, but things take a turn for the worse with the appearance of the Cadi.

---

228 José Luis Alonso Hernández’s Léxico is extremely useful in deciphering this part of the text, as is the excellent edition of Luis Gómez Canseco.
On his arrival, the Cadi is quite irritated that the Turkish customs are not being followed, by the Sultan insists that Catalina must have her way. The Cadi reluctantly indulges the performers, but is shocked when he learns that the Great Turk has consented to allow Catalina to remain a Christian. A bit of comedy is injected into the scene when, upon recognizing Madrigal among the participants, the Cadi remarks, "¡El diablo es este cristano! Yo le conozco, y sé cierto /que sabe más que Mahoma" (III, vv. 2351-53). Taking a risk, Madrigal decides he wants to dance with Catalina who, in her innocence and with her grace, remarks that she was taken at such a young age that she doesn't know the Spanish dances (III, vv. 2360-61). Madrigal and the musicians sing and dance several verses about the unusual love of the Sultan and his Sultana, and all appears to be well. But things take a turn for the worse, when the Turk decides that he wants to see Madrigal's miraculous ability to teach an elephant to speak for himself, and when the Cadi takes it upon himself to advise the Sultan in the ways of (corporeal) love:

**CADÍ.**

Es tan hermosa
Catalina, que no niego
ser su suerte venturosa.
Pero, entre estos regocijos,
atiende, hijo, a hacer hijos,
y en más de una tierra siembra. (III, vv. 2461-2466)

The Cadi advises the Sultan to sleep with other women, if for no other reason than to increase his chances of begetting an heir. At this point in the play, the Sultan is actually reluctant, but he sees the reasoning of the Cadi, and decides that perhaps his councilor is correct, and that he should return to his former ways in order to beget an heir.

Shortly thereafter, Madrigal asks the Cadi for thirty escudos, with which to procure a rare parrot from the Americas, that he claims will provide invaluable insight and wisdom. Of course, Madrigal intends to keep the money for his own purposes. Meanwhile, Rustán and Mami are asked by the Sultan to bring before him two girls from his Harem. Zelinda and Zaida (who are Lamberto
and Clara) are quite perturbed by this news, knowing that they might be chosen. Zaida remarks,
"¿Tan presto se le fue de la memoria / la singular belleza que adoraba? / El suyo no es amor, sino
apetito" (III, vv. 2555-57). But they are the chosen two of the Sultan, as he now has an even
stronger desire for Christian women. Although there is some dramatic tension in the scene, it is
quite comical too. Zelinda points out the terrifyingly absurd situation:

ZELINDA. ¡Ahora sí que es llegada
la infelícísimá hora,
antes de venir, menguada!
¿Qué habemos de hacer, señora,
yo varón y tú preñada? (III, vv. 2575-2579)

Just as Lamberto/Zelinda is taken off to meet with the Sultan, the Sultana arrives just in
time, and Zaida is able to ask for her favor. She explains their tragic and comedic situation to
Catalina, who, is now more resolved than ever to restore things to balance, this time herself stating,
"...espero/ en la gran bondad de Dios, / salir bien de aqueste estrecho" (III, vv. 2706-2707).

In order to save himself from the Sultan's now renewed sexual appetite, Lamberto must
invent a clever ruse. He pretends that, from a young age, seeing the superior virtues of man, he
wished to be male, and prayed to the Prophet Muhammad to transform him, and that now, in order
to protect his innocence, Muhammad has once again transformed him into a man. When the Great
Turk asks his Cadi if such a thing is possible, the superstitious Cadi accepts the "miracle" without
question. Fortunately for Lamberto, the Sultana Catalina arrives before the Sultan can reflect on
what has happened any further, and is furious with his lascivious behavior. The Turk, for his part,
is once again completely under her thrall, finding her jealousy to be one of her most attractive
qualities. For her part, Catalina remarks,

Si por dejar herederos
éste y otros desafueros
haces, bien podrá afirmar
que yo te los he de dar,
y que han de ser los primeros,
pues tres faltas tengo ya
de la ordinaria dolencia
que a las mujeres les da. (III, vv. 2794-2801)

Catalina confirms here that she and the Sultan have, in fact, consummated their marriage at this juncture in the play, and assures the Sultan that there is a good chance that she is pregnant, to put an end to his foolish behavior. Being almost as credulous as the Cadi, the Sultan accepts the "miraculous" transformation of Lamberto/Zelinda as a sign from the heavens of blessing their new child. The Sultana decrees that Zaida and Zelinda be married, given a good station in life, and removed from her sight. Zaida initially protests, simply to make it more likely that the Sultan won't suspect their plan. The Turk elevates Lamberto to the status of a Bajá of Rhodes, thus resolving the difference of social category between Lamberto and Clara.

Overjoyed by the happy prophecy, the Great Turk wants the festivities to begin again, more lavish than before, with extraordinary olympic-style games and more. The Sultana then saves Lamberto and Zaida definitively remarking that she no longer wishes to see them, for fear that it will "change the prophecy." Zaida thanks her for her wisdom, stating, "por sin par y por divina tendré vuestra discreción" (III, vv. 2880-81). After this dramatic resolution, Madrigal has been able to procure passage on a ship, and he and Andrea make their escape, as he tells her the strange tale of the Christian Sultana. This is a metatheatrical moment towards the end of the play: Madrigal wishes to find himself among the corrales de comedias in Madrid as an actor, telling his incredible tale (which the audience would have been witnessing had this work ever been performed in Cervantes' day). The play ends with Roberto and Salec from the play's opening, summing up what we have just witnessed, and with Rustán once more praising the glory of the Christian Sultana.

As we have seen, the play features three different examples of elicit, forbidden love: one between two Christians of different social standing, one between Catalina and the Great Turk, and
finally, the comedic love between Madrigal and the Alárabe woman. Each level of romantic entanglement corresponds to a different philosophical treatment and resolution as well. Catalina is counseled and guided by both the eunuch Rustán, as well as her father, with examples of religious casuistry and theological reasoning. On the comedic side of the play, Madrigal himself becomes a literal false-prophet, reading omens in the calls of birds in order to exploit the gullibility and superstitious nature of the Turks for his personal gain. The play concludes with Catalina having tamed the tyrannical nature of the Sultan, resulting in the release of her fellow Christian captives, as well as in the Great Turk himself become a better ruler. Young Lamberto and Clara may now marry and achieve their happy ending. Thanks to the title and position granted to Lamberto by the Sultan, he is now no longer of a lower social standing than Clara. Finally, in a comedic vein, the false prophet Madrigal remains a false-prophet, and is able to profit personally from his antics and folly, becoming, ultimately, an actor in the drama we have just witnessed (through a meta-theatrical guiño or wink at the audience on the part of Cervantes).

The basic premise of the play is that at all levels of society, Christianity shows itself to be a more rational, cleverer, and more spiritual faith than Islam. The wit and resourcefulness of Madrigal allows him to make fun of the Jewish culture, with its overly rule-based, rigid view of religion, as well as Islamic culture, with its superstitious tendencies, belief in omens, and its sexual permissiveness in allowing homosexuality. Meanwhile, the will of the tyrannical Sultan with an insatiable sexual appetite is tamed and enlightened by Catalina's beauty, intelligence, and grace, until he inevitably comes to see her and respect her, a Spanish Christian woman, as his equal. It is through her beauty and defiance of him that he inadvertently comes to submit more and more to the values of courtly love (rather than being driven by appetite, though he back-slides a bit), and consequently, to Christian values. Thus, along with other more contemporary critics, we might
regard the play as primarily a political flight-of-fancy, in which Spain is able to conquer the
Ottoman Empire without firing a single shot, and the Christian beauty, intellect and soul of
Catalina tames the tyrannical impulses of the Turkish Sultan.
7. EL GALLARDO ESPAÑOL

Each of the three captivity plays in the compendium depicts a different aspect of the conflict between the two major monotheistic religions at war with one another on the Iberian Peninsula. Whereas *Los Baños de Argel* exemplified the tragic dimensions of heroism and collective struggle of the Spanish Christian soldiers in captivity, *La gran sultana* is much more farcical and lighthearted, with the appetitive, impulsive Turkish Sultan yielding more and more to the conventions of courtly love as he is captivated by the physical and spiritual beauty of Catalina de Oviedo. In *El gallardo español*, Cervantes gives us the heroic side of the captivity narrative.

In the other two cautiverio plays, there is no clear, single protagonist, but *El gallardo español* presents us with don Fernando Saavedra, a gallant soldier who is torn between his sense of personal honor in combat and his military duty to the Spanish crown. Although the drama is heavily grounded in actual historical events, it is also replete with action that could come from a Byzantine novel, and the romantic intrigue seems inspired by the comedia de capa y espada genre popularized by Lope de Vega. Finally, as Florencio Sevilla Arroyo and Antonio Rey Hazas have already seen, the conventions of chivalry and mutual respect even among enemies of opposing

---

229 Aside from don Fernando Saavedra himself, who appears to be entirely a fictional creation of Cervantes, most of the noblemen and the battles contained within this play can be linked to concrete historical events. Diego de Suárez informs us of a very similar Spanish assault on a Moorish aduar in Orán. For the historical origins of the play, see in particular Canavaggio (1977), 53-58, and Cotarelo y Valledor, 261-266; Rodolfo Schevill and Adolfo Bonilla, "El teatro de Cervantes," intro. to their edition of Comedias y entremeses, vol. VI, 102. All the details about the defense of the fortification at San Miguel (real-life San Salvador) by don Fernando de Cárcamo against the combined forces of Hasán Bajá (the governor of Argel) and kings of Cuco and Alabez, as well as the unexpected arrival of timely reinforcements of the four ships of don Álvaro de Bazán, the attack on Mazalquivir, the defense of Orán by don Martín de Córdoba, and the arrival of the flotilla commanded by don Francisco de Mendoza, are all based on real-life events. For an excellent summary, see ed. Sevilla Arroyo and Rey Hazas, p. XIII, upon which my own summary of these events is based.

230 In their introduction, ob. cit., p. XXI.
religions on the battlefield between don Fernando and Alimuzel has precedent (and was probably inspired by) the dynamic between Abindarráez and Rodrigo Narváez in the *novela morisca*, by an unknown author, the *Abencerraje* (1561).

Because a concise summary of plot and theme for a play with this many characters and disguised identities is rather cumbersome, I ask the reader to bear with me at the outset as I attempt to sketch out the essential elements of the argument with all its intrigues. In due time, the different and competing pairs of relationships, which offer significant and important contrasts, will highlight the central theme, and provide a sense of the overall design of the play. In this drama, we will bear witness to Cervantes' mastery in staging games of equivocation, deception by means of the truth, and the confusion of multiple assumed identities. These are all dramatic techniques that we will examine again in our subsequent chapters concerning the *comedias de enredo* as well.

*El gallardo español* opens with Arlaxa expressing her rather unusual obsession with don Fernando to Alimuzel, a brave Moorish soldier who is in love with her. Arlaxa won't be satisfied with marrying any Moor unless he can prove to her his valor in battle by defeating don Fernando in honorable combat, and offering him alive to her as tribute, as a captive slave. In her words:

> Es el caso, Alimuzel
> que, a no traerme el cristiano,
> te será el Amor tirano,
> y yo te seré crüel.
> Quiérole preso y rendido,
> aunque sano y sin cautela.  (I, vv. 1-6)

The feelings that Arlaxa expresses towards Fernando in this play are not those of a true lover, but rather, of a woman who seeks dominance over another. She will not truly be impressed by any of her suitors unless they are capable of conquering the most valiant enemy soldier she has heard of. Her "infatuation" with Fernando on the basis of his exploits initially seems like "*un enamoramiento de oidas*," so common in the literature of the day, but it has this curious underpinning of a desire
to dominate that isn't part of this tradition. She is clearly meant to serve as the foil for the "true" enamoramiento de oídas that we see later with Margarita, the female romantic lead, who truly does wish to join herself with don Fernando in Christian marriage.

Just as Arlaxa is placed in opposition to Margarita, so too is Alimuzel juxtaposed with don Fernando. He is represented as a Moorish soldier who is indeed truly courageous, to the point of gaining the mutual respect of don Fernando later in the play. His one tragic flaw is that he loves Arlaxa to the point of being willing to do anything to satisfy her, even when her demands are unreasonable. He expresses his frustration with the difficulty of her request, but shows himself disposed to do anything he can to please her, even going so far as to acknowledge, rather sacrilegiously, that it is not Allah, but another God that drives his actions. That is to say, Eros, the god of love:

ALIMUZEL. No me trae aquí Mahoma
   a averiguar en el campo
   si su secta es buena o mala,
   que Él tiene otro deso cuidado.
   Tráeme otro dios más brioso,
   que es tan soberbio y tan manso,
   que ya parece cordero,
   y ya león irritado.
   Y este dios, que así me impele,
   es de una mora vasallo,
   que es reina de la hermosura,
   de quien soy humilde esclavo. (I, vv. 159-167)

It is significant that Alimuzel recognizes the fact that he is unable to resist the pull that love has over his decisions. Even though attempting to take don Fernando prisoner in combat (rather than killing him) is a fool's errand, Alimuzel is compelled to follow the whims of this beautiful woman to win her love. But the fact that he acknowledges his (nearly) fatal flaw demonstrates a self-awareness we might not normally expect from a tragic hero. It is perhaps for this reason that
Alimuzel is ultimately spared in the play. Although he is fundamentally flawed, he is nevertheless an honorable character, worthy of don Fernando's respect and even friendship.

Alimuzel comes to the walls of the Spanish fortification at Orán, challenges don Fernando publically to a duel, and declares his intentions of defeating him in order to win the heart of his lady love. Don Fernando is impressed with the Moorish soldier's bravery, and declares his intention of facing Alimuzel. But don Fernando's commanding officer, don Alonso de Córdoba, refuses to grant don Fernando permission to undertake this duel, stating the following reason:

D. ALONSO. Porque no es suyo el soldado
que está en presidio encerrado
sino de aquél que le encierra,
y no ha de hacer otra guerra
sino a la que se ha obligado.
   En ningún modo sois vuestro,
sino del rey, y en su nombre
sois mío, según lo muestro,
y yo no aventuro un hombre
que es de la guerra maestro
por la simple niñería
de una amorosa porfía;
don Fernando, esto es verdad. (I, vv. 252-264)

Don Alonso advises don Fernando that his will as a soldier is not his own, and that he has an obligation to the crown. Under the authority granted to him by that royal power, don Alonso refuses to give don Fernando his permission, arguing that risking a soldier as skilled in combat as don Fernando over a trivial romantic matter such as this is unwarranted. This is the principal theme of the play: the conflict between don Fernando's personal honor and his duty to the crown and to follow orders. By bending the rules, don Fernando is able to do both. Nevertheless, don Fernando disobeys a direct order, accepting Alimuzel's challenge on the condition that they duel after nightfall, so that he can slip out quietly without don Alonso noticing. Don Fernando instructs his
friend and fellow soldier Guzman to tell Alimuzel that he will duel him, but that the duel will have to be postponed, and Guzman agrees to help him in this endeavor.

Alimuzel is consistently depicted as a brave soldier, worthy of the respect and courtesy afforded to him by don Alonso. In contrast to him, there is another, much more cowardly and treacherous character in the Moorish camp, Nacor. Nacor secretly pines for Arlaxa, but being craven and unsuited for combat, he dishonorably plots to make Alimuzel appear cowardly in the eyes of Arlaxa, so that he might win her love for himself. When Guzman arrives at the Moorish camp, he is initially mistaken for Don Fernando by Alimuzel. Alimuzel once again (indirectly) shows his admiration for his mortal enemy, going so far as to proclaim himself inferior (although not by much). Alimuzel states (believing Guzman to be don Fernando), "yo confieso, / que tu buen talle y buen brio / llega y se aventaja al mio / pero no en muy grande exceso" (I, vv. 412-416). Guzmán, however, quickly relieves Alimuzel of this misconception, and reveals his true identity. Alimuzel continues to be distraught at Arlaxa's obsession with don Fernando, but nevertheless receives Guzmán cordially and without incident, and accepts the terms of the duel presented to him by Guzmán on don Fernando's behalf. Nacor, on the other hand, doesn't share this humility with Alimuzel and, secretly hoping to make him appear cowardly in the eyes of Arlaxa, "advises" him that the Spaniards might be trying to mount a trap, and that he would be ill-advised to go to the agreed-upon meeting place for the duel.

The next few scenes take place in the Spanish camp. Don Alonso de Córdoba, Count of Alcaudete and General of Oran, his brother don Martín, and don Fernando, receive a petition from doña Isabel de Avellaneda, a noblewoman of high standing, in which she agrees to pull all the elderly and children off of the battle front, but declares (in the name of all Spanish women) that the women will remain, and serve God's will courageously alongside the men. Although this scene
doesn't serve a direct dramatic function in the play, it does serve to show the bravery of both genders of the Spanish nation, and probably corresponds with a similar real-life petition of around that time period.\(^{231}\)

In the following scene, we are introduced to Buitrago, who provides some comic relief. Buitrago is considerably more one-dimensional and less clever than Madrigal in \textit{La Gran Sultana}, but he does show himself to be a capable soldier in the second act of the play, in spite of his mostly buffoonish character. There is, however, slightly more to Buitrago than initially meets the eye. Buitrago is charged with collecting alms in the form of small provisions of food as an offering for the recently deceased to help their souls in purgatory (a common Catholic practice of the day). Yet, he is gluttonous, and cannot help but eat some of the sardines and other small offerings he collects himself. While this is humorous, it also becomes apparent that Buitrago represents the lower-class of soldiers. He is disheveled, ill-mannered and constantly hungry. These characteristics, however, are partly a result not only of his social standing, but also of his actual poverty. While providing a little humor in the play, Cervantes is also able to display a portrait of the average low-ranked soldier, who was constantly hungry, and not very well compensated for the risks that he endured. The condition of the impoverished soldier was one with which Cervantes himself was quite acquainted from his own lived experience.

In the next scene, Arlaxa, speaking with Oropesa, her Christian captive and slave, reveals the reasons for her obsession with don Fernando. She proclaims:

\(^{231}\) Although I have thus far uncovered no direct evidence for a petition of this nature from around this time, it stands to reason that Cervantes based this upon an actual historical event, as most of the dialogue dealing with individual battles and troop movement that occurs offstage in this play does indeed correspond to historical battles. Since this scene serves little dramatic function in the play, it would greatly surprise me if it didn't have a historical precedent, which I hope to be able to uncover in the future.
Las alabanzas estrañas
que aplicaste a aquel Fernando,
contándome sus hazañas,
se me fueron estampando
en medio de las entrañas;
y de allí nació un deseo
no lascivo, torpe o feo,
aunque vano por curioso,
de ver a un hombre famoso
más de los que siempre veo. (I, vv. 700-709)

Thus, as Arlaxa explains, her desire for don Fernando is not one born out of lust, but rather, out of curiosity and the wish to meet in person the man that has become a myth. When Alimuzel returns, she is extremely disappointed to learn that he not only returns without don Fernando, but that they have not even had occasion to duel. Nacor, taking advantage of the situation, lies to Arlaxa, attempting, according to his plan, to make it appear as though Alimuzel backed down in cowardly fashion from don Fernando's request to postpone the duel one day, when it was Nacor's advice in the first place, as we know, that prompted Alimuzel not to meet with don Fernando out in the open. Nacor shows himself once again to be the true coward, hiding behind his rank and noble title of Jarife,

232 when both Arlaxa and Alimuzel threaten him with physical violence for his lies. Alimuzel clarifies the truth of the matter, and Arlaxa believes him, as she has never reciprocated Nacor's feelings of love towards her, and in fact, finds Nacor to be quite irritating.

It is at this juncture that the intrigue of the play begins in earnest, as don Fernando is brought in as captive by two Moors. Don Fernando proclaims defiantly that he allowed himself to be taken prisoner, announcing, "Si no quisiera entregarme, / no pudieran cautivar me / tres escuadras, ni aun trecientas" (I, vv. 814-816). Don Fernando isn't as concerned with his personal honor here as he is with the Moorish soldiers falsely trying to take credit for taking him into their

232 The name Jerife or Jarife was a noble title, originally a name meaning a direct descendent of Muhammad by the bloodline of his daughter, Fátima. See Academia.
custody, as though it was some heroic undertaking. He explains, pretending to be a defector, "Soy un soldado / que me he venido a entregar / a vuestra prisión de grado, / por no poder tolerar / ser valiente y mal pagado" (I, vv. 820-824). From his bravery and general demeanor, Oropesa immediately recognizes don Fernando, but he nevertheless manages to conceal his true identity from his "captors." Don Fernando also corroborates Alimuzel's version of the events, indicating that one don Fernando was indeed to duel with Alimuzel, but was unable due to his general's orders. At this point in the play, don Fernando commences speaking in a series of equivocations that are in line with the Golden Age trope of deceiving others by means of the truth (enganar con la verdad). Throughout the remainder of this act and much of the second act, don Fernando talks about his own exploits in the third person. He comically alludes to the fact that he is, in fact, don Fernando, without the Moorish troops catching, all while delighting the audience of the play:

D. FERNANDO. Es don Fernando Robusto
y habrá que hacer en prendelle.
    Conózcole como a mí,
y sé que es de condición
que sabrá volver por sí,
y aun buscará la ocasión
para responder a Alí.

ARLAXA. ¿Es Valiente?
D. FERNANDO. Como yo.
ARLAXA. ¿De buen rostro?
D. FERNANDO. Aqueso no,
porque me parece mucho.

ALIMUZEL. ¡Todo esto con rabia escucho!
ARLAXA. ¿Tiene amor?
D. FERNANDO. Ya le dejó.
ARLAXA. ¿Luego túvole?
D. FERNANDO. Si creo.
ARLAXA. ¿Será mudable?
D. FERNANDO. No se fuerza
que sea eterno un deseo. (I, vv. 888-902)
This excerpt of the conversation between Arlaxa and don Fernando is a prime example of one of the theatrical writing techniques that Cervantes puts on display so masterfully with great frequency in his oeuvre. This style of rapid-fire question-and-answer exchange adds great dynamism and pace to the dialogue, and is another technique that I feel Cervantes probably learned from some of the interludes and comedias of Lope de Rueda. It functions almost like a Spanish Golden Age version of stichomythia, the ancient Greek theatrical technique of sequencing single, alternating lines, often featuring repetition and antithesis, in which two characters converse or dispute intensely. In this context, it serves to accentuate the tension felt from the dramatic irony of the audience being aware of don Fernando's true identity, while Arlaxa is completely unaware that don Fernando is, in effect, talking about himself. I felt it worth quoting in part here to give a better sense of how Cervantes adapts this technique not only for his comedic works, but also for some of his more serious dramatic works as well. The exchange between don Fernando and Arlaxa continues in this fashion until Alimuzel, feeling a twinge of jealousy, interrupts Arlaxa, proclaiming his undying loyalty and willingness to serve her once again. Arlaxa now states explicitly that if Alimuzel should return for don Fernando and bring him to her alive and defeated, that she will gladly marry Alimuzel for this display of prowess and bravery, to which Don Fernando states, "Tú le mandas una cosa / donde ha de sudar en vano" (I, vv. 918-919), adding further to the dramatic irony of the scene. Since don Fernando is already present, he knows that Arlaxa's request of Alimuzel is, at the time, impossible.

When the others leave for a moment, Oropesa and don Fernando speak, giving him the opportunity to explain both to her and the audience how he came to sneak out of the Spanish fortification and, not finding Alimuzel, decided on this new, spy-like course of action. She agrees to help him conceal his identity, at which point Alimuzel re-enters and promises to free her only
if she helps him match swords with don Fernando, and don Fernando (still pretending to be someone else) agrees to help him also in this endeavor. Most significantly, Alimuzel honorably explains to the others that he doesn't consider don Fernando an enemy, as he has respect for his battle prowess, but that his love for Arlaxa demands that he follow her every whim, declaring, "No es enemigo el cristano; / contrario, sí; que el lozano / deseo de Arlaxa bella / presta para esta querella / la voz, el intento y mano" (I, vv. 1035-1039).

The first act concludes back at the Spanish camp where the captain Guzmán argues (and then begins to fight physically) with the alférez Robledo about the fate of don Fernando, letting us know that word has reached the Spanish camp that he has allowed himself to be taken prisoner by the Moors. Guzmán is convinced that there is no possible way don Fernando could have defected, but Robledo is not as sure. There is much debate and commotion over whether or not he has become a renegade (that is, defected to the Moors), or whether something else entirely is going on.

At the beginning of Act II, don Fernando finally gives a name to his false identity, calling himself Juan Lozano. He once again speaks truths concealed in equivocations. When Arlaxa inquires as to whether don Fernando is a friend of his, he simply states, "es otro yo" (II, v. 1114). Even Oropesa partakes of the deliberate equivocation and dramatic irony in this scene, stating of the similarity between "Juan Lozano" and don Fernando, "Yo no sé qué diferencia / entre los dos se me ofrece; / ésta es su misma presencia, / y el brazo que le engrandece" (II, vv. 1140-1143). Arlaxa's curiosity gives Oropesa the opportunity to relate for the audience one of don Fernando's most famous heroic deeds, in which he single-handedly captured an enemy ship (II, vv. 1149-1204). This anecdote further enhances don Fernando's semi-mythical status for the real life audience of the play as well, and Oropesa compares him explicitly to Hercules, Hector, and Roland (II, v. 1206). At this juncture, Nacor enters unexpectedly, promising that he will go to Orán, to
bring don Fernando before Arlaxa. The latter is, as always, unreceptive of his advances, but gives him her blessings anyway.

In the following scene, we are finally introduced to doña Margarita, who is disguised as a man, and Vozmediano, an old man, who tends to her needs and assists her in her travels and perilous endeavor. Cervantes maintains the interest of his audience by delaying the revelation of her tragic backstory until later in the play. At this point, we know only that she has fallen in love with don Fernando from hearing about his exploits, and is seeking his hand in marriage. She refuses to believe that he has become a renegade, and endeavors to continue her search for him in spite of the rumors that are circulating. Vozmediano and doña Margarita come across Buitrago, who once again solicits alms for the souls in purgatory of the fallen soldiers (clearly intending to eat the food himself), but they are unable to provide him with any provisions. This scene provides further comic relief, and once again shows us Buitrago's uncouth manner of speaking and misappropriation of the food he is collecting as alms.

In the next scene, Nacor ventures to the Spanish camp, and offers Count don Martín and Captain Guzmán information about the location of the Moorish soldiers in exchange for their help in capturing Arlaxa, so that he might be the one to "free" her, and in this way, win her heart. Although he is aiding the Spanish troops, Nacor is still presented extremely unfavorably in this play, as he would betray his own faith for the love of a woman. In contrast with Alimuzel, who seeks to win Arlaxa's heart honorably by proving his valor in battle, Nacor plots and schemes, even going so far as to betray his own people in the hopes of winning her love. The character's presence can be explained in terms of the central theme: that is, the conflict between personal honor and collective responsibility, in matters of both love and war. This becomes particularly apparent when Nacor tries to explain his actions to the Spaniards:
Por ella tengo tan infame empresa
por ilustre, por grande, y no por baja:
que, por reinar y por amor no hay culpa
que no tenga perdón y halle disculpa.
No siento ni descubro otro camino,
para ser poseedor de aquesta mora,
que hacer este amoroso desatino,
puesto que en él crueldad y tración mora.
Ámola por la fuerza del destino,
y, aunque mi alma su beldad adora,
quiérola cautivar para soltalla,
por si puedo moverla o obligalla. (II, vv. 1386-1398)

As don Martín immediately makes explicit once Nacor has left, Nacor is simply rationalizing his treachery. Even though he is handing them a victory, the Spaniards are wisely cautious around him, and consider his true intentions carefully. In both matters of love and war, Nacor is characterized as an individual who betrays the proper rules of conduct. He hides behind his noble title, betrays his own people and his honor, in his desire to possess Arlaxa. It is also interesting to note that, contrary to Alimuzel, who always expresses his love as submission to Arlaxa's will (in concord with the conventions of courtly love, Nacor seeks to possess Arlaxa, indicating that his unrequited love is a less true love than that of Alimuzel. Finally, Nacor also serves as a point of contrast to don Fernando, as he is the traitor who appears faithful, whereas don Fernando is the loyal Spanish soldier who, in order to execute his plan, must appear a traitor to the others for the time being.

As Buitrago, Vozmediano and doña Margarita join the other Spaniards, Vozmediano reproaches Buitrago for his ill manners in soliciting alms, and Margarita continues to pretend to be a male soldier. When the others have left, Margarita discloses her intention to allow herself to be captured by the Moors, so that she might uncover the truth about don Fernando and his apparent
defection. Vozmediano attempts in vain to dissuade her from this precarious course of action, but Margarita is resolute in her determination to find out what happened to don Fernando.

Meanwhile, Arlaxa calls Alimuzel and don Fernando (still pretending to be Juan Lozano) to her side, to confide in them about a prophetic dream she had in which Nacor betrayed her, and she was taken captive by Spanish soldiers. Alimuzel, responds with unknowing irony, "No son los sueños verdad; / no tengas miedo, mi amor" (II, vv. 1615-1616). For his part, don Fernando also swears his hand to protect Arlaxa, much to the consternation and dismay of Oropesa. In this scene, Oropesa serves to voice the concerns that the audience of the day would doubtless feel as well, that don Fernando was betraying his honor in swearing to take up arms against his own countrymen, as she proclaims (presumably when the others are out of earshot, although there is no explicit stage direction to this effect), "En armarte a tal empresa, / de tu valor te desarmas" (II, vv. 1665-1667).

We have the immediate juxtaposition of don Fernando with Nacor in the following scene, who advises Guzmán as to how to best surround the Moorish encampment in an ambush and take as many prisoners as possible. Buitrago, not trusting Nacor, wants to keep him bound until they have executed the plan, but Guzmán orders him to release Nacor, honoring their original agreement. As Margarita is left alone on the stage, she gives a minor "damsel in distress" type soliloquy, in which she expresses her dismay at the peril involved in her plan, leaving herself at the mercy of the enemy, proclaiming, "Estos pasos son testigos / que huyo de los amigos, / y, llena de ceguedad, / de mi propia voluntad / me entrego a los enemigos" (II, vv. 1707-1711).

In the following scene, the ambush that has been built up comes to fruition, as the two camps finally meet face-to-face, in what is undoubtedly the most action-packed portion of the drama. As Buitrago captures Arlaxa, she cries out for help, and Alimuzel comes to her aid. In the
confusion, Margarita (still disguised as a Spanish soldier) agrees to help Arlaxa escape if she will lead the way. As they make their escape, Buitrago pursues Alimuzel, invoking the souls of purgatory (from whom he has been taking a cut of the alms) to give him strength in battle. Don Fernando comes face-to-face and sword-to-sword with his friend Guzmán. Fernando takes great care not to wound his friend or any of the other Spaniards in combat, expertly parrying blows and evading without striking back except to disarm his opponents. When Guzmán asks if Fernando has become an enemy of Christ (defecting to the other side), he replies, "Ni de veras, ni burlando," reassuring his friend that "Vendrá sazón / más llana y acomodada, / en que te dé relación / de mi pretensión honrada. / Cristiano soy, no lo dudes" (II, vv. 1751 & 1753-1757). Once again, we see the conflict between personal honor and responsibility to the crown and his countrymen come into play. As don Fernando swore to protect Arlaxa, he must hold true to his word and defend her against the Spaniards. But as we shall see, although he disobeyed a direct order, he never truly betrayed the Spanish camp, and of course does not wound a single Spanish soldier. Fernando cries out to the Spaniards to take whatever other spoils or prizes they desire from the encampment, but to leave Arlaxa in peace. Nevertheless, Buitrago pursues the Moors, and winds up severely wounding Alimuzel, who is trying to defend Arlaxa. Don Fernando, furious, declares "Éste que va a dar el pago / de tus bravatas, Buitrago, / mejor cristiano es que tú" (II, 1817-1819), and threatens to strike him down. Buitrago recognizes don Fernando, and immediately withdraws, as he fears death and knows he cannot defeat don Fernando in combat. Guzmán proceeds to order the Spanish troops to withdraw, as daybreak is upon them, and they have achieved their main objective. Although the rapid-paced action of this scene would have been difficult to stage, owing both to the number of actors as well as the fast-paced fight choreography, it is expertly executed. Without the need for many explicit stage directions, it is still perfectly clear who is fighting whom,
and at what times all of the major transitions in the scene occur. It is a testament to Cervantes' dramatic form that, while he ordinarily prefers for the plot to be driven by dialogue rather than action, he is nevertheless quite capable of doing the reverse, and gives form to the staged combat implicitly with the way the scene is set up, and the verbal exchanges between the characters.

At this juncture, don Fernando finds Margarita, still dressed as a Christian soldier, and offers to help return her to the Spanish troops. She, however, insists that he allow her to remain, prompting him to ask, "¿Quieres quedar cautivo por tu gusto?" to which she responds, "Quizá mi libertad consiste en eso," prompting him to comment, "¿Hay otros don Fernandos en el mundo?" in recognition of the similarity of their situations (II, vv. 1851-1853). Cervantes delights in this play in the seeming contradictions of his protagonists. Don Fernando, in appearing to be a traitor, is actually an extremely loyal and astute soldier for the Spaniards, who intends to find a way to free all the Christian captives, while still protecting the love and honor of Alimuzel and Arlaxa. Margarita can only find her true freedom by becoming a prisoner of the Moors, for reasons that will soon be explained. Thus, we have the Cervantine paradoxes of loyalty in treason and freedom in captivity that must be resolved in the play's third act. Cervantes makes expert use of this kind of seeming contradiction, particularly in the title of many of his works, such as the exemplary novels, *El amante liberal*, *La española inglesa*, and *La ilustre fregona*, using such suggestive titles and contradictory language to draw his audience's attention and create intrigue as to how the paradox can be explained logically.

In the next scene, Bairán, a renegade, gives the Count don Alonso de Córdoba and Don Martín vital information about the position of the Moorish fleet, as well as the accords and plans of the various high-ranking Moorish military and naval officers. All the characters and places
named in this scene correspond to actual historical details as recorded in Diego de Haedo's, *Topografía e historia general de Argel*, and add great deal of verisimilitude to the text.

Oropesa, now back at the Spanish camp, having been liberated in the ambush, is able to defend don Fernando's reputation to the Count after Buitrago accuses him of interfering and saving Alimuzel's life. Guzmán further corroborates her account of events, stating "Con tiento pareció que iba esgrimiendo, / y palabras me dijo en el combate / por quien fui sus designios conociendo" (II, vv. 1939-1941). Guzmán tries to make clear that don Fernando never had any intention of wounding the Spanish soldiers, but the Count is still furious, declaring that don Fernando's failure to comply with a direct order by sneaking out at night to meet with the Moor already proves his guilt, and that he can't be forgiven for that breach of protocol. Don Martín is equally outraged at don Fernando's seeming treachery, but Oropesa assures them that he is plotting something that will be for the greater glory of the Christian soldiers. After the spoils of the raid are distributed among the troops, Vozmediano laments doña Margarita's hasty decision to join the Moorish camp to find out the truth about don Fernando.

We return to the Moorish camp in the next scene, and don Fernando tries to learn the reason why doña Margarita (who he still believes to be a male soldier) has handed herself over to the Moorish camp. Before she can unveil her tragic tale, we learn that Alimuzel was not killed by Buitrago, and that Arlaxa was able to mend his wound in time to save him. The second act then concludes with doña Margarita beginning her tragic backstory, but she is interrupted in the middle of her recounting by a call to arms of the Moors. Cervantes has often been credited with adapting techniques from the theater for use in his narrative, but he does the opposite as well. Here, he makes use of the typical narrative technique for suspense found in Byzantine novels of interrupting...

---
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the action as a way of prolonging the suspense. The technique works well, and also serves as a way for him to distract from what could otherwise potentially be tedious narrative exposition employed to introduce character history. Particularly in the wake of such an action-packed scene as the previous one, a slow recounting of backstory might well not function in this play if not for the interruption. Presumably, this space in between the second and the third act would also have been filled with the performance of a comedic interlude, perhaps even one of Cervantes' own Entremeses, had the play ever been performed on the stage of his day.

The final act begins with the Moorish kings of Cuco and Alabez paying a visit to the Moorish encampment. The Kings praise Arlaxa's beauty, in accordance with the paradigms of courtly love. Arlaxa, for her part, offers them gifts in the form of many gourmet food provisions, in exchange for their assistance in bringing those responsible for sacking the encampment to justice. The importance of the scene is that previously, Nacor was able to hide behind the noble title of Jarife, but he will no longer be able to do so now that Arlaxa has won the favor of the Moorish kings. This scene is central to the eventual resolution of the play, and it also enables Cervantes to interject a little more suspense before Margarita concludes her tale.

Margarita explains that she was of a very high social class, and that her parents enrolled her in the monastery of Santa Clara, never intending for her to become a nun, but rather intending to educate her. Upon their death, she was supposed to marry, but her arrogant brother would not accept any of the suitors that presented themselves, giving innumerable and trivial reasons why they were not of her caliber. One of the suitors was apparently so offended that he went so far as to wound Margarita's brother gravely with his sword, and promptly fled to Italy. After this had transpired, Margarita finally came to the realization that her brother was trying to prevent her from marrying so that he might inherit their parents' estate, so she took it upon herself to find a worthy
suitor. Margarita's parents also left her in their will the services of an elderly gentleman of noble standing, an *hidalgo*, to counsel and advise her upon their passing, as well as to take care of any needs she might have (III, vv. 2179-2245). The audience immediately deduces that she is referring to Vozmediano, who agreed to help her in this endeavor. He told her the tale of don Fernando, a man of such high standing and so many courageous feats that even her brother would have no choice but to accept such a man as a worthy suitor. Upon hearing of his many exploits, Margarita immediately fell in love with don Fernando, and decided to seek his hand in marriage. She first escaped from the convent, dressed as a man, and travelled to Italy, where she learned that don Fernando's most recent duties had brought him to Oran. She promptly departed from Naples, and soon learned of the unthinkable rumors that don Fernando had become a traitor, and joined the Moors (III, vv. 2254-2309).

This scene of recounting is mostly straightforward exposition, really more at home in narrative than upon the stage, but it oddly works in this play because of the dramatic situation. Don Fernando is present during all of this recollection, and it is thus more plausible that he would fall for doña Margarita, despite knowing her for such a short period of time, upon understanding that both her social standing and her bravery make her a good match for him. Additionally, it complicates the drama that, as much as he might wish to reveal his true identity to her at this juncture, he is unable to do so, as he has a more pressing duty to conceal his identity in order to continue infiltrating the Moorish camp and devise a way to defend his fellow countrymen, as well as to free the remaining Christian captives. Finally, Arlaxa, who has shown herself to be quite harsh and demanding in her treatment of the male characters in the play nevertheless is able to commiserate with doña Margarita in spite of their different religions over their shared desire to meet don Fernando and the difficulties it has brought them thus far. She remarks, "Cristiana, de
tu dolor / casi siento la mitad; / que tal vez curiosidad / fatiga como el amor” (III, vv. 2310-2313).

It is also in this scene where don Fernando learns for himself that Margarita's love for him is true, when he asks her (still in the guise of Juan Lozano) whether she might change her mind upon seeing don Fernando's countenance and learning that he is not as dashing or handsome as she had imagined. She replies, simply:

La fama de su cordura
y valor es la que ha hecho
la herida dentro del pecho:
no del rostro la hermosura;
que ésa es prenda que la quita
el tiempo breve y ligero,
flor que se muestra en enero,
que a la sombra se marchita“

(III, vv. 2341-2349).

Although it is not the main theme of the play, one of the major sub-themes, as well as the primary motor which initiates the dramatic action, is the theme of what constitutes real love and a well-adjusted marriage. In this case, Cervantes is instructing his audience in the nature of true love, by having his female protagonist eschew the world of ephemeral physical beauty in favor of the true beauty of don Fernando's character, full of wisdom and valor. Perhaps it is for this reason that Astrana Marín attempted to link the interlude El juez de los divorcios, a play about marriage gone wrong with this play, which concludes with an exemplary marriage. Don Fernando does not yet reveal his true identity to Margarita, but it becomes clear to the audience that she is indeed worthy

234 In his exhaustive study, Astrana Marín attempts to link each interlude with one specific full-length comedy. Though this has been attempted many times throughout the history of the study of these plays, I am not convinced that such efforts have ultimately proven fruitful. I feel compelled to make this connection here, nevertheless, for the broader purpose of illustrating how Cervantes was at all moments making a conscientious effort to instruct his audience through his dramas, not in a pedantic way, but by giving them examples upon which to reflect.
of him, and he of her. This prepares the viewers for their marriage at the play's conclusion. At this juncture, don Fernando merely agrees to help Margarita, but doesn't specify how.

The following scene returns us once again to the historical reality of the play. The characters in the Spanish camp are called to arms by Buitrago, and the Count and Guzmán explain the military situation, as Fernando de Cárcamo defends their stronghold. Sevilla Arroyo and Rey Hazas note in their edition\textsuperscript{235} that the historical Fernando de Cárcamo received word that the fort of San Salvador was going to fall to the Turks, and managed to arrive just in time to defend the Spanish soldiers as they fled, preventing the Turkish forces from taking them prisoner. Count don Alonso observes that they will soon be surrounded by the Turkish forces, and calls the troops to arms.

Shortly thereafter, the Turkish nobles discuss their invasion plans, and the Spanish troop movement. The renegade Bairán, the Azán Bajá (the king of Algiers) and the kings of Cuco and Alabez discuss what to do about the arrival of various Spanish soldiers and Naval officers, with Bairán briefing the others on the latest news from the battlefront:

\begin{quote}
BAIRÁN. Don Francisco, el hermano del valiente don Juan, que naufragó en la Herradura, apercibe gran número de gente, y socorrer a esta ciudad procura. Don Álvaro Bazán, otro excelente caballero famoso y de ventura, tiene cuatro galeras a su cargo, y éste ha de ser de tu designio embargo. (III, vv. 2430-2437)
\end{quote}

In this passage, don Francisco is a reference to the historical don Francisco de Mendoza, the son of don Antonio de Mendoza, and Don Álvaro Bazán was a celebrated admiral, first marquis of

\textsuperscript{235} Ob. cit., 112, n. 22.
Santa Cruz of Marcenado, and captain general of the Spanish seas. Álvaro Bazán's charge was to patrol the southern Spanish seaboard, and to insure the security of the coastline. In 1563, he dispersed the Moorish fleet from the coasts of Orán and Mazalquivir, and also distinguished himself in the defense of La Goleta, exploits which Cervantes also mentions in the captive's tale in *DQI*, ch. XXXIX. Cervantes honors the great military generals and naval captains of his day by incorporating their exploits into the action discussed by the characters. In addition to adding verisimilitude to this dramatic work, these two back-to-back scenes with historical details provide an attempt by Cervantes to reconstruct the battles for his audience with a great deal of dramatic detail, as well as to establish a contrast between the two camps and the turning tides of the war.

At this point in the play, the two major dramatic threads (the amorous and the bellicose) become further intertwined, as don Juan is brought in as a captive to the Moorish encampment, and is presented to Arlaxa as tribute by Azán. As it turns out, don Juan is the greedy and arrogant brother of Margarita, and has now become a soldier in the conflict. The dramatic situation becomes doubly complicated, as he knows the true identities of both don Fernando and doña Margarita, and they must both dissimulate to maintain false appearances for opposite reasons. After Arlaxa and the others exit for a moment, don Fernando is left to speak alone with don Juan. He must make don Juan believe that he is somebody else as well, so that Arlaxa and the others do not discover his true identity. At the same time, doña Margarita, who has revealed her true self to Arlaxa and

---

236 See ed. Rey Hazas and Sevilla Arroyo, 114, n. 30-31. The don Juan in this passage is simply don Francisco's brother, don Juan de Mendoza, and should not be confused with the don Juan of this play, who is Margarita's brother.

237 Ibid., 114, n. 30. & 32. In *DQI*, Cervantes reminds us of Bazán's exploits. "En este viaje, se tomó la galera que se llamaba *La Presa*, de quien era capitán un hijo de aquel famoso cosario Barbarroja. Tomóla la capitana de Nápoles, llamada *La Loba*, regida por aquel rayo de la guerra, por el padre de los soldados, por aquel venturoso y jamás vencido capitán don Álvaro de Bazán, marqués de Santa Cruz" (*DQI*, ch. XXXIX, 490).
the others, must now take on a different disguise, that of a Moorish woman, so as to conceal her identity from her brother. Cervantes expertly employs these games of equivocation, deception by means of the truth, and the confusion of multiple assumed identities in his comedies, as we will see later, but he can make use of the same devices to great serious dramatic effect as well, as is the case here. Don Juan is condemned to be confused for the remainder of the play, much to the audience's amusement. Don Fernando, for his part, explains the dramatic situation, summarizing for the benefit of the audience:

D. FERNANDO. Entre sospechas y antojos, y en gran confusión metido, va don Juan lleno de enojos, pues le estorba este vestido no dar crédito a sus ojos. No se puede persuadir que yo pudiese venir a ser moro y renegar; y así, se deja llevar de lo que quise fingir. Su confesión está llana, y más lo estará si mira y si conoce a su hermana; que entoces no habrá mentira que no se tenga por vana. Pregunto: ¿en qué ha de parar este mi disimular, y vestirme de moro? En que guardaré el decoro con que más me pueda honrar. (III, vv. 2588-2607)

Indeed, the idea that don Juan has of don Fernando as an honorable and brave Spanish soldier is so strong that he cannot accept the reality that his eyes present him with, choosing instead to accept the fiction that don Fernando has created, as Fernando himself explains here. Sure enough, as don Fernando predicts in this soliloquy, don Juan will recognize his sister shortly thereafter, and become even more confused when all the others present refuse to corroborate his suspicions, claiming that she has always been a Moorish woman. Before this can transpire, we have a brief
aside, in which the Moorish troops raise their crescent moon banner over the fallen Spanish fort of San Miguel, and are almost ready to celebrate their victory. The way that the scenes of this play "cut" back and forth between the Spanish and the Moorish camp give us perhaps some slight insight into why this play may not have been performed in its day. The kind of staging and artifices required to execute these quick transitions would have been very difficult indeed, and almost make one think of the cross-cut transition of modern cinema more than something which could realistically be performed upon the stage.

In the following scene, don Juan is in effect confused, frustrated, and greatly angered by seeing his sister in the Moorish camp, and having everyone deny that it is indeed his sister. In spite of her demanding nature towards the male characters of the play, Arlaxa shows herself to be compassionate and charitable towards Margarita, insisting that she is her *fátima*, her sister, prompting the following exchange:

ARLAXA. ¡Tuya mi hermana! ¿Estás loco?  
D. JUAN. Ya la miro.  
ARLAXA. ¿Qué dices, pues?  
D. JUAN. Que me admiro,  
y en el juicio me apoco.  
Por dicha, ¿hace Mahoma milagros?  
ARLAXA. Mil a montones.  
D. JUAN. ¿Y hace transformaciones?  
ARLAXA. Cuando voluntad le toma.  
D. JUAN. ¿Y suele mudar, tal vez,  
en mora alguna cristiana?  
ARLAXA. Sí.  
D. JUAN. Pues aquésta es mi hermana,  
y la tuya está en Jerez. (III, vv. 2695-2707)

The "miraculous transformation" of don Fernando is a difficult pill for don Juan to swallow, but it is made easier by the fact that it is in concord with a reality that he is more ready to accept. In the
case of his sister's "transformation," however, don Fernando wants to believe his eyes, and hence
is less ready to accept the "alternative reality" that Arlaxa conjures up for him. Hence, in order to
protect Margarita, Arlaxa is forced to threaten don Juan with physical violence if he doesn't
abandon this "madness" at once, ordering her servant Roama to have him whipped should he
persist in such proclamations. Margarita, though she has no great love for her brother after he has
wronged her, nevertheless shows herself to be a noble Christian once again, as she doesn't wish
him harmed, and tries to intervene on his behalf. Fortunately for both of them, the Christian assault
on the camp forces them to abandon the conversation for the time being. The scene concludes
with D. Juan making the following affirmation:

¡Y quieren que desto dude!
Por ser grande la distancia
que hay de mi hermana a ser mora,
imagino que en mi mora
gran cantidad de ignorancia.
Estraño es el devaneo
con quien vengo a contender,
pues no me deja creer
lo que con los ojos veo. (III, vv. 2730-2739)

This passage is excellently well-conceived from a literary standpoint, as the polysemy of
the word "mora" here adds to the overall sense of confusion both of the language as well as the
dramatic situation, with don Fernando unable to believe that people he knows well are suddenly
"turning into" moors before his very eyes. The idea of a person readily accepting these two
"miraculous" transformations might seem ludicrous and implausible to a modern audience, more
at home in a farce than a heroic tale like this one. But perhaps there is more in the character of
Don Juan than is immediately apparent. A comparison with similar situations in Cervantes'
interludes is in order. In La cueva de Salamanca, the ironically named Pancracio shows his powers
of deduction to be impotent, rather than all-powerful, as his name would imply. As we have already
discussed in the second chapter of this study, Pancracio's credulous nature, superstitiousness, and willingness to believe in the supernatural make him the perfect mark for the Student's ruse, as he has practically convinced himself that the sacristan and the student are devils assuming human form. By contrast, in this play, don Juan is no fool, and, in this passage, even proclaims his own ignorance, fully aware that there is some vital piece of information to which he is not privy. He has already shown himself to be clever in his conniving plot to commandeer the inheritance his sister would otherwise receive should she marry. Nevertheless, he is able to accept one of the "transformations" with which he is presented, because it is closer to the reality that he wants to believe. Though he is not a foolish character type, he is in this way forced to accept what he knows to be false, and in a sense, finds himself in an analogous situation as that of Pancracio, though in this case, by no fault of his own.

Margarita's "transformation," on the other hand, presents a situation more analogous to El retablo de las maravillas. Not unlike the villagers of that play, don Juan here correctly perceives the reality around him, but is coerced by social pressure into conforming to what he knows deep down is a lie. Fearful that Arlaxa will inflict physical injury on him, and uncertain as to whether he can trust his own senses (as she accuses him of madness), he finally reluctantly decides, in a highly confused state, to accept the reality that the other characters are imposing upon him. Thus, his character is nuanced in the way that he deals with the lies presented to him, and through him, Cervantes is able to explore the immutable nature of truth in contrast to the highly mutable nature of perception and persuasion.

