6460 NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

CANADA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR... RICHARD A. YOUNG.....

TITLE OF THESIS... THE PASTORAL MODE IN SPANISH DRAMA BEFORE 1520.....

UNIVERSITY... UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA.....

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED... PH.D.....

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED... 1970.....

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) R. A. Young

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

8517 - 75 Avenue.
Edmonton 82
Alberta

DATED 15th April 1970.

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

# THE PASTORAL MODE IN SPANISH DRAMA BEFORE 1520

by



Richard A. Young

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1970

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled THE PASTORAL MODE IN SPANISH DRAMA BEFORE 1520 submitted by Richard A. Young in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Juan Ferraté
Supervisor

[signature]

[signature]

[signature]

[signature]

[signature]

[signature]
External Examiner

Date 16th February 1970

ABSTRACT

This thesis is intended to contribute to a better understanding of the early Spanish drama. Through its two parts, dealing, respectively, with commemorative and love plays, a detailed play by play analysis is presented of some fifty dramas, including all known pastoral pieces written before 1520. Each play is discussed with the aim of providing a clear view of its subject-matter, particular emphasis being given to the analysis of the elements contributing to the action and the devices of characterization evident in the personages, in order to assess the adaptation and suitability of both plot and character to the immediate purpose of the dramatists in question. The initial product of this thesis, therefore, is a body of analyses of early plays, all of which are approached afresh and many are given a new interpretation. The subsequent result is a more complete view and a fuller evaluation of the early drama in Spain than has hitherto been attempted. While it is confirmed that the Spanish theatre first developed in close association with pastoral traditions and conventions, it is also concluded that the earliest dramatists should be evaluated at the level appropriate to their achievements. They should not be gratuitously classified, as has been the case, as artless imitators, without making the necessary reservations about the subjects they dramatized, the conventions of composition in which they wrote, and the intended purpose of their plays.

My thanks to Professor Juan Ferraté, supervisor of this thesis,
for his guidance at all stages of my work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE ..... 1

Part I COMMEMORATIVE PLAYS

I INTRODUCTORY ..... 15
II JUAN DEL ENCINA ..... 40
III LUCAS FERNANDEZ ..... 103
IV FIVE NATIVITY COMPOSITIONS ..... 137
V GIL VICENTE ..... 164
VI MISCELLANEOUS COMMEMORATIVE PLAYS ..... 234
VII FOUR NON-PASTORAL PLAYS ..... 299

Part II PASTORAL LOVE PLAYS

VIII INTRODUCTORY ..... 308
IX JUAN DEL ENCINA ..... 324
X LUCAS FERNANDEZ ..... 442
XI THREE PASTORAL PLAYS ..... 506
XII PEDRO MANUEL DE URREA ..... 536
XIII THREE MORE PASTORAL PLAYS ..... 561

CONCLUSION ..... 590

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS ..... 601
LITERARY TEXTS ..... 602
CRITICAL TEXTS ..... 607

APPENDICES

A A CHRONOLOGY OF EARLY PASTORAL PLAYS ..... 617
B A CATALOGUE OF DRAMATIC DEVICES ..... 622

# PREFACE

An interest in Spain's earliest dramatists, leading to the re-discovery of their identities and works and the re-evaluation of their merits, did not awake till long after the decline of Spain's Golden Age of theatre. It may well be traced to Leandro Fernández de Moratín's Orígenes del teatro español,[1] first published in 1830. This work is not a comprehensive study of the origins of the drama in Spain as its title might imply, but an annotated, chronological survey of dramatic compositions known to Moratín and written before the time of Lope de Vega. It nevertheless provided a substantial stimulus for further interest and investigation. Moratín's curiosity, however, can be considered as only one part of a wider and increasing interest in the history of literature. Several notable works of literary history were published in the second half of the nineteenth century:[2] the Spanish translation of Ticknor's history appeared between 1851 and 1856;[3] Amador de los Ríos dedicated to his sovereign his lengthy work in seven volumes published between 1861 and 1865;[4] and the history of the Spanish drama by the German diplomat, scholar, and poet, the Conde de Schack, was translated and published between 1885 and 1887.[5] The latter half of the nineteenth century was, indeed, a formative period for the study of Spanish literature, a period eventually dominated by Marcelino Menéndez y Pelayo, whose activity embraced almost half a century, including the last three decades of the nineteenth and the first two of the twentieth.

Each of the above made a significant contribution toward the compiling of Spain's literary history and of the early drama in

particular.[6] In the field of the drama alone, Manuel Cañete's name must certainly be added to these. In addition to his responsibility, on behalf of the Real Academia Española, for critical editions of the works of Juan del Encina[7] and Lucas Fernández,[8] Cañete enthusiastically sought lost texts of early plays and succeeded in uncovering and publishing much hitherto unknown information.[9] His efforts were not lost on those subsequently interested in Spain's early theatre.

During the last years of the nineteenth century and the first of the twentieth, several publications concerned with the early history of the drama in Spain were printed. Spanish sixteenth century theatre merited a chapter in Creizenach's study of the European drama,[10] while the origin and early history of the drama in Spain were the subjects of Bonilla y San Martín's discourse on his admission to the Real Academia.[11] In addition to general histories, including speculation about the origins of drama, a number of studies on regional and local developments were also written. Sánchez-Arjona researched the evolution of the theatre in Seville,[12] while Milá y Fontanals did the same for Catalonia,[13] Díaz de Escobar for Málaga,[14] Milego for Toledo,[15] Merimée for Valencia,[16] and Alonso Cortés for Valladolid.[17]

While these works publicized the existence of a drama in Spain before Lope de Vega, a more precise documentation of its development was possible only through the gradual republication of early and forgotten plays. This task was undertaken largely by Joseph E. Gillet,[18] Urban Cronan,[19] Eugen Kohler,[20] Adolfo

Bonilla y San Martín,[21] Léo Rouanet,[22] and others.[23] Overall, it made all extant, sixteenth century plays available. It permitted a fuller description of the early history of the Spanish drama and a more detailed discussion of its characteristics. W. Schaffer Jack's investigation of the evolution of the entremés,[24] Joseph A. Meredith's history of the introito and loa,[25] and W. S. Hendrix' study of the comic character,[26] together with other studies,[27] shed much light on the nature of early dramatic writing in Spain. These descriptive studies, with his own series of articles on a variety of topics related to the Spanish drama in the sixteenth century,[28] allowed J. P. Wickersham Crawford to write his history of the early Spanish theatre.[29]

Without doubt Crawford's Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega is a singularly significant work in the study of the early drama in Spain. Much has been achieved since publication of its second edition in 1937, but no significant new plays have come to light nor further documents discovered[30] to effect any radical changes in the general outline of Crawford's account. Subsequent historians, such as Eduardo Juliá Martínez[31] and Ángel Valbuena Prat,[32] may differ from him in particulars about the precise date or interpretation of a play, but contribute little new data. Without adding to the general history of the sixteenth century drama, scholars have, nonetheless, arrived at a better understanding of it by attempting to describe its major characteristics and the principal aspects of its evolution. The uncertain origins of Spain's dramatic tradition, for example,

have been investigated by R. B. Donovan,[33] Fernando Lázaro Carreter,[34] Charlotte Stern,[35] and Humberto López Morales.[36] Some scholars have concerned themselves with the evolution of a single element of the dramatic genre, whether it be the Nativity play,[37] the dramatic pastoral,[38] the religious theatre,[39] or tragedy;[40] others have occupied themselves with specialities such as language[41] or staging.[42]

This survey of publications is not a complete account of scholarly endeavour. It may show, however, that there has now emerged a fairly comprehensive picture of the growth of drama before Lope de Vega, a picture enhanced by further publication of editions of both major and minor dramatists,[43] and by studies of individual writers and plays.[44] Nevertheless, the picture is not quite complete. One of its most outstanding deficiencies is the lack of reliable, critical texts. All extant plays are ultimately accessible, but no corpus of the entire dramatic works of the sixteenth century is easily available. Cañete's edition of Fernández's Farsas y églogas (1867) is, with many inadequacies, the sole published, critical edition of that work.[45] There is no complete, recent edition of the works of Juan del Encina,[46] nor a critical edition of the plays by Juan de Timoneda,[47] and those of Diego Sánchez de Badajoz have only very recently been made available in a critical edition.[48]

Alongside the lack of reliable texts must be placed the deficiencies of much that has been written about the dramatists, their plays, and the literary trends to which they are associated.

While it is readily admitted that many studies on the Spanish drama of the sixteenth century conform to a high standard of scholarship and adopt an acceptable critical standpoint,[49] many others are not so successful in establishing a valid position.

The studies alluded to above should not be faulted for major inaccuracies, either in the factual presentation of the history of early Spanish drama, or in the description of the devices of action, characterization, structure, etc., of which the plays are compounded. The many works concerned with the drama before Lope de Vega together sought to establish an accurate chronology and description of the early theatre, but their authors did not fulfil their roles completely as critics and interpreters of the works they described. Consequently, the existing histories of the Spanish drama in the sixteenth century and the descriptions of the components of the plays provide only a partial view of the subject, and, above all, I believe, a biased view.

As if cowed by the drama of the seventeenth century, that of the sixteenth has easily become termed "the theatre before Lope de Vega". It has inevitably been considered as a period of development, to be studied only for the light it might shed on Spain's Golden Age of drama.[50] Many minor dramatists, with a total known output of one play, or little more, have been summarily dismissed.[51] They have been considered only in their capacity as followers and close imitators of a style established by some more reputable figure. The history of Spanish sixteenth century drama has consequently come to be viewed as a succession of schools, of

which the leading figures were Juan del Encina, Bartolomé de Torres Naharro, and Lope de Rueda.[52]

This view has been perpetuated by appraisals of the drama describing the links uniting the plays in their various schools.[53] The resulting descriptions have a somewhat negative critical value. They substantiate the undeniable fact that writers relied on certain conventional devices in the construction of their works, but provide no positive theory of the nature of drama and the dramatist's art. Indeed, the more or less consistent bracketing of plays into schools such as that dominated by Juan del Encina, combined whith the notion, derived from the descriptions of common features, that a great number of plays are the works of disciples slavishly following their masters, have resulted in a set of <u>idées reçues</u> from which even the most recent critics have been unable to detach themselves.[54] In certain instances, justification for an idea or an interpretation appears to be founded on earlier formulation by another scholar.[55]

Thus, in spite of a large body of critical work, the sixteenth century Spanish drama awaits full definition. The total description of the plays is still incomplete, and many fundamentals of interpretation have been overlooked. With some important exceptions--almost only in the area of major dramatists--[56]the plays have not been analyzed as individual, independent compositions written by different authors with differing ends in view. As a consequence, an interpretation of their meaning and an explanation of the form in which they are known have yet to be proposed. Hitherto, a valid theory of the early drama in Spain has not been

established; the degree of its artistic primitiveness or possible sophistication has not been verified; the nature of the dependence of lesser dramatists on others of greater renown and ability has not been properly determined.[57]

The principal aim of this study is to take a first step toward a richer and more specific definition of the Spanish drama of the sixteenth century. By analyzing the plays as independent compositions, I hope to establish a valid interpretation of their meaning and of the measure of artistry of the dramatists, along with their reasons for writing in the forms chosen and the kind of originality of composition possible within the imitative use of conventional devices.

Given this aim, and the method chosen to attain it, it is evident that the sheer bulk of the primary sources involved would make it impossible for us to undertake at this stage an exhaustive analysis of all dramatic works written in Spain before and during the sixteenth century. The number of plays taken into account must, of necessity, be reduced in order that the conclusions subsequently drawn may be the more valid and far reaching within the limits of their application. Consequently, only a part of the early Spanish drama is evaluated here and our conclusions are related to it alone. Beginning with the dramatic eclogues published in Juan del Encina's Cancionero (1496), all pastoral plays written before approximately 1520 in the manner first exemplified by Encina's eclogues, and only these, are analyzed. Neither the non-pastoral plays of Torres Naharro, nor those of dramatists who wrote in a style popularized by his

works are treated, for their inclusion would have resulted in a study of unmanageable length and prevented us from reaching any positive conclusions.[58]

For the sake of a more satisfactory analysis, and on account of the relatively short time-span involved, I have chosen to deal with the plays included on the basis of their subject-matter and authorship rather than in chronological order. Consequently, the first part of the study is devoted to works written for performance and commemoration of specific occasions, particularly of Christmas, but also of other festivities, and, in addition, it contains a brief chapter dealing with four non-pastoral plays by Juan del Encina and Lucas Fernández. The second part includes analysis of pastoral love dramas, only some of which could be considered as strictly occasional pieces. To complete the picture presented of the early drama, in Appendices A and B, respectively, are included a chronology of the plays and a catalogue of the most common dramatic devices employed in them.

NOTES TO THE PREFACE

[1]Orígenes del teatro español, in Obras de D. Leandro Fernández de Moratín, Vol. I, Madrid, 1830. (Concerning problems of censorship and the differing editions of Moratín's work, see R. K. Spaulding, "The Text of Moratín's Orígenes del teatro español", PMLA, XLVIII, 1932, 981-991.)

[2]For a comprehensive bibliography, see José Simón Díaz, Bibliografía de la literatura hispánica, 2nd revised ed., Madrid, 1960, I, items 1-515. Two important bibliographical studies, relevant to the documentation of the early Spanish drama were Cayetano Alberto de la Barrera y Leirado, Catálogo bibliográfico y biográfico del teatro antiguo español desde sus orígenes hasta mediados del siglo XVIII (Madrid, 1860), and Bartolomé José Gallardo, Ensayo de una biblioteca española de libros raros y curiosos (4 vols., Madrid, 1863-89). (Both have been republished in facsimile.)

[3]Historia de la literatura española, ed., trans., and annotated by Pascual de Gayangos and Enrique de Vedia, 4 vols., Madrid, 1851-56 (1st English ed., Boston, 1849).

[4]Historia crítica de la literatura española, 7 vols., Madrid, 1861-65.

[5]Historia de la literatura y del arte dramático en España, trans., E. de Mier, 5 vols., Madrid, 1885-87 (1st German ed., 3 vols., Berlin, 1845).

[6]Among Menéndez y Pelayo's writings are a critical study to accompany Manuel Cañete's edition of Torres Naharro's Propaladia (Madrid, 1900), and an edition and study of Tres comedias de Alonso de la Vega (Dresden, 1905). Both are available in Estudios y discursos de crítica histórica y literaria, Vol. II (Madrid, Edición Nacional de las Obras Completas de Menéndez Pelayo, VII, 1942), in the chapter "Teatro anterior a Lope de Vega", together with studies on the Celestina and Pamphilus de Amore. The same author's Antología de poetas líricos castellanos contains his view of a number of early dramatists (see Antología..., III, pp. 221-395, Edición Nacional, Vol. XIX).

[7]Teatro completo de Juan del Encina, Madrid, 1893. (Completed by Francisco Asenjo Barbieri, himself a noted scholar and fellow Academician. See Barbieri, Cancionero musical de los siglos XV y XVI, Madrid, 1890, containing music by Juan del Encina.)

[8]Farsas y églogas al modo y estilo pastoril y castellano fechas por Lucas Fernández, Salmantino, Madrid, 1867.

[9]See Cañete's introduction to Fernández's Farsas y églogas

(reprinted with Cañete's introductions to editions of plays by other dramatists in Teatro español del siglo XVI, Madrid, 1885).

[10]Geschichte des neuren Dramas, 5 vols., Halle, 1893-1916 (2nd ed., revised by Adalbert Hämel, 3 vols., Halle, 1911-23, reissued, New York, 1965). See Vol. III, revised ed., pp. 1-92.

[11]Las Bacantes, o del origen del teatro, Madrid, 1921.

[12]El teatro en Sevilla en los siglos XVI y XVII (Estudios históricos), Madrid, 1887.

[13]Los orígenes del teatro catalán, Barcelona, 1895.

[14]El teatro en Málaga. Apuntes históricos de los siglos XVI, XVII y XVIII, Málaga, 1896.

[15]El teatro en Toledo durante los siglos XVI y XVII, Valencia, 1909.

[16]L'art dramatique à Valencia depuis les origines jusqu'au commencement du XVIIe siècle, Toulouse, 1913.

[17]El teatro en Valladolid, Madrid, 1923.

[18]See the bibliography of Prof. Gillet's works, HR, XXVII (1959), 18-22.

[19]Teatro español del siglo XVI, Madrid, 1913; "Egloga interlocutoria", RHi, XXXVI (1916), 475-488.

[20]Sieben spanische dramatische Eklogen, Dresden, 1911; Representaciones de Juan del Encina, Strasbourg, 1914.

[21]"Cinco obras dramáticas", RHi, XXVII (1912), 390-498.

[22]Colección de autos, farsas y coloquios del siglo XVI, 4 vols., Barcelona-Madrid, 1901.

[23]Much credit must be given to the Real Academia Española for its work in this field. In addition to a series of facsimile texts (Encina's 1496 Cancionero in 1928, Fernández's Farsas y églogas in 1929, and Timoneda's Turiana and Tres comedias both in 1936), The Academy also sponsored several critical editions of plays (Cañete's edition of Lucas Fernández in 1867, the Cañete-Barbieri Teatro completo de Juan del Encina in 1893, Cotarelo y Mori's edition of the works of Lope de Rueda in 1908, and the Poetas dramáticos valencianos edited by Julia Martínez and published in 1929). Many other plays written in the sixteenth century were republished at this time, particularly in academic journals. (See Crawford's bibliography to Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega.)

[24]The Early "Entremes" in Spain: The Rise of a Dramatic Form, Philadelphia, 1923.

[25]"Introito" and "Loa" in the Spanish Drama of the Sixteenth Century, Philadelphia, 1928.

[26]"Some Native Comic Types in the Early Spanish Drama", Ohio State University Contributions in Language and Literature, Vol. I (1924), 1-115.

[27]See Ronald B. Williams, The Staging of Plays in the Spanish Peninsula Prior to 1555, Iowa, 1935; William H. Shoemaker, The Multiple Stage in Spain during the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries, Princeton University Press, 1935 (in Spanish trans., Los escenarios múltiples en el teatro español de los siglos XV y XVI, EE, 1957); Kohler, Sieben spanische..., pp. 1-191.

[28]See the bibliography of Prof. Crawford's works, HR, VIII (1940), 4-8.

[29]Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega, Philadelphia, 1922, 2nd revised ed., Philadelphia, 1937 (reissued, with a bibliographical supplement by Warren T. McCready, Philadelphia, 1967 and 1968). Before this work, Crawford had already written The Spanish Pastoral Drama, Philadelphia, 1915.

[30]Of the plays discussed in this study, only the dramatic eclogues of Pedro Manuel de Urrera were unknown to Crawford (see Eugenio Asensio, ed., Églogas dramáticas y poesías desconocidas de Pedro Manuel de Urrea, Madrid, 1950).

[31]"La literatura dramática peninsular en el siglo XV", in Historia general de las literaturas hispánicas, ed. Guillermo Díaz-Plaja, Barcelona, 1951, II, pp. 237-315, and "La literatura dramática en el siglo XVI", ibid., Barcelona, 1953, III, pp. 107-213.

[32]Literatura dramática española, Barcelona-Buenos Aires, 1930.

[33]The Liturgical Drama in Medieval Spain, Toronto, 1958.

[34]Teatro medieval, 2nd revised ed., Madrid, 1965, pp. 9-90.

[35]Her article, "Fray Iñigo de Mendoza and Medieval Dramatic Ritual" (HR, XXXIII, 1965, 197-245), in part attempts to establish the nature of Spanish liturgical Christmas drama, and in part seeks to show the liturgical origin of the Spanish literary Nativity play.

[36]Tradición y creación en los orígenes del teatro castellano, Madrid, 1968.

[37]Beatrice Patt, "The Development of the Christmas Play in Spain from the Origins to Lope de Vega", doctoral dissertation, Bryn Mawr, 1945.

[38]Mia I. Gerhardt, La Pastorale, essai d'analyse littéraire, Assen, 1950.

[39]Bruce W. Wardropper, Introducción al teatro religioso del siglo de oro (evolución del auto sacramental 1500-1648), 2nd revised ed., Madrid, 1967.

[40]Alfredo Hermenegildo, Los trágicos españoles del siglo XVI, Madrid, 1961.

[41]J. E. Gillet, "Notes on the Language of the Rustics in the Drama of the Sixteenth Century", in Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal, Madrid, 1925, I, pp. 443-452; John Lihani, "Some Notes on Sayagués", Hisp., XLI (1958), 165-169; Charlotte Stern, "Studies on the Sayagués in the Early Spanish Drama", doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania, 1960.

[42]N. D. Shergold, A History of the Spanish Stage from Medieval Times until the End of the Seventeenth Century, Oxford, 1967.

[43]Editions of the plays by Torres Naharro by Joseph E. Gillet (1946), of Gil Vicente by Thomas R. Hart (1962), of Juan del Encina by Humberto López Morales (1963), of Fernán López de Yanguas by Fernando González Ollé (1968), and of Diego Sánchez de Badajoz (1969) have provided readily available texts. (Complete bibliographical details of the edition of Diego Sánchez de Badajoz were not available at the time of writing.)

[44]See, for example, Bruce W. Wardropper, "The Dramatic Texture of the Auto de los reyes magos", MLN, LXX (1955), 46-50; idem, "Metamorphosis in the Theatre of Juan del Encina", SP, LIX (1962), 41-50; Joseph E. Gillet, "Propalladia" and Other Works of Bartolomé de Torres Naharro, 4 vols., Bryn Mawr and Philadelphia, 1943-61 (Vol. IV transcribed, edited, and completed by Otis H. Green); the series of articles devoted to the problems of interpretation of Vicente's Auto de la Sibila Casandra: Thomas R. Hart Jr., "Gil Vicente's Auto de la Sibila Casandra", HR, XXVI (1958), 35-51; María Rosa Lida de Malkiel, "Para la génesis del Auto de la Sibila Casandra", Fil, V (1959), 47-63; I. S. Révah, "L'Auto de la Sibylle Cassandre de Gil Vicente", HR, XXVII (1959), 167-193; Leo Spitzer, "The Artistic Unity of Gil Vicente's Auto da Sibila Casandra", HR, XXVII (1959), 57-77.

[45]William C. Bryant's transcription of the Farsas y églogas from the Academy facsimile, included as an appendix to his dissertation, "Lucas Fernández and the Early Spanish Drama"

(California, 1965), is not a critical text.

[46]Even with the Cañete-Barbieri and Kohler editions (see nn. 7 and 20) of the works of Juan del Encina, a complete, modern, critical edition is lacking. The promised second volume of the edition prepared by López Morales, containing the linguistic study of the eclogues, has apparently been abandonned.

[47]The Obras completas of Juan de Timoneda, begun by Menéndez y Pelayo, remained incomplete (Valencia, 1911). In addition to anthologies, editions of single plays, and the Academy facsimiles of the Turiana and Tres comedias, Timoneda's plays may be read in Obras de Timoneda, ed. E. Juliá Martínez, Madrid, 1947-48, Vols. II and III.

[48]Apart from the Recopilación en metro (ed. D. V. Barrantes, 2 vols., Madrid, 1882-86), the incomplete edition of J. López Prudencio (Badajoz, 1910), and the facsimile of the Recopilación issued by the Spanish Academy (1929) only plays selected for anthologies were available in modern editions until the recent publication (Buenos Aires, 1969), of a critical edition of Diego Sánchez's plays. (See n. 43.)

[49]See the works of Crawford, Gillet, and Wardropper (see nn. 18, 28, 39, and 44), for example.

[50]Crawford's book is entitled Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega; Wardropper's Introducción... dwells on the Spanish drama of the sixteenth century in order to trace the origins and growth of the seventeenth century auto sacramental; Bryant's thesis on Lucas Fernández in part attempts to evaluate the Salamancan as a precursor of the Golden Age dramatists.

[51]Summary dismissal, excusable in a general history of literature, is less easily forgiven in a history of the drama. The minor dramatists received insufficient attention, for example, in Valbuena Prat's book and Juliá Martínez's essays (see nn. 31 and 32).

[52]Part of the blame must be laid to Crawford and the approach adopted in Spanish Drama..., but the idea of an "Encinaschule" had already been established before him by Kohler in Sieben spanische..., and was continued after by such critics as Juliá Martínez (see n. 31).

[53]I am thinking here of a number of books and articles which have focused on the description of a certain character type (the shepherd, the hermit, the braggart, etc.), or a particular set of devices of dramatic action (in the Nativity play, or the wedding pieces, for example). These studies are invaluable descriptions, but they fail to tackle the fundamentals of interpretation, and tend to emphasize the imitative nature of the early drama.

[54]See, for example, Alfredo Hermenegildo, "Nueva interpretación de un primitivo: Lucas Fernández", Segismundo, no. 3 (1966), 9-43. Hermenegildo initially rejects all critical commonplaces made concerning Fernández's works and claims to have reached a new understanding through a close reading of the texts. Certainly he offers a different interpretation of the Auto de la Passion as a result, but, in passing, he also steadfastly repeats all the commonplaces of criticism concerning Fernández's other works--and without the close reading he promises.

[55]A thesis by Laurel H. Turk ("Juan del Encina and the Spanish Renaissance", Stanford, 1934) has this quality. It amounts to a statement of the content of Encina's writings, accompanied by an anthology of critical opinion about them. More recently, López Morales (Tradición y creación...) has also occasionally relied on descriptions and interpretations made by his predecessors.

[56]Important exceptions are the studies on Torres Naharro's plays ("Propalladia"...), and, from many on individual plays, the series of articles on Vicente's Sibila Casandra (see n. 44). On the other hand, it is necessary to dispute some analyses of important plays (e.g. J. Richard Andrews, Juan del Encina, Prometheus in Search of Prestige, University of California, 1959, and the analyses of Vicente's plays by Thomas R. Hart contained in his edition of the Castilian plays by the Portuguese poet).

[57]Classification and description of dramatic devices has verified the imitative nature of early dramatic writing, and, thereby, has emphasized its primitiveness. It has not led to a valid assessment of the understanding of the early drama. López Morales, for example, failed to further the understanding of the early drama. His book (Tradición y creación...), the most recent study of the subject, is a recapitulation of the familiar. Assessing the early dramatists' creativity or adherence to tradition, the author did not adopt a sufficiently broad vision to allow the drawing of conclusions about the overall nature of the plays he discussed.

[58]In part, the dates are arbitrary. Introductory chapters, concerned with dramatic writing prior to Juan del Encina, are included, and plays of which first known editions are post 1520 are analyzed. Moreover, this limitation is not intended to foster the view that the drama of the sixteenth century is a series of schools. While finding it necessary to make comparisons among the plays, each work is treated as an independent composition, not as part of a school of dramatic writing.

# Part I

# COMMEMORATIVE PLAYS

## Chapter I

## INTRODUCTORY

The process of the derivation of modern drama from the liturgy of the Medieval Church has been adequately documented.[1] The evolution from Latin ritual exercises to vernacular plays and the gradual movement of the site of presentation away from the church and its precincts are equally well known.[2] In spite of inadequate evidence, by way of texts of liturgical plays, it is safe to suppose that the pattern of growth in the drama observed in Europe in general is also valid for Spain in particular. It may be assumed that the earliest presentations were derived from certain liturgical practices associated with the celebration of particular feasts of the ecclesiastical calendar.[3] Similarly--as much being true of the European liturgical drama--it can be assumed that, in Spain also, secular and extra-scriptural material was incorporated from the earliest of times into the religious subject.[4] This assumption justifies the claim for a dual intention, apparent in religious drama almost from its inception: on the one hand, as part of a religious ceremony, drama was intended for the edification and instruction of the people; on the other, containing worldly elements foreign to its strictly religious subject, it sought to delight and entertain an audience.[5] Consequently, in dealing with religious plays, it is necessary to determine how early dramatists, writing on principally religious subjects, combined in one play, and often in one personage, the disparate elements

of devotion and entertainment, instruction and delight.

To illustrate this kind of combination in early religious drama, a brief account may be given of the sole surviving medieval drama (twelfth century), the anonymous Auto de los Reyes Magos.[6] Because only a fragment of the Auto is known, a complete idea of it is not possible. It is necessary to hypothesize both in order to assess the amount of secular intrusion into lost portions and to predict the outcome of the action and the ideas it implies.[7] Nonetheless, critics agree that, in spite of certain peculiarities, the Auto is associated to the general traditions of the European Epiphany play.[8] The implications of its association with this tradition are not relevant to this study, however, but a topic of immediate interest is the introduction of extra-scriptural material, even in the short length of the known part of the play, through development of the personages and the use of the action to illustrate a particular idea.

The Magi enter singly at the beginning of the Auto and recite a monologue in turn. Each is an astrologer who awaits further observation before deciding that the special star he has observed is a token of the birth of Christ, whom he must try to find. The Magi are barely differentiated, but, as a trio, their characterization is an elaboration of the scriptural narrative. They are depicted as astrologers, behaving with what might be viewed either as human doubt, or scientific pragmatism, for they must first verify the meaning of the star and, later, test the Child's divinity by judging his choice of the gifts they offer. The action is, similarly, an

amplification of St. Matthew's narrative (II, 1-2), since the Evangelist neither described the Magi as individual witnesses of the star, nor related their meeting on the road to Bethlehem.[9]

The appearance of the Magi at Herod's court is a simple dramatization of the scriptural source (Matt. II, 7-8). The dialogue is in the form of a question and answer sequence until Herod dispatches the Magi, having requested their subsequent return to him with further news of the Child. Only after the departure of the Magi is the scriptural source significantly elaborated to portray the attitudes of Herod and his court. Herod is not quite the ranting tyrant as in English mystery plays, but he is somewhat more than troubled.[10] At first he is arrogant:

> ¿Quin uio nunquas tal mal?
> ¡sobre rei otro tal!
> Aun non so io morto
> ni so la terra pusto!
> ¿Rei otro sobre mi?
> Nunquas atal non ui! (11. 107-112)[11]

Then he summons his steward and calls for his court:

> Id me por mios abades
> i por mis podestades
> i por mios scriuanos
> i por meos gramatgos
> i por mios streleros
> i por mios retoricos;
> dezir man la uertad, si iace in escripto
> o si lo saben elos o si lo an sabido. (11. 119-126).

This portrayal of Herod's dilemma, a feature of the European Epiphany play,[12] would undoubtedly have enhanced the audience's entertainment and helped to hold their attention on a familiar story. The same is to be said of the last scene, when the sages at Herod's court argue about the prophecies concerning the birth of the Child the Magi sought. This episode is in apparent

contradiction of the Evangelist (II, 4-6), who described no dissent among Herod's advisors; on the contrary, they cited chapter and verse of rabbinical texts indicative of the birth of Christ.[13]

Elaboration of St. Matthew's account is a necessary process in the dramatization of the Epiphany story. The Evangelist provided only the barest outline, of which the author of the Auto de los Reyes Magos developed the salient features: the Magi's observation and following of the star, their arrival in Jerusalem, the disturbance at Herod's court, and the Rabbis' recitation of the prophecies. In the process of dramatization, the Magi become astrologers who question their observations, Herod becomes a ranting tyrant, and the Rabbis are portrayed as argumentative. These developments permit the author to present an otherwise skeletal story to his audience, and to this extent the adaptation of St. Matthew is nothing less than any author might have done to present a familiar story in an entertaining way. In addition, the elements introduced to dramatize the scriptural narrative are used to emphasize a central idea.

In an article entitled "The Dramatic Texture of the Auto de los Reyes Magos", Bruce W. Wardropper studied the thematic content of the Auto. He demonstrated that caridad and verdad were deliberately employed in the Auto to convey the attitudes of the personages and the meaning of the event in which they were involved. Motivated by charity, the Magi possess a different wisdom from the book-learning of the Rabbis, and the lack of both charity and wisdom in Herod. Wardropper wrote: "The difference

——between wisdom and learning is a moral one, and here the specific differentiating quality is shown to be charity, the primary virtue of the dawning New Dispensation... Where charity is not, the Messiah and his New Law will not be received. The inseparability of truth and charity becomes apparent as the themes which give spiritual unity to the play are intertwined" (pp. 48-49). This interpretation makes it clear that whoever wrote the Auto was as much concerned with conveying the implications of the Nativity as with telling one of its stories. Moreover, when his adaptation of the scriptural source and this interpretation are related, it is further clear that extra-scriptural material was introduced with the purpose of emphasizing these implications.

The Magi are depicted as astrologers, whose doubts and desire for confirmation of their observations indicate their wish for truth. They represent "disinterested wisdom seeking truth" (Wardropper, p. 48), and they act through charity. As astrologers, "they read in the divine book of the heavens,[14] their eyes are turned ever toward the Highest. Because of this, though they are pagans, they are potentially saved, or are capable of salvation" (ibid., p. 47). Herod's anger, barely mentioned in the gospel, is emphasized in the Auto to portray him as an arrogant non-believer, fearful of a rival, and lacking charity to accept the significance of Christ's birth:

> Aun non so io morto
> ni so la terra pusto!
> ¿Rei otro sobre mi? (11. 109-111)
> .....
> ia non so que me faga.
> Por uertad no lo creo
> ata que io lo ueo. (11. 114-116)

In Wardropper's interpretation: "He has no wisdom in him. Instead of raising his eyes to heaven in search of truth, like the Magi, he calls in his court intellectuals; he relies on the world, 'el seglo', terrestial writing. Herod's doubt is utterly skeptical, because he wishes it to be so, and because it is based on ignorance" (p. 47). Similarly, the Rabbis' dispute, contrasting with their unanimous response in the gospel narrative, is included to emphasize the inappropriateness of their attitude and the futility of their learning. They dispute their knowledge because they have not had charity enough to recognize the truth of their reading:

> R 2°: ¿por que non somos acordados?
> ¿por que non dezimos uertad?
>
> R 1°: Io non la se, par caridad.
>
> R 2°: Por que no la auemos usada
> ni en nostras uocas es falada. (ll. 143-147)

"In these words," Wardropper wrote, "we have the first indication that the gentle oath 'for charity's sake' is meant to be taken seriously as a theme in the play. Uncharitableness is recognized as a source of intellectual, as well as of moral, error. Herod and his counsellors differ from the Magi in that they have no charity, therefore no wisdom, and therefore no sure knowledge of divine truth. ... Because truth is in the air at this point of history, the Second Rabbi is given the light to see that truth is not at Herod's court because charity is not there" (p. 49).

The elements of the Auto which add to the scriptural narrative are precisely those required to illustrate the significance of the Nativity. The development of the action beyond the gospel story

is therefore deliberate. It explains why Winifred Sturdevant, although able to relate the Auto to a European tradition, was unable to find parallels for the doubting Magi and the argumentative Rabbis (see nn. 9 and 13). They were included by the author with a specific intention and are, therefore, peculiar to his play.

In the earliest known vernacular Spanish Nativity drama, then, the source material was adapted, through the introduction of extra-scriptural matter, to facilitate the expansion of a skeletal action into an acceptable entertainment and the development of the subject by means of a particular idea. The Auto reveals what Wardropper described (p. 49) as "a characteristic of the Spanish religious theatre": the "imposition of a simple metaphysical system on a liturgical play".

It is unfortunate that the Auto de los Reyes Magos is a solitary survivor. Because of the lack of texts it is impossible to obtain a clear view of Spanish medieval theatre.[15] There is a long gap from this anonymous Epiphany play to the end of the fifteenth century, when comparable vernacular texts are available. During the intervening three centuries Spain was not entirely void of all forms of drama. Documentary evidence--in books of law, history chronicles, and synodal and conciliar decisions of the ecclesiastical authorities--[16]shows that various forms of dramatic activity persisted. Even without this evidence, it can be reasonably assumed that liturgical dramas performed in celebration of Easter and Christmas thrived as elsewhere in Europe.[17] When presentations to celebrate religious festivals became more elaborate, the evidence gathered to support the existence of

drama is proportionately greater, and, dating from the fifteenth century, some texts are known.[18] These presentations, like the celebrations in honour of "royal entries" and other civic occasions, were more akin to pageants[19] than drama in the strictest sense of the word.[20] Hence, there is little before the last decade of the fifteenth century, and the dramatic eclogues of Juan del Encina, which merits attention.

For the most part, works having some of the qualities of drama belong to the literature of the debate, the poem in dialogue form.[21] On the other hand, there are two texts which immediately precede Encina's eclogues and must be considered on account of their qualities as drama and treatment of a subject favoured by later dramatists. These are the Representaçion del naçimiento de Nuestro Señor by Gómez Manrique and part of the Vita Christi fecho en coplas by Iñigo de Mendoza.

Gómez Manrique's Representaçion was written, according to its title, "a instançia de doña Maria Manrrique, vicaria enel monesterio de Calabaçanos, hermana suya" (p. 53).[22] From this, and the last stanza of a lullaby which concludes the work,

> Cantemos gozosas,
> ermanas graciosas,
> pues somos esposas
> del Jesu bendito, (p. 56)

it is justifiably conjectured that a performance, with nuns playing the parts, took place at the convent where the author's sister was "vicaria".

Movement in the piece, which consists of a series of recitations, is minimal. It begins with Joseph's concern for

Mary's pregnancy, followed by her prayer for his enlightenment and, paraphrasing the Magnificat,[23] her praise of the new-born Christ. There follow scenes representing the adoration of the Child by shepherds and angels, and the martyrs' presentation to Him of the symbols of the Crucifixion. The entire performance is concluded with a lullaby. The appearance of the piece as a series of recitations without movement is not, however, what has most impressed its commentators. Valbuena Prat noticed (Literatura dramática..., p. 19) that "dentro de una agrupación primitiva, la sabia adivinación del poeta va construyendo una obra perfectamente organizada, en orden de menos a más, en una hábil combinación de personajes". Julia Martínez reached a similar conclusion: "Con la visión de un primitivo se yuxtaponen distintos planos, todos ellos de primer término, pero con una curiosa gradación que, partiendo de la sola presencia de San José receloso y desalentado, acaba con la intervención de todos los personajes que figuran en la obra" ("La literatura dramática peninsular...", p. 243). This view has been further analyzed by Harry Sieber in his article "Dramatic Symmetry in Gómez Manrique's La representaçion del naçimiento de Nuestro Señor".[24]

From Sieber's investigation, two points relevant for the discussion of the early Spanish Nativity plays can be established: that Manrique was concerned for the structural appearance of his work, and that he used this structure to impose a simple devotional idea on the familiar Christmas story. The tables drawn by Sieber (pp. 118-122) to depict the symmetrical

evolution of the action show that the speakers are introduced according to a precise pattern into which are interwoven the predominant themes. Just as the author of the Auto de los Reyes Magos, Manrique was as much concerned with presenting the significance of the Incarnation as with narrating the Christmas story. Thus, the recitations begin with reference to Christ's birth and conclude with a foresight of his death. In the interval, the ideas that Christ was born to redeem, to suffer, and to die for Man are intertwined while the personages devoutly offer themselves to the new-born Child. These ideas are further combined at the end when the devotional attitudes of the speakers, and their references to Christ's birth and death, are united in the "Cancion para callar al niño" (Sieber, pp. 126-128).

The section of Iñigo de Mendoza's Vita Christi fecho en coplas (Zamora, 1482) containing an embryonic Nativity play is even less of a drama than Manrique's Representaçion because, as part of a narrative poem, it was not written for performance. Mendoza, however, came closer to the drama and is a truer predecessor of Juan del Encina than Gómez Manrique, since, as analysis reveals, he could handle a technically more advanced action and characterization.

The extract in question of Mendoza's Vita Christi centres on the shepherds' reception of the news of the birth of Christ. Few incidents are added to the New Testament narrative (Luke, II, 8-20), which, in Mendoza's verse, falls into three sections, each preceded by an intervention from the author: the

shepherd's fear on seeing the angel and the latter's announcement of the birth of Christ; the shepherds' recovery of their senses and decision to pay homage to the Child; finally, the narration of the scene at Bethlehem. Where Mendoza elaborated the Evangelist's account is in the portrayal of the shepherds. They occupy the centre of attention, and the birth of Christ is seen solely through presentation of their reaction to it. In particular, Mendoza relied on the two elements of characterization found in the scriptural source: that the shepherds were first afraid, and, then, full of praise and joy.[25]

At the beginning of this extract Mendoza enjoins his reader to witness the timorous shepherds:

> Corramos por ver, sy quera,
> aquella gente aldeana,
> como se turba y altera
> en ver de nueua manera
> enel ayre forma humana,
> diziendo con grand temor
> el vno al otro temblando:
> Cata, cata, Juan Pastor,
> y, juro ami, peccador,
> vn ombre viene bolando. (Biv-r)[26]

Fear is revealed through their subsequent conversation; but their reactions are not uniform. Mingo experiences an abject fear. He admits his hair is standing on end ("que se me eriza la greña", ibid.) and he is rigid with fright:

> ...estoy tan pauorido
> que mudar no me podria,
> segund es la medrosia
> que enel cuerpo me ha metido. (ibid.)

Juan is more rational. He first thinks of hiding, before the flying figure sees them, but then decides that they should run to the village. He tells Mingo to control himself:

Tu eres hi de Pascual,
el del huerte corazon.
Torna, torna en ti, zagal, (Biv-v)

remembers that his dog, his "perra bermeja" (ibid.) will protect them, and reflects that the flying figure would only outpace them if they did flee to the village. It is Mingo who suggests the phenomenon is an evil spirit ("algund peccado", ibid.) to be conjured with song and dance, while Juan continues to rationalize. He had earlier said,

Seque no nos hara mal
tan adonado garçon, (ibid.)

and now remembers the angel who heralded the birth of John the Baptist:

queste a Zacharias vino
enel oficio diuino
a dezille lo de Juan. (ibid.)

The distinction between the two shepherds is maintained after the angel's announcement, when they are "en sy tornados" (Bv-r). Aware of the importance of it all, Juan is immediately prepared to go to Bethlehem. Mingo is not so eager because he is still afraid:

...si no fueses mi amigo
alla no huese contigo,
segund que tengo el espanto;
que oy a pocas estaua
de caer muerto enel suelo. (Bv-v)

His change of heart derives from a desire not to disappoint Juan:

Mas no quiero estorcejar
delo que tu, Juan as gana. (ibid.)

Fear, however, is not the only attitude in which the shepherds are portrayed. They are frightened only as long as they do not understand the reason for the angel's appearance. When they are

enlightened, fear gives way to joy, expressed through music in the playing of instruments, singing, and dancing. This is particularly evident with Mingo.

Mingo's reaction to the appearance of the angel was to conjure him with song and dance. He said to Juan,

> ...ponte la tu çamarra,
> la que tienes de holgar,
> y tiempla bien tu guitarra,
> y yo con una piçarra
> començemos de baylar. (Biv-v)

Later, when Juan suggests a journey to Bethlehem, Mingo forgets his fear by thinking of the pleasure that singing and dancing will give him. He says,

> ...sy estan ay garçones,
> como es dia de domingo,
> haras tu, Juan, delos sones
> que sabes de saltejones
> y veras qual anda Mingo. (Bv-v)

In the excitement of the moment, Mingo gives vent to his feelings through song and dance. Lastly, it is evident from the shepherd's (Mingo's?) narration of the scene at Bethlehem that the singing and dancing impressed him most. The shepherd relates how he exhibited his joy:

> El gallego llouiznaua
> por todo mi çamarron,
> mas viendo cantar de vero
> con la gayta los garçones,
> desnuye la piel de cuero
> por correr, asmo, ligero
> a notar las sus canciones.
>
> Vi los claros como el rayo
> y, al muedo de sus cantares,
> alahe, dexe el mi sayo
> y bayle sin capisayo
> por somos los escobares,
> y tome tanta alegria

con su linda cantadera
que a sobejo paresçia
que panar se derretia
por la mi gorgomillera. (Bvi-v)

To conclude, he recalls the angel's song, and attempts a rendering:

Aun tengo enla mamoria
sus cantos: asmo, que creo
vnos gritauan vitoria,
los otros cantauan groria,
otros indaçielçis deo... (ibid.)

Mendoza explained his insertion of this rustic scene into his narrative poem in the following terms:

Por que no pueden estar
en vn rigor toda via
los arcos para tirar,
suelen los desenpulgar
alguna pieça del dia;
pues razon fue declarar
estas chufas de pastores
para poder recrear,
despertar y renouar
la gana delos letores.

Por ende ningund liuiano
nolo juzgue a liuiandad;
pues nuestro linaje humano
tiene tan flaco la mano
despues de su enfermedad,
que si la nuestra derecha
non consuela la esquerda,
es por fuerça que quien flecha
nuestra natura contrecha
le quiebre el braço o la cuerda. (Bvi-v and Bvii-r)

This explanation could be accepted without further comment, did not the nature of the extract, and its importance in the history of the early Spanish drama, demand a further look at it.

In a dissertation on the development of the Christmas play in Spain, Beatrice P. Patt wrote that "Iñigo de Mendoza's mind was filled with unconscious recollections of other liturgical plays which he had probably seen many times" (p.78),[27] and that

"the skeleton of the play conforms to religious tradition" (ibid.). Another commentator, Charlotte Stern, has used the extract from Vita Christi as a basis from which to reconstruct a ritualistic, liturgical Christmas play. While she makes a number of valid observations, as an analysis of Mendoza's work her study, "Fray Iñigo de Mendoza and Medieval Dramatic Ritual", is continually belied by two facts. Firstly, although the extract is eminently representable, it was patently never intended for representation, and all the assertions to the contrary do not alter this fact.[28] Secondly, her reconstruction of the liturgical Christmas play is hypothetical.[29] Although agreeing that certain elements were probably "pre-determined by Spanish celebrations of the time" (p. 201), particularly since subsequent dramatists used them, a fact indicative of an established tradition, as much cannot be definitely concluded in respect of the overall piece because the extent of Mendoza's innovations cannot be assessed.[30] Given these facts, it is imposible to conclude with Miss Stern that "Mendoza hopes to arouse in the spectators the spirit of reverence and devotion and thus revitalize their religious faith" (p. 211). The liturgical drama may have had an essentially ritualistic nature, but Mendoza's poem, intented for the reader, not the spectator, does not, and could only partake of it vicariously.

The structure of the piece is founded on the simultaneous evolution of action and character, elements which, together, fulfil what may be taken as the author's purpose: narration of a Nativity story and explanation of its meaning. The story is

apparent enough: the announcement of the birth of Christ to the shepherds, and their celebration. The expression of its meaning is achieved simply by coupling the story to the evolution in the attitudes of the shepherds. The angel's announcement is presaged by manifestations of fear, superstition, and lack of understanding from the shepherds, but the announcement itself disipates all feelings of apprehension, replacing them with sentiments of joy and excitement. In the words of the author, the shepherds are "Encendidos y animados / con sus matiegas razones" (Bvi-r), as they abandon their flocks and depart for Bethlehem. They reflect the angel's message of joy, both in their lively anticipation of the pleasure they will find, and in their description of the scene at Bethlehem, when they beheld Christ and excitedly participated in the celebration of his birth. By extension, the shepherds also reflect the general significance of the event in which they participate. The evolution in their attitude, from apprehension to joy, embodies the effect of Christ's birth, just as the angel had announced:

> O pobrezillos pastores,
> todo el mundo alegre sea,
> quel señor de los señores,
> por saluar los peccadores,
> es nascido en vuestra aldea.
>
> Es ya vuestra humanidad
> por este hijo de Dios
> libre de captiuidad
> es fuera la enemistad
> dentre nosotros y vos... (Bv-r)

From the point of view of devotion or instruction, of satisfying the religious aspect of the subject, Mendoza used the

shepherds to convey the happiness felt on account of the Nativity. At the same time, proposing it as his reason for introducing "estas chufas de pastores" (Bvi-v), Mendoza resolved to amuse his readers, "recrear, / despertar y renouar / la gana delos letores" (ibid.). He therefore focused on the shepherds and developed their characterization beyond the scriptural source at his disposal. He had sought to entertain by elaborating a religious subject through the introduction of predominantly secular elements derived from contemporary sources.

The language of the shepherds, their Sayagués, is essentially a contemporary, literary language, already popularized in the Coplas de Mingo Revulgo and the poems of Rodrigo de Reynosa.[31] The speaking of a dialect, realistic language, and the portrayal of low life are not exclusive to the shepherds of the Nativity plays. On the contrary, Mendoza's shepherds are the literary representatives of the contemporary Spanish rustic. In addition, they represented the shepherds of Bethlehem. Without going so far as Charlotte Stern, in concluding that this ambivalent role resulted from the ritualistic church drama, it is possible to accept in principle her definition of it: "The shepherd is a realistic-comic type when he expresses himself in Sayagués; his Biblical personality asserts itself when he indulges in Biblical allusions; as in the reference to Zachariah, or when he raises theological questions. ... Mendoza's technique is characteristic of the sixteenth-century autos. It is not a question of the presence in a single work of shepherds of diverse traditions as we have in the novela pastoril but of a single

shepherd endowed with a double or triple personality" (p. 220).

The resulting multiplicity of identity, as Miss Stern also indicated (pp. 217-218), obliterates all concept of time. The event in which the personages are involved is re-enacted as a contemporary happening, rather than as the commemoration of a past occurrence. In this respect, Mendoza's explanation for introducing "estas chufas de pastores" as entertainment and relaxation may be recalled. The explanation is adequate, for, without any major departure from the religious subject and its scriptural source, Mendoza adapted it and used it for the secular purpose of entertainment.[32]

Were more Castilian texts known, the origins and growth of religious drama could doubtless be traced more clearly. The texts referred to in this chapter are nevertheless sufficient to warrant the claim that, when it eventually emerged in the shape of Encina's dramatic eclogues, several elements of composition had already been formed. A simple, metaphysical or ideological idea could be imposed on a traditional story; a scriptural narrative could be adapted to serve both as a source of amusement and a means to devotion; the principal personages, the shepherds, were already moulded to the basic characterization which, with some refinement, served throughout the first half of the sixteenth century,[33] and which established the drama as a timeless phenomenon whereby an historical event could be re-enacted rather than just commemorated. Encina's eclogues were not, therefore, a bolt from the blue. Even

though the course of the evolution of the drama during the fifteenth century is not completely clear, it is certain that Encina's plays culminated years of experiment. He wrote on subjects which had concerned earlier poets; his career as a dramatist began with the story which, if the works by Manrique and Mendoza are any guide, was customarily enacted at Christmas. To this extent Encina was a traditionalist. His plays are almost a trick of chance, for he began writing them to amuse and honour his benefactors at a time when amusements of a similar kind, performed at court or in noblemen's houses, had become fashionable.[34] Their importance was their popularity and that they were imitated; their achievement was that their author, unlike his predecessors, grasped the essence of dramatic form and understood the concepts of impersonation and performance.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER I

[1]Karl Young, The Drama of the Medieval Church, 2 vols., Oxford, 1933.

[2]The early European drama in general is described in Creizenach, Geschichte...; for individual countries, see Sir Edmund K. Chambers, The Medieval Stage, 2 vols., Oxford, 1903, Paolo Toschi, Le origini del teatro italiano, Turin, 1955, Grace Frank, The Medieval French Drama, Oxford, 1954, Donovan, The Liturgical Drama...; for the folk origins of drama, see Allardyce Nicoll, Masks, Mimes, and Miracles, New York, 1931; and for further discussion of the origins of the drama in Spain, Bonilla y San Martín, Las Bacantes,..., and Lázaro Carreter, Teatro Medieval, pp. 9-90. (To abbreviate notes and prevent their excessive multiplication and duplication, references are made by authors' names and/or by short titles after a first complete reference.)

[3]Donovan could not find a wealth of liturgical texts, particularly early works of Castile, but he uncovered a sufficient number to warrant the claim that the tradition of liturgical drama was known and practised in Spain. (See, however, López Morales' discussion of the matter in Tradición y creación..., pp. 41-87.)

[4]Young, II, p. 569, s.v. "Comedy".

[5]Young, II, p. 422, noted that "particularly important in the general dramatic expansion, no doubt, was the impulse toward increasing the worldly appeal of the plays through the comic element". He further remarked (loc. cit.) that comic elements were expanded as plays became increasingly secularized.

[6]The manuscript of the Auto was discovered by Felipe Fernández Vallejo (see J. E. Gillet, "The 'Memorias' of Felipe Fernández Vallejo and the History of the Early Spanish Drama", in Studies in Honor of Carleton Brown, New York, 1940, pp. 264-280); the date was first fixed by K. A. Martin Hartmann, Über das altspanische Dreikönigspiel, Bautzen, 1879. The critical history of the Auto is surveyed in Guillermo Díaz-Plaja, "El Auto de los Reyes Magos", EE, IV (1959), 99-126.

[7]Shergold, A History of the Spanish Stage..., p. 6, suggested a liturgical ending: "It is to be supposed that a third scene, the adoration of Jesus, has been lost; unless, that is, the play was intended to merge into church ceremonial at this point, with the three Kings making their offerings without further dialogue. That this may have been so is suggested by the existence and use of Magi plays outside

Spain to introduce, or dramatize, the oblation proceeding Epiphany Mass". This opinion is supported in Young (II, pp. 32-33). An adoration scene would also be a satisfactory conclusion for Bruce W. Wardropper, who would see it as the appropriate culmination of the themes worked out in the Auto: "The missing scene--the conjectural visit to the praesepium, where Christ will demonstrate that he is, at one and the same time, a mortal man, King of Earth, and King of Heaven--could only be a dénouement of these thematic threads" ("The Dramatic Texture...", p. 47). See, also, Díaz-Plaja, "El Auto...", pp. 124-126.

[8]Díaz-Plaja, "El Auto...", pp. 120-124. See, also, Winifred Sturdevant, "The Misterio de los Reyes Magos: Its Position in the Development of the Medieval Legend of the Three Kings", Baltimore (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages), 1927, and the chapter entitled, "The relation of the Reyes Magos to the Benediktbeurn transitorial Latin play and the Medieval French, German, and English three Kings plays". In addition, see the hypothesis of Rafael Lapesa about the origin of the Auto argued in "Sobre el Auto de los Reyes Magos: sus rimas anómalas y el posible origen de su autor", in Homenaje a Fritz Krüger, Mendoza, 1954, II, pp. 591-599.

[9]Sighting of the star and the journey to Bethlehem are briefly described in the New Testament: "Cum ergo natus esset Jesus in Bethlehem Juda in diebus Herodis regis, ecce Magi ab oriente venerunt Ierosolymam, Dicentes: Ubi est qui natus est rex Judaeorum? Vidimus enim stellam ejus in oriente, et venimus adorare eum" (Matt. II, 1-2). Depiction of the Magi as critical of their own observations is, Miss Sturdevant concluded, unique to the Spanish Auto (see n. 8). Their characterization as astrologers can be attributed to a contemporary interest in astronomy (the Lapidario of Alfonso X is of the thirteenth century) and to certain Medieval traditions concerning the identity and origin of the Magi (see Young, II, pp. 30-31). The meeting of the Magi can be attributed to tradition. In his edition of Vicente's works (Obras dramáticas castellanas, Madrid, 1962, p. 36, n.), Thomas R. Hart described the meeting as a theme of Medieval painting. The evidence to this tradition is, however, later than the twelfth century Auto de los Reyes Magos. Johannes Hildesheimensis' Liber trium regum, in which a meeting at Golgotha, the site of the Crucifixion, is described, is a fourteenth century work, and paintings depicting the scene are early fifteenth (see Erwin Panofsky, Netherlandish Painting: Its Origins and Character, Cambridge, Mass., 1953, I, p. 64, n. 4, and p. 83, n. 1; II, figs. 84 and 99). It has not been possible to verify the existence of the tradition in the twelfth century.

[10]Herod is described as follows: "Audiens autem Herodes rex,

turbatus est, et omnis Ierosolyma cum illo" (Matt. II, 3); "Tunc Herodes videns quoniam illusus esset a Magis, iratus est valde, et mittens occidit omnes pueros qui erant in Bethlehem" (II, 16). Compare the portrayal of Herod in the Magi plays of the English York, Chester, and Wakefield miracle plays.

[11]Quotation of the Auto de los Reyes Magos is according to Ramón Menéndez Pidal, Crestomatía del español medieval, Madrid, 1965, I, pp. 71-77.

[12]See Young, II, chaps. XVIII-XIX, "The Coming of the Magi", pp. 29-101.

[13]"Et congregans omnes principes sacerdotum et scribas populi, sciscitabitur ab eis ubi Christus nasceretur. Et illi dixerunt ei: In Bethlehem Judae; sic enim scriptum est per prophetum: Et tu Bethlehem, terra Juda, nequaquam minima es in principibus Juda; ex te enim exiet dux, qui regat populum meum Israel" (Matt. II, 4-6). The dispute of the Rabbis was, in Miss Sturdevant's findings, another example of originality in the Auto (see nn. 8 and 9).

[14]Wardropper refers the reader to Ernst Robert Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, New York, 1953, chap. XVI.

[15]A lack of texts need not necessarily imply a complete lack of drama; opinions run both for and against the existence of a Spanish Medieval drama (see, Lázaro Carreter, Teatro medieval, and López Morales, Tradición y creación...).

[16]Of the many studies containing discussion of this evidence, see López Morales, Tradición y creación..., pp. 68-74, and Crawford, Spanish Drama..., pp. 2-11.

[17]Donovan's findings and, also, the later course of the drama, through Juan del Encina and the sixteenth century, substantiate the continuity of the religious theatre.

[18]For a description of several fifteenth century works--all from outside Castile--see Shoemaker, The Multiple Stage..., and Juliá Martínez, "La Asunción de la Virgen y el teatro primitivo español", BRAE, XLI (1961), 179-334.

[19]Some idea of the pageants and popular festivals may be had from Shoemaker, "Fernando de Basurto's 'Lost Play' on the Martyrdom of Santa Engracia", HR, VI (1938), 35-45.

[20]Many studies on the early drama in Spain lack a definition of the term "drama". Lázaro Carreter, for example, allows a very elastic definition when making his selection for his

anthology Teatro medieval. Young's definition is "a story presented in action, in which the speakers or actors impersonate the characters concerned" (I, p. 80). Accepting this, Donovan commented, "For him, and we believe that he is right, it is the word impersonate which is all-important; a ceremony without this quality is not a play" (The Liturgical Drama..., p. 6). To Donovan's words may be added that a poem, or similar composition lacking this quality is equally not a play. This definition is taken as the criterion for this study.

[21]Among them are the Denuestos del agua y el vino, Elena y María or Disputa del clérigo y caballero, the Disputa del alma y el cuerpo, and the Revelación de un ermitaño (see Antología mayor de la literatura española, ed. Guillermo Díaz-Plaja, Barcelona, 1958, I, pp. 209-211) and, from the literature of the fifteenth century, several of the works included by Lázaro Carreter in Teatro medieval (the Danza de la muerte, the Queja by the Comendador Escrivá, the Coplas by Puertocarrero, and the Diálogo entre el amor y un viejo by Rodrigo Cota).

[22]Quotations are according to Cancionero castellano del siglo XV, ed. R. Foulché-Delbosc, Madrid, 1915, II, pp. 53-56.

[23]Manrique's text runs,

> ...mi anima engrandeçe
> a ti, mi solo señor,
> y en ti, mi saluador,
> mi espiritu floreçe; (p. 54)

the scriptural text, "Magnificat anima mea Dominum, et exsultavit spiritus meus in Deo salutari meo" (Luke, I, 46-47).

[24]HR, XXXIII (1965), 118-135.

[25]The scriptural source runs, "Et ecce angelus Domini stetit juxta illos, et claritas Dei circumfulsit illos, et timuerunt timore magno. ... Et reversi sunt pastores glorificantes et laudantes Deum, in omnibus quae audierant, et viderant, sicut dictum est ad illos" (Luke, II, 9 and 20).

[26]Quotations are from Vita Christi fecho en coplas por Fray Iñigo de Mendoza (Zamora, 1482), reproduced in facsimile by the Real Academia Española, Madrid, 1953.

[27]Miss Patt's comparison of Mendoza's work to the liturgical drama is, however, somewhat weak. She says, for example, of Juan Pastor's reference to the angel ("queste a Zacharias vino / enel oficio diuino / a dezillo lo de Juan, "Biv-v), "It is obvious that the shepherd is here referring to some liturgical presentation previously witnessed by the author"

(The Development of the Christmas Play...", p. 76). On the contrary, the shepherd is "obviously referring" to Luke I, 8-22, and an episode which, in the Evangelist's account, occurred before the birth of Christ.

[28]Miss Stern can undoubtedly show that Mendoza's work has many of the qualities of a drama, but she analyzes it as if it were one, effectively begging the question.

[29]The reconstruction of the liturgical Nativity drama is ingenious, but there are no earlier or contemporary works in Spain with which Mendoza's piece can be compared, and the reconstruction thereby verified.

[30]Crawford also saw the extract from the Vita Christi as a faithful reproduction of the liturgical drama: "It is true that this scene was not represented, but we may look upon it as a faithful transcription of the performances which were given at that time either in the church itself or in the yard. We could hardly conceive of a serious writer inventing this scene in which the comic element plays so large a part. It is particularly interesting inasmuch as the shepherds here represented have the same characteristics that we find in the plays of Encina and later writers. They speak their own crude language, they are filled with terror at the sight of the angel and the star, they sing and dance as they go to the manger, and tell of their love for food. It was used as an introduction to the Nativity scene, but already we find the shepherds occupying a disproportionate place" (Spanish Drama..., pp. 13-14). Without the evidence that a comparison with the liturgical drama would supply, it is impossible to prove a wholesale dependence on liturgical practises. That the piece is ultimately derived from the liturgical drama is not in dispute, but Mendoza might be required only to know of the liturgical Christmas shepherds and their tendency to comedy as the source for his initial inspiration. For the rest, he could rely on St. Luke, literary convention, and his own imagination.

[31]For the importance of the Coplas de Mingo Revulgo and the poems of Rodrigo de Reynosa in the development of the early drama in Spain, see Menéndez y Pelayo, Antología..., II, pp. 296-302, and J. E. Gillet, "Coplas de unos tres pastores attributed to Rodrigo de Reynosa", PhQ, XXI (1942), 23-27.

[32]Largely for this reason Charlotte Stern's interpretation of Mendoza's work as a dramatic ritual is to be rejected. Her definition of ritual (pp. 211-215) is not applicable to the Vita Christi because Mendoza introduced the shepherds and elaborated the scriptural source not for the purposes of presentation, nor to incorporate an audience into the action, but in order to entertain a reader. As an artificial,

literary composition, divorced from the religious rite from which it derived, the Vita Christi lacks the fundamental requirements for it to be classified as ritual.

[33]The shepherd reached his apogée as the central character of the drama in the sixteenth century in the works of Diego Sánchez de Badajoz (Recopilación en metro, Seville, 1554).

[34]See Lázaro Carreter, Teatro medieval, pp. 52-73.

## Chapter II

## JUAN DEL ENCINA

For one so prominent in the early Spanish drama, Juan del Encina has not received full justice from literary critics and historians. Since the Viaje entretenido (1603) of Agustín de Rojas,[1] he has been traditionally considered the founder of the Spanish theatre, but his works have rarely been judged fairly, and no adequate assessment of his ability and technique as a dramatist has been made. Ticknor's acclamation of him as "el verdadero fundador del teatro español", and his opinion of the plays: "Son rudas en la forma y pobres de ingenio. En algunas no hay más que dos o tres interlocutores, la que más tiene seis, y todas carecen de enredo y demás accidentes que constituyen el drama",[2] written in 1849, has been repeated with variations to the present day.[3] J. Richard Andrews justifiably lamented in 1959 (Prometheus..., pp. 100-101) that "the theater as a genre and Encina as the initiator ... of that genre, have become the central problems, while the question of his theater as an expression within a vital situation has been overlooked". Encina as a person and as a representative figure of his age in the early history of Spanish drama have been the subject of much discussion;[4] the quality of his drama and his ability as a dramatist still lack adequate assessment.

Four plays are studied in this chapter. All were performed

to celebrate Christmas, and all contain pastoral characters. These are: the first and second eclogues in Juan del Encina's first Cancionero (Salamanca, 1496)[5] which were presented together before the poet's patrons, the Duke and Duchess of Alba, traditionally at Christmas in 1492;[6] the same author's Egloga IX (the so-called Egloga de las grandes lluvias), presented in celebration of Christmas 1498[7] and first printed in the 1507 Cancionero;[8] and the Egloga interlocutoria, an anonymous play similar to those by Encina and attributed to him by some critics.[9]

Eglogas I and II, unified in a single performance and by the employment of the same personages, may be considered together, although, because of differing subjects, they must also be viewed as separate entities. The title-prologue to the first reads as follows:

> Egloga representada en la noche de la navidad de nuestro Salvador, adonde se introduzen dos pastores, uno llamado Juan y otro Mateo. Y aquel que Juan se llamava entro primero en la sala adonde el duque y duquesa estavan oyendo maytines, y en nombre de Juan de Enzina llego a presentar cien coplas de aquesta fiesta a la señora duquesa. Y el otro llamado Mateo, entro despues desto, y en nombre de los detratores y maldizientes començose a razonar con el. Y Juan, estando muy alegre y ufano porque sus señorias le avian ya recibido por suyo, convencio la malicia del otro, adonde prometio que venido el mayo, sacaria la copilacion de todas sus obras porque se las usurpavan y corrompian; y porque no pensassen que toda su obra era pastoril segun algunos dezian, mas antes conociessen que a mas estendia su saber. (p. 23)

That to the second:

> Egloga representada en la mesma noche de navidad, adonde se introduzen los mesmos pastores de arriba, llamados Juan y Mateo. Y estando estos en la sala adonde los maytines se dezian, entraron otros dos pastores,

> que Lucas y Marcos se llamavan; y todos cuatro, en nombre de los cuatro evangelistas, de la natividad de Cristo se començaron a razonar. (p. 33)

The superficial differences and similarities between the two eclogues are immediately apparent on a cursory comparison of these two introductory passages; but there remains a problem of whether to consider them as one or two plays, and, if two, the nature of their relationship.

The customary solution has been to consider Egloga I the prologue to Egloga II. For Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 13), the first was "a prologue to the Christmas play which followed", an opinion virtually repeated by Georges Cirot: "On est ... autorisé à voir dans cette Egloga une sorte de prologue, ou loa, amenant l'Eglogue qui suit".[10] Turk ("Juan del Encina and the Spanish Renaissance", p. 228), was of the same mind.

This solution has several favourable points. It would be particularly justifiable if the first eclogue of the Cancionero also proved to be the first in order of composition (see n. 6, however) and the first presented before the Duke and Duchess of Alba. It would have been logical for Juan del Encina to have introduced himself, to have justified his patrons' choice of him as their poet, and to have expressed a hope of remuneration, all of which is done during the eclogue. As a prologue, however, Egloga I does not obviously refer to, nor introduce Egloga II. The nature of its function as a prologue therefore warrants investigation.

J. Richard Andrews attempted just this. He examined

Egloga I as a prologue both to Egloga II and to the whole of Encina's dramatic production. His study, Juan del Encina: Prometheus in Search of Prestige, is, however, a biased investigation of Encina's work. Its objective is to elucidate Encina's personality from a study of his poetry and plays. Encina is consequently viewed as a poet in search of recognition, and Andrews produces an unbalanced interpretation, containing a number of untenable conclusions, which are disputed in the course of this study.[11]

An analysis of the dialogue, in Egloga I, between the shepherds Juan and Mateo (Juan del Encina and his critics) revealed for Andrews that "the secular theater in Spain began as a shout for personal recognition" (p. 108), a shout sustained throughout the rest of Encina's dramatic compositions: "It can be said that the first égloga contains explicitly the intent, motive, and goal-purpose which will appear more or less implicitly ... in the rest of his theatrical pieces" (p. 109).[12] The first eclogue is, then, a prologue to the second because it is a prologue to all the plays. Moreover, Andrews purports to decipher a close union between the two plays as the result of the continuation at a different, higher level in Egloga II of the ideas expressed in Egloga I. It is suggested (p. 119) that "the most important theme of the first égloga and the fundamental and essential connection of it with the second is precisely this idea of the divine gift of poetic inspiration and the exaltation of Encina as a recipient of that gift. It is this idea which acts

as the core to the various imagery groups--bread, light, shepherd--which interjoin and confirm one another throughout the plays".

The unity between these two eclogues was also discussed by Bruce W. Wardropper in his article "Metamorphosis in the Theatre of Juan del Encina". He, too, considered the first a dramatic prologue to the second, provided in part by the transformation of the personages from one eclogue to the other, in part by a similar transformation of ideas. Wardropper wrote of the personages (p. 43) that "by the time that the second égloga is under way the aristocratic audience is required to suppose that the actors are--at one and the same time--their own sheep-herding employees, the Nativity shepherds, their court poet and his enemies, and the four evangelists, as well as actors portraying fictional characters". He noted that Juan, representing Juan del Encina, changes his concerns: his "petty troubles have been replaced by eternal, all-embracing interests of mankind". As a "metaphoric shepherd" and "literal poet" in Egloga I he worried about his daily bread; in Egloga II, as Juan the Evangelist, he spreads the gospel and his concern is for the true bread, Christ. The two eclogues are thereby linked, with the second as a kind of loose versión a lo divino of the first (pp. 43-44).[13]

Both Andrews and Wardropper uphold, although with varying emphasis, the notion that the two eclogues are united on account of a continuous idea and the employment of the same personages with transformed identities. When the overall unity of the two eclogues is discussed, these points of view will be borne in mind.

For the moment, however, it is necessary to analyze Eglogas I and II as separate entities.

There can be no doubt about the identity of the personages in Egloga I. The matter is made perfectly clear in the title-prologue: there are "dos pastores, uno llamado Juan y otro Mateo"; "aquel que Juan se llamava" speaks "en nombre de Juan de Enzina", and "el otro pastor llamado Mateo" speaks "en nombre de los detratores y maldizientes" (p. 23). The duality of the two interlocutors is stressed: on the one hand, Juan and Mateo are shepherds, fictional creations in a fictional situation; on the other, they are real people involved in real circumstances. Egloga I is consequently a prolonged metaphor in which the literal meaning of the dialogue and the identity of the personages are clothed in pastoral disguise.

This disguise, apparent from Juan's first appearance, is sustained throughout the play. He greets the audience as a peasant, in peasant dialect, and with peasant exuberance:

> ¡Dios salve aca, buena gente!
> ¡Asmo, soncas! Aca estoy,
> que a ver a nuestrama voy. (ll. 1-3)

Praise of the Duke and Duchess of Alba is cast in the pastoral mould. The Duke, supposed employer of the fictional shepherd Juan, is described as

> ...tan justo y tan chapado,
> tan castigador de robos,
> que los mas hambrientos lobos
> huyen mas de su ganado. (ll. 37-40)

Juan's monologue at the beginning of the eclogue bears interpretation

at both levels of its meaning: as the poet praising his patrons, or the shepherd praising his master.

The pastoral tone does not change with the entry of Mateo. At one level the ensuing dialogue is an argument between shepherds, and the attitude revealed in the course of their conversation is compatible with their supposed rustic origin. Mateo's criticisms may be interpreted literally. He questions the right of a low-born shepherd to sport himself in the halls of dukes, and accuses Juan of adopting pretensions beyond his birth. Mateo's sneer,

> ¡O, lazerado pastor,
> de los mas ruynes del hato,
> aun no vales por un pato
> y tieneste en gran valor! (ll. 64-67)

is spoken by one who despises the success of an equal. His condemnation of Juan's achievement,

> Yo conoço bien tus obras;
> ¡todas no valen dos pajas! (ll. 75-76)

is a groundless rejection of an inferior. Mateo is evidently jealous.[14] When he realizes the lack of substance in his arguments he supports them with a list of friends who share his opinion. All are country people, in keeping with the station of the two speakers:

> ...Pravos, ques buen gaytero
> te remuerde los çancajos,
> y el carillo de Sorvajos,
> y el padre de Gil Vaquero,
> y el sobrino del herrero,
> y aun Lloriente, tu cuñado,
> y el hijo del messeguero,
> ques zagal de buen apero,
> te tacha quanto has labrado. (ll. 109-117)

With his arguments exhausted, Mateo yields, recognizes his

companion's worth, and changes his attitude. Learning that Juan's claims were no idle boast, that he has already been received by the Duke and Duchess, and expects payment from them, Mateo's vindictive jealousy turns to the envy of admiration and congratulation:

> Si tales amos tuviesse
> saldria de cuyta yo. (ll. 174-175)

Juan's self-defence may also be interpreted as that of a shepherd forced to justify himself, his work and promotion. Disclaiming Mateo's accusation of social pretentiousness, Juan counter-accuses his critic in his own coin:

> Calla, calla ya, malsin,
> que nunca faltas de ruyn. (ll. 56-57)

Juan's defence of the work given and promised to his employers is expressed in the terms of his shepherd's life and rustic appurtenances:

> Aunque agora yo no trayo
> sino hato de pastores,
> dexa tu venir el mayo,
> y veras si saco un sayo.
> que relumbren sus colores.
>
> Sacare con mi eslavon
> tanta lumbre en chico rato,
> que vengan de qualquier hato,
> cada cual por su tizon.
> Darles he de mi monton
> bellotas para comer,
> mas algunas tales son
> que en roer el cascaron
> avran harto que hazer. (ll. 86-99)

The final outburst, silencing his critic, is in the spirit of the shepherd, or the artisan (his work is "mi lavor"), who has learnt his trade and is justifiably proud of it. Juan confidently

boasts of the excellence of his work and the versatility of his talent,

> ¡Tenme por de los mejores!
> Cata que estas engañado,
> que si quieres de pastores
> o si de trobas mayores,
> de todo se, Dios loado.
>
> Y no dudo aver errada
> en algun mi viejo escrito,
> que quando era zagalito
> no sabia quasi nada;
> mas agora va labrada
> tan por arte mi lavor,
> que aunque sea remirada,
> no avra cosa mal trobada
> si no miente el escritor. (ll. 122-135)

Pride of achievement is equally apparent at the end of the eclogue when Juan announces that he has been received into the service of the Duke and Duchess and expects to be rewarded. Pride in his employers,

> Nunce tal amo se vio
> ni tan ama tan querida,
> nunca tal ni tal nacio, (ll. 176-178)

reflects his pride in his work, not to mention his satisfaction at the thought of a steady income.

The presentation of the personages as fictional entities is complete, since the portrayal of Juan and Mateo as shepherds is sustained throughout the entire work. Furthermore, a precise fictional relationship is established between them: they react through feelings of mutual antagonism--a fundamental device in the early Spanish drama--[15] and develop their relationship in the course of their argument. Initially opposites in a quarrel,

Mateo's jealous derision gives way to congratulatory envy when he yields to Juan and acknowledges his worth. Consequently, in spite of the limited action and subject of Egloga I, there is nonetheless a certain amount of character creation. A relationship between the characters and the audience is created also; the Duke and Duchess of Alba assume the roles of the pastoral employers of the shepherd Juan.

Underlying the make-believe of the pastoral situation, however, is the fact that the shepherds speak in the name of the author and his supposed critics; the pastoral identity of the shepherds and their audience is used to veil a real situation.

J. Richard Andrews accurately assessed the purpose of the eclogue when he wrote (Prometheus..., p. 103) that "the play is an address to the Duke and Duchess and never swerves from this basic function". By defending himself against his critics, Encina justified himself before his patrons. In the argument with Mateo, Juan invokes the audience, the Duke and Duchess, as part of his self-appraisal:

> Delante destos señores,
> quien me quisiere tachar,
> yo me obrigo de le dar
> por un error mil errores. (ll. 118-121)

Continuing this speech, he acclaims (ll. 122-135) the quality and variety of his works, and, in the concluding part of the eclogue, hints at its adequate recompense:

> Mateo: ¿Que te han dado? ¿Que has avido?
> Juan: Aun agora no he cumprido.
> Mateo: Llugo, ¿no te han dado nada?

Juan: No me han dado, mas daran
dexandolos Dios bivir.
.....
No son amos que se estan
recachando en las meajas. (ll. 151-162)

Nevertheless, an interpretation of the eclogue on the basis of its being a dramatization of a real situation must be made carefully. The overtones of meaning, inferred by J. Richard Andrews concerning Encina's attitude toward his patrons, cannot be accepted.[16] Similarly, Mateo is not necessarily the embodiment of a number of real critics, least of all of one in particular.[17] Certainly, the eclogue is an address by the poet to his patrons, and the possibility of Juan del Encina having performed the role of his namesake Juan must be accepted. On the other hand, without more knowledge of Encina's life and of his service with the Duke and Duchess of Alba, a meaning cannot be given to this eclogue beyond that apparent from its immediate content. An attempt to psycho-analyze Encina through his works will only result in a hypothetical interpretation (see n. 16).

Insofar as Juan del Encina's relationship with his patrons is concerned, Egloga I represents an occasion on which he regaled his patrons with a performance of his work, fulfilled the duties of his position as their poet, and alluded to the conditions of his service. His duties were accomplished by presenting the Duchess with an example of his work ("cien coplas de aquesta fiesta", p. 23), and by praising both her and the Duke in verse. This business is completed in Juan's opening monologue and in the concluding part of the eclogue through the dialogue between

Juan and Mateo, in the course of which Encina also refers to the conditions of his service. He justifies his patrons' choice of him as their poet by establishing the variety and quality of his work, and then broadly hints that his labour be adequately rewarded. The introduction of Mateo as a hostile critic, and the enactment of an argument with him, are devices allowing Juan del Encina to allude to his personal affairs. The description of Mateo as one who speaks "en nombre de los detratores y maldizientes" (ibid.) need not, therefore, solely refer to real critics envious of Encina's social success and literary achievements. The description is equally applicable to Mateo's function within the action of the eclogue, and to his fictional role.

The fact is that Juan del Encina has completely confused fiction with reality. The predominant element of reality in the eclogue is the occasion of its performance. Combining fiction and reality in the action and the identity of the personages,[18] Juan del Encina established a definite liaison between the actors and the audience. In fact, both on the real and the fictional levels, the eclogue is a dramatization of a moment in this liaison, a subject, by itself, not specifically dramatic. As a drama, the eclogue has an invented action and characters, and presents a simple relationship between the two personages involved in it; as a real occasion, as a performance before the Duke and Duchess of Alba, the eclogue is a moment in the lives of the poet and his patrons during which the former addresses the latter. Hence, the combination of fact and fiction is the major factor in the nature

of Egloga I, and is nothing less than the essence of drama. Encina has gone further than any poet who merely addressed his patrons in pastoral verse. He has cast himself in the form of another and impersonated a shepherd in order to make the address to his patrons the subject of a live entertainment. He has taken the essential step to turn poetry into play.

In the title-prologue to Egloga II Encina also defined the identity of the personages. He wrote that there appeared "los mesmos pastores de arriba, llamados Juan y Mateo", joined by "otros dos pastores, que Lucas y Marco se llamavan", and that "todos cuatro en nombre de los cuatro evangelistas de la natividad de Cristo se començaron a razonar" (p. 33). The fact that Juan and Mateo already appeared in different guises in Egloga I may be taken into account later, so that Egloga II can first be examined as an independent unit.

Egloga II has an outward simplicity which Beatrice P. Patt, after relating the play to its Biblical sources, summarized as follows: "Presented before us is a tableau of four shepherd-evangelists who discuss the Birth, the function and the nature of Christ. The speeches of each evangelist follow rather closely the content of the gospel from which each derives his name, but the doctrinal framework is so well covered over that the casual reader is unaware of the close Biblical parallel" ("The Development of the Christmas Play...", p. 98). Since the action consists solely of the discussion between the four personages, the purpose of the eclogue, as a piece presented to celebrate

Christmas, is the narration of the Nativity and discourse on its significance. But the mould in which the personages are cast attests to the author's desire to entertain as well as instruct his audience.

Just as in Egloga I the personages of Egloga II are shepherds, whose manners and speech reveal their contemporary, rustic identity. They speak the rustic dialect, as, for example, in their opening greeting:

Lucas, Marco: ¡Dios mantenga! ¡Dios mantenga!
Juan, Mateo: ¡O, nora buena vengays!
Lucas: Y vosotros, ¿aca estays?
Mateo: ¡Miafe ha! Venga quien venga, (ll. 1-4)[19]

or in the villancico sung with peasant fervour when they depart for Bethlehem at the end of the eclogue:

Gran gasajo siento yo.
¡Huy ho!
Yo tambien, ¡soncas que ha!
¡Huy ha!
Pues Aquel que nos crio
por salvarnos nacio ya.
¡Huy ha! ¡Huy ho!
Que aquesta noche nacio. (ll. 181-188)

Their characterization as contemporary rustics is acceptable since they also represent Biblical shepherds, rustics of an historical past. Relating how word of the birth of Christ was received, Lucas makes this additional identity quite apparent:

...de un angel lo supimos.
Aunque gran temor huvimos
y nos puso gran anteo,
gran gasajo recebimos,
que a los angeles oymos
la grolla del celis Deo. (ll. 76-81)

Through the historical and contemporary identities of the rustics, the past and the present are contained within a single temporal

plane. As shepherds, the four interlocutors of Egloga II have the same historical ambivalence as Mingo and Juan in the extract from Mendoza's Vita Christi. The Nativity is thereby re-created rather than just commemorated, and the actors portraying the parts can show their excitement and celebrate with the same enthusiasm as the shepherds on the night of the first Christmas.

A similar historical ambivalence is present in the personages in their capacity as evangelists. Their portrayal is through a pastoral disguise: they are shepherd-evangelists. Thus, while as evangelists they belong to the past, as shepherds they behave like contemporary rustics. Miss Patt's remark: "It is interesting to observe that the author makes Lucas distort the words of the Gloria, although, despite his rustic speech, he seems sufficiently well informed to have been able to render it correctly. The distortion must be considered as having already become a convention by that time, for there is little in Lucas' speech in this section of the play to warrant the use of sayagués in this particular phrase" ("The Development of the Christmas Play...", p. 96), is out of place, since Lucas' parody of the Gloria is in keeping with his fundamental characterization as a shepherd.[20]

Being shepherds, Juan, Mateo, Marco, and Lucas are associated with the past and present as just shown; being evangelists also, they can discuss the birth of Christ with a knowledge denied to them either as Biblical shepherds or contemporary rustics, and, because of their ambivalent historical role, they can discuss it with a complete knowledge of the past and the present. The

actual position of the four in history is relatively unimportant. Through their guise as Biblical shepherds they are witnesses to an event they did not see, while, simultaneously, in their own identity as evangelists, they refer to Christ's ministry in present or near-past tenses as a series of events they really witnessed. Juan refers to Christ's designation of Peter as the head of the Church:

> ...despues ha de dexar
> a Pedro, nuestro carillo,
> las ovejas a guardar,
> y las llaves del lugar,
> y su hato y caramillo, (ll. 95-99)

and Marco talks about

> el hijo de Zacarias,
> la boz que tu, Juan, dezias
> que en el desierto clamava.
>
> Aquel que nos predico,
> que vernia despues del
> que es Aqueste que oy nacio.
> Y Este mesmo le embio,
> yo le vi por nuestra aldea.
> Y aun el dixo: no so yo,
> ni menos soy dino, no,
> de desatar su correa. (ll. 115-126)[21]

Finally, in the re-creation of the Nativity as a current event, the four evangelists, as contemporary shepherds and discussing distant history as the present or near-past, relate everything to the occasion of performance. The overall effect is a complete loss of temporal value. The personages cannot be exclusively bracketed in any single one of the historical periods with which they are associated, but adopt the timeless significance of the event in which they are involved.

Egloga II has quite a complex structure, but its expression is rigidly economic. Encina apparently presents four personages who, as Biblical shepherds and evangelists, receive word of the birth of Christ, discuss its importance, and depart to pay homage. In fact, the characters have a number of important facets and functions. The combination shepherd-evangelist is paramount. As Biblical shepherds the personages receive the news of the Nativity and go to adore, thereby telling the traditional Christmas story. As evangelists they not only receive the news, but also propagate it.[22] They do what the shepherds alone could not have easily accomplished without violence to the verisimilitude of their characterization: discuss the significance of the Nativity. Finally, on account of their portrayal as contemporary rustics, they may receive the news of the birth of Christ, discourse on its importance, and depart to pay homage as if it were all happening for the first time. Thus, the Nativity is presented in the eclogue as a novel event, for the entertainment as well as the instruction and devotion of the audience.

The independence of the two eclogues is emphasized by the fact that it has been possible to discuss them separately and by the differences immediately apparent between them. Their subject-matter is at variance, the one involved with a secular situation (the author, his patrons, and his work), the other concerned with a religious subject (the Nativity and mystery of the Incarnation). In keeping with this distinction, Egloga I

portrays secular personages, while Egloga II, related to the celebration of a religious festival, presents personages with a predominantly religious identity. Any attempt at linking the two works is legitimate, however, because of a number of internal and external unifying features.

Insofar as the external indications are concerned, unity between the two eclogues must be sought at the level of their performance. The two works combine as a single presentation since both were intended for the same day, before the same audience, and in the same location. This is made abundantly clear in the title-prologue of Egloga II where the scene is set as for Egloga I: "Egloga representada en la mesma noche de navidad ... en la sala adonde los maytines se dezian" (p. 33). Moreover, in their separate spheres, both eclogues are related to the day of their intended performance.

Egloga I is its own dramatization. As an address by the poet to his patrons, his audience, its justification is the audience-actor-author relationship it establishes. The occasion of performance and the action of the eclogue are one and the same. Egloga II is similar. As a work performed at Christmas it is related to the occasion of its performance, and is also the dramatization of this occasion insofar as it re-enacts rather than commemorates the Nativity. Thus, unified by a common relationship to the day of their performance the two eclogues are further linked by portraying the same personages. It is more than a matter of "dramatic economy"[23] to have Juan and

Mateo appear in both eclogues. The separate eclogues--the poet's address to his patrons and dramatization of the Nativity--are united not only by a single performance but also by use of the same personages. From the standpoint of performance, also, the audience's anticipation of a change in subject and in the identity of the personages must be considered as a unifying factor, for a Nativity presentation of one kind or another was expected. The internal indications of unity between the two eclogues, are to be sought in the mechanism employed by Juan del Encina to juxtapose a secular and a religious work, and to present the same personages in both by transforming their identity.

J. Richard Andrews attempted to solve the problem of the unity between the two eclogues by relating it to Encina's supposed self-assertion and quest for recognition in his work. While agreement with Andrews is possible insofar as Juan del Encina was concerned with self-evaluation in Egloga I, it is not possible to admit the same for Egloga II, which, for Andrews, resulted in equating Encina with Christ and his poetry with divine inspiration.[24] Bruce W. Wardropper ("Metamorphosis...", p. 43) approached a better solution when he focused on the transformation wrought in the character of Juan and in the central idea of Egloga I: "Juan the ill-paid retainer and maligned poet of the first égloga, turns into Juan the shepherd who brings and interprets the Good News of the Incarnation in the second égloga. ... His petty everyday troubles have

been replaced by eternal all-embracing interests of mankind." Wardropper proposed (p. 44) that Egloga II might, consequently, be seen as a loose versión a lo divino of Egloga I, a proposal worthy of further examination.

Encina's character equation must be tabled in order to verify the equality of the two halves and see whether the Juan and Mateo of the first eclogue are "los mesmos pastores de arriba" (p. 33) in the second. In Egloga I Juan is a shepherd, a disguise for Juan del Encina, who "llego a presentar cien coplas de aquesta fiesta a la señora duquesa" (p. 23). He justified himself to his patrons against Mateo's criticism, and requested remuneration for his services. In the second half of the equation, Egloga II, Juan is a shepherd and evangelist, the former, in addition to embodying the identity of a Biblical shepherd, being a metaphorical disguise for the latter. To a certain extent, the evangelist can be equated with the poet. Just as Encina wrote "cien coplas"[25] and a Nativity play in honour of Christmas (Egloga II), the Evangelist also wrote about Christ in the gospel which bears his name. In joining with the other evangelists to explain through scriptural references what the Nativity meant, he also discusses what he has written, and he too expects remuneration through salvation, just as Encina discussed his literary efforts and sought a reward from his terrestrial Maecenas. Thus far, the equation is complete: Juan in the second eclogue is a versión a lo divino of the Juan portrayed in the first.

What must be emphasized, however, is Juan's transformation.

He may be the same actor impersonating a shepherd with the same name, but he no longer represents the same person. There is no reason to suppose, as did J. Richard Andrews, that "los mesmos pastores de arriba" literally implies that Juan still embodies Encina when he appears in Egloga II.[26] It is true that similar imagery is used in both eclogues, but the difference in context makes for a world of difference in meaning. No longer is Juan speaking "en nombre de Juan de Enzina", but "en nombre de" Juan the Evangelist. As Wardropper indicated, Juan refers to a personal situation and his own daily bread in Egloga I; in Egloga II all reference is to the Nativity and the true bread, Christ.[27] The disparity of subject-matter remains, but Juan del Encina utilized the secular eclogue as the basis for the religious play.

The transformation of Mateo, from shepherd-critic to shepherd-evangelist, is more problematic, but may be resolved. If Egloga II is accepted as a loose versión a lo divino of Egloga I, Mateo's transformation is a necessary corollary of Juan's. As part of the eclogue he is a necessary element in its re-writing. It may be shown, however, that this transformation is something more than mere expediency and that his appearance in Egloga II represents a divinization of his former self.

From earlier secular interests, Mateo becomes involved in the religious implications of the Nativity. He had earlier chided Juan for his humble birth, but in Egloga II his concern for lineage is for the genealogy of Christ.[28] In Egloga I

Mateo was interested in Juan's daily bread, but in Egloga II, as a shepherd-evangelist, he shares the concern of his fellows for the spiritual bread of Christ. The transformation that Mateo undergoes is, thus, equivalent to that found in Juan, where the secular interests of the first play are replaced by parallel, religious interests in the second.

The nature of the unity between the two plays should now be evident. It is to be understood at the level of performance and the occasion of presentation. Just as evident should be the fact that they are linked by a manipulation and transformation of character and idea. Egloga I advances the idea of multiplicity of character, which is adopted in Egloga II and endowed with greater complexity. Juan and Mateo are, indeed, "los mesmos pastores de arriba", but they have undergone a transformation, so that the ideas with which they were concerned and the characters they showed have all been elevated beyond a wordly situation to form part of a religious atmosphere. As a consequence, the two plays are technically combined, but remain apart in the presentation of their separate subjects. Egloga I is, therefore, very much the prologue of Egloga II, and functions as the model on which the latter is based.

Analysis of these two eclogues reveals, even at this stage in Juan del Encina's career as a dramatist, and at this early moment in the history of the Spanish drama, a certain ability in the use of character and in the manipulation of subject-matter, and a certain understanding of the nature of drama. There is

no attempt at the creation of clearly defined individuals, nor even of a precise plot, since as much is not required in the exposition of the subject. But if, as Wardropper remarked ("Metamorphosis...", p. 43), "the essence of drama is impersonation, these first two églogas are very complicated dramaturgy",[29] for impersonation is complex to the extent of one actor embodying several identities in his role. It is as if Encina had given the personages the quality of symbols, the value of which could be changed to suit his purpose.[30] The element of impersonation would be that much more prominent if it could be shown that Juan was performed by Encina. In pastoral disguise, he would have played himself in Egloga I, and, still as a make-believe shepherd, he would have abandoned that role in Egloga II, when his own identity would have been submerged to impersonate a Biblical shepherd-evangelist. By employing the personages in this fashion, Encina also overcame the problem in early religious Spanish drama of effectively combining secular elements with a religious subject while preserving a degree of separation in order to avoid a lack of verisimilitude. He achieved this by writing two separate eclogues which could be performed as one.

Egloga IX was first printed in the 1507 edition of Encina's Cancionero, but had been performed to celebrate the Christmas of 1498 (see nn. 7 and 8). The differences from the earlier Christmas presentation are immediately apparent in the title-prologue:

> Egloga trobada por Juan del Enzina, representada la noche de Navidad, en la qual se introduze a quatro pastores, Juan, Miguellejo, Rodrigacho y Anton llamados, que sobre los infortunios de las grandes lluvias y la muerte de un sacristan se razonavan. Un angel aparece y el nacimiento del Salvador les anunciando; ellos, con diversos dones a su visitacion se aparejan. (p. 129)

There are, however, certain similarities. Encina again refers to his personal affairs, as in Egloga I, and again introduces secular elements alonside the religious subject. In Egloga IX, however, the contrasting religious and secular elements are combined in a single play, and there is no hint of the kind of character transformations so essential to unite Eglogas I and II in a single performance. The personages are clearly designated as "quatro pastores" in the title-prologue, an identity to which they adhere throughout the eclogue.

The audience[31] first sees Juan. He immediately calls Miguellejo, who promptly arrives and suggests they summon Rodrigacho. Rodrigacho, however, is already seated by a fire and asks Juan and Miguellejo to join him. They do so, and find Anton already there. The four shepherds who are to appear in the eclogue are thus united.

The reason for their reunion is readily apparent. They intend to amuse themselves during their vigil over their flocks. Juan made this clear when he called to Miguellejo at the beginning:

> ¡que esta noche, ques vegilla
> gran prazer acudira! (ll. 3-4)

and Miguellejo expressed a similar sentiment on arrival: "Gasajemonos un cacho" (l. 6). In addition, they intend to find

shelter and warmth from the weather. Huddled around the fire, their conversation is dominated by this topic (ll. 33-40). The two motives--warmth and pleasure--are then combined. As talk of the bad weather continues, Anton comments,

> Todos estamos con llodo,
> no ay ninguno bien librado, (ll. 47-48)

but is interrupted by Miguellejo, who suggests forgetting their troubles and entertaining themselves:

> ¡Noche ese esta de prazer!
> Calla, tomemos gasajo. (ll. 49-50)

Thus far, a number of devices characteristic in the portrayal of shepherds in the early drama have been used. The shepherds' language is Sayagués, that prevalent in early Spanish drama as the dialect proper to the rustic, which Encina had used in earlier plays, as had Mendoza before him. The personages are introduced in a conventional way. Eglogas I and II both began with greetings, the former by Juan to his patrons, the latter by the evangelists to one another.[32] Other devices conventional to the early drama are to be recognized in the introduction of personages by calling, in the shepherds' eagerness for amusement, and in their complaints against the weather.

In this instance, however, the complaint against the weather has the appearance of topicality and possibly refers to local flooding.[33] Conversation on this matter allows the natural introduction of a recent visit by Juan to the town. The shepherds first enquire about the effect of the flooding there, then listen to Juan's account of the devastation (ll. 66-88). As a

natural corollary they then ask Juan the reason for his visit. It resulted, the shepherds learn, from Juan's application at the "igreja mayor" (l. 99) for the position of choir-master, fallen vacant on the death of the incumbent. There follows a discussion of Juan's hopes for a successful application (ll. 92-133).

On ending discussion of Juan's application, Rodrigacho asks him "si traxiste alguna fruta" (l. 135). There immediately follows a division of some figs and chestnuts (ll. 137-160), and a game of "pares y nones" in which the fruit is used as coinage (ll. 161-192). These two activities--preoccupation with food and a predilection for games--may be added to the list of devices used to portray the rustics. Encina had already used the food device ("pan") with a figurative meaning in Eglogas I and II, and the device was important in another of his earlier plays, the Carnival Egloga VI.[34]

So far there has been little to expect, as the shepherds think of another game, the sudden appearance of an angel and announcement of the birth of Christ. There are some possible, veiled allusions to the joy to be experienced that night from the birth of a Saviour. Calling to Miguellejo at the beginning of the eclogue, Juan exclaimed,

> ¡que esta noche, ques vegilla
> gran prazer acudira! (ll. 3-4)

The statement refers to the shepherds having to watch their sheep during the night and to their spending the occasion enjoyably. Simultaneously, it is a reference to the very day on the

calendar, the vigil of Christmas, an occasion of anticipated pleasure.[35] A similar reference to the pleasure expected that night is made by Miguellejo:

> ¡Noche es esta de prazer!
> Calla, tomemos gasajo. (ll. 49-50)

Both statements are immediately appropriate. They reflect the shepherds' desire for amusement as an antidote for the cold and the rain. Miguellejo's line, in particular, is spoken to silence Anton's complaints. The shepherds do try to enjoy themselves, as is evident from their conversation, their preoccupation with the fruit, and their game of "pares y nones". Any definite Biblical allusions in their speech are unrelated to Christmas.[36] Thus, the two statements singled out for comment are significant only in retrospect.

To all appearances, the religious subject is introduced by the angel, whose announcement of the birth of Christ is contained in sixteen lines (ll. 193-208).[37] Moreover, the announcement produces no substantial change in the shepherds as characters who have been discussing contemporary events and behaving in a manner compatible with contemporary rustics. Rodrigacho gives their immediate reaction:

> Compañeros, digo yo
> que vamos hasta Belen
> porque persepamos bien
> quien es este que oy nacio. (ll. 209-212)

There is only a brief allusion to the fear and astonishment which Mendoza evoked so vividly, and this is made in jest:

Rodrigacho: ¿Quien dixo quera nacido?
Juan: ¡Cuydo quel saludador!
Miguellejo: ¡Que no, sino el Salvador!
¿no lo tienes entendido?
Juan: De atordido
no puede perentenderle. (ll. 217-222)

Rodrigacho's reaction is shared by all four shepherds as they prepare to go to Bethlehem and list the gifts they will take. There is no discussion of the significance of the event and no allusion to the Biblical history it culminates, the prime elements of Egloga II. In the whole of this short scene (ll. 209-256) the one topical allusion is to the rains about which the shepherds had earlier talked. Almost the last lines of the eclogue are spoken by Miguellejo:

Vamos, vamos
antes antes que mas llueva. (ll. 253-254)

Thus, after a brief interlude including the angel's announcement and the shepherds' preparation for their journey to Bethlehem the audience is reminded of the situation at the beginning of the play. This is a further example of the historical ambivalence of Spanish Nativity drama: the announcement of the birth of Christ is re-enacted and placed on the same temporal plane as the events which had figured in the shepherds' earlier conversation.

The combination of religious and secular subjects, by placing both on the same temporal plane, justifies consideration of the eclogue as a secularized, religious play. This was Beatrice Patt's opinion: "Unlike the play of 1492 [Egloga II], this work is not primarily concerned with conveying the Christmas story, but rather with presenting a homely, rustic picture of peasant

life. ... The center of interest, therefore, is not the religious theme; either it was introduced to make a purely popular play fit the Christmas season, or popular elements were added to a serious play to suit an entertainment-loving audience. ... Considered as a whole, the work is not outstanding for its unity, but the rustic language and the charm of the picture of four shepherds chatting and amusing themselves around a fire make this play a good example of a popular Christmas performance" ("The Development of the Christmas Play...", pp. 99 and 102).[38] Leaving the matter there, however, leaves several problems unsolved. Whatever criticisms are made of Juan del Encina, it could not be said he was unaware of the poet's art. He wrote an Arte de poesía castellana, and in Egloga I demonstrated his confidence in his achievements and talent. Primitiveness must not be judged as naivety.

The structure of Egloga IX distinguishes it from other commemorative plays by Juan del Encina. When wishing to refer to matters somewhat extraneous to the festival commemorated by his play, Encina wrote his eclogues in pairs and separated the different subjects. This was so in Eglogas I and II, and in Eglogas V and VI (see chap. VI). In each pair, the first play referred to Encina's personal situation, and the second commemorated the festive occasion. In Egloga IX, by contrast, personal affairs are combined in a fictional, rustic scene, and there is no pause before the commemorative subject is introduced.

J. Richard Andrews offered an explanation for this different

structure. He believed that Encina was striving for the same effect in Egloga IX that he supposedly sought in Eglogas I and II: "Within its self-containment one finds a chart of interests analogous to those of the prologue-and-play division of the 'first'-and-'second' égloga combine (where the first was mundane and the second religious)" (Prometheus..., p. 125). It is concluded that the telescoping of secular and religious interests into one play allowed Encina to give added emphasis to his personal situation. The dialogue concerning Juan's aspirations to the position of cantor[39] is interpreted as "another attempt to move the Duke and Duchess to recognize him and to act in his behalf" (p. 126). It is viewed as the author's attack on his patrons for lack of patronage. In this interpretation, Juan is seen as a persecuted shepherd. A reference to him as "el mejor gaitero" (l. 131) and the juxtaposition of his personal troubles with announcement of the birth of Christ represent Encina's quest for recognition through self-praise and his setting himself on a par with Christ, another persecuted shepherd (Andrews, pp. 126-128).

The explanation is ingenious but ill-conceived. It might be justifiable to interpret Encina's pessimism over his application for the Cathedral post as a protest against adequate patronage, but there is nothing to warrant that the juxtaposition of secular concerns with a religious subject was intended to facilitate so elevated a comparison. In any case, Andrews' explanation is a non sequitur, founded on erroneous conclusions regarding the juxtaposition of Eglogas I and II. Moreover, it is not certain

that Egloga IX was performed before the Duke and Duchess of Alba (see n. 31). Without their presence, the relevance of an attack against them would be lost.

With the exception of plays on the Passion and Resurrection (see below chap. VII), perhaps too serious to be tampered with extensively, Encina habitually introduced his personal affairs into his early plays. There is, however, no reason to suppose that he did so to the same end each time. It is as if Encina has realized that drama could embrace other topics beyond the re-enactment of those festive events which provided the basic subjects and occasions for plays in the first years of the Spanish theatre. In Encina's earliest plays, where he dramatized his personal affairs, he made a drama out of the occasion of performance. He incorporated the audience into the performance by addressing them directly about his current concerns. A single interpretation of his early works must, therefore, be eschewed. Since the eclogues are related to the occasions of their performance, the recurrence of similar elements in different plays need not necessarily be equated.

With regard to the unity of Egloga IX, the sudden intervention of an angel, terminating the shepherds' activities and introducing a religious topic, is an acceptable dramatization of St. Luke's narrative; presumably the angel's appearance on the night of the first Christmas was equally unexpected. Moratín's criticism is, therefore, partly unwarranted because the action of the eclogue is in keeping with its source and

purpose.[40] The startling feature of Encina's drama is that so much emphasis is placed on the secular scenes of a work supposedly intended to dramatize a religious subject, and that a supposedly devotional piece is a source of entertainment. To assess the nature of Egloga IX, however, closer attention must be given to several aspects of its subject.

The discussion of Juan's application for the position of cantor is an integral part of the shepherds' conversation and is introduced without violence to it. The only violence to the sequence of their talk and their business with the fruit and games is that which ends it: the abrupt announcement of the birth of Christ. The angel's speech causes a complete change in the shepherds' conversation and activity. Their earlier preoccupations are recollected in the penultimate sentence of the play spoken by Miguellejo:

> Vamos, vamos
> antes antes que mas llueva. (ll. 253-254)

His lines have already been alluded to for their effect in placing the birth of Christ on the same temporal plane as the events of the shepherds' earlier conversation. Spoken at the close of the play, the audience recalls the conversation in which the rain had figured and places it alongside the new interests, the birth of Christ and preparations to visit Him. This being the case, then more than arbitrarily combining religious and secular elements in one play Encina deliberately invited the audience to place them side by side. Analysis of the play may be reviewed in this light and the juxtaposition of the religious and the secular

considered as a means of deliberate contrast.

The reasons for the shepherds' gathering around the fire have already been mentioned. They sought shelter and warmth, solace and amusement during their vigil. Juan called out at the beginning,

> ¡que esta noche, ques vegilla
> gran prazer acudira! (ll. 3-4)

Miguellejo silenced Anton's complaints with an enjoinder to all of them to forget their troubles and amuse themselves:

> ¡Noche es esta de prazer!
> Calla, tomemos gasajo. (ll. 49-50)

Consequently, the behaviour of the shepherds may be viewed as attempts to find "prazer" and "tomar gasajo".

They derive little pleasure from their conversation, which includes Juan's description of the flooding and the narration of his fruitless journey to town. The figs and chestnuts Juan brought back with him provide some consolation, but Miguellejo is not entirely satisfied with his share and asks,

> Compañon,
> trocamesta ques podrida. (ll. 157-158)

Even the game of "pares y nones" ends in disatisfaction and Miguellejo protests,

> Yo no soy
> en jugar juego tan ruyn;
> ¡mas juguemos al trentin
> que muy desdichado estoy! (ll. 189-192)

At this moment, when the shepherds are about to change their game for one more enjoyable, and when one of their number, Miguellejo, is not finding the pleasure he suggested (ll. 49-50) they seek,

an angel appears to announce,

> ¡Pastores, no ayays temor,
> que os anuncio gran prazer! (ll. 193-194)

The birth of Christ provides the "gran prazer" the shepherds had lacked, sought, and not found. From this point their attitudes change and they are no longer preoccupied with personal discomfort and disappointment. There is a greater sense of enjoyment in their conversation while preparing to go to Bethlehem than had been evident previously. Moreover, their journey will be made under far happier circumstances than Juan's visit to the town when he saw destruction by flooding and had his own ambitions thwarted. The list of gifts the shepherds will take with them is quite a feast compared with their earlier fare of figs and chestnuts, one of which was rotten anyway. Finally, their enumeration of the gifts they will offer the Child recalls their gambling at "pares y nones". As if raising the stakes in a game, they vie with one another in describing their gifts:

Miguellejo: Yo leche le endonare,
soncas, de mi cabra mocha;
harele una miga cocha
con que le empapiçare;
llevarl'e
de camino, quando vaya,
una barena de haya
la que di lunes llabre.

Juan: Yo le dare un cachorrito
de los que pario mi perra;
xetas y turmas de tierra.
Anton: Yo le llevare un cabrito.
Juan: Yo un quesito.
Rodrigacho: Yo natas y mantequillas.

Miguellejo: Yo tres o quatro morcillas.
Anton: Y yo, miafe, un xerguerito.

Juan: Yo le dire mil cantares
con la churumbella nuevos.
Rodrigacho: Yo le dare muchos huevos.
Miguellejo: Y yo de las mis cucharas,
dos, tres pares.
Juan: ¡Gasajemonos con el!
Rodrigacho: Darl'e yo manteca y miel
para untar los paladares. (ll. 225-248)

Everything contrasts with their earlier state; as if all that had been discussed before the angel's intervention had not transpired. All is forgotten till Miguellejo reminds them they should leave before it rains again. His reminder recalls their earlier state and contrasts it with the present one. With the repetition of "vamos" and "antes", it also has a note of urgency (Miguellejo, l. 214, "Pues vamos toste priado", had shown it before), suggesting they take immediate advantage of this opportunity for fear of being returned to their former unhappy state.

Bruce W. Wardropper wrote, in "The Dramatic Texture of the Auto de los Reyes Magos", that "the imposition of a simple metaphysical or ideological system on a liturgical play seems ... to be characteristic of the Spanish religious drama" (p. 45). In that same article Wardropper further remarked (p. 50) about Egloga IX, "The Christmas shepherds are distraught with the rains, their gambling disputes, Juan's disapointment over his professional setback, etc.; the Angel announces the Birth; the shepherds, by this downpouring of divine grace receive peace; discord changes to concord; saña gives way to risa".[41] The change in the personages is one of attitude, similar to that of the shepherds in

the Vita Christi. The rustics in Mendoza's work were frightened at first, but joyfully celebrated when they understood the angel's message. Like them, the four shepherds of Egloga IX embody the joy of Christmas.

In this situation Juan is representative of Encina, but is not the key figure; nor is the application to the position of cantor the key element. Juan is but one among four shepherds, and his grievance is but one source of disconsolation among several. If there is a key personage in the play, it is Miguellejo. He is prominent in the progression of the conversation and significant lines are given to him. It is he who urges his companions to end their complaints and "tomar gasajo"; who asks Juan to relate why he went to town; who finds the rotten chestnut in his share; who expresses the deepest dissatisfaction with the game of "pares y nones", who begins the competition over the gifts to be taken to Bethlehem; and, finally, who links the two halves of the play by recalling the earlier conversation and suggesting they hurry to Bethlehem before it rains again. If there is a key personage in the structure of the eclogue, there is, however, no equivalent key incident or section in the shepherds' conversation. There is only the dominant concern of the search for pleasure. This is a further reason for insisting on the error of an interpretation of Egloga IX dependent on acceptance of Encina's personal problems as key elements.