Furthermore, it is entirely possible that one or both of the interludes I have mentioned here would have been performed in conjunction with this play between acts, had Cervantes been able to sell them to a theatrical company. As I have stated previously, I believe that any attempt to
establish a one-to-one relationship between the full-length comedies and the interludes presented in Cervantes' compendium is a fruitless enterprise. Here, nevertheless, we have good cause to associate this play with three Cervantine interludes (the other play being *El juez de los divorcios*, as discussed earlier). There is no good justification, in my view, for believing that only one interlude, at any given time, was meant to be performed with this play. Surely, some themes and ideas will resurface throughout Cervantes' theatrical oeuvre, and the relationship between the comedies and the interludes is well worth exploring. But there is no indication anywhere that Cervantes had the intention of limiting the environment in which his interludes were performed in this strict one-to-one correspondence manner. In the case of other authors, such as Lope de Rueda, where some of the full-length plays directly contain short interludes, there can be no doubt about the intention of the author to establish a relationship between the two. This is simply not the case with Cervantes. Indeed, as we have discussed in the first chapter of the present study, one of the great developments in the history of the *entremés* was precisely the gradual independence that this subgenre gained over time, existing independently from the longer drama with which it was paired.

Returning to the matter at hand, the Moorish troops finally reach the fort at Orán, and begin scaling the walls with ladders. Fernando realizes that he has kept up his ruse long enough, and that it is now his duty to aid his fellow Christians and true comrades-in-arms before they are overtaken. As Alimuzel begins ascending a ladder into the fort, don Fernando proclaims, "Ya no es tiempo de aguardar /a designios prevenidos, / viendo que están oprimidos / los que yo debo ayudar. / ¡Baja, Muzel!" (III, vv. 2764-2768). Don Fernando pulls Alimuzel back to the ground, and draws his sword against him, to which Alimuzel confoundedly exclaims, "Poco puedo y poco valgo / con este amigo enemigo. / ¿Por qué contra mí, Lozano, / esgrimes el fuerte acero?" (III, vv. 2778-2781), prompting the reply of don Fernando, "Porque soy cristiano, y quiero / mostrarte que soy
cristiano" (III, vv. 2783-2785). Don Fernando has resumed his true identity, coming to the aid of his fellow Christians when they are most in need of his dexterous skill, and is able to take on multiple aggressors single-handedly. The king of Cuco, furious, draws his sword against don Fernando, who responds with several quick ripostes, mortally wounding him. While all of this is transpiring, don Martín expertly commands the troops and the artillery fire to repel the invading forces. When the battle is concluded, Guzmán remarks that don Fernando has made up for his past disobedience, by slaying three Moors, mortally wounding the king of Cuco, as well as gravely injuring ten others. Nevertheless, the Spaniards are forced to pull back, but don Fernando vows to stay and fight to the death at the foot of the walls while the other Christians retreat. In this way, he hopes to atone for his past defiance of Count don Alonso, and prove his valor.

In the following scene, Vozmediano arrives at the Moorish encampment, brought in as a prisoner by Roama. Vozmediano informs the audience of the valiant attack by Alvaro Bazán, who has come to rescue Orán from the Moorish troops. Upon being recognized by don Juan, Vozmediano continues the ruse, also pretending to be someone else, and calling himself Pédro Álvarez. Don Juan can no longer tolerate the tricks being played on him, defiantly exclaiming, "Que si éste no es Vozmediano / y no es Margarita aquélla, / y el que causó mi querella / no es el otro mal cristiano, / tampoco soy yo don Juan, / sino algún hombre encantado" (III, vv. 2911-2915). The Cervantine theme of "enchantment" as conformity to a socially imposed reality appears once again. In this play, it is neither a fool nor a madman who is at its mercy, but rather an arrogant man trying unsuccessfullly to usurp his sister's rightful inheritance.

Suddenly, Arlaxa receives word from Azán that they must flee at once, lest they be captured by the reinforcements to the Spanish fleet sent by Alvaro Bazán. The Spaniards, for their part, give chase, with don Fernando fully aware that they must reach Arlaxa's ship, so that he might
rescue Margarita from her fate, as well as resolve his previous promise to keep them both safe. Don Francisco de Mendoza arrives, and is greeted by the Count, Don Martín, Buitrago, and others (who remain nameless in the stage direction). Buitrago, as usual, behaves in a fashion inappropriate for greeting such a nobleman, proclaiming himself worthy of addressing him, as he fears nothing but the dreaded Hunger itself. Although Buitrago is indeed an uncouth comic figure, he has proven his mettle in battle, and once again allows Cervantes to comment (in a comedic fashion) on the poverty and constant hunger of the lower-ranking soldiers. Buitrago is somewhat of an ill-mannered glutton, and clearly exaggerates his personal exploits in battle, but it should be recognized that he is not a coward. His presence in the play serves the primary function of making all of the higher-ranking soldiers and officers appear much nobler, wiser, and better mannered, by contrast with him. To say that Buitrago serves as a deeper kind of social commentary would be a great exaggeration, and at variance with his primary role in the drama, but he does show some characteristics that make him more than a simple gracioso, as I hope I have shown.

Don Francisco then gives don Fernando license to pursue the ship carrying Arlaxa (and Guzmán to accompany him), proclaiming that he has earned that privilege with his exploits in battle and made up for his past offences. He asks the Count of Alcaudete to pardon don Fernando's past transgression in failing to obey orders. The Count for his part, begrudgingly accepts Francisco de Mendoza's request. It is worth noting as well that don Francisco doesn't order the Count to pardon don Fernando. Rather, it is a personal request, a favor, to which the Count acquiesces of his own volition, for though he still resents don Fernando's defiance, he doesn't wish to offend don Francisco.

We come finally to the play's conclusion, in which don Fernando arrives with Alimuzel, Arlaxa, Margarita, don Juan, and Vozmediano, presumably having taken their ship. Don Fernando
confesses his wrongdoing, and asks for forgiveness, proclaiming, "A la voz del desafío / deste moro corrí ciego, / sin echar de ver los bandos, / que al más bravo ponen freno" (III, vv. 3019-3022). He acknowledges that it was improper for him to have run off to fulfill a point of personal honor against a direct order, and leaves himself at the mercy of the Count. Don Alonso grants his forgiveness, and gives don Fernando license to speak. It is at this point where, with a few simple phrases, don Fernando concludes all the main points of conflict. He begins by revealing his true identity to Arlaxa, and explains his actions. He then proceeds to explain the rest of their identities to don Juan, while asking for Margarita's hand in marriage. She happily accepts, and don Juan, repentant and happy that his reality is finally as it appeared to him in the first place, graciously accepts as well. Don Juan also grants half of his estate (now his sister's) to don Fernando, in accordance with the original agreement spelled out in their parent's will. Finally, Arlaxa grants her hand in marriage to Alimuzel, who doesn't speak at all in this concluding scene, acknowledging that he upheld his end of their agreement by bringing her don Fernando, and by fighting valorously against him.

To add levity, don Martin agrees to augment the rations given to the soldiers, much to Buitrago's immense delight. Right at the beginning of the victory celebration, however, Buitrago begins to argue with another nameless soldier about trivial matters, providing Guzmán the opportunity to break the fourth wall by declaring:

Guzmán

Buitrago,

no haya más, que llega el tiempo
de dar fin a esta comedia,
cuyo principal intento
ha sido mezclar verdades
con fabulosos intentos. (III, vv. 3129-3134).

With these concluding lines, Cervantes acknowledges that this dramatic work is a curious mix of fact and fiction. He paints a very vivid picture of an idealized Spanish hero, who dramatizes a
personal conflict of honor, and ultimately emerges victorious. In the course of this patriotic play, the author is also able to recount for the audience many famous historical battles between the Moors and the Christians, and ennable and further immortalize the military exploits of several Spanish military heroes. This is, without a doubt, one of Cervantes' most action-packed plays, and it is surprising indeed that he was unable to procure a buyer for it in its day given how undoubtedly entertaining it would have been to see performed. As we have suggested earlier, this perhaps due to the difficulties of staging and the sheer number of actors required, particularly for the scenes of combat. It stands, nevertheless, as a testament to Cervantes' ability to produce an excellent historical drama of a heroic tone, replete with elements of both the Byzantine novel and the novela morisca. Together with Los baños de Argel and La gran sultana, it gives us a more well-rounded portrait on Cervantes' attitudes and dispositions towards Moorish culture in general. While he was hardly "tolerant" of other cultures in the modern sense of acceptance, he nevertheless was a highly sensitive intellectual of his era, fully capable of appreciating the nuance and gamut of personalities in all cultures. In this play in particular, he treats the character of Alimuzel with great respect, putting him on almost equal footing with don Fernando. As previously stated, both Alimuzel and Arlaxa, while ultimately noble figures, are nevertheless tragically flawed in a way that the idealized don Fernando and Margarita are not. But don Fernando too made a mistake when he fled the Spanish fortress and disobeyed a direct order in order to fulfill a point of personal pride and individual honor. It is only through his cleverness and expertise in combat that he is able to liberate himself from this otherwise grave mistake, and "save the day," concluding all the major plot threads, both amorous and bellicose, or Venutian and Martial, to utilize the language that Cervantes does constantly throughout the play.
8. EL RUFIÁN DICHOSO

Although I have chosen to label this chapter "the picaresque plays," owing to the shared elements of underworld culture represented in both works, the two dramas in question are in fact radically different from one another, and neither one represents a picaresque dramatic work in the most conventional sense of the genre. *El rufián dichoso* is a hagiographic play, based on the transformation and redemption of a real-life hustler whose good works towards the end of his life earned him the respect and reputation of a saintly figure.\(^{238}\) *Pedro de Urdemalas*, on the other hand, is a much more heavily meta-theatrical work, which deals with the nature of deception and representation, and once again delves into Cervantes' topic *par excellence*, the relationship between life and artistic representation.

Owing to its historical content, *El rufián dichoso* is one of the few dramas of Cervantes that we can date with a great deal of certainty. Thanks to the investigations of Jean Canvaggio and of Armando Cotarello Valledor before him, we know that Cervantes was primarily inspired by two sources for the details he gives us on the life of Cristóbal de Lugo: the *Historia de la Orden de Predicadores* (1596) by fray Agustín Dávila Padilla, and the *Consuelo de penitentes* (1583) by fray Alonso de San Román.\(^{239}\) Although most of the historical details of Cristóbal's life come from Dávila Padilla's work, the fact that Cristóbal's father was a *tabernero* was clearly taken from San Román's writings. Additionally, Cervantes' version of Cristóbal corresponds much more to San Román's version in that they both downplay his lascivious tendencies, whereas Dávila Padilla depicts the young Cristóbal as a shameless, gambling, fighting, womanizing pimp, controlled by

---

\(^{238}\) Although he was ultimately not canonized, the hope that Cristóbal de Lugo would be beatified was quite clearly one of the principal motivations for the play's composition.

\(^{239}\) See Canavaggio (1977), 46-53 and (1990), 461-476; and Cotarelo Valledor, 351.
his appetites, and constantly falling in and out of "love" with various women.\textsuperscript{240} Cervantes began writing the play shortly after the publication of the \textit{Historia de la Orden de Predicadores} in 1596. Canavaggio informs us that Cervantes probably began work on this drama with the intention of contributing to the beatification of Cristóbal de la Cruz, which was one of the objectives of his Dominican Order.\textsuperscript{241} This hypothesis is reinforced by the fact that Dávila Padilla himself was part of the commission of theologians assembled by the Duque of Lerma in 1600 to make a decision about the re-opening of public theaters in Madrid. Unfortunately, we do not know what direct connections Cervantes had with fray Agustín Dávila Padilla, only that they probably existed.

Although Cervantes does follow these two historical texts of the life of Cristóbal de Lugo rather closely,\textsuperscript{242} he nevertheless takes some dramatic liberties. He replaces, for example Toledo (the historical location of Cristóbal's early roguish life) with Seville, a city that would provide him with the perfect backdrop for all of Cristóbal's underworld dealings. The Seville of Cervantes' day was known for being infested with all manner of rapscallions, rascals, scoundrels, hustlers, ne'er-do-wells, prostitutes, and pimps. It was, after all, the most populous city of Spain at the time, and a major commercial port, and hence not possible to regulate as strictly as other parts of the country. The physical space in which the play occurs also furthers the symbolic function of Cristóbal de Lugo's transformation into Cristóbal de la Cruz. The sojourn to Mexico (and removal from the physical world of temptation that surrounds him) is necessary for Cristóbal's transformation from a sinner among sinners to a saint who saves sinners. The dialogue between Tello de Sandoval and

\textsuperscript{240} See also the introduction in ed. Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas, p. XXXI-XXXVI; my own introduction to the historical details of this play draws heavily upon theirs.  
\textsuperscript{241} See Canavaggio (1977), 409.  
\textsuperscript{242} Cervantes also insists on the verisimilitude of the tale repeatedly throughout the work, calling attention to the fact that even the more fantastical parts of the story involving the intervention of demons were recorded in this manner in the historical documents, as we shall see later.
the alguacil is one of the key transitional moments in the drama, and it is the decision to take Lugo from Seville to Mexico, away from his libertine surroundings, that facilitates his transformation into the saintly figure he will become.

The contrast between the first act of this play and the two acts that follow is striking on many fronts, so much so that it has led some scholars to postulate that the play was originally conceived of as a four-act work. Alfredo Rodríguez sees the meeting between Tello de Sandoval and the alguacil that decides the fate of Cristóbal as a marked transition in the tone and overall mood of the play.243 His argument is compelling given the extension of the first Act of the play, which is almost twice as long as each of the other acts. I am nevertheless more inclined to agree with the interpretations regarding the structure of the play given by Casalduero244 and Sevilla Arroyo and Rey Hazas.245 While some earlier twentieth century interpreters opined that the first act would have made a perfect interlude in its own right,246 arguing that the dynamism and realism of the first act was quite divorced from the contrived depiction of Mexico in the two subsequent acts, I believe that modern critics have sufficiently dispelled this opinion, and have more properly understood the overall thematic and structural unity of the play. Joaquín Casalduero247 explains in his interpretive analysis:

La primera jornada es la del pecado, la segunda la del arrepentimiento, la tercera la del perdón — santidad y milagros. Dos lugares, Sevilla y Méjico. Para justificar el sustituir la relación por la representación, los cambios de lugar y el adaptar a éstos no a la historia sino a la acción dramática, la Comedia habla interrogada por la Curiosidad. (108)

---

243 See Rodríguez López-Vázquez, 433-446.
244 Casalduero, 107-108.
245 Ed., pp. XXXVI-XLI.
246 Schevill and Bonilla, El teatro de Cervantes (intro.), 127.
247 Ob. cit.
Cervantes himself goes to great pains to argue for the verisimilitude of this play, which superficially, might seem to violate his own theatrical concepts, with its radical shift in time and space between the first act of the play and the two subsequent acts, and with the apparition of allegorical figures and miracles. It is for this reason that Cervantes introduces a metatheatrical aside (presumably added later) after the first act, in which the Comedy itself, personified, is interrogated by Curiosity, and explains its own dramatic conception. With this aside, Cervantes has given us all the tools necessary to give an adequate interpretation. It makes sense that the first act would have appeared more "realistic" to early twentieth century critics, with the two subsequent acts seeming more "contrived." The first act is precisely about Cristóbal's interaction with the physical world, the world of libertine temptation. The following two acts are about his gradual elevation to the spiritual world and relinquishing of his past life.\(^\text{248}\) Thus, the portion of the play dealing with the material world would necessarily seem much more "realistic" in its depiction of the quotidian elements of the Seville of that time than the section dealing with Mexico, which isn't really so concerned with the material surroundings and day-to-day life except insofar as they stand in stark contrast to the \textit{mundo del hampa} of Seville.

The first act opens in the heart of the underworld of Seville, with Lugo appearing as both a roguish student and a student of the ways of rogues. In the opening lines of the play, Lugo shows himself more than capable of matching wits with the other rogues and defends himself as not simply a mere "rufo de primer tonsura" (I, v. 4), but rather, a distinguished rogue, capable of matching any of his colleagues' dubious exploits. The ruffians Lugo, Ganchoso, and Lobillo begin to argue playfully with one another and scuffle, before they are forced to flee by the arrival of the

\(^{248}\) Stanislav Zimic makes similar observations in his discussion of the "organic unity" of this play. See Zimic (1992), 171-172.
constable (alguacil) and two of his deputies (corchetes). Lugo, however, is caught, and interrogated briefly. It is at this point in the play when we begin to understand that, even at the beginning, Lugo isn't just any low-born street hustler. Although he is indeed the son of a tavern worker, he is also the criado of the inquisitor Tello de Sandoval, who has taken it upon himself to ensure that Cristóbal has a proper upbringing. The purpose of these early scenes is to establish the humble beginnings of Cristóbal and the reasons for which he is capable of redemption. Even at the opening of the play, we see that Cristóbal's fate is not predetermined in the strict sense of the word, but, rather, that his choices are a major determining factor. The Alguacil himself remarks, "¡Cuán mejor pareciera el señor Lugo / en su colegio que en la barbacana, / el libro en mano, y no el broquel en cinta!" (I, vv. 46-48). He advises Lugo with these lines to prefer his studies and his books to the wild and violent life of the streets (referenced by metonymy to the small buckler shield he carries on his waist). At this point, Lugo does not heed the words of the Alguacil, instead mocking him for being so preachy, declaring, "Crea el so alguacil que no le cuadra / ni esquina el predicar; deje ese oficio / a quien le toca, y vaya y pique aprisa" (I, vv. 49-51). Lugo is still a willful, defiant, and churlish young man, eager to defy authority, and seeking to become a big-shot amongst the rogues with whom he keeps company. It is for this reason that he so readily dismisses the advice of his mentor.

After the departure of the Alguacil and the two Corchetes, Lugo remarks:

¡Que sólo me respeten por mi amo
y no por mí, no sé esta maravilla!;
mas yo haré que salga de mí un bramo
que pase de los muros de Sevilla.
Cuelgue mi padre de su puerta el ramo,

---

249 Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas inform us in their edition that the historical Francisco Tello de Sandoval was a highly educated individual who held a doctorate, and who also held the title of Inquisitor of Toledo for several years. He would be appointed consejero de Indias in 1543 by Charles V. (ed., p. 155, n. 27).
As numerous critics have already observed, Lugo's situation in the first act of the play is one of frustration. Realizing that his only claim to social status is through the respect afforded to him as the *criado* of Tello de Sandoval, he wishes to make a name for himself, and become respected on his own merits. Feeling diminished by his own low birth, he wishes to become famous through his exploits. There is a certain irony in the last few lines of this quotation, as Lugo's words wind up becoming true, but not at all as he might have imagined. In the first act of the play, he is determined to become a master hustler, but soon learns that the true path to having respect is by devoting one's life to God and the care of others, as opposed to being consumed with his own ego and vainglorious desires for social recognition.

In the following scene, Lagartija, a young roguish compatriot of Lugo's, informs him that a group of prostitutes has invited him to a lavish dinner, where all the members of the criminal underworld will be present. The descriptions of food in this scene are so opulent as to be almost ridiculous, with the comic implication that a considerable amount of the food was either pilfered, swindled, or hustled away from others by some unspecified illicit means. Indeed, the description of the banquet is so sumptuous that it even prompts Lugo to remark, "¡Lagartija, bien lo pintas!" (I, v. 130). The purpose of this scene is not only to paint a vivid picture of the picaresque life in Seville, but, more importantly, for the broader themes of the work, to show how deeply immersed Lugo is in the physical world of material delights, and the constant temptation he faces in his early life. The vivid descriptions of the food, in this passage, with the "conejo empanado, / por mil partes traspasado / con saetas de tocino; blanco el pan, aloque el vino, / y hay turrón alicantado"

---

250 For example, Casalduero, ob. cit., ed. Talens & Spadaccini 57, and Zimic (1992), 158-159.
(I, vv. 106-110), add not only to the realism of the scene, but to the sense of excess and libertine abandon that characterize the lives of Lugo's associates. Additionally, Lugo gives us some insight into why he is a friend of Lagartija's, remarking, "tienes un no sé qué / de agudeza, que me encanta" (I, vv. 147-149). Although there is a lot of emphasis on the physical dominance of Lugo in the first act, with his constant violent altercations and knife-fights, he values a sharp tongue and wit just as much as he values prowess with a blade. Furthermore, Lagartija will serve as the comic counterpart to Lugo, particularly in the final two acts of the play, where Lugo's complete transformation is contrasted with Lagartija's occasional nostalgic longing for their former lives as rogues.

Lagartija also produces a romance jácaro from his breast pocket, which he knows by heart, and recites for Lugo. The romance concerns a brave street tough who fights a bull in the plaza of San Francisco and wins. The romance provides Cervantes with the opportunity to do a little tongue-in-cheek literary criticism, as Lagartija praises the romance for its simple style and wit and comments that Tristán, its composer, is a greater poet than Garcilaso and Boscán. Although this is basically a trivial aside, there is perhaps some social commentary here as well, for Lagartija informs us that this Tristán "gobierna en San Román la bendita sacristía" (I, vv. 233-234). Perhaps Cervantes is criticizing the ocio of certain members of the clergy that devote themselves to profane poetry (rather than the divine). In the next two acts of the play, Lagartija will become precisely this kind of fraile desocupado.

The next scene of the play is a curious one, and seems to conflict strongly with the portrait that we have of the young Cristóbal de Lugo in the writings of fray Agustín Dávila Padilla. More in line with fray Alonso de San Román's depiction, Cervantes greatly downplays the sexual appetites of this young ruffian, as he rebuffs the advances of a young married woman, who has
fallen hopelessly for him. Cervantes is probably trying to show us that even the young Cristóbal possesses some redeeming characteristics that distinguish him from other common rogues. Cristóbal is acutely aware of his station in life and doesn't wish to come between another man's healthy marriage, nor does he wish to ruin the life of this young woman, in spite of her commenting, "no fea, y muy rica soy; / sabré dar, sabré querer, / y esto lo echaréis de ver / por este trance en que estoy" (I, vv. 270-274). Even knowing that she is wealthy, Lugo curiously doesn't wish to damage her reputation, remarking, "Pudieras, ya que querías / satisfacer tu mal gusto, / buscar un sujeto al justo / de tus grandes bizarrías" (I, vv. 299-302), adding, "ocúpome en bajas cosas, / y en todas soy tan terrible, / que el acudir no es posible / a las que son amorosas: / a lo menos, a las altas [...]" (I, 311-323). Curiously, Cristóbal rejects himself as a possible candidate for the young lady's advances, on the grounds that he is of too low a social standing to be worthy of her love. This fact sets him apart from the other rogues we encounter in this act, who doubtless would jump at such an opportunity.

In fact, Lugo manages the situation quite ably when the woman's husband arrives on the scene. After telling the wife to hide, Lugo tells the husband that another man seeks to steal his wife away, and that, in spite of her rejection of his advances, he continues to pursue her. Once again, Lugo shows us his curious code of honor. In spite of his profession, he remarks, "Yo, aunque soy mozo arriscado, /de los de campo través, /ni mato por interés, ni de ruindades me agrado" (I, vv. 395-398). Lugo has no desire to ruin another man's life without provocation, nor does he wish to ruin the woman's life by allowing her to get involved with a man of such low social standing as himself. Lugo advises the husband to watch his wife closely and to pull her away from where that man might reach her, remarking, "Retiradla, que la ausencia / hace, pasando los días, volver las entrañas frías / que abrasaba la presencia" (I, vv. 419-422). The husband thanks Lugo
for his advice, and, vowing to keep his wife safe from her would-be pretender in a remote "safe house" he happens to own, takes his leave of Lugo and his ensconced wife. Lugo demonstrates his cleverness in this scene by telling both the husband and the wife half-truths to protect both the woman's honor, as well as protect himself from the husband's wrath. He tells the wife that he has been made a runner of illicit goods, but doesn't specify what kind, and tells her she must be quiet about everything until the transaction is completed if she wishes to see him again. Once she has left, he secretly asks God to deliver him from this imprudent woman's desires, proclaiming, "como de fiera indignada, / del vulgo insolente y libre, / pediré a Dios que me libre / de mujer determinada" (I, vv. 491-494). Lugo invokes God's help directly for the first time in the play here. Although he is, in point of fact, taking God's name in vain, his intentions are nevertheless pure, setting him apart from the other rogues with whom he keeps company. He refuses to exploit the situation at hand to improve his economic standing by taking advantage of a married woman. It wouldn't be correct to say that Lugo follows a code of ethics at this point in the play, but he nevertheless has an intuitive sense of duty and obligation to others, which is what will later enable him to complete his transformation to the saintly figure that he does become. Lugo shows himself capable of being a better person here by putting the welfare of this desperate woman and her complicated marriage ahead of his own financial gain. Indeed, it is the strengthening of Lugo's propensity to make sacrifices for others over the course of the play that ultimately enables him to reach sainthood.

In the following scene, we witness a conversation between Tello de Sandoval and the Alguacil concerning Lugo, his mischievous undertakings, and his irrepressible bravado. This conversation marks the first major transition of the play. Not only does it divide the first act quite nicely into two almost equal parts, but it is also the crucial moment in the first act that determines
Cristóbal's future. The conversation is also of great significance in that it reveals Cristóbal's more redeeming qualities as well as his great faults. When Tello asks if Cristóbal is a thief, the Alguacil confirms that he is not, prompting Tello to inquire further into the nature of his crimes:

**TELLO.** ¿Qué hace, pues?
**ALGUACIL.** Otras cien mil diabluras. Esto de valentón le vuelve loco: aquí riñe, allí hiere, allí se arroja, y es en el trato airado el rey y el coco; con una daga que le sirve de hoja, y un broquel que pendiente tray al lado, sale con lo que quiere o se le antoja. Es de toda la hampa respetado, averigua pendencias y las hace, estafa, y es señor de lo guisado; entre rufos, él hace y él deshace, el corral de los Olmos le da parias, y en el dar cantaletas se complace. Por tres heridas de personas varias, tres mandamientos traigo y no ejecuto, y otros dos tiene el alguacil Pedro Arias. Muchas veces he estado resoluto de aventurallo todo y de prendelle, o ya a la clara, o ya con modo astuto; pero, viendo que da en favorecelle tanto vuesa merced, aun no me atrevo a miralle, tocalle ni ofendelle. (I, vv. 503-524)

In this passage, we see that Cristóbal de Lugo's principle sin is his pride. He is a brave, boastful, irascible young con man and hooligan, walking the streets with his signature hooked dagger, and never backing down from a fight. But he isn't just a street tough: he is also a very clever, adroit hustler and wheeler-dealer, with his finger on the pulse of all the shady dealings and goings-on. He is described as a kind of nobleman of the underworld, getting away with whatever he fancies. He receives tribute from the corral de los Olmos (a famous street in Seville, known for its criminal activities in Cervantes' day), and is as rowdy as he likes. He has won the respect of all the wrong people: namely, the low-lives and ruffians of the underworld. Yet, with these words, the Alguacil
confirms what Cristóbal had earlier told the audience: that he is respected by people in positions of authority only because he is favored by Tello de Sandoval, a fact which greatly irritates and frustrates the young Cristóbal.

For his part, Tello recognizes his own culpability for having taken it upon himself to give Cristóbal a proper upbringing and to be responsible for him, and clearly hasn't succeeded in this role. Tello thanks the Alguacil for bringing Lugo's bad behavior to his attention, and vows, "Mas lo mejor es quitalle / de aquesta tierra y llevalle / a Méjico, donde voy, / no obstante que puesto estoy / en reñille y castigalle" (I, vv. 531-535). As we will see later, this voyage to Mexico and removal from the toxic environment of el hampa de Sevilla is a major part of the transformation of Lugo, and symbolically marks the transition from his devotion to the flesh to his devotion to the cloth.

Immediately after Tello and the Alguacil leave, we return to the life of Sevilla's hampa, as Lugo armed with his accustomed dagger and buckler, enters with two musicians and their guitars. The musicians sing a jácara in the tradition of La Celestina, dedicated to a prostitute, to try to entice her to come outside and cavort with them. But a voice within the house informs them that she has been arrested for her association with Pierres Papín,251 to which they react in anger. The whole scene is very much a portrait of Lugo's life as a young rogue, and the mischief-making with which he is involved. There is, however, one key detail in this scene that again points to the characteristics of Lugo's better nature, which will eventually lead to his salvation. After Lugo and the other rogues resolve to go assault the pastelero for one of his meat-pies, they encounter a blind

---

251 Cervantes himself informs us about Pierres Papín in Don Quixote: "un caballero novel, de nación francés, llamado Pierres Papin, señor de las baronías de Útrique" (DQI, XVIII, 206, n. 28). Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas inform us in their annotation that there was apparently a real-life Pierres Papín of this description that owned and operated a gambling house in Seville.
beggar on the street who asks them for alms. Lugo generously gives the man a full real and seventeen maravadies, telling him, "oraciones decid, una tras otra, por las almas que están en purgatorio" (I, vv. 631-632). At this point in the play, we recognize this act and commentary as merely a hypocritical gesture, without the true spirit of religion behind it. Lugo himself emphasizes that it is a kind of investment for him, remarking, "Las ánimas me llevan cuanto tengo; mas yo tengo esperanza que algún día / lo tiene de volver ciento por uno" (I, vv. 646-648). In other words, Lugo hopes that these acts of charity will buy him a place in heaven, but he also believes that no good deed goes unrewarded. Still, good works are, at this point, a kind-of commodity exchange relation for him. Cervantes is careful to emphasize that prayers alone, or even noble actions and ritual charity without the proper intention behind them, are insufficient for a person to gain entrance to heaven. To be a truly good Christian, one must feel the love for his fellow man, and be willing to sacrifice for him. Nevertheless, Lugo's charitable act still shows that he has the potential to develop these characteristics later on in the play, as he is unusually generous, causing one of the musicians to remark, "¡Vive Roque, / que tienes condición extraordinaria! / Muchas veces te he visto dar limosna / al tiempo que la lengua se nos pega / al paladar, y sin dejar siquiera / para comprar un polvo de Cazalla" (I, vv. 640-645). Lugo is so generous that he has spent all the money they would otherwise have spent on wine and food to aid the poor beggar, a surprisingly uncharacteristic action for a rogue of his low social standing, and yet quite characteristic of his good nature even early in this first act of youthful folly. This gesture of generosity is immediately contrasted with the gang then proceeding to accost the pastelero, who initially tries to fight them off with the other workers. Once the pastelero realizes that Lugo is the criado of Tello de Sandoval, he immediately accepts Lugo and his friends, again emphasizing the undeserved power of association from which Lugo benefits.
The next scene gives the audience some further insight into Cristóbal's character through the dialogue between a young prostitute, Antonia, who is in love with Lugo, and Tello de Sandoval. Antonia, hoping to find Lugo in the early morning so that they might pursue their amorous inclinations, instead encounters Tello, deeply immersed in prayer. Tello is irritated by this situation, but wishes to learn as much as he can from Antonia about the true nature of his young criado. Antonia informs us that she is in love with Lugo not because he has seduced her, but because she admires his bravery. She comments, "Verdad es que él es travieso, / matante, acuchillador; / pero en cosas del amor, / por un leño le confieso. / No me lleva a mí tras él / Venus blanda y amorosa, / sino su aguda ganchosa / y su acerado broquel" (I, 754-761). These verses inform us that it is his bravery and skill in combat with buckler and dagger that attracts the women to Lugo, rather than because he is given to seduction, at least, according to Cervantes' version of the character.

Tello de Sandoval tells Antonia to hide so that he might speak with Lugo. Upon Lugo's entrance, Tello confronts him more sternly for his unacceptably bad behavior, while Lugo attempts to exculpate himself. Lugo confesses his crimes in this scene, but tries to downplay their severity:

**TELLO.**
Más sé que hay de un mandamiento para prenderte en la plaza.

**LUGO.**
Sí; mas ninguno amenaza a que dé coces al viento:
que todas son liviandades de mozo las que me culpan,
y a mí mismo me disculpan,
pues no llegan a maldades.
Ellas son cortar la cara a un valentón arrogante,
una matraca picante,
aguda, graciosa y rara;
calcorrear diez pasteles o cajas de diacitrón;
sustanciar una quistión entre dos jaques noveles;
el tener en la dehesa
dos vacas; y a veces tres,
pero sin el interés
que en el trato se profesa;
procurar que ningún rufo
se entone do yo estuviere,
y que estime, sea quien fuere,
la suela de mi pantufo. (I, vv. 792- 814)

Lugo recounts his escapades with just a little too much enthusiasm in this scene. Cervantes masterfully depicts a man who is attempting to show some humility (albeit false humility) before his *amo*, and thereby minimizes the severity of his crimes. At the same time, the manner in which Lugo recounts his dubious exploits is not at all humble, since it comes across as though he is bragging about what he can get away with. He depicts himself as nobility among rogues, vanquishing braggarts in combat, making off with meat pies without paying, resolving disputes between other rogues, and maintaining in his stable two or three prostitutes at a time. Lugo is careful to observe, however, that as a pimp, he is not a wanton man, given to wild sexual abandon, remarking that he performs this role "sin el interés / que en el trato se profesa." As Sevilla Arroyo and Antonio Rey Hazas observe in their edition, Cervantes minimizes the more lascivious aspects of the nature of Cristóbal de Lugo that we find in fray Agustín Dávila Padilla's account of the historical figure. Cervantes seems to be trying to make the figure of the young Lugo, and his capacity for reform, both more plausible and more palatable for an audience of his day. One should note that he nevertheless does depict his former ruffian face-to-face with temptation when the nymphs come to him to try to lead him astray in the second act, as we shall later explore in more depth.

---

252 Ed., p. XXX.
Cristóbal also hypocritically reassures Tello that, although he has been led astray by his youthful whims in the past, he attempts to make amends through prayer and charity, prompting the reproach by Tello, "Haces a Dios mil ofensas, / como dices, de ordinario, / ¿y con rezar un rosario, / sin más, ir al cielo piensas?" (I, vv. 826-829). Tello de Sandoval hopes to teach Cristóbal that paying lip service to the church and its traditions is insufficient to forgive his sins. In order for Cristóbal to be forgiven by God, he must not only genuinely repent, but also make sacrifices that prove his love for his fellow man. It is also at this point where Tello de Sandoval informs Lugo that he will take him to Mexico, where he will dedicate himself to God, proclaiming, "¡Bien iré a la Nueva España / cargado de ti, malino; / bien a hacer este camino / tu ingenio y virtud se amaña!" (I, vv. 854-857). Tello is now resolved to remove Cristóbal from the negative environment of Sevilla, where he is constantly surrounded by the temptations of the flesh. Finally, to further insist on his main point and the harm he is doing to others by living his life with such reckless unrestraint, Tello invites Antonia to come out to testify about the kind of man that Lugo is. Presumably, Tello wishes to impart to Lugo some sense of the harm he is doing in corrupting the souls of these young women that fall for him hopelessly, but before Antonia can speak, Lagartija makes a dramatic entrance on the scene, interrupting Tello's reproach.

Lagartija enters, quite visibly shaken, with the news that Carrascosa has been taken into custody. Carrascosa is a kind-of underworld kingpin, comparable to Monipodio in Cervantes' exemplary novel, *Rinconete y Cortadillo*. Upon hearing the news, Lugo rushes out with Lagartija to go to Carrascosa's aid. Entirely ignorant of the slang of the criminal underworld, Tello de Sandoval is confused by the fact that all the other characters present refer to Carrascosa as *el padre*, and, believing him to be a friar, asks to what order he belongs. Antonia has to explain that he is, "de los de la casa llana," (I, vv. 929) meaning that he is the head pimp in charge of the brothel.
Tello expresses his disapproval of terms like "Alcalde" and "Padre," terms that normally convey titles worthy of respect, when used frivolously to describe individuals engaged in these objectionable professions. He gives Antonia his blessing to leave in pursuit of Lugo, swearing that he will correct Lugo's flaws.

We are then briefly introduced to Carrascosa (listed as Padre in the stage directions). Carrascosa's dramatic function is to show the audience the kind of person that Lugo would likely have become in his late age (assuming he lived that long) if Tello had instead allowed him to remain in Seville. Carrascosa goes into a harangue, infuriated by the way he is being treated by the authorities:

PADRE. Soy de los Carrascosas de Antequera,
y tengo oficio honrado en la república
y hásme de tratar de otra manera.
Solíanme hablar a mí por súplica,
y es mal hecho y mal caso que se atreva
hacerme un alguacil afrente pública.
Si a un personaje como yo se lleva
de aqueste modo, ¿qué hará a un mal hombre?
Por Dios, que anda muy mal, sor Villanueva;
mire que da ocasión a que se asombre
el que viere tratarme desta suerte. (I, vv. 946-956)

In spite of his relative power within the criminal underworld, Carrascosa has very few lines, and is indeed not a major character in the play. Presumably, his function is largely to demonstrate the relative insignificance of power born out of illicit dealings. Though Carrascosa is greatly respected by the other thieves, rogues, pimps and bandits, the authorities hold no such regard for him, and ultimately he is powerless before them, a fact which causes him great anger and indignation, as seen in this passage. Carrascosa still views himself as a principal figure, worthy of respect. But he is ultimately little more than a common criminal, in spite of his stature within this sector of society. Through this character, Cervantes is showing us the insignificance of power born of a self-
serving nature, rather than from a devotion to God and one's fellow man. Carrascosa is characterized with precisely the same kind of vainglory and misplaced pride in his dubious achievements that Lugo has shown throughout most of the first act.

Indeed, Lugo prides himself above all else on his strength and ability with his dagger in the first act, using force more often than his wits, although he has shown himself to be quite clever and mentally dexterous as well. When our illustrious rogue enters the scene, he demands that the authorities release Carrascosa to him immediately, lest he assault them with his dagger. The authorities, seeing little choice, release Carrascosa, and Lugo advises the "Padre" to take refuge in San Salvador. The Alguacil and the Corchetes curse Lugo and their own bad luck, while he and the other rogues escape and celebrate their victory. Showing his foolish pride, Lugo does not content himself with this single victory. Rather, he expresses his desire to gamble once again with a fellow student, Gilberto, "que siempre ha sido mi azar, / hombre que ha de ser bastante / a hacerme desesperar" (I, vv. 1004-1006). In other words, Lugo has frequently lost to Gilberto in the past when he gambles with him, and now wishes to recoup his losses. Another rogue, Lobillo, offers Lugo a marked deck, so that he might cheat his way to victory. But Lugo replies with perhaps his boldest statement of sacrilege so far, proclaiming, "¡Largo medio es el que escoges! / Otro sé por do se ataja. / Juro a Dios omnipotente / que, si las pierdo al presente, /me he de hacer salteador" (I, vv. 1018-1020). As Zimic has explained very well, Lugo's invocation of God here is not only hypocritical and self-serving but downright sacrilegious. He is actually attempting to

---

253 It was a common practice in the time period for rogues to take refuge in churches, where the authorities were not permitted to apprehend them on the grounds that they would be disturbing a sacred space. This was related to the medieval religious right of asylum, and is also mentioned in numerous other Cervantine texts. See also Ed. Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas, p. 193, n. 175, and their editions of La gitanilla, p. 490, n. 191, El celoso extremeño, p. 703, n. 3 and El colloquio de los perros, p. 956, n. 329.

manipulate the will of God, defiantly swearing that he will become a highwayman if God doesn't allow him to win the next game that he plays with Gilberto. Lugo wins, which ironically gives him cause for reflection and leads to his eventual conversion. Although Lugo's profane prayer was born out of a desire simply to get away with his whims, it leads him, at the conclusion of this act, to a more profound understanding and contemplation of his folly up to this point in his life.

Antonia then laments to a student called Peralta about her frustration caused by her unrequited love for Lugo. This scene is of relatively minor importance, except that it shows us the "extracurricular" lessons of the roguish student life. What Peralta learns from their conversation is that prostitutes like Antonia are more attracted to ultra-masculine tough-guys full of bravado than cowardly men. Cervantes is showing us a portrait of the folly and temptations involved in the student life of the day, but he also provides some insight into the psychology of a downtrodden young prostitute, who might feel some kind of "love" for a pimp or cutthroat owing to a sense of protection and security with which he provides her. In this case, Antonia is in love with Lugo, in spite of his rejection of her, because she knows that no man dares challenge or threaten him, owing to his reputation as a skilled fighter, and hence she feels safe around him.

In the following scene, we see that Lugo has devastated his gambling buddy in their game. Gilberto remarks, "Más me has ganado este día, / que yo en ciento te he ganado" (I, vv. 1090-91). The two comment on the twists and turns of fortune, before Gilberto returns to his studies. To conclude the scenes of foolish student life, the husband from the earlier encounter returns to thank Lugo for warning him about the man who would steal his wife. Since he demands to know who would dare commit such an affront to him, Lugo observes, "Ya aquel que pudo poneros / en cuidado está de suerte / que llegará al de la muerte, / y no al punto de ofenderos" (I, vv. 1118-1121). With this line, Lugo puts the husband's fears to rest, having completed his act of good
service in attempting to save the man's marriage. The husband thanks Lugo, remarking, "No aquel estilo en vos veo / que el vulgo, engañado, piensa" (I, vv. 1132-1133).

In the final scene of the first act, Lugo reflects on his frivolous life and, in light of his recent victories, starts to pray when Lagartija enters to greet him. Lagartija is annoyed to find Lugo praying rather than celebrating with him and the other rogues, and comments, "O sé rufián o sé santo; / mira lo que más te agrada. / Voime, porque ya me enfada / tanta Gloria y Patri tanto" (I, vv. 1146-1149). Lagartija, the foil and counterpart to Lugo, is still wholly governed by his appetites. He simply tells his friend to do whatever he pleases. But Lugo has been changed by God's clemency towards him. As the first act concludes, he is left alone with his thoughts and prayers, and begins a lengthy soliloquy about his wrongdoings, clearly understanding the greater significance of his actions. Lugo declares:

Solo quedo, y quiero entrar
en cuentas conmigo a solas,
aunque lo impidan las olas
donde temo naufragar.

    Yo hice voto, si hoy perdía,
de irme a ser salteador;
    claro y manifestó error
de una ciega fantasía.

    Locura y atrevimiento
fue el peor que se pensó,
puesto que nunca obligó
mal voto a su cumplimiento.

    Pero, ¿dejaré por esto
de haber hecho una maldad,
adonde mi voluntad
    echó de codicia el resto?

    No, por cierto. Mas, pues sè
que contrario con contrario
    se cura muy de ordinario,
contrario voto haré,
    y así, le hago de ser
religioso. Ea, Señor;
veis aquí a este salteador
de contrario parecer. (I, vv. 1150-1173)
Lugo then proceeds to invoke the help of God, the Virgin Mary, the saints and the angels to aid him to free himself from the demons that plague him. The act concludes with an angel rejoicing in Lugo's decision to turn towards God. The quoted material above not only marks the major transition in the major transformation of Lugo's character, but it also shows that his decision was not sudden, but rather a culmination of several events coming together to show him the error of his ways. Having seen Carrascosa in chains, albeit briefly, gave Lugo a glimpse of the future that might await him on earth should he continue his wicked ways. His own fate and the fate of his friend Gilberto demonstrated to him the cruelty of the whims of fortune, and the need for a sinner to confide in the power of the divine order of God. Finally, God's own clemency showed Lugo the error of his former life, and the possibility of forgiveness if he could change his attitude and abandon the trivial pursuit of personal glory.

The second act begins with a dialogue between a personified, allegorical figure of the Comedy itself and Curiosity. Although this exchange has often been seen as a concession on the part of Cervantes to some of Lope's theatrical stylistic innovations, it is more likely that he was simply trying to smooth out the transition between the first act and the subsequent two acts, as well as to explain the differences in time, location, and character names, so as not to confuse the audience. Additionally, it serves as a kind of meta-theatrical commentary, in which the Comedia itself is attempting to justify its existence to Curiosidad, in the hopes that it might not be judged too harshly for this seemingly abrupt transition between its first two acts. The Comedia explains to its friend, Curiosidad, the reasons for which it appears so differently from before.

255 For some examples of this interpretation, see in particular ed. Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas, p. 203, n. 1, and ed. Nagy, 20-21.
256 Cf. Casalduero, 108 & 119-120.
Using the metaphor of a map, Comedia explains how great distances of time and space can be traversed in seconds in the new comedy, in the same way that Rome and London are a mere finger's length apart on a map. The Comedy also tries to justify the use of Seville instead of Toledo for the action of the play's first act, and explains the transition of time, space, and the name changes of Lugo and Lagartija between the first and second acts:

Su conversión fue en Toledo,
y no será bien te enafe
desde la verdad,
en Sevilla se relate.
En Toledo se hizo clérigo,
y aquí, en Méjico, fue fraile,
con el discurso ahora
nos trajo por el aire.
El sobrenombre de Lugo
mudó en Cruz, y es bien se llame
fray Cristóbal de la Cruz,
desde este punto adelante. (II, vv. 1276-1288)

It is important to note the insistence with which Cervantes speaks of telling the truth in this play, and the clear responsibility he feels to the audience to inform them of the historical location of Cristóbal's life, as it differs from the poetic location most appropriate to the action of the first act. As we shall see, each time something supernatural or seemingly implausible occurs in the play, Cervantes is quite insistent that the play does not lie, but only relates the truth as it was recorded and witnessed. To this end, he also gives the audience a perfect explanation of the comedy's three act structure, when the Comedia declares:

A Méjico y a Sevilla
he juntado en un instante,
surciendo con la primera
ésta y la tercera parte:
una de su vida libre,
una de su vida grave,
una de su santa muerte
y de sus milagros grandes. (II, vv. 1289-1296)
Each act represents a different phase of Cristobal's life, with act one corresponding to his life of sin and youthful folly, act two showing his reformed, holy life in the service of God, and act three showing his saintly death after his great sacrifice for others.

Additionally, the Comedia also explains how Lagartija is now known as Antonio, and hints at his function in the play:

Da lugar, Curiosidad,
que el bendito fraile sale
con fray Antonio, un corista
bueno, pero con donaires.
Fue en el siglo Lagartija,
y en la religión es sacre,
de cuyo vuelo se espera
que ha de dar al cielo alcance. (II, vv. 1301-1308)

"Sacre" could also be used metaphorically to mean "Ladrón de gran habilidad." With this little bit of wordplay, Cervantes indicates to his audience that Lagartija (now called Antonio) has not had as easy a time adjusting to the life of the cloth as Cristóbal. The second act now begins in earnest with a complaining Antonio, who expresses to Cruz his discomfort at having to fast, and laments the loss of their previous libertine life. In these scenes, Antonio serves as a comedic foil and point of contrast for Cruz. Whereas Antonio's conversion was somewhat under duress, Cristóbal's conversion came from within. As a result, Cristóbal has truly embraced his new life. In contrast, Antonio finds it significantly less pleasant, often reminiscing nostalgically about their previous "days of glory." Cristóbal, who has finally freed himself from the shackles of his former vices, constantly provides Antonio with his wisdom, in many exchanges like the following:

ANTONIO. Rufián corriente y molinente
fuera yo en Sevilla agora,
y tuviera en la dehesa
dos yeguas, y aun quizá tres,
diestras en el arte aviesa.
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CRUZ. De que en esas cosas des,
sabe Dios lo que me pesa;
mas yo haré la penitencia
de tu rasgada conciencia.
Quédate, Antonio, y advierte
que de la vida a la muerte
hay poca diferencia:
   quien vive bien, muere bien,
   quien mal vive, muere mal. (II, vv. 1391-1404)

Whereas Antonio imagines himself back in Seville, living as a common pimp with two or three
prostitutes, "skilled in their art," Cruz will have none of this, and declares that he will atone on
Antonio's behalf, reminding Antonio that he should be more mindful of leading a good life so that
he might have a good afterlife. Cruz, the true believer is contrasted with Antonio, the well-
meaning but nevertheless still sinful and hypocritical man of the cloth. Antonio is then seen leading
fray Ángel, another friar of the Dominican order, into temptation, with a deck of cards he claims
to have gotten from "una devota que tengo" (II v. 1424). We are left to wonder if Antonio is
perhaps falling back on his old habits in more ways than one.

In clear juxtaposition with this scene, the Prior and Tello de Sandoval arrive. The Prior
comments that Cruz is now "un ángel en la tierra" (II, v. 1448) and that he lives in such a humble
and penitent way that he is like the holy men of ancient times. Tello is overjoyed with the
transformation he has witnessed in Cristóbal, commenting, "Por millares de lenguas sea bendito /
el nombre de mi Dios; a este mancebo / volvíó de do pensé que iba precito" (II, 1466-1468). Tello
is relieved that God has seen fit to aid Cristóbal in his quest for redemption. The Prior and Tello
discuss how Cruz has become an excellent example for the local population, and they agree that it
would be best if he continued his work there. Tello is now satisfied that he can return to Spain in
peace, but before he does so, he says his goodbyes to Cruz.
When Cruz first encounters Tello again, he excuses himself for not showing as much respect as he feels he owes him. For his part, Tello replies, "yo soy el que he de postrarme / a sus pies" (II, vv. 1498-9). A very significant transformation has occurred. Cruz is no longer anyone's criado. Free from his former vices, he is now his own master, serving no one other than God. Tello's desire to prostrate himself at the feet of Cruz, and Cruz's refusal and the mutual courtesy and respect they show each other, demonstrate that Cruz has attained the respect and social standing he always has sought, but not by serving his own interests. Rather, by submitting to God's will, he has become the equal of Tello in showing his true devotion to the Lord. Being the humble individual that he now is, Cruz is moved by Tello's gesture, and thanks him profusely for all that he has done for him, before he blesses Tello's journey home to Spain.

In stark contrast, Antonio inappropriately asks Tello if he would be so kind as to convey his regards to several prostitutes and rogues with whom he was associated. Both the Prior and Cruz correct Antonio for his foolishness, and Tello and Cruz say their goodbyes. Once the Prior and Tello have left, Cruz once again shows his new demeanor, correcting Antonio and imploring him to thank God in all things, and remember their old life only as an example of what not to do.

The sinner Doña Ana Treviño is introduced in the following scene. Her Doctor informs everyone that she is afflicted with leprosy, and that he and her two criados can do nothing for her. They implore her to confess her sins. Ana believes she is beyond redemption, her sins too many to be forgiven, and she refuses confession. Her significance in the play, in addition to being the soul that Cristóbal will save, is that she represents the fear of someone, close to death, who doesn't truly have faith. Believing she cannot be saved, she despairs at the thought of the brevity of her life and the agony that awaits her, proclaiming, "La muerte y la mocedad / hacen dura compañía, / como
la noche y el día / la salud y enfermedad" (II, vv. 1707-1711). She is beyond consolation, and her *criados* proclaim that they have never seen her in a worse state.