Encina used the shepherds of Egloga IX in several respects quite differently from those in Eglogas I and II. In the latter eclogues

personages could be likened to symbols the value of which was changed to combine a religious and secular subject in a single performance. The personages in Egloga IX are constant, but a change in their situation changes their attitude, although their desire for pleasure is consistent, a fact which gives the play its unity and combines the disparate elements of the mundane and religious subjects.

The multiple identity of the personages, noted in Eglogas I and II, is also a feature of Egloga IX. The shepherd Juan represents Encina--but the play is not about his personal problems. Juan's worries are only a portion of the general despondency burdening the shepherds in the first part of the play. His problems, like those of his fellows, are forgotten when the angel announces a cause for rejoicing. The autobiographical element in the play is, thereby, subordinated to an overriding interest: Encina can forget his personal worries when they are placed in the context of the birth of Christ.[42]

Multiplicity is also present in all four personages to the extent that all are historically ambivalent characters. At one and the same time, they are contemporary figures who discuss current events, and Biblical shepherds who heard of the birth of Christ from the angel and went to pay homage. This ambivalance has, moreover, a functional purpose and reflects a dual intention: as contemporary personages the shepherds pursue their rustic activities to delight and entertain Encina's audience, but as Biblical shepherds they also convey the play's instructional and

devotional purpose by re-enacting and commemorating the Incarnation.

In total, the eclogue could not appear more simple. The devices of character and action employed in the first part of the play are unaffected, and the religious subject, in the second part, is without adornment. Encina did not need to dwell on the shepherds' fear on seeing the angel, nor have them discuss the significance of the Nativity. Their reaction of hastening to Bethlehem, enumerating the gifts they will take, is a response compatible with their earlier behaviour; it is sufficient to illustrate that Christmas is cause for celebration and pleasure. The eclogue is unified by the consistency of its personages and, through them, adequately conveys the religious subject. It is, therefore, necessary to disagree with critics who believe that it was "primarily concerned ... with presenting a homely, rustic picture of peasant life", that its "center of interest ... is not the religious theme" and that the "work is not outstanding for its unity" (see n. 38).

The last of the four plays discussed in this chapter is the anonymous Egloga interlocutoria. Urban Cronan's edition of the play[43] is preceded by a few brief notes: "The following Egloga interlocutoria is described by Salvá, Catálogo, I, p. 434. In commenting on it he says: 'El título precedente y la circunstancia de hallarse encuadernada esta composición con otras cuatro églogas de Juan del Encina, no deja casi duda de que esta pieza es del mismo; sin embargo no se halla el nombre mencionado en ella, ni la encuentro en su Cancionero. Moratín tampoco la cita

en los Orígenes del teatro español'" (p. 475). After citing in full the titles of two of Encina's plays (Eglogas VII and VIII) Cronan concluded: "Not only the title alone, but also the text of the Egloga interlocutoria shows the closest relationship to Juan del Encina's theatre. This fact, together with the absence of any other dramatic works of the same epoch which might be cited in comparison, permits us to consider the ascription to Juan del Encina as being exact, in so far as the word 'exact' may be employed in questions of this nature" (p. 476).

Other commentators were less precise. For Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 18) the work was "anonymous and undated"; Georges Cirot ("Le Théâtre religieux...", p. 17) was equally reluctant in attributing the play to Encina: "Le lien avec la fête de Noël n'est pas contestable; mais l'attribution à Encina est loin d'être sûre, bien que les ressemblances avec les Eclogues I et II aillent jusqu'à la littéralité: ne serions-nous en présence d'un de ces plagiats dont précisément se plaint notre poète quand il parle de 'Juan el sacristan que anda hinchado ya de mi...' (Egl. I)?" Humberto López Morales, the most recent editor of Juan del Encina's dramatic eclogues, excluded the Egloga interlocutoria from his edition on the grounds that, in spite of evident similarities with Encina's plays, there were no adequate reasons for attributing it to him: "Ninguna de las razones ni de las suposiciones aducidas por House tienen suficiente peso para probar la autenticidad de ese texto, y algunas de ellas--como la dificultad para encontrar un motivo que llevara al imitador a silenciar su

presupuesta originalidad--son completamente inválidas para la literatura de esta época" (Eglogas..., pp. 15-16). The reference to Ralph E. House is to his article, "A Study of Encina and the Egloga interlocutoria",[44] in which the eclogue is considered in the light of Encina's known works. After his comparison, House proposed the following tentative theory as that which "best explains the various difficulties that the text offers": "The play was written in haste by Encina for a Christmas celebration then close at hand. The author did not intend it for publication. Its preservation was due to the actors, who wrote it out from memory, thinking that it might serve on other occasions" (p. 469).

A definite solution to the problem of authorship of the Egloga interlocutoria is not attempted in this study. Justification for its inclusion in this chapter is in the textual parallels and similarities in treatment of subject existing between it and Encina's accredited works. The Egloga interlocutoria is best analyzed while aware of its proximity to Encina's eclogues, so that the techniques employed in it can be compared with elements already known to be prominent features of Encina's dramaturgy. From this comparison some observations can be made concerning the Egloga interlocutoria and its possible author.

The subject-matter of the Egloga interlocutoria, Ralph E. House remarked (p. 464), observes the same tripartite division (birth of Christ--"pares y nones"--personal affairs) as Encina's Egloga IX, but in reverse order. Beatrice P. Patt also emphasized this division: "The work can be divided into three parts: the Nativity,

the game, and the praises of the Duke and Duchess. The Nativity comprises approximately two thirds of the play, while the other two sections comprise equal parts of the remaining third".[45] In analyzing the play, the division in subject-matter suggested by these critics is followed.

The relationship of the eclogue with Christmas is clear from its first lines, containing Pascual's greeting to the audience:

> Dios salue aca, buena gente!
> soncas que Dios es nacido!
> poquillo y de buenamente
> ora lo dixo Llorente,
> que de Gil lo auia oydo. (ll. 1-5)[46]

Announcement of the Nativity is immediately followed by reference to two non-Christian sects, the Jews and the Moors, prompted perhaps by some contemporary event, perhaps merely by the opportunity afforded in the announcement of the birth of Christ to inveigh against the traditional enemies of Christianity. Whatever the reason, Pascual's malediction of both (ll. 6-20) is brief but barbed.[47] When Benito enters, the first part of the conversation recalls, with close verbal parallels, that between Juan and Mateo at the beginning of Encina's Egloga I when Juan defended his presence in the ducal palace.[48] The dialogue of the Egloga interlocutoria, however, has no apparent justification. There is no reason why Pascual "se torna palaciego" (l.22) beyond his statement,

> quiero mudar el pellejo,
> que del aldea reniego. (ll. 24-25) (see n. 48)

In addition to its derivation from Egloga I, the conversation is in the spirit of the popular pullas, a competitive exchange of

insults.[49] Its subject, Pascual's presence in the palace, allows Benito to ask,

> Pues dime, dime ora, tu,
> quien te truxo a probado? (11. 41-42)[50]

The shepherd's reply re-introduces the supposed subject of the Egloga, the Nativity, since news of the birth of Christ has brought Pascual to town. Benito is disinclined to believe his companion when told of the event. Later convinced he promises a lamb in "albricias":

> Yo te mando vna borrega
> por nueua tan quellotrada, (11.51-52)[51]

and feels bloated with pleasure:

> Ya esto ancho, Dios loado!
> todo estoy repantigado. (11. 58-59)[52]

He suggests a celebration, but Pascual, the indolent shepherd (see Appendix B, s.v. "sleep"), prefers to take things easier. He cannot subdue Benito's excitement, however. Benito sees Pascuala and Gil Verto approaching and calls to them. Their arrival begins the discussion proper of the Nativity, a matter already twice begun.

Gil Verto's announcement of the birth of Christ is a paraphrase of the angel's traditional greeting:

> Ya no ay dolor ni pena,
> todos salgan de cadena;
> oy se remedian los males,
> ques nacido el Redemptor
> en vn pobre portalejo
> en Belen, y el Saluador
> tenia grande tembror
> quando lo empañaua el viejo. (11. 93-100)[53]

Gil repeats the spirit of the angel's words, enhanced by his having already witnessed the scene at Bethlehem. Hence the

descriptive reference to the swaddling clothes in which "el viejo" (St. Joseph?) was binding the Child. As in Encina's plays, no adoration scene is enacted; but it is described, and conversation about the Nativity begins in the Egloga interlocutoria where it ends in Encina's eclogues, when the shepherds have completed their journey to Bethlehem and seen what was announced to them.

The interests of Pascual and Benito are mundane and a source of comedy. Benito would know if the Child has a halo:

> relumbra mucho su gesto
> o soncas es como nos? (ll. 106-107)

He is surprised to learn that Christ appears the same as any normal being and sucks his mother's milk (ll. 123-125). All references to Biblical history are made by Gil Verto, as befits his position as the one who announced the birth of Christ and described the scene at Bethlehem. Pascual and Benito, however, are not concerned with theological implications. They want to know what the Child was doing, who else was there, and what gifts were presented (ll. 126-155). The matter of the gifts, give rise to a feature particular to this eclogue. In contrast to Encina's Egloga IX, where the shepherds vie with one another in enumerating gifts for the Child, Pascual refuses to contribute anything. He protests,

> No se nada desos juegos;
> dexeme lo que tuuiere.
> Delo otro vaya y venga,
> enesto nadie me toque. (ll. 159-162)

Only after an argument, in which Gil berates the selfish shepherd

and threatens all kind of injury (ll. 163-200), does Pascual repent.

The restoration of peace and friendship concludes the first section of the play. The points of similarity with Encina's accredited plays have been indicated above and in notes (see nn. 46, 48, 50, 51, and 52). They are extensive, often to the extreme of direct verbal parallels, suggestive of close imitation. Nonetheless, this part of the Egloga interlocutoria is sufficiently distinctive to suggest that although its author was very familiar with at least Encina's Cancionero of 1496, and probably that of 1507, he also knew how to remould the material of his sources. The fundamental elements of the Christmas shepherd story are scriptural, but their appearance in this play is a development of that tradition. The role of the angel is embodied in Gil, who makes the customary announcement and acts as preceptor to the other shepherds, explaining the significance of the event and describing the scene at Bethlehem to them.[54] The conversation about the Nativity has a comic bias and a tone in keeping with the characterization of the personages as rustics which was not so evident in Encina's Egloga II; and the discussion of the gifts in the Egloga interlocutoria differs entirely from the competitive spirit of the shepherds in Egloga IX, Pascual's negative attitude contrasting sharply with the exuberant generosity of Encina's rustics.

The verbal parallels between the Egloga interlocutoria and Encina's eclogues involve a number of the latter's plays, not all

of which are related to Christmas. Were Encina the author of the Egloga interlocutoria, it would be difficult to understand his random borrowing from his own work when he has not resorted to the same practice in the works definitely attributed to him. The difference in the development of devices of character and action, and the employment of verbal parallels in random contexts, justifies the supposition that the author of the Egloga interlocutoria, impressed by certain features of Encina's plays, adapted them for his own use.[55]

The game of "pares y nones" is begun for a reason similar to that for its introduction in Egloga IX: for pleasure, although in the Egloga interlocutoria it is also motivated by celebration of the Nativity. When Pascuala resolved the argument over Pascual's refusal to contribute a gift to the Christ Child, she suggested, "ayamos todos plazer" (l. 210). Her suggestion, accepted by the rest, is elaborated by Gil:

> Mira todos los garzones
> por noche tan plazentera;
> arrimemos los çurrones,
> juguemos pares y nones. (ll. 221-225)

In addition to the motivation for the game, the manner of its play is also partly the same, nuts being used instead of the figs and chestnuts of Egloga IX. The elaboration of the game is distinct, however. Greater emphasis is placed on the stakes and the losses incurred by Benito and Gil, who loses everything. Pascual's unsuccessful attempts to induce Gil to gamble his flute and crook bring the game to a close. In this section (ll. 221-

291) no immediate, evident verbal parallels have been noted to relate it to the corresponding section of Egloga IX.[56] It would appear that the gambling device was introduced as a characteristic of the shepherds' behaviour, but its presentation, while analogous to Encina's use of it, is nonetheless different.

There are also analogous elements in the final section of the Egloga interlocutoria containing the shepherds' praise of their masters. Encina's early works were written to honour his patrons, the Duke and Duchess of Alba. Thus, if the Egloga interlocutoria is not Encina's, its writer has also borrowed the context of Encina's plays. The title-prologue states that Pascual "estatua enla sala del duque y la duquesa" (p. 476). The same formula as that employed by Encina; but there is no evident pretext in the Egloga interlocutoria to justify the shepherds' speeches of praise.[57] The excuse is put by Gil:

> E pues que ya nos juntamos,
> alcemos los coraçones,
> y como huertes garçones
> alabemos nuestros amos. (ll. 292-295)

There are, however, a number of trends reminiscent of plays by Encina. Benito and Gil, although the latter suggested praise of their masters, have the same reticence as Mingo in Encina's Egloga VIII:

> Benito: Dios que me praze de grado,
> si Gil habrasse primero,
>
> Gil: Dios que no quiero, ni menos yo oso;
> que tanto relumbran que me hazen temer.
> Pascuala: Anda, bobillo, que no te han de morder.
> Gil: Mas tu queres viejo y algo donoso,
> que yo de oteallos estoy tan medroso,

y de regozijo habrar no podria;
mas si tu comienças, yo no callaria.

Pascual: Dios, que me praze, sin ser perezoso. (ll. 300-309)[58]

The pattern of their speeches (ll. 310-345) also follows along lines already known from Encina: the worthy lineage, military renown, and role as protector to the shepherds and their flocks.[59]

The arguments in favour of attributing the eclogue to Encina may also be used against it: just as Encina could have repeated successes from his other plays, so an imitator, or plagiarist, could have capitalized on what Encina had to offer. Moreover, in view of Encina's known work, where similar repetition is infrequent, although devices used before are developed, the latter interpretation is more acceptable. The Egloga interlocutoria has all the appearance of a work in which some of the principal features of Encina's plays have been adapted to make a quite different piece.

A further feature of the Egloga interlocutoria--one characteristic of Encina's Nativity plays also--is the simple unification of its separate parts. Having calculated that the Christmas story occupied the greatest portion of the Egloga interlocutoria, Beatrice Patt ("The Development of the Christmas Play...", p. 101) remarked that a kind of unity is preserved between it and the other two sections of the eclogue: "The three parts are not entirely lacking in unity, for the playing of odds and evens is a form of celebration of the good news, and the final villancico concerns both the royal patrons and the Nativity". The matter is worth further comment.

The refrain at the beginning of the villancico, incorporated into each of its stanzas, calls for the forgetting of cares and the seeking of pleasure:

> Demonos al alegria,
> pues vemos que los pesares,
> ellos se vienen a pares. (ll. 358-360)

In the first stanza the shepherds refer to themselves:

> Agora, pues me parece
> questamos dentro en poblado,
> demonos al gasajado,
> quel callar pena merece;
> en demas quando se offrece
> tiempo de oluidar pesares,
> avn que se vengan a pares. (ll. 361-367)

They had earlier enjoyed a game of "pares y nones" precisely to forget the argument over Pascual's refusal to contribute a gift, and to celebrate their happiness over the birth of a Saviour (see ll. 215-225).

The second stanza is related to their masters:

> E pues que soys nuestros amos,
> todos juntos y vno a vno
> sin sacar de nos ninguno
> vos besamos pies y manos;
> agora quedanos sanos
> y sin temor de pesares,
> avn que se vengan a pares. (ll. 368-374)

The song thus recalls their speeches of praise when they referred to their "amos" as their protectors. Finally, referring to the birth of a Redeemer,

> Y pues nacio el Redemptor
> de vna zagala tan bella,
> offrezcamos a ella
> y a su hijo y su señor;

y por tan garrido amor
no se nos peguen pesares,
avn que se vengan a pares, (ll. 375-381)

they recollect Gil's remarks when he announced the benefits of the birth of Christ:

Ya no ay dolor ni pena,
todos salgan de cadena;
oy se remedian los males,
ques nacido el Redemptor. (ll. 93-96)

The three apparently disparate sections of the action are loosely connected by the predominant idea of the villancico; cares are forgotten and happiness found in an atmosphere of security provided by the shepherds' own endeavours, their masters, and Christ. At the same time, the villancico also unites the apparently discordant secular and religious interests presented in the eclogue, for the shepherds' overall motive in the Egloga interlocutoria, as in Egloga IX, is the search for pleasure, a motive as predominant in the secular as in the religious portions of the work.

On the other hand, there are notable differences in the Egloga interlocutoria which distinguish it from Encina's Nativity plays. There is no attempt, as in Egloga I to manipulate the identity of the personages and thereby accomodate the juxtaposition of the religious and secular subjects; nor is there any attempt to portray contrasting attitudes in contrasting situations, as in Egloga IX. In the Egloga interlocutoria the religious and the secular elements are placed side by side in a continuous action, and, while containing devices of dramatization similar

to those used by Encina, is a unitary piece solely through the idea imposed on it by the concluding villancico. Unity in the structure and subject is more of an afterthought than a result of integration between the separate sections of the play.

The characterization of the personages in the Egloga interlocutoria is in part also distinct from that in Encina's eclogues. Although the shepherds are intended to represent the supposed employees of the masters they praise, a device conceivably borrowed from Encina, there is no reason to suppose that they are intended to represent specific real persons, as were some of Encina's shepherds. Multiple identity in the shepherds is preserved only insofar as they are Biblical figures protrayed as contemporary rustics. They therefore partake of that ambivalent historical role to be taken for granted as a fundamental part of the Nativity shepherds' make-up. In general, however, characterization in the Egloga interlocutoria is dependent on certain devices of portrayal. Henceforth, as more writers experiment with the pastoral Christmas play, the personages are created virtually through these devices alone and adopt a literary identity barely recognizable from the original Biblical source. The shepherds become standard types, even if different aspects of their characters are emphasized in different plays. By the same token, one personage is often more prominent in a play than the rest. This was so with Miguellejo in Egloga IX and is also true of Pascual in the Egloga interlocutoria. Pascual does

not necessarily have a more distinct personality than that of his fellows, but he is prominent at key points in the action. He introduces the play, stands his ground in refusing to donate a gift, begins and wins the game of "pares y nones", and, finally, initiates the speeches of praise when his companions are fainthearted. It is, however, only within the standard devices of characterization that any relationships between the personages are portrayed. Gil, for example, is the preceptor, who explains the meaning of the Nativity to his fellows. A relationship of this nature and the predominance of one personage in the action became accepted devices in the early Spanish Nativity dramas (see Appendix B, s.v. "Friends, advisors, and preceptors").

In concluding this discussion of the Egloga interlocutoria, it may be noted that no attempt was made in this eclogue to differentiate the identities and functions of the shepherds. The rustic's Biblical origin is obscured by his characterization as a contemporary peasant, a situation obtaining in the plays discussed in the next chapters. The secular and religious aspects of the plays are barely distinguished, so that the shepherd's ambivalent role becomes an intrinsic part of his make-up. Although dramatists were continually aware of the problems caused by the combination of disparate elements in one play, they were, however, less disturbed by them, and capable of a variety of solutions.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER II

[1]Agustín de Rojas Villandrando wrote of Encina:

> Juan del Encina el primero,
> aquel insigne poeta
> que tanto bien empezó,
> de quien tenemos tres églogas,
> que él mismo presentó
> al almirante y duquesa
> de Castilla y de Infantado,
> que estas fueron las primeras.
> Y para más honra suya
> y de la comedia nuestra,
> en los días que Colón
> descubrió la gran riqueza.

(Viaje entretenido, ed. Justo García Morales, Madrid, Aguilar, 1964.)
For an appraisal (a somewhat naive one) of Encina's founding role, see Bro. Austin, F.S.C., "Juan del Encina", Hispania, XXXIX (1956), 161-174.

[2]Historia de la literatura española, ed. José A. Oría, Buenos Aires, 1948, I, p. 280.

[3]It is not possible to rehearse here all opinions of Encina's drama. For a bibliography of relevant writings, see the notes to Bro. Austin's article (see n. 1).

[4]The biography of Encina is discussed in Ricardo Espinosa Maeso, "Nuevos datos biográficos de Juan del Encina", BRAE, VIII (1921), 640-656, and E. Giménez Caballero, "Hipótesis a un problema de Juan del Encina", RFE, XIV (1927), 59-69. The biographical element is uppermost in the chapter on Encina in Crawford's Spanish Drama..., in Cotarelo's prologue to the Academy facsimile of the 1496 Cancionero, in Juliá Martínez's essay in the Historia general..., II, pp. 246-266, and even in the recent work by J. Richard Andrews. Other studies have emphasized Encina as the founder of the Spanish theatre and have examined his position in literary and cultural history (see Emilio Cotarelo, "Juan del Encina y los orígenes del teatro español", in Estudios de historia literaria de España, Madrid, 1901, pp. 103-181; Menéndez y Pelayo, Antología..., III, pp. 221-297; and Turk, "Juan del Encina and the Spanish Renaissance").

[5]For a bibliography of the editions of Eglogas I and II, see Eglogas de Juan del Enzina, ed. Humberto López Morales, Madrid, 1963, pp. 21 and 31. (All quotations and the numbering of Encina's plays are according to the edition by López Morales.)

[6]Modern commentators on Eglogas I and II have placed their performance in 1492, but this date cannot be substantiated. The only documentary source for that year is Agustín de Rojas' Viaje entretenido, in which the performance of Juan del Encina's first eclogues is made contemporary with Columbus' discovery (see n. 1). But Rojas wrote a full century after the first edition of Encina's Cancionero, and seems not to have had a first hand knowledge of his work since he remembers only three eclogues. Rojas' testimony is not reliable. Encina's biographers have also accepted 1492 as the year of the poet's entry into the service of the Duke and Duchess of Alba, and it has been concluded that the first dramatic eclogue in the Cancionero was the first performed for his patrons. Again, no documentary evidence is offered to substantiate the date of the beginning of Encina's service at Alba de Tormes. The fact that the eclogue in question is the first in the Cancionero does not necessarily mean that it was the first in order of composition, and there is insufficient internal evidence to justify it as the first performed before the Duke and Duchess of Alba. In fact, if Encina's promise, made in the title-prologue to this eclogue, "que venido el mayo sacaria la copilacion de todas sus obras" (p. 23), is to be believed, the date of Egloga I is nearer 1496 (the year of the Cancionero) than 1492. Without further evidence, 1492 can be accepted only as a traditional date for Encina's first eclogues.

[7]The date of Egloga IX is given in ll. 83-84: "año de noventa y ocho / y entrar en noventa y nueve". The title Egloga de las grandes lluvias was accorded by J. N. Boehl de Faber in Teatro anterior a Lope de Vega, Hamburg, 1832, p. 417.

[8]For a bibliography of Egloga IX, see López Morales, Eglogas..., p. 127.

[9]"Egloga interlocutoria", ed Urban Cronan, RHi, XXXVI (1916), 475-488.

[10]"Le théâtre religieux d'Encina", BHi, XLIII (1941), p. 15.

[11]In deference to Andrews, remarks made in his preface (p. viii) must be cited: "It is the purpose of this study to investigate the function and scope of those appeals, studying Encina's prologic writings not as artistic expressions but as opportunities for understanding certain key attitudes, values, and preoccupations which supported his creative efforts. In thus seeking to indicate certain aspects of Encina's self-image and certain facets of his life project, I have chosen a special point of view: that of literature as instrument rather than literature as art. In this respect the problem I have undertaken is less literary than biographic, but biographic in a nonanecdotic, intimate perspective". (See, however, the review by R. O. Jones in BHS, XXXVII, 1960.)

[12]Andrews did not, however, analyze all of Encina's dramas.

Excluding the two Easter plays, he looked only at the eclogues in the 1496 Cancionero and at Egloga IX (1498).

[13]Wardropper described the process of divinization as follows (p. 44): "This poetic movement from wheaten bread to spiritual bread exemplifies what Dámaso Alonso calls a thematic divinization. And indeed one might go so far as to call the second égloga a loose versión a lo divino of the first. A theme is stated secularly in a secular situation by unredeemed characters; in the interval between the two playlets an event is supposed to have occurred, the birth of the Saviour, and to illustrate the nature of this event the poet presents his theme and his characters influenced by this significant happening. The soma fit only for dogs which Encina so desperately needs to keep body and soul together has become the pan de vida which nourishes the soul itself". (Reference to Dámaso Alonso is to Poesía española: ensayo de métodos y límites estilísticos, Madrid, 1950, p. 237; see, also, Wardropper, Historia de la poesía a lo divino en la cristiandad occidental, Madrid, 1958.)

[14]Juan asks Mateo, "¿que haras en el estio / que con ravia de mi brio / se te quemen las entrañas?" (ll. 61-63); and later says to him, "Desmuele ya, pecador, / essa embidia que en ti mora" (ll. 68-69).

[15]See Hendrix, "Some Native Comic Types...", pp. 95-102. (The principal devices of composition of the sixteenth century drama are described in Hendrix; those of the plays discussed in this study are catalogued in Appendix B, below. Consult the latter to substantiate claims of conventionality made in the course of this study for devices of dramatic composition.)

[16]Andrews (pp. 101-122) delves deeper into the meaning of the eclogue than objective criticism allows. His interpretation is inadmissible because it purports to decipher the unknown psychology of Encina's address to his patrons, based on the scantily known context of its delivery. The resulting conclusions concerning the content of the eclogue are, therefore, conjectural.

[17]Mateo has been equated with Lucas Fernández. The rivalry between Encina and Fernández in 1498 for the position of cantor at the Cathedral of Salamanca after the death of the incumbent, Fernando de Torrijos, is well known (see Egloga IX; Espinosa Maeso, "Nuevos datos...", pp. 646-653; and idem, "Ensayo biográfico del maestro Lucas Fernández", BRAE, X (1923), pp. 396-397). Thus, it is thought that the following lines of Egloga I:

> Calla, calla ya malsin
> que nunca faltas de ruyn
> tu tan bien como tu tio, (ll. 56-58)

refer to the literary rivalry between the two Salamancans, the last

line being a reference to Fernández's uncle who raised and patronized him (see, "Ensayo biográfico...", pp. 394-397). In fact, it is not known whether the professional rivalry of the two men for the position of cantor extended to personal vituperation of their respective literary endeavours. Certainly Lucas Fernández imitated Juan del Encina's dramatic eclogues, but it is not known whether he would have been included among those who supposedly usurped and corrupted them, as Encina wrote at the beginning of Egloga I (p. 23). The identification of Mateo with Lucas Fernández is, therefore, without adequate foundation. Had Encina wished to make the identification clear he could have used the name Lucas, since a shepherd-evangelist of that name was to appear in Egloga II.

[18]Mateo, with Juan, also belongs to fiction and reality. He is a fictional creation to the extent that he is a device allowing Juan del Encina to express his views; at the same time, Mateo is the representative of those real rivals who, if Encina's word is accepted, usurped and corrupted the poet's work.

[19]This type of greeting became standard with the shepherd in the later religious drama. See the works of Diego Sánchez de Badajoz, Recopilación en metro.

[20]Cf. the distortion of the Gloria in Vita Christi:

> vnos gritauan vitoria,
> los otros cantauan groria,
> otros indaçielçis deo,
> otros Dios es pietatis,
> otros et in tierra paz
> homanibus varitatis,
> otros buena voluntatis,
> otros abondo que mas. (Bvi-v)

Distortion of Latin texts was frequent in early Spanish drama.

[21]Wardropper (Introducción..., p. 166) identified the shepherd Juan with both John the Baptist and the Evangelist. The reference to the Baptist, however, is not to Juan's identity but to what he wrote as the Evangelist. (See John, I, 19-28.)

[22]While the idea of identifying the shepherds with the Evangelists, the propagators of Christianity, is ingenious, it is not entirely novel. The idea, implicit in Luke (II, 20: "Et reversi sunt pastores glorificantes et laudantes Deum, in omnibus quae audierant, et viderant, sicut dictum est ad illos"), is explicit in Vita Christi:

Tornados ya de groseros
de conoscer tan sabido,
quieren ser los primeros
cristianos y pregoneros
del grand misterio ascondido.
Todos tres en continente,
despues del niño adorado,
començan publicamente
a descubrir ala gente
el secreto reuelado. (bvi-r)

[23]The phrase is from Meredith, "Introito" and "Loa"..., p. 10: "Juan is bringing a gift to his lady, just as the shepherd-apostles take their offering to the Child. ... Besides, since Juan was taking the role of a shepherd in the second eclogue, it was only dramatic economy to have him make his presentation in the same costume". Meredith saw no unity between Eglogas I and II beyond the occasion of performance. He earlier wrote (p. 9) of Encina's custom of composing and presenting his eclogues in pairs: "The chief function of these [introductory] églogas is to sing the praises of the Duke and Duchess of Alba, Encina's patrons, although the first also presents, in pastoral metaphor, the poet's defense against certain critics of his art. They have no organic connexion with the pieces that follow them, and the heading égloga in each case seems to indicate that Encina thought of them as complete in themselves".

[24]Andrews wrote (p. 111) of the title-prologue to Egloga II: "Encina here indicates the close ties linking the two églogas together. He does not reveal, of course, that in spite of the transition from poet to Apostle, Juan continues to be related to himself (i.e. Juan del Encina). The very fact of the 'mesmos' is, however, a clue". Andrews overlooked that the personages of Egloga II speak "en nombre de los cuatro evangelistas" (p. 33), not in the name of the poet and his critics. He has not adequately considered that "mesmos" is more applicable to the conditions of performance than to the meaning of the eclogue or the identity of the characters.

[25]Emilio Cotarelo could not locate these "cien coplas" (Cancionero de Juan del Encina facsimile, p. 11, n. 1). La natividad de nuestro salvador, trobada por Juan del Enzina (Cancionero..., fols. VII-XI), has exactly "cien coplas".

[26]A further point to bear in mind is that the title-prologue containing the description of the personages was conceivably written solely for the publication of the eclogue and simply intended to describe the conditions of performance.

[27]In Egloga I, for example, Mateo refers to Juan's daily bread:

que yo te seguro, Juan,
no estas a lumbre de pajas
ni te falte ya del pan. (ll. 158-160)

Reflecting on the use of the bread imagery in Egloga II, Wardropper wrote ("Metamorphosis...", p. 44): "This is the figural basis for the bread of the New Testament: the bread which is symbolic of the Messiah and the Eucharistic wafer, and the five loaves which Christ distributed to the multitude. It is Juan, transformed into the spreader of the Gospel, who says:

¡Hartar, hartar ya gañanes,
qu'es venido pan del cielo,.
pan de vida y de consuelo!
No comays somas de canes
ni andeys hecho albardanes
comiendo vianda vil;
que Aqueste con cinco panes
hartara mas rabadanes
que otro con cinco mil (ll. 136-144)".

On bread as a figura Christi, Wardropper refers his reader to Erich Auerbach, Scenes from the Drama of European Literature, New York, 1959, pp. 31ff. The shepherds in the Vita Christi also refer to hopes of food in plenty as a result of the birth of Christ:

Abras, Mingo, si la escuchas
ni avn comer migas con ajo,
ni borregos en tasajo,
ni sopar huerte las puchas. (Bvi-r)

[28]Compare the appropriate passages:

¡Ya tu presumes de gala
que te arrojas al palacio!
¡Andar mucho en hora mala!
¿Cuydas que eres para en sala?
¡No te vien de gerenacio! (Egloga I, ll. 50-54)

Pesame que no ay espacio,
que aun de aquessa yo sabria
contar la genalogia
de todo su gerenacio.

El es hijo de David,
de David y de Abrahan. (Egloga II, ll. 60-65)

Wardropper noted this aspect of divinization ("Metamorphosis...", p. 44, n. 6). Mateo nonetheless appropriately alluded to Christ's genealogy since its source is St. Matthew's gospel

(I, 1-17). As Wardropper remarked (p. 42), Encina carefully delegated his scriptural sources to the appropriate shepherd-evangelist: "Given the limited scope of the playlet, the personages are sufficiently differentiated from one another, and their characters are grounded in the Gospels they have written: Saint Matthew dwells on the genealogy of Christ; Saint Mark insists on the prophecies of the Messiah's imminent coming; Saint Luke tells the story of the Nativity; Saint John points out the theological implications of the event, abstracting from it the conclusion that the Word has become flesh. It is Saint John, moreover, who has reported the words of Saint John the Baptist:

> la boz que tu, Juan, dezias
> que en el desierto clamava (11. 116-117)".

Wardropper continues to say that St. John "is further characterized as neat and clever" (l. 23, "tu, Juan, del buen asseo", and l. 67, "zagal de buen ardid"). Andrews capitalized (p. 111) on this further characterization of Juan to suggest that Encina singled him out in order to draw attention to his own problems: "It would appear ... that through the figure of Juan-Apostle Encina is maintaining himself in position for special attention, and continuing the personal emphasis of the prologue-play over into the second égloga". It could equally be, however, that Encina, following the characterization of the Evangelists from their gospels, merely emphasized the well known prominence of St. John as the disciple whom Jesus loved best.

[29]See, also, Wardropper, "Metamorphosis...", p. 41, n. 2, and above, chap. I, n. 20.

[30]In "Metamorphosis...", p. 42, Wardropper drew attention to the allegorical nature of Mateo. Speaking "en nombre de los detratores y maldizientes" (p. 23), "a single actor--and character--subsumes the real-life role of several people: this technique is not far removed from allegorical personification". In Introducción..., pp. 165-166, Wardropper refers to the symbolic qualities of the personages in Egloga II: "Aun en esta Egloga, cuando es lícito pensar en la historia más que en las consecuencias dogmáticas, Encina se muestra, muy a la española, fuera del ambiente del 'misterio' europeo, y plenamente sumido en la corriente abstraccionista que llega a Calderón. Prueba de ello es su decisión de dar nombres significativos a sus pastores: se llaman Mateo, Marcos, Lucas y Juan, no por el mero capricho de aprovecharse de un grupo conocido de cuatro nombres, sino para dar a entender que los pastores tienen un sentido simbólico. Representan, en efecto, la Iglesia misma, que recibirá la buena nueva del Nacimiento por los escritos de los Evangelistas, inspirados ellos--como los pastores de Belén--por la Divinidad

misma".

[31] It is by no means certain that the audience to Egloga IX was the Duke and Duchess of Alba. The title-prologue does not contain the customary statement that the shepherds entered "en la sala adonde el duque y duquesa estavan" (pp. 23, 33, 71, 83, 95, and 107) so characteristic of the eclogues performed before Encina's patrons. There is no evident praise of the Duke and Duchess, and no specific allusion to them. The eclogue does contain references to "amos" (ll. 41-42, and 105-112), but since the date of Encina's resignation from service at Alba de Tormes is unknown these references need not necessarily be to the Duke and Duchess. (See, Alfredo Alvarez de la Villa, El aucto del repelón, Paris, 1910, pp. 13 and 24.)

[32] Compare the following texts:

> Juan: En buen ora esteys zagales.
> Anton: Y en tal vosotros vengays. (Egl. IX, ll. 25-26)

> Lucas, Marco: ¡Dios mantenga! ¡Dios mantenga!
> Juan, Mateo: ¡O, nora buena vengays!
> Lucas: Y vosotros, ¿aca estays?
> Mateo: ¡Miaffe ha! Venga quien venga. (Egl. II, ll. 1-4)

(See, also, n. 19, above.)

[33] It has not been possible to document the topicality of these references, but the probability of their referring to a local situation is likely, given the topical nature of the first part of Egloga IX and its allusions to Encina's personal affairs.

[34] For the figurative meaning of "pan" see n. 27. Egloga VI is discussed below (chap. VI).

[35] A possible source for this word is St. Luke (II, 8): "Et pastores erant in regione eadem vigilantes, et custodientes, vigilias noctis super gregem suum". Dictionaries give two meanings. Nebrija's Dictionarium latino hispanicum et vice versa hispanocolatinum (Antwerp, 1570), contains the following entries:

> Vigilia--por la vela, obra de velar (fol. cciv).
> vigilia o velada--Vigilia, ae. Peruigilium, ii (fol. llliii).

Sebastian de Covarrubias (Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española, 1611, ed. Martín de Riquer, Barcelona, 1943), emphasized the religious connotations of the word: "La vela que se haze por devoción de partes de tarde y en la noche, antes de la festividad en que la Iglesia Católica señala las vigilias, o dentro de los templos o en sus cimenterios" (1007b, 35-39). The current

Spanish Academy Dictionary (Madrid, 1956) gives both religious and secular implications of the word.

[36]Juan compares the flooding and the destruction caused by the river overflowing its banks to the drowning of the Egyptians in the Red Sea (Ex. XIV, 5-31):

> ¡con los andiluvios grandes
> ni quedan vados ni puentes,
> y a las gentes
> reclamar a voz en grito;
> andan como los de Egipto! (ll. 67-71)

[37]The angel's announcement is an exact parallel of the scriptural source (Luke, II, 10-12).

[38]Miss Patt's conclusions are characteristic of opinions held about Egloga IX. In Cañete-Barbieri, Teatro completo... (p. xlii), it is suggested that Encina included secular matter "ya para dar mayor variedad y movimiento al diálogo, ya para buscar ocasión de ensartar chistes y agudezas al alcance de toda clase de espectadores". A similar opinion is offered by Bro. Austin on a comparison between Egloga IX and Eglogas I and II: "Little more came from his next try at this kind of humor a few years later: the so-called Egloga de las grandes lluvias, a Christmas playlet that has practically nothing to do with Christmas. Again the characters are shepherds...; again there is no action. The rustics merely talk about the damage caused by the recent rains, and how best to divide up a bag of chestnuts, which leads to the guessing game of 'pares y nones'. The sudden apparition of an angel announcing the Birth of Christ produces but little stir, and the piece ends with a list of homely gifts the shepherds plan to carry to Bethlehem. Throughout, Encina strives for comic effects, resorting even to rustic misunderstanding and plays on words, but without notable success" ("Juan del Encina", p.66).

[39]For the biographical background to this dialogue, see Espinosa Maeso, "Nuevos datos...", pp. 646-653.

[40]Moratín wrote, "Es un diálogo en estilo rústico, que se acaba con la inoportuna aparición de un ángel. Cuéntales a los pastores el nacimiento del hijo de Dios, y ellos se encaminan a Belén para adorarle; pero como los tales pastores no son los del Evangelio, sino unos cabreros cristianos y españoles que hablan de los aguaceros y avenidos del año de 1498, resulta demasiado absurdo el anuncio del ángel y el desatinado viaje que emprenden" (Orígenes..., ed. cit., pt. 1, p. 125).

[41]See, also, "Metamorphosis...", p. 45.

[42] After Egloga I Encina's personal concerns were subordinated to a preoccupation for the Nativity in Egloga II. In fact, in those two eclogues and in Egloga IX Encina showed his realization of the scope of drama. He saw that his personal concerns could be used to highlight a performance and be incorporated into the dramatization of another subject. See, also (chap. IV, below), discussion of Egloga V.

[43] See n. 9. All quotations of the Egloga interlocutoria are according to Cronan's edition.

[44] RR, VII (1916), 458-469. Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 19) was equally skeptical of House's conclusions: "It has been noted that this play has the same incidents as the Egloga de las grandes lluvias, arranged in reverse order. It shows carelessness in workmanship and is far inferior to any play printed with Encina's name. It has been argued that it was written in haste by Encina for a Christmas celebration; that its author did not intend to publish it, and that its preservation was due to an actor who wrote it out from memory. It is difficult to decide whether this be true or whether someone unscrupulously pilfered from Encina's Egloga de las grandes lluvias after the latter had left Salamanca".

[45] "The Development of the Christmas Play...", p. 105. Miss Patt accepted the ascription of the Egloga interlocutoria to Encina, and assumed it was presented before the Duke and Duchess of Alba.

[46] Cf. Egloga I, ll. 1-3:

> ¡Dios salve aca, buena gente!
> ¡Asmo, soncas! Aca estoy,
> que a ver a nuestrama voy.

House (p. 460) considered this parallel as "undoubtedly accidental". (See, also, nn. 19 and 32 above.)

[47] Cirot ("Le théâtre religieux...", p. 16, n. 3) thought the allusion to the Jews was a reference to their expulsion. If this is so, it is a late reference since the date of the expulsion (31, March, 1492) is prior to several of the works by Juan del Encina with which the Egloga interlocutoria has textual parallels.

[48] Compare the two texts.

> Benito: A Dios praga conel viejo!
> ya te tornas palaciego!
> Pascual: Ala fe, chapado consejo!
> quiero mudar el pellejo,
> que del aldea reniego.

Benito: Ni eres hombre de sala,
ni se te apega el palacio.
Pascual: Andar mucho enoramala;
has de auer tu el alcauala?
Benito: No te viene de generacio.
Pascual: No me viene de natio.
Benito: Mi fe, no mas que a vn mastin.
Pascual: Pues no faltes de ruin,
tu tambien como tu tio.
.....
Quando agora enel estio
a ladrar tambien te amañas,
que haras tu conel frio?
que de rauia de mi brio
se te queman las entrañas. (Egl. inter., ll. 21-40)

Mateo: ¡O, Juan, Juan, hi de Pascuala!
Cata, cata, ¿aca estas tu?
Juan: Digo, digo, ¿pues que hu?
¿Has de aver tu ell alcavala?
Mateo: ¡Ya tu presumes de gala
que te arrojas al palacio!
¡Andar mucho en ora mala!
¿Cuydas que eres para en sala?
¡no te vien de gerenacio!

Juan: ¡No me viene de natio!
Calla, calla ya, malsin,
que nunca faltas de ruyn.
Tu tambien como tu tio,
quando agora con tal frio
a ladrar tan bien te amañas,
¿que haras en el estio,
que con ravia de mi brio
se te quemen las entrañas? (Egl. I, ll. 46-63)

See House, pp. 460-461. In addition, the lines from the Egloga interlocutoria, "quiero mudar el pellejo, / que del aldea reniego", recall the situation of Encina's Egloga VIII.

[49]See Crawford, "Echarse pullas: A Popular Form of Tenzone", RR, VI (1915), 150-164. The argument in Egloga I is possibly from the same tradition.

[50]Cf.: Dinos, dinos, dinos Juan,
en tiempo de tan manzilla,
¿para que huste a la villa? (Egl. IX, ll. 89-91)

[51]Cf.: Yo te mando una borrega
de las que andan al majuelo.

Pues me das nueva tan buena,
por estrena
te la mando, si no mientes. (Egl. V, ll. 209-213)

See House, p. 461.

[52]Cf.: Beneyto: Espera, espera
que aun no estoy repantigado.
Bras: ¡Ya estoy ancho, Dios loado! (Egl. VI, ll. 2-4)

See House, p. 461.

[53]His announcement is not so close to the scriptural source, however, as that spoken by angels in the Vita Christi and Egloga IX.

[54]These developments are characteristic features of Spanish Nativity drama. They serve to eliminate the improbabilities of an angel appearing in the play and untutored shepherds discussing theology (see Appendix B, s.v. "Announcement of the Nativity" and "Friends, advisors, and preceptors").

[55]House's conclusion that the Egloga interlocutoria was written from memory by an actor could apply to an independent author who incorporated phrases he had remembered, either from a performance or a reading of Encina's works.

[56]A comparison was made by House (pp. 462-463). There are points in common, but the close textual parallels of the first part of the eclogue are lacking.

[57]Encina neither introduced his personal affairs, nor praised his patrons without prompting. Either he presented them with an example of his work (Eglogas I and VIII), or he was prompted by some external event (Egloga V).

[58]See Egloga VIII, ll. 1-80, and House, p. 463.

[59]Cf.: Egloga I, ll. 19-45, and Egloga V, ll. 57-140.

## Chapter III

## LUCAS FERNANDEZ

Lucas Fernández has the rare distinction of being the author of "the first printed collection entirely of dramatic pieces" (Bryant, "Lucas Fernández...", pp. 8-9), the Farsas y églogas al modo y estilo pastoril y castellano (Salamanca, 1514), but has not generally been regarded as an innovator in dramatic writing; nor has he shared the glory given to Juan del Encina as one of the earliest Spanish dramatists. On the contrary, Fernández's reputation has been overshadowed by that of the "patriarch", and, as William C. Bryant phrased it, he has been "dismissed ... as a slavish imitator of his illustrious contemporary" ("Lucas Fernández...", p. 3).

Eduardo Juliá Martínez's opinion, given in his essay on early Spanish drama in the second volume of the Historia general de las literaturas hispánicas, is representative of what is usually thought about Fernández. A lack of originality in Fernández's works is attributed to a character distinctive from that of Juan del Encina: "En verdad es la antítesis de su maestro: sedentario y reposado, no salió de su rincón natal y vivió sin crisis pasionales que violentaran su tranquilidad general. El único conflicto que sufrió fue el originado por su rivalidad con el propio Juan del Encina, cuando los dos aspiraron a la vacante producida por el cantor Torrijos. ...

Esta antítesis repercutió en la obra, pues, partiendo Fernández de una imitación respetuosa, alcanzó al fin una personalidad bastante independiente" (p. 267).[1] How Juliá Martínez could penetrate the personalities of these two dramatists, and arrive at such contrasting portraits, is a matter only he could have answered.[2] Nevertheless, Juliá Martínez saw the reflection of Fernández's character in his work. In his Nativity works "tiende a pintar caracteres y tipos ya populares en aquel tiempo y alguno de renombre universal conquistado muy justamente" (p. 271). Only with a purely religious subject, in the Auto de la Passion, did Fernández supposedly achieve independence of expression, the result of "su fervor sacerdotal" (ibid.). Pointing again to the contrast between the two Salamancans, Juliá Martínez concluded: "Sus pastores [Fernández's] no son graciosos, sus personajes bíblicos comparten la vida con el poeta. Encina aprovechó su talento para divertir a sus mecenas; Lucas Fernández, para sembrar lo ascético entre el pueblo. Encina representó ante los nobles y en los palacios; su discípulo, ante la multitud y en la iglesia" (p. 274).

More recent commentators have attempted to rehabilitate Lucas Fernández's literary reputation. In his dissertation, "Lucas Fernández and the Early Spanish Drama", William C. Bryant stated as his purpose: "To inquire into the scope and significance of his [Fernández's] writings, pointing out his contributions to the field of literature and showing his relation to Spain's literary renascence, especially in relation to the theater" (pp. 3-4). After an analysis of his writings, Fernández's achievements are

summarized and the following conclusion proposed: "Synthesizing all these currents, Fernández emerges as less medieval than modern, less an imitator than a creator" (p. 131).

A similar conclusion was reached by Alfredo Hermenegildo in "Nueva interpretación de un primitivo: Lucas Fernández", but only with regard to the Auto de la Passion. After discussing this play and its author's biography, Hermenegildo proposed a Fernández who was more of an innovator than an imitator, and more of a Renaissance than a Medieval personality. This was not Hermenegildo's entire thesis, however. Having analyzed the Auto de la Passion in detail--although somewhat intuitively--Fernández's Easter play is considered the culmination of his technique, beside which his other works are inferior.[3]

Without prior analysis, Fernández's pastoral works and Nativity dramas are grouped together as having "un aire común" and treating "hechos de la vida corriente, más o menos ocultos o caricaturizados bajo los toscos trazos de los pastores" (p. 16). Hermenegildo adduced several reasons for their inferiority to the Easter play. They lack structural originality and must be faulted for "el uso casi abusivo de un tipo de escenas prefiguradas de antemano. Una especie de moldes estéticos, de clichés que Lucas Fernández coloca en determinados momentos, bien sea para llenar lagunas, bien sea por seguir una corriente general en el teatro de su época, bien sea a causa de la presencia subterránea de Encina" (p. 17). All this produced the "sensación de que falta la inventiva creadora de situaciones dramáticas" (ibid.).

A second reason also condemned structural deficiencies: "Es un detalle evidente de primitivismo la falta de agilidad para introducir los personajes en la acción. Lucas Fernández libra una verdadera lucha contra la brusquedad en la entrada de las personas" (ibid.). A third point concerns character portrayal: "Es que en ninguna de las cinco obras encontramos caracteres definidos y diferenciados con rasgos individuales" (p. 18). Referring then to the two Nativity plays, Hermenegildo continued, "En el Auto o farsa del Nascimiento lo mismo nos da Pascual que Lloreinte. En la Egloga o farsa del Nascimiento no hay caracterización distinta entre Bonifacio y Gil. El ermitaño Macario no es una PER-SONA, sino un simple portavoz de la didáctica religiosa y un blanco inerme de las sátiras de los pastores y del autor" (ibid.).

It is concluded that Fernández was capable of imitating "un prototipo clásico" or of outlining "tipos abstractos, arquetípicos, aunque no ejemplares", but "nunca a pergeñar personajes de carne y hueso" (ibid.). To all this is added the crowning condemnation, "que las cinco primeras obras dramáticas son reflejo de la influencia de Encina y que, en consecuencia, adolecen de falta de espontaneidad y originalidad creadora" (ibid.).

The circle is complete. Far from assessing his work as the product of an individual writer, Fernández's plays are assessed in terms of those by Juan del Encina. Such evaluation is negative at best. In all honesty, commentators, who focus on the "primitivism" of a dramatist such as Lucas Fernández and interpret his work as

the result of imitation of another equally "primitive" dramatist, ought to define their standpoint and state what they expect. In early sixteenth century Spain the drama was still in its infancy; there were virtually only three topics possible for dramatization, and all subject to restrictions. The purely religious subjects (the Easter plays) all but forbade excessive elaboration and originality on account of their overall seriousness.[4] Similarly, the semi-secular Christmas shepherd play was limited in scope because of its pre-determined action. As to the remaining possible topic of dramatization, love, innovation was restricted on account of its familiarity and derivation from other literary genres. The general pastoral framework of the drama, the action involved, the personages portrayed, and the devices employed all contributed to impose an overall impediment on originality of expression.[5]

To expect a radical development between Juan del Encina and Lucas Fernández, fellow-Salamancans and contemporaries at that, is too much; to demand improvement or even equality with Encina is asking Fernández to be a better dramatist than his talent and literary environment may have allowed. The spectre of Juan del Encina certainly looms large over the plays written in Castilian during the early sixteenth century, the inevitable result when the work of a single writer is popular and dominates a certain literary form in one generation,[6] but his achievements should not be permitted to cloud the lesser claims to fame of those who adopted the tradition he moulded.

The Egloga o farsa del nascimiento is first known from Fernández's Farsas y églogas.[7] There is some evidence for composition in 1500 or thereabouts. That year, proclaimed a Jubilee by ecclesiastical authorities, is possibly referred to in the course of the play.[8] In an analysis of the Egloga o farsa, however, the central problems are the same as those in Encina's Nativity plays: the juxtaposition of secular and religious subjects and the techniques employed in their combination. Viewing the work as a whole, there are two apparently disparate parts, one containing a comic, shepherd scene, the other dwelling on the Incarnation.

The égloga begins with Bonifacio's monologue, a boastful declamation of his superiority in all realms of rustic life. His attitude is summarized in the following lines:

> ño ay zagal tan quellotrido
> enesta tierra,
> tan sabiendo ni entendido,
> tan loçano y tan garrido
> aunque vayan ala sierra. (Di-r)

His claim extends to a greatest of popularity with "las zagalas" and at country gatherings ("en bodas y en cofradias", and "a nuestras romerias"), to an all-conquering ability in every sport and a smartness in dress that is second to none. With the entry of Gil, however, Bonifacio's extensive accomplishments are challenged. Gil's opposition is twofold: in addition to suggesting he is as good, if not better, he pours scorn on Bonifacio's claims. This is particularly so when Bonifacio prides himself on his "casta y gerenacio", and on the wisdom and

reputation of his mother. Gil takes the opportunity to relate a few home truths and gives an unpleasant description of Bonifacio's mother, concluding that "peor es que Celestina". Defeated, Bonifacio taunts his oponent: "¿Tienes tu otros mijores?" (Dii-r). He implies that Gil is no better related, but fails to score because Gil evades the question and drives home his victory in the debate:

> Todos somos de vn terruño,
> baxos, altos y mayores,
> pobres, ricos y señores;
> de aldran viene todo al cuno.
> Venci vos don Cabareño
> por San Vasco. (ibid.)

This argument ends, but another ensues. Gil wants to take a rest and sleep, but is urged by Bonifacio, stressing the virtue of vigilance, to keep watch over his flocks lest they be attacked by wolves. To support his argument, Bonifacio cites (Dii-v) a number of Biblical figures, men whose lack of vigilance was their downfall. Finally prevailed upon, Gil changes his mind to soothe his companion's temper.

Resolution of this second argument coincides with the entry of Macario, a hermit lost in the night and in need of directions. Far from helping the lost hermit, the two shepherds demonstrate their zest for an argument as they unite to abuse the new arrival. They jest at Macario's expense. The argument is about to become unpleasant and Macario subject to serious mischief when he interrupts and pleads that there is no time for amusement:

> No es tiempo ya mas de estar
> en burletas,
> que Dios no puede tardar

que no venga ya encarnar,
segun hallo enlos profetas. (Dii-v and Diii-r)

From this point, the Nativity is the centre of attention.

The second part of the play is a series of climaxes. Macario's first mention of the Incarnation leads to Bonifacio's question:

Pues soys sacristan o abad,
¿que cosa es encarnacion? (Diii-r)

Macario explains that God will take on "nuestra humanidad / para nuestra saluacion" (ibid.). He enumerates the prefigurements of Christ in the Old Testament and explains why so much time has elapsed since the Fall and the promised Redemption. Explanations are interrupted, however, by the precipitate arrival of another shepherd, Marcelo. Less than an hour ago he has heard from an angel of the birth of Christ (Diii-r). Initial discussion of this news is contained in the questions put to Marcelo by Bonifacio and Gil. Then Macario breaks his silence. In 54 lines he expresses his feeling of joy and wonder on welcoming the news of the Nativity (Diii-v). The climax to his speech, the first in the series, is reached after a brief intervention by the shepherds, when the central phrase of the Credo is entoned ("Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de celis et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria virgine") and all four personages kneel to sing thrice "en canto de organo": "Et homo factus est" (ibid.).

This climax is immediately broken when the shepherds Bonifacio and Gil discuss their knowledge of Latin and one of them attempts

to reproduce a piece he learned as an acolyte. Marcelo berates him for vying "conel padre a llatinar" (Div-r) and the conversation returns to the Incarnation with Bonifacio's question, "¿Que aprouecha encarnacion?" (ibid.). What follows is a series of questions and answers in which the hermit tries to enlighten the ignorant shepherds and satisfy enquiries about the Incarnation and the parentage of the Mother and Child. Re-introduction of the subject leads to another climax when Macario, aided by Marcelo, praises the Virgin (ibid.). The final passages of the work contain: Marcelo's brief description of what he saw at Bethlehem and the shepherds' traditional decision to take gifts to the Child as an act of homage. The whole piece is concluded on a final note of climax with a villancico which summarizes its principal ideas.

The main idea of the play, emphasized in the second part of the action, is that by the Incarnation God became man and redeemed the human race. From the moment the subject is introduced by Macario ("Dios no puede tardar...", Dii-v), and in spite of comic interruptions from Bonifacio and Gil, this idea is never lost. It is exposed as soon as it is mentioned, for Bonifacio's question, "¿Que cosa es encarnacion?" (Diii-r), prompts Macario to dwell on the origin of the concept and to talk about Biblical history and the promise of a Saviour. The hermit's sense of expectancy and his talk of the past are changed to feelings of joy and preoccupation with the present when he hears Marcelo's announcement,

Descruziemos ya de penas
ques Christo nascido ya. (ibid.)

Macario is overwhelmed by the magnitude of the event, but his speech of marvel centres on the mystery of the Incarnation. He prefaces it by inviting the shepherds to contemplate this mystery:

Pastorcicos inocentes,
contemplad
los misterios excelentes
questa noche son presentes
en Bethlen essa ciudad, (Diii-v)

and his outburst is a contemplation of the wonder that the night portends. Finally, his speech is followed by a statement of the mystery of the Incarnation, the central portion of the Credo.

When the Incarnation is again discussed, it is to elaborate it further. Macario answers the shepherds' questions, "¿Que aprouecha encarnacion?" and "¿Quien obro tal perhicion?" (Div-r). In subsequent questions and answers the Virgin is discussed, culminating in speeches prasing her. Finally, the whole idea is again stated in the concluding villancico, a gloss on a Latin text. (John, I, 14),

Verbum caro factum est,
alleluya,
et habitauit in nobis,
alleluya. (Div-v)

In this villancico all previous deliberations on the Incarnation are united: in the new-born Christ, the same God worshipped by the Old Testament patriarchs has become man, giving mankind cause to celebrate his redemption. In the second part of the play an overall view of the Nativity, the motive of composition and performance, is, thereby, presented. The history, purpose, and

attendant circumstances of culmination of the Incarnation are all conveyed.

The subject is presented in parallel series, progressing through three stages. The first begins by stating the theme (Bonifacio's question about the Incarnation and Macario's reply), is followed by its elaboration (Macario's reference to Biblical prefigurements of the Incarnation), and culminates in a speech of praise and a scene of adoration (Macario's expression of joy and the intonation of the Credo), both resulting from Marcelo's announcement of the birth of Christ. In a second series, this pattern is repeated. Bonifacio's question on the purpose of the Incarnation and Macario's reply begin the sequence, as an earlier question and reply involving the same personages began the earlier one. Elaboration is again provided and is also drawn from the Old Testament (parentage of the Child and lineage of the Mother). In turn, this leads to a eulogy--this time of the Virgin--begun by Macario and completed by Marcelo. The latter's intervention to describe what he saw at Bethlehem, as had his earlier announcement of the birth of Christ, also leads to a scene of adoration. Here, however, only the preparations are witnessed and the actual scene of adoration is to be understood. There is no exact correspondence between the first and second series, but the basic progression from the statement of the theme to a scene of adoration is the same, as is the deployment of the personages in each of the stages.

A third series is contained in the villancico at the end of

the play. There is no division of roles, however, since it is assumed that all personages take part. The theme is stated in the Latin text (cited above) and in the first stanzas:

> Manifiesto a todos sea
> questes nuestro Dios eterno,
> nascido chiquito y tierno
> de vna virgen galilea... (Div-v)

The idea is elaborated in following stanzas, including reference to Biblical figures:

> Estes el Dios de Abrahan,
> Dios de Ysac, Dios de Jaco,
> y el Dios quel mundo formo..., (ibid.)

and expressions of praise and joy:

> Y ansi todos nos gozemos
> con este gozo profundo.
> Oy se goze todo el mundo,
> pues que a Dios con nos tenemos... (ibid.)

The pattern of the presentation of the subject of the play is also founded on the use of the personages in determined roles. The exposition of the theme is motivated by the two shepherds, principally by Bonifacio, whose questions provoke Macario's explanations. Thus, if the hermit represents "la didáctica religiosa", the shepherds must surely stand for the ignorant in need of instruction, so that these personages together function as teacher and pupils. Marcelo's role is equally essential. Although a shepherd, he is a serious character. Marcelo reproves the frivolity of his fellows and joins with Macario in discoursing on the Incarnation. His function may be paralleled with that of the angel in the Bible story who announced the birth of Christ to the shepherds and told them what they would find at Bethlehem. Marcelo's two principal

interventions are for that purpose: on his entry he brings tidings of the Nativity; later his description of what he saw at Bethlehem leads the others to decide upon their journey.[9]

Marcelo is also essential to Macario's fulfilment of his role as the spokesman of religion. When Macario enters he is lost on account of the dark and asks Bonifacio and Gil to direct him:

> ¿Do va el camino,
> por aca o por alla?
> Por caridad me mostra,
> que con la noche no atino. (Dii-v)

Fernández may be interpreted as indulging in a bit of symbolism, for Macario is metaphorically as well as physically lost. The two shepherds he questions cannot enlighten him--quite the contrary, they mock him. In subsequent conversation with them concerning the Incarnation Macario can only refer to the past, but, when Marcelo enters with news of the Nativity Macario's way is made clear and dark becomes light. When the event he had predicted from a reading of the prophets takes place he is no longer lost. After Marcelo's announcement Macario's first intervention in the conversation is a speech expressing his boundless joy. In addition, his speech expresses his release from the bondage of the past as a result of the birth of a Saviour:

> Rompan, rompanse mis venas
> y riesguense mis entrañas
> con plazer, pues que las penas
> son ya gloria y las cadenas
> libertades muy estrañas... (Diii-v)

Macario has now found his way.

In the dramatization of the religious story each personage has

a definite function. If Marcelo fulfils the role of the announcer, then Macario is the expositor of the event, and Bonifacio and Gil are the recipients and learners of the good news that it implies. Each has a representative or symbolic role.

The secular element of the play is provided by Bonifacio and Gil. The opening of the Egloga o farsa, with Bonifacio's vainglory, his argument with Gil, his pride in his family, and Gil's desire for sleep are all devices readily encountered in differing forms in either the Christmas plays or secular dramas (see Appendix B). In his study, "Introito" and "Loa" in the Spanish Drama of the Sixteenth Century (pp. 11-17), Joseph A. Meredith fully analyzed Bonifacio's monologue. He pointed to the many precedents for Bonifacio's pride in rustic achievement in earlier literature (in Juan Ruiz's Libro de buen amor, in Encina's early dramatic eclogues, and in the poetry of the Cancioneros) and concluded: "I believe we are justified in considering Fernández's monologue as the combination and exaggeration of certain traits common to the Cancionero literature before him" (p. 15). Meredith also thought there was an element of burlesque implicit in the transference of this subject to a comic, rustic context. Furthermore, he suggested that the impetus for its use in this context was provided by Juan del Encina. Meredith proposed that Bonifacio's boasting and his argument with Gil were derived from Egloga I, and the subsequent discussion with Macario on the Incarnation from Egloga II. This opinion, supported by Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 32), led to the conclusion that Fernández

attempted a parody of Juan del Encina: "It is sufficient to note that Fernández anticipated the introito of Torres Naharro by using the pastor in an opening monologue which presents in burlesque manner certain stock traits of the courtly school of poets, of which Encina was the leader" (Meredith, p. 17).

For the moment, it is enough to note that the device of the rustic's pride of ability was used for possible burlesque purposes. Bonifacio's pride of lineage is a similar device. It had been used before, and was employed by Fernández himself in other contexts.[10] W. S. Hendrix ("Some Native Comic Types...", p. 84) suggested that the shepherd's paradoxical pride in his humble family background was a bit of dramatic irony and a source of amusement for noble audiences. Bonifacio's pride of lineage, particularly his pride in his mother, certainly contains elements of paradox. If Gil's protests, against which Bonifacio has no adequate reply, are accepted, this pride approaches downright fantasy. Bonifacio's family, his mother above all, are described by Gil in such derogatory terms that Fernández's intention of parodying the doubtful values of pride of lineage is clear. The point is particularly stressed by Gil's concluding remarks ("Todos somos de vn terruño...", Dii-r), which put the matter in its proper perspective.

Further elements of burlesque are also apparent in the first part of the play. When exalting Gil to stay awake and watch his sheep, Bonifacio cites several Biblical figures whose lack of vigilance was their downfall:

ño te niembras de Sanson

y de Esau que perdio
por dormir lança y baril,
y aun Judit descabeço
a Olofernes y libro
su pueblo de mano vil.
Ysboset descabeçado
dixcas hu
por dormir muy sossegado
y el buen Tobias cegado;
¿porque no te yergues tu? (Dii-v)

These allusions are out of place in the mouth of a shepherd and could not be less appropriate than when applied to another shepherd. Certainly this would not be the first misuse of Biblical allusions, but the effect is decidedly comic.

The maltreatment of Macario by the shepherds has already been alluded to as a relevant part in the hermit's achievement of his role as expositor of the Incarnation. During the incident Macario is the object of the shepherds' satire, but not its subject. Although the recipient of their invective, their jibes are not applicable to him, but to those clerics who fit the descriptions the shepherds provide. Throughout the play Macario is a serious person, preoccupied with his saintly calling,[11] but placed alongside the jesting of the shepherds some doubts are cast on his seriousness. Burlesque again predominates, and the hermit is made to appear as something other and less than he is.

There is, however, no evident unifying point amid all these elements of burlesque. In two instances it is directed against different individuals (the clergy and, possibly, Juan del Encina), but the remaining two (burlesque of lineage and Biblical allusions) are seemingly included gratuitously. Moreover, each is derived

from an established or semi-established device. It was suggested (see above) that Fernández modelled his play on Eglogas I and II and combined them into one work, but, although Encina's influence may be detected in the division of the subject-matter into secular and religious portions and in the employment of certain dramatic devices, even the most superficial comparison reveals the differences between the work of the two authors. Fernández attempted none of the character manipulations central to Encina's eclogues, and his presentation of the rustic scenes and the discussion of the Incarnation take directions different from those in the plays of his contemporary. Although the devotional part of the Egloga o farsa conforms to a definite pattern, the pattern does not include the rustic scene at the beginning of the work. There is not even an imposed unity of idea between the two sections of the kind Encina had achieved in Egloga IX. There are, however, indications that Fernández was aware of the uncomfortable result produced by the inclusion of a secular scene in a religious play, for he made some attempts at reconciling the two.

By contrast with Eglogas I and II, and even with Egloga IX, the Egloga o farsa has a continuous action. Fernández neither separated the secular and religious subjects into individual works, nor broke the continuity of the rustic scene by the sudden intervention of another personage or topic. The central topic of the play, the Incarnation, is introduced without violence to the rustic scene by the arrival of Macario and his assimilation into the action through the shepherds' abuse of him. The announcement

of the birth of Christ is not made by an angel, an incongruous figure in the rustic setting, but by the shepherd Marcelo. Moreover, Marcelo appears only after his announcement has been anticipated by discussion between Macario and the shepherds of the promise of a Saviour. There is, then, every effort to integrate the rustic scene and the religious topic into a single, continuous action.

The continuity of the action of the Egloga o farsa is further emphasized through consistency of characterization. Bonifacio and Gil, comic, argumentative shepherds in the first part of the play, retain their portrayal as ignorant rustics and humorous characters in the part concerned with the Nativity. They do not seriously participate in the theological discussion of the Incarnation, but conform to their original characterization by representing those needing instruction. Consequently, they are used as a source of burlesque comedy even at the most serious moments. When all four personages kneel in adoration and entone the central portion of the Credo, their singing of the Latin verses is immediately followed by a frivolous discussion between Bonifacio and Gil on their knowledge of Latin, concluding with the recitation of a piece of gibberish:

> Dixi domino de apodoño,
> de apodoño de apoderas,
> de apoderas delas heras,
> ño lo atinara el demoño. (Diii-v)

Apart from shattering the climax produced by the adoration and the chant, the recitation of the gibberish makes a mockery of it. It is the same type of humour in which Fernández had indulged in the

first part of the play.[12]

Two of the devices used in the earlier rustic scene were Bonifacio's misplaced pride of lineage and his application of Biblical precedents to the sleepy Gil. Both devices appear again during the discussion of the Incarnation, although without the overtones of humour apparent in their earlier usage. Macario refers to the Old Testament prefigurements of Christ, and the shepherds question the hermit about the lineage of the Virgin; but, just as precedents for use of these devices in the rustic scene can be found in contemporary secular literature (see above), so also can precedents be noted for their use in the Nativity drama.[13] It cannot be drawn from all this that Fernández superimposed an overall structural pattern and a unity of subject on the disparate portions of his work, nor even that he showed great originality in the choice of its various elements; what is claimed for him is an ability in ordering his material and in combining an entertaining, comic rustic scene with a didactic, devotional topic, and thereby achieving a degree of fusion between them.

A further contributing element in Fernández's successful combination of secular entertainment with religious didacticism is the accepted ambivalence of the personages in the Nativity play. Fernández freely indulges in anachronism. Bonifacio's speech of self-appraisal at the beginning of the Egloga o farsa is a fine rustic vignette; during the argument with Gil concerning Bonifacio's pride in his mother there is a clear reference to the

Celestina; in the course of the shepherds' jesting with Macario the unfortunate hermit is charged with all the malpractices of the contemporary clergy; and in the midst of the discussion about the Incarnation occurs that delightful anachronism when Bonifacio and Gil refer to their service as acolytes and recite their gibberish. The Egloga o farsa is intended to re-enact a past event, but these anachronisms are as deliberate and as accepted as the presentation of the Nativity in a contemporary setting in Iñigo de Mendoza's Vita Christi and Juan del Encina's Egloga IX. There is nothing untoward in two shepherds one moment receiving word of the birth of Christ and, the next, discussing their experiences as acolytes taking part in the rites of the religion He founded. It is all part of the technique of dramatization which permits the writer to instruct his audience on the enduring significance of the Incarnation at the same time as he entertains with a comic scene of contemporary humour. Lucas Fernández used this technique to the full so that there is a unity between the religious and secular elements of his Egloga o farsa simply by virtue of the nature of the Nativity play as a genre and the fact that he conformed to it.

Fernández's other Christmas play, the Auto o farsa del nascimiento, is also contained in the Farsas y églogas. Without giving any reason, Crawford suggested (Spanish Drama..., p. 33) that it "seems to be still earlier" than 1500, the date he proposed for the Egloga o farsa del nascimiento.[14] The position of the work in the Farsas y églogas--after the Egloga o farsa--is

no criterion since Fernández probably arranged his plays according to subject, not date of composition. A comparison between the two Nativity compositions, likewise, does not permit calculation of their respective dates, since any decision would rest on whether it is decided that the dramatist was still seeking a formula in the Auto o farsa, or attempted further experiment with the one he had already tried in the Egloga o farsa. The matter is difficult because of the many points of contact between the two plays--the rustic scene, a semi-theological discussion, reference to the Old Testament, and praise of the Virgin.

The Auto o farsa begins, just as the Egloga o farsa, with a monologue spoken by a shepherd. The scene equally recalls the beginning of Egloga IX where the shepherds complained of the weather and sought each other's company. In the Auto o farsa Pascual enters, "Muerto de frio, blasfemando delos temporales y doliendose delos ganados y fructos de la tierra" (Fi-r). He attempts to forget his troubles with thoughts of pleasure:

> Hora se haze de almorzar;
> quiero me aqui rellanar
> con gozo muy prazentero,
> como zagal costumero. (ibid.)

He thinks of lighting a fire and eating:

> ...quando come el zagal
> los duelos suyos y agenos
> dixcas que con pan son buenos
> para desllotrar del mal,
> aunque le falte la sal, (ibid.)

but he adds that

> el prazer y el reholgar
> que no es bien comunicado
> no es entero gasajado, (ibid.)

and goes to call his companion Lloreynte.

The shepherd's complaints and his preoccupation with food are frequent devices of the early Spanish drama. A third is encountered with the entry of Lloreynte--the device of the sleepy shepherd. Fernández also employed it in the Egloga o farsa as a source of contention between Bonifacio and Gil, but in the Auto o farsa the device is differently developed and is used in a comic scene to portray a shepherd who is not quite mentis quo after awakening from deep slumber.[15] When Lloreynte finally comes to his senses he welcomes Pascual and enquires after his flock, but from the dialogue ensuing between them it appears that all is not in order. Pascual is unsettled by the restlessness of his animals:

> Mis cabras y mis cabritos,
> asmo, que tienen espritos
> segun que anda oy alterado, (Fi-v)

and Lloreynte has felt a similar disturbance:

> Juro a diez, yo tambien siento
> esta noche turbacion.
> Alguna mala vision
> rebolbio este turbamiento (ibid.).

The shepherds speculate on the meaning of all this:

> Unos dizen que es el cielo
> bien ansi como cebolla;
> otros dizen ques la grolla
> de nuestro bien y consuelo, (ibid.)

marvel at the stars, the singing of the birds (at night!),[16] and the peaceful state of Nature. It is all beyond their comprehension, however, and they close the matter saying,

> El crego ños lo dira,
> o sino el saludador.
> Mas Benito Sabidor
> yo cuydo lo acertara, (Fii-r)

and turn their thoughts to amusing themselves.

The shepherds' predilection for games is a device already familiar from Encina's Egloga IX and the anonymous Egloga interlocutoria, both of which contain games of "pares y nones". Although Pascual and Lloreynte do not play that game, their playing is nonetheless a device. Equally so is the manner of Juan's arrival, heralded by shouts exchanged between him and the other pair (cf. Egl. IX, ll. 1-25); even the arrival of another personage as an interruption to the shepherds' game has a precedent.[17]

Juan's entry is also a cause for comedy. He intends to convey some news to his companions and is as much resolved to tell it as they are determined not to have their game interrupted. Consequently, the news is drawn out in the telling. Juan must first be persuaded to climb off the rock he is perched on, rather than jumping and risking injury; he has then to catch his breath before he can speak to the shepherds, now anxious to listen to him; finally, when he reports the birth of Christ, Pascual and Lloreynte do not believe him. Only when Juan berates them and exhorts them to believe:

> O toscos, hoscos campestres,
> que ya las bestias siluestres
> de rodillas se han hincado,
> por señor le han adorado
> en el pesebre do esta.
> Creed me, creed me ya,
> que oy el mundo ya es librado
> de tributo y restaurado, (Fiii-r)

do they recall the earlier signs which had puzzled them and are convinced.

Thus far, the Auto o farsa follows a direction similar to

that of the Egloga o farsa before the introduction of the religious subject and the discussion of the Incarnation. Both plays contain rustic scenes, but there is no trace in the Auto o farsa of the burlesque comedy so characteristic of the Egloga o farsa. Nevertheless, the rest of the action of the Auto o farsa is a parallel of Fernández's other Nativity play.

Aided by scraps of knowledge contributed by Pascual and Lloreynte, the conversation is led by Juan and hinges on the relationship of Christ to the prophecies of the Old Testament. It culminates in the shepherds' kneeling to adore and recite a prayer, just as in the Egloga o farsa the personages kneel and sing a portion of the Credo "en canto de organo". With the customary shouts of recognition and welcome, a fourth shepherd, Pedro Picado, then joins their number. He, too, has seen the angels and heard their song, but is unable to explain the phenomenon:

> He estado casi embabido
> mirando que van volando
> zagales y van cantando
> por cosmo del exido
> vn cantar desminuydo,
> haziendo mill gargalismos
> y gozandose ellos mismos,
> y no se por do se han ydo,
> ni les atinare el nido. (fiii-v)

Juan enlightens him, and when the conversation is renewed it has a particular bearing, as in the Egloga o farsa, on the Virgin.

The work concludes in the traditional manner, and as Fernández's other Nativity play concludes. The shepherds decide to leave their flocks and go to Bethlehem, carrying gifts to offer in tribute. On this occasion, however, they call upon on one more

shepherd, Minguillo, to help them in the singing of two villancicos (see Appendix B, s.v. "Villancicos and other songs"). Both songs are "baylado y cantado" and the second, with the introduction,

> Dezid pastores
> que venis de ver
> con tanto plazer, (Fiv-v)

suggests that, in performance, the two songs are separated by an adoration scene.

The parallel of this part of the Auto o farsa to the equivalent part of the Egloga o farsa can be further illustrated. The entry of Juan, who introduces the religious topic and is its principal expositor, is a matter for comedy, just as the entry of Macario in the Egloga o farsa. The parallels in the discussion of the Incarnation, when reference to its Biblical prefigurements leads to a scene of adoration, have already been mentioned; to them may be added another: the dissipation of the climax of adoration by comedy. In the Egloga o farsa this occurred through the shepherds' discussion of their knowledge of Latin and their gibberish recitation; in the Auto o farsa the same effect is produced by Pedro Picado's description of the angels' fly-past (Fiii-v). For the rest, the parallels continue in further Biblical reference and praise of the Virgin, the decision to go to Bethlehem, and the concluding villancicos.

It was observed by Beatrice Patt ("The Development of the Christmas Play...", p. 120) that "the structure of the play is somewhat similar to that of Encina's Egloga de las grandes lluvias; the first part is based chiefly on the details of rustic life,

references to the weather, and the playing of a game. The second major division concerns the Christmas story proper". There is, however, no attempt at combining the two parts in the same way as Encina. If the shepherds' joy after hearing of the birth of Christ is intended to contrast with Pascual's earlier misery on account of the weather, as the shepherds' joy in Egloga IX after the angel's announcement contrasts with their earlier disposition, an indication of the fact is lacking. But Fernández was aware of the uncomfortable juxtaposition of the secular and religious elements in his play, for he attempted to solve it and avoid the sudden introduction of the religious subject, a point which Moratín had found so disturbing about Egloga IX (see, above, chap. II, n. 40). Miss Patt remarked on Fernández's preparation for the introduction of the religious subject: "The great event is anticipated in the description of natural disturbances, and the scene in which Juan prepares to tell them [Pascual and Lloreynte] the news forms a bridge between the game and the announcement of the Nativity" (p. 120).

This use of one scene to prepare for another has its parallel in the Egloga o farsa. There, the audience could accept Marcelo's announcement of the birth of Christ on account of Macario's earlier reference to the history of its promise. In the Auto o farsa Fernández similarly relied on the continuity of the action to effect a non-violent transition from rustic comedy to discussion of the Incarnation. While the second part of the play is presaged by the shepherds' observations of the natural disturbances,

the whole matter of the Nativity is introduced gently. Juan's entry and announcement is the subject of comedy, which effectively assimilates the serious topic into the earlier comic scenes.

On account of these many similarities between Fernández's two Nativity plays, it is impossible to establish which is the earlier piece. This is specially true with regard to the personages. In the Egloga o farsa each performed a determined role, a situation partially obtaining in the Auto o farsa. Macario's function as expositor is performed by Juan. Juan also announces the birth of Christ, a function in part shared by Pedro Picado, and which belonged to Marcelo in the Egloga o farsa. The two shepherds, Pascual and Lloreynte, with Pedro Picado added, act, like Bonifacio and Gil, as representatives of those in need of instruction. There is, therefore, the same basic teacher-pupil relationship established between Juan and his companions as between Macario and Bonifacio and Gil.

On the other hand, there are some differences. While the overall didactic purpose implicit in the explanation of a religious subject is not reduced, this subject is somewhat secularized in the Auto o farsa. The role of the learned Macario is eliminated and replaced by that of the shepherd Juan, the overall effect being to reduce the evident didactic presence. There is a clear distinction between Macario, an erudite and pious hermit, and Bonifacio and Gil, rough and ignorant rustics. Macario is no companion to the shepherds' frivolity, and they do not share his function as expositor of the theme. Although in the Auto o farsa Juan predominates in

the discussion of the Incarnation, his status is not distinguished from that of his fellows. He is one of their number, a shepherd, and is as much a party as they to the comic scene preceding his announcement of the Nativity. Moreover, Pascual and Lloreynte are not entirely ignorant rustics. If Fernández intended to portray them as such by showing their inability to explain the signs they saw in Nature and their refusal to believe Juan's news, he soon glossed over the fact. Instead of solely listening to Juan's deliberations, Pascual and Lloreynte, at first hesitantly and comically, then without reserve, soon become co-expositors of the religious subject. The effect is to reduce the overall tone of didacticism since it is not conveyed by a religious, an instructor, but by comic rustics, whose essential function is to entertain.

It would be unjust to fault the Auto o farsa because Biblical allusions and semi-theological discussions are heard from the lips of shepherds.[18] The practice is conventional and appeared in the first known Spanish play of this type, Encina's Egloga II, even if its effect was mitigated by identifying the shepherds with the Evangelists. Moreover, a reading of the text reveals that Fernández did not employ the convention arbitrarily. The principal "theologian", Juan, is characterized as one capable of enlightening his companions: he has heard the announcement from the angel and has come to tell his comrades about it. The entry of the other shepherds into the discussion of the Incarnation, with their reference to Biblical figures, is gradual. Their first allusions are comic, as of persons unsure of themselves. Pascual, for

example, attempts to remember the name of a prophet:

> El profeta desterrado
> alla enla zona quemado,
> deste no le quedo nada
> enel tintero oluidado
> sin dexar lo solletrado.
> .....
> Do me a Dios que Ysayas
> llamaua aqueste rucio. (Fiii-r)

Their whole-hearted entry into the discussion, Biblical allusions and all, does not really come till after they kneel in adoration and after Pedro Picado's entry and description of the angels, when the subject of the Incarnation is fully established.

It must not be overlooked that these are ambivalent characters, Biblical shepherds presented as contemporary Spanish rustics. Consequently, Biblical allusions have a legitimate place. Charlotte Stern's definition of the Nativity shepherd's ambivalence may again be cited: "He is a realistic-comic type when he expresses himself in Sayagués; his Biblical personality asserts itself when he indulges in Biblical allusions ... or when he raises theological questions". Finally, the Nativity play itself has an ambivalent purpose. In one work it combines instruction, devotion, and entertainment by presenting them through one personage--the rustic, who is both a comic figure and a Biblical shepherd.[19] The combination is no less remarkable, and no less successful than that achieved by the allegorical figures of the auto sacramental.[20]

The relative dates of composition of Fernández's two Christmas plays cannot be decided on the basis of a comparison between them to determine his progress as a dramatist. It could

be argued that the hermit was introduced to give the Christmas play a more solidly instructional foundation and avoid the possible anomaly of using the rustics as the mouthpieces of didacticism;[21] at the same time, in the light of points made above, it could be concluded that the use of rustic personages alone represented an advance in technique, an attempt to reduce the force of the didacticism and resolve problems caused by combining matter intended for both instruction and entertainment.

Having commented on Lucas Fernández's two Christmas compositions, reference can again be made to the critics of his work cited at the beginning of this chapter. They were answered in part and judged as unwarranted; it was asked what Fernández was supposed to have written. As Emilio Cotarelo correctly pointed out ("Juan del Encina y los orígenes...", pp. 111-112), a sure sign of the exhaustion of the liturgical Christmas drama was the lack of further development after the plays by Juan del Encina.[22] Consequently, it may be admitted that Fernández employed "una especie de moldes estéticos" and that his scenes are "prefiguradas de antemano". Analysis of his two Nativity compositions has revealed as much. It can be concluded that "lo mismo nos da Pascual que Lloreynte" and that "no hay caracterización distinta entre Bonifacio y Gil"; but it must be added that a distinction between the personages is not always needed, and, where it is required it is provided in appropriate measure.

The limited subject of the Christmas shepherd play did not permit the establishment of individuality of character and complex

interrelationships among the personages. Individuals are encountered in Encina's eclogues where certain personages are identifiable with real figures and a relationship of antagonism is established between contending personalities. Some of the personages in Fernández's plays are distinguished by a similar individuality, as when they occupy opposite sides in a dispute: thus, there is Bonifacio versus Gil, Bonifacio and Gil versus Macario, Pascual and Lloreynte versus Juan. The relationships and the individuals are simply contrived, but they are in keeping with the kind of plays to which they belong. Moreover, as shown above, there is adequate individuality of character for the personages to be apportioned determined roles in both Lucas Fernández's Christmas plays.

While the "primitive" nature of these plays is accepted, their "primitivism" should not cloud the issue and prevent their being viewed objectively as plays employing certain established and acceptable techniques of composition. It is perfectly feasible to maintain that Fernández's shepherds are not "graciosos", but this is a defect only when such a quality is desired and necessary. It cannot, however, be maintained that Fernández employed the various dramatic devices with an "uso casi abusivo", that he inserted them arbitrarily into his work "en determinados momentos, bien sea para llenar lagunas, bien sea para seguir una corriente general en el teatro de su época, bien sea a causa de la presencia subterránea de Encina". The analysis of the Egloga o farsa and the Auto o farsa has shown that, if not a creator of dramatic devices and situations, Fernández could at least handle those he borrowed.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER III

[1]Other opinions are the following: "The two Christmas plays ... show no advance over the eclogues of Enzina dealing with the same subject. Although their didactic purpose is evident, the comic element introduced in the crude representation of the daily life of the shepherds shows to what extent the spirit of the popular farce had obtruded itself into the religious plays. ... The three secular plays of Lucas Fernández treat themes which we have already found in the early eclogues of Enzina and introduce but few new elements" (Crawford, The Spanish Pastoral Drama, pp. 51-52). "Los caracteres generales del teatro de Lucas Fernández son muy semejantes a los de Juan del Encina, pero en escala inferior, y con cierta exageración en el primero de los defectos del segundo" (Bonilla y San Martín, Las Bacantes,..., p. 108). "Fernández no está oreado por el aire humanístico que respiró Encina; sigue el espíritu medieval, popular, exclusivamente" (Valbuena Prat, Literatura dramática..., p. 35).

[2]For a biography of Lucas Fernández, see Espinosa Maeso, "Ensayo biográfico...". A differing interpretation of Fernández's life is given by Alfredo Hermenegildo in "Nueva interpretación...".

[3]The Auto de la Passion is discussed below (chap. VII).

[4]Writers did, however, seek to dramatize the Passion and Resurrection as they judged fit (see below chap. VII).

[5]In fact, it is somewhat futile to expect originality in the early drama. Dramatists wrote on familiar subjects and attempted to present them in a novel way. Originality must, therefore, only be sought at the level of convention.

[6]Apart from the allusions to Encina's eclogues in other plays of the sixteenth century, the popularity of Encina's Cancioneros is attested by numerous editions. After the first edition in 1496, it was reprinted in 1501, 1505, 1507, 1509, and 1516 (see, Eglogas..., pp. 7-9).

[7]The titles by which Fernández's plays are referred to are adapted from longer title-prologues and have generally become consecrated by usage. Quotation of the plays throughout this study is according to the Academy facsimile of them.

[8]The allusion was first noted by Manuel Cañete, who drew attention to it in the prologue of his edition of the Farsas y églogas (pp. xxxvi-xl). A terminus post quem for the Egloga o farsa is provided by a reference to the Celestina (Dii-r), of which the earliest known edition was printed in 1499.

[9]Marcelo fulfils the same role as Gil Verto in the anonymous Egloga interlocutoria. Although Macario explains the importance of the Incarnation to the shepherds, he does not perform the role of the angel who announced the birth of Christ as Bruce W. Wardropper suggested (Introducción..., p. 169).

[10]See John Lihani, "Lucas Fernández and the Evolution of the Shepherd's Family Pride in the Early Spanish Drama", HR, XXV (1957), 252-263.

[11]See, G. H. Lovett, "The Hermit in Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega", MLJ, XXXV (1951), 340-355.

[12]Fernández's indulgence in humorous blasphemy by parodying the most serious part of his own work was an accepted device. This kind of humour was characteristic of contemporary comedy. (See the Chapter "Medieval Laughter: The Book of Good Love", in Otis H. Green's Spain and the Western Tradition. The Castilian Mind in Literature from 'El Cid' to Calderón, Vol. I, Madison, 1963, pp. 27-71, and, also, Encina's parody of the Office of the Dead in Egloga XIV.)

[13]Reference to the Bible abounded in Egloga II, including allusions to the genealogy of Christ; specific recitation of the prophecies concerning the birth of a Saviour and the prefigurements of Christ in the Old Testament were characteristic of the Procession of Prophets and the old liturgical drama (see Young, The Drama of the Medieval Church, II, chap. XXI, "The Procession of Prophets", pp. 125-171; for liturgical prophet plays in Spain, see Donovan, The Liturgical Drama..., and Gillet, "The 'Memorias' of Felipe Fernández Vallejo...").

[14]The date of the Egloga o farsa could be fixed by a possible reference to the Jubilee Year of 1500 (see n. 8 above). A reference to date the Auto o farsa is lacking, although the terminus ante quem of 1514, the year of printing of the Farsas y églogas, must be accepted. There is no apparent reason for Fernández's meticulous titling of his plays and why he called one Nativity composition Egloga o farsa and the other Auto o farsa (see Bryant, p. 41).

[15]Cf. this device in Encina's Egloga XII, in an Egloga interlocutoria by Diego de Avila, and in a Farsa by Pero López Ranjel—all discussed below in other chapters.

[16]Fernández set the time of day inconsistently. Pascual stated, "Hora se haze de almorzar", at the beginning (Fi-r). Later it is evidently night since Lloreynte refers to the stars, but his reference is belied by Pascual, who immediately refers to the singing of the birds (Fi-v). Fernández was apparently unconcerned for detail.

[17]The angel's announcement of the birth of Christ interrupted the shepherds' games in Egloga IX just as Juan's entry--to make the same announcement--interrupts the games of Pascual and Lloreynte.

[18]Wardropper (Introducción..., p. 169) objected to the play on these grounds.

[19]The shepherd's ambivalent role was perfectly acceptable to contemporary audiences. He was doubtless a recognizable type and an intrinsic part of a popular performance. (See Bryant, pp. 82-83: "Just as Fernández's secular plays reflect the sentimental taste of the final years of the fifteenth century, the two Christmas plays show the popularity of religious themes, a popularity which became even more marked in the following century and formed an important segment of the literature of the Golden Age".)

[20]The allegorical figures of the auto sacramental were an acceptable means of entertaining an audience while presenting the significant doctrines of Christianity (see Wardropper, Introducción..., chap. IX, "La alegoría y los autos sacramentales", pp. 97-107).

[21]Although by accepted convention shepherds could eruditely refer to Scripture, many dramatists attempted to make it acceptable. Thus, Encina identified his shepherds with the Evangelists in Egloga II and totally avoided scriptural references from rustics in Egloga IX.

[22]Writers who followed Encina's manner of dramatizing the Christmas shepherd story could either re-deploy the devices of action bequeathed to them, or expand those devices by introducing further elements of rustic humour. Innovation was possible only when dramatists abandoned the presentation of St. Luke and looked to other sources for plays to commemorate the Nativity.

## Chapter IV

## FIVE NATIVITY COMPOSITIONS

The principal conventions of the early Spanish Christmas shepherd play are accountable from either the works of Juan del Encina or Lucas Fernández. The predominant source of action was the Biblical shepherd story as narrated by St. Luke and dramatized in Egloga IX or the Auto o farsa del nascimiento, but the dramatization of this story conformed to varying patterns. Personages extraneous to the original narrative were introduced, with the result that a play could in part become a kind of theological dialogue: Encina, in Egloga II, portrayed his shepherds as evangelists; Fernández, in the Egloga o farsa, introduced the hermit Macario to lead discussion of the history and theological implications of the Incarnation. Moreover, the potentiality of the shepherds as figures of fun and sources of amusement was realized, even in the context of a devotional play. This accounts for the rustic scenes at the beginning of Egloga IX, the Egloga o farsa, and the Auto o farsa del nascimiento, and explains the comic intrusions in the religious portions of both Nativity compositions by Lucas Fernández. The overall result of popularizing the devices employed by the two Salamancans was to make them conventional, so that, with certain variations, plays discussed in this chapter conform to the patterns of composition they established.

Bartolomé de Torres Naharro's only Nativity composition, the Diálogo del nascimiento and its accompanying Addición del diálogo, is a combination of theological discussion and rustic comedy, but in a measure quite different from that presented by either Juan del Encina or Lucas Fernández. The year Torres Naharro wrote his work is uncertain. Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 37) thought that a reference (ll. 208 ff. of the Diálogo)[1] to the Battle of Ravenna (11 April, 1512) justified dating it between that event and its publication (1517).[2] Gillet, by contrast ("Propalladia"..., IV, pp. 471-472), believed that the same allusion was a clearer reference to victories of the Great Captain at Carignola (28 April, 1503) and Garigliano (28 December, 1503) and thought that the Diálogo and Addición were written between 1505 and 1507, the latter date arrived at on account of Torres Naharro's influence on the Egloga ynterlocutoria by Diego de Avila (1509) (see, below, chap. XI). In either case, the evidence is circumstantial and the date of the work cannot be further verified, although Gillet's arguments are more weighty.

Crawford was certainly mistaken, however, in doubting that the Diálogo and the Addición were performed together: "It might appear that the new part [the Addición] was introduced before the singing of the romance three or four days after Christmas of the same year or later with the object of reproducing, at least, the burlesque spirit of the Boy Bishop" (Spanish Drama..., p. 38).[3] It may well have been that the work was written in stages and perhaps even begun before Torres Naharro set foot in Italy (see, "Propalladia"..., IV, pp. 471-472), but the introito, the Diálogo, and the Addición

in the form in which they are now known were all presented at a single performance in Rome one Christmas Eve. A common performance is envisaged in the introito, which contains (ll. 100-124) an argument to both the Diálogo and the Addición. The word Addición, Gillet noted ("Propalladia"..., IV, p. 550, n. 1), did not necessarily imply a later addition to the original. Performance on Christmas Eve is a justifiable inference from the subject-matter and specific allusions to that occasion (Diálogo, ll. 35-64, 155-157; Addición, ll. 116, 185, 192, et passim) and the place of performance is also alluded to (Diálogo, ll. 181 and 576, et passim). The total work, therefore, represents a single Christmas shepherd play.

The combination of the disparate elements of devotion and amusement is as apparent as in the Nativity plays by Encina and Fernández, but the essential difference of Torres Naharro's work is that he intended to commemorate and not re-enact the Christmas story. His work, when performed one year at the beginning of the sixteenth century, celebrated a particular Christmas in Rome. Consequently, shepherds are included in the work principally as a source of amusement, not to re-enact the Nativity story. In this respect, as Dr. Gillet saw, "the Diálogo's devout and pastoral atmosphere is not so much the atmosphere of Encina as that of Lucas Fernández, with whose Egloga o farsa del nascimiento the Diálogo can be best compared" ("Propalladia"..., IV, p. 471).[4] The comparison is valid, for the comic rustics Bonifacio and Gil in the Egloga o farsa are in part disassociated from the original

Biblical story and used as a source of humour.[5] Moreover, there is a parallel in the Diálogo with Fernández's introduction of the hermit Macario.

Macario's presence in the Egloga o farsa permitted Fernández to discuss the history and significance of the Incarnation freely; Torres Naharro could achieve the same effect by presenting a dialogue between Patrispano and Betiseo, two pilgrims newly arrived in Rome. Instead of re-enacting the Biblical story, both it and the legends associated with it are narrated by Patrispano (see above n. 4), who answers a series of questions put to him by Betiseo and indirectly sermonizes the audience on the Trinity, the Fall, the Inmaculate Conception, and the Redemption (see "Propalladia"..., IV, pp. 554-556).[6] In addition, Torres Naharro could refer to the contemporary scene and comment on topical events. Both Patrispano and Betiseo are Spaniards (see ll. 67 and 170) so that, as they narrate their respective experiences, they comment (ll. 170-244) on the prevailing political situation and provide news from home.[7] At the same time, as visitors to the Eternal City, they tell (ll. 560-592) what they expect to see and do there.

Miss Patt ("The Development of the Christmas Play...", p. 152) was critical of Torres Naharro's Nativity piece: "This Diálogo is, of course, a dialogue and not a play; there is no action whatever. If this procedure fails to arouse interest, at least it allows the presentation of an abundance of elements within a relatively small space". Her view is too modern, however. Had she seen the

Diálogo as a member of Torres Naharro's audience, she would have recognized that he chose the dialogue form precisely in order to include so many subjects. The Diálogo is a sort of Christmas "news-round-up" and was relevant to a particular audience at a particular time and place--the Spanish community (see above n. 7) in Rome at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Although the discussion of topical politics has lost its immediate relevance it was of interest to the audience who first heard it. Moreover, this discussion is associated to the Christmas occasion. Gillet noted ("Propalladia"..., IV, p. 554, n. 1) that "the Diálogo is a combination of a Christmas and a political peace play, like Francisco de Madrid's Egloga (1494), on the invasion of Italy by Charles VIII of France and other plays" (see below chap. VI). After Betiseo has narrated (ll. 190-244) an account of the current political situation and the state of war in Europe, Patrispano is induced to lament that even Christians cannot live in peace after the example of Christ, a reflection which leads him to narrate the Christmas story (ll. 245-314).

A consistent feature of early Spanish Christmas plays was the inclusion of shepherds intended, even as comic rustics, to represent Biblical counterparts. The Diálogo del nascimiento and its Addición are preceded by an introito spoken by a rustic who is not, however, representative of the Biblical shepherds, but whose appearance can be accounted for with several reasons. He introduces the performance and recites an outline of the content of both the Diálogo and the Addición. He is an evolved version of the shepherd

who addressed the audience at the beginning of Encina's Egloga I, and of Bonifacio, who began Fernández's Egloga o farsa by speaking a comic monologue.[8] Above all, the shepherd was already a comic figure associated with the drama to the extent that plays were not written at this time in which he did not appear. The shepherd had become the hallmark of drama.

The distinguishing factor between Torres Naharro's introito speaker and those introduced in plays by Encina and Fernández is that the first named is not a part of the performance he introduces and the introito he speaks is considerably more salacious than anything either of the Salamancans included in their works. The rustic addresses the audience first, telling them to leave their donkeys tied at the door and warning "las moças" not to steal the fruit (ll. 1-19). He then launches into a somewhat indecent narration of his courtship and eventual betrothal to "la sobrina de Alonso Llarado" (ll. 20-99), an episode undoubtedly derived from a long established Fescennine tradition.[9] Only after this does he remember his supposed task and recite the argument to the performance (ll. 100-129). In many respects this introito is a foretaste of things to come. Torres Naharro had one for each of his plays, most of them characterized by a narration of a similar indecency, and the fashion was adopted by writers who imitated his works.[10] The use of a rustic to speak an introductory monologue, however, points to a later time when the shepherd was still the hallmark of drama, but was introduced because his presence was expected rather than demanded by the subject of the play (see

below chap. V).

Shepherds also appear in the third section of Torres Naharro's performance, the Addición del diálogo, but are there more identifiable with the occasion of presentation. When explaining the relationship of this part to the earlier Diálogo, Beatrice Patt did not take all aspects of the Christmas shepherd play into account. Her opinion ("The Development of the Christmas Play...", p. 154) that the "Addición seems to bear little relation to the serious Diálogo" resulted from a consideration of subject-matter alone: "The mention of the romance and the reappearance of Betiseo and Patristano show that the two are not unrelated, but they certainly do not correspond in general tone". Miss Patt overlooked the consistent combination in Nativity drama of serious devotion and rustic frivolity, the latter frequently unrelated to the religious occasion. The feature was a characteristic of Encina's Egloga IX, the anonymous Egloga interlocutoria, and Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento. A comparison with Fernández's play is, moreover, particularly apposite because he and Torres Naharro employed a similar brand of humour. Just as Fernández used Bonifacio and Gil as a source of burlesque comedy (see above chap. III), Torres Naharro introduced Garrapata and Herrando to parody the dialogue between Patrispano and Betiseo.

The arrival and subsequent behaviour of the two shepherds as Betiseo and Patrispano are about to depart is anticipated in the introito:

Mas ya que se yrán,
no sé qué pastores a ellos saldrán,
al menos Herrando con vn Garrapata,
qu'el vno presume de gran sacristán
y ell otro también de medio poyata. (ll. 115-119)

Displaying his own wit, Herrando initiates a reasonably serious bout of questions and answers concerning the Nativity, just as Betiseo posed theological questions to Patrispano in the Diálogo. Herrando's replies, however, are well-seasoned with humour and eventually degenerate to the level of frivolous repartee, irrelevant to the Nativity and a mockery of religion:

Garrapata: .....
quando acá moraua Dios,
¿quál hu su mayor cordura?
Patrispano: Ser quien era.
Herrando: Mas quando al cielo subiera,
hu gran seso y anteresse
lleuar tras sí la escalera,
porque otro allá no subiesse.
Betiseo: Gran doctor.
Herrando: Dezí vos, padre señor,
agudillo como huso:
¿Quál hu el peligro mayor
en que Dios acá se puso?
Betiseo: El madero.
Herrando: ¡Hideputa, y qué romero!
Mas peligro hu, a la crara,
quando se hizo cordero
si algun lobo lo topara. (ll. 148-164)

When the subject of the Nativity is again introduced on Garrapata's suggestion,

Ea, ea,
vámonos cara ell aldea
a ver la missa del gallo, (ll. 185-187)

it is met with Herrando's recitation (ll. 195-279) of scandalously irreverent pullas directed at a range of ecclesiastical officials. The apparent blasphemy is taken even further in the final part of the Addición, when a repetition of the romance "Triste estaua el

padre Adam", sung at the end of the Diálogo is suggested by Betiseo. Patrispano's recommendation of the hymn "Ave Maris Stella" is accepted, but its singing is outrageously burlesqued as Herrando accompanies Patrispano's Latin version with another in doggerel Romance:

Patrispano: Celorum via,
nobilis est Maria.
Herrando: Zagales bía,
qu'en Nápoles es María.
Patrispano: Sumens illud aue.
Herrando: Soncas como sabe.
Patrispano: Gabrielis ore.
Herrando: La miel y el arrope.
Patrispano: Funda nos in pace.
Herrando: Damos buena parte.
Patrispano: Mutans Eve nomen.
Herrando: Mil hueuos por hombre,
celorum via. (ll. 304-316)

The Addición contains, therefore, three sections, each burlesque: the question and answer session, the sacreligious pullas, and the parody of the "Ave Maris Stella". Through their juxtaposition with the Diálogo and the introito Torres Naharro presented a more extreme combination of the sacred and the profane than has so far been seen in the early drama; but his blasphemous humour was not beyond either the bounds of propriety,[11] or the conventions of the Christmas shepherd play. The introito, Diálogo, and Addición must be taken as a single work. In the words of Otis. H. Green, it was "a carefully planned triptych: boisterous fun--sincere devotion--boisterous fun" ("Propalladia"..., IV, p. 559). Hence, Miss Patt's conclusion about the Diálogo alone is partially incorrect. She wrote that "although many critics call this a primitive work in the Encina tradition, we are inclined to

think it looks ahead to the more serious and allegorical works of the middle sixteenth century" ("The Development of the Christmas Play...", p. 152), but the essential point is that the three parts of Torres Naharro's work together reflect the past and future development of the Christmas shepherd play. Like Encina and Fernández, Torres Naharro sought to entertain his audience and give them cause for devotion, and, like Fernández in particular (in the Egloga o farsa), he presented a theological discussion combined with burlesque rustic humour. At the same time, however, Torres Naharro abandoned the dramatization of St. Luke's Christmas story. His Diálogo and Addición commemorate the Nativity but do not re-enact it; his shepherds, unlike those in the plays by Encina and Fernández, are not Biblical figures and, only incidentally related to his central subject, serve principally as a source of comedy. Further changes of mood in the Nativity plays of the early sixteenth century are observed during the discussion of four more works in this chapter.

The five dramatic eclogues of Pedro Manuel de Urrea published in an edition of his Cancionero (Toledo, 1516), were largely unknown till they were edited by Eugenio Asensio in 1950.[12] Since two earlier editions of Urrea's Cancionero (1513 and 1514) did not contain the eclogues, they were probably written between 1514 and 1516. They are, therefore, among the earliest dramatic compositions of the sixteenth century.

The fifth eclogue in Asensio's edition is a short Nativity piece entitled Egloga sobre el nascimiento de nuestro saluador Jesu Christo. Asensio wrote of it in his introduction (p.xli):

"La máscara pastoril ha caído y la égloga se reviste de una solemnidad ritual". His description is apt, as the first part of the argumento which introduces the eclogue shows:

> Los quatro euangelistas entrarán primero. Luego entra San Juan y después Lucas y Mattheo y Marco. Cada cual lleuará en la mano pintada en vn papel su figura para ser conoscidos: San Juan, vn Aguyla; San Lucas, vn Toro; San Mattheo, vn Angel; San Marco, vn León. Y porque cada vno habló de su manera de lengua differenciados y vinieron a dezir todos vna cosa, por mostrar que era mucho de Dios, assí tambien hablan aquí cada qual de su arte: vno en prosa, otro en metro, vno de arte real, otro de arte mayor. (p. 65)

There is no movement, nor any communication between the four speakers. The scene is a tableau presenting the Evangelists, who are distinguished by the symbols of their gospels and the different forms of their speech.[13] This was conceivably derived from Encina's Egloga II, as Eugenio Asensio suggested: "La inspiración deriva a las claras de la segunda égloga de Juan del Encina, que había sacado a los cuatro evangelistas en disfraz de pastores" (p. xli). In the first part of his eclogue, however, Urrea did not identify the Evangelists with the Biblical shepherds and portray them as contemporary rustics.

The second half of Urrea's eclogue is as static as the first:

> Y después que todos quatro abrán hablado sobre el nascimiento de nuestro saluador, entra San Pedro con las llaues del paraýso y razonando con ellos hará que se pongan todos quatro en cruz. Y él se porná en medio dellos. Y loando el nascimiento de nuestro redemptor, después de auer muchas razones en loor del hijo de Dios, dirán que quieren yr a verle. Y yrse an todos cinco cantando el villancico que está al cabo. (p. 65)

Even when St. Peter is introduced and a kind of dialogue is begun,[14] the eclogue retains the quality of a tableau. St. Peter,

identified by the keys of Paradise, leads the dialogue. He questions the Evangelists in turn and induces them to confirm the birth of a Saviour, to praise the Virgin, and, finally, to journey to Bethlehem to the tune of a villancico. Consequently, the atmosphere of spontaneous conversation characteristic of Encina's Egloga II is lacking. There is solely St. Peter's address to each of the Evangelists, who stand around him in the form of a cross and reply.[15]

With its concluding villancico and presentation of the four Evangelists, who eventually journey to Bethlehem to visit the Christ, Urrea's eclogue is in the tradition of Encina's Christmas shepherd plays, although it lacks the pastoral tone. The Evangelists do go to Bethlehem, but there is no indication that they are intended to represent either contemporary rustics or Biblical shepherds. The overall tone of the work is consequently didactic rather than popular; it is a commemoration rather than a re-enactment of Christmas and, like Torres Naharro's Diálogo, foreshadows the time when the Biblical shepherds derived from St. Luke were supplanted as the central figures of the Christmas plays.

The impression must not be created, however, that shepherds were eventually effaced from the Spanish Nativity plays. At the end of the sixteenth century shepherds, intended to represent their Biblical counterparts, appeared in Christmas performances, even when the central topic was an allegorical action (see below chap. V). What happened was that it was found nc longer necessary to adhere solely to the traditional story. The shepherds remained, therefore, but they could be joined by personages of a

non-scriptural origin, or become involved in theological discussions about the Incarnation and Redemption, developments already envisaged in plays of Juan del Encina and Lucas Fernández. Of this type, a shepherd play with theological discussion, is the Egloga en loor de la Natividad de Nuestro Señor by Fernán López de Yanguas.

Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 38), Gillet ("Propalladia"..., IV, p. 37, n. 2), and Wardropper (Introducción..., p. 176) all wrote that this play was finished before 1518, but none explained the date, as Yanguas' most recent editor, Fernando González Ollé, remarked.[16] On the other hand, without a colophon on the earliest known edition of the work, 1518 can be accepted as the approximate year of its composition on the basis of López de Yanguas' other dramatic works.[17]

For the most part, the eclogue is a didactic presentation of the Christmas story and lacks the rustic or comic elements found in Encina's Egloga IX or Fernández's two Nativity plays. The content of the Egloga en loor de la Natividad, summarized by González Ollé, is as follows:

> Uno a uno van apareciendo los cuatro pastores, tañendo instrumentos musicales. Todos manifiestan su alegría por el nacimiento de Cristo y cuentan las señales extraordinarias que han tenido de él, especialmente la visión de ángeles. Comentan el suceso en un diálogo formado principalmente por referencias a personas y hechos del Antiguo Testamento, que se mezclan con algunas alusiones mitológicas, hasta que uno de los pastores, Mingo, más enterado que sus compañeros, asume el papel de narrador para referir la genealogía de Cristo, según el texto de San Mateo. Prosigue la conversación sobre los motivos de la Redención, también con citas mitológicas, y acuerdan llevar dones al Niño. Antes, en varias estrofas, hay un elogio de su Madre, hasta que

> llegan ante ella y le presentan sus regalos, que la propia Virgen les agradece en una breve intervención. Termina la obra con un villancico que cantan y bailan los pastores. (pp. xxxi-xxxii)

The quality of Yanguas' eclogue is clear from this statement of its content. The religious subject is introduced at the beginning; there are no major deviations away from it and no preoccupation with secular interests. In spite of this, if Yanguas intended to instruct by outlining the theological significance of the Nativity, he also realized the need to lighten his didacticism.

The eclogue begins ebuliently as the shepherds enter, each playing an instrument and singing of the joy occasioned by Christ's birth. The first speech, spoken by Mingo Sabido, is representative of the delight felt by all four shepherds:

> ¡Las gaitas, guitarras, rabés repiquemos
> y las churumbellas muy huerte tangamos!
> ¡Cordojos, renzillas de nos despidamos
> y brincos, corcovos y saltos echemos!
> ¡Los hatos y migas y burras dejemos,
> quitemos las tristes capillas de nos!
> ¡Que nuevas hay, nuevas, que es nacido Dios!
> ¡Gil Pata, Gil Pata, ven, ven, y bailemos!
> (ll. 1-8)

The <u>villancico</u> sung at the conclusion is characterized by the same liveliness. The song, however, is not the conventional carol honouring the Nativity and summarizing its theological implications; it is concerned with the shepherds' joyful dance:

> Demos çapatetas, saltos,
> cada cual con su respingo,
> haz una vuelta tu, Mingo,
> vayan los corcovos altos.
> ¡Passo, passo! ¿Qué es carillo?
> Ten crianza,
> no desconciertes la dança
> por servir a este chiquillo. (ll. 484-491)[18]

During the play itself the shepherds are more subdued and intent on learning about the Saviour. Their characterization as shepherds, derived from earlier Nativity eclogues and St. Luke, is principally a device permitting a serious discussion of the Incarnation, but is evident in their Sayagués speech and their references to the Nativity in terms of their rustic life (ll, 1-64). Their origin is also recalled by their songs and dances, by their country arithmetic when totalling Christ's ancestors with beans (ll. 256-271),[19] and by the humble gifts they present to the Virgin and Child (ll. 408-439).[20] But López de Yanguas did not elaborate these rustic elements.

The true purpose of his eclogue is discernible from marginal notes, giving chapter and verse of Biblical references, and from the occasional display of classical knowledge.[21] Yanguas adapted both the traditional shepherd and the customary characterization of the shepherd in Nativity drama, but emphasized the devotional and didactic aspects. Consequently, there is little to distinguish the four shepherds as individuals, and none of the interplay between humorous rustic activities and theological discussion characteristic of the Nativity plays by Encina and Fernández. It may just be remarked in passing that Mingo Sabido plays a role similar to that performed by Fernández's Juan and Macario by answering his companions' questions and explaining the events which confounded them (see Appendix B, s.v. "Friends, advisors, and preceptors"). In the remaining two plays discussed in this chapter the instructional, or devotional, element is still prominent, but so also is that of secular entertainment.

Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 39) had little to say about the first of these two: "The Farsa nuevamente trobada by Fernando Díaz shows no advance over the Christmas plays of Encina and Fernández. Composed like the aforementioned in coplas de arte mayor, it presents the conventional quarrel between shepherds, an angel who explains the Redemption, the gifts at the manger, and a song in conclusion. Preserved in an edition of 1554, it must have been written in 1520 or before".[22]

The action of the Farsa juxtaposes a comic rustic scene with the Nativity story; the former, not quite approaching the grossness of Torres Naharro's introitos, was enough to convince Eugen Kohler of the degeneration of the Christmas play.[23] The Farsa begins with a monologue from the shepherd Juan Casado, who describes the enormity of his girth, the capacity of his appetite, and his somewhat pugilistic relationship with the shepherdess Toribuela. With the entry of Antón Bodigo an argument begins, a contest of pullas[24] in which the two shepherds wish every kind of physical affliction on each other, the following being a representative example:

Juan: Falten te los ojos y dientes y boca,
mexillas, pestañas, cejas y oydos.
Todos tus miembros esten descosidos;
abundes en daño y holgança muy poca.
Antón: ¡Do al diabro llengua tan loca!
Seca la tengas y a un lado pegado;
quiças que por pago de tanta porrada,
te avré de frocar muy bien essa coca. (ll. 57-64)

At the end of it they come to blows, but peace is quickly restored with the entry of a third shepherd, Pero Grullor. Pero invites the contending pair to shake hands and to return home. Just as they are leaving they see the angels in the sky and one approaching them.

The comic rustic scene at the beginning of the Farsa has nothing to do with what follows. It was a somewhat gratuitous piece of comedy, a prelude without purpose to the religious subject. Fernando Díaz was probably guided by the traditional division of subject-matter in the Nativity drama, apparent from Encina's Egloga IX onward. He made no attempt, however, at uniting the rustic scene with the discussion of the Nativity. Nevertheless, the sudden entry of the angel, ending the activities of the shepherds, is an appropriate dramatization of the Christmas story, a point made earlier in reference to Egloga IX. The apparent anomaly of Fernando Díaz's Farsa is the linking of so crude a rustic scene to a piece seemingly intended as a devotional and instructional performance.[25]

The comic tone introduced through Juan's monologue and the contest of pullas is not maintained in the rest of the Farsa. It disappears with the angel's announcement. Then the shepherds adopt the role of rustics in need of enlightenment, while the angel fulfils the function of the expositor of the religious subject. Consequently, the action has the familiar pattern of question and answer, by which the significance and circumstances of the Incarnation are explained.[26] The angel speaks most of the lines, but the three shepherds are entirely incorporated into the exposition of the religious subject by providing the questions as the motivation for the angel's discourse. In certain respects the Farsa is similar to the Christmas eclogue by López de Yanguas. Fernando Díaz's rustics give speeches of praise and are portrayed

in an adoration scene (ll. 323-353). Moreover, there is one shepherd who stands above his fellows. This is Pero Grullor, the peacemaker in the comic introduction and the leader in the questioning of the angel.

Kohler was offended by the beginning of the work and considered it symptomatic of the degeneration in the Christmas play in general. Certainly the first part of the Farsa is disconnected from the religious subject; the play undergoes a complete change in spirit, and the conclusion reflects a tone of popular devotion completely excluding the earlier comic atmosphere. Rather than looking at the work as a mark of a degenerate form, however, the Farsa can be viewed as a development in the nature of Nativity drama. Earlier dramatists took pains to combine the sacred and profane elements. With the Farsa by Fernando Díaz, on the other hand, the juxtaposition of the two elements had become conventional to the extent that it was no longer necessary to reconcile them. This conclusion is supported by Torres Naharro's Diálogo del nascimiento and Addición del diálogo. Once the shepherds had been introduced as comic figures, there were no limits to the lengths that dramatists could go. The Biblical shepherd had not degenerated, he had progressed, for his behaviour was no longer dictated by scriptural sources.

The degree of evolution may be judged from the last play discussed in this chapter, the Farsa a honor y reverencia del Nascimiento de Nuestro Redemptor Jesuchristo y de la Virgen gloriosa madre suya by Pero López Ranjel. If 1530, the year this

work was printed, was also the year it was written, then it is a much later work than the majority of Nativity compositions discussed in this chapter. As commentators have remarked, however, López Ranjel's work evidently belongs to the early group of Christmas plays regardless of its date of composition. Joseph E. Gillet, the modern editor of the Farsa, observed: "The play, with its embryonic introito, its villancicos, its pastoral tone and its general use of stock incidents, evidently belongs to the school of Encina, from whom a line or two have been actually borrowed".[27] Beatrice P. Patt described it as follows: "A rather conventional shepherd play, it seems to continue the tradition of Encina and Lucas Fernández. ... As in some of the other plays, one shepherd is singled out to play the part of preceptor. To make up for the rather scanty Biblical material, Ranjel makes full use of stock comic devices: the sleepiness of one of the shepherds, the lost burra, the gorging scene, the incantation, and the scene with the salvaje" ("The Development of the Christmas Play...", p. 180).

Miss Patt's description emphasizes the diversity of subject-matter in the Farsa, in fact an unusual combination of the sacred and the profane. The three sections of the Farsa each concludes with a villancico and each contains both religious and secular interests. It is almost as if there were three plays in one, for each section follows a pattern similar to that encountered in individual plays: rustic activities--the Nativity--a villancico.

The personages are all shepherds and there is no "learned"

character of different standing given the task of explaining the significance of the Incarnation. This role is performed by the shepherd Juan, just as Mingo Sabido performed it in the Christmas eclogue by López de Yanguas.[28] Juan begins the Farsa by eulogizing the Virgin, and he receives the news of Christ's birth from an angel; it is Juan who informs his companions of the news and they ask him about its significance, constantly referring to him as one more knowledgeable than they (see ll. 57-60, 355-356, 421-422, 448-449, et passim). According this distinction to one shepherd has precedent (see n. 28), but López Ranjel appears to have had the Juan of Encina's eclogues in mind. Domingo asks Juan,

> Sabes tu ya mas que vn crego
> que dize el fa, mi, re, vt.
> Dime, Juan, por tu salud,
> ¿quando huste palaciego? (ll. 57-60)[29]

Apart from this one distinguishing feature in the shepherd Juan, the rustics are much of a kind and appear in a series of familiar actions. Having heard the news of the Nativity, Juan awakens his sleeping friend Domingo and shares it with him. The action recalls the awakening of Lloreynte by Pascual in Lucas Fernández's Auto o farsa del nascimiento and serves the same purpose as a means of introducing another personage into the action. The entry of Bras, a third shepherd, is also executed in a conventional way: Domingo calls to him and he responds to the summons. A villancico is sung in praise of the new-born Child and the first section of the play is thereby ended.

The second section of the Farsa begins with a completely new topic. A fourth shepherd, Benito, enters to enquire after his lost

donkeys. None of the other rustics can help him and a futile discussion of Benito's loss ensues. Finally, when Benito is asked about the news he has heard while searching for his lost animal, the subject of the Nativity is reintroduced. This conversation dwells mainly on the merits of the Virgin and concludes with a villancico sung in her praise.

At the beginning of the third section the shepherds return to their personal affairs. They prepare a meal and sit down to eat. Juan's invitation,

> Hincarancho, hincarancho,
> comamos a muerde y sorue
> hasta que este lleno el pancho;
> vno a otro no se estorue, (ll. 261-264)

and the business of passing around the drink are close parallels of a passage and a piece of action in Juan del Encina's Egloga VI.[30] The shepherds' meal is of short duration, however, interrupted by the unexpected arrival of a salvaje, a figure for whom there is no precedent in the earlier Nativity drama. The only other early Spanish play in which a salvaje appears is the Coplas de la doncella, el pastor y el salvaje.[31] Without suggesting a connection, there is a similarity with the Coplas in the manner of the salvaje's entry, his description of himself as a "melancholy savage", and the shepherds' flight for safety.[32] In López Ranjel's Farsa Juan, the leader of the rustic group, faces the wildman. He conjures the salvaje to explain his pitiful state, but succeeds only in exciting the madness of the creature, who departs after a brief exchange of insults.

Whatever the salvaje's purpose, his appearance facilitates a

return to the Nativity. Juan recalls his companions and, answering their question as to who the salvaje might have been, suggests,

> La serpenta cuydo quera
> que engaño con la manҫana
> a nuestra primera madre. (ll. 357-359)

The suggestion provides a convenient entry for the discussion of the Nativity and the shepherds' subsequent decision to go to Bethlehem to pay homage and offer gifts to the Child. The third section, and the entire Farsa, is then concluded with two villancicos, the first sung by the shepherds while on their way to Bethlehem, the second after a scene of adoration--just as the two villancicos at the conclusion to Lucas Fernández's Auto o farsa del nascimiento.

López Ranjel's play has an overall structural pattern, alternating between the religious and secular subjects, but the unity of the piece is one of intention. The overriding motive in the religious portions of the play is devotion and praise of the Virgin: this motive is included in the title of the work; the Farsa begins with praise of Mary (ll. 1-16); the angel's announcement of the Nativity is in the terms of the Annunciation, the Ave Maria (ll. 25-36); when the shepherds discuss the Nativity they emphasize Christ's Mother (ll. 184-228); of the four villancicos sung in the course of the work, three are related to the Virgin; finally, Juan addresses a special "Copla a nuestra señora" (ll. 470-473) in the adoration scene at the end of the work. That the author built his play around the devotion and praise of the

Virgin is not to be doubted, for it provides a unifying and consistent motif to which attention continually returns.

The Farsa by López Ranjel represents a stage in the evolution of the Nativity play. The personages are "stock" types, the incidents in which they are portrayed are derived from conventional devices. It would seem that Christmas drama had already passed its peak and that further originality could only be achieved by ringing the changes of a technique that had already been exhausted. It must be stressed, however, that, within the undeniable imitativeness of the early Spanish dramatists, there is an appreciable degree of invention: it is as if novelty could be achieved in the re-combination of standard elements with different emphasis and variation. Moreover, if López Ranjel's play is illustrative of the stagnation which had overtaken the genre, it also shows the extent to which sacred and profane subjects could be combined, since it was possible to oscillate almost arbitrarily between them. The problems of inconsistency arising from the union of these disparate elements are completely overlooked. Although imitative works, and perhaps inferior in quality because of it, the writers of the Nativity plays discussed in this chapter grasped the essence of what Encina and Fernández sought: the complete fusion of the disparate elements of instruction, devotion and entertainment. They recognized what Encina had already envisaged with his Eglogas I and II: that dramatization of the traditional shepherd story was not the sole subject fit for a Nativity performance and that shepherds could appear in many roles in addition to their Biblical guises.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

[1]All quotations are according to the text in "Propalladia"..., I, pp. 261-292.

[2]Menéndez y Pelayo (Estudios y discursos, II, ed. cit., p. 332) was of the same opinion.

[3]See, also, Crawford, "Note on the Boy Bishop in Spain", RR, XII (1921), 146-154.

[4]Gillet continues in this vein: "The hermit Macario, explaining the Immaculate Conception and the Incarnation, seems to have been the model for Torres Naharro's Patrispano. Moreover, the introito of the Egloga [o farsa] seems to mark a stage of development leading directly to the typical Naharresque introito of the Diálogo". Otis H. Green, who completed the last volume of Gillet's work, contradicted him, however: "Torres Naharro was a pioneer in making the Christmas eclogue largely theological and discursive. But for his example, Lucas Fernández probably would not have introduced into his Egloga o farsa del nascimiento the hermit Macario, who comes upon the shepherds Bonifacio and Gil and enlightens them concerning the Redemption" ("Propalladia"..., IV, p. 561). Green's view is also inconsistent with proposed dates. If Fernández's Egloga o farsa was written c. 1500 (see above chap. III) he could not have been influenced by Torres Naharro, whose Propalladia was not published till 1517, three years after the Farsas y églogas.

[5]The shepherds in Fernández's other Nativity play, the Auto o farsa del nascimiento, are, of course, of Biblical origin and although a source of comedy are used to convey the central topic of the Incarnation.

[6]Gillet's notes to his edition of Torres Naharro's Nativity piece ("Propalladia"..., III, pp. 158-221) are indispensable.

[7]The discussion of news from Spain is one argument in favour of the conclusion that the work was performed for the Spanish community in Rome (see, also, "Propalladia"..., III, p. 162, l. 113, and pp. 192-193, l. 561).

[8]See above n. 4, and Meredith, "Introito" and "Loa"..., pp. 7-24.

[9]This tradition was particularly associated with wedding and betrothal ceremonies, in part the subject of the introito speaker's monologue. See Appendix B, s.v. "Fescennine tradition", and Otis H. Green, "A Wedding Introito by Francisco de Aldana (1537-1578)", HR, XXXI (1963), 8-21.

[10]For a study of the introito of Torres Naharro and his imitators, see Meredith, "Introito" and "Loa"..., pp. 25-56.

[11]Green wrote on this subject ("Propalladia"..., IV, pp. 559-560), "That fun and devotion went hand in hand in the Middle Ages (and in mitigated form even after Trent) is a well known historical fact. This was true not only in Christendom but also in Islam and among the Jews. Indeed, so essentially human is the desire and need for relief from the awe of the sacred that the parody- and burlesquing of rites, even the insulting of holy personages and the wilful defiling of sacred objects or places has been characteristic of all religions, the outrageousness of the apparent disrespect being proportional to the intensity of the awareness of sanctity". Cf. Green, "On Juan Ruiz's Parody of the Canonical Hours", HR, XXVI (1958), 12-34.

[12]Cancionero de todas las obras de Pedro Manuel de Urrea, Toledo, 1516. The history and content of the Cancionero are described by Eugenio Asensio in his introduction to the unknown dramatic eclogues and poems (Eglogas dramáticas..., pp. xi-lii).

[13]As in Encina's Egloga II (see above chap. II, n. 28), Urrea identified the Evangelists by the content of their speeches. Thus, for example, Juan dwells on the theological aspects of the Incarnation and Lucas refers to the adoration of the shepherd.

[14]Eugenio Asensio suggested (p. xli) that St. Peter's appearance was derived from Encina's Egloga II and the lines (ll. 95-96) spoken by Juan: "Y despues ha de dexar / a Pedro nuestro carillo".

[15]If the positioning of the Evangelists in the form of a cross is symbolic of the Crucifixion, the point is not emphasized.

[16]Fernán López de Yanguas, Obras dramáticas, CC 162, Madrid, 1967, p. xxxi. The year 1518 probably derives from Eugen Kohler, Sieben spanische..., p. 155. All references to López de Yanguas' plays are according to the edition by González Ollé.

[17]See the bibliography of López de Yanguas' dramatic compositions compiled by González Ollé, pp. xxii-xxvi, and the study of these works, pp. xxxi-lxi.

[18]The importance of music in Yanguas' eclogue and as a device in the Nativity drama was emphasized by Kohler: "Fügt man hinzu, dass sämtliche Hirten auf Instrumenten spielend eingeführt werden, so kann man über den Charakter des Stückes nicht im Zweifel sein: es war ein religiöses Singspiel, gleich den religiösen Eklogen Encinas und Fernandez', wo die Musik, wie wir gesehen haben, ebenfalls eine grosse Rolle spielte" (Sieben spanische..., p. 155). In the earliest of the Nativity shepherd compositions, Iñigo de Mendoza's Vita Christi (Zamora, 1482), the rustics reacted with

singing and dancing.

[19]Allusion to the ancestry of Christ was a commonplace of the Nativity drama. It figured in Encina's Egloga II and Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento. Yanguas' use of this device, however, was the first time Christ's genealogy was given entirely (see Gillet, "Propalladia"..., IV, p. 37, n. 2).

[20]This is the first eclogue discussed in this study containing an adoration scene. It is not, however, the earliest. Gil Vicente's Auto pastoril castellano and Auto de la Sibila Casandra both contained a similar scene (see below chap. V).

[21]See for example, ll. 113-120, 287-299, and 312-319. These allusions are all employed to describe Hell and the Devil.

[22]The year 1520 is derived from Kohler (Sieben spanische..., p. 181), who arrived at it on the basis of a comparison with the Nativity eclogues of the early sixteenth century. There is no other source for a definite date.

[23]"Auffallend ist die breit ausgesponnene burleske Einleitung des religiösen Stückes, in der diesmal der Dichter nicht einmal vor einer Prügelszene zurückschreckt: Ein Zeichen der Vergröberung und Verrohung des religiösen Schauspiels und der Geschmacklosigkeit des Dichters, der so heterogene Elemente vereinigen, und des Publikums, das daren Gefallen finden konnte" (Sieben spanische..., p. 181). References to the text of the Farsa are according to Kohler's edition (Sieben spanische..., pp. 317-328).

[24]The presentation of the argumentative shepherd is a recurrent device in the early Spanish drama (see Appendix B, s.v. "Argument"). For the contest of pullas, see Crawford, "Echarse pullas...".

[25]For an unexplained reason, Kohler was convinced that the Farsa would have been performed in a church (Sieben spanische..., p. 181).

[26]Cf. Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento, the anonymous Egloga interlocutoria, Torres Naharro's Diálogo, etc.

[27]"Perolópez Ranjel, Farsa a honor y reuerencia del glorioso Nacimiento (Early Sixteenth Century)", PMLA, XLI (1926), p. 860. All references to the text of the play are according to Gillet's edition.

[28]Compare also the shepherd Juan in Lucas Fernández's Auto o farsa del nascimiento and the role of Pero Grullor in Fernando

Díaz's Farsa.

[29]The line "¿quando huste palaciego?" recalls the argument between Juan and Mateo in Encina's Egloga I (see, also, the begining of the anonymous Egloga interlocutoria). Encina's ability as a musician was referred to in Egloga IX when Juan alluded to his application for the position of the position of cantor at the Cathedral of Salamanca. The influence of Encina's work is also found in López Ranjel's Farsa at the beginning of the final villancico, where the lines "Huyha, huyho, pues nascio / el quel mundo redimio" (ll. 453-454) recall those used as the refrain in the villancico at the end of Encina's Egloga II.

[30]Ll. 262 and 264 are almost word for word ll. 163-164 of Encina's Egloga VI (see, also, Appendix B, s.v. "Food").

[31]The Coplas have been attributed to Lucas Fernández and were therefore included by Emilio Cotarelo as an appendix to the Academy facsimile of the Farsas y églogas.

[32]There is, however, a considerable difference between the situation of the Coplas and that of the Farsa since the salvaje in the former turns out to be quite tame (see below chap. X).

## Chapter V

## GIL VICENTE

Notwithstanding that he was a Portuguese, Gil Vicente is an important figure in the early history of the drama in Spain. His Castilian Nativity plays, the only plays of his discussed in this study,[1] were derived from the works of Castilian dramatists. Vicente employed the same devices of action and characterization so fundamental to the Nativity compositions of his contemporaries, but in doing so he surpassed them. Consequently, Vicente's plays are discussed out of their chronological position in order to facilitate a comparison with the works of other dramatists.

The Auto de la visitación, the work with which Vicente made his début as a dramatist, is not a religious composition, but is a Nativity play by association. Since it was performed to celebrate the birth of a prince and contains the devices employed in the Nativity drama, it may serve as a point of departure for a study of Vicente's Christmas shepherd plays.

In the introduction to his edition of Vicente's Castilian plays Thomas R. Hart described the circumstances of presentation as follows: "El Auto de la visitación fue recitado por el propio dramaturgo en el palacio de la Alcáçova, en Lisboa, la noche del 7 de junio de 1502, con motivo del nacimiento del príncipe Juan la mañana del día antes. ... La acción se identifica así con las circunstancias de la representación; los miembros de la

familia real que presencian el espectáculo se convierten en personajes pasivos del mismo" (pp. xx-xxi).[2] Comparison with Encina's eclogues is inevitable, for the modern Portuguese drama began in a similar way to the Spanish,[3] the dramatist having presented his own composition before his patrons, who played a silent role in the performance. Vicente's début was not made in dialogue (the entire Auto is a monologue spoken by a vaquero);[4] and he was not preoccupied with personal problems,[5] but this brief piece is based on devices initially popularized by Juan del Encina.

The vaquero's entry is boisterous and to the tune of a complaint as he relates his struggle to pass the doorkeepers:

> ¡Par diez! Siete arrepelones
> me pegaron a la entrada,
> mas yo di una puñada
> a uno de los rascones... (ll. 1-4)[6]

Having entered, he experiences some of the malaise felt by Mingo, a personage in Encina's Egloga VIII who marvels at the magnificence of his surroundings when finding himself in aristocratic company:

> ésta deve ser la gloria
> principal
> del paraíso terrenal. (ll. 28-30)[7]

Then, addressing the Queen, he announces his purpose:

> O que sea o que no sea,
> quiero dezir a qué vengo;
> ño diga que me detengo
> ñuestro consejo y aldea.
> Embíame a saber acá
> si es verdá
> que parió vuestra ñobleza. (ll. 31-37)[8]

Incorporating the Queen into his speech, the vaquero acknowledges her affirmative sign and immediately demonstrates his delight over

the prince's birth in word and action, showing his excitement in leaps of joy:

> Mi fe saltar quiero yo;
> ¡He, zagal!
> Digo, dizi, ¿salté mal? (ll. 48-50)

He reacts as the shepherds of the Christmas plays to the news of the birth of Christ.[9]

The parallel with the Nativity plays continues when the vaquero proclaims the universal joy felt on the birth of so excellent a prince. This joy is reflected, as at the birth of Christ, in the state of Nature:

> Todo el ganado retoça;
> toda lazeria se quita;
> con esta nueva bendita
> todo el mundo se alvoroça.
> ¡Oh, qué alegría tamaña!
> La montaña
> y los prados florecieron,
> porque ahora se complieron
> en esta misma cabaña
> todas las glorias de España, (ll. 61-70)

and is felt throughout the entire royal court.[10] Moreover, in keeping with the model provided by the Nativity plays, the family of the new-born child is also praised. Like Mateo, Encina's shepherd-evangelist, Vicente's vaquero comments,

> Si me ahora vagara espacio,
> y de prissa no viniera
> jure a ños que yo os diera
> cuenta de su generacio. (ll. 89-92)[11]

The culmination of the speech comes when the vaquero announces the entry of "unos treinta compañeros / porquerizos y vaqueros" (ll. 100-101) ready to run the doorkeepers' gauntlet and present the young prince with a multitude of gifts, items similar to those which the shepherds in the Nativity plays presented to Christ.[12]

Vicente condensed the significant elements of the Nativity play into a monologue of 112 lines. The vaquero parallels the Christmas shepherds in speech and behaviour: his entry recalls their rustic activities and his language is Sayagués; he addresses himself to the prince's mother as did the shepherds to the Mother of Christ and Encina to his patrons; he receives confirmation of the birth from the Queen, as the shepherds did from an angel; he proclaims his joy and the feeling of universal contentment in a guise similar to the Bethlehem rustics; finally, he dwells on the lineage of the new-born infant and ushers the presentation of gifts, both featured elements of the Nativity play.

Vicente's achievement consists primarily in having grasped the essence of the form and technique of the Nativity play and applied it to another circumstance. From the outset of his career as a dramatist, he showed himself ready to adapt accepted dramatic devices to the demands of his own plays.[13] This, above all, distinguishes Vicente's plays from those by his Castilian contemporaries, and this is the area in which he surpassed them. Departing from the conventional elements of the Christmas shepherd play, Vicente's elaboration and remoulding of the material brought new perspectives to the portrayal of character and the presentation of the subject.

Gil Vicente's first Christmas play was written and presented in the same year as the vaquero's monologue (1502). His royal patrons requested an adaptation of the monologue to suit the Christmas season. The Auto pastoril castellano Vicente wrote,

however, was still within the frame of the shepherd play, but represented a new undertaking (see Hart, Obras dramáticas..., p.6). Scholars have emphasized the similarites between the eclogues of the Salamancan dramatists and Vicente's early plays. Menéndez y Pelayo, for example, wrote of them: "Son puras y netas imitaciones de Juan del Encina sin ningún cambio ni progreso. ... Es un género literario imitado de obras contemporáneas que se llamaban églogas en vez de llamarse autos, como los llamó Gil Vicente: a esto se reduce la diferencia" (Antología..., III, p. 352).[14] By contrast, Thomas R. Hart described Vicente's mastery of the Nativity genre in the Auto pastoril castellano as follows: "Aquí Gil Vicente revela su perfecta maestría de la tradición pastoril, tal como la venían cultivando Encina y Lucas Fernández. En el Auto pastoril castellano encontramos todos los rasgos distintivos del género: el empleo del sayagués; los juegos rústicos de los pastores; la sátira del orgullo que sienten éstos de su linaje humilde, cosa que sin duda pareció especialmente graciosa al público palaciego; la reproducción, en un español lleno de sabor rústico entremezclado con fragmentos de latín más o menos corrumpidos, de las profecías del nacimiento del Señor" (Obras dramáticas..., p. xxxii). Hart's description emphasized the undeniably imitative nature of the Auto pastoril castellano, but did not do Vicente complete justice. As the analysis of his Auto reveals, Vicente mastered the distinctive devices of the genre and gave them a superior artistic elaboration.[15]

The play begins conventionally with the entry of the

shepherd Gil, who complains of the inclement weather.[16] He takes shelter and decides to cheer himself by singing. He is soon joined by another shepherd, Bras, who asks him,

> Di, Gil Terrón: tú ¿qué has,
> que siempre andas apartado? (ll. 25-26)

Gil's reply indicates his difference from his companions and from the customary shepherds in the conventional Christmas play. His view of life is a striking contrast to the normal, such as that given by Pascual in Lucas Fernández's Auto o farsa del nascimiento:

> El prazer y el reholgar
> que no es bien comunicado
> no es entero gasajado
> ni se puede bien llotrar. (Fi-r)

Gil avoids society and is inclined to solitary contemplation. He sets no store by the pleasures sought by his rustic acquaintances, but has his mind fixed on matters other than the capture of a few fleeting moments of happiness. Preferring the beauty of the stars even to that of the shepherdesses, he says,

> 'N esta soledad me enseño
> que el ganado con que ando
> --ño sabré cómo ni quándo--,
> según sueño,
> quiça será d'otro dueño. (ll. 47-51)

Bras has no fellow-feeling and scorns Gil's musings,

> El crego de Bico Nuño
> te enseño esso al domingo, (ll. 63-64)[17]

and then advises him to enjoy life before it passes him by. Gil will not be baited and replies that his inclinations derive from a preference for solitude (ll. 72-73, "mas yo aprisco mejor / apartado en la montaña"), not from misanthropy (ll. 70-71, "Aunque huyo la compaña / no quiero mal a pastor").

The subject is temporarily changed with the entry of another shepherd, Lucas, enquiring about two missing animals. From Gil's questioning, it is learned that the loss occurred through negligence, since Lucas spent "dos horas valientes" (l. 93) watching his companions dancing. The explanation confirms Gil's preference for solitude and dislike of frivolity:

> Y aun por esso que yo sospecho
> me aparto de saltijones;
> que vanas conversaciones
> no traen ningún provecho.
> Siempre pienso en cosas buenas,
> yo me hablo, yo me digo,
> tengo paz siempre conmigo
> sin las penas
> que dan las cosas agenas. (ll. 97-105)

His words fall on deaf ears, however. Lucas is unsympathetic to Gil's line of thinking. "Ya perdido es lo perdido" (l. 107), and it is worth neither searching for the missing animals, nor commending their safety to God as Gil suggests:

> Si los lobos las comieron,
> ¿hámelas Dios de traer?
> ¡Harto terná que hazer!
> Y si murieron,
> mucho más que yo perdieron. (ll. 119-123)

The loss is accepted without further ado. Lucas turns his thoughts to pleasure and summons his companions.

Thus far, a definite contrast is established between Gil and his companions, indicative of their differing opinions about life and their differing attitudes towards each other. Bras and Lucas are pleasure-loving shepherds, who, rejoicing in company, enjoy a song, a game, and a dance. Consequently, they are contemptuous of Gil, who, taking pleasure in solitude, regards their merriment

as frivolity. The relationship of mutual antagonism established is more fundamental than similar situations between personages of other plays. It is not solely a question of differing ideas, such as separated Bonifacio and Gil in Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento, or Juan and Mateo in Encina's Egloga I, but a matter of contrasting character.

The introduction of more shepherds into the action is conducted in familiar fashion and for a familiar purpose: they arrive with a conventional exchange of calls and gather together for their common pleasure (see Appendix B, s.v. "Entry of personages"). This is evident from their dialogue, beginning with Lucas' call to his companions:

Lucas: ¡Ah, Silvestre! ¡Ah, Vicente!
¡Ah, Pedruelo! ¡Ah, Bastián!
¡Ah, Jarrete! ¡Ah, Bras Juan!
¡Ah, Passival! ¡Oh, Clemente!
Silvestre: [Lejos.] ¡Ah, Lucas! ¿Qué ños quieres? Di.
Lucas: Que vengáis acá priado.
Tomaremos gasajado,
que Gil Terrón está aquí
en abrigado
allegre y bien assombrado.

Vienen los pastores y dice Silvestre:

Silvestre: Ora terrible plazer
tenéis vosotros aca.
Bras: ¡Sí tenemos, soncas, ha!
Pues, ¿qué havemos de hazer?
Quien al cordojo se dio,
más cordojo se le pega.
Silvestre: Bailemos una borrega.
Bras: Mia fe, ño,
que tú bailas más que yo. (ll. 133-151)

This dialogue also further implants the contrast of character between Gil and his fellows. The newly-arrived shepherds are fully

aware of Gil's love of solitude and his attitude toward merry-making. Silvestre replies caustically to the call from Lucas that Gil Terrón is with them (ll. 143-144, "Ora terrible plazer / tenéis vosotros aca"), and the rejoinder from Bras (ll. 145-148, "¡Sí tenemos, soncas, ha! / Pues, ¿qué havemos de hazer? / Quien al cordojo se dio / más cordojo se le pega"), is made in a similar tone.

For all his love of solitude, however, Gil is not above the society of his fellows. He is inquisitive enough to ask Silvestre to explain his smart appearance, and, learning of the shepherd's betrothal, is capable, for one living "apartado en la montaña", of giving a detailed genealogy of the bride (ll. 159-190). Gil appears as a knowledgeable rustic and it is fitting that he is singled out to speak this traditional speech (see above n. 11).

After Gil's review of the bride's family connections, Silvestre enumerates the items of her dowry (ll. 196-204), similarly a traditional element.[18] The shepherds then drop this subject and think of enjoying themselves by playing some games. In spite of his conviction of their frivolity, Gil is not against joining them. In fact, it is worth nothing that Lucas invites him to select the game, a mere detail, but possibly a mark of respect in spite of the differences between them. Similarly, when the shepherds have tired of their first game, abejón, and are about to begin a game of riddles, Bras invites Lucas to begin, but the latter again concedes the right to Gil, whose

leadership and the respect he commands from the other shepherds are again evident at the end of this part of the eclogue. Tired of their games, the shepherds adopt Gil's suggestion to sleep, and follow his leadership in crossing themselves for protection against the "demuño" before they lie down.[19]

Here the secular portion of the Auto pastoril castellano is concluded. Insofar as the principal elements of action and characterization are concerned, Vicente departed little from the rustic scenes of Encina and Fernández, whether these elements are traced to the Salamancans' religious or secular works. Vicente also adopted the structural pattern of their plays by presenting an amusing scene before introducing the religious topic. The important, distinguishing feature of Vicente's Auto, the differentiation of one personage from the others, is, however, the vital one.

The religious subject of the play is introduced while the shepherds sleep with the angel's sudden and brief announcement:

> ¡Ah, pastor!
> que es nacido el Redemptor. (ll. 254-255)

As Thomas R. Hart observed, the announcement transforms Gil: "Sólo Gil oye el canto del ángel. Unicamente él recibe la noticia del nacimiento de Cristo. Gil aparece ahora transformado como por milagro. Sabe todas las profecías acerca del nacimiento del Mesías; hasta conoce--y esto es lo que parece impresionar más a sus compañeros--la lengua latina" (Obras dramáticas..., p. xxiv). In the light of some of the Nativity plays already

considered in this study, Gil's transformation is conventional, since he assumes the role of preceptor, for which a shepherd was often singled out.[20]

If Gil was ostensibly different from his fellows, he now assumes a definitely dominant role and directs their actions. His companions are characterized by their complete bewilderment and at no point really understand what is happening. They ask Gil what to do and adopt his suggestion of going to Bethlehem to visit the Child and present gifts (ll. 256-283). During the adoration scene itself, only Gil addresses the Virgin and Child with any real awareness of the significance of the event (ll. 293-301). His companions only comment on the poverty of the stable (ll. 302-310), and have to be prompted by Gil to make their offerings (ll. 321-324). They have no equivalent insight into the meaning of the event they witness and after seeing the Child and offering their gifts they remain as clueless. They can only marvel at Gil's knowledge in answering their questions and expounding the Biblical texts.

Gil has, as it were, blossomed in the second part of the Auto. The transformation worked in his character, the way it is accomplished, and its implications in relation to the other personages is the key to the understanding of the play. It is through this transformation that Gil Vicente's mastery of the Christmas shepherd play and his ability as a dramatist in combining its secular and religious elements can be gauged.

The relationships between the personages are not static, for

Gil's transformation causes a concomitant change in the attitude of the other shepherds toward him. Gil's companions earlier had little regard for their friend's love of solitude and denigration of frivolity. Hart observed that "es possible que Gil tenga un no sé qué de santurrón que no agrada mucho a sus compañeros" (Obras dramáticas..., p. xxiv). After his transformation, however, these same companions are impressed by Gil's acquired knowledge and, in particular, by his facility with Latin. Moreover, they are impressed to the extent of respect and admiration; they delight in Gil's new-found wisdom and even feel slightly jealous of it.

Silvestre is the first to comment on the transformed Gil after hearing the latter's paraphrase of the Song of Songs (ll. 348-361):

> ¡Ha, Dios plaga con el roín!
> Mudando vas la peleja:
> ¡sabes d'achaque d'igreja! (ll. 362-364)

He is aware that Gil has been transformed. When Gil replies that he has just acquired the knowledge of Latin, Silvestre compliments him. It is a pleasure to listen to him and a gift he would treasure himself:

> Con esso hablas llatín
> tan a punto que es plazer.
> ¡Más lo preciasse saber
> que me daren un florín! (ll. 366-369)

These comments contrast with Silvestre's earlier sarcasm (ll. 143-144, "Ora terrible plazer / tenéis vosotros aca"), uttered when Lucas invited him to join Gil's company.

Bras is equally impressed with Gil's newly-acquired knowledge. Having heard the latter's discourse on the prophecies concerning

the Messiah, Bras exclaims,

> ¡Gil Terrón lletrudo está!
> ¡Muy hondo te encaramillas! (ll. 421-422)
> .....
> Quien te viere no dirá
> que naciste en serranía. (ll. 425-426)

There is no reason to doubt Bras' sincerity, and it contrasts considerably with earlier comments (ll. 63-64, "El crego de Bico Nuño / te enseñó esso al domingo", and ll. 147-148, "Quien al cordojo se dio / más cordojo se le pega"), when Bras scorned Gil and denigrated his pretensions to a life of solitude and contemplation.

Thus, the attitudes established in the first part of the Auto are developed in the second part. Because of this the characters of the rustics--Gil excepted for the moment--could be evolved in a manner compatible with the course of the action. The rustics are as ignorant at the end of the play as they were at the beginning, and just as ill-disposed to understand the mysteries to which Gil has gained insight. On the other hand, the event cannot leave them untouched. Vicente mastered the situation by attempting no violent change in their disposition.[21] The birth of Christ changes the shepherds, but indirectly, and not in relation to the event, which they cannot understand, but to Gil, whom they learn to appreciate. This development in the relationship between personages also serves to emphasize that a very substantial change has occurred in Gil, for it is not only noticed by his companions, but changes their attitude toward him. Finally, this same development provides partly for the fusion of

the religious and secular elements of the play. The difference between Gil and his companions is manifest from the start and was shown during the presentation of the rustics' personal activities. In the religious part of the play, the attitude of the shepherds toward Gil is equally prominent. The relationship established between personages evolves as a result of the subject, but provides a consistent feature to unify the play.

Gil's transformation is quite substantial--the change caused in his companions' attitude toward him is ample evidence of this. His transformation is also necessary to avoid inconsistency of character. Thomas R. Hart's remarks concerning Gil's role in the Auto pastoril castellano reflect these ideas, and may be cited at length:

> Aquí Gil Vicente soluciona uno de los defectos de la tradición heredada de los salmantinos, en cuyas obras los pastores humildes, cuyos juegos y disputas rústicos constituyen la primera parte del auto, deben también explicar la significación del nacimiento del Señor que lo concluye y culmina. Lucas Fernández había intentado solucionar el problema por medio de la introducción de un personaje, por ejemplo un ermitaño, que conoce las profecías y sabe emplear además el lenguaje culto; de esta manera consigue el dramaturgo no sólo poner de relieve el lenguaje rústico de los pastores, sino también da más elegancia a la exposición de la Natividad. Gil Vicente le aventaja al establecer una oposición entre Gil y sus compañeros: ya no es cuestión de erudición ni de clase social, sino de temperamento. Gil ya está dispuesto a aceptar la noticia del nacimiento de Cristo, pronto a ponerse al servicio del rey recién nacido; por consecuencia, ya sabe cuanto le es necesario para la salud de su alma. Su conocimiento de las profecías y aun de la lengua latina, por muy impresionante que resulte a sus compañeros, no añade nada esencial. (Obras dramáticas..., pp. xxiv-xxv)

While agreeing that Vicente solved a possible defect in the system of dramatists such as Lucas Fernández, and contrasted the

temperaments of Gil and his companions, a more precise definition than Hart's description of Gil's role in the play is possible. He is certainly more disposed than his comrades to accept and understand the news of the Incarnation. The differences between their rustic lives and Gil's love of contemplation have been described, including (ll. 27-62) Gil's musings on the possible existence of a supreme being, but his initial disposition does not warrant a sudden change from speculation and ignorance to certainty and knowledge. Without another explanation, Gil's transformation is as inconsistent as that in shepherds who at one moment are abysmally ignorant and incapable of elevated thought, and are, the next, freely discoursing on the Incarnation and Redemption with liberal quotation from the Old Testament. While Gil's initial disposition prepared him, his transformation cannot be attributed to it entirely. His change occurs through a veritable deus ex machina, the angel who announces the Nativity.

Before hearing the angel's voice, Gil can only guess at the meaning of things. The vagueness of his thinking is implicit in his statement to Bras,

> 'N esta soledad me enseño
> que el ganado con que ando
> --ño sabré cómo ni quándo--,
> según sueño,
> quiça será d'otro dueño. (ll. 47-51)

After the angel's announcement, he has acquired all knowledge, including a fluency in Latin. His change is complete and as sudden as the angel's intervention, as if the announcement itself had filled him with knowledge. In fact, Thomas R. Hart suggested

a Biblical source for the incident: "Tal vez Gil Vicente haya sido influido por las leyendas de personajes bíblicos que fueron agraciados con una ciencia infusa, como aconteció a los apóstoles cuando recibieron el don de las lenguas" (Obras dramáticas..., p. xxv, n. 24). The suggestion was a good one, for further investigation shows Gil's transformation to be a parallel of the enlightenment of the Apostles by the Holy Spirit described in the Acts of the Apostles (II, 4-12).

The parallel is not forced, but is clear. Before the shepherds lie down to sleep and the angel's announcement is heard, Gil suggests, "Santíguáos del demuño" (l. 248), and then gives a blessing, to all intents and purposes a parody of the sign of the cross:

> eñ el mes del padre
> eñ el mes del fijo
> --ell otro mes se m'olvidó. (ll. 251-253)

The "mes" he has forgotten is, of course, the Holy Spirit, who, as the symbol of wisdom and understanding (see I, Corinthians, II, 6-16) represents the elements Gil lacked in attempting to solve his problems about the nature of things. With the angel's announcement, he is endowed with the faculties he lacked and is as filled with the Holy Spirit as the Apostles at Pentecost. He experiences a similar transformation, being able to discourse on the mysteries of Christianity and, having received the gift of tongues, is able to speak in Latin. The latter point is stressed by his companions, who marvel at his gift as the inhabitants of Jerusalem marvelled at the same gift in the Apostles. Hart incorrectly wrote, therefore, that Gil's "conocimiento de las

profecías y aun de la lengua latina ... no añade nada esencial". These two facets of his knowledge are the essential ones and are central to the mechanism by which his transformation is performed.

Significantly only Gil is transformed, for only he was singled out at the beginning of the play and distinguished as a contemplative. He was, thereby, prepared for the Pentecostal transformation to be wrought in him. Consequently only he hears the angel, since he is the only one disposed to do so, and he is the only one to receive the divine gifts granted. In fact, the angel's words are addressed to Gil alone. The angel says (l. 254), "¡Ah, pastor!" not "¡Ah, pastores!" Finally, Gil is aware of his change. Replying to Silvestre's amazement at his newly-acquired knowledge of Latin, Gil says (l. 365), "Ahora lo deprendí". He, too, is aware that the transformation occurred through divine intervention, for he later tells Bras (l. 423), "Dios haze estas maravillas".

Viewing the Auto pastoril castellano in its entirety, Vicente's mastery of the Christmas shepherd play can now be appreciated. He did not deviate from his predecessors in the external appearance of his work: he portrayed conventional personages in a conventional rustic scene, to which he coupled the religious action, in which the rustics heard of the Nativity, journeyed to Bethlehem, offered their gifts, and discussed the significance of the event. But Vicente gave this a greater internal cohesion. He did not combine the disparate elements of the sacred and profane subjects simply by juxtaposing the two, but synthesized them by portraying a development in character

relationships and by singling out one of the personages and subjecting him to a transformation which not only justifies his own role, but also those of the other personages.

The transformation of character portrayed by Gil Vicente in the Auto pastoril castellano warrants a further look at a similar piece of character manipulation in Encina's Eglogas I and II. Encina's technique and his custom of writing plays in pairs in order to separate the secular and religious interests appear in a somewhat different light. The conclusion to be suggested is that, aware of the difficulties in obtaining a non-violent transition from one interest to another, Encina skirted the consequent problems by doing away with them; but, also aware of the need for unity, he employed the personages as the necessary link and achieved the transition by transforming their characters. It might be concluded that Encina's technique was insufficiently advanced to achieve the synthesis within a single play.[22] In Egloga IX he again avoided the challenge by not dwelling on the theological aspects of the Nativity and, thereby, incurring an inconsistency in the portrayal of the rustics.[23]

Analysis of Vicente's Auto pastoril castellano warrants the claim that he was as aware as Encina of the necessity for structural unity and consistency of character. It may also be claimed that Vicente understood very well what Encina had attempted in Eglogas I and II. There is a close parallel between the transformation of Gil from shepherd to shepherd-apostle--he became an apostle figure by virtue of his Pentecostal

transformation--and the metamorphosis of Juan and Mateo from shepherds to shepherd-evangelists.[24] The parallel would be even nearer completion if, as one critic suggested, the identification of Gil with Gil Vicente were accepted, just as Juan is to be identified with Juan del Encina.[25] The two dramatists came close in their dramatization of the same subject, but Vicente's technique surpasses that of Encina, for he achieved in a single play the effect for which Encina required two.

Vicente's second Christmas play, the Auto de los reyes magos, was written for the Epiphany in 1502, also at the instigation of his royal patrons (see Hart, Obras dramáticas..., p. 25). As in the Auto pastoril castellano, Vicente adopted the traditional shepherd play, but showed an even greater independence from its characteristic devices and a certain originality in the combination of the stories of the Bethlehem shepherds and the Magi. Furthermore, he used his material to illustrate a particular idea.

The central part of the action is the antagonism between two shepherds and a friar, a situation probably derived from Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento.[26] But Vicente took it further than Fernández and extracted more than just its comic possibilities. Thomas R. Hart was struck by the dichotomy in the attitudes of the shepherd Gregorio and the friar Alberto. The former had abandoned everything to search for the newly-born Saviour; the latter, apparently, made no similar effort: "Es evidente que la erudición del fraile no le ha incitado a buscar al niño Jesús; las preguntas de los pastores hacen entrever también que el fraile no se ha dedicado al estudio de los problemas fundamentales de la

religión, sino a la elucidación de quisquillas teológicas" (Obras dramáticas..., pp. xxv-xxvi). After mentioning, erroneously, that the traditional prophecies of the Incarnation are spoken by a knight, a member of the Kings' entourage, and not by the friar, Hart concluded: "Así se subraya uno de los temas fundamentales de la pieza, el de que la erudición por sí sola no vale nada si no incita a la acción" (p. xxvi).

A theme of this kind is central to the play, but it is not expressed in quite the manner described by Hart, who was fooled by the false trail laid by Vicente. To understand the theme and how it is conveyed, closer attention must be paid to the personages and the relationships established between them.

The Auto de los reyes magos begins with the entry of the shepherd Gregorio, not to complain of the weather, nor the unfortunate life of the rustic, however, but to announce that he has spent thirteen days[27] searching for the new-born Christ:

> Dios plega, ¿quién me dirá
> adó está
> este niño que es nacido?
> Que ando bobo perdido
> sin sentido:
> treze días perhavrá
> que ño sé qué haga ya. (ll. 7-13)

His flock and belongings have been abandoned, a fact which is of little store provided he can find the Child:

> de todo no me doy nada
> si topasse la posada
> muy loada
> donde está rezién nacido
> este niño esclarecido. (ll. 34-38)

Then, encountering Valerio and friar Alberto, Gregorio explains his problems. He relates that his search is prompted by a message received from an angel and adds,

> Treze días son passados,
> bien contados,
> que ando perdido el tino
> sin hallar nengún camino
> ni soy dino
> de lo ver por mis pecados. (ll. 52-57)

These three quotations emphasize three points of character relevant to the subject of the play. Gregorio's description of himself as lost (ll. 10-11, "ando bobo perdido / sin sentido", and ll. 54-55, "ando perdido el tino / sin hallar nengún camino") are applicable to his mental and physical state, showing a desire for enlightenment about the meaning of Christ's birth as well as its locality. Gregorio's words only indicate a conviction that he must find the Child; the why and wherefore are both beyond his reckoning. This conviction led him to abandon everything without further thought (l. 34, "de todo no me doy nada"); material concerns, the World, are left behind to allow him to search freely. Finally, his attitude is one of humility. As a shepherd he is humble in respect of social origin, but his humility is a trait of personality, and he confesses a sinful unworthiness to pay homage to the Child (ll. 55-56, "ni soy dino / de lo ver por mis pecados").

Having heard Gregorio explain his problem, Valerio introduces friar Alberto, who, he suggests, will provide some enlightenment,

> ...porque los lletrados
> son guía de los errados. (ll. 63-64)

Thomas R. Hart (Obras dramáticas..., p. xxv) remarked on the "nota de

ironía" in Valerio's statement, but he overlooked its many implications. The statement is ambiguous depending on whether it is considered as spoken by Valerio or applied to the friar. As spoken by Valerio it is certainly ironic, for he has a definite notion about the clergy and their ability to guide. As applied to the friar it is not in the least ironic, but a statement of truth, because subsequent conversation shows just how the friar is a "guía de los errados". Valerio's remark has both a double meaning and a double application. In meaning "los errados" designates those who sin (" yo pecador mucho errado") and those who wander, having lost their way ("errar el camino").[28] In application it initially refers to the errant Gregorio and the context of the play, for he is a confessed sinner and has lost his directions; but it is also a generalization, applicable to all sinners and all wanderers, which is how the friar understands it.

It is essential to elucidate the implications of Valerio's remark because the personages adopt different standpoints in relation to it and, consequently, talk at cross-purposes. The shepherds adhere to a narrow meaning of "errar" and apply it only to Gregorio with the meaning that he is lost, not knowing which road to take; the friar, departing from Gregorio's loss of direction, embraces all meanings of the word and applies it to all men.

The friar's words are addressed to a wider audience than his two rustic interlocutors. In answer to Gregorio's plea for news

of the whereabouts of Christ (ll. 65-73) the friar assures him,

> Pastor, no tomes enojos,
> que tus ojos
> verán quién todos buscáis. (ll.74-76)

A singular verb is used to address the shepherd, but the friar then generalizes and employs a second person plural: "your (sing.) eyes will see He whom you (plural) all seek". His remarks are intended for a wider audience.

The friar does not answer Gregorio directly, but in his next intervention praises the Lord and the fact that a

> ...rústico pastor
> con amor
> lo busca con gran cuidado,
> desempara su ganado
> muy de grado
> por ver al niño glorioso. (ll. 93-98)

It makes him think of his inadequacy:

> ¿qué haré yo, religioso
> perezoso,
> que ando tan sin cuidado
> por aqueste despoblado? (ll. 99-102)

and marvel that the Redeemer chose to receive homage from the humblest of men:

> De estos pobres labradores
> y pastores
> quiso ser oferecido,
> adorado y conocido
> y servido
> con cantares y loores,
> escuchando sus primores
> y clamores
> la Virgen Nuestra Señora
> y la vaquilla loadora
> en la hora
> que el Señor de los Señores
> nació de flor de las flores. (ll. 103-115)

Finally, he exclaims on the sense of peace and pleasure that would have been found on seeing the new-born Child:

¡Qué descanso y qué plazer
fuera ver
el resplandor glorioso,
aquel Verbo gracioso,
tan lloroso,
acabando de nascer! (ll. 116-121)

Thus far, friar Alberto has not indulged in theological niceties. He has envisaged the Nativity and adoration of the shepherds. For a moment, using the supposed Biblical shepherd Gregorio as a point of departure, the friar has stepped out of the context of the play to function as a narrator inviting the audience to imagine the scene at Bethlehem. Once the example of Gregorio has been presented, the verbs are in past tenses (l. 105, "quiso ser ofereçido", and l. 117, "fuera ver"), like one who views things from the perspective of the present.

Hearing friar Alberto's speech, Valerio fatuously comments on his eloquence and suggests that he is a buldero.[29] The friar denies the charge and claims that he is reflecting on what must be done to belong to Christ:

Harto es esso de desmando,
pues veis que estoy hablando,
contemplando
lo que nos es menester
se suyos queremos ser. (ll. 125-129)

The last four lines are the key to all he says, which is not vain theologizing, but a serious reflection on the Nativity. Thus, the friar virtually ignores the hair-splitting by Valerio and Gregorio, who attempt to see if he is "lletrado en la scriptura" (l. 154), and when he speaks it is to describe the fruits of his contemplation. In doing so, he draws a lesson from his earlier description of the adoration of the shepherds.

The cares of the World are the cause of perdition, the reason for Man's deviation from the proper path:

> Este mundo peligroso
> sin reposo
> nos trae a todos burlados,
> ciegos, mal aconsejados,
> desviados
> d'aquel reino glorioso; (ll. 181-186)

but the way can be cleared and troubles soothed through contemplation of Christ's Nativity:

> Quien se viere sujuzgado
> y apretado
> de mundano pensamiento,
> contemple su nacimiento.
> ¡Quán contento
> lo verá desnudo echado,
> de los fríos trespassado
> y adorado
> de los brutos animales!
> Luego olvidará los males
> desiguales
> que le presenta el pecado. (ll. 194-205)

The trajectory of the friar's thoughts and Vicente's exposition of the idea of his play are now clearer. Vicente first presented the shepherd Gregorio who, through humble compulsion, abandoned everything he owned and went in search of Christ. Taking Gregorio as a point of departure, the friar invited contemplation of the simple, but moving, picture, of the adoration of the shepherds. Then he drew a lesson from it and explained that all could find peace by reflecting on the simplicity of the Nativity and seeking Christ with the attitude of abandon for worldly concerns that was evident in the shepherds of Bethlehem. Vicente simply moved from the particular to the general. Offering first the specific, historical example of the shepherds of Bethlehem,

visualized in the person of Gregorio, the dramatist validated this example for all men at all times through the friar's presentation of it.

It is, therefore, entirely erroneous to conclude that the friar is given to "la elucidación de quisquillas teológicas". He is very much concerned with the fundamentals of religion, since through his discourses on the Nativity he advocates a return to first principles and the adoption of a humility and simplicity derived from the circumstances of the birth of the founder of Christianity.[30] The shepherds are the indulgers in theological niceties. They misunderstand the friar's deliberations as much as Thomas R. Hart did, and as much as those who preoccupy themselves with "quisquillas teológicas" misunderstood and disregarded the true meaning of Christmas.

The friar and the shepherds talk at cross-purposes as a result of intending different meanings. The shepherds, ever pragmatic in their outlook, have only a literal meaning in view. Hence, they completely miss the figurative interpretation and the universal application of the friar's words. When Gregorio asks (ll. 65-73) how to find Christ, he expects a literal reply and to be told which road will lead him to Bethlehem. The friar's assurance, "tus ojos / verán quién todos buscáis" (ll. 75-76), giving the question a figurative interpretation in a universal context, is beyond the shepherd, who thinks he is being mocked: "he miedo que me burláis" (l. 77). Consequently, Gregorio plays tit for tat, comparing the friar to clerics with whom he is

probably familiar and whose stock-in-trade represents the trappings of religion:

> ¿Traéis a ende brevario
> o calandario,
> o sois fraile como quiera?
> Si aliño aquí hoviera,
> bien quisiera,
> si sabéis bien de vicario,
> que digáis un trintanario
> al rosario,
> porque Dios me dexe ver,
> sin tener
> al demuño por contrario
> aquel precioso sagrario. (11. 78-89)[31]

Valerio similarly mocks the friar. When Gregorio's question remains apparently unanswered, and the friar praises the Lord for having desired the adoration of humble shepherds, Valerio comments,

> Buldas devéis de traer
> a vender
> que os estáis chacorveando. (11. 122-124)[32]

Neither Gregorio nor Valerio understands the friar. Both expect literal replies to their questions and, when these are not forthcoming, construe the friar's answers as the mark of one whose thoughts on religion are confined to vain pulpit oratory and indulgence salesmanship. Both Gregorio and Valerio have their own ideas about the concerns and ability of a man of God. Hence they gloss over the friar's justification of his words,

> ...veis que estoy hablando,
> contemplando
> lo que nos es menester
> se suyos queremos ser, (11. 126-129)

and beg for solutions to insignificant problems about the definition of sin, which they think fall within the province of a man learned in Scripture. Valerio asks,

¿halláis scripto
si es pecado estrañudar? (ll. 131-132)

and Gregorio,

Si el hombre de birra pura,
per ventura,
adrede despierna un grillo
por no vello ni oíllo
y encobrillo
¿es pecar contra la natura? (ll. 142-147)

The reason for these questions is known when Valerio puts the last of them. He prefaces his question by saying,

Otra cosa más escura
y más dura
quiero, Gregorio, hazer:
pregúntale, quiero ver
su saber,
que a según su gestadura
es lletrado en la scriptura, (ll. 148-154)

and then asks,

...es gran pecado
denodado
andar tras las zagalejas, (ll. 155-157)

elaborating his question in the next 23 lines. He intends to see if the friar is learned and to test his knowledge by baiting him. But the shepherds' idea of knowledge is perverse and shows that they consider the business of a man learned in Scripture to be the elucidation of theological niceties.

The friar neither replies directly, nor answers the questions individually. He gives a general response applicable to sin as a whole and how it can be overcome by searching for Christ in the spirit of the first Christmas. The friar puts both the shepherds and those who elaborate on theological niceties firmly in their place by showing it not to be the purpose of Christianity.

Inevitably, the shepherds do not understand, for this is not the literal answer they expected. Valerio is thus prompted to answer his own final question, both he and Gregorio believing that the friar has said it is sinful to chase after girls. His speech (ll. 207-244) is a burlesque of the reply he anticipated and of those who indulge in "quisquillas teológicas".

The dichotomy of the friar and the shepherds does exist, but not in the form suggested by Thomas R. Hart since at no time is the friar preoccupied with the kind of questions put to him by the shepherds. In assessing the purpose of the shepherds' questions, Lucas Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento may be recalled. The hermit Macario in Fernández's eclogue was above the mockery of Bonifacio and Gil, who accused him of vices he did not possess, so that, although subject to their abuse, he was not the object of the dramatist's satire. The same situation obtains in the Auto de los reyes magos. It is patently obvious that the friar is subject to the shepherds' abuse, but it is misguided because the friar is not the type that Gregorio and Valerio believe him to be. He is sincerely concerned with his calling, the discovery of Christ and the true spirit of Christianity. He is not, therefore, the object of the shepherds' abuse, but the device, just as Macario had been, for the author to contrast the true spirit of religion with the false and direct his satire against those who failed to recognize the essential matters of Christianity through deviation into vain theologizing. The theme of the vanity of mere erudition is underlined, as Hart recognized, but not in the manner he

proposed.[33]

After Valerio's burlesque justification of love, the action of the Auto returns to the subject with which it began, the quest for Christ's birthplace. A caballero from the entourage of the Magi enters and asks,

> ¿sois sabedores
> se iré por aquí bien
> para el lugar de Belén? (ll. 251-253)

Gregorio exclaims that he has been searching for the same place, but Valerio answers the knight rudely, causing an argument in which they exchange insults. The altercation is ended by the friar, who asks the knight his origin. There follows the caballero's explanation of the history of the watch for a star which would announce the Saviour's birth, the recent observation of the phenomenon, and the journey of the Magi--facts which the friar verifies with quotations from Isaias and the Psalms. The knight enumerates the gifts of incense, myrrh, and gold brought by the Kings, friendship is established between the knight and the shepherds, and the Auto concludes with the entry of the Magi to the tune of a villancico.

The story of the Magi is derived from Biblical tradition,[34] but there are few examples of its dramatization in Spain.[35] Nevertheless, Vicente adapted the story to the conventional shepherd play. The argument between the shepherd and the knight is a feature of the early drama;[36] the friar's declaration of the prophecies about Christ repeats a consistent feature of the Nativity play, although the specific quotations from the Old Testament referring to the journey of the Magi have not been

previously encountered.[37] The completely untraditional element in the Auto is the combination of the Epiphany story with that of the shepherds of Bethlehem, a combination which, in spite of Bruce W. Wardropper's observation that "el tema de la Epifanía está agregado al tema fundamental con bastante torpeza" (Introducción..., p. 174), has a purpose.

The Auto de los reyes magos is unified through its central idea: the search for Christ, presented on a literal and figurative level. This idea is literally illustrated with the shepherd Gregorio and the caballero. Both have received signs of the Incarnation--one from the angel, the other from a star--and both have lost their way. The figurative meaning is provided by the friar, who explains how the cares of the World have caused Man to lose himself in his journey to Christ. It is the friar, also, who unites these two levels by taking Gregorio and the caballero as literal examples of his figurative meaning.

The friar explains that it is to the praise and glory of the Redeemer that a simple shepherd should seek Him:

> Oh, bendito y alabado
> y exalçado
> sea Nuestro Redemptor,
> que un rústico pastor
> con amor
> lo busca con gran cuidado, (ll. 90-95)

and, presenting him as an example, invites all to do the same in an attitude of humility and abandon for worldly concerns. The friar also considers that the journey of the Magi was made to the same glory and with equal humility, a fact well emphasized through his

quotation of the Old Testament:

> "Llevántate a ser alumbrado,
> hierusalén visitado
> y acatado.
> Recibe tus alegrías,
> que la gloria del Messías
> que querías
> sobre ti es ya venida,
> y los reys de gran partida
> nobrecida,
> 'n el resplandor de tus días
> en tus tierras los verías".
> David 'n el psalmo setenta
> y uno cuenta
> reys de Tarsis y Sabá
> y de Arabia vernán
> con humildá,
> muy gran compaña sin cuenta,
> adorar sin más afrenta,
> muy contenta. (ll. 309-327)

Thus the two elements of the action have a common idea.

In the Auto de los reyes magos Vicente presented a definite idea--the search for Christ in the true spirit of Christianity--and to convey it combined all elements of action and characterization. His technique is founded on the conventional devices of the genre, but he surpassed his predecessors. The inclusion of a cleric, for example, who suffers the jesting of some shepherds has a precedent in the Egloga o farsa del nascimiento, but Vicente used this personage and the comic incidents in which he is involved more cleverly and subtlely than Lucas Fernández. The abuse of the friar allowed Vicente to satirize clergymen whose principal preoccupations were with the trappings of religion and "quisquillas teológicas". The friar's saintly nature and concern for the fundamentals of religion permitted the dramatist to place the idea of his play in a universal context and highlight its importance. Finally, the

argument between the friar and the shepherds, having both a didactic and comic tone, combined the two traditionally predominant features of the plays of this type, for entertainment and instruction stand side by side in harmony.

Gil Vicente also made effective use of the traditional historical ambivalence of the Nativity drama. Just as in the Nativity plays already discussed in this study, the personages of the Auto de los reyes magos are Biblical figures presented in a contemporary mould. Vicente, however, played the past and the present against each other. The idea of the search for Christ is illustrated in the action by the quest of the shepherd and the caballero, and is exemplified by the friar who contemplates the adoration of the shepherds as a past event. The friar, as was seen, stepped out of the historical action, viewed the Nativity from the perspective of the present, and invited contemplation of it. At that moment he addressed a contemporary audience and urged them to recapture the significance of the Nativity, lost through preoccupation with the World. He updated the past and proclaimed that the Nativity was as significant for the present as for history. The idea of the search for Christ is thereby reinforced through emphasis on the universality of the quest. At the same time, the reason for the suppression of temporal barriers in the Nativity play is underlined, for such performances essentially re-enacted rather than commemorated the birth of Christ, an event valid for all times.

The plays by Gil Vicente discussed thus far, have shown a

degree of independence from the dramatic traditions established by Juan del Encina and Lucas Fernández, but were largely based on conventional devices. Vicente's overall dramatic technique, however, was an improvement on that of his predecessors. If in the Auto pastoril castellano he advanced new possibilities in character portrayal and character relationships, in the Auto de los reyes magos he was more concerned with illustrating an idea. In both works he attempted to solve the problems of the genre, in particular those caused by the transition from secular to religious interests and by the fusion of the disparate elements of entertainment, instruction, and devotion. The last Nativity play discussed in detail in this study, the Auto de la Sibila Casandra, fulfils the promise of Vicente's earlier works and shows just how well he had mastered the genre. In it he achieved the complete fusion of the sacred and the profane, the past and the present, and, at the same time, illustrated a particular idea.

The Auto de la Sibila Casandra was written in 1513, at a comparatively early date in the history of the drama in Spain, but it came some ten years after those plays by Vicente already considered in this chapter,[38] a fact which might alone be sufficient to account for its advance technique. On the one hand, the devices of earlier works are still apparent: the setting is rustic and the characters have the same pastoral disguise as of old; song and dance play as important a part as in the Vita Christi. On the other, Vicente was not bound by convention, since he incorporated numerous traditions into his play.

In liturgical Christmas traditions Vicente found the Ordo Prophetarum, derived from a pseudo-Augustinian sermon containing Old Testament prophecies related to the birth of Christ.[39] From the same source he capitalized on the tradition of the pagan sibyl as a prophetess of the Incarnation and the Last Judgement.[40] In addition, Vicente employed contemporary literary sources, having derived Casandra's assertion of divine motherhood from the Italian novel Guerino Meschino by Andrea da Barberino (published in translation, Seville, 1512), a work containing an episode concerning a proud sibyl imprisoned for having declared herself the future mother of Christ.[41] Literary sources were also at hand in the Crónica Troyana's portrayal of a sibyl who prophesied incorrectly, and in the traditional theme of the joies de marriage seen from the feminine point of view.[42] Finally, Vicente found inspiration for his play in iconography, from which he derived the relationship between Solomon and Casandra.[43]

With all these elements in the play, it is no wonder that commentators found it confusing. In his study "L'Auto de la Sibylle Cassandre de Gil Vicente" (pp. 172-175), I. S. Révah summarized past critical opinions, a repetition of which is unnecessary. It may solely be remarked that the view prevailed of a play containing a curious mixture of paganism and Christianity, more or less arbitrarily combined in a simple plot of which the most engaging features were the sung lyrics.

Recent criticism, beginning with an essay by Thomas R. Hart, "Gil Vicente's Auto de la Sibila Casandra", opted for a clearer

view of the play and sought a unifying factor amid the confusion. Hart suggested that "the play is not really so incoherent as it seems and that its dramatic unity lies not so much in the interrelationships of the things that are said and done on the stage as in the relationships of the things that are symbolically, or, if one prefers, allegorically, implied by them" (p. 35). In this interpretation, Casandra's rejection of a marriage with Solomon (a _figura Christi_) is viewed as a rejection of union with Christ. This situation is resolved in the adoration scene at the end, when Casandra pays homage to the new-born Christ and, thereby, becomes a _sponsa Christi_.

Hart's view of the play was not agreeably received, however. Révah ("L'_Auto de la Sibylle Cassandre_...", p. 174) objected that Vicente did not make a subtle allegorical interpretation clear to the audience. María Rosa de Malkiel, in "Para la génesis del _Auto de la sibila Casandra_" (p. 49, n. 2), dismissed an interpretation on the basis of allegory as unnecessary and inapplicable. She concluded that Hart's allegorizing of the personages was inconsistent and employed at the convenience of his interpretation. Leo Spitzer, in "The Artistic Unity of Gil Vicente's _Auto de la Sibila Casandra_", agreed with Hart that the play had unity, but differed as to its nature. In his view--also held by Bruce W. Wardropper (_Introducción_..., pp. 173-174)--the central topic of the play is prophecy. Spitzer observed that all its personages were prophets from the pagan or Biblical world. The exception was Casandra, who, in addition to being a prophetess,

also believed herself the object of prophecy and the mother-to-be of Christ: "It is to this cosmos united in the expectation of the Redeemer that Casandra with her personal hybris and consequent tragic isolation opposes herself, though the harmony disturbed by her alone will be reëstablished at the end when she too will bow in adoration to Mary" (pp. 57-58). She functions in the play as an example of conversion and as a contrast to the humility of the Virgin.

With so much ink already spilt to discover the sources of the Auto de la Sibila Casandra and unravel its subject, it may be wondered what remains to be said. This study, however, is concerned with the same subject on which the scholars cited above have expressed their views. The initial problems of the Auto de la Sibila Casandra are those resulting from a duality in action and character and the combination of sacred and profane elements. The personages all have two identities: they are secular figures caught in a fictional action and, also, historical entities, part of a religious subject; moreover the action is a source of entertainment and devotion.

In this particular case, however, the situation is aggravated by the degree of compenetration of the separate elements of the play, so that its interpretation could well depend on which element is most emphasized. It is, therefore, necessary to understand how Vicente synthesized the different parts of his play and how he intended each moment of the action to be understood. It must be determined, for example, when Solomon is speaking and

acting as a simple rustic and when as a Biblical patriarch, or when Casandra is a headstrong shepherdess and when an erring prophetess. The matter is made all the more difficult since there is no single point at which the personages change identity and the action its tone. The change occurs, not through an external intervention, such as the sudden announcement of the birth of Christ,[44] but through a gradual turning from the secular to the religious subject.

The secular subject in the Auto is a variation of the pastoral courtship theme, a conventional device of action dealt with more fully in the second part of this study.[45] Casandra makes it abundantly clear from the outset, however, that she does not intend accepting her rustic suitor. The subject of her monologue, which begins the play, is her refusal to marry:

> ¿Quién mete ninguno andar
> ni porfiar
> en casamientos conmigo?
> Pues séame Dios testigo
> que yo digo
> que no me quiero casar. (ll. 1-6)

There is no shepherd worthy of her:

> ¿Quál será pastor nacido
> tan polido
> ahotas que me meresca?
> ¿Alguno hay que me paresca
> en cuerpo, vista y sentido? (ll. 7-11)

and she thinks marriage is a form of slavery:

> ¿Quál es la dama polida
> que su vida
> juega, pues pierde casando,
> su libertad cautivando,
> otorgando
> que sea siempre vencida,
> desterrada en mano agena,
> siempre en pena,
> abatida y sujuzgada? (ll. 12-20)

Her position declared, the shepherd proposed as her husband enters. His name is not revealed, but he is a rustic with thoughts only for his marriage to Casandra, which he announces almost as soon as he begins to talk to her. As she revealed in her monologue, however, marriage is not agreeable to Casandra. Unimpressed by the shepherd's self-description as a "valiente zagal polido" (l. 53). Casandra is obdurate:

> Yo te digo
> que comigo
> no hables en casamiento;
> que no quiero ni consiento
> ni con otro ni contigo. (ll. 70-74)

The shepherd is perplexed since the match had already been arranged. He believes that she must love someone else, although Casandra assures him,

> No quiero ser desposada
> ni casada,
> ni monja ni ermitaña. (ll. 91-93)

Still dissatisfied, the shepherd asks for her objections, which she gives him by elaborating (ll. 117-157) on her earlier affirmation that marriage is a form of slavery. The shepherd's protests that he would not treat her badly avail him nothing and he departs to find Casandra's aunts.

After the shepherd's departure, Casandra reiterates in song her view of marriage:

> Dizen que me case yo:
> no quiero marido no. (ll. 200-201)

Marriage would represent surrender of her liberty:

> Más quiero bivir segura
> 'n esta sierra a mi soltura,

que no estar en ventura
si casaré bien o no, (ll. 202-205)

and that there is no shepherd worthy of her:

No será ni es nacido
tal para ser mi marido;
y pues que tengo sabido
que la flor yo me la so. (ll. 214-217)

When Casandra's suitor returns with her aunts, who enter "bailando una chacota", persuasion is renewed. Cimeria reminds Casandra of her mother's wish that she marry, while Erutea describes the qualities of the shepherd-suitor. But Casandra remains obdurate, reasserting her reasons for not resigning herself to matrimony. Consequently her uncles, "que son hombres entendidos" (l. 303), are summoned to make the girl see reason. They enter dancing, like Casandra's aunts, and, in addition, sing a song descriptive of Casandra's obstinacy. Their presence, however, only aggravates their niece's stubborness because she interprets the gifts they offer her as a bribe:

¿Téngome de captivar
por el dar?
No me engaño yo ansí:
yo digo que prometí
sólo de mí
que no tengo de casar. (ll. 333-338)[46]

Thus far there has been little indication of religious overtones which might indicate a devotional conclusion to the Auto. To all intents and purposes the action and the personages are profane. Casandra's rebellion against her family is based on pride in herself and a distaste for marriage, for which there is substantial testimony in her remonstrances with the shepherd-suitor,

her uncles and aunts. Casandra, it appears, is simply a headstrong girl unwilling to accept family authority.

The matter is, precisely, a petty family affair. Casandra is portrayed as acting in defiance of her mother; the personages introduced to support the suitor are specifically presented as the girl's uncles and aunts. Moreover, the principal preoccupations are mundane. Casandra's refusal is through a concern for her welfare: she has no wish to be shackled to a man who will browbeat her. Similarly, her antagonists' persuasion is mundane. Her suitor boasts,

> Yo soy bien aparentado
> y abastado
> valiente zagal polido, (ll. 53-55)

while her aunts also attempt to impress Casandra in the same manner:

> Es generoso
> y vertuoso,
> cuerdo y bien assombrado;
> tiene tierras y ganado
> y es loado
> músico bien gracioso, (ll. 257-261)

at which the shepherd again boasts and enumerates his possessions (ll. 262-266).

If Vicente intended the conclusion to his work to be forseen, there is little to warrant it. Leo Spitzer was right in saying ("The Artistic Unity...", pp. 62-64) that the opening scenes are comic, with few serious overtones, and he correctly observed that the shepherd-suitor shows none of the wisdom of Solomon, the role he eventually assumes. He is a vain rustic, boastfully conscious of himself in a manner not entirely incompatible with Casandra's

conceit, nor with the conventional portrayal of the amorous rustic in the early Spanish drama. Casandra's relatives are rustics also. Their entry is made with the lightheartednes of song and dance and their attitudes towards Casandra's obduracy show them to be family-minded peasants.

With this secular mood in the first part of the Auto de la Sibila Casandra Vicente created the same atmosphere as in any number of Nativity plays where the sacred and profane are combined. The comic scenes at the beginning of the play entertained the audience and made them more receptive to the religious subject of the second part. The difference between the Auto de la Sibila Casandra and other Nativity plays is the lack of a clear division between the secular and religious parts of the action.[47] A complete fusion between the two parts of the play is achieved by a modulation in the key of a continuous, unitary plot, and by the full revelation of the identities of the personages.

The action becomes more serious when Casandra's uncles enter the argument about her refusal to marry. After refusing the gifts from her uncles and again asserting her determination not to marry, Casandra is rebuked by Moses. He accuses her of blasphemy and, paraphrasing the story of the Creation, reminds her (ll. 339-387) that marriage was instituted by God. With this speech by Moses, the argument between Casandra and her family moves to a different level and the religious implications of her refusal to marry occupy a more prominent position.

Casandra protests that she has no quarrel with marriage as

instituted by God; she rebells against

> ...aquellos que el diablo
> en su retablo
> haze y ordena cadaldía. (ll. 392-395)

In answer to Abraham's suggestion (ll. 412-414) that she might find a good husband, Casandra rephrases her original argument of an impossible harmonious union; but she gives it an additional nuance by stating that only God is perfect and immutable. Finally, she asserts a reason for preserving her virginity:

> Pero yo quiero dezir
> y descobrir
> por qué virgen quiero estar:
> sé que Dios ha de encarnar,
> sin dudar,
> y una virgen ha de parir. (ll. 430-435)

The religious topic has been introduced, officially, as it were. Casandra's assertion causes her aunts to reveal their knowledge of the Incarnation. Erutea confirms it, adding that the Child who is to be born will be adored by shepherds and kings (ll. 436-446); Cimeria dwells on the beauty of the Virgin, her conquest of the Devil, and her significance for all mankind (ll. 447-485); and Peresica pictures the Child weeping at the thought of future suffering (ll. 489-508).[48]

After these statements from the three aunts, now clearly speaking as prophetesses, Casandra reveals the full meaning of her earlier statement about the virgin-birth:

> Yo tengo en mi fantasía
> y juraría
> que de mí ha de nascer,
> que otra de mí merescer
> no puede haver

en bondad ni hidalguía. (ll. 509-514)

They all turn on her, Solomon included--the shepherd-suitor's name being now revealed--believing she has taken leave of her senses, and Isaiah describes the paradox between Casandra and the Virgin of the prophecies:

> Tú eres de ella al revés
> si bien ves,
> porque tú eres humosa,
> sobervia, y presumptosa,
> que es la cosa
> que más desviada es.
> La madre de Dios sin par,
> es de notar
> que humildosa ha de nascer,
> y humildosa conceber,
> y humildosa ha de criar. (ll. 538-548)

The personages all completely forsake their identities as a rustic family concerned with the marriage of a stubborn girl and speak in their roles as Biblical patriarchs and sibylline prophetesses to recall the prophecies they have all made of the Virgin and Child. This part of the action concludes with a description by Isaiah of the Second Coming of Christ on the Last Day (ll. 620-654), a speech culminating in the revelation of a Nativity scene. After a lullaby sung by four angels, the Child in the crib is acknowledged as God incarnate and all personages approach, "cantando y bailando una chacota", to adore. Among them is the erring Casandra, who confesses her fault and speaks to the Virgin whose position she presumed to usurpe. With the adorations concluded and Casandra cured of her aberration, the Auto concludes with a cantiga and a sung and danced villancico.

In spite of the different tones of the beginning and end of the play, the action is a single unit. Departing from the presentation of a shepherdess who refuses to marry the husband chosen by her family, the attempts to persuade her develop into a discussion of the prophecies concerning the birth of Christ and culminate in the presentation of a devotional Nativity scene. The action therefore combines sacred and profane elements; entertainment and devotion are contained in a single sucession of events.

This combination is no better illustrated than by the personages. In presenting the fictional part of the action all the personages were characterized as rustics and were involved with secular interests, but during the religious part they revealed their identities as prophets and prophetesses. All the personages, therefore, have a multiple identity; but their characters are unitary since the transition from their fictional to their historical identities is gentle. Even a violent change, however, would have been acceptable to Vicente's audience, who, at home with the conventions of the Nativity drama, would have expected the pastoral comedy to evolve into a religious drama. Nevertheless, the expectancy of a change does not exempt the dramatist from achieving it as artistically as possible and in accordance with his own dramaturgy.

Even with the audience's anticipation of a change, it would be necessary to assume much to propose that Casandra's declaration of herself as the virgin mother-to-be of Christ is apparent from

the beginning. To suppose she is any more than a shepherdess in revolt against her family would be to anticipate the conclusion of the play and, also, to make an immediate association between Casandra and her prototypes in Vicente's sources, for which there is no justification. Her disdain for her husband-elect derives from pride and a distaste for marriage. Furthermore, Casandra's relationship with the other personages is not founded on a common prophetic ability, but on family ties (as aunts, uncles, and a prospective husband) and her position as an antagonist in a family dispute.

On the other hand, the spectator is partially prepared for Casandra's declaration that she is to be the mother of God, toward which there is a gradual movement. In her opening monologue and in the scene with the shepherd-suitor Casandra adamantly refuses to marry. Her statement,

> No quiero ser desposada
> ni casada,
> ni monja ni ermitaña, (ll. 91-93)

indicates an unwillingness to accept any status beyond her present one and her assertion, sung in the villancico at the conclusion of her dialogue with the shepherd,

> Más quiero bivir segura
> 'n esta sierra a mi soltura. (ll. 202-203)
> .....
> No será ni es nacido
> tal para ser mi marido, (ll. 214-215)

re-affirm her position. It would be erroneous to attribute, as Thomas R. Hart has done ("Gil Vicente's Auto...", pp. 41-43), an allegorical meaning to her words. Her statements justifying her

refusal are significant in their context. To say that they indicate a rejection of Christ, because the shepherd is a figura Christi, is to anticipate the identification of the shepherd with Solomon.

Throughout her conversation with the shepherd in the first scene of the play, Casandra rests her case on the arguments given in her monologue. With the entry of her three aunts, she continues to insist on them, but she does reveal a glimpse of something else at the back of her mind. She tells her aunts,

> ...no quiero casar, no.
> Vosotras, ¿quién vos metió
> que case yo?
> Pues sabed que pienso en ál. (ll. 222-225)

She is certainly thinking of something else insofar as she thinks differently from her aunts, but the phrase is ambiguous, suggestive of an ambition other than marriage. This is confirmed when she says,

> Otro casamiento ordeno
> en mi seno, (ll. 228-229)

in reply to Cimeria, who reminded that Casandra's mother had wished her to marry.

Further cause for doubt that Casandra has totally explained her position comes when she declares that she would not give herself for any price:

> No quiero dar mi limpieza
> y mi pureza
> y mi libertad isienta,
> ni mi ánima contenta,
> por sessenta
> mil milliones de riqueza, (ll. 238-243)

and asserts moments later,

> Yo quiero ser escogida
> en otra vida
> de más perfecta manera. (ll. 247-249)

She does not elaborate further, however, and returns to her former argument of the wife's subjection to her husband.

When the uncles are summoned and attempt to persuade her, Casandra again defends herself with her original arguments. She will not marry for any reason, refuses the gifts offered her (to illustrate, perhaps, that she will not give herself at any price), and argues that marriage is a form of slavery. Only then does she elaborate on the additional idea which she had alluded to fleetingly. Remarking first on God's perfection and the mutability of men, Casandra declares,

> Pero yo quiero dezir
> y descobrir
> por qué virgen quiero estar:
> sé que Dios ha de encarnar,
> sin dudar,
> y una virgen ha de parir. (ll. 430-435)

With this declaration, the full significance of Casandra's attitude is exposed. The revelation has been prepared, however, by the chance remarks dropped earlier. Casandra had, in fact, been gradually moving toward an assertion of this sort.

She has not yet claimed outright that she is the mother-to-be of God incarnate, although it is implicit in her reason for remaining a virgin. She does, indeed, have an ambition other that proposed for her by her family, so that her earlier arguments in defence of her attitude must be given another meaning in addition

to the mundane significance attributed to them. Her constant theme was that marriage enslaved women. Men, she maintained, were inconstant. When her shepherd suitor insisted that he would not be the type she feared, Casandra asked him,

> ¿Y con floritas
> piensas que me engañaré? (ll. 161-162)

The idea was more fully expressed to her aunts after they had praised the qualities of her proposed husband:

> ¿Qué sé yo si mudará,
> o qué hará
> quando se vea casado?
> ¡Oh, quántos ha hí de solteros
> plazenteros,
> de muy blandos condiciones,
> y casados son leones
> y dragones
> y diablos verdaderos! (ll. 276-284)

and was repeated to her uncles after they had reprimanded her blasphemy and suggested she might find a good husband:

> ¿Cómo puede sin passión
> y alteración
> conservarse el casamiento?
> Múdase el contentamiento
> en un momento
> en contraria división. (ll. 418-423)

This statement was followed by her conviction,

> Sólo Dios es perfección
> sin razón,
> si verdad queréis que hable;
> que el hombre todo es mudable
> y variable
> por humanal comprissión, (ll. 424-429)

and declaration of the reason for remaining a virgin.

With her declaration, her earlier enigmatic remarks ("Otro casamiento ordeno / en mi seno", ll. 228-229, and "Yo quiero ser escogida / en otra vida / de más perfecta manera", ll. 247-249)

are clarified and her arguments against marriage are seen as the very reasons for remaining single. Casandra desires a perfect marriage with God, who will not maltreat her as she believes a mortal husband would. For this reason, her rejection of the shepherd cannot symbolize a rejection of God and Christ. Rejection of him only indicates Casandra's refusal to enter an earthly union. The opening scenes of the play, are, therefore, purposefully secular and depict Casandra's disdain for the world and aspiration toward the divine.

Once Casandra has stated her real reason for not marrying, it is a short step for her to declare outright that Christ will be born of her:

> Yo tengo en mi fantasía
> y juraría
> que de mí ha de nascer,
> que otra de mi merescer
> no puede haver
> en bondad ni hidalguía. (ll. 509-514)

From the point of view of her characterization, however, the operative lines are the last three. In addition to disliking marriage as a form of slavery, Casandra was proud. At the very beginning of the play she was quoted as asking,

> ¿Quál será pastor nacido
> tan polido
> ahotas que me meresca? (ll. 7-9)

and in the villancico sung when her suitor left to find her aunts, she asserted her superiority over all possible husbands:

> No será ni es nacido
> tal para ser mi marido;
> y pues que tengo sabido
> que la flor yo me la so. (ll. 214-217)

It is no surprise that Casandra should prophesy a divine future for herself. In fact, she is criticized precisely on account of her pride (see ll. 535-571), which, as Leo Spitzer observed ("The Artistic Unity...", p. 58), turns her into an "anti-Mary".

The first part of the Auto is comic, but, at least in respect of Casandra's characterization, it contains the necessary ideas for the emergence of the religious subject in the second half. In the Auto pastoril castellano Vicente prepared the shepherd Gil for his transformation by portraying him with an appropriate disposition, even if the transformation itself occurred through external intervention. Casandra is also prepared for the transformation from refusal of an earthly marriage to aspiration to a divine union, but the change occurs solely through the evolution of character. Both the rejection of the shepherd-suitor and the claim to the divine motherhood of Christ have the same motivation. Casandra rejects the shepherd on account of a scorn for the insufferable mutability of men and her pride in herself, the same pride which causes her to consider herself worthy of a perfect and immutable God.

There is a definite transformation worked in the character of Casandra. Her transition from the mundane concerns of her marriage to a shepherd to a preoccupation with divine fecundation is consistent, but there is a clear contrast between her state at the beginning and at the end of the play. Her attitude has changed. At the begining she is proud and intransigent; at the end she is humbled and repentent and begs forgiveness from the Virgin and Child. Her identity has also changed. While concerned

with defending her refusal to marry the shepherd proposed as her husband, Casandra is a headstrong shepherdess in rebellion against her family, but from the moment that she unreservedly bases her arguments on her belief that she is to be the mother of God incarnate, she is Casandra the prophetess. Moreover, she is a prophetess whose predictions are false, a fact she recognizes herself during the adoration scene at the end of the Auto:

> Señor, yo, de ya perdida
> 'n esta vida,
> no te oso pedir nada,
> porque nunca di passada
> concertada,
> ni deviera ser nacida. (ll. 734-739)

The nature of Casandra's character and the manner of its development are paramount for the understanding of the other personages since the gradual unfolding of her interest and the transition from one identity to another cause a parallel evolution in them. As her relatives or her husband-to-be, all the other personages are initially concerned with Casandra's marriage from a purely mundane point of view. Their interests and behaviour derive from Casandra's refusal to follow their wishes, but when she broaches the subject of the Incarnation they are no longer concerned with persuading her to accept the marriage. Their concern is for the event Casandra has prophesied and they speak as prophets and prophetesses, not as members of a particular family circle.

Casandra's three aunts enter to the tune of a chacota, determined to vanquish their niece's obstinacy. They are motivated by family concern and give little hint that they are later to recite the prophecies of the Incarnation. Their names,

however, are known even before they enter, since the shepherd-suitor announces as he leaves to find them,

> Yo voy llamar all aldea
> Erutea
> y a Peresica, tu tía,
> y a Cimeria... (ll. 190-193)

Consequently, they could be immediately associated with the pagan sibyls. The revelation of these identities is stalled, however, till long after their entry and is prepared firstly by Moses' speech in which Casandra's attitude to marriage is rebuked by reference to Genesis and, secondly, by Casandra's own mention of the Incarnation. After this second incident they speak solely as prophetesses who relate their knowledge of the birth of Christ. The marriage of a rebellious niece is forgotten.

Casandra's three uncles, who enter dancing a folía and singing a cantiga, are similarly introduced as secular personages. The opportunity to assimilate them as Casandra's uncles is barely given, however. Introducing himself as he accused Casandra of blasphemy, Moses recited a paraphrase of Genesis:

> Blasfemas, que el casamiento
> es sacramento,
> y el primero que fue.
> Yo, Moysén, te lo diré,
> y contaré
> dónde huvo fundamiento. (ll. 339-344)

He is, therefore, immediately identified with the Old Testament patriarch. His recitation introduces the religious topic, since it prompts Casandra to make her declaration about the Incarnation, which, in turn, is followed by the prophecies spoken by the three aunts. By the time the other two prophets, Isaias and Abraham, are heard, prophecy has been well introduced as a topic of

conversation, and the personages can easily refer to each other as people who had foretold the birth of Christ and the circumstances of its accomplishment.

Casandra's shepherd-suitor is equally assimilated into his role as a prophet. At the beginning of the play his name is unknown. To all appearances he is a rustic concerned only for his marriage to Casandra. There are some indications, however, that he is something other than a simple rustic. Attempting to convince Casandra of the worth of her suitor, Erutea speaks of the shepherd (ll. 260-261) as a "loado / músico muy gracioso", which may be construed as a reference to the Biblical Solomon. Similarly, the shepherd himself describes his possessions in terms of what could be a reference to the Song of Songs:

> Tengo pumares y viñas
> y mil pinas
> de rosas pera holgares;
> tengo villas y lugares
> y más treinta y dos galinas. (ll. 262-266)[49]

Finally, Erutea makes what could be interpreted as an oblique reference to Solomon's royal lineage:

> Sobrina, este zagal
> es real,
> y para ti está escogido. (ll. 267-269)

These references, however, are all relevant to their context and adopt additional significance only in retrospect (see above n. 49).

When the shepherd's identity is transformed these references can be recalled, but the process is above all the consequence of transformations already taken place in the other personages. Since they have all become prophets, the shepherd must become so

also in order to avoid an inconsistency in the overall pattern. The change in identity, however, is almost imperceptible. The revelation of his name is only half a revelation. After hearing Casandra claim she will be the mother of Christ, he says,

> Casandra, según que muestra
> essa repuesta
> tan fuera de conclusión,
> tú loca, yo Salomón, (ll. 527-530)

He calls himself a Solomon in wisdom by comparison with her madness, but he is also declaring that he is Solomon in person. The latter is not the uppermost idea, however, and confirmation of it does not come till several lines later when Moses refers to him,

> Y tú también, Salomón,
> buen garçon,
> los cantares que hazías
> todos eran profecías. (ll. 583-586)

The change is subtle, without violence to his previous characterization as a rustic. The shepherd is now as much a prophet as the other personages, but, presumably in deference to his earlier characterization as a rustic, he does not participate in the recitation of prophecies. Any possible incongruity is avoided by having the other personages pronounce the prophecies of the Biblical Solomon.[50]

The Auto de la Sibila Casandra has the same duality in the action and characters as that found in the majority of early Spanish Nativity dramas. It contains a religious subject evolving from a secular action and combines the purposes of entertainment and edification without lacking in unity. Moreover, Vicente

integrated the personages into all facets of his work and avoided the inconsistencies common in this type of drama. It cannot, therefore, be agreed with Leo Spitzer, who stated that Vicente was more interested in the construction of the individual scenes than the complete play and the overall psychology of the personages.[51] It has been shown that the Auto is to be comprehended as a complete unity and that Vicente took special care to combine the disparate elements of his work.

Leo Spitzer's classification ("The Artistic Unity...", pp. 56-60) of the central idea of the play as prophecy, however, may be accepted. The entire movement in the action and in characterization is toward the recitation of the prophecies concerning the birth of Christ and the final revelation of the Nativity scene. In this respect, Vicente's skill as a dramatist must be acknowledged.

The portrayal of Casandra both as a rebellious shepherdess and as an erring prophetess are the keys to the action of the Auto. These two aspects account for the symmetrical presentation of the action and the relationships of the personages in the two halves of the play. In the first part, the personages are related by family ties and a common hostility to Casandra. These relationships are preserved in the second part, but on a different level. Then, the personages are related by their common identity as prophets and prophetesses and their continued hostility to Casandra, now presented as an erring prophetess. As a result, the second, religious part of the work may be considered as a form of divinization of the earlier, secular portion.

The possibilities of action and character manifest in the second part of the play are already latent in the first. All the personages are capable of becoming prophets and prophetesses and Casandra's arguments for refusing to marry can be associated to her final reason, her claim to divine motherhood. The secular action is, therefore, the device for presenting the personages in their final roles and celebrating the Christmas festival.

This last point is stressed by the neglect for Casandra's marriage once she has introduced the topic of prophecy. With her statements concerning the Incarnation, all the other personages change their interests and become preoccupied with their own prophecies, a development produced in two stages, both connected with statements from Casandra. The first is her declaration of the true reason for not marrying:

> Sé que Dios ha de encarnar,
> sin dudar,
> y una virgen ha de parir, (ll. 433-435)

which prompts her three aunts (as prophetesses) to relate their knowledge of the Nativity. The second stage is marked by Casandra's outright assertion that she is the Virgin of the prophecies. Her uncles (as prophets) expose Casandra's falsehood by giving the true picture of the Virgin and Child discernible from their own prophecies and, although at first concerned with correcting Casandra's error, their interest soon rests on the prophecies for their own sake.

In the final part of the play, the sole topic of interest, to which everything has led, is prophecy. Lines spoken by Abraham,

Si hoviéssemos de declarar
y platicar
quanto de ella está escrito,
sería cuento infinito
que el spirito
no puede considerar:
todo fue profetizado
por mandado
d'aquel día profundo,
no segundo
mas postero, es devulgado, (ll. 594-605)

are the closest statement of this topic to be found in the play. The first of the clear Biblical references was spoken by Moses when he rebuked Casandra's rejection of marriage by paraphrasing Genesis; the last, spoken by Isaias, is a description of the Last Day. Thus, between them they cover the whole of history and the whole of prophecy (see Spitzer, "The Artistic Unity...", pp. 57-58).

The topic of prophecy is emphasized by the revelation of a Nativity scene after the references to the Last Day, whereupon Christ's birth is graphically depicted as the culmination of all prophecy. The ingenuity and the effect of juxtaposing this scene with the prophecies of the Last Day are remarkable. Without detracting from Vicente's ingenuity, however, it may be recalled that the effect he sought was also contained in Church liturgy. Prophecy, particularly of the Last Day, is a prominent feature of Advent, the liturgical season preceding Christmas.[52] In this respect, and in spite of the secular action in the Auto, Vicente did not depart from a liturgical basis. What he did was embroider it by incorporating into it a number of other features from several sources.

The juxtaposition of the Nativity with the prophecies concerning the Last Day also recalls the historical ambivalence of the Christmas

shepherd play. In Vicente's Auto, however, this ambivalence is more complex than that of many other Nativity plays. His play presents shepherds as contemporary rustics in its first part and, in its second, these same personages as historical figures, each belonging to a different period of either pagan or Christian history, but nonetheless presented as contemporary with the birth of Christ. This characteristic is, however, relevant to the subject of the play. Just as in the Auto de los reyes magos, Vicente was concerned with the continuing validity of the Incarnation, significant not just for one moment in history, but for all persons at all times. It can, therefore, be presented as the culmination of the past, present, and future, as occurs when the Nativity scene is revealed after a discussion of prophecies relating to the whole of history. In this context, all temporal barriers are invalid and personages of differing historical periods--even of different cultures--may consort as familiars and contemporaries without any sense of inconsistency.

With the Auto de la Sibila Casandra, the early Christmas shepherd play in Spain reached its apogée. The problems of combining the sacred and the profane, with the concomitant problems of historical ambivalence, were all solved and in doing so Vicente eliminated the defects in the work of his Castilian contemporaries from Juan del Encina onward. To achieve this, however, he had to broaden the base of the Christmas shepherd play by associating a number of other traditions with it.

Vicente's remaining Nativity composition in Castilian requires only a brief mention. The Auto de los cuatro tiempos was written

for performance before Vicente's royal patrons, probably in 1511 or 1516.[53] The work has been fully analyzed by Eugenio Asensio in "El Auto dos quatro tempos de Gil Vicente"[54] and convincingly shown to be a dramatization of part of the Office of Our Lady. Asensio traced the separate elements of Vicente's sources (liturgy, iconography, cosmology, and mythology) to the prayers for Christmas Matins, iconographical and architectural depictions of the universe and the seasons, the encyclopoedia of Bartholomeus Angelicus, El libro de proprietatibus rerum (1494), and to the Coronación of Juan de Mena. Asensio's conclusion is readily acceptable: "El auto que analizamos es una laude escenificada; ... no ha dejado sucesión conocida en el teatro religioso. Ha sido una tentativa aislada, una aventura poética" ("El Auto...", p. 375).

The Auto has affinities with Vicente's other Nativity compositions: the depiction of Winter as a freezing rustic readily recalls the shepherds complaints against the weather; the dispute between the seasons evokes memories of arguments between shepherds; above all, the combination of figures representative of pagan and christian history recalls a similar combination in the Auto de la Sibila Casandra. In spite of these affinities, however, the Auto is omitted from this study because it differs radically from the Nativity plays discussed and does not present the same problems. While showing the author's continued ability to find and mould sources not traditional to the Nativity drama, the Auto de los cuatro tiempos is more closely related to Vicente's later,

allegorical plays written mostly in Portuguese. Consequently, it is better evaluated in an investigation devoted to Gil Vicente's overall dramaturgy rather than in a study intended to evaluate aspects of the early Castilian theatre (see above n. 1).

The close relationship of Gil Vicente's Castilian Nativity plays with the tradition of which Juan del Encina was the first exponent is clear, but Vicente's works also indicated the future trends of that tradition. In order to produce works which were not simple imitations of those written by his contemporaries, Vicente resorted to non-conventional sources and enlarged upon the staid devices of action and characterization. Thus, in spite of assertions to the contrary, the Nativity play was not dead. It could continue as a creative genre as long as dramatists were able to expand its subject-matter and modify its existing forms.[55] A discussion of developments in Spanish Nativity drama during the middle years and second half of the sixteenth century is not relevant to this study.[56] It is, however, apposite to observe that trends established in the first two decades of the sixteenth century did not disappear in a few years, but continued to flourish long after the demise of the early dramatists. The Danza del santissimo nacimiento de Nuestro Señor Jesucristo (Madrid, 1561), by Pero Suárez de Robles,[57] for example, has many of the characteristic features of the earliest Nativity plays. If the same trends survived, however, they generally did so in evolved forms, since the simple dramatization in a contemporary setting of St. Luke's narrative was no longer adequate.

The traditional story of the shepherds of Bethlehem was partly abandonned, a development already apparent in the first decade of the sixteenth century. Torres Naharro's Diálogo del Nascimiento and Addición del diálogo combined political discussion and religious didacticism with bawdy rustic comedy and humorous blasphemy (see above chap. IV). The subject-matter of his composition is somewhat remote from the juxtaposition of religious and secular elements in the Nativity performances of Juan del Encina and the moralizing in those by Lucas Fernández. The Christmas shepherd play in part tended henceforth to commemorate rather than re-enact the Nativity. While shepherds remained important figures in the action in which they were involved, they only incidentally reflected their Biblical origin.

The composition combining didacticism and rough rustic humour prevailed in the middle years of the sixteenth century with the work of Diego Sánchez de Badajoz. His Recopilación en metro (Seville, 1554), containing 28 plays, has 11 works associated with the Nativity, in which rustics play important roles, but not necessarily as Biblical shepherds. By his time they had become devices of comedy, foils of the dramatist's didacticism and satire, and are involved in situations unrelated to the Nativity story. Thus, the role of the shepherd evolved and the traditions of the Christmas shepherd play became less restrictive. Stories from the Old Testament were dramatized by Diego Sánchez and performed as Christmas celebrations with allegorical personages intervening in the action. In fact, Diego Sánchez's Nativity plays must be seen

in the broader context of the history of the religious drama as a whole and the evolution of the auto sacramental.[58]

Once the original Christmas shepherd play had been so radically altered, it could not survive in its earlier form. Hence the combination of a shepherd play with a morality is a characteristic of some later Nativity works: Bartolomé Aparicio's El pecador[59] combines an Everyman type morality play with a rustic Nativity scene; the Comedia a lo pastoril para la noche de Navidad[60] presents the allegory of the Four Daughters of God with the traditional shepherd play; and a work by Jorge de Montemayor unites Biblical allegory and rustic realism.[61] On the other hand, with the continued juxtaposition of a religious subject and a secular action, the problems of disunity and disparity of interest apparent in the Nativity plays discussed in the preceding chapters survived even in the different kinds of plays about the Incarnation written in the later years of the sixteenth century. The Nativity play was no longer what it was, but dramatists were still confronted with the same problems as their predecessors, the presentation of entertainment and instruction in one work in order to provoke laughter and devotion.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER V

[1]A discussion of Vicente's Portuguese plays is beyond the scope of this study, which is concerned only with Castilian drama. It is understood, however, that a full appraisal of his ability would entail an analysis of all his dramatic compositions. (See Obras completas, ed. Marques Braga, 2nd. ed., 6 vols., Lisbon, 1951; Aubrey F. G. Bell, Estudios vicentinos, trans. Antonio Alvaro Doria, Lisbon, 1940; Anselmo Braamcaamp Freire, Vida e obras de Gil Vicente, "trovador, mestre da balança", Lisbon, 1944.) In the present study only Vicente's contribution in the development of the early Castilian shepherd play is evaluated.

[2]The text of Vicente's plays cited in this chapter is according to Obras dramáticas castellanas, ed. Thomas R. Hart. The dates, occasions, and circumstances of performance of many of Vicente's plays are given in his Copilaçam, edited by his son in 1562. Although the dates proposed for Vicente's Castilian Nativity plays are not questioned, I. S. Révah ("La comedia dans l'oeuvre de Gil Vicente", BHTP, II, 1951, 1-39) has exposed the incorrectness of many of the dates and occasions suggested for other plays.

[3]Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 33) emphatically proclaimed Vicente the founder of the Portuguese theatre: "Few men can be said to have created a national drama, yet the title of creator of the drama in Portugal belongs unquestionably to Gil Vicente... Before his time... both secular and religious drama were in an undeveloped state, and his extraordinary production was due almost entirely to his own originality and artistry". I. S. Révah examined Vicente's claim as the creator of the drama in Portugal in "Gil Vicente, a-t-il été le fondateur du théâtre portugais?" BHTP, I (1950), 153-185, and in the aforementioned "La comedia dans l'oeuvre de Gil Vicente".

[4]Hence its other title, the Monólogo del vaquero (Crawford, Spanish Drama..., p. 33).

[5]The role of the vaquero was conceivably performed by Vicente, just as Encina probably played the shepherd Juan in Egloga I. Hence, although not concerned with personal problems, the performance of Vicente's Auto was possibly based on a personal situation.

[6]Compare the argument between Bonifacio and Gil in Lucas Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento, the pullas in the Farsa by Fernando Díaz, and the rustic introitos to the comedias by Torres Naharro.

[7]Egloga VIII, ll. 1-80. In the same eclogue, see (ll. 171-172 and 176-177) Menga's amazement at her surroundings.

[8]The situation recalls Eglogas I, V, and VIII, in which Encina's patrons were silent participants in the performance.

[9]See, in particular, the excerpt from Iñigo de Mendoza's Vita Christi.

[10]The celebration of the Nativity by Nature is found in Fernández's Auto o farsa del nascimiento and the idea that Nature and man celebrated together was a feature of several commemorative plays (see below the works analyzed in chap. VI).

[11]Cf.: Pesame que no ay espacio,
que aun de aquessa, yo sabria
contar la genalogia
de todo su gerenacio. (Egl. II, ll. 60-63)

The lineage of Christ and of the shepherd Bonifacio were discussed in Lucas Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento; in López de Yanguas' Nativity eclogue the whole genealogy of Christ was featured. The device also appeared in secular drama. See Appendix B, s.v. "Genealogy"; Crawford, "Early Spanish Wedding Plays", RR, XII (1922), 370-384; and John Lihani, "Lucas Fernández and the Evolution...", passim.

[12]Compare, for example, the items enumerated in the final scene of Encina's Egloga IX.

[13]Encina's achievements must not, however, be belittled. He,too, exploited the conventions he helped to form and suited them to the circumstances of his performances. His Eglogas I, V, VI, and VIII are sufficient evidence.

[14]In fairness to Menéndez y Pelayo, it must be added that he did point out the value and originality of Vicente's later works (see Antología..., III, pp. 356 ff.). For an outline of the total evolution in Vicente's dramaturgy, see the aforementioned articles by Révah.

[15]Hart did credit Vicente with surpassing his contemporaries, but somewhat imprecisely: "Gil Vicente no se contentó con lo que habían hecho los salmantinos. Les superaba mucho como poeta lírico. No hay nada en las obras de Encina y Lucas Fernández que pueda compararse con las delicadas canciones de los autos navideños vicentinos ... Gil Vicente supo aumentar el interés dramático de sus autos, fijando la atención de su auditorio no ya en el nacimiento del Señor, sino más bien en las reacciones diversas de los hombres ante este acontecimiento" (Obras dramáticas..., pp. xxii-xxiii).

[16]The device also appears in Encina's Egloga IX and in Fernández's Auto o farsa del nascimiento.

[17]Compare the following lines from Fernández's Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella:

y el crego de Vico Nuño,
que es un hombre bien sesudo. (Aiv-v)

(See Lihani, "Lucas Fernández and the Evolution...", p. 259.)

[18]See Crawford, "Early Spanish Wedding Plays", passim, and Appendix B, s.v. "Gifts". Vicente expanded the rustic scene--the conventional first part of the Christmas shepherd play--by introducing elements from the purely secular drama, particularly those most closely associated with wedding plays.

[19]Compare the "night-spell" cast by Mark in the Wakefield Second Shepherds' Pageant (see "Everyman" and Medieval Miracle Plays, ed. A. C. Cawley, Everyman's Library, London, 1962, p. 91.)

[20]See, for example, the roles of Juan in Lucas Fernández's Auto o farsa del nascimiento, of Gil in the anonymous Egloga interlocutoria, of Juan in the Farsa by López Ranjel, and of Mingo in López de Yanguas' Egloga en loor de la Natividad.

[21]In Lucas Fernández's Auto o farsa del nascimiento, for example, the comic rustics in the first part of the play also had to be the expositors of the Incarnation in the second half.

[22]Encina combined his personal affairs with a fictional plot in Egloga VIII, but even in that work he separated the two parts of the action with a villancico.

[23]Egloga IX did, however, have unity, but not as a result of evolution of character. See (above, chap. II) the analysis of that eclogue.

[24]The point has already been made, however (see above chap. II, n. 22), that the idea of the Biblical shepherds as the propagators of Christianity was well established in the Christmas shepherd drama.