The next few scenes could probably have been omitted without significantly impacting the principle subject matter. Their inclusion, however, shows not only that Cervantes was interested in depicting as much of the historical Cristóbal's story as possible, but also in showing that, in spite of his reform, Cristóbal is not yet saintly at the beginning of the second act of the play. He is surely pious and leads a humble life of penitence, but from what we witness in the next scene, it appears that Cristóbal is still bound by worldly temptations, and must struggle not to stray from his righteous path. Antonio comes upon Cruz, who is deeply immersed in prayer, when the two hear guitars and other instruments in the distance. Six nymphs appear, wearing masks, and attempt to entreat Cruz to resume his former life of carnal pleasures. They chant, "No hay cosa que sea gustosa / sin Venus blanda, amorosa" (II, vv. 1760-1761). Cruz wisely ignores this temptation, responding "No hay cosa que sea gustosa / sin la dura cruz preciosa" (II, vv. 1782-1783).

What is almost more noteworthy than the scene itself is the unusual nature of the stage directions. In his stage directions, Cervantes insists, "(Todo esto desta máscara y visión fue verdad, que así lo cuenta la historia del santo)."\(^{258}\) As most editors have already commented, Cervantes doubtless has in mind his own pronouncements in the mouth of the *Cura* from *Don Quixote I*.\(^{259}\) Always preoccupied with verisimilitude, Cervantes seems unusually insistent on the true nature of all the apparitions and miracles presented in this play. Indeed, just a few lines later, the stage

---

\(^{258}\) Between vv. 1743 & 1744.

\(^{259}\) "Pues, ¿qué, si venimos a las comedias divinas? ¡Qué de milagros falsos fingen en ellas, qué de cosas apócrifas y mal entendidas, atribuyendo a un santo los milagros de otro! Y aun en las humanas se atreven a hacer milagros, sin más respeto ni consideración que parecerles que allí estará bien el tal milagro y apariencia, como ellos llaman, para que gente ignorante se admire y venga a la comedia" (*DQI*, ch. XLVIII, p. 589).
directions reaffirm, in a second parenthetical remark, "(Todo esto fue así, que no es visión supuesta, apócrifa ni mentirosa)." With this line in particular, Cervantes practically echoes the language of the Cura's pronouncements against bad religious comedies in *Don Quixote Part I*, perhaps anticipating criticisms and allegations of hypocrisy that his play might have received. I would suggest that Cervantes' insistence on the veridical nature of these scenes belies his own belief in them. From what we can tell about Cervantes and his own religious beliefs, he was not a man who seemed to have any belief whatsoever in the supernatural. As I hope to have shown in this study, he was indeed a deeply religious man, but in a very unconventional way for his time. Cervantes was a progressive humanist, deeply influenced by the teachings of Erasmus, and not given to popular superstitions. Thus, I submit that he was trying to justify the presence of these scenes not only to any potential readers of the play, but in fact, to himself as well. Perhaps he himself had difficulty believing that some of the miracles saints performed occurred exactly as people described them. Even if this were true, to make these pronouncements publically would have been heretical, and certainly not something Cervantes would have risked, but it is nevertheless interesting to speculate about what these stage directions might reveal about Cervantes' own belief system.

Once the scene is over after Cristóbal has warded off the demonic nymphs, Antonio affirms that he too has witnessed the horrible vision that afflicted Cruz. Cruz, however, vehemently denies that anything out of the ordinary has transpired, exclaiming, "Debía de estar durmiendo, / y soñaba" (II, vv. 1823-1825). I find it curious that Cristóbal tries to conceal the truth from Antonio at this juncture of the play. Is it simply because he is trying to set a good example for Antonio and lead him away from temptation? Or is it, rather, that he doesn't wish to reveal the temptation and inner doubt that still plagues his soul? Either interpretation is equally valid, and could easily be
supported by the text. Cristóbal has indeed made an almost superhuman effort to reform his old ways, but at this point in the play, he is not yet a saint. It is not until he makes the sacrifice for doña Ana at the conclusion of this act that he is finally allowed to reach true sainthood. Cervantes is showing his audience once again that acts of kindness and compassion for others, rather than religious gestures and acts of contrition, are the true path to salvation.

At the conclusion of this scene, Antonio insists that he was not dreaming, but before he is able to pursue the matter further, he and Cristóbal are interrupted by two citizens who are speaking with the Prior, and expressing their concern over doña Ana. The citizens once again reiterate Ana's strange refusal to confess, prompting the Prior to comment, "Que diga que Dios no puede / perdonalla, caso extraño; / es ése el mayor engaño / que al pecador le sucede" (II, vv. 1836-1839). At this point, the two citizens and the Prior decide to ask for Cruz's help in this matter, to which he happily agrees. It should be noted as well that Ana's actual sins are never made explicit at any point in the text. This may well be due to the fact that the nature of these sins is less significant than Ana's belief that she is beyond redemption. Almost the entire remainder of the second act is devoted to Cruz's struggle to persuade Ana that God forgives all who confess their sins and who genuinely seek out His clemency within their heart.

An unnamed cleric attempts unsuccessfully to convince doña Ana of the error of her belief by reciting scripture, primarily from the Book of Psalms, regarding God's infinite goodness and power to forgive even the worst sins against him. Just before Cruz intervenes, the tormented doña Ana professes:

¿Qué me queréis, padre, vos,
que tan hinchado os llegáis?
¡Bien parece que ignoráis
cómo para mí no hay Dios!
No hay Dios, digo, y mi malicia
hace, con mortal discordia,
It is at this point in the drama that Ana’s faith is in gravest peril. The language she uses here is indeed very significant, as she twice proclaims, "no hay Dios," indicating the extreme of her doubt. Cruz responds to this proclamation by reciting *Dixit insipiens in corde suo: no es Deus.*

Although Cruz recites the appropriate passage to counter Ana's assertion, it should be noted that she is not, in fact, an atheist. If she were, her soul would not be saved, according to Catholic dogma. But she is at a crossroads, a point of extreme doubt, as she nears her death at such a young age. She believes that she is already being punished, and that there is no redemption for her, hence confessing her sins is pointless. She makes this explicit shortly thereafter, when she declares, "La justicia de Dios me tiene a raya: / no me ha de perdonar, por ser tan justo; / al malo la justicia le desmaya; / no habita la esperanza en el injusto / pecho del pecador, ni es bien que le habite" (II, vv. 1978-1982). After significant efforts to dissuade her of her resolve, Cruz prays for God's aid in helping to find a way to save Ana's soul. Up to this point, Cruz has shown himself every bit as able and as versed in scripture as the Clérigo that was addressing doña Ana before him. But in the next scene, his ingenuity allows him to surpass even this level of religious devotion, and ultimately save Ana's soul.

When Ana states that she has no good works to speak of to her name, Cruz comes up with a stratagem to save her. He exclaims, "Si fee recobras, / yo haré que te sobren obras" (II, 2035-2036). After getting Ana to acknowledge that a sinner might be redeemed by an accumulation of good works, he proclaims, "Yo os daré todas las mías, / tomaré el grave cargo / de las vuestras a mi cargo" (II, vv. 2080-2084). If she will confess her sins, Cruz is willing to make this great

---

260 *Psalms*, 14:1; "the fool hath said in his heart: 'there is no God.'"
sacrifice, not only relinquishing all his good deeds to her name, but also taking on the great burden of all her sins. Both Antonio and the Clérigo are astonished by Cruz's tremendous and "unprecedented act." With this Christlike action, Cruz takes on the burden of all of doña Ana's sins, whatever they may be, in exchange for all of his noble acts, so that her soul might find the eternal peace of heaven. Doña Ana confesses her sins, finally, and is redeemed. In keeping with the Catholic tradition, the spiritual transformation of both Cruz and Ana has physical manifestations, as Ana feels tremendous relief and humility before her death, and Cruz takes on the characteristics of her leprosy. This physical transformation is emphasized by the characters in the play as well, both at the end of the second act and the beginning of the final act. Antonio remarks, "Parèceme que vuelve al Sicut erat, / y que deja el brevario y se acomoda / con el barcelonés y la de ganchos. / Siempre fue liberal, o malo, o bueno" (II, vv. 2159-2165). Antonio's commentary emphasizes that fact that Cristóbal, because of his generous and self-sacrificing act, has indeed returned to his initial degraded, sinful state. Not only has he taken on all of doña Ana's sins, but in giving her all of his own good works, he is now weighed down by the double-burden of her sins and all of his youthful sins for which he had previously atoned.

The third act commences with a reiteration of the end of the preceding act by a citizen, who is speaking to the Prior. Had this play been performed, in all likelihood, there would have been an interlude between the second and third acts, and this conversation would have served as a summary to bring the audience back to the principle drama. The citizen also adds some significant details to the previous description, such as relating for the audience that doña Ana claimed to be surrounded by one thousand virgins, and to hear the sweet music of heaven, as she drew her last breath. It is here that we learn Cruz has also taken on the physical characteristics of her leprosy, as the citizen declares, "cuando en aquella misma feliz hora / se vio del padre Cruz cubierto el rostro de lepra, /
adonde el asco mismo mora. / Volved los ojos, y veréis el monstruo, que lo es en santidad y en la fiereza, / cuya fealdad a nadie le da en rostro" (III, vv. 2215-2222). The image of the pristine-looking, handsome and divine Cruz of the second act is replaced here with the physically deformed and slowly dying Cruz of the third act, who must bear both the physical and spiritual repercussions of having taken on the burden of all doña Ana's sins.

As the others gather around the ailing Cruz and praise his noble acts, he humbly rejects their praise, reminding them that he is simply the humble son of a tabernero, and as such, unworthy of their accolades. This shows the true completion of Cruz's spiritual journey. He now has all the praise and respect that he desired for himself at the play's outset. But being a humble and spiritually transformed man, he no longer has those same vainglorious desires. For his part, Antonio (who is still the same well-meaning but foolish priest as in the previous act), declares that he will tend to Cruz's leprous ulcers until the end of his days, and that he won't allow Cruz to fall back to his prideful ways of old, stating, "y no tendrá conmigo alguna parte / la vana adulación, pues, de contino, antes rufián que santo he de llamarte" (III, 2257-2259). Antonio does his best to help his friend in his greatest time of need. When it comes to his own vices, however, Antonio is not as resolute in his resistance, as we see later.

Before the following scene, which depicts allegorical apparitions of a supernatural nature, Cervantes once again feels compelled to comment in a parenthetical stage direction:

Éntranse todos, y salen dos demonios; el uno con figura de oso, y el otro como quisieren. (Esta visión fue verdadera, que así se cuenta en su historia).

Once again, Cervantes comments on the truthful nature of the supernatural events he depicts on the stage, as though he were insecure about how they would be received. He also seems rather insistent that one of the demons should look like a bear, but that the appearance of the other is unimportant. It is interesting to see how Cervantes grapples with the details of Cristóbal de la
Cruz's life as he would have read them in *Historia de la Orden de Predicadores* (1596) and the *Consuelo de penitentes* (1583). He wants the specifics of these scenes to faithfully reflect the account that others have given of Cristóbal's life, but he almost seems to be trying to convince himself that, as seemingly implausible as these events are, they don't detract from the verisimilitude of his dramatic work, since he is only following the historical account of Cristóbal's life. Hence, he argues, his use of apparitions and miracles in this dramatic work, although not normally to his liking, are completely justified, because this is how the events actually occurred, implausible as it might seem to some.

In the next scene, the demons Saquiel and Visiel converse with one another about Cruz's recent sacrifice. They are furious at him for having snatched doña Ana out of their nefarious clutches. Realizing that he will almost certainly get into heaven, even assuming her sins, through his great charitable sacrifice, they plot to exact their revenge, tormenting him until his final moments. This scene is less significant than the demon's reappearance later on, because they don't interact with any of the other characters at this juncture. It serves merely to let the audience know that there are supernatural forces afoot, conspiring against Cristóbal.

After the demons exit, fray Ángel and fray Antonio appear. These two roguish friars are still quite given to games and diversions of various sorts, and have a difficult time letting go of their old ways. As Canavaggio has previously observed, the principal function of Lagartija/Antonio in this play is to provide both a comic figure that represents the world of the *hampa*, as well as to serve as a privileged witness to the complete transformation of Cristóbal. I am inclined, for this reason, to agree completely with Dalmacio Rodríguez Hernández's
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261 This demon is usually referred to as Saquiel in the stage directions, though he appeared as Saquel in the *dramatis personae*.

262 Jean Canavaggio (1980), 51-64.
characterization of Antonio as one of the few, if not the only, true *gracioso* or *figura del donaire* in Cervantes' theater. Antonio is at all time a figure who is subordinate to Cristóbal, whose journey parallels his own, and who provides a contrast with the principle subject of the play. In this scene, Antonio has some *bolas de argolla*, that Ángel initially mistakes for eggs. Antonio explains that he obtained the balls and the *paletas* from a fray Beltrán, who acquired them from his cousin. Antonio then begins to use the *paletas* to show Ángel how to fence. Not only is this scene quite funny, but it also functions as a parody of the noble fencer in *comedias de capa y espada*. Unfortunately, much of the physical comedy of the scene is lost to us as moderns, as there are no stage directions to indicate how the two actors would execute the various thrusts and parries. Presumably, if this play had ever been performed in its day, Antonio would have been played by someone familiar with fencing techniques, or at the very least, with stage fencing, to exaggerate the movements and add to the comedic effect. The scene with Antonio and Ángel serves both to introduce a little levity into what is otherwise the most serious act of the play, as well as to show just how far Cruz's transformation has progressed, when he reappears in the next scene, imploring the two friars to desist from their foolishness.

With the departure of fray Antonio and fray Ángel, Saquiel reappears, this time addressing Cruz directly. In his stage direction, Cervantes once again insists, somewhat less emphatically this time, "Todo fue ansí," regarding Saquiel's bear-like appearance. Saquiel torments Cruz, trying in vain to convince him that a sinner and former pimp such as he will never get into heaven. Saquiel declares, "Que es locura en la que das / dignísima de reír; / que en el cielo ya no dan puerta a que
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263 See Rodríguez Hernández, 391-405.
264 As I understand the explanation in Autoridades, this was something like croquet, except that a spade-like tool was used instead of a mallet to manipulate the balls.
265 These were the shovel-like tools used for throwing the *argolla* balls.
266 See Dalmacio Rodríguez Hernández, ob. cit., 12.
entren de rondón, / así como entró un ladrón, / que entre también un rufián" (III, vv. 2446-2451).

Cruz, however, is unphased by the demon's pronouncements, understanding now more fully than ever that the demon has no power over him, unless God wills it otherwise. When the demon threatens that he has come to claim Cruz's life, Cruz boldly replies, "Si es que traes de Dios licencia, / fácil te será quitalla, / y más fácil a mí dalla / con promptísima obediencia" (III, vv. 2460-2463). Finally, the demon tries to entreat Cruz to resume his former life as Lugo, calling him a hypocrite. While Cruz realizes there is some glimmer of truth to the demon's words, he puts his faith in God, and the demon retreats, bellowing, to the nether realm.

As fray Antonio enters to treat Cruz's lesions and boils, Cruz comments that he knows it is in vain, but not because he despairs, but simply because he knows that the illness is the will of God and that this is his fate. Fray Ángel enters as well, bearing the news that Cristóbal has been elected the new Prior. This point of the drama marks yet another significant transition for the character. In the first act of the play, Cristóbal would have been overjoyed by the newfound status afforded to him by such a position. Even in the second act of the play, the healthy and able-bodied Cristóbal might have graciously accepted such a charge. But in this act, Cristóbal rejects the honors the others would afford him, exclaiming, "¿Sobre unos hombros podridos / tan pesada carga han puesto? / No sé qué me diga desto" (III, 2512-2514). Later, Cristóbal reminds them of his ancestry and former life, declaring, "¿No saben estos benditos / como soy simple y grosero, / y hijo de un tabernero, / y padre de mil delitos?" (III, vv. 2535-2540). Cruz shows his true humility and submission to God, in rejecting any personal honors for himself. This action would have been unthinkable for the young, vainglorious Lugo, but is completely concordant with the personality of Cruz, the humble servant. Antonio, for his part, reaffirms Cruz's claims, and serves as the witness to "la vida que de hombre roto / en Sevilla y en Toledo / te vi hacer" (III, vv. 2542-2544).
This is the first mention that any of the characters within the dramatic work, other than the allegorical figures of Comedia and Curiosidad, have made of Toledo, and there was no indication anywhere earlier in the play that this dramatic version of Cristóbal had known Lagartija/Antonio in Toledo. It is quite possible that Cervantes wishes to give greater verisimilitude to the tale, and unify the historical account of Cristóbal's life with the fictionalized drama he has crafted. Whatever the case, Antonio recounts Cruz's former life as Lugo, taking perhaps a little too much pleasure in reminiscing about his "great" exploits as a pimp, rather than his newfound saintly deeds. Cruz, however, thanks his good friend Antonio for reminding him and the others of his past self, and in this way, avoiding the potential for self-aggrandizement and misplaced pride that would come with acquiring the title of Prior. With this scene, Cervantes instructs his audience that even religious titles themselves might be a path to temptation and foolish pride. If one truly wishes to be in concert with God, then one must always remain humble, understanding that such titles are a privilege and a burden, rather than cause for pride.

When the former Prior enters, and shows his submission to Cruz as the new prior, Antonio once again defends Cruz's intention not to be prior, vehemently exclaiming:

Pues qué, ¿no es santa?
A un Job hacen prior, que no le falta
si no es el muladar y ser casado
para serlo del todo. ¡En fin: son frailes!
Quien tiene el cuerpo de dolores lleno,
¿cómo podrá tener entendimiento
libre para el gobierno que requiere
tan peligroso y trabajoso oficio
como el de ser prior? ¿No lo ven claro? (III, vv. 2582-2589)

Honoring the wishes of his friend, Antonio objects to Cruz's appointment as Prior, on the grounds that he is far too ill to serve in a position that requires so much work, and is so potentially hazardous (given that they are in the Americas). Cruz agrees with Antonio's reasoning, and also insists once
again that he is the son of a tabernero, and that he has committed innumerable offenses against God. It is significant in this scene that Cruz objects to becoming Prior not only because he doesn't wish to be prideful, but also because he senses it is not God's plan for him. Having accepted the sins of doña Ana upon his own shoulders, he knows he is destined to die soon, and that all of this, including the temptation of titles and accolades, are merely tests of his faith and humility before he passes on.

In perhaps the most dramatic moment of the entire work, Lucifer himself enters the scene with his minions, Saquiel and Visiel. Interestingly enough, Cervantes does not insist on the veracity of this scene; rather, he states in his stage directions that Lucifer should enter "con corona y cetro, el más galán demonio y bien vestido que se pueda, y Saquiel y Visiel como quisieren, de demonios feos" (III, between vv. 2615 & 2616). In other words, it is important to Cervantes from a dramatic standpoint that the difference in category and rank between the fallen angel Lucifer and his demonic minions be immediately apparent, not just in their speech and mannerisms, but in their physical appearance as well. It is also noteworthy that Cervantes no longer seems preoccupied with Saquiel appearing as a bear or dressed as a bear, as he had earlier, perhaps because he doesn't wish to divert attention away from the figure of the devil himself, who has taken such an interest in the particular case of Cristóbal that he now feels compelled to intervene directly.

Lucifer goes on a lengthy tirade against his ill fate and against God, in which he complains about being cast out of heaven with his rebel angels for their treachery, and reveals, as well, his awareness and envy towards God's forgiveness of man's sins. The most interesting part of the speech is that Lucifer here earnestly admits his jealousy of God's leniency towards man, proclaiming that, through Jesus, God has become increasingly more and more tolerant of man's folly. He alludes specifically to Mary Magdalene, "la pecadora pública arrebata / de sus pies el
perdón de sus pecados" (III, vv. 2640-2641), as well as to Saint Mathew,\(^{267}\) "un cambiador, que en
sus usuras trata, / deja a sola una voz sus intricados / libros, y por manera nunca vista / le pasa a
ser divino coronista" (III, vv. 2644-2648). Lucifer is greatly angered by the fact that God has now
seen fit to save the soul of a pimp, and commands his minions to torment Cristóbal until his final
moments, so that he might despair and lose faith. Lucifer declares:

   Este rufián, cual no lo fue ninguno,
   por su fealdad al mundo aborrecible,
está ya de partida para el cielo,
y humilde apresta el levantado vuelo.
   Acudid y turbadle los sentidos,
y entibiad, si es posible, su esperanza,
y de sus vanos pasos y perdidos
hacedle temerosa remembranza;
no llegue alegre voz a sus oídos
que prometa segura confianza
de haber cumplido con la deuda y cargo
que por su caridad tomó a su cargo. (III, vv. 2659-2671)

In this play, Lucifer shows his envy of mankind to be just as great a sin as his prideful revolt
against God. Cervantes ably depicts Lucifer's petty jealousy, as well as his relentless desire to
capture Cruz's soul by plunging him into despair in his final moments.

   To add to the drama of this scene, and make manifest the conflict between heaven and hell
that rage in Cristóbal's soul, three pure souls enter as soon as Satan and his minions depart,
commenting that the devout soul of Cruz will soon be among their number. Their purpose in the
play is simply to praise Cristóbal's saintly life and remind the audience that he lived a full thirteen
years in this humble manner of penitence, devoted to his religious service. Once again, Cervantes
does not insist on the reality of this scene either. With his previous parenthetical remarks,
Cervantes seems to be distinguishing between the seemingly fantastical visions that were actually

\(^{267}\) Indeed, we should not forget that Cervantes himself was, for a time, a tax collector, much as the former publician, St. Matthew.
witnessed and recorded in the account of Cristóbal's life, and these visions of his own invention, which dramatize the conflict between the divine and the infernal, fighting over Cristóbal's soul.

In the following scene Antonio informs us that fray Cruz has drawn his last breath, and that his soul has ascended to the heavens, after his many years of faithful service, sacrifice, and superhuman suffering. Cervantes also once again emphasizes the physical manifestations of Cruz's redemption and passing on to the afterlife. In the words of Antonio:

Tu cuerpo, que ayer era
espectáculo horrendo,
según llagado estaba,
hoy es bruñida palta y cristal limpio:
señal que tus carbuncos,
tus grietas y aberturas,
que podrición vertían,
estaban por milagro en ti, hasta tanto
que la deuda pagases
de aquella pecadora
que fue limpia en un punto:
¡tanto tu caridad con Dios valía! (III, vv. 2768-2780)

As Antonio helps the audience understand here, the suffering endured by Cruz as a result of his leprosy was necessary in order to fully purge the collective burden of his own sins and those of doña Ana from his soul. Cruz has nobly endured this torment, and has now been fully cleansed of his sins, and though his noble sacrifice for doña Ana, is permitted to enter the kingdom of heaven.

This, of course, would seem to be a perfect ending, but the play goes on. Cervantes wishes to impart not just the fact of Cruz's attaining sainthood, but also his impact on those whose lives he touched. Everyone of importance, up to and including the Viceroy Luis de Velasco himself, attend Cruz's wake and pay him their respects. Cervantes also depicts the foolish behavior of three

---

268 Even though the historical Cristóbal was never canonized, in spite of the feeling of many that he should be.
nameless citizens, who attempt to make off with whatever few possessions belonging to Cruz that they can. One makes off with one of his bloodied bandages, while another takes a tattered piece of his hood. The third citizen contents himself with having kissed his feet four times, affirming that they emitted a holy aroma. Although this scene could easily be read humorously from a modern standpoint, I don't believe it is intended to be. Rather, it emphasizes the power of the spiritual over the material, demonstrating that the third citizen's act of reverence is in fact superior to the desire to possess something physical of the deceased saint.

Immediately prior to the play's conclusion, we see that Lucifer and his minions are not even able to desecrate the body of Cruz, let alone his soul, as it is protected by rosaries and other holy symbols. The demons leave in disgust, causing Antonio and Ángel to comment that they heard the demons pass. Finally, the Viceroy gives his own blessings to the deceased Cruz, and comments on the miracle of his body, so recently deformed by the illness, now fully restored. The Prior and the Viceroy agree to exhibit the body for a little longer, at the request of one of the citizens, so that the public might kiss Cruz's feet and pay their respects.

As we have seen, Cervantes dramatizes with this play the path of redemption for an individual of the lowest stratum of society. The example of Lugo/Cruz serves as a demonstration not only that salvation is possible for anyone who believes in God in their heart and seeks His forgiveness, but also reveals the path that is necessary to attain redemption. Cervantes is careful to show his audience that not only are acts of charity, and rituals insufficient to achieve salvation, but that, indeed, belonging to a religious order in and of itself might not be sufficient either. We have also seen the folly of Antonio and the ironically named Ángel in this play, despite their best intentions to be pious. In accordance with his Erasmian beliefs, Cervantes seeks to impart the message that true acts of self-sacrifice for others, as well as a steadfast belief in the mercy and
redemptive power of God, are both necessary for anyone seeking admittance into the gates of heaven. In spite of his own reservations, Cervantes dramatizes both the mundane and the miraculous in this play, further illustrating the path of increased spiritual ascension that Cristóbal must follow in seeking redemption. His extreme humility and sacrifice, as well as his resolute belief in the forgiving, redemptive power of God right up until his final moments, are what make his salvation possible.


9. PEDRO DE URDEMALAS

Pedro de Urdemalas is not, in fact, a play of the picaresque genre in the strictest sense. Rather, it is a dramatic work that utilizes elements of the picaresque, romances de germania, as well as historical and biographical details\(^{269}\) to weave an intricate tapestry that cannot wholly be described by or reduced to any of its constitutive elements. It is fair to say that Pedro de Urdemalas is Cervantes' drama par excellence, as it examines the relationship between theater and life, simultaneously calling into question many dramatic conventions of the sixteenth century, while grappling with the baroque philosophical trope of the world as a stage. Jean Canavaggio has described this comedy as "la más fascinante de las comedias cervantinas,"\(^{270}\) and it isn't at all difficult to see why. The play is as protean as the figure of Pedro himself, borrowing from many different literary genres, comprised of seemingly disparate episodes that all come together to form a coherent, contemplative masterwork of theater, in which the destructive falsehood and deception brought about by human egotism, greed and vanity are contrasted with the constructive "falsehood" that enables the contemplation of human experience achieved on the stage. In many ways, the play could almost be viewed as a kind of treatise of Cervantes' ideas on theatrical production. Rather than adhering to character tropes and stereotypes, which are necessarily inauthentic, Cervantes proposes a theater in this play that breaks the expectations of conventional characters, and enlightens the audience by presenting subject matter that doesn't draw conclusions for his audience, but rather, invites them to ruminate on the greater significance of what they have just witnessed. As Zimic observes of Pedro's role at the play's conclusion, "Con ademán quijotesco, Pedro escoge ahora el teatro como campo de su acción, aspirando a librar al arte de todo lo impuro

\(^{269}\) Cf. Canavaggio (1977), 127.
mundanal. Su contemplada misión es así de gran nobleza, inspirada en el bello ideal de encontrar en la vida materia digna del arte y, simultáneamente, de tratar el arte como digna expresión de la vida."

The character of Pedro de Urdemalas comes from a long folkloric tradition, and can also be found in the works of numerous authors before, contemporary with, and after Cervantes. Gonzalo Correas' *Vocabulario de refranes y frases proverbiales* (1627) informs us, "Pedro de Urdemalas es tenido por un mozo que sirvió a sus amos y a todos hizo muchas burlas, y a otros muchos" (1038). The Pedro that Cervantes crafts, however, shows numerous key differences with both the folkloric Pedro, as well as the traditional figure of the *pícaro*. After all, the traditional figure of the picaresque rogue is fundamentally a narrative character, so it is only natural that Cervantes would have had to modify this template for the stage. But beyond the dynamism with which Cervantes ably infuses Pedro, there is a major change in his character that is fundamental. Unlike most picaroons, Pedro de Urdemalas is not purely self-serving. Indeed, Pedro more often than not has a higher goal than merely serving his own interests when we encounter him in the play. Though he intimates that he had a considerably more checkered past, the Pedro we see in

---

272 Earliest among these, *Libro del paso honroso, defendido por el excelente caballero Suero de Quiñones*, Juan del Encina's *Almoneda trovada*; references to the character also appear in the works of Lucas Fernández, Francisco Delicado, Lope de Rueda, Juan de Timoneda, Espinel, Lope de Vega, Tirso de Molina, Calderón de la Barca, and Francisco de Quevedo. See the intro. to ed. Sevilla Arroyo and Rey Hazas, p. XXXIV.
273 We might be reminded, for example, of the three most classic rogues of Golden Age Spain, Lazarillo de Tormes from the picaresque novel of the same name (1554), Mateo Alemán's *Guzmán de Alfarache* (1599 & 1604), and Don Pablos from Quevedo's *Buscón* (1626). While Lazarillo is quite clearly less cruel than the other two, all three are nevertheless primarily invested in their own well-being and survival. No matter how they might rationalize their numerous gambits to themselves and to their audience, the picaresque rogue is a self-serving character, whose viewpoint is fundamentally myopic, limited to his own hardships and potential gains. Thus, most (if not all) of the pranks and tricks that they engage in are at another character's expense, and for their own profit.
the play is generally kind to others, and well-liked by almost all. He is a kind of *burlador discreto*, an anti-pícaro, who uses his ingenuity to bring order to the chaotic world around him. He achieves his ends, and helps his friends to achieve theirs, through a keen use of his intellect, his verbosity, and his adroitness at donning different costumes, and assuming a plurality of roles and jobs. It is for this reason that he is able to fulfill his true destiny by becoming a stage actor at the play's conclusion. It is worth noting also that Pedro never resorts to violence or actively harming anyone to achieve his ends. Rather, he tricks only those who deserve to be ridiculed or swindled, owing to their foolishness, greed, and hypocrisy, as we shall see.

*Pedro de Urdemalas* inevitably invites comparison with numerous other works of Cervantes, as many critics have already observed.²⁷⁴ The gypsy life that Maldonado describes to Pedro is reminiscent of Berganza's discussion of the same topic in *El coloquio de los perros*, just as the story of Belica is parallel with, but also differs significantly from, the origins of Preciosa in *La gitanilla*. Whereas Preciosa is a model of generosity, grace, ingenuity and discretion, Belica, by contrast, proves to be incredibly egotistical, ungrateful to the gypsies who raised her and took care of her, and above all, inappropriately flirtatious, given the acceptable conventions of the time.²⁷⁵ The scenes with the inept magistrate Martín Crespo and his judicial decisions remind us of the deficiencies and pretense of the magistrate candidates in the entremés *La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo*, which we have already discussed in a previous chapter,²⁷⁶ and are also reminiscent, as almost every modern editor of the text has observed, of the judgments of Sancho as governor of the Ínsula Barataria. Given the number of elements this play shares in common with Cervantes' earlier works, it should not be surprising that *Pedro de Urdemalas* is one of Cervantes'

²⁷⁴ Among them, Joaquín Casalduero, Luis Astrana Marín, Jean Canavaggio, and Stanislav Zimic.
²⁷⁵ For a similar comparison of the characters, see ed. Sevilla Arroyo and Rey Hazas, p. XXXVII.
²⁷⁶ See ch. 2 of the present study.
As far as the structure of the play is concerned, it initially seems like a collection of disparate, at times unrelated episodes, in which we gain a greater sense of the dynamism and constantly changing nature of Pedro. In his *Cervantès Dramaturge*, Jean Canavaggio describes the dramatic space of *Pedro de Urdemalas* as "une mosaïque d'incidents divers, soit la conjonction de deux actions, l'une épisodique et animée par le protagoniste, l'autre continue et à la charge de Belica" (223). Certainly, the observation that the principle action of the play is centered on the development of and opposition between the two main protagonists, Pedro and Belica, is undoubtedly correct. But what initially appears as a mosaic of diverse incidents, as Canavaggio puts it, in my view has a kind of internal coherence and structure that is unified by more than just the constantly mutable nature of Pedro. In this regard, I find Stanislav Zimic's interpretation of the play extremely suggestive and provocative, and while I cannot agree with all of the aforementioned critic's conclusions, I nevertheless believe that his basic analysis of the play is not only correct, but has the virtue of unifying the dramatic action in a way that was not entirely appreciated by critics before him. Zimic sees *Pedro de Urdemalas* as Cervantes' philosophical take on the theme of the *gran teatro del mundo*. Rather than elaborate this theme allegorically as Calderón later would, Cervantes develops a character that experiences the world as a great series of deceptions and tricks, in which people around him are never what they appear to be, and he must alter his own identity and job function accordingly. Each different major moment of dramatic action in the play either furthers our understanding of the superficial nature of the world around Pedro, or provides us with more insight into his past and character. As we shall see, each individual episode of Pedro's

---

interaction with other people all reveal the falsehoods and pretense of the characters who fall for
his tricks. Whether they are comedic or serious, none of the seemingly episodic moments of the
text are without a specific dramatic function with respect to what they reveal either about Pedro,
or about the world that surrounds him. Zimic observes:

Pedro es un viajero en la vida, a la que siempre observa con gran perspicacia y que le hace
concluir que todo el mundo es un ridículo espectáculo, una inmensa picardía, en que nadie
es lo que aparenta o cree ser, o lo que debiera ser. Los hombres son farsantes que bajo
apariencias de bondad, integridad y dignidad encumbren la maldad, la deshonestidad y la
tontería. Lo que se proclama como amor no es sino atracción superficial, capricho egoísta
o burda sensualidad; la autoridad civil, vanidosamente concentrada en su propia
importancia, es una parodia del sabio, prudente y justo desempeño del deber cívico y
político; la religión, exenta de toda virtud cristiana, es una especulación comercial y tonta
superstición; la nobleza de título es innoble en su comportamiento; los ideales patrióticos
y religiosos son una mera superchería para engañar y explotar la patria, etc. Entre estos
hombres que engañan y se engañan, Pedro se impone con su aguda inteligencia y su fértil
fantasía. (284)

I find Zimic's interpretation of the play to be compelling, and to have the added virtue, as already
mentioned, of unifying what could easily be perceived as a series of unrelated comedic episodes,
demonstrating that they are, in fact, much more closely related than one might initially assume.
One of the most impressive dramatic feats of this comedic drama is the way in which Cervantes
presents so lightheartedly such difficult subject matter for the audience's contemplation. The play
often oscillates between moments of great comedy and near tragedy, for example, when we learn
of Pedro's difficult past, or when the Queen arrests the entire group of gypsy dancers towards the
conclusion. My primary disagreement with Zimic, nevertheless, stems from the fact that this is
ultimately an optimistic comedy, whereas his article presents it in a seemingly more satirical light.
Cervantes presents his hopes and aspirations for the potential that artistic drama has to enliven the
soul, and, through its art and constructive deception, awaken its audience to deeper truths about
the world they inhabit. In our analysis of the play, we will attempt to show how the various,
seemingly disparate episodes are in fact unified by the common thread of *desengaño*, both
regarding what Pedro learns about the world around him in order for his tricks to be successful, as well as what the characters reveal about their own true nature.

*Pedro de Urdemalas* opens with Clemente, a young man, asking the help of his friend Pedro, to win the hand of Clemencia, the daughter of Pedro's amo. Pedro first appears to us as a simple laborer, which is significant, as his costume and job will change numerous times throughout the play. Clemente explains his great dilemma: namely that Martín Crespo, Clemencia's father and the new magistrate, doesn't approve of him, because he is of a lower social standing. Clemente proclaims, "Del padre el rico caudal / el mío pobre desprecia / por no ser al suyo igual" (I, vv. 61-63). As we shall later see, Martín Crespo, who is not intellectually gifted, values only the money and the status that the relationship will bring, rather than seeking for his daughter un matrimonio acertado. He is initially motivated by monetary interest rather than by trying to find a husband most suitable for his daughter. Additionally, as Clemente explains, "Clemencia / a mi amor no corresponde / por no sé qué impertinencia / que le han dicho, y así, esconde / de mis ojos su presencia" (I, vv. 70-75). Someone has circulated a rumor that has caused Clemencia to turn a deaf ear to Clemente's advances. Fortunately for him, the astute Pedro has a solution: "Dile con lengua curiosa / cosas de que no disguste, / y ten por cierta una cosa: / que no hay mujer que no guste / de oírse llamar hermosa" (I, vv. 111-115). In other words, Pedro advises Clemente to make Clemencia forget about the pernicious rumors by showering her with compliments. Pedro understands that the sure way to win someone's love is by appealing to his or her vanity.²⁷⁸

²⁷⁸ Cf. Zimic (1992), 267. While I agree with his interpretation of Pedro's advice to Clemente, and Pedro's (usually correct) views on the vanity of the world, Zimic doesn't comment on the fact that Pedro's initial advice doesn't actually work as he planned in this instance, perhaps owing in part to its cynical nature.
Clemencia, nevertheless, shows herself to be more astute, and not at all vain, when she and her friend Benita, on their way to the fountain, encounter Pedro and Clemente. She initially accuses Clemente of being little more than an insincere flatterer, proclaiming, "No eres sino un parlero, / adular, lisonjero / y, sin porqué, jactancioso,\textsuperscript{279} / en verdades mentiroso / y en mentiras verdadero" (I, vv. 137-140). As it turns out, she is angered with Clemente because after she had given him a carnation colored ribbon as a token of her affection, he boastfully showed the ribbon to Jacinta, another woman from the village, to prove Clemencia's love for him. She is upset with Clemente for being so presumptuous, since she never explicitly told him she loves him. But Clemente repents, and delivers a heartfelt apology, proclaiming his true and steadfast love for her once again. Clemencia then relents, and the love between the two is clear. As she exits, Pedro promises to help Clemente with the second part of his difficulty (Martín Crespo's disapproval). Although this scene is quite lighthearted, Cervantes nevertheless presents his audience with a valuable lesson, that is, that neither money nor insincere compliments can buy true love. Clemente's initial error is that he is overconfident, and hence, Clemencia is angered with him. But when he apologizes and sincerely proclaims his love to her, she is much more receptive, and soon agrees to his marriage proposal.

When the new Alcalde Martín Crespo and the regidores Sancho Macho and Diego Tarugo enter in the following scene, we find ourselves almost in an entirely different genre. This scene owes much more to the world of the entremés, strongly reminding us of La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo. The two regidores initially praise Martín Crespo and congratulate him on his recent appointment to the position of Alcalde, comparing him with great pomp to king Solomon (whose

\textsuperscript{279} The word "jactancioso" appears this way in the text. Though most modern editors (Schevill-Bonilla, Ynduráin, Valbuena, Talens-Spadaccini, Díaz Larios, and Canavaggio) emend it.
name Tarugo comically deforms into Salmón, showing his own lack of erudition). Nevertheless, we soon learn that neither Martín Crespo himself nor the two regidores feel that Crespo is up to the task of being magistrate. All their compliments are mere insincere, interested ritual, in which the participants in the charade are behaving in accordance with the roles they feel socially obliged to assume. The second that Crespo is out of earshot, Sancho and Tarugo more sincerely discuss their reservations about Crespo as a magistrate, as Sancho declares, "se rija aquesta villa / por la persona más necia / que hay desde Flandes a Grecia / y desde Egipto a Castilla" (I, vv. 250-254). Although this scene is of a very different nature than the first, it is still consistent in revealing the principle vices we have seen criticized in this act thus far: namely, that of the vanity and hypocrisy involved in hollow praise and gossip, whether in love or in politics, and their deleterious effect on the interactions between common folk.

Just before the two regidores comment on Crespo's ineptitude, Crespo talks alone with Pedro, recognizing his intelligence and wit, and acknowledging his own limitations to fulfill his duties. Pedro devises a means to help him in court, declaring:

    Yo os meteré en la capilla
dos docenas de sentencias
que al mundo den maravilla
todas con sus diferencias,
civiles, o de rencilla;
y la que primero a mano
os viniere, está bien llano
que no ha de haber más que ver" (I, vv. 230-237).

Pedro of course can't completely resist the idea of having a laugh at the foolish magistrate's expense with this stratagem, as he must be aware of the public debacle that will no doubt be caused by literally choosing random sentences and verdicts out of a hat (or, in this case, out of the magistrate's hood). For part of the purpose of this trick, as we will see, is to get the magistrate to consent to
marrying his daughter Clemencia to Clemente. But Pedro is not without heart, and does help the foolish town magistrate out of his predicament.

The following scene, featuring Martín Crespo in the village courthouse, is reminiscent of Sancho's governance of the Ínsula Barataria in *DQII*, ch. XLV-LIII, as well as of the interlude *La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo*, as we have earlier remarked. The constant butchering of words and confusion of registers committed by Crespo, who is corrected by the escribano Redondo, is a comedic technique that Cervantes learned from Lope de Rueda and which he employs on numerous occasions throughout his comedies, as we have observed in the first chapter of this study. Crespo refers to a "sonador romano" (I, v. 295) instead of a *senador*, and to giving a "sentencia rota y justa" (I, v. 300) instead of "recta y justa" as well as numerous other errors, for which he is immediately corrected by the Escribano. The fact that it is almost always the scribe making the corrections in all of Cervantes' writings is probably also a satirical commentary on the fact that the scribes in local village governments were often more literate and more knowledgeable of the laws than the elected officials who were supposed to make the rulings, as we already mentioned our analysis of *La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo*.

Crespo's only truly wise decision in the court scene is to insist that Pedro sit behind him, so that he might give him advice on what sentences to dispense in each case. In the first case, Hornachuelos and Lagartija, two laborers, argue over a monetary debt that the former owes the latter. Hornachuelos claims, "Prestóme Lagartija tres reales, / volvíle dos, la deuda q\textsuperscript{ue}da en uno, / y él dice que le debo cuatro justos" (I, vv. 302-304).\textsuperscript{280} Crespo, not knowing how to rule, pulls a

\textsuperscript{280} If I understand this scene correctly, I believe Sevilla-Arroyo and Rey Hazas are in error when they earlier assert in their edition that the phrase "la deuda queda en uno" in this context means "saldada; equiparada" (n. 30). Though the phrase certainly means that in other contexts, in this case, Hornachuelos is literally stating that he owes Lagartija only a single real rather than four. Otherwise, the arithmetic of the scene doesn't make sense.
completely irrelevant sentence from his hat, and Pedro steps in to help make a judgment. Our beloved rogue now assumes the role of the wise arbiter, using a clever stratagem to trick Hornachuelos into admitting the truth of the loan. When Pedro demands, "Deposite primero Hornachuelos, para mí, el asesor, doce reales" (I, vv. 345-346), Hornachuelos responds "Pues sola la mitad importa el pleito" (I, v. 347). Pedro then declares "Así es verdad: que Lagartija, el bueno / tres reales de a dos os dio prestados, / y déstos le volvisteis dos sencillos; / y por aquesta cuenta debéis cuatro" (I, vv. 348-351). By tricking him into complaining about the unreasonable "consultation fee," Pedro is able to deduce, using basic arithmetic, that Lagartija must have loaned Hornachuelos three double-reales\(^{281}\) (that is, six reales in total), and been returned only two single reales. Thus, Hornachuelos still owes Lagartija four reales, as Lagartija himself has correctly asserted. The twelve reales that Pedro demands as payment for arbitrating this dispute might initially seem like a fraud on his part, but it serves both as a way for him to deduce the total amount of money in question, and as a punishment for Hornachuelos' attempt to scam Lagartija.\(^{282}\) The significance of this scene is that it demonstrates (in a very quotidian way) the powers of reasoning that a good arbiter should be capable of for this kind of case, faculties of which Martín Crespo is not in possession.

\(^{281}\) During the reign of Phillip II & III, there were denominations of the real "de a dos, de a cuatro, y de a ocho," in addition to the "real simple." The confusion about the debt in the scene has to do with Hornachuelos speaking ambiguously about which kind of real Lagartija leant him. See Canavaggio (ed.), p. 264, n. 352. According to Autoridades, "REAL. Moneda de treinta y cuatro maravedís, que es la que oy se llama real de vellon; pero no la hai efectiva. En algunas partes, se entiende por real, el real de plata," and "REAL DE A DOS. Moneda de plata de la quarta parte del real de a ocho, o mitad del real de a cuatro."

\(^{282}\) To the best of my knowledge, no modern editors of the text have explained Pedro's trick in this scene in much detail. Canavaggio's explanation in his edition (p. 264, n. 352) is the best explanation to date, in my view, but he doesn't comment on the fact that Pedro's fee is a way of tricking Hornachuelos to speak clearly and unambiguously about the debt. Pedro doesn't guess at the amount of money in question; rather, he uses deductive reasoning and arithmetic to arrive at the correct conclusion after making an initial hypothesis.
In the second case, Clemente and Clemencia appear in court with their faces covered, so that Crespo cannot identify them. Clemente explains that they are in love and wish to marry, but that her tyrannical father will not permit it. He explains that, while he lacks money, he more than makes up for this deficiency in other ways. He proudly declares, "a su riqueza igualo / con estar siempre ajeno / de todo vicio perezoso y malo; / y, entre buenos, es fuero / que valga la virtud más que el dinero" (I, vv. 406-411). With this scene, Cervantes imparts another moral lesson to his audience. Namely, that a good father, in seeking a husband for his daughter, must look not only at the dowry that she will inherit, but also at the kind of person the husband will be, and whether the couple is well suited for one another. It should be clear to the audience at this point in the play that Clemente and Clemencia are both honorable individuals who are in love with one another, and that their marriage will therefore be a good one. Crespo, on the other hand, cannot see what has been laid out so plainly before him, and asks Pedro to read another sentence from his hood. This time, however, Pedro reads a sentence that he knows will be appropriate to the proceedings (albeit comically), "Yo, Martín Crespo, alcalde, determino / que sea la pollina del pollino" (I, v. 436-7). Crespo assures the couple that the sentence will be carried out as ordered, at which point Clemencia reveals her true identity to her father, kneels at his feet, and asks him to let the sentence stand if it is just, since he delivered it of his own free will. He replies simply "Lo que escribí, escribí; bien dices, hija: / y así, a Clemente admito por mi hijo, / y el mundo deste proceder colija / que más por ley que por pasión me rijo" (I, vv. 462-465). In this way, Pedro has successfully used his astuteness to help his friend Clemente, while simultaneously helping Crespo to rule justly. It is worth noting again here that this use of engaños to right injustices rather than for personal gains is not a typical trait of a picaroon, and shows Pedro to be of an altogether different nature in this play than the folkloric figure from which he draws his inspiration.
It quickly becomes clear also that Martín Crespo assumes the title of *Alcalde*, in spite of knowing he is not truly up to the task, because of the attraction of power and wisdom that are implicitly assumed for this position of authority. In his case, he is more concerned about the status the title affords him than whether or not he will actually perform his function adequately. As such, he shows not only his own foolishness and vanity, but reveals as well the central theme of the comedy perhaps as well as any other character: that is, the difference between essence and appearance. Martín Crespo is essentially a fool, who seeks prestige through his office. As Stanislav Zimic observes,\(^{283}\) "Crespo anticipa con deleite pleitos, cuantos más mejor, sólo porque un alcalde debe oírlos. Lo importante es proclamar juicios y sentencias oficiales, independientemente de su acierto o implicación" (266). Crespo isn't a true town magistrate. He is interested only in the performative aspects of the office, and doesn't truly understand the law or his duties. He is, in this sense, merely playing the part of magistrate, trapped in a role that doesn't correspond to him. This is another dominant theme of the play: how frequently inadequate we are as human actors on the stage of the world. Everyone is simply playing a part in the great theater of life: some well, and some poorly.

In the following scene, Pedro once again plays matchmaker, as he agrees to help Pascual, another villager, win the hand of Benita. Pascual explains that that night, the night of San Juan, Benita, whom he loves, will participate in a traditional folkloric superstition, along with many of the other young women of the village. She will, while standing in a basin filled with water, and with her hair unfastened in the night air, listen until the wind carries to her ears the name of the man she is to marry.\(^{284}\) Pedro gives his friend the following advice, "sé tú primero en nombrarte /

\(^{283}\) Zimic (1992).
\(^{284}\) The night of San Juan, held on June 24\(^{th}\), is an important popular festival still celebrated today. This particular superstition, associated with the festival, is mentioned throughout sixteenth and
en su calle, de tal arte, / que claro entienda tu nombre" (I, vv. 525-527). Unfortunately for both of
them, a Sacristan, with designs of his own, has overheard their conversation, and plans to use this
trick to his advantage. The stage is set for more hilarious calamity to ensue, but before this can transpire, Maldonado, the head of the gypsies, emerges, speaking with a stereotypical ceceo, and the genre of our play shifts towards the picaresque and the *gitanesca*. He and Pedro discuss the
nomadic gypsy life, which is presented by Maldonado in relatively idyllic terms, "Mira, Pedro:
nueztra vida / ez zuelta, libre, curioza, / ancha, holgazana, estendida, / a quien nunca falta coza / que el deceo buzque y pida" (I, vv. 550-554). This depiction of the carefree nature of the gypsy, who is also described as living without jealousy and with a great deal of freedom, contrasts harshly with the depiction of royalty we see later. These noblemen are depicted as lascivious, jealous, petty and even cruel. Cervantes defends in part with this comedy, the noble, simple life of both the
nomadic gypsy and the humble villager, and contrasts them with the life full of pretense and falsehood of the court. This should not be taken as particularly "subversive," for an opposition of this kind was already a common trope of the pastoral genre, in which the simplicity of life in the countryside is contrasted with "pernicious" court or city life. By uniting this theme with that of life as a stage, Cervantes is able to give us a real Erasmian critique of the hypocrisy of men and women in positions of authority.

In this scene, Maldonado also introduces Belica, the other main character of the play, who serves as a foil for Pedro. He explains, "Una gitana, hurtada, / la trujo; pero ella es tal, / que, por hermoza y honrada, / muestra que es de principal / y rica gente engendrada" (I, vv. 580-584). We


Sevilla Arroyo and Rey Hazas note in their edition that the description of gypsy life here is reminiscent of that in Cervantes' exemplary novels, *La gitanilla* and *El colloquio de los perros*. Ed. cit., 160, n. 65.
learn in act III from the nobleman Marcelo that she was, in fact, not stolen away from her parents. Rather, Marcelo brought her to an old gypsy woman and charged her with taking care of the child, in order to conceal Belica's illegitimate birth. Maldonado either knows this and doesn't want to give away her true identity for his own reasons, or he simply was never told by the gypsy woman the truth of Belica's noble origin. The text is unclear on this point. Given his later desire to wed Belica to Pedro, it seems likely that the gypsy woman lied to him as well to safeguard Belica's secret. Whatever the case, Belica herself, like Pedro, is unaware of her true origin, which is why this is the perfect place for the beginning of her backstory to be unveiled. It serves to establish a parallel right away between her and Pedro, who now tells the tale of his own backstory to Maldonado, describing himself with the oft quoted phrase, "Yo soy hijo de la piedra, / que padre no conocí: / desdicha de las mayores / que a un hombre pueden venir" (I, vv. 600-602). Like Belica, Pedro doesn't know who his parents are, but unlike her, he never finds out the truth of his origins.