[25]See Carolina Michaelis de Vasconcellos, "Notas vicentinas. Preliminares duma edição crítica das obras de Gil Vicente", Revista da Universidade de Coimbra, IX (1925), p. 357. The identification with Gil Vicente, however, even if he performed the role of Gil, contributes nothing further to the understanding of the Auto since the work is without personal overtones similar to those in Encina's eclogue.

[26]The shepherds Bonifacio and Gil in that play (see above chap. III) set about the hermit Macario. See nn. 29, 31, and 32 below.

[27]The same figure, the number of days between Christmas and the Epiphany, appears in the twelfth century Auto de los Reyes Magos.

[28]The references in parentheses are to Covarrubias, Tesoro de la

lengua castellana o española, ed. cit., p. 531a, l. 59, and p. 683b, ll. 19-31.

[29]Bonifacio taunts Macario with the same accusation in Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento (see below n. 32)

[30]The idea has overtones of Erasmianism. See Marcel Bataillon, Erasmo y España: Estudios sobre la historia espiritual del siglo XVI, trans. Antonio Alatorre, Mexico-Buenos Aires, 1966, p. 910, s.v. "Vicente".

[31]See the following lines from Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento having a similar rhyme and expressing a similar idea:

Gil: Gran famulario
deueys ser.
¿Rezays nesse calendario?
Bonifacio: Mas santilario a mi ver. (Dii-v)

[32]Compare Bonifacio's question to Macario:

¿Soys echacuerbo o buldero
de cruzada? (Dii-v)

[33]López Morales (Tradición y creación..., p. 200) accepted Hart's conclusions, but neither he nor Hart paid close enough attention to friar Alberto's words.

[34]Vicente derived little from the New Testament story in Matthew (II, 1-16). For his sources, see Hart, Obras dramáticas..., p. 35, note to l. 296.

[35]The only other early known vernacular Spanish Epiphany play is the twelfth century Auto de los Reyes Magos.

[36]Portrayal of the differences between representatives of the town and the country appears, for example, in Encina's Egloga VII and X (see Appendix B, s.v. "Town and country contrasted").

[37]Vicente did not adhere to traditional texts because he chose references appropriate for the Epiphany (Isaias, LX, 1-3, and Psalm LXXI), a story his contemporaries did not dramatize (see above n. 35).

[38]The Copilaçam gave the occasion of performance as Christmas Day Matins at the convent of Xóbregas before the Portuguese royal family (Hart, Obras dramáticas..., p. 43), but did not give the year. This can be inferred from the occasion of performance as 1513 (see Braamcamp Freire, Vida e obras de Gil Vicente..., pp. 154-155).

[39]See Young, The Drama of the Medieval Church, II, chap. XXI, pp. 125-171.

[40]Donovan, The Liturgical Drama..., p. 228, s.v. "Sibyl", and Gillet, "The 'Memorias' of Felipe Fernández Vallejo...", pp. 267-280.

[41]See Lida de Malkiel, "Para la génesis del Auto de la sibila Casandra".

[42]See Révah, "L'Auto de la Sibylle Cassandre de Gil Vicente", pp. 181-188 and 192-193.

[43]Georgiana Goddard King, The Play of the Sibyl Cassandra, Bryn Mawr, 1921.

[44]The audience would have grown accustomed to the change and, therefore, expected it, but in some plays this change was abrupt. See, for example, Encina's Egloga IX and Vicente's own Auto pastoril castellano, although the shepherd Gil had been prepared for the event in the latter play. Lucas Fernández, on the other hand, attempted a gradual introduction of the religious subject in both his Nativity plays.

[45]Encina had already dramatized the subject in Egloga VII (published 1496) and Lucas Fernández employed it in the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella, which Vicente knew (see above n. 17), and in the Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella. Vicente expanded the traditions of the Nativity drama by including devices from the secular plays, just as in the Auto pastoril castellano when he included a scene more appropriate to a wedding play (see above n. 18).

[46]Casandra's refusal can be taken quite literally. There is no reason to suppose, as Hart did ("Gil Vicente's Auto...", p. 46), that the gifts were symbolic. Their inclusion is conceivably derived from the tradition of the pastourelle and the pastoral love drama, whereby the suitor offered gifts to the shepherdess he courted.

[47]Lucas Fernández had attempted to avoid such a division, but was not so successful as Gil Vicente (see above chap. III).

[48]The idea of the Child weeping at the thought of future suffering is also found in Gómez Manrique's Representación, in which the subjects of the birth and death of Christ are combined.

[49]There is a danger, however, of seeing too many symbolic overtones and too many possible Biblical references. Hart, for example, had difficulty in fitting the "treinta y dos galinas" into his allegory ("Gil Vicente's Auto...", p. 44). Spitzer, however, put the matter in its proper perspective: "Those 32 hens appearing at the end of the list, 'anticlimatically', as Mr. Hart has felt, have to my ear (which is not an allegorical one) a distinctly jocular ring. Solomon is here not yet an almighty

king, but a small chicken farmer, proud of what he owns" ("The Artistic Unity...", p. 64).

[50]See ll. 587-592, a paraphrase of part of the Song of Songs attributed to Solomon, but here spoken by Moses.

[51]"The Artistic Unity...", p. 63. It is true, as Spitzer said when he made this point, that it was convenient for Vicente to transform the shepherd-suitor into Solomon when he was no longer required in the former role. But the Auto de la Sibila Casandra is the sum of all its scenes and in it there is a consistent and combined evolution of action and character.

[52]Reference to the Last Day and Judgement was also a feature of the Ordo Prophetarum (see above nn. 39 and 40).

[53]The occasion of performance is described in the Copilaçam (see Hart, Obras dramáticas..., p. 69), the date of which is inferred from this information (see Braamcamp Freire, Vida e obras de Gil Vicente..., p. 154).

[54]RFE, XXXIII (1949), 350-375.

[55]Emilio Cotarelo remarked on the stagnancy of the liturgical drama, "El teatro litúrgico se hallaba, pues, estacionado: cuando quiso introducir alguna novedad tuvo que echar mano de cierto elemento profano, duramente reprobado por los prelados y concilios; lo cual demuestra que no era aquel su sitio" ("Juan del Encina y los orígenes...", pp. 111-112). Certainly the liturgical drama was exhausted, but it is incorrect to assume that the Nativity drama developed no further after Juan del Encina.

[56]For the further history of the Nativity drama in the sixteenth century, with a study of the different directions of its evolution, see Beatrice Patt, "The Development of the Christmas Play...".

[57]Ed. J. E. Gillet, PMLA, XLIII (1928), 614-634.

[58]There are few monographs on the work of Diego Sánchez de Badajoz, the most important being José López Prudencio, Diego Sánchez de Badajoz: Estudio crítico, biográfico y bibliográfico, Madrid, 1915. For an evaluation of Sánchez de Badajoz's contribution to the auto sacramental, see Wardropper, Introducción..., pp. 185-209.

[59]Ed. Bartolomé José Gallardo, Ensayo de una biblioteca..., I, cols. 221-244.

[60]Ed. J. P. W. Crawford, RHi, XXIV (1911), 497-541.

[61]"Three Autos of Jorge de Montemayor", ed. Florence Whyte, PMLA, XLIII (1928), 953-989.

## Chapter VI

## MISCELLANEOUS COMMEMORATIVE PLAYS

The recurrence of devices of action and characterization in the Christmas shepherd plays can be ascribed partly to their dramatization of the same subject. Almost without exception, the dramatists were confronted by problems arising from the combination of disparate elements in one work. They resolved such problems in the style of the primitive artist by eliminating all sense of perspective and dimension. At the same time, certain characteristics of the Christmas shepherd plays were determined by the circumstances of performance. The works were intended to entertain a contemporary audience and sometimes to flatter a patron; in addition, they commemorated or re-enacted an historical event of religious significance and thereby promoted a spirit of devotion. Consequently, the characters had a multiple identity and the action a multiple purpose, while both characters and action were relevant to the circumstances of performance and the historical events re-enacted.

With the group of plays discussed in this chapter it is also necessary to take account of features of composition already observed during description of the Christmas shepherd plays. Whether of some national, political event, of some religious or civic festivity, all the plays in this group were commemorative and entertained as well as promoted participation in and reflection about

the event commemorated. The idea of "enseñar deleitando" persists. Moreover, these plays, written as a result of specific historical or festive occasions, were intrinsically related to a single performance and, in some cases, were intended for a prescribed audience in a determined locality.

Problems caused by multiplicity of action and character are also encountered, although in a form different from those posed by the Nativity plays. A number of personages appear in pastoral disguise and partake of fictional and historical identities, but there is no longer a question of historical ambivalence. Where a specific event is dramatized, it is a matter of contemporary history, so that there is no temporal disparity in the portrayal of contemporary figures as contemporary rustics. On the other hand, it will be necessary to comment on the use of allegory, a facet of characterization not encountered in the Nativity drama.

The first five plays of this group are related to the struggle between France and Spain during the last decade of the fifteenth century and the first quarter of the sixteenth. It could be argued that there are only four plays, or, if five, that only four are directly related to the political subject. The first two of the group differ in subject, but are linked by their composition for performance on a single occasion and by their introduction of the same personages. These are Eglogas V and VI by Juan del Encina. Both eclogues were first printed in Encina's Cancionero (Salamanca, 1496),[1] but an allusion in the first of them to a treaty signed between France and Spain, probably the Treaty of Barcelona (January, 1493), and their known composition for a Shrove Tuesday place their

performance during Carnival in 1493.[2]

Superficially, the relationship between the two plays is the same as between Encina's Eglogas I and II, where the first was concerned with the poet's personal affairs and his standing with his patrons, and the second with a festive occasion. Since Encina chose to present two eclogues, however, each must be considered as a separate entity before discussing any overall unity.

From the title-prologue of Egloga V, it is known that performance took place "en la noche postrera de Carnal, que dizen de Antruejo o Carnestollendas" and that "cuatro pastores llamados Beneyto y Bras, Pedruelo y Lloriente" (p. 71) were introduced in it. Beneyto speaks first, lamenting an unknown misfortune. He is eventually prevailed upon by Bras to reveal the cause of his distress, which arises from the imminent departure of their master for a war against France. The two shepherds discuss their sense of impending loss and eulogize their master for his military prowess and their mistress for her beauty. Finally, still unconsoled, Beneyto renews his lament. Bras, however, calls to Pedruelo, who has been to the market and may have heard more news. On Pedruelo's entry a brief discussion of the business at the market is followed by a reference to the coming season of Lent. The news is then given (see above n. 2),

> Miafe, dizen que estara,
> si a Dios praz,
> ya Castilla y Francia en paz,
> que ninguna guerra avra. (ll. 197-200)

Beneyto gleefully receives the news and awards Pedruelo a "borrega".[3] The eclogue ends when, joined by a fourth shepherd, Lloriente, a villancico in praise of peace is sung.

The content of the eclogue left little room for development of character. As the title-prologue informs, the personages are all shepherds. In this guise they are fictional creations, and, in the simplest of terms, the eclogue first portrays the reaction of a group of shepherds to the news of their master's departure for war and, later, to the tidings of peace. Consequently, they are characterized as conventional rustics. Their language is the customary Sayagués and their grief is expressed as an effect on their lives, a loss of protection on account of their absent master:

Bèneyto: ¡Ay de mi! Tan sin abrigo,
mi ganado
no quiere pacer bocado,
aunque lo lanço en el trigo.

Bras: ¡O, que casta tan aguda!
La res muda,
¡sentir el mal de su dueño!
Beneyto: Mi ganado, en verme el ceño
se demuda
como persona sesuda.
Bras: Beneyto, no pongo duda,
que bien siento
que sentiras gran tormento
en quellotrança tan cruda.

Beneyto: Tan cruda dizes, ¡y cuanto!
Yo me espanto
como no soy muerto ya.
En pensar que se nos va
ya no canto;
mi cantar es todo llanto. (ll. 57-76)

Although the personages are portrayed as make-believe shepherds, the situation they represent is not so. The title-prologue relates that the performance took place "en la sala adonde el duque y duquesa estavan" (p. 71). Hence the shepherds are not any shepherds, nor their master any master. On the contrary, the actors are intended as the employees of the audience, so that an actor-

audience relationship is established in which the latter performs a necessary, if silent, role. In fact, Encina's audience, the Duke and Duchess of Alba, is the justification for the performance. The shepherds' distress at the imminent departure of their master for a war against France is simply the excuse for Encina to flatter his patrons and voice his fear of losing them. Alfredo Alvarez de la Villa correctly suggested (El aucto del repelón, p. 147) that "probablemente en el pastor Beneito hemos de ver al propio Juan del Encina", and if Encina played the role himself--just as he may have played roles in other plays alluding to his own affairs--the Duke and Duchess would have had no difficulty in recognizing the purpose of the eclogue. Multiplicity is apparent, therefore, to the extent that Encina adopted a conventional pastoral disguise to cover his own identity and thoughts.

The nature of the play is determined by specific circumstances and its dedication to a prescribed audience, but Encina transcended these limitations and related his work to a wider audience and a more general situation. The action of the eclogue relies on the relationship between the actors and the audience (i.e. between the shepherds and their master, or the poet and his patrons). The threat of war and the departure of the Duke, perhaps to his death on the battlefield, affects the immediate livelihood of both the shepherds of the pastoral fiction and the real poet. Loss of a master or patron is a loss of security. The actors, therefore, convey a personal reaction; but after welcoming the news of peace they convey a more universal or national sentiment. Having rejoiced that their master will not leave,

Buenos ramos
avremos con nuestros amos,
si Dios las pazes ordena, (ll. 218-220)

the shepherds pray and sing a villancico in the final scene for the preservation of peace,

Roguemos a Dios por paz
pues que dEl solo se espera
quEl es la paz verdadera, (ll. 241-243)

and hope that in the event of a fight the French may be soundly beaten,

Si guerras forçadas son,
El nos de tanta ganacia
que la flor de lis de Francia
la vença nuestro leon. (ll. 258-261)

Encina was initially prompted by a situation caused by a political event, arisen between himself and his patron, who become the actor and audience of his work. As a result, he concerned himself first with a personal worry and second with a national desire for peace or victory. In addition, therefore, to embodying himself in one of the personages and making use of a kind of multiple identity as in Eglogas I and II, Encina also used the personages for a double purpose. They allow him to address his patrons and duely flatter them for protecting his literary work, and they permit him to place his private concerns in the wider context of a general desire for peace. The double purpose recalls that of his Christmas eclogues (Eglogas I, II, and IX), in which Encina referred to his personal concerns and then dwelt on the birth of Christ, thereby placing his own troubles in a universal context.

The second eclogue of the pair is the Carnival play proper. Its significance for the early history of the drama was not lost on

Charlotte Stern, who commented in her article "Juan del Encina's Carnival Eclogues and the Spanish Drama of the Renaissance": "With this noisy Carnival farce [Encina] has broken with the medieval liturgical tradition and has ushered in an exciting new era in the history of the theater" (p. 195).[4] But Encina did not break entirely with his own dramatic techniques. The formula employed in the title-prologue of Egloga VI, announcing that "se introduzen los mesmos pastores de arriba ... en la sala adonde el duque y duquesa estavan" (p. 83), is the same as for Egloga II, but the subject-matter of Egloga VI is as different from that of Egloga V as that of Egloga II from Egloga I. Although the personages and the circumstances of performance are the same, the situation presented in Egloga VI is entirely different from that provoked by preoccupation with the consequences of a political struggle between France and Castille. In Egloga VI the shepherds are concerned with pleasure and satiating their appetites before the penitential season is upon them. Their conversation and behaviour is typified by the refrain of the villancico sung at the end:

> Oy comamos y bevamos,
> y cantemos y holguemos
> que mañana ayunaremos. (ll. 201-203)

As the essence of the eclogue, this refrain is supported by the principal elements of its content: the narration of the allegorical battle between Feasting and Fasting (with the victory of the latter at the beginning of Lent) and the portrayal of four gluttonous shepherds living the last day of plenty to the full knowing that on the morrow their fare will be far less wholesome. Both elements are traditional. The battle between Feasting and Fasting appeared

in the Libro de buen amor; the Carnival meal was a tradition of the festival; a concern with food was a stock device in the early drama, its appearance in Egloga VI being one of the earliest and most extreme uses.[5]

Just as Egloga V, Egloga VI was determined by its intended performance. If the former was provoked by a national event affecting the personal life of the poet and his patron, the latter was occasioned by a specific day in the calendar, the last of Carnival, and was presented by the poet to entertain his employer. Consequently, the multiple identities of the personages in Egloga V are preserved in Egloga VI. On one level the work is a fiction and the audience is entertained by four rustics who celebrate the last day of Carnival; on another, the same relationship exists between the actors and the audience as in Egloga V. The locality is likewise "la sala adonde el duque y duquesa estavan" (p. 83) and the four shepherds are still the supposed employees of the Duke and Duchess, to whom they refer at one point:

> Beneyto: Estiendete, Bras, y ayamos
> gran solaz,
> oy ques san gorgomellaz,
> que assi hazen nuestros amos.
>
> Bras: Nuestros amos ya han cenado
> bien chapado.
> Beneyto: ¡Y aun hasta traque restraque! (ll. 27-33)

The rapport established between the audience and the actors in Egloga VI does not have the same significance as that of Egloga V since there is no comment on personal affairs, but the audience is nonetheless a part of the play and performs a silent role in it, a point which further stresses how much the audience and the circumstances of

performance are contributing factors in the composition of the two eclogues.

The different subjects of Eglogas V and VI justifies their consideration as separate works, but, because of their performance on a single occasion and their introduction of the same personages, they can be thought of as a single work. In his study Juan del Encina: Prometheus in Search of Prestige, J. Richard Andrews found a unity in the two Carnival eclogues provided by two complementary themes showing the author's antagonism toward his patrons. He wrote (pp. 124-125): "The portrait of the victorious (to-be) Duke (in the Antruejo play) and that of the conquering Doña Cuaresma (in the tandem égloga) can function as thematic counterparts and thus symbolically mirror one another, so that the "positive" attitude toward the Duke fades off into the negative one toward Cuaresma in such a way as to catch reflections of that negativity". His conclusion (p. 125) was that "Encina would be symbolically complaining that life under Ducal protection was a continual Lent in secular form".

To credit this interpretation, rather more justification than the mere juxtaposition of the two eclogues is required.[6] It is evident that the separate subjects of the two plays were determined by external circumstances. Egloga V was relevant to the personal situation arising between the author and his patron and was prompted by a political event. There is no indication of a hostile attitude and nothing to doubt the sincerity of the shepherds' lament for the imminent departure and possible death of their master; there is no reason to suspect that the eulogy of the Duke and Duchess was

anything more than the conventional flattery. Moreover, Encina transcended personal considerations. He initially presented the effects of a certain political event on a group of shepherds as a means of presenting its effect on himself, but he concluded with a prayer for peace in which personal concerns were subordinated to national desires.

Egloga VI was related to the day of performance, the last of Carnival. Consequently, the narration of the victory of Feasting over Fasting must not be considered out of this context. It is a traditional element and was perfectly appropriate to the play. Moreover, the behaviour of the shepherds must not be put in a false perspective. They behave conventionally, objecting to the idea of Lent as shepherds would, so that their talk need not imply condemnation by Encina of Lent's rigours. The shepherds simply celebrate the last day of Carnival to the full. In the last resort, the objection to Andrews' interpretation of Eglogas I and II (see above chap. II) is applicable here. Because Encina used shepherds for a personal purpose in Egloga V, he did not necessarily continue to use them for the same purpose in Egloga VI. The personages in the second Carnival eclogue are the same as those in the first, but the topic of conversation is different and they behave as characters in a farce.

If the two eclogues are to represent a unified composition, they do not do so by means of a theme. One source of unity has already been emphasized, performance on a single occasion and employment of the same personages in similar roles. This, however, provides only a circumstantial unity, perhaps all that is to be expected. On the

other hand, Egloga VI is a continuation of Egloga V, in which its performance is envisaged. At the entry of Pedruelo in Egloga V, he and Bras discuss the business of the market. Pedruelo explains,

> Traxe puerros y sardinas
> por comer
> el domingo a mi prazer, (ll. 164-166)

and Bras replies,

> Aun te juro a mi poder
> tal estava,
> que no se me percordava
> la cuaresma que ha de ser. (ll. 167-170)

There follows a discussion about the rigours of fasting during Lent, concluded by Bras, who turns the conversation back to the original subject of the play, the imminent departure of the Duke for a war against France:

> Dexemos hasta cenar
> esse preyto,
> que te quiere ora Beneyto
> no se que repreguntar. (ll. 187-190)

Thus the shepherds' conversation briefly draws attention to the proximity of Lent, a matter to be discussed further at their meal. This is precisely what occurs in Egloga VI, when the shepherds enjoy their meal and comment on the coming of Lent. Egloga V thereby anticipates the performance of Egloga VI, but the latter makes no retrospective reference to the former. In Egloga VI there is no reference to war and peace between France and Spain and the Duke's military service. There is only one allusion to the Duke and Duchess (cited above) and that is complete in its context.

The unity of the two eclogues is more apparent than real. Angel Valbuena Prat's assessment (Literatura dramática..., p. 28) that Egloga V "es la loa antecedente del verdadero auto de Carnaval" was

basically correct. Charlotte Stern was of the same mind. She disputed Andrews' interpretation and asserted: "The first eclogue is clearly rhetorical, whether its eulogistic tone is interpreted ironically or not. Its function, moreover, is immediately apparent. It is a prologue that serves to introduce the audience to the rustic Carnival scene that follows. The interdependence of the two plays is achieved through the brief summary in the prologue ... of the action of the Carnival scene and through the reappearance of the same four actors. In this respect the first Carnival eclogue is comparable to the introitos of Torres Naharro and the loas of other sixteenth-century dramatists" ("Juan del Encina's Carnival Eclogues...", p. 182).

Miss Stern went a step further, however, and suggested that the prologue play serves a specific technical purpose: "In the prologue the actors involve themselves in the duke's affairs and although they do not address him directly, as was done in Encina's first Christmas eclogue, their conversation about him draws him and his retinue into the special realm of dramatic illusion by bridging the boundary between reality, which is the duke's drawing room, and theater, which is the rustic Carnival scene. Encina, then, is experimenting with the complex phenomenon of theatrical illusion in his transitional prologue piece" (p. 192). Encina again combined illusion and reality. He again made an occasion of performance a dramatic event and realized the potential of his own affairs as a fit subject for dramatization. Having incorporated the audience into the action of Egloga V, they were prepared to accept a continued participation in Egloga VI. The action of the second Carnival eclogue could consequently be viewed as

a real situation in which the servants of the Duke and Duchess of Alba ape a traditional custom of enjoying their Carnival meal before their employers, or it could be seen as an imaginative situation in which actors entertain an audience with traditional Carnival feasting (see above n. 5). Given these factors, as explained by Charlotte Stern, it must be concluded that, just as Eglogas I and II, Eglogas V and VI were united principally through their performance.

The conflict between France and Spain was further dramatized in an eclogue by Francisco de Madrid entitled Egloga de tres pastores. An original text of it has not survived, but the work was preserved in a manuscript copy made by Manuel Cañete from "un antiguo códice". This copy has been edited by Gillet in an article entitled "Egloga hecha por Francisco de Madrid (1495?)". In the introduction to his edition of Encina's plays (p. xxxviii) Cañete related the eclogue to Encina's Egloga X on the grounds of technical similarity. Eugen Kohler, on the other hand, described the composition as an allegorical, political eclogue, indicated the discrepancies of Cañete's comparison, and suggested a greater similarity with Encina's Egloga V on the grounds of subject-matter (Sieben spanische..., p. 159).

Egloga V, attributed to the year 1493, contained a probable reference to the signing of the Treaty of Barcelona between France and Spain earlier in that year; Madrid's play is concerned with the breaking of the Treaty by Ferdinand the Catholic as a consequence of the invasion of Italy in 1494 by Charles VIII of France. Calculating from the events alluded to in the eclogue, and allowing time for the news to reach Spain and the play to be written, Gillet concluded that the probable date of composition was March-May, 1495 ("Egloga

hecha...", pp. 276-277).[8]

As Gillet surmised, the eclogue was almost certainly a piece of political propaganda to explain and exonerate the Spanish monarch for breaking the Treaty of Barcelona and attacking the French expedition to Italy. It was possibly commissioned especially as a defence of the Spanish cause and, by Gillet's reckoning, could have been performed at the Spanish court: "That this performance took place before the Spanish Court would seem probable, both in view of the official position of its author and the nature of the play itself; and, moreover, that it took place in Madrid, where the somewhat nomadic court of the Catholic Sovereigns sojourned, as it happens, during the month of May" ("Egloga hecha...", p. 277).[9] This being so, the eclogue was as conditioned by the occasion of its intended performance as Encina's Egloga V. The subject was determined by the necessity of narrating a political occurrence, interpreted in favour of Ferdinand. A direct rapport was, therefore, established between the actors and the audience because the dramatist sought to persuade them to accept his arguments. The rapport is not quite the same as Encina's, but is no less substantial.

Cañete adequately classified the eclogue as "una composición semi-dramática" (see "Egloga hecha...", p. 293, note), for its scant action is fully described in the few words of its brief title-prologue:

> Egloga hecha por Francisco de Madrid en la cual se introducen tres pastores. Vno llamado Evandro que publica e yntroduce la Paz; otro llamado Peligro que representa la persona del Rey de Francia Carlos (VIII) que quiere perturbar la paz que Evandro publica; otro llamado Fortunado cuya persona representa el Rey D. Fernando (el Católico) que tambien quiere romper la guerra con el Rey

> de Francia llamado Peligro; y razonan muchas cosas; y en fin de la obra va una cancion. (p. 282)[10]

The prologue also clearly establishes the three interlocutors as "tres pastores", each clearly identified: Peligro and Fortunado represent the kings of France and Spain respectively; Evandro is the proclaimer of peace. In the course of the discussion of the eclogue, it will be seen how the historical and allegorical aspects of the figures are combined in a pastoral disguise.

Evandro's monologue at the beginning of the eclogue is a proclamation of peace directed to the audience as if he were addressing a gathering of shepherds. Commenting first on the serenity of the times, he urges world rulers to maintain peace. The shepherds are exhorted,

> O pobres pastores, en vuestra cabaña
> contentos estad con vuestros ganados, (ll. 7-8)

are told to put away articles of strife, "los cayados, las hondas y perros" (l. 9), and pressed to take up "chirubelas, gaitas, caramillos" (l. 10), the symbols of peace. Finally, Evandro assuages their fears of threats to their livelihood, promises a temperate climate and food in plenty, and concludes with a prayer for the preservation of peace.

The pastoral metaphor is sustained in a second monologue spoken by Peligro, who is resolved to increase the size of his flock and enhance his reputation. He asks,

> ¿Que me aprouechan ereçidos reuaños;
> de bacas, pastores, ser muy abundado,
> si siempre he de ser señor de un ganado
> y no conocido de pueblos extraños? (ll. 41-44)

Peligro intends to mobilize his shepherds, take up the weapons of war,

and conquer new pastures, thereby disturbing Evandro's peace.

The two shepherds argue and Evandro attempts to persuade the other that a bellicose attitude will avail him nothing. Their arguments throughout are phrased in a pastoral metaphor. Soldiers are constantly referred to as "perros valientes" (l. 113), "fieros Mastines" (l. 171), or "lobos" (l. 183); the civilian population, unwilling sufferers of the misfortunes of war, are referred to as "cabras y ouejas que resciben daño" (l. 228) at the hands of the attacking armies, designated as "el hato" (ll. 159, 184, 222). The whole of the dialogue, whether referring to persons, places, or events, is presented in the terms of the country life and the impending conflict is portrayed as a struggle between rival bands of shepherds.

Unable to pacify the obstinate Peligro, who leaves to arrange his affairs (ll. 265-266), Evandro returns to the audience, again envisaged as his fellow-shepherds, and warns them to seek shelter in preparation for the coming onslaught;

> O pobres pastores, bolued la pelleja
> que ya se comiença el tiempo a mudar:
> el çierço rebuelve que no ha de dejar
> oueja, ni cabra, ni cera en la oreja.
> Huid de los campos, venios a poblado,
> de hondos garranchos hazed aparejo;
> estad hoy alerta y creed mi consejo
> que no hareis poco si os dais buen recado.
> (ll. 269-276)

It is then that the shepherd Fortunado is introduced as the man of destiny:

> Deueis ansi mismo arrimo tomar
> con el Fortunado y habreis buen abrigo. (ll. 283-284)

After a preliminary greeting and exchange of views between Evandro and Fortunado, the latter relates the saga of Peligro's Italian

campaign, using the same pastoral terms encountered earlier in the eclogue:

> Con pocos pastores, y muy menos perros,
> vsando sus artes que presto se roçen,
> mostrando fiereza do no le conoscen,
> pasado ha Peligro los valles y cerros.
> A unos repela la lana y pellejo,
> a otros otorga lo que otros pelaron... (ll. 321-326)

The marauding armies are bands of shepherds and dogs, their victims innocent sheep, in whose defence Fortunado will assemble his own armies ("mis hatos", l. 413, as before) and break the agreement of friendship (the Treaty of Barcelona) made with Peligro. When Fortunado departs to fulfil his resolve, Evandro concludes the eclogue and returns to the initial subject of peace, "haciendo una exclamacion y en fin rogando a Dios que aquella guerra sea convertida en paz y concordia" (p. 292).

A pastoral metaphor is sustained throughout the eclogue to convey the activities and interests of its three personages. Consequently, the events of history are transposed to fit this metaphor; for example, the treatment of Pope Alexander VI (Alexander Borgia) by Charles VIII of France and the breaking of the Treaty of Barcelona by Ferdinand the Catholic.

The harm that Peligro's invasion of Italy would inevitably do to the Papal States is mentioned to Peligro by Evandro:

> Cata, Peligro, que deues membrarte
> de la nuestra burra que con tanto afan
> nos trae de contino el vino y el pan.
> Si tu la fatigas habra de dejarte.
> Y el padre de todos qu'en cargo la tiene
> pastor de pastores a quien tanto deues,
> que siempre tus cargos ha hecho muy leues
> renombre te dando de que honra te viene;
> y siempre te ha dado con mano muy llena
> gran abundancia de lana y corderos,

zurron y cayado con otros aperos:
yngrato pareces y aun digno de pena. (ll. 141-152)[11]

Both the Pope and the Church are viewed in pastoral terms. Peligro's violation of the Papal States is viewed as a violation of grazing rights, for he would be allowing his flock to enter where the Church ("la burra") grazes:

Mal hazes, Peligro, tu das ocasion
que el mar y la tierra y el cielo te aburra,
que metes tu hato do pace la burra:
veras que no sale sin su perdicion. (ll. 157-160)

The same metaphorical terms are employed by Fortunado when relating the effects of Charles' invasion on the Pope and the latter's retreat from Rome to the castle of San Angelo:

...desque vio el agua qu'entraua en su barca,
en una cauaña muy fuerte que hauia
a si y a la burra y a su compañia
metio como hizieron en tiempo del arca;
y alli la sostuuo bien zerca de un mes
vsando saber y seso tan grato
hasta que uuo Peligro y su hato
por bien de venir delante sus pies.
Jamas un pastor de tal ardimento,
constancia y reposo, consejo y sauer
en manos de otro pudiera caer
que hubiera la burra assaz detrimento. (ll. 341-352)

Consequently, Fortunado's declaration of war derives from a desire to defend the Pope. He reasons as Evandro had earlier to Peligro:

Llegada es la hora que el mundo fenece.
Justicia lo pide; Raçon favorece;
que nadie apaçiente do la burra paze. (ll. 426-428)

In the language of the pastoral metaphor, the grazing rights of the "burra" must be defended.

The idea that Peligro led his flocks to graze where others had rights is also employed to depict the French entry into Naples, a territory disputed between France and Spain. Evandro warned

Peligro to look to the safety of his own home:

> Asi que es mejor, y aqui te resuelue
> guardar tu cauaña que no es poca buena,
> que desamparalla por ir a la agena, (ll. 209-211)

but Peligro entrusted the safety of his own cabin (i.e. France) to his queen, Anne of Brittany (l. 215, "la sauia Zagala"), and, alluding to the terms of the Treaty of Barcelona, to the watchful eye of "mi Carillo el pastor Fortunado" (l. 216), namely Ferdinand the Catholic. Continuing the pastoral idiom, Evandro reminded Peligro of the Spanish claims on Naples:

> Tu quieres, Peligro, qu'el guarde lo tuyo,
> y tu sin pedille consejo o licencia
> pones tus mientes, poder y hemencia
> en ir a pacer lo qu'es casi suyo. (ll. 233-236)
> .....
> Mal hazes, Peligro, debias priado
> con Fortunado ir consejarte
> que dudo no quiera en algo euitarte
> viendo que paces en su dehesado. (ll. 241-244)

Charles VIII is, thus, portrayed as a trespassor, invalidating any agreement made with him. Speaking for Ferdinand, Fortunado can claim that he has not broken faith, but has been obliged to reconsider because of the action of his ally:

> Asi que Peligro pues es reuellado
> y quiso seguir su mal apetito,
> rompiendo la paz qu'estaua en scripto
> conviene que guste quien es Fortunado.
> Guardar su amistad del todo querria
> por bien de los hatos y paz de la tierra:
> Peligro es pastor de muy mala guerra,
> no dura jamas con el compañia. (ll. 389-396)

A comparison between Francisco de Madrid's eclogue and Encina's Egloga V is valid because in both works real events are cloaked in the dialogue and behaviour of shepherds. Consequently, the personages are similar in that those of both eclogues have more than

one identity. They are shepherds, a result of the pastoral metaphor; in addition, in one they are the supposed employees of the Duke and Duchess of Alba, and in the other the Kings of Spain and France.

As an act of homage, the tribute of poet to patron, Encina's Egloga V is not a didactic work and has no persuasive purpose. Madrid's eclogue, on the other hand, is undoubtedly flattering to King Ferdinand, but purported to persuade the audience to accept his justification for breaking an international agreement. This persuasive element is conveyed principally by two means. The first, already described, involves the portrayal of Charles VIII as a wicked shepherd who violates the territory and peace of others and the depiction of Ferdinand as a good shepherd and defender of innocent sufferers. The second measure concerns the idea of peace.

Each of the three interlocutors in Madrid's eclogue embodies some aspect of this concept. Peace itself is represented by Evandro, who introduces it at the beginning of the eclogue with the proclamation that all enjoy its fruits and a life unmolested by disorder. Both Evandro and his peace are disturbed, however, by Peligro's bellicosity. Peligro--his name implies danger--in addition to standing for the King of France, is the representative of disturbance. He is an anti-peace, immune to Evandro's pleas and stubborn to recognize the injustice of war. Consequently, no longer the proclaimer of peace, Evandro has to cry for protection against war. His object then is to restore peace after its disturbance by Peligro.

Fortunado is presented as the answer to Evandro's problem. The Spanish King is, thereby, introduced as the defender of peace, a function deriving from the author's intention of exonerating him for

breaking the Treaty of Barcelona. In the allegory of peace and war, Ferdinand represents what is desirable. His alias is significantly chosen: Ferdinand, graced by Fortune, is envisaged as capable of curing the ills caused by the erring Peligro. At one point Evandro says to Fortunado,

> Tus manos dichosas y buena ventura
> tocaron la llaga del Partenopeo,
> que de otra manera, sin duda, me creo
> su mal no lleuara remedio ni cura, (ll. 369-372)

and, at another,

> O buen Fortunado, ¿que quieres hazer?
> En tu discrecion tenia confiança,
> qu'el mundo perdido tornase a bonança. (ll. 405-407)

Finally, as Fortunado retires to activate his plans to chastise Peligro, Evandro describes the optimum qualities of this restorer of order:

> Tu gran discrecion y mucho saver
> con el Pantheon seyendo, soy cierto
> podres concertar cualquier desconcierto
> y tornar el mundo a su primer ser.
> Esta esperança me pone consuelos,
> aunque aora te partes con prisa sañosa. (ll. 433-438)

Evandro's prayer for peace at the end of the eclogue also serves to ennoble Fortunado's motives in breaking his league of friendship with Peligro, for God and righteousness are placed on his side. This, however, was Francisco de Madrid's design throughout. By exploiting the idea of peace he could present the two antagonists in the clearest of lights. Ferdinand and Charles oppose each other as good and bad respectively, as the upholder and violator of peace.

The personages in the eclogue emerge as a compound of three elements. With the exception of Evandro, they are historical figures, but their real identities and the events in which they are

involved are cloaked in a pastoral disguise. Each, including Evandro, who is also a shepherd, has an allegorical identity as part of the idea of peace, determined by the author's political motive. In total, therefore, all elements of the work are directed to the same purpose of propaganda. To this extent, it must be concluded that the work was conditioned by the occasion and circumstances for which it was written and performed.

The political struggles in the Italian peninsula between France and Spain continued into the sixteenth century and into the reigns of two new monarchs, Francis I and the Emperor Charles V, and also continued providing writers in Spain with new events to chronicle in dramatic compositions. The source of a play by Andrés Ortiz was the Battle of Pavia (24 February, 1525), in which the French were routed and Francis I captured.[12] Crawford wrote (Spanish Drama..., p. 59) that the work was "interesting primarily because of its international significance rather than because of its real value". As a historical document, the play is indicative of the Spanish attitude toward their victory over the French at Pavia, but it is also of interest because it conforms to the general pattern of early shepherd plays. For Gillet, who edited the work in his article "A Spanish Play on the Battle of Pavia", it was "a festival play, combining with political preoccupation the bucolic tone of the dramatic égloga, a type of which the origin may well be the fifth égloga of Juan del Encina".[13]

In both the Egloga V and the Egloga de tres pastores the bucolic tone was a conventional cover for the identities of real personages and events; in the play by Andrés Ortiz a conventional shepherd and

shepherdess are portrayed in order to narrate certain events and the bucolic tone is not employed as a disguise, but as conventional and convenient setting for a play at a time when shepherds were the inevitable characters. Encina's Egloga V was a personal affair, although it concluded with overtones of national enthusiasm when all the personages joined in a prayer for peace. Francisco de Madrid's eclogue, however, was not a celebratory play, but a political diatribe related to and occasioned by an international conflict. Like Encina's work, it ended with a prayer for peace, but in hope of its restoration, not with delight for its preservation. Ortiz's play is a more festive work than the other two because it reflects the feeling of national elation as a result of a resounding victory and the capture of the French king. Consequently, the predominant mood is one of celebration and rejoicing, determined by the circumstances of composition, the victor's gloating over a vanquished foe.

The full title of Ortiz's composition is as follows:

> Coplas nueuamente trobadas sobre la prision del Rey de Francia en que se contiene toda la verdad del trance de la batalla como passo conforme ala carta de su majestad y a otras cartas de mas larga relacion de personas dinas de fe. Van compuestas por arte mayor en modo de dialogo que passa entre vn pastor y vna pastora y acaban con vn villancico. Fechas por Andres Ortiz a intercession de Gonçalo Martinez. (p. 517)

There is no colophon, but the topical subject would demand composition no later than the end of 1525. As both Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 60) and Gillet ("A Spanish Play...", pp. 516-517) suggested, the work was conceivably never intended for performance, but may have been a ballad-form news-sheet. The matter cannot be verified, but the piece is justifiably included among the drama on account of its

affinities in subject and form with a number of early shepherd plays.

As its title indicates, Andrés Ortiz's play is a dialogue between a shepherd and shepherdess, through whose conversation the victory at Pavia is described. The principal device of action, therefore, is the interplay between these two personages: on the one hand Bartolo does not understand the reason for celebration and, on the other, the shepherdess Toribia enlightens him.[14]

In common with a number of plays already considered in this study, this piece begins with a monologue spoken by a shepherd, in this instance Bartolo, who wonders about the festive spirit in the people and Nature:

> El polo esta alegre, triunfante, jocundo;
> la tierra se goza con grande plazer;
> hasta los peçes del mar muy profundo
> se espantan mirando tambien este mundo
> como es alegre tornado en su ser.
> Las aues yo veo cantar mill canciones;
> los campos florecen mas que solian;
> las gentes se visten de mill inuenciones
> mostrando jocundos los sus coraçones
> ser mas pujantes con grande alegria. (ll. 1-10)

This description is later repeated when Bartolo asks Toribia to explain the reason for celebration to him:

> ¿Que es lo que sientes? dime zagala;
> que veo los exidos llenos de flores,
> todos vestidos ansina de gala
> como si agora mi hermana Pascuala
> se desposasse con grandes primores.
>
> Ueo del otro lado las aues cantar
> con lenguas harpadas enesta montaña,
> y veo sacabuches muy rezio entonar,
> que nunca jamas lo puedo alcanzar
> porque se ha alegrado ansi nuestra España.
> (ll. 100-109)

The inability of a shepherd to understand these natural phenomena was a characteristic of the Nativity plays and commemorative shepherd

drama (see Appendix B, s.v. "Rustic ignorance"). In fact, Ortiz's piece, whether or not it was ever written for performance, is founded on several characteristic features of the early pastoral drama.

The first lines of Toribia's romance sung about the victory at Pavia produce almost verbatim the angel's Christmas message:

> Gloria sea enlos cielos
> y enla tierra sea alegria. (ll. 21-22)

Bartolo's references to genealogy are further devices of the early drama (see Appendix B, s.v. "Genealogy"). In his opening monologue he alludes to his own:

> Mi seso no alcança ni puede saber
> que cosa es esta de gran marauilla
> avn que soy primo de Juan Bachiller, (ll. 11-13)

and later refers to that of another when trying to guess the cause of Toribia's excitement:

> O dizes, por suerte, de Juan Meseguero,
> aquel que fue nieto de Anton Sacristan... (ll. 115-116)

His attempts to explain Toribia's rejoicing (ll. 95-146) recall the rustic games of the early drama, particularly of the Nativity plays (see Appendix B, s.v. "Games"), and the delayed announcement of the shepherdess' news calls to mind a similar situation in Fernández's Auto o farsa del nascimiento. Finally, the victory at Pavia is celebrated in the same way as the Nativity. Toribia enters singing and later tells Bartolo he will jump and dance for joy when he shares her excitement. He will celebrate in the same way as the shepherds did the birth of Christ (see Appendix B, s.v. "Pleasure"):

> Por cierto, carillo, si tu lo supiesses
> que luego dexasses el hato y las migas,
> saltos y brincos, corcobos tu diesses
> y que de gasajo te desiziesses
> viendo se libre ya de fatigas. (ll. 140-144)

Then, at the end of the piece, the two rustics continue their way singing a villancico to celebrate the capture of the King of France. The piece thereby concludes with the conventional ending of the shepherd plays.

Andrés Ortiz's work conveys the sense of elation at the news of the victory at Pavia. In it he appropriately exploited devices traditionally associated with the Nativity plays. Even if never intended for performance, the dramatic form he adapted for his subject obliged his adherence to convention, that is, to the shepherd play. What his work and several others discussed in this chapter illustrate is that the formulae suitable for the Christmas shepherd play were adaptable for the dramatization of other subjects presented in a bucolic tone.

The last of the plays in the group concerned with the struggle between France and Spain in Italy is the Farsa de la concordia, written by Fernán López de Yanguas to celebrate the Peace of Cambrai (August, 1529), which momentarily brought the warring to a halt.[15] Like Encina's Egloga V, the eclogue by Francisco de Madrid, and Andres Ortiz's play, the Farsa was concerned with peace and, although written at a much later date, was nonetheless part of an earlier tradition. The pastoral convention is still employed, not, however, as a cloak for real figures and events, but as a mould in which to cast the attributes of allegorical personages; for López de Yanguas surpassed Francisco de Madrid by using allegory unreservedly and, moreover, by working the events of history into a plot.

Tiempo hears a horn and is greeted by Correo, a messenger who imparts some news to him and immediately departs. This induces

Tiempo to proclaim the signing of peace, which, in spite of his age, he attempts to celebrate in song and dance. Mundo, astounded at Tiempo's behaviour, approaches to enquire the reason and the details of the Peace of Cambrai are revealed during their conversation. In the second act Paz and Justicia are also given the news by Correo, the former in a letter, the latter by word of mouth. Both are delighted, but their dialogue is curtailed by the sound of a lamenting pilgrim, whom they discover to be Guerra. During the third act Guerra is condemned by Justicia and, defenceless, is bound and beaten. This condemnation and maltreatment is continued in the fourth act till Guerra, promising never to return, is sent into exile. As she departs, she meets Plazer and Descanso, who rejoice at her discomfort and further ill-treat her. The final, fifth act is celebratory. It tells how, on account of the peace, all the peoples of the world will come to Spain to enjoy a new Golden Age. The entire play is then concluded with singing and dancing.

The allegorical personages are, thereby, portrayed in an allegorical plot involving the liberation of Peace, the trial, condemnation, and banishment of War by Justice, and the entry of Pleasure and Ease as War goes into exile. With each of the personages, the dramatist described the portrayal of the allegorical element. The simplest of the personages is Correo. He enters "como correo, tañendo su corneta" (p. 76) and is an expediency for conveying the news of peace. To preserve the total allegory he could be envisaged as the personification of News passed from one person to another, but the identification is unnecessary. Yanguas wrote of him, "entra en tres partes de la obra, cada vez muy de prisa"

(ibid.). He therefore warrants no further consideration.

Tiempo and Mundo are to be portrayed "como viejos y en hábitos de pastores, salvo que el tiempo llevará un instrumento para tañer cual él quisiere" (ibid.). Correo addresses Tiempo as "pastor" (I, l. 16); bound and beaten by Paz and Justicia, Guerra cries,

> ¿No hay por aquí algún pastor
> a quien moviessen mis vozes? (III, ll. 231-232)

and the "pastores" who answer her plea are, precisely, Tiempo and Mundo. Their dialogue and behaviour show that they are envisaged as conventional rustics. Having heard of peace from Correo, Tiempo describes the reaction of the Universe:

> Cielo y tierra,
> pues hay paz sin haber guerra,
> se muestran regozijados;
> reverdezcan los collados
> y los vales y la sierra.
> Las montañas,
> los bosques, breñas extrañas,
> los solanos y sombríos,
> fuentes, arroyos y ríos
> sientan gozo en sus entrañas. (I, ll. 30-39)

The shepherd's description of a compassionate Nature is a commonplace observed in several Nativity plays and also in Ortiz's celebration of the victory at Pavia (see Appendix B, s.v. "Compassionate Nature"). Also characteristic of the pastoral convention is the description of life in bucolic terms. Thus Tiempo thinks of the benefits accruing to shepherds through the peace:

> Los pastores
> bien pueden por los alcores
> repastar bien sus ganados;
> no teman ya los soldados
> que les roben los mejores, (i, ll. 50-54)[16]

and even recalls the song of peace sung to the Biblical shepherds at Christmas: "Gloria in excelsis Deo ... et in terra pax" (I, ll. 59

and 64).[17] With true rustic style Tiempo attempts, in spite of advanced age, to celebrate the news of peace in song and dance, and when Mundo receives the news he wishes to show his pleasure in like manner:

> Sus, andar.
> Bien sé yo en que ha de parar
> este mi gozo y plazer;
> comiença, Tiempo, a tañer
> que es razón ya de bailar. (I, 11, 255-259)

Rustic song and dance are again evident at the close of the Farsa, when these two aged shepherds end the discussion about peace and suggest a more active celebration:

> Tiempo: Razón sobra,
> pues la paz haze tal obra
> que todos nos gasagemos.
> Mundo: Bien has dicho, ¡sus, bailemos,
> que tal tiempo ya se cobra! (V, 11. 160-164)

Descanso and Plazer are also shepherds. In contrast to the aged Tiempo and Mundo, however, they are "pastores mancebos, muy regozijados" (p. 77), a condition to which there are some references during the play. They first appear in answer to Guerra's plea as she goes into exile, "¿Hay algún pastor aquí?" (IV, 1. 127), and they are referred to by Tiempo as "Dos zagales repicados" (IV, 1. 163). Like Tiempo, they also think of the peace for the benefits it will bring to shepherds:

> ¡Grida, grida,
> ya la Guerra es despedida,
> para nunca más volver!
> ¡Huelga, Plazer, a plazer!
> ¡Gozemos de hoy más la vida,
> que ha mil años
> que pastores y rebaños
> andamos cabezcaídos!
> Ya son los tiempos venidos
> que dan fin a nuestros daños. (IV, 11. 150-159)

Just as Tiempo and Mundo are appropriately aged rustics, Descanso and Plazer are fittingly their youthful counterparts. It suits their allegorical identities as Pleasure and Ease, for they may join as wholeheartedly as any shepherd in the singing and dancing at the end of the play and thereby celebrate the peace.

Guerra, "en hábito de romera, con sus veneras y con su bordón en la mano" (p. 77), is not a rustic, but is nonetheless part of a pastoral setting. When accosted by Paz and Justicia and sent into exile, she calls to shepherds to aid her (III, ll. 231-232, and IV, l. 127). Moreover, as a pilgrim exiled to wander hopelessly in the wilderness, she is a part of a pastoral convention. She may be compared with the despairing lovers of the pastoral dramas, or with the salvajes in López Ranjel's Nativity play and in the anonymous Coplas de la doncella, el pastor y el salvaje (see Appendix B, "Wilderness"). As a pilgrim, however, Guerra's characterization conveys the idea that she must expiate her past misdemeanours and, banished from the world on account of the achievement of peace, must wander perpetually.

The remaining two personages are portrayed to convey the noble qualities they represent: "Paz entrará muy bien ataviada, como gentil dama, y la Justicia también, salvo que la Paz llevará un ramo verde de oliva en la mano, o de laurel, y la Justicia una vara" (pp. 76-77). Although there is little gentility in the way the pair set about the discomfort of Guerra, their identity as ladies is preserved. Correo addresses Paz as "Noble dama" (II, l. 12) and Tiempo calls both ladies "donzellas / honestas, santas y bellas"

(IV, ll. 5-6). All personages show the utmost respect for them and, at the end of the play, when singing and dancing come naturally to the rustic quartet, the two gentlewomen are cordially invited to participate.

For most of the personages, Yanguas adhered to a traditional pastoral disguise, to which he added the appendages of their abstractions. Each of the personages is portrayed with the symbols of his role: the pilgrim Guerra bears the characteristic shell and staff, Paz an olive branch, and Justicia the rod of Justice. Tiempo and Mundo are aged shepherds as befits the concepts they represent, while Plazer and Descanso are fittingly young shepherds full of life and vigour. The feminine dignity of Peace and Justice is as much in keeping with their allegorical identities as the portrayal of Guerra as a wandering, harassed pilgrim. There is, therefore, a kind of multiplicity of identity similar to that encountered in other political plays, but here one identity is not used to cloak another, as in Encina's Egloga V or Francisco de Madrid's eclogue. Yanguas simply exploited the conventional figures of the drama in order to give the abstract concepts he portrayed an easily recognizable form.

At the same time, Yanguas left no doubt concerning the purpose of the play he wrote: "El argumento y summa de esta obra no es más de dar descanso a los letores y auditores, diciendo el bien que de la paz al mundo viene y los daños que de la guerra se siguen" (p. 77). To entertain the audience, the subject and the moral he intended to convey were incorporated into a plot. The background and narration of the event which prompted his composition are

completed in the first of the five acts during a conversation between Tiempo and Mundo. The next four acts, concerned with the effects of the Treaty of Cambrai, contain a fiction, of which the principal elements are the banishment of War and the heralding of a new Golden Age. Consequently, the audience is made to view the whole situation in a way more entertaining than a bare narrative and discussion.

The author's intention of amusing also accounts in part for the roles assumed by the allegorical personages. The shepherd was not only a traditional character, one whose appearance was anticipated in the early drama; he was also a comedian. Because he is a shepherd, Tiempo's dignity is not offended by his being a cause of laughter and attempting to sing and dance in defiance of his croaking voice and creaking bones. Such antics are expected of him and are amusing. Similarly, with four personages characterized as shepherds, the author could entertain the audience with a song and dance at the end of the play without detracting from its seriousness.

For the audience, however, probably the greatest source of pleasure was the festive spirit embodied in the play. Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 60) hit the mark when he wrote that "although the note of rejoicing is present, the play seems to have been chiefly inspired by a profound sense of relief at the cessation of warfare". A contemporary audience would have welcomed the news of peace as overwhelmingly as Tiempo, Mundo, Paz, and Justicia would have applauded the banishment of Guerra and would have hailed the return of Plazer and Descanso, anticipating the Golden Age

announced by these two. Finally, they would have joined in the cries of long life to their Emperor and Empress shouted at the end of the play. Yanguas' statement that the purpose of his work "no es más de dar descanso" may be taken literally. The trial of Guerra and the debate for and against war, the banishment of Guerra and the return of Plazer and Descanso make heavy reading, but to Yanguas' contemporaries all this was an allegorical re-enactment of an event long since desired and finally achieved. Yanguas would have had an attentive audience, delighted to hear his lecture on the virtues of peace and the evils of war, for in the Egloga de la concordia he anticipated and conveyed the mood of his audience.

The plays chronicling the conflict between Spain and France in Italy demonstrate the adaptability of the rustic characters and the bucolic setting in early Spanish drama; the formula employed in the Christmas shepherd plays was equally suitable for performances intended to commemorate occasions other than Christmas. Thus events referred to earlier (see above chap. I) as important civic festivals, long since observed by some kind of public performance, whether a masque, pageant, or tourney, could also be celebrated by an adaptation of the conventional shepherd play. The comic rustic was established as a performer equally before the people, princes, and prelates.

The Comedia Trophea, by Bartolomé de Torres Naharro, was performed in Rome sometime between March and June in 1514 to honour a Portuguese embassy to Pope Leo X and celebrate the continued and victorious expansion of the Portuguese empire (see "Propalladia"..., IV, p. 474). Consequently, it is both a play with political

overtones and a festive occasion.[18] Portuguese imperial expansion is favourably viewed, highly lauded, and celebrated with an act of homage representing Portugal's King Manuel receiving his subject princes. Coupled to this are scenes of rustic comedy occupying at least half of the performance. The total effect displeased several critics, such as Moratín (Orígenes..., ed. cit., pt. 1, p. 135) and Menéndez y Pelayo (Propaladia..., ed. Cañete, II, p. xxii). Gillet recognized the deficiencies of the action of the Comedia and wrote ("Propalladia"..., IV, p. 492): "All this does not add up to a play--there is no plot even though there is a theme--but rather a spectacle with comic relief". At the same time, however, he also recognized that Torres Naharro did not combine the diverse elements of his play arbitrarily.

The serious business of the work, the eulogy of the Portuguese and the celebration of their conquests, is achieved principally in Acts I and III. Act I begins with Fama's speech of praise, which she ends by declaring that King Manuel has won more lands than Ptolemy knew existed:

> ¡Por quán laudable manera
> como veo,
> con quán onesto deseo,
> con quán sanctísimas guerras
> ha ganado muy más tierras
> que no scriuió Ptholomeo!
> Ptholomeo, agora creo
> que tu fama
> no terná tan alta rama
> como tuuo hasta aquí. (I, ll. 77-86)

The claim makes Ptolemy ascend from Hell to defend himself. A discussion between the two follows, permitting Fama to enumerate (I, ll. 124-172) the Portuguese dominions and to praise their king.

Ptolemy, by contrast, criticizes Fama's neglect of humble people as members of the hall of fame (I, ll. 173-226) and promises to watch the upcoming ceremony to ensure an adherence to truth:

> Yo terné modos y vías
> para mi satisfación;
> si estas cosas ansí son
> que rrefieres,
> no me atiendas ni me esperes,
> piensa que soi satisfecho;
> donde no, con gran despecho
> saltaré donde estuuieres. (I, ll. 285-292)

The ceremony Ptolemy is to watch is the homage paid by Portugal's subject princes to King Manuel, which fills the whole of Act III. It consists of a monologue spoken by an intérprete, who introduces each prince in turn and comments on the land of his origin.[19] Although the occasion provided another opportunity to enumerate the Portuguese conquest and praise Portugal's military might, without the pageantry of performance Act III is dull reading.[20] This serious part of the Comedia Trophea is, however, flanked by the less burdensome dialogue between Fama and Ptolemy and by the comic scenes involving conventional rustic characters.

The comedy of the performance begins, even before the eulogy of the Portuguese visitors to Rome, in a comic introito. After the customary greeting ("¡Dios mantenga!") the rustic speaker takes advantage of the ecclesiastical officials in the audience (see ll, 1-10) to make fun of them with a burlesque recitation of his knowledge:

> Ya sé también qué decrina
> lugo arreo
> dominos dominos meo
> con la media alima christe,
> y el cara m'arrebolliste
> de la jódicame deo.
> Y an confessar cuydo y creo

que sabría,
son que lugo asoluería
las moças, en mi cocencia. (11. 35-44)

Undoubtedly the clerical element of the audience would have appreciated this irreverent humour. Certainly the entire gathering would have enjoyed the narration which followed it of the salacious episode involving the rustic speaker and one Marenilla (11. 45-124) and including a contest of pullas.[21] The comic part of the introductory monologue is then concluded when the shepherd attacks the audience and defends the country bumpkins who are a continual and conventional butt of criticism:

Callay, que burlan contino
los señores
de nosotros los pastores
y de nuestros pobres trajes,
porque ellos sorben potajes
y mil suertes de sabores
y enfingen de muy doctores. (11. 125-131)

He gives his own humorous praise of the King of Portugal and, then, remembering that he is supposed to announce a play, recites (11. 215-304) the argument of the Comedia Trophea.

The comic introito is a feature of all Torres Naharro's plays and that to the Comedia Trophea bears many of the characteristic marks. Its speaker not only prepares the audience by reciting an argument to the play, but also creates a receptive frame of mind. Since he is a rustic, he is a familiar figure, a convention of the drama with which the audience can easily identify. Moreover, his burlesque humour and scabrous story titillate the spectators' interest and leave them waiting for more. The introito is, therefore, a very effective introduction, a perfect curtain-raiser and a means of wooing and winning the audience.

In fact, after Act I, containing the discussion between Fama and Ptolemy, Torres Naharro returned to the brand of humour presented in the introito. The whole of Act II is a rustic farce. Caxcoluzio and Juan Tomillo have been assigned to clean the throne room for the ceremony that is to take place in Act III. Caxcoluzio, however, sits in the throne and the two shepherds play at priest and acolyte:

Caxcoluzio: Parta, parta, hi de neja,
Juan Tomillo;
verás si me encaramillo,
sentaréme de verdade.
Juan: Ora, pues, sé tú'll abade,
yo seré tu monazillo.
Caxcoluzio: ¿Quieres que cante vn poquillo
como el crego?
Juan: A la fe que te lo ruego.
Mas di la crialaysón. (II, ll. 11-20)

Caxcoluzio's mock sermon (II, ll. 31-52) degenerates into a contest of pullas (see above n. 21) when he is criticized by Juan Tomillo. The episode is concluded with the entry of a page, when the two shepherds are threatened with punishment for shirking their duties, but are forgiven in exchange for a song and a dance (II, ll. 203-226). Another song is requested by the page, who accepts instead a story told by Juan Tomillo. The tale happens to be a practical joke, however, a pega into which Caxcoluzio falls.[22] Both shepherds are hired by the page to tend the garden of his mistress and Act II ends with a foretoken of the ceremony in Act III and of the shepherds' own tribute in Act IV. The page warns Caxcoluzio and Juan Tomillo not to attend the festivities without bringing a gift for the young Prince John. They will be pleased to comply, however, and will even bring their friends Gil Bragado and Mingo Oveja.

At the beginning of Act IV, the shepherds return joined by the companions they named earlier. The act of homage to the young prince fills the entire Act. The four shepherds first argue about who is to speak first and eventually draw lots for the honour. Then, in turn, each introduces himself, presents his gift, and describes its significance. At the end, all four shepherds are invited to the despensero by the page for a meal.

Gillet ("Propalladia"..., IV, p. 490) admired Torres Naharro's showmanship in presenting Act I "by framing it between the primitivistic introito and the equally rustic Act II". The same opinion could be held of Act III, which is flanked by the rustic comedy of Acts II and IV. This vacillation between low comedy and high design is, however, part of a cleverly contrived pattern which allows Torres Naharro to pander to his audience without radically deviating from his principal purpose of praising the distinguished visitors to Rome.

The introito and argument prepare the audience for both the serious and humorous parts of the play. The serious eulogy begins in Act I with Fama's monologue and conversation with Ptolemy, at the end of which is an allusion to the homage portrayed in Act III (see above). In Act II preparations for this scene of homage are continued, but on a different level. The shepherds skylark in the throne room instead of making it ready. Their behaviour ends with a warning of the approaching ceremony, but the effect of their conduct has been to make the audience receptive to a serious moment by provoking laughter at the preparations for it. Act III, therefore, is

anticipated with both humour and awe. Consequently, through the interchange of rustic comedy and serious eulogy in the first four Acts of the Comedia Trophea, there is a consistent equilibrium of tone. The shepherds are not simply a comic diversion from the full but burdensome praise of the Portuguese and their victories; they are incorporated into the central topic of praise and are an integral part of the spectacle.

The shepherds of the Comedia Trophea are conventional types. They are comic figures who present the same kind of humour so characteristic of the Christmas shepherd plays: sacreligious parody, bawdy and burlesque comedy, and rustic farce (see above n. 21). Moreover, their incorporation into Torres Naharro's play in Acts II and IV closely resembles the standard Nativity performance. If Act II may be taken as a conventional, comic rustic scene, then Act IV is a conventional adoration complete with the presentation of gifts.[23] Overall, the Comedia Trophea has the appearance of a combined political and shepherd drama.

In Act V, the two prevalent tones of the play--rustic comedy and serious eulogy--are combined. The Act begins with Apollo's monologue and call upon Fama to proclaim the prosperity of Portugal and its future king. Fama, presented as a winged lady, agrees and to that end distributes leaflets given to her by Apollo. Her activity is interrupted, however, by Mingo Oveja, who questions her identity and her business and asks to borrow her wings. Hesitantly, Fama accedes, but Mingo's attempts at flight are disastrous. He returns the wings to their owner and looks at Fama's leaflets, which,

in addition to a eulogy of the young Portuguese prince, contain the villancico sung as the conclusion to the entire play.

After the homage paid to the young Portuguese prince by the shepherds in Act IV, Fama fittingly returns at the beginning of Act V to complete the eulogy. Having updated the past by resurrecting Ptolemy in Act I and having praised a currently triumphant Portugal in Act III, the central topic of the play, the flattery of the Portuguese ambassadors, is appropriately concluded with a prophecy of future glory under the future rule of the heir to the throne.[24] The accompaniment of this conclusion with a further comic episode involving Mingo's abortive flight with Fama's wings is also appropriate. Quite probably, as Gillet surmised,[25] the episode is relevant to a specific topical allusion, but it is also in keeping with the rest of the play. After the serious speeches comes their burlesquing through rustic farce. Mingo Oveja's attempted emulation of Fama's ability to fly is an opportunity for slap-stick. His fall is a chance to indulge in bawdy humour of the type found in the introito, since it is attributed to an unsuccessful affair with "la hija del xastre" (V, ll. 261-281), to which Mingo reluctantly confesses (see, also, "Propalladia"..., IV, p. 501, n. 2). Thus, in Act V Torres Naharro continued the vacillation in tone he had pursued throughout the entire play.

In the Comedia Trophea the shepherds are exploited both as comic characters and as accepted figures in the commemorative drama. In the episode involving Mingo's attempted flight the rustic is made to appear ridiculous, just as he makes a mockery of Fama, but the entire scene is a piece of gratuitous fun. To this extent,

however, Torres Naharro's play is in the established tradition of the commemorative shepherd plays. The rustic characters are not solely intended to convey a plot; their purpose was not just to enact a fiction, but to commemorate an occasion and convey a feeling of festivity. Gillet recognized this. He saw that the Comedia Trophea was a spectacle and, in his last remarks about it, described how it could be best appreciated: "Could we visualize the scene and recreate the mood of the performance, the jostling and the heat, the laughter, the shouts, the singing, and realize the mysterious emergence of a communal sense of pride and hope, it might then seem that mythology and pageantry could blend effectively with earthly realism" ("Propalladia"..., IV, p. 503). With suitable adaptations, Gillet's remark could be applied to the majority of plays discussed in the first part of this study. The commemorative shepherd plays have lost much of their effect because the audiences and occasions they were written to enliven have long since passed away. In Gillet's words, "only the almost lifeless script remains" (ibid.).

The following two plays could also merit the term lifeless, since, without the occasions for which they were written, they have lost the greater part of their significance. The Egloga real, by the Bachiller de la Pradilla, for example, was written for performance at Valladolid in December, 1517, to commemorate the arrival of the Emperor Charles V in Spain. Part of the title runs, "Presentóla en la muy noble villa de Valladolid en fin de mes de Deciembre del año próximo de quinientos y diez y siete" (p. 210).[26] The original work was both in Latin and Castilian, but, as Kohler described

(Sieben spanische..., pp. 155-156), the Latin version has not been preserved completely. Gallardo prepared a manuscript copy (the basis of Kohler's edition) from a text since lost, but only wrote out the Castilian version in full and copied just a few verses of the Latin.

In a recent study, "El Bachiller de la Pradilla, humanista y dramaturgo",[27] Fernando González Ollé collected the available facts about the author of the Egloga real and finally established his identity as distinct from that of Fernán López de Yanguas, a matter which had been the source of considerable controversy.[28] The regaining of his identity, however, has not increased Pradilla's reputation as a dramatist. Kohler was very unflattering of the Egloga real and Pradilla's ability: "In diesem Stücke kommt in viel höherem Masse der gelehrte Kenner des Altertums, der Lehrer lateinischer Grammatik und Rhetorik, als der Dichter zum Vorschein, zeigt sich viel mehr der Gelehrte, der sich auf seine ausgedehnten Kenntnisse etwas zugute tut und sie selbstgefällig ausbreitet, als der Dichter, der eine wenn auch knappe Handlung dramatisch zu gestalten versteht" (Sieben spanische..., p. 157). Crawford was equally condemning and described the Egloga real as written in "stiff, pompous language" (Spanish Drama..., p. 59).

The work, an occasional piece determined by its intended presentation to Charles, is a eulogy of him and his family, prophesying a glorious future for the nation on his accession to the throne. The content of the piece is, therefore, comprised of fulsome eulogies of the royal family, constructed around a slight

pastoral fiction. The shepherd Telefo, who introduced the work, is asked by his fellow, Guilleno, to praise the Emperor. With many erudite allusions, Telefo confesses his inability. Finally, invoking the aid of his muse, the Virgin, and his companions, he is joined by Guilleno in praising the Monarch and his family in recitations heavily interlarded with references to Classical literature and Mythology. Their speeches, concluded with a villancico, are followed by more of the same spoken by the Infante and the Estates of the Realm (Presidentes, Oradores, Defensores, and Labradores). The whole piece is concluded by the poet, who presents a copy of his work to the Emperor.

Telefo's prologue, as Crawford indicated (Spanish Drama..., p. 59), recalls that spoken by Gil Cestero in Encina's Egloga XIV. It begins with a familiar greeting:

> ¡Dios salve acá, que salvó
> todo el mundo de pecado! (ll. 1-2)

followed by the shepherd's justification of his presence:

> ¡Soncas! ¿no sabeis quién só,
> ni por qué causa aballado
> a la corte?
> Sí, vengo solo sennero;
> no traigo algún compannero
> al deporte, (ll. 3-8)

and customary reference to his family:

> Yo soy Telefo muy rudo,
> el cuñado de Pascual... (ll. 9-10)

He then describes the content of the performance that is to come.[29] If Telefo is introduced as a rustic and the performance envisaged as a shepherd play, however, this origin is soon forgotten in the body of the play, where the author's classical learning is most prominent. The pastoral mould is simply a conventional expedient for praising

Charles and his family, just as the introduction of the Estates of the Realm, each personified in one speaker, is a device for further praise and a means of showing the nation's act of homage to the new ruler.

As a eulogy, Pradilla's work achieved its end, but as a drama it has several shortcomings, which González Ollé described:

> La Egloga real supone una aproximación de dos fórmulas teatrales dispares. En esto radica su interés; constituye uno de los varios intentos del teatro prelopista para lograr la fusión de modalidades dramáticas diversas. Claro está que el Bachiller de la Pradilla no la alcanzó, pues su Egloga real no es sino la mera juxtaposición, como a primera vista se percibe, de un auto pastoril con una comedia escolar: el primero concluye de acuerdo con las características del género, con un villancico que cantan los pastores; al terminar, éstos desaparecen definitivamente y ceden su puesto a otros personajes. La única víncula entre ambas obras se reduce, prescindiendo del Argumento, a la primera frase del Infante, que pide a los pastores que le dejen llegarse hasta el Rey. ("El Bachiller de la Pradilla...", p. 299)

In the first part of Pradilla's work the presentation of the personages as rustics is only token, an imitation of the convention. Since the entire work is concerned with welcoming Charles and his family, the shepherds become the mouthpiece of the author's erudite eulogy. These facts are important, for, while the Egloga real was cast in the mould of the auto pastoril, certainly as a result of tradition, the Bachiller de la Pradilla was directed more by the dictates of the occasion for which he wrote and by his own scholarly learning.

The second of the two lifeless compositions alluded to was written to celebrate the birth of the future Philip II. Its full title is as follows:

> Obra nueuamente compuesta sobre el nascimiento d'l

> serenissimo principe don Felipe, hijo delas cesareas y catholicas magestades, por Diego Hernandez. Con otras en que dize la reyna Seuila y los quatro prophetas. Fechas por Santillana. (p. 48)[30]

The extant edition has no colophon, but the topicality of its subject is indicative of composition in 1527 when Philip was born.

As the title shows, there are two pieces, the work of two authors. The first, "por Diego Hernandez", need not concern this study. It is a verse narrative praising the royal family and the new-born prince and describing his ceremonial baptism. Gillet, the modern editor of the work, suggested (p. 50) that it was written after Santillana's play and included with it for publication.

The play itself is similar to the Egloga real by the Bachiller de la Pradilla insofar as the content consists of laudatory speeches. Instead of shepherds, however, in Santillana's work four prophets, Abachuc, Neemias, Zoroastes, and Balaam, prophesy a glorious future for the prince and the nation, and the whole work is introduced and concluded by a sibyl. Although Santillana's work is not in the pastoral vein, it is nonetheless derived from a tradition with which shepherds were associated. This is the Ordo Prophetarum, in which the Old Testament patriarchs and often a pagan sibyl recited their prophecies concerning the birth of Christ, a role frequently performed in the Nativity drama by shepherds. The ceremony was not widespread in Castile, but is reflected in several Castilian Nativity plays (see above chap. V, nn. 40 and 41). In fact, Santillana used a readily available formula and portrayed prophets praising a terrestrial prince instead of Christ.[31] His work is a further example of a traditional form adapted to suit a particular occasion.

The remaining three plays discussed in this chapter are

appropriately considered as a group and may also be viewed as adaptations of existing formulae. All three commemorate religious festivals, are associated with the pastoral traditions of the early Spanish drama, and, in addition, are important for the early history of the auto sacramental. The first of these, the Farsa del mundo y moral, by López de Yanguas, unlike the remaining pair, is not a sacramental work, but a Marian play celebrating the Assumption. With its moral tale of the penitent sinner, however, the Farsa is a worthy precursor of the later Eucharistic drama.

The first known edition is dated 1524, but there was possibly an earlier one for reasons explained by González Ollé in the introduction to his edition of Yanguas' dramatic works: "Puesto que en [la Farsa] ... se alude a Fernando el Católico como ya muerto, su composición ha de situarse entre ... [1524] ... y ... 1516. Crawford concreta más ese breve período, suponiéndola escrita hacia 1518. No justifica su suposición, pero debe de basarse en la creencia de que en 1519 morirá doña Juana de Zúñiga, a quien va dedicada, pues en ese año, según noticias de Cotarelo, otorgó testamento. Pero de haber ocurrido así los hechos, no sólo hay que suponer que para esa fecha estaba ya escrita, sino que existía edición anterior a la que hoy pasa por primera, pues si no, carecería de sentido" (pp. xlii-xliii). The probability of an earlier edition is greater in view of the popularity of the work, which was printed in 1528 and 1551 in addition to the earliest known year of 1524.[32]

The content of the Farsa is briefly as follows: Seeking a master, Apetito is beguiled into serving Mundo by promises of wealth,

happiness, and a bride. Apetito then encounters a hermit, who convinces him that Mundo's promises are illusory and urges him to serve Fe. Apetito complies, accepts Fe's advice, and rejects Mundo. There the morality play concludes and the final part of the Farsa contains Fe's narration of the Assumption.

From this brief statement of the content it is clear that, as in the later Farsa de la concordia (see above), Yanguas presented allegorical personages and plot. Moreover, he also adapted the conventional pastoral mould and announced his purpose in the Farsa in an introductory prose prologue:

> Esta obra es nuevamente compuesta por Hernán López de Yanguas sobre este dicho del Apóstol que dize: "Hec est victoria que vincit mundum, fides nostra". ...
> Es la intención del autor manifestar las cautelas del Mundo: como engañan a cada uno de nosotros, que se entiende por el Apetito. Junto con éste, cómo por el Hermitaño, que es la predicación y religión, nos arrimamos a la Fe. Y con ella vencemos como la obra declara. (p. 33)

Consequently, the attitudes and interrelationships of the personages are determined by the abstractions they represent. It would be little more than an exercise to rehearse their characteristics as allegories, but it is relevant to discuss how the allegory is conveyed in a recognizable form.

In Yanguas' words, Apetito is intended to represent "cada uno de nosotros". He is Everyman, the sinner attracted to the World, led astray, and finally shown the path of righteousness and the folly of his error. He is portrayed "como pastor" (p. 33) and, in spite of an occasional classical allusion in his speech (see, for example, ll. 9-16), he is recognizable in this form. His initial greeting to the audience is a sort of classicized "Dios mantenga":

Apolo conserve tan noble ganado
y Júpiter alto le guarde de mal,
Minerva le tenga contino apastado,
que nunca mis ojos han visto otro tal. (ll. 9-12)

When offering himself out for service, he cries his abilities like any shepherd proud of his rustic talents (see Appendix B, s.v. "Rustic abilities"):

¡Hao! ¿Quién quiere un moço, zagal bien dispuesto,
que salta, que corre, que bien tira barra
y pinta sambugas, rabés y guitarra
y haze otras cosas allende de aquesto? (ll. 17-20)

During his conversation with Mundo, Apetito's rustic origin often shows. When offered Mundo's sister as a wife he confesses,

...siendo yo rústico y pobre pastor,
casado con dama de mucho primor,
ni sabré servilla ni habré qué le dar, (ll. 142-144)

and later laments his inferiority on account of his clothes, a sentiment Mundo soon remedies by giving him money. Before this, Apetito had visualized Mundo's sister as a rustic like himself:

¡Por sancto Pego, que ya rabio yo
por vella y tenella con mí la zagala!
¿Llámase acaso Benita o Pascuala? (ll. 155-157)

He invokes the names of the saints in the familiar rustic jargon and, encountering the hermit, shows the hostility usually given to clerics in the early drama.[33]

In the introduction to his edition of Yanguas' plays, González Ollé cited Bruce Wardropper's opinion that pastoral traditions could not be justified in this work, unrelated to Christmas. Wardropper wrote, "La tradición dramática religiosa se ha mostrado más fuerte que el sentimiento de lo conveniente" (Introducción..., p. 181). The portrayal of Apetito as a shepherd is certainly due to the

weight of tradition, just as Mundo, Tiempo, Plazer, and Descanso in Yanguas' Farsa de la concordia. It was a means of portraying an abstract concept in a recognizable form and it also served the purpose of Yanguas' morality play. González Ollé rightly commented, "Claro está que el Mundo y el Apetito podrían haber sido simbolizados de muy diversos modos, pero no resulta inadecuada su dramatización como mayoral y zagal respectivamente" (p. xlvi). Apetito is appropriately portrayed as a shepherd. As the symbol of mankind, distracted from spiritual concerns in favour of material comfort, Apetito is well cast as an ignorant rustic easily beguiled into placing worldly comfort above other priorities. In this he follows a line of selfish rustics in the early drama and is the able vehicle for Yanguas' didacticism. As a shepherd, he is a traditional figure of fun and the audience would have been amused at his ingenuous, rustic ignorance and country attitudes. Consequently, Apetito embodies the double role of instruction and entertainment, much as the pastoral-allegorical figures of Yanguas' Farsa de la concordia.

The hermit is also part of the pastoral tradition of the early drama (see above n. 33). His role in the Farsa is identifiable with that of predecessors in Christmas plays. When he enters he is subject to the type of verbal abuse endured by the hermit in Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento and the friar in Vicente's Auto de los reyes magos. In addition, Yanguas' hermit serves a function similar to that fulfilled by those clerics. The hermit of the Nativity plays was, as Alfredo Hermenegildo described him, "la portavoz de la didáctica religiosa", and the shepherds represented

the faithful in need of instruction. This is precisely the situation of the Farsa del mundo y moral, in which the hermit and the shepherd are both specially designated as allegorical representations of the Church and faithful respectively, personifications which in the Nativity plays could only be attributed to them by implication. The shepherd Apetito was to be viewed as "cada uno de nosotros" and the hermit as "la predicación y religión". Clearly Yanguas exploited the personages and the relationships he inherited from the Nativity play.

To the world of the pastoral, Yanguas added two solely allegorical personages. Mundo "se ha de vestir como rey" (p. 33). González Ollé's opinion that his portrayal as Apetito's master serves the allegory has already been cited (see above). His characterization as a king is equally appropriate. Apetito may, thereby, be presented as Mundo's subject as well as being subject to him. Moreover, depicted as a king, Mundo may freely dispense the benefits promised to Apetito as if they were the rewards of a munificent monarch. Subjection to the world is thus allegorically portrayed as subjection to a bountiful but devious ruler.

The second purely allegorical figure, Fe, is to be portrayed like Paz and Justicia in the Farsa de la concordia. Fe is to appear "como dama y un ramo verde en la mano" (p. 33). Her presence is accounted for by the quotation cited in Yanguas' prologue: "Hec est victoria que vincit mundum" (ibid.). The hermit introduces Fe to Apetito as the conqueror of Mundo. Consequently, she is necessary to complete the action of the

morality and the exemplification of the scriptural text on which the Farsa is based.

Fe is also necessary in the final part of the play containing the narration of the Assumption. Wardropper alleged that this part and the morality were disconnected: "La alusión a la fiesta de la Asunción se hace de manera incidental como el homenaje eucarístico en los primeros autos sacramentales: la Fe describe, sin motivo alguno, la Corte del Cielo después de la Asunción de María" (Introducción..., p. 182). Certainly, this narration is not a continuation of the action of the morality. It is introduced to fill time when the hermit invites Fe,

> El tiempo que resta, señora, se gaste
> en darnos la cuenta, si a ti, Fe, te agrada,
> hoy dónde has estado contino ocupada,
> que no has parescido, y aquesto nos baste.
> (ll. 605-608)

The two parts are linked, however, for Yanguas intended the morality play as an appropriate performance for the feast of the Assumption.

The link is provided in the prose prologue. Having narrated that Fe would conquer Mundo and liberate Apetito, Yanguas continued, "Relátase, en fin, la Assumpción de Nuestra Señora, en la cual hay bien que ver y que no ver, porque no alcançan los ojos" (p. 33). The statement is clear. Good is to be seen in the Assumption, but not literally. It must be accepted on faith, just as the hermit, the personification of "la predicación y la religión", accepted it at the conclusion of Fe's narrative saying, "Yo tal creo, sin dubda ninguna" (l. 841). The unifying factor in both parts of the Farsa is, therefore, Fe. She will save man from the evils of the world

(the liberation of Apetito) and will reveal to him the mysteries of Heaven (for example, the Assumption). The whole idea of the work, that faith can guide man from this world to the next, is clearly stated in the villancico sung at the end of the Farsa:

> Ganemos en este suelo,
> con arte de bien vivir,
> como podamos subir
> sin impedimento al Cielo.
> Tengamos con Dios el zelo
> y con sus bienes extraños,
> y no temeremos daños.
>
> Llevamos la Fe por guía,
> que sabe bien el camino,
> con la cual, con muy bien tino,
> no erraremos la vía.
> El mundo con su porfía
> es causa de graves daños:
> huyamos de sus engaños. (ll. 860-873)

The morality is intended to illustrate how man (Apetito), led by the Church (the hermit), can accept the guidance and teaching of Faith (Fe) and, like the Virgin, "subir / sin impedimento al Cielo". The overall unity and appropriateness of Yanguas' play for performance on the feast of the Assumption is clear. His work is fundamentally of the same nature as the other commemorative works discussed in this chapter. He, too, employed traditional dramatic devices, but suited them to the occasion for which he was writing.[34]

Although the Farsa del mundo y moral, like the later auto sacramental, was a morality play, it was not intended to commemorate the feast of Corpus Christi. The reverse is true of the last two plays discussed in this chapter: they are not moralities, but were written to honour the Eucharist. On the other hand, neither can be properly called autos sacramentales, a title properly belonging to

works of the genre which flourished in the seventeenth century.[35] Their importance in the early history of that genre must be recognized, however, and with it their position in the early Spanish drama as a whole.

Fernán López de Yanguas' Farsa sacramental[36] is unfortunately known only in fragmentary form. The only historian of the drama who knew a complete version was Emilio Cotarelo, who published parts of it in 1902 in "El primer auto sacramental del teatro español y noticia de su autor, el Bachiller Hernán López de Yanguas".[37] His source has since disappeared, so that only the fragments he published have survived. Cotarelo's discovery of the play in a volume also containing a work printed in 1520 led him to assume that the Farsa sacramental was of the same year, but there is no evidence to justify that date (see "El primer auto...", pp. 253-254). González Ollé (pp. xxxix-xl) thought this one of Yanguas' earlier compositions and approximated its date as about the same time as his Nativity play (before 1518).

The second play, the anonymous Farsa del santísimo sacramento, edited by M. Serrano y Sanz in "Farsa sacramental, compuesta en el año 1521",[38] is clearly dated in the last sentence of its Latin dedication: "Vale, Nonas Octobres 1521" (p. 68). Cotarelo suggested ("El primer auto...", p. 253, n. 1) that "por la manera de tratar el asunto, la metrificación, ciertos pormenores de estilo, y hasta el ser obra de humanista", the Farsa might be an unknown composition of López de Yanguas. The attribution was discredited, however, by both Serrano y Sanz (p. 67) and by González Ollé

(pp. xxxix-xl). Nevertheless, the similarities between the two works permit their discussion together.

For the Farsa sacramental it will be necessary to rely on Cotarelo's prose synopses of parts of the play. The work begins, "Con las exclamaciones de asombro que al pastor Hierónimo le arrancan las extrañas señales y cambios que observa en la naturaleza" (p. 129) He calls to Ambrosio, who is surprised by similar manifestations and is unable to offer any explanation. A third shepherd, Hostín, is just as bewildered and relates, "Con palabras de Virgilio, ... de que podrán pastar juntos corderos y lobos, los bueyes andar entre tigres y leones, y los galgos y las liebres, las aves menudas y los gavilanes y las perdices y garzas con los halcones" (p. 130). An explanation is expected from the shepherd Gregorio, "otro zagal más instruido" (ibid.),[39] who enters "vestido de fiesta" (ibid.). He, too, marvels at the happenings because he has seen the seven spheres dancing in the heavens. Finally, an angel, "el mismo que hogaño nos vino al ganado" (l. 18), appears to answer their questions.

The anonymous Farsa begins similarly. Pelayo enters, wondering what festival has made people dress in their best clothes:

> ¿Que fiesta es aquesta, Dios praze sagrado,
> que tal prazentorio se haze en la villa?
> De fiesta la gente esta a maravilla,
> y tal regozijo que yo estoy asmado. (p.68)

He sees Pascual and calls to ask why he is "de Pascua vestido" (ibid.). Pascual cannot explain, but says,

> He visto montones venir rebolando
> de ángeles tantos que es vn espanto,
> la música y bozes y acuerdo de canto

que era vna groria de estar escuchando
"tantum Sacramentum" muy huerte cantando
acá en el lugar, que ovieras prazer,
y mil latinorios que no sé entender;
y vengo acá a vello, qual ves, muy trotando. (p. 68)

They encounter Justino, also dressed in Sunday best, going to town to join the celebration. He tells them that the celebration is to honour the feast of Corpus Christi and further describes wonders he has seen. Like Pascual, he has heard the singing:

Y avn yo donde estaua guardando mi hato
mil cosas veýa que te espantarías;
cantares oýa y mill armoníias,
tanto que atonito estoue vn grand rato,
y por somo villa quando no me cato
hete do canta a tanto garçon
que estaua eleuado oyendo su son
y mil cosas otras que no las percato. (p. 69)

In addition, he has noticed that Nature is resplendent:

...todo lo vía muy lleno de olores
de rosas, çuçenas, claveles y flores
que en forma era cosa de maravillar;
victas las aves gozosas estar
muy lindas, hermosas, de muchas colores,
calandres, tinicos, allí ruyseñores,
que nunca cessavan muy dulce cantar, (ibid.)

and has seen,

bolando vn garçon, diziendo: Justino,
esta es la fiesta que el Verbo Divino
en el Sacramento se da en este día. (ibid.)

In spite of all this, however, Justino cannot explain the situation satisfactorily. This is done by Fe, who now enters.

Thus far, the development of the two plays is parallel and recalls the conventional, commemorative play. The shepherds' bewilderment is characteristic of this type in some Nativity eclogues. In Fernández's Auto o farsa del nascimiento Pascual and Lloreynte could not understand the signs which presaged the birth of Christ;

López de Yanguas used the device at the beginning of his own Nativity composition and it also appeared in a later play commemorative of the Battle of Pavia (1525), in which Bartolo could not understand signs in Nature and the reason for popular rejoicing. The fundamental difference between the two sacramental plays is the description of the shepherds' bewilderment. López de Yanguas displays his humanist's learning with references to Virgil and astronomy,[40] while the anonymous author achieves his effect through the ingenuous ignorance of the rustics. In both plays, however, references to supernatural beings recall the Nativity eclogues. In Yanguas' Farsa the appearance of the angel reminds Hierónimo of "el mismo que hogaño nos vino al ganado" (l. 18), probably an allusion to the angel who announced the Nativity to the Biblical shepherds. Angels do not intervene in the action of the anonymous work, but the description of their flying through the air and singing is reminiscent enough of similar descriptions in the Christmas plays.[41]

The parallel development of the two plays continues with the explanations given to the shepherds--in one instance by an angel, in the other by the allegorical figure of Faith--of the mystery behind the strange manifestations in Nature and the festive spirit of the people. In Cotarelo's synopsis of Yanguas' work, the angel accounts for the celebration and then "Gregorio le pregunta en qué manjar pudo Dios darse a sí mismo, y el ángel le explica éste y otros misterios de la Eucaristía en un diálogo algo pesado. El Bachiller, según su costumbre en otras obras, intercala multitud

de textos de la Sagrada Escritura; formula por boca de los pastores una especie de credo, pues empieza algunas coplas y aun versos: "Yo credo que Tú eres" el que hizo tal o cual cosa, siempre recordando pasajes del Antiguo y del Nuevo Testamento" (p. 131). There follows a scene of adoration in which each shepherd entones a hymn and the angel is then asked to describe the heavenly Jerusalem. Finally, tired of their questioning, the shepherds decide to return home, but not before singing and dancing a villancico in which the angel also joins.

The anonymous Farsa del santísimo sacramento appears as a fuller version of Cotarelo's fragmentary reproduction of Yanguas' work, for it follows a similar pattern. Fe is asked to explain the nature of the feast being celebrated. She obliges and the shepherds, understanding the cause of the wonders they saw, praise the Eucharist. Fe then introduces an act of faith, in the form of a credo, a recitation of the creeds and mysteries of Christianity, which the shepherds affirm and accept. As in Yanguas' play, this is followed by an adoration scene, during which each personage praises the Eucharist and two of the shepherds repeat their declaration of faith. Conversation subsequently turns to the Biblical prefigurements of the Sacrament, its administration by the Church, and its institution at the Last Supper, all this culminating in further laudatory speeches describing the benefits derived from the sacrament. The final piece of discussion is a warning to those who eat the sacramental bread unworthily. Then, as in Yanguas' play, after a description of Heaven and the rewards awaiting those who do

partake of the sacrament, the work is concluded with a villancico.

The principal features of content are common to both plays: the explanations by the angel and Fe, the speeches praising the Eucharist, the acts of Faith, the adoration scenes, and the description of Heaven. These features are in part also common to the Nativity plays. The culmination of the Christmas eclogue is the adoration scene, prepared for, just as the adorations in these two sacramental plays, by a theological discussion containing many Biblical allusions. Moreover, the discussion is conducted as in some Nativity plays. One knowledgeable person is given the role of explaining matters conventionally incomprehensible to the simpler rustics and, thereby, of indirectly revealing the subject to the audience. From the line of Yanguas' Farsa already cited (l. 18), the angel fulfilling the role of preceptor in his play seems to be a direct derivation of the Christmas angel.[42] An allegorical figure such as Fe is not found in any Nativity drama, but Fe's role is analogous to that played by the hermits or the better informed shepherds who enlightened the ignorant rustics (see Appendix B, s.v. "Friends, advisors, and preceptors"). Wardropper suggested that the idea for the use of this figure might have been derived from the liturgy: "Nos parece muy probable que dictaron esta innovación ideas expresadas en los himnos de Santo Tomás verbigracia: 'Ad firmandum cor sincerum Sola fides sufficit', y 'Quod non capis, quod non vides, Animosa firmat fides'" (Introducción..., pp. 180-181). It would be satisfying to think that allegory was first introduced into the dramas for Corpus Christi as a result of liturgical inspiration, but given the parallel

of the entire play with López de Yanguas' sacramental work, the allegorical figure was possibly derived from the Farsa del mundo y moral, another of Yanguas' plays (see below).

An overall evaluation of Yanguas' Farsa is prevented by an incomplete text. Crawford's opinion (Spanish Drama..., pp. 47-48) was that "here with the setting of a primitive Christmas play, after the manner of Encina, the significance of the Eucharist is explained by an angel to four shepherds". In this respect, however, Yanguas adopted the mould of his own Nativity play, with its display of classical and scriptural erudition and predominantly didactic tone. González Ollé was correct in assuming that "los pastores (Jerónimo, Ambrosio, Gregorio, Agustín) de la Farsa sacramental están simbolizando a otros tantos padres de la Iglesia, sus homónimos" (p. xxxviii), but the symbolism is unimportant. There is no shepherd-Church Father interplay similar to Encina's shepherd-evangelists of Egloga I. The names simply add tone to a didactic work.

The anonymous Farsa del santísimo sacramento is equally serious in tone and also dispenses with the comic, rustic scenes which characterized many commemorative plays, sacred and profane. Both authors exploited the conventional rustic figures, but where Yanguas employed these personages as the mouthpieces of his own knowledge, the unknown writer characterized them as the more familiarly ingenuous types. A more important distinction between the two plays, however, is the employment of allegory in the anonymous Farsa.

The central topic of the Farsa del santísimo sacramento is the discussion of the mystery of transubstantiation, a topic for which Fe's appearance is necessary. The three shepherds in the work are all conventionally unable to understand the wonders they see, in spite of their desire for enlightenment. They are ready, however, to celebrate the Eucharistic feast even before knowing what it is about. They learn by faith, since only through faith can the mystery of the Eucharist be accepted and believed. Hence the appearance of Fe, and hence the central portion of the play is Fe's proclamation of the mystery and Church doctrines, followed by an adoration scene and the shepherds' affirmation of their belief. While the shepherds represent the believers who accept a mystery on faith, Fe represents the way they come to accept it. In this context the Farsa del mundo y moral is recalled as a possible source for the appearance of Fe in the anonymous Farsa. In Yanguas' morality play Fe was also man's guide toward an acceptance of matters not to be seen, "que no alcançan los ojos", but believed through an act of faith.

Like the other works discussed in this chapter, the Farsa del santísimo sacramento is based on the same pastoral frame which served many commemorative plays in the early history of the Spanish drama. As with all these works, however, this anonymous Farsa has distinctive variations which make the conventional frame suitable for the occasion of its intended performance. In this case, one variation, the presentation of an allegorical figure to

explain a theological subject, was decisive. As Wardropper commented (Introducción..., p. 181), with it "ha nacido la idea de presentar la materia eucarística por medio de la alegoría". In this sense, it would not be incongruous to claim that the auto sacramental was a derivation of the commemorative, shepherd play.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

[1] For a bibliography of editions of Eglogas V and VI, see Eglogas..., pp. 69 and 81.

[2] The reference to the Treaty (ll. 197-200) is cited below. Crawford (Spanish Drama..., pp. 14-15) dated the two Carnival eclogues in 1494, believing that the reference in the first of them was to a treaty between France and Spain signed in September, 1493. The only agreement concluded between the two nations at this time was the Treaty of Barcelona (19 January, 1493). See Diccionario de historia de España, Madrid, Revista de Occidente, 1952, I, p. 381. Encina's two eclogues, performed only a few weeks after the Treaty was signed, were presented while the news was still fresh.

[3] In the anonymous Egloga interlocutoria a shepherd awarded a "borrega" to his fellow on hearing the news of the birth of Christ (see above chap. II, n. 51).

[4] See Renaissance Drama, VIII, Evanston, 1965, pp. 181-195. Although Encina may have broken with the traditions of liturgical drama, he did not break with medieval tradition, as Miss Stern recognized (see below n. 5).

[5] For a full discussion of the traditional elements of Egloga VI, see Miss Stern's article, pp. 182-192.

[6] Miss Stern remarked: "While I recognize the general validity of Andrews' main thesis, it seems to me that in his interpretation of the second Carnival play particularly he has stretched his point beyond belief" ("Juan del Encina's Carnival Eclogues...", p. 182).

[7] HR, XI (1943), 275-303. References to the text of the eclogue are according to this edition.

[8] For the historical background to the eclogue, see "Egloga hecha...", pp. 276-280.

[9] For the identity of Francisco de Madrid and his official court position, see "Egloga hecha...", p. 276.

[10] Gillet (p. 282) ascribed the words in parentheses to Cañete.

[11] The meanings of the names given to people, places, and events are explained by Gillet in the notes to his edition ("Egloga hecha...", pp. 294-303).

[12] For the historical background to the Battle of Pavia, see Diccionario de historia de España, II, pp. 784-785.

[13] PMLA, XLV (1930), p. 516. References to the text of the work are according to Gillet's edition.

[14]The kind of relationship where one personage fulfils the role of instructor is characteristic of several Nativity plays and of early shepherd plays in general (see Appendix B, s.v. "Friends, advisors, and preceptors").

[15]For the political background and the probable date of the Farsa de la concordia, see González Ollé's preliminary study (pp. li-liv) to his edition of Yanguas' plays. All references in this chapter to these plays are according to González's Ollé's edition.

[16]Cf. Evandro's addresses to the audience as fellow-shepherds in Francisco de Madrid's eclogue (ll. 1-32 and 269-284).

[17]Cf. Andrés Ortiz's play on the Battle of Pavia (ll. 21-22):

> Gloria sea enlos cielos
> y enla tierra sea alegria.

[18]Gillet noted ("Propalladia"..., IV, p. 554, n. 1) that Torres Naharro's Diálogo del nascimiento had a similar combination of a political subject with a festive occasion. All references to the Comedia Trophea are after Gillet's edition ("Propalladia"..., II, pp. 81-138).

[19]Gillet suggested that the role of the intérprete might have been played by Torres Naharro himself, "serving his Portuguese friends without reward, past or expected, ... and therefore deserving the audience's confidence" (see "Propalladia"..., III, p. 354, l. 53, and IV, p. 491).

[20]For the political background and implications of the Portuguese embassy to Rome, see "Propalladia"..., IV, pp. 492-496.

[21]Sacreligious parody, bawdy humour, and pullas are the same principal comic devices employed by Torres Naharro in the introito to the Diálogo del nascimiento and in the Addición del diálogo (see above chap. IV).

[22]The origin and popularity of the kind of tale told by Juan Tomillo is described by Gillet, "Propalladia"..., III, p. 349, l. 235.

[23]Gil Vicente also adapted the conventional Nativity play for the Auto de la visitacion, in which he paid homage to the same Portuguese prince, then newly born (see above chap. V). For the possible sources of Torres Naharro's play, including the influence of Vicente, see "Propalladia"..., IV, pp. 497-502.

[24]See Gillet's view of the combination of the past, present, and future, "Propalladia"..., IV, pp. 492-493.

[25]After considering all the evidence ("Propalladia"..., III, pp. 372-374), Gillet concluded (p. 374): "We may well suggest that

in Mingo Oveja's ludicrous effort to fly with wings of Fama, Torres Naharro was burlesquing an early attempt at flying in Rome, no doubt after 1500, probably in a machine similar to the upright type of Leonardo (whom Torres Naharro may have known in Rome after September, 1513)".

[26]All references to the Egloga real are according to Kohler's edition (Sieben spanische..., pp. 209-236).

[27]RJ, XVII (1966), 285-300.

[28]See González Ollé's discussion, containing complete bibliographical notes, in the preliminary study to the edition of Yanguas' plays (pp. xxvi-xxxi).

[29]For the features of characterization apparent in Telefo's prologue, see Appendix B. For the evolution of the use of a shepherd as a prologue or introito speaker, see Meredith, "Introito" and "Loa"...

[30]See Gillet's edition, "Hernández-Santillana, Obra nuevamente compuesta sobre el nascimiento del príncipe don Felipe (1527?)", HR, IX (1941), p. 48.

[31]Gil Vicente, in 1502, adapted the Christmas shepherd play in the Auto de la visitación to honour the birth of the future John III of Portugal and Torres Naharro, with a similar adaptation, honoured him in the Comedia Trophea performed at Rome in 1514.

[32]For a complete bibliography, see González Ollé's introduction, p. xxv.

[33]Compare the attitude of the rustics towards a cleric in Vicente's Auto de los reyes magos, in Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento, and, in the secular drama, in the Farsa by Juan de París (see below chap. XIII).

[34]The Assumption was also an occasion traditionally celebrated with religious pageants and plays, particularly in Eastern Spain (see Juliá Martínez, "La Asunción de la Virgen y el teatro primitivo").

[35]See Wardropper's discussion of the two autos, Introducción..., pp. 176-181.

[36]To avoid confusion, the titles of these two plays conform to the usage adopted by González Ollé in the introduction to his edition of Yanguas' plays. All references to Yanguas' Farsa sacramental are after González Ollé's reproduction of Cotarelo's text (see below n. 37).

[37]RABM, VI (1902), 251-272.

[38] *RABM*, X (1904), 67-71 and 447-450.

[39] In several of the Nativity plays one shepherd was portrayed as more knowledgeable than his fellows and able to enlighten them. This was the role of Mingo Sabido in Yanguas' own Nativity eclogue (see Appendix B, s.v. "Friends, advisors, and preceptors").

[40] López de Yanguas also intermingled classical allusions with Biblical references in his *Egloga en loor de la Natividad*.

[41] See, for example, Fernández's *Auto o farsa del nascimiento* and Yanguas' *Egloga en loor de la Natividad*.

[42] In one surviving Christmas play, a work by Fernando Díaz (c. 1520), the angel who announced the Nativity was also the shepherds' preceptor (see above chap. IV).

## Chapter VII

## FOUR NON-PASTORAL PLAYS

The overriding tone of the Spanish drama at the beginning of the sixteenth century is indisputably pastoral, but it must not be overlooked that several non-pastoral plays were written before 1520. Of these, the most important were by Torres Naharro, whose Propalladia was first published in 1517 (Naples).[1] The influence of his comedias was not widespread before 1530, however, so that only the predominantly pastoral features in them have been examined in this study. After 1530 Torres Naharro's plays were more influential in setting the trends of the drama in the middle years of the sixteenth century, affecting the tone, techniques of composition, subjects and structure of the plays written in that period. Consequently, any comprehensive study of the pastoral drama that ventured beyond the limits imposed for this work would have to take proper account of Torres Naharro's non-pastoral plays.[2]

Nevertheless, to complete the picture of the Spanish drama at the beginning of the sixteenth century, a few words must be devoted to four non-pastoral plays, three by Juan del Encina and one by Lucas Fernández, in order to relate them to their authors' pastoral works. The first of those by Encina is really a pastoral play insofar as it involves shepherds, but, neither a commemorative piece, nor a pastoral love composition, it is unrelated to those discussed in this study. The piece in question,

the Auto del repelón, although conceivably written some time before, was first published in 1509 as part of Encina's Cancionero.[3] The action of the Auto involves two shepherds, speaking a Sayagués considerably thicker than in any of Encina's other eclogues, in flight from a hazing meted out by a group of students. Having sheltered in a gentleman's house, Pernicurto and Johan Paramas, the two shepherds, exchange accounts of their plight and, out of sight and sound of their oppressors, soon regain their courage, so that they eventually take their revenge on a lone student who passes by. The whole situation is amicably concluded, however, when the two shepherds are joined by the chastised student and a third rustic, Juan Rabe, to sing a villancico.

The connection of the Auto del repelón with Encina's pastoral plays is provided by the rustic characters. Pernicurto and Johan Paramas are conventional, cowardly but argumentative, shepherds, distinguished principally by the roughness of their speech. In the total picture of the early pastoral drama, however, the Auto del repelón is unique. There are no other pieces of so early a date in which the central element of the action was the portrayal of physical discomfiture as the result of a practical joke. This was a characteristic of the later entremés and of a few scenes in Torres Naharro's plays.[4] For this reason the Auto del repelón has long since been considered a forerunner of the entremés.[5]

In the two remaining plays by Juan del Encina, Eglogas III and IV, there is still less association with his usual pastoral tone. In fact, these are the only two plays by Encina which are

totally serious, lacking even the conventional comic rustics. The difference is accountable to the difference in subject, however, since both works belong to the Easter cycle. Both were first published in the first edition of Encina's Cancionero (Salamanca, 1496) and must, therefore, have been written for a performance sometime before then, presumably for the benefit of the Duke and Duchess of Alba.[6] The seriousness of both works is evidently to be attributed to their purpose as dramatizations of the Crucifixion and Resurrection respectively, subjects which did not permit the kind of levity that could be introduced into a Nativity performance.[7] Encina himself appears to have been aware of this difference, since he did not describe Eglogas III and IV in the usual way. They are not églogas, but representaciones, described as follows: "Representacion a la muy bendita passion y muerte de nuestro precioso Redentor" (p. 45) and "Representacion a la santissima resurrecion de Cristo" (p. 61).

The purpose of the two plays combined is to describe the Crucifixion and Resurrection, discuss its theology, and evoke an appropriate attitude of devotion. To do this, Encina avoided direct dramatization of the Biblical narrative and, instead, relied upon portraying the situation through representation of dialogue about it and the evidence of eye-witnesses. In Egloga III, the Crucifixion is first described in a dialogue between two hermits. A younger man (hijo) stops his older companion (padre) to ask where he is going in such a hurry. He is anxious, it appears, to see Christ's tomb, but willingly answers questions about the Crucifixion.

The technique of question and answer recalls that used in the Nativity eclogues, whereby the shepherds learned about the Incarnation, but the conversation between the two hermits is completely lacking in touches of comedy, so characteristic of the pastoral plays. Description of the Passion is completed through an encounter with Veronica. She describes Christ's injuries and betrayal by Judas, and shows the cloth on which He left the impression of his face. Her speech leads her to lament the pain endured by the mother of the Redeemer, a reflection perhaps of the medieval Planctus Mariae, and the hermits kneel in devotion to offer prayers before the tomb. The devotional tenor of the occasion is enhanced by the appearance of an angel who enumerates the benefits of the Redemption and then pronounces a eulogy of Christ.

The predominant tone of Egloga III is one of sadness, but the feeling of total despondency is alleviated at the end. The death of Christ contains the promise of Resurrection and, therefore, also a reason for celebration. Hence the villancico sung at the end of Egloga III:

> Esta tristura y pesar
> en plazer se ha de tornar. (ll. 352-353)

The anticipated pleasure is, in fact, conveyed in Egloga IV, a dramatization of the Resurrection. Encina again avoided a direct presentation of the subject by portraying instead the reactions of those involved in the event. Thus the eclogue begins with the appearance of Joseph of Arimathea, in whose vacant tomb Christ's

body had been laid. His apostrophe of the tomb and disclosure of the Resurrection is interrupted by Mary Magdalene, who describes her vision of the risen Christ, who appeared to her in the guise of a gardener. The subsequent eulogy is curtailed by the arrival of Lucas and Cleophas, two disciples who met and talked with Christ on the road to Emmaus.[8] The conversation of all personages then dwells on the theological implications of the Crucifixion and Resurrection, including ample praise of the benefits derived from it for mankind. The play is then concluded with an angel's proclamation of peace and happiness to the world, and with a villancico of celebration.

Encina's two Easter plays are certainly a far cry from his pastoral plays. He sought a novel way of making a familiar subject palatable to his audience by using, for example, the hermits in one play and the disciples of Emmaus in another, but the predominant tone of both works is devotional. Lucas Fernández sought a similar effect in his Auto de la Passion. This piece is the last in the Farsas y églogas and, for some, the last and best written of all Fernández's plays.[9] The only date that can be mentioned with any confidence, however, is the terminus ante quem of 1514, the year of first known publication. Moreover, in the long run, a discussion of Fernández's Auto in connection with his pastoral plays in order to assign the former an appropriate position in the chronology of his total production is a futile exercise on account of the difference between the two types of plays and the relatively little information known about Fernández himself (see above n. 9).

The tone in Fernández's Auto is as serious as that prevailing

in Encina's play and the subject is presented through the same device of dialogue and description rather than direct dramatization of the Biblical narrative. The structural appearance of the two works by the two authors is, therefore, remarkably similar, the distinguishing features of Fernández's play being the greater variety of personages and the overt devotional tone created by two adoration scenes.

The Auto begins with the entry of St. Peter, who reproaches himself for his triple denial of Christ. He is joined by St. Dionysius, an anachronistic figure, but nonetheless a useful device since his questions provoke those who witnessed Christ's arrest, trial, condemnation, and death to describe what they saw. St. Peter takes the story as far as the arrest, when the narrative is taken over by the newly-arrived St. Matthew. He continues as far as the trial, but is interrupted by the three Maries (Magdalene, Cleophas, and Salome) and a lament sung "en canto de organo". When Matthew continues the narrative, he describes the trial before Pilate and the presentation of Christ to the people, an episode which provokes the first adoration scene, an act of homage before an Ecce homo. The condemnation of Christ is then described by St. Matthew and the death on the cross by Mary Magdalene, descriptions which result in the second scene of adoration, this time before a crucifix. A further anachronism at this point is the introduction of the prophet Jeremiah, who relates the Crucifixion to the Old Testament and hails it as the fulfilment of all prophecy. The description of the events is concluded with an account of the

descent from the cross, which includes a Planctus Mariae, the Virgin's traditional lament over the body of her son. Then, before Dionysius is taken to be shown Christ's tomb, all the personages kneel and sing a villancico in adoration.

Lucas Fernández's play is a completely serious and devotional piece, quite the opposite of his secular, burlesque comedies and even a contrast with his Nativity eclogues. This contrast is further emphasized by the didacticism inherent in the Auto de la Passion. Just as Encina, Fernández intended to convey the meaning of Good Friday as well as the events it commemorates. Hence the introduction of Dionysius, a pagan who is led to enquire about Christ's death, and of Jeremiah, an Old Testament patriarch who provides the words required to link the old and new Laws. Both are devices for conveying the relevance of the Crucifixion, as well as means to provoke the narration of the events connected with it.

As may be seen from the above descriptions, the tone of the plays by Juan del Encina and Lucas Fernández commemorating the Crucifixion and Resurrection is quite different from those intended to re-enact or commemorate the Incarnation. Aside from theological considerations, the essential difference between the two types is the humorous, pastoral atmosphere of the Nativity eclogues. For, although both Encina and Fernández may have used techniques developed from the religious pastoral to portray a serious Biblical subject (introduction of anachronistic figures, or question and answer, to convey either the drift of a Biblical story or a

theological argument), the Easter plays, occasions for devotion rather than amusement, could not be made the subject of jest.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

[1]For a detailed bibliography of Torres Naharro's plays, see "Propalladia"..., I, pp. 5-95.

[2]The relevant text for the position of Torres Naharro's plays in the early Spanish drama is, of course, "Propalladia"..., IV, "Torres Naharro and the Drama of the Renaissance".

[3]For a bibliography of the Auto del repelón, see Eglogas..., p. 207. The Auto is printed as Egloga XIII in this edition. Crawford (Spanish Drama..., pp. 22-23) thought the Auto was written before Encina went to Italy. Another scholar, Oliver T. Myers, believed, on linguistic grounds, that Encina did not write the play (see "Juan del Encina and the Auto del repelón", HR, XXXII, 1964, 189-201).

[4]See W. Shaffer Jack, "Development of the Entremés before Lope de Rueda", PMLA, XXXVII (1922), 187-207.

[5]See, for example, Crawford, Spanish Drama..., p. 22, Cotarelo, "Juan del Encina y los orígenes...", passim, and Juliá Martínez, "La literatura dramática peninsular...", p. 262.

[6]For a bibliography of Eglogas III and IV, see Eglogas..., pp. 43 and 59. Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 14) wrote, without supporting his statement, that Encina's two Easter plays were performed in either 1493 or 1494. They might equally, however, have been performed in 1495--in short, at any Eastertide before publication in 1496 while Encina was employed by the Duke of Alba.

[7]This is generally true of Crucifixion plays, although some dramatizations of Good Friday in the English miracle cycles have moments of grim humour.

[8]See Pedro Altamira's "Auto de la Aparición que Nuestro Señor Jesucristo hizo a los discípulos que iban a Emaús", ed. Gillet, RR, XIII (1922), 228-251. For the occurrence of this subject in the liturgical drama, see Young, The Drama of the Medieval Church, II, p. 573, s.v. "Emmaus".

[9]Juliá Martínez ("Literatura dramática peninsular...", pp. 273-274) was of this opinion and it formed the basis of Alfredo Hermenegildo's analysis of the Auto de la Passion in "Nueva interpretación...".

# Part II

# PASTORAL LOVE PLAYS

## Chapter VIII

## INTRODUCTORY

All the plays discussed in the first part of this study were mainly written as commemorative works, with the result that many characteristics of composition were determined by the occasion of intended performance. The pastoral love dramas discussed in this second part, however, need not always be related to a single event and a precise occasion of presentation, although several were probably intended for performance under given circumstances. Principally the same types of personages, the familiar comic rustics, continue to appear, but incorporating certain differences. For the most part, the action and personages are fictional and, portrayed in accordance with conventional ideas, are used to create a theatrical illusion unlimited by special circumstances of performance, nor by a commemorative or didactic purpose, but relevant for presentation on more than a single occasion.

Nevertheless, there are strong connections between the pastoral love dramas and the commemorative shepherd plays. Any division between religious and secular drama, or between commemorative and non-commemorative plays, is artificial because all these types evolved contemporaneously and can only be categorized and considered in separate groups on account of their

different subjects. Dramatists whose plays formed important chapters in the first part of this study will be the subject of important chapters in the second; features of characterization, elements of action, and devices of dramatic technique already described will appear again, sometimes repeated exactly, sometimes modified; with several plays it will be necessary to take account of a specific performance. The fact is that at this early moment of the drama in Spain no one component of the total genre can be understood completely in isolation.

The same difficulty of knowing where to start is felt as much at the beginning of this second part as at the beginning of the first. It is not intended to investigate the origins of the drama; consequently, the comments and bibliographical notes made at the beginning of this study will serve here (see chap. I, nn. 1 and 2). There is, however, some truth in conflicting opinions about the state and extent of dramatic literature before Juan del Encina. At the end of his study (Tradición y creación..., pp. 231-233) Humberto López Morales concluded that Encina and his generation could only have derived their plays from non-dramatic sources. Another scholar, Fernando Lázaro Carreter, claimed the existence of a flourishing drama in Spain during the late fifteenth century. Having outlined the origins of secular drama and traced the growing taste in court circles for varying kinds of entertainments, he concluded as follows in the revised introduction to his anthology Teatro medieval: "Por todo cuanto llevamos dicho, no creemos osado

hablar de un teatro profano en la segunda mitad del siglo XV. Se observarían en él varias tendencias: la político-humanística de la égloga de F. de Madrid; el auto de amores, representado por la Queja de Escrivá; la elegíaca (en la línea, por ejemplo, del Pamphilus) de las Coplas de Puertocarrero, y quién sabe si las fórmulas últimas del debate, representado por las Coplas de Rodrigo de Cota" (p. 70). The difference between the two men is largely semantic, however, caused by differing interpretations of the term "dramatic": López Morales severely limited its application; Lázaro Carreter gave it a much wider meaning (see above chap. I, n. 20).

It is beyond the scope of this study to examine the respective claims of López Morales and Lázaro Carreter, but since both their opinions stress that Encina's plays and those of his contemporaries were derived from some kind of established tradition, the antecedents of the works discussed in the following chapters must be briefly considered. The works of a político-humanística tendency to which Lázaro Carreter alluded, were discussed in the first part of this study (see chap. VI). In them, certain affinities with the Nativity drama, by way of the pastoral convention and many familiar devices of action and characterization, were discovered. This study is less concerned, however, with classifying works for their appearance as autos de amores, elegiac comedies, or debates, than with certain manifestations of subject-matter and how it was presented which found favour with Encina, his generation, and his successors. To this end,

two tendencies prevalent in semi-dramatic literature in the second half of the fifteenth century are important: the exploitation of love as a subject and the employment of a pastoral convention.

However much the shepherd grew in importance through the drama of Juan del Encina, his appearance in literature did not coincide with the emergence of the drama and he was not produced by a single literary form. His literary career in Spain dates at least from the pastourelle and its burlesque version in the Libro de buen amor.[1] The shepherd and the pastoral convention were known from Virgil's Bucolics, semi-dramatic poems which Encina himself adapted into Castilian.[2] Even before the publication of Encina's Cancionero in 1496, containing the first dramatic eclogues, the convention of pastoral disguising was employed in the Coplas de Mingo Revulgo, an anonymous, political satire of the reign of Henry IV.[3] The inclusion of shepherds in poems and dialogues, not to mention the liturgical Nativity drama,[4] consequently made their appearance almost inevitable in the early plays which drew on those forms for their sources.

One early piece in which country types are portrayed is the Egloga sobrel molino de Vascalon. The manuscript volume in which it was discovered gave neither a date nor the name of an author, but H.R. Lang, who described the entire volume, concluded that the works it contained, written in an eighteenth century hand, were "evidently a copy of several older collections of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries".[5] After mentioning

Bonilla's reference to the Egloga sobrel molino de Vascalon in connection with Mendoza's Christmas shepherd piece in the Vita Christi (Las Bacantes,..., p. 90, n. 1), Gillet, the modern editor of the eclogue, pointed to several enclitic forms and concluded: "It may well be a late fifteenth-century or early sixteenth-century product".[6] Quite possibly, therefore, this semi-dramatic eclogue is earlier than Encina's plays, a conclusion further warranted by the minimal action and lack of conventional devices associated with the early drama.

Leading a donkey laden with grain to the mill, Iñigo Scicio fears his frail animal will not survive under the weight, or will fall into the river. When Juan Molinero comes out to greet him, a discussion begins about the damage done to the mill by flooding. Iñigo is afraid of a wasted journey and complains of previous bad milling, but the miller eases his mind and explains that all is well. The dialogue is then concluded with a sort of Laus Deo and Iñigo's prayer that the miller will be able to satisfy his customers:

> Plega Dios por que la gente
> se mantenga, y se contente
> vandear tambien en esto:
> que les des en paz y presto
> correcion y bien moliente. (ll. 105-109)

Flooding was also a topic of conversation in Encina's Egloga IX, where discussion of local problems also ended on a religious note. A relationship between the two eclogues is not suggested--in a sense both were conventional--but the country characters are portrayed in similar situations. The effect of

the Egloga sobrel molino de Vascalon is that of a vignette, but, without further information on the circumstances of writing, its purpose is obscured. It was conceivably relevant to a local disaster, although the only traceable allusion in it is a possible passing reference to the milling trade of Avignon.[7] For this study, it is enough to note that the country types contained in the eclogue attest their popularity as literary figures.

Another piece portraying country characters is the Coplas de unos tres pastores, a work preserved in an unique copy, a pliego suelto without colophon. The discovery of the Coplas in a volume containing several other works by Rodrigo de Reynosa, however, led Salvá to attribute them to him.[8] In subject they are related to Reynosa's works and to the Coplas de Mingo Revulgo insofar as they present low social types and criticize social conditions. However, even if the Coplas de unos tres pastores were not written by Reynosa, he deserves a mention in the early history of the drama on account of several semi-dramatic dialogues and lyrics.[9]

The first part of the Coplas is concerned with Martín, a shepherd who complains of the rough treatment received from his employers and decides to risk the outcome of neglecting his duties by taking a rest (see Appendix B, s.v. "Sleep"):

> Dome a Dios damajadar,
> quierome bien estender
> y dormir a mi prazer
> y holgar,
> avnque pese a quien pesar. (ll. 12-16)

Nevertheless, he is soon reminded of the probable consequences by Miguel, who warns him he is courting arrest and further ill-

treatment:

> Para esta, si el montaraz
> te lo entiende,
> yo te juro que te prende.
> Porque estas muy echado,
> que si bien bien lo miramos,
> con esto rauian tus amos,
> desaziado
> con tu muy poco cuydado. (11. 31-38)

Undeterred, Martín complains anew against his employers and is of a mind to find better services and higher pay (11. 45-77). Miguel is pessimistic of Martín's chances of improvement, pointing out he is no worse off than his fellows and stressing the possibility of a change from bad to worse (11. 78-105). Martín is still disatisfied. In spite of a binding contract and Miguel's advocation that he ought to fulfill "lo que ... cumple hazer" (1. 121), he remarks (11. 122-130) that he will ask Antón if he has heard of any more satisfactory jobs.

Mention of the shepherd Antón and his simultaneous entry close the subject of Martín's dissatisfaction and begin a new topic. Miguel and Antón are indebted to each other and each is determined to recover his debt. After a heated quarrel, with Martín as arbitrator and eventual guarantor of Antón's outstanding debt to Miguel, the pair of shepherds resolve their conflict more or less amicably. Martín does not renew the question of his intended change of employment and the shepherds' conversation turns to other matters. The prize sheep of the flock has been lost, probably stolen, an occurence causing further discontent (11. 298-364), but this conversation and the

entire Coplas are abruptly ended with the entry of Cremente, who interests his companions in the lighter matters of music and entertainment.

The Coplas contain three loosely combined conversations, presented like those spoken by the shepherds in the Nativity plays. In fact, the principal elements of the conversation are also found in the Nativity eclogues: Martín's desire to forget his cares in sleep and Miguel's exhortation to beware the consequences of a lack of vigilance are paralleled in Lucas Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento; the shepherds' discontent is found in Fernández's Christmas Auto o farsa and in Encina's Egloga IX; the disagreement about money recalls many another difference of opinion (in Encina's Egloga I, in the anonymous Egloga interlocutoria, and in Fernández's Egloga o farsa, for example); the device of the lost animal occurs in Vicente's Auto pastoril castellano and in López Ranjel's Nativity play; finally, the shepherds' musical entertainment at the end of the Coplas is reminiscent of the inevitable villancico at the end of virtually every shepherd play.[10]

The use of these devices poses a question about the date of the Coplas de unos tres pastores. If written, even at the latest, in about 1510, it could be unhesitatingly concluded that these devices were derived from those already established in the early drama. On the other hand, if Rodrigo de Reynosa wrote the Coplas, he could have done so before any of Encina's eclogues were known. This being the case, the Coplas could be

considered as belonging to a tradition established before the time of Encina's eclogues in which the shepherd and the devices of his portrayal were already popular literary resources.

This conclusion is supported by the principal topics of the shepherds' conversation, which reflect a feeling of social discontent similar to that encountered in the Coplas de Mingo Revulgo. At the beginning Martín and Miguel argue in favour of the downtrodden, under-paid peasants, the former somewhat militantly, the latter with an air of resignation. The shepherds' discontent re-appears in the two following topics of conversation, when they quibble over their petty debts and lament the loss of a sheep, recovery of which is doubtful. The whole situation provided an effective device for the author to voice his own discontent at social evils. Consequently, he was probably not concerned with the exigencies of plot. Martín's unhappiness and will to change his job is not resolved. Once presented and discussed, another problem is introduced, the shepherds' indebtedness to each other, and then another, the stolen sheep. The Coplas are, therefore, episodic and the effectiveness of their social criticism is dependent on the cumulative effect of the shepherds' different topics of conversation.

Neither the Egloga sobrel molino de Vascalon nor the Coplas de unos tres pastores is an important work in the early history of the drama, but both document the popularity of certain devices of composition and character portrayal. Neither was concerned with the subject of numerous secular plays written at the beginning

of the sixteenth century, for in the years following publication of Encina's first dramatic eclogues, alongside the commemorative subjects, the principal topic for dramatization was love. The choice was natural, since the Cancioneros of the fifteenth century were well stocked in love poetry, some of it semi-dramatic in form.[11]

One popular form was the pastourelle, involving some action and occasionally dialogue.[12] It provided the source for one of Encina's earliest eclogues, Egloga VII, and was an important device of action in the early secular drama in Spain. While the pastourelle was the source for one of the earliest pieces of dramatic composition in French, the Jeu de Robin et Marion, written by Adam de la Halle at the end of the thirteenth century,[13] the form was not dramatized in Spain till much later, but was, nonetheless, widely known. Its popularity is no better shown than by the Serranillas of the Marqués de Santillana and the burlesque forms of it in the Libro de buen amor.[14] To some extent, both these examples, Santillana's poems and the burlesque of Juan Ruiz, prefigure the comic and the serious presentation of this conventional topic in early plays. Moreover, with its country setting, the pastourelle was easily identified with other semi-dramatic forms of literature (the political satire, the pastoral dialogues, and the Nativity plays) in which the shepherd played a prominent role.

A second form popular in the Cancioneros were poems demonstrating the power of love, depicted through the portrayal

of a suffering lover subjected to the extremes of both pleasure and pain. The Libro de buen amor contains ample illustration of this subject,[15] but in the literature of the end of the fifteenth century are several compositions on this subject which are semi-dramatic in form insofar as they contain dialogue and a rudimentary action. Of this type are the Coplas by Puertocarrero, the Querella ante el dios de amor by the Comendador Escrivá, and the Diálogo entre el Amor y un viejo by Rodrigo Cota.[16] The topic of all three is the same, although presented in different guises--a lover sees his desires frustrated.

The first known edition of the Diálogo entre el Amor y un viejo, a work relevant to the subject exploited in the early Spanish pastoral drama, is that contained in the Cancionero of Hernando del Castillo (Valencia, 1511).[17] The date of composition of the Diálogo is uncertain, although the facts of Rodrigo Cota's life would indicate composition some years before the first known edition of 1511.[18] Moratín, for example, placed it in the year 1470 (Orígenes..., ed. cit., pt. 1, p. 115) and, beginning with him, virtually all commentators on the dialogue have agreed on its qualities as a drama. Moratín wrote: "Este diálogo es una representación dramática con acción, nudo y desenlace; entre dos interlocutores no es posible exigir mayor movimiento teatral" (ibid.). Menéndez y Pelayo emphasized the same aspects of the poem and stressed the subordination of the dialogue to the action: "El debate está subordinado a la acción, que es el vencimiento del Viejo por el Amor y el desengaño

que sufre después de su mentida transformación" (Antología..., III, p. 202).

The two speakers are antagonists at the beginning of the poem, a position created by the old man's refusal, through previous experience, to listen to Amor. At this stage, Amor's antagonism is veiled, and is seen only through the old man's reproval:

> Las culebras y serpientes
> y las cosas enconadas,
> son muy blandas y pintadas
> y ala vista plazientes;
> mas vn secreto venino
> dexando pueden llegar,
> qual, segun yo adeuino,
> dexarias en el camino
> que comigo quies lleuar. (p. 581)

His persuasive tongue soon causes the old man to change his mind, however:

> Escucha, padre, señor,
> que por mal trocare bienes:
> por vltrajes y desdenes
> quiero darte honor.
> A ti que estas mas dispuesto
> para me contradezir,
> assi tengo presupuesto
> de sofrir tu duro gesto,
> porque sufras mi seruir. (ibid.)

When the old man agrees to listen he has not changed his mind about Amor, but is as hostile as ever:

> Habla, ya, di tus razones,
> di tus enconados quexos;
> pero dimelos de lexos,
> el ayre no me enfeciones:
> que segun se de tus nueuas,
> si te llegas cerca de mi,
> tu daras tan dulces prueuas,
> que el vltraje que ora lleuas
> ese lleue yo de ti. (p. 582)

The argument, following the old man's agreement to listen,

consists of a statement of the attitudes of both parties: Amor enumerates the gifts he offers his subjects; the old man describes the inevitable suffering resulting from acceptance of his rule. Only when Amor shows that suffering is a necessary corollary of pleasure does the old man change his attitude. Still recognizing the evil Amor can dispense, he invites him to approach:

> Allegate vn poco mas:
> tienes tan londas razones,
> que sofrirte e que me encones
> por la gloria que me das.
> Los tus dichos alcahuetes,
> con verdad o con engaño,
> en el alma me los metes,
> por lo dulce que prometes,
> de esperar es todo el año. (p. 586)

and the climax of the action occurs when the old man surrenders to Amor's embrace and there is a momentary harmony between the two antagonists:

> El Amor
> Abracemonos entramos,
> desnudos sin otro medio;
> sentiras en ti remedio,
> en tu huerta frescos ramos.
>
> El viejo
> Vente a mi, muy dulce Amor,
> vente a mi, braços abiertos!
> Ves aqui tu seruidor,
> hecho sieruo, de señor,
> sin tener tus dones ciertos. (ibid.)

The momentary harmony in their relationship results from the changing attitude of the old man. In two stages--agreeing to listen, then surrendering completely--the old man's antagonism is eroded. When this occurs Amor reveals his true colours, earlier concealed, although fully described by the old man. Their

positions are then reversed and the old man, rejected with a callousness equivalent to his earlier rejection of Amor, laments that he allowed his reason to sleep:

> A do estauas, mi sentido?
> dime, como te dormiste?
> Durmiosse triste, perdido,
> Como haze el dolorido
> que escucho de quien oyste. (p. 587)

The action of the poem, consisting of a conflict between the lover and his feelings, presents love in conventional terms as an irresistible force causing both pleasure and pain, the same way in which love is portrayed in the plays discussed in the following chapters.[19] Consequently, although Cota's Diálogo was probably never performed, its value for the early history of the drama in Spain is that of a prototype. The early dramatists can be viewed as innovators insofar as they wrote in a relatively new form, but they were nonetheless part of a general panorama of literary endeavour and their achievements frequently rested on their ability to exploit in dramatic form what had already been commonplace in other areas of literature.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

[1]See El libro de buen amor, ed. Julio Cejador y Frauca, CC no. 17, Madrid, 1959, pp. 29-66.

[2]Cancionero de Juan del Encina (Salamanca, 1496), Academy facsimile, fols. XXXI-r to XLVIII-v.

[3]Published in facsimile, with a paleographic version, introduction, and notes by L. de la Cuadra Escrivá de Romaní, Madrid, 1963.

[4]There are no known vernacular Christmas shepherd plays before those by Juan del Encina, but the popularity of the shepherd and the manner of his portrayal is attested by the rustic Nativity scene in Iñigo de Mendoza's Vita Christi (see above Chap. I).

[5]"The So-called Cancionero de Pero Guillén de Segovia", RHi, XIX (1908), p.58. The eclogue is item 10 in Lang's table of contents.

[6]"The Egloga sobrel molino de Vascalon", PhQ, V (1926), p. 87. References to the text of the eclogue are according to Gillet's edition.

[7]See Gillet's note to l. 99 of the eclogue (loc. cit., p. 89).

[8]Catálogo de la biblioteca de Salvá, Valencia, 1872, I, p. 15.

[9]See Gillet, "Coplas de unos tres pastores...", pp. 23-27. Gillet's entire introduction to his edition of the Coplas--the one cited in this study--is relevant, containing a discussion of Reynosa's works and his position in relation to the early Spanish drama. For a descriptive bibliography of Reynosa's works, see John M. Hill, "Notes for the Bibliography of Rodrigo de Reynosa", HR, XIV (1946), 1-21, and, idem, "An additional Note for the Bibliography of Rodrigo de Reynosa", HR, XVII (1949), 243-250.

[10]Further examples of all these devices are catalogued below in Appendix B.

[11]See López Morales, Tradición y creación..., pp. 109-119.

[12]For the history and forms of the pastourelle, see Edmond Faral, "La pastourelle", Romania, XXL (1923), 204-259; Edgar Piguet, L'Evolution de la pastourelle du XIIe siècle à nos jours, Bale, 1927; and Mia I. Gerhardt, La Pastorale... In the last of these, in a chapter entitled "La Pastorale espagnole", Miss Gerhardt considered the pastoral motif in the early Spanish drama and wrote that the source of Encina's first

eclogues was to be traced to the medieval European pastoral: "Il n'y a que cette pastorale médievale qui puisse expliquer la genèse et le caractère des premières Eglogas dramatiques de Juan del Encina. Le père du théâtre espagnol ne s'inspire aucunement de l'antiquité pour le coté pastoral de ses pièces, et l'Italie ne fait sentir son influence que dans la dernière partie de son oeuvre" (p. 130).

[13]For a discussion of the Jeu de Robin et Marion, see Grace Frank, The French Medieval Theatre, pp. 231-236.

[14]See above (n. 1) for the relevant passages of the Libro de buen amor. For the Marqués de Santillana, see Obras de Don Iñigo López de Mendoza, Marqués de Santillana, ed. José Amador de los Ríos, Madrid, 1852, pp. 464-478, and Rafael Lapesa, La obra literaria del Marqués de Santillana, Madrid, 1957, pp. 46-73.

[15]See, for example, CC no. 14, pp. 73-75. The Libro de buen amor is, of course, not the only piece of testimony to the popularity of love themes. The Cárcel de amor (1492) and the Celestina (1499) were both published in Encina's lifetime and had become very popular by the time he wrote his last eclogues.

[16]Modern versions of these three poems are contained in Lázaro Carreter's anthology Teatro medieval. The edition of the Diálogo entre el Amor y un viejo referred to in the course of this chapter is, however, that published by R. Foulché-Delbosc in Cancionero castellano del siglo XV, Madrid, 1912, II, pp. 580-587.

[17]See Cancionero general, recopilado por Hernando del Castillo (Valencia, 1511), published in facsimile by the Real Academia Española, with introduction and appendices by Antonio Rodríguez-Moñino, Madrid, 1958.

[18]See Emilio Cotarelo y Mori, "Algunas noticias nuevas acerca de Rodrigo Cota", BRAE, XIII (1926), 11-17; idem, "Adición a Noticias de Rodrigo Cota", BRAE, XIII (1926), 140-142; and Augusto Cortina, "Rodrigo Cota", RBAM, VI (1929), 151-165. An argument in favour of an earlier date for composition is supported by the influence of the Diálogo on Encina's plays and by the conclusion that it was included in the Cancionero general on account of its popularity.

[19]It is not possible in this study to enumerate the various conventional ideas about the conduct and language of love. See Otis H. Green, "Courtly Love in the Spanish Cancioneros", PMLA, LXIV (1949), 247-301. For the position of the Diálogo in relation to these ideas, see Diálogo entre el amor y un viejo, ed. Elisa Aragone, Firenze, 1951, pp. 13-54.

## Chapter IX

## JUAN DEL ENCINA

Of all Encina's dramas, Eglogas VII and VIII have been singled out for particular praise. Laurel H. Turk, for example, described them ("Juan del Encina...", p. 241) as "the gems of Encina's dramatic production" and Alfredo Álvarez de la Villa (El aucto del repelón, p. 157) was equally ecstatic: "Puede juzgarse esta obra [Egloga VII] como la más perfecta del teatro de Juan del Enzina, pues en ella y en la siguiente [Egloga VIII], que pueden considerarse como una, llega con una trama sencillísima a conseguir poéticos efectos. El trance vulgar de las ofertas de dos enamorados para conseguir el favor de una mujer, lo ha tratado el poeta con toda la frescura y jugosidad poéticas que derrama en los villancicos".

As the other dramatic eclogues published in Encina's 1496 Cancionero, however, Eglogas VII and VIII were also written for performance on a specific occasion and before a particular audience, a reason why they must be understood in the same terms as Eglogas I and II and the two Carnival eclogues. Once the idea of writing a script for re-enactment on a specific occasion was conceived, it was a small matter for numerous occasions to be so commemorated, for, in their way, both Egloga VII and VIII were commemorative plays. Their important distinguishing feature, however, is a greater reliance on theatrical illusion and less dependence on

a unique occasion for performance than the conventional, commemorative work.

Eglogas VII and VIII were printed as the last two works in the 1496 edition of Encina's Cancionero.[1] This final position, the fact that Encina did entertain his patrons at Christmas,[2] the presentation to them of his complete works during Egloga VIII, supposedly at the end of a year, coupled with references to a year passing between the performances of Eglogas VII and VIII,[3] have all contributed to a belief that the two eclogues were performed at the Christmas of 1494 and 1495 respectively.[4] This belief has led to the opinion that Encina's profane dramas were derived from his religious works. Turk was emphatic on this point: "This performance of a profane drama at the Christmas celebration is worthy of note in the transition from the religious to the secular plays. It lends credence to the belief that Encina's profane dramas are a continuation and development of his religious plays, and not a separate development. We still have shepherds who are related to Christmas but they no longer suggest the religious atmosphere; there is no mixing of the religious and profane elements" ("Juan del Encina...", pp. 245-246).

It is certain that Encina presented his complete works to his patrons during Egloga VIII, a year after the performance of Egloga VII (see above n. 3); the uncertainties are which complete works, the years, and the season. The reference to the season as "cabo de año" (Egl. VIII, ll. 54 and 159) could imply either the beginning or the end of a year.[5] Possible dates,

therefore, are the turning of the two years 1494-95 and 1495-96 before the two eclogues were published in 1496, but these dates are acceptable only provided that the gift presented to the Duke and Duchess was the 1496 Cancionero and that no lengthy interval elapsed between its presentation (presumably in manuscript) and eventual publication. There is no evidence, however, that either Egloga VII or VIII was written for performance at Christmas. Attribution to this occasion may only be made through default of any reason for performance and by analogy with the fact that Encina entertained his patrons at one Christmas before 1496 with Eglogas I and II and possibly with Egloga IX in 1498.[6] Moreover, the similar pastoral setting of Eglogas VII and VIII and the Christmas shepherd plays must not be over-emphasized. The shepherds of the Nativity plays are partly derived from Biblical figures; in the secular eclogues are similar personages, who share some of the characteristics of their Biblical counterparts, since they conform to a single pastoral convention, but are less related to them than to the shepherds of the pastourelle.

If Eglogas VII and VIII evolved from Encina's Nativity eclogues, the extent and manner must be clarified. Both were dedicated to and presented before Encina's patrons, in the same style as the Christmas Eglogas I and II and the Carnival Eglogas V and VI--"en la sala adonde el duque y duquesa estauan" (pp. 95 and 107). To this extent, the customary audience-actor relationship of Encina's earlier eclogues is established. It

is particularly apparent in Egloga VIII, during which the poet appeared as Mingo, a shepherd who spoke "en nombre de Juan del Enzina" (p. 107) and presented a gift to his patrons just as the shepherd Juan in Egloga I. Consequently, there are aspects of multiple identity in Mingo much as in the shepherds of the Nativity and Carnival eclogues. Finally, Eglogas VII and VIII have problems of unity, both of the two eclogues combined and of the second alone. These problems, aggravated by the year elapsing between performances, arise, in familiar forms, through introduction of the personages from one play to another, transformation of character, and intervention of the author in the action.

The action of Egloga VII is in the tradition of the pastourelle (see above chap. VIII, n. 12), as its title-prologue shows:

> ...se introduze una pastorcica llamada Pascuala, que yendo con su ganado, entro en la sala adonde el duque y duquesa estavan. Y luego despues della entro un pastor llamado Mingo, y començo a requerilla; y estando en su requesta, llego un escudero, que tambien preso de sus amores, requestandola y altercando el uno con el otro se la sossaco, y se torno pastor por ella. (p. 75)

It is clear, however, that the usual patterns of the pastourelle are not strictly preserved, for, as Fitzmaurice-Kelly remarked, "aristocratic tradition goes overboard" with the metamorphosis of the escudero at the conclusion of the play.[7] In the love contest between court and country, the court prevails, as often occurs in the pastourelle, but instead of the courtier carrying

his prize away to the court he is persuaded to become a shepherd. The ending is not, however, a mere novelty, but is in keeping with Encina's dramatization of the pastourelle.

The first part of the eclogue is a conventional courtship scene between two rustics, in which a shepherd unsuccessfully tries to woo a shepherdess. After Mingo's traditional greetings, "Dios te mantenga" (l. 1) and Pascuala's reply, "Nora buena vengas" (l. 2) (see Appendix B, s.v. "Greetings"), the shepherdess asks,

> Oy, ques dia de domingo,
> ¿no estas con tu esposa Menga? (ll. 3-4)

Mingo's explanation,

> No ay quien alla me detenga,
> que el cariño que te tengo
> me pone un quexo tan luengo,
> que me acossa que me venga, (ll. 5-8)

and his avowal to Pascuala of love for her in preference to his wife,

> ¡Soncas! ¡Soncas! ¿no te digo
> que eres, zagala, tan bella
> que te quiero mas que a ella?
> Dios lo sabe, ques testigo, (ll. 13-16)

are met with Pascuala's reminder that he is married and she not inclined to receive his love:

> ¡Y no praga a Dios contigo,
> y aun con tu esposa Menguilla!
> ¿Como dexas tu esposilla
> por venirte aca comigo? (ll. 9-12)
> .....
> ¡Miafe! Mingo, no te creo
> que de mi estes namorado,
> Pues eres ya desposado,
> tu querer no lo deseo. (ll. 17-20)

Mingo is not easily dissuaded and offers Pascuala a rose, which she accepts with thanks:

¡O, que chapados olores!
Mingo, Dios te de salud
y goces la juventud
mas que todos los pastores. (ll. 33-36)

Consequently, the shepherd hopes for a favour in return:

Y tu dasme mil dolores...
Dame, dame una manija,
o siquiera essa sortija,
que traya por tus amores, (ll. 37-40)

but Pascuala only tells him not to be so earnest,

Tirte, tirte alla, Minguillo,
no te quellotres de vero. (ll. 41-42)

Pascuala accepted the rose and was touched by Mingo's generosity, but she does not seriously entertain his proposition. Her attitude reflects the general tone of the eclogue as a lighthearted piece with which Encina intended to entertain his patrons. The amusement continues when the escudero arrives and begins to court Pascuala. He speaks as earnestly as Mingo, but the rivalry between the two men is a further source of entertainment.

The difference in status between Mingo and the escudero is established from the beginning of their argument. Pascuala first sees the approaching escudero just after telling Mingo not to take his flirtation with her too seriously. She then urges Mingo to show himself as a shepherd:

¡Hete! viene un escudero.
Vea que eres pastorcillo;
sacude tu caramillo,
tu hondijo y tu cayado,
has que aballas el ganado,
¡silva, hurria, da gritillo! (ll. 43-48)

Mingo's identity as a rustic is thereby clearly established both with the audience and the approaching escudero. The effect is

to facilitate the contrast between the two men and provide a basis for their argument, for as soon as the escudero speaks it is apparent that he is a townsman, the antagonist of the rustic Mingo.

The escudero greets Pascuala courteously,

> Pastora, salvete Dios. (l. 49)
> .....
> Guarde Dios tu galania, (l. 51)

praises her beauty,

> Tienes mas gala que dos
> de las de mayor beldad, (ll. 53-54)

offers gifts,

> Por mi vida, pastorcica,
> que te haga presto rica
> si quieres tener mi amor, (ll. 58-60)

and suggests that if she leaves Mingo for him she will be treated as she deserves,

> Vete comigo, carilla.
> Dexa, dexa esse pastor.
>
> Dexalo, que Dios te vala;
> no te pene su penar
> que no te sabe tratar
> segun requiere tu gala. (ll. 63-68)

Pascuala is not won so easily, however. She tells the escudero to save his flattery for city girls,

> Essos que soys de ciudad
> perchufays huerte de nos. (ll. 55-56)
> .....
> Essas tronicas, señor,
> alla para las de villa. (ll. 61-62)

Mingo answers the escudero by denigrating his city origin and urging Pascuala not to be deceived:

Estate queda, Pascuala,
no te engañe este traydor
palaciego, burlador,
que ha burlado otra zagala. (ll. 69-72)

The basis for the argument between Mingo and the escudero is thereby established. The former, a country boy, will vilify the escudero for his city origin; the latter, a palaciego, will revile Mingo's rustic background. The argument is a conventional device in the early Spanish drama (see Appendix B, s.v. "Argument") and was a feature of the pastourelle.[8] It would certainly have amused the audience to watch these two characters in a stock situation abusing each other by trotting out their well-worn insults. The source of amusement is precisely the familiarity and predictability of the behaviour and attitudes of the personages. Both Mingo and the escudero are conventional personages portrayed as they are expected to be.

The principal device in the argument between the two men is their contrasting backgrounds. Each denigrates the other's origin:

Escudero: ¡Hi de puta, avillanado,
grossero, lanudo, brusco!
Mingo: ¡Ha, no praga a Dios con vusco
porque venis muy pendado!
Escudero: Cura alla de tu ganado,
calla si quieres matiego. (ll. 73-78)

Mingo defends his right to be a suitor, which he maintains is not the sole prerogative of courtiers:

¿Cuydays que los aldeanos
no sabemos quebrajarnos?
No penseys de sovajarnos
essos que soys ciudadanos,
que tambien tenemos manos

y lengua para dar motes
como aquessos hidalgotes
que presumes de loçanos. (ll. 81-88

He wants to leave and take Pascuala with him, but she is not so inclined. Although having belittled the escudero's city manner, she is nonetheless willing to play her suitor's game. Thus, the escudero declares his love and the suffering he endures on her account:

Penasme por solo verte,
y con tu vista me aquexas;
si tu vas y me dexas,
muy presto veras mi muerte.
No me trates de tal suerte,
pues que yo te quiero tanto. (ll. 97-102)

His plea, couched in courtly language,[9] results in a renewed argument with Mingo, who claims a greater love for Pascuala. Contrast is again the dominant device. The escudero claims Mingo owns nothing and asks what he could give Pascuala. Thus goaded, Mingo enumerates (ll. 116-160) his rustic abilities and describes the rustic fare he could offer. His speech further establishes him as a rustic, since it is a list of conventional country items (see Appendix B, s.v. "Gifts"). The escudero's reaction is also typical. It is the townsman's rejection of the countryman:

Calla, calla, que es grossero
todo quanto tu le das.
Yo le dare mas y mas,
porque mas que tu la quiero. (ll. 161-164)

Thus far, the eclogue is a dramatization of the conventional pastourelle and the behaviour of all three personages could have been largely anticipated. Its outcome, however, is not so

conventional (see above n. 7). A solution of the conflict between Mingo and the _escudero_ is finally proposed by Mingo, who suggests (ll. 166-168) Pascuala's choice of one of them. The _escudero_ agrees and Pascuala choses him, but imposes his becoming a shepherd as the condition of her choice. With this simple twist to the outcome of the action, Encina could make the conventional _pastourelle_ serve his own ideas. Although Mingo and the _escudero_ argue from different standpoints, love is the cause and subject of their quarrel. Consequently, although the _escudero_ wins and is obliged to become a shepherd, neither the court nor the country, but love, is victorious, for the point of the eclogue is that the _escudero_ becomes a shepherd on account of love.

Pascuala is a shepherdess and remains one. Consequently, her choice of the love of a courtier in favour of the love of a shepherd reflects no concomitant choice of the courtier's way of life. On the contrary, he must become a shepherd. By accepting the courtier, however, Pascuala acknowledges the kind of love he offers and her request obliging the _escudero_ to become a shepherd is compatible with the kind of love he professes. She requires him to fulfill her wishes, just as the courtly lover would fulfil those of his beloved, and the _escudero_, true to his background, obeys her in the spirit of willing service.[10]

This is apparent in the dialogue between Pascuala and the _escudero_ during which she makes her request. Addressing him as "mi señor" (l. 182), a courtly form,[11] Pascuala tells him,

Si os quereys tornar pastor,
mucho mas os quiero a vos. (11. 183-184)

The escudero sees the request as a command ("mandado") and agrees because of his love for her:

¡Soy contento y muy pagado
de ser pastor o vaquero!
Pues me quieres y te quiero,
quiero cumplir tu mandado. (11. 185-188)

Pascuala then hands him her shepherd's crook and pouch, the symbols of his service:

Mi çurron y mi cayado
tomad luego por estrena, (11. 189-190)

which he gladly receives as the lover fulfilling the commands of his lady:

Venga, venga en ora buena,
y vamos luego al ganado. (11. 191-192)

The imposition of Pascuala's condition and its acceptance by the escudero are both founded on love.

The change in the escudero is quite substantial: through love he abandons one form of life and adopts another. Bruce Wardropper's assessment of the eclogue as a depiction of the transmuting power of love is, therefore, acceptable ("Metamorphosis...", p. 46). Less certain, however, is Wardropper's reference to Mingo's "adulterous love" and claim that the escudero's adoption of the country life is the dramatist's means of resolving a social problem (ibid.). Both Mingo and the escudero are conventional figures and there is no reason to suppose any difference in their motives for courting Pascuala.[12] Moreover, if, as Wardropper contended, the problem was one of love and the social classes,

resolved in the only way possible--"the escudero 'se tornó pastor por ella'" ("Metamorphosis...," p. 46)--an equally appropriate solution would have been the conventional one of the pastourelle by which Encina would have allowed Pascuala "tornarse palaciega por él".

If the eclogue illustrates anything about the social structure, it is the conventional idea--encountered in several plays discussed in this and the following chapters--that love is not bounded by social barriers and the prerogative of one particular group. In their dispute over Pascuala, the escudero and Mingo vilify each other on account of background. Their difference in status, quite apart from rivalry of sentiment, is an obstacle preventing their reaching a reasonable understanding; but they both love Pascuala, the point on which their argument is based because the escudero considers Mingo inept and vulgar.[13] The essential difference between the two rivals is style, a difference no better illustrated than by Pascuala. She is a rustic who chides her suitor for his city style, telling him to save it for city girls (ll. 61-62), but she appreciates the kind of love the escudero offers and responds to it because the condition of acceptance she imposes is motivated by love. Since she does not aspire to the escudero's status, but his love, she tests him to see if he is capable of what he vows. Her test shows that even she, a shepherdess, is capable of the conventional lover's behaviour, for she commands the escudero to become a shepherd and to serve her

just as a courtly lady might command some equivalent task of her admirer. The subject of the eclogue is love, depicted in conventional terms, and society does not really enter the picture except at this conventional level.

Although a continuation of the acti[illegible] begun in Egloga VII, the subject of love is not immediately introduced in Egloga VIII. After the statement that the personages appearing, with the addition of Menga, are those who appeared in Egloga VII, the action of the first part of Egloga VIII is described as follows:

> Y primero Gil entro en la sala adonde el duque y duquesa estavan, y Mingo, que yva con el, quedose a la puerta espantado, que no oso entrar. Y despues importunado de Gil, entro y en nombre de Juan del Enzina llego a presentar al duque y duquesa, sus señores, la copilacion de todas sus obras, y alli prometio de no trobar mas, salvo lo que sus señorias le mandassen. Y despues llamaron a Pascuala y a Mengua, y cantaron y baylaron con ellas. (p. 107)

The initial part of the action is concerned with Mingo's presentation of Encina's complete works to the Duke and Duchess of Alba. Overcome with awe, Mingo has to be persuaded by Gil--the escudero of Egloga VII--to approach the noble audience:

> ¡Dome a Dios! Que estoy asmado,
> no me mandes entrar mas. (ll. 7-8)

As a peasant Mingo is ill at ease in the presence of nobility. He does not know how to comport himself:

> Yo te juro a san Crimente
> que no se que me hazer, (ll. 29-30)

invokes the names of the saints,

> Espera, santiguarm'e,
> porque san Julian me de

buen estrena este verano, (ll. 38-40)

and begs Gil's moral support,

Ora, Gil, sus, anda alla,
vamos en nombre de Dios,
que en entrar ambos a dos
algun esfuerço me da. (ll. 45-48)

In all this Mingo and Gil are contrasted. The latter is sure of himself and tries to encourage Mingo, for, as the timid shepherd recalls, Gil was once a palaciego:

Mas que pastor nunca hu,
y aun quiças que mas que tu
que has ya sido palaciego. (ll. 78-80)

When finally persuaded to approach the Duke and Duchess, Mingo evokes his own lowliness before presenting his offering. Then, as if overcome by the situation and at a loss for further words, he makes a hurried farewell[14] and rushes away to rejoin Gil:

Y a Dios, a Dios os quedad
que me esta Gil esperando. (ll. 95-96)

Reunited with his companion, Mingo asks if his task was well accomplished. Gil assures him (ll. 100-101) it was and they both praise the Duke and Duchess. Mingo alludes to the "mil mercedes" (l. 105) received from them and Gil urges him to continue in their service:

Sirveles, sirveles, Mingo,
quando fuere gran domingo
vente siempre a su vigilla
y mucho te les omilla;
dales de tus cantilenas. (ll. 115-119)

Gil concludes his speech by asking,

Hazme algunas cosas buenas
para la mi Pascualilla. (ll. 120-121)

Mention of Pascuala, however, reminding Mingo of Gil's victory of a year before, presented in Egloga VII, arouses his animosity. Mingo reproaches Gil,

> ¿No basta que la llevaste
> y que me la sossacaste
> sin membrarme tal dolencia?
> Devrias aver conciencia
> en tal cosa me pedir;
> aqui podemos dezir:
> ¡sobre cuernos penitencia! (ll. 123-129)

and then resolves,

> Aqui hago despedida,
> que ¡juria Dios! en mi vida
> no me vean mas trobar
> en veras ni por burlar,
> quanto mas para Pascuala,
> que en aquesta mesma sala
> por ti me quiso dexar.
>
> Trobe y cante quien cantare,
> que yo te prometo, Gil,
> so pena de ruyn y vil,
> si yo nunca mas trobare
> salvo quando lo mandare
> qualquiera destos mis amos. (ll. 131-143)

Mingo laments the events of the previous year (see above n. 3), but is, in turn, reproached by Gil, who suggests a celebration "en memoria del amor" (l. 153). The shepherdesses Menga and Pascuala are, therefore, summoned. As they enter, a contrast between them is portrayed similar to that between Mingo and Gil at the beginning of the eclogue. Menga is unwilling to enter the hall first and allows Pascuala, whom she knows is more familiar with the room, to precede her, just as Mingo had dallied on the threshold and tried to persuade Gil to accompany him:

> ...primero tu, Pascuala,
> que sabes ya bien la sala. (ll. 171-172)

Amid the customary exchange of greetings, Menga marvels at the palace halls:

> ¡Dome a Dios! ¡Que esta cabaña
> ques bien chapada y bien luenga! (ll. 176-177)

while Pascuala merely recalls that she had performed there a year before (see above n. 3).

When the events of a year ago are mentioned, Mingo again recalls his disappointment. This time, however, it is to show he has forgiven and forgotten and is solely concerned with his wife Menga. He says to Pascuala,

> Ya se te rehila el ojo.
> Ya de ti no tengo enojo,
> que quiero tanto a mi esposa
> que ya no quiero otra cosa
> ni me percude otro antojo. (ll. 181-185)

Gil, however, urges that troubles be forgotten with singing and dancing. His suggestion is adopted with the villancico,

> Gasagemonos de huzia,
> quel pesar
> viniese sin le buscar, (ll. 194-196)[15]

with which the first part of Egloga VIII is concluded.

The problem of multiple identity in Egloga VIII really arises only with Mingo, who is a fictional shepherd and speaks "en nombre de Juan del Enzina". Consequently, the difficulties of interpretation are the same as for Eglogas I, II, V, and VI, where fiction and reality are merged in the identity of one person. In performance, however, the situation could have been resolved as in Egloga I, where the role of the shepherd Juan was probably performed by Encina himself. If Mingo were performed by Encina, the

identities of fictional shepherd and real poet would have been effectively combined. Mingo could then have easily addressed the Duke and Duchess of Alba, even in a fictional context, since Encina himself would have been speaking. He merely had to speak to his patrons, who would have realized that their poet was speaking to them as himself. Difficulties arise only when the eclogue is divorced from the occasion of its intended performance.

In fact, the whole of the first part of Egloga VIII is dependent on this occasion. It would not exist without Encina's presentation of his complete works to his patrons, for, just as Egloga I, Egloga VIII is the record of a moment during Encina's service with the Duke and Duchess of Alba. The extra complication in Egloga VIII is that Encina adopted the disguise of a personage he had possibly already portrayed as an actor in Egloga VII and who had a character already formed in the context of the situation of that eclogue. Mingo was, therefore, a known quantity. It would have been inconsistent to portray him in Egloga VIII as anything but a simple rustic, the condition of his first appearance. Hence, he is appropriately timorous of approaching the Duke and Duchess and is ignorant of the proper behaviour. Moreover, when Encina addressed his patrons directly he did so as Mingo and his personal affairs conformed to this characterization. To this extent, Encina conducted his business in pastoral disguise--just as in Eglogas I and V--without violating Mingo's fictional identity.

While the shepherd's reticence at the beginning of the eclogue

stems from his rustic nature, his reaction is nonetheless compatible with Encina's adopted attitude of reverent flattery toward his patrons. The shepherd's behaviour is, therefore, appropriate to the design and duty of the poet. The same can be said of his language. In the terms of the poet and his patrons, Mingo presented "la copilacion de todas sus obras", as it is called in the title-prologue; but this gift is described in rustic terms as the fruits of the harvest. Mingo says to Gil,

> Que trayo para les dar,
> agora, por cabo de año,
> el esquilmo del rebaño,
> quanto pude arrebañar, (ll. 53-56)

and to the Duke and Duchess,

> Miafe, vengo, ¡juro a ños!
> a traeros de buen grado
> el esquilmo del ganado,
> no tal qual mereceys vos. (ll. 85-88)

Similarly, the poet's flattery of his patrons is phrased in rustic jargon and spoken as if shepherds were praising their masters (see ll. 102-118).

In addition to using the same personages as in Egloga VII, Encina also exploited its content. At the beginning of Egloga VIII the action of Egloga VII is referred to when Mingo prepares to address Encina's patrons and present them with a copy of his complete works. Recalling that Gil was once a palaciego, his role in Egloga VII, Mingo looks to him for advice and encouragement. After the presentation, the two shepherds discuss the events of that eclogue, prompted by Gil's request for verses for Pascuala,

the shepherdess whose love he and Mingo disputed a year before. The request leads Mingo to recall his defeat, to repudiate his writing, and to vow to write in future only for his masters. Mingo's words, cited above in full, show better than any other the complete fusion of the dramatist's identity with that of the shepherd. Hence, it is necessary to clarify his meaning and decide when Mingo is speaking as a fictional rustic and when as Juan del Encina. The fictional state of affairs derives from Egloga VII, when Mingo courted Pascuala and lost her to an escudero, now known as the shepherd Gil. Mingo became indignant when asked to write some verses for Pascuala; it is enough to have lost without being asked to remember defeat:

> ¡Ya me tientas de paciencia!
> ¿No basta que la llevaste
> y que me la sossacaste
> sin membrarme tal dolencia? (ll. 122-125)

Mingo's "despedida" is, therefore, made in the context of this situation. His resolve to write no more save at the request of his masters shows that, once bitten, he is shy of further involvement. Hence, as well as deciding to dedicate his verses to his master and mistress, who will not deceive him, Mingo also resolves to concern himself with his wife Menga, who will presumably reciprocate his feelings. This is clear from a statement made after the entry of Menga and Pascuala, when Mingo reveals his devotion to his wife and recovery from the wound caused by Pascuala a year before:

> Ya se te rehila el ojo.
> Ya de ti no tengo enojo,
> que quiero tanto a mi esposa

que ya no quiero otra cosa
ni me percude otro antojo. (ll. 181-185)

Mingo's words must, however, also be read as a statement by Encina to his patrons. In this context, Mingo's resolve,

Trobe y cante quien cantare,
que yo te prometo, Gil,
so pena de ruyn y vil,
si yo nunca mas trobare
salvo quando lo mandare
qualquiera destos mis amos, (ll. 138-143)

is not out of place. Through Mingo, Encina presented his patrons with the "copilación de todas sus obras" during an eclogue marking the presentation ceremony. The ecloge is also the final work of the Cancionero, the "copilación" presented to the Duke and Duchess. It would, therefore, be appropriate to consider Encina's promise to write no more save at his patrons' request as a form of palinode with which to conclude his complete works.[16]

The reason for Encina's intervention need not be queried further. Encina exploited the character and situation readily available from Egloga VII. Once Mingo has presented the gift and recited Encina's dedication to and flattery of his patrons, it is no longer necessary to couple the identities of the shepherd and the dramatist, since Mingo is then only a simple rustic involved in a certain fictional situation. Nevertheless, the rapport established between the actors and their audience at the beginning of the eclogue is sustained throughout.

The audience is not a detached body, uninvolved in the scene enacted before it. Its members are part of that scene and even play a silent role in it. In the fictional situation,

with Mingo as a shepherd, the audience contains his master and mistress. The real situation of the appearance of the actors and the poet before their patrons is, thereby, dramatized in the confrontation between the shepherd and his "amos". The play is, thereby, a form of pastoral allegory and in the first part there is an interplay between the actors and their audience, with reality and fiction inextricably fused and no distinction made between the actors and the characters they portray. If Encina himself played Mingo, he could easily speak as a shepherd and refer to the events of Egloga VII at one moment and, the next, without any change of costume, voice, or even relationship between character and audience as servant and master respectively, speak as himself and be clearly understood. By the same token, there is no distinction between the ideal setting of the fictional plot and the real setting of the performance in the palace of the Duke and Duchess of Alba.

Although Egloga VIII is to continue and complete the action begun in Egloga VII, it does not do so immediately. The relationship of the two eclogues is alluded to at first only by Mingo's reference (l. 180) to Gil's former state as a palaciego. Only with the "despedida" (ll. 131-143) and after the presentation of the "copilación" to the Duke and Duchess is there a return to the original plot. Even this is not so much a return as a recollection of Egloga VII in order to update it for the continuation in the second part of Egloga VIII.

Mingo laments his loss of Pascuala and says that a year has

passed since his defeat and Gil's victory,

> Oy haze, ¡por mi dolor!
> un año punto por punto,
> que me dexaste defunto
> sin amiga y sin favor,
> y te tornaste pastor
> por tu provecho y mi daño. (ll. 146-151)

The year's interval is conceivably intended to refer here to the fictional action, but when Menga and Pascuala enter later it is clear that the time lapse is to be understood in the context of both the performance before the Duke and Duchess and the events enacted in it. Menga bids Pascuala enter first, saying,

> ...primero tu, Pascuala,
> que sabes ya bien la sala. (ll. 171-172)

Then, after Menga's exclamation at the size and beauty of the palace hall, Gil and Pascuala explain that the previous year's events took place there:

> Gil: Pues aqui fue el descordojo
> que passamos ora un año.
> Pascuala: Henos aqui donde antaño. (ll. 178-180)

Pascuala and Gil allude to Egloga VII as a performance in the palace of the Duke and Duchess of Alba in which they took part as actor and actress. This is apparent when it is understood that Egloga VII, a fiction which did not necessarily require the setting of the ducal palace, is remembered in association with the place where it was enacted. The significance of Eglogas VII and VIII is consequently limited to the occasion on which they were performed. Like Egloga I and the two Carnival eclogues, Egloga VIII is neither wholly illusion nor reality. Its imagined plot and fictional rustics were created by actors,

but their performance required a unique occasion and the specific setting of the palace halls, with the Duke and Duchess in attendance.

The technical function of the first part of Egloga VIII is virtually that of a prologue.[17] By offering flattery and a gift to his patrons, Encina fulfilled his personal obligations to them and, to this extent, the first part of Egloga VIII is a kind of preliminary loa. Further, Encina re-established the plot of Egloga VII and prepared the audience for its continuation by portraying a certain change in Mingo. Having once suffered defeat, he is now prepared to forget any animosity toward his fellows. His speech of reconciliation (ll. 181-185, "Ya se te rehila el ojo...") occurs almost at the end of the first part of the eclogue, just before the villancico preceding the second part, in which the action begun in Egloga VII is continued.

The action of the second part of Egloga VIII is briefly described in the last part of the title-prologue as follows:

> Y otra vez tornandose a razonar, alli dexo Gil el abito de pastor que ya avia traydo un año, y tornose del palacio, y con el juntamente la su Pascuala. Y en fin, Mingo y su esposa Menga, viendolos mudados del palacio, crecioles embidia, y aunque recibieron pena de dexar los abitos pastoriles, tambien ellos quisieron tornarse del palacio y provar la vida del. Assi que todos quatro juntos, muy bien ataviados, dieron fin a la representacion cantando el villancico di cabo. (p. 107)

Since its dominant features are the transformations in the personages from rustics to courtiers, the meaning of the eclogue and the techniques employed in it are best understood by considering the

motivations prompting these changes.

Gil's return to the palace derives from the simplest of motives. Having been a courtier--he was the escudero in Egloga VII--he can, in Bruce Wardropper's words ("Metamorphosis...", p. 47), "return to his former state merely by wishing to ". Gil's decision not to return home with Mingo and his statement,

> Miafe, no quiero que sea
> ya mi Pascuala pastora,
> ni yo pastor desde agora
> pues no me viene de ralea, (ll. 229-232)

are quite clear. Gil's background, his "ralea", is courtly, not rustic, so there is nothing unusual about his decision to live as his breeding teaches. His renewal of a former way of life is all important, since it provides an incentive for the subsequent transformations in the lives of his wife and his companions. In each case, however, the motivation is greater than a wish to follow the lead given by Gil.

Pascuala is prompted to change by her husband's request:

> Quita essos hatos, Pascuala,
> y dellos ya derreniega,
> y, a fuer de la palaciega
> te me pone muy de gala,
> Y luego, ¡assi Dios te vala!
> te me torna muy polida;
> dexemos aquesta vida
> ques muy grossera y muy mala. (ll. 241-248)

Her compliance reflects her obedience; but in agreeing she stresses she will become a courtier because she loves Gil, just as he, through love for her, became a shepherd:

> Que me plaze, mi señor,
> mudarme, pues os mudastes,

que tambien vos os tornastes
por amor de mi, pastor.
Y pues me teneys amor,
yo jamas os dexare;
quanto mandardes hare
libremente, sin temor. (ll. 249-256)

This factor is emphasized in a dialogue between Mingo and Menga. The latter can understand Gil's denigration of the country life:

Ya de Gil no es maravilla

que Gil ha sido escudero,
y vienle de gerenacio;
primero fue del palacio
que pastor ni vaquero. (ll. 264-268)[18]

He is merely returning to his former state. Pascuala's resolve to accompany her husband is more puzzling because she has no courtly background:

Que nunca criada fue
sino en terruño grossero. (ll. 271-272)

Menga's bewilderment is soon dispelled by Mingo, who tells her about the transformations caused by love:

Es tan huerte zagalejo,
miafe, Menga, el amorio,
que con su gran poderio
haze mudar el pellejo,
haze tornar moço al viejo,
y al grossero muy polido,
y al muy feo muy garrido,
y al muy huerte muy sobejo.

Haze tornar al cruel,
quando quiere, piadoso,
haze lo amargo sabroso,
haze que amargue la miel,
haze ser dulce la hiel,
y quita y pone cuydados;
haze mudar los estados,
¡mira, mira quien es el! (ll. 273-288)

Menga understands and applies Mingo's description to the case in

question:

> Bien deslindas sus lavores,
> y aun por eso Pascualeja
> ha mudado la pelleja
> por tener con Gil amores. (ll. 290-293)[19]

The point is well made: Pascuala changes her life through her love for Gil.

The transformation of Mingo and Menga is no less substantial than that of Pascuala and Gil; the same imagery, "mudar la pelleja", is used for all personages as if they were sloughing off one way of life.[20] Mingo's reason for leaving the life of the country is contained in the title-prologue (p. 107). He reacts principally through "embidia" and thinks himself as capable as Gil of becoming a courtier:

> Pero, ¡juro a diez! Si me visto
> los mis hatos domingueros,
> y si mudo aquestos cueros,
> que te mando mal galisto.
> Guarde que si yo ensisto
> en tornarme palaciego. (ll. 306-311)

Hence, in spite of doubts (ll. 330-335) about abandoning the pleasures of the village and an eloquent defence (ll. 342-365) of the country life, Mingo asks Menga to dress herself as elegantly as Pascuala and to accompany him:

> Ora yo quiero provar
> este palacio a que sabe,
> siquiera porque me alabe
> si bolviere a mi lugar.
> Y el hato quiero mudar.
> antes que otra cosa venga,
> y tu, miafe, tambien Menga,
> encomiençate a dusnar. (ll. 370-377)

The transformations in Mingo and Menga may, therefore, be attributed

to the former's jealousy of Gil and desire of self-aggrandizement (see ll. 370-373), but they are also caused by love.

Menga is a parallel of both Pascuala and Mingo. She enters the ducal hall as reticently as Mingo and, like him protests--when she is later requested to become a courtier---her ignorance of the norms of palace behaviour. Her ignorance is taken into account, however, and just as Mingo is guided by Gil, Menga is schooled by Pascuala. Menga's characterization is, thus, a parallel of her husband's. The reasons for her change parallel those given by Pascuala for hers. She agrees to become a courtier on her husband's request, just as Pascuala is petitioned by Gil, and her obedience derives from the same source as Pascuala's--love for her husband. After protesting her ignorance of court customs, Menga agrees to comply with Mingo's request because of her love for him:

> Ora, que por ti me creo,
> y quiero, pues Mingo quiere,
> ser en todo lo quel fuere,
> quel es todo mi desseo. (ll. 394-397)

When she appears in courtly finery, her transformation completed, she testifies that the change occurred through love because it would not have been possible before she loved Mingo:

> Yo, no sabes que tal era
> antes que a Mingo quisiesse,
> que aunque la vida me fuesse
> a la villa no viniera. (ll. 478-481)

Mingo's transformation is caused in the same way as Menga's, insofar as he is guided by another. The difference is that Mingo's change, symbolized in his change of clothes, takes place

before the audience. Mingo was, in fact, prepared for the change in the first part of Egloga VIII. Whereas he was an unrequited lover in Egloga VII, rejected by Pascuala, in the first part of Egloga VIII he showed his recovery from disappointment. He will not be deceived by love again (ll. 131-143) and he is contented with Menga. Like Gil, he has become a happy lover, although the two have different outlooks. Mingo is a rustic, and when he tries to transform himself into a courtier through envy of Gil the result is comic.

After Mingo has dressed in courtier's clothes, Gil, his mentor, emphasizes how the clothes should be worn and the stance Mingo should adopt. His bonnet must be at a rakish angle and his hand on his hip. Gil tells him,

> Ponte el bonete de tema
> y en el costado la mano. (ll. 440-441)
> .....
> Echa el bonete a un lado,
> assi como aqueste mio. (ll. 446-447)

Mingo is ignorant of the reasons for these antics and believes Gil is mocking him. To dispel these qualms, Gil explains the importance of appearance. He who dresses in that fashion is said to be "requebrado", the term applied

> ...al que esta namorado
> y se muestra muy penado
> por la que le enamoro. (ll. 459-461)

Emphasis on appearance and its meaning, indicates that this shepherd-become-courtier's entry into his new estate is under the auspices of its code of love. Initiation into the life of the court and to courtly love are simultaneous.

The comedy of the situation is that Mingo is neither a courtier nor a courtly lover. At the beginning of the eclogue, when Mingo first entered the ducal hall, he was a cause of amusement because he did not know how to behave there. He is consequently a mockery of a courtly lover because the courtly conventions are inappropriately applied to him. Out of his environment, he cannot adapt to new surroundings, which he ridicules by equating them with his true background. Although a courtier could become a shepherd in the service of love, a shepherd like Mingo cannot become a courtly lover because he cannot be taken seriously, for, in the context of the eclogue, Gil is amusing himself at Mingo's expense, just as Encina is finding amusement at the expense of courtly convention.

It is largely because Mingo cannot be taken seriously that his behaviour cannot be given a serious interpretation. Although Encina's eclogues were, in part, dramatizations of events in his life, it is erroneous to place false emphasis on their value as autobiographical material. A statement, for example, such as the following by Eduardo Juliá Martínez is misleading: "El dramaturgo es una consecuencia del lírico. Lo subjetivo se impone tan imperiosamente, que, hasta en detalles, hay grandes elementos autobiográficos en sus composiciones y el conjunto es un reflejo de la vida del escritor" ("La literatura dramática peninsular...", p. 250). The autobiographical element is part of Encina's eclogues, an important part, but not their total. It would be unwarranted to maintain that Egloga VII was concerned

with a personal end beyond that of the poet entertaining his patrons. There is no evidence that Encina's affairs are touched upon during the play, even if he appeared in it as an actor. Egloga VIII is a different matter, since Mingo is clearly a disguise for Encina. What Encina did, however, was to exploit the situation offered by one of his plays and the occasion of its presentation to include his business with his patrons.

In the part of his study, Juan del Encina: Prometheus in Search of Prestige, devoted to Egloga VIII (pp. 129-141), J. Richard Andrews over-emphasized Mingo's identification with Juan del Encina. He assumed the identification was valid for all traits of character at all stages of the eclogue. He contended that Mingo's humble approach to the Duke and Duchess at the beginning of the eclogue reflected a concomitant humility in Encina and supposed that Mingo's transformation from shepherd to courtier intended to portray a similar transformation in the poet, who, wishing to break through the social strata, sought recognition of his poetic talent. As a result, for Andrews, "Mingo's change of clothes is the symbolic representation of Encina's emergence from a disdained into a valued status" (Prometheus..., pp. 137-138). Moreover, Andrews maintained, Encina used Mingo, a personage from an earlier eclogue, for an ulterior motive. He suggested that the name was employed to imply the standpoints and criticisms of the Coplas de Mingo Revulgo and chosen, in preference to other names used by Encina,

as a means of symbolizing the relationship with his patrons. Andrews declared: "By choosing to develop the character of Mingo into a mask for himself, Encina would be signalizing an intended break with the Duke and Duchess. He was for them no longer the known Juan, but the stranger Mingo, a stranger who, at the same time on a different level, was a servant expecting recompense" (Prometheus..., p. 139).[21]

Encina certainly took advantage of a readily available character and situation, but there is no substantial change either in the characterization of Mingo when he assumes the role of the author, or in the situation when it is related to the audience. The illusion of a fictional plot and the reality of its enactment are combined in the person of Mingo, who represents a fictional character and a real figure. But it is not possible to draw a completely valid equation between these two elements. Once the gift has been presented and Mingo has promised to write only at the behest of his "amos", Encina was no longer concerned with a real situation, only with a fictional plot. There is simply no justification for Andrews to assert that the continuation of this plot symbolized the author's relationship with his patrons.

Any equation drawn between Encina and his appearance as the shepherd Mingo must be restricted to the first part of the eclogue; and even there it is not so much an equation as Encina's simple exploitation of one of his own personages through which to address his patrons directly. The characteristics of the shepherd were therefore adopted as a matter of course. Moreover,

the probability that Encina himself played the role of Mingo is important because Encina would literally have been speaking face to face with his patrons and would have been recognizable to them as their poet. It would have served him no additional purpose to have embodied his thoughts symbolically in the action of the rest of the eclogue when he could have turned to his patrons and expressed them out loud. The resort to subterfuge is consequently unnecessary.

Above all, however, Andrews mistakenly described the second part of Egloga VIII. It is clearly separated by a villancico from the first part, in which Encina addressed his patrons, much as the personal elements of Egloga I and V were separated from Eglogas II and VI respectively. The villancico, the customary conclusion to a dramatic performance (see Appendix B. s.v. "Villancicos and other songs"), contributes a note of finality to the first part of the eclogue so that the second part is almost a fresh beginning. Moreover, the second part of Egloga VIII, just as Egloga VII, is a piece of fun. By implying that there is some symbolic meaning in Mingo's transformation from shepherd to courtier, Andrews took the affair too seriously. Mingo behaved as a conventional rustic of the pastourelle tradition when he courted Pascuala in Egloga VII and contested her love with the escudero. Being a rustic he did not know how to behave when he presented a gift to his master and mistress in the first part of Egloga VIII. The transformations of the second part of this eclogue are conceivably an

alternative ending to Egloga VII and are derived from the same tradition of the pastourelle, whereby a shepherdess would follow her courtier-suitor to the court.[22] Mingo's transformation is a lighthearted mockery of this convention. Having shown he is a rustic in Egloga VII and that he is ignorant of courtly behaviour at the beginning of Egloga VIII, his decision to become a courtier, an attempt to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, is ludicrous. In the last resort, Encina obtained a deal of fun simply by portraying a shepherd behaving as a shepherd while trying to behave as a courtier.

While insisting on the multiple identity of several personages in Encina's eclogues, it must also be stressed that this was a device for incorporating himself into his own plays. The possibility of Encina himself having performed these roles must not be overlooked. On account of it an equation between the poet and those personages who speak on his behalf, valid for all elements of action and all traits of character, cannot be forced since the dramatist showed considerable ability in alternating between reality and illusion. Encina the actor could easily become himself in the course of his eclogues; he could address the audience and then, disappearing behind the mask of the role he was performing, efface his own identity. It would, therefore, be misleading to over-emphasize one aspect of Encina's technique and allow the autobiographical element of his works to be the sole measure of his ability. The events of the poet's life during his service with the Duke and Duchess of Alba provide a

certain basis for the partial understanding of his work, but not its totality. These events and their dramatization cannot be interpreted as the single key to the understanding of Encina's eclogues and psychology.

Eglogas VII and VIII are to be understood primarily at the level of their performance, insofar as both eclogues were produced for specific occasions and a particular audience. In this regard, Encina wrote to satisfy his patrons, an object forming part of the performance itself in Egloga VIII, which contained a dramatized presentation of Encina's complete works; but Eglogas VII and VIII satisfy the general obligation imposed by Encina's duty to entertain his patrons.

As entertainment, Eglogas VII and VIII contain a simple story, based on a conventional subject and certain conventional ideas, impersonated by actors before the Duke and Duchess of Alba. The most prominent ideas of both eclogues are expressed in the villancico which concludes Egloga VIII and which contains two topics: that enclosed in the refrain,

> Ninguno cierre las puertas
> si Amor viniere a llamar,
> que no le ha de aprovechar, (ll. 514-516)

and that elaborated in several of the stanzas, as for example,

> Aquel fuerte del Amor
> que se pinta niño y ciego
> haze al pastor palaciego
> y al palaciego pastor. (ll. 538-541)

These lines depict love as an irresistible force which transforms the lover, the precise subject of the combined action of the two

eclogues.

The prime illustrations of these ideas are Gil and Pascuala. Gil became a shepherd in the spirit of submission to his love and his beloved--that is, in the spirit of the courtly lover. This is stressed by Gil's own explanation at the conclusion of Egloga VIII:

> Ningun galan namorado
> no tenga quexa de mi,
> que en pastor me converti
> porque fue de amor forçado.
> Donde amor pone cuydado
> luego huye la razon,
> y muda la condicion
> con su fuerça, y aun de grado. (ll. 490-497)

Pascuala also behaved in accordance with the rules of love. In declaring Gil her favoured suitor on the condition of his becoming a shepherd, she showed herself attuned to the courtly code, in that, complying with it, she demanded a period of service from her suitor. Similarly, her entry in Egloga VIII into the court is made through love, which induces her to obey Gil and forsake her life as a shepherd. Both Gil and Pascuala respond, therefore, to the demands of love. During the eclogues in which they appear Encina explicitly states that love has the power to transform and illustrates the point by presenting an affair in which transformation takes place.

The presentation of Mingo and Menga as equal illustrations of this transmuting power is less evident, but is just as important, if for a different purpose. To support his claim that Mingo's change of state symbolized Encina's social aspirations, J. Richard

Andrews wrote : "No mention is made of the generative force that accomplishes his change of status. It is only by default that the audience must attribute it to love" (Prometheus..., p. 137). This is not the whole picture, however. Both Mingo and Menga imitate Gil and Pascuala. The initial impetus for their change derives from Mingo's jealousy and his assertions (ll. 306-311 and 313-319) that he is as capable as Gil of becoming a courtier and commanding his wife to follow suit. Even as imitators of Gil and Pascuala, however, Mingo and Menga become courtiers as if under the auspices of love. Menga, like Pascuala, obeys her husband and even confesses (ll. 478-481) that her change occurred through love for him. Mingo is also depicted as a lover. He has recovered from the disaster of Egloga VII and is now content to love Menga (see ll. 181-185). Moreover, when initiated by Gil into the life of the court, Mingo is clothed and made to behave as a courtly lover, being introduced to the court as one who is "requebrado" (ll. 439-465). The difference between Gil and Pascuala, on one side, and Mingo and Menga, on the other, is that the former behave as a pair of conventional lovers, while the latter mimic their behaviour and, particularly through Mingo, produce a comic effect because courtly conduct is not appropriate in conventional rustics.

Juan del Encina, therefore, took certain conventional ideas about love as the central aspects of Eglogas VII and VIII and proposed to entertain his patrons with their dramatization. Egloga VII, for example, with its contest between a peasant and

a courtier for the love of a shepherdess, is derived from the pastourelle and the personages are depicted as their types demand. Similarly, the whole idea of the transforming power of love, portrayed through the combined action of Eglogas VII and VIII, was a concept familiarized through cancionero literature.[23] Encina's originality was not the subject he dramatized, but the fact he dramatized it. As far as it is known, no other works exist in the literature of Spain earlier than Eglogas VII and VIII in which the conventional pastourelle and concepts of love were presented through impersonation by actors. Moreover, just as the audience would have been entertained by the conventional aspects of the eclogues, it would also have been amused by their parody. The conventional conduct of Gil and Pascuala is portrayed in a serious tone, but this pair and the conventions of the pursuit of love are ridiculed through Mingo and Menga, who, in spite of their rustic shortcomings, strive to imitate them.

Largely on account of the dramatization of a single set of conventions, Eglogas VII and VIII can be considered a unit in spite of the year's intervention between their performance. The action of Egloga VIII is a continuation and development of that presented in Egloga VII and, in fact, contains an alternative ending, derived from the conventional pastourelle and comically treated. Consequently, the conventional subject and the continuous action create continuity. In addition, a unity between the two works is created by the conventions of Encina's own technique

and his method of coupling his eclogues. Unlike other pairs (Eglogas I and II, Eglogas V and VI), Eglogas VII and VIII were not presented on a single occasion, but the year's hiatus is bridged by the personages, the continuity of the action, and, at the level of performance, by presentation in the same locality before the same audience. Just as in Eglogas I, II V, and VI, in Eglogas VII and VIII there is a special audience-actor relationship, an alternation between theatrical illusion and reality, whereby the actors could vacillate between the roles they impersonated and their real identities as servants of the Duke and Duchess of Alba. Because of this special relationship, Encina's personal appearance in Egloga VIII to present his works to his patrons cannot be understood as a violation of either the individual unity of Egloga VIII or the unity of Eglogas VII and VIII combined. His appearance is compatible with the nature of his eclogues and the conventions of his drama.

To a degree, therefore, it may be agreed with Laurel H. Turk that "Encina's profane dramas are a continuation and development of his religious plays and not a separate development" ("Juan del Encina...", p. 246), but the close association between Encina's religious and profane plays derives from his having employed similar techniques in their composition, written them for similar circumstances of performance, and used them to experiment in a relatively new area of literature. At the heart of this technique is the concept of transformation, which,

in Bruce Wardropper's words, was a means of exploring the basis of theatre: the metamorphosis of an actor into a character, "the justification for dramatic impersonation" ("Metamorphosis...", p. 51). Wardropper made this statement after reviewing Encina's entire dramatic output and the appearance of the concept as a persistent idea. His statement may be considered, however, in relation to those pairs of eclogues where transformation of character occupied a central position.

In Eglogas I and II all the personages were characterized by a multiple identity and had the propensity of symbols with changeable values according to a changing real, fictional, or historical situation. The actual transformation, taking place in the interval between the eclogues, caused the subject-matter and the personages to be viewed at a different level--for the dramatist also changed from a secular to a religious topic--but it also embodied the concept of the actor's metamorphosis into a character. The personages in the first of the eclogues represented both the characters and their actors, namely two fictional shepherds, Juan and Mateo, and the real Juan del Encina and his supposed critics. Those in the second were represented by the same actors, but their characters were transformed into Biblical shepherd-evangelists, in which the personalities of the actors were submerged. They had, thereby, abandoned their own personalities and adopted those of others, the process by which the actor impersonates a role (see above chap. II, analysis of Eglogas I and II).

In Eglogas V and VI, the Carnival eclogues, no specific transformation of character from one identity to another occurs, but the line between reality and illusion is so finely drawn that the actors are simultaneously in both worlds. In Egloga V they are imaginary shepherdslamenting the possible departure of their master for war and then rejoicing at the declaration of peace, but they are also the real servants of the Duke of Alba involved in a situation having a precise parallel in reality. Similarly, in Egloga VI the personages may be viewed as the real servants of the palace of Alba enjoying their Carnival meal in the presence of their lord and lady, or they may be seen as actors impersonating roles and presenting a traditional Carnival ritual for the entertainment of the Duke and Duchess of Alba. In these instances the plays are closely linked to the occasion of performance. Because of the lack of a clear distinction between the actor and the role he performs, the characters of these two eclogues cannot attain independent existence, and the notion that the actor is impersonating an imaginary character is ever present (see above chap. VI, analysis of Eglogas V and VI).

In Eglogas VII and VIII Encina explored the possibility of transformation within a purely fictional situation, but still alternated between illusion and reality. The changes from courtier to rustic and vice versa are not part of the actor's assumption of his role, but belong to a fictional action embodying certain conventional ideas about love. To this extent, the

personality of the actor is not involved in the transformation. Indeed, in Egloga VII the personages exist independently of the personalities of their actors, a fact not valid for Egloga VIII. In this eclogue, specifically in its first part, the illusion that the personages have an independent existence is broken by Encina's personal appearance and by references to the real circumstances of the performance in which the actors are involved. In part, therefore, and in spite of the transformations occurring within a fictional context, the finely drawn line between theatrical illusion and reality is trod again and, with it in Egloga VIII, the idea of the metamorphosis of an actor into a character.

Only in the group of plays by Juan del Encina to which attention may now be given, works which, unlike those previously discussed, were not dramatizations of the occasions of their performances, is there no evident intrusion of the author's own personality. The actors can then assume their roles completely and the created character hold the stage.

The first play in this group is Egloga X. It was first published in Encina's Cancionero printed at Salamanca in 1507,[24] but was certainly written and performed ten years earlier since the title-prologue has the following description: "Representacion por Juan del Enzina ante el muy esclarecido y muy ilustre principe, don Juan, nuestro soberano señor" (p. 141). It was probably performed for Don Juan, the ill-fated son and heir of the Catholic Kings, at the celebrations honouring his marriage to

Margaret, daughter of the Emperor Maximilian of Austria, at Burgos in April, 1497.[25] The eclogue is, therefore, a commemorative piece insofar as it was written for a specific occasion; but it is not tied to a single occasion as were the eclogues dedicated to the Duke and Duchess of Alba. There is no audience-actor understanding as in those eclogues, and the subject is not determined by the occasion of performance. Consequently, in company with Eglogas XI, XII, and XIV, Egloga X can exist independently of the circumstances of composition and intended performance. In fact, with this work, Encina began to liberate his dramas from the occasions of their presentation, even if he did not choose an original subject for them. The subject of Egloga X and of the rest of Encina's eclogues discussed in this chapter is the conventional one of love, the same subject dramatized in Eglogas VII and VIII.

The content of Egloga X is divisible in two sections. It begins with Amor's declamation of universal power and is followed by an action illustrating the ideas contained in this declamation. Everyone is susceptible to love; none can avoid subjection to it. Amor asks,

> ¿Quien podra de mi poder
> defender
> su libertad y su alvedrio,
> pues puede mi poderio
> herir, matar y prender? (ll. 6-10)

Once wounded, escape is impossible; the victim is subject alternately to happiness or sadness, pleasure or pain, at the whim of the god of love:

Yo pongo y quito esperança,
yo quito y pongo cadena,
yo doy gloria, yo doy pena
sin holgança;
yo firmeza, yo mudança,
yo deleytes y tristuras
y amarguras,
sospechas, celos y recelos;
yo consuelo, desconsuelos,
yo ventura, desventuras. (ll. 31-40)

Amor has the power to transform:

Hago de mis serviciales
los grosseros ser polidos,
los polidos mas luzidos
y especiales;
los escasos, liberales.
Hago de los aldeanos
cortesanos,
y a los simples ser discretos,
y a los discretos perfectos,
y los grandes, muy umanos. (ll. 51-60)

Above all, no-one is free from persecution:

Tengo casi todo el mundo
por entero
por vasallo y prisionero:
principes y emperadores,
y señores,
perlados y no perlados.
Tengo de todos estados
hasta los brutos pastores. (ll. 93-100)

In the action which follows this monologue Cupid's claims are exemplified. The shepherd Pelayo encounters Amor while hunting and is challenged for not having sought permission. Pelayo is unperturbed, however, and unimpressed when Cupid reveals his identity (l. 110, "Yo so Amor"). The shepherd is defiant and, with much bravado, questions that love could even harm, let alone conquer, him:

Tu, ¿que me puedes hazer?
Haz todo lo que pudieres,

que segun lo que dixieres,
a mi ver,
assi te han de responder. (ll. 151-155)
.....
¡No dare, juro a mi!
un maravedi
por ti zagal, ni dos cravos
que otros he visto mas bravos
y no me espanto yo de ti. (ll. 176-180)

Intolerant of this rebellion, Amor wounds Pelayo with a dart and shows that the claims made in the monologue were no idle boast:

Asi, don villano vil,
porque castiguen cien mil
en ti tal castigo doy.

Quedate agora, malvado,
en esse suelo tendido
de mi mano mal herido,
señalado,
para siempre lastimado.
Yo hare que no feneça,
mas que creça
tu dolor aunque reclames.
Yo te hare que feo ames
y hermoso te pareça. (ll. 188-200)

A second shepherd, Bras, enters on hearing Pelayo's cries of pain. He eventually learns that Pelayo crossed with Amor and questions the wisdom of his temerity:

¿Y con el Amor te tomavas?
¿Por que davas
coces contra el aguijon?
¿Con tan valiente garçon
tu, Pelayo, peleavas? (ll. 246-250)

Even Bras recognizes that Amor is not to be tangled with, but Pelayo cannot justify himself because he falls faint. Bras summons a third shepherd, Juanillo, telling him to bring water for the ailing Pelayo. Bras and Juanillo discuss their companion's malady and the latter recommends the ministry of a priest or a

doctor. "Los males de amor" (l. 288) are not so easily cured, however:

> ques un mal muy desygual,
> y en aquestos males tales
> tan mortales,
> mas quellotra un palaciego
> que no fisico ni crego,
> aunque saben de otros males. (ll. 295-300)

As Amor asserted at the beginning of the eclogue, the ills of love are indomitable. A courtier, one versed in the ways of love would, therefore, be of greater service than either a priest or a doctor.

As if to illustrate the point, an escudero enters. His arrival facilitates the further validation of Amor's claims. The escudero initially thinks Bras is jesting with him when he says (l. 304) that Pelayo's malady is caused by love. He cannot believe that one who is not a courtier could be subject to it. Bras assures him, however, as Amor had claimed, that love does not discriminate; shepherds also feel the pains of love:

> Sentimos malaventura
> hartas vezes por zagales.
> Los llatidos de sus galas
> y hermosura
> nos encovan en tristura. (ll. 311-315)

Bras knows that resistance to Amor's power is foolhardy (see ll. 326-330 and 336-340). To illustrate this fact, the escudero recollects several Biblical figures (Solomon, David, and Samson) who fell foul of Amor, and Bras, at his own level, beginning with himself, enumerates a few village victims of Cupid's arrow.

When Pelayo regains consciousness, conversation has again

turned to his particular case. He has fallen for Marinilla, "la carilla de Pascual" (l. 370). His companions pacify him with assurances that he will see his beloved, but the main topic of conversation is the lover's feelings. In reply to Pelayo's question of whether he is in this world or the next, the escudero asserts,

> ...el Amor es de tal suerte
> que de mil males de muerte
> que nos trata,
> el peor es que no mata. (ll. 402-405)

He then asks Pelayo how he feels and, on learning (ll. 416-418) that the poor shepherd is so full of sighs he is fit to burst, remarks that this is symptomatic of the malady and a condition to be prized. The suffering caused by love is to be enjoyed as part of the experience:

> ...nosotros sospirando
> desvelamos nuestro pena,
> y tenemosla por buena,
> desseando
> servir y morir amando;
> que no puede ser mas gloria
> ni vitoria,
> por servicio de las damas,
> que dexar bivas las famas
> en la fe de su memoria. (ll. 421-430)

The discussion is concluded when Bras interrupts and declares that "aca" in the country lovers are not so demonstrative as "alla" in the town. Love is felt within and the lover does not expose his affliction as they do at the court. With this comparison the whole matter is concluded and all prepare to leave singing "de amores un cantarcillo" (l. 443).

This action illustrates two claims made by Amor at the beginning

of the eclogue: the indomitability and ubiquity of love. Testimony to the former is ample, Pelayo's suffering being the major witness. In spite of his claims, Pelayo's ability to resist is ineffectual. Both Bras and the escudero reprimand the shepherd for his foolhardy challenge of Amor and cite both rustic and Biblical precedents to show the indomitable power of the enemy. An illustration of the power of love, Pelayo is an example of a recalcitrant lover brought to task and made to suffer like any of Amor's victims.

The claim to ubiquity is illustrated through the action and the contrasts in the personages and their ideas about love. Cupid's claim was that every being, regardless of rank, was a fit target for his darts:

> Tengo casi todo el mundo
> por entero
> por vasallo y prisionero:
> principes y emperadores,
> y señores,
> perlados y no perlados.
> Tengo de todos estados
> hasta los brutos pastores. (ll. 93-100)

Thus the personages of the eclogue are representative of different types. The shepherds are represented by the afflicted Pelayo and by his companions Bras and Juanillo, while the courtiers are represented by the escudero. In fact, the escudero's appearance is justified by the need to exemplify Amor's claim to no discrimination among the victims of love on account of rank.

It is significant that the afflicted lover is a shepherd, not a courtier, for in matters of love the sole difference

between the courtier and the rustic is one of education. Each expresses himself in his own terms and in accordance with his own conventional background. Thus, while Pelayo, a "bruto pastor", is unable to account for his suffering, Bras, even before the escudero's entry, competently discourses on the cause of Pelayo's affliction, as he shows when speaking to Juanillo and admonishing Pelayo. Juanillo, by contrast, is like Pelayo and unable to understand. He is effaced from the eclogue when the escudero enters and the action develops into a dialogue between Bras and the courtier about the qualities of love.

It is in the course of this dialogue that the universality of love is particularly emphasized. The escudero is surprised that a rustic is even capable of loving and, when told of Pelayo's affliction, questions, "¿Y amores aca sentis?" (l. 310). He reasons that, with all the courtly refinement attached to love, it is the preserve of the courtier, an attitude evident in his whole approach to the subject. He illustrates the indomitability of Cupid's power with figures from Biblical history and, in keeping with his ideas as a courtier, sees (ll. 421-430) the pains of love as a welcome suffering, a demonstration of the lover's complete subjection to his lady.

Bras does not share this attitude. He sees love through a rustic's eyes, without the courtly overtones of the escudero. When the escudero questions the possibility of Pelayo's being in love, Bras informs him that shepherds are very susceptible to the charms of shepherdesses; when the escudero recollects the

great lovers of Biblical history to illustrate the universal power of Amor, Bras cites their rustic couterparts, including himself in the list; finally, when the escudero discourses on the joyous-suffering and living-death of the courtly display of love, the knowledgeable shepherd comments that such extrovert behaviour is not the style of the village. Love is felt within and is not a matter for display.

Juan del Encina certainly contrasted the town and the country, but the contrast is a conventional aspect of the description of love and a means of portraying the established attitudes of the peasant and the courtier toward love (see Appendix B, s.v. "Town and country contrasted"). It would be false to assume that the dramatist was simply highlighting the ignorance of the rustic. There is more to the eclogue than was implied, for example, by Alfredo Álvarez de la Villa's assertion that "Juan del Encina, con feliz acierto, pinta la ignorancia del pastor con la cortesana y amorosa sabiduría del escudero" (El aucto del repelon, p. 250). As a universal sentiment, love is present in all walks of life and is acknowledged by both shepherd and courtier alike, even if their respective attitudes differ.

In total, therefore, the action and dialogue of Egloga X illustrate the definition of love made through Amor's monologue at the beginning of the eclogue. When the two parts--Amor's monologue and its exemplification in the action--are united, the whole is a kind of allegory. The only allegorical personage in the play is Amor, a personified abstraction presented as the

god Cupid, of whom an adequate self-portrait is presented in the monologue at the beginning of the eclogue. The encounter between Amor and Pelayo may be viewed as the personification of a struggle within the shepherd, who is determined not to become subject to love. Thus the arrow Amor lets fly is Pelayo's act of falling in spite of himself. This part of the action is, thereby, an allegory in which Amor represents the indiscriminate power of love and Pelayo the unwilling, but inevitable, lover.[26] After this scene at the beginning of the eclogue Amor's presence is no longer required, for the concepts he represented are embodied in the afflicted Pelayo and are enlarged upon by Bras and the escudero.

The significance of Bras and the escudero and their relationship has already been discussed. Necessary elements in the exposition of the subject, they are also integral parts of the allegory. Through the contrast between them, Bras speaks on behalf of the shepherd and the escudero on behalf of the courtier. Thus, without actually speaking to the allegorical figure, they establish a direct and differing relationship with Amor, the one rustic, the other courtly. Through discussion of Pelayo's case, they present the commonplace opinions of the affliction and the different reactions it produces; they represent the points of view of Amor's many victims.

The sole personage not presented in the allegory is Juanillo. After Pelayo's faint, he provides a listener to Bras and allows him to demonstrate his competence about love before the escudero's

entry and before the courtly attitude is conveyed. As a foil to Bras, Juanillo is a clown. He does not understand Pelayo's affliction and is, therefore, redundant after the escudero has arrived. Juanillo makes no further contribution to the eclogue and is summoned at its conclusion only to assist with the singing of the recessional song.

Juanillo excepted, therefore, all the personages of the eclogue participate in the allegory. All, with the same exception, embody some aspect of the definition of love. With the different aspects of the action and the personages combined, the entire play may be viewed as a form of loose allegory. Its central element is a description of certain facets of love rather than a fictional situation, in which the focal point is the progress of an action. The work is a discussion rather than a narrative, for which reason alone it would be erroneous to judge it by its plot and condemn it on account of its lack of action.[27]

Although Egloga X is a serious composition, its action and subject are not to be taken seriously. Presented before the Infante Don Juan, probably as part of the celebrations honouring his marriage, the eclogue was an entertainment intended to delight its spectators. Encina dramatized certain ideas about love, but these ideas would have been familiar to his audience, whose interest would have derived partly from this familiarity and partly from the amusing way Encina conveyed a set of conventional ideas. The action of Egloga X was not original, but could be traced to Rodrigo Cota's Diálogo, and in the course of its unfolding a number of

devices conventionally associated with the subject of love appeared. The personages behave in conformity with accepted patterns: Pelayo is a prototype of stubborn, rustic ignorance; Juanillo is predictably stupid; Bras displays the opinions of love expected of a rustic; the escudero airs the orthodox version of courtly love and conventionally contrasts with the shepherds. The audience thereby views what it knows and expects about the subject and accepts the work with the token seriousness due it as a representation of the ideas they accept themselves.

At the same time, as entertainment, the audience is made to smile at these ideas about love. There is an element of ridiculousness in the fight between Pelayo and Amor. The balance of power is tipped heavily in favour of Amor and, characteristic of the rustic, Pelayo has neiher wit nor means to out-manoeuvre his enemy. His stubborn defiance and exaggerated, indefensible stand make the scene comparable with the conventional rustic quarrels of the early Spanish drama (see Appendix B. s.v. "Argument"). Even the discussion of love is punctuated with comedy. The ignorance of Pelayo and Juanillo is conventionally comic and there is an element of parody in Bras' conversation with the escudero. His insistence that shepherds are capable of love destroys the esoteric quality of the courtier's fancy and makes a common experience of it; the enumeration of his fellow-rustics as notable lovers reduces the escudero's previous list of Biblical figures to the absurd; and

Bras' denigration of the extrovert behaviour of the courtly lover casts a shadow of contempt on the fashions of the court. Encina does the same as in Egloga VIII. The accepted conventions of love are not severely criticized, but they are made a source of humour and held up to ridicule by a personage who neither practises nor appreciates them, for Bras knows about love, but is not a courtier. All this is part of the entertainment. From the ensuing pages of this study it will become apparent that this kind of situation, the parody of love through a rustic personage, was a conventional part of the early Spanish pastoral love drama.

In concluding this discussion of Egloga X, a brief comparison may be made between the treatment of a similar subject by Juan del Encina and Rodrigo Cota. Both adhered to conventional ideas about love and both allegorized it in a similar way, but the old man of the Diálogo entre el Amor y un viejo and the shepherd of Egloga X are not mirror images. The old man is as defiant as Pelayo, but ultimately submits to love through an act of will; Pelayo remains defiant and is subjected to Amor in spite of his resistance. It would seem that while Rodrigo Cota illustrated that love and its dangers could be conquered by an effort of will and that man fails through his own weakness, Juan del Encina portrayed a situation in which resistance is of no avail and the victim is subjected to Amor in spite of his own determination. In the next play discussed in this chapter, Egloga XI, the same subject is dramatized again, but its solution is more akin to that

offered by Rodrigo Cota.

Egloga XI was never included in any of Encina's Cancioneros, but was discovered in an unique copy now held in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid.[28] This copy lacks a colophon and has been variously dated by commentators. Emilio Cotarelo, in the introduction to the Academy facsimile of Encina's 1496 Cancionero (p. 26), thought it was written and performed in 1497; Giménez Caballero tentatively dated it 1506-09.[29] In fact, it is impossible to date the eclogue and give it an irrefutable position in the uncertain chronology of Encina's drama. A reference to the eclogue in Lucas Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado can only verify, as Crawford recognized, that Encina's work was written and known before 1514, the date Fernández's Farsas y églogas were published.[30]

The action of Egloga XI is briefly summarized in its title-prologue:

> Egloga nuevamente trobada por Juan del Enzina adonde se introduze un pastor que con otro se aconceja, queriendo dexar este mundo y sus vanidades por servir a Dios, el qual despues de averse retraydo a ser hermitaño, el dios de Amor muy enojado porque sin su licencia lo avia hecho, una ninfa embia a le tentar, de tal suerte que forçado del Amor dexa los abitos y la religion. (p. 159)

From this brief synopsis it is apparent that the conflict of the action involves a shepherd's aspirations to a life of piety and his downfall when tempted by the attractions of the world. Commentators are generally agreed, as subsequent reference to them will show, that this conflict is illustrative of a choice between ascetism and pleasure. This facile categorization of

the eclogue and its meaning conceivably assumes, however, a level of seriousness not necessarily intended by the author. It supposes that Encina intended some didactic purpose in addition to amusing himself and his audience.

Cristino announced his reason for becoming a hermit at the beginning of the eclogue in a dialogue with Justino, whom he had sought in order to explain his resolve and obtain a reaction. The would-be hermit begins by describing the trials and tribulations of a transient world:

> Ya sabes, Justino hermano,
> quan liviano
> y quan breve es este mundo;
> y esto por razon me fundo,
> que es como flor de verano,
> que si sale a la mañana
> fresca y sana,
> a la noche esta ya seca,
> que muy presto se trastrueca,
> y mas pierde quien mas gana.
>
> Tambien sabes los ventiscos,
> los pedriscos,
> las tormentas, los nublados,
> que por mi son ya passados,
> los peligros, los arriscos... (11. 41-55)

Cristino has experienced both pleasure and pain:

> Pues si digo enamorado,
> ¡mal pecado!
> tampoco no mentire;
> bien puedo dezir que fue
> venturoso y desdichado. (11. 61-65)
> .....
> Si quanto mal y cuydado
> he passado
> por amores y señores
> sufriera por Dios dolores,
> ya fuera canonizado, (11. 76-80)[31]

but he has decided to escape life's uncertainties by retiring to

a hermitage and serving God:

> Todo lo quiero dexar,
> y darme a servir a Dios.
> Quiero buscar una hermita
> benedita,
> do penitencia hazer,
> y en ella permanecer
> para secula infinita. (ll. 69-75)

Justino's description (ll. 86-90) of the hardness of the hermit's life and his enumeration (ll. 91-115) of the pleasures it lacks[32] only give Cristino added strength:

> mas merece quien mas dexa,
> no me estorbes el camino. (ll. 119-120)

Cristino's decision is, therefore, simply explained: life is a vain, transient experience, the source of pleasure, but also the cause of much pain. In this conventional view, love is one reason for Cristino's flight,[33] an element necessarily included since the conflict of the action is based on it. Inevitably, Amor appears after Cristino's departure, determined to recapture him. When Amor asks Justino (l. 149) what has become of his companion, he is told that Cristino has put pleasure behind him (l. 150, "Despidiose de plazeres") and fled to the mountains away from Amor's power:

> Fuesse por essa montaña
> tan estraña
> por huyr de tu potencia. (ll. 151-153)

Consequently, Amor resolves to assert his authority and decides to punish Cristino for leaving without permission:

> Pues se fue sin mi licencia
> yo le mostrare mi saña,
> yo hare su triste vida
> dolorida

ser mas aspera y mas fuerte,
desseosa de la muerte,
que es peor la recayda. (ll. 154-160)
.....
A Cristino, aquel traydor
de pastor,
por tomar fuerças comigo,
yo le dare tal castigo
que en otros ponga temor. (ll. 176-180)

Thus, Cristino's return is caused through Amor's intervention. The nymph Febea is sent as a temptress. Cristino falls for her and agrees to leave his hermitage when Febea offers herself on that condition:

Torna, tornate pastor,
si quies que quiera quererte. (ll. 329-330)

In a monologue (ll. 334-385) spoken after Febea's departure, Cristino regrets his succumbing to Amor. He laments that his reason and will were both powerless to keep him free of temptation, conquer his passions, and escape Amor's clutches. Cristino's subsequent dialogue with Amor himself (ll. 386-432) is a further illustration that love is the reason for his downfall, for he agrees to leave his hermitage in exchange for Febea's love and promise to be Amor's "buen sujeto" (l. 431).

In the final part of the eclogue Cristino confesses to Justino that he has succumbed to love's temptations and is now ready to abandon the hard life of the hermit and return to his former existence. The shepherd's lot, he agrees, is happier than the hermit's:

A hotas, Justino, que es
sin reves
la verdad esso que habras,
¡mas huelgo una ora entre cabras

que en hermita todo un mes! (ll. 466-470)

Nonetheless, Cristino still has some misgivings. He wonders about his reputation (l. 508, "¿Que diran en ell aldea?"), but, above all, laments that he is again subject to the vicissitudes of love,

> ¿Donde esta tan gran tristura
> y amargura,
> Justino, como la mia?
> Mal se finge ell alegria;
> sobre negro no ay tintura.
>
> Mira quan deshecho estoy,
> que me voy
> a la muerte por amores,
> con estos y otros dolores,
> ya no semejo quien soy. (ll. 516-525)

Justino sets about re-introducing Cristino to his former ways by urging him to dance and be cheerful. He has not lost all his gaiety, but his heart is heavy with love because Amor has recaptured him. In the villancico sung by the two shepherds at the end of the eclogue (ll. 601-631)[34] the disturbance caused in Cristino by the sight of a zagala is described.

Cristino's behaviour, his renunciation of the world and subsequent return to it, exemplified two conventional ideas: the difficulties of defeating temptation and escaping the pains and trials of life, and the power of Amor to subdue his victims and control their destiny. These ideas are emphasized through Cristino's contacts with his companion Justino and his adversary Amor.

Justino is a cynic. When Cristino asks his opinion he announces his advocacy of plain speaking, even to the crego and

the sacristan:

> Siempre les digo lo cierto
> muy despierto,
> que en esta lengua maldita
> no se me para pepita,
> y si miras siempre acierto. (ll. 26-30)

Thus, while commending Cristino's noble action, Justino stresses its difficulties:

> Seguir las santas pisadas
> y sagradas
> es muy bueno, quando tura;
> mas cierto, cosa es muy dura
> dexar las cosas usadas. (ll. 86-90)

He does not believe Cristino will remain firm and after his departure says,

> No creo que cumpla el año
> a segun que del magino;
> a hotas, segun quien es,
> que aun mes
> pongo en duda que el ature.
> Nunca mas mal año dure,
> que Amor le dara reves. (ll. 134-140)

Justino seems to know Cristino better than Cristino himself since he predicts his downfall and forsees Amor as the cause.

Justino's cynicism again appears after Cristino has succumbed and forsaken his life of contemplation. Then he argues in favour of rustic pleasures against the hermit's existence, reasoning that only old men, in whom life has grown cold, are fit candidates for a hermitage:

> Las vidas de las hermitas
> son benditas;
> mas nunca son hermitaños
> sino viejos de cien años,
> personas que son prescritas,
> que no sienten poderio
> ni amorio,

ni les viene cachondez,
porque, miafe, la vejez
es de terruño muy frio.

Y es la vida del pastor
muy mejor,
de mas gozo y alegria;
la tuya de dia en dia
yra de mal en peor. (ll. 451-465)

Moreover, on learning that Cristino succumbed to Amor, Justino is cynically delighted in seeing his predictions verified:

¿Cupido dizes? No mas;
ve veras,
contra lo que te amonesta,
su venganza esta tan presta
que no se tarda jamas.
De mi concejo, Cristino,
que me inclino
siempre a remediar tu daño;
antes que cumplas el año
tornarte por tu camino. (ll. 481-490)[35]

He then re-introduces Cristino to life's pleasures, reconciling him to abandon the hermitage and renew his former existence.

Justino's attitude accounts for Cristino's behaviour. He contends that the shepherd leads a better life than the hermit. The difference between the two aspects of Cristino's experience has consequently led commentators to emphasize its importance. For Laurel H. Turk the eclogue "presents, with pastoral setting, the conflict between asceticism and worldliness, and the triumph of the flesh over the spirit" ("Juan del Encina...", p. 306). His comment reflected Menéndez y Pelayo's opinion: "Esta sencilla fábula, muy lindamente escrita y versificada ... no respira más que alegría sensual y epicúreo contentamiento de la vida. No creemos que el autor tuviese en mientes disuadir a nadie de

la vida ascética y contemplativa, pero lo cierto es que de su obra no resulta otra moraleja" (Antología..., III, p. 293).

The action of the eclogue is certainly based on a conflict of opposing desires, but there is no implicit moral. Justino's advice is positive and reveals a lust for living, not a negation of asceticism, in Menéndez y Pelayo's words, an "alegría sensual y epicúreo contentamiento de la vida". Learning of Cristino's desire to retire to a hermitage, Justino commends its worthiness, but also dwells on its difficulties because of life's attractions (see ll. 86-115). There is no serious attempt to dissuade Cristino, only a wish for his perseverance and regret for a lost companion. Justino's prediction that Cristino will succumb sooner or later to the pleasures of life derives from his awareness of the difficulties involved in Cristino's decision. His cynicism, reflected in such statements as his remarks that only the old make suitable hermits (ll. 451-460), provides amusing and relevant comment. Justino's attitude is a gentle parody of religious asceticism since he presents the alternative that life is too happy and too attractive to be forfeited for a hermitage.

Cristino, by contrast, unaware of the difficulties before him, has only a resolve to foster his spiritual well-being:

> Dexar todo determino
> ya, Justino,
> porque ell alma este sin quexa;
> mas merece quien mas dexa,
> no me estorves el camino. (ll. 116-120)

He underestimated the attractions of the world and when temptation appears in the form of Amor he falls with the first blow. After

submitting to Febea's charms, Cristino laments that he could not conquer himself:

> Ya no soy en mi poder,
> no puedo dexar amores
> ni dolores;
> pues que no quieres dexarme,
> forçado sera tornarme
> a la vida de pastores. (ll. 336-340)

He realizes his weakness:

> Dios me dio
> razon y libre alvedrio.
> ¡O, que mal seso es el mio
> que tan presto se volvio! (ll. 347-350)

and recognizes that spiritual glory is only won by enduring temptations and conquering the passions:

> Aquel es fuerte llamado
> y esforçado
> que sufre las tentaciones;
> quien vence tales passiones
> es de gloria coronado. (ll. 356-360)

For Cristino the call of pleasure was too strong; he is returned to its enjoyment and concomitant pains.

Cristino's decision to become a hermit did not take proper account of the situation. He did not allow, as did Justino, for the attraction of pleasure, nor consider that escape from the world did not also entail escape from its temptations. As Amor argued (l. 154), Cristino could not abandon the world "sin [...su]licencia." Moreover, Cristino did not envisage pleasure as a legitimate pursuit. This was Justino's attitude, and the idea was also presented to Cristino by Febea. Offering her love to Cristino, she argued that a life of pious contemplation was not the sole qualification for eternal glory:

Bivir bien es gran consuelo,
con buen celo
como santos gloriosos;
no todos los religiosos
son los que suben al cielo.
Tambien serviras a Dios
entre nos
que mas de buenos pastores
ay que frayles y mejores,
y en tu tierra mas de dos. (ll. 201-300)

Febea's statement embodies a central idea in the eclogue, that pleasure is not to be eschewed, but enjoyed for its own sake. The corollary of this idea, that pleasure is not easy to forfeit, is contained in Justino's advice to Cristino and is exemplified by Amor. Portrayed in the same conventional guise as in Egloga X, the figure of love is easily suited to represent the attraction of pleasure and source of Cristino's temptations. Amor is again an indomitable force capable of overpowering any opponent,[36] a whimsical god who subjects his victims to his fancies.[37] Cristino, like the viejo of Cota's dialogue, is not free of Amor's advances, any more than he is free of the attraction of pleasure. With Amor Encina had a model of characterization and a form of situation readily available. In stating that he will inflict Cristino with desires of love,

...le visitare
con la fe,
con el desseo amoroso,
con la pena sin reposo
mil congoxas le dare, (ll. 231-235)

and distract him from his pious intentions,

Robarele la memoria
de la gloria
que piensa aver en el cielo,

no le dexare consuelo
ni esperança de vitoria, (ll. 241-245)

Amor may be envisaged as representing the flesh in conflict with the spirit. Amor, behaves, however, as the conventions of his characterization demand and Encina simply placed a conventional struggle between Amor and one of his victims in a different context and gave it a different emphasis.[38]

P. Mazzei placed this struggle in the context of specific cultural movements. He viewed the victory of the flesh over the spirit as a triumph for the Renaissance. Man's life is no longer depicted as the battle of external forces for his penitent soul, but as an internal conflict, which left him to his own devices to struggle with his own conscience.[39] To view the eclogue in this light is not relevant here. It is conceivable that Encina is a Renaissance personality, but he did not invent the ideas and situations he exploited in his eclogues. Nonetheless, Mazzei's suggestion that the action of Egloga XI represents a conflict taking place in Cristino's conscience merits further examination.

It was observed that the conflict portrayed in Egloga X represented an abstract situation (see above n. 26). This is no less true of Egloga XI. Ordinarily Amor exists only as an attitude of mind. The figure, therefore, represents the temptations felt by Cristino for the pleasures of his former life in spite of his adopted state as a hermit. His dialogue, first with Febea, then with Amor, visualizes an inner argument by which he is tempted to forsake his spiritual resolve in favour of

worldly pleasures. In the dramatization of the workings of Cristino's mind, Amor and Febea are virtually one and the same thing, but with separate identities for the sake of visualizing the situation. Amor is the temptation itself, Cristino's desire for love; Febea is what he would possess were he to succumb to it. Crawford's objection that "the poet's lack of familiarity with this type [Febea] is shown by the fact that she appears at Cupid's summons as a supernatural creature, yet, on the earnest plea of Cristino, he is promised her love by Cupid" (The Spanish Pastoral Drama, p. 43), is out of place in an abstract situation. Since the whole argument between Cristino and Febea is the representation of Cristino's state of mind, Febea is solely the object Cristino would obtain by yielding to his temptations. This is emphasized in the conclusion of the play when Cristino refers to her somewhat vaguely as (l. 593) "aquella ninfa que vi" and in the villancico sung by Cristino and Justino she is no more than an unknown zagala. Cristino is not embroiled in a real affair. As the allegory shows, he has fallen victim to Amor; he has succumbed to temptation and become susceptible to love.

Insofar as the action of Egloga XI is an allegory, the personages fulfil representative roles. Amor and Febea are abstractions, the representations of love itself and Cristino's desire for love. Cristino is the being in whom the struggle between pleasure and austerity, amor and desamor, takes place, while Justino has the role of a commentator. He is a necessary companion to Cristino and provides him with an audience for his

views, but he also expresses his own opinions. He states directly the ideas on which the action of the eclogue is based--that pleasure is not easily forsworn and that Amor is an implacable foe. The supposition that the action of Egloga XI was derived from an episode in Encina's life cannot be proven[40] and, in any event, would contribute nothing to the understanding of the eclogue, of which the probable source, as Crawford indicated (Spanish Drama..., pp. 24-25), was Cota's Diálogo entre el Amor y un viejo. Like the old man of Cota's work, Cristino submits to Amor by an act of will:

> Dios me dio
> razon y libre alvedrio.
> ¡O, que mal seso el mio
> que tan presto se volvio! (ll. 347-350)

Like the old man, too, with greater strength Cristino could have overcome temptation:

> Aquel es fuerte llamado
> y esforçado
> que sufre las tentaciones;
> quien vence tales passiones
> es de gloria coronado. (ll. 356-360)[41]

The central idea of the eclogue, as in Cota's dialogue, is that temptation is too strong and the attraction of pleasure too great. In the remaining two plays by Encina discussed in this chapter similar presentations are involved. In these eclogues the conventional powers of love are again demonstrated, through lovers who become martyrs to Amor.