Pedro continues describing his life, explaining how he had many harsh masters, who taught him how to recite prayers, but little else, causing him to go hungry. Pedro observes, "aunque también con aquesto / supe leer y escribir, / y supe hurtar la limosna, / y desculparme y mentir" (I, vv. 612-615). In keeping with the picaresque tradition, Pedro had many masters, but his true teacher was necessity. In order not to go hungry, he had to learn to do many things. Most modern scholars comment only on the negative things he learned from this experience, like how to lie, cheat, and steal, but I find it worth observing that Pedro also comments that he learned to read and write, as well as how to apologize. Our antihero holds all the skills he learned to escape his dreaded hunger in equal regard as far as their utility for his survival. Pedro then goes on to describe the entirety of his youthful misadventures, the details of which aren't important per se, except that they provide us with a considerable amount of information about both the wide range of odd-jobs that
he has held, as well as the skills he has acquired as a hustler.\textsuperscript{286} We learn that he once served a wise old blind man, from whom he learned many things, including the slang of the blind community, and how to act like a blind man, details which become relevant in the play's second act. We also learn of the prophecy that a certain sage told Pedro when he had his palms read some years ago, "Añadidle Pedro al Urde / un malas; pero advertid, / hijo, que habéis de ser rey, / fraile y papa, y matachín" (vv. 747-751). At this point in the text, the prophecy is a sort of riddle, a seeming contradiction with a logical resolution of the sort that Cervantes was so fond, but Pedro doesn't learn of his true vocation until the third act. Since the prophecy mentioned among his many roles that he was to be a gypsy, Pedro decides that he will join their number, much to the delight and approval of Maldonado.

The following scene concludes with the second incident of Pedro uniting two members of a couple with his ingenuity. When Benita goes to undertake the ritual described earlier by Pascual, the Sacristan cleverly intervenes as he planned, telling Benita that she will marry a man named Roque, which is of course his name. He is, however, caught by Pedro and Pascual. The Sacristan explains that he was simply having some fun with the traditions of the night, commenting on the vain fantasies of women who participate in such superstitions, "que la vana hechicería / que la noche antes del día / de San Juan usan doncellas, / hace que se muestren ellas / de liviana fantasía" (I, vv. 864-868). Pascual then tries in vain to win back Benita's favor, utilizing stylized language of the pastoral genre. But she replies simply that she cannot marry anyone who isn't named Roque. Pedro, once again comes to his friend's rescue, declaring that it is a simple matter to resolve, as

\textsuperscript{286} According to Pedro, he has been an \textit{esportillero} (a laborer charged with bearing heavy loads from one place to another), a \textit{mandil} (pimp's apprentice and errand boy), a backpack-carrier, a watchman of the shoreline, a seller of aguardiente and later, of biscuit rolls, a fake blind beggar, a caretaker of mules that belonged to a card sharp, and finally, assistant to the magistrate Martín Crespo (I, vv. 600-767).
Pascual need only change his name to Roque. This satisfies Benita, and she agrees to marry him. The significance of the scene on the whole is primarily to point out the foolishness of adhering to silly superstitious nonsense, but also to show the mental and spiritual blindness that it causes. Rather than trusting her own common sense and feelings, Benita would rather let the first voice she hears on the night of San Juan tell her whom to marry. As if that weren't bad enough, a simple name change on the part of Pascual is enough to allay all her concerns. Although on the surface this is simply a lighthearted, farcical episode in the play, it reconnects with the play's main theme of essence vs. appearance. It is relatively easy for a person to adopt a new name, but that doesn't change their essential character. But this is of no concern to Benita, who happily agrees to marry Pascual on the condition that he change his name so as to concord with the superstition. Benita is just as unreflective as Crespo was earlier when he selected random judgments from his hood. Their folly is that they both allow "fate" to make their decisions for them, rather than making informed, rational decisions themselves. There is, however, a deliberate irony in this fact, as Pedro and Benita, albeit in a much more deliberate manner, both allow themselves to be swept up in the pursuit of their own destinies. In each of their cases, they are much more active agents in the pursuit of their respective fates, as we shall later see.

In the conclusion of this scene, Clemente and a band of musicians appear, singing of the Night of San Juan and of Benita's and Pascual's love. Clemente joins Pascual and Benita, and the three of them go off to find Clemencia and celebrate their upcoming marriages. This scene concludes the principal action of the first act, where Pedro served as arbiter and matchmaker. This initial act has shown us both the significance and insignificance of names and titles, the foolishness and hypocrisy of man, as well as the need to employ reason and common sense even in the pursuit of love. But the act doesn't conclude there, for we return first to the gypsy camp, to find the gypsy
Inés and Belica in conversation with one another. Belica dreams of being wealthy and marrying a king. Inés, who like Pedro has the capacity to see things as they truly are, warns Belica of her presumptuousness, remarking, "Confiada en que eres bella, / tienes tanta presunción. / Pues mira que la hermosura / que no tiene calidad, / raras veces aventura" (I, vv. 1060-1065). Although we eventually learn that Belica is, in fact, of noble birth, this doesn't change the fact that she is egotistical, vain, flirtatious, and presumptuous, certainly not characteristics of true nobility. But as we observe in the following acts, the nobles of this play are no better than she.

Pedro and Maldonado reenter at this juncture, and Pedro is briefly introduced to Belica. They spot Marina, a stingy widow, approaching, whom Inés unsuccessfully asks for alms. Once the widow and her squire Llorente have left, Maldonado then explains her great fortune "Pues es fama / que tiene diez mil ducados / junto a los pies de su cama en dos cofres barreados / a quien sus ángeles llama" (I, vv. 1173-1177), explaining further that she only gives a single real every month to a blind beggar who says prayers on behalf of her deceased family members:

| por si acaso sus parientes, |
| su marido y ascendientes |
| están en el purgatorio, |
| haga el santo consistorio |
| de su gloria merecientes; |
| y con sola esta obra piensa |
| irse al cielo de rondón, |
| sin desmán y sin ofensa. |

(I, vv. 1188-1195)

With the character of the widow, Cervantes provides commentary and critique, comparable to what we have seen in *El rufián dichoso*, of hypocritical acts of religious devotion that are devoid of any real sentiment of charity and good will towards mankind. The widow believes that she can buy her way into heaven, and it is this grave mistake that paves the way for another of Pedro's ingenious confidence tricks. He agrees to help Maldonado swindle away her money, but he comments, "Vamos, y verás después / lo que haré en aqueste caso / por el común interés" (I, vv. 1212-1215).
While Pedro is acting out of *self-interest* here, he is *not* acting out of *selfish* interest. Unlike the typical picaroon, he once again has the concern of his community in mind, in this case acting as a kind of Robin Hood figure, swindling from the avaricious old widow to benefit his newfound gypsy family, and Belica, in particular.

An *alguacil* (court officer), the *alcalde* Martín Crespo, and the *regidor* (council member) Sancho Macho discuss preparations for a festival to be attended by the King and Queen at the commencement of the second act. Martín Crespo explains that before leaving his service (after joining the gypsies), Pedro suggested that they perform a most unusual dance for the king:

*Dijo que el llevar doncellas
era una cosa cansada,
y que el rey no gusta dellas,
por ser danza muy usada
y esta ya tan hecho a vellas;
mas que por nuevos niveles
lleve una de donceles
como serranas vestidos;
en pies y brazos ceñidos
multitude de cascabeles[.]* (II, vv. 1243-1252)

Martín Crespo shows himself once again to be completely incapable of reaching a decision on his own, relying on the "wisdom" of Pedro. It is clear in this instance that Pedro is laughing at the lack of sensibility of Crespo, by suggesting this travesty of a popular dance spectacle for the king's entertainment. In addition to displaying Crespo as an inept town magistrate, this scene also serves as a critique of the tendency of the *vulgo* to seek out newness and innovation, even at the expense of quality. Crespo, in his simplicity, is easily impressed with Pedro's suggestion for the dance, because it is novel, and hence, he believes it will impress the king. It should be clear to him that it will wind up being a fiasco, since the idea of replacing young virginal woman with bearded men for the same tradition is inherently comical. The Alguacil, on the other hand, declares, "Si juzgo al parecer mío, / nunca vi cosa peor; / y temo que, si allá vais, / de tal manera volváis, / que no
acertéis el camino” (II, vv. 1296-1300). But Crespo accuses him of being envious, and proceeds with his plan, remarking, "porque invenciones noveles, / o admiran o hacen reír" (II, vv. 1306-1307). In this respect, Crespo once again shows his preoccupation with innovation, irrespective of quality. With this scene, it is likely that Cervantes is indirectly criticizing elements of *el teatro nuevo*, as well as the tendency of *el vulgo* to flock towards whatever is novel rather than considering its overall quality first, evaluating it on the basis of its artistic composition, rather than simply on the basis of whether it is innovative.

The following scene features Pedro in yet another role: that of a blind beggar. As we learned earlier from his recounting of his past, Pedro is versed in how to pretend to be unsighted, as well as the slang and mannerisms of the blind, which he learned from his old visionless (yet unusually perceptive) former master, details which add further verisimilitude to Pedro's bluff. In this case, Pedro must be wary, as the truly blind beggar, who has been collecting alms from Marina, takes issue with Pedro's presence, insisting, "Hermano, vaya a otra puerta, / porque aquesta casa es mía, / y en rezar aquí no acierta" (II, vv. 1334-1336). Pedro insists that he is there only as a courtesy, and that there is no reason for the "fellow" blind individual to get upset. He skillfully obtains information about the miserly widow from the other mendicant, so that he might more effectively scam her. The two have a conversation that reveals Cervantes' own intimate knowledge of the sub-culture of blind beggars, and their profession of memorizing scripture and prayers for any occasion so as to better inspire the charity of others towards them. As Pedro informs us, he is skilled in reciting verses to cure both infirmities of the body and passions that afflict the soul, a service he performs in exchange for their generous donations.

When the widow finally appears, Pedro promises to reveal miracles to her if she dismisses the other blind man. She agrees, and Pedro proceeds to weave an elaborate tale to con her out of
her money. He claims that the souls of her deceased relatives in purgatory have chosen one from among their number to take on the form of an honorable old man, so that he might convey their needs to obtain relief from their torment or to obtain pardon for their sins. He then assures her that this man will come by later to give her a list of their demands, but that she must meet him alone, and that she must give him all the money he requests. Pedro finally tells the widow that the old man will have the same form and countenance as him, so that she might recognize him. In this scene, the trick here bears similarity with the one played by the student on Pancacio in the interlude *La cueva de Salamanca*. Instead of using her intellect and powers of reasoning to deduce that the more likely explanation for what she is witnessing is that she is being conned, the old widow is so entrenched in her superstitious, and ultimately self-serving desire to save her soul that she completely ignores all logic. Although she is stingy, Marina is very credulous. In this regard, she shows herself to be just as superstitious as Benita in the earlier episode, but with the added negative quality of her egotistical attitude.

In the following scene, Maldonado addresses Belica, advising her to take the hand of Pedro in marriage. Belica refuses, preserving her grand designs of becoming associated with royalty. Although Belica ultimately achieves her desires, there is a significant contrast between the sound advice that Maldonado gives her here and the irrational will of Crespo to refuse initially the marriage between Clemente and Clemencia in the first act. Maldonado advises, "Cásate, y toma tu igual, / porque es el marido tal / que te ofrezco, que has de ver / que en él te vengo a ofrecer / valor, ser, honra y caudal" (II, vv. 1580-1584). Unlike Crespo, Maldonado demonstrates that he has given the union of Pedro and Belica considerable thought, and is trying to match her with her equal. But Belica simply refuses to listen, since she has much bigger pretentions. When Belica leaves, and
Pedro reemerges on the scene, dressed now as a gypsy, Maldonado converses with him about Belica's refusal. Pedro and she are kindred spirits, and he understands her desires, remarking:

Déjala, que muy bien hace,
Y no la estimes en menos
Por eso; que a mí me aplace
que con soberbios barrenos
sus máquinas suba y trace.
   Yo también, que soy un leño,
príncipe y papa me sueño,
emperador y monarca,
y aún mi fantasía abarca
de todo el mundo a ser dueño. (II, vv. 1597-1604)

With these verses, Cervantes reestablishes the parallel but also opposite trajectory of Pedro and Belica, as we shall see at the play's conclusion.

The King then enters with Silerio, one of his criados, both of them in pursuit of a wounded deer. Belica impertinently flirts with the King:

Señor, yo digo una cosa:
que el Amor y el cazador
siguen un mismo tenor
y condición rigurosa.
   Hiere el cazador la fiera,
y aunque va despavorida,
huyendo en larga carrera,
consigo lleva la herida,
puesto que huya dondequiera;
   hiere Amor el corazón
con el dorado harpón,
y el que siente el parasismo,
llena tras sí su pasión. (II, vv. 1641-1654)

Although the comparison between the hunter and Cupid/Eros was a common trope, the King doesn't expect to hear such poetic erudition from the mouth of a common gypsy, and is indeed quite taken with Belica, though he initially denies it. Silerio informs us that it is simply to save face in front of the Queen that he dismisses Belica's high aspirations, and not because he doesn't like her. This initial contact between Belica and the King is essential for interpreting their
relationship and interaction throughout the remainder of the play, for it isn't completely clear whether the manner in which she behaves is warranted. What is clear is that she does transgress the boundaries that her initial rank and social standing would have allowed, which ultimately has positive consequences for the character herself, but only because she was indeed correct about her noble birth. Her behavior after her "transformation" towards the gypsies who took care of her and brought her up, however, is significantly less forgivable, and is censured harshly by Cervantes. For his part, Pedro realizes that Belica will not desist from the pursuit of nobility, and decides not to continue pursuing her romantically, declaring, "Mira, Belica: yo atino / que en poner en ti mi amor / haré un grande desatino, / y así, me será mejor / llevar por otro camino / mis gustos" (vv. 1685-1690). Cervantes plays with the audience's expectations that Pedro and Belica will get married at the end of the play, instead choosing to have them pursue parallel but nevertheless distinct destinies. We will see Cervantes explore the deliberate denial of his audience's expectations in a different way later in our analysis of La entretenida.

In the following scene, an Alguacil of the court enters after Pedro makes his exit, and converses with Maldonado about the arrival of the King and Queen to the dance and festivities that are to come. The scene serves mostly as exposition for the audience, to reinforce the fact that the queen is extremely jealous by nature, of which the Alguacil reminds us in his conversation with Belica.

At this point in the text, there is a significant inconsistency. Pedro had earlier told Maldonado of his plan to dress as a hermit in order to complete his swindle of the widow (II, vv. 1695-1698). Therefore, the scene of the engaño of Marina would seem to make most sense after the scene we have just analyzed, particularly considering what follows. In the princeps edition of the text, nevertheless, which is the only version of the text we have from the date of its original
publication in 1615, the following scene comes at the beginning of Act III. Joaquín Casalduero explains "Hay que suponer, creo, que el editor traspapeló los pliegos. Esta escena del engaño debe ir en la jornada segunda, probablemente entre el diálogo del comisario de las danzas con Maldonado y Belica y el próximo diálogo entre el criado del rey y la gitana Inés" (187). While it is clear that there has been some sort of error in the transmission of the text, given the chronological order of events clearly indicated by the dialogue and costumes, there has been a considerable amount of disagreement as to how this error occurred. Díaz Larios and Canavaggio agree with the conclusion of Casalduero, and choose to include this scene (vv. 2127-2371) in act II of the play. Zimic, however, disputes this, and makes the case instead that either Cervantes himself committed an error, or it is an artistic choice on his part. 287 López Alfonso has argued that the scene is where it belongs, and that it reinforces the dramatic artifice of the piece. 288 Although I am inclined to agree with Casalduero and previous editors that have relocated the scene to the second act, since there is no way to be certain exactly where the scene belongs, it seems that Sevilla Arroyo and Rey Hazas' decision to leave the text as it appears in the princeps edition with a footnote is perhaps the most prudent course of action. In keeping with their model, I will preserve the verse numbers they use for the scene.

In the scene in question, Pedro, dressed as a hermit, reappears before the widow, with details of her family members. It is never made explicit in the text how Pedro knows the names and some of the circumstances of her deceased relatives, but given what we know of his wit, ingenuity, and linguistic and conversational dexterity, it seems likely that he researched her family situation, gleaning the details he needed from other villagers, the gypsy camp, and perhaps even

288 López Alfonso, 271-77.
from the blind beggar. Whatever the case, Pedro is able to manipulate Marina with great skill, as she has no doubts that he is, in fact, the messenger sent to her by her relatives in purgatory. In a very comical scene, Pedro describes to her the specific torment that each of her relatives is experiencing and specifies an exact monetary quantity that is required to liberate them from their torment. As the widow asks questions about additional relatives, Pedro invents new torments for them as well, accompanied by corresponding payments for the salvation of their souls. Before long, Pedro has conned her out of almost the entirety of her inheritance. As Zimic has observed, this scene represents "una aguda sátira de la falsa devoción religiosa, que es un mero regateo mercantil de oraciones e indulgencias, con el intento grotesco de sobornar a Dios mismo, a precios meticulosamente calculados: ridícula superstición, sin, por otra parte, el menor asomo de un verdadero sentimiento cristiano, como la caridad o el amor al prójimo" (270). I am absolutely in agreement with this reading, in which Pedro takes Marina's crass interpretation of religious devotion to its logical extreme, specifying an exact fiscal correspondence between the torment suffered by each relative and the amount of money required to free the soul from torment. In this way, Cervantes satirizes what is tantamount to an attempt to bribe God. Although it can't be said that the widow is entirely self-serving, since she does at least seem to care about her relatives, this scene is a clear critique of "charity" that fulfills only a selfish purpose, rather than aiming to benefit all people, including complete strangers, in the interests of human kindness and compassion. The widow's superstition is significantly less innocent in this regard than Benita's folkloric beliefs ridiculed earlier, for in this case, there is much more of a self-serving purpose behind it.

Ironically, Pedro is much less selfish than the widow, since he doesn't intend to keep the money for himself, but rather seeks it for the benefit of Belica. Pedro comments:

---

Belilla, gitana bella,
todo el fruto deste embuste
gozarás sin falta o mella,
aunque tu gusto no guste
de mi amorosa querella.

Cuanto este dinero alcanza
se ha de gastar en la danza
y en tu adorno, porque quiero
que por galas ni dinero
no malogres tu esperanza.  (III, vv. 2322-2331)

Although he knows it will not help him win her love, Pedro selflessly wishes to give the money to Belica, so that she might be better positioned to win the favor of the royals. It is also for this reason, as well as for the fact that Pedro is still dressed as a hermit and speaks with Maldonado about his success, that I agree with Casalduero's placement of this scene directly before the conversation between Silerio and Inés in Act II. It could also occur directly after this scene, but the stage direction "Entran Maldonado y Pedro, de ermitaño" makes much more sense if there is a scene between these two encounters, as does Inés' remark about Maldonado's return.

The dialogue between Silerio and Inés itself is a short scene that concerns Belica and the Queen's jealousy. Here we learn from Silerio of the King's earlier hypocrisy in dismissing Belica, as Silerio informs, "[P]ues la quiere ver el rey / con amorosa intención" (II, vv. 1747-1748). Inés, for her part, agrees to tell Belica of the King's wishes, and to keep this knowledge a secret from anyone else, so as not to incur the Queen's wrath. The King's orders belie his nobility, and he shows himself to be clearly motivated by lust in his amorous desire for Belica, behavior unbecoming of a king. Although Casalduero believes "Ya que el rey entra en escena como rey y como enamorado, y se presenta como rey enamorado según el convencionalismo tradicional" (184), the fact that Silerio uses the phrase "con amorosa intención," as well as "Pudiérase usar la fuerza / antes aquí que no el ruego" (II, vv. 1759-60), are indicative of the king's less than noble intentions towards
Belica, particularly considering that he is already married. Though his love does indeed follow the paradigms of courtly love, his behavior seems more becoming of a young prince or noble bachelor than a married regent. I think it more likely, therefore, that Cervantes is boldly criticizing the lack of propriety and self-control of their passions that the royals demonstrate. This will become more apparent in the third act, where the King and Queen recognize their faults, showing that they are not beyond redemption.

The dialogue that follows this scene between Maldonado and Pedro quite clearly alludes to the *engaño* of the widow, with Pedro still dressed as a hermit, observing, "Aunque yo pintara el caso, / no me saliera mejor" (II, vv. 1779-80). Maldonado praises his skill as a master of *ingenio* and *engaño*, comparing him to Brunelo (II, v. 1781), a famous thief from Boiardo's *Orlando innamorato* and Ariosto's *Orlando furioso*,\(^{290}\) as well as to the mythological Greek hero Sinon and the orator Demosthenes (II, vv. 1789-90). Inés informs the two of the arrival of the royals, and Pedro proclaims, "Haga, pues, Belica alarde / de mi rica y buena andanza; / púlase y échase el resto / de la gala y hermosura" (II, vv. 1793-96). In other words, Pedro provides the money he swindled from the widow so that Belica and the other gypsies can be very well dressed for the dance performance for the royals. This scene would also seem to indicate that Pedro very much knew what he was doing in advising the magistrate, Martín Crespo, to put on a ridiculous show for the King and Queen, in which men would perform the dance dressed with jingle bells and ridiculous garments. Knowing that the show would be a fiasco, and probably never come to fruition, Pedro already has a "back-up plan" prepared, which he probably plotted all along.

In the following scene, the King anxiously awaits Belica's arrival, after being informed by Silerio that she has agreed to meet with him. In equal measure as he anticipates her presence, he

\(^{290}\) See ed. Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas, 202, n. 44.
dreads that the Queen will become aware of his amorous intentions, and that he will not be able to placate her jealous rage. In the bickering between the King and Queen that ensues, we see a pair of royals that love one another, but that are nevertheless controlled by the affliction of love, but in opposite ways. In the case of the king, he cannot curb his amorous instincts, and in the case of the Queen, she cannot control her suspicions and anger at the thought of her husband loving another. The audience is left to wonder, perhaps, if these royals cannot even govern themselves, what kind of rulers could they possibly be?

As Martín Crespo and Tarugo enter, and explain the incredible failure of the proposed dance. Crespo airs his grievances to the King, and explains that the King's own pages, when they saw how the young male "dancers" were costumed, proceeded to beat them with old rags and throw clumps of dirt at them. He explains, "y con trapajo y con lodo / tanta carga les han dado, / que queda desbaratado / el danzante escuadrón todo" (II, vv. 1887-90). The description of the treatment of the dancers is a complete travesty, and initially seems of relatively minor importance to the principle themes of the play. But Crespo comments with surprising insight, "¡Oh, cuántos pajes se crían / en Corte para perderse! / Pensé que por ser del rey, / y tan bien nacidos todos, / usarían de otros modos / de mejor crianza y ley" (II, vv. 1913-18). What he says is correct. Even though the dance prepared by Crespo is laughable and indeed, worthy of ridicule, the behavior of the pages is not becoming to servants of the crown. It is unsurprising that the court is so poorly disciplined, given what we have already seen in the behavior of the royals themselves. The scene is no doubt primarily funny, but Cervantes is still able to tie it in with the principal theme of the play of the great stage of life, and the hypocrisy of the actors in it. In spite of their noble origins, the members of the court depicted in this comedia behave anything but nobly, and their servants reflect this as well.
Tarugo then brings in Mostrenco, one of the badly beaten male dancers, and the latter comments that he is unable to dance, as one of his toes has been broken from the beating. Crespo, furious, asks the King and Queen to discipline their pages, but they refuse, commenting amongst themselves:

| REINA. | El alcalde es estremado. |
| REY.   | Y la danza bien vestida. |
| REIN.  | Bien platicada y reñida, |
|        | y el premio bien esperado. (II, vv. 1955-1958)

The King and Queen feel that the performers have been aptly "rewarded" for the travesty they would have presented. Once again, Cervantes doesn't moralize to his audience but simply presents a scene and allows them to draw their own conclusions.

Pedro enters, dressed again as a gypsy, with the entirety of the gypsy band, arriving just in time to save the proceedings. Although the gypsies dance beautifully, Belica trips and falls before the King. As he helps her to her feet, he comments, "y entended que con la mano / os doy el alma también" (II, vv. 2015-16). Belica acts entitled to the courtesy that the King shows her, infuriating the Queen and sending her into an envious rage. As quickly as the mirth and humor of the scene begins, it comes to a crashing halt, as the Queen orders the immediate arrest of the gypsies. Inés, frantically, arranges to meet in private with the Queen to attempt to ameliorate her wrath. Before exiting, the King comments to Silerio, "Venid, y daremos orden / cómo se tiemple en la reina / la furia que en ella reina, / la confusión y desorden" (II, vv. 2079-2082). The antanaclasis of the word "reina" here serves to reinforce the disparity of her governing position and her current lack of self-governance brought on by her extreme jealousy. The act concludes with Pedro and Maldonado discussing the rapid and unfortunate turn of events, and making plans to escape if necessary. Pedro comments, "que las iras de los reyes / pasan términos y leyes / como es su fuerza suprema" (II, vv. 2120-22).
In the scene we have just analyzed, the Queen arbitrarily closes down the performance of the gypsies because she feels an attack of jealousy, thereby demonstrating the whims and abuse of power of which the nobility was capable. In his analysis of Pedro de Urdemalas, Stanislav Zimic indicates that the relationship between the King, Silerio, and the Queen reveals a veiled critique of the court of Felipe III. "[E]l rey, Silerio y la reina revelan una semejanza esencial incontrovertible con Felipe III, el Duque de Lerma y la reina Margarita de Austria, respectivamente" (279).291 While I am more inclined to agree with Florencio Sevilla Arroyo and Antonio Rey Hazas, who state in a footnote, "No vemos razones concretas que permitan sostener que la alusión a los monarcas se refiera a Felipe III y a su mujer, como cree S. Zimic,"292 I nevertheless feel that Zimic has touched upon something significant with this observation. Although there is nothing in the text that directly links the King and Queen to the reign of Philip III, the monarchs of this text are extremely unconventional for the theater of the time period. Sevilla Arroyo and Rey Hazas themselves have observed that the maternal, benevolent queen and the king as a paternal, tutelary, supreme judge that are omnipresent throughout the theater of Lope de Vega and his followers are completely absent here.293 What we have with these monarchs, as I mentioned earlier, is an unmasking of the figures of power. Cervantes isn't afraid in his drama to tackle the notion that even the King and Queen themselves may perform their roles poorly in the great drama of life.

Although this revelation in his theater is indeed quite bold for his time, it wouldn't be fair to say either that it is "subversive" or "revolutionary," as I fear some modern critics might be tempted to claim. Rather, Cervantes, guided once again by his Erasmian humanism, gives a kind of platonic critique of the royals he depicts in this play. Although we don't see how they govern

293 Ibid., p. LII
explicitly except in one or two rare instances, it is implied in the text that they would govern poorly. After all, how can they possibly govern a whole kingdom if they can't even govern themselves? We have a King and Queen who enjoy partaking of leisure activities such as hunting and attending public spectacles, similar to the unoccupied Duke and Duchess of *DQII*. Additionally, the King is driven by his romantic and sexual urges, against his better judgment, and is willing to abuse the privilege of his power to obtain his desires. We have seen how he enlists Silerio to help him in his "romantic" quest. On the other hand, we have seen how unbalanced the Queen is, as she is prone to fly into a jealous rage at the slightest hint of unfaithful thoughts from her husband. Though her feelings are not unwarranted, her reaction to her insecurity is most unsettling. Like her husband, she is willing to abuse her power to get what she desires, and we feel that her persecution of the entire gypsy band simply because she was angered with Belica is unwarranted to say the least. I don't believe that Cervantes is so bold as to directly attack the monarchs of his time with these characters, but is rather demonstrating in a general sense the fault of rulers who are incapable of self-governance and the propriety attributed to their rank. Cervantes' criticism, it seems to me, is less of a contemporary, revolutionary nature, and is something more akin to an early modern precursor of the concept of *noblesse oblige*.

When the principal action of our drama resumes in the third act, the Queen has a lengthy conversation with Marcelo, an old knight of the court, about the true origin of Belica. Marcelo is able to identify Belica by some gems that were in her possession, that originally belonged to her noble house. As it turns out, she is the illegitimate daughter of the duchess Félix Alba and Rosamiro, the Queen's brother. Marcelo explains that he was charged with ensuring the child's

---

294 Taking into account the displaced scene of the Widow and Pedro dressed as a hermit, which, as we discussed, almost certainly belongs towards the end of the second act.
safety, and that he delivered her to a gypsy woman, who took in the child. He told the gypsy not to remove the girl's jewelry so that he might one day recognize her and return her to her rightful place in the court when the time was right. In this seemingly miraculous and artificial way, Belica achieves her dream of becoming royalty, and the dramatic tension between the King, Queen and Belica is instantly dissolved. The King and Queen forgive one another for their folly, and acknowledge their respective faults. This might seem a facile resolution at first glance, but it reveals quite a bit about all three characters. The monarchs, in spite of their faults, are capable of recognizing when they are in error and of making amends for their mistakes. In this regard, they show the potential for growth and improvement. In contrast, Belica shows her true egotistical nature. No sooner does she discover her true origins than she completely turns her back on the gypsies that raised her and cared for her for so many years. Inés reminds Belica of their kindness towards her, imploring her:

INÉS. 

Haz algún bien, pues podrás,
a nuestros gitanos pobres;
así en venturosa sobres
a cuantas lo fueron más.
Responde a lo que se ve
de tu ser tan principal.

BELICA

Dame, Inés, un memorial,
que yo le despacharé. (III, vv. 2652-2659)

In Belica's detached, procedural response to Inés, we see how quickly she has forgotten her origins, and how little humility she has. Although she doesn't outright deny Inés' request, she seems to want to distance herself from her previous life as a gypsy as quickly as possible, and already assumes the formal tone of courtly language.

As Pedro reenters in the following scene, dressed as a student, he comments on his constantly mutable nature, remarking on the variety of jobs, clothing, and languages he has used and changed, and compares himself to Proteus. In his guise as a student, which he dons in order to
hide from the Queen's wrath, not knowing what has become of the gypsies, Pedro reverts somewhat to his older, more roguish ways. Given that he is on the run (or so he believes), he resorts to using a confidence trick for personal gain. He encounters a laborer with two chickens, who blames his inability to sell them on the fact that it is Tuesday, a day of ill-omens. Pedro once again has a laugh at the simple nature of the townsfolk, claiming that he requires the chickens as payment to free two captive soldiers held in Algiers. Pedro's claim is obviously absurd, and two actors that happen to be passing by, initially attempt to expose his ruse. But the players are quite amused with Pedro's ability and technique, and decide to join him in his ruse for fun. The poor laborer, who really can't afford this "act of charity," and isn't in the mood for games, runs off, claiming he will find a peace officer.

Pedro, intrigued by the actors and their craft, decides to join them, adopting the name Nicolás de los Ríos in the process. He explains, "que éste fue el nombre de aquel / mago que a entender me dio / quién era el mundo crüel, / ciego que sin vista vio / cuantos fraudes hay en él" (III, vv. 2822-26). As most editors of the text have observed, Nicolás de los Ríos was, in fact, the name of a real-life dramatist and actor who had his own theater company by 1586, and became one of the eight playwrights officially recognized and allowed to perform by the decree of 1603. He died in 1610, the year that Cervantes likely would have begun work on this play. The lines between reality and fiction become blurred, as Pedro becomes a real-life actor that had graced the Spanish stage just a few years earlier, in a game of mirrors in which the fictional characters reflect the actors that depict them. Adding to this correspondence, Sevilla Arroyo and Rey Hazas observe in their introduction that the name Malgesí is one of the characters of Viaje entretenido (1603) by Agustín de Rojas, another playwright whose life circumstances coincide with Pedro's in that he

too held a wide range of odd-jobs over the course of his life before becoming an actor. Cervantes clearly wanted to give a greater dimension of reality to Pedro's transformation. In this way, he adds not to the effect of breaking the fourth wall, but rather, blurring the boundaries altogether between this fiction and our reality.

It is at this moment in the drama, too, when Pedro finally realizes the significance of the sage Malgesí's prophesy:

Ya podrá ser patriarca,  
ponfíce y estudiante,  
emperador y monarca:  
que el oficio de farsante  
todos estados abarca  
y, aunque es vida trabajosa,  
es, en efecto, curiosa,  
pues cosas curiosas trata,  
y nunca quien la maltrata  
le daré nombre de ociosa. (III, vv. 2862-2871)

Pedro/Nicolás understands now in full the dynamic power that the actor possesses and embraces this power for his own. This scene reads additionally as a defense of the comedia against its many detractors, who would accuse it of being an idle waste of time or worse (as I shall discuss at this chapter's conclusion). But Cervantes is not content to merely comment on the fact that theater and acting are beneficial for society. Indeed, he wants us to understand the qualities that make a good actor as well. Pedro and an Autor de comedias discuss what faculties an actor must possess in the following scene. Pedro has quite an intuitive knowledge of the theater, commenting

---

296 See ed. Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas, p. L.  
297 This play refers to "un cierto Malgesí" (I, v. 745) as the party responsible for imparting the prophecy to Pedro. Here, the name is used in a generic fashion to refer to a sage, clairvoyant, or magician, as opposed to the specific use of the proper name as the character from Carolingean legend that we see in La casa de los celos.  
298 The reader should be aware that an autor de comedias was not the author of the play, in the modern sense of the term, but rather the impresario of a theater company, responsible for rehearsals, staging and direction, as mentioned earlier.
that an actor must be, "De gran memoria, primero; / segundo, de suelta lengua; / y que no padezca mengua / de galas es lo tercero" (III, vv. 2900-2907). An actor must have a prodigious memory, be articulate and possess good oratory abilities, and must have an extensive wardrobe. Additionally, Pedro/Nicolás decries the abuses of speaking with affectation, of not maintaining proper decorum pertaining to the character depicted. He must also be able to control the emotions of the crowd, "Ha de sacar con espanto / las lágrimas de la risa, / y hacer que vuelvan con [p]risa / otra vez al triste llanto" (III, vv. 2920-24). In this way, Pedro de Urdemalas presents us not with a teatro dentro del teatro proper. Rather, the whole play is an experimental metatheatrical production, a commentary about plays and playwriting in the form of a play. This in and of itself would be a major feat, but Cervantes goes further with his probing, philosophical gaze. In commenting on plays and playwriting, Cervantes also uses the metaphor of el gran teatro del mundo to show his audience both what a life can teach us about theater and what truths the theater can reveal to us about life. As Pedro de Urdemalas reaches its conclusion and the various interwoven threads of the plot come together, Pedro is made aware by an Alguacil de las comedias that Belica is, in fact, the Queen's niece.

Shortly thereafter, the King and Silerio are greeted by musicians, singing of the strange circumstances of Belica. The Queen, Belica (now called Isabel), Inés, Maldonado, the autor, Martín Crespo, and Pedro de Urdemalas all take the stage in the lengthy final scene. Pedro prostrates himself at the feet of the royals, explaining his new station in life. In particular, he addresses Belica/Isabel:

Tu presunción y la mía
han llegado a conclusión:
la mía sólo en ficción;
la tuya, como debía.
[...]
Yo, farsante, seré rey
cual le haya en la comedia,
y tú, oyente, ya eres media
reina por valor y ley.
En burlas podré servirte,
tú hazme merced de veras,
si tras las mañas ligeras
del vulgo no quieres irte. (III, vv. 3030-3034 & 3040-3047)

With these lines, Pedro neatly sums up his situation and that of Belica. He has fulfilled his
destiny though the transformative power of acting, and she, against all probability, has become
almost a member of the royal family. He places himself in her service, and asks for her favor.
Pedro then appeals to the King to grant him and his theater company special royal privilege as
actors, explaining that acting requires special skill, and that not just any old fool should be allowed
to perform. He beseeches the King, "Preceda examen primero, / o muestra de compañía, / y no por
su fantasía / se haga autor un pandero" (III, vv. 3080-3083). Pedro wants to establish a universal
standard of performance that all theater companies be required to pass, so as not to represent
absurdities, or simply, represent poorly. For her part, Belica, much more generously than she
behaved towards Inés, agrees to convince the King to accept this petition. The King and Queen are
both pleased by these words, and agree to his terms, with the Queen astutely observing, "Vamos a
oír la comedia / con gusto, pues que los cielos / no ordenaron que mis celos / la volviesen en
tragedia" (III, vv. 3100-3104). Not only is the Queen now aware of her prior fault, but she also
gives us insight into the dramatic structure of Pedro de Urdemalas. Cervantes manipulates his
audience utilizing established theatrical convention, and almost sets up the play to end in tragedy
at the culmination of the second act. Just as Pedro earlier observed that an actor must be able to
make his audience laugh one minute, weep the next, and return to laughing in an instant, that is
precisely what Cervantes sets up with the resolution of this comedy. Pedro de Urdemalas comes
extremely close to ending in tragedy, as the Queen herself has observed, only to end on an
optimistic note, which breaks with the established conventions of genre in Cervantes' time. It is also a brilliant amalgam of many different genres, as we have observed. The ending of the play, in spite of the incredible coincidence of the circumstances of Belica's life, still feels verisimilar, and avoids in this way the expected ending of a marriage between Belica and Pedro. In avoiding a conventional ending, Cervantes gives us a drama that feels more true to life.

Before the drama concludes, Belica once again refuses to make time for her former gypsy family, as she brushes Maldonado and Inés aside when they attempt to speak with her. Inés angrily remarks, "¡Válame Dios, y qué ingrata / mochacha, y qué sacudida!" to which Pedro responds, simply, "La mudanza de la vida / mil firmezas desbarata, / mil agravios comprende, / mil vivezas atesora, / y olvida sólo en un hora / lo que en mil siglos aprende" (III, vv. 3128-3135). Pedro now fully understands the nature of life as a dynamic, ever-changing set of circumstances. Although Belica has achieved a higher status than him, unlike him, she remains basically unchanged. She is still essentially the same vain, egotistical girl she was at the beginning of the play. As our drama resolves, Pedro is greeted by Martín Crespo, and we are reminded of all of Pedro's sound judgments and good acts. Crespo informs Pedro that both Clemente and Clemencia and Benita and Pascual are now living happily together as married couples, thanks to his aid. This serves to remind the audience of how many people he has helped along the way, in the course of his own evolution.

As the comedy draws to a close, Pedro is set to present a play for the King and Queen. In an ingenious game of mirrors, the play that Pedro describes bears a remarkable similarity to the play that the audience would just have witnessed:

Mañana, en el teatro, se hará una,

---

299 The masculine indefinite article is used in the text with hora. There was still considerable of variability with some of the noun genders in the time period, as this example demonstrates.
donde por poco precio verán todos
desde principio al fin toda la traza,
y verán que no acaba en casamiento,
cosa común y vista cien mil veces,
ni que parió la dama esta jornada,
y en otro tiene el niño ya sus barbas,
y es valiente y feroz, y mata y hiende,
y venga de sus padres cierta injuria,
y al fin viene a ser rey de un cierto reino
que no hay cosmografía que le muestre. (III, vv. 3166-3176)

This final passage of the play helps us to better understand what Cervantes set out to do in writing *Pedro de Urdemalas*. Contrary to what is often said about *Pedro de Urdemalas*, this ending does not present teatro dentro del teatro. Indeed, we never see the drama that Pedro claimed he would represent for the King and Queen performed. Hence, in the strictest sense of the phrase, I don't believe it is correct to say that there is theater within the theater. *Pedro de Urdemalas*, much like *Don Quixote*, is more profound than that. It isn't simply a work of theater containing scenes of self-referentiality or "breaking the fourth wall." Rather, the whole work is a meta-theatrical reflection on the relationship between the theater of life and the life of the theater, upon which we have already commented.

With this play, and in particular, with the scene in which the Queen shuts down the dance of the gypsies, I believe it is highly likely that Cervantes is commenting indirectly on the moral debate surrounding the theater that took place towards the end of the reign of Philip II. A lot of the debate surrounding theater in Cervantes' time, not unlike contemporary debates about cinema, television and video games, had to do with moralists' concern that audiences would be unable to distinguish between theater and reality. The idea that an actress could depict the Virgin Mary one moment, and then play a prostitute or an innkeeper in one of the interludes between acts, was considered extremely inappropriate, even scandalous by some. Malveena McKendrick informs
us\textsuperscript{300} that a memorandum was submitted to King Philip II in 1598 suggesting that theaters in Madrid not be re-opened after the customary mourning period caused by the death of the King's daughter was concluded. This memorandum gives examples of the inappropriate behavior and lack of \textit{decorum} of some of the actors, who would bicker with one another or drink backstage while still in costume, dressed as saints and angels. Interestingly, the author of the memorandum is believed to be Cervantes' contemporary, the classicizing dramatist and poet Lupercio Leonardo de Argensola, as McKendrick further explains.\textsuperscript{301} Whether or not this is the case, Philip II was persuaded by the memorandum and other complaints that he received, and he banned \textit{corrales de comedia} and private theater performances later that same year. This decree notwithstanding, and given the huge financial importance of the theater in Madrid, theater companies were back in operation scarcely a year later, following the death of Philip II. Thus, during Cervantes' lifetime, he was privy to a very controversial and polemic debate against the theater. As we earlier observed, Nicolás the los Ríos is the name of one of the "autores" officially recognized by the decree of 1603. With this play, Cervantes proposes his own decree about what the ideal theater should resemble, and its relationship with our reality.

\textit{Pedro de Urdemalas} is a play as dynamic and polysemous as the titular character himself. Although of a much smaller scale, what Cervantes has achieved with this comedy is nothing short of a meta-theatrical presentation and reexamination of various genres and of the role of theater in society. Cervantes presents his audience with several interrelated episodes, unified by the common thread of Pedro, and his dynamic observation of and participation in each scene. Without moralizing, each moment of the play presents us with vignettes of the deceptions, foolishness, and

\textsuperscript{300} In her \textit{Theater in Spain (1490-1700)}, 201-204.

\textsuperscript{301} Ob. cit., 202.
hypocrisy of everyday life. We see how Pedro is able to skillfully manipulate and traverse this world, until he becomes so adept at representing different roles that he finds his ideal profession: that of an actor. Finally, through his meditations on theater, Pedro becomes aware of a very significant difference between the type of mendacity that occurs in everyday life and the kind of "lying" that occurs upon the stage. Stage acting allows for a kind of constructive, imaginative lying, that, rather than seeking to conceal the true nature of the world, aims to reveal it, that is, when theater achieves its highest ends. In many regards, the play reads as a resounding defense of the virtue of theatrical representation against its detractors, but with the caveat that, in order to be true to life and reveal truths about life, the theater must not be bound excessively by tropes and conventions, and must always present its subject matter with great verisimilitude. In Pedro's observations about theater, Cervantes intimates his own theatrical goals and comments on the kind of theater he would like to see come to the forefront, theater such as this very play. Although Belica seems to achieve her dream in "reality," whereas Pedro only in fiction, as Nicolás de los Ríos, he achieves a kind of transcendence that Belica never can.  

Even as a queen, she is still merely a fictional character. Pedro/Nicolás, on the other hand, becomes and actor of flesh and blood, in this way creating a masterful "three-dimensional" effect that is infinitely more sophisticated than anything we will ever see with silly modern optical tricks and ridiculous looking glasses. With the final moment of Pedro de Urdemalas, and with Pedro assuming the name of a real-life actor, and addressing the audience directly, Cervantes deliberately obfuscates the boundaries between reality and theatrical fiction, placing the great stage of the world face-to-face with the world of the stage.

At the play's conclusion, Pedro is able to free himself from the shackles of the farce of life by assuming his final and greatest role: the role of an actor. By playing this part that suits him

---

302 My thinking coincides here with Rey Hazas & Sevilla Arroyo, ob. cit., p. XLIX
perfectly, Pedro is the only character in the play that is able to achieve true freedom. Rather than have the farce of life assign to him a role that doesn't really suit him, Pedro, through his artistic expression on the stage, is able to be many things simultaneously, in a way that enlightens his audience to the truth of the world that he has been able to perceive. That truth is the revelation of things as they really are as opposed to how they appear (*el ser y el parecer, or la esencia y la apariencia*). The meta-theatrical game that Cervantes elaborates with this comedy is not an instance of *teatro dentro del teatro* in the truest sense of the term, as a play is never represented for the characters, but only intimated. Rather, as Zimic has observed, Cervantes juxtaposes two different stages: the actual, artistic stage, and the stage of the great theater of the world.\(^{303}\) In so doing, he reveals the hypocrisy in the "play-acting" we engage in on a daily basis to fulfill our assigned roles in life, and the creative power that theater has to reveal greater truths to us about the world we inhabit. Enhancing this effect, Cervantes avoids conventional character tropes and endings of the *teatro nuevo* school of theater, so as to provide us with a world that feels more "true to life."

---

\(^{303}\) Zimic (1992), 287.
10. LA CASA DE LOS CELOS

*La casa de los celos* is one of the more seemingly convoluted Cervantine texts, that is characterized by numerous episodic complications at the plot level, but at a deeper level, it demonstrates a great deal of thematic unity. The most fundamental and obvious source for the text is the Italian epic poem *Orlando Innamorato* (I-II, 1483; III, 1495), by Mateo Boiardo, as Armando Cotarelo Valledor observed early on in the modern interpretation of this play. From this source material comes a great deal of the dramatic intrigue; the rivalry between Roldán and Reinaldos, the arrival of Angéllica at the court of Charlemagne, the challenge she issues for winning her hand in marriage, the apparition of the sorcerer Malgesí, the confrontation between Reinaldos and Roldán over Angéllica, Angéllica's journey into the jungle of Ardenia, and the death of her brother, Argalia, at the hands of the moor Ferraguto. We must be careful, nevertheless, not to fall into the same trap as Cotarelo Valledor of characterizing the text as sharing a fundamental "identity" with *Orlando Innamorato*. As Canavaggio later correctly observed, the text is in fact considerably more nuanced. It is a "reelaboration which puts into play a triple process: the revision of material properly belonging to the text of Boiardo, the periodic insertion of pastoral episodes, and the

---

304 See Cotarelo Valledor, 490-493.
305 Since there are various alternate nomenclatures for the characters of the Carolingian cycle throughout the centuries and in different countries, I have opted to maintain the names as they appear in the text for the sake of clarity as opposed to translating them into their English variants, with the exception of Caromagno, whom I refer to as Charlemagne, since of all the characters, the historical king Charlemagne or Charles I of France is the only one that constitutes part of the common knowledge of an average educated English speaker today. In English, the character names are actually closer to the original Italian; Reinaldos is normally called "Rinaldo," and Roldán or Rolando is rendered "Orlando."
306 Originally known as Maugris, and appearing as Malagigi or Malagi in Boiardo's text; known in Spain as Malgesí.
307 In his *El teatro de Cervantes*, Cotarelo y Valledor observes, "Su gran semejanza, mejor dicho, identidad [con *Orlando Innamorato*], con el argumento y detalles de la comedia, resultará patente a cuantos se tomen la molestia de compararlos" (493).
crystallization of the fiction constituted in this way around the allegorical and mythological motif of the passion of love."\textsuperscript{308}

In addition, the second major source for the text is the Ludovico Ariosto's \textit{Orlando furioso}, as Chevalier first indicated.\textsuperscript{309} The episodes involving Angélica's meeting with the shepherds, Reinaldos' misfortune, Marfisa's personal quest for glory, the interference/intervention of Malgesi's sorcery, and the apparition of the angel announcing the Muslim invasion at the play's conclusion, are all elements drawn from Ariosto. Finally, Cervantes also incorporates Spain's great epic hero, Bernardo del Carpio, into the fantastical space of the play.

Chevalier\textsuperscript{310} and Canavaggio\textsuperscript{311} have determined that \textit{La casa de los celos} was probably composed sometime around 1585, the same year that the two Italian Roland epics reached the height of their popularity in Spain, and the same year that Cervantes published his own bucolic narrative, the \textit{Galatea}. This was coincidentally also the same year that Agustín Alonso published \textit{Las hazañas de Bernardo}, which popularized the Bernardo del Carpio in Spain. The fact that all of these elements comprise the material of the play makes it all the more likely that it was indeed composed sometime around this year.\textsuperscript{312}

We can already begin to see the complexity of the seemingly unrelated elements that make up the source material for \textit{La casa de los celos}. In light of this, it is perhaps not surprising that early twentieth-century critical evaluations of this drama were overwhelmingly negative, with

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{308} "Cette réélaboration met en jeu un triple processus: une refonte de la matière proprement boïardienne; une insertion périodique d'épisodes pastoraux; enfin, une cristallisation de la fiction ainsi constituée autour du motif allégorique et mythologique de la passion amoureuse."
\item Canavaggio (1977), 104; the translation is my own.
\item Chevalier (1966), 445-446.
\item Chevalier (1966), 441-446.
\item Canavaggio (1977), 220.
\item See ed. Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas, pp. XXXII-XXXIII.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Menendez Pelayo\textsuperscript{313}, Cotarelo\textsuperscript{314}, and Francisco Ynduráin\textsuperscript{315}, judging the work increasingly more harshly. It is only since the study of Casalduero\textsuperscript{316} moving forward, and especially the invaluable contributions of Canavaggio\textsuperscript{317} to the evaluation of this drama that it has been more broadly understood and appreciated in its literary context. Friedman,\textsuperscript{318} Zimic,\textsuperscript{319} and Meregalli\textsuperscript{320} have all given the play a much more positive evaluation, and contributed more recently to our contemporary understanding of the drama.

*La casa de los celos* constitutes what is no doubt one of Cervantes' earlier attempts at theater, and as such, shows many flaws, particularly with regards to its conception of stagecraft. It reveals a clear lack of the professional trade understanding of the difficulty involved with staging certain effects. *La casa* is nevertheless a very revealing drama, as it shows us how Cervantes' own understanding of stagecraft evolved over time, and also informs us about his earlier efforts at parodying the chivalric and pastoral traditions so popular in his day. Indeed, with this play, Cervantes demonstrates what was perhaps the initial insight that would later come to full fruition in his *Don Quijote*: namely, the separation between literary convention and reality. Among other things, with this drama, Cervantes criticizes the falseness and egocentric nature of the "courtly love" displayed in both the chivalric and the pastoral traditions. In parodying these two popular genres in this play, his audience is able to understand that the so-called "love" displayed by the

\[\text{313} \text{"Sólo la reverencia debida a su inmortal autor impide colocar esta obra entre las que él llama 'conocidos disparates.'" Menéndez y Pelayo (1902), p. XCV.}\]
\[\text{314} \text{"No hay que buscar aquí orden ni concierto, ni arte por ningún lado." Ob. cit., p. 494.}\]
\[\text{315} \text{"Ni con la mejor voluntad hallamos rasgo que pueda salvar esta comedia de una repulsas total." ed. Ynduráin (1962).}\]
\[\text{316} \text{Ob. cit., 56-78.}\]
\[\text{317} \text{Particularly, Canavaggio (1977).}\]
\[\text{318} \text{Friedman (1981), 281-89.}\]
\[\text{319} \text{Zimic (1992), 119-138.}\]
\[\text{320} \text{Meregalli, 23-35.}\]
characters is really little more than a thinly veiled self-love, motivated by sexual desire, greed, and jealousy. Although the broader reflection upon the nature of literature on the whole that we would refer to as "metaliterary" today is entirely absent from this particular play, it nevertheless demonstrates that Cervantes was beginning to consider as early as 1585 the inconsistencies between many literary "heroes" and the Christian ideals they were supposed to embrace.