Egloga XII first appeared among Encina's collected works in the Cancionero of 1509 and exists also in a suelta edition, without

place or date of printing, containing additional lines at the beginning and end not found in the Cancionero.[42] Cotarelo and Juliá Martínez both reasoned that the eclogue was written as early as 1497,[43] but Crawford's argument that Egloga XII was derived from an ecloga recitativa by the Italian poet Antonio Tebaldeo and was written between 1507 and 1509 must be accepted.[44]

The question of the date of Egloga XII inevitably leads to speculation about the national, cultural influences which shaped Encina's work and the degree to which he assimilated and exploited what he learned in Italy. Perhaps with a little too much patriotism, the possibility of Italian influence has been denied by claiming that almost all Encina's plays were written before he set foot in Italy and, therefore, resulted from an entirely Spanish tradition. Menéndez y Pelayo asked himself if there was any Italian influence on Encina and answered, "Con la mejor voluntad del mundo, nada hemos podido encontrar que directamente recuerde al teatro italiano, salvo en uno de ellas el uso del prólogo o introito" (Antología..., III, p. 286). Julía Martínez supported this opinion by citing Encina's sources as Diego de San Pedro's Cárcel de Amor, Rodrigo Cota's Diálogo, the Celestina by Fernando de Rojas, the Corvacho by the Archpriest of Talavera, and the Amadís de Gaula (see "La literatura dramática peninsular...", p. 263).[45]

With the evidence provided by Crawford, Italian influence on at least Egloga XII must be accepted as a fact. One result of this is a decided difference in tone in Egloga XII from

Encina's earlier dramatic eclogues, as Laurel H. Turk described: "As the title suggests, this play also deals with shepherd, but there is little of the manner of the early shepherd plays. The interlocutors talk learnedly, after the manner of the courtiers of the day. Instead of being persons of flesh and blood, they resemble the conventional characters of the learned pastoral literary type. The scene is no longer in the rural district of Salamanca, but in an idealized setting that recalls the Arcadian fields of the eclogues of Theocritus and Virgil" ("Juan del Encina...", p. 286).[46]

There are enough close textual parallels to substantiate that the central element of the action, the suicide of a distraught lover, was derived from Antonio Tebaldeo,[47] but it would be wrong to consider Encina's play solely as a meek imitation of an Italian original. Encina could also count on Spanish literary tradition. The lover's suicide, for example, figured in the Cárcel de Amor (1492), which could have influenced Encina's choice of Tebaldeo's poem as the basis for Egloga XII. Moreover, Encina did not simply dramatize the Italian work, but expanded it.[48] He added a contrasto of the faults and virtues of women and, in Zambardo, included an entirely new character. The former element, though ultimately derived from Boccaccio's Corbaccio, was a naturalized literary device in Spain;[49] the latter, the inclusion of Zambardo, derived from Encina's own drama. In fact, on account of his expansion of the Italian poem, Encina parts company with Tebaldeo. The Italian wrote a short, unitary composition intended

for recitation; the Spaniard was a practised dramatist and expanded the same subject into a play. Thus, in discussing the possible sources of Egloga XII, the availability of Encina's own plays and the fact that he had already exploited certain ideas, characters, and situations, must not be overlooked.

Egloga XII is a further exploitation of the conventional ideas on love, but in plays by Encina where love is the central issue, different aspects of the same ideas are emphasized. In the combined Eglogas VII and VIII he dramatized a conventional courtship scene derived from the pastourelle and used it to illustrate the transforming power of love. Egloga X was particularly concerned with love as a universal and indomitable force, while in Egloga XI the conventional portrayal of Amor as an irresistible tempter was a device to illustrate the attraction of pleasure. In Egloga XII Encina again returned to the idea of love as a powerful enemy completely controlling his victims. The wretched Fileno becomes so distraught that he loses his reason and, in despair, commits suicide.

Fileno's distress is shown from the beginning of the eclogue, when he is already distract and decided on asking a friend for advice because he cannot rely on himself:

> Provado he las fuerças de mi pensamiento;
> mas no pueden darme vida segura. (11. 7-8)

He is approaching despair when he first speaks to Zambardo:

> Ya no se que haga, ni se que me diga,
> Zambardo, si tu remedio no pones.
> Tanto macossan mis fieras passiones,
> veras de mi mesmo mi vida enemiga, (11. 9-12)

whom he hopes will calm his troubles and restore the equilibrium of his mind:

> Pues quise escogerte, porque eres prudente
> y porque mis males tu seso concierte. (ll. 39-40)

Zambardo, however, is incapable of giving consolation. He has had a hard day in the fields (ll. 58-68) and cannot stay awake long enough to hear Fileno's complaint against love and the faithless Zefira. Far from sympathizing, Zambardo aggravates the situation and causes Fileno to rail further against a fate which does not even permit his friends to console him:

> ¡O sorda Fortuna, o ciego Cupido,
> adultera Venus, Vulcano cornudo!
> ¿Por que contra un pobre, estando desnudo,
> armays vuestras furias, si no os ha ofendido?
> ¿No os basta tenerme en fuego metido
> donde en un punto me abraso y me yelo,
> si no que el hombre do espero consuelo
> oyendo mis males se me aya dormido? (ll. 137-144)

Zambardo excuses himself (ll. 153-158) while Fileno, continuing his invective (ll. 161-180), comes closer to ruin. Fileno's despair is not total, however. He promises,

> Pues tu [Amor] me persigues con furia infernal
> yo me delibro, o darm'e al demonio,
> o andar noche y dia llamando Cardonio,
> que se que es amigo conforme a mi mal. (ll. 181-184)

Zambardo could not listen because of his tiredness, but discussion is possible with Cardonio. Apart from being wide awake, Cardonio knows about the pains of love. He is potentially more "conforme" to Fileno's malady, but he is as unable in the long run to help. Fileno and Cardonio hold contrasting views about love because of the relative success of their respective

affairs. Fileno is unhappy, Cardonio is not. As a result, Fileno's state is further aggravated because Cardonio, the happy lover tries to show Fileno the errors of his judgement and futility of his lament.

Initially, the mere fact he is a happy lover makes Cardonio refuse to listen. He condemns Fileno by saying that the loudness of his complaint is no gauge of his suffering:

> Si piensas, Fileno, que porque tu vayas
> quexando, tus males se muestran mayores,
> y yo porque calle, los sienta menores,
> en falsa razon tus sesos ensayas.
> Ni mengua dolor, ni passa las rayas
> por ser encubierto ni mucho quexarse;
> antes yo creo quexando menguarse,
> y crecer quanto mas cubierto lo trayas. (ll. 209-216)

Moreover, he will not listen,

> Porque en tiempo que estoy trasportado
> me den grave pena agenos aferes. (ll. 219-220)

Only Fileno's persistance persuades him.

Having won an audience, Fileno then begins on the wrong track. By inculpating all women with Zefira, Fileno only incites Cardonio's animosity. He also serves a lady and will brook no slander of her:

> ...porque Zefira te causa dolor,
> que no se si viene por tu merecido,
> no deven las otras entrar en partido
> do pierden por ella el devido onor. (ll. 277-280)

The differing opinions of the two shepherds results in a <u>contrasto</u> in the style of the <u>Corvacho</u> (see above n. 49), in which the faults and virtues of women are compared. Fileno (ll. 297-353) reviles all women as a source of evil and condemns Zefira as the guiltiest of all. The final outburst in this tirade is directed

against Cardonio:

> A mi no me culpen, que cosa es onesta
> dezir mal de aquella que quiere matarme.
> Si tu desto quieres, Cardonio, acusarme,
> ni tienes razon, ni eres amigo;
> antes devrias firmar lo que digo,
> pues yo te llame para consolarme. (ll. 355-360)

Fileno anticipates agreement, for it is clear that the consolation he seeks is sympathy for his views through an expression of fellow-feeling.

Predictably, Cardonio is not prepared to, indeed he cannot, offer this kind of consolation. To do so he would have to deny his own judgement and the virtues of the lady in whose service he lives. Far from agreeing, Cardonio ably argues that Fileno's suffering is self-induced. He asks,

> ¿Quien te compele que sirvas y sigas
> esta muger que sin intervalo
> dizes ser mala? Si sigues lo malo,
> ¿que razon ay de que otras mal digas?
>
> ¿Que armas, que fuerças pudo tener
> con que ella prendiesse tu libertad? (ll. 365-370)

Fileno's reply, "¡Sola beldad!" (l. 371), is met with scorn and the imputation of an impoverished reason:

> ¡O pobre de seso! Mas que de plazer,
> de sola pintura te dexas vencer
> sin que otra virtud cubierta detenga. (ll. 372-374)

Fileno has shown no cause to blame Zefira, still less accuse all women of her supposed fault, for, as Cardonio demonstrated (ll. 381-416), there are many praiseworthy and virtuous women.

That Fileno is inconsolable and seeks only to confirm his own opinion is apparent when he concedes victory to Cardonio but

still refuses to admit his own mistakes. Cardonio's victory in the contrasto is essential for the full portrayal of Fileno's plight. It stresses that Fileno's position is untenable, his reasoning adrift, and his punishment self-induced. His intransigence is further emphasized in the concluding part of the dialogue between him and Cardonio. The idea of suicide becomes more prominent and is evident in Fileno's request to be left alone:

> Dexame solo buscar mi consuelo,
> vete, Cardonio, por Dios te lo ruego.
> Que si en la vida faltare sosiego
> buscarl'e en la muerte sin otro recelo. (11.425-428)

Cardonio does not appear to see the point of Fileno's intention immediately, but is aware that the situation is serious and leaves Fileno some advice. He recommends reason: "Que nunca rehuyas jamas la razon" (l. 432), and, when Fileno again suggests suicide, tells him there is hope in life, not death (ll. 465-480). All advice is ineffectual, however, because Fileno has long since ceased to be rational. He confessed his distraction at the beginning of the eclogue (ll. 7-8); Cardonio demonstrated his companion's irrationality and, when Fileno refuses further advice, calls him a madman (l. 455). Fileno has reached a point where complaint is his only remedy because the cause of his suffering has not been removed. He says to Cardonio as he again bids him leave,

> ...sola una cosa tan congoxado
> me tiene, y me pone el cuchillo en la mano:
> en averme Zefira por otro trocado,
> y aver tanto tiempo servidola en vano. (ll. 493-496)

With Cardonio's departure, Fileno immediately prepares to kill himself. Cursing Cupid and Zefira, the forces which drove him to this action, his despair is total and he sees death as a welcome release. The torment of Hell, he feels will be slight in comparison with present pains:

> Tu, alma, no pienses ni tengas temor
> que andando al infierno ternas mayor pena;
> mas piensa, sin duda, tenerla menor
> do quier que te halles sin esta cadena. (ll. 549-552)

Thus, breaking the symbols of his pastoral trade and bidding farewell to his flocks, Fileno commends himself to Jupiter's protection:

> ¡O Jupiter magno, o eterno poder!
> Pues claro conoces que muero biviendo,
> la inocente alma no dexes perder,
> la qual en tus manos desde agora encomiendo,
> (ll. 589-592)

and stabs himself, dying a martyr to love.

The final part of the eclogue, containing Cardonio's return, the burial of Fileno, and the inscription of an epitaph on his tomb, presents some reflections on the lover's suicide. Cardonio fears for his companion's safety and decides to return, not because he thinks Fileno may have killed himself, but because he may have fallen asleep and been attacked by wild animals. When he discovers that Fileno is dead by his own hand, Cardonio feels more sympathy than condemnation. He regrets not having made a proper farewell:

> Pues dime, enemigo, ¿por que me negaste
> el ultimo abrazo, siendote hermano?
> ¿O qual es la causa que no me tocaste,
> como era razon, al menos la mano? (ll. 629-632)

and laments that the world will judge Fileno wrongly:

> ...peor es que, siendo por sabio estimado,
> luego que sea tu muerte sabida
> de todos seras por loco juzgado;
> porque el fin es aquel que onrra la vida.
> (ll. 637-640)

Cardonio pities the dead lover, envisaging the possibility of love driving him to desperate action:

> Conoço que Amor no va por razon;
> por donde me acuerdo yo, triste mezquino,
> de un viejo refran que dobla mi enojo:
> que viendo pelar la barba al vezino,
> comiences a echar la tuya en remojo.
>
> Que si por ventura plugiesse al demonio
> que aquessa que adoro assi me tratasse,
> forçado seria que el pobre Cardonio
> mas cruda muerte que aquesta buscasse.
> (ll. 644-652)

Although Cardonio then dismisses the eventuality, his acknowledgement of the circumstances of Fileno's suicide approaches acquiescence of it. Whether approving or not, however, Cardonio recognizes Fileno as a "martyr de amor" (l. 660), as he describes him when calling Zambardo to help with the burial.

Further exoneration of Fileno is found at the very end of the eclogue. Zambardo, the sleepy shepherd of the first scene, attempts (ll. 689-694) to recite an epitaph he composed and forgets it, but the final inscription appears to excuse the dead shepherd. Fileno is first offered as a warning:

> "¡O tu que passas por la sepultura
> del triste Fileno, espera, si quieres,
> y leyendo veras quien sirve a mugeres
> qual es el fin que a su vida procura!" (ll. 697-700)

In the second half of the epitaph, however, the guilt is placed

squarely on those who drove Fileno to suicide, Amor and Zefira:

> "Veras como, en premio de fiel servidor,
> Amor y Zefira, por mi mala suerte,
> me dieron trabajos, desdeños, dolor,
> lloros, sospiros, y al fin cruda muerte."
> (ll. 701-704)

The apparent mitigation of Fileno is continued in further lines contained only in the undated suelta, where the dialogue between Cardonio and Zambardo is prolonged for another sixteen lines and more shepherds are introduced to assist in singing "un triste requiem que diga de amores".[50] In these additional lines Zambardo recommends Fileno for canonization and veneration as a "martyr de amor", as Fileno had already called him (l. 660):

> No rueguen por el, Cardonio, que es sancto,
> y asi lo debemos nos de tener.
> Pues vamos llamar los dos sin carcoma
> al muy sancto crego que lo canonice;
> aquel que en vulgar romance se dice
> alla entre grosseros el Papa de Roma.

As much as the personages in the pastoral dramas by Encina already discussed in this chapter, Fileno is a conventional figure. The main difference between him and those personages being that he is a more extreme representative of the suffering lover because his plight results in death; but the suicide is an integral element in the conventional portrayal of love, included in the eclogue as part of the imitation of an Italian poem, not as an original conclusion (see above n. 47). In fact, Fileno's companions exonerate him because the whole situation is conventional.

In spite of references to Christian ethics (l. 476 and ll. 549-550, for example) and the implication that Fileno's suicide will cost him his soul, it was not Encina's purpose to moralize

about his personages and either condemn or condone their actions. Encina simply exploited a convention. Nevertheless, in order to make the suicide acceptable, some mitigation of it was necessary. As Otis H. Green suggested (Spain and the Western Tradition, III, pp. 112-113), the force of Fileno's death is lessened by the condemnation implicit in Cardonio's warning and calling him a madman, and by the inclusion of comedy through the appearance of Zambardo at the beginning and end of the eclogue. Encina was, however, caught between reality and fiction. Egloga XII differs from his earlier eclogues in that, as Laurel H. Turk wrote, it was placed in "an idealized setting that recalls the Arcadian fields of Theocritus and Virgil". The action is, therefore, a phantasy and must be judged according to its own conventions. Fileno's self-sacrifice is an act of martyrdom to the gods who rule the imaginary world of which he is part. The fact is, however, that Encina did not preserve his imaginary world intact, since its illusion is broken by occasional references to Christian ethics, which are not part of the idealized setting, and by the comic behaviour of the shepherd Zambardo.

In the convention of love, Fileno's suicide is inevitable. His plight is a repetition of that endured by Pelayo in Egloga X and Cristino in Egloga XI. His fate is more extreme, but the indomitable and transforming power of Amor, familiar notions, drive him to it. When he began to narrate his troubles to Zambardo, Fileno stressed that his love for Zefira was ordained:

Fortuna, mudable governadora,
y Amor, de quien es Piedad enemiga,
hambrientos de darme perpetua fatiga
me dieron por vida morir cada ora.

Mandaronme amar, y amando seguir
una figura formada en el viento. (ll. 85-90)

This is the crux of his plight, for when he has confessed that Cardonio has defeated him in argument, Fileno is still incapable of freeing himself. Only death can resolve his situation, a conclusion to which he is driven because love has transformed him from his former self.

The transformation Encina portrayed to demonstrate the power of love in the plays already discussed in this chapter were represented by changes in a way of life: from courtier to shepherd and vice versa in Eglogas VII and VIII, and from shepherd to hermit and vice versa in Egloga XI. Fileno's transformation is different and is portrayed through physical and mental degeneration. Love has reduced him to a shadow of his former self. Zambardo remarks on the changed appearance,

...claras señales conoço en tu gesto
de que tus males me hazen seguro:
flaco, amarillo, cuydoso y oscuro,
a lloros, sospiros, conforme dispuesto;
en tus vestiduras no nada compuesto
te veo, y solias andar muy polido, (ll. 25-30)

and Cardonio on the overall degeneration,

¡O Dios, quanto se es Fileno mudado
de aquello que era desde agora dos años!
(ll. 601-602)

The change is most emphasized, however, in Fileno's state of mind. He admitted (ll. 7-8 and 15-16, for example) his inability

to govern himself and Cardonio consistently proclaimed (l. 284, ll. 372-374, and l. 455, for example) Fileno's irrationality. Finally, on discovering the corpse, Cardonio reflected that the world would judge Fileno as mad, whereas he was "por sabio estimado" (l. 637). The transformation in Fileno is one of degeneration from strength to sickness, from sanity to madness, and thence to suicide.

In presenting this subject, Encina adhered fundamentally to familiar devices, the major difference from Eglogas X and XI being the lack of allegory. At the centre of the action is a shepherd subject to love. The doubtful qualities of love's blessings are personified, however, not in an allegorical figure, such as Amor, but in the cruel Zefira, whose change of heart caused Fileno's suffering. The effect is nonetheless the same, since the situation provides ample opportunity to display the nature of love. Encina could describe the emotion in more violent terms, but the description is in keeping with his presentation of the same subject in eclogues discussed thus far.

Although Fileno is the principal vehicle for the ideas on love, Cardonio plays an important role. In agreeing to listen to Fileno's complaint, Cardonio simultaneously provides an audience for the lovesick shepherd and contributes further ideas. As a sane and happy lover, Cardonio is an appropriate contrast to the deranged and distraught Fileno, and the two shepherds together present the positive and negative faces of love. Moreover, Cardonio helps to establish the phantasy. Although he continually

criticized Fileno, he did so as a happy lover and when he saw that Fileno died by his own hand he was forced to acknowledge him as a martyr and victim to love. Cardonio is, therefore, an integral part of the imaginary pastoral world.

It is a different matter with Zambardo. In the adaptation of Antonio Tebaldeo's eclogue he is the most significant addition. When Encina expanded the Italian poem into a dramatic eclogue he was guided by the principles of his own dramaturgy. Hence, even in an idealized setting, he included a comic character, a personage of the same type as the rustics in the Nativity plays, in Eglogas VII and VIII, and in Egloga X, as if the comic rustic were an essential part of any drama.[51]

Both Crawford ("The Source of Encina's Egloga...", p. 226) and Green (Spain and the Western Tradition, III, p. 213) correctly suggested that Zambardo was included in the eclogue to provide a necessary comic relief. Zambardo serves a definite purpose by contributing to the aggravation of Fileno's plight, but, significantly, he appears at the beginning in a comic scene which puts the audience in a mood to endure the lovers' debate between Fileno and Cardonio and again at the end, when his comic behaviour banishes the woe of Fileno's suicide.

Zambardo provides, as it were, a touchstone of reality for the idealized setting of the lovers by dampening their ardour and exposing their idealism. At the beginning of the eclogue Zambardo minimizes the importance of Fileno's complaint. The "optics of love", for example, were a conventional device in the

description of love. It was said that the lover lost his soul with the look he exchanged with his lady,[52] an image employed by Fileno to refer to his capture by Zefira:

> ...tuvo en los ojos fuerças tamañas
> que me robo el alma y las entrañas. (ll. 98-99)

Because he is sleepy, however, Zambardo cannot help Fileno recover what he has lost to Zefira. He embodies a comic twist to the conventional image since, through sleep, his eyes prevent a response to Fileno's request. He says,

> Los ojos me estan tan fuerte cerrando
> que de la luz del todo me priva. (ll. 117-118)

Zambardo's sleepiness, a conventional device (see Appendix B, s.v. "Sleep"), parodies Fileno's plight and implies that the lover's complaints are enough to drive anyone to sleep. The belittling of Fileno's situation is again evident at the end of the eclogue. Zambardo joins Cardonio's lament for Fileno, but does not remain serious for long. He begins to recite an epitaph, but forgets what he had composed[53] and, in the suelta, makes fun of Fileno's martyrdom by irreverently suggesting a petition to the pope for his canonization.[54]

Zambardo's presence in the eclogue and his debunking of the conventional ideas about love make it difficult to believe that Encina was any more serious in presenting these ideas than in Eglogas VII, VIII, X and XI. It confirms the conclusion that Encina exploited a conventional subject according to a pattern he had already developed, for the sake of the amusement it would provide. Egloga XII is not, therefore, an exceptional

piece among Encina's pastoral dramas.[55] Again the centre of interest is not so much the progress of an action as the amusement provided by certain conventional ideas on which the action is based. In this respect, Encina sought to place the conventions in a more completely illusory world, a characteristic which points to Egloga XIV, the last of Encina's dramas discussed in this chapter, in which the conventional ideas of love are also dramatized in an idealized setting.

Egloga XIV, like Egloga XI, did not appear in any edition of Encina's Cancionero. It is preserved in an unique copy, without date or place of printing, currently held in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid.[56] Even this copy is certainly not representative of Encina's original. The title describes the eclogue as newly emended and with a number of additions:

> ...agora nuevamente emendado y añadido un argumento siquier, introducion de toda la obra en coplas; y mas otras doze coplas que faltavan en las obras que de antes eran impresas. Con el Nunc dimittis trobado por el bachiller Fernando de Yanguas. (p. 227, n.1)

The "Nunc dimittis trobado" is clearly the work of Fernán López de Yanguas, a dramatist whose plays have already been discussed in this study (see above chaps. IV and VI), and the "otras doze coplas" have been shown, by Carolina Michaelis de Vasconcellos ("Notulas sobre cantares...", pp. 355-362), to be works by other poets. It is as if an anthology of love poems, all related to the subject-matter of the eclogue, had been appended to Encina's work. Moreover, given the spurious nature of the coplas and the Nunc dimittis, it is probable that the prose

argument (described in the title as coplas) was the work of a hand other than Encina's. Consequently, these additions may be disregarded in the following discussion of Egloga XIV, not only because of their suspect authorship, but also because they do not contribute further to the eclogue itself.[57]

According to Moratín (Orígenes..., ed. cit., pt. 1, p. 126), who cited no authority, Egloga XIV was printed in 1514. The length and the greater exploitation of ideas used in other eclogues are arguments which justify accepting Egloga XIV as the last of Encina's known dramas, but its date of composition is uncertain. It could be that a reference to a Castilian play about love written by Encina, who performed in it, presented at the house of the Cardinal Archbishop of Arborea on the feast of the Epiphany, 1513, in Rome, was to Egloga XIV.[58] The matter is indecisive, however, since the reference could equally apply to other plays by Encina, or even to one which has not survived.[59] Further conjecture is futile without a dated copy or some equivalent piece of evidence.

Although the longest of Encina's dramatic compositions, on account of its length Menéndez y Pelayo thought it one of the most unsatisfactory: "Es más larga que ninguna, y tiene más complicación de elementos dramáticos, ya sentimentales, ya naturalistas, ya fantásticos y mitológicos, pero no están combinados, sino meramente yuxtapuestos, con tan poco artificio, que más de la mitad de las escenas (si tal nombre merecen) podrían disgregarse, sin que se cercenara en un ápice el pobrísimo argumento"

(Antología..., III, p. 290). Cotarelo praised the eclogue as poetry, but was dissatisfied with it as drama: "Por el lenguaje y la versificación es indudablemente esta obra superior a las demás de Encina. También es más enérgica y precisa la expresión de afectos. Mas no sucede lo mismo en cuanto al diálogo, que aquí no parece, ni al movimiento dramático que asimismo es nulo" ("Juan del Encina y los orígenes...", p. 177). Apparently, therefore, the greater dimensions of Egloga XIV over Encina's earlier eclogues were not matched with an equivalent quality.

Other commentators drew attention to the contributions of pagan and supernatural elements. Mazzei described it as literary machinery (see Contributo..., p. 50-51) and Crawford found it required an explanation: "The reader need not be surprised at the unexpected dénouement, for the pastoral drama often defied all laws of probability" (The Spanish Pastoral Drama, p. 49). Crawford accounted for the supernatural elements of the eclogue as a commonplace deriving from Italian pastoral literature (Spanish Drama..., p. 27).

Certain faults of Egloga XIV are indefensible, but some of the adverse criticism is unfair and not entirely justified. The evidence of Encina's other dramas testifies that he was not over concerned with the exigencies of plot, but exploited conventional ideas and situations for their own sake. Consequently, it is not remarkable that in Egloga XIV Encina continued to apply conventions in conformity with a system he had already developed. His work must, therefore, be evaluated in these terms.

The eclogue properly begins with Plácida's entry after an introito spoken by Gil Cestero, whose function at the beginning of the work may be assessed later. Plácida appears twice before her suicide, both times to soliloquize on her distress. In the first speech Plácida's thoughts are haphazardly expressed, a disorder which reflects the uncertainty of her mood. Her essential complaint is Vitoriano's broken faith, a theme to which she repeatedly returns, speculating on his whereabouts and his reasons for leaving her. Her distress results from the void caused in her through Vitoriano's departure and loss of his love, for she reveals that she loves Vitoriano with her whole being, is subject to him and the love which bound them.

Many of the conventional notions about love appear in the course of her speech. The irresistibility of love is again presented.[60] Plácida protests that her love is uncontrollable, that her distress and attraction for Vitoriano were determined by Fate. In spite of her good family, she was born a luckless being:

> ¡O fortuna dolorosa!
> ¡O triste desfortunada,
> que no tengo dicha en cosa,
> siendo rica y poderosa,
> y de tal emparentada!
> Hados son:
> ¡en el viernes de passion
> creo que fuy batizada! (ll. 193-200)

She cannot end the liaison with Vitoriano and her suffering because the situation was pre-ordained:

Quiero sin duda ninguna
procurar de aborrecello;
mas niña, desde la cuna,
creo que Dios o Fortuna
me predestino en querello. (ll. 209-213)
.....
No le puedo querer mal
aunque a mi peor me trate. (ll. 217-218)

Consequently, her plight is unavoidable. She is completely subject to Vitoriano and cannot stop loving him:

...en su vida esta la mia.
Mi vida, mi cuerpo, y alma
en su poder se trasportan,
toda me tiene en su palma. (ll. 112-115)
.....
Confiara mis entrañas
de su minima palabra;
con sus falagueras mañas,
mama las suyas y estrañas,
como el hijo de la cabra.
Y a sabiendas,
y aun con todas sus contiendas
no vendra vez que no le abra. (ll. 137-144)

Moreover, Plácida is equally subject to love itself. As much as she condemns Vitoriano's infidelity, she also curses the god of love:

¡O traydor!
¡O maldito dios de Amor,
que me tratas tanto daño! (ll. 158-160)

Because, however, she worships at the altars of the god,

Trayote puesto en retablo
y adorote como a Dios,
¡tu eres dios y eres diablo! (ll. 161-163)

it would be tantamount to heresy to renounce Vitoriano:

¡Que se vaya! Yo estoy loca,
que digo tal heregia,
¡Lastima que tanto toca!
¿Como salio de mi boca?
¡O, que loca fantasia,
fuera, fuera! (ll. 105-110)

Plácida is in the same dilemma as Fileno in Egloga XII after he had been left by Zefira. Like him, she cannot escape her predicament and so turns to death as the only solution. She would live to serve Vitoriano,

> Conhortase con morir
> la que pena como yo;
> mas solo por le servir
> querria, triste, bivir, (ll. 121-124)

but she has lost hope:

> ...ya no espero bonança
> mi tormenta
> cada dia se acrecienta;
> va perdida me esperança. (ll. 245-248)

Nonetheless, she is not yet ready to die. She leaves the town, going into "asperas montañas" (l. 225) and "bosques mas sombrios" (l. 226), surroundings more sympathetic to her state.

If the principal elements of Plácida's first monologue show her conventional subjection to love, her second speech, pronounced before stabbing herself, emphasizes the fact. This second speech is preceded by a villancico[61] a complaint against Amor, who ignores good service, ill-treats his servants, and is deaf to all pleas. Plácida's soliloquy begins with her lament (ll. 1217-24) that the solitude of the wilderness has increased her pains. Death is now her only avenue of escape:

> Muy estraño pensamiento
> a mi flaqueza combate
> sin tener defendimiento.
> Para salir de tormento
> cumple, triste, que me mate
> sin tardança, (ll. 1225-30)

because all other hope has since been lost:

Remedio para mi llaga
no lo siento ni lo espero (ll. 1233-34)

Preparing herself, Plácida utters a final complaint against Vitoriano, equating him with the lovers of Antiquity (see Appendix B, s.v. "Love"). Above all, like Fileno, Plácida approaches death as a servant of the god of love. She begs Cupid receive her soul,

¡O Cupido!
que la recibas te pido
entre quantas has robado, (ll. 1246-48)

enjoins her body not to fear Hell,

Cuerpo tierno,
aunque vayas al infierno
ternas penas; mas no dudo, (ll. 1286-88)

and, stabbing herself, invokes Cupid's protection:

¡O Cupido, dios de Amor!
Recibe mis sacrificios,
mis primicias de dolor,
pues me diste tal señor
que desprecio mis servicios.
Ve, mi alma,
donde Amor me da por palma
la muerte por beneficios. (ll. 1305-12)

Like Fileno she is a martyr to love.[62]

From this section and from the two speeches which led to it, Plácida's role as a conventional lover is clear. She lives in an illusory world of love and in accordance with its laws; her existence depended on the love shared with Vitoriano, so that when their liaison was broken she no longer had any cause for living and took death as the only escape from the state of acute distress which resulted. Vitoriano is part of this same world and is governed by the same laws.

Vitoriano enters after Plácida's first monologue and his first speech, like hers, is also a lament. A conventional lover, he is also captive of his love:

> ¡O desdichado de mi!
> ¿Que es de ti, Vitoriano?
> ¿Coraçon estas aqui?
> Yo me acuerdo que te vi
> preso, libre, enfermo y sano.
> Mas agora
> cativo de tal señora,
> ¿como saldras de su mano? (ll. 257-264)

and his life vacillates between the experience of happiness and pain, with small hope of finding peace:

> Nunca espero libertarme
> de tan dichosa prision,
> ni de aquesta fe apartarme;
> es ya imposible mudarme
> que alla queda el coraçon.
> Mi desseo
> crece quando no la veo. (ll. 265-272)

His situation is akin to Pláçida's: love causes suffering and a desire to escape it, but any attempt only causes renewed pain. In this plight, Vitoriano resolves to seek advice, like Fileno in Egloga XII, and eventually decides to look for Suplicio ("que sepa concejo darme / y que muy secreto fuesse", ll. 292-293).

Vitoriano then explains his problems anew. Suplicio's suggested cure is to forget one love by finding another. Vitoriano is reluctant, believing it will not help him because he feels his suffering is far greater than any experienced through love before. When finally persuaded, he agrees to try his fortune with one Fulgencia. The courtship scene, her conversation with Eritea,

and the relevance of the entire episode to the eclogue as a whole will be discussed later. The episode does not benefit Vitoriano, however, but makes him realize he is as subject as ever to his old love. Although acknowledging Flugencia's qualities, Vitoriano cannot subdue his attraction for Plácida. He tells Suplicio,

> Suplicio, daca la mano,
> a fe te do como a hermano
> que a mi no me agrada cosa.
> Y bien se
> que lo haze que mi fe
> sin Plácida no reposa, (ll. 795-800)

earnestly praises Plácida, and ends by confessing his continued subjection to her:

> Dentro en mi contemplo en ella;
> siempre con ella me sueño;
> no puedo partirme della. (ll. 817-819)

As a result, even Suplicio is led to remark that Vitoriano is beyond recall:

> Desde agora me despido
> de te dar concejo mas.
> Estas della tan vencido
> que jamas pornas olvido. (ll. 825-828)

When asked for an honest assessment, the only piece of advice he can give is "morir o vencer" (l. 853). Thus Vitoriano leaves to find Plácida.

He is not away long, however, since Plácida's absence is soon discovered. Some shepherds reported that, lamenting her lost lover, she had gone into the wilderness. Vitoriano's response matches Plácida's behaviour at the beginning of the eclogue. He also resolves to go into the wilderness and, as if to expiate his

lost love and the faults committed in the service of Amor, sacrifice his life:

> Soy contento de morir
> por los yermos despoblados,
> pues que no supe seguir,
> amar, querer y servir
> amores tan acabados. (ll. 961-965)

Suplicio, however, decides to accompany him and share his affliction. They question the shepherd who had seen Plácida pass by and then leave to find her.

Vitoriano and Suplicio again appear after a rustic scene between two shepherds and after Plácida's suicide. When Suplicio and Vitoriano enter, the latter despairs of ever finding Plácida (ll. 1321-1420). They find Plácida's body soon after, a discovery which completes Vitoriano's despair:

> Mi dolor
> ya no puede ser mayor.
> ¡Ay, que el alma se me va! (ll. 1450-52)

He falls faint and when revived by Suplicio tries to kill himself. Suplicio restrains him, urges him to be reasonable,

> Da lugar a la razon,
> que estas agora con passion, (ll. 1503-04)

and to remember his soul and reputation:

> ¿Tu quieres perder ell alma
> con el cuerpo? ¿Tu estas loco?
> ¿Quieres de loco aver palma?
> Dexa estar tu fama en calma,
> no la tengas en tan poco. (ll. 1509-13)[63]

For the moment, Vitoriano is calmed and promises not to harm himself while help is sought to bury Plácida's body.

The section following Suplicio's departure, Vitoriano's

Vigilia de la enamorada muerta, occupies a central position and is an integral part of the eclogue. Since it is about a quarter of its entire length (from l.1548 to l. 2186) it cannot be dismissed as an unnecessary interpolation without a very adequate explanation.[64] Plácida and Vitoriano are conventional lovers and it is quite natural for Vitoriano's vigil over the body of his dead mistress to be framed within the conventions of which the lovers themselves are formed. The entire section is thus a reconstructed Officium Defunctorum, in which the prayers of the Latin ceremony are glossed in Castilian and directed to the pagan deities of love instead of to a Christian God. A thorough analysis of the Vigilia to show how the Officium Defunctorum was adapted is unnecessary. It is sufficient to illustrate, with a few lines of quotation, how the conventional ideas about love, as exploited throughout Encina's eclogues, are evident in Vitoriano's lament for himself and the dead Plácida.

Vitoriano addresses the pagan deities, invoking their attention at the beginning of the Vigilia:

> ¡Dios de amor,
> oye tu mi gran clamor,
> entiende mis pensamientos!
>
> Intende mis oraciones,
> intende mis sacrificios,
> entiende mis oblaciones,
> entiende mis devociones,
> no desprecies mis servicios,
> que son tales,
> que conforman con los males
> que me das por beneficios. (ll. 1599-1609)

His submission to them is total and he begs for death as a deliverance

from suffering:

> Introibo en casa tuya
> y aun adorare al tu templo
> pues que soy primicia tuya. (ll. 1650-52)
> .....
> Convertere, dios Cupido,
> saca mi alma del mundo,
> esto te ruego y te pido,
> no lo pongas en olvido;
> da con ella en el profundo,
> con aquesta
> que robaste agora; desta
> sea yo luego el segundo. (ll. 1722-29)

He also prays for Plácida's repose, asking for her to be given the honours of a martyr to love:

> Asuelve, señor, el alma
> de Placida de cadena;
> torna su tormenta en calma,
> y dale vitoria y palma,
> ab omni malo sin pena. (ll. 2099-2103)

Throughout the Vigilia the conventional ideas of love are expressed in the conventions of religion. Lines already cited demonstrate the point, but to them may be added a few more in which the ritual of accepted religion is transposed to suit the ideas of love:

> Cupido, kirieleyson,
> diva Venus, Christeleyson,
> Cupido, kirieleyson.
>
> Et ne nos inducas, dios,
> donde alguno este entre nos;
> sed librala, Amor, a malo
> y a mi dalo,
> y estemos juntos los dos,
> Ne tradas bestiis al alma
> de mi amiga,
> y a mi dame la fatiga. (ll. 2081-91)[65]

From this section of the eclogue, a whole code, with love as a religion exactly paralleling Christianity, could be extracted.

In this respect, the Vigilia illustrates the existence of the personages in a totally illusory world, in which love is supreme. They are not governed by the normal rules of behaviour because love and its rules have become the sole justification for their existence. Consequently, when Vitoriano has concluded his prayers, he resolves to take his own life and allow his spirit to join that of his departed mistress:

> Plácida, quiero que vaya
> mi anima con la tuya,
> entre o caya donde caya,
> la mia quiero que aya
> parte de la pena suya;
> con morir
> ya lo entiendo de seguir,
> aunque en el infierno huya. (ll. 2155-62)

Before witnessing Vitoriano's attempted suicide, however, a further rustic scene occurs. Suplicio tries to persuade the shepherds Gil Cestero and Pascual to hurry and bury Plácida and is, in turn, persuaded to rest the night first. Apart from providing a necessary comic relief after the long Vigilia, the rustic scene is a necessary interval for Vitoriano to find a dagger with which to kill himself.[66] Vitoriano then sacrifices himself in the same spirit as Plácida. He will also die for love, but feeling that Cupid has abandoned him he offers himself to Venus:

> ¡O, Venus! dea graciosa,
> a ti quiero y a ti llamo;
> toma mi alma penosa
> pues eres muy pïadosa
> a ti sola aora llamo,
> que tu hijo
> tiene conmigo letijo,
> nunca escucha mi reclamo.

A ti mi bien verdadero,
mis sacrificios se den,
como te los dio primero
tu siervo Leandro y Hero,
Tisbe y Piramo tambien;
tu, señora,
recibe mi alma agora. (ll. 2299-2313)

The goddess hears his plea, bids him stay his hand, and explains that Plácida's death was only a test:

No quieras desesperar,
que esto todo
ha sido manera y modo
de tu fe esperimentar. (ll. 2319-22)

She is not really dead,

Placida no se mato
sino por matar a ti,
y no es muerta;
yo te la dare despierta
antes que vamos de aqui. (ll. 2326-30)

Venus charges Vitoriano to trust her and to love Plácida as before. She then summons Mercury to resurrect Plácida. The lovers are reunited and praise the dieties who achieved the miracle.

Plácida's resurrection by supernatural beings solves the central problem of the eclogue with a veritable deus ex machina, but is perfectly in keeping with the tone of the play and the characterization of its two principal personages. Plácida and Vitoriano inhabit the conventional phantasy of an idealized world, the gods of which are pagan deities who readily intervene on behalf of those who believe in them, just as they did in the legends of Antiquity. The "coglomeration of the sacred and the profane", as Crawford described the eclogue, adding the epithet "grotesque" (Spanish Drama..., p. 27), is necessary to

present Plácida and Vitoriano as conventional lovers, since throughout Egloga XIV the conventional notions of secular love are embodied in a pagan religion exactly paralleling Christianity. In this sense there is no conglomeration, nor simple juxtaposition of the sacred and the profane. On the contrary, the profane has adopted the sacred as a medium of expression.

As a parody of religious practice and belief, Egloga XIV follows a long established tradition of burlesque literature in Spain. Otis H. Green wrote on this subject (Spain and the Western Tradition, III p. 205) that "neither the author nor his audience were overstepping the limits of what was permitted by the conventional medieval taste for humourous blasphemy". Bruce Wardropper remarked on the combination of religious and secular elements in the eclogue that the play was a secularization of the religious resurrection theme, so startlingly presented "that it has the impact of a parody, if not actually blasphemy" ("Metamorphosis...", p. 49). His view was too serious, however. Although purposefully intended, the parody of religion contains no implicit criticism, since it was a conventional device[67] and served to portray the personages so dominated by their love that it became as much the reason for their existence as any formal religion. There is, also, an undoubted source of humour in his parody. If Egloga XIV was performed in the house of the Cardinal Archbishop of Arborea the parody of the Office for the Dead in the Vigilia de la enamorada muerta and the presentation of Plácida and Vitoriano as pagan fanatics must have amused the

clerics in the audience.

Discussing the suicide presented in Egloga XIV, Otis H. Green drew attention to the mitigation of its force. He wrote (Spain and the Western Tradition, III, p. 205) that "the suicide is not genuine and the 'resurrection' is accomplished by the intervention of mythical deities, in an atmosphere of unreality".[68] This is precisely the point. Plácida and Vitoriano are involved in phantasy, and it may be shown that Encina did not intend their situation to be taken seriously, but to be accepted as make-believe. Alongside the two lovers is another world with which they are compared and which provides a basis for viewing them as products of illusion. This world is represented by the remaining characters and those episodes of the action alluded to above only in passing.

Suplicio is a figure comparable with Cardonio in Egloga XII or Justino in Egloga XI as the friend and advisor of the distressed lover, but he has an ambivalent role in the eclogue. Suplicio becomes involved in the lovers' world through Vitoriano's need for advice. Vitoriano considers him well versed in the ways of love (ll. 420-421, "...en las cosas de amigas / ya tu eres perro viejo") and Suplicio himself shows sympathy and understanding for Vitoriano's problem. After the unsuccessful courtship of Flugencia, Suplicio grants Vitoriano's invincible subjection to Plácida and offers advice appropriate to the lover's feelings: "¡Deves morir o vencer!" (l. 853). Moreover, when Vitoriano has left to find and reconcile himself to Plácida, Suplicio

soliloquizes on the change caused in Vitoriano by love. With its tirade against Cupid, the beginning of the speech could easily have been spoken by either of the two lovers:

> Infernal furia de fuego,
> o traydor, falso Cupido,
> bien das porradas de ciego;
> donde hieras dexas luego
> el dolor muy encendido.
> ¡Quien dixera
> que Vitoriano saliera
> tan fuera de su sentido! (ll. 865-872)

Although capable of understanding and sympathy, Suplicio never completely shares Plácida and Vitoriano's illusion, but is attached to another world. At the height of Vitoriano's trial, when he discovered Plácida's body, Suplicio restrained him from suicide. He advised Vitoriano, as Cardonio did Fileno in Egloga XII, to be reasonable and to remember his soul and reputation (see above n. 63). Furthermore, the episodes in the action, contrasting with the phantasy of Plácida and Vitoriano, are introduced through Suplicio's mediation. He suggested courtship of Flugencia to forget Plácida, and after Vitoriano's unsuccessful attempt the conversation between Flugencia and Eritea is presented. He made further enquiry from the shepherd Pascual before leaving to find Plácida, thereby introducing the first of the rustic scenes--Vitoriano did not speak to the shepherd. Finally, Suplicio introduced the two remaining rustic scenes by summoning the shepherds to help bury Plácida. He stands, therefore, as the liaison between the lovers and the rest of the personages in the eclogue.

When Suplicio advised a new love to cure the old and suggested

courtship of Flugencia, Vitoriano hesitatingly agreed. In Vitoriano's opinion Flugencia cannot compare with Plácida, although he eventually agrees to her beauty:

> ...es de gran ecelencia
> Flugencia mas que ninguna. (ll. 443-444)
> .....
> ...basta su hermosura
> para quitar qualquier mal
> y qualquier pena mortal,
> que el remedio esta en ventura. (ll. 458-461)

Suplicio describes her as a "linda criatura" (l. 464) and, after the event, Vitoriano says she is a "muger de pro" (l. 786), but there is every reason to believe that she is neither a "muger de pro" nor "muy linda".

The courtship follows the conventional pattern of the requesta scene. Thus, when Vitoriano avows he is overwhelmed by Flugencia's beauty and offers himself in her service, she is non-committal and replies with a hint of mockery.[69] The difference between this and the conventional pastoral courtship scene, however, is that Flugencia is not a simple shepherdess, but a hardened courtesane. She belittles Vitoriano's praise of her beauty, for her mirror tells a different story:

> ¡Bueno es esso!
> aun soy yo de carne y hueso;
> alla a las que piedras son.
>
> Espejo tengo muy claro
> que me dize la verdad
> quando a remirar me paro.
> A muchos cuesta muy caro
> creerse de liviandad. (ll. 574-581)

Although teasing him, she nonetheless gives Vitoriano reason for hope, which he avidly seizes. When told that his attentions will

in time be rewarded, he is anxious to gain immediate entry to the house and access to Flugencia, evidently for the same purpose that Calisto had for entering Melibea's garden. The event is postponed, however, by Eritea's arrival and Flugencia's promise that Vitoriano's desires will eventually be satisfied.

The dialogue between Flugencia and Eritea following the courtship scene accentuates Flugencia's worldly character. Eritea's greeting, although not necessarily to be taken literally, further contradicts the opinions of Suplicio and Vitoriano about Flugencia's beauty:

> Buenas noches os de Dios.
> Flugencia, como estas fea,
> tal venga siempre por vos. (ll. 649-651)

The dialogue mostly concerns Eritea's livelihood. She is on her way to assist at a pretended childbirth which will allow her to blackmail the supposed father. It transpires from the conversation, however, that midwifery and extortion are not Eritea's sole claims to fame. Like Celestina, Eritea also attends to the restoration of lost virtue and she reveals (ll. 697-699) that she has tended to innumerable patients. Flugencia shows a familiarity with Eritea's business and the seamy side of life hardly in keeping with a "muger de pro". Moreover, it is clear that Flugencia has found it necessary to require the administrations of the bawd:

> Eritea: Hago el virgo tan estrecho,
> que van bien descalabrados
> mas de dos;
> ¡esto bien lo sabeys vos!
> Flugencia: Ya lo se, por mis pecados. (ll. 700-704)

The inclusion of the dialogue between Flugencia and Eritea

was undoubtedly influenced by the popularity of the Celestina.[70] The episode would have amused the audience and provided some comic relief after the high drama of the affair between Plácida and Vitoriano. To this extent, the scene is a piece of popular convention, but the mere fact that these unsavoury creatures, Eritea and Flugencia, are introduced and the idealistic Vitoriano is involved with them is enough to diminish the importance of the lover's ideals and problems. After the uncompromising view of love presented through the conversation between the whore and the bawd it is impossible to believe that either Encina or his audience could have been seriously concerned with the plight of Plácida and Vitoriano and the illusions they built around their love.

It may be readily granted that the shepherds also appear in Egloga XIV primarily as comic relief to counter-balance the gravity of the central action; but there is more to it than that. In Crawford's words, they serve "as a foil to the extravagance of the protagonists" (Spanish Drama..., p. 27). The shepherds are necessary because they provide the basis on which the illusions of Plácida and Vitoriano can be accepted. In part they appear, for the same reason as Zambardo in the dramatization of Tebaldeo's eclogue, to justify the performance, since the mere appearance of shepherds could establish the eclogue as drama and the picture it presents as imaginary (see above n. 51).

This role is virtually spelled out, before the play proper has begun, in the prologue spoken by Gil Cestero. The measure of

the performance is set by this shepherd, who announces his purpose to the audience:

> ...daros algun solacio
> y gasajo y alegria. (ll. 17-18)

A few lines later he adds,

> Y aun verna mas compañia.
> ¿Sabeys quien?
> Gente que sabra muy bien
> mostraros su fantasia. (ll. 21-24)

With this introduction, the eclogue must be viewed as an entertainment and a phantasy.

Gil Cestero continues the prologue with a synopsis of the action; then, before calling the audience to attention and commanding the play to begin, he states,

> Yo me quiero aqui quedar
> que seremos dos pastores,
> y con ellos razonar. (ll. 81-83)

Gil Cestero addressed the audience directly and announced that a phantasy was to be performed in which he would appear. The relationship he established in this prologue continues during the eclogue proper, so that the audience can view the central action as a series of imaginary events through the conventional responses of the shepherds and, thereby, connect it to a normal reality. In this respect, Gil Cestero and Pascual are indispensable. They do not belong to the illusory world of Plácida and Vitoriano and, consequently, raise the same objections to it which would have occured to the audience. Thus the shepherds provide a basis on which the illusion can be accepted simply by establishing it as illusion. The devices employed by Encina to do this are

comedy and parody, so that the outcome is the same as for the episode involving Flugencia and Eritea: the seriousness of the lovers' plight is questioned and made an object of little concern.

The first rustic scene is introduced by Suplicio, who suggests he and Vitoriano question the shepherds concerning Plácida's whereabouts before searching for her. Suplicio calls to Pascual to hurry toward them. Pascual cannot, however, and explains he is in pain; but his distress is not the same as Vitoriano's burden. The shepherd's misfortune occurred during a wrestling match and is more mundane, but his injury and suffering are described in terms parallel to the lovers' emotional disturbance. Pascual, with similar exaggeration, finds himself equally incapacitated for life:

> Tal dolor tengo y passion
> que ya no juego al cayado,
> ni a la chueca, ni al mojon,
> ni aun a cobra, compañon,
> ni corro tras el ganado;
> que no puedo
> sino estar aqui a pie quedo
> jugando al puto del dado. (ll. 1017-24)

Pascual and, later, Gil Cestero, tell all they know, but, after Suplicio and Vitoriano have departed, cannot refrain from commenting on the effects of love among townsfolk. Gil, with a less exotic oath than the protagonists' invocation of the mythical deities, exclaims,

> ¡O Jesu, Jesu, Jesu!
> El amor no se quien hu,
> mas muy malas vidas da. (ll. 1082-85)

Pascual is even more vehemently critical of townsfolk and their bedevilment through love:

> ¡Dalos a ravia y a roña
> los de villa y palaciegos!
> El amor les endimoña.
> Peores son que ponçoña,
> todos son unos rapiegos
> lladrobazes
> que nunca querrian pazes.
> ¡Dios les de malos sossiegos! (ll. 1105-12)

Undoubtedly, Pascual's vehemence derives in part from a conventional animosity between the town and the country (see Appendix B, s.v. "Town and country contrasted"), but his statement is nonetheless valid from the standpoint of his view on life and the view of the audience. The shepherds are somewhat more down-to-earth. They turn from the affairs of others and enjoy a game of dice, gambling for various implements of their rustic trade and other effects which they hope to win and present to their respective shepherdesses. Their activity is a far cry from the illusions of Plácida and Vitoriano, whose affair is a matter of life and death.

The second of the rustic scenes, also introduced by Suplicio, who calls the shepherds to help bury Plácida, further debunks the lovers' illusions. Pascual and Gil are surprised making garlands when Suplicio arrives. Not recognizing the newcomer, their instinctive reaction is fear for their safety and their flocks. When at ease, they listen to Suplicio's explanation of Plácida's suicide and urgent request for help in the burial because Vitoriano, "que en peligro queda y loco" (l. 2266), is keeping vigil. Although the shepherds genuinely regret Plácida's death, their attitude deflates Suplicio's sense of urgency and disperses

any sense of impending doom as far as Vitoriano is concerned. The shepherds are in no mood to hurry and insist on sleeping first. Their insistence, a characteristic of the comic rustic (see Appendix B, s.v. "Sleep")[71] removes all urgency and importance from the lovers' situation and qualifies Vitoriano's possible attempt at suicide, which in fact follows this scene, as a matter of no serious concern.[72]

The final rustic scene, also the final scene of the eclogue, occurs after Plácida's resurrection. Suplicio awakens the sleeping shepherds, telling them to hurry now that it is dawn. Pascual and Gil are more prompt to respond than before and set out, composing an epitaph to place on Plácida's grave.[73] They soon sight two figures approaching them, whom they distinguish as Plácida and Vitoriano. Gil, Pascual, and Suplicio all react with amazement and incredulity:

Gil: ¿Es posible?
Suplicio: ¡O milagro tan terrible!
Pascual: ¡Dios me libre della y del!

Deve ser qualque fantasma,
o vos nos aveys burlado.
Cata, cata
una muger que se mata
¿puede a vida aver tornado? (ll. 2520-27)

As far as they are concerned, the occurrence is impossible. Their reaction distinguishes the world of Plácida and Vitoriano from conventional reality. Return from the dead can only occur in a situation where the norms of behaviour are suspended. Hence, their reaction classifies the episode as illusion and connects its unreality with the audience's sense of reality.

Viewing the eclogue as a whole, there are certain grounds on which it must be faulted. The lovers' laments, particularly the Vigilia de la enamorada muerta, are repetitiously long. The overall structure of the eclogue cannot be condemned, however, without certain reservations. Although the action appears to alternate restlessly between the illusory situation of the lovers' plight and the scene of conventional reality, the continual change of tone is in part accountable to the progress of the action and a balanced structure. Comedy and gravity are effectively counter-balanced. The scene containing the courtship of Flugencia and her dialogue with Eritea is welcome after Plácida and Vitoriano have both unburdened their souls; the rustic scenes provide a similar relief from the central action and also permit its progress. Thus, the shepherds' reluctance to return to Vitoriano with Suplicio provides a necessary delay for Vitoriano to find a dagger and attempt suicide (see above nn. 66 and 72). Moreover, even if the scenes with Flugencia and Eritea and those with the rustics did not further the action, they are not gratuitously attached to it. They are introduced through the mediation of Suplicio and contribute to its completion. Flugencia is a possible cure for Vitoriano's malady and the shepherds are sought for information about Plácida and for help in the burial of her body.

Some defence of the "conglomeration of the sacred and the profane" can also be offered. At all levels, from the comic rustics and the celestinesque Eritea to the fanaticism of Plácida

and Vitoriano, Encina exploited conventional, popular devices of character and situation. Just as the shepherds were expected to be simpletons and a source of humour, the lovers predictably associated themselves with a world of pagan mythology and made their love a religion to parallel Christianity. Encina, therefore, entertained no serious purpose; neither he nor his audience were seriously concerned with Plácida's plight. The entire situation is an entertainment.

If there was no serious concern, however, Egloga XIV was nonetheless seriously written. Encina wrote on two levels: on one hand is the conventional reality of the minor personages, on the other the conventional illusion of Plácida and Vitoriano. Through these two elements, Encina hoped to establish an imaginary picture of two lovers which would exist with its own rules of verisimilitude. Consequently, in the prologue he introduced the eclogue as a phantasy and during the action there intervened a number of scenes of conventional reality on which the illusions of Plácida and Vitoriano could be founded. By this method the lovers' plight could be accepted as an imaginary picture; but the failure of the eclogue is that this picture is unacceptable because it is not supported by the personages who do not share the lovers' illusion. These personages debunk the ideals held by Plácida and Vitoriano and invalidate them even as phantasy. Moreover, as a parody of conventional religion, the lovers' beliefs and behaviour cannot be seriously entertained because they are an inherent source of ridicule.[74] The overall result is that

even the illusion of Egloga XIV is impossible.

Essentially what Encina attempted was a theatrical illusion with its own rules of verisimilitude and independence of conventional reality. He already understood the concept of transforming an actor into a character and experimented with it in the eclogues he performed in the household of the Duke and Duchess of Alba, where the occasion of performance was also, in part, the subject of the play. With the story of Plácida and Vitoriano, he sought to create an independent picture. That he failed is no real discredit; it was enough to have understood the principle.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER IX

[1]For further editions of Eglogas VII and VIII, see Eglogas ..., pp. 93 and 105.

[2]Eglogas I and II were possibly, but not necessarily, earlier than Eglogas VII and VIII (see above chap. II, no. 6). Egloga IX was certainly later, since it contains a reference to the year 1498 (see above chap. II, n. 7).

[3]The semantics of these references are discussed below (see n. 5). It is clear, however, that they refer both to the fiction of Egloga VIII and its performance in relation to Egloga VII. Mingo alludes to the passage of a year since the events enacted in Egloga VII:

> Oy haze, ¡por mi dolor!
> un año punto por punto,
> que me dexaste defunto
> sin amiga y sin favor,
> y te tornaste pastor
> por tu provecho y mi daño, (Egl. VIII, ll. 146-151)

and Gil suggests a celebration of the anniversary:

> Hagamos oy, cabo de año
> en memoria del amor. (Egl. VIII, ll. 152-153)

Later, Gil and Pascuala state that a year has passed since the performance of Egloga VII in the palace of the Duke and Duchess of Alba:

> Gil: Pues aqui fue el descordojo
> que passamos ora un año.
> Pascuala: Henos aqui donde antaño. (Egl. VIII, ll. 178-180)

[4]See, for example, Alvarez de la Villa, El aucto del repelón, pp. 157 and 168, Crawford, Spanish Drama..., pp. 15-16, and Cotarelo, Cancionero de Juan del Encina (Academy facsimile), p. 22.

[5]The phrase "cabo de año" occurs twice (l. 54 and l. 152) in Egloga VIII. The second usage clearly means "first anniversary" and refers to the events of Egloga VII, which took place exactly a year before. This meaning is found in the current Academy dictionary and also in Covarrubias (ed. Martín de Riquer, p. 254b, ll. 54-56): "Cabo de año, la memoria y sufragios que se hazen por el difunto cumplido el año que murió". The phrase is, therefore, appropriately used by Gil (l. 152) to suggest an anniversary celebration since Mingo had just proclaimed (ll. 146-

151) that, exactly a year to the day, he had been left "defunto". This meaning cannot apply to Mingo's earlier use (l. 54) of the word "cabo", however, since it is not clear to what anniversary he might be referring. Probably he uses the word with the Academy Dictionary sense of "cualquiera de los dos extremos de las cosas", or in Covarrubias' definition (p. 254b, ll. 59-60): "Cabos, las estremidades". Mingo could, therefore, have been referring to either the beginning or the end of the year, the conclusion reached in this study as to the respective dates of Eglogas VII and VIII.

[6]See above n. 2. It is not certain, however, that Egloga IX was presented before the Duke and Duchess of Alba (see above chap. II, n. 31).

[7]A New History of Spanish Literature, Oxford, 1926, p. 154. (See, however, the Marqués de Santillana, Obras..., ed. Amador de los Ríos, pp. 475-477, "Serranilla IX".)

[8]See Faral ("La Pastourelle", pp. 218-226) for the comic role of the shepherd and his relationship with the chevalier.

[9]The language is a further point of contrast between the shepherd and the escudero. The former has a rustic jargon, the latter a more polished courtly speech employing the conventionalized language of love.

[10]See Otis H. Green's description of courtly love in Spain and the Western Tradition (I, pp. 72 ff.), particularly his explanation of the concepts of Frauendienst and Vassallität.

[11]Pascuala reserves a polite style of speech for the escudero, indicative of his status as a palaciego and contrasting with the familiar forms she uses when addressing Mingo.

[12]Faral wrote of the chevalier's behaviour in the pastourelle: "Où est ici cet humble servant, mains jointes et genou plié devant sa suzeraine? cet amant qui n'ose requérir et dont toute la hardiesse se borne à espérer? qui ne cherche dans l'amour que la "joie", ce sentiment sublime, où la volupté a été purifiée aux souffles de l'âme? qui ne veut l'amour de sa dame qu'en récompense d'une longue série d'épreuves et de soins attentifs? Le héros de pastourelle est d'une autre humeur. Ses moyens de persuasion, c'est le compliment flatteur, c'est un présent, c'est la force. Ce qu'il demande, c'est le seul plaisir de ses sens. De mariage, naturellement, point question: bien naïve qui le lui demanderait! et si un jour quelqu'un s'y risque, il a beau l'avoir trouvée 'tout aussi plaisant' et 'aussi savorée' ... il tire pays et laisse la trop simple dupe à ses pleurs" ("La Pastourelle", pp. 232-233). This is exactly the type that both Mingo and Pascuala see in the escudero. Mingo (ll. 69-72) accuses the

escudero of having deceived others already and Pascuala (ll. 55-56 and 61-62) refuses to be tricked by flattery. The escudero may be a courtier and express himself with courtly conventions, but his reputation as a seducer precedes him.

[13]The escudero asks Mingo,

> ¿Que aprovecha tu querer,
> que no tienes que le dar?
> Y la fe y el bien amar
> en las obras se ha de ver, (ll. 105-108)

and then dismisses Mingo's list of rustic fare and abilities:

> Calla, calla, que es grossero
> todo quanto tu le das. (ll. 161-162)

[14]The Duke and Duchess remain, however, to watch the eclogue which follows.

[15]Compare these lines with the refrain to the villancico at the end of the anonymous Christmas Egloga interlocutoria:

> Demonos al alegria,
> pues vemos que los pesares,
> ellos se vienen a pares. (ll. 358-360)

[16]This is not, however, the type of palinode described by Otis H. Green (see Spain and the Western Tradition, IV, p. 329, s.v. "Palinode") containing the author's recantation of his errors. Encina simply re-dedicated himself to his patrons. It is of little consequence that he later employed his talents for purposes other than the service of the Duke and Duchess. Encina's resolve was conventional and could be broken as easily as it was made (see Juliá Martínez, "La literatura dramática peninsular...", p. 263).

[17]Among others, Crawford saw this as the function of the first part of Egloga VIII (see Spanish Drama..., p. 16).

[18]Compare these lines with the following from Egloga I:

> ¡Ya te presumes de gala
> que te arrojes al palacio!
> ¡Andar mucho en ora mala!
> ¿Cuydas que eres para en sala?
> ¡No te vien de gerenacio! (ll. 50-54)

[19]The lines are incorrectly numbered in Eglogas... from l. 290 onward, l. 289 having been omitted in the count. For easy location of references, however, the mistaken numbering is preserved.

[20]Menga even asks, "¿Que mude como culebra / los mis cueros?" (ll. 388-389). The image also occurs in other plays. See, for example, the anonymous Egloga interlocutoria,

> Ala fe, chapado consejo!
> quiero mudar el pellejo,
> que del aldea reniego. (ll. 23-25)

[21]Andrews overlooked that Encina presented himself as Beneyto, not Juan, in Egloga V, a work placed before Egloga VIII even in Andrews chronology. It is difficult to envisage that Encina found it necessary to resort to such complicated subterfuge in order to communicate with his patrons. Moreover, if he was so disatisfied with them, it is strange to see him still in their service when three years later, still complaining, so Andrews argued, he performed Egloga IX for their benefit.

[22]See Mia Gerhardt's discussion of Eglogas VII and VIII in relation to the conventions of the pastourelle (La Pastorale..., pp. 132-135).

[23]See, for example, Amor's self-portrait in Cota's Diálogo (ed. cit., pp. 582-584).

[24]For a bibliography of the editions of Egloga X, see Eglogas..., p. 139.

[25]The publication of Encina's Cancionero in 1496, in which Egloga X was not included, provides a terminus post quem for the composition of the eclogue. The death of the Prince, to whom Egloga X was dedicated, on 6th October, 1497, provides the terminus ante quem. The royal wedding, falling between these two dates would, therefore, have been an appropriate occasion of performance (see Diccionario de historia de España, II, pp. 119-120).

[26]The whole of this part of the eclogue is comparable with Cota's Diálogo, which contains a similar allegorization of Amor and subjection of a victim. The essential differences between Cota's dialogue and Encina's eclogue, apart from their relative qualifications as drama, are the comic overtones of the latter. (See Richard F. Glenn, "Rodrigo Cota's Diálogo entre el amor y un viejo: Debate or Drama?" Hispania, XLVIII, 1965, 51-56.)

[27]George Ticknor's comment on Encina's plays (Historia de la literatura española, ed. cit., I, p. 280), "Todas carecen de enredo y demás accidentes que constituyen el drama", is, therefore, invalid. It does not make allowance for the techniques, however primitive, and subjects which Encina exploited in his eclogues.

[28]For a bibliography of editions of Egloga XI, see Eglogas..., p. 157.

[29]Egloga de Plácida y Vitoriano, Clásicos Ebro, Zaragoza, 1954, p. 18.

[30]In Lucas Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado the suffering lover, Prabos, refers to several personages who appear in Encina's eclogues:

> Phileno, el se mato
> y murio
> por amores de Zafira.
> .....
> Tambien me ñembra Pelayo,
> aquel quel amor hyrio.
> .....
> ...aun Mingo, si se decrala,
> por Pascuala
> mill quillotranças passo.
> .....
> Y aun Christino en religion
> se metio y dexo su hato. (Cii-r)

Later, in the same work, the shepherd Pascual says,

> Dende aqui al diablo do
> a rapaz de tan ruyn maña.
> Este cuydo, enla montaña,
> ogaño a un pastor hirio, (Ciii-v)

lines which Cotarelo understood to be a reference to Pelayo's quarrel with Amor in Encina's Egloga X. Cotarelo further supposed that by "ogaño" Pascuala meant "this year", that is, 1497, when Egloga X was performed (see above n. 25). He therefore concluded that Fernández's Farsa was written in 1497 and that the eclogues by Juan del Encina alluded to in it were written at their latest in the same year. Cotarelo used this argument as a basis for dating a number of plays by the two Salamancan dramatists, upon which he commented in the prologues to the Academy facsimiles of Fernández's Farsas y églogas (pp. xviii-xix) and Encina's Cancionero (pp. 24-26).

Cotarelo's conclusions were disputed by Crawford. In two articles ("The Source of Encina's Egloga de Fileno y Zambardo", RHi, XXXVIII, 1916, 218-231, and "Encina's Egloga de Fileno, Zambardo y Cardonio and Antonio Tebaldeo's Second Eclogue", HR, II, 1934, 327-333) he demonstrated conclusively that Encina's Egloga XII was derived from an Italian poem and must have been written between 1507 and 1509. Fernández's Farsa, in which Fileno and Zefira, the lovers of Egloga XII, are alluded to, could not, therefore, have been written in 1497,

and Egloga XI is not necessarily of that year. Of the date of Egloga XI, it may only be said that it was written and known before 1514, the date Fernández's Farsas y églogas were published.

It may also be added that the subject of a shepherd wounded by love was also to be found in a popular ballad as well as in Encina's play. (See, Carolina Michaelis de Vasconcellos, "Notulas sobre cantares e vilhancicos peninsulares e a respeito de Juan del Encina", RFE, V, 1918, 337-366). Pascual's reference to "ogaño" could simply have been the topicality of common knowledge rather than allusion to a specific year.

[31]The idea of canonizing a shepherd because of his troubles is also found in Egloga XII, where it is suggested that Fileno's cause, as a martyr to love, be taken up with the pope (see below analysis of Egloga XII).

[32]Praise of the country life is a convention of the pastoral drama. Compare Justino's description with Mingo's speech in Egloga VIII (ll. 330-336 and 342-365) when the shepherd is about to abandon his country life and become a courtier.

[33]On the conventional idea of life's vanity and fugacity, see J. Huizinga, The Waning of the Middle Ages, Peregrine Books, 1965, pp. 134-146, and the Coplas of Jorge Manrique. The lover's flight from society when beset by overwhelming problems was conventional in the early Spanish pastoral drama (see the following plays discussed below: Encina's Egloga XIV, Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella, the anonymous Coplas de la doncella, el pastor y el salvaje, and the Farsa by Juan de París).

[34]In Eglogas..., the lines after 605 of Egloga XI are unnumbered.

[35]Cf. ll. 134-140, cited above.

[36]See Egloga X, ll. 1-20 and 91-100.

[37]See Egloga X, ll. 31-70 and, also, the descriptions of love in Egloga VIII, ll. 273-288 and 514-557.

[38]The temptation of a hermit was not uncommon, however, but even a popular subject of paintings. The triptych by Hieronymous Bosch, The Temptation of Saint Anthony (Lisbon, Museum of Fine Arts), was executed about 1500.

[39]Contributo allo studio delle fonti italiane del teatro di Juan del Enzina e Torres Naharro, Lucca, 1922, pp. 40-42.

[40]Juliá Martínez thought that Egloga XI derived from "la crisis espiritual sufrida un día por el escritor, reflejada en su poesía 'a una señora de quien se enamoró estando muy apartado de amores y metido en devoción'" ("La literatura dramática

peninsular...", pp. 265-266). See, also, Crawford, The Spanish Pastoral Drama, p. 43.

[41]Compare Cristino's lament with the following lines spoken by the old man at the end of Cota's Diálogo:

> A do estauas, mi sentido?
> dime, como te dormiste?
> Durmiosse triste, perdido,
> como haze el dolorido
> que escucho de quien oyste. (ed, cit., p. 587)

[42]For a bibliography of editions of Egloga XII, see Eglogas..., p. 179.

[43]For the basis of Cotarelo's date, accepted by Juliá Martínez ("La literatura dramática peninsular...," p. 263), see above n. 30.

[44]In the first of two articles (se above n. 30 for bibliography) Crawford compared Egloga XII with Tebaldeo's eclogue and concluded that Encina imitated the Italian poet. In the second article he defended this conclusion against Cotarelo, who had rejected it in the prologue to the facsimile edition of Encina's Cancionero (pp. 24-26).

[45]It must be added, however, that not even Crawford maintained that any of Encina's eclogues were derived from Italian theatre. What Crawford insisted upon was the influence of Italian literature and particularly the pastoral, a source of influence which Cotarelo and Juliá Martínez nonetheless denied. Only writers such as Mazzei (in Contributo...) looked for the origin of Encina's eclogues in the Italian stage.

[46]See, also, Crawford, Spanish Drama..., pp. 20-21.

[47]See the textual comparisons in Crawford, "The Source of Encina's Egloga...", pp. 226-230.

[48]Crawford ("Encina's Egloga de Fileno...", pp. 331-332) used the greater length and diversity of the Spanish eclogue as one argument to point to Encina's imitating Tebaldeo and not vice versa.

[49]Crawford concluded, however, that the parallels with the Corbaccio were closer to Boccaccio's Italian than the imitation by the Archpriest of Talavera (see "The Source of Encina's Egloga...", p. 223, n. 2).

[50]These additional lines may be read in Teatro completo..., p. 226. López Morales excluded them from his edition as apocryphal, but gave no reason for this conclusion (see Eglogas..., p. 205, n. 1).

There is, however, every reason to suppose that Encina could have written them since they contain the kind of comic touch frequently found in lines spoken by his rustic characters (see Egloga XI, ll. 76-80).

[51]Thus, in the suelta edition of Egloga XII Zambardo is the first personage to enter. He, the comic rustic, sets the scene with a conventional sleepiness:

> Descansar yo quiero en aqueste prado,
> que, mia fe, vengo de cansancio lleno;
> quizá que verná en tanto Fileno,
> que suel por aquí repastar su ganado.
> Que ha mucho tiempo que no l'he habrado,
> y esme, por cierto, muy leal amigo.
> Muestra que toma gran pracer comigo;
> habremos gasajo más que dobrado.
> (Teatro completo..., p. 187).

There follows another stanza in which Zambardo settles himself down to sleep. López Morales, mistakenly attributing the lines to Fileno (Eglogas..., p. 181, n. 1), thought them apocryphal. It would have been appropriate, however, for Encina to have used the comic rustic to establish the scene and the work as a drama, as he did with Gil Cestero in Egloga XIV (see below), for this kind of personage was a recognized and virtually essential ingredient of the early plays. His association with the drama was such that in later plays he was used to introduce works with which he had no evident connection (see Crawford, "The Pastor and Bobo in the Spanish Religious Drama of the Sixteenth Century", RR, II, 1911, 376-401, and Meredith, "Introito" and "Loa"...).

[52]See Green, Spain and the Western Tradition, I, pp. 104-105.

[53]Forgetfulness was later a conventional characteristic of the rustic introito speaker (see Appendix B, s.v. "Forgetfulness", and Meredith, "Introito" and "Loa"..., passim).

[54]See above, n. 50. Zambardo's remark is in keeping with Encina's own and a general, popular taste for blasphemous humour (see above chap. III, n. 13).

[55]It did, however, provide a pattern for dramas by other authors (see below chap. XI, the discussion of the Egloga de Torino and the Egloga de Breno).

[56]For a bibliography of editions of Egloga XIV, see Eglogas..., p. 225.

[57]López Morales did not include them in this edition of Encina's eclogues. The additions may be read in Teatro completo..., pp. 367-371.

[58]For the text and circumstances of the reference, see Crawford, The Spanish Pastoral Drama, pp. 43-44.

[59]Michaelis de Vasconcellos, for example, disputed ("Notulas sobre cantares...", pp. 362-366) that the reference was to Egloga XIV.

[60]See above allusions to this topic in the analyses of Eglogas VIII, X, XI, and XII.

[61]This villancico (ll. 1193-1216), sung by "algun gaytero" (l. 1179), acts as a scene divider and permits the transition from a comic rustic scene to Plácida's suicide.

[62]Compare the following lines spoken by Fileno before his suicide with those spoken by Plácida:

> Tu, alma, no pienses ni tengas temor
> que andando al infierno ternas mayor pena;
> mas piensa, sin duda, tenerla menor
> do quier que te halles sin este cadena. (ll. 549-552)
> .....
> ¡O Jupiter magno, o eterno poder!
> Pues claro conoces que muero biviendo,
> la inocente alma no dexes perder,
> la qual en tus manos desde agora encomiendo.
> (ll. 589-592)

[63]Compare the advice given by Cardonio to Fileno:

> Yo soy contento, pues quieres, dexarte
> solo contigo quexar tu passion,
> con solo primero, Fileno, rogarte
> que nunca huyas jamaś la razon. (ll. 429-432)
> .....
> ...si se mata no ay esperança
> salvo de ver ell alma perdida. (ll. 475-476)

[64]See Kohler, Representaciones de Juan del Encina, p. 15. Giménez Caballero (Egloga de Plácida y Vitoriano, p. 22) wrote: "Siguiendo el criterio justo del profesor Kohler... nosotros suprimimos esta Vigilia, no sólo por irreverente, sino por innecesaria al drama". With the same puritanism, Giménez Caballero also suppresed part cf the dialogue between Flugencia and Eritea: "Eritea es una Celestina, pero presentada de modo tan escabroso y crudo, que su escena con Flugencia la hemos reducido en esta edición, dado el carácter pedagógico de la misma" (ibid.).

[65]The first three lines are derived from a Greek invocation to Christ employed in the liturgy of the Mass and in several litanies. The remainder is a parody of the Pater noster.

[66]Suplicio took the knife with which Plácida had killed herself, consequently Vitoriano has to borrow another from some shepherds (see ll. 2163-70)--presumably not the same shepherds who intervene in the action of the eclogue.

[67]As an example of conventional prayer adapted to suit the conventions of love, see Jorge Manrique's transposition of St. Bernard's prayer to the Virgin, the Memorare, into the poem "Acordaos por Dios señora" (Cancionero general, Academy facsimile, fol. CI-v).

[68]Crawford (The Spanish Pastoral Drama, p. 49) also commented on the unreality of the ending of Egloga XIV: "The reader need not be surprised at the unexpected dénouement for the pastoral drama often defied all the laws of probability".

[69]Flugencia reacts, for example, as Pascuala when courted by Mingo and the escudero in Egloga VII.

[70]The first, sixteen-act, edition of the Celestina was published in Burgos, 1499. Its popularity and influence is attested by the numerous imitations and continuations written shortly after. See Menéndez y Pelayo, Orígenes de la novela (Edición Nacional), Madrid, 1962, IV, p. 302, s.v. "Celestina".

[71]Encina also used this device in Egloga XII, where Zambardo belittled Fileno's complaint by being unable to stay awake to hear it.

[72]In the structure of the eclogue, the shepherds' delay also gave Vitoriano the opportunity to find a knife and attempt suicide (see above n. 66).

[73]An epitaph was also composed, for Fileno, in Egloga XII.

[74]The Vigilia de la enamorada muerta, for example, is inevitably comic simply because it is a parody of a liturgical rite.

## Chapter X

## LUCAS FERNANDEZ

Before beginning a discussion of Lucas Fernández's secular plays and those included in the following chapters, the general nature of some of the works, apparently written for a performance at a betrothal or wedding celebration, must be established. Weddings are alluded to in several of the plays already considered in this study, conveying the idea that, at least in rustic circles, they were festive occasions which provided one of the greater attractions of country life. In the Egloga o farsa del nascimiento by Lucas Fernández Bonifacio included among his accomplishments,

> En bodas y en cofradias
> siempre soy mas remirado. (Di-r)

On at least two occasions Juan del Encina emphasized the pleasures of wedding festivities by asking how it was possible to forego them. When Gil was about to become a courtier again, Mingo reminded him of the pleasures of country life, and, among them, the enjoyment of weddings, "las holgançaș de las bodas" (Egl. VIII, l. 363). Similarly, when Cristino was about to become a hermit, Justino wondered,

> ¿Como podras olvidar
> y dexar
> nada destas cosas todas,
> de baylar, dançar en bodas,
> correr, luchar y saltar? (Egl. XI, ll. 91-95)

If these references alone were insufficient indication of the popularity of weddings as festive occasions, further evidence is available to corroborate it and show that burlesque and bawdy humour formed part of the festivities.[1] Encina's Egloga X was probably performed as part of the celebrations to honour the marriage of Prince John in 1497 (see above chap. IX, n. 25). Although the earliest of the wedding plays available, however, Egloga X does not conform exactly to the pattern which eventually emerged. It contained burlesque, rustic humour, but did not include several of the features enumerated by Crawford, in his article "Early Spanish Wedding Plays", as the principal characteristics of the type.

Whether serious, semi-serious, or plainly burlesque in tone, the wedding plays are all pastoral love dramas. Moreover, the action is punctuated by certain stock devices, the very presence of which led Crawford to consider the plays as a group and summarize their common features at the conclusion of his study as follows:

> A comparison of the plays already discussed shows that in all a wedding occupies a prominent place; that in most of them a burlesque wedding serves as a dénouement; that the majority end with a song suitable for a wedding, and that a burlesque genealogy of bride or groom, a long list of objects representing the bride's dower and the groom's gifts, and a burlesque sermón de amores occur with frequency. Since we know that certain of these plays were performed at weddings and that the Farsa del matrimonio [by Sánchez de Badajoz] specifically bears the rubric "para representar en bodas", we are justified in believing that a special type of play was frequently performed at weddings, and that they often contained some of the features mentioned above. ("Early Spanish Wedding Plays", p. 384)

Having noted the presence of these characteristics and remarked

that they recur in several plays, it will not be necessary to dwell on them for their own sake. The following discussion is concerned with the way different dramatists exploited them for their own purposes.

Crawford thought (Spanish Drama..., p. 68) the first play in the Farsas y églogas (Salamanca, 1514), the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella, was also the first of Fernández's dramatic productions. He judged that in it Fernández showed his familiarity with Encina's Egloga VII and was probably written between 1498 and 1500, dates accepted by Gillet ("Propalladia"..., IV, p. 36). Cotarelo thought that the work was written earlier. Departing from 1497, the date he gave to the Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado, in which the personages Bras-Gil and Beringuella are mentioned,[2] Cotarelo concluded (Farsas y églogas, Academy facsimile, p. xvi) that the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella was "de 1496 o del año anterior". In fact, there are no means of ascertaining whether or not the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella was the first of Fernández's compositions, nor whether it was written in the years to which these commentators cited above have assigned it.

The Comedia was certainly written before the Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado because of the allusion to it in that work, but could easily have come after any of Fernández's other plays. The initial position of the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella in the Farsas y églogas is no criterion since Fernández probably arranged the plays by subject, not by order of composition,

grouping the secular works before the religious. As to the actual date, a terminus ante quem is provided by Gil Vicente's Auto pastoril castellano, written and performed for the Portuguese court at Christmas, 1502 (see above chap. V). In his article "Lucas Fernández and the Evolution of the Shepherd's family Pride in Early Spanish Drama", John Lihani pointed out several textual parallels between Fernández's Comedia and Vicente's Auto showing that the latter had been influenced by Fernández's play. Consequently, the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella was certainly written before 1502. A terminus post quem is less easily arrived at. Given the familiarity, suggested by Crawford, of its author with Encina's Egloga VII, the Comedia could have been written any time after 1496, the date of Encina's first Cancionero, in which the eclogue was included.[3] Beyond this, it is impossible to speculate.

On the subject of the Comedia, Crawford observed (Spanish Drama..., p. 67): "As a burlesque on courtly practices it is highly diverting". More recently William C. Bryant described the nature of this burlesque in his dissertation "Lucas Fernández and the Early Spanish Drama". A few years before Bryant's work, however, Charlotte Stern, in "Studies on the Sayagués in the Early Spanish Drama", had already indicated the principal devices used to mock the courtly tradition in Fernández's plays:

> When courtly love becomes the concern of the peasant, it is removed from its lofty and poetic setting and relocated in the realistic, pragmatic world of the rustic. All the virtues of the caballero are mocked by the rustics who are simply parodying

> a literary theme. When Sayagués writers permit the stage rustic to fall in love, the language in which the yokel clumsily attempts to describe his feelings accentuates the burlesque treatment of the theme. ... The lofty sentiments and elegant language of the Spanish gentleman are translated into the barbarous jargon of a country bumpkin. A comic situation inevitably results when the rustic behaves in a manner contrary to his basic nature, and the comedy is intensified through the humorous effects conveyed by the yokel's grotesque verbiage. Lucas Fernández uses the stage jargon effectively in this situation, fully exploiting its comic potentialities. (pp. 190-191)

From his entry at the beginning of the play, Bras-Gil's rustic origin and temperament as a lover are clearly identifiable. He curses his suffering from love with a conventional vehemence:

> Dereniego del amor;
> doyle a rabia y doyle a huego;
> del blasfemo y del reniego
> con gran yra y gran furor,
> pues que siempre su dolor
> ño me dexa reposar,
> ni aun apenas resolgar,
> mostrandome disfauor. (Aii-r)

He has spent the entire day unsuccessfully looking for Beringuella, and compares himself to farmyard animals in search of a mate:

> Ando y ando ñunca paro
> como res que va perdida.
> .....
> Voy como tras perra el perro,
> o baca tras su bezerro.
> .....
> Como modorra borrega
> estoy lleno de carcoma. (ibid.)

Introduced in these terms, Bras-Gil is clearly a rustic lover. With his country dialect and farmyard comparisons he cannot be accepted as a serious representative of convention, but as the object through which convention may be mocked, for any employment of the courtly idiom is belied by Bras-Gil's rustic background.

When Bras-Gil finds Beringuella he describes his feelings quite applicably, but in Sayagués:

> ¡Ay, Beringuella garrida!
> ño seas tan zahareña.
> Torna, tornate alagueña
> porque remedies mi vida;
> que ya la traygo aborrida
> y no quiero mas viuir,
> sino llugo me morir,
> si no as de ser mi querida. (Aii-v)[4]

His tone falls short of the conventional courtier's lament and his use of the morir-vivir paradox:

> Sera mi viuir morir,
> mi gloria la sepultura, (ibid.)

is simply an imitation of the courtly manner, inappropriate in a rustic. Undeniably, the shepherd feels as deeply as a courtly lover, but the description of his longing cannot be coupled with the language employed by a conventional courtier without making the latter appear ridiculous. To sustain any description of his feelings, Bras-Gil is forced to rely on similes which come more easily to his rustic tongue. Consequently, after indulging in courtly paradoxes, Bras-Gil returns to his farmyard analogies:

> ¡Ay, que en tu amor estoy preso,
> muy mucho mas que te habro
> y aun mas que burras nestabro! (ibid.)

By intermingling the rustic and courtly levels of expression, Fernández stressed his character's true background and used him to parody the courtly convention.

William Bryant's assessment that "the piece constitutes an unmistakable parody" ("Lucas Fernández...," p. 25) is correct, but some of his remarks are questionable. By writing that "the

shepherds are more than simple, conventional rustics. Bras-Gil is a shepherd transformed into a courtier by love... Although the characters resemble pastoral personages in their speech and action, their emotions are clearly those of courtly people. ... The parody consists precisely in the fact that the rustic expresses his noble sentiments in an elevated language and that he imitates courtly mannerisms" (pp. 23 and 25), Bryant obscured the issue. Bras-Gil is a country bumpkin and more than resembling one quite definitely speaks and acts as a conventional rustic. His emotions are those of courtly people because he is in love, the conventional preoccupation of the court; he is not, however, a courtier and does not become a courtly lover. He is simply a device, a figure in which the conventions of love are ill-suited. Fernández, thereby, burlesqued the conventional code, portraying it through an inappropriate personage and deriding its language by its misuse and translation into the barbarous jargon of the rustic.

In this regard, Fernández exploited a vein in the drama already opened by Encina. Pelayo, in Egloga X, was a comic personage and Mingo's transformation into a courtier in Egloga VIII was a mockery of courtly convention. The essential difference between the two dramatists was Fernández's more wholehearted use of the conventional rustic as a device for ridicule. With Mingo's transformation into a courtier, Encina elevated the peasant to the code, so that the principal source of comedy was Mingo's stupidity. In the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella, by contrast, Fernández ridiculed the conventional code by reducing

it to the level of the peasant, where it is made to appear foolish. Miss Stern's quotation ("Studies on the Sayagués...", p. 183) of Henri Bergson may bear repetition: "A comic effect is always obtainable by transposing the natural expression of an idea into another key".

In the opening scene of the Comedia Beringuella is the foil of her rustic suitor. She emphasizes the inappropriateness of Bras-Gil's manner and, thereby, provides a further means of accentuating Fernández's burlesque. When first hearing Bras-Gil's flattery,

> ...tu gala
> me da ya vida tan mala
> que no me pude tener
> sin te venir aca a uer,
> porque a ti nadie se yguala, (Aii-r)

Beringuella admits her surprise and alarm at his strange speech:

> Bien llo sabes rellatar.
> ¡Cuan llarga me la lleuantas!
> Por mi salud, que me espantas
> en te ver assi hablar. (ibid.)

She is not initially inclined to listen, but then encourages Bras-Gil. She invites him, "Pues dime, di que me quieres" (Aii-v), an invitation literally accepted: "Quiero te ya, que me quieras" (ibid.); but Bras-Gil will not win her merely with persistent pleas for her love. The shepherdess again dismisses him and mocks the rustic version of his courtly flattery.

When Bras-Gil finally manages to describe his passion, he is met with derision and doubts of his sanity:

¡Valas, valas te el diabro!
Y ¿tu estas, digo, en tu seso? (ibid.)

A confession of the blindness of his love:

¿No te duele mi dolencia,
pues por tu amor esto ciego? (ibid.)

is greeted with a mocking reply:

¡Pardios, si lo sabe el crego,
que me de gran penitencia! (ibid.)

and, when Bras-Gil exclaims that his malady is incurable, Beringuella suggests appropriate remedies:

Ponte una poca de untura.
.....
Xaropate con cordura
y purgate con sofrir. (ibid.)

Only after all this does Beringuella finally take compassion on Bras-Gil and accept him as a suitor:

En te ver tan lastimado
me fuerças a te querer;
quel dolor que e de te ver
me aze ser tuya de grado. (ibid.)

As a conventional shepherdess, teasing her admirer and vacillating between encouragement and reproval, Beringuella is a good representative of the type[5] and is only associated to the courtly code to the extent of the dramatist's burlesque of it. Above all, she is the foil to Bras-Gil's extravagance. During the courtship scene she continually reduces the shepherd's attempted flights of courtly fancy to a conventional rustic level because she is a rustic herself. Consequently, Beringuella contributes a further aspect to Fernández's burlesque, since not only is Bras-Gil's courtly manner ill-conceived, it is also completely misdirected, not intended for one in whom it would be appropriate,

namely a courtier, but a rustic like himself. In this respect, although a conventional figure, Beringuella is suited to Fernández's purpose. As a conventional figure she is the counterpart of Pascuala in Encina's Egloga VII; but there is a certain difference between the two. Pascuala is not so entirely a device for a burlesque of the courtly code. She makes fun of the escudero's advances, but, in Eglogas VII and VIII she is also employed to exploit the conventional ideas about love for their own sake. Beringuella, on the other hand, is a kind of "straight man" for Bras-Gil, through whom the courtly conventions are exploited for the purpose of burlesque.

The courtship scene of the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella is concluded with an exchange of tokens between the two rustics. Bras-Gil offers a ring, bought at the market, and receives in return a piece of ribbon of indistinguishable colour. They then decide to return to their flocks and, at the shepherd's suggestion, sing as they go. Their villancico expediently concludes the courtship scene and separates it from the action which follows it, a device also employed by Encina to separate the two parts of his Egloga VIII.

The completeness of the courtship scene is emphasized by the content of the villancico itself:

> En esta montaña
> de gran hermosura
> tomemos holgura.
>
> Haremos cabaña
> de rosas y flores
> en esta montaña

cercada de amores;
y nuestros dolores
y nuestra tristura
tornarse ha en olgura.

Gran gozo y plazer
aqui tomaremos,
y amor y querer
aqui nos ternemos;
y aqui viuiremos
en grande frescura
en esta verdura. (Aiii-r and v)

Having pledged their love and Bras-Gil's woes been turned to joy, the rustic couple sing as if they were expected to live happily ever after. While, however, Bras-Gil and Beringuella are made to enact a traditional scene, they are nonetheless burlesque representatives of tradition. Hence, even the outcome of their courtship is comic. They cannot depart to build a mountain cabin of roses and surround it with love as they sing in the villancico. On the contrary, the unexpected arrival of Juan Benito, Beringuella's grandfather, who reproves them for being together, destroys all the illusions about their future. The parody of the conventional pastourelle is continued and is linked to a burlesque, wedding play.

The nature of the second part of the play and of the role played in it by Juan Benito must be clarified. Bryant suggested that "the grandfather Juan Benito represents not only paternal concern but a typically Spanish preoccupation with family pride and honour. ... The theme of honor is so basic to the plot that the Comedia could justly be called the first honor play in Spanish literature, thus anticipating the Golden Age comedia"

("Lucas Fernández...", pp. 24 and 27). Bryant, however, took the situation too seriously. Any concern for family pride and honour in the play is not present as a serious theme, but as a device for comedy and ridicule. Juan Benito is concerned with reputation, since he demands to know why Bras-Gil and Beringuella were together, is convinced of their mischief, and is prepared for a lawsuit to prove it. He certainly believes he has been dishonoured, because he accuses Bras-Gil,

> ¡Ay, ay viejo pecador!
> ¿Y ora en cabo de mis dias,
> y tu, de venir auias
> a me dar tal deshonor? (Aiv-v)

Moreover, he at first refuses to accept him as a husband for his granddaughter on the grounds of inferior birth. All these concerns, however, must be seen in the context of the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella as a whole: an entertainment for which Fernández exploited a conventional subject in order to mock it.

If any of the illusions of courtly love persist after the burlesque courtship scene, they are surely banished by Beringuella's grandfather, who harbours no illusion about why the courting couple consort. When Bras-Gil and Beringuella are found together the worst is automatically suspected. Juan Benito prevents their taking refuge in flight and believes he has caught them in flagrante delicto:

> Que ño, ño, ños podres yr,
> por mas que querays huyr,
> que aqui os tengo de prender.
>
> Pues dezi ora, veamos,
> ¿como yo nos lo dezia

que algun dia os tomaria
con el hurto entre las manos? (Aiii-v)

Without allowing for a reasonable explanation of their conduct, Juan Benito demands the truth; or, rather, demands to have his suspicions confirmed. He insists to Bras-Gil,

Anday aca jurareys
en las manos des jurado
si laueys vos defrorado,
o ques lo que aqui hazeys. (Aiv-r)

The effect is to ridicule the conventions of love, for here it is bared of the illusions in which it is conventionally clothed.

If, as Bryant attempted, the psychology of the grandfather must be analyzed, his attitude is less one of parental concern than one of downright annoyance at having been caught napping and discovered something which occured without his knowledge and approval. In this context, concern for honour is ludicrous, since Juan Benito's principal objective is not its vindication, but the prevailing of his stubborn insistence that he is right. This is the subject of the argument with Bras-Gil and the reason why Juan Benito insists on litigation. The perversity of his notions, contrasting it with any Golden Age comedia concepts, is his ridiculous desire to prove his own dishonour. Miguel's Turra's offer of arbitration is emphatically rejected:

Aunque me sepa perder,
de partirme he neste dia
para la chançonoria
alauer de conoscer,
ver si es hombre o si es muger,
y juzgarnos ha este preyto.
.....
No me querays estorbar,
por vuestra fe, Miguel Turra,

que aunque me cueste la burra,
lo tengo d'pleytar. (Aiv-v)

The argument, beginning with verbal insults and nearly resulting in an exchange of blows, finally hinges on the ability of each party to threaten the other with lawsuits. Not to be outdone, Bras-Gil would counter-sue the plaintiff:

Tambien yo sabre gastar
un borrego y dos y tres
y aun una bacuna res.
¿Vos cuydays me despantar? (ibid.)

Sense of honour becomes secondary to a determination for victory in the argument. It is, therefore, a travesty to liken Fernández's work to a Golden Age honour play, or even see it as a precursor of the later drama of this subject. On the contrary, from a burlesque of the conventional pastourelle the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella degenerates into a rustic farce, in which the principal device of action is an argument between two shepherds. From there it shapes into a comic wedding play.

The possibility of a marriage to solve the quarrel between Bras-Gil and Juan Benito is first suggested by Miguel Turra, an idea rejected by Juan Benito with the argument that the shepherd is not worthy of Beringuella:

Buen consejo es comunal,
mas la casta ño se yguala
del conel de la zagala
en valer ni enel caudal. (Aiv-v)

He changes his opinion only after hearing Bras-Gil enumerate his family connections:

Nieto soy yo de Pascual
y aun hijo de Gil Gilete,

sobrino de Juan Jarrete,
el que viue en Verrocal.

Papiharto y el Cãcudo
son mis primos caronales
y Juan delos Bodonales
y Anton Prauos Bollorudo.
Brasco-Moro y el Papudo
tambien son de mi terruño
y el crego de Vico-Nuño,
que es un hombre bien sesudo.

Anton-Sanchez Rabilero,
Juan Zabato el Sabidor,
Assienso y Mingo el pastor,
Llazar-Allonso el gaytero,
Juan Cuajar el viñadero,
Espulgazorras, Lloreinte,
Prauos, Pascual y Bicente
y otras que contar no quiero. (ibid.)[6]

Juan Benito is also impressed when he learns that he and Bras-Gil's mother are old acquaintances. It is certain that the concern for family pride is not to be taken seriously, for Bras-Gil's connections, as the passage cited above shows, are not exactly remarkable. Pride of family is a convention in the portrayal of the rustic, the same paradoxical pride exhibited, for example, by Bonifacio in Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento. Moreover, Juan Benito's pride and Bras-Gil's genealogy must be seen in the total context of the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella, a work formed by exploiting conventional devices of burlesque humour and probably intended to be presented at a wedding festivity. The device of genealogy, its origin obscured in literary and popular tradition,[7] was one convention among many and became a standard element of wedding plays in the early sixteenth century.[8] To it must be added others at the conclusion of the Comedia:

the brief, burlesque wedding ceremony conducted in pidgin Latin by Miguel Turra,[9] the recitation of Beringuella's dowry by Juan Benito, and Bras-Gil's enumeration of the gifts he would bestow on his bride.[10]

The probable criterion in the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella was the provision of entertainment for a wedding festivity. The subject-matter is, therefore, applicable to the burlesque spirit of such an occasion. Here are no courtly lovers, but a pair of rustics whose behaviour and language mocks convention and whose courtship results in a farcical rustic argument, a match-making scene, and a burlesque wedding. All this, with Bras-Gil's genealogy and the enumeration of the gifts for the bride, amounts to a conventional rustic picture characteristic of the early sixteenth century drama. The gifts offered to Beringuella by her grandfather and groom include neither riches nor finery, only conventional peasant wealth. While the grandfather provides a dowry to ensure the future livelihood of the bride-to-be and her husband:

> Yo les mando un tomillar
> de buen tomillo salsero,
> y un cortijo y chivitero,
> y una casa y un pajar,
> y un arado para arar;
> dos vacas con añojales
> y dos yeguas cadañales,
> y un burro muy singular..., (Av-r)

the bridegroom donates the personal necessities required by his future bride:

> Sus toquexos y tocados,
> todos sus paños dobrados

le pienso de endonar

Dar le alfardas orilladas
y capillejos trenados,
cercillos sobredorados
y gorgueras bien llabradas,
y sortijas prateadas,
camisas de cerristopa,
su manton y aljuba y hopa,
faxa y mangas colloradas... (ibid.)

Even to the villancico at the end of the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella, Lucas Fernández exploited convention. The courtship scene, derived from the traditional pastourelle and a probable direct inspiration from Encina's Egloga VII,[11] was used as the basis for a wedding play containing the devices of action and burlesque humour which came to be the accepted marks of such a performance. In this respect, Fernández was no more original than Encina. The difference between them is one of tone, perhaps even of poetic ability. Fernández was less a poet than Encina, but more forthright in ridiculing the conventions he accepted for his plays. Originality, however, is not really the issue and is not to be expected of the dramatists of this period. From the plays discussed in the rest of this study it is apparent that writers employed their talents to exploit commonplace problems and situations. Consequently, their success must be measured by their ability to form novel combinations from conventional elements and, where necessary, suit them to the occasion of performance.

The date of composition of the second play in Lucas Fernández's Farsas y églogas is also uncertain. Without substantiating the

claim, Crawford suggested that it, the Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella, "was probably composed about the year 1500". He also speculated on the occasion of performance and argued: "Because of the content and of the two villancicos in praise of Love with which the play ends, it was undoubtedly written for performance at some betrothal festivity" (Spanish Drama..., p. 68). The link is tenuous, however, and there is no definite association, as in the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella, with such a festivity through a mock-wedding, a betrothal scene, or a recitation of genealogy and dowry. Only the lack of another occasion on which the work might have been performed makes Crawford's assertion acceptable. Any attempt at assessing the date is equally speculative, since it is only sure that the work was written before 1514, the date of its first known publication.[12]

Structurally, the Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella is similar to the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella, being in two, albeit uneven, parts, the first presenting a courtship scene and the second its outcome, but without a villancico between. A rustic lover is again the device through which convention is burlesqued, but, by introducing courtly personages (the doncella and her caballero), Fernández exploited the conventional portrayal of courtly love more fully than in the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella.

The personages provide a key to the work. Fernández did not envisage them as individuals, since he wrote in the title-

prologue as follows:

> Farsa o cuasi comedia fecha por Lucas Fernandez en la qual se introduzen tres personas. Conuiene a saber, vna donzella y vn pastor y vn caballero, cuyos nombres ygnoramos y no los conoscemos mas de quanto naturàleza nos los muestra por la disposicion de sus personas. (Bi-r)

From an analysis of the work, it will be seen that the nature, or disposition, of the personages is determined by certain conventions, and that the play results from the differences between them. By writing as he did in the title-prologue, Fernández drew attention to his personages as representatives of certain patterns of behaviour. His statement amounts to an admission that he intended purely to amuse himself and his audience by playing with convention, a fact which clears the work of any imputations of seriousness.

Unlike Beringuella, the doncella of the Farsa o cuasi comedia is courtly, with all the traits of the conventional lover, as the figure appeared in Encina's eclogues.[13] Her caballero has disappeared and she wanders abroad to find him, dispairing of success, lamenting her fate, and contemplating death as a remedy. This is her attitude when she enters and begins the play with her complaint:

> ¡Ay de mi, triste! ¿Que are
> por aqueste escuro valle?
> ¡Ay de mi! y ¿a donde yre?
> Do buscare
> al mi señor que le halle?
> Miro y miro y no le veo.
> Cierto la fortuna me es
> al reues
> segun tarda mi desseo.

¡Cuytada! no se que me diga,
ni que pudiesse yo azer.
Fortuna me es enemiga
y desabriga;
ya mi gloria es padecer. (Bi-r)

During the following dialogue with the pastor, the conventional features of her disposition are portrayed.

She asks a passing shepherd for news of her caballero and incidentally reveals her dependence on her love for him when she describes his appearance to the rustic:

El es tal que su figura
y hermosura
me da vida con afan.

El es mi bien y desseo
y enel viue mi esperança;
el es la gala y asseo
en que me veo
con muy firme confiança. (ibid.)

She employs the customary antitheses of hope and despair, life and death:

Quien espera desespera;
el que busca anda perdido;
no hay muerte mas verdadera
y mas entera
que viuir el aborrido. (Bi-v)[14]

Recalling others in similar straits who ended their lives, the classical "muy noble reyna Dido" and the Castilian "gran dama Coronel" (ibid.), she resolves to do the same:[15]

Ansi hare yo ala mia,
pues mi alegria
del toda va ya perdida. (ibid.)

The pastor's offered assistance, his attempts to cheer and court her, are all in vain. They only accentuate her distress:

Ya no es para mi morada
sino fuera de tristura;
ya mi gloria es acabada
y rematada;
mi casa la sepultura,
de solloços mi manjar,
mi beber lagrimas viuas;
las esquiuas
fieras me han d'acompañar. (Biii-r)

She is prepared to wander in the wilderness, at the mercy of the elements, with only the birds for company, a design frustated only by the lost caballero's return.

The doncella's disposition is clearly that of the conventional courtly lover, which puts her in good company with Encina's Plácida, but contrasts her considerably with the pastor. This contrast was mentioned by Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 68) as a source of comedy: "The farcical element consists in the inability of a poor lout to share the refined feelings and to understand the conventional language of the aristocracy". The inability of the pastor to equate with the doncella derives from their different dispositions: she is a courtier, he a rustic. When he asks the maiden whom she seeks and is asked by her if he has seen "vn caballero passar" (Bi-r), the pastor stupidly enquires:

Y ¿que cosa es cauallero?
¿Es algun huerte alemaña,
o llobo rabaz muy fiero,
o vignadero?
¿O es quiças musaraña? (ibid.)

The doncella provides a description:

Es un hombre del palacio,
de linda sangre y facion
y condicion, (ibid.)

but the rustic, perceiving no distinction, believes he would make an adequate substitute:

> Daile a rabia y ño cureis
> ya mas del, que muy mejor
> con amor
> vos seruire si quereys. (ibid.)

Even in spite of further description and the doncella's declaration of her love for the caballero, the shepherd persists. From the beginning, a difference of outlook on the same situation is, thereby, established between the courtier and the rustic and is sustained throughout the entire work.

The shepherd invites the maiden to take a good look at him:

> Pues ¿veys, veys? Aunque me veys
> vn poco bragui vaxuelo,
> ¡ahotas! que os espanteys
> si sabeys
> como repico vn maçuelo.
> ¡Alahe, ahe, ahe!
> zagal soy de buen zeman,
> juro a san,
> que quiça os agradare, (Bi-r)

and oblivious to her objections, continues to describe his talents. Ignorant of any difference between himself and the caballero, the pastor is equally unable to understand the doncella's distress. The advice given when interrupting her lament is comically superfluous, inconsistent with both her affliction and her gentle state:

> Daldo, daldo a prigonar.
> y aborri vn marauedi,
> que ansi ogaño vine allar
> sin tardar
> vna burra que perdi.
> .....
> Procura delo encantar
> o encomendar;

o acodid al mostranquero. (Bi-v)

The pastor's selfish sympathy shows in repeated attemps to attract her attention. There occurs quite a comic exchange (Bi-v and Bii-r) in which the two dialogue at cross-purposes, thus illustrating the differences between them: she is intent on her sorrow; he equally intent on diverting her attention to himself and making her accept his proposition.

Through the personages, Fernández played one convention against another, just as Encina did in Egloga XIV. The doncella's lament and description of her distress are part of the illusion of love, in which the pastor conventionally does not share. When he sees the maiden, he naturally falls for her, but, with traditional stupidity, fails to understand why he is not welcome. His conventional behaviour, however, and inability to share the doncella's illusion provide a basis for accepting her extravagance. Being a conventional figure himself and behaving according to a determined pattern, the pastor exposes the different conventionality of the doncella. He also, with his formal stupidity, ridicules the doncella's conventional ideas:

The contrast between the pastor and the doncella and its relevance are most clearly demonstrated in their dialogue about love. When the pastor confesses his feeling for her, the doncella, true to her character, is surprised that he is even capable of it and asks,

Y ¿hasta aca el amor estiende
su poder entre pastores? (Bii-r)[16]

The shepherd quickly replies, however, that he and his kind are very susceptible:

> ¡Ay, señora! aqui nos prende
> y nos ofende
> con mill ansias y dolores.
> Haze nos mill sinsabores,
> y al triste pastor que hiere,
> sino muere,
> siempre da grandes cramores.
>
> Quita nos los retentiuos;
> roba nos los mamoriales;
> trae muertos los mas viuos;
> muy catiuos
> tray aca muchos zagales.
> Hasta el triste del herrero
> le dio ogaño vn batricajo
> en vn lauajo,
> que quedo medio lladero.
>
> Catiua nos los sentidos;
> sojuzga nos los pensamientos;
> andamos tristes, perdidos,
> desmayados
> con congojosos tormentos. (Bii-r and v)

He describes the effects of love in the rustic community:

> ...aun el crego esta otoñada
> de amor andaua aborrido
> por Juana la desposada.
> .....
> Los viejos aman las moças;
> los moços aman las viejas;
> por las breñas, por las broças,
> por las choças
> amor siembra sus consejos.
> Haze ser lo hermoso feo
> y lo feo ser hermoso.
> El malicioso
> da al mas suyo mas desseo,
>
> y al mas suyo mas le mata,
> --no entiendo aqueste amorio--
> y al que le aballa la pata
> mal le trata
> con castigo muy crudito.
> Y al pastor mas desastrado
> suele dar mayor ventura,
> y da tristura
> al zagal mas perllotrado. (Bii-v)[17]

The pastor's description is conventional (see above nn. 16 and 17) and leaves no doubt that he is capable of loving. He is as aware of love's effect as the doncella, but he makes no bones about it, does not pretend to understand it ("no entiendo aquesto amorio"), and does not share its courtly illusions. For this reason, he can expose the conventional make-believe of the courtly lovers. His love and the description of it are fundamentally the same as the doncella's, lacking only the esoteric notions and language. These are vital differences, however, and the principal source of the action in the play, as the final part of the dialogue between the pastor and the doncella reveals.

Having heard the pastor enumerate the effects of love in the village, the doncella conventionally grants its universal presence:

> Ya no ay cerro, ya no ay llano
> ni castillo, ni montaña
> ni cabaña
> que Amor no tenga en su mano.
> .....
> Bien alcanço a conocer
> que desde oriente a poniente
> sojuzga su gran poder
> el querer
> de toda la humana gente. (ibid.)[18]

She adheres, however, to her courtly illusions and believes that lesser beings, such as the shepherd, do not feel the full rigours of love:

> Mas al linage grossero
> bien creo que no castiga
> ni hostiga
> tan rezio, ni les tan fiero. (ibid.)

The pastor, again used to expose the doncella's conventional attitude, objects adamantly and explains that his suffering is as great as any:

> ¡Ay, ay, ay! no digays tal,
> que en mal punto os mire yo,
> que pecado vinial
> ni mortal
> ñunca tal pena me dio.
> Sino, ved, tentad me aqui
> quanto el coraçon llate
> y me combate
> desde denantes que os vi.
>
> Todo esto concallecido;
> la intencion, triste, me duele;
> la mamoria y el sentido
> he ya perdido;
> la ygaja se me desmuele;
> refriase me la sangre;
> respelluncase me el pelo;
> con gran duelo
> me toma frio y callambre. (ibid.)

The difference between the pastor and the doncella is simply that one is a rustic and the other a courtier, a contrast resulting in a comic situation because the pastor fails to appreciate it. From the beginning, when first offering himself in substitution for the caballero, the shepherd did not distinguish between himself and the missing courtier. As the doncella now tells him, however, he lacks the qualities expected of her suitor--he is not refined:

> ...aunque padecays
> cierto falta os lo mejor;
> pues criança no teneys
> no podeys
> bien mostrar vuestro dolor. (ibid.)

The comedy of the situation is that the shepherd, expressing himself in rustic jargon and with characteristic vanity, believes in his

equality with the caballero:

> Yo bien ancho y bien chapado
> esto, y relleno y gordo,
> bien milordo.
> ¡Asmo! ño me haueys mirado. (ibid.)