The first act commences with the Carolingian subject matter of *Orlando inamorato*. Reinaldos and Malgesí discuss Reinaldos' apparent anger with Roldán, whom he feels has insulted him. He explains that he heard Galalón and Roldán conversing, and that when he entered, they laughed at him for his poor condition, as he wasn't as richly adorned in his attire as they were. The motive for the initial dispute between Reinaldos and Roldán might not seem of great consequence, as the main source of their rivalry later on is clearly their mutual desire to win the hand of Angélica. This initial scene, however, serves two primary purposes. First of all, it introduces the idea that their rivalry is ongoing, and has to do with more than their shared love for Angélica. Secondly, it shows the insecurity that Reinaldos harbors as a result of being of a lower social standing than Roldán. Although he may well be Roldán's equal in combat as a paladin of Charlemagne, his impoverished condition leads him to constantly suspect, as it turns out rather baselessly, that he is being looked down upon by his brothers-in-arms. This idea is important, as the notion of money interfering in love, both as a result of el interés and as a result of the envy that it engenders in others, is one of the principal preoccupations of the comedy, as we shall see in the second act.

When Reinaldos confronts the pair about their laughter, Galalón flees, demonstrating his cowardly nature, while Roldán stands his ground, and tries to assure Reinaldos of his error in judgment. Reinaldos ask Roldán, "¿puede, por dicha, la pobreza / quitar lo que nos da naturaleza?" (I, vv. 71-72), arguing that while he may be poor, his ability in combat will prove his true nature
as a great warrior, something that money cannot buy or alter. But Roldán has no idea why Reinaldos is so enraged. After Malgesí explains the situation, Roldán remarks, "Hiciera mal, porque por Dios os juro / que no pasó tal por pensamiento; / y esto puede estar cierto y seguro, / pues yo lo digo y más con juramento" (I, vv. 105-109). Roldán ameliorates the situation, proclaiming that he had no such pretension, and declaring Reinaldos his equal and comrade-in-arms. This initial misunderstanding between Reinaldos and Roldán is the first in a series of episodes of escalating bravado and posturing about a combat or duel that never comes to fruition. One of the most humorous elements of Cervantes' take on this subject matter is that, unlike their counterparts in the literary tradition from which they are drawn, Charlemagne's paladins never actually fight one another here. Time and again, they almost come to a duel, but one circumstance or another prevents them from ever drawing their swords and confronting one another. Not only does this fact elicit a lot of laughter, but it also draws attention to the inaction of this version of the knights. For one reason or another, these knights are simply impeded from facing one another in combat, either by the intervention of another character, by having second thoughts, or even by magic, as we shall see recurrently throughout the play. When they come before Charlemagne in the following scene, Roldán even remarks, excusing their petty rivalry before the emperor, "Muchas veces confieso que reñimos, / mas ninguna de veras" (I, vv. 148-149).

In the following scene, when they do defend their actions before Charlemagne, Galalón is once again made to look like the coward he is. Fearful that they would come to harm one another grievously, he informs Charlemagne of the paladin's rivalry. For his part, the emperor is persuaded by Roldán's assurance that their conflict with one another is not altogether that serious. But before they can discuss the matter further, a Page enters the court, bearing news of Angélica's arrival. Not knowing her identity, the Page can describe her only as "Una diosa del cielo" (I, vv. 175),
accompanied by pages and *escuderos*. At this point, Malgesí wishes to learn her identity and consults his magic tome, prompting the first of a very elaborate series of stage directions. More than any other Cervantine drama, this comedy is replete with elements of special effects, as this direction makes clear:

> Apártase MALGESÍ a un lado del teatro, saca un libro pequeño, pónese a leer en él, y luego sale una figura de demonio por lo hueco del teatro y pónese al lado de MALGESÍ; y han de haber comenzado a entrar por el patio ANGÉLICA la bella, sobre un palafrén, embosada y la más ricamente vestida que se pudiere; traen la rienda dos salvajes, vestidos de yedra o de cáñamo teñido de verde; detrás viene una DUEÑA sobre una mula con gualdrapa: traen delante de sí un rico cofrecillo y a una perrilla de falda; en dando una vuelta al patio, la apean los salvajes, y va donde está el EMPERADOR, el cual, como la vee, dice[.]321

We see here that the play will make use of supernatural elements, through the use of trap doors and the stage pit, the figure of the demon that follows Malgesí around, as well as other devices we will later examine. Cervantes' desire to control not only the elements of stagecraft, but also the appearance of the characters emerging on the stage, becomes readily apparent here as well. Although we have seen these elements utilized in similar ways in other plays, as we already discussed in, for example, *El rufián dichoso*, Cervantes must have later realized that the excessive specificity of such details as those he gives us here was not needed. We do not see quite this level of detail in any of his subsequent plays. Additionally, this stage direction immerses us in a world of fantasy and magic, in which the special effects of the play do most of the work of conveying the fantastical world of chivalry and sorcery that Cervantes parodies here. Unlike his other plays, the miraculous and the magical are indeed part of the dramatic space of *La casa de los celos*. It is perhaps in part because of this heavy reliance on special effects, and the difficulty involved in staging them, that this play was never performed in its day.

321 Stage directions between vv. 184-185.
Malgesí's magic tome proves ineffective in determining Angélica's nature, and we don't learn who she is until she enters the court in the next scene, accompanied by her savage attendants. The scene of Angélica's arrival in the court itself comes almost unaltered from the original in Orlando Inamorato. Angélica explains that she is the daughter and sole heir to the great King Galafrón. She advises Charlemagne's court that she is to marry the man who can defeat her brother, the brave Argalia, in singular combat, and that he awaits whosoever wishes to challenge him in the jungles of Ardenia. Angélica explains the terms of the duel:

Quien fuere derribado del golpe de la lanza, ha de ser preso, porque le está vedado poner mano a la espada; y es expreso del rey este mandato, o, por mejor decir, concierto y pacto.
Y si tocare el suelo mi hermano, quedará quien le venciere levantado a mi cielo, o noble sea, o sea el que se fuere, y no de otra manera. (I, vv. 250-259)

The initial presentation of the duel and its terms here is indeed quite faithful to Ariosto's text. The most important aspect of this contest for the hand of Angélica is that it is supposed to be an honorable joust between knights, more akin to a tournament for honor and entertainment than a real fight to the death, as the combatants are not to draw swords. Significant also in this scene is the language used with respect to the enchantress Angélica, who is described as "enchanting" in both senses of the word. Unlike Reinaldo and Roldán, Malgesí is the only character present who distrusts Angélica and her motives, remarking, "¡El mismo engaño en esta falsa vive!" (I, v. 277).

Although it is not readily apparent at this juncture, I believe Cervantes' goal here is to criticize the falseness of the motivations of courtly love as depicted in both the pastoral and the chivalric genres. In so doing, he puts the "falseness" of the female characters being sought after on display, as well
as the selfish and hypocritical motives of those seeking them out. This is evident as the Reinaldo and Roldán promptly resume their rivalry, this time motivated by the "prize" of Angélica, as soon as she leaves.

Malgesí warns of the dangers of this enchantress, commenting, "Manda prender aquella deshonesta, / que será, a lo que veo, / la ruina de Francia en cierto modo" (I, vv. 290-292). He explains that her father, Galafrón, wanted to chain up the Twelve Peers, so that he might conquer Charlemagne's territory for his own. The peers will not be able to defeat Argalia in a mounted duel, since, "La lanza es encantada, / y tiene tal virtud, que, aquel que toca, / le atierra, y es dorada; / por eso pide aquella infame y loca / que la espada no prueben / los que a la empresa con valor se atreven" (I, vv. 309-314). Charlemagne, however, doesn't fully believe Malgesí's warning, and orders him to intervene in this matter if he truly believes his own words. Malgesí vows "Haré cuanto mi industria y ciencia pueda" (I, v. 330). As we shall see, although he employs magic of a clearly demonic origin, the necromancer Malgesí in this play acts more as a sage trickster, intervening to prevent catastrophe. His magic, however, is perhaps not up to the task of overcoming the real powers of enchantment that Angélica possesses with her beauty, as he himself observes, "¡Oh ciego engaño, / oh fuerza poderosa / de la mujer que es, sobre falsa, hermosa!" (I, v. 335-7).

In the following scene, we depart from the subject matter of the Carolingian epics. The Spanish hero Bernardo del Carpio is introduced for the first time, accompanied by his Biscayan squire. Although the squire is undoubtedly depicted in a stereotypical and deliberately comedic fashion, his advice to Bernardo in this scene is nevertheless sound. He is concerned that Bernardo is leaving Spain in search of frivolous adventure at a time when the frontiers are, in fact, in peril due to the threat of the Moorish invasion. "Bien que en España hay que hacer; / moros tienes en
fronteras" (I, vv. 350-351). But Bernardo is determined to prove his mettle in France, and desires the advice of Merlin, the great sorcerer of Arthurian tradition. Sleeping next to a memorial erected to Merlin, Bernardo seeks out the wisdom of the sage magician. Cervantes describes this monument in his stage directions: "ha de ser un mármol jaspeado, que se pueda abrir y cerrar" (between vv. 414 & 415). In this case, Cervantes shows again his desire in this early play to make use of various tricks of stagecraft to enhance the magical qualities of the play. While Bernardo sleeps, Angélica and her brother Argalia meet up, and she confers with him about her recent meeting in the court of Charlemagne. Upon their exit, a spirit emerges from Merlin's memorial, with instructions for Bernardo. The Spirit of Merlin advises Bernardo, as his own squire had already done, that he should return to his native land to seek his true glory: "Deja estas selvas, / do caminas ciego, / llevado de un curioso desvarío. / Vuelve, vuelve, Bernardo, a do te llama / un inmortal renombre y clara fama" (I, vv. 503-505). With the character of Bernardo, Cervantes presents an honorable but yet foolhardy knight, who initially commits the error of seeking glory and fame abroad instead of remaining to defend his homeland against foreign powers. We might consider whether, after returning from his captivity in Argel, Cervantes was already beginning to strongly question the Spanish expansionist agenda of his day, suggesting instead that the country might be better served by turning its focus inwards, and defending its boarder from foreign invaders.

In the following scene, both Roldán and Reinaldos wander haplessly through the fog of the enchanted jungle of Ardenia, in search of Argalia. Reinaldos falls asleep, and Roldán comes upon him. Although he feels intense jealousy, and desires to kill Reinaldos in his sleep, his sense of honor overpowers his homicidal thoughts, as he declares in soliloquy:

Yo fui Roldán sin amor,
y seré Roldán con él,
en todo tiempo fiel,
pues en todo busco honor.
   Duerme, pues, primo, en sazón;
que arrimo te sea mi escudo;
que, aunque amor vencerme pudo,
no me vence la traición. (I, vv. 595-603)

Imprudent as the two knights may be, they are still honor-bound, and even Roldán's intense jealousy cannot compel him to such a cowardly act of treason. Roldán sleeps by Reinaldo's side, and as Reinaldo awakes, he is gripped by similar thoughts, and wonders if Roldán's motives in sparing his life were noble, or motivated simply by a lack of regard for his person. After awakening Roldán, the two exchange harsh words and prepare to duel. Their fight, however, is impeded by Merlin's magic, as Cervantes notes in his stage direction: "Vanse a herir con las espadas; salen del hueco del teatro llamas de fuego, que no los deja llegar" (Btw. vv. 730 & 731).

One is left to wonder exactly how this would have been performed on the stage. Did Cervantes intend to make use of some incendiary device or have a bonfire that could be summoned up from the stage pit, or did he simply intend to use lights or some other device that resembled flames? Unfortunately, we may never know the details of the pyrotechnic effects that the author desired to employ in this play. He doubtless realized later in his career the technical difficulties that such a staging would require, and perhaps in part owing to this reason kept most of his later plays confined to earthlier terrain, devoid of such artifices.

The flames, however, are insufficient to restrain the two combatants, and Bernardo must intervene, at the request of the spirit of Merlin. The three exchange words, and Bernardo attempts to pacify Reinaldos and Roldán, before Merlin finally employs his magic to cause the two would-be combatants to step backwards away from one another, all the while continuing to affirm their courage and hurling insults at one another. Roldán is then compelled by the magic to retreat upwards towards the mountaintop, followed by Reinaldos in pursuit, and Bernardo. We are then
introduced to the fierce female warrior Marfisa, seeking to challenge them, and prove herself the
equal or better of any male warrior. Upon seeing the others, she ascends the mountain herself,
while Roldán, and Reinaldos continue to attempt to fight, unable to draw their swords due to
Merlin's enchantment. Bernardo, meanwhile, tries to keep Roldán and Reinaldos from harming
each other. Although their inability to fight is due to Merlin's intervention, the impotence of the
would-be combatants in this scene completely and deliberately obliterates any gravity the scene
would otherwise have.

The farcical, chaotic ascent of these four characters is brought to an abrupt end when the
distraught Angélica enters, bearing the news that her brother has been killed by the giant,
Ferraguto, who drowned him in a river. Argalia's death brings to an end the impending duel with
the peers, as well as the pretext of marriage. Although the Moorish giant Ferraguto is, in fact,
Bernardo's enemy, he declares Ferraguto his "friend," with deliberate irony, but also to draw the
ire of Roldán away from Reinaldos, and towards himself. At this juncture Angélica flees, having
no real interest in marrying either Roldán or Reinaldos. Just as Angélica exits the stage, Marfisa
enters, coming to her aid, and putting a stop to any combat that would otherwise take place. But
Roldán and Reinaldos then both proceed to chase after Angélica, each promising to cut the other
to ribbons should he dare to follow her. Finally, the scene concludes with Marfisa conversing with
Bernardo and his Biscayan squire, while Bernardo explains to her what has just transpired. She
remarks, "Iréte acompañando, / que quiero saber más de tu hazaña; / que descubro en ti muestras
/ que muestran que eres más de lo que muestras" (I, vv. 883-886). The Cervantine polyptoton and
word play with "mostrar" in this closing phrase promises much more to be revealed about both
characters in the acts to follow. Marfisa, clearly impressed with Bernardo in this, their first
encounter, agrees to accompany him in search of adventures.
As the second act commences, we depart from the realm of the chivalric tradition and are abruptly immersed in a parody of the pastoral genre, in which many of the same jealous concerns of the first act plague the characters of this second genre as well. The act begins with two shepherds, Lauso and Corinto, lamenting their inability to win the favor of a beautiful Shepherdess named Clori, with whom they are both enamored. The scene makes use of all the expected literary conceits of the genre, but also has some rather unconventional commentary. Corinto observes:

> Pesado contrapeso es la pobreza<br>  para volar de amor, ¡oh Lauso!, al cielo,<br>  aunque tengas cien alas de firmeza.<br>  No hay amor que se abata ya al señuelo<br>  de un ingenio sutil, de un tierno pecho,<br>  de un raro proceder, de un casto celo.<br>  Granjería común amor se ha hecho,<br>  y dél hay feria franca dondequiera,<br>  do cada cual atiende a su provecho. (II, vv. 916-925)

Corinto observes in this passage, in a rather crass fashion, the facility with which love is procured through monetary exchange, and how all the traditional virtues cannot compete against it. Neither wit, ingenuity, a tender heart, a noble origin, nor an honest demeanor can compete against the tyranny of money. In case Corinto's meaning wasn't entirely clear, he drives home the point by describing love as reduced to "granjería común," and a "feria franca," comparing the love to the commerce of animals, with the implication that money has reduced love to mere sexual commerce. Corinto and Lauso are both extremely angered by their mutual inability to woo their love Clori, who instead loves Rústico, a wealthy shepherd. Although they seek to win her love, the implications they make about her in private belie the "honesty" of their intentions, and instead reveal their lustful jealousy.

Once Clori enters, she sings a rustic villancico, which Corinto and Lauso use as the basis for a song of their own with which they try to court her. In topical Petrarchan language, they
accuse her of being of bronze, marble, or oak in her firmness in rejecting their pleas, instead choosing the wealthy Rústico. Clori, for her part, is very pragmatic in her response, declaring, "Con él tengo, Corinto, más ganancia / que contigo, con Lauso y con Riselo, / que vendéis discreción con arrogancia" (II, vv. 991-993). Clori rightly points out that, while Lauso and Corinto accuse her of being superficial for her desire to marry for money, they behave arrogantly in their criticism of her. She also believes Rústico to be more intelligent than they, owing to his skill in earning money. Lauso and Corinto chastise her for this superficial view, "es gusto de mujeres ordinarío" (Ii, vv. 1021), and vow to prove Rústico's foolishness with a prank of their invention.

Lauso and Corinto trick Rústico into assisting them with the capture of a nonexistent parrot. After tying a rope to each of his arms, declaring that they will hoist him up so they may reach the parrot, the two roguish shepherds tie Rústico to the tree. Clori, however, is not the slightest bit perturbed by Rústico's simple-mindedness. She frees him and suggests more gifts and favors from him, all the while commenting that the sonnets and songs of Lauso and Corinto cannot compete with the riches that he offers her (II, vv. 1161-1164). The following exchange between Lauso and Clori concludes the scene and helps situate it within the broader context of the play:

LAUSO.   Eres mujer y sigues tu costumbre.
CLORI.   Sigo lo que es razón.
LAUSO.   Será milagro
         hallarla en las mujeres.
CLORI.   ¿Qué razones
         puede decir la lengua que se mueve
         guiada del desdén y de los celos?
         Tú eres la causa. (II, vv. 1165-1169).

With this scene of the exchange between the shepherds vying for the love of Clori, Cervantes presents a triangle of flawed individuals. Lauso and Corinto share the same flaws. They are both witty and clever with their tricks and word-games, but lack any financial capital, or any compelling reasons why Clori should marry them. Rústico, for his part, is simple-minded, but
nevertheless wealthy, and in this sense, a better provider for Clori. Consequently, Clori shows herself to be quite rational and cunning. Although it seems from the broader context of the play that Cervantes presents her as a character worthy of criticism as well for her willingness to assent to the power of money, she nevertheless ably defends herself against the jealous criticism of the other two Shepherds. As she correctly asserts, her preference for Rústico, though not born of true love and compatibility, is an eminently rational decision. In fact, she refuses to hear the critical words of Lauso and Corinto who are ironically behaving far less sensibly than she. As she indicates again, any points they make about the true nature of love are nullified by their own patently obvious jealousy and disdain for Rústico. Of all the participants in this scene, Clori is clearly the most mentally adept, and shows a facility both to manipulate Rústico into giving her what she desires as well as to defend herself from the criticism of the other jealous shepherds. Although the play is clearly quite critical of her actions, she certainly appears to come out ahead of all three male shepherds.

With the arrival of Angélica in the following scene, the two genres of the Pastoral and the Chivaric come together and intersect for the first time in the drama. She asks for asylum from her pursuers, which the shepherds grant her, providing her with the rustic clothes of a shepherdess and a place to stay. Reinaldos, in his pursuit of Angélica, comes upon a fire-breathing dragon in the woods. The necromancer Malgesí emerges from the mouth of the beast, proclaiming, "Soy el Horror, / portero de aquesta puerta, / adonde vive el temor / y la sospecha más cierta / que engendra el cielo de amor" (II, vv. 1263-1267). The dragon's maw is, in fact, a cave of sorts, in which Reinaldos must confront his own fears and suspicions, and come to self-knowledge. This trope of the cave of challenges and trials that instill in a main character a greater degree of self-awareness is, of course, parodied later in *DQII*, ch. XX, when the knight-errant enters the Cave of Montesinos.
In this play, however, the scene is much less parodic and much more allegorical. Some scholars have even suggested that allegorical figures of this scene are a way for Cervantes to express the internal, psychological frame of mind of the characters without employing the soliloquy ad nauseum. Zimic, for example, comments:

De seguro, meditando mucho sobre estos problemas, a Cervantes en cierto momento se le ocurrió una solución ingeniosa: representar "las imaginaciones y los pensamientos escondidos del alma, sacando figuras morales al teatro" (Prólogo a Ocho comedias y ocho entremeses, 180); es decir, escenificándolos concreta, plásticamente. Con este recurso no sólo elimina la artificialidad de estos extensos soliloquios, sino que se puede mostrar la experiencia interior del modo más gráfico posible y, a la vez, en sus inherentes vagos matices, contribuyendo así a la verosimilitud y estimulando aún más la imaginación del público." (132-133)

Although I am uncertain as to how this adds to the "verosimilitude" of the text, I agree with Zimic's observation about how Cervantes makes use of this technical device. At this juncture of the play, Reinaldos is forced to confront his Suspicion, his Curiosity, his Desperation and finally, His Jealousy (Celos), personified. With this magical artifice, Malgesí sought to cure Reinaldos of his ailments of love. But the forces in his heart are too powerful, and begin to consume him, until Merlin intervenes on his behalf by confronting Malgesí.

Once Malgesí agrees to leave Reinaldos alone, the latter encounters the goddess, and her son Cupid (also referred to as Amor in the stage directions), who are summoned by Merlin to aid Reinaldos, and cure him of the madness of his jealousy. This version of Venus, defended by Cupid, is a grotesque parody of the original. In this scene, Cervantes alludes to the magical fountain waters of the original Boiardo text that cause whoever consumes them to fall out of love. Here, Venus and Cupid guide Reinaldos to the fountain. But Venus is relatively powerless, and Cupid appears

---

with a broken bow and a quiver filled with gold coins. When Venus asks him how he came to this sad state of affairs, Cupid replies:

Has de saber, madre mía,
que en la corte donde he estado
no hay amor sin granjería,
y el interés se ha usurpado
mi reino y mi monarquía.

Yo, viendo que mi poder
poco me podía valer,
usé de astucia, y vestíme,
y con él entremetíme
y todo fue menester.

[...]

Del carcaj hice blosón,
y del dorado arpón
de cada flecha, un escudo,
y con esto, y no ir desnudo,
alancé mi pretensión. (II, vv. 1448-1467)

With these verses, Cupid states that he has replaced his traditional arrows of Gold and Lead (to make people fall in and out of love, respectively), with money. As he explains, bribes are a far more efficacious means of persuading people to marry whomsoever he chooses for them. This quoted material helps us to piece together the seemingly disparate episodes of this act. Although at first glance, the appearance of Cupid and Venus to aid Reinaldos has little to do with the shepherds we encountered earlier, we now see how the episodes are intertwined. Recalling the first act, we are reminded that Reinaldo's initial conflict with Roldán, before the two were even introduced to Angélica, was provoked by his perception that Roldán and the other knights held him in low esteem due to his lower economic standing. Similarly, Clori's attraction towards Rústico, and the subsequent jealousy of Lauso and Corinto is also a result of the pernicious influence of money in affairs of love. As Cupid explains, monetary bribes are a far more effective means of persuasion, even in matters of love, than any magic he possesses. And it is precisely this
leitmotif, that of the corrosive nature of money in matters of love, that unifies the pastoral and the chivalric episodes of the text.

As if on cue, the characters from the pastoral episode take to the stage once again at this juncture in the play, and Lauso and Rústico wish to show their reverence for the semi-divinity of love, as Rústico makes comical remarks about the minor cherub-like deity. Cupid explains the fate of each member of the trio to them. Predictably, he reveals to both Lauso and Corinto that they would be wise to abandon their pretentions, as Clori will never accept their love. To Rústico, and to the disguised Angélica, he proclaims, "Rústico, mientras tuviere / riquezas, tendrá contento: / mudará cada momento / Clori el bien que poseyere; / La pastora disfrazada / suplicará a quien la ruega" (II, vv. 1515-1519). In other words, Rústico will have Clori's love so long as he continues to possess riches, which will be in constant decline due to Clori's excessive spending of his wealth. Angélica, on the other hand, will fall for her pretender. There is additional deliberate and comical irony in the fact that, although Cupid informs Angélica that she will choose one of her suitors, he fails to mention which one, and thus doesn't resolve the conflict between Roldán and Reinaldos in the slightest. Although Corinto, Clori, and Lauso sing in reverence to Cupid as he and Venus depart on their chariot, Cupid has proven to be completely powerless and ultimately worthless in this scene against the overwhelming and subjugating power of money. His "prophetic" words don't really reveal anything the characters didn't already know to begin with.

It should also be noted that, before the shepherds sing Cupid's praises, when he is giving his proclamations about the future of the lovers, he finishes by declaring, "Y, esto dicho, el fin se llega de dar fin a esta jornada" (II, vv. 1520-21). It seems probable, as other scholars have noted as well,\(^{323}\) that this line is indicative of a four-act structure in an earlier draft of the play.

\(^{323}\) See ed. Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas, p. 143, n. 1.
demonstrating that Cervantes did revise and edit the play before its publication in the 1615 compendium. After all, he does inform us in his prologue that he was the first Spanish dramatist to reduce the dramatic structure from four or five acts to a mere three, and although this assertion is probably not entirely true, it is clearly a contribution he feels is significant.

In the following scene, Bernardo and his squire discuss Marfisa's desire to challenge the Twelve Peers to a duel, and Bernardo's determination to remain by her side, in search of adventure. Bernardo wishes to test Roldán's mettle in combat. Finding him overly distracted by his love for Angélica, Bernardo decides not to engage him, proclaiming "Quisiera yo remedialle si lo pudiera hacer" (II, vv. 1636-7), just as Roldán disappears through the trap door in the stage, in pursuit of Angélica. At this juncture of the play, Cervantes once again makes use of the sophisticated system of trap doors and characters appearing and disappearing rapidly from the stage, another indication of the play's early date of composition. It cannot be doubted that, although he never fully mastered the art of stagecraft itself, Cervantes' understanding of the difficulty of setups of this kind improved substantially throughout his career, and it is for this reason in large part that we don't see these devices used in his later theater. It must also be understood, however, that owing to the magical nature of this play, such devices were much more necessary here than in the vast majority of his theater, which inhabits a world much closer to a quotidian depiction of reality. It is not that one theater is more verisimilar than the other. It is simply that the two kinds of theater, the more "magical" and the more "realistic," are built upon different conventions and presuppositions of verisimilitude. As we can readily observe in Cervantes' later works, it seems he became increasingly more suspicious of any work that relied too heavily on magical or supernatural occurrences, owing, no doubt, to his own more "naturalist" and "empirical" world view.
Just as Reinaldos earlier faced his own insecurities born out of jealousy in their personified forms, Roldán is now confronted by the specter of La Mala Fama, a character who appears as a dark herald, with blackened wings, and bearing a trumpet. La Mala Fama warns him of the folly and shortcomings displayed by many great men before him who made grave errors in judgment "cuando de amor la vana ley siguieron" (II, v. 1670). Among those who erred, the personification of Ill Repute names Alcides (Hercules), King Solomon, and Marc Anthony, and cautions Roldán that the folly of his actions in his relentless pursuit of Angélica will lead to his eventual downfall in a similar fate to that of these otherwise exemplary individuals. Roldán dialogues with Bernardo about the wary words of the vision, concluding that all lovers indeed commit great foolishness in the pursuit of their love and resolving to follow a different path. Although this scene begins in a serious fashion and could easily provide more gravity and resolution to the conflict of the play, it is almost immediately rendered comical by what follows.

Upon recognizing Roldán, Marfisa once again wishes to prove her mettle in combat by crossing swords with him. But before this can occur, Roldán has a spontaneous change of heart and returns to his pining for Angélica, and declares, "Falsa fue aquella visión, / y de nuevo el corazón / parece que se me quema" (II, vv. 1728-1730). In the Orlando Innamorato, Rinaldo and Orlando indeed fall in and out of love with Angélica, and she with them, by means of enchantment. As they drink from the fountains of Love and Hatred in the forest, the love triangle of the original text is twice reversed. In my view, Cervantes parodies and trivializes here these spontaneous, magical interventions, as Roldán falls out of love for a mere second before immediately returning to his former longing. This brave knight, who is supposed to be highly rational and full of courage, is incapable of maintaining any kind of resolution when it comes to matters of love. Even Bernardo's squire remarks, "¡Por Dios, que se ha vuelto al tema!" (II, v. 1727), and "Poco ha durado
el amigo / en su honroso parecer" (II, v. 1733-1734). Without being pedantic, Cervantes ridicules the cannons of courtly love into which the Carolingean heroes are inscribed, by showing how fickle their emotions are, and how readily they can alter their resolve, albeit under the influence of magic. Let us not forget that feminine beauty itself, and the kind of power it exerts on men's hearts, was and is viewed as a kind of enchantment, after all.

As Roldán turns once again to pursue his love, he is greeted by La Buena Fama, who appears as the angelic counterpart to La Mala Fama, adorned with a white dress and multi-colored wings. La Buena Fama tries to dissuade him from pursuing Angélica, and attempts to steer him towards the pursuit of fame and accolades for his heroism, naming Judas Maccabeus and Julius Caesar as examples of the level of fame he could achieve. But Roldán is not persuaded, as he becomes aware that both visions of Fame must be mere illusions created by Malgesí to discourage him from his amorous quest. The second act ends with Roldán cursing Malgesí's trickery, and parting ways with Marfisa and Bernardo, who resolve to continue their own journey towards Paris and the court of Charlemagne. Although Roldán's rejection of the two images of Fama is rather abrupt, it nevertheless serves as an apt transition between the second and third acts, since the audience too leaves these heroes, and returns to the pastoral genre at the beginning of the final act.

Lauso and Corinto commiserate with one another over their loss of Clori in the opening of the third act. Corinto remarks, "tanto llorar es vicio / si bien lo consideramos" (III, vv. 1831-2). The two then decide to join Clori and Angélica in singing a pastoral song about the chains of love, in which they make references to the power of money once again, on debating the superiority of

---

324 Judas Maccabeus, the Jewish priest and Biblical figure responsible for leading the revolt against the Seleucid Empire, was one of the Nine Worthies (los Nueve de la Fama), the paradigmatic examples of great heroes for the middle ages. Cervantes also recalls Los Nueve in DQL, ch. V. See Montoto y Rautenstrauch, I, 286.
money over true love. Although Corinto has vowed not to let his sorrow get the better of him, he clearly still harbors the desire to show his mental superiority to Rústico, once again endeavoring to play a cruel prank on him. Since Rústico wishes to join them in their singing, Corinto says he will help make him a good singer with the use of a thread he has for holding up stockings. Rústico says he would like to be a contrabass, but as Corinto tightens the chord around his neck, the former bellows, "¡Que me ahogas, enemigo!, to which Corinto responds, "Contralto quedas, sin duda, / que la voz lo manifiesta" (III, vv. 1909-1910). The slapstick continues in this fashion until Clori intervenes on Rústico's behalf, and the scene ends with Corinto singing a folkoric song about a rich abbot who is humiliated at a carnival for being a foolish borrizo (ass) in spite of his wealth. Although scenes such as these are indeed quite comical, I believe the audience is also meant to see the pettiness of Lauso and Corinto in their treatment of Rústico, particularly in light of the fact that Clori has already made her choice. It is pure jealousy that guides their actions, and in the end, their juvenile display serves no purpose and actually makes them appear far worse in the eyes of Clori.

In the following scene, Angélica flees from Reinaldos, much to the confusion and consternation of the pastoral characters. Clori and Lauso leave to see what has upset her. As the three exit, Corinto and Reinaldos are left alone on the stage. Reinaldos initially launches into a semi-philosophical courtly love discourse against the cruelty of Eros. He pauses to ask Corinto if a miraculously beautiful woman has passed through the area recently. What follows is an interesting precursor to the clash of different linguistic registers and literary conceits that Cervantes would later carry to full fruition in Don Quixote. Reinaldos describes Angélica with the typical language of courtly love made famous by Petrarch and Garcilaso, comparing her hair to threads of gold, her teeth to pearls, her breath to the finest perfumes, her lips to coral, and her skin to white
marble. To this high literary language, Corinto responds quite rustically, with the language of a slightly more "true-to-life" shepherd. He declares that he has not seen such wonders pass through the area, and that if he had, it surely would have drawn his attention, "Que una espaciosa ribera, / dos estrellas y un tesoro / de cabellos, que son oro, ¿dónde esconderse pudiera?" (III, vv. 2006-2010). Mocking the high courtly language with which Reinaldos addresses him, Corinto also declares that although he has not seen this woman of immense beauty, he has indeed found something. When Reinaldos takes the bait and asks him what he has seen, Corinto responds, "Tres pies de puerco / y unas manos de carnero" (III, vv. 2017-2018). Corinto obliterates the high register of Reinaldo's speech, and brings the conversation down to the most quotidian, mundane level possible, infuriating Reinaldos, and provoking him to chase Corinto off-stage. Even though the scene is essentially a comedic aside, culminating in a bit of slapstick, this mocking of the courtly language of Reinaldos by Corinto sets a clear precedent for the much more elaborate parody and critique of the language and conceits of the pastoral genre that we see in DQ (in particular, DQI, ch. XI-XIV). It is not Reinaldo's love for Angélica that Corinto pokes fun at, but rather, the way in which he describes her in impossibly idealized terms.

Immediately following this comedic aside, which briefly removes the audience from the imaginary conceits of the play, we are abruptly plunged back into the heart of the magical space in which the action transpires, with Angélica crying out for Reinaldos to rescue her from two Satyrs that have taken her captive. Reinaldos is made impotent once again in this exploit, as he finds his feet bound by magic and is unable to pursue her captors. Reinaldos appears to witness Angélica killed before his very eyes, powerless to save her. He then threatens to take his own life as penance for his failure so that he might join her. Fortunately, before he can do so, Malgesí intervenes, explaining that the whole affair was but an illusion he conjured up. He explains:
Aquesta enterrada y muerta
no es Angélica la bella,
sino sombra o imagen della,
que su vista desconcierta.
Para volverte en tu ser,
hice aquesta semejanza;
que el amor sin esperanza
no suele permanecer. (III, vv. 2140-2146)

Malgesí merely wished to cure Reinaldos of the madness by appearing to remove the object of his love. But Reinaldos' yearning for Angélica is such that he would sooner destroy himself than continue to live having failed her. Malgesí has now failed on four separate occasions to cure the two paladins of their amorous affliction by means of his illusions. Indeed, all the power of his magic is nothing compared to the power of love, which itself pales in comparison to the subjugating power of money, as we have seen earlier. These are all different kinds of illusions that act upon the selfish desires of the characters and cause them to stray from their more noble natures.

The following scene takes place back at the court of Charlemagne, where Marfisa and Bernardo finally come face to face with Charlemagne himself and Galalón. Marfisa issues a challenge before all present to the Twelve Peers, proclaiming:

Soy más varón en obras
que mujer en el semblante;
ciño espada y traigo escudo,
huigo a Venus, sigo a Marte.
poco me curo de Cristo;
de Mahoma no hay hablarme;
es mi dios mi brazo solo,
y mis obras, mis Penates.
Fama quiero y honra busco,
no entre bailes ni cantares,
sino entre acerados petos,
entre lanzas y entre alfanjes. (III, vv. 2204-2211)
Marfisa presents herself here very much in line with the archetype of the *mujer varonil*, declaring her brave deeds a more accurate representation of her character than her feminine exterior. It is unsurprising that she is represented here as pagan or simply unreligious, since she does not learn of her true Christian origin and does not fight on the side of Charlemagne against the Saracens until much later in the source texts.\(^{325}\) What is significant in Cervantes' characterization of her fiery temper and her relentless pursuit of glory is that her attributes, while generally quite positive, still represent a kind of excess. Marfisa is so single-minded in her pursuit of fame and honor that she neglects not only love, but more importantly, faith. In this passage, she declares that her only god is her sword-bearing arm and her deeds. In spite of her overall positive depiction, these words could not have been seen as desirable qualities to a Christian audience. Marfisa and Bernardo's pursuit of glory is analogous in this way to the other characters' pursuit of an unrequited love. It is similar to jealousy in that the subject cannot bear the thought that someone else has taken away one's reputation of being the best or the bravest at arms, and hence endeavors to conquer all, heedless of the circumstances. Marfisa is no doubt presented as admirable for her virtues throughout the play, but her relentless pursuit of glory is excessive, and indeed quite unchecked by anything. She fights only for herself, not for any greater cause, nor for any god, neither Muslim nor Christian nor Pagan. From the standpoint of the Catholic audience of the time, this is her singular flaw, but it is one that is eventually remedied with her conversion to Christianity in the Orlando texts, a conversion that never takes place in this play, but is intimated to anyone familiar with the source material when she departs after the arrival of the personified Castile later in the comedy.

\(^{325}\) The conclusion of this play occurs chronologically before the major moment of revelation for Marfisa in the source text.
Curiously, when Bernardo chimes in, explaining that he too has come in pursuit of glory and that the duels must be to the death, he also relegates himself to the role of Marfisa's assistant, proclaiming that she has chosen him as her "ayudante" (III, v. 2235). In this way, he shows himself to be less aggressive, but perhaps also more level-headed and less impulsive than Marfisa. It is still curious that he presents himself here almost as her subordinate, as this is not true at any other point in the text. Perhaps he is merely assessing the situation before he decides to act.

At this juncture, Charlemagne also laments that his best paladins, Roldán and Reinaldos, are under the spell of Angélica and have hence left his court, for he truly believes no one can vanquish his own best warriors in honorable combat. Galalón, the paladin who would prove traitorous in the original Boiardo and Ariosto texts, accepts Marfisa's challenge, but he is "vanquished" in spectacularly pathetic and comical fashion, as we later learn. The entirety of this scene contrasts with the much more significant duel that initially appears to be taking place in the following scene, in which Roldán is finally able to confront and battle with Ferraguto for his murder of Angélica's brother and protector.

There is a rather abrupt transition at this point, in which Roldán and Ferraguto duel with swords in what is the only genuine scene of combat in the entire play. Roldán accuses Ferraguto of atheism and dishonorable conduct, declaring, "Tú le mataste, y fue alevosamente, / moro español, sin fe y sin Dios nacido" (III, 2273-2274). While the Moor denies these accusations, declaring that the victor in combat may do whatever he wishes with the vanquished, the audience knows already that Ferraguto has defeated Argalia dishonorably by drowning him, rather than by slaying him with his sword in their duel. By emphasizing that Ferraguto is both a Moor and that he has come from Spain, Cervantes prepares his audience for the conclusion of Bernardo's story arc in the play, in which he realizes that his pursuit of glory abroad is foolish, and that he should
return home to defend Spain's borders. In this way, Cervantes establishes the threat of the Moorish invaders making their way up through Spain, and eventually invading the remainder of Christian Europe, a much more immanent threat that must be attended to immediately by Spain's great heroes, and which Charlemagne himself must eventually confront as well.

Ferraguto is unable to hold his ground, as their duel is interrupted by the intervention once again of Malgesí and his magic. Roldán is confronted again with a false image of Angélica and of a satyr, as he desperately thrusts at Ferraguto, who disappears by means of the stage trap door. Finally, Malgesí manifests himself in his true form, and acknowledges that this has been yet another of his tests. As Roldán and the magician disappear from the stage (by means of the trap door, once again), we return to Bernardo and Marfisa in their travels.

In the following scene, Galalón, who has departed the Parisian court in pursuit of Bernardo and Marfisa, confronts them, wishing to demonstrate his superiority in combat. After Galalón properly introduces himself, Bernardo naïvely tries to praise him, but Marfisa, knowing his reputation as a traitor and a coward, confronts Galalón and challenges him outright. Galalón accepts agreeing to serve her and never again to draw his sword against her should she win. But before the contest can even begin, the combat is once again thwarted, this time not by magical intervention, but by Galalón's own laughable fragility. When Marfisa extends her hand to shake his as a show of good will between them, she crushes the bones of his hand. Galalon cries out in pain, astounded and frightened by the extreme strength of the woman standing before him, and then proceeds to faint. Not only is the scene extremely funny, but it shows both Marfisa's incredible strength and virile qualities, as well as the pathetic weakness of Galalón, who is finally withdrawn from the stage by two of the Satyr servants of Malgesí. The cowardice and treachery of Galalón are manifest here as physical characteristics, as are the bravery and steadfastness of
Marfisa. The scene is probably also a parody in part of Bernardo's eventual triumph over Roldán in the various Spanish versions of the epic, in which he crushes Roldán to death with his bare arms in the battle at Roncesvalles, as Cervantes also recalls in *DQI* (ch. I, p. 42 and ch. XXVI, p. 316). Although Malgesí doesn't appear on the stage in this scene, his voice is heard from off stage. He serves as the witness to this "momentous victory," and helps Marfisa by using his magic to inscribe the shield of Galalón with verses proving Marfisa's triumph, a fact which becomes relevant towards the play's conclusion.

Marfisa and Bernardo then sleep separately in the forest, awaiting future adventures, but Bernardo is awakened by the living embodiment of Castile, who, according to the stage directions, should appear holding a lion in one hand, and a castle in the other. Castile informs Bernardo that he must return to his homeland at once in order to prevent his uncle (Alfonso II the Chaste) from giving away Spanish territory to Charlemagne:

```
Advierte que tu tío,
contra todo derecho,
forma en el casto pecho
una opinión, un miedo, un desvarío
que le mueve a hacer cosa
ingrata a ti, infame a mí, y dañosa.
     Quiere entregarme a Francia,
temeroso que, él muerto,
en mis despojos no se entregue el moro,
y está en esta ignorancia
de mi valor incierto
y dese tuyo sin igual que adoro.
```

[...]

---

326 The direct source for Cervantes' version of Bernardo del Carpio is probably Agustín Alonso's *Historia de las hazañas y hechos del invencible caballero Bernardo del Carpio* (Toledo, 1585), as mentioned earlier, and as also alluded to in *DQI*, ch. VI, p. 85).
327 Alfonso II was willing to give away the territory of Castile to Charlemagne, since the latter had been named Emperor of Rome by Pope Leo III, but was ultimately stopped by his nephew Bernardo del Carpio. See ed. Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas, 237, n. 49.
Ven, y con tu presencia
infundirás un nuevo
corazón en los pechos desmayados;
curarás la dolencia
del rey, que, ciego al cebo
de pensamientos en temor fundados,
sigue vanos cuidados[.] (III, vv. 2461-2472 & 2480-2486)

In this final appearance of Bernardo, Castile helps usher him and his squire back home, where they can do more good, and also cautions Marfisa that she too should turn her attention elsewhere, as the French paladins are too enamored with Angélica and obsessed with their private rivalries to be interested in combat with her. In part, this scene helps to explain the significance of Bernardo in the play. In addition to bringing a Spanish hero to themes of Charlemagne's court, Cervantes is able to use mythical/historical figures to criticize Spain's expansionist agenda indirectly. Marfisa, though she possesses many noble characteristics, neglects God in pursuit of personal glory, and is ultimately frustrated in her quest, since she is unable to find a worthy adversary. Bernardo, although he certainly doesn't neglect his faith, is similar to Marfisa in this regard, and his rather cavalier, adventurous demeanor leads him astray from his homeland, where real conflict is brewing, in pursuit of imagined glory abroad. As the personified Castile leads Bernardo and his squire through the trap door in the stage, the audience is assured that he is returning home to become the hero he was destined to be. Immediately following Bernardo's departure, Marfisa debates whether she should believe her eyes regarding the conversation between Castile and Bernardo. She then resolves to go where she can truly display her prowess in battle. She journeys to the field of Agramante,328 and thus concludes her own foolish quest for glory where there is none to be found.

328 The camp or battlefield of Agramante, also known as the camp/field of discord, is a poetic creation of Ariosto, and refers to the battlefield upon which Charlemagne and his forces fought and defeated the invading Saracen forces, led by Agramant, the King of Africa. Agramant's father
With so many characters in this play, it would have been almost impossible for Cervantes to craft a finale that concludes story arcs of all the characters simultaneously. Thus, our summary will focus on a series of episodes that sequentially give resolution to each of the major episodes of the play. With the completion of Bernardo and Marfisa's story, we are returned to the pastoral scene, where Corinto continues to assist Angélica, still disguised as a shepherdess. In reality, the pastoral scenes were already concluded at the culmination of the second act and this scene serves as a quick reminder of the jealous shepherd's character, and as his farewell from the stage. Corinto vows to return Angélica to her native Catay, boasting of his skill as a sailor, and of his bravery. But the minute that Reinaldos arrives, he flees in the most cowardly way possible, fearful of Reinaldos' wrath, never to reappear upon the stage.

As Angélica and Reinaldos converse, she tries to conceal her face, but is inevitably discovered, and Reinaldos rejoices in having found her. She once again attempts to flee in a brief chase through doors, only to come face to face with Roldán, who is also overjoyed to see her. Immediately, Reinaldos and Roldán begin hurling insults at each other, childishly posturing and declaring their rightful "ownership" of Angélica's heart. The scene is filled with Cervantes' masterful rapid-fire exchanges, such as the following:

REINALDOS. ¡Suéltala, digo!
ROLDÁN. ¡No quiero!
REINALDOS. ¡Defiéndete, pues!
ROLDÁN. ¡Ni aquesto!
REINALDOS. ¡Loco estás!
ROLDÁN. Yo lo confieso

had been killed in battle with Charlemagne, and he planned the invasion of France (alluded to later in this play by the angelic herald) to exact his revenge. In the Ariosto text, Marfisa initially fights alongside the Saracen Moors, until learning her true Christian origin, and then takes up arms alongside Charlemagne and his paladins to defend the Christian territories. See CE, Vol. 1, p. 7-8.

Catay is a fictionalized version of the principal part of China, and is the native country of Angélica according to the chivalric tradition. See CE, vol. 1, p. 115.
The behavior of the two knights in this exchange is hardly becoming of two of the most celebrated paladins of Charlemagne's court. The juvenile quibble between the two suitors is not only hilarious, but also revelatory of their true intentions. This cannot be love but merely lust. Angélica's attempt to persuade the pair to desist by employing Solomonic discourse furthers this point, since neither one of the knights is willing to relinquish their claim to save her life, instead threatening one another should they harm her. Indeed, Angélica herself compares the pair to tyrannical wolves, fighting over a docile sheep. Just as it appears that the pair is going to come to blows, both paladins and their ladylove are enveloped in a cloud, in what would surely have been an impressive technical accomplishment of stagecraft for the time.

According to the stage direction, all three actors are to disappear through the trap door as the cloud envelops them, and Charlemagne and Galalón are to take their place as it dissipates, something no doubt easier to accomplish with modern fog machines and the like than would have been possible in Cervantes' day. As we have already observed, Cervantes is compelled to dazzle his audience using as many elaborate props, technical effects, and trap-door entrances as exits as possible in this particular comedy. This recourse to an excessive preponderance of technical effects probably reflects his relative inexperience from a professional standpoint with many of these devices, even though their use is highly appropriate for a play that takes place in a setting so replete with magic. In this sense, this early play is almost the reverse of the brilliant, imagined, non-play-
within-a-play of *El retablo de las maravillas*. Rather than placing a lot of demands on the capacity for imagination of his audience, Cervantes wants to show us Malgesí's and Merlin's powers in all their glory. It would be interesting to know how he intended to create many of these practical effects, but unfortunately this dimension of stagecraft of that era is partially lost to us.

In the following scene, the cowardly Galalón returns to Charlemagne's court in Paris and attempts to take credit for vanquishing Marfisa and Bernardo, lying about his injury. But Malgesí arrives with the inscribed shield of Galalón, the inscription of which reads (as was stated earlier in the play):

> Estar tan limpio y terso aqueste acero,  
> con la entereza que por todo alcanza,  
> nos dice que es, y es dicho verdadero,  
> del señor de la casa de Maganza. (III, vv. 2430-2434)

The comical inscription makes reference to the shield's immaculate condition, intact without a scratch, indicating of course that it could not possibly have seen actual combat. By these marks, we all know that it must indeed belong to the "illustrious" man of the house of Maganza, since it is presumed that we all know Galalón belongs to this house, and is, in fact, a lying coward. Galalón, for his part, swears revenge on Malgesí, but never reappears.330

Finally, Malgesí serves as a kind of deus-ex-machina to bring all the characters together, as the cloud once again appears, causing Reinaldos, Roldán, and Angélica to be present before Charlemagne's eyes. Even after being enveloped by the fog, they are still arguing, prompting Angélica to comment, "¡Cobardes como arrogantes, / de tal modo me tratáis, / que no sea posible seáis / ni caballeros ni amantes!" (III, vv. 2684-2687). With these verses, Angélica reinforces the
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330 According to the epics, Galalón was said to have betrayed Charlemagne's army to the Moors at Roncesvalles in his retreat from Spain, but these events do not transpire on the stage, because this battle occurs after the events of the play.
central theme of the play: namely, that the general behavior of the jealous characters is not at all becoming of people in their position and certainly not consistent with the ideals of a true knight in shining armor.

The play concludes with an Angel appearing before Charlemagne, warning of the coming conflict with the Saracen (Moorish) forces. After naming many of the famous enemy combatants and kings, the Angel cautions:

Queda Libia desierta, sin un moro;  
de Africa quedan solas las mezquitas,  
y todos a una voz tus lirios de oro  
afrentan con palabras inauditas.  
Mas tú, guardando el sin igual decoro  
que guardas en empresas exquisitas,  
sal al encuentro luego a esta canalla,  
puesto que perderás en la batalla.  
   Pero después la poderosa mano  
yudarte de modo determina,  
que del moro español y el africano  
seas el miedo y la total ruina. (III, vv. 2709-2720)

The angel prophesizes with these verses Charlemagne's initial loss, but eventual triumph over the Saracen forces, a prophecy for which the latter shows great gratitude. Charlemagne himself is the only member of the Carolingean court not ridiculed and actually treated with great respect by Cervantes in this drama. In general, his behavior is quite becoming of the Emperor and guardian of the Carolingean Empire, though he seems somewhat unconcerned with his knights' affairs at times. His Paladins, by contrast, continue to bicker with one another until he intervenes, decreeing that they shall temporarily place Angélica in the care of the Duke of Bavaria, and that she shall eventually be wed to whichever of the two triumphs over a greater number of enemy combatants. The pair of foolish paladins are content with this decree, each proclaiming that they shall be victorious, each expressing their eagerness to triumph on the battlefield. Malgesí warns, "¡Vano saldrá vuestro intento!" and "No te alagues, arrogante, / que Dios dispone otra cosa, / como
en efecto verás" (III, vv. 2744 & 2748-50). Although the play concludes with the question of who is to marry Angélica unresolved, Malgesi's warning serves to caution once again against the excessive pride and arrogance that ironically serves as a principal attribute of the supposedly heroic characters in tales of chivalry.