He is told that "criança" consists

> ¶En ser cortes
> y muy limpio, y bien hablado
> y requebrado, (ibid.)

rather than in mere appearance, but the distinction is lost on the pastor, who asks,

> Requiebro ¿que cosa es?
> Requebrar y esperezar
> todo deue de ser vno,
> y de consuno
> bocezar y sospirar. (ibid.)

For him, love is love and there are no two ways.

There is no hope of compromise between the conventional beliefs of the pastor and the doncella. They share a common experience--both are in love--but their respective attitudes are poles apart, so that the shepherd becomes a laughing stock when he attempts to approach the doncella on her terms. When she tries to explain the word "requiebro",[19] it is beyond the shepherd. As the doncella is then about to leave he makes a last ditch effort with his own familiar kind of courtship. He invites her to his cabin to sample his rustic fare:

> Vamonos a mi majada
> que esta en somo esta floresta.
> Cuydo estays desambrinada
> y aynada
> de aquesta cruda requesta.
> Daros he priscos, vellotas,
> madroños, ñuezes, mançanas
> y auellanas,
> y cantar vos he mill ñotas. (Biii-r and v)[20]

The gulf between them persists; his offer is still unacceptable, and also to no avail because the missing caballero arrives and is reunited with his lady.

The argument which erupts between the caballero and the pastor is predictable because one is a courtier and the other a rustic and because the latter inevitably sees the new-arrival as an intruder. The basis of their altercation, a traditional animosity between town and country folk,[21] was foreseeable at the beginning of the work when the pastor asked,

> Y ¿que cosa es cauallero?
> ¿Es algun huerte alimaña...? (Bi-r)

Protesting leave to court the doncella, the shepherd insults the caballero's background. He calls him a "palaciego" and "Don Hydalgote pelado", and jeers at the fashions of the court:

> Desque traes melena
> hazcas que en guis muy pendada
> y carmenada
> enfengis ¡Dios ƒorabuena! (Biii-v)

The caballero retaliates and calls the shepherd "Don villano avillanado" and "Don bobazo bobarron", thrashes him, and warns that, but for their different stations, he would permanently silence the animated shepherd:

> Sino por no ensuziar
> en tu sangre vil mi mano
> yo te ouiera hecho callar
> y aun chistar. (ibid.)

In addition to receiving a beating, the shepherd suffers as an unrequited lover. He laments,

> ¡Ay, triste de mi, mezquino,
> que me fino!

¡Ay cuytado! ¡Muerto so!
¡O maldita mi ventura!
.....
Mi vida sera llorar
y lamentar
hasta el dia en que yo muera. (Biv-r)

Although his words have some characteristics in common with a courtier's lament, the pastor has not changed. He has fallen for the doncella and lost, but is still as foreign as ever to the myths of courtly love. His lament is compatible with the description he gave when explaining that love afflicted country folk. The pastor is not, however, the total pessimist in defeat that is characteristic of the courtly lover. Consequently, he is reconciled to his position and the play does not end in sadness. The shepherd accepts the caballero's prior claim to the doncella's affection, the differences arising from the argument are repaired, and the play concludes with two villancicos when the shepherd agrees to show the courtier's their way.

William C. Bryant observed ("Lucas Fernández...", p. 52): "Fernández offers, in dramatic form, an admirable synthesis of the theories of courtly love" in the "same theme-with-variations". Bryant illustrated his point by showing how the two villancicos contain a summary of these theories. In this regard, however, Fernández exploited convention. The principal devices of action, the doncella's lament, the shepherd's rustic courtship, and the quarrel between the pastor and the caballero, including the ideas they all convey, may be countered in Encina's eclogues. The central action harks back to the conventional pastourelle, from which Fernández did not radically deviate.

The rivalry between a rustic and a courtier was already a part of that convention, and its principal comic characteristics were already established by Encina. An important deviation from convention, however, was the attempted courtship of a courtly lady by a rude and borish rustic, a deviation later adopted by authors of other plays.[22] All these elements are presented, however, through the conventional dispositions of the personages.

There is no doubt about the nature of the doncella and the caballero, for even if the latter is only briefly portrayed he is known through the doncella. Both are courtly lovers and through their disposition, particularly that of the doncella, Fernández conveyed the conventional ideas of courtly love. The pastor is different, however. He is a rustic and not part of the phantasy shared by the doncella and the caballero. Consequently, because a view of love lacking in courtly illusions is presented through him, he provides a different convention on which their illusions can be based. At the same time, because he is a stupid, comic character, his rustic vanity, country jargon, and peasant ignorance are forms of clowning with which to ridicule the doncella's extravagant attitudes and feelings. In all this the pastor is conventionally employed.

It is essential to understand that the pastor is a conventional figure, even when he falls for the doncella. When Bryant analyzed the play and related the pastor to the courtly doncella and caballero he remarked: "The fact that the pastor exhibits an amazing

number of the same qualities is very important: The play is not only a 'farsa a lo pastoril' but also a courtly lover 'a lo pastoril' is the main character. ... The shepherd may ... be considered as the first villano noble in Spanish literature. ... He is a simple rustic who, by the end of the play, expresses himself in accordance with the pattern of courtly love" ("Lucas Fernández...", pp. 50-51). Bryant was too enthusiastic, however, in claiming a position of distinction for Lucas Fernández in the early Spanish Drama. The basic dispositionof the pastor is that of a conventional antithesis to the doncella and the caballero. He has the conventional peasant's outlook of one boastfully proud of his appearance and ability to perform the feats appreciated in this own environment. His attempted courtship of the doncella is consequently conducted purely from this standpoint.

When the shepherd encounters the doncella, his vanity is enough to make him believe she would like him. Above all, he courts her because of convention, because no other form of relationship between the pair could have been envisaged. If the pastor changes, it is not that he has become a courtier, but that he has been smitten with love for the doncella, a perfectly acceptable situation. Through the doncella Fernández conveyed the accepted notions about love and, with the presence of the pastor, dwelt, in addition, on the conventional idea of its universality. There is ample evidence for this idea in the pastor's description of love and its effects in the country environment, and in the

doncella's recognition of love's universal dominion (see passages cited above). It is also corroborated by the first of the two villancicos at the end of the play, the following being one relevant stanza:

> Dime, dime, di pastor,
> ¿como aca entrestos boscajes
> y entre estas bestias saluajes
> os cativa el dios de amor?
> ¿Sus halagos, su furor
> sienten tambien labradores?
> ¡Ay, Dios, que muero de amores! (Biv-r)

The shepherd's lament after his beating from the caballero is a true reflection of his feelings. The pastor propositioned the doncella, fell for her, and lost her to a rival, but because he was reconciled to this rival and accepted defeat this is no justification for viewing him as a villano noble, as Bryant believed. Since he is not a courtly lover, but a conventional rustic who loved and lost, he does not despair, but accepts defeat. In this respect, he is no different from Mingo, who lost Pascuala to the escudero in Encina's Egloga VII. Reconciliation was, therefore, a conventional conclusion to the play.

The conventionality of Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella may be easily shown from a comparison with Encina's Egloga X. Both dramatists dwelt on the universality of love and juxtaposed the attitudes of the rustic and the courtier. Although both Salamancans resorted to similar devices to convey the same subject, they wrote different plays and elaborated the devices differently. Fernández did not portray the subject

allegorically, as Encina did, but by presenting a sorrowing courtly lady molested by a borish peasant. He used the conventional differences between rustic reality and courtly illusions to create a comic situation through which to portray and mock the extravagances of courtly behaviour. His work is not original, but within its conventional framework Fernández exercized a certain freedom in exploiting the customary devices of composition.

The verification of the date of Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado by interpreting the clues contained in it for the dates of several of Encina's eclogues resulted in the polemic between Cotarelo and Crawford discussed in an earlier note (see above chap. IX, n. 30). Recalling that discussion, Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado was written later than some of Encina's eclogues because Fernández's shepherd Prabos refers to several personages who appeared in them.[23] Since one of the personages is Fileno, the shepherd who appeared in Egloga XII, written between 1507 and 1509,[24] Fernández's play must have been composed between 1507 and 1514, the latter date being the year the Farsas y églogas were published.

Whatever its exact year, the Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado was certainly written after several of Encina's eclogues, with which Fernández was obviously familiar and on which he could have capitalized. In fact, Fernández exploited in this play, the last secular work in the Farsas y églogas and possibly the last secular play written for publication,[25] the same subject dramatized in Encina's eclogues and his own Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella

and Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella. He combined the manners of courtly love with conventional rustic comedy, using the latter to expose and ridicule the extravagance of the former. In addition, he dwelt on the notions of the universal and transforming power of love, concepts already familiar from Encina's eclogues. Fernández did not adhere to the patterns of dramatization first established by his contemporary, however. In place of the conventional courtier as the device for conveying ideas about love, he introduced a braggart soldier and used, as in the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella, the conventional action as a basis for a burlesque wedding play.

The Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado begins with the entry of Prabos, a love-sick shepherd. "It begins", Crawford wrote, "with a take-off of the preparation for suicide as found in Encina's Egloga de tres pastores Egloga XII" (Spanish Drama..., p. 68). With the burlesque tone already found in Fernández's secular and religious plays, it is not surprising that Prabo's monologue should be in a similar vein. Encina also debunked the courtly lover's behaviour, not only through such figures as Mingo in Egloga VIII, Zambardo in Egloga XII, and the shepherds in Egloga XIV, but also through Pelayo in Egloga X, to which Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia bears a marked similarity. The principal difference between Encina's comic shepherds and Prabos is that Fernández's rustic lover is a specific parody of the courtier, the reason he can be thought of as a "take-off" of Fileno. Encina was not so extreme in using the comic figure as

a source of burlesque humour.

Prabos is not simply a rustic who mingles courtly language with his country jargon, as did Bras-Gil in Fernández's Comedia. Through him the whole gamut of conventions are transcribed to suit a rustic. Prabos' torment, the loss of his senses, and the change he suffered are described as physical pain:

> Lleno estoy de medrosia.
> Ya me llate el coraçon
> con passion;
> traygo dos mill torcijones
> por medio desta intencion,
> y laficion
> me desmuele estos pulmones. (Ci-r)

The severity of his distress is cursed in rustic language,

> A rauia doy tal dollencia,
> que ño tien nengun sossiego;
> dende aqui della reniego
> pues que ño tien resistencia, (ibid.)

and his despair of a cure includes the inability of the village "witch-doctors" to provide an effective remedy:

> Ya no ay besibro que saba
> decrallarme este rencor,
> ñi de do mana este ardor
> que assi me cuelga la baua;
> menos la bendizidera
> enxalamadera
> ques vna sabionda vieja,
> ni aun tampoco la partera
> aunque es artera
> y sabe cosas de ygreja. (ibid.)

By his despair and recognition of the transformation caused by love, Prabos is a parallel of Fileno. The ill-starred rustic prefaces a description of his change and disinclination for his former life with words strikingly reminiscent of Fileno's apostrophe to the Universe:

¡O montes, valles y cerros!
¡O prados, rios y fuentes! (ibid.)[26]

Prabos then sinks to the ground[27] and laments his plight in three stanzas, the last of which is sufficient illustration:

Quien me vio buscar plazeres,
quien me vio aborrir pesares,
quien me vio entonar cantares
y a baylar cansar mugeres,
quien me vio y me vee agora,
que no llora.
Quien me vio enlas romerias
cantar, saltar y baylar
sin cansar,
regozicar cofradias. (Ci-v)[28]

As a "take-off" of Fileno, Prabos' self-description is a reductio ad absurdum of courtly love. Prabos is as distressed as his counterpart in Egloga XII, experiences a similar suffering and transformation from happiness to dejection, and is in despair of his state. The difference and inherent comedy of the situation is the language. The customary notions about love are not conveyed in the usual courtly idiom, with its standard imagery and concepts, such as characterized Fileno, but in the conventional language of the rustic and against the background of village life. In this respect, Prabos is a burlesque of the courtly lover. Moreover, having depicted him as a conventional rustic, Fernández could then employ Prabos to expose the conventions of love. He could play one convention against another, for, although the rustic Prabos did not convey the traditional courtly version of love, he could be used as the basis for another to present it. Hence the introduction of a soldado, one whose views and language conform more to conventional,

courtly ideas and speech.

Seeing Prabos on the ground, the soldier asks the reason. The shepherd, at first wary of the soldier's motives, eventually divulges that he suffers "grandes quexidos de amor" (ibid.). Like the escudero in Encina's Egloga X and the doncella in Fernández's own Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella, the soldado disbelieves him:

> ¿De amores tan mal te sientes
> enestas brauas montañas,
> entre peñas y cabañas,
> no conuersando con gentes? (Ci-v and Cii-r)

Because of the particularly stylized language and behaviour guiding the courtly lover, it was conventionally held that an uneducated peasant from the backwoods could not love because he could not conduct himself as a courtier (see above n. 16). Paradoxically, however, although conventionally held that some people were not able to experience love, the universality and irresistibility of love was also a conventional concept. Hence Prabos, explaining his woe, substantiates its validity by enumerating pastoral figures who suffered on account of love:

> Phileno el se mato
> y murio
> por amores de Zafira.
> .....
> Tambien me ñembra Pelayo,
> aquel quel amor hyrio,
> que en el suelo quedo
> tendido con gran desmayo.
> .....
> Que Bras-Gil por Beringuella
> passo vn monton de quexumbres
> por montes, cuestas y cumbres
> hata que topo conella.
> Y aun Mingo, si se decrala,

por Pascuala
mill quillotranças passo,
y el que por esta zagala
pompa y gala
dexo, y pastor se torno.

Y aun Christino en religion
se metio y dexo su hato.
Despues amor de rebato
le saco de su intencion.
Enviole mensajera
muy artera
que lo tentasse de amor,
nimpha llamada Febrera
muy artera,
y bolviole a ser pastor. (Cii-r)

His examples are all shepherds and, with the exception of Bras-Gil and Beringuella from one of Fernández's plays, from Encina's dramatic eclogues.

Alluding to these references, Crawford stated that "in spite of his long-standing rivalry with Encina ... there is not a trace of animus in his mentioning Encina's five plays", but added that Fernández "did not take Fileno's death with all the seriousness which its author might have expected" (Spanish Drama..., pp. 68-69). Like any figure in the pastoral drama, Fileno's behaviour conformed to a set of established conventions, which may have had an air of gravity, but which were not intended to be seriously entertained. The pastoral hero was simply a puppet of fashion and could nonetheless be a source of amusement.[29] Fernández included the list of names to substantiate Prabos' claim as a lover and because the recitation of such a list was conventional (see above n. 15).

By referring particularly to personages from Encina's eclogues,

Fernández exploited the audience's familiarity with them providing a kind of yardstick to measure Prabos' distress, at the same time as supporting his contention with the soldado. A more relevant matter is not that Fernández did not take Fileno's death seriously, but that he did not distinguish between Fileno's suffering, that of the other personages, and Prabos' own distress. All are equated and Prabos' rustic lament is no different from the more elevated and conceptual terminology employed in Fileno's complaint or Cristino's dilemma. Significant, too, is the inclusion of Bras-Gil, one of Fernández's own creations, who was not a courtly lover, but a comic rustic. The conclusion is that Prabos enumerated these personages because they were familiar shepherds and lovers. Their common link, Prabos included, is their experience of the same emotion to the same degree.

That the relevant question is their common suffering is emphasized when the soldado takes up the dialogue and mentions that love similarly effects noble souls:

> Si te comiençe a contar
> de caualleros troyanos
> y enamorados romanos,
> sera para no acabar. (ibid.)

His reference to their suffering is the same as Prabos' to his own and that of other shepherds. All are united by a single experience. Just as Prabos is compared with his equals, he is also placed on a par with the worthies of Rome and Troy. The device of recalling the famous lovers of history and juxtaposing them with a list of pastoral figures is not new, since Encina employed it in Egloga X to illustrate the universality of love.

Fernández used it with equal deliberation to convey the same conventional idea that love is as at home in rustic cottages as in the palaces of the great. At the same time, the device produces a comic effect, the same as in Egloga X, on account of the comparison between a country bumpkin and the hallowed heroes of Antiquity.

Thus far, Prabos has been established as a conventional lover, albeit a rustic, but his distress has been used to debunk the conventions of love. With the introduction of the soldado, Prabos' situation is also employed as a basis for dwelling more fully on some of the ideas about love. After establishing the validity of Prabos' suffering the dialogue turns to another familiar topic, the cure for love's pains.[30] This subject is important since through its discussion Prabos' distress is cured, so that his plight will have served as the basis for a wedding scene. Prabos had already comically introduced the matter of a cure in his monologue when he complained that the village "witch-doctors", for all their science, could not find an effective remedy. It is now considered from the courtly point of view, as the soldado, fully briefed on the nature of the shepherd's complaint, offers his own suggestion:

> ...vn contrario cura al otro.
> Al frio cura el calor
> y al desamor el amor.
> .....
> La yra cura paciencia,
> y la sciencia
> da salud ala yñorancia;
> diligencia a negligencia. (Cii-v)

He continues in this vein with advice and consolation, but Prabos

feels his malady is too far advanced to be cured so easily:

> La verga nueua del robre
> muy facilmente es torcida,
> mas desques viga crescida
> ño ay fuerça que la desdobre;
> y el principiar del camino,
> sino ay tino,
> haze al fin muy gran herror.
> Bien tal soy, triste, mezquino,
> pues contino
> me acude el viejo dolor. (ibid.)

The presentation of the customary ideas on love has so far been conducted as an amicable dialogue between Prabos and the soldado with little fire in their discussion. The soldado could voice his opinions without contradiction and mockery. This situation is altered with the arrival of Pascual, a shepherd whose entry into the conversation gives rise to a series of heated exchanges. Courtly and rustic conventions are then juxtaposed and an argument between Pascual and the soldado nearly ends with a brawl.

Pascual has been present only a few moments when he and the soldado are at loggerheads, each denigrating the other's background (Cii-v and Ciii-r), much as in the arguments deriving from the traditional animosity between town and country.[31] As yet, however, their verbal duel is of little consequence and the conversation returns to Prabos' problems and their remedy. The love-sick shepherd is now confronted with two commentators on his state, each representing a different point of view. The soldado adheres to the elevated notions of love and advises in accordance with courtly ideas; Pascual confines his musings to a different level and his suggestions befit a comic rustic.

Even before knowing the cause of his fellow-shepherd's distress, Pascual suggests a remedy in startling contrast to the cure proposed by the soldado, but which worked wonders on a donkey:

> Con madresilua y gamones
> sanaras, y maluarisco,
> y con rabano gagisco,
> encienso macho y bayones.
> Flor de sago y doradillo
> y mançanilla
> es muy chapada hesica;
> que ño ay vesibro de villa
> sin tranquilla;
> que ańsi sane mi borrica
>
> que andaua bien de tu suerte
> medio mustio y mangonera.
> Si aquesto yo no le hiziera,
> ya debrocaba de muerte. (Ciii-r)[32]

The soldier reprimands Pascual, who nonetheless persists and suggests Prabos is "trasijado de correncia" (ibid.). Even when properly informed, Pascual continues with his inanities and defines love in his own inimitable way:

> ¿Nifica amor morteruelo,
> morcilla, o quiças mortaja?
> ¿Murcia, muerdago o moradaja?
> ¿O quiças deue ser muello?
> .....
> Llugo amor es el mamar
> hasta hartar
> las cabras rellanado. (ibid.)

The manner of this intervention is determined, however, by Pascual's portrayal as a rustic. Much as the pastor in Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella, or Mingo in Encina's Egloga VIII, Pascual reacts with a predictable stupidity to ideas of which his ignorance was already legend. Hence he misses the soldier's conceptual definition of love and asks,

Esse amor, ¿es colorado,
o verde, azul o pardillo?
Quiças blanco o amarillo? (ibid.)

In two stanzas, with the rubric, "Diffinicion de amor" (ibid.), the soldado had defined love as "transformacion / del que ama enlo amado", an emotion "que haze ser dos cosas vna", and described its effects as follows:

...este amor nel coraçon
nace y reuerdece
y enel desseo florece,
y el su fruto es aficion.
Cogese en toda sazon
con passion,
y es sabroso y amargoso,
y es de mala digestion;
da alteracion;
dexa el cuerpo emponçoñoso. (ibid.)

Pascual's conventional inability to understand this is shown by his question as to the colour of love and by his need to visualize an actual case. He recalls another shepherd (conceivably Pelayo from Encina's Egloga X--see above chap. IX, n. 30) who suffered the same affliction as Prabos:

Dende aqui al diablo do
a rapaz de tan ruyn maña.
Este cuydo, enla montaña
ogaño a vn pastor hirio. (Ciii-v)

The soldier's definitions are fitting descriptions of Prabos' state, but could not have been formed and understood by a rustic. Pascual's presence in the play at this point in the play is important, however, because he prompts the soldado to disclose the conventional ideas of love and makes fun of them. The soldado's courtly extravagance is countered by an extravagant stupidity from the shepherd, by which love and its concepts are effectively burlesqued.

The part of the play following these definitions of love seems disconnected from its central action. Impressed by the soldado's knowledge, Pascual asks who he is. When the soldado announces that he is a member of the military, he and his profession are severely lampooned, particularly by Pascual, but at first also by Prabos. The soldado vainly parries the shepherd's attacks and ends by boasting about his prowess and the injury he could inflict on the argumentative Pascual. Peace is finally restored by Prabos, who had dropped out of the argument, and after a discussion of the soldier's equipment the conversation returns to the problems of the love-sick shepherd.

Referring to this part of the Farsa o cuasi comedia, some commentators have compared the soldado to the miles gloriosus and considered him a direct descendent of the Roman Pyrgopolinices. As types the two share points in common, but the comparison is unnecesary and it would be difficult to insist on a direct relationship.[33] It is possible, as Bryant suggested ("Lucas Fernández...", p. 65), that the soldado's discomfiture and boasting were included as social criticism or satire. If this were the case, Fernández could have found his models in reality without it being necessary to trace his source to Roman comedy. The whole scene is more easily related to contemporary drama, however, and to the device of argument as a source of action. The way Prabos and Pascual harrassed the soldado readily recalls how Bonifacio and Gil, in Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento, molested the hermit Macario. In both cases the resulting argument is a gratuitous

piece of fun. Comparison with Fernández's Nativity play is appropriate, moreover, because the soldado is really no more than a military version of the boastful Bonifacio. The shepherd's boasts of rustic ability and pride of family are merely transposed to relate to military prowess and pride of physical strength. Both are similar indulgences in hyperbole.

Although the argument with the soldado does not appear to further the central action, it does fit in with the overall tone of the Farsa as a burlesque comedy, just as the equivalent situation between the shepherds and the hermit in the Egloga o farsa. Belittled by his critics, the soldado's protests are barely token. He is virtually forced to admit his faults:

> Pues no hazemos tanto mal
> que no hagamos algun bien, (Ciii-v)

and made to confess an attraction for the fairer sex approaching the philandering with which he had been accused:

> Dime, ¿quien podra dexar
> de amar?
> ¿No vees que somos humanos?
> .....
> En los casos del amor
> jamas ouo resistencia. (Civ-r)

The threats with which the soldado retaliates are too hollow, too extravagant to be taken as anything save pompous vanity. He is clearly a braggart:

> ¡Juro a tal, si te arrebato,
> que te buelua del reues!
> .....
> ...dar te vna bofetada
> tan pegada
> que scupas diez años muelas.
> .....

Hare de tus huessos birlos;
desossar te he pieça a pieça
y bola de tu cabeça.
.....
Dime, ¿no sudas de miedo?
Desgarrarte he todo crudo,
don Xetudo.
.....
Hare te del culo chupas
y delas mangas girones.
.....
Ya me hueles a defunto.
Bien barrunto
tu morir sin confession.
Cortar te bofes y el vnto
eneste punto. (ibid.)

Pascual is unperturbed by these threats and succeeds in making a laughing-stock of the soldado, just as he ridiculed the soldado's ideas on love with his conventional stupidity. The argumentative shepherd is used as a device to expose the soldado.

With the conclusion of the argument, Prabos succeeds in drawing attention to his own problems again. His desire for death returns the conversation to the possibility of a cure for his troubles. As earlier, the soldado takes the conceptual view and repeats the cure by opposites:

Souerbia cura omildad;
justicia cura malicia;
la largueza ala auaricia;
la razon sensualidad;
lealtad a traycion,
y ala prision
es salud la libertad. (Cv-r)

Specifically, he recommends easing the pain by eliminating or forgetting its source:

...mientra estouierees
pensando en tu gran tristura
jamas ñunca abras holgura
ni ternas en ti plazeres;

sino que deues mirar
y pensar
ques mijor quitarte della
para poder descansar,
que no andar
toda tu vida tras ella. (ibid.)

Both Prabos and Pascual recognize the sense of the soldado's words and better understand the shepherd's suffering, but, although agreed on his wisdom, Pascual is not so willing to abide by it, since such deliberations are foreign to him and amuse him:

Estas riziones me ñota;
los ahuncos y descrucios,
sobrecejos, respelluzios,
ques amorio remota.
Ya ño me puedo sufrir
en oyr
al señor alabardero.
Ayna me querre reyr,
sin mentir,
como habra tan por entero. (ibid.)

When Pascual broaches the problem, he treats it much more lightheartedly, but finds a completely effective remedy. Moreover, his cure links the conventional, pastoral love action of the Farsa to its probable performance at a betrothal or wedding celebration. Pascual's solution is simply for Prabos to marry the girl he loves.

Pascual first attempts to enliven the proceedings by introducing a note of merriment and ending the serious debate:

¡Al diabro que xufriera!
¡Oyxte, ahuerta tal debate!
¡Por Sampego, que me llate
ya la cholla de alegria! (ibid.)

His cheer is ill-received, however, and he tries a more direct approach. After coaxing Prabos to reveal the name of his beloved shepherdess (Antona), Pascual sums up the problem and its solution

in a few words:

> Ya se donde tu coxeas;
> ¿tu cuydas que ño lo sabo?
> Yo te prometo hasta el cabo
> pongo yo cuero y correas,
> quel domingo que vinier,
> si Dios quisier,
> ha de estar ella en la boda. (Cv-v)

His assessment of the situation further belittles the soldado's opinions because it is far more effective than his consolatory advice and philosophical cures. No sooner the word than the blow: Antona is summoned and eventually prevailed upon to accept Prabos as a husband. Pascual performs a mock-wedding, gives the couple his blessing, and Prabos' cure is complete.

At the end of the scene the soldado sums up the situation. He addresses Prabos,

> Descansan ya tus cuydados;
> afloxen ya tus gemidos;
> tus desseos son cumplidos
> y tus males acabados, (Cvi-r)

and is about to discuss the shepherd's experience and the nature of his love when Pascual, who has had a surfeit of this talk, ends the conversation by suggesting they drop the subject and celebrate the betrothal:

> Ño cures de rellatar
> lo que ya hu y se passo
> y s'oluido,
> son tañe hazia el llugar
>
> y haremos el desposorio
> pubrico a todas las gentes. (ibid.)

All agree and depart for the village singing a villancico.

The Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado is identifiable with

Fernández's other works since in it he exploited conventional ideas through conventional personages, all used for a comic purpose and as the basis for a wedding play. In this scheme, each of the personages fulfils an assigned role. At the centre is Prabos, a conventional lover, but distinguished by the fact he is a rustic, so that, although his portrayal conforms to the accepted ideas about love, he is a comic figure and a parody of the customary lover. Through him conventional language and behaviour are burlesqued because they are transposed from their familiar setting to the conventional environment of the rustic. Even as a comic figure, however, Prabos may nonetheless be used to expose the ideas of one who does share the conventional illusions of love. Hence the initial role of the soldado is to act as a mouthpiece to convey the accepted theories about love, using Prabos as his example. In addition, he is a device for comedy since his opinions are ridiculed by Pascual and he is made a laughing-stock through his quarrel with the shepherds.[34]

Considering the Farsa as a comedy, Pascual is an important figure. His stupidity and ignorance of courtly behaviour and language, comic remedies and definitions of love are used to ridicule the views advanced by the soldado. Courtly extravagance is, consequently, countered with outrageous stupidity. In addition, Pascual is used to ridicule the soldado himself, since, by arguing with him, Pascual exposes him as a rogue and a braggart. It must not be overlooked, however, that Pascual is himself a conventional figure of fun. The burlesque works two ways. In

addition to ridiculing others, Pascual's stupidity rebounds on himself, making him appear ridiculous. The shepherd's role is, therefore, that of a comedian, a role continued even to the last scene,when he acts as the celebrant at the betrothal ceremony and, incidentally, provides a successful conclusion to the action, linking it to the probable occasion of performance at a wedding or betrothal festivity.

By reason of the comic roles of the personages in the Farsa o cuasi comedia, it can be justifiably concluded that Fernández was not concerned with the theories of love as a serious topic. The Farsa is a comedy of love, in which conventional ideas and a conventional situation were exploited as a source of amusement. Beginning with Prabos's "take-off" of Fileno, the play is predominantly comic. Even with the soldado's deliberations on the nature of love and its cures, it is a burlesque romp, exactly the kind of work Fernández would have required for a wedding festivity, a piece without pretension or fuss intended to amuse a gathering in a mood for celebration.

The pastoral love dramas of Juan del Encina and Lucas Fernández are quite similar. Both exploited the same ideas (the suffering lover's dilemma, the universal and transforming power of love, etc.) and, even if Encina was the first to dramatize them, both resorted to the same devices (the requesta scene, the portrayal of an anguished shepherd, and the contrast between courtly and rustic conventions, for example). Even with these evident similarities, however, each dramatist approached

the subject with individuality, so that the differences between their work are perhaps more important than their similarities.

Encina was more concerned with the courtly code for its own sake. Beginning with Eglogas VII and VIII, he cultivated it and moved toward its extreme expression, culminating in Egloga XIV. His eclogues contained, as it were, the courtly conventions exploited as a suitable subject for drama. Fernández was not so inclined. He accepted the conventions which Encina developed and exploited them, not for their own sake, however, but principally to parody them and use them as a source of comedy. The difference between the two dramatists is best appreciated from a cursory glance at their presentation of comedy. Of all Encina's plays on love, only Eglogas VII, VIII, and X could be called prevalently comic; of all the lovers he portrayed, only Mingo is a rustic whose ignorance is used to parody convention. Moreover, both the comic tone of these eclogues and the portrayal of a comic, rustic lover are subsidiary to the presentation of conventions. Where comedy is featured in other pieces (Eglogas XII and XIV) it is principally as comic relief and a means of exposing the conventional behaviour of the central personages. By comparison, Lucas Fernández presented an ignorant, rustic lover in each of his three secular plays. He dwelt specifically on their rustic character and emphasized it by relating the conventions to them, portraying them as persons unable to understand conventional behaviour (Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella), as abusers of it (Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella), or as burlesque represent-

atives (Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado). In the one play where courtly lovers appear, the Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella, they are the foils to the comic rustic, a means of emphasizing his character through contrast and of allowing him to burlesque them and their ideas. Thus, where Encina employed comedy primarily as a means of highlighting the courtly concepts or obtaining comic relief, Fernández used the same concepts to highlight the situation of his rustic personages. The overall effect in Fernández's works is a tone of burlesque only sporadically apparent in Encina's eclogues.

Before ending this chapter, one further piece may be considered, the Coplas de la doncella, el pastor y el salvaje, attributed to Lucas Fernández. Bartolomé Gallardo first made this attribution by assuming that the work was a "Signature 'E'" supposedly missing from the Farsas y églogas.[35] For this reason and a similarity of subject, Cotarelo edited a 1604 edition of the Coplas from Alcalá de Henares and included it as an appendix to the Spanish Academy facsimile of Fernández's plays.[36] Fernández's authorship is not easily substantiated, however. Although the pagination of the Farsas y églogas does omit a signature 'E' and runs from 'D' to 'F', the lack could be traced to a printer's error. The argument that in Fernando Colón's catalogue the 1514 volume was described as containing seven plays and that the Coplas form the missing seventh is also doubtful. The extant copy of the Farsas y églogas does only have six plays, but the addition of a Diálogo para cantar, also bound with them, would make Colón's

calculation correct. The similarities with Fernández's work, particularly the Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella (presentation of personages known only as a doncella, pastor, salvaje, and ermitaño and the portrayal of a rustic wooing a courtly lady) may be accounted for as part of the stock of the pastoral drama. Commentators on the Coplas have been particularly struck by the disimilarities between them and Fernández's plays. Crawford wrote: "There is undeniably a resemblance between this and the secular plays of Fernández in the choice of subject, which was in a sense conventional, but the two authors were poles apart in dealing with the same situation" (Spanish Drama..., p. 75). Bryant ("Lucas Fernández...", p. 136) shared this opinion: "The disimilarities are so striking that the play could hardly have been the work of Lucas Fernández". To these comments it might be added that the burlesque spirit of Fernández's plays is largely lacking and the devout conclusion is an outcome Fernández had not envisaged. Nevertheless, the Coplas must be included in this study on account of their affinity with the early pastoral drama[37] and, for better assessment, may be discussed in a chapter devoted to Fernández's works.

Crawford wrote (Spanish Drama..., p. 74): "All the ingredients of a recuesta de amores theme are found ... but they are treated seriously and, in the end, devoutly". His evaluation was only partly true, however. The tone of the dialogue between the doncella and the salvaje is serious, but the pastor's courtship of the doncella and his prayer to the Virgin in the final scene are comic.

The Coplas begin, as did Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella, with the entry of a doncella "andando perdida por una montaña" (p. 1). The reason for her sorrow and why she is lost are as unknown as her name, however. Without saying that love is to blame, she speaks as if it were, insofar as, like a conventional lover in a similar predicament, she desires an end to her life:

> Mejor fuera no nacer,
> pues nací en tan triste suerte,
> que deseo más la muerte
> que otro ningún placer.
> Si lo pudiese hacer
> daría fin a mi vida,
> por no verme así perdida,
> cual nunca se vió mujer. (ibid.)

In this frame of mind, she is encountered by a pastor, likewise anonymous. He first believes her to be "la Virgen de la Floresta" (p. 2), a belief soon dispelled. The doncella begs the shepherd to leave:

> ...me doblas mi tristura
> en verte que eres grosero.
> Sólo, por Dios te requiero
> que te partas ya de mí.
> .....
> Aquí me quiero quedar
> sola y sin más alegría;
> ni quiero tu compañía
> ni tu tosco razonar.
> Sólo con oírte hablar
> se me trasdobla mi pena. (pp. 2-3)

His presence distresses her since she cannot abide his rustic dress and language:

> Dame pena ver tu traje,
> y ese tu grosero gesto,
> y tu cuerpo mal dispuesto,
> y tu pastoril lenguaje. (p. 3)

She displays the same animosity as the doncella in Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia and the shepherd is portrayed just as the pastor in that play. He cannot understand her attitude toward him and, like Fernández's pastor, believes it is a matter of appearance. He departs to dress as he thinks will be more acceptable. Before leaving, however, he warns the doncella of the salvaje, to which she is heedless. An encounter with a wildman, to be carried off and killed by him, would solve her problem and meet her desire for death.

The pastor soon returns, dressed in new clothing, and courts the doncella with renewed hope. In spite of his insistence on his worth,

> Quien me hobiere por marido
> ¡Oh, qué zagal llevará! (p. 5)

the doncella still considers him a brute,

> Una disforme figura;
> una criatura bestial. (ibid.)

The pastor's further assertions of charm and ability, and his offer of protection against the salvaje are all to no avail. She accuses him of boasting and, when the salvaje appears, invites him to prove his valour. Needless to say, the shepherd takes to his heels.[38]

In this first scene of the Coplas the personages behave conventionally, quite conveivably in imitation of those in Lucas Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella. They are portrayed in an equivalent situation and with the same traits of character. The doncella laments her distress, as did Fernández's

heroine, and shows a similar antipathy to her borish, rustic suitor. The pastor is a mirror of Fernández's comic rustic. He is the same ridiculous figure, conducting his courtship with the same boastful vanity and failing to appreciate why the doncella rejects him.

With the entry of the salvaje, the Coplas become more serious and another conventional courtship scene is presented, different from the comic scene with the pastor. As Crawford observed (Spanish Drama..., p. 74), the salvaje shows "no other sign of a 'wildman' except perhaps abysmal melancholy". To all appearance he is a conventional courtier. He greets the doncella courteously ("¡Sálveos Dios, dama graciosa!" p. 6), is pained to see her sadness, and, at her request, describes his life in the mountains. It is a suffering existence, without consolation or pleasure, but, as in the case of the doncella, its cause is not disclosed. Nevertheless, the salvaje could dismiss his pains if allowed to serve the doncella:

> Todos mis males pasados,
> cuantos mi vida sufrió,
> en poder serviros yo
> serían bien empleados.
> Y por vos ser tan hermosa
> mis angustias quitaréis,
> mi vida haréis dichosa,
> vos bien me la sanaréis. (p. 9)

In turn, she would accept him as her servant, but will not gamble her reputation and bids the salvaje farewell. The complaint against his mountain existence is then changed to one against love, for if she departs his life goes with her. He begs one favour, however, and asks the doncella to accompany him to a shrine

of the Virgin. The favour is readily granted and the pastor suggested as their guide.

In spite of the differing tone between this and the preceding scene, the dialogue is equally conventional. Although presented as a salvaje, the doncella's admirer is a courtier for all that. Consequently, their conversation is conducted in conformity with established conventions. His language is genteel, his behaviour refined; he offers himself in a spirit of servitude and declares that the doncella is his reason for living.

When the shepherd re-enters he is still wary of the salvaje. Like the pastor is Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia, he too has fallen for the doncella and is bewildered on account of it:

> Dome a Dios que perdí el tino
> después que enamorecí;
> que ya no sé de mí
> con este mal que me vino. (p. 13)

Nevertheless, he is no longer persistent, but, again like Fernández's pastor, agrees to act as a guide. Suggesting they take gifts, he leads them to the shrine of the Virgin, where they are welcomed by a hermit and invited to offer their prayers. This they do, and their prayers bring the work to its end. The pastor's words and his offering of a humble gift to the Virgin end the play on a comic note and recall the shepherds' adoration in the Nativity plays:

> ¡Oh, Virgen glorificada
> de alto merecimiento!
> yo me aburro, y os presento
> esta cincha tachonada,
> pues los otros no os dan nada.

Tomadla, señora mía,
porque no quedéis man vacía
agora desta vegada... (p. 16)

Crawford tentatively suggested (Spanish Drama..., p. 74) that the Coplas "were probably written to be performed at a marriage, but if such be the case, the tone is quite different from the other wedding plays". It is difficult to see why he thought this. The Coplas have none of the characteristics he compiled himself as marks of a betrothal or wedding play: there is no mock-wedding scene, no recitation of genealogy and dowry, and no appropriate song.[39] The purpose of the Coplas can be calculated from its conclusion, when the personages offer their prayers to the Virgin. This conclusion, partly pre-figured by the pastor, who thought the doncella was "la Virgen de la Floresta" (p. 2), indicates the devout intention of the work, probably performed to celebrate a Marian festival.[40]

Although not the only early Spanish pastoral drama to include a hermit among its personages and be set partly at a hermitage,[41] this is the only one to have a devout conclusion. For the rest, the Coplas are conventional. The personages are types and the courtship scenes are standard pieces of action which the author exploited as a basis for a devotional play. If the work is conventional, however, it nonetheless contributes to the formation of an overall view of the early drama in Spain. The drama was limited, often reduced to a single element of action, such as the comic pastourelle, but this could be exploited to suit several occasions: by Juan del Encina to entertain his patrons; Lucas

Fernández for two burlesque wedding plays; Gil Vicente, in the Auto de la Sibila Casandra, as the basis of a Nativity composition; and the author of the Coplas de la doncella for a prayer to the Virgin.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER X

[1]See Otis H. Green, "A Wedding Introito by Francisco de Aldana (1537-1578)".

[2]For the basis and bibliography of Cotarelo's argument, see above chap. IX, n. 30. The reference to the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella in the Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado is as follows:

> Que Bras-Gil por Beringuella
> passo vn monton de quexumbres
> por montes, cuestas y cumbres
> hata que topo conella. (Cii-r)

[3]It is possible that Fernández knew Encina's eclogue before its publication (for a discussion of the date of Egloga VIII, see above chap. IX). William C. Bryant maintained ("Lucas Fernández and the Early Spanish Drama", p. 23) that the reference to a lawsuit in the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella was derived from litigation between Fernández and Encina for the vacant position of cantor at the Cathedral of Salamanca (see, Espinosa Maeso, "Ensayo biográfico..."). This would place the Comedia after 1498, but there is nothing in the work, in the threats and counter-threats between Juan Benito and Bras-Gil, to substantiate an association with the legal entanglement between Encina and Fernández.

[4]Compare, for example, Egloga XII, ll. 537-544 spoken by Fileno.

[5]Compare her treatment of Bras-Gil with Pascuala's treatment of Mingo in Egloga VIII.

[6]It is this speech which contains the parallels with Gil Vicente's Auto pastoril castellano. See John Lihani, "Lucas Fernández and the Evolution...", pp. 258-259.

[7]John Lihani remarked ("Lucas Fernández and the Evolution...", p. 252): "It must be remembered that the shepherd's paradoxical pride in his humble family background was a bit of dramatic irony and was used by the authors as a comic device to entertain their noble audiences". Hendrix ("Some Native Comic Types...", p. 84) indicated several sources to explain the popularity of genealogy recitations in the early drama: "The Spanish, being proud of their race, would like to refer to their origin. This tendency, put into the mouth of a comic character, naturally takes on comic form. A more probable theory is that the device is a reaction against the custom of the novels of chivalry to extoll the birth and lineage of the hero... Another force which caused repeated references to the family in the plays is the well established habit of cursing each other's families--echarse pullas". Gillet ("Propalladia"..., IV, pp. 35-37) discussed

both the literary and folk origins of the delight for genealogies. One important source for the early drama was the genealogy of Christ (Matt. I, 1-16; Luke III, 23-38), often found in Nativity plays and, in López de Yanguas' Christmas eclogue (see above chap. IV), reproduced in its entirety.

[8]See Crawford, "Early Spanish Wedding Plays", passim; Hendrix, "Some Native Comic Types...", pp. 84-87; and Appendix B. s.v. "Genealogy".

[9]See Appendix B. s.v. "Betrothal or wedding". Parody of religion had long since been a source of comedy (see above chap. III, n. 12 and chap. VI, n. 11) and the deformation of Latin as a comic device figured in the earliest religious plays (the excerpt from the Vita Christi, by Iñigo de Mendoza, and the Nativity eclogues by Juan del Encina and Lucas Fernández). Both were inevitable sources of comedy for the drama and figured in a number of wedding plays where a wedding scene was portrayed (see, also, Appendix B, s.v. "Sacrilegious humour").

[10]See Crawford, "Early Spanish Wedding Plays". Discussing the origin of enumerating gifts, Gillet ("Propalladia"..., IV, pp. 38-40) traced the device to a widely practised folkloric tradition.

[11]There are no exact verbal parallels with Encina's eclogues, except, perhaps, Beringuella's directive to Bras-Gil to leave her and find Menga (Aii-v), which recalls a similar directive from Pascuala to Mingo in Encina's Egloga VII (ll. 3-4 and 9-10). The similarity between the works of the two writers is of a more general nature--structure, choice of subject, etc.

[12]Crawford's conjecture was reasonable, however. Fernández's plays seem to have been written some time before their eventual publication in 1514, with 1500 as the approximate year of his greatest activity.

[13]If Fernández's play was written about 1500, the doncella's wandering in the wilderness would, however, have been one of the first examples of this device of action. Encina's Egloga XIV, in which both Plácida and Vitoriano behave similarly was probably written in 1513 (see Appendix B, s.v. "Wilderness").

[14]This is the same living-death paradox parodied through the language of Bras-Gil, although in the doncella it is more conventionally employed.

[15]The citing of the names of well-known lovers of the past was a convention of the pastoral drama (see Appendix B, s.v. "Love"), and one which was even burlesqued, as in Encina's Egloga X. Whatever its origin, the recollection of prominent historical figures, whether in the spirit of memento mori as in Jorge

Manrique's Coplas, or to exalt the glories of the past, was an established literary device. The citing of noble precedents and the exaltation of heroic men and women was a feature of the later pastoral novel tradition in Spain.

[16]Compare the escudero's reaction in Egloga X to the news that Pelayo is smitten with love, the reaction of the soldado to Prabos' malady in Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado, or the content of the villancico at the conclusion of the Egloga de Torino (see Appendix B, s.v. "Town and country contrasted").

[17]Compare Amor's self-portrait in Egloga X, ll. 1-100, or in Egloga VIII, ll. 273-289, with this speech by Fernández's pastor.

[18]Cf. Egloga X, ll. 91-100.

[19]The word was also a cause for comedy in Encina's Egloga VIII (ll. 449-461) when Gil tried to explain its meaning to Mingo.

[20]Cf. Mingo's enumeration of the gifts he would offer Pascuala (Egloga VII, ll. 449-461).

[21]There are many examples of animosity between town and country personages in the early Spanish drama. That between Mingo and the escudero in Encina's Egloga VII, caused by their rivalry for Pascuala, may be cited as a close parallel to the situation in Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia. Both, however, may be traced to the conventional pastourelle.

[22]See, for example, the Coplas de la doncella, el pastor y el salvaje (discussed below) and the Farsa by Juan de París (discussed chap. XIII).

[23]The relevant lines are cited below in full.

[24]These dates because Egloga XII was derived from a poem by Antonio Tebaldeo (see above chap. IX, nn. 30 and 44).

[25]It is possible that the works contained in the Farsas y églogas are not the total of Fernández's compositions. There is evidence that he wrote two autos for Corpus Christi in the years 1501 and 1503 (see Cotarelo, Farsas y églogas, Academy facsimile, pp. xxi-xxii).

[26]Cf. Egloga XII, ll. 73-80:

> ¡O montes, o valles, o sierras, o llanos,
> o bosques, o prados, o fuentes, o rios,
> o yervas, o flores, o frescos rocios,
> o casa, o cuevas...

[27]Prabos' collapse was conceivably intended as a copy of Pelayo's faint in Egloga X.

[28]The idea of transformation and other conventional aspects of Prabos' speech are catalogued in Appendix B, s.v. "Love".

[29]The point is clearly made in Egloga XII, where Fileno's predicament is a source of rustic comedy. See above, chap. IX, for the analysis of that play.

[30]This topic figures, for example, in Egloga XIV, where it is the pretext for the scenes involving Flugencia and Eritea.

[31]An equal comparison could be made with arguments between shepherds and a hermit, as in Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento and Vicente's Auto de los reyes magos, in which the shepherds mock the hermit's traditional shortcomings.

[32]Donkey cures were favourite among the comic remedies in the early drama. One example occurs in Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella (Bi-v), another in Torres Naharro's Comedia Aquilana (ed. Gillet, "Propalladia"..., II, p. 527).

[33]The view that the soldado was of Roman descent was advanced by Daniel Boughner in his chapter devoted to the Spanish drama in The Braggart in Renaissance Comedy. A Study in Comparative Drama from Aristophanes to Shakespeare (Minneapolis, 1954). For the contrary view and a criticism of Boughner's approach and conclusion, see María Rosa Lida de Malkiel, "El fanfarrón en el teatro del Renacimiento", RPhil, XI (1958), 268-291. See, also, Crawford, "The Braggart Soldier and the Rufián in the Spanish Drama of the Sixteenth Century", RR, II (1911), 186-208, and Raymond Leonard Grismer, The Influence of Plautus in Spain before Lope de Vega, together with Chapters on the Dramatic Technique and the Revival of Plautus in Spain, New York, 1944. The works alluded to above also investigate the possibility of a relationship between Fernández's soldado and Centurio in the later editions of the Celestina.

[34]In this respect, the soldado is comparable to the hermit Macario in the Egloga o farsa del nascimiento. The hermit acted as the mouthpiece of orthodoxy, but was also the motive for the shepherds' tomfoolery.

[35]Ensayo de una biblioteca..., I, cols. 703 ff. The work was also alluded to by Salvá (Catálogo, I, p. 240), who mentioned an edition of about 1530.

[36]Cotarelo reached no definite conclusion about the authorship of the piece, but included it in the Academy facsimile on the

grounds that Fernández's authorship was "probable" (see Farsas y églogas, Academy facsimile, pp. xv-xvi and p. xxi). All quotations from the Coplas are according to Cotarelo's edition.

[37]Although the earliest extant edition of the Coplas is the Alcalé de Henares edition of 1604, their subject places them in the first half of the sixteenth century.

[38]Compare the role of the salvaje in this work with that of another in López Ranjel's Nativity play, in which some shepherds also take to their heels (see above chap. IV).

[39]See the extract from Crawford's "Early Spanish Wedding Plays" cited above at the beginning of this chapter.

[40]The performance of a play to celebrate a Marian festival is credible (see, Juliá Martínez, "La Asunción de la Virgen y el teatro primitivo español"). The Farsa del mundo y moral, by López de Yanguas, was a Marian play (see above chap. VI).

[41]In the other plays (Encina's Egloga XI, the Farsa by Juan de París), however, the setting at the hermitage is introduced as part of the love subject.

## Chapter XI

## THREE PASTORAL PLAYS

The three works discussed in the following pages were all written before Lucas Fernández published his Farsas y églogas in 1514. A case could, therefore, be made for placing this chapter before the previous one, but since Fernández's plays were probably written before 1514 they could have become widely known before 1508, the earliest date of composition among the three aforementioned works. On the other hand, on account of the uncertain chronology of Lucas Fernández's works and a possible limited diffusion before 1514, care must be taken in attributing similarities between his plays and these three works to his influence. The possibility must not be overlooked that devices apparently employed for the first time by Fernández and the apparent result of his originality, then used by other writers, were not derived by all of them from a common tradition. Without more knowledge about the origins of the drama in Spain and more data on its early dramatists and their plays, without more texts, and without even a definite chronology of the works of the principal writers, it is not easy to determine when an author was guided by a generally accepted convention and when by a convention as moulded by one particular dramatist. This position must be adopted equally in determining the extent of Encina's influence as well as that

of Lucas Fernández.

Inclusion of Diego de Avila's Egloga ynterlocutoria in Fernando Colón's catalogue with a record of a copy purchased at Alcalá de Henares in 1511 provides a terminus ante quem for the date of publication.[1] The extant copy gives the place of printing as Alcalá de Henares, but is not dated. Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 76) easily classified the eclogue as a wedding play since it contains a recitation of pedigree, dowry, and the groom's gifts to his bride, a mock-marriage scene, and a wedding song. Accepting this as the purpose of the play, and guided by its dedication to the Great Captain, Crawford also suggested that "it was probably written for performance in 1509 at the betrothal festivities of Elvira, his only daughter, to his old friend Bernardino de Velasco, Constable of Castile" (Spanish Drama..., p. 77).

The Egloga ynterlocutoria is one play to which the remarks made at the beginning of this chapter may apply. Eugen Kohler wrote in the introduction to his edition[2] that the play was richer in dramatic devices than any other piece of so early a date, a fact which led him to suppose foreign influence:

> Die Ekloge...hat in der spanischen Literatur kein Vorbild. Lucas Fernandezs' Farsen waren noch nicht erschienen, vielleicht zum Teil noch nicht einmal gedichtet. Nur Encinas Auto del Repelon kann als Vorgänger genannt werden. Aber welch ein Abstand zwischen dieser doch recht primitiven Posse und der Egloga ynterlocutoria! Nicht nur ist diese bedeutend umfangreicher als Encinas Auto, sie enthält auch eine Menge neuer, komischer, zum Teil recht derber und grotesk wirkender Elemente, die die spanische Eklogendichtung bis dahin nicht aufzuweisen hatte, wie die Schilderung des Totschlags,

> die Einführung des Heiratsvermittlers, die Beschwörungsszene; die komischen Antworten im Schlaf usw. Darin liegt die Bedeutung der Ekloge, die eigentlich ohne rechten Zusammenhang in der spanischen Literatur dasteht, über alle Produktion gleicher Art jener Zeit weit hinausragt; und darin liegt zugleich einer Entlehnung aus der italienischen Bauernposse begründet. (Sieben spanische..., pp. 171-172)

Kohler's assumption was confirmed for him by identifying Diego de Avila, the author of the eclogue, with one of the same name who lived for a time in Rome (see Sieben spanische..., pp. 170-171). Crawford, however, rejected Kohler's argument:

> Whether the author ever lived in Italy or not--it is by no means certain that he did--he got his material nearer home. The comic pedigree, the gifts, and the matchmaker were found in Fernández's Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella. What was easier than to have Diego de Avila add in his play the priest, the sacristan, and the burlesque service? It is true that so far as is known Fernández's plays were printed later, but Avila may have seen the Comedia de Bras-Gil performed or have heard of its performance. If such was not the case, he used some other native material, written or oral, for the plot and the situations. The pullas--a versified contest in abuse--were popular in many wedding plays. (Spanish Drama..., pp. 76-77)

He saw no reason why Diego de Avila could not have derived his plays from a combination of popular tradition and conventions shaped by earlier dramatists. In the following analysis, the relevance of the dramatic devices employed in the eclogue to its purpose as a betrothal play, together with the validity of the conclusions reached by Crawford and Kohler, will be assessed.

The central personage is Tenorio, a rustic of the conventional breed. In the opening scene with his father Hontoya, who had been impatiently waiting for his son, the conversation concerns

Tenorio's delayed arrival. The shepherd has been plagued with troubles: his dog stuck in a rabbit-warren; he had to defend his livestock against a wolf; finally, he had to recover a donkey stolen by a fellow-shepherd, who was left for dead after a fight. Tenorio cares little for the consequences he might have to pay of the fight ("Si me colgaren, colgado seré," l. 99)[3] and brushes aside his father's advice to seek sanctuary in the church. True to his rustic temperament, Tenorio is more concerned with immediate comforts, the need to satisfy his hunger and sleep to recover from his trying experiences. At Hontoya's insistence, he rests while a meal is prepared.

Thus far, nothing exceptional has occured. The rustic personages are predictably hungry and sleepy, concerned for their livestock and argumentative (see Appendix B). As Tenorio settles to sleep, a marriage-broker, Alonso Benito, arrives to negotiate a match with one Teresa Turpina. With the prospective groom asleep, the case is put to his father. Alonso Benito conventionally exalts the pedigree of the bride-to-be:

> Ella es sobrina de Pero García,
> y nieta también de Andrés del Batán,
> y prima segunda de Juan Sacristán,
> y hermana carnal de Alonso Matía.
> Y en Carrascalejo tiene una tía
> qu'en toda ll'aldea no l'hay más rica, (ll. 145-150)

but Hontoya is not enthusiastic. He does not want to lose his son and have no-one to tend the animals. Moreover, he is not impressed with his proposed daughter-in-law. In the last resort, Hontoya is more concerned for his stomach and turns his attention

to his meal.

Not having progressed with the father, Alonso Benito turns to the sleeping son. At first the somnolent shepherd produces only gibberish and, when eventually aroused, explains he had been dreaming he was "porquero de todo el lugar" (l. 236) before dozing off again. Alonso Benito recites an incantation to arouse Tenorio a second time and finally succeeds in obtaining his complete attention. Again the basis for the action is conventional. Diego de Avila developed the device of the sleepy shepherd further than other dramatists,[4] but did so by exploiting the conventional stupidity of the rustic and coupling it with a comic incantation, a device probably to be traced to folk tradition.[5]

With Tenorio awake, the marriage is again discussed and Alonso Benito lies that Hontoya has already agreed to it. He and Tenorio approach Hontoya--who, meanwhile, has eaten all the food he had prepared and left none for the others--and eventually obtain his consent, conditional to Tenorio's agreement. As yet, however, Tenorio has neither seen his intended bride, nor knows her name. When told it is Teresa Turpina he demures and is persuaded only after a tantalizing description of her from Alonso Benito. The sole remaining hurdle is the dowry, in which Hontoya, as a diligent father, is interested. The list of items, conventional to the wedding play, is recited by Alonso Benito:

> Cama, escaño, cedazo, gamella
> y todo ell apero que habrán menester.

Y dalle han jarro, barreña y puchero,
y más le darán sartén y caldera
y un buen vasar con su cantarera,
y aqueste en que maja que llaman mortero,
y el novio se puede ser majadero. (ll. 479-485)
.....
También le darán la burra preñada,
oveja parida con dos cordericos;
y más una clueca con cinco pollicos,
y una cochina que tiene cinchada,
y ella está bien vestida y calzada. (ll. 489-493)

Both Hontoya and Tenorio are satisfied, the latter now anxious to see matters concluded.

The action is interrupted at this point to eulogize the Great Captain and Don Pedro de Acuña and is taken up again, the dramatist having done his duty to his patrons, when Alonso Gaitero arrives, sent by the bride's mother to enquire how negotiations have proceeded. Since they are concluded, he leaves to summon the wedding party and Tenorio is sent by his father to dress himself for the occasion. Tenorio's return and the arrival of the wedding party are preceded, however, by a further comic scene. So that Tenorio may get his Sunday clothes, Toribuelo is sent for a key. Toribuelo describes the approaching wedding party and, before Tenorio's precipitate return, drinks all the wine Hontoya offers him.

The wedding itself, a further conventional feature, is despatched summarily, but formally, by the crego, urged by the sacristán not to spare the holy water, "que no es cosa que cuesta dinero" (l. 744). Immediately after, the scene is disturbed by the sudden arrival of Gonzalo Ramón, sent by the cura to prevent the ceremony. The argument this causes is finally settled by

Alonso Benito, who explains that the priest wanted to keep the bride for himself. The company then thinks about entertainment. There is first a wrestling match and then a contest of pullas, in which Alonso Gaitero, eventually victimized by all, ends the affair by suggesting a song from three of the zagalas present. This is done and the eclogue is concluded with an appropriate villancico:

> Regocíjese el pastor
> y descanse su cuidado,
> pues que ya está desposado. (ll. 977-979)

Beginning with the wedding, the final part of the eclogue contains a series of familiar elements. The anti-clerical humour figures in both religious and secular plays, the shepherds' games are characteristic of the Nativity drama, and the villancico is a customary conclusion to any kind of play.[6]

From this brief account of the eclogue, the variety of incident in its action may be appreciated. For the most, however, these incidents are stock elements encountered throughout the early Spanish drama. The basis of the work is the standard wedding play. Commencing with the negotiations for the marriage between Tenorio and Teresa Turpina, Diego de Avila introduced the recitation of pedigree and dowry, included a wedding scene, and ended with a customary song. To this extent, the performance at the betrothal festivities of the Great Captain's daughter was an adaptation of a traditional subject. The eclogue is associated, moreover, with drama insofar as its author exploited the conventional portrayal of rustic types. The

stupid Tenorio, the shepherd's games, including the contest of pullas, the preoccupation with food and sleep were standard devices of pastoral farce (see above n. 6). For the rest, Diego de Avila had only to resort to his own imagination and acquaintance with popular humour in order to develop these comic devices and unite them in a single plot.

As Crawford suggested (see above), Diego de Avila could easily have derived the principal elements of the wedding eclogue from Lucas Fernández's Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella, which was possibly well known before its publication in 1514. It is equally possible, however, that both he and Fernández derived their works from a common popular tradition, a possibility more apparent on a further scrutiny of Diego de Avila's eclogue and the purpose for which he intended it. The Egloga ynterlocutoria is unreservedly in the tradition of the early pastoral drama, and it is unnecessary to postulate foreign influence, but it is equally derived from a popular Fescennine tradition, which Otis H. Green distinguished as a characteristic of wedding festivities.[7]

The essential difference between Diego de Avila's eclogue and the wedding plays by Lucas Fernández is the tone of the subject. Fernández exploited the conventional portrayal of the rustic and the conventions of courtly love as a source of burlesque comedy; Diego de Avila, by contrast, exploited similar rustic characters, but as personages in a ribald farce. Consequently, the courtship and wedding motifs in the latter's play are quite distinctive. Although in the tradition of the comic pastoral, the

conventions of love are ignored. The matching of Tenorio with Teresa is not conducted through a conventional courtship scene in the style of the pastourelle, but through a farcical action involving a rustic casamentero and a pair of comic shepherds. In fact, there is even a reversal of the normal situation in that a shepherd has to be persuaded to accept a shepherdess. The allusions to love, by contrast, are in the tone of the Fescennine tradition popular at wedding and betrothal festivities.

Tenorio's first objection, raised on hearing the name of his intended bride, is based on Teresa's intellectual poverty:

> ¡O hí de puta, y qué mala espina!
> Por Dios, que entiendo que está trastornada, (ll. 415-416)

and is promptly refuted by Alonso Benito. A second protest, about Teresa's meagre physique, is also rejected by Alonso Benito, who, in the process, arouses Tenorio by an enticing description of the wench:

> Ves, aunque tiene la cara flaquilla,
> no pienses qu'es toda de aquella natura;
> qu'estos dos dedos y más de gordura
> entiendo que tiene en cada costura.
> ¡O hí de puta, y qué rabadilla
> debe tener la hí de vellaca!
> Una espaldaza mayor que una vaca,
> y tetas tan grandes, qu'es maravilla. (ll. 433-440)

Tenorio is gratified and, enquiring about the source of Alonso Benito's information, is further excited by a tale equivalent to Torres Naharro's bawdy introitos (see above n. 1):

> Vila el domingo estar retozando
> con Pero Rodriguez el hijo de Pablo. (ll. 449-450)
> .....
> Echó más de tanta pierna de huera,
> que en vellas m'estaba la carne temblando.

Y aún más te diré: que aynas llegara,
¿quies que lo diga? a dalla un pellizco;
si no me tuviera mi hermano Francisco,
a la hé, yo con ella pegara,
¡o, hí de puta! y ¡quál la parara!
según la rabieza qu'entonces tenía;
y aún que me asiera de cuanto tenía,
entiendo pardios que no la soltara. (ll. 455-464)

Tenorio needs to be told no more:

¿Sabes, Benito quál m'has parado
conestas razones que tú 'stás diciendo?
Que todo m'he 'stado aquí deshaciendo.
Por esto, si quieres, acaba priado, (ll. 465-468)

and, henceforth, he is anxious to see the matter settled, for reasons readily apparent. He insists on a quick end to the discussion about the dowry:

Mira ¡qué tiempo para escuchar!
Acaba, si quieres, ayna priado, (ll. 505-506)

and is similarly anxious for Hontoya and Alonso Benito to end their eulogy of the Great Captain:

¿Querés saber, padre, que tengo pensado
que entramos a dos tomais por remedio
d'estaros metiendo palabras en medio
porqu'este mi hecho se quede olvidado?
(ll. 577-580)

The nature of Tenorio's anticipation is stressed in remarks from the other personages. Alonso Benito tells him to stop drooling and curb his impatience:

Alimpia ese moco que traes colgado;
ya la querrías encima saltar, (ll. 507-508)

an observation later repeated by Hontoya:

Está ya Tenorio la baba colgada
que entiendo pardios que no vee la hora.
(ll. 613-614)

The emphasis on the enticement of Tenorio to accept the proposed

match, with the portrayal of him as a drolling rustic, are symptomatic of the purpose of the eclogue. The salaciousness of these aspects is not unique. The reason for the cura's attempted delay of the ceremony is to save Teresa Turpina for himself (ll. 819-822) and the contest of pullas (ll. 864-960) is, in parts, overtly ribald. All these elements are consistent, however, in a work intended for a wedding festivity, even before such exalted company as the Great Captain and his friends. The occasion for ribaldry and burlesque which a wedding festivity provided (see above n. 7) justifies the conclusion that the Egloga ynterlocutoria was as equally derived from the popular traditions of these festivities as from conventional dramatic formulae. In the last resort, both Lucas Fernández and Diego de Avila exploited similar sources, but where the former incorporated the conventions of love into a rustic comedy, the latter, introducing similar rustic personages, adhered to a different comic tradition and excluded the conventional portrayal of love as a predominant topic. In total, the Egloga ynterlocutoria is another illustration of the versatility of conventional drama. In addition to appearing in Nativity plays, a series of commemorative works, and the pastoral love drama, the same devices of composition could be used in an eclogue based on the traditions of popular comedy.

Salazar's Egloga de Breno is also a wedding play, but of a different type from the Egloga ynterlocutoria. The extant copy was transcribed and published by Heaton,[8] but no more is known

of the author of the eclogue than that contained in its title:

> Egloga hecha por Salazar de Breno y otros tres pastores compañeros suyos. Dirigida al muy yllustre y magnifico señor el Duque de Medinaceli. (p. 76)

In spite of the anonymity surrounding the author's identity, however, the purpose of the eclogue he wrote is clear. Crawford demonstrated[9] that it was probably written in 1511 for the celebrations honouring the marriage of Don Juan de la Cerda, second Duke of Medinaceli, to whom the piece is dedicated, to Doña María de Silva y Toledo. He also showed that the Cerdano and the Silvana, referred to in the eclogue, were pastoral disguises for the parties contracting the marriage.

The Egloga de Breno shares dramatic devices common to the works of both Lucas Fernández and Diego de Avila, but lacks the latter's ribald tone. In common with Lucas Fernández, Salazar incorporated the conventional portrayal of love with rustic comedy. His eclogue must, therefore, also be placed in company with those by Encina, from whose Egloga XII he probably derived the action. The difference is that whereas Encina dramatized conventions of love for their own sake and highlighted their conventionality with scenes of rustic comedy, Salazar exploited both as a basis for a wedding play and appropriated them to the occasion of performance.

If the action of Salazar's work is derived from Encina's Egloga XII, his central figure, the shepherd Breno, is also modelled on Encina's central personage, since Breno follows the same behavioural pattern as the ill-fated Fileno. He is not

quite so vociferous but, like Fileno, nonetheless invokes the world to witness his affliction:

> ¡Gentes, aues, animales,
> sierras, bosques venid a ver
> mis cordojos desiguales! (ll. 1-3)[10]

Both Fileno and Breno disdain life and desire death because of their intense suffering through love. Like Fileno before suicide, Breno also bids his belongings farewell. He does not break them, as Encina's hero did, but burns them on a fire kindled for their destruction, into which they are thrown with appropriate words for each item from the lamenting shepherd (ll. 21-80). At the end, Breno has only his soul and after some hesitation, prompted by thinking that he will not see his beloved after death, he resolves to be rid of that:

> No tengo mas que despida.
> Sin ninguna cosa quedo
> sino esta anima aflegida,
> que seria bien que fuesse yda.
> Y despedilla no puedo;
> mas si muero
> no vere la que bien quiero
> que es peor.
> Mas biuir con tal dolor
> dolo a fuego no lo quiero. (ll. 81-90)

The execution of his resolve is delayed, however, by the arrival of another shepherd, Briseno.

After the serious tone of Breno's monologue, involving the burning of his belongings and the decision to kill himself, there is a comic scene. Briseno tries to guess his friends complaint and suggests,

> ...mal de riñonera
> o dolor en el meollo. (ll. 112-113)
> .....

...gota coral
o dolor de la asadura. (11. 124-125)

Even when informed by Breno that his malady is love, Briseno comically enumerates other illness:

Mal de tripas, sauañones,
ques peor que pestilencia;
y aun peor
es tener hombre dolor
de cabeça.
Y aun si corre y estropieça
le queda mayor rencor. (11. 134-140)

His flippancy makes a mockery of Breno's plight. Consequently, comedy was used by Salazar in the same way as Juan del Encina. It provides relief after the gravity of the lover's complaint, but, by ridiculing his complaint, the comic personage exposes its conventionality and shows it is not to be taken seriously.

If Briseno is a comedian, however, he is also employed to convey the theories of love. As well as humouring Breno, he is also sympathetic and listens to Breno's complaint. In this respect, he functions, like either Cardonio or Suplicio in Encina's Eglogas XII and XIV, as a friend and adviser to the distressed lover. Briseno tells Breno not to suffer silently, but to gain some relief by speaking about his pain. Breno, however, goes no further than revealing that he sighs for the shepherdess Silvana and reiterating that his sorrow is unbearable and death his sole means of escape. Briseno's best advice ("Que la oluides pues que mueres", 1. 207) is barely adequate; Breno bids farewell and goes off to die.

Breno is in the same straits as Fileno and driven to the same lengths, but, as earlier indicated, his state is not depicted

as being so extreme as Encina's hero. Love is not deified, as by Fileno, and there is none of the extravagance of Plácida and Vitoriano. Breno is portrayed as a conventional lover, but is used solely as the basis for the play, so that his plight is not a matter for serious concern. The conventionality of the situation is apparent in the scene following Breno's departure, when Briseno complains of love's injustices:

> ¡O amores,
> engañadores, traydores,
> bien mortal!
> cas muerto el mejor zagal
> dentro todos los pastores.
>
> Con quanto tu juntaras
> con tu falsedad riente.
> Aunque lo procures mas
> nunca fructificaras, (ll. 256-264)

and describes the changes in Breno. Briseno sorrows for Breno and his flocks, which, left without a shepherd, are invited to join the dirge sung for their master.

The mourning shepherd desires the company of his friend Talante, to whom to relate the sorrowful event and who appears with conventional promptness.[11] As if to banish any seriousness again and show that Breno's predicament is not seriously intended, there is another comic scene, the twin of that occurring at Briseno's entry, since Talante tries to guess the cause of Briseno's sorrow. When it is finally revealed, the two shepherds discuss the plausibility of Breno's love for Silvana. Briseno points out that love can occur through "mil conuenientes" (l. 331), a fact which explains to Talante how Breno can have fallen for Silvana, who is clearly of different status

than he (see ll. 326-330 and 341-342). The conversation then again hinges on the conventions of love as the two shepherds discuss Breno's change from happiness to sadness, a further characteristic of the afflicted pastoral lover.

This discussion is interrupted, however, by the arrival of Carmeno, who also prevents their going to find Breno. Talante and Briseno chide him for the interruption, but Carmeno is too cheerful to be daunted and, after hearing about Breno's plight, announces that "Siluana esta desposada / con vn zagal de Medina" (ll. 461-462). Talante and Briseno are overjoyed when they hear the news and forget about Breno for a while. They praise Cerdano and Silvana, the Duke of Medinaceli and his bride in pastoral disguise, referring to their worthiness for each other and their noble lineage (ll. 467-570).[12]

When the conversation eventually returns to Breno, the shepherds decide to look for him, either to bury or console him. Their discovery of him soon after, apparently dead, is not, however, cause for a sorrowful ending to the play. It is an occasion for further rustic comedy. Debating what to do, Carmeno suggests singing "mucha cosa del ygreja" (l. 615), as at the removal of an aunt's body, and, at Briseno's instigation, intones three lines. Before burying Breno, however, the shepherds decide to ensure he is dead and do so by shouting in his ear. Breno revives immediately, protesting he had been dead:

> ¿Para que me aueys tornado
> pues que era ya fallescido? (ll. 637-638)

Briseno quickly denounces his claim, but, unperturbed, Breno relates what he saw in the lands of the dead. All who loved were suffering:

> Todos vi que padescian
> los que mucho se querian (ll. 656-657)

and Breno enumerates the names of celebrated lovers, all of whom he saw tortured (ll. 664-698).[13] The multitude was so great that he concludes:

> Vide tantos
> cantando llorosos cantos,
> que pluguiesse
> a Dios que en el cielo viesse
> tanto numero de santos. (ll. 699-703)

The only exceptions, presumably in deference to the pair for whom the work was written, were married couples. By contrast, they were treated more gently:

> Yuan por vnos pradales
> dos a dos,
> dandole gracias a Dios
> en lindas bozes yguales. (ll. 660-663)

When the eclogue ends with this prophecy of the fate awaiting lovers, Breno, it is assumed, has been suitably chastised by his vision of the after-life and cured of his love for Silvana.

Although Salazar undoubtedly derived the action of this eclogue from Egloga XII and the portrayal of his central personage from Encina's Fileno, although the conventions of love and rustic comedy were exploited as the basis of the work, the uses to which these sources were put distinguish the Egloga de Breno from Juan del Encina's eclogues. Salazar did not exploit convention for its own sake, but as a basis for an entertainment

offered to amuse and honour a bride and groom at their wedding festivities. No less than the speeches in praise of Cerdano and Silvana, Medinaceli and his bride, it would have been flattering to have portrayed a shepherd enamoured of Silvana's beauty and willing to sacrifice his life for her. It would not, however, have been appropriate to have lingered on Breno's plight, nor to have presented his death as caused by a member of the distinguished audience, albeit in pastoral disguise. Consequently, Salazar did not exploit his character's suffering to the full. Each scene concerned with Breno's sorrow is followed by another lighter in tone, in which his conventional affliction yields to laughter. Witness Briseno's guessing at his distress, Talante's conjectures as to Briseno's sorrow, the pleasure on learning of the marriage between Cerdano and Silvana, the comedy over the discovery of Breno's body, and the eventual happy outcome of the eclogue. Even the imitation of Fileno's suicide is made to serve flattery when Breno describes a vision of tormented lovers in Hell and married couples in Heaven, the latter presumably intended to be the happy lot of the pair in honour of whose marriage the eclogue was performed. Salazar may have been constrained to dramatize a conventional subject, but he nonetheless exercized the freedom to exploit it in accordance with the exigencies of his performance. As a lighthearted wedding play the Egloga de Breno is a product of convention, but it also illustrates, when compared with the works of Diego de Avila and Lucas Fernández, the different forms convention could take.

For Creizenach (Geschichte..., III, pp. 9-10), Crawford (Spanish Drama..., pp. 69-71), and Kohler (Sieben spanische..., pp. 160-162) the third play discussed in this chapter was also an imitation of Encina's Egloga XII. All three commentators on the Egloga de Torino, the play in question, drew attention to its arte mayor verses and the concluding villancico, as in Encina's play. The eclogue, named after its principal personage, is contained in an anonymous, historico-sentimental roman à clef, the Question de Amor. This novel is set in Naples and, from the historical events alluded to in it, was probably written between 1508 and 1512. It was published in Valencia in 1513, the first known of a series of editions.[14] Evidence of a performance of the eclogue is lacking, but the historical veracity of the novel in which it is contained makes a performance feasible. Menéndez y Pelayo wrote: "La Egloga de Torino tiene todas las trazas de haber sido representada con las circunstancias que allí se dicen, y que si bien escasa de acción y movimiento, compite en la expresión de afectos y en la limpia y tersa versificación con la mejor que en los orígenes de nuestra escena puede encontrarse" (Orígenes..., III, p. 50). Nevertheless, the inclusion in the Egloga de Torino of several traditions of the early Spanish drama warrants its inclusion in this study.

Because the eclogue was written in Italy, the possibility of Italian influence is raised. Crawford, for example, wrote that "the origin of the eclogue is undeniably Italian, and the

author got from Italian literature the practice of introducing real persons under a semi-veiled name, but for the rest of the play he followed in Encina's footsteps" (Spanish Drama..., pp. 70-71). But the matter is not so cut and dried. Remembering that Encina had introduced himself in his works before setting foot in Italy, that Francisco de Madrid had presented the French King Charles and Ferdinand the Catholic in allegorical disguise in an eclogue (in arte mayor, moreover) performed in 1494, and that Salazar, in 1511, alluded to "real persons under a semi-veiled name" in the Egloga de Breno, Crawford's claim is amiss, since pastoral disguising was a convention of the Spanish drama. Moreover, the Egloga de Torino is part of the Question del Amor, resulting in personages with a rather curious nature. The dramatis personae of the eclogue are disguises for the novel's fictional characters, which, in turn, are disguises for historical figures.[15]

Italian influence in the Egloga de Torino is traceable to two sources. As an episode in the Question del Amor, it is derived from part of Boccaccio's Il Filocolo, the general source of the Spanish novel. In addition, it is part of the Italian vogue for pastoral. It is to be traced indirectly to the eclogue by Antonio Tebaldeo which Encina dramatized in Egloga XII, the parallel of the Egloga de Torino. Consequently, the ultimate origin of the eclogue is Italian, but the conventions exploited in it and the form given them resulted from the influence of Encina and the traditions of the Spanish pastoral drama. The content of the Egloga de Torino is, therefore, also similar to that

of Salazar's Egloga de Breno. The action involves a distressed lover intent on suicide, and the gravity of his plight alternates with comedy. Moreover, as in the Egloga de Breno, the distraught lover finds, if not a cure, consolation for his troubles. It is difficult to suppose that Encina, Salazar, and the author of the Egloga de Torino could each have arrived independently at the same dramatic formula. The origin was undoubtedly the Italian eclogue by Antonio Tebaldeo as dramatized by Encina in Egloga XII. His dramatization was then adopted by the other two writers, who each added his own variations.

In the usual style of the pastoral love dramas, the Egloga de Torino begins with the monologue of a lover. Torino describes his suffering in conventional terms. His condition has become unbearable. The tone at the beginning of his speech prevails throughout and establishes him as the customary lover:

> O grave dolor, o mal sin medida,
> o ansia rabiosa mortal de sofrirse,
> ni puede callarse, ni osa dezirse
> el daño que acaba del todo mi vida;
> mi pena no puede tenerse escondida,
> la causa no sufre poder publicarse,
> ni para decirse ni para callarse,
> ni entrada se halla, ni tiene salida. (p. 67)

He employs the conventional paradoxes of speech and, as convention demands, rails against the suffering imposed by love:

> Contentate agora, amor engañoso,
> pues todos tus fuegos con tanto furor
> encienden y abrasan de vn pobre pastor
> sus tristes entrañas sin dalle reposo.
> Bien te podrás llamar vitorioso
> venciendo vn vencido que quiso vencerse
> de quien imposible le fue defenderse. (p. 68)

Torino's complaint is equally akin to those spoken by Breno

and Fileno, but, as gradually revealed during the eclogue, he is not so extreme a representative of the conventional lover as Encina's personage. In fact, for one who so completely influenced the early Spanish drama, Encina's exaggerated version of the pastoral lover, portrayed in Eglogas XII and XIV, was not adopted and none of the imitations of his eclogues exploited the conventions of love so fully as he. Encina used these conventions for their own sake as a source of drama, but his imitators swam with the stream and simply used his works as the basis for their own productions, adapting them to suit their own purposes. Hence, convention in Lucas Fernández was a source of burlesque comedy appropriate for a wedding play. For Salazar's Egloga de Breno it was also the basis of a wedding play and a means of flattering his patrons, while in the Egloga de Torino it provided an episode in a novel. In all these examples, however, the exploiting of convention for its own sake as the subject of a drama was not the uppermost idea and aim.

Above all, dramatists accepted the exterior appearance of convention. The use to which they put it was, however, a different matter. Thus, Torino follows the behavioural pattern of Fileno and Breno. He, too, bids farewell to his flocks and belongings, destroying the latter as did the other shepherds. The only item he saved was his crook, kept as a support in his last moments, for, having destroyed his possessions, he resolves to kill himself. Torino's lament was overheard, however, by Guillardo, the fool of the eclogue. Characteristically, he cannot

understand why Torino is distressed, for Guillardo is traditionally stupid and does not share the conventional ideas about love.[16] He therefore wonders whether Torino has been bitten by a dog or a rabid wolf, whether he has argued with his master, or witnessed some disaster to his flock. He tries unsuccessfully to stir the prostrate Torino with his crook and then, seeing another shepherd, Quiral, calls to him for help (see above n. 11).

Both Guillardo and Quiral approach Torino to find the cause of his troubles. At first Quiral cannot understand Torino, who answers his questions in riddles, and when the truth finally dawns on him that the complaint is love he is hardly sympathetic. On learning that Torino sighs for the shepherdess Benita, Quiral tells him this should be cause for happiness. Needless to say, Torino is not impressed by the comment and speaks about the hopelessness of his love for Benita. The situation develops on the lines of Encina's Egloga XII, where Cardonio fruitlessly advised Fileno. The roles of the personages are duplicated: Fileno (the afflicted lover) and Cardonio (his friend and advisor) are paralleled by Torino and Quiral respectively.

The gravity of the discussion is not maintained for long, however, as the conventional comic rustic enters the conversation. Guillardo asks about Torino's malady and Quiral tries his best to enlighten the ignorant rustic, explaining the causes and symptoms of love. Guillardo, however, cannot penetrate the mystery and replies,

O yo no t'entiendo o no sé que s'es.
Ni es esso ni essotro, ni es cosa ni al;
no es bestia, ni es ave, ni pece, ni res;
no está del derecho ni está del enues;
no dexa viuir ni mata tampoco;
no es gusarapa, no es cuerdo ni loco.
Pues yo te prometo que a la fin algo es. (p. 70)

Without realizing it Guillardo has adequately, but comically defined love. He hopes for further enlightenment and questions Torino, whose replies only add to the confusion, so that when Guillardo sees Benita approaching, accompanied by Illana, he suggests,

Pues hela que viene, la que assi te mata,
con otra zagala que se anda tras ella,
levanta, Torino, e vamos a ella.
Por baxo estas matas pues no se decata,
e pues que te quexas que assina te trata,
aburrelle un tiro con este mi dardo. (p. 71)

The initial purpose of the rustic in the Egloga de Torino is as a comedian. Without Guillardo the eclogues would have as much interest as a flat dialogue about the conventions of love. Creizenach's criticism (Geschichte..., III, p. 10) that the comic character was "ohne besonderen Erfolg", did not compensate for Guillardo's conventional make-up. He plays the role apportioned him by tradition and keeps the eclogue as a lighthearted piece by intruding his comic behaviour into the serious discussion of love. At the same time, his conventional stupidity provides an opportunity for Torino and Quiral to disclose their ideas about love. Consequently, Guillardo's reaction to Torino's plight exposes it as conventional and prevents it from being taken seriously, for his stupid ignorance of love subjects it to ridicule.

With Benita's entry, Torino has the opportunity to confront

her with his grievance. He does so at considerable length (pp. 71-72), but unsuccessfully. Benita is annoyed, rejects him, and leaves him. Torino's assertion as she departs,

> Miafe, Benita, imposible sería
> que aunque me dexas allá voy contigo,
> e tú aunque te vas aquí estás comigo,
> que siempre en mis ojos tu figura está.
> Benita está aquí, Torino está allá;
> si esto no crees la obra es testigo, (p. 72)

because of its paradoxes, contributes to Guillardo's further bewilderment and results in more comedy. Seriousness is again dispersed and the extravagance of the conventional ideas about love is used to provoke amusement. Guillardo is silenced by Quiral, however, who wishes to speak to Torino seriously. Quiral chides the love-sick shepherd for his confession to Benita and advises that greater glory is gained by silent suffering in an attitude of service. Torino is convinced:

> Al fin tu consejo hauré de seguir
> pues pena me sobra y en ella razon,
> que poco es mi daño según la ocasion,
> pues quiero penando muriendo viuir;
> quiero cantar, llorar e reyr;
> quiero plañir, baylar e quexar;
> quiero suffrir, gritar e callar;
> quiero por fuerça de grado servir, (p. 73)

and the eclogue ends optimistically. Guillardo's suggestion of a song is adopted and the three shepherds sing a villancico. The theme of the song,

> Nunca yo pense que amor
> con sus amores
> d'amor matasse pastores.
> Tras galanes palaciegos
> yo pense que siempre andaua,
> e no pense que mataua
> los pastores ni matiegos, (ibid.)

recalls the idea of the universality of love exploited by both Encina and Fernández. The idea is not dwelt on during the Egloga de Torino itself, but this fact is unimportant. The concept was commonplace in the pastoral drama and was, therefore, appropriately contained in a villancico ending a dramatization of this conventional subject.

The essential feature of the Egloga de Torino is its conventionality. Torino conforms to a type and through him, his lament, his discussion with the other shepherds, and confrontation with Benita are conveyed the traditional ideas on love. Quiral and Guillardo complete the presentation, the former as the lover's advisor and the latter as a comic rustic who prompts elucidation of the theories of love from both Quiral and Torino. In this regard, the Egloga de Torino is in the same vein as Encina's Egloga XII and Salazar's Egloga de Breno and is completely part of the early Spanish pastoral drama.

Nevertheless, the Egloga de Torino has distinctive features and was written for a reason different from either of the eclogues by Encina and Salazar. Encina's Egloga XII, a dramatization of an eclogue intended for recitation by Antonio Tebaldeo, exploited the potential of the conventions of love for drama and adapted them to the formulae of Encina's own dramatic eclogues of earlier composition. Salazar accepted Encina's formula and adapted it for use in a lighthearted wedding play to celebrate the marriage of the Duke of Medinaceli. The author of the Egloga de Torino accepted that same formula, but his work is only one episode in the larger Question del Amor and consequently is part of the

general purpose of that novel.

The introduction to the Egloga de Torino reveals that its action related "en metro ... lo que passó en prosa" (p. 68). It is a dramatization of an event already taken place in the novel. In Crawford's words (Spanish Drama..., p. 70), the novel itself is a "bit of casuistry". It was imitated from part of Boccaccio's Il Filocolo dwelling on a series of problems concerned with love.[17] In this context, the Egloga de Torino is one such problem, proposed, debated, and resolved. The problem, Torino's unrequited love and unbearable pain, is introduced at the beginning of the eclogue. The subsequent action consists in the further debating and elaboration of this problem, first with the two shepherds, Guillardo and Quiral, then with Benita, the object of Torino's love, and then, with the shepherds. Torino, defeated in argument with both Benita and the shepherds, is, as a result, obliged to accept Quiral's solution of the problem and persuaded to endure his suffering in silence.

The formula derived from Juan del Encina's Egloga XII provided a convenient vehicle for this problem, but the problem itself is not a matter for serious concern. Torino's predicament provides an opportunity for a discussion on the theories of love, punctuated with episodes of conventional rustic humour. Probably, like Salazar in the Egloga de Breno, the author of the Question del Amor was constrained to adhere to an established pattern for his play, but he also exercized his freedom to exploit it. In the Egloga de Breno, a wedding play, Breno's complaint and

its outcome were suited to the occasion of performance. His plight was solved, not by suicide as he contemplated, but by a vision of a lovers' Hell and a Heaven for married couples. Similarly, the Egloga de Torino has an ending suitable to its purpose as a discussion of a conventional problem. Torino is reconciled to his sufferings and will endure a living-death while serving his lady, in accordance with the code of love of which he is a representative type. His conventional situation is, thereby, conventionally concluded.[18]

It is not adequate to say that the author of the Egloga de Torino followed in the footsteps of Juan del Encina without qualifying the proximity with which he followed him. Although the overall similarity of several dramatic eclogues with Encina's works is undeniable, the differences must not be neglected. Egloga XII, the Egloga de Breno, and the Egloga de Torino all contain a similar action dramatized through similar devices, but each is characterized by the purpose and occasion for which it was written. While recognizing the conventionality of the subject-matter and its presentation, it must also be admitted that room for manoeuvre remained, that conventions could be differently emphasized, differently exploited, and related to different occasions.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER XI

[1]A *terminus post quem* is provided by Torres Naharro's *Diálogo del nascimiento* (1505-07?), which Gillet believed influenced the *Egloga ynterlocutoria* (see, above, chap. IV and "*Propalladia*"..., IV, p. 472), but the probable date was uncovered by Crawford (see below).

[2]*Sieben spanische*..., pp. 236-266. All references to the text are according to Kohler's edition.

[3]Compare a similar lackadaisical attitude shown by Lucas after losing a pair of animals in Gil Vicente's *Auto pastoril castellano*:

> Si los lobos las comieron,
> ¿hámelas Dios de traer?
> ¡Harto terná que hazer!
> ¥ si murieron,
> muchomás que yo perdieron. (ll. 119-123)

[4]Compare, for example, the sleepy shepherd device used in Lucas Fernández's two Nativity eclogues.

[5]See the chapter on primitivism in "*Propalladia*"..., IV (pp. 3-57). The comic incantation is also found in Torres Naharro's *Comedia Aquilana* (ed. Gillet, "*Propalladia*"..., II, pp. 514-516) and in an anonymous Valencian eclogue (ed. Kohler, *Sieben spanische*..., pp. 294-296).

[6]For these conventions in the early sixteenth century drama as a whole, see under the appropriate heading in Appendix B. For the specific conventions of the wedding play, including the *Egloga ynterlocutoria*, see Crawford, "Early Spanish Wedding Plays", *passim*.

[7]See Green, "A Wedding *Introito* by Francisco de Aldana".

[8]"Two Sixteenth Century Dramatic Works", *RHi*, LXXII (1928), pp. 76-99. All references to the *Egloga de Breno* are according to Heaton's edition.

[9]"The Date of Salazar's *Egloga de Breno*", *HR*, IV (1936), 280-282.

[10]Cf. Fileno's speech, *Egloga* XII, ll. 73-80.

[11]The early dramatists experienced difficulties when introducing new personages and often resorted to the "calling device", or simply mentioned the new-comer's name. For a full documentation of this feature, see Appendix B, s.v. "Entry of personages".

[12]The exaltation of the lineage of Cerdano and Silvana may be

compared with the genealogy recitations customary in wedding plays (see Appendix B, s.v. "Genealogy").

[13]The enumeration of famous lovers was a convention of the pastoral (see above chap. X, n. 15).

[14]See Menéndez y Pelayo, Orígenes..., III, p. 48. Quotation of the Egloga de Torino is according to the original edition of Orígenes... (Vol. II, NBAE 7, Madrid, 1907, pp. 67-73), which also contained the texts of many early novels.

[15]For the key to the identity of the personages in the novel, see Menéndez y Pelayo, Orígenes..., III, pp. 51-53.

[16]Guillardo is a combination of the type represented by Zambardo in Encina's Egloga XII or by Briseno and Talante in Salazar's Egloga de Breno, used to provide comedy in an otherwise serious situation, and of the stupid shepherd found in the two plays by Lucas Fernández called Farsa o cuasi comedia.

[17]On the subject of Boccaccio's work in the Spanish drama, see two notes by Crawford: "Notes on the Amphitrion and Los Menecmos of Juan de Timoneda", MLR, IX (1914), 248-251, and "Again the Cuestion de Amor in the Early Spanish Drama", HR, I (1933), 319-322.

[18]On suffering as a convention of love, see Green, Spain and the Western Tradition, IV, p. 308, s.v. "Courtly love".

## Chapter XII

## PEDRO MANUEL DE URREA

The date and provenance of Pedro Manuel de Urrea's five dramatic eclogues, virtually unknown till Eugenio Asensio edited them in 1950 (see above chap. IV, n. 12), were alluded to during a discussion (chap. IV) of a Nativity play contained among them. The eclogues are some of the earliest plays written in the sixteenth century, but, not published till 1516, were influenced by still earlier works, thus demonstrating the extent to which conventions had already been shaped. Urrea's Nativity play, for example, was not the characteristic shepherd play, but was nonetheless derived from Encina and shared several of the features of his Christmas eclogues. This situation holds for Urrea's four secular plays, all of which are ultimately traceable to the products of his earlier contemporaries. Consequently, his work may be assessed in the terms of his exploitation of the pastoral legacy.

The Egloga llamada naue de seguridad, the first in Asensio's edition, is a good example of the kind of exploitation in which Urrea indulged. Its subject, presented in two distinct parts, is based on two elements predominant in the early Spanish drama: the shepherd's farewell to the country life to adopt another existence, and a conventional love situation. In both parts of the eclogue, however, there is an attempted re-moulding of conventional

features by placing them in new contexts.

After a prose argument of the eclogue, inserted, it seems, more for the benefit of a reader than a spectator,[1] a shepherd, Mingo, enters and criticizes the state of the world. His complaint is phrased as an address to a sea-captain, advised to remain a seafarer:

> ¡Patrón que nauegas en mar tantos años!
> avn que cossarios y vientos den guerra,
> no vendas la naue por salir a tierra,
> porque hallarás mayores engaños. (ll. 1-4)

Were he to abandon the sea for the land, he would be confronted with strife among men, in a corrupt, unjust, and lawless society, worshipping evil and unconcerned for spiritual welfare. Hence, Mingo has decided to go to sea and enlist with the first sailor who chances by:

> Y pues que conosco la poca verdad,
> la mucha malicia nunca castigada,
> acuerdo mudarme de aquesta morada
> por otro elemento de más calidad:
> tomáos la tierra, la mar me dexad
> por do Dios anduuo, San Pedro y los sanctos:
> porque en la tierra ay trabajos tantos,
> entro en la naue de seguridad.
>
> Si algún marinero por aquí viniesse,
> pues que tan cerca de aquí está la mar,
> como aquí otras veces suelen andar,
> yo juro a mi vida que con él me fuesse,
> porque en mala tierra yo no me viesse:
> que en estos romeros, tomillos, montañas,
> aquí me alcançan las furias, las sañas:
> querría yo andar do no me perdiesse. (ll. 32-48)

He repeats this intention to Bertol, a fellow-shepherd who vainly attempts to dissuade him:

> A la fe, Bertol, con esto concluyo:
> dexar quiero el cargo, cabaña y avn hato,

porque en la tierra ay tan falso trato,
por donde me pierdo, me daño y destruyo, (ll. 77-80)

and when a sailor does appear on the scene, Mingo volunteers as his servant and eventually departs with him.

Mingo's situation is a superficial repetition of the beginning of Encina's Egloga XI, where Cristino, dissatisfied with the transient world, decided to pursue the eternal benefits accruing from a spiritual life by retiring to a hermitage. The resemblance with Encina's eclogue does not extend much further, however. The outcome of Mingo's abandon of the country life is a situation exploiting the conventional aspects of love, as in Egloga XI, but is nothing like Cristino's involvement with Amor. Mingo's companion, Bertol, moreover, is not comparable with Justino, Cristino's advisor. Bertol does wonder, like Justino (see Egl. XI, ll. 91-115), how it is possible to forget the pleasures of the country:

¿Y podrás dexar tan gran gasajado,
como el olor de aquestos tomillos,
y en estas aguas el son de los grillos
y el dulce balido de nuestro ganado? (ll. 153-156)

but the eulogy of the countryside was, in any case, conventional (see Appendix B, s.v. "Praise of countryside"), particularly when personages were on the point of leaving it. Bertol is a rustic of the stupid type. His pursuits are those of the pleasure-loving shepherd, unconcerned with making life problematic or evaluating its morality. Consequently, he does not share Mingo's views and, through his ignorance, makes fun of them:

¿Qué cosa tan alticamada
que, juro a Sant Pego, por alto me passa? (ll. 57-58)
.....

No fundes tu gesta en cosa fundada;
deniega y oluida las cosas letradas;
estemos aquí en estas majadas,
que no verná cosa que sea penada. (ll. 61-64)
.....
¡Qué pensamiento tan alto es el tuyo!
Es materia de predicación.
Aburre las cosas de grande intención,
que yo contra eso ni entiendo, ni arguyo.
(ll. 73-76)

In this, however, he behaves conventionally.[2]

More than just related to one play (Egloga XI), Urrea's piece reflects ideas and episodes traceable to several works. The concept of transformation from one state to another, for example, was a distinctive characteristic of Encina's drama, appeared in several of his plays, and, with the change from shepherd to hermit and vice versa, was indeed a feature of Egloga XI. Mingo, the central figure of the first part of the Egloga llamada naue de seguridad, undergoes a change similar to that experienced by Cristino, but he is also the namesake of the rustic in Egloga VIII who became a courtier and went through the motions of his transformation by changing his clothes in the course of the eclogue. Urrea's Mingo does no less, since during the play he, too, casts his shepherd's clothes as if he were simultaneously sloughing his shepherd's life. He tells the sailor whom he hopes to serve:

Mas, porque me véays mi buen natural,
con vos quiero yrme donde os seruiré,
con otros vestidos y con mucha fe,
que nadie me juzgue a mí por zagal.
Mas dezidme luego si os es bien o mal.
Catadme desnudo, mirad qué tal quedo:
¿yo no paresco que basto y que puedo
hazeros seruicios como hombre leal? (ll. 105-112)

The distinguishing feature of Urrea's play is that love is not

included in the motivation for Mingo's change of state. Nevertheless, this fact did not prevent Urrea from portraying Mingo in accordance with the devices of the pastoral drama with which he was familiar. In part, Mingo conforms to the behavioural pattern of which Fileno, from Encina's Egloga XII, was the prototype, and which was adapted in the Egloga de Breno and the Egloga de Torino. Before leaving with the sailor, Mingo makes a farewell reminiscent of Fileno's words before his suicide. While Fileno, Breno, and Torino all destroyed their belongings as a preparation for death, however, Mingo hands his to Bertol and bequeathes them to his son Benito:

> Cata aquí luego primero el çurrón,
> yesca, eslauón, también pedreñal;
> cata la piedra do damos la sal;
> cata el cayado con el çamarrón:
> toma el rabel con que hago son
> y el caramillo; de todo reniego:
> toma el vestido que no es palaciego,
> que yo ya me hago de más perfección.
>
> Toma el bonete blanco que tenía
> y el gancho de hierro con estos cencerros;
> toma el siluillo que llama los perros,
> y el cuero de lobo que lleuo por chía;
> sortijas de cobre que me dió mi tía
> te dexo también en esta gran quiebra:
> toma estos guantes de cuero de enzebra
> que lleuo en el frío desta serranía. (ll. 137-152)[3]

The similarity with Egloga XII is continued even after Mingo's departure, since Bertol's lament for the loss of his friend is the counterpart of Cardonio's feeling of bereavement over Fileno (see Egl. XII, ll. 601-660):

> ¡O qué triste quedo, qué solo, qué muerto!
> ¡qué desuenturado sin tal compañía!
> en huertas y en montes, la noche y el día

he de passar con gran desconcierto.
¡O Mingo! ¡o Mingo! ¡o Mingo! por cierto
amigo y hermano de sangre y de amor,
¿porqué me has dexado, o triste pastor,
aquí tan confuso en este desierto?

Bien ha diez años somos compañeros
y nunca reñimos y siempre holgamos:
¡y agora, cuytado, que no nos veamos!
Venimos a tiempo de hazer herederos.
¿Cómo andaré por estos oteros
los ojos llorosos de triste razón?
que creo que sienten mi gran turbación
tomillos, alyagas, ontinas, romeros. (ll. 161-175)

The speech is conventional to the pastoral love drama in that it is typical of the pastoral figure's lament for a lost love or lost friend.[4]

This description of the first part of Urrea's Egloga llamada naue de seguridad makes his familiarity with the work of his contemporaries undeniable. He certainly knew Encina's eclogues, for he seems to have taken advantage of a least Eglogas VIII, XI, and XII,[5] and it is feasible that he had also read the Egloga de Torino, as Eugenio Asensio believed.[6] Whatever its literary origins, however, Urrea's eclogue is firmly entrenched in the traditions of the pastoral drama, even if its devices were not traditionally employed and those conventionally associated with the dramatization of love exploited to portray Mingo's decision to go to sea. It is as if the aparatus employed to dramatize a particular subject had been transposed to another, albeit related, subject. In this there is nothing remarkable, since the versatility of the conventions of the early Spanish drama has been continually argued in this study. The problem in this case is one of deciding what is meant by Mingo's behaviour.

Eugenio Asensio posed the same query when describing the content of the eclogue: "Mingo ... se lamenta de la injusticia de la tierra en que el malo triunfa y el bueno padece, en que reina la maldad sin castigo. Anuncia su intención de abandonar la tierra para embarcarse en la Nave de seguridad. ¿Nave simbólica? ¿Nave de la iglesia?" (Eglogas dramáticas..., p. xxxvi). The morality of Mingo's behaviour is clear, but not its symbolism. It is conceivable that none was intended because the matter was not pursued. Urrea seems to have been principally interested in exploiting the devices he admired in the works of other dramatists, for he used them virtually arbitrarily and did not follow through the new direction he gave them. This fact is emphasized by the second part of the eclogue.

After the episode concerning Mingo, attention is turned to his son Benito and the situation evolves into one characteristic of a conventional love play. Bertol breaks the news of Mingo's departure to Benito, who exclaims in grief and then faints. When Bertol cannot revive him unaided, help is summoned in the person of a físico, who suggests the cure by opposites, happiness to cure pain, and recommends calling Benito's girlfriend to cheer him:

> Todas las cosas y enfermedades,
> según han escrito los sabios passados,
> ningunos casos serán bien curados
> sino con contrarios de sus calidades:
> a las calenturas dan humedades;
> mas esta dolencia es de tristura:
> es menester que tenga holgura
> y ha de venir por las voluntades.
>
> Y assí es menester, que venga su amiga,
> alguna si tiene allá en el aldea,

porque yo creo, que quando la vea,
él no verá su triste fatiga. (ll. 217-228)[7]

The soothing words of the shepherdess, in fact, prove effective. Benito revives and, after wondering whether he is alive or dead, sees Menga and forgets his troubles. Having finished the task for which she was summoned, Menga is prepared to leave and the rest of the company departs with her singing a villancico.

The fact that Urrea was not really concerned with exploiting Mingo's behaviour to the full and seriously applying its moral is confirmed by the second part of the eclogue, which contains a different conventional situation. Benito faints because of his father's departure, but his predicament is presented in the terms of that of a conventional lover. His fainting is preceded by Bertol's lament for Mingo, which sets the stage for a conventional love situation (see above), and Benito's exclamation is equivalent to that of a chastised lover:

¡O lazerado, maldito de mí!
si en su partida la buelta dilata,
ya no ay árbol, ni çarça, ni mata
que no me cognosca el mal que sentí.
¡Ay, que so muerto! ¡cátame aquí!
su triste partida ya yo la sabía:
ya yo anunciaua que él yrse quería:
nunca me verá ya qual yo me vi. (ll. 185-192)

His behaviour is equivalent to that of Pelayo, who fell victim to Amor in Encina's Egloga X, a situation similar to that which plagued Prabos in Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia de la soldado. In fact, the cure by opposites suggested by the físico is exactly that proposed by Fernández's soldado (see above n. 7) and the solution to Benito's malady (sending for his girlfriend) is the

same as that finally proposed by the shepherd Pascual as Prabos' cure. Moreover, the cure is just as effective for Benito; he regains consciousness and, although bewildered at first, just as Pelayo had been,[8] he is recovered, his distress banished. The villancico at the end of the play reiterates his remedy with a sentiment common to several pastoral plays:

> Buscar plazer es cordura,
> y avn que en mí yo no le hallo,
> fingido quiero mostrallo. (ll. 321-323)[9]

The Egloga llamada naue de seguridad is a combination of assorted commonplaces arbitrarily united in a plot of which the full potential is not exploited. Eugenio Asensio's concluding comment on the work, written in the introduction to his edition of it, is perfectly applicable: "Urrea no ha conseguido armonizar los motivos amoroso y moral, y la desaparición de Mingo y su sustitución por Benito parecen un truco poco afortunado de prestidigitación literaria" (p. xxvii). Asensio need not, however, have been quite so severe. Urrea exploited the drama of his contemporaries, but nevertheless attempted to re-direct their work, a characteristic of his plays. He failed by adhering too closely to commonplace subjects and established devices, so that, in spite of his attempted novelty, he was inevitably constrained by his original sources. Urrea tried to experiment within a limited medium when progress could only be achieved by experimenting with the medium itself and enlarging its capabilities.

The second of Urrea's eclogues in Asensio's edition has no definite title. In the prose argument at the head of the work it

is described simply as "Otra égloga suya adonde se introduzen tres pastores" (p. 17). Like the Egloga llamada naue de seguridad, however, this piece also contains several familiar elements. The stage is set, for example, by a monologue spoken by the shepherd Pedro. His speech, a eulogy of the countryside, is partly a commonplace of the early drama and kindred to the rustic's praise of his country life. Pedro's sentiments are not, however, exactly those of, for example, Mingo in Encina's Egloga VIII. Pedro is not attracted to the rustic life with its festive weddings, sports, and country dances. His feeling is for the peaceful scenery, which he describes as if it were a locus amenus. He exclaims at the very beginning of the eclogue,

> ¡Val me Dios, qué lindo prado!
> nunca jamás tal le vi:
> ¡quién pudiesse traer aquí
> a pacer todo el ganado! (ll. 1-4)

and when his companion Pascual arrives in search of him, Pedro eulogizes the peacefulness of his surroundings:

> Aquí me estó en esta tierra:
> linda yerua, agua y vientos,
> que quita todos tormentos
> la dulçura desta sierra.
> Ha, Pascual, que aquí se encierra
> todo plazer y holgura:
> todo lo otro es desuentura,
> esto es paz y lo otro es guerra. (ll. 49-56)

The setting of the eclogue is idyllic, a perfect one for shepherds to speak about love--in fact, the topic of their conversation. When Pascual enters, he is not eager to taste the fruits offered by Prabos because he is preoccupied with problems arising from his amours:

Mas yo vengo tan mortal
que la fruta no m'es fruto:
trayo vn dolor dissoluto,
vn bien conuertido en mal. (ll. 65-68)
.....
¿No sabes porqué lo digo?
porque vengo namorado
y este plazer tan sobrado
no puede ligar comigo. (ll. 73-76)

The suffering lover rejects Pedro's suggestion to put aside his sorrow, complaining that his love was ordained:

Como no estuuo en mi mano
al principio enamorarme,
tan poco está el apartarme
deste pensamiento vano. (ll. 81-84)

When Pedro insists:

Pues, Pascual, dexa este huego
que quema y no haze ceniza;
toma plazer, toma riza,
cobra vista, que estáis ciego, (ll. 96-99)

and even claims that he will cure Pascual:

Hora quiero remediarte
porque te veo en la muerte
y paresce cosa fuerte
dexar morir sin sanarte, (ll. 105-108)

the latter refuses and decides first to see what his go-between has negotiated. Thus, if the setting of the eclogue is pictured as an idyllic locality, the situation enacted in it is based on the devices of contemporary literature. One shepherd, Pascual, earnestly protests his misery, although not to the same lengths as some pastoral heroes, while another, Pedro, reduces the seriousness of the lover's complaint by trying to persuade him to forget it. The situation then develops into one derived from imitation of the Celestina.

Before the arrival of the go-between, Pascual persuades Pedro to feign sleep so that the old woman, undeterred by the strange company, will feel free to speak. The device of the sleeping shepherd, common to the early drama (see Appendix B, s.v. "sleep"), has not, however, been encountered quite in this form in this study. Pedro's snores convince the old woman that he is sound asleep and she speaks her piece to Pascual, first assuring him that she is a competent go-between and then relating that Bertola, Pascual's beloved, will be out walking the following day with her relative Lloriente. The association with the Celestina is clear; Urrea's vieja is a certain derivation from Fernando de Rojas' bawd. She assures Pascual of her competence by claiming kin with Celestina:

> ¿Y no sabes tú que soy
> hermana de Celestina,
> y que soy yo muy más fina,
> que sabemos ya más oy? (ll. 161-164)

and, after she has left, Pedro's description of her (ll. 209-244) is an equally fitting description of Fernando de Rojas' creation.[10]

Pascual defends his vieja's reputation against Pedro, for, although the passage of a day is not clear, Bertola and Lloriente appear as she predicted. A conventional courtship scene then begins between Pascual and Bertola, in which the shepherd's courteous pleas are rejected by his beloved. The situation does not progress very far, however, since Lloriente suggests they leave and amuse themselves "en la cabaña" (l. 282) and then heralds the arrival of a tambor. The name is not a familiar one in the early pastoral drama,[11] but the role he plays is

conventional. His reputation as an argumentative braggart precedes his entry and is described by Pedro:

> Denuedo quiere mostrar,
> en son viene de reñir:
> no es música de dormir
> lo que aquí nos quiere dar.
> Como es viento el soplar,
> él viene lleno de viento,
> como açarán peguniento
> arroquero sin ganar. (ll. 289-296)

In this regard he is analogous to the soldado in Lucas Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado and, as Pascual's rival, his role is also similar to that played by the escudero in Encina's Egloga VII, or the caballero in Lucas Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella. As soon as he arrives, the tambor greets the company with a "Dios mantenga, garçones" (l. 296) (see Appendix B, s.v. "Greetings"), promises to entertain them with many songs, and then flirts with Bertola. His flirtation inevitably incites Pascual's antagonism and results in a conventional argument (see Appendix B. s.v. "Argument"). The tambor insults the shepherd and calls him a country bumpkin:

> Anda, rústico pastor,
> aquí criado y nascido,
> que según es el vestido,
> a de ser vuestro primor. (ll. 313-316)
> .....
> Mandá vosotros callar
> este nescio que presume,
> no lo haga yo y lo emplume
> virote para tirar.
> Porque quiere razonar
> rudo como el mismo queso. (ll. 329-334)

The outcome is that Pascual bids his companions precede him to the fiesta while he returns to the village to dress as fits his condition. The eclogue will conclude, therefore, with a kind of

transformation episode into which several familiar motifs are incorporated.

The tambor continues insulting Pascual even after the latter has left:

> ¿Vistes donoso gañan,
> quán vellaco y quán parlero?
> siendo el triste tan grosero
> presumía de galán.
> O mal empleado pan
> el que come aquel mastín;
> pues es tan triste y ruýn,
> no sé porqué gelo dan.
>
> ¡Quán tierco y quán desabrido
> a estado el inico rudo!
> ¡y dize que está desnudo;
> va a vestirse más garrido!
> Atauiado y vestido
> verná con aquella greña,
> tan duro como vna péña,
> como perro da ladrido. (ll. 345-360)

His argumentative nature is further illustrated on the arrival of a hermit. Lloriente greets the hermit reverently, but is not imitated by the tambor, who mocks the holy man:

> Yo juro all agua bendita,
> Don Fraylejón, si os apaño,
> que, avn que seáys hermitaño,
> no estaréys año en hermita. (ll. 389-392)
> .....
> ¡O lobo con piel de oueja!
> qúe no tiene vuestra oreja
> más conciencia que Mahoma.
>
> Hábito sancto y de Dios,
> mas vos muy mal le vestís,
> que los pecados que oýs,
> todos se quedan en vos.
> Vsáys mal entre nos,
> que viendo zagala alguna,
> santiguáysos en la vna
> y acostáysos con las dos. (ll. 398-408)

The tambor, however, has uttered one insult too many. Pedro,

Lloriente, and Bertola all criticize him and the hermit, revealing himself as Pascual in disguise, gives the tambor a drubbing and makes him take refuge in flight. The eclogue ends, therefore, with Pascual's revenge satisfied and the trickster tricked. After the tambor's departure, the personages gather to enjoy themselves and depart to the tune of the villancico they sing.

The principal element of the last part of the eclogue is the argument between the hermit and the tambor, a situation for which there is ample precedent in the pastoral drama. The tambor sets about the hermit and insults him with the same vigour as Bonifacio and Gil against Macario in Lucas Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento, or Gregorio and Valerio against the friar Alberto in Gil Vicente's Auto de los reyes magos. Urrea's eclogue contains the reversal of the normal situation, which ends with the complete discomfiture of the hermit's antagonist. Although the similarities with the plays mentioned above are noticeable, it is conceivable that Urrea had plays by Juan del Encina in mind. Pascual's resolve to change his clothes is reminiscent of Mingo's behaviour in Egloga VIII[12] and his eventual return as a hermit recalls Cristino's change of status in Egloga XI.[13] The disconcerting factor in Urrea's eclogue, as always, is the lack of a central idea to unite the various elements of its action, in which the episode with the hermit is just one part. Beyond its combination and exploitation of several devices common in early Spanish drama, to which is added a scene derived from the Celestina, Urrea's eclogue has no purpose other than being a gratuitous piece

of popular comedy mingled with the conventions of the description of love.

The third of Urrea's plays is as conventional as the two already discussed in this chapter. In one sense it is even more so because Urrea did not attempt to incorporate new facets into existing conventions and convey them in a different light. The topic of the eclogue is that of the wedding play, with many similarities in its dramatization with that by Lucas Fernández in the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella, or Diego de Avila in the Egloga ynterlocutoria. A comparison with these works, as Eugenio Asensio saw, however (Eglogas dramáticas..., p. xxxix), is not favourable to Manuel de Urrea.

Urrea's eclogue begins with a lament from the love-sick shepherd Galeyo, who complains that he has been deceived. He has been wounded by Cupid's dart, but has not seen his desires fulfilled:

> Todos le llaman amor
> y es dolor;
> con el nombre nos engaña,
> venenoso como araña... (ll. 31-34)
> .....
> Nunca junta la zagala
> con su gala
> con el zagal que la quiere;
> no siente pena, si muere
> quien lo quiere en ora mala. (ll. 41-45)

In this state of mind, Galeyo is joined by Gil, who had overheard Galeyo's earlier monologue. Gil recommends forgetting, says that time will cure Galeyo's ill, and finally offers to put the whole matter in the hands of a casamentero. Galeyo agrees, but, when Gil has left him to begin the negotiations, expresses

his pessimism (ll. 121-150). On the casamentero's arrival, Galeyo is repeatedly assured that his affair will have a successful conclusion:

> Ten por cierto, buen pastor,
> con ayuda del Señor
> que tu casamiento es hecho,
> que a los dos viene prouecho;
> tu fauor es su fauor.
>
> No vayas de rama en rama,
> que tu fama
> será como se razona,
> que Galeyo con Antona
> dormirán en vna cama. (ll. 156-165)
> .....
> Alegra, Galeyo hermano,
> no tengas esto por vano,
> que con la garrida moça
> estarás en vna choça
> en inuierno y en vernano. (ll. 186-190)

Galeyo is asked to enumerate the items of his dowry and does so (ll. 196-260) in one of the longest speeches of this type in the early pastoral drama (see Appendix B, s.v "Gifts"). The casamentero is satisfied and he and Gil depart to summon the prospective bride and her mother. During the absence of this pair Galeyo changes his clothes, a stock feature in Urrea's secular theatre,[14] and dresses to suit the approaching occasion. When the bride-to-be and her mother arrive, a brief courtship scene is enacted, in which Galeyo courteously addresses Antona (ll. 356-420), his intended bride. Her mother is satisfied and the matter is concluded satisfactorily, subject only to the anticipated approval of Antona's father. Galeyo asks for, and receives, a kiss as a token of the agreement concluded and all depart for the village to celebrate the wedding, singing a villancico about love.

Most of the characteristics of the pastoral wedding play are found here. The love-sick shepherd, the go-between, the enumeration of dowry, courtship and betrothal scenes, and an appropriate song as a conclusion are all present, but they are reproduced in stereotype. A comparison with the work of Lucas Fernández or Diego de Avila is certainly unfortunate for Urrea. His eclogue suffers for the lack of burlesque comedy or bawdy humour. As a result, it is a flat composition, a good example of the sort of product to be expected when over-worked devices are exploited without further adaptation.

The final eclogue discussed in this chapter is similarly based on the combination of several conventional elements, but, unlike Urrea's wedding play, this eclogue is bereft of plot. Its first part is concerned with the misfortune of the shepherd Solino, whose love is unrequited. He complains that fate is against him:

> ¿En qué signo he yo nascido,
> en qué planeta nublosa
> que nunca veo otra cosa
> sino verme aborrescido? (ll. 1-4)

curses his subjection to love:

> Maldita cosa es amor;
> es cimiente de beleño;
> el que le tiene por dueño
> no biue con buen señor, (ll. 9-12)

and finally summons Rolano for companionship. Rolanc advises him not to venture after the inaccessible:

> no pongas la fantasia
> donde no alcança la mano, (ll. 31-32)

warns him of the vicissitudes of love, and concludes that misery can change to happiness when least expected:

> Siempre procura el hablar,
> que, quando menos catares,
> se conuierten los pesares
> en plazer de gassajar. (ll. 76-79)

Solino agrees, and describes love as a universal enemy, the cause of both joy and pain:

> Mi fe, creo tus razones,
> que amor es alegre daño,
> es buen lustre de mal paño,
> los hilos son de passiones.
> Quita pluma a los halcones
> y avn los pastores retoça,
> captiua al que duerme en choça
> y avn al que duerme en colchones. (ll. 80-87)

Finally, Solino is induced to reveal the name of his beloved (Pavina) and discusses his subjection to her with Rolano.

Solino's predicament is conventionally depicted, but leads nowhere. It is interrupted by the arrival of a rufián and the potential courtship scene which might have been its outcome does not develop. The rufián is a braggart, whose reputation is well known. Rolano says as he appears:

> Cata do viene vn rufián:
> guarda no nos lleue el pan;
> vino y queso apañaría, (ll. 129-131)

and Solino recognizes his braggadocio:

> Furia muy arrabatada
> es essa de hombre liuiano;
> agua rezia de verano
> cata que es presto passada. (ll. 136-139)

The rufián's threats,

> ¡Ha gente sin cortesía!
> dadme aqui con que me cebe,

sino juro a Dios que os lleue
a vender a Beruería. (ll. 132-135)
.....
Pese a mi suegra baruada
con este pastor matiego,
si no le hago tornar ciego
sin tocalle con la espada, (ll. 140-14143)

are ignored and he is not allowed to intrude or browbeat the shepherds, as did a tambor in another eclogue by Urrea. His potentiality as a rival to Solino is squashed by Rolano, who warns him to be more subdued when Pavina arrives on the scene:

Vos, galán, no hagáys ruýdo:
juntarse han aquí pastores,
donde no os ternán temores
avn que a más ayas vencido. (ll. 172-175)

The rufián is, consequently, a combination of the characteristics appearing in the escudero of Encina's Egloga VII and the soldado of Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia. Urrea did not, however, exploit these characteristics to the full, since the situation produced by the entry of the rufián and the possible conflict of personalities deriving from it are not developed.

Instead of progressing into a conventional courtship scene, as might be expected, the remainder of the eclogue is concerned with the shepherds' amusements. With Pavina's entry, all forms of antagonism are dismissed and the personages are happy to enjoy a game together. They play at a game called maravillas suggested by the rufián, during which each personage takes a turn at expressing his amazement at aspects of life and society (see ll. 199-271). The tone of the eclogue becomes serious as reflections about life are exchanged, but a sharp change is introduced with the arrival of Argineo. He is a pleasure-loving shepherd,

who exchanges insults first with Solino, then with Rolano, and, finally, with the rufián (ll. 276-319). The exchange is not vindictive, however, but is part of the shepherds' amusements, a contest of pullas, in which Argineo is victorious. The final part of the eclogue is also concerned with the shepherds' quest for pleasure. The new-comer Argineo joins the assembled company of Solino, Rolano, Pavina, and the rufián and, after suffering a little teasing from them, discusses with them how they can next amuse themselves. Rejecting several suggestions, they finally decide to sing. They sing a villancico about the sufferings caused by love, after which they will depart to enjoy a meal as planned.[15]

It is unnecessary to prolong any enquiry into Urrea's dramatic eclogues since the predominant elements of his plays have already been discussed and his use of the pastoral love motif shown. He is one dramatist among those of the early sixteenth century who deservedly merits the title of an imitator. As all the authors discussed in this study, he wrote in accordance with conventionally accepted ideas and devices of composition. The two principal elements around which his eclogues were constructed were the depiction of an unhappy lover and the presentation of a scene involving transformation. The former could result in a wedding play, a courtship scene, or an argument between rivals, one of them a braggart; the latter involved portrayal of a character who changed his status in life, or simply his clothes. Not withstanding the way Urrea presented these elements, the

situation he produced was always traceable to the works of his contemporaries. His fault was not that he imitated, but that he did not imitate cleverly. In many cases, he did not exploit familiar conventions as fully as he could; in others, the new directions he sought led nowhere. In the last resort, Urrea's eclogues are gratuitous imitations, unsuccessful attempts to emulate a popular style.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER XII

[1]All Urrea's five eclogues have a prose argument, of which only that for the Nativity piece was definitely intended for recital, it being preceded by the rubric, "Entra luego vno a dezir este argumento" (p. 15). Except where contained in spoken, verse introitos, the majority of arguments included in the title-prologues of the early dramas were probably also intended more for the reader than the spectator.

[2]Compare the attitude of the shepherds to Gil in the first part of Vicente's Auto pastoril castellano. Bras, for example, tells him:

> El crego de Bico Nuño
> te enseñó esso al domingo.
> Anda, anda acompañado,
> canta y huelga en las majadas,
> que este mando, Gil, a osadas,
> ¡mal pecado!
> se debroca muy priado. (ll. 63-69)

[3]See comparable passages in Egloga XII (ll. 553-568), the Egloga de Breno (ll. 31-80), and the Egloga de Torino (p. 68).

[4]See a comparable passage in Egloga XII (ll. 601-656).

[5]Urrea could have known a number of Encina's eclogues since 1496, the year of the first Cancionero, and from 1509 could have read in Cancioneros all Encina's plays except Eglogas XI and XIV, only known in suelta editions (see Eglogas..., pp. 7-8).

[6]Eugenio Asensio (Eglogas dramáticas..., p. xxxvii)thought that Urrea's verses, "Retorna, ¿qué es esso zagal?" (l. 193) and "padeces dolencia de gota coral" (l. 200), were both traceable to equivalent lines in the Egloga de Torino (p. 69, "Retorna, retorna, Torino", and, p. 70, "o asmo que pienso ques gota coral"). Lines from the villancico at the end of Encina's Egloga XI (l. 601, "Torna ya, pastor, en ti", and, l. 604, "Torna, torna en tu sentido") are just as appropriate a source for Urrea's first verse, while others from the Egloga de Breno (ll. 123-124, "Luego,Breno, aquesse tal / sera de gota coral") are equally appropriate for his second. These verbal parallels show that the sources of Urrea's eclogues cannot be traced to a single author, but to the conventions of the early pastoral drama in general. They also support the view of the general acceptance of these conventions.

[7]Compare the following lines from Lucas Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado

> Que vn contrario cura al otro.
> al frio cura el calor
> y al desamor el amor... (Cii-v)

[8]Benito asks on regaining consciousness,

> Valame Dios, ¿que oyo dezir?
> resuscitado me hallo y despierto. (ll. 265-266)
> .....
> ¿Adónde estó yo? ¿si duermo o si velo? (l. 273)

a question also put by Pelayo (Egl. X. l. 400, "¿soy de vida o soy ageno?").

[9]Compare, for example, the refrains to villancicos in Encina's Egloga VII (ll. 194-196):

> Gasagemonos de huzia,
> quel pesar
> viniese sin le buscar,

and in the anonymous Egloga interlocutoria (ll. 358-360):

> Demonos al alegria,
> pues vemos que los pesares,
> ellos se vienen a pares.

[10]Manuel de Urrea's familiarity with the Celestina is indisputable. He transposed its first act into verse (published in his Cancionero of 1513) and wrote an imitation entitled Penitencia de Amor (1514). (See Asensio, Eglogas dramáticas..., pp. xlv-xlvi.) The influence of the Celestina on plays discussed in this study is recognizable only in allusions to or imitations of Celestina herself (in addition to Urrea' s eclogue, see Encina's Egloga XIV and Fernández's Egloga o farsa del nascimiento), but Fernando de Rojas' Tragicomedia was an important influence on non-pastoral drama. As a semi-dramatic composition, it was in the traditions of Roman comedy (see M.R. Lida de Malkiel, La originalidad artística de la Celestina, Buenos Aires, 1962, pp. 27-78) and contributed to the formation of the theatre of Torres Naharro and his contemporaries and imitators (see "Propalladia"..., ed. Gillet, IV, p. 628, s.v. "Celestina").

[11]An atambor did appear, however, in Torres Naharro's Comedia Soldadesca, dated by Gillet as 1510 ("Propalladia"..., IV, pp. 473-474), but the roles of the two figures are quite different.

[12]Mingo's accompanying change of status is lacking in Pascual's behaviour. Compare, however, the shepherd's change of clothing in the anonymous Coplas de la doncella, el pastor y el salvaje, in López de Yanguas' Farsa del mundo y moral and in Diego de Avila's Egloga ynterlocutoria (see Appendix B, s.v. "Change of clothes", for exact references).

[13]The association with Cristino's behaviour is strengthened by a slight verbal parallel. Compare, in Urrea's eclogue, the

tambor's comment (ll. 391-392),

> ...avn que seáys hermitaño,
> no estaréys año en hermita,

with Justino's thoughts on Cristino's resolve to become a hermit in Egloga XI:

> No creo que cumpla el año
> a segun que del magino. (ll. 134-135)
> .....
> Nunca mas mal año dure,
> que Amor le dara reves. (ll. 139-140)

[14]The device occurs in three of four secular plays (see Appendix B, s.v. "Change of clothes").

[15]The second eclogue in Asensio's edition also ends in just this way. The personages sing a villancico as they leave to go to their meal (see Appendix B, s.v. "Food").

## Chapter XIII

## THREE MORE PASTORAL DRAMAS

The conventionality of the pastoral love drama at the beginning of the sixteenth century has been argued in the course of the previous chapters in this study, but it has also been established that, even if the result was a failure, as, generally speaking, were the eclogues by Manuel de Urrea, tradition could be exploited with some versatility. The conventional theories on love could be seriously conveyed through a stereotyped lover, or be comically interpreted through a rustic character. Encina's eclogues, for example, held the possibility of either tragedy or comedy; Fernández's plays were predominantly farcical; in works such as the Egloga de Breno and the Egloga de Torino convention was moulded to suit a single context--performance at a wedding, or inclusion in a sentimental novel. The three works discussed in the present chapter further contribute to the idea of the versatility of the pastoral convention. Each was derived from similar sources, but for performances on diverse occasions. One is a kind of commemorative piece, another a possible Lenten farce, and the third a wedding play.

The first of the three, an anonymous Egloga pastoril, begins with some shepherds' discussion about a series of troublesome events in Valencia and then develops into a pastoral love farsa. Because of events alluded to during this discussion, the eclogue

must have been written in either 1519 or 1520[1] and because the shepherds report that the dangers menacing Valencia have abated, it was, as Crawford wrote (Spanish Drama..., p. 71), "probably performed to celebrate the escape of the city from the dangers of plague and from a threatened invasion by a Moorish fleet". It was, therefore, a probable celebratory eclogue.

Eugen Kohler, who edited the work (see above n. 1), thought the Egloga pastoril one of the most displeasing products of the early Spanish drama:

> Est ist zweifellos eins der unerfreulichsten Produkte der Encinaschen Schule; die Mängel sind in die Augen springend. Wie lang auch die Ekloge ist, enthehrt sie doch der Handlung. Wenn zum Schluss die Befreiung eines liebeskranken Hirten durch einen Zauberer in komischer Weise dargestelt wird, so kann dieser kurze Abschnitt, in dem sich die ganze dramatische Aktion des Stückes erschöpft, nicht entschädigen für die voraufgehenden endlosen Schilderungen der traurigen Zustände, die zu jener Zeit in Valencia geherrscht haben. Diese Ereignisse mögen den Dichter überhaupt zur Komposition seines Stückes veranlasst habe. (Sieben spanische..., p. 174)

Kohler did not, however, examine the eclogue fairly. He placed it in the "School of Encina", but did not see it as one conventional work among many, and did not evaluate it as a possible commemorative piece, of the kind described earlier in this study (see above chap. VI), combined with a pastoral love farce of the kind written by Lucas Fernández and Diego de Avila. The anonymous eclogue is conceivably no better drama than the plays by Manuel de Urrea, but its qualities must nonetheless be appreciated at the appropriate level.

The importance of the shepherds' discussion of local events

in the first part of the eclogue must not be underestimated. Not only does it occupy half the eclogue (470 out of 991 lines), but the topics discussed identify the play as a piece written and performed as a result of certain circumstances, and relevant to a specific occasion and place. The local events discussed by the shepherds are, even if conventionally presented, therefore the justification and distinguishing feature of the play. The lamentable events troubling Valencia and its environs are described from the beginning of the eclogue and the first words of the shepherd Juan. He greets his companions cheerfully, but quickly remembers that a cause for happiness is lacking because many shepherds have fallen to the plague:

> No sé porque merecemos
> y tenemos
> tantos males y dolencia;
> que de fiebre y pestilencia
> claramente nos perdemos. (ll. 16-20)

In addition, the following conversation between Juan, Perantón, and Gil, reveals a danger from Turkish raiders, who took many hostages and now threaten the city. Consequently, the people have fled inland and a Spanish fleet has been raised to ward off the threat of the Infidel (see ll. 66-120). The flight of the population is described by Gil (ll. 123-175), who tells how the city has been emptied by the exodus. To cap all this, as Perantón relates (ll. 246-268), the pastures are barren and the livestock is dying of starvation.

After this tale of woe and disaster, the shepherds' morale is at its lowest ebb. Their spirits are revived, however, by

words of consolation from Juan (ll. 361-365). Cause for complaint had diminished in the last month (ll. 369-375); the cows are growing fat (ll. 422-424), the sheep are not dying as before (ll. 425-429); and, if his fellows will look around, they will see crops growing thick and green and people returning to their homes (ll. 430-444). The worst is over and life can return to normal. It is because of Juan's consolatory words that the eclogue can be considered a celebratory play, intended to commemorate the city's recovery from the dangers which threatened it.

In addition to employing the shepherds as conventional narrators, the author of the Egloga pastoril used them to comment on the events they described. The troubles afflicting Valencia provided an opportunity to reprimand the audience and recommend improvements in their ways. The suffering of the people is attributed to their sins (see ll. 51-54 and 81-84); Perantón tells Gil,

> No te espantes, Gil hermano,
> estando sano,
> que Dios nos dé malas fadas,
> ni las landras a manadas
> embiadas de su mano.
> Porque está enojado
> el soberano
> con justa razón con nos. (ll. 181-190)

He explains, however, that God may be appeased through the intercession of the Virgin and St. Vicent Ferrer, the patron of Valencia. Similarly, when consoling his fellows, Juan tells them (ll. 386-419) that, in spite of their sinfulness, God will be merciful. Thus, when he speaks of the improving situation, he does so with praise to God:

¡O, qué sublimados bienes
--¿no los vedes?--
nos haze nuestro señor!
Y nosotros con error
ignoramos las mercedes. (ll. 445-449)

Moreover, the first part of the eclogue ends with praise and thanks to God for delivery from misfortune.

On account of the tendency in the Egloga pastoril to attribute misfortune and recovery from it to the anger and mercy of God, Kohler (Sieben spanische..., pp. 175-176) identified the unknown author as a cleric. However, this tendency would have been equally compatible with a layman.[2] Kohler was less justified, however, in criticizing the first part of the eclogue for its lack of plot (see above). A complicated plot is unnecessary. By exploiting shepherds to describe and comment on the events with which he was concerned, the author conformed to convention. He required no more plot than in the usual commemorative play.[3] The same is to be said of the second part of the eclogue, portraying the shepherds' amorous adventures. The love farce may have been combined with the description of topical events to amuse the audience with a series of entertaining rustic scenes, but both parts of the eclogue are compatible because the roles of the shepherds as narrators of contemporary events and as comic lovers are the parts assigned them in the early Spanish drama. There is, therefore, a definite link between the two parts of the eclogue at the level of convention, because the author exploited two of the shepherds' accepted roles. Moreover, a further link is provided at this level by the interaction of the two parts of

the eclogue. Since in the first part the shepherds are preoccupied with familiar, local events, their concern and association with fact may serve as a basis for accepting their conventional, comic behaviour in the second part. Their love affairs are, consequently, portrayed against the backdrop of the troubles which afflicted Valencia.

After the discussion about Valencia, Juan is on the point of leaving (l. 470) when he is detained by Perantón with a further complaint, one caused by love. He describes how he fell for Llorenta, exchanged promises with her, but lost her to another. His lament is brief, but characteristic:

> ¡O triste de mí, perdido,
> dolorido!
> Nunca fue tal sin razón. (ll. 510-512)

Gil charges Perantón not to take life so seriously and invites him to share a hive of honey; but Perantón's grief forbids contemplation of food and pleasure:

> Nunca más el mi pellejo
> yo le dexo
> poder plazer sostener,
> ni gasajar en comer,
> seyendo moço ni viejo. (ll. 530-534)

As an old hand, Gil gives the benefit of his experience and suggests that Perantón should call the tune and make the shepherdesses chase after him. Perantón is not convinced, however, for he wistfully concludes:

> Es muy natural razón
> --aun sin sazón--
> que la que hombre quiere y ama
> aquella más le dessamava
> y dale mayor valdón. (ll. 550-554)

Nevertheless, his problem is not pursued since Juan, a second shepherd crossed in love, returns to the scene.[4] While chasing Juana, he fell and was stung by a bee. His knee swollen, he again pursued the shepherdess, but to ask for help. At first she wanted nothing to do with him and then advised putting mud on his wound. Perantón laughs at Juan for taking this advice, but further discussion about it is curtailed by the entry of Gil Calvo,[5] which introduces a third affair.

After exchanging welcomes and handing over some fruit he brought with him, Gil announces his betrothal to "la Ximena de Hontorio" (l. 618). The news, Juan predicts, will certainly upset Climentejo, a shepherd in love with the same girl. Climentejo is summoned immediately. The news is broken to him by Juan and confirmed by Mossén Bartolomé, the priest who officiated at the betrothal. He reacts conventionally, feeling a deep sense of despair, a disinclination for the pleasures of life, and a desire for death:

> ¡O, triste de mí cuytado,
> lazerado,
> pastor de gran desventura!
> No me bastará cordura;
> moriré desesperado
> en pensar, quanto esperado,
> apassionado,
> pensando casar con ella,
> pues ventura no ha bastado.
> Nunca más peynaré greña
> ni melena,
> ni me vestiré el jubón,
> ni el cinto ni el camisón,
> que me avía hecho por ella.
> Déxame, quiero morir
> por salir
> de tan ásperas fatigas;

no me den gachas ni migas,
que no lo puedo sufrir. (ll. 676-695)

The earlier part of the eclogue is recalled when Climentejo's complaint reminds Juan of the sorrows endured then:

¿Qu'es esto? ¿Tienes calambre,
o quál landre
de las que corrían ogaño?
Que muestras tan gran desmayo
que as cuytado espantarme.
Aora, que todo hombre es sano,
Dios loado,
y las gentes son tornadas,
no será razón que hagas
tanto del apasionado. (ll. 696-705)

He suggests Climentejo will easily find another love from among the girls who returned to their homes. Climentejo disagrees and argues with Juan about the conduct of the women during Valencia's time of troubles (ll. 716-760). The argument does not go far, however, because Climentejo is too preoccupied with his own misfortune to be concerned for other affairs. Juan begs him to obtain absolution before thinking of death, then, believing Climentejo is enchanted, summons Llorente, the encantador, to cure him. Llorente answers the call promptly. He boasts about his ability as a magician and about his successful love potions (ll. 841-890) and, after haggling over the price (ll. 891-923), finally sets to work. He annoints the love-sick shepherd and casts a spell on him. Success is achieved, for the eclogue then ends with a villancico confirming the effectiveness of the cure:

¡A la hé, Climentejo, ha!
Nuevas suenan en poblado,
que de pena eres librado,
y que ella a buscarte va. (ll. 972-975)

The author overlooked that Ximena was already betrothed to another.

When Kohler complained of a lack of plot, he must have assumed one was required. The plots in the pastoral plays were, however, as conventional as the personages appearing in them. The portrayal of a completed action and the development of dramatic situations were not prime concerns. Dramatic poets exploited current conventions as devices for amusement, accepting the standard situation which conventions dictated. While, therefore, the failure of the Egloga pastoril may be traced, as in Urrea's eclogue, to a docile and unfulfilled exploitation of convention, the faults are as much with the pastoral genre as with the dramatist.

The comparison with Urrea's eclogues is valid, for the three episodes in the second part of the Egloga pastoril are equivalent pieces of gratuitous imitation and entertainment. The shepherds' amorous entanglements cannot be taken any more seriously than the eclogue as a whole can be accepted as serious drama. The audience can laugh at the shepherds' behaviour just as these laugh at themselves: Perantón is urged to enjoy himself; Juan is derided as a fool; Climentejo, told not to complain so loudly, is cured at the price of an entertaining scene involving an encantador. From the discussion about topical events, the portrayal of commonplace ideas on love, the shepherds' antics, and the intervention of an encantador (see above chap. XI, n. 5), the unknown author concocted a commonplace

play. Its uniqueness is the juxtaposition of a love farce with a semi-political, celebration play.

The second play discussed in this chapter, an Egloga nueva by Diego Durán, was attributed to this author by Eugen Kohler,[6] who identified it with one of the compositions in Cañete's list in the introduction to the Academy edition of Fernández's Farsas y églogas (p. lxi). Although the extant version Kohler used for his edition (see above n. 6) had no colophon, he suggested (Sieben spanische..., p. 179) that, on account of the subject-matter and its treatment, the eclogue could not have been much later than 1520. Kohler further suggested (p. 178), and found a supporter in Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 72), that the Egloga nueva was a Lenten farce because its concluding villancico ("Oy, que es día de plazer", l. 654) referred to Carnival. The probability of this suggestion is supported by two further elements: an exclamation from the santero (l. 405, "¡Carnal dentro, carnal dentro!"), which parallels the cry beginning Encina's Carnival Egloga VI ("¡Carnal fuera, carnal fuera!"), and the meal shared at the end of the work, which recalls the shepherds' meal in Encina's same Carnival play. Although a possible Lenten farce, the Egloga nueva nonetheless conforms to the pattern of the pastoral love drama. The principal device of action is the comic courtship scene, differentiated from the customary scene in that a santero, not a pastor, is the central figure. As to the rest, Diego Durán exploited familiar devices: quarrelling, gaming, and food.

The eclogue begins with a villancico sung by a pastora:

> ¿Quién podrá estar sin temor
> de las fuerças del amor? (ll. 1-2)

She is not, however, the customary lover. Her monologue, spoken after the villancico and beginning "Reniego de todo el hato" (l. 3), is a complaint against life in general and her grudge against love is that she is continually accosted by "garçones palaciegos", conceivably a jibe at the conventional fate of the shepherdess in the pastourelle and the dramatic eclogues:

> O, reniego de mi vida
> con tanta pena y cordojo,
> que mil vezes con enojo
> no me hanzio por nascida.
> Y han a ratos requestada,
> muy querida y festejada
> de garçones palaciegos,
> tanto que con mil reniegos
> ando siempre aperreada. (ll. 21-29)

As if to illustrate her complaint, an intruder appears and molests her with unwelcome advances. He is not a courtier, however, but a santero, who greets the shepherdess and avows his love for her:

> ¡Deo gracias, la pastora
> cumplida de hermosura!
> por cuya gentil figura
> no descanso sola un'hora;
> pues es tal mi captiverio,
> que mi triste vida ferió
> por muerte muy dolorida;
> y por vos tengo aborrida
> la celda y el monesterio. (ll. 30-38)

As he says, men of religion are equally subject to Cupid's darts:

> A los sanctos religiosos
> que hazen obra divina
> captiva amor más aýna
> con sus tiros poderosos. (ll. 75-78)

Consequently, he behaves no differently from other lovers in the pastoral drama who, on seeing a shepherdess, try to make lov- › her. The situation is somewhat more amusing than usual be the lover is a santero, behaving precisely as he ought not ut as his reputation in the drama invariably portrayed him.[7] He is, therefore, a figure of fun and the principal source of comedy in the eclogue.

The santero's courtship of the pastora is, in addition, with the interruptions preventing him from accomplishing his designs, the principal source of action. The first to intervene is a melcochero. He assesses the situation quickly and threatens to chastise the erring santero:

> ¡Por Dios! que es caso donoso,
> ¿aún hombre religioso,
> queréys la muger forçar?
> Pues yo os haré castigar
> d'un yerro tan criminoso. (ll. 115-119)

The two abuse each other verbally and are about to exchange blows when the shepherdess steps in and bids them shake hands and be friends. They comply and the melcochero invites the santero to gamble the alms received that day. Their game of cards ends with the melcochero's financial discomfort and when he leaves the santero renews his courtship with added vigour.

A second interruption occurs on the entry of a frayle. He too recognizes the santero's intentions and roundly rebukes him. The result is another verbal exchange, described by Crawford (Spanish Drama..., p. 72) as "an unedifying scene" in which "these two ministers of the Church accuse one another of gross misconduct". The burlesque at the expense of the clergy is more

pointed in this scene than in any other, but, as in other plays where the phenomenon is encountered, the implied criticism of the clergy is principally intended as a source of humour.

When the frayle finally departs to report the matter to his superiors, the santero has little time to abduct the shepherdess, as he threatens, let alone win her, before a third and definitive interruption. A pastor, the pastora's betrothed, arrives on the scene. The santero profusely denies any underhand motives in his conversation with the shepherdess, but the pastor is unconvinced and summons his companion Gil, intending to chastise the amorous santero. Gil adds his rebukes to those already given, but the santero's punishment is delayed by a game, "¿do posa la mariposa?" (ll. 487-557), a form of pullas. The santero, tricked about the stakes, loses and receives a drubbing as the reward for his misconduct. The series of courtship episodes and their outcome is, thereby, concluded. The entire company, santero included, settle down to a meal, each providing part of the fare. Their hunger satisfied at this traditional repast, including a quarrel over the wine, as a result of the santero's drinking too deeply (see Appendix B. s.v. "Food"), the entire piece is concluded with the villancico alluded to above.

The Egloga nueva contains little novelty since Diego Durán exploited the conventional features of the drama. The courtship scene, for example, was a fundamental device in the pastoral piece, and the devices of gaming, quarreling, and eating were equally part of the Nativity eclogues and the secular pastoral plays. The

distinguishing feature of his eclogue was the fuller exploitation of the cleric as a figure of fun. It would have been highly amusing to watch this wordly santero behaving as a conventional rustic, repeatedly interrupted while attempting to foist himself on a reluctant shepherdess; to see him fleece a melcochero of his earnings and hear him argue with a brother in religion; and, finally, to witness his discomfiture at the hands of a pair of rustics. It all amounts to a glorious farce, in which the conventions of action and comedy have been appropriated for a probable Carnival entertainment.

The final pastoral play discussed in this study is the Farsa by Juan de París. The earliest extant copy is dated 1536.[8] The possibility of earlier composition cannot be completely disregarded, however, and, in any case, the Farsa must be included in this study because of its affinity with the pastoral plays written before 1520. In fact, it is appropriately the last discussed in this study because it combines several features of plays already considered. Estacio and Numida share the customary characteristics of the pastoral lovers and their behaviour recalls that of Plácida and Vitoriano; Estacio's adoption of the hermit's life to forget his woes, subsequently rejecting them when reunited with Numida, is reminiscent of Encina's Egloga XI; the rustic comedians are conventional figures, and their attempted courtship of Numida recollects similar scenes in Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella and in the anonymous Coplas de la doncella, el pastor y el salvaje; finally, the burlesque service at the

end of the Farsa marks the piece as a betrothal or wedding play and puts it in the company of such works as Fernández's Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella and Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado, Diego de Avila's Egloga ynterlocutoria and Salazar's Egloga de Breno. Juan de París' work is clearly a product of convention.

When Estacio enters, after a hermit's monologue, his lament shows him to have the symptoms of love and places him in the company of the major figures of Encina's drama: Pelayo, Fileno, Plácida, and Vitoriano. Estacio has lost all hope of consolation:

> ¡O triste cuytado de mí, sin ventura!
> a quien esperança del todo ha faltado. (ll. 65-66)
> .....
> Ya, ya no espero tener más holgura. (l. 69)

His despair derives from the cruelty of Cupid, whom Estacio loyally served, but whom he now bitterly accuses:

> ...Cupido muy falso y cruel,
> por serle obediente, por serle fiel,
> ha me perdido son pena muy dura. (ll. 70-72)
> .....
> ¡O falso Cupido! ¡qué mal me has pagado
> mis grandes servicios en tanto leales!
> ¡Cómo por premio me das tantos males
> y tanta tristeza, tormento doblado! (ll. 77-80)[9]

Like other heroes of the pastoral drama, Estacio cites famous lovers similarly treated by this malevolent god (ll. 89-104) (see Appendix B, s.v. "Love"). Later, when conversing with the hermit, Estacio maintains his suffering was determined by Cupid:

> Haveys de saber qu'el bravo Cupido
> es causador de mi pena y tormento.
> Aqueste Dios ciego, mochacho sin tiento,
> hizo que amasse a quien me aborresciesse
> y de la su vista me despidiesse.
> Aqueste Dios ciega el mi entendimiento. (ll. 147-152)[10]

Estacio's solution to his plight is the same as that arrived at by Plácida and Vitoriano: he will lose himself in the wilderness and hopeto die:

> Pues qu'esto es assí, yo quiero morar
> por montes y sierras, por bosques, xarales;
> y andando en compaña de los animales
> mi vida muy triste me plaze acabar,
> aquí mis tormentos y penas doblar.
> Pues en esto solo a mi bien serviré,
> y al fin cruel muerte a mismo daré,
> despues que remedio no pueda hallar. (ll. 113-120)

Numida's attitude toward love and its suffering is equivalent. She first appears in the Farsa after Estacio's entry into the hermitage and after a devil has sworn Estacio will renounce his life of religion. Lamenting her lost lover, having learned "qu'es ydo a morir por montañas" (l. 275), Numida begs Cupid to find Estacio and asks that someone may chance by to guide her to him:

> IO alto Cupido, donzel muy hermoso,
> armado de flechas de mucho poder!
> ruégote agora que me dexes ver
> a todo mi bien, olgança y reposo.
> Y pues por un monte tanto fragoso
> me traes perdida con pena muy dura,
> demuéstrame alguno por essa espesura,
> a quien aya visto mi bien desseoso. (ll. 281-288)

Noticing the shepherd Vicente, in hiding for fear of the devil he has just seen, Numida believes her prayer to Cupid has been answered and that Vicente is her guide. The ensuing dialogue exposes the conventional nature of her suffering. Behaving like Briseno in the Egloga de Breno, or Guillardo in the Egloga de Torino, Vicente tries to guess Numida's complaint, greater than anything he can imagine, but because Vicente does not know where Estacio is Numida quickly loses the little hope she retained.

Even more subject to Cupid, she feels her burden has increased:

> De todo es agora esperança perdida;
> agora del todo se dobla mi pena;
> agora del todo me tiene en cadena
> el bravo Cupido travada y prendida. (ll. 337-340)

Estacio and Numida are, thus, two of a kind: courtiers subject to Cupid and despair, driven to forsake the town and wander the wilderness searching for a remedy to their sufferings caused by love. In this respect, the situation found in the Farsa is similar to that presented in Egloga XIV, where love is portrayed as a religion, to which the lover is irrevocably subject. The religious tone of Juan de París' play is not so extreme, however, as in Encina's eclogue, where the religion of love is presented as a parallel of Christianity. The play is equally akin to Egloga XI, where the ideas about love are juxtaposed with conventional Christian values. This juxtaposition is evident through the appearance of a hermit and a devil, and through the outcome of the action.

The Farsa begins with the hermit's monologue (ll. 1-64). He speaks about man's struggle in the world and dwells on the fugacity of life. Kneeling, he prays for freedom from the temptations of the World, the Devil, and the Flesh. At this point Estacio enters, as if to exemplify the hermit's speech and prayers, for Estacio is troubled with such problems. Then, through the two men, two conventional attitudes are portrayed, each used to expose the other. Estacio's view as the conventional lover has already been discussed, but during his dialogue with the hermit a different attitude is recommended. The hermit is

sympathetic to Estacio's troubles, but corrects his idea about love. He reprimands Estacio for considering Cupid a god,

> No deves pensar qu'es Dios el amor,
> según creýan los ciegos gentiles. (ll. 153-154)

and defines love as a source of sin:

> ...mira, señor, por modos subtiles
> su diffinicion, qu'es mucho mejor.
> Amor es tristeza, amor es error,
> que los coraçones abrasa y los ciega,
> y es una llama qu'el demonio pega
> a las entrañas del nuevo amador. (ll. 155-160)

Responding to Estacio's request for a cure, the hermit quotes Ovid (ll. 177-204) and suggests a life of piety and good works, since idleness would only increase the pains caused by love. Estacio is convinced and decides accordingly:

> Ha sido tan buena tu habla y razón,
> y assí ha movido mi sesso y trocado,
> que quiero dexar el mundo y su estado,
> y me place bivir en la tu religion. (ll. 205-208)
> .....
> Vámonos luego sin más dilatar.
> No quiero en aquesto poner más contraste.
> Y pues que del todo, amor, me olvidaste,
> también yo del todo te quiero dexar. (ll. 213-216)

Like Cristino, he becomes a hermit and hopes to escape the trials of life.

The action of the Farsa is, consequently, envisaged in terms similar to those of Egloga XI. The difference between them is in the differing emphasis on conventional ideas. In Encina's play the conflict is depicted as a struggle between amor and desamor; in the Farsa by Juan de París, the same situation is viewed through conventional religious concepts as a struggle against sin. Appropriately, therefore, temptation in the Farsa is

embodied in a devil rather than in an allegorical figure such as the Amor of Encina's Egloga XI. The different identities, however, are not indicative of different purposes since both the diablo and Amor are employed to divert the would-be hermit from his life of devotion. The devil believes that, if Numida seeks and finds her lover, Estacio will renounce the hermitage and return to his former ways. In the monologue where he decides on his action the devil states his intention to distract Estacio and claim his soul:

> No basta que triste del cielo me echaste,
> sino que me quites los que míos son.
> En muy poco tiempo qualquier coraçon
> le truecas de malo haziéndole sancto,
> y hazes que pierda lo que con quebranto
> he trabajado y con grande aflición. (ll. 219-224)
> .....
> Que s'es ya metido aquel hermitaño
> a quien yo tenía enlazado y prendido.
> Yo hize su amor le pusiesse en olvido,
> pensando que avía de desesperar,
> porque pudiesse del alma gozar.
> Mas todo al revés se me ha convertido.
>
> Agora yo quiero muy bien trabajar,
> que aquella muger, que tenía por amiga,
> por montes y sierras perdida le siga,
> hasta que pueda con él encontrar.
> Que, desque lo halle, hazerle ha dexar
> el santo propósito que ha començado. (ll. 227-240)

The plan is completely successful, since one sight of Numida is enough to make Estacio revert to his former life:

> Agora reniego de mala fraylía,
> ni quiero hermitaño ni frayle más ser, (ll. 537-538)

and recognize his debt to Cupid,

> Agora del todo mi bien es cumplido.
> Ya tiene remedio muy grande mi vida;
> ya la tristeza de mí es despedida;

ya la holgança y plazer me ha venido;
ya soy en la cumbre y altura subido
de bienes, fortuna, de honrra y estado.
Por tal beneficio yo serte obligado
de aquí te prometo, hermoso Cupido. (11. 545-552)

To this extent, the Farsa repeats the ideas of Encina's Egloga XI and, also, with slight variation, repeats its action--the diablo stands in lieu of Amor and Numida in lieu of Febea.

It is clear, however, that Juan de París exploited the situation in Encina's play solely as the basis for his own work. Estacio is not an exact parallel of Cristino. In chosing the religious life, he did not reject the world as completely as Cristino in Egloga XI. The hermit's life providesa remedy for a specific complaint, his loss of Numida. When she returns, the complaint disappears and the remedy is no longer required. Thus, Estacio explained his reason for becoming a hermit to Numida:

Por cierto, mi vida, hazerlo quería
por verme de vos despedido con pena.
Mas con la venida, señora tan buena,
el tal pensamiento de mí se desvía. (11. 541-544)

Cristino, by contrast, sought a remedy for love and a complete freedom from wordly cares, both a remedy and a freedom he could not achieve. Encina thereby exploited the ideas of the attraction of pleasure and the weakness of the will against temptation, ideas with which Juan de París was not concerned. Estacio's retirement to a hermitage and eventual reconciliation with Numida are just two devices of action in the total work.

If love, the Devil, the World--whatever it is called--is triumphant, it is not completely seen to be so in the Farsa by

Juan de París. Although both Estacio and Numida attribute their reunion to Cupid (see ll. 533-536 and 545-552), the conventions of religion also enter the picture. By attributing the reunion of the lovers to God and proposing marriage, the hermit provides the view of conventional reality, not the view of the conventional phantasies of love. He proposes,

> Muy nobles señores, pues Dios, como veys,
> entrambos a dos ha querido juntar,
> deveys matrimonio sagrado tomar.
> Assí a Dios muy alto contento terneys,
> y en esto os suplico que no dilateys. (ll. 553-557)

Estacio agrees (ll. 558-560) and a burlesque ceremony follows, at which the shepherd Cremón officiates. The scene is, however, no denigration of marriage, but a joke, as Cremón explains to the credulous Vicente:

> ...¿no viste
> que no fue el gasajo cumplido de vero?
> Allá en el lugar se hará por entero. (ll. 589-591)

In the concluding scene of the work the final element which appears to deny love its victory is the villancico, sung as the personages return home. The main idea of this song is summarized in its refrain:

> ¡Huygamos de ser vasallos
> del amor!
> pues por premio da dolor. (ll. 633-635)

With the idea that love is an undesirable form of vassallage, even for the most faithful of lovers, the song implies that Estacio and Numida have learnt their lesson. Thus, far from conveying the idea of the complete triumph of love, these last words infer its conquest.

The content of the Farsa by Juan de París discussed thus far is governed by determined formulae. The ideas about love, the attitudes of the personages, and the situations in which they are portrayed were all conventional, derived from the notions contained in Cancionero literature and dramatized in the early sixteenth century according to patterns largely established by Juan del Encina. The outcome of the Farsa, however, conforms to a different set of conventions. As Crawford wrote (Spanish Drama..., p. 73): "The burlesque marriage ceremony humourously performed by a shepherd indicates that the play was written to be performed at some wedding". Consequently, Juan de París was not so concerned as Encina in making the Farsa conform to conventional ideas about love. In company with the Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado and the Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella, both by Lucas Fernández, and the Egloga de Breno, by Salazar, the Farsa of Juan de París contains a conventional subject exploited as an equally conventional wedding play.

The central affair of Juan de París' play is presented in a more or less serious tone, but several comic sketches, with rustics as the central figures, intrude upon it. These rustics fulfil a necessary comic role in the dénouement of the Farsa since they guide Numida to the hermitage where Estacio is found. They are, therefore, instrumental in the successful and happy conclusion of the action. In this respect, their role is similar to that of the pastor in the Coplas de la doncella, el pastor y el salvaje, who also served as a guide to a hermitage and attempted to woo

the courtly doncella. The principal role of the shepherds in the Farsa, however, is as comedians.

Vicente is the first shepherd to enter. He has just seen the devil, who appeared to prophesy Estacio's temptation and fall, and runs into hiding (see ll. 241-272). While hidden, he sees Numida and believes her to be another devil; she, seeing him, thinks he is the answer to her prayer to Cupid for a guide. Numida is about to ask for news of Estacio, but, before she can do so, the shepherd tries to guess the cause of her distress:

> ...dezíme, señora, ¿por qué inconveniente
> estades llorando con huertes passiones?
> ¿Tenés mal de madre, dolor de riñones;
> o quiças del baço, también de la frente?
>
> ¿O estays empreñada de mala manera,
> y estays en puntillos de aver de parir?
> Y si es d'esta guisa, deveys lo dezir.
> Yré yo corriendo a llamar la partera. (ll. 309-316)[11]

His enquiries introduce a little humour into the situation and allow Numida to speak about her suffering, thus exposing the characteristics of her complaint. Vicente, true to his rustic nature, does not understand.[12] He has not seen Estacio, suggests Numida console herself with another, and very obligingly offers himself. There follows a rustic's requesta of a courtly lady, such as Lucas Fernández depicted in the Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella. Vicente enumerates the customary items of country fare, boasts about this rustic abilities, and even gives a demonstration of his dancing:

...si a mí queredes tomar,
señora bendita, que no perdays nada.
Y'os puliré y os terné rechapada,
comigo gasajos no's pueden faltar.

Y os serviré y os terné contentada.
Terméos el toriño de huerte manera;
chaparte he camisas y más dominguera;
daréte la saya y gorguera labrada.
Y si esto, señora, ño's praze ni agrada,
mis gracias, saberes te quiero contar.
Que si te las paras, señora, a escuchar,
a hotas que quedes de mí bien pagada.

Yo soy muy llozido, loçano garçon;
sé bien guardar las ovejas y cabras;
so sabiondo, cortés en las hablas,
y muy repicado en dezir la razón.
Sé chapar bayles y buen saltejón;
so... ¡mira, señora, quan bien que lo hago!
Hago lo bien, dezí si os agrada.
¡Tomadme, señora, con buen coraçon! (ll. 349-368)

Numida is not impressed, however, and Vicente's behaviour has the same effect on her as the pastor's courtship on the doncella in the Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella. His rough manner only aggravates her state:

Tan toscas razones, pastor, te ruego,
no quieras hablar ni menos dezir.
Mas queda con Dios que yo quiérome yr,
qu'estando contigo no tengo sossiego. (ll. 369-372)[13]

Instead of insisting, like counterparts in other plays, Vicente agrees to help. He calls another shepherd, Cremón, who may have more news of Estacio's whereabouts. He has not seen Estacio either, however, and also offers himself as a substitute. When Vicente objects that his similar offer was rejected, an argument follows in which Cremón somewhat violently attempts to prove the other stupid. Numida restores the peace and, at Vicente's suggestion, all three set out for the hermitage, where, after more

comedy on the way, they eventually find Estacio.

The principal comic devices of this scene are familiar. They serve familiar purposes as a distraction from the serious tone of the central action and as a means of revealing the conventional behaviour and attitudes of the central personages. In addition, they provide an element of comic entertainment which makes the work an appropriate wedding play. Indeed, the final scene of the Farsa is a comic wedding celebration. The burlesque ceremony itself, performed by Cremón, was a conventional source of comedy (see Appendix B, s.v. "Betrothal or wedding") and appropriate for a wedding festivity. Moreover, the shepherds' abuse of the hermit in this scene, including their accusation that he wanted to detain Numida at this hermitage to satisfy his own designs on her, is also appropriate to the wedding occasion. While jesting at the expense of a cleric is a familiar device, its inclusion here and the nature of the jest was conceivably provoked by the tradition of ribald humour at wedding festivities.[14]

Whether or not Juan de París wrote his Farsa long before the publication of its first known edition (1536), he certainly capitalized on conventions of composition popularized during earlier years of the sixteenth century. In his work, a mosaic of some of the principal devices of the drama of that period, he re-combined and exploited established traditions. To this extent, his achievement is equal to that of his earlier contemporaries. Juan de París, however, reflects the popularity of pastoral plays beyond the first quarter of the sixteenth century, the

period with which this study is concerned. Like the commemorative pastoral in the form of the Nativity eclogues (see above chap. V), the earliest conventions of the pastoral love drama survived even till the beginning of the seventeenth century.[15] Thus, Juan de París' Farsa was published again in 1551 (see above n. 8) and the anonymous Coplas de la doncella, el pastor y el salvaje was printed in 1604 (see above chap. X).

The pastoral tradition in Spain still had a long life after the achievements of Encina and his contemporaries were forgotten. Its greatest accomplishments were perhaps in the novel, not the drama, in the wake of the influence of Sannazaro's Arcadia and Montemayor's Diana, the latter a product of the mid-sixteenth century which ensured the survival of the pastoral tradition in Spain for another hundred years. In the drama, the serious tone of the Italianate eclogue, as dramatized in Encina's Eglogas XII and XIV, was continued in the Castilian poems of Sâ de Miranda, of which two, the Egloga Alejo (c. 1532) and the Egloga Epitalamio (c. 1535), were possibly intended for recitation.[16] The significant developments in the theatre, however, were in the realm of comedy, where the continuity of the genre is clearly manifest. The conventional ideas and the predicaments of the conventional lover continued to be burlesqued, as in Diego Sánchez de Badajoz's Farsa de la hechicera (printed 1554)[17] and the Farsa llamada Cornelia (printed 1603) by Andrés Prado.[18] A requesta scene, comically exploited, was still a basic device of action, as in Diego de Negueruela's Farsa llamada Ardamisa (1530?)[19] and

plays, such as the Farsa del matrimonio (printed 1554) of Diego Sánchez de Badajoz[20] and the Comedia Florisea (printed 1551 and 1553) by Francisco de Avendaño,[21] continued the relationship of the drama with wedding festivities.

Many of the characteristic features of the plays alluded to above can be traced to comedies discussed in this and the foregoing chapters, but they are all distinguished by their multiple and diverse comic elements and are the products of an evolution beyond the plays comprising this study. Representative of the type is the Farsa a manera de tragedia (printed 1537),[22] which would have to be examined as a derivative of Torres Naharro's non-pastoral theatre in addition to the shepherd plays of Juan del Encina. The mid-sixteenth century pastoral drama was certainly the product of its predecessor, but must be considered in the light of newer traditions, involving different attitudes about drama and certainly resulting from different techniques of composition and elements of subject-matter. Consequently, the pastoral plays alluded to above, showing the influence of further currents, from, for example, the Celestina and Torres Naharro's non-pastoral plays, are not matter for this study and the conclusions reached about the early Spanish drama expressed in the following pages are not intended to apply to them.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER XIII

[1]For verification of the historical background to the Egloga pastoril, see Eugen Kohler, Sieben spanische..., p. 175. The edition referred to in the following pages is Kohler's (pp. 266-296).

[2]The author of the eclogue cannot be identified as a clergyman solely on the grounds of a moralizing tendency in the play. Nativity plays and commemorative works discussed earlier in this study had a predominantly religious and sententious vein, but were written by laymen (see, for example, the works of López de Yanguas).

[3]Compare, for example, the plots of those plays discussed above in chap. VI.

[4]It is assumed that this is the same Juan who was present during the discussion of the topical events, although there is no indication of his earlier exit.

[5]Presumably Gil Calvo is the same Gil who earlier discussed the situation in Valencia, but no indication of his earlier exit is given. Moreover, when he enters to announce his betrothal, he greets his companions as if for the first time.

[6]Sieben spanische..., p. 176. All references to the Egloga nueva are according to Kohler's text (pp. 297-317).

[7]For a discussion of the hermit's role in the early drama, see G.H. Lovett, "The Hermit in the Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega". (See, also, Appendix B, s.v. "Sacrilegious humour".)

[8]This edition was reprinted by Urban Cronan in Teatro español del siglo XVI, but quotations in this study are according to an edition of 1551 reprinted by Kohler (Sieben spanische..., pp. 329-350).

[9]Compare, for example, Estacio's state with that of Fileno at the beginning of Encina's Egloga XII.

[10]Fileno held this view (Egl. XII, ll. 85-94), as did Plácida and Vitoriano (Egl. XIV, ll. 193-213 and 401-413).

[11]Compare the behaviour of Guillardo and Briseno, in the Egloga de Torino and the Egloga de Breno respectively, trying to guess the cause of distress in Torino and Breno (see above chap. XI).

[12]Vicente is comparable to the pastor in Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella because he has the same characteristics and serves the same function. He is a source of comedy since his

conventional stupidity is a means of mocking the conventions of love, but his conventional ignorance allows traditional ideas about love to be presented.

[13]Compare the folllowing lines from the anonymous Coplas de la doncella, el pastor y el salvaje spoken by the doncella to the pastor:

> Aquí me quiero quedar
> sola y sin más alegría;
> ni quiero tu compañía
> ni tu tosco razonar.
> Sólo con oírte hablar
> se me trasdobla mi pena. (pp. 2-3)

[14]See, for example (above, chap. XI), the analysis of Diego de Avila's Egloga ynterlocutoria.

[15]The basic text on the mid-sixteenth century pastoral drama is Crawford, The Spanish Pastoral Drama, pp. 66-104.

[16]See Crawford, The Spanish Pastoral Drama, pp. 66-71.

[17]See Crawford, The Spanish Pastoral Drama, pp. 72-75. Diego Sánchez's plays may be read in the Academy facsimile of the Recopilación en metro.

[18]Reprinted by C. Pérez Pastor, La imprenta en Medina del Campo, Madrid, 1895, pp. 330-337. An edition of this play was possibly also printed in 1537 (see Crawford, Spanish Drama..., p. 74).

[19]Ed. L. Rouanet, Madrid, 1900. See Crawford, The Spanish Pastoral Drama, pp. 76-78.

[20]See Crawford, Spanish Drama..., p. 78. For a text, see, above, n. 17.

[21]Ed. A. Bonilla y San Martín, "Cinco obras dramáticas", pp. 398-422. See Crawford, The Spanish Pastoral Drama, pp. 80-83.

[22]Ed. H.A. Rennert, RHi, XXV (1911), 283-316. See Crawford, The Spanish Pastoral Drama, pp. 90-91.

# CONCLUSION

As expressed in the introduction (see above p. 7), the general intention of the foregoing study was to contribute toward a richer definition of the early Spanish drama, a subject to which critics and historians of literature had devoted much time and attention, but, it was thought, had not provided either a complete or fully acceptable account. Following that intention, the material proposed for this study was limited to the early pastoral drama, and the first dramatic eclogues of Juan del Encina (published 1496) were taken as the point of departure. Subsequently, with a few, non-pastoral works (see chap. VII), some fifty plays have been discussed, including all known pastoral plays written before 1520 and several others written after that date, but in which an earlier style prevailed. The subject-matter of each pastoral play has been described, and particular emphasis has been given to the analysis of the elements of action contributing to the plot, the devices of characterization evident in the personages, and the adaptation and suitability of both plot and personages to the immediate purpose of the dramatist in question. All plays have been discussed in this way, regardless of the relative importance of one play in the development of the drama on account of its influence on others, regardless, also, of the amount and depth of previous critical treatment, length, or other external considerations. The uniform application of this method has produced, in a single study, some repetitiveness in discussions and a proliferation of descriptions of similar plays, but

the shortcomings of the method are justified by the results obtained.

A systematic description has facilitated a complete view of the subject, a group of pastoral plays never before analyzed in this way. Alongside this complete view, permitting appropriate appreciation of even the least significant play without dulling the prestige of worthier pieces, it has also been possible to describe and interpret each of the plays as individual compositions. This, in some cases, led to a questioning of interpretations held as misleading, such as J. Richard Andrews' discussion of Juan del Encina's eclogues, or Alfredo Hermenegildo's impression of the works by Lucas Fernández; in others, it amounted to reassessing acceptable theories, such as those by Bruce W. Wardropper and Charlotte Stern about Encina's theatre, and pursuing them in the light of the aims established for this study; for yet others, works which had so far merited small, critical attention (Manuel de Urrea's eclogues and the plays described in chapters XI and XIII), new evaluations had to be undertaken. The total is a body of analysis of the early Spanish pastoral drama. It is unnecessary to recall the conclusions reached in the preceding pages for each play, but it is important not to overlook some of the characteristics readily discernible among the combined interpretations and descriptions. In this regard, the benefit of having sought a total view can be reiterated, for it will now be possible to evaluate it more adequately, knowing that the total has been described. Some of the long-standing opinions about the early drama can be reaffirmed, but with new emphasis, and some additional

ideas offered for its further understanding.

The most immediately recognizable features of early Spanish drama are its conventional, pastoral forms. If pastoral literature can be loosely classified as the description of shepherds, their setting and behaviour, both idealized and real, then the early Spanish theatre must be accepted as part of it. With a few exceptions, the subjects of all the plays discussed in this study, which includes virtually all known plays written in Castilian before 1520, were either completely accommodated with the pastoral traditions or showed very visible affinities with them, not really a remarkable situation since pastoral antecedents can be found for all the principal types of the early drama, the Nativity, political, and pastoral love plays (see chaps. I and VIII). The depth of the roots of the pastoral traditions incorporated into the drama can be gauged by the survival and popularity of the earliest pastoral devices of dramatic composition until the beginning of the seventeenth century. Its strength can be measured by the way new trends were made to conform to old traditions. New currents in the drama, introducing elements of Italian and Roman comedy and kinds of allegory, through works like the Celestina, the plays of Torres Naharro and Diego Sánchez de Badajoz, could all be assimilated to the pastoral mould, even while existing in other, non-pastoral forms.

The role of the pastoral element in shaping the early Spanish drama is paramount, for although the earliest dramatists had no immediately apparent dramatic tradition on which to depend, they could exploit the many facets of an already developed pastoral

literature. In fact, a strong argument could be made to favour the origin of modern drama in Spain from secular, pastoral literature, as much as from the religious, or liturgical pastoral. Since the pastoral element, a developed form, was present right from its inception with the dramatic eclogues of Juan del Encina, the drama could immediately thrive as an accepted phenomenon, to which both writers and spectators could respond alike, as to familiar ideas. The pastoral atmosphere of the plays could provide a recognizable feature and a unifying factor among the works of the earlier dramatists. The shepherds' behaviour and their country setting were familiar enough to create an easily communicable background which, even when transplanted from one situation to another, could also create a firm basis of understanding between the actor and the audience. To this extent, the pastoral traditions of literature could easily become the trademarks of drama and be perpetuated throughout the greater part of the sixteenth century with this function.

The pastoral characters were employed in the drama in the roles they had already fulfilled in pastoral tradition. Hence the many examples of pastoral disguising, the cloaking of the author's own identity, or that of historical or allegorical figures, in pastoral garb, and of the use of the pastoral situation as a vehicle for the expression of personal opinion, or for the conveying of a religious or political didacticism. Above all, the pastoral characters could be a source of gratuitous amusement. The role of the shepherd was frequently that of a predictably comic figure, whose inherited stupidity provoked an anticipated laughter and who could be used to

mock any ideas presented. This overall familiarity of the pastoral characters established a standard for the audience, from which the events enacted in a play could be appraised and related to the spectators' own sense of reality.

In total, the pastoral element was but the central convention of a conventional theatre, which tended to portray preconceived notions about both real and unreal situations, a fact equally true of both religious and secular plays. The conventionality of this theatre is apparent specifically in its function as a vehicle for commonplace ideas, expressed in conformity with established terminology. Whether it was a matter of the Incarnation, a yearning for peace, or the portrayal of a lover's anguish, the dramatist knew that his ideas and situations were communicable to andbelieved in by an audience already receptive to them and the form of their delivery. This receptiveness outwardly manifests itself, for example, in the predictable exploitation of certain devices. The courtship scene, the lover's distress, the appearance of angels, the stupidity of shepherds, and the vocabulary of the personages in general are all familiar points of contact with the audience (see Appendix B). In the last resort, conventionality in the pastoral drama is simply a language evolved to permit immediate communication between the writer and the spectator.

These observations about the conventionality of the pastoral elements in the drama in part reaffirm the conclusions of previous criticism; but, from here, critics argued in favour of a general imitativeness among early dramatists. Certainly, an overall con-

ventionality resulted in a remarkable uniformity, with basically the same or similar subjects dramatized in a whole series of plays in much the same ways, so that many writers could conceivably be called imitative. "Conventional" is a better word, however, since it is not purely a matter of writers imitating their predecessors, as it is of their adhering to formulae already proven successful and popular. An excess of attention paid to the conformity among dramatists to a particular style has, consequently, resulted in a neglect of both the versatility of the pastoral tradition itself and the conventions of its dramatization. Moreover, inadequate justice has been rendered to the dramatists' ability in exploiting such conventions. This study has sought to remedy this situation.

In spite of the overriding uniformity imposed by adhering to a popular convention, the differences among the pastoral plays are nonetheless striking. There are substantial variants among plays by Encina, Vicente, Fernández, Urrea, and López de Yanguas, each of whom made a distinguishable contribution to the total collection. Analysis of their plays has shown that, without incurring a radical departure from chosen formulae, dramatists attempted to diversify and suit their compositions to the appropriate occasion of performance. Thus, the structure of the Christmas play, with only slight changes of emphasis, could serve López de Yanguas as a primitive auto sacramental; the pastoral wedding play, for Gil Vicente, could figure in two Nativity autos; Encina's adaptation of an Italian eclogue could give rise both to a wedding play, the Egloga de Breno, and an episode in a sentimental novel, the Egloga

de Torino. The versatility of the pastoral tradition easily allowed such reconstructions, just as it allowed a wide range of differences from one Nativity play, or love drama, to another, and the analyses presented in the preceding pages are testimony to these claims. In those analyses, due attention was paid to the dramatists' manipulation of their subjects and its pastoral form in order to commemorate the occasion of performance. It may be concluded, as a result, that the Spanish theatre was not born, and did not grow and progress, for the sake of posterity, often the judge which has condemned it. The majority of plays discussed were written for the benefit of a single performance in circumstances which could never again coincide. Consequently, their meaning must be sought in those circumstances and, in part, their glory seen as ephemeral, facts for which the latter-day reader must make due allowance, for otherwise he will not appreciate their qualities to the full.

That the early dramatists understood and made good capital of the inherent versatility in the pastoral convention, is adequate reason for eschewing their classification as gratuitous imitators; but the analyses conducted of their plays can also show that their artistic primitiveness is not to be confused with artlessness. The early pastoral drama is certainly primitive by comparison with a later, more sophisticated theatre, but it lacks neither technique nor artistry. Its dramatists, although constrained by conventions of both subject and composition, genetally knew how to exploit the material at hand, how to adapt it to their requirements, and how to match the conventions for the best effects. Thus, analysis has

revealed how competently a dramatist could combine apparently disparate conventions, a secular pastoral scene with a devotional play, or a courtly lover's predicament alongside its burlesque representation, without any sacrifices to unity or consistency of plot and character. The primitive artist is no less an artist for being primitive; his production is simply better understood and appreciated at the level of its execution.

In any conclusions about the early pastoral theatre, a special word must be reserved for Juan del Encina. His work, contributing the leading plays of the major areas considered in this study, has rightly been singled out for praise, but not always for the right reasons. Encina, acclaimed as the patriarch of Spanish theatre, has been considered the mentor of his later contemporaries, and they his disciples and imitators. Insofar as the subjects of his eclogues were derived from traditions long established in literature, Encina's plays were as conventional as those of his successors, but Lucas Fernández's plays, with the kinds of situations, characters, and comedy he exploited, are generally more representative of the early drama. Encina's position as the originator of the drama rests in part on the absence of earlier dramatists to vie for the honour; this reputation derives from the single fact that he first thought of writing eclogues, to be impersonated by actors, based on the prevailing forms of pastoral literature. In doing so, he founded the basic patterns from which his successors could depart; but, although establishing the popularity of dramatizing the pastoral conventions, he did not invent them. This explains why the conventions of his

work were so readily and extensively followed, why there could exist more than those dramatized in his eclogues, and, also, why Fernández's plays could consequently come to be more representative.

Encina's real achievement, largely overlooked by his commentators, was his understanding of the notions involved in creating a theatrical illusion. The concept of transforming an actor into a character is embodied in his eclogues through their inclusion of his own self and through his movement from the dramatization of a real to a fictional situation. Encina thereby experimented with the basis of theatre, the combination of illusion and reality, more extensively and deliberately than any of his contemporaries. Beginning in his earliest plays with the dramatization of events important to his own life and well-being, he concluded his career as a dramatist with plays intended to exist as phantasies alone. In doing so, he sought to write a work which, not commemorating just one single occasion, could relevantly be performed innumerable times and produce, each time, the same illusion.

If a poet as reasonably accomplished as Encina could achieve no more than a token success, it is not remarkable that others, who took for granted the concepts of theatre he consciously explored, in general neither equalled nor surpassed him, with perhaps the exception of Gil Vicente. But this is not to diminish the value and ability of Encina's fellow, pastoral dramatists. Progress was possible because other writers, however primitively or naively, exploited a new trend in pastoral literature by imitating and developing the work of its

first known exponent. Consequently, it is to their work that the initial popularity of the drama is accountable and their work which consolidated its earliest conventions and established its trends. In the last resort, the pastoral drama in the form created jointly by Encina and his generation, although it was not destined for greater achievements, provided nevertheless a first and basic step, sufficiently interesting by itself and requiring some kind of independent, critical understanding, such as the one we have tried to reach, in the way of the development of Spanish drama toward its greatest destiny, realized by later generations in a later century.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## ABBREVIATIONS

BRAE - Boletín de la Real Academia Española de la Lengua, Madrid.

BTHP - Bulletin d'Histoire du Théâtre Portugais, Lisbon.

BHS - Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, Liverpool.

BHi - Bulletin Hispanique, Bordeaux.

CC - Clásicos Castellanos, Espasa Calpe, Madrid.

EE - Estudios Escénicos, Barcelona.

Fil - Filología, Buenos Aires.

Hisp - Hispania, Lawrence, Kansas.

HR - Hispanic Review, Philadelphia.

MLJ - Modern Language Journal, New York-Chicago.

MLN - Modern Language Notes, Baltimore.

MLR - Modern Language Review, Cambridge.

PhQ - Philological Quarterly, Iowa City.

PMLA - Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, New York.

RABM - Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos, Madrid.

RBAM - Revista de la Biblioteca, Archivo y Museo del Ayuntamiento de Madrid, Madrid.

RFE - Revista de Filología Española, Madrid.

RHi - Revue Hispanique, Paris.

RPhil - Romance Philology, Berkeley.

RR - Romanic Review, New York.

RJ - Romanistisches Jahrbuch, Hamburg.

SP - Studies in Philology, Chapel Hill.

## LITERARY TEXTS

(Abbreviated titles in parentheses indicate the forms employed for frequent references in the text, notes, or bibliography.)


Altamira, Pedro, "Auto de la Aparición que Nuestro Señor Jesucristo hizo a los discípulos que iban a Emaus", ed. J. E. Gillet, RR, XIII (1922), 228-251.

Anonymous, Auto de los Reyes Magos, ed. R. Menéndez Pidal, in Crestomatía del español medieval, Madrid, I, pp. 71-77.

_____, "Comedia a lo pastoril para la noche de Navidad", ed. J. P. W. Crawford, RHi, XXIV (1911), 497-541.

_____, Coplas de Mingo Revulgo, facsimile edition, with a paleographic version, introduction, and notes by L. de la Cuadra Escrivá de Romaní, Madrid, 1963.

_____, Egloga de Torino, ed. M. Menéndez y Pelayo, in Orígenes..., 1st ed., Madrid, 1907, II, pp. 67-73.

_____, "Egloga interlocutoria", ed. Urban Cronan, RHi, XXXVI (1916), 475-488.

_____, Egloga pastoril, ed. E. Kohler, in Sieben spanische..., pp. 266-296.

_____, "The Egloga sobrel molino de Vascalon", ed. J. E. Gillet, PhQ, V (1926), 87-89.

_____, "Everyman" and Medieval Miracle Plays, ed. A. C. Cawley, Everyman's Library, London, 1962.

_____, "Farsa a manera de tragedia", ed. H. A. Rennert, RHi, XXV (1911), 283-316.

_____, "Farsa sacramental, compuesta en el año 1521", ed. M. Serrano y Sanz, RABM, X (1904), 67-71 and 447-450.

Aparicio, Bartolomé, Obra del pecador, ed. B. J. Gallardo, in Ensayo de una biblioteca..., I, cols. 221-244.

Avendaño, Francisco de, Comedia Florisea, ed. A. Bonilla y San Martín, in "Cinco obras dramáticas", pp. 398-422.

Avila, Diego de, Egloga ynterlocutoria, ed. E. Kohler, in Sieben spanische..., pp. 236-266.

Boehl de Faber, J. N. (ed.), Teatro anterior a Lope de Vega, Hamburg, 1832.

Bonilla y San Martín, Adolfo (ed.), "Cinco obras dramáticas", RHi, XXVII (1912), 390-498.

Castillo, Hernando del, Cancionero general recopilado por Hernando del Castillo (Valencia, 1511), published in facsimile by the Real Academia Española, with introduction and appendices by A. Rodríguez-Moñino, Madrid, 1958.

Cota, Rodrigo, Diálogo entre el Amor y un viejo, ed. Elisa Aragone, Firenze, 1951.

_____, Diálogo entre el Amor y un viejo, ed. R. Foulché-Delbosc, in Cancionero castellano del siglo XV, Madrid, 1912, II, pp. 580-587.

Cronan, Urban (ed.), Teatro español del siglo XVI, Madrid, 1913.

Díaz, Fernando, Farsa nuevamente trobada, ed. E. Kohler, in Sieben spanische..., pp. 317-328.

Durán, Diego, Egloga nueva, ed. E. Kohler, in Sieben spanische..., pp. 297-317.

Encina, Juan del, El aucto del repelón, ed. A. Álvarez de la Villa, Paris, 1910.

_____, Cancionero de Juan del Encina (Salamanca, 1496), issued in facsimile by the Real Academia Española, with a prologue by E. Cotarelo, Madrid, 1928.

_____, Egloga de Plácida y Vitoriano, ed. E. Giménez Caballero, Zaragoza, 1954.

_____, Eglogas de Juan del Enzina, ed. H. López Morales, Madrid, 1963. (Eglogas...)

_____, Representaciones de Juan del Encina, ed. E. Kohler, Strasbourg, 1914.

_____, Teatro completo de Juan del Encina, ed. M. Cañete and F. A. Barbieri, Madrid, 1893. (Teatro completo...)

Fernández, Lucas, Farsas y églogas al modo y estilo pastoril y castellano fechas por Lucas Fernández, Salmantino (Salamanca,

1514), issued in facsimile by the Real Academia Española, with a prologue by E. Cotarelo, Madrid, 1929.

_____, Farsas y églogas al modo y estilo pastoril y castellano fechas por Lucas Fernández, Salmantino, ed. M. Cañete, Madrid, 1867.

Juliá Martínez, Eduardo (ed.), Poetas dramáticas valencianos, 2 vols., Madrid, 1929.

Kohler, Eugen, Sieben spanische dramatische Eklogen, Dresden, 1911. (Sieben spanische...)

López Ranjel, Pero, "Farsa a honor y reuerencia del glorioso Nacimiento (Early Sixteenth Century)", ed. J. E. Gillet, PMLA, XLI (1926), 860-890.

López de Mendoza, Iñigo, Marqués de Santillana, Obras de Don Iñigo López de Mendoza, Marqués de Santillana, ed. J. Amador de los Ríos, Madrid, 1852. (Obras...)

López de Yanguas, Fernán, Obras dramáticas, ed. Fernando González Ollé, CC no. 162, Madrid, 1967.

Madrid, Francisco de, "Egloga hecha por Francisco de Madrid (1495)", ed. J. E. Gillet, HR, XI (1943), 275-303. ("Egloga hecha...")

Manrique, Gómez, Representaçion del naçimiento de Nuestro Señor, ed. R. Foulché-Delbosc, in Cancionero castellano del siglo XV, Madrid, 1915, II, pp. 53-56.

Mendoza, Fray Iñigo de, Vita Christi fecho en coplas por Fray Iñigo de Mendoza (Zamora, 1482), reproduced in facsimile by the Real Academia Española, Madrid, 1952.

Montemayor, Jorge de, "Three Autos of Jorge de Montemayor", ed. Florence Whyte, PMLA, XLIII (1928), 953-989.

Negueruela, Diego de, Farsa llamada Ardamisa, ed. L. Rouanet, Madrid, 1900.

Ortiz, Andrés, "A Spanish Play on the Battle of Pavia", ed. J. E. Gillet, PMLA, XLV (1930), 516-531. ("A Spanish Play...".)

París, Juan de, Farsa, ed. E. Kohler, in Sieben spanische..., pp. 329-350.

Pradilla, Bachiller de la, Egloga real, ed. E. Kohler, in Sieben spanische..., pp. 209-236.

Prado, Andrés, Farsa llamada Cornelia, ed. C. Pérez Pastor, in La imprenta en Medina del Campo, Madrid, 1895, pp. 330-337.

Reynosa, Rodrigo de, "Coplas de unos tres pastores attributed to Rodrigo de Reynosa", ed. J. E. Gillet, PhQ, XXI (1942), 23-46. ("Coplas de unos tres pastores...".)

Rojas, Fernando de, La Celestina, ed. J. Cejador y Frauca, CC nos. 20 and 23, Madrid, 1962-63.

Rojas Villandrando, Agustín de, Viaje entretenido, ed. J. García Morales, Madrid, 1964.

Rouanet, Léo (ed.), Colección de autos, farsas y coloquios del siglo XVI, 4 vols., Barcelona-Madrid, 1901.

Rueda, Lope de, Obras de Lope de Rueda, 2 vols., ed. E. Cotarelo, Madrid, 1908.

Ruiz, Juan, Arcipreste de Hita, Libro de buen amor, ed. J. Cejador y Frauca, CC nos. 14 and 17, Madrid, 1959-60.

Salazar, Egloga de Breno, ed. H. C. Heaton, in "Two Sixteenth Century Dramatic Works", RHi, LXXII (1928), pp. 76-99.

Sánchez de Badajoz, Diego, Recopilación en metro (Seville, 1554), issued in facsimile by the Real Academia Española, Madrid, 1929.

_____, Recopilación en metro del Bachiller D. Sánchez de Badajoz, 2 vols., ed. D. V. Barrantes, Madrid, 1882-86.

_____, Recopilación en metro del Bachiller Diego Sánchez de Badajoz, ed. J. López Prudencio, Badajoz, 1910.

Santillana, "Hernández-Santillana, Obra nuevamente compuesta sobre el nascimiento del príncipe don Felipe (1527?)", ed. J. E. Gillet, HR, IX (1941), 48-64.

Suárez de Robles, Pero, "Danza del Santissimo Nascimiento de Nuestro Señor Jesucristo", ed. J. E. Gillet, PMLA, XLIII (1928), 613-634.

Timoneda, Juan de, Obras completas, ed. M. Menéndez y Pelayo, Valencia, 1911.

_____, Obras de Timoneda, 3 vols., ed. E. Juliá Martínez, Madrid, 1947-48.

_____, Las tres comedias de Juan de Timoneda (Valencia, 1559), issued in facsimile by the Real Academia Española, Madrid, 1936.

_____, Turiana, colección de comedias y farsas, issued in facsimile by the Real Academia Española, Madrid, 1936.

Torres Naharro, Bartolomé de, Propaladia, 2 vols., ed. M. Cañete, with a critical study by M. Menéndez y Pelayo, Madrid, 1880 and 1900.

_____, "Propalladia" and Other Works of Bartolomé de Torres Naharro, 4 vols., ed. J. E. Gillet (Vol. IV transcribed, edited, and completed by O. H. Green), Bryn Mawr-Philadelphia, 1943-61. ("Propalladia"...)

Urrea, Pedro Manuel de, Eglogas dramáticas y poesías desconocidas de Pedro Manuel de Urrea, ed. E. Asensio, Madrid, 1950. (Eglogas dramáticas...)

Vega, Alonso de la, Tres comedias de Alonso de la Vega, ed. M. Menéndez y Pelayo, Dresden, 1905.

Vicente, Gil, Obras completas, 6 vols., ed. Marques Braga, 2nd. ed., Lisbon, 1951.

_____, Obras dramáticas castellanas, ed. T. R. Hart, CC no. 156, Madrid, 1962. (Obras dramáticas...)

## CRITICAL TEXTS


Alonso, Dámaso, Poesía española: ensayo de métodos y límites estilísticos, Madrid, 1950.

Alonso Cortés, Narciso, El teatro en Valladolid, Madrid, 1923.

Amador de los Ríos, José, Historia crítica de la literatura española, 7 vols., Madrid, 1861-65.

Andrews, J. Richard, Juan del Encina: Prometheus in Search of Prestige, University of California, 1959. (Prometheus...)

Asenjo Barbieri, Francisco, Cancionero musical de los siglos XV y XVI, Madrid, 1890.

Asensio, Eugenio, "El Auto dos quatro tempos de Gil Vicente", RFE, XXXIII (1949), 350-375. ("El Auto...".)

Auerbach, Erich, Scenes from the Drama of European Literature, New York, 1959.

Austin, F.S.C., Bro., "Juan del Encina", Hisp., XXXIX (1956), 161-174.

Barrera y Leirado, Cayetano Alberto de la, Catálogo bibliográfico y biográfico del teatro antiguo español desde sus orígenes hasta mediados del siglo XVIII, Madrid, 1860.

Bataillon, Marcel, Erasmo y España: Estudios sobre la historia espiritual del siglo XVI, trans. A. Alatorre, Mexico-Buenos Aires, 1966.

Bell, Aubrey F. G., Estudos vicentinos, trans. A. A. Doria, Lisbon, 1940.

Bonilla y San Martín, Adolfo, Las Bacantes, o del origen del teatro, Madrid, 1921. (Las Bacantes,...)

Boughner, Daniel, The Braggart in Renaissance Comedy. A Study in Comparative Drama from Aristophanes to Shakespeare, Minneapolis, 1954.

Braamcamp Freire, Anselmo, Vida e obras de Gil Vicente, "trovador, mestre da balança", Lisbon, 1944. (Vida e obras de Gil Vicente, ...)

Bryant, William C., "Lucas Fernández and the Early Spanish Drama", doctoral dissertation, California, 1965. ("Lucas Fernández...".)

Cañete, Manuel, Teatro español del siglo XVI, Madrid, 1885.

Chambers, Sir Edmund K., The Medieval Stage, 2 vols., Oxford, 1903.

Cirot, Georges, "Le théâtre religieux d'Encina", BHi, XLIII (1941), 5-35. ("Le théâtre religieux...".)

Cortina, Augusto, "Rodrigo Cota", RBAM, VI (1929), 151-165.

Cotarelo y Mori, Emilio, "Adición a Noticias de Rodrigo Cota", BRAE, XIII (1926), 140-142.

_____, "Algunas noticias nuevas acerca de Rodrigo Cota", BRAE, XIII (1926), 11-17.

_____, "Juan del Encina y los orígenes del teatro español", in Estudios de historia literaria de España, Madrid, 1901, pp. 103-181. ("Juan del Encina y los orígenes...".)

_____, "El primer auto sacramental del teatro español y noticia de su autor, el Bachiller Hernán López de Yanguas", RABM, VI (1902), 251-272. ("El primer auto...".)

Covarrubias, Sebastián de, Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española, 1611, ed. M. de Riquer, Barcelona, 1943.

Crawford, J. P. Wickersham, "Again the Cuestión de Amor in the Early Spanish Drama", HR, I (1933), 319-322.

_____, "The Braggart Soldier and the Rufián in the Spanish Drama of the Sixteenth Century", RR, II (1911), 186-208.

_____, "The Date of Salazar's Egloga de Breno", HR, IV (1936), 280-283.

_____, "Early Spanish Wedding Plays", RR, XII (1922), 370-384.

_____, "Echarse pullas: A Popular Form of Tenzone", RR, VI (1915), 150-164.

_____, "Encina's Egloga de Fileno, Zambardo y Cardonio and Antonio Tebaldeo's Second Eclogue", HR, II (1934), 327-333. ("Encina's Egloga de Fileno...".)

_____, "Note on the Boy Bishop in Spain", RR, XII (1921), 146-154.

_____, "Notes on the Amphitrion and Los Menecmos of Juan de Timoneda", MLR, IX (1914), 248-251.

_____, "The Pastor and Bobo in the Spanish Religious Drama of the Sixteenth Century", RR, II (1911), 376-401.

_____, "The Source of Encina's Egloga de Fileno y Zambardo", RHi, XXXVIII (1916), 218-231. ("The Source of Encina's Egloga...".)

_____, Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega, Philadelphia, 1922, 2nd. revised ed., Philadelphia, 1937 (reissued, with a bibliographical supplement by W. T. McCready, Philadelphia, 1967 and 1968). (Spanish Drama...)

_____, The Spanish Pastoral Drama, Philadelphia, 1915.

Creizenach, Wilhelm, Geschichte des neuren Dramas, 5 vols., Halle, 1893-1916 (2nd. ed., revised by A. Hämel, 3 vols., Halle, 1911-23, reissued, New York, 1965). (Geschichte...)

Díaz, José Simón, Bibliografía de la literatura hispánica, 7 vols., Madrid, 1960-67.

Díaz-Plaja, Guillermo, "El Auto de los Reyes Magos", EE, IV (1959), 99-126.

Díaz de Escobar, Narciso, El teatro en Málaga. Apuntes históricos de los siglos XVI, XVII y XVIII, Malaga, 1896.

Diccionario de historia de España, 2 vols., Madrid, Revista de Occidente, 1952.

Donovan, Richard B., The Liturgical Drama in Medieval Spain, Toronto, 1958. (The Liturgical Drama...)

Espinosa Maeso, Ricardo, "Ensayo biográfico del maestro Lucas Fernández ¿1474-1542?", BRAE, X (1923), 386-424 and 567-603. ("Ensayo biográfico...".)

_____, "Nuevos datos biográficos de Juan del Encina", BRAE, VIII (1921), 640-656. ("Nuevos datos...".)

Faral, Edmond, "La pastourelle", Romania, IXL (1923), 204-259.

Fernández de Moratín, Leandro, Orígenes del teatro español, in Obras de D. Leandro Fernández de Moratín, Vol. I, Madrid, 1830.

Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J., A New History of Spanish Literature, Oxford, 1926.

Frank, Grace, The Medieval French Drama, Oxford, 1954.

Gallardo, Bartolomé José, Ensayo de una biblioteca de libros raros y curiosos, 4 vols., Madrid, 1863-89. (Ensayo de una biblioteca...)

Gerhardt, Mia I., La Pastorale: essai d'analyse littéraire, Assen, 1950. (La Pastorale...)

Gillet, Joseph E., "The 'Memorias' of Felipe Fernández Vallejo and the History of the Early Spanish Drama", in Studies in Honor of Carleton Brown, New York, 1940, pp. 264-280. ("The 'Memorias' of Felipe Fernández Vallejo...".)

_____, "Notes on the Language of the Rustics in the Drama of the Sixteenth Century", in Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal, Madrid, 1925, I, pp. 443-452.

Giménez Caballero, E., "Hipótesis a un problema de Juan del Encina", RFE, XIV (1927), 59-69.

Glenn, Richard F., "Rodrigo Cota's Diálogo entre el Amor y un viejo: Debate or Drama?", Hisp, XLVIII (1965), 51-56.

González Ollé, Fernando, "El Bachiller de la Pradilla, humanista y dramaturgo", RJ, XVII (1966), 285-300. ("El Bachiller de la Pradilla...".)

Green, Otis H., "Courtly Love in the Cancioneros", PMLA, LXIV (1949), 247-301.

_____, "On Juan Ruiz's Parody of the Canonical Hours", HR, XXVI (1958), 12-34.

_____, Spain and the Western Tradition. The Castilian Mind in Literature from 'El Cid' to Calderón, 4 vols., Madison-Milwaukee, 1963-66.

_____, "A Wedding Introito by Francisco de Aldana (1537-1578)", HR, XXXI (1963), 8-21.

Grismer, Raymond Leonard, The Influence of Plautus in Spain before Lope de Vega, together with Chapters on the Dramatic Technique and the Revival of Plautus in Spain, New York, 1944.

Hart, Thomas R., "Gil Vicente's Auto de la Sibila Casandra", HR, XXVI (1958), 35-51. ("Gil Vicente's Auto...".)

Hartmann, K. A. Martin, Über das altspanische Dreikönigspiel, Bautzen, 1879.

Hendrix, William S., "Some Native Comic Types in the Early Spanish Drama", Ohio State University Contributions in Language and Literature, Vol. I (1924), 1-115. ("Some Native Comic Types...".)

Hermenegildo, Alfredo, "Nueva interpretación de un primitivo: Lucas Fernández", Segismundo, no. 3 (1966), 9-43. ("Nueva interpretación...".)

_____, Los trágicos del siglo XVI, Madrid, 1961.

Hill, John M., "An additional Note for the Bibliography of Rodrigo de Reynosa", HR, XVII (1949), 243-250.

_____, "Notes for the Bibliography of Rodrigo de Reynosa", HR, XIV (1946), 1-21.

House, Ralph E., "A Study of Encina and the Egloga interlocutoria", RR, VII (1916), 458-469.

Huizinga, Johan, The Waning of the Middle Ages, Peregrine Books, 1965.

Jack, W. Shaffer, "Development of the Entremés before Lope de Rueda", PMLA, XXXVIII (1922), 187-207.

_____, The Early "Entremés" in Spain: The Rise of a Dramatic Form, Philadelphia, 1923.

Juliá Martínez, Eduardo, "La Asunción de la Virgen y el teatro primitivo español", BRAE, XLI (1961), 179-334.

_____, "La literatura dramática en el siglo XVI", in Historia general de las literaturas hispánicas, ed. G. Díaz-Plaja, Barcelona, 1953, III, pp. 107-213.

_____, "La literatura dramática peninsular en el siglo XV", in Historia general de las literaturas hispánicas, ed. G. Díaz-Plaja, Barcelona, 1951, II, pp. 237-315. ("La literatura dramática peninsular...".)

King, Georgiana Goddard, The Play of the Sibyl Cassandra, Bryn Mawr, 1921.

Lang, H. R., "The So-called Cancionero de Pero Guillén de Segovia", RHi, XIX (1908), 51-81.

Lapesa, Rafael, La obra literaria del Marqués de Santillana, Madrid, 1957.

_____, "Sobre el Auto de los Reyes Magos: sus rimas anómalas y el posible origen de su autor", in Homenaje a Fritz Krüger, II, Mendoza, 1954, pp. 591-599.

Lázaro Carreter, Fernando, Teatro medieval, 2nd, revised ed., Madrid, 1965.

Lida de Malkiel, María Rosa, "El fanfarrón en el teatro del Renacimiento", RPhil, XI (1958), 268-291.

_____, La originalidad artística de la Celestina, Buenos Aires, 1962.

_____, "Para la génesis del Auto de la Sibila Casandra", Fil, V (1959), 47-63.

Lihani, John, "Lucas Fernández and the Evolution of the Shepherd's Family Pride in the Early Spanish Drama", HR, XXV (1957), 252-263. ("Lucas Fernández and the Evolution...".)

_____, "Some Notes on Sayagués", Hisp, XLI (1958), 165-169.

López Morales, Humberto, Tradición y creación en los orígenes del teatro castellano, Madrid, 1968. (Tradición y creación...)

López Prudencio, José, Diego Sánchez de Badajoz. Estudio crítico, biográfico y bibliográfico, Madrid, 1915.

Lovett, G. H., "The Hermit in Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega", MLJ, XXXV (1951), 340-355.

Mazzei, Pilade, Contributo allo studio delle fonti italiane del teatro di Juan del Encina e Torres Naharro, Lucca, 1922. (Contributo...)

Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino, Antología de poetas líricos castellanos, 10 vols., Edición Nacional de las Obras Completas de Menéndez Pelayo, Vols. XVII-XXVI, Madrid, 1944 (Antología...)

_____, Estudios y discursos de crítica histórica y literaria, 7 vols., Edición Nacional de las Obras Completas de Menéndez Pelayo, Vols. VI-XII, Madrid, 1942.

_____, Orígenes de la novela, 4 vols., Edición Nacional de las Obras Completas de Menéndez Pelayo, Vols. XIII-XVI, Madrid, 1962.

Meredith, Joseph A., "Introito" and "Loa" in the Spanish Drama of the Sixteenth Century, Philadelphia, 1928.

Merimée, Henri, L'Art dramatique à Valencia depuis les origines jusqu'au commencement du XVII$^{e}$ siècle, Toulouse, 1913.

Michaelis de Vasconcellos, Carolina, "Notas vicentinas. Preliminares duma edição crítica das obras de Gil Vicente", Revista da Universidade de Coimbra, IX (1925), 1-394.

_____, "Nótulas sobre cantares e vilhancicos peninsulares e a respeito de Juan del Encina", RFE, V (1918), 337-366. ("Nótulas sobre cantares...".)

Milá y Fontanals, Manuel, Los orígenes del teatro catalán, Barcelona, 1895.

Milego, Julio, El teatro en Toledo durante los siglos XVI y XVII, Valencia, 1909.

Myers, Oliver T., "Juan del Encina and the Auto del repelón", HR, XXXII (1964), 189-201.

Nebrija, Antonio de, Dictionarum latino hispanicum et vice versa hispanocolatinum, Antwerp, 1570.

Nicoll, Allardyce, Masks, Mimes, and Miracles, New York, 1931.

Panofsky, Erwin, Netherlandish Painting: Its Origins and Character, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1953.

Patt, Beatrice, "The Development of the Christmas Play in Spain from the Origins to Lope de Vega", doctoral dissertation, Bryn Mawr, 1945. ("The Development of the Christmas Play...".)

Piguet, Edgar, L'Evolution de la pastourelle du XII$^{e}$ siècle à nos jours, Bale, 1927.

Révah, I. S., "L'Auto de la Sibylle Casandre de Gil Vicente", HR, XXVII (1959), 167-193. ("L'Auto de la Sibylle Cassandre...".)

_____, "La comedia dans l'oeuvre de Gil Vicente", BHTP, II (1951), 1-39.

_____, "Gil Vicente, a-t-il été le fondateur du théâtre portugais?", BHTP, I (1950), 153-185.

Salvá y Mallén, Pedro, Catálogo de la biblioteca de Salvá, 2 vols., Valencia, 1872.

Sánchez-Arjona, José, El teatro en Sevilla en los siglos XVI y XVII (Estudios históricos), Madrid, 1887.

Schack, Adolf Friedrich, Graf von, Historia de la literatura y del arte dramático en España, 5 vols., trans. E. de Mier, Madrid, 1885-87.

Shergold, N. D., A History of the Spanish Stage from Medieval Times

until the End of the Seventeenth Century, Oxford, 1967. (A History of the Spanish Stage...)

Shoemaker, William H., "Fernando de Basurto's 'Lost Play' on the Martyrdom of Santa Engracia", HR, VI (1938), 35-45.

_____, The Multiple Stage in Spain during the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries, Princeton University Press, 1935 (in Span. trans., Los escenarios múltiples en el teatro español de los siglos XV y XVI, EE, 1957). (The Multiple Stage...)

Spaulding, R. K., "The Text of Moratín's Orígenes del teatro español", PMLA, XLVIII (1932), 981-991.

Spitzer, Leo, "The Artistic Unity of Gil Vicente's Auto da Sibila Casandra", HR, XXVII (1959), 57-77. ("The Artistic Unity...".)

Stern, Charlotte, "Fray Iñigo de Mendoza and Medieval Dramatic Ritual", HR, XXXIII (1965), 197-245.

_____, "Juan del Encina's Carnival Eclogues and the Spanish Drama of the Renaissance", in Renaissance Drama VIII, Evanston, 1965, pp. 181-195. ("Juan del Encina's Carnival Eclogues...".)

_____, "Studies on the Sayagués in the Early Spanish Drama", doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania, 1960.

Sturdevant, Winifred, "The Misterio de los Reyes Magos: Its Position in the Development of the Medieval Legend of the Three Kings", Baltimore (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages), 1927.

Ticknor, George, Historia de la literatura española, 4 vols., ed., trans., and annotated by P. de Gayangos and E. de Vedia, Madrid, 1851-56.

Toschi, Paolo, Le origini del teatro italiano, Turin, 1955.

Turk, Laurel H., "Juan del Encina and the Spanish Renaissance", doctoral dissertation, Stanford, 1934. ("Juan del Encina...".)

Valbuena Prat, Ángel, Literatura dramática española, Barcelona-Buenos-Aires, 1930. (Literatura dramática...)

Wardropper, Bruce W., "The Dramatic Texture of the Auto de los Reyes Magos", MLN, LXX (1955), 46-50.

_____, Historia de la poesía a lo divino en la cristiandad occidental, Madrid, 1958.

_____, Introducción al teatro religioso del siglo de oro (evolución del auto sacramental, 1500-1648), 2nd. revised ed., Madrid, 1967. (Introducción...)

_____, "Metamorphosis in the Theatre of Juan del Encina", SP, LIX (1962), 41-50. ("Metamorphosis...".)

Williams, Ronald B., The Staging of Plays in the Spanish Peninsular Prior to 1555, Iowa City, 1935.

Young, Karl, The Drama of the Medieval Church, 2 vols., Oxford, 1933.

# APPENDICES

## Appendix A

## A CHRONOLOGY OF EARLY PASTORAL PLAYS

1493 Juan del Encina: Eglogas V and VI.
Both plays, as their title-prologues show, were performed for the Duke and Duchess of Alba on the last day of Carnival. The year is deduced from an allusion in Egloga V to the Treaty of Barcelona (19 January, 1493). (See chap. VI, n. 2.)

1494-95(?) Juan del Encina: Egloga VII.
The date is uncertain. Egloga VII was certainly performed for the Duke and Duchess of Alba exactly a year before Egloga VIII, and probably at a year's end or beginning. The dates proposed are the most feasible if Egloga VIII is accepted as the last piece written and performed by Encina before the publication of his first Cancionero in 1496. (See chap. IX, nn. 3 and 5.)

1495 Francisco de Madrid: Egloga de tres pastores.
The topicality of the subject, the invasion of Italy by Charles VIII of France in 1494 and its consequences, would have been lost had the eclogue been written any later. (See Madrid, "Egloga hecha...", pp. 276-280.)

1495-96(?) Juan del Encina: Egloga VIII.
Since Encina presented his patrons with his complete works (presumably the Cancionero of 1496) in the course of this eclogue, it is assumed that Egloga VIII was the last piece he wrote before their publication. The references to the season of performance contained in the eclogue are ambiguous, however, and could mean either the beginning or end of a year, although exactly one year after the performance of Egloga VII. (See chap. IX, nn. 3 and 5.)

Before 1496 Juan del Encina: Eglogas I and II.
Both eclogues were performed at Christmas for Encina's patrons one year during his period of service with them before the publication of his Cancionero in 1496, in which both eclogues appeared. The traditional date of 1492 cannot be accepted, for want of verification. (See chap. II, n. 6.)

1497 Juan del Encina: Egloga X.
Dedicated to the short-lived heir to the Catholic Kings, Don Juan, Egloga X was probably performed during the celebrations to honour his wedding (6 October, 1497) to Margaret of Austria. (See chap. IX, n. 25.)

1498 Juan del Encina: Egloga IX.
There is a reference to the Christmas season and the year in the course of the play. (See chap. II, n. 7.)

Post 1498 Anonymous: Egloga interlocutoria.
The parallels in this Christmas play with several eclogues contained in Encina's first Cancionero (1496) and with the same author's Egloga IX (1498) indicate composition after 1498. (See chap. II and House, "A Study of Encina and the Egloga interlocutoria", passim.)

1500(?) Lucas Fernández: Egloga o farsa del nascimiento and Auto o farsa del nascimiento.
There is some slight evidence favouring composition of the Egloga o farsa in about 1500, Cañete having believed he could identify an allusion to that year, which was a Holy Year (see Fernández, Farsas y églogas, ed. Cañete, pp. xxvi-xl). Regardless of this possibility, the Egloga o farsa was certainly written after 1499 on account of an allusion to the Celestina (see chap. III, n. 8). There is no evidence upon which to base a date for the Auto o farsa, only an assumption that it was written at about the same time as the Egloga o farsa and the certainty that both plays were written before 1514, the year of Fernández's Farsas y églogas (see Chap. III, n. 14).

1496-1502 Lucas Fernández: Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella.
Assuming that the content, including a requesta scene, was prompted by Encina's Egloga VII (first published 1496), the Comedia was written after 1496 (see chap. X, n. 3). The outside date of 1502 is derived from the influence of Fernández's play on Gil Vicente's Auto pastoril castellano (see chap. X, n. 6).

1502 Gil Vicente: Auto de la visitación, Auto pastoril castellano, and Auto de los reyes magos.
The occasions of performance of these three plays were, the birth of an heir to the Portuguese throne, Christmas, and the Epiphany, 1502. The dates, occasions, and circumstances of performance of many of Vicente's plays, including these three, were given in his Copilaçam (see chap. V, n. 2 and Vicente, Obras dramáticas..., pp. 1, 6, and 25).

1505-07 Bartolomé de Torres Naharro: Diálogo del Nascimiento and Addición del diálogo.
The dates were calculated by Gillet from allusions contained in the work which, he believed, referred to victories of the Great Captain in Italy, and from Torres Naharro's influence on the Egloga ynterlocutoria (1509) of Diego de Avila. (See "Propalladia"..., IV, pp. 471-472.)

1507-09 Juan del Encina: Egloga XII.
These dates must be accepted, in contrast to the proposal of 1497 by Cotarelo and Juliá Martínez, who denied Crawford's demonstration of an Italian eclogue by Antonio Tebaldeo as Encina's source. (See chap. IX, nn. 30 and 44.)

1509 Diego de Avila: Egloga ynterlocutoria.
Crawford has shown (Spanish Drama..., p. 77) that the eclogue, a wedding play, was probably performed at the betrothal festivities of the daughter of the Great Captain, to whom the piece is dedicated.

1511 Salazar: Egloga de Breno.
The eclogue was dedicated to the Duke of Medinaceli and written to celebrate his wedding. (See Crawford, "The Date of Salazar's Egloga de Breno".)

1508-12 Anonymous: Egloga de Torino.
Forming part of the sentimental roman à clef, the Question de Amor, the eclogue was first published in 1513, but could have been written at any time between the dates proposed, which are the years chronicled in the novel. (See Menéndez y Pelayo, Orígenes..., II, pp. 48-54.)

1513 Gil Vicente: Auto de la Sibila Casandra.
The date was not cited in the Copilaçam, but could be calculated on the basis of the information given there about the occasion of the performance. (See chap. V, n. 38.)

1513(?) Juan del Encina: Egloga XIV.
A document referring to the performance of an eclogue by Encina on the feast of the Epiphany, 1513, in Rome at the house of the Cardinal Archbishop of Arborea, is conceivably to Egloga XIV. (See chap. IX, nn. 58 and 59.)

Before 1514 Juan del Encina: Egloga XI; Lucas Fernández: Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella.
The terminus ante quem for both these plays is the publication of Fernández's Farsas y églogas (1514). Alluded to in Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado, Egloga XI must have been written before that piece, but since the date for Fernández's work is imprecise (1507-14) the year of Encina's play cannot be more closely ascertained (see chap. IX, n. 30). There are no clues by which the Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella can be dated, short of its appearance in print in 1514 (see chap. X, n. 12).

1507-1514 Lucas Fernández: Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado.
On account of the allusion contained in it to a number of eclogues by Encina, Fernández's Farsa o cuasi comedia must have been composed after the latest of them. In particular,

it must have been written after 1507, the earliest possible date for Egloga XII, but after 1514, the date of the Farsas y églogas. (See chap. IX, n. 30.)

1514 Bartolomé de Torres Naharro, Comedia Trophea.
The Comedia was performed in Rome to honour a Portuguese embassy to Pope Leo X (March-June, 1514). (See "Propalladia"..., IV, p. 474.)

1514-16 Pedro Manuel de Urrea: Five eclogues.
Not included in editions of Urrea's Cancionero published in 1513 and 1514, the five eclogues first appeared in an edition of 1516. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that they were written in the interval, a conclusion supported by the evident influence on them of Fernández's plays (1514). (See chap. IV, n. 12.)

1511 or 1516 Gil Vicente: Auto de los cuatro tiempos.
These dates are inferred from the occasion of performance described in the Copilaçam. (See chap. V, n. 53.)

1517 Bachiller de la Pradilla: Egloga real.
The work, dedicated to Charles V, was performed for him at Valladolid shortly after his arrival in Spain, as much being stated in the title-prologue. (See Egloga real, ed. cit., p. 210.)

1518(?) Fernán López de Yanguas: Egloga en loor de la Natividad and Farsa sacramental.
There is no evidence for a precise date for either of these two plays. They may be given only a tentative position in the chronology of López de Yanguas' plays, based on the general trends discernible in his development. (See chap. VI, n. 17.)

1516-19(?) Fernán López de Yanguas: Farsa del mundo y moral.
These dates are determined by an allusion to Ferdinand the Catholic as dead (he died in 1516) and by the dedication of the piece to Doña Juana de Zúñiga, who is believed to have died in 1519. Acceptance of these dates, however, necessitates an edition prior to 1524, the first known one, since the dedication would then have had no meaning. (See López de Yanguas, Obras dramáticas, pp. xlii-xliii.)

1519-20 Anonymous: Egloga pastoril.
With its discussion of the time of troubles in Valencia, for the sake of topicality, this eclogue could only have belonged to the years indicated. (See chap. XIII, n. 1.)

1520(?) Diego Durán: Egloga nueva; Fernando Díaz: Farsa.
The extant edition of the Egloga nueva, a possible Carnival work, has no colophon, but the nature of the play places it in

the early sixteenth century (see Sieben spanische..., p. 179). By contrast, the Farsa by Fernando Díaz is known in an edition dated in 1554. Its content and form, however, justify the hypothesis that it was written at about the same time as other Christmas plays of similar kind (see Sieben spanische..., p. 181).

1521 Anonymous: Farsa del santísimo sacramento.
The year of composition is stated in a Latin prologue. (See chap. VI, n. 38.)

1525 Andrés Ortiz: A Play on the Battle of Pavia.
The date is warranted by the topicality of the subject, the celebration of the Spanish victory over the French at Pavia (24 February, 1525). (See Ortiz, "A Spanish Play on the Battle of Pavia", pp. 516 ff.)

1527 Santillana: Obra sobre el nascimiento del príncipe don Felipe.
The date is warranted by the topicality of the subject, the celebrations to honour the birth of the future Philip II. (See Santillana, "Hernández-Santillana, Obra nuevamente compuesta sobre el nascimiento del príncipe don Felipe", pp. 48 ff.)

1529 Fernán López de Yanguas: Farsa de la concordia.
The celebration of the Peace of Cambrai (August, 1529) as the central topic of this play justifies its date. (See López de Yanguas, Obras dramáticas, pp. li-liv.)

1530 Pero López Ranjel: Farsa a honor y reuerencia.
The earliest known edition of this work (1530) is appreciably late, but the Farsa is clearly in the traditions of earlier Nativity compositions. (See López Ranjel, "Perolópez Ranjel, Farsa a honor y reuerencia del glorioso Nacimiento, Early Sixteenth Century", pp. 860 ff.)

1530(?) Anonymous: Coplas de la doncella, el pastor y el salvaje.
The extant edition of the Coplas is of the year 1604, although Pedro Salvá mentioned an earlier one. Nevertheless, the Coplas belong to the early pastoral drama on account of a similarity of subject and treatment. (See chap. X, nn. 35, 36, and 37.)

1536 Juan de París: Farsa.
The earliest known edition of this wedding play is of 1536, a second edition of 1551 being also known. The many similarities between this work and the pastoral tradition in the drama before 1520 couple the Farsa to that early period, however. (See Sieben spanische..., pp. 182-183.)

## Appendix B

## A CATALOGUE OF DRAMATIC DEVICES

The following is a catalogue of the principal devices of action character, and structure employed in early Spanish drama to which reference has frequently been made in the foregoing study. All references (in parentheses) are to the editions already cited as textual sources. The Roman numerals designating the eclogues by Encina and Manuel de Urrea correspond to the numerical orders of their respective editors.

### Abbreviations

Anonymous, ACD (Coplas de la doncella, el pastor y el salvaje).
_____, AEI (Egloga interlocutoria).
_____, AMV (Egloga sobrel molino de Vascalon).
_____, AEP (Egloga pastoril).
_____, AET (Egloga de Torino).
_____, ASS (Farsa del santísimo sacramento).

Diego de Avila, DA (Egloga ynterlocutoria).

Rodrigo Cota, CD (Diálogo entre el Amor y un viejo).

Fernando Díaz, FDF (Farsa nuevamente trobada).

Diego Durán, DD (Egloga nueva).

Juan del Encina, E I-XIV (Eglogas).

Lucas Fernández, FC (Comedia de Bras-Gil y Beringuella).
_____, FCC I (Farsa o cuasi comedia de la doncella).
_____, FCC II (Farsa o cuasi comedia del soldado).
_____, FEF (Egloga o farsa del nascimiento).
_____, FAF (Auto o farsa del nascimiento).

Pero López Ranjel, LRF (Farsa a honor y reverencia).

Fernán López de Yanguas, YN (Egloga de la Natividad