As we have seen, what characterizes the entirety of the play is the inability of the characters to fulfill their desired roles, as they are all constantly thwarted by jealousy and other external impediments. Roldán and Reinaldos are at odds with one another over their love for Angélica, who, in turn, flees them both as she cannot abide their rivalry. Yet they are unable time and time again to properly duel one another to determine who is the most valiant and hence worthiest of her love. Malgesí, for his part, attempts to cure the two heroes of their amorous affliction, but, in spite of his great magical ability, is completely unable to do so. Merlin, rather than curing the characters of their love, has them come face to face with the goddess of love and Eros themselves, yet even the powerful Eros is vanquished by a more powerful force: that of money. It is this immense, tyrannical power that has also conquered the heart of Clori, engendering the jealousy of her two less wealthy suitors, Lauso and Corinto.

Marfisa is never able to test her steel against the true French paladins and has a pathetically easy victory against the unworthy Galalón, who is not even able to withstand her firm handshake. Bernardo, although depicted in a considerably more favorable light than his French counterparts, is still criticized for foolishly venturing away from Spain in pursuit of glory and adventure. He is finally warned by the living embodiment of Castile that he must return to Spain to defend its borders against the real threat of the Moorish invaders and ensure that his uncle doesn't give away Spanish territory to the French out of fear. Finally, the Angelic herald warns Charlemagne of the impending Moorish threat, and of what he must do in exercising his position as emperor to defend
the Christian territories. In its totality, we might view the play as a commentary on and parody of the conceits of love and jealousy as they pertain to the chivalric and pastoral genres. Dominant leitmotifs of the play are the corrosive power of money to influence amorous relationships, and the inability of the characters to accomplish much of anything when gripped by the madness of jealousy. Additionally, Cervantes also seems to be providing a subtle, understated critique of Spain's expansionist foreign policy in his day, making the case that the crown would be wise to direct its attention back to the battlefront at home, rather than getting involved in untenable, ill-planned quixotic adventures abroad in pursuit of imagined glory.

Cervantes also anticipates some of the parody of the chivalric and pastoral genres that he would later carry to full fruition with Don Quixote. He is not yet at the self-referential, meta-analytical stage of his career, but during this phase of his writing, he is still very much able to cast a critical eye on the comportment of character types of these genres, and on how they do not, in fact, live up to the ideals of bravery, heroism, and good conduct they are supposed to embody. They are instead, as we have seen, very much characterized by human flaws such as excessive pride and jealousy. He also provides a satire of "love" that is bought by money, but also equally ridicules the shepherds who are critical of Rústico not out of true moral concern, but rather, out of sheer jealousy, and who behave childishly in their attempts to ridicule him. Finally, to emphasize once more, Cervantes concludes by casting a critical gaze on heroes who pursue glory abroad when they should be focused on the defense of their homeland, which we might interpret as an indirect critique of Spanish foreign policy of his own time period. In some of his later works, he would express his criticism more directly, such as we have seen in La gran sultana, but here is able to indirectly criticize such quixotic endeavors through the characters of Marfisa and Bernardo.
Although this is one of the weakest of Cervantes' plays, we can certainly see that it has a lot more merit than has been ascribed to it by some early critics.
El laberinto del amor is in my estimation one of the most misunderstood and underappreciated Cervantine dramas. Francisco Ynduraín has criticized the play by claiming that "Cervantes ha forzado la complicación hasta los límites que rebasan lo tolerable," and along with Schevill and Bonilla, has deplored "sus confusiones verdaderamente laberínticas." Most modern critics have seen that this line of critique is highly ironic, given that this is precisely what Cervantes set out to achieve, as he himself informs from the very title of the play. Although Casalduero, Zimic and Canavaggio have already made this observation, I believe nevertheless they too get lost in the labyrinthine complications and miss the mark with certain aspects of their interpretation. Owing to the complexity of the dramatic situation, it is easy to overlook seemingly minor details of the language employed in certain sections of the drama. I hope to demonstrate that a careful reading of these overlooked details will radically alter our interpretation of the significance of specific events during the dramatic denouement. Before we begin our analysis, let us review some background information about the drama.

It is estimated that Laberinto was written in 1587. It constitutes either one of the last dramatic works of his early writing period, or one of the first of his second. Although the motif of the false accusation was originally attributed by Schevill & Bonilla to the accusation of Polines
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331 Ed. Francisco Ynduraín (1962), "Estudio preliminar," p. XL.
333 Casalduero, 151-163.
334 Zimic (1992), 205-220.
335 Canavaggio (1977), 110-115. I should note that Canavaggio's analysis is basically correct, although, as I point out later, there is good reason to believe that Dagoberto's initial accusation is not an out-and-out lie, but rather a partial truth, or a deception by means of the truth, which has repercussions for the play's conclusion and overall interpretation. In my estimation, he devotes perhaps too much attention to the motif of the false accusation, which does not operate here as exactly as it does in the Boiardo material to which Canavaggio compares it.
336 Ed. Sevilla Arrollo & Rey Hazas, p. XXXV.
against Ginebra in *Orlando Furioso* (canto IV), this hypothesis has rightly been somewhat refuted by Chevalier and later, Canavaggio, who have convincingly demonstrated that the motif of the false accusation is far too common in the writing of this time period to be attributed to any single source.\(^{337}\) I will go further than this, and state that the two false accusations in this text are in fact more partial truths than outright lies, as we shall see later. Though the accused characters, Rosamira and Manfredo, are ultimately innocent, the accusations leveled against them turn out to be partially true in a way that is ironic.

In spite of some of the criticism this play has received, it has a very tightly written dramatic construction and a plot that is both entirely coherent and not completely conventional, though it falls well within the parameters of the genre of the *comedia de capa y espada*. It is a play characterized by the usual assumed identities, equivocation, deceiving by means of the truth, and general confusion common to the genre, but developed with an unusual degree of complexity. Certain characters assume so many identities and sport such numerous disguises that they become difficult to keep track of upon an initial reading. Indeed, the intercrossed loves of the play confound with their labyrinthine complexity, as the title promises. One of the major innovations in this regard is that, rather than having a two or three pairs, whose designs to marry one another change over the course of the drama, in this case, all three male protagonists initially have designs on the same woman, Rosamira. Here, it is the male protagonists that create all the conflict of the play, and the female protagonists that bring about its resolution, exercising an unusual amount of autonomy even by the standards of this genre.

*El laberinto del amor* begins with Anastasio, the son of the Duke of Dorlán, who is also a Duke himself. He is one of the three suitors seeking Rosamira's hand in marriage, disguised as a

humble laborer. He engages two common citizens of Novara in conversation, in order to glean the latest news concerning the Duke Federico de Novara's daughter, Rosamira. From them, he learns that another gallant Duke, Manfredo, is set to arrive with his ambassador, and that he too seeks Rosamira's hand in marriage. Anastasio also asks if Rosamira is prepared to be married to Manfredo of her own free will, to which one of the citizens tellingly replies, "Nunca al querer del padre fue siniestra; / cuanto más, que se vee que gana en ello, / siendo el duque quien es" (I, vv. 15-17). One of the key recurring themes of the play has to do with the volition (voluntad) of the women to marry of their own free will. For the most part, Rosamira remains passive, allowing both her father and her love, Dagoberto, to dictate the course of events in her life. It is primarily Dagoberto's convoluted ruse, as well as Rosamira's inaction in speaking up to defend herself, that creates the principle conflict, as we shall see shortly. We learn from the Citizens that Rosamira is extremely loyal to her father, and dares not oppose his will under any circumstance. According to these Citizens, this loyalty is not misplaced, as Duke Federico is a just ruler.

In the following scene, the Duke Federico of Novara and the ambassador of Duke Manfredo of Rosena enter. They exchange pleasantries, both obviously quite pleased with the pairing of Manfredo and Rosamira. The ambassador expresses his gratitude for all of Federico's generosity. But the cordial exchange between the two is abruptly brought to an end with the entrance of Dagoberto, the Duke of Utrino. Dagoberto enters abruptly, and accuses Rosamira of having already had sexual relations with a nobleman, proclaiming:

Digo que en deshonrado ayuntamiento
se estrecha con un bajo caballero,
sin tener a tus canas miramiento,
ni a la ofensa de Dios, que es lo primero.
Y a probar la verdad de lo que cuento
diez días en el campo armado espero;
que ésta es la vía que el derecho halla;
do no hay testigos, suple la batalla. (I, vv. 63-69)
Virtually all modern editors of the text have noted that Dagoberto's accusation of Rosamira is a fabrication, an assertion with which I take issue.\textsuperscript{338} I will attempt to demonstrate later in my analysis that a close reading of several key passages of the text reveals the implication that Dagoberto and Rosamira have already consummated their love and agreed to marry in secret. Thus, when Dagoberto accuses Rosamira, he is really accusing himself of wrongdoing, and for this reason, can have utmost confidence of backing up the truth of his words with his blade. We later learn that Dagoberto himself loves Rosamira and cannot bear to see her marry another. Thus, he calls into question her honor with this convoluted ruse to prevent her marriage to Manfredo. What has been discussed significantly less is the language with which he makes his accusations and his proposed "solution" to this invented dishonor. Dagoberto's language is rather legalistic in nature, but it responds to a much older, antiquated code of honor in judicial matters that is already an anachronism in Cervantes' time. First of all, he makes an appeal to ethos (in the classical sense of the word), calling upon himself as a "reliable" witness in this matter. He declares:

\begin{quote}
Si no supiera, ¡oh sabio Federico!,
grand duque de Novara generoso,
que sabes bien quién soy, y que me aplico
contino al proceder más virtuoso,
juro por lo que puedo y certifico
que a este trance viniera temeroso;
mas tráeme mi bondad aquí sin miedo,
para decir lo que encubrir no puedo.

Tu honra puesta en deshonrado trance
está por quien guardarla más debiera,
haciendo della peligroso alcance
la fama, en esta parte verdadera. (I, vv. 38-49)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{338} The only critic who has suggested otherwise is Zimic (1992), who only mentions a possible alternate reading in a footnote. He observes, "Cervantes no aclara hasta qué punto han llegado las relaciones de Rosamira y Dagoberto, pero el secreto en que las mantienen parece sugerir la ilicitud. De ser esto así, Dagoberto no miente en absoluto cuando acusa a Rosamira de yacer 'con un vil y bajo caballero'" (p. 212, n. 12).
Dagoberto attempts first of all to ingratiate himself with Duke Federico by recognizing him as both wise and generous, and then claims that he has come because of his own good will to reveal an unpleasant truth that he cannot conceal. The hypocrisy in this appeal quickly becomes apparent to the audience. Dagoberto wishes Federico to take him at his word, because of his social standing and reputation. As we quickly learn, Dagoberto's word is not to be trusted, and his high social standing and reputation are indeed misplaced in this matter. Nevertheless, Federico takes him at his word, and continues to listen to Dagoberto's "misgivings" about Rosamira's marriage. Finally, as we have seen, the solution that Dagoberto proposes to the alleged dishonor is also one that responds to an anachronistic legal code: that of trial by combat. As there are no other witnesses to corroborate Dagoberto's story, he proposes to "prove the truth" of his words by backing them up with steel in armed combat, affirming, "do no hay testigos, suple la batalla" (I, v. 69). In this way, Dagoberto makes an appeal to an older, legal tradition of trial by combat, or judicial duel (lides) in which he will defend not only his own word, but also restore Rosamira's and Federico's honor through an armed contest.

Naturally, Duke Federico is perplexed by Dagoberto's accusations, but is forced to take them seriously, since Manfredo's ambassador makes clear that even the accusation is enough to
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339 One of the best examples of this legal tradition is encountered in the *Cantar de Mio Cid* (Cantar III, vv. 2985-3735), though in Cervantes' time, this practice was clearly outlawed by both church and state, it nevertheless still existed. According to *Autoridades*, "DUELO. s. m. Combate entre dos personas, en que cuerpo a cuerpo se llega a las manos, determinando lugar y tiempo para la pelea, a fin de purgar alguna sospecha infame, o assegurar algún derecho dudoso, o por conseguir crédito de valiente, o por vengar algún odio. El origen desta voz sale del Latino Duellum, que vale lo mismo que duorum bellum, contienda de dos; pero yá por duelo se entiende todo género de desafío o contienda aplazada. Latin. Duellum. Certamen, inis. DOCTR. DE CAB. lib. 3. tit. 3. Introd. Mui vedada es, aunque en algunas partes se usa, esta manera de lid, que para prueba de maleficio por causa de riepto se face, la qual los Juristas dicen duel, que quiere decir batalla de dos. IBAÑ. Trad. de Q. Cure. lib. 7. cap. 4. Haviendo dexado libre el campo, atendian al fin de aquel duelo" (emphasis added).
put a halt to the proposed marriage. Federico indeed shows himself to be a wise ruler, and is reticent to jump to conclusions, remarking, "yo he visto engaños por verdad creídos" (I, v. 106). Unfortunately, he does not realize how painfully prophetic his words will be, for when he orders Rosamira brought before him, she refuses to respond to the accusations, which only furthers the suspicion of her transgression. Her motives are not made entirely clear at this juncture, but there is some hint of the reason for her silence in the second and final acts, as we will later observe.

Dagoberto reiterates his accusation and adds:

\[
Y \text{ esta prueba remítola a mi espada,} \\
\text{que ha de ser el testigo más perfecto} \\
\text{que se halle en la causa averiguada;} \\
y \text{ esto será cuando deste aprieto} \\
\text{ se admita tu disculpa mal fundada;} \\
\text{ mas sabes que tan cierta ésta tu culpa,} \\
\text{ que no has de atrever a dar disculpa. (I, vv. 119-125)}
\]

He appeals once again to a trial by combat, declaring his sword his "perfect witness," perhaps intimidating Rosamira into silence as well with his declaration that she knows her blame and should not dare to try to defend her actions.

What might be the most unsettling element of Dagoberto's ruse is that he is ultimately rewarded for this deception. The play concludes with the marriage of Dagoberto and Rosamira, who, as it turns out, loves him as well and chooses to be with him of her own free will. This is a critical point when it comes to our understanding of this play. The primary theme of this comedy is not simply of love as intrinsically a labyrinth, but rather, of the convoluted and labyrinthine complications resulting from social impositions that prevent women from marrying of their own free volition. From this point up until the final act, Rosamira doesn't speak a single word, and although Dagoberto initiates the primary conflict, he too will retire to await the trial by combat until very near the conclusion of the comedy. Their secret love for one another could simply have
been made explicit, as Dagoberto is a man of high social standing, and Rosamira's father shows himself to be a reasonable individual. Yet, Dagoberto's own insecurity leads him to propagate a ruse that puts not only Rosamira's honor, but also his own and that of her father in jeopardy as well.

Rosamira's silence persuades her father to accept Dagoberto's word, and, when he confronts her, she faints, rendering her unable to respond further. Although this fainting spell is a dramatic convention in the *comedia de capa y espada*, it also serves to punctuate her disbelief that her father would take Dagoberto at his word rather than trusting her loyalty to him, as well as her disbelief that the man who loves her would so heinously profane her good name in this manner. She is confined to a prison tower by order of the now distraught Federico, who professes, "Mostrado me has, Fortuna, que quien honra / tus altares, en humo levantados, / por premio le has de dar infamia y mengua, / pues quita cien mil honras una lengua" (I, v. 162-165). With these words, he comments on the common tropes of the fickle nature of Fortune and of the destructive power of rumors and accusations.

Before Dagoberto is able to withdraw to await the expected combat from anyone who challenges his word, he is confronted by Anastasio, who is still dressed as a laborer. Anastasio accuses Dagoberto of indiscretion in either repeating unsubstantiated rumors or offending with his own loose tongue. He comments that if Dagoberto is truly concerned with the honor of the Duke of Novara as he claims, then he should find some other way to defend his honor, without placing that of Rosamira in jeopardy. He concludes by observing that it is rage and envy more than diligence and honor that motivates Dagoberto (I, vv. 204-5). Knowing the truth of his words, Dagoberto has no recourse but to feign indignation before making his retreat from the stage, claiming that it is the patience of his good will that has saved Anastasio from his wrath. After
Dagoberto's departure, the two citizens from the play's opening confirm Anastasio's suspicions about his love for Rosamira, and he departs as well, distraught with the realization that Dagoberto's motives are not pure. For their part, the citizens show themselves to be quite astute, as they see right through Anastasio's disguise, owing to his language and mannerisms. This is another of Cervantes' innovations within the genre: the characters are not always successful in their deception through disguise, as their manner and bearing sometimes belies the image they attempt to convey. This leitmotif of deception, disguise, and its varying degrees of success is another principle focus throughout the comedy.

While the first half of the first act seems to establish Anastasio as the hero, and Dagoberto as the primary antagonist, in reality, it is the female characters, Porcia and Julia, who are the true protagonists of this comedy. In keeping with the motif of disguise and deception, we are introduced to Julia and Porcia in the costumes of young male shepherds, with Porcia assuming the name Rutilio, and Julia taking on the moniker Camilo. In the scene where they are introduced, Porcia repeatedly instructs Julia that she must not falter in calling her Rutilio, lest their deception be revealed. Porcia and Julia discuss at length the nature of their situation, and of the nature of the cruel game of love, with Porcia remarking, "Ya en el ciego laberinto / te metió el amor crúel; / ya no puedes salir dél / por industria ni distinto" (I, vv. 281-285). In spite of this remark, it is precisely their industria that ultimately allows these two characters to emerge triumphant in their intentions. In this scene, Porcia coaches Julia on how to more convincingly appear to be a man, on both the
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340 Casaldueño has already noted in his Sentido y forma, "Desde el primer momento, las damas que solicitan todo nuestro interés son Porcia y Julia" (158). I would actually go further and say that not only among the female characters, but, among the entire cast of the play, these two characters are by far the most complex and nuanced, and elicit our greatest interest, as is demonstrated by the almost exclusive devotion to an analysis of their characters by the vast majority of modern scholarship.
way that she must speak and carry herself. Porcia advises Julia to curse more frequently, and not to carry herself in such a dainty manner. She is deeply concerned that if they are discovered, all their efforts and plans will be for naught. Cervantes brings these practical concerns of the art of disguise to the forefront in a way that is simply taken for granted by most of his contemporaries, adding verisimilitude to the scene.

As our two protagonists continue to discuss their situation, we become more fully aware of the complex and convoluted nature of the love and relationships between the main characters. We learn that Porcia is Dagoberto's sister, and that Julia and Anastasio are their cousins. Thus, we have two brother and sister pairs. Julia pines for Manfredo, while Porcia seeks Anastasio's hand in marriage. In their conversation, Julia mentions that Anastasio, "de Rosamira está / en estremo enamorado / y sírvela disfrazado" (I, vv. 370-372), a fact which we already knew, to which Porcia replies, "Eso importa poco ya; / que, en llegando el de Rosena, / Celia se casa con él" (I, vv. 373-375). The arranged marriage that is supposed to take place between Anastasio and Celia adds to the dramatic confusion, but is never mentioned again. Indeed, this "Celia" to whom Anastasio seems promised, never actually appears in the play, and is only mentioned in passing this one time by the two protagonists. This brief mention serves, nonetheless, to reinforce the principle theme of the play, which is the confusion and deception that is imminent in matters of love due to the problem of arranged marriage. Rosamira's father, Duke Federico of Novara, has chosen Duke Manfredo of Rosena as a suitor for her, and it seems that upon learning this, the Duke of Dorlán, Anastasio's father has also arranged for him to marry this Celia. Thus, Anastasio becomes the only male protagonist who is explicitly resisting his father's wishes, and disguising himself to do so. In this way, he becomes indirectly linked with the female protagonists in their shared travails. Julia
and Porcia lament the difficulty of their romantic entanglements, and contemplate how they will win over their respective loves, when Manfredo enters with two of his hunters.

Porcia and Julia (as Rutilio and Camilo) converse with Manfredo. He immediately notices the beauty of their countenances and comments, "En verad / que parecen de ciudad / vuestros nombres y el estilo, / y que en ellos, y aun en él, / poco es, mentís villanía" (I, vv. 459-463). Despite abundant discussion of the nature of disguise, deception, and assumed identities in the modern scholarship of this play, to my knowledge no one has commented in much detail on the fact that, repeatedly throughout the play, the disguises employed are only partially successful. Although only a minor element of this comedy, the limited nature of disguise in concealing identity should be noted. There is more to taking on a new persona than simply wearing different clothes: one must also be acutely aware of speech, mannerisms, bearing, and general behavioral characteristics as well. In this way, Cervantes indirectly comments on the nature of acting and performance with this minor element of Laberinto. Here, Julia and Porcia are ultimately successful in fooling Manfredo, but he is aware that there is something a little strange about their overall comportment as young shepherds. Porcia excuses this fact by commenting simply that they have picked up some of the mannerisms of the students that have come through their town.

When they are alone briefly, Porcia advises Julia not to reveal her identity prematurely, assuring her that the right opportunity will present itself for them to make their true intentions known. But the two characters are about to learn that their deception has unintended consequences that put others in Jeopardy as well. Manfredo's ambassador enters, informing his Duke of Dagoberto's accusation, and of the subsequent dissolution of the wedding. To make matters worse, one of the Duke of Dorlán's ambassadors arrives, accusing Manfredo of kidnapping the Duke's daughter, Julia and his niece, Porcia, and arriving with a threat of war. The initial false accusation
of Rosamira by Dagoberto is now compounded with this second false accusation by the Duke of Dorlán, which is the result of a misunderstanding. The Duke of Dorlan is unaware that his daughter and niece have ventured out in pursuit of love, and hence, under the misapprehension that they were kidnapped by Manfredo, who of course promptly proclaims his innocence. Confounded by this development, Manfredo can do little more than curse the cruelty of Fortune for his bizarre duel predicament: his wedding plans in shambles, and a looming declaration of war for crimes he did not commit.

In his response, Manfredo shows himself to be a man of great honor, declaring that he does not accept Dorlán's challenge, as he has committed no wrong and wishes to clear his name, but that if the Duke of Dorlán continues to believe this falsehood and he is forced to defend his honor, he will not flee the combat (I, vv. 613-620). The presentation of Manfredo's character is another crucial aspect in which Cervantes' Laberinto differs from the traditional comedia de capa y espada. Though he is depicted as the honorable hero, he nevertheless has very little control over the events that befall him. He is much more passive than the extremely active female protagonists of the play, and ultimately much less responsible for the resolution of the conflict at Laberinto's conclusion. Given the conventions of the time period, the audience would probably expect him to play a much more central role in the drama, by seeking to restore his own honor. In the end, it is actually the women's astucia and ingenuity that clears Manfredo's good name. At this juncture, however, they choose to continue with their ruse, even though it could place Manfredo in danger, in order to try to get closer to him and Anastasio. Manfredo, still believing them to be shepherd boys, allows them to accompany him to Novara (I, vv. 668-671).

In the following scene, Anastasio and his criado Cornelio appear on the stage. Cornelio is a fairly conventional character, who fulfills the archetypal role of the loyal servant that
occasionally acts as mentor and counselor to his master. In his first appearance here, he advises Anastasio not to be blinded by Rosamira's beauty, as virtue and reputation factor into the overall beauty of a woman (I, v. 700-702). But Anastasio is extremely displeased with this rehearsed and conventional speech about women and virtue, since he has good reason to suspect Rosamira's innocence. Anastasio reveals himself to have an overall noble character, but to be somewhat given to a hot temper. In this scene, for example, Cornelio's words anger him to the point of threatening violence, and he goes so far as to declare, "Tu sangre harás, Cornelio, que derrame, / pues procuras la mia así alteralla / con tus razones vanas y estudiadas, / y entre libres discursos fabricadas" (I, vv. 712-715).

In the following scene, Anastasio is greeted by two vagabond students, who wear the traditional cape and hat that identifies them as part of the roguish lot to which they belong. These students, Tácito and Andronio, serve primarily as comic relief, but add to the confusion of the other characters with their jests, jibes, and coded language that they use to communicate with one another, further complicating the dramatic situation. Tácito asks Anastasio several questions in deliberately confusing at times nonsensical language, and Anastasio replies that he is unable to respond, since he doesn't understand. To give a simple example of the kind of verbal games and confusion that Tácito incites, I quote his response to Anastasio's confusion:

Pues bien claro se aclara,
que es clara, si no es turbia, el agua clara.
    Quiero decir que el tronto,\(^{341}\)
    por do su curso lleva al horizonte,
está a caballo y prompto
    a propagar la cima de aquel monte. (I, vv. 764-769)

\(^{341}\) I believe that the "Tronto" in question refers to a river in Italy which runs from Monti della Laga and ends the Adriatic Sea. Cervantes also mentions to this river in his poetry (CE, p. 743). This meaning makes sense given the context of the verses, although most editions fail to capitalize this proper name.
Tácito's use of the polyptoton, antanaclasis, the deliberate insertion of Latinate words, and other rhetorical devices is not at the service of poetic complexity. Rather, it is used merely to confuse, and to make his communication less intelligible, so as to provoke his interlocutors, or rather, his targets, to anger. It is simply a language game that the ironically named Tácito enjoys playing on his unsuspecting victims. Anastasio, however, has little patience with these games, and quickly becomes aware that he is being made the butt of a joke. Once he has managed to partially "decode" the students' invented slang, they leave him and Cornelio alone, since their prank has been discovered. Although this brief scene is principally for comic relief, it also further complicates the dramatic situation. Julia and Porcia arrive dressed as students, and almost cross paths with Anastasio and Cornelio. The latter is eager to try to tease this new pair of students, but Anastasio is in no mood for games, because he still wishes to learn the truth of Rosamira's situation and determine whether he has any chance of winning her heart. So the two make a hasty exit, just as our female protagonists (now dressed as male students) come upon the two roguish students. To further complicate matters, Julia is aware that her brother Anastacio is somewhere in this territory, wandering around disguised as a laborer, and is afraid that he will recognize her, and discover their ruse.

Unlike the distressed Anastasio, who refused to play the students' games, Porcia and Julia must play along, lest their identities be revealed. Porcia and Julia show their mental acuity, impressing Andronio with their quick-witted responses. The scene also makes use of the classic baroque trope of deceit by means of the truth. When Andronio responds, "No se deben de escusar, / si es que quieren mostrar / que son hombres de palacio," Julia replies, "Ni aun de nada somos hombres" (I, vv. 827-830), a fact which happens to be true, but is unknown to the actual students. Julia and Porcia deftly fend off the two roguish students' attempts to unveil their true identities,
and, when Manfredo arrives (himself now disguised as a student), the students decide it is better to flee, with Tácito speaking in broken Italian to Andronio, so as not to be understood by the other characters. Manfredo continues to address Porcia and Julia as Rutilio and Camilo, unaware of their true identities.

The two citizens from the beginning of the first act reemerge, and Manfredo engages them in conversation to learn the latest news of Rosamira. He learns what the audience already knows concerning the accusation with no proof given by Dagoberto, about which Rosamira maintains her silence. The two citizens also comment on the situation of the Duke of Rosena, unaware that it is he with whom they speak. This scene serves a dual purpose: first, it informs Manfredo of the details of Rosamira's situation, of which he was not fully appraised thus far, and secondly, it reviews the principle conflicts of the drama, such that audience can more easily follow the plot. Although this repetition could seem tedious, in a play with as many disguises and assumed identities as this one, it is quite helpful for the audience. Repetition, indeed, is written into the scene in a way that does not feel forced or overdone. There is another instance here of the physical disguise being insufficient to conceal one's true identity on its' own. The citizens correctly recognize the origin of Manfredo's accent, but he denies it, arguing that he has picked up a bit of the accent when he was studying in Pavía, a justification that ironically echoes the earlier dialogue between the female protagonists and Manfredo.

The first act concludes with one final scene back in the tower where Rosamira is imprisoned. Her father the Duke of Novara converses with the jailer. The latter openly confesses his doubts about Dagoberto's accusations and shows his sympathy for Rosamira's situation. But her father, although he is distraught at the situation, still maintains that he must take the accusation seriously, remarking, "A que lo crea su bondad me obliga, / y el ver que Rosamira, en su disculpa,
el labio no ha movido ni le mueve; / y es muy cierta señal de tener culpa / el que a volver por sí nunca se atreve" (I, vv. 989-993). It is Rosamira's own silence that, together with Dagoberto's reputation and social standing, ultimately condemns her. She is, in many ways, the exact opposite of Porcia. Rosamira simply accepts her fate, unwilling either to confirm or deny the accusations made against her. By contrast, Porcia actively seeks to change her own fate and to marry whom she chooses. She does so by disguising her voice and her appearance, and by manipulating the situations she encounters until she is able to win Anastasio's hand in marriage. As we will see, it is her intrepid nature and that of her faithful companion Julia, and their relentless desire to determine their own fates, which ultimately results in the freedom of the passive Rosamira.

The opening of the second act returns us to Anastasio and his faithful servant Cornelio, as they discuss the former's intentions. Anastasio reveals that he merely wishes to uncover Dagoberto's motives and defend Rosamira's honor, by combat if necessary. The significance of this brief declaration is that Anastasio indirectly agrees to Dagoberto's terms of trial by combat. Without even realizing it, he is now playing into Dagoberto's plan. Once again, Cornelio imparts his wisdom, cautioning Anastasio to be certain that if he were to defeat in Dagoberto in armed combat, his victory would be guided by reason and not brute force. Cornelio cautions, "Porque de Dios los secretos / son tan incomprehensibles, / que a veces vemos visibles, / de bienes, malos efetos" (II, vv. 1026-1029). With the motif of trial by combat, Cervantes seems to be criticizing once again the idea of proving "truth" though brute force rather than by reason. Cornelio wants to ensure that his friend and master is acting justly, not defending Rosamira's honor at all costs, regardless of her guilt or innocence, simply because of the love he feels for her. For his part, Anastasio has no patience for his servant's advice, proclaiming, "Haga el Cielo lo que ordena; yo honraré mis pensamientos" (II, vv. 1033-1034).
Julia and Porcia then take the stage, and Porcia cautions Camilo (Julia) not to drop her guard now and reveal their true identities, as fate has granted them the unexpected chance to serve Manfredo as his pages. Julia agrees, telling Rutilo (Porcia) that she will do her best to maintain their ruse. The pair sees Cornelio and Anastasio approaching them and Julia immediately recognizes her brother. So as not to be recognized, she makes a hasty retreat leaving Porcia to converse with the pair. The dramatic situation is extremely well conceived, as Porcia finally has the opportunity to speak to her true love, yet she cannot reveal her love for him, lest her facade be unveiled.

Anastasio and Porcia once again discuss the events that have taken place thus far. Porcia reveals to him the confusion regarding Manfredo and his alleged kidnapping of Julia and Porcia. In this scene, she must speak about herself in the third person, so as not to reveal her identity, proclaiming, "Yo entreoí / que la Porcia quería bien a Anastasio" (II, vv. 1130-1132). Cornelio is initially astonished by this news, prompting Anastasio's comment, "Di: ¿no puede acontecer, / sin admiración que asombre, / que una mujer busque a un hombre, / como un hombre a una mujer? (II, vv. 1145-1149). This question reveals the central theme of the play and serves as an open question which Cervantes poses to his audience. We have already seen Cervantes' probable critique of ill-matched marriages in the interlude El juez de los divorcios. In this full-length comedy, Cervantes explores some of the same ideas in a different light. Here he proposes the idea that perhaps it is not wrong for women to seek out the man they wish to marry, just as men seek out the women to whom they wish to be wed, in lieu of traditional arranged marriages. In this play, the silent Rosamira is nearly punished in innocence for her blind obedience and failure to confront her father with her true feelings. By contrast, Porcia and Julia are rewarded for actively seeking to
be the masters of their own fates, and in the process, liberate Rosamira, both literally and figuratively, from the prison of her inaction.

As Porcia and Anastasio continue to converse, Cornelio is very impressed with the reasoning and acuity of this apparent student. Anastasio offers his friendship, remarking, "os ofrezco / el género de amistad / que engrandece la igualdad" (II, vv. 1206-1208). Although she responds, "Daisme lo que no merezco," she in fact shows herself to be his equal, and perfectly suited to marry him based on her verbal and intellectual merits. At this point though, Anastasio, unaware of Porcia's true identity, merely sees this apparent "young man" as a follow traveler along the path of love and heartbreak. Porcia affirms to herself that her resolve must be strong if her love is indeed true, and then exits the stage after Anastasio and Cornelio.

In the following scene, the real students, Tácito and Andronio, return. Andronio is anxious to visit Rosamira in her prison cell to learn the truth of her situation. Tácito advises him against this imprudent course of action delivering a series of platitudes about good governance and obedience, essentially arguing that it is best for them to leave the situation alone (II, vv. 1240-1272). Tácito doesn't believe that the truthfulness (or lack thereof) of Dagoberto in this matter is their concern. The primary significance of this scene is that it reinforces the motif of Dagoberto's trial by combat as an ultimately unjust and regressive resort to an older legal tradition. The students, however, don't seem particularly perturbed by this fact. Given the ultimate resolution of the conflict, it seems that Cervantes is preparing his audience to come to their own conclusions in the matter. The following except of dialogue conveys the overall tenor of their conversation:

\[
\begin{align*}
TÁCITO. & \quad A \text{ la espada me remito de Dagoberto en la riña.} \\
ANDRONIO. & \quad ¿Si vence...? \\
TÁCITO. & \quad Pague la niña: que a buen bocado, buen grito. \\
& \quad \text{Quien de honestidad los muros}
\end{align*}
\]
ANDRONIO.  
Cuando la zorra predica,  
no están los pollos seguros. (II, vv. 1275-1287)

Although the scene is not of major dramatic importance, it does clearly convey the sense that it would be a tremendous injustice were Rosamira to be sentenced on the basis of nothing more than Dagoberto's victory in combat, rather than on the basis of facts and evidence.

After Tácito and Andronio make their exit, Julia and Porcia reemerge, with Porcia now dressed as a laborer, and Julia still dressed as a student. The two protagonists discuss their plans to win over the hearts of their respective loves, realizing that, if they are to have a chance of accomplishing this, it is likely that they will have to aid Rosamira in clearing her name first. They are well aware that Anastasio is single-mindedly obsessed with clearing her name. Julia, now showing increasingly more confidence and self-assurance, wants to be able to have some time alone with Manfredo, to which Porcia remarks, "Ingenio tienes, y brío, / y ocasión tienes también / para procurar tu bien / como yo procuro el mío" (II, vv. 1324-1327). In this way, the women acknowledge their own autonomy as shapers of their own respective destinies. It is through their ingenuity, determination, and taking advantage of the opportunities presented to them that they will ultimately triumph in love and free themselves from the labyrinthine entanglements in which they are currently trapped. In speaking about how Manfredo would react were he to learn the truth of their identities at this juncture, Porcia even remarks, "Nuestro mucho encerramiento / y libertad oprimida, / como causó esta venida, / cegará su entendimiento" (II, vv. 1332-1335). The literal enclosure of the protagonists before they decided to travel incognito and determine their own fates mirrors the imprisonment of Rosamira and reveals how that incarceration is compounded by her own silence.
Anastasio, Manfredo, and the two unnamed citizens retake the stage, and discuss the rumors surrounding Manfredo. What makes this scene particularly compelling is that, aside from the two citizens, everyone is concealing their identity by means of a disguise. Manfredo is still sporting his student costume from earlier, and Anastasio, his laborer's garb. It is worth noting that the two pairs that will eventually get together are similarly attired, as both Manfredo and Julia are dressed as students, whereas Porcia and Anastasio wear laborers' clothing. The dramatic irony of the scene is immense, as the two citizens and Anastasio criticize Manfredo for his lack of honor, not realizing that they are in the presence of not only Manfredo, but both of the supposed "kidnapped" women as well. Manfredo, curious at Anastasio's fierce conviction in this matter, inquires, "A un pobre labrador, ¿por qué le duele / tanto de Julia y Porcia el robo incierto? / Quizá miente la fama" (II, vv. 1366-1368). The leitmotif of the unreliability of rumors as word of mouth, and the pernicious nature of \textit{la fama} once again surfaces, and Manfredo attempts to defend his honor without actually revealing his identity. Not knowing who Anastasio is either, he is perplexed as to the degree of indignation that seems to be felt by this "common laborer." Manfredo and Anastasio converse, and their argument becomes increasingly more heated, with the dramatic tension growing ever more palpable, as Julia and Porcia debate whether (and to what extent) they should intervene in the dispute, knowing the truth of Manfredo's innocence. Manfredo and Anastasio almost come to fight with daggers drawn, Julia and Porcia devise a clever way to prevent the conflict from coming to pass: they feign indignation over the accusations as well, and begin to fight one another, forcing the two nameless citizens to intervene, and break up the fight between the four "combatants." The scene is both comical and filled with tension at the same time, for although Julia and Porcia are merely pretending to fight, Anastasio and Manfredo are quite serious, unaware that they are both honorable men in a similar predicament.
Once the two citizens have successfully intervened and prevented the fight from occurring, Porcia and Julia concoct an explanation for their dispute. Manfredo recognizes Rutilio (Porcia), but doesn't recognize Julia in her new costume, so Rutilio/Porcia is able to claim that he couldn't help but come to Anastasio's defense, recognizing his attire as that of his home territory. Manfredo accepts this explanation, and he and the two citizens part ways with the other characters. Julia departs shortly thereafter, and Porcia (still in the guise of Rutilio) is briefly left alone with Anastasio for a time.

Anastasio laments his fate once again and is both confused and embarrassed at apparently being accosted by a student, and saved by a young laborer. The "laborer" Porcia swears loyalty to him, proclaiming "Yo de serte fïel sólo me encargo, / con pecho noble, sin torcido enredo, / sin que dificultad me ponga embargo" (II, vv. 1489-1491). In these words, we detect the clear situational irony. Porcia wishes to proclaim her undying love and loyalty to Anastasio, but is completely impeded from doing so at this point in time by the very "torcido enredo" in which all the characters find themselves. This entanglement only becomes more complex in this scene, with Anastasio almost revealing his true identity to Porcia (who, in fact, already knows who he is). Additionally, Anastasio asks "Rutilio" to aid him in a clever ruse, imploring, "y es menester, si gusto darme quieres, / que, fingiendo ser moza labradora... / ¿De qué te ries?" (II, vv. 1504-1506). Naturally, Porcia cannot help but be amused, as the audience surely would as well, at the further irony of Anastasio asking her to pretend to be a woman. His plan consists of having the disguised Rutilio/Porcia to adopt the disguise of a young female laborer and go to the tower where Rosamira is being held and deliver a blank note to her, where she might write to him the truth of her guilt or innocence (II, vv. 1527-1529). Porcia vows to serve him faithfully, but is clearly somewhat
disconcerted by his unwavering love for Rosamira. Although she is well aware of his true feelings, her own love for him incites her to aid his cause regardless.

In the following scene, we return to the other future couple, Manfredo and Julia (still in the guise of Camilo). Manfredo and Julia briefly discuss Rutilio's overly bold comportment in their previous encounter. Julia/Camilo then tells Manfredo her story, but in the third person, declaring that he encountered the disguised Julia, who implored him for help. In this scene, Julia is testing the waters with Manfredo, and trying to gauge by his reaction whether or not he would be sympathetic to her amorous cause. But before she can finish her story, she and Manfredo must make their exit, as they hear others approaching.

In the following scene, Porcia returns, wearing yet another disguise, that of a female laborer (as she had planned early with Anastasio), and bearing a basket filled with fruits and flowers. In what is essentially a brief soliloquy, she recounts her travails and the various identities she has assumed thus far in the name of Love:

Primeramente pastor
me hiciste, y luego estudiante,
y, andando un poco adelante,
me volviste en labrador,
para labrar mis desdichas
con yerros de tus marañas:
que éstas son de tus hazañas
las más venturosas dichas. (II, vv. 1658-1666)

It seems rather ironic that in spite the frequent clarifying soliloquies or bits of dialogue of this nature, early scholarship found the play to be confusing and convoluted. Indeed, it is precisely this deliberate complication that gives the play its title, and Cervantes provides repeatedly a clarifying exposition to ensure that his audience is able to follow the basic plot. After all, what interest would a play have, bearing the title of "the labyrinth of love," if the audience were not at all lost in the corridors of love's maze themselves during key moments of the drama?
Unfortunately for Porcia, she happens upon Tácito and Andronio, who are also on their way to the prison tower. After blocking her path and taunting her with their verbal jibes, they attempt to steal her fruit basket. She cries out for someone to intervene, and after the jailer comes to her aid, the two roguish students pilfer and partially consume the fruit right in front of him, before running off. The scene doesn't serve much of a dramatic purpose, except to introduce a bit of comic relief and to give the jailer a reason to be sympathetic to Porcia. Indeed, at the scene's conclusion, he does take her to see Rosamira without any reservations or suspicions. Additionally, the scene serves to break up Julia's tale into two parts. As in other dramas, Cervantes shows us his understanding of how to keep an audience interested even with long portions of spoken exposition in a play. Although he can be criticized for interjecting these long narrative passages that would probably be more suited for a novella or long novel, he is well aware of the problems this can introduce from a dramatic standpoint, and hence generally introduces some quick-paced action to break up the potential monotony of lengthy expository moments.

Manfredo and Julia then reemerge on the stage, and she continues telling him the remainder of her tale, while still maintaining her assumed identity as Camilo, and speaking of herself in the third person. "Camilo" relates how Julia "told him" about how she came to be enamored of Manfredo, and to risk everything to be with him. She declares, "dejé mi padre, ¡ay cielos!; / dejé mi libertad, dejé mi honra, / y, en su lugar, recelos / y sujeción tomé, muerte y deshonra; / y a buscar he venido /este huésped apenas conocido" (II, vv. 1771-1776), giving a clear sense of all the risk and sacrifice she has had to endure up to this point in pursuit of her love. She states that she is wealthy, not ugly, and of good lineage, and that, although Rosamira was initially promised to Manfredo, it is she who loves him intensely to the point that not even this could dissuade her. Manfredo listens carefully to the tale and doesn't completely know how to respond, but states that
he has no intention of consummating a relationship with Julia, as it would only further his dishonor. Rather, he plans to send her home to her father, "que con esto restityo / mi inocencia y su querella" (II, vv. 1851-1852). Julia is understandably disappointed and somewhat distraught at this pronouncement, exclaiming, "¡Mal pagas lo que te quiere!" (II, vv. 1853), to which Manfredo responds, "La honra se satisfaga: / que un torpe amor esta paga / y aun otra peor requiere" (II, vv. 1854-1856). He then proceeds to launch into a diatribe about the evils of libidinous love and the danger of succumbing to appetites even when starting with the best of intentions. In this scene, it becomes clear that Manfredo is a man principally concerned with honor and reputation, even to the point of appearing somewhat cold and detached at times. He is a prudent individual, who would rather err on the side of caution than risk dishonoring himself or others for personal pleasure. Thus, restoring his lost honor is more important to him than the promise of love. He nevertheless agrees to "Camilo's" offer to at least meet and converse with Julia, although he is clearly intent on restoring his honor above all else, much to Julia's dismay.

Rosamira then reappears on the stage for the first time since the first act, wearing a veil that partially covers her face. Before she is greeted by the jailer and Porcia, she delivers the following soliloquy:

Quien me viere desta suerte,  
juzgará, sin duda alguna,  
que me tiene la fortuna  
en los brazos de la muerte.  
Pues no es así: porque Amor,  
cuando se quiere extremar,  
con el velo del pesar  
suele encubrir su favor.  
Honra, eclipse padecéis  
porque entre vos y mi gusto  
la industria ha puesto un disgusto,  
por que cual escura os veís;  
mas pasará esta fortuna  
que así vuestra luz atierra
como sombra de la tierra,
puesta entre el sol y la luna. (II, vv. 1905-1920)

With these words, Rosamira compares the apparent bleakness of her situation to the fleeting darkness of an eclipse, holding out hope that Love will favor her, and help her overcome her current predicament. This soliloquy directly contrasts with Julia's distressed words that end the previous scene, in which she too invokes deified Love, inquiring, "¿Qué consejo en mis enojos / es, ¡oh Amor!, el que me das?" (II, vv. 1889-1900). The brief soliloquy of Rosamira is perhaps more significant than it appears at first glance, as it serves multiple dramatic functions. To begin with, this is actually the first time we have heard Rosamira say anything of great substance in the play, and indeed, anything in her own defense. Up to this point in the play, it might not even have been clear to the audience that she was in love at all, let alone that that love is the reason for her silence in the face of Dagoberto's false accusation. Secondly, it establishes a parallel, but also a significant contrast, between Rosamira and Julia of the previous scene. Both characters are the victims, directly or indirectly, of an accusation that has made the pursuit of their respective loves more difficult. Their reaction to their fates, however, could not be more different. Whereas Rosamira remains confined, accepting her father's punishment, Julia escaped confinement when, together with Porcia, they ventured out in pursuit of their respective loves. Curiously, however, Julia is much less trusting that things will work out of their own accord she is confounded by Manfredo's words concerning his honor, and doesn't know what she should do next to attempt to win his heart. She is an active character, not trusting her fate to the whims and fortunes of Love. By contrast, Rosamira, who is much more passive, trusts her fate to the stars. In fact, it is not the stars or fate, but the most active character of all, Porcia, that will liberate her from her cell.

After concluding her brief speech, the jailer and Porcia make their entrance. The two women are left alone to converse. After Porcia introduces herself and announces her determination
to learn the truth of her case, Rosamira finally speaks in her own defense, exclaiming, "Quien me deshonra ha de ser / el mismo que me ha de honrar, / y esto me hace callar / y culpada parecer" (II, vv. 1973-1976). Rosamira inquires too about Manfredo's fate, and Porcia informs her of his predicament. Porcia also makes clear to her Anastasio's intention to defend her reputation against Dagoberto in armed combat, to which Rosamira responds, "Así mostrará mejor / su valentía y nobleza. / Pero, puesto que él venciese, / con él no me casaré" (II, 2005-2006). When Porcia inquires as to her reasoning, Rosamira simply responds, "Yo sé el porqué" (II, v. 2008). The scene concludes with Rosamira declaring that her fate rests in Porcia's hands, and with Porcia swearing her loyalty and service to Rosamira.

Of particular interest in this scene is what Rosamira reveals without stating it explicitly: that she has consummated her relationship with Dagoberto. It is for this reason that she says he is the person that should honor her rather than defaming her reputation, and also why she says, "yo sé el porqué." It turns out that Dagoberto is not entirely without honor, but rather, was deceiving by means of the truth, for he was, in fact, the nobleman that consummated his love with Rosamira, and it is his jealousy that compels him to levy this accusation against her, in order to prevent her from marrying another. This is a reading of the play that to the best of my knowledge has not been proposed previously by other scholars. I contend, however, that Rosamira would have absolutely no other reason to fear her father's wrath if she declared that Dagoberto, a man of high rank and good social standing, and she were in love. As we have seen, Duke Federico of Novara seems a reasonable man, and not particularly likely to object to their marriage. But the fact that they have

While Zimic does mention in passing the possibility of Dagoberto and Rosamira having consummated their relationship (p. 212, n. 12), he doesn't make a strong case for it one way or another. It is my contention that the dramatic conclusion and the older legal paradigms Cervantes references in this play subtly suggest this interpretation of events, as I explain below.
probably consummated their love outside of wedlock would have been unacceptable. This is worth bearing in mind as well at the play's conclusion, because after Rosamira's name is cleared and her father allows her to choose a suitor of her own volition, she never mentions the truth of the full extent of her relationship with Dagoberto. Moreover, it seems unlikely that Dagoberto would be willing to stake his word and reputation on an outright lie, particularly given that he is ultimately rewarded at the end of the play. I believe that for all of these reasons, the explanation that his accusation is *not* an outright lie, but rather, a deception by means of the truth, seems very plausible.

The final act begins with Julia (still disguised as Camilo) and Manfredo conversing about Julia's recent departure. Disappointed at Manfredo's reaction to her disguised declaration of love in the preceding act, Julia now adopts a new strategy to try to win over Manfredo. She knows that, if she reveals herself immediately, he will simply return her home and she will probably be unable to escape again, thus losing him forever. She therefore opts instead to tell Manfredo that Julia has departed, upset by the way that he has spurned her love. In this way, she at least forces him to continue his search for her, even though, ironically, she is right before his eyes. "Camilo" informs Manfredo that Julia might just fall into despair, in other words, become suicidal, if she is not found and consoled. Manfredo's response reveals more about his character:

    En eso echarás de ver,
    Camilo, bien claramente,
    que apenas hay acidente
    que sea bueno en la mujer.
    Quieren do han de aborrecer,
    vanse de adonde han de estar,
    temen donde han de esperar,
    esperan do han de temer.  (III, vv. 2065-2072)

With these words, Manfredo reveals the traditionalism of his character. He has very commonplace views of women for the time, and speaks about the traditional "character flaws" of women who assert themselves. As we have seen, he is an honorable man, but is nevertheless clearly quite risk-
averse and conventional in his thinking. In order to win him over, Julia must employ all of her cleverness and inventiveness. "Camilo" insists that if he is to "recover" the "lost" Julia, that Manfredo must not continue his talk of chastising her or returning her to her father. Manfredo assents to this request.

In the following scene, Rosamira appears in Porcia's clothes, using her scarf to partially conceal her face. Likewise, Porcia has donned Rosamira's attire, with her face partially obscured by Rosamira's veil. Porcia warns Rosamira about the variable nature of the topical wheel of Fortune, and advises her not to return to the prison, since, in spite of her innocence, she doesn't have many allies (III, vv. 2127-2133). Porcia explains that she is convinced that she will not suffer for helping an innocent such as Rosamira to clear her name, and once again shows the steadfastness and tenacity of her character, undeterred by the possibility that she might be punished in Rosamira's stead.

After Rosamira departs, the jailer returns, clearly deceived by the swapped identities of the two women. Throughout the play, the jailer shows his sympathy for Rosamira, and vows to try to help her in any way he can, in spite of being perplexed by her silence. He informs the disguised Porcia that the trial by combat is to take place in the morning, and explains to "Rosamira" the symbolism of how she is to be escorted and attired, according to her father's orders. She is to wear a two-colored veil, and to be accompanied by half the royal guard bearing emblems of mourning, and the other half, emblems of celebration. The executioner will walk with a dagger in hand to her left, and to her right, a child bearing a crown of laurels will accompany her (III, vv. 2158-2175). Unfortunately, I have not been able to locate any historical or literary information about this kind of ritual, but the significance and symbolism is nevertheless quite clear and made explicit in the text. Rosamira's father, torn between his love for her but bound by a responsibility to uphold his
honor, makes preparations for Dagoberto's ritualized trial by combat, and is prepared for both a happy and a tragic outcome. After delivering this news, Porcia thanks the jailer, and sends him on his way. The jailer comments that he must help her out, "¡aunque la vida me cueste!" (III, vv. 2189).

Cornelio and Anastasio reemerge on the stage in the following scene, and Cornelio scolds his master for entrusting Rosamira's safety to an unknown young man (secretly, Porcia). But when the pair comes upon the veiled Rosamira, they now mistake her for the young "man" to whom Anastasio entrusted the note. Anastasio is distressed upon realizing that it is not "Rutilio" with whom he speaks, and demands to know how Rosamira came to possess her garments. Anastasio detains her, and just as he is about to unmask her, Dagoberto emerges on the scene with one of his servants. Rosamira reveals her true identity to only Dagoberto, and asks to speak with him in private. The conversation that transpires between the two once again reveals Rosamira's passive nature, leaving everything in the hands of her "hero" and lover. More to the point, the silence between them in my view hints at the fact that they have already consummated their relationship, even though neither says so explicitly:

[ROSAMIRA]. El tiempo, que es corto, ataje el darte cuenta de todo. Sólo vengo a que me lleves luego a Utrino.

DAGOBERTO. ¿Cómo así?

ROSAMIRA. Y lo ordenado hasta aquí, ni lo intentes ni lo pruebes. No quiero en un cadahalso verme puesta, hecha terrero del vulgo bajo y grosero, ni a ti juzgado por falso.

DAGOBERTO. ¿Tienes más que me decir?

ROSAMIRA. No.

DAGOBERTO. ¿Ni viniste a otra cosa?

ROSAMIRA. No.

DAGOBERTO. Mi aldeana hermosa,
mal me sabéis persuadir.
Vamos; que yo daré medio
a lo que más nos importe.

ROSAMIRA. Yo no sé otro mejor corte.
DAGOBERTO. Mil tiene nuestro remedio. (III, vv. 2247-2264)

What is particularly revealing in this exchange is the fact that, although Rosamira has been placed in grave danger by Dagoberto, she never explicitly accuses him of ruining her reputation. Rather, she tries to dissuade him from pursuing his current course of action, arguing that it could result in either her being executed, or him being judged as a liar. The fact that she is clearly concerned for his well-being, and also doesn't ever call him a liar herself, points to the fact that they did, in fact, consummate their relationship, and that it is for this reason that Dagoberto felt the need to resort to such a drastic stratagem. Otherwise, given his high social standing, there should have been nothing impeding him from imploring her father the Duke of Novara to consider him as a potential suitor for his daughter. This would also explain Rosamira's earlier statement in the preceding act, "Quien me deshonra ha de ser / el mismo que ha de honrar, / y esto me hace callar / y culpada parecer" (III, vv. 1973-1976). On the surface, when she utters these words, it appears that she is merely referring to the setup of the trial by combat, wherein the very man who accused her must fight to defend his honor against hers. But beneath these words, we may also detect the obligation to honor her that he should feel if they had consummated their relationship. This also explains his asking her if she has anything else to say to him, and her simple response, no, which she reiterates. This relative silence between them explains their relationship perfectly. If Dagoberto's false accusation were completely baseless, we would expect more anger and indignation from Rosamira than she expresses here. Indeed, she has been highly ambivalent in her silence throughout the play, and once again here, entrusts her safety to her love, even though it
was his misleading accusation, actually a self-accusation and deception by means of the truth, that set the conflict of the play in motion.

After they exit, we return to the prison, where Manfredo and Julia (still disguised as Camilo) go to speak with "Rosamira" (who is really Porcia). Manfredo swears his loyalty to "Rosamira," and vows to defend her in armed combat whether she be innocent, or if her fault was born of true love. Porcia, however, relates instead that she has heard the same promises many times over, and that she decided to maintain her silence and denounce her traitorous accuser with her gaze alone (III, vv. 2341-2348). She then relates a "vision" she had, in which Julia came to her and related her amorous intentions towards him and her great misfortune. Manfredo is both annoyed and confused, proclaiming Rosamira to be crazy, but Camilo (really Julia) is overjoyed with her friend's quick thinking and clever ruse, proclaiming, "Antes parece profeta. ¿Quién le ha dicho lo de Julia?" (III, vv. 2403-2404).

To add to the confusion, Anastasio then arrives after their departure, seeking to speak with Rosamira, and also still unaware of the switch that has taken place. Anastasio then proclaims his loyalty to "Rosamira," vowing to defend her honor. Porcia then makes up an excuse for why the messenger got "lost," and replies, "Ofrecía, finalmente, / de tomaros por esposo: / señal de que es mentiroso / Dagoberto, y yo inocente" (III, vv. 2477-2480). Anastasio, believing Porcia to be Rosamira, accepts with great joy. The real Rosamira's passiveness in allowing her fate to rest in Dagoberto's hands is again contrasted here with Porcia's astucia and activeness in trying to determine her own fate.

Julia, no less the protagonist than Porcia, devises a clever ploy of her own in the following scene, in which Manfredo is preparing to arm himself and practice with sword and buckler for his upcoming duel with Dagoberto. Julia (as Camilo) has the innkeeper call her outside to meet with
Julia, so that she may change into her dress and finally reveal her true identity to Manfredo. Before Manfredo even sees Julia, he begins expressing his doubts, realizing that the upcoming combat has him understandably nervous, owing to Dagoberto's reputation as a skilled swordsman, and also to the uncertainty he feels as to Julia's love for him, admitting, "¿Con qué, para que me venza, / Julia me ha obligado a mí? / Pues no es señal verla aquí / de amor, más de desvergüenza" (III, vv. 2591-2584).

What follows is a comical scene, in which the uncertainty and trepidation that Manfredo feels in his heart is matched by his unsteady hand. As the innkeeper tries to help Manfredo prepare for his upcoming duel by fencing with him, Manfredo encourages the man to charge at him with sword unsheathed. The innkeeper, not wishing to harm the Duke by accident, insists on sheathing the sword, noticing that Manfredo's mind is clearly preoccupied by the situation presented by Julia, and that he cannot keep calm hand. He remarks, "¡Dios ponga tiento en sus manos!" (III, vv. 2607), to which Manfredo replies, "¡Las de amor / son las que me desatienan!" (III, vv. 2608). The cautious and risk-averse Manfredo must now acknowledge that he too has been touched by the hands of Love. The innkeeper cautions him, "estás del Amor tratando, / cuando has de tratar de Marte" (III, vv. 2628-2629).

They are then greeted by the student Tácito, who argues with the innkeeper about loaning him a horse in a bit of very funny, fast-paced dialogue, in which the innkeeper tells the student the horse is too old, lame, and blind to be of service, but Tácito continues to persist in his request. Manfredo finally gives him the money to rent a steed elsewhere. This second portion of the scene is not only delightfully humorous; it also serves principally to introduce a little levity at a point where the dramatic tension is escalating towards a potentially fatal conclusion.
The principle dramatic action resumes in the following scene, where a radiant Julia enters still wearing a veil, planning to reveal her countenance both literally and figuratively to Manfredo. He was apparently so convinced by her disguise that when Julia now reveals her true identity, he initially believes that Camilo is playing a cruel joke on him. But she explains how she came to disguise herself as a shepherd, and then a student, and how she was the person that appeared to Rosamira in her vision. She laments, "soy la que de sí se admira, / viendo las muchas mudanzas que Amor en sus trajes pone, / y que en ninguno dispone, / el fin de sus esperanzas" (III, vv. 2759-2763). Though not nearly as complex as the commentary on performance in Pedro de Urdemalas, Cervantes nevertheless manages to interject commentary on the nature of the mutable roles that the women have to assume in this drama in order to achieve their romantic desires. Indeed, it is only through disguise and changing their identities that they are able to achieve their freedom, much like Pedro in the eponymous play. Moreover, the masculine disguises that the female characters assume, their initial difficulty in acclimating to the speech and mannerisms they must adopt, and their ultimate success in this regard also reflects an unusual degree of awareness in the author's attempt to create verisimilitude, and also contributes to the perception of these women as being imbued with positive, traditionally masculine characteristics like courage and steadfastness. We might think of Malveena McKendrick's analysis of the "mujer varonil" in Spanish drama, which would certainly apply to both Julia and Porcia.343

It is for this reason, in part, that Manfredo is won over by Julia. Not only is she beautiful, but she has also demonstrated her wit and ingenuity and steadfast determination. Manfredo, therefore, admits that he finds her captivating, but still insists that he must see the combat through
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343 See McKendrick (1974) for her elaborate explanation of this archetypal feminine character with traditionally masculine characteristics.
to the end, and asks her to accompany him as his *padrino* in the upcoming battle. He concludes by stating "No te arrodilles; levanta, / que eres mi igual, y aun mejor" (III, vv. 2781-2782). The honorable but cautious Manfredo, who is hardly given to hyperbole, finally recognizes the true merit of Julia, declaring her not only his equal, but perhaps even his superior.

Duke Federico of Novara emerges with two judges, and brings out Rosamira (secretly Porcia), attired as he had instructed, and as the jailer earlier related (in III, vv. 2158-2175). In this final scene, the labyrinthine confusion comes to a climax, as the disguised participants emerge in pairs on the stage. Porcia is now wearing the strange dual-colored veil of mourning and celebration, still pretending to be Rosamira. But the real Rosamira is present, along with Dagoberto, both of whom are disguised as shrouded pilgrims. Anastasio also emerges, himself wearing a veil, and accompanied by Cornelio. After Duke Federico mistakes Anastasio for Dagoberto, Anastasio corrects him, denouncing Dagoberto, and vowing to defend Rosamira. Shortly thereafter, Manfredo emerges with his face wrapped in a silk cloth, with Julia by his side. One of the Judges by Federico's side remarks, "Sin duda, pienso / que had de tener de sobra defensores / la duquesa" (III, vv. 2807-2809), correctly anticipating that Manfredo has come to Rosamira's defense. When the Duke asks "Rosamira" which of the two will defend her, the disguised Porcia places her faith in Anastasio, and responds, "En Dios y en el primero deposito /mi agravio, mi inocencia y esperanza" (III, v. 2833-2334). The judges and crowd grow impatient at Dagoberto's apparent tardiness, for he has not revealed himself yet. Tácito is also present in this scene, serving the dual function of comic relief, as well as providing the reaction of the "common man" to the events as they unfold. He vehemently and violently denounces Dagoberto, furious at his late arrival, and distrustful of his words.
Finally, before the combat can come to pass, a messenger arrives, bearing a letter from Dagoberto (who is still present and disguised, unbeknownst to the crowd). In the letter, Dagoberto explains that he felt forced into denouncing Rosamira in order to prevent her marriage to Manfredo, so that he might not lose her. He explains in the letter that he has already chosen her as his legitimate wife, and that he is of equal social standing as Manfredo, declaring, "tu hija escogió lo que quizá tú no le dieras casándola contra su voluntad." He then vows to serve Federico faithfully as his son if he will have him, and signs the letter, "Tu hijo Dagoberto." Rosamira's earlier statement in act II that "Quien me deshonra ha de ser / el mismo que ha de honrar " (II, vv. 1973-1976) now becomes perfectly clear. Their secret union responds to an earlier paradigm of marriage, prohibited by the Catholic Church during the Council of Trent, which allowed for two individuals who had promised themselves to one another and consummated their union to be officially bound to one another. Rosamira's earlier silence, therefore, was due to her having had relations with Dagoberto previously. This also explains the Duke's reaction to the letter when he resignedly proclaims, "Si esto permite el cielo y lo consiente, / ¿qué puedo yo hacer? Ello está hecho; / gócela en paz" (III, vv. 2875-2877). The fact that Duke Federico himself uses the term "gozar" in this context makes the nature of Dagoberto and Rosamira's relationship quite clear in my view. Federico could of course just be referring to the trick itself, but the wording perhaps reveals that he suspects more has taken place between his daughter and Dagoberto before. Hence, Dagoberto can be forgiven up to a certain point, since he wasn't telling an outright lie in saying Rosamira had slept with a lesser nobleman; rather, he was deceiving by means of the truth, and doing so in the name of their true love. Although it placed both her and others in grave danger, the danger is all averted now. Furthermore, he never intended to abandon her or do wrong by her. It was always
his intention to honor her by taking her hand in marriage, but this was impeded by Duke Federico's attempt to arrange a marriage between her and Manfredo.

Anastasio and Manfredo, greatly displeased with this news, both make their own claim to Rosamira's hand. Anastasio argues that she belongs to him, as he was the first to come to her defense, and Dagoberto, who has shown himself to be dishonest, has not even appeared to face him in combat. Manfredo counters that if she belongs to anyone other than Dagoberto, it is to him. He unveils himself, stating his true identity, and his right to marry Rosamira. Anastasio, unaware of Manfredo's innocence, repeats the accusation that he has stolen Julia and Porcia from his father's kingdom. He then reveals himself as "Anastasio, el heredero / de Dorlán, y de Julia único hermano, / de Porcia primo, por las cuales quiero / probar que eres ladrón torpe y villano" (III, vv. 2919-2922). The interconnected nature of all the characters is made clear to the audience once again, and following Anastasio's lead, Dagoberto now reveals his true identity, demanding that Manfredo safely return his sister Porcia. As the three men continue to argue about the legitimacy of their various claims to Rosamira's hand in marriage, Federico calls upon his daughter to choose her suitor. Indeed, in all the chaos, he shows himself to be a level-headed and just ruler, and does not seem opposed to allowing his daughter to pick her suitor. He is still, however, under the mistaken notion that the disguised Porcia is his daughter, however, and so naturally, she chooses Anastasio as her husband, debating whether she should reveal the truth. This action finally forces the real Rosamira to action, and she cries out, "Lo que tú dices desdigo: / que Dagoberto es mi bien" (III, vv. 2986-2987).

This series of successive dramatic revelation is quite artfully written, and the deliberate confusion is perfectly plotted in a sequence where everything comes to a rapid-fire conclusion, in which the three pairs are finally united. Anastasio first takes Porcia's hand, and declares himself
to her, still believing her to be Rosamira, just as the real Rosamira and Dagoberto join hands and declare their love. When Anastasio realizes he has just promised to marry someone other than Rosamira, he demands to know her identity. In her response, we have a poetic summation of the sequence of events, and her incredibly active role, replete with trials, travails, and folly, in attempting to win her cousin Anastasio's hand:

Soy la que quiso
el Cielo, en todo piadoso,
sacarla de un riguroso
infierno a tu paraíso;
soy la que, en traje mudado,
trayendo amor en el pecho,
procurando tu provecho
he mi gusto procurado;
soy aquella a quien tú diste
de esposa la fe y la mano;
soy quien tiene amor ufano
por ver que no se resiste;
soy de Dagoberto hermana
y soy tu prima, y soy quien,
cuando me falte tu bien,
no soy más que sombra vana.   (III, vv. 2995-3010)

Porcia has once again reiterated the nature of all of the characters’ mutual relations and interconnectedness, and bares her soul to Anastasio in seeking his reciprocal love. Anastasio is moved by her pleas and accepts, but demands to know Julia's whereabouts. Julia finally reveals her true identity to the others. Since Manfredo has lost Rosamira, and his honor and name have now been restored, he graciously accepts Julia's marriage proposition. He declares, "Tu industria y el cielo han hecho / que les seamos esposos; / ellos son lances forzosos; / no hay sino hacerles buen pecho" (III, vv. 3039-3042). Manfredo importantly restates the principal motive of the women's industria as the principal driving force behind the play. The drama concludes with Tácito and the Duke of Novara proclaiming their astonishment at what has just unfolded, and with the
Duke calling for celebration at the miraculous news of the triple marriage, hoping to learn the complete details of their stories.

With this play, Cervantes seems to ask the open question: would it not be better to allow women to participate in the decision of whom they marry, rather than arrange marriages without their say? We have already seen Cervantes' own apparent disillusion and cynicism regarding forced dysfunctional marriages in the interlude *El juez de los divorcios*, in which he advocates caution in entering hastily into a marriage in which the two individuals show clear signs of being ill suited for a long term partnership. Here, the two female protagonists must disguise themselves in order to escape the castle towers where they are being held, where their parents sought to keep them "safe" from the outside world. It is only through the power of disguise and deception that they are able to obtain their freedom, but this is justified in the text by the unreasonable nature of the enclosure to which they are subjected.

It is also worth noting that, in spite of all the transformations that the characters undergo in terms of assumed identities and costume changes, they never fundamentally lose the essence of their respective characters. Unlike the protean Pedro de Urdemalas that is able to reinvent himself countless times, in this play, the function of assumed identities is simpler. It is merely that of a deception that grants freedom and mobility to the play's protagonists. But assuming an alternate identity here lacks the true transformative, creative potential that it has in *Pedro*. We have already seen how at many points in the play, the disguised characters almost give themselves away, owing to their comportment, bearing, and mannerisms, both physical and linguistic. Indeed, at the drama's conclusion, their identities are all restored, and the confusion and the deception dissipate. It is for this reason that I disagree with most modern analysis of this comedy that try to examine it in the
light of being fundamentally about identity. As we have already observed numerous times, it is the active autonomy of Julia and Porcia, contrasted with the reserved dependence and passiveness of Rosamira, that is truly highlighted as a virtue in the play. We must not forget that this is of course a poetic fantasy, and reflects little or nothing of the real social circumstances of the time period. In fact, both the convention of secret marriage and the legal convention of trial by combat dated back to older paradigms, outlawed by the Catholic Church. It is an appeal to these older legal traditions that Dagoberto uses to artfully protect his marriage, by means of an apparent lie that is really a partial truth. Both the accusation levied against Rosamira by him and the accusation against Manfredo turn out to be partial truths, for Manfredo is, in fact, travelling with Julia throughout most of the play, although he is unaware of this fact, and certainly not responsible for any crime, much less a kidnapping. Although the reputation of honorable characters (Rosamira and Manfredo) is placed in jeopardy by Dagoberto and by Julia and Porcia with their respective ruses, in the end, all is justified and forgiven by the true nature of their love. Based on this play, Cervantes clearly sympathizes with young men and women being placed in arranged marriages by their parents without their consultation. Through this play, he suggests that no marriage can be true without the consent of both parties involved and will only cause discord. In this case, it is only strong will (voluntad) and determination of the female characters that liberate them from this fate.

344 There are many excellent modern interpretations of how the female protagonists manipulate various linguistic and dress codes, and even silence itself in order to artfully manipulate and control their circumstances. See in particular Alcalde Fernández-Loza, 193-99, Taddeo, 183-98, and Anderson, 165-85. While I generally agree with all of these analyses of how the women in the play employ language, disguise, and assumed identities to their advantage, in my view, there has been an overemphasis on the significance of metatheater and identity, which I think are both relatively minor themes of the play. In my estimation, the play is more about effectively employing deception in a positive light in the pursuit of freedom, self-determination, and above all, love.
In addition to the playwright's clear admiration for the more traditionally "varonil" characteristics of his two feminine protagonists, there is another respect in which this play differs from the conventional "comedia de capa y espada." And that is the complexity of the relationship between the characters. Rather than having three men, each of whom loves a different woman, but end up pairing off with one of the other women unexpectedly, here, we have three men all seeking to marry the same woman, with two more woman each seeking one of the men's hand in marriage. Casalduero compares this configuration of discordant lovers with the crossed paths of love established by Montemayor in his Diana, noting that the contrast between Cervantes and Montemayor in this case reflects a difference between what he calls "the organic harmony of the Baroque and the mechanical harmony of the Renaissance" (156). But there is an additional consequence of Cervantes' pairing scheme, which is that it grants more autonomy to the female characters. In this case, it is not male suitors that seek to win them over; rather, they must conquer their loves and prove themselves worthy. There is also the added complexity that they are also mutually related, as Anastasio and Julia are brother and sister and cousins with the other brother and sister pair, Dagoberto and Porcia. This serves not only to add to the confusion and complexity of the plot, but also serves to further justify Porcia and Julia's need to employ their masculine identities as Rutilio and Camilo, lest they be discovered by their respective siblings. Although the trope of women dressing up as men is common to many plays of the genre, what makes Cervantes' variation of the trope unique, as we have seen, is the degree of freedom he grants his female characters in taking on the traditionally masculine role of actively seeking out the partner whom they love, rather than passively waiting for him. Finally, the play seems to adopt a sympathetic view towards all the deceptions of its characters, who, in spite of their folly, have ultimately noble intentions. Even though Dagoberto's ploy places Rosamira in danger, he merely intended to delay
her marriage, until he could proclaim the truth. Criticism of this work has been almost silent on all the textual clues we are given which in my view imply that Dagoberto was not, in fact, lying, except by omission, in not implicating himself as the guilty party in "stealing" Rosamira's honor. It is for this reason that he is "allowed" to marry her at the play's conclusion. Dagoberto shows that his only true fault was acting brashly out of jealousy and of rushing headlong into love, a fault for which he makes amends, clearly intending to marry Rosamira himself from the outset. Ultimately, the love between them is mutual, and it is a love that they have already likely consummated. It is for this reason that Duke Federico of Novara is more or less obligated to accept the marriage, for, indeed, it is only if they were not allowed to marry that they would remain in disgrace and public dishonor. In the end, Cervantes seems to suggest that women too should have a say in the business of whom they marry. He creates a couple of strong willed, determined heroines that, to paraphrase Manfredo, are not only the match of the honorable men whom they marry at the play's conclusion, but perhaps their betters. Certainly, to our modern sensibilities, they are far more interesting and intriguing characters than their rather conventional male counterparts, and it is for this reason principally that this play deserves further study the current community of Cervantes scholars.
La entretenida, like some of the previous plays we have examined, has received an incredibly wide range of critical valuation. Maldonado Ruiz stated of the comedy that it was “one of Cervantes’ most perfect,” whereas Marrast felt it was laboriously written and of relatively limited interest. Most modern scholars agree on the depth and complexity of the play, although many are still uncertain about its underlying themes. In order to begin analyzing this play, therefore, it is helpful to begin with what most scholars acknowledge, i.e., that La entretenida is Cervantes' comedic response to and critique of the genre of the comedia de capa y espada. It contains all the usual confusion, intrigue, disguised and assumed identities and trickery common to the genre, but with one key difference: namely, that at the play's conclusion, none of the characters get married, and all their schemes and machinations are for naught. With this play, Cervantes both parodies and critiques the tropes that define the genre. The lack of resolution at the play's conclusion is not only imminently more funny than the more conventional and expected ending of everyone getting married, but it also exposes the human folly of the characters who all sought marriage for imminently selfish reasons, rather than pursuing their true best match.

Joaquín Casaduero rightly observes that this play is located in Cervantes’ compendium directly after El laberinto de amor and suggests that Cervantes himself was deliberately highlighting the difference between the two dramas. Unlike the previous drama, this play does
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345 Maldonado Ruiz, 87 (my translation).
346 Marrast, 23.
347 Ricardo Rojas has suggested that “Cervantes quiso emular a Lope en la comedia de enredo, y fue entonces cuando se extravió por lo confuso de la trama y lo ficticio de las situaciones” (223).
348 This view is shared by Cotarelo Valledor, 431-460; Castro (1925), 50-52; Casalduero, 164-174; Marrast, 23; Avalle-Arce (1959), 418-421; Friedman (1981), 103-117; and Zimic (1992), 221-263, to name a few. According to Cotarelo (98), it was Nasarre who proposed the first incarnation of this view (as far as we know) in the late 18th century.
349 Casalduero, 164.
not take place in a fictionalized, novelesque version of Italy. Rather, it takes place in a verisimilar contemporary Madrid of Cervantes’ day. Further, the protagonists of this play are not upper nobility, but rather, lower-standing ladies and gentlemen of the court, members of the bourgeoisie. To further the parodic contrast with the established paradigms of the genre, an additional feature of this play is the prominence of the servant class, presented in an almost full interlude-like fashion. In this case, the scullery maid Cristina and her three suitors, Ocaña, Quiñones and Torrente, are given just as much protagonism as their courtly counterparts, and serve as a point of contrast with the primary dramatic action. The openly flirtatious and easygoing nature of Cristina provides a point of contrast with her much more reserved and at times standoffish lady of the house Marcela. In this respect, the play is characterized not by a greater degree of complexity than Laberinto, but rather, a different kind of complexity altogether. As we shall see in the course of our investigation, the principle device that moves the dramatic action to its logical conclusion in this play is precisely the denial and deliberate frustration of expectation, through which Cervantes is able to mock the conventions of the genre precisely by not allowing them to come to fruition.

Our play begins with the lackey Ocaña expressing his admiration for the scullery maid Cristina, and trying to win her favor through his platitudes, even though he is aware she is more interested in Quiñones, also vying her for amorous attention. Cristina remains unimpressed, and mocks his trite aphorisms, exposing the lustful drive behind his "noble" proclamations. She also makes several pronouncements indicating that she feels entitled to upward social mobility through

\[350\] \text{Ibid., 165.}

\[351\] \text{Zimic speaks extensively about this aspect of the play, although his interpretation of the author’s humanizing and dignifying the frustration felt by the servant class in this play differs substantially from my own. See Zimic (1992), 221-262.}
marriage, feelings which the play ultimately seems to deride, not so much for the sentiment itself, but, rather, owing to Cristina's feelings of superiority over Ocaña. Ocaña declares, "La mujer ha de ser buena, / y parecerlo, que es más" (I, vv. 81-82), to which Cristina retorts, "Gran predicador estás; / mas tu doctrina condena / a tus lascivos intentos" (I, vv. 83-85). In this way, the play begins to introduce the leitmotif of the contrast between appearance and reality, since Ocaña implies that the appearance of being a good woman is even more important than the underlying truth, a notion Cervantes clearly mocks, as we will later see. Ocaña is visibly angered, his advances having been rebuffed by Cristina, and he laments that she seems more interested in Quiñones only because he is of a marginally higher social standing.

Cristina briefly leaves to clean the grain and returns with the page, Quiñones. She promptly advises him not to speak with Ocaña, lest the latter detect Quiñones’ jealousy, but he refuses to heed her warning. The minor drama is now set: Quiñones and Ocaña both seek to win over Cristina and have mutual jealousy and distrust of one another. They would be archetypal rival lovers, except that, rather than being of the court, they are members of the servant class, more belonging to the entremes genre than the full-length comedy. The scene is characterized by fast-paced dialogue, accusations that take the form of non-accusations, and quick retorts as illustrated by this excerpt:

OCAÑA. Voyame a mi caballeriza, 
por no ver este retablo 
destas dos figuras juntas 
que no se apartan jamás.

QUIÑONES. En tales malicias das, 
que con una mil apuntas; 
y que te engañas sé yo.

OCAÑA. Y también sé yo muy bien 
que a los dos estará bien 
el callar.

CRISTINA. Yo sé que no, 
porque quien calla concede 
con el mal que dél se dice.

OCAÑA. Ninguno te dije o hice.
Although the dialogue is very straightforward and quotidian, it still contains the tropes of rumors and accusations and of their impact on one's reputation. In his jealousy, Ocaña implies, without stating explicitly, that Cristina and Quiñones are already lovers, an accusation which Cristina quickly denies. Ocaña coyly replies that he has not accused Cristina of anything, to which Quiñones responds by stating that this is simply because there could be no possible accusation to be made. The comedy of the scene, as well as the lighthearted commentary on rumors, derives from the accusatory "non-accusation," and the responses it provokes. Quiñones is practically prepared to duel Ocaña for his insolence, but Cristina reminds him that Ocaña is a good man and also an able swordsman. Cristina speaks of her position almost as if she was a member of the court, and they, knights trying to win her hand. She expresses her disdain for Ocaña, since he is a "lowly" lackey, whereas Quiñones is a page. Ocaña himself remarks on the absurdity of this evaluation, given that the role of the page was virtually the same as that of the lackey, and the distinction between the two positions was, in fact, a very minor one. He declares "en mi conciencia, / que hay muy poca diferencia / entre un lacayo y un paje" (I, vv. 142-144).

It is not until the following scene that the main protagonists of the play begin to be introduced. Don Antonio begins to describe to his sister Marcela how he has become afflicted with an all-consuming, jealousy-inducing love. After dismissing Cristina and Quiñones, he continues to describe his love to Marcela:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARCELA.</th>
<th>¿Siquiera no me dirás el nombre desa tu dama?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. ANTONIO.</td>
<td>Como te llamas, se llama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCELA.</td>
<td>¿Como yo?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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D. ANTONIO. Y aun tiene más: que se te parece mucho.

MARCELA. [Aparte] ¡Váleme Dios! ¿Qué es aquesto? ¿Si es amor éste de incesto? Con varias sospechas lucho. ¿Es hermosa?

D. ANTONIO. Como vos, y está bien encarecido.

MARCELA. [Aparte] El seso tiene perdido mi hermano. ¡Válgame Dios! (I, vv. 181-192)

This humorous and yet rather unsettling scene revolves around a misunderstanding. As we later learn in the second act, Don Antonio is in love with a woman named Marcela Osorio, who not only happens to share the name of his sister, but several other characteristics as well. As a result of the unintended seeming equivocation of his words here, Marcela Almendárez, Don Antonio's sister, erroneously suspects him of having incestuous designs towards her. Here, we see the full fruition of what was probably Cervantes' later writing period, in elaborating a complicated enredo that, in certain regards, is conceptually more sophisticated, though not more complicated, than that which he crafted in El laberinto del amor. In Laberinto, the confusion that characters experienced had principally to do with disguise and assumed identities. In this play, by contrast, some of the enredo is based on duplicitous identities, but a significant measure is also constructed around ambiguous language that leads to misunderstandings between the characters. To give one example, part of the humor of this scene is only appreciated in full after the fact, when the audience becomes aware of Marcela Almedárez's understandable error in believing her brother to have incestuous desires for her.

Before Don Antonio is able to disabuse Marcela (Almendárez) of her misunderstanding, his friend and colleague Don Francisco arrives, bearing the unfortunate news that Marcela (Osorio) has been carried off by her father's wishes, and is now being sequestered in an undisclosed location. Don Francisco advises Don Antonio to trust that providence will favor him. But Don Antonio
remains unconvinced, declaring that he should already be favored, since his intentions are pure and he wishes nothing else than to marry his beloved Marcela. This scene establishes the genuine love of Don Antonio for Marcela Osorio and sets up the contrast with the following scene, in which Cardenio enters wearing the traditional ecclesiastical cape and robe worn by students of the era, which immediately identifies him to the audience as a roguish student. He is accompanied by his capigorrón servant Torrente, who is both more pragmatic and a more skillful trickster than his master, and without whom Cardenio’s plan would be impossible. This contrast between master and servant is also in line with the author’s denial of expectations the audience would have for the play, since we would certainly expect this dynamic to be reversed. Cardenio laments the fact that he has fallen impossibly in love with a woman of a higher social standing, which turns out to be Marcela Almendárez. In topical poetic language, Cardenio compares himself to the falling Icarus, remarking, "Yo vengo a ser perfecto semejanza / de aquel mancebo que de Creta el suelo dejó, y, contrario de su padre al celo, / a la region del cielo se abalanza. Caerán mis atrevidos pensamientos, / del amoroso incendio derretidos, / en el mar del temor turbado y frio" (I, vv. 249-255). The use of this hyperbolic and trite language here shows the author’s desire to ridicule the language so often employed in this style of comedy. Indeed, for Cardenio to express himself in these self-aggrandizing terms could only be seen as hilarious by the audience, particularly when contrasted with the language that follows.

Cardenio quickly becomes irritated on realizing that Torrente is eating throughout the duration of his discourse as they walk through the streets. This prompts a Sancho-esque response
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from Torrente, in which he defends his quotidian habit of eating in the street as an inevitable necessity, much to the disgust of his master. He remarks:

Sé cierto que decir puedo,
y mil veces referillo:
espada, mujer, membrillo,
a toda ley, de Toledo.
Las acciones naturales
son forzosas, y el comer
una dellas viene a ser,
y de las más principales" (I, vv. 267-274).

The exchange between the two is not only humorous, but it also serves to accentuate the difference in character and comportment between them. Torrente is clearly a more down-to-earth individual, driven by his compulsions, whereas Cardenio lives a self-imposed tortured existence, in which he is constantly unable to act, as we will see later. The contrasts established between the masters and their servants in this play also gives a much higher degree of protagonism to these secondary characters, who appear here as a more developed version of his similar interlude characters.

Another similar character is Muñoz, Marcela Almendárez's squire. Muñoz is characterized by his advanced age (that is, by the standard of the day; he is probably in his late forties or fifties), and by his desire for profit. His interest in helping Cardenio to win Marcela's hand in entirely self-serving, and motivated by el interés. Cardenio pays Muñoz an escudo (half a gold doubloon) for information about Marcela, prompting Torrente to remark, "la avara condición / vive con la senectud. / Pero, ¿a qué pecho no doma / la hambre del oro?" (I, vv. 329-332). Thus, we see the minor motif of these three men being controlled by one earthly appetite or another, whether it be gluttony, greed, or lust.

Muñoz begins by explaining that Marcela (Almendárez) is not easily moved by pleas, tears, nor sighs, and that she is unlikely to be moved by any outward display of affection of this nature. Torrente, for his part, is extremely skeptical, as they converse briefly about this matter, before
Muñoz finally reveals the substance of his real information about Marcela. He comments that in Lima, Marcela has an uncle who is a gentleman and *caballero* of excellent lineage. About this uncle, he explains, "Tiene un hijo que se llama / don Silvestre de Almendárez, / el cual con doña Marcela, / aunque prima, ha de casarse" (I, vv. 379-382). It merits mention here that in this comedy, unlike in *Laberinto*, the fact that Marcela and Don Silvestre are cousins is relevant as far as the legal requirements of matrimony is concerned, as they require special dispensation from the Pope to marry. By contrast, in *Laberinto*, there is no mention of this in the text when it comes to Anastasio and Porcia's union. This is of no great concern, when we consider that the time and space in which *Laberinto* occurs is much more vaguely defined. Whereas *Laberinto* occurs in a fictionalized Italy of the past, that is somewhat disconnected from any concrete political or historical reality, *La entretenida* takes place in the present-day Spain of Cervantes' time. Hence, the fact that some of the characters are first cousins, but still wish to marry one another, creates a problem for the characters in this play, whereas it was inconsequential in *Laberinto*.

Muñoz's suggestion to Cardenio involves the initial intrigue and confusion of the play. Muñoz counsels:

\[
\text{Fíngete tú don Silvestre,} \\
\text{que yo te daré bastantes} \\
\text{relaciones con que muestres} \\
\text{ser él mismo; y serán tales,} \\
\text{que, por más que te pregunten,} \\
\text{podrás responder con arte,} \\
\text{que, acreditando el engaño,} \\
\text{tus mentiras sean verdades.} \quad (I, \text{vv. 387-395})
\]

Muñoz informs Cardenio that, as don Silvestre has not yet docked in port, Marcela has no idea what he looks like, and, given the right paperwork and knowledge of the family situation, Cardenio could indeed very effectively "infiltrate" the family disguised as don Silvestre. In these verses, we see one of the principle motifs of the play emerge once again, namely, the motif of the
distinction between appearance and reality. In contrast with *Laberinto*, where the assumed identities of the female protagonists granted them freedom and autonomy, here, the assumed identity of don Silvestre is much more in line with the theme of disguise as nothing more than deception. As we shall see, all does not go according to plan, and the ruse winds up creating just as many complications as it could potentially resolve for Cardenio. As Cardenio and Muñoz continue to scheme together, they surmise potential problems with the deception, and try to prepare countermeasures in advance. Torrente comments on the absurdity of the entire situation. He considers the plan to be as flimsy as a house of cards or a tower made of toothpicks (I, vv. 469-470), but Cardenio is determined to go through with it.

In the following scene, Marcela Almendárez expresses her concern to her servant Dorotea over her brother's possible incestuous intentions. But Dorotea tries to put her at ease, correctly observing "pues podrá ser que su dama / se llame, señora, así, / y que se pareza a ti, / si de hermosa tiene fama" (I, vv. 527-530). After this brief exchange, don Antonio reemerges, and Dorotea and Marcela, unseen by him, eavesdrop on him, while he expresses his amorous thoughts and torment out loud. Unfortunately, his words are so passionate and poetic as to convince Dorotea that Marcela may have cause for concern after all, and advises her not to be alone with her brother if at all possible. All this leads to the further complication of the dramatic situation, aggravating the misunderstanding between the characters.

After Marcela and Dorotea depart, unseen by don Antonio, Ocaña emerges and begins talking to his master, after listening to the final portion of his lament. Dialoguing with don Antonio, Ocaña first defends his right to the six rations owed to him, commenting on the injustice that Cristina and Quiñones have received more than he. Don Antonio acknowledges that Ocaña is in the right and promptly vows to pay him the owed rations (I, vv. 589-603). Once again, Cervantes
interjects details of quotidian reality into this play, interrupting the expected conventions of the genre. The reader cannot miss the humor of don Antonio’s amorous lamentations being interrupted to haggle over salary. As we have seen and will continue to see, this is a recurring pattern in the presentation of material. This constant interruption and denial of the expected or conventional by something unexpected or altogether out of place for the genre indeed appears to be the guiding principle around which the entire play is constructed.

Ocaña, like Cristina, thinks very highly of himself, in spite of his low social standing, and proceeds to launch into a discourse about his dexterous mental abilities and discreción, in spite of his condition as a lackey. He exclaims, "Lacayo soy, Dios mediante; / pero lacayo discreto, / y, a pocos lances, prometo / para ser marqués bastante" (I, vv. 653-656). Like Cristina, Ocaña does not accept his station in life, believing himself to be of higher worth than is afforded him by his social position. This inconformity is another recurring theme throughout the play, in which Cervantes shows himself to be more aligned with the conventional values of his day than with our modern sensibilities. Much of this play deals with individuals in love who pretend to be or aspire to be what they are not, as evidenced by their personal shortcomings. In this sense, Cervantes gives us an explanation for why these characters are ultimately not prepared for marriage, and hence wind up alone at the conclusion. They are ultimately immature in their lack of self-knowledge and capacity for self-assessment, and as we have said, unprepared for matrimony. This provides a broader justification for the intricate parody of the comedia nueva style of comedia de capa y espada Cervantes gives us with this play. He orchestrates a complex dismantling not only of the comedia de capa y espada popularized by Lope de Vega, but also of some of the values it embraces, as will become eminently clear at the conclusion.
Don Antonio, inspired by Ocaña's "erudite" pronouncements, decides to make him his confidant. But, in keeping with the humor of the play, don Antonio quickly becomes irritated with his servant’s frivolity, and departs himself, after dismissing Ocaña to his stable. Ocaña, for his part, is too consumed by his own amorous designs to be preoccupied with don Antonio, and sets out for the public plaza, hoping to find Cristina. In the following scene, don Ambrosio, another pretender for Marcela Osorio's hand in marriage, converses with Cristina. He hands her a note to deliver to Marcela, which she agrees to do, in hopes that she will be richly rewarded, mirroring the earlier scene between Muñoz and Cardenio. Don Ambrosio, true to his word, rewards her generously with an ornately painted box, provoking her comment, "La menor de tus mercedes suele ser un Potosí" (I, vv. 750-751), in which she makes the topical hyperbolic comparison between his wealth and the silver mines of Potosí, Alto Perú (present day Bolivia), and thanks him for his liberal generosity. It becomes clear later in the play that don Ambrosio charged Cristina with this task because he is under the mistaken impression that she serves Marcela Osorio rather than Marcela Almendárez. She, however, is quite resourceful, and although it is never made explicit in the play how she manages this, she does deliver the note to the correct Marcela.

Quiñones, who observed the two of them together but couldn't hear their full conversation, immediately expresses his jealousy, which Cristina immediately and rightly dismisses. The dialogue that ensues between them is both playful and angry, with Quiñones threatening to slap her for her "gallardía." As we have already seen thus far, all the characters in this play exhibit significant character flaws. In the case of Quiñones, it his inability to control his irrational jealousy that largely defines the character's actions and expressions of reproach. In this case, when Cristina asks whether he would actually raise his hand against her beautiful countenance, he replies,
"Siempre son desatinadas las venganzas de los celos" (I, vv. 778-779). He is capable of acknowledging his fault, but not of controlling his emotions.

Following this brief exchange, Quiñones commands Cristina to hide among the crowd, hearing Ocaña's approach, and they both exit. Ocaña enters briefly, only to deliver a soliloquy about his lamentable bad fortune in missing Cristina at the plaza. The language he employs is once again typical of courtly love, and doesn't correspond to his status as a lowly lackey, reinforcing once again his self-conception as a "lacayo discreto." In fact, the language he uses is so excessively high-brow in his lament as to be comical. He proclaims:

Partió mi sol de su Oriente,
y al ocaso se encamina,
y tras sí lleva la sombra
que le sirve de arrebol.
Para mí no es este sol,
sino niebla que me asombra. (I, vv. 782-787)

Although his discourse is topical, we might well observe that it is much more the dialogue that we would expect from a noble figure than from a lackey, a figure much more common to the entremés genre. With this drama, Cervantes, as we have mentioned earlier, deliberately gives a much greater degree of protagonism to the servant class, none of whom behave entirely in the expected conventional manner. This deliberate violation of the decorum for their respective roles not only adds to the comedy of the play, but it also serves to "demystify" the language typical of the genre. It creates a disconnect between the courtly language itself and its intended purpose. As becomes clear, it is not real love that characterizes most of the relationships in this play, but rather, lust, foolishness, and desire for wealth. Among other things, it was likely Cervantes' intention to satirize ornate language used to mask these less-than-noble desires.

After Ocaña departs, Muñoz makes a brief appearance, soliloquizing about his regret in taking part in such a convoluted and potentially dangerous plot as his plan with don Antonio. He
is then joined by don Antonio, and Torrente, who is now disguised as a pilgrim, much to Muñoz's consternation, as it was not part of their original plan. Torrente then proceeds to describe how he and his master, "don Silvestre" (who the audience is aware is really Cardenio) came to be shipwrecked, and lost all of their riches and documentation. The scene is extremely funny, with Torrente overacting to the utmost extreme in his description of all the lavish wealth and treasures from the Americas they were forced to abandon:

De perlas, ¡qué de cajas arrojamos; tamañas como nueces, de buen tomó, blancas como la nieve aún no pisada!; de esmeraldas, las peñas como cubas, digo, como toneles, y aun más grandes; piedras bezares, pues dos grandes sacos; anís y cochinilla, fue sin número. (I, vv. 861-867)

Torrente employs the age-old technique of persuading by hyperbole. His claims are so exaggerated and outrageous that no one questions him, for the simple reason that his assertions of wealth are so opulent and ridiculous that they actually become more credible, because they seem too exaggerated for someone to make up without looking like a fool if disproven. He even impresses Muñoz with his glib-seeming sincerity, which is reinforced by the excessive details he provides. Torrente then describes the details of their "voyage," cementing don Antonio's faith in their story and gaining his trust.

The second part of their con is to pretend as though "don Silvestre" is too humble and too proud to accept any aid. Cardenio arrives on the scene, also dressed as a pilgrim, and Torrente exposes his "true" identity as don Silvestre, urging him to accept the help of those who would gladly give it. Cardenio responds, "¡Oh traidor, malnacido! / Por Dios vivo, / que os engaña, señor, este embusterio: / que yo no soy aquese don Silvestre / que dices de Almendárez, sino un pobre / peregrino, y tan pobre" (I, vv. 921-924). By pretending to be too dignified to reveal his "true"
identity, Cardenio cements don Antonio's belief that he is don Silvestre, and don Antonio accepts his "cousin" with open arms. The ruse is certainly rather ingenious, and once again speaks to Cervantes' almost certain direct contact with and intimate knowledge of the real-life underworld culture of the Spain of his day. Indeed, this particular confidence trick of false humility and "refusing" help when presenting oneself as the victim of a tragic mishap is still used in the present day. At the conclusion of this scene, which also concludes the first act, Torrente and Muñoz rejoice in their good fortune at the success of the scam, anxiously dreaming of the riches they will surely receive.

The second act opens with a conversation between Marcela and Cristina, in which the former accuses the latter of lacking discretion, and being too bold in her speech, mannerisms, and actions. Cristina defends herself, proclaiming that servants like herself always suffer the irrational jealousy of the women they serve, who order them around and insult them incessantly. She claims the reason for this jealousy is the freedom with which the servants can interact with their male counterparts, a freedom their masters lack. She observes, imitating the chastising words of these masters: "Vas y nunca vuelves, / y tienes bureo / con Sancho en la calle, / con Mingo y con Pedro. Eres, en fin, pu... / El ta diré quedo, / porque de cristiana sabes que me precio" (II, vv. 1036-1043). As other scholars have already observed, this proclamation is similar to Areusa's complaint in La celestina (I, ix). Both characters, Cristina and Areusa, defend their actions on the grounds that they have done nothing wrong, and that their amas only criticize them because in this one very limited regard, they enjoy a greater degree of freedom, since they aren't held to the same standards of social conduct. Dorotea, who is also present in this scene, is surprised by Cristina's impetuousness with her words, and Marcela remarks that speaking so brazenly chases away shame
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and fear, but that she will emend this fault in her servant (II, vv. 1056-1063). The scene serves as a preview of what is to come in this act, as Cristina's interactions with Quiñones and Ocaña become even further complicated when she meets Torrente, introducing a third potential competitor for her affection. It also serves to establish a contrast between Marcela's reserved approach in matters of love, and her intention to emend the faults in her servant, which run in stark contrast to Cristina's more brash and openly flirtatious nature.

Quiñones enters, announcing the arrival of Don Antonio and two pilgrims, whom the audience now knows are actually Torrente and Cardenio (in the guise of don Silvestre). Muñoz enters with them as well. Cardenio apologizes for his situation caused by the alleged shipwreck once again, before proceeding to throw himself at Marcela's feet, claiming that he is unworthy of kissing her hands. During the entire proceeding, Muñoz makes witty side remarks, commenting on the nature of their scheme, and Cardenio's lack of sincerity. Cardenio then furthers his courtly deception by talking once again of his lost riches, finally proclaiming "hoy se aumenta mi riqueza, / pues con nueva vida y ser, / peregrino llego a ver / la imagen de tu belleza" (II, vv. 1112-1115). With these words, he implies that all the wealth he allegedly lost cannot compare with the wealth he is about to gain in acquiring Marcela's hand in marriage. The dramatic irony of the situation, of course, is that the audience knows that he has, in fact, not lost any money, making his romantic-sounding words completely hollow.

Ocaña then appears on the scene, declaring that he hopes to partake of the collective happiness of the other characters, such that his own unfortunate lot might improve. Concurrently, as Cardenio and Marcela continue their conversation, Torrente also begins to speak to Cristina, clearly taking an interest in her. Torrente is rather forward in the language he employs towards her, and Cristina takes offense, to which Torrente replies with self-deprecating remarks about his
character. As we shall later see, Torrente, just as Quiñones or Ocaña, is completely captivated by Cristina's beauty and wit. At this point, he does not really pursue her as intently as the other two characters; rather, he merely "tests the waters" to see whether or not she might be interested in him.

As the scene progresses, don Antonio suggests that after he rests and recovers, "the pilgrim" tell them of the whereabouts of their aunt and uncle, to which Cardenio once again responds by claiming that all their letters and gifts for the family were lost at sea. While this is transpiring, Ocaña becomes increasingly agitated by Torrente, and by the way that he looks at and speaks to Cristina. Finally, the other characters exit, with don Antonio promising to help "don Silvestre" find some better clothes than his tattered pilgrim attire. As the "nobler" characters exit, only Muñoz, Torrente and Ocaña remain on the stage. Muñoz advises Torrente not to address him just yet to be on the safe side, lest their ruse be discovered, before retreating himself.

After Muñoz's exit, Ocaña confronts Torrente about his desire for Cristina. Once again employing more overly courtly language than would normally be afforded his position of lackey, Ocaña comments, "[Es] C[r]istina un harpón, / es un virote, una jara / que el ciego arquero dispara, / y traspasa el corazón" (II, vv. 1205-1208). Ocaña goes on to describe the raging fires of love that Cristina inspires in his heart. Torrente feigns respect for Ocaña. He comments, "No pienso en manera alguna / seros rival: que sería / género de villanía / que al ser quien yo soy repugna." (II, vv. 1229-1232). Ocaña, in turn, thanks Torrente for his promise, and apologizes for his initial jealousy. Torrente once again shows his devious nature in his attempt to mislead Ocaña into believing he will not be a rival for Cristina. As we will soon see, this is not the case at all.

Don Ambrosio then reappears, and converses with Cristina about whether he still has a chance to win Marcela Osorio's hand. She then disabuses him of his own confusion about the two
Marcelas in question (II, vv. 1318-1334). It is in fact Marcela Osorio, the same Marcela that don Antonio loves, whose hand don Ambrosio seeks. But unaware of this, don Ambrosio confronts Cardenio, mistakenly believing him to be a rival for Marcela Osorio's hand. The language employed by don Ambrosio, who accuses "don Silvestre" of being an "embuster" (II, v. 1338) creates a comical situation in which Cardenio and Torrente believe their cover has been blown, when in reality, they have not yet truly been discovered. Fortunately for Muñoz and Torrente, Cardenio is able to keep his composure, and maintain their collective deception. While this transpires, Cristina quickly flees, as don Francisco and her master and the brother of this Marcela, don Antonio, enter.

Don Ambrosio then proceeds to proclaim that Marcela Osorio properly belongs to him, and urges his rival, don Antonio, to desist in his attempt to win her favor. He mistakenly believes that Marcela Osorio's father has hidden her in his rival’s house. Don Francisco immediately realizes that don Ambrosio is referring to Marcela Osorio, and not don Antonio's sister (II, vv. 1398-1399), finally alleviating some of the tension between the two, for although they remain romantic rivals, don Ambrosio's jealousy is somewhat assuaged by knowing that the Marcela he seeks is not already ensconced in the home of another man who seeks to marry her. Don Antonio then agrees to take don Ambrosio to his sister Marcela Almendárez to lay to rest his confusion once and for all. Don Antonio, don Francisco and don Ambrosio exit, leaving the scheming trio of Muñoz, Torrente and Cardenio on the stage. Cardenio then proceeds to chastise Muñoz for being so nervous, and Torrente and Muñoz mutually recognize that there can be no turning back from their ruse now. The rapid juxtaposition and fast pace of the dialogue in these scenes is well controlled, and the confusion between the characters and the dramatic tension is sustained through all these asides.
Marcela confides in Dorotea once again in the following scene, confessing that she is not too taken with her cousin "don Silvestre." Dorotea tries to console her with the thought that it is simply his humble rags that cause him to appear less gallant, but Marcela rebukes her by saying simply "Basta; poco me apetece" (II, v. 1445). She also makes it apparent that she still believes her brother don Antonio has incestuous intentions towards her, unaware that he in fact loves Marcela Osorio.

Don Antonio brings don Ambrosio to meet his sister, and the latter immediately recognizes that he was in error in believing her to be "his" Marcela, explaining, "Ésta le parece en algo, / y no es ella; mas ya veo, / sin duda, que es devaneo, / y que de sentido salgo" (II, vv. 1462-1464). He explains to Marcela Almendárez that he loved another with the same name and similar grace and composure, but whose father locked her away from the world. Don Antonio replies simply, "Ésta es mi historia" (II, v. 1485), as the characters mutually acknowledge for the first time that they love the same woman. Don Ambrosio then once again states his love for Marcela Osorio, and apologizes for his foolish behavior. At this point, Dorotea realizes that it must be this Marcela Osorio with whom don Antonio is enamored, and the continued confusion that had carried over from the first act is neatly resolved, at least, until the subsequent arrival of the real don Silvestre in the final act. Torrente, Muñoz and Cardenio breathe a collective sigh of relief, finally understanding that don Ambrosio had not, in fact, uncovered their ruse. Rather, his anger with Cardenio was simply a result of his mistaken belief that they both sought the hand of Marcela Osorio. For his part, don Ambrosio continues to apologize profusely for his confusion, and, with the expected poetic tropes and references to classical antiquity, once again proclaims his love for Marcela Osorio, stating, "Yo vuelvo a renovar mi pena antigua, / buscando aquélla que me encubre el cielo, / y, mientras dónde está no se averigua, / un Sísifo seré nuevo en el suelo" (II, vv. 1554-
before exiting. Don Antonio then remarks on his own distress at the confirmation that don Ambrosio loves the same woman as he, and his friend don Francisco consoles him and gives him advice. All the while, Muñoz and Torrente express their relief at having narrowly avoided discovery (II, vv. 1563-1581). To conclude the scene, Cardenio, Dorotea and Marcela discuss the latter’s mistaken belief that her brother had an indecent crush on her, and her embarrassment at ever having believed such a thing (II, vv. 1582-1616). As we can see from the example of this scene, one of the major virtues of this play is the ease with which Cervantes has mastered the simultaneity of multiple actions on the stage. The fact that there are numerous rapid-fire exchanges and asides between the characters allows for extremely funny and dynamic action, even when the confusion of the characters is finally brought to a natural resolution, as it is here.

In the following scene, Cardenio once again converses with his two cohorts, Torrente and Muñoz, about their plot. Torrente is somewhat irritated with Cardenio for taking so long to get closer to Marcela, but Cardenio responds simply that he has had scarcely any occasion to be alone with her. Muñoz, for his part, scolds Torrente for his imprudence. The conversation quickly turns to the money they hope to gain from their gambit, with Muñoz expressing extreme skepticism about obtaining any of the treasure from Peru in the possession of the real don Silvestre's family. Once again we are reminded that Muñoz's only motivation to aid Cardenio in his scheme was material, and he is increasingly concerned that the wealth they plan to obtain may be as nonexistent as that which Cardenio claims to have lost at sea. Before the trio can continue their

355 Like the earlier allusion to Icarus, this allusion to the Greek myth of Sisyphus, king of Ephyra, who was condemned by the Gods to push a large boulder up a hill, only to watch it roll back down and be forced to start all over again, for all eternity, is extremely topical. Indeed, even today, the use of this myth as a symbol for fruitless labor continues to be employed with great frequency. In this particular drama, however, it has an added significance. We must not forget that Sisyphus himself was a great trickster, and condemned by the gods for his self-aggrandizing deceitfulness.
conversation, Cristina approaches, and Torrente asks for a moment alone to converse with her. He begins by trying to court her explicitly, completely betraying his earlier promise to Ocaña. Unfortunately for him, Ocaña hides behind a tapestry, and eavesdrops on their entire exchange. Even the stage directions for this scene are replete with comedic touches, as Cervantes calls for the character to hide behind the tapestry in such a way that "se le parezcan los pies no más."

In trying to win her affection, Torrente immediately uses the recourse of talking about the money he possesses from the West Indies. Still playing the role of the well-to-do servant of don Silvestre, he comments, "Que es posible que no precies / los montones de oro fino / y por un lacayo indino / un perulero desprecies?" (II, vv. 1679-1682). Some comedic dramatic irony is present when Cristina, unaware of Ocaña's presence, remarks, "Hablad, Torrente, más bajo, / si por ventura podéis; / que dicen que las paredes a veces tiene oídos" (II, vv. 1701-1704), a sentiment which Torrente echoes shortly thereafter as well. Cristina then attempts to take advantage of the situation by getting Torrente to handle Ocaña for her. She claims that she has been the victim of Ocaña's rumors and harassment, and that she will be in Torrente's debt and throw herself at his feet if he beats up Ocaña for her, declaring, "Con sólo media docena / de palos que tú le des, / rendida vendré a tus pies" (II, vv. 1731-1733). Torrente agrees to her request and departs shortly thereafter. Cristina is quite pleased with herself, until she catches sight of Ocaña's feet, and cries out, causing him to emerge from behind the tapestry.

In the final scene of the second act, Ocaña confronts Cristina about her betrayal, but she tries to pretend the whole affair was merely an amusing jest. She explains that she had no serious intention of having him come to harm, and that she was going to warn him before this could come to pass. Although Ocaña has his doubts, Cristina is able to persuade him that her intentions were not to have him assaulted. After Ocaña departs, however, she comments to herself "Con esto me
quitaré dos importunos delante" (II, vv. 1799-1800). Cristina shows herself once again to be masterful at flirting, scheming, and manipulating the men in her life to get what she desires. As we have seen thus far, her principle characteristics are her beauty, her cunning, and her exuberance, all of which she uses to her maximum advantage. Unfortunately for her, as we already know, in the end, her playful flirtation with and manipulation of her three suitors ultimately backfires, and she winds up alone.

The act concludes with a comedic sonnet de cabo roto\textsuperscript{356} pronounced by Ocaña, which has the particularity of having not only the final syllable at the end of each verse omitted, but also the final syllable of the middle of each verse. The omission of syllables is deliberately inconsistent at one or two points, adding to the comedy. It is, in fact, one of six sonnets featured in this drama, all of which are a parody of love sonnets and their use in the theater.\textsuperscript{357} Because this particular sonnet closes out the second act, and because its comedic effect is so clear, it bears reproducing in its entirety for the benefit of the reader:

\begin{quotation}
Que de un lacá- la fuerza poderó-,
hecha a machamartí- con el trabá-,
de una fregó- le rinda el estropá-,
es de los cie- no vista maldició-.

Amor el ar- en sus pulgares to-,
sacó una fle- de su pulí- carcá-,
encaró al có-, y diome una flechá,
que el alma tó- y el corazón me do-.

Así rendí-, forzado estoy a cre-
cualquier mentí- de aquesta helada pu-
\end{quotation}

\textsuperscript{356} This particular poetic form, in which the final syllable of each verse is omitted, such that the rhyme is comprised of what would otherwise be the penultimate syllable of each final word, is, of course, also used by Cervantes in some of the poems that introduce \textit{DQI}. This form, apparently invented or at least popularized by the infamous satirical poet of the underworld, Alonso Álvarez de Soria (1573-1603), was used exclusively for burlesque parodic or satirical poems. See ed. Sevilla Arroyo & Rey Hazas, \textit{DQI}, p. 25, n. 67.

\textsuperscript{357} See Casalduero (1951), 169, for more details about the other sonnets of this play. The others are considerably more conventional, but I feel the burlesque and irreverent nature of this sonnet in particular merits a slightly more detailed analysis here.
que blandamen me satisface y hie-.
¡Oh de Cupí- la antigua fuerza y du-,
cuánto en el ros- de una fregona pue-,
y más si la sopil se muestra cru-! (II, vv. 1803-1816)

Clearly, the language of this poem is already in stark contrast with some of the other, more courtly language that Ocaña has used earlier in claiming to be the erudite lackey. Although it begins with typical lament of *el amor no correspondido*, Ocaña goes so far as to literally call Cristina "a cold bitch" in this sonnet (omitting, of course, the final syllable of the insult), in stating that the force of his love is such that he is compelled to believe whatever lies she wishes to feed him. Aside from this, all of the language is deliberately commonplace, except for the topical reference to cupid; Cervantes mocks just how clichéd this language was in poems of the day. To have words like "fregona," "marchamartillo," and "estropajo" in a poem about unrequited love is obviously hilarious and perfectly achieves the desired effect. From a dramatic standpoint, the poem also informs us that Ocaña is aware that Cristina is lying to him and doesn't fall for her ruse, but feels obliged to believe her regardless. Such is the extent of his mad love for her.

The third act opens with another sonnet, spoken this time by don Antonio, which stands in stark contrast to the last. Not only is this love sonnet much more conventional and serious in tone, but it is replete with the topical courtly language that we would normally expect in this kind of *comedia*. It concerns the passing of the seasons from winter to spring restoring the plant life to its former glory. Don Antonio argues that sadly, this is not the fate of the spurned lover, who is damned to infernal rage by his jealousy that not even time can cure (III, vv. 1817-1830). The short sonnet serves a dramatic purpose as well, in marking a contrast between the rustic Ocaña and the courtly gentleman, don Antonio, and the differences between how each of them approaches and discusses his unrequited love. As we have seen, although Ocaña considers himself a "lacayo discreto," and can occasionally employ courtly language aptly, he is still characterized by more
quotidian language when he is not in the presence of others. The frustration and jealousy felt by these characters, Ocaña and don Antonio, is revealed here to be quite similar in nature, in spite of the stark contrast of the language with which it is expressed. With this contrast between their speech patterns, the drama illustrates that regardless of the language with which someone expresses something, the underlying reality remains the same.

The third act begins in earnest with the entrance of don Francisco. This loyal friend and confidant of don Antonio desperately tries to convey glad tidings, but in the comical exchange that ensues between them, don Antonio is so caught up in his own woeful regret over his unrequited love that don Francisco can scarcely get a word in edgewise. Don Francisco has many false starts in this exchange, in which he interjects optimistic platitudes to attempt to provoke a transition in the conversation and announce his good news, but each time he does so, he is immediately interrupted by more of don Antonio's morose lament. Even when he finally manages to begin to relate his news, don Antonio is insufferable in his constant interjections, which completely interrupt the narrative flow. In this way, Cervantes parodies the archetypal anxious lover of the comedia de capa y espada, who is so overanxious in this instance that the conversation takes much longer than it reasonably should. The dialogue comes to a point where don Francisco becomes so flustered and so impatient with don Antonio's utterances that he launches into a series of irate pronouncements. He angrily exclaims, "¡Por vida juro! ¡Muérđome / la lengua! ¡Voto a Chito, / que estoy por...! ¡Lleave el diablo / a cuantos álfeñiques hay amantes!" (III, vv. 1903-1906). He then relates a comic short anecdote relaying the proverbial message of attentive silence when a friend comes bearing news. Even after he convinces don Antonio to let him speak, he is still interrupted by don Antonio's impatient request for him to hurry up and get to the point of his story, which ironically only delays the conclusion further.
Finally, don Francisco is able to relay the relevant information, and informs his friend that he spoke with don Pedro, the father of Marcela Osorio. He explains their conversation, "Dijo que yo sea parte, / como que él nada entiende, / que a Marcela, su hija, / se la demandes por mujer" (III, vv. 1963-1966). After a considerable amount of shock and disbelief on the part of don Antonio, who goes so far as to remark, "¿Viste si era fantasma o no?" (III, v. 1978) regarding the encounter with don Pedro, he is finally able to hear and accept the good news that his friend has brought him. He also learns that Marcela Osorio is sequestered at the monastery of Santa Cruz. The whole of this scene is a masterful way to keep the audience in suspense, while at the same time parodying the tropes and conventions of the comedia de capa y espada, with all of its romantic clichés. The suspense is punctuated by the rapid back-and-forth exchange between the two characters, in which don Antonio's unwillingness to hear and finally accept his good fortune can only be described as hilariously insufferable.

After this conversation is finally concluded, Marcela and Cristina enter, and Marcela asks on behalf of Cristina for permission to stage a party and brief theatrical interlude, complete with song and dance, performed by the servants. At this point, don Antonio is so elated with the good news he has received from don Francisco that he gladly accepts their proposal without any reservations. After don Francisco and don Antonio depart, Marcela cautions Cristina to ensure that the dance and entremés they perform be "discreto, alegre y cortés, / sin que haya en él cosa fea" (III, vv. 2058-2059). Cristina tries to praise the composition that the servants have put together as much as possible, remarking that Torrente, Muñoz and Ocaña have all contributed to the writing. She remarks that Ocaña is "un poeta valiente" (III, v. 2064), and also comments about the dance "tiene de lo grave y tierno, / de lo melifluo y flautado" (III, vv. 2070-2072). Cristina also confesses "Es lacayuno y pajil / el entremés, y me admira / de verle una tiramira / que tiene de fregonil" (III,
vv. 2073-2076). In this way, Cristina does a bit of her own critique of the themes and overall nature of the play-within-a-play that the audience (both theatrical and within the play) will soon see performed. The metatheatrical elements of this play, though not ultimately as sophisticated as those on display in Pedro de Urdenas, are nevertheless quite insightful. In this drama, Cervantes is able to incorporate a short interlude that is actually integral to the action of the main drama and hence inextricable from it. As we shall see, Torrente and Ocaña are able to get their revenge on Cristina for her conflictive messages to each of them by means of a deception in the play-within-a-play.

In the following scene, Torrente and Ocaña confront one another, each bearing clubs, with which they intend to bludgeon the other. As irate as they both are initially, and after much posturing they come to realize the absurdity of the situation, as Ocaña remarks in self-aggrandizing fashion, "¿Han de fenecer aquí, / por gustos de mozas viles, / dos Héctores, dos Aquiles?" (III, vv. 2125-2127). The pair quickly becomes aware that Cristina has bid each of them to thrash the other. United in their shared plight, they vow to get revenge on her. Just as they are about to venture to drink and scheme together, Cristina approaches expecting to see the pair tattered and beaten and finding them calmly sitting instead. With the three together, each of the two men makes a claim to Cristina. Naturally, Cristina is only interested in what she can get out of either man, and she does not truly fancy either of them. Torrente tries once again to bribe her with the money he claims will surely arrive from Perú, whereas Ocaña, not possessing much money and not being given to such trickery, offers merely that he has penned the verse of the interlude they will perform, and that she should content herself with that. When the pair once again insists that Cristina tell them which of the two she favors, she replies simply that their request is unjust, and states "si gustáis / que por señas os lo diga, / haré lo que a más me obliga / el amor que me mostráis" (III, vv. 2189-2192).
She then proceeds to request Ocaña's handkerchief, which he gladly offers to her, and then she hands Torrente a handkerchief of her own before departing, leaving the two as confused as ever. Once again, Cristina delights in amusing herself with the men who pursue her, giving deliberately ambiguous signs and leaving them in consternation. Of course, we already know that her coquettish ways do not ultimately lead to her success. After Cristina's departure, the two men continue to debate what her signs meant, and which of them she truly favors, before agreeing that her answer is not clear. They then depart themselves.

In the following scene, don Antonio, Muñoz, Cristina and Marcela reemerge, announcing the beginning of the play-within-a-play. Torrente and Ocaña also appear, dressed as lackeys wearing shrouds. They proceed to debate the opening of the interlude about to be performed, before Dorotea and Cristina emerge on the scene, dressed as scullery maids. Cristina and Dorotea likewise discuss the short interlude they are about to perform, describing how they will dance until they drop. They also talk about the other dancers briefly, before gossiping about their own respective masters (amos). They lament the fact that their amas are so well behaved and have so few objectionable habits that they have no bits of gossip they can hold over them as leverage to avoid being scolded. As Dorotea articulates this view, "Verdad dices: / que el ama de quien sabe su criada / tiernas fragilidades, no se atreve, / ni aun es bien que se atreva, a darle voces, / ni a reñir sus descuidos, temerosa / que no salgan a plaza sus holguras" (III, vv. 2279-2284).

The short interlude then begins, with the town barber dancing as the musicians play. It was mentioned earlier in the play that the town barber was a skilled dancer, and the musicians

---

358 Zimic, 252-253, presents an excellent and very suggestive alternate interpretation of this “interlude” in his analysis of the play, in which he deliberately asks more questions than he answers. In the course of his inquiry, he compares the effect of this play-within-a-play dynamic to that of the nineteenth-century opera I pagliacci by Leoncavallo, and also asks the question of
comment on this fact once again for both audiences (the actual public, as well as the other characters within the play observing the spectacle). Ocaña doesn't approve of the music and dance with which they begin, and demands that they play seguidillas and play cleanly. The musicians then perform a traditional *cantarcillo*\(^{359}\) about a young woman addressing her mother who has her locked away. The lyrics deal with how appetite and desire increase when one is in a state of privation, as well as with the implacable force of love, ending each verse with the coda, "que si yo no me guardo, / mal me guardaréis" (III, vv. 2321-2322). Initially, everyone except Ocaña enjoys the performance. He seems to feel, however, that the dancing is indecent, because the female and male dancers are too close to one another for his taste. Torrente then chimes in with disapproving remarks of his own, stating that "pues son requiebros los quiebros" (III, v. 2356). Part of the humor in this scene emerges from the fact that it is the lackeys, precisely the characters who are supposed to be of the lowest social standing, and consequently the least refined, who are most upset about the "lascivious" nature of the dancing. This posture is designed to make themselves seem more decent and well-intentioned, and it contains as well a parodic touch that furthers their characterization as the jealous *galán* lovers, a role which would normally be afforded only to their masters and other higher-ranked courtly counterparts.

As the dance progresses, Ocaña expresses his desire to dance with Cristina. Torrente, of course, refuses to allow this to come to pass. The two of them begin to argue, until Torrente, seemingly consumed by jealous rage, appears to stab Ocaña in front of the entire crowd. Muñoz remarks "Diole. ¡Mal haya la farsa / y el autor suyo primero! Pero yo no di esta traza, / ni escribi

---

\(^{359}\) The traditional *cantarcillo* which they sing was one of the most widespread in texts of the time period, and can also be found in *El celoso extremeño*. See ed. Sevilla Arrollo & Rey Hazas, 107, n. 138.
tal en mis versos" (III, vv. 2404-2407). With these verses, he indicates to the audience that Torrente's response was not part of the script. In an instant, it appears as though the comedy has turned into a tragedy, as Cardenio cries out, "¡Huye, traidor enemigo; / huye, traidor que le has muerto!" (III, vv. 2418-2420). Don Francisco vows to bring the authorities, as Cristina praises his actions and condemns the two men and their foolish, jealous love. The constable (alguacil) arrives with his peace officer (corchete) and the two begin to investigate. At this point, Ocaña arises, miraculously unharmed, and explained what has actually transpired. He comments, "Tú, compasivo barbero, / por lo hueco de una bota / entraste la tienta a tiento" (III, vv. 2369-2471). In other words, Ocaña has simply been stabbed through a wineskin, concealed in his clothing, and it was wine rather than blood that was spilled. It was all a prank to scare Cristina and exact their revenge for her cruel attempt to play a trick on them and have them beat each other. Clearly, their prank did not have the desired effect, since Cristina hardly lamented Ocaña’s loss when she believed him dead. Although this drama does not contain nearly as much commentary on the nature of theater as Pedro de Urdemalas, this scene provides playful commentary on the ease with which an author can manipulate the emotions of the audiences or change the entire tone of a piece with one dramatic scene. The Alguacil himself notes how close they came to tragedy, commenting, "De que todo sea comedia / y no tragedia, me alegro" (III, vv. 2496-2497). Part of what makes this scene so effective on a dramatic level is that neither the fictional audience within the play nor the real audience observing both the play and the play-within-the-play is initially aware of Ocaña and Torrente's prank. Thus, this scene presents us with a kind of reverse dramatic irony, in which some of the characters are aware of a truth of which the audience is not. These characters, Torrente and Ocaña, foil the authorial intentions of the fictional author, Muñoz, who also has no idea of what his two actors are doing, apparently fighting for real in the middle of the play. Muñoz comments
that the design of the trick was his invention together with the barber, but that the employment of the device in this way was not his intention. He remarks, "El principio todo es mío, / pero no lo fue el progreso; el perulero y Ocaña / tienen el diablo en el cuerpo" (III, vv. 2504-2507). In this respect, the scene is much more complex than it initially appears. Although not nearly as profound a commentary about the nature of acting and performance as we see in Pedro de Urdemalas, it nevertheless serves as a very effective commentary on and criticism of the manipulation of tone and emotion in the Spanish comedia. As Cervantes illustrates here, with a single device, an author can turn a tragedy into a comedy or vice-versa. In this case, however, it is the actors who undermine the authorial intentions of Muñoz, adding an additional layer of complexity to the scene.

After the ruse is revealed and all the characters exit, the following scene introduces a conflict of an entirely different nature. The real Don Silvestre de Almendárez\(^{360}\) enters sporting a large gold chain with his travel companion Clavijo. The real don Silvestre remarks that he will not marry Marcela if her beauty does not match that of her portrait (III, vv. 2527-2530). Clavijo approves of this resolve and advises him in the typical expected fashion of a friend and confidant. Don Silvestre immediately recognizes his cousin don Antonio's house and is grateful for what will in his mind surely be a pleasant reunion. Marcela and Dorotea then emerge, along with Quiñones and Muñoz, on their way to church. These characters discuss the prank that has just transpired once more, and also comment that “don Silvestre” (Cardenio) is still resting at the Almendárez home, taking advantage of his leisure perhaps a little too much. As they pass by, don Silvestre and Clavijo make cordial gestures to Marcela and her company, which she reciprocates without realizing who they are. As the quartet of Marcela, Muñoz, Dorotea and Quiñones exits, don

---

\(^{360}\) The stage directions here make a point of clarifying for the benefit of the theatrical company performing the drama that this is, indeed, the real Don Silvestre, as opposed to Cardenio impersonating him, referring to him as "Don Silvestre de Almendárez, el verdadero."
Silvestre and Clavijo realize something is amiss, having heard Marcela’s comments about “don Silvestre” resting comfortably at their home. Don Silvestre recognizes his cousin from the portrait of her he bears, but at this juncture, she is still unaware of his identity.

Don Silvestre and Clavijo then spot the lazy Muñoz skipping out on part of the church service, too hungry and cold, he remarks, to stand on his feet through the sermon. Just to be certain, Clavijo inquires of Muñoz who the woman was that just passed them by and entered the church of San Sebastián. Muñoz details to them what they already knew, that she is in fact his cousin, and that “don Silvestre” is already staying with them. Muñoz explains that this “don Silvestre” arrived “en camisa, porque en una gran tormenta / echo al mar dos mil valijas / llenas de tejuelos de oro / finísimo y plata fina” (III, vv. 2627-2631). The comedy produced in this scene is due to the fact that Muñoz, having helped Cardenio and Torrente with their ruse, is completely unaware of don Silvestre’s identity at this point, and hence unwittingly reveals too much.

Torrente then returns and enquires about Cristina. Shortly thereafter, a letter carrier comes, bearing a letter for Don Antonio. This letter presumably contains the expected special dispensation from the Pope which would enable the marriage between (the real) don Silvestre and Marcela. But the dramatic revelation of whether or not the dispensation was granted is delayed until the play’s conclusion. Muñoz, being both poor and stingy, reacts indignantly to the fee of one escudo that he is told he must pay to receive the letter, sending the mail carrier to approach the butler for the fare instead (III, vv. 2664-2667). Once the messenger leaves, Torrente and Muñoz continue to dream of the festivities that will take place once the marriage proceedings are in order. As Muñoz and Torrente continue their conversation, they once again make reference to the feigned shipwreck, trying to stay in character. All the while, they are completely unaware of don Silvestre’s true identity, and he and Clavijo begin to press Torrente on the details of this supposed voyage, by
mentioning specific nautical points of reference. Torrente desperately tries to fake a working knowledge of sailing and of the specific geographical points of reference, about which he clearly knows little. Don Silvestre, amused by Torrente’s farce, remarks with a mocking irony, “Donaire encierra / el peregrino, en verdad: / que si aspirara a piloto, / que yo le diera mi voto / con poca dificultad, / porque describe los puertos / y los golfos bravamente” (III, vv. 2715-2721). Muñoz responds by stating that Torrente is indeed one of the most skilled pilots of Gadacanal, Alanís, Jerez, and Cazalla, all regions known for their wine production, none of which is a port city. With this comment, he jocularly implies as an inside joke that Torrente is a drunk. Torrente and Muñoz then exit, still leaving the real don Silvestre curious about who is impersonating him.

In the following scene, don Ambrosio emerges holding a letter, accompanied by don Antonio and don Francisco. He is overjoyed that, after all his travails, he has received the best possible news he could hope for. He declares, “Ya Marcela ha parecido, / y con esa letra y firma / todos mis bienes confirma; / ya, cual veis, soy su marido” (III, vv. 2748-2751). Don Antonio, feeling rather dejected, acknowledges don Ambrosio’s good fortune, but also remarks that he knows her father will not approve, but don Ambrosio is unconcerned. He observes, “Él ni nadie será parte / a que se rompa la fe / que con sangre viene escrita / en ese papel que veis” (III, vv. 2758-2761). This point marks a stark contrast between the two Marcelas of the play. Unlike the levelheaded and at times rather dispassionate Marcela Almendárez, Marcela Osorio responds with passionate ardor to don Ambrosio’s request. In fact, this is the only solid proclamation of marriage to which both parties seem committed that transpires during the duration of the drama, even if it never ultimately comes to fruition. There is a certain irony in the fact that this more passionate and perhaps more interesting character of Marcela Osorio never appears on the stage, once again defying our expectations. In light of this response, Don Antonio then wishes don Ambrosio well.
in his future marriage, recognizing that he has already lost in view of Marcela’s commitment to
marriage signed in blood. But just as don Ambrosio begins to rejoice in his good fortune, Pedro
Osorio approaches, prompting don Ambrosio to make a hasty retreat, since he knows Marcela’s
father disapproves of him.

In keeping with the reversal of fortune so essential to this drama, in the following scene,
Pedro Osorio speaks with don Antonio, telling him that he happily accepts his marriage proposal
for his daughter, and offers a dowry of two thousand ducados. Don Antonio responds that he would
happily accept this, were it not for the news of Marcela’s acceptance of don Ambrosio’s marriage
proposal. The father, furious, cannot bear this news, proclaiming irately, “Primero que él la vea, /
primero que él la toque, / primero que la goce, / ha de perder la vida, o yo la mía” (III, vv. 2816-
2819). One curious point to note about the relationship between don Ambrosio and Pedro Osorio
is that we never learn why it is specifically that don Pedro disapproves so strongly of the former,
other than that he sees him as somewhat of a dandy and a seducer. The relationship between Pedro
and his daughter is simply presented as another classic case of the daughter disagreeing with the
decision made by her father. Just as in El laberinto de amor, Cervantes shows once again the
problem with arranged marriages. Only, in this play, given that he is parodying the genre of
comedia de capa y espada, the conclusion is different. Just as the characters turned what could
easily have been a tragic moment in the play-within-a-play into a comical one, Cervantes will turn
the traditional expected ending of marriage into a comedic denial of expectations for everyone. In
this case, as we shall soon see, don Antonio is frustrated by Marcela’s own choice of don
Ambrosio, who in turn is frustrated in his attempt to marry Marcela by her own father, who favors
don Antonio. Thus, each of the characters, selfishly promoting their own agenda, winds up
blocking the intention of the others, and as a result, no marriage at all takes place. We will see this
pattern repeat itself with the other two major romantic entanglements, that of the servants and that of Marcela Almendárez and her suitors, as well at the play’s conclusion.

Ocaña also expresses his disapproval at this most recent dramatic development, feeling sympathy for Marcela Osorio’s father (III, vv. 2828-2835). But don Antonio rebukes his servant for this indiscretion in expressing his sentiment as though they were all of the same social standing. Finally, don Pedro leaves in a rage, vowing to block his daughter’s marriage. Don Antonio, though distraught, is somewhat more sensible, and realizing that he has already lost Marcela, accepts his fate, proclaiming “Doncella de escritorios, / de públicas audiencias, / de pruebas y testigos, / no es para mí” (III, vv. 2860-2863). Even if don Ambrosio’s handwritten acceptance from Marcela is falsified, don Antonio is not willing to take the risk, knowing that even a forgery would already have sullied her reputation, and that many would not question that she had promised herself to don Ambrosio already. It is noteworthy, however, that the characters even question whether or not Marcela Osorio’s handwritten acceptance of don Ambrosio is a forgery. Both don Antonio and especially don Pedro seem unwilling to accept that Marcela has made her own decision, which differs from that of her father. Even though don Antonio accepts that he has lost Marcela, he only accepts this because he does not wish to subject himself to the legal debate and public scrutiny over who Marcela’s rightful husband is that would doubtlessly ensue. In this way, Cervantes reminds us once again that in his time, marriage was primarily a financial agreement, and the notion of marriage for love alone was still largely a literary fiction.

Torrente and Cardenio then reemerge, and Torrente advises Cardenio not to remain in silence, and to proclaim his love openly for Marcela Almendárez. Cardenio is still the anxious, apprehensive lover, so paralyzed by his fear that he is unable to act. Immediately afterwards, Marcela, Dorotea, Muñoz, Cristina, and Quiñones enter, followed by don Silvestre and Clavijo.
Now that all the major characters are present, the stage is set for the grand finale. Don Silvestre coyly asks to speak with the “Don Silvestre” he has heard is staying at the Almendárez house. The real don Silvestre pretends to be a servant of his own father, demanding of Cardenio that he reveal what happened to the thirteen thousand pesos he was supposed to have been given by his parents. Torrente foolishly disputes the amount, claiming it was in fact fourteen thousand. Of course, Cardenio once again tries to claim that all of the money was lost at sea, but as the real don Silvestre interrogates him more and more, his story starts to fall apart. Don Silvestre inquires, “¿Vuesa merced tiene, acaso, / otro hermano?” (III, vv. 2923-2924), to which Cardenio responds in the affirmative, immediately prompting Muñoz to exclaim, “No, señor. ¡Oh grande error! / ¡Mil sustos de muerte paso!” (III, vv. 2926-2927). Don Silvestre, after having a little more fun investigating Torrente and Cardenio, then reveals his true identity, and produces the papers and the portrait of Marcela he was carrying that prove his true identity. The significance of this brief inquiry is that, since neither Marcela nor her servants had ever seen the real don Silvestre before this moment, it is necessary for him to first cast suspicions on the other “don Silvestre” before he reveals his own identity, lest they suspect him of being the imposter.

Furious with Cardenio for being so slow to declare his love for Marcela, Torrente berates him, before they both both reveal their true identities to the others. As the roguish student and his servant’s plans come unraveled, Torrente also reveals Muñoz’s treachery, presumably so as not to bear the unmitigated wrath of the others alone. Cardenio then begs forgiveness, employing the topical refrain, “los yerros por amores / son dignos de perdonar” (III, vv. 2981-2982). Don Antonio then states that he would pardon Cardenio if it were up to him alone. He also warns that the note
he received from the Pontiff states that he did not grant his dispensation for don Silvestre to marry Marcela after all. Clavijo is prepared to go to Rome in person to seek the dispensation, but don Silvestre decides against pursuing the marriage further after all, proclaiming:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Yo, aunque primo verdadero,} \\
&\text{ni quedarme en casa quiero,} \\
&\text{ni poner en ella el pie:} \\
&\text{que la honra de mi prima} \\
&\text{ha de ir contínuo adelante,} \\
&\text{sin que haya otro estudiante} \\
&\text{que la asombre o que la oprima. (III, vv. 2993-2999)}
\end{align*}
\]

Don Silvestre’s reasons for rejecting the marriage to his cousin are not completely clear, but one can infer that it is owed to a combination of the dispensation from the Pope not being granted, as well as to the fact that he is upset that Marcela was nearly fooled by a false pretender to her hand. Just as don Antonio earlier, he finally opts against pursuing marriage under these circumstances presumably because he doesn’t wish to be under public scrutiny, with even the slightest suspicion of scandal in his wife’s past, including the potentially problematic fact that they are cousins. Thus, he implies in these verses that he would rather see her confined to a convent, so as to protect her from the advances of other students and rascals like Cardenio, and thus protect her honor.

Cristina then asks if no one will be married that day after all, at which point Ocaña tries to ask for her hand. She states instead her preference to marry Quiñones. But Quiñones responds surprisingly in the negative. When Cristina angrily demands, “¿Tú, para no ser mi cuyo, / hallas razón?,” Quiñones simply responds, “Y razones” (III, vv. 3006-3307). Similar to the attitude of the real don Silvestre, Quiñones doesn’t make explicit what his reasons are now for not wishing to marry Cristina. We can infer nevertheless both from his tone and from what we have seen earlier

\[^{361}\text{The reader will recall that the delivery of this news was earlier delayed by Muñoz, who didn’t wish to pay the delivery fee to the courier.}\]
that, rather than allow his jealousy to get the better of him, he has decided that Cristina is not the woman for him. We may never know exactly how Cervantes intended the character to deliver the line, but it would strike me as very effective if Quiñones gestured in the direction of Torrente and Ocaña when delivering the line “Y razones,” as it is clearly his frustration with her constant coquetish nature that prompts him to reject her. In view of this rejection, Cristina immediately turns her attention to Ocaña, and proposes to him. Not being without pride, he replies, “No es mi linaje / tal, que lo que arroja un paje / escoja yo, ni tal creas” (III, vv. 3009-3011). Ocaña, bitter with her initial rejection of him, and angered by her fickle nature, proceeds to reject her. He refuses to marry her now that she is the reject of his rival, feeling it would be beneath him. Torrente, on the other hand, and having no shame, remarks “A no estar temiendo aquí / la penca de algún Verdugo, / ese arrojado mendrugo / le tomará para mí” (III, vv. 3012-3015). In other words, he very unromantically compares Cristina to a discarded bread crust, but says he would gladly marry her, if not for the fact that he now fears persecution and execution for his elaborate deception.

Finally, Marcela remarks that with the license of her brother, she would like her cousin, the real don Silvestre, to stay with them for a few days, while Cardenio will leave as penniless as when he entered. She then condemns Muñoz to exile as well for his role in the scheme. Muñoz is grateful for her mercy and profusely thanks her for not having him whipped (III, vv. 3036-3039). Cristina optimistically proclaims that she will not give up hope that someone will win her love someday, while Dorotea laments her solitude, and expresses her unhappiness that no one even pursued her to begin with. Torrente claims that he only regrets the loss of Cristina, and Muñoz likewise laments his fate. The play then concludes artfully with each of the remaining characters uttering one final verse of lament about their own fate and lack of matrimony before exiting, save for Ocaña, who concludes the play:
Esto en este cuento pasa:
los unos por no querer,
los otros por no poder,
al fin ninguno se casa.

Desta verdad conocida
pido me den testimonio:
que acaba sin matrimonio
la comedia *Entretenida.*  (III, vv. 3080-3087)

With these verses, Ocaña perfectly characterizes the principle idea behind *La entretenida.*

Rather than writing a typical *comedia de capa y espada,* Cervantes unmask the entire genre by endeavoring to write a play that concludes with everyone encountering obstacles and impediments that prevent them from marrying. There is no happy ending here for anyone. Ultimately, the characters’ collective folly is their own, and they have only themselves and each other to blame for this deliberately unsatisfying conclusion. As Canavaggio has noted, unlike many of the Cervantine *entremeses,* *La entretenida* does not resolve in a non-conclusion. Rather, what Cervantes presents us with in this instance is a deliberate denial and rejection of the standard conventional conclusion. It is important to understand this distinction, because in order to craft a drama such as this, Cervantes had to know from the outset that he would conclude the play with by denying marriage to all of the characters. The artfulness of this *comedia* lies in its ability to present a complicated, intricate, and entertaining drama that gives the audience numerous conflicts and seeming conclusions and resolutions to each, only to result in a deliberately banal ending for the sole purpose of denying expectation. The play is principally about two things in my estimation: the impossibility of marriage for love in the “real world” of Cervantes’ time period, particularly in the face of the institution of arranged marriage. Secondly, it is about the author’s ability to manipulate his audience’s expectations and to alter the entire tenor of a piece with a single scene.

---
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The author in this case achieves this effect by keeping the audience in the dark about many important details. This is, indeed, one of the only plays of its time that I can think where the audience frequently knows less than the actual characters, creating a curious sort of reverse dramatic irony. We are initially led to believe, along with Marcela Almendárez, that her brother has an incestuous desire for her, prompting much initial scandal. But we then learn that this is all a misunderstanding, averting a potentially tragic situation. Later, when Ocaña and Torrente appear to fight during the play-within-a-play, we are shocked, along with most of the rest of the characters, by the apparent shedding of blood, and believing we might have a tragic conclusion. Once again, we are deceived, along with the others, and the scene concludes joyously. When don Pedro Osorio grants don Antonio the permission to marry his daughter, we fully expect that this will transpire, unaware of what don Ambrosio knows: that he has won her favor. Later, we fully expect that Cardenio will be revealed as the fraud he is, but we also anticipate the Pope will send his approval for the marriage of Marcela Almendárez and her cousin, the real don Silvestre. Once again, this does not occur. Finally, the fact that Cristina at once rejects and is later rejected by her potential husbands, while the third suitor is sent into exile, catches the audience off guard as well. The entire structure of the play revolves around creating expectations for the audience, and then shattering them, leaving us with a brilliantly contradictory conclusion. It is at once utterly unsatisfying and yet extremely gratifying, since none of what the audience has expected has come to pass, leaving it instead with an uproariously funny final scene in which everyone’s grand designs are completely undone.

It is not surprising that this drama is so often compared with *El laberinto de amor*. Indeed, this is the natural antithesis of that drama. Whereas in *Laberinto*, Cervantes crafted a more conventional *comedia de capa y espada* that takes place in a fantastical world where the characters
are able to overcome the overwhelming impediments to their respective marriages, here, all the marriages are thwarted by the conflicting intentions of the various characters, by outside papal and paternal intervention, and other more trivial obstacles. In *Laberinto*, Cervantes gives us a more idealized world, in which a woman’s ability to determine who she marries ultimately liberates all the characters. In *La entretenida*, the characters seem more “real” in the sense that they are all characterized by various flaws and vices of one sort or another. Some are too timid and proper. Others are controlled by their greed or other worldly appetites, others are too proud. Ultimately, none of them conforms to the mold of the stock characters that we expect them to be, although they all resemble these character types. And that is what truly distinguishes *La entretenida* as an extremely accomplished anti-*comedia de capa y espada*. The play is perfectly structured on the principle of the frustration of desires and expectations: both the audiences’ and the characters’ themselves.
CONCLUSIONS

Over the course of this investigation, we have seen that these eight plays and eight interludes are of a very high dramatic quality and give us further insight into Cervantes as both a playwright and as an inquisitive and unconventional thinker of his day. Most of his plays rely on his rich characterization, fast-paced dialogue, and complex dramatic situation to maintain the interest of his public. Even comedias that have sometimes been regarded poorly by critics of the past, such as El laberinto del amor, actually demonstrate Cervantes' ability to control a highly complex plot, and to provide his audience helpful reminders of what has already transpired, without significantly interrupting the main action of the play. When Cervantes does choose to suspend the main action for necessary exposition, such as the character backstory of Margarita in El gallardo español, he interrupts these intervals by returning us to the main action of the drama, employing techniques normally seen in the Byzantine novel or the Italian novella. As we have seen, he serves, to a certain extent, as a bridge between the theatrical tradition of Spain's past and Lope's teatro nuevo and the subsequent tradition it inspired. It is neither wholly traditional nor wholly innovative, but represents an alternative vision of theater to that of Lope and his other contemporaries, as other scholars have already observed in a similar light.\(^{363}\)

Cervantes, as we have seen, is also considerably less conventional in many important regards than other dramatists of his era. Unlike Lope de Vega, he chooses to avoid the expected, stock ending, indeed subverting it completely with some of his dramas, as we have demonstrated in our analysis of his Entretenida. This tendency to resist the expected, customary conclusion is

\(^{363}\) See in particular Canavaggio's Cervantès dramaturge, in which Canavaggio argues that, although Cervantes never explicitly articulated a theory of drama, we can glean principles of his style and technique for dramatic composition from his plays. These principles give us some insight into what Cervantes' theory of drama might have been had he composed a treatise, and they represent a departure from and perhaps a deliberate alternative to Lope's Teatro nuevo.
perhaps most notable in his *Entremeses*, where he frequently leaves us with an open-ended conclusion, wherein the main conflict is not resolved on the stage, as is the case in *El juez de los divorcios*, *La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo*, and *La cueva de Salamanca*. Unlike other dramatists, Cervantes does not moralize with his theater; he presents a subject for the consideration of his public and then allows us to draw our own conclusions. This seemingly unresolved nature of his compositions nevertheless provides us with some crucial insights into his core beliefs about writing theater. He has his own unique interpretation of the Horatian dictum "*aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae / aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae*" (*Ars Poetica* vv. 333-4). Though this principle of delighting and profiting (or instructing) one's audience was a common guiding principle for composition in for centuries in Europe, it was interpreted very differently by other others. In late medieval Spanish religious dramas, for example, the details of the plot were secondary to the moral. In the case of Cervantes, however, his theater does not serve as a didactic vehicle. Rather, he allows the characters, situations and dramatic development to speak for themselves, presenting a focused subject matter for the attention of the audience, and inviting them to participate actively in drawing a moral from what they have just witnessed. In this way, Cervantes successfully transformed the genre of the interludes, which had previously been little more than a lighthearted, escapist form. He greatly expanded the expressive possibilities of this little genre, and, in fact, allowed future dramatists to take these one-act works more seriously.

In our close reading of each of the eight interludes and plays, we have also seen how Cervantes draws from tradition and how he innovates within each individual subgenre. We have explored three different classes of *entremeses*: those dealing with amorous relationships between characters (*El viejo celeso*, *La cueva de Salamanca*, and *La guarda cuidadosa*), the short legal farce (*El juez de los divorcios* and *La elección de los alcaldes de Daganzo*), and those influenced
by the picaresque tradition (*El rufián viudo, El vizcaíno fingido*, and *El retablo de las maravillas*).

Since I have already summarized Cervantes' innovations and overall thrust with respect to each of the interlude subgenres earlier, I refer my reader to the concluding statements of my second, third, and fourth chapters for these observations.

Regarding the full-length comedies, we have likewise divided the eight plays into three separate categories: the drama of Spanish captives and their conflict with the Moors (*Los baños de Argel, La gran sultana*, and *El gallardo español*), the picaresque dramas (*El rufián dichoso* and *Pedro de Urdemalas*), and the drama of romantic entanglements (*La casa de los celos, El laberinto del amor*, and *La entretenida*). This classification has enabled us to see how Cervantes cultivates each individual subgenre, how the innovations he makes within each genre reveals aspects of his own thinking about the world he inhabited.

Through his captivity dramas, Cervantes shows himself to be a deeply Christian, deeply patriotic individual, who nevertheless practiced a very particular and personal form of the religion. In *Los baños de Argel*, we see the suffering that the Christian captives experienced, to which Cervantes himself was doubtlessly subjected during his five-years as a prisoner in Algiers. In this play, he seamlessly interweaves a tale of great tragedy, a romantic intrigue, some light comedic elements involving the Sacristán, and, finally, a tale of the heroism and triumph of the Spanish captives over their seemingly impossible circumstances. Ultimately, each of the three captivity plays serves to demonstrate the superiority of the Catholic faith over the other two monotheistic religions of the Iberian Peninsula. Each of these plays belongs to the same genre, but is written in a different mood. *Baños* is the most serious, and the most tragic, *Sultana* is more farcical and humorous, while *Gallardo* represents the heroic depiction of this subject matter. Each play's primary hero is likewise appropriate to its subject matter. Whereas *Baños* is characterized by the
collective heroism of all the Christian individuals involved, *Sultana* is characterized by the dual protagonism of the titular character herself, and of the mischievous trickster, Madrigal. The *Sultana*, Catalina de Oviedo, represents perfect beauty of both body and mind, as well as perfect devotion to Christianity and submission to God's will. Madrigal, in a comedic vein, demonstrates a roguish cleverness which saves him from great peril. He ultimately shows himself to be devoted to the Christian faith, in spite of his occasionally sinful behavior. *Gallardo* is protagonized by the two heroic rivals, Fernando and Alimuzel, idealized representations of heroes of their respective cultures, and meriting equal respect as soldiers, even though Alimuzel is clearly the more flawed of the two. Whereas the Moors are treated largely as deserving of ridicule for their credulousness and lust in *Sultana*, Cervantes gives us a much more nuanced perspective in both *Baños*, where the mercenary renegade Yzuf is judged much more harshly than any of the Islamic-born characters, and in *Gallardo*, where Alimuzel shows himself to be very nearly the equal of Fernando.

Cervantes' two picaresque full-length plays could not be more distinct from one another. Whereas one represents a path to redemption for a great sinner, who indeed makes a selfless sacrifice to save another, the other is a profound metatheatrical drama with a benevolent picaresque protagonist. In fact, neither of these dramas is a pure picaresque, for only the first act of *El rufián dichoso* is truly in the codes of the picaresque genre (the rest corresponds more to the hagiographic drama), and *Pedro de Urdemalas* is really more of a commentary on the nature of performance and representation than anything else, as we have already observed. In my estimation, both of these dramas represent a fairly radical departure from the expected conventions of the time period. In *El rufián dichoso*, we are presented with what initially appears to be almost three distinct plays: one
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364 That is, at least until the Sultan is somewhat transformed by perceiving the true nature of God indirectly through Catalina, as we have observed in our sixth chapter.
picaresque, one of repentance and conversion, and finally, one of sacrifice and transcendence. Each act of the play represents a different step in Cristóbal de la Cruz's path towards redemption and eventually, sainthood. We see him initially as the street ruffian, gambling and cavorting with prostitutes. After God allows him to win a bet following a blasphemous prayer, Cristóbal sees the true power of the Lord and regrets his blasphemous ways, genuinely converting and purifying himself as much as possible through harsh penance. Having been fully redeemed, he once again blackens his soul, but this time, not in a selfish way. Rather, Cristóbal does so in order to absolve a woman of her sins, taking on her burden. Though he dies of a horrible illness, his body a mere shell of its former self, his soul is assured eternity in heaven.

In *Pedro de Urdemalas*, the titular sage trickster and protean protagonist takes on all manner of odd jobs and roles, in the pursuit of his own destiny and identity. His path is parallel but opposite to that of Belica, a woman raised by Gypsies, but, as we later learn, of noble birth. With an intricate game of mirrors, Cervantes expounds on the nature of dramatic representation and its true potential not to deceive, but, rather, to reveal greater truths about the authentic nature of humanity through an artistic exploration of different roles and characters. As we have seen, the meta-theatrical game of *Urdemalas* also enables Cervantes to make subtle social criticism on the deceptions, foolishness, and hypocrisy encountered in society, all the while commenting on the nature of *el ser y el parecer* (seeming and being).

In his plays concerning jealousy, love, and folly, Cervantes likewise defies convention, while still drawing several distinct elements from tradition. In what is probably his oldest and least cultivated of the eight comedias, *La casa de los celos*, Cervantes elaborates his own dramatic version of Carolingian legend found in Boiardo and Ariosto. This drama is, in reality, a pastiche of different subgenres, and anticipates some of the parody of both the chivalric and the pastoral
genres that Cervantes would latter carry to full fruition in Don Quixote. The play is essentially an intricate, though flawed, parody of Carolingian legend, and in particular, on the conceits of love in the aforementioned literary genres.

Finally, it is hard not to position El laberinto del amor and La entretenida in direct opposition to one another, because of what each play conveys within the subgenre to which they both belong, namely, the comedia de enredos. Laberinto represents Cervantes' unique take on the comedia de capa y espada variant of this subgenre. El laberinto del Amor, on the surface somewhat more conventional, nevertheless provides a far greater degree of protagonism to the feminine heroines, who are responsible for the majority of the dramatic action and development. Not only does this play demonstrate Cervantes' ability to control a very complex basic plot, but it also presents us with the bold suggestion, for the time period, that women must have a say in whom they marry for the marriage to be completely legitimate. In contrast to the happy ending presented to us at this play's conclusion, we have also examined the intricacies of the brilliantly hilarious Entretenida, in which Cervantes subverts the expected conventional ending involving the marriage of all the main protagonists. In La entretenida, Cervantes presents us with a sort of anti-comedia-de-capa-y-espada, in which all of the main characters' intentions wind up frustrated due to a character flaw present in each of them. Whether it be excessive greed, temerity, laziness, or pride, all of the characters' collective designs are in the end thwarted by circumstance, coincidence, or their own character flaws. In this way, Cervantes frustrates not just their expectations, but the audience's as well, in a grand and deliberate fashion.

All in all, Cervantes' theatrical production represents a major milestone in the dramatic development of some of these genres, particularly in the case of the entremés, and it is quite unfortunate that it did not receive more widespread recognition in his era. As we have seen,
Cervantes' theater shows us aspects of the writer not completely explored in *DQ* nor in his *Novelas ejemplares*. It reveals the full extent of his patriotism and humanistic Catholic beliefs, and provides us with a more well-rounded picture of both Cervantes the man, and Cervantes the artist. In the course of this investigation, I have favored a close-reading model of analysis, that minimizes extensive historical background and dating of the works. I have preferred not to engage in comparative analyses between the plays and Cervantes' prose works, as well as comparisons between the dramatic works themselves. All of these approaches to analyzing the dramas are important and necessary for a full understanding of what each represents, but I have wanted to focus on a consideration of each individual drama, to reveal some of what the author was likely trying to achieve with the composition of each one. I have provided some context for the tradition upon which Cervantes is building, and for the techniques and insights he gleaned from that tradition, and in particular, from Lope de Rueda. Most significantly, I have examined and categorized each play on its own dramatic merits, scene-by-scene, in order to provide details and insights into individual moments and aspects of each *comedia* and *entremés* all too often overlooked when the plays are analyzed as a whole without fully examining the constitutive parts.

An analysis of genre, or rather, of each individual subgenre considered above has been paramount for understanding the different innovations that Cervantes brings to each, and, moreover, what each subgenre represents for his respective and multifaceted concept of *verisimilitude*. As we have seen, what can be considered *verisimilar* depends on both the subject matter and the subgenre into which it falls, and on the materials and techniques appropriate to the representation of each respective subgenre. In each case, we have demonstrated both the traditional
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I feel that Canavaggio, building on the work of Cotarelo Valledor, Schevill & Bonilla, Buchanan, and Astrana Marín, has done an excellent job of this already, and I would have little to add to this particular discussion.
aspects of representation from which Cervantes draws, and the ways in which his ever questioning, ever non-conformist nature led him to modify or in some cases subvert the conventions pertaining to each subgenre so as to adhere better to the guiding principle of *placere et docere*, to delight and instruct his audience simultaneously, in an original and non-didactic manner.
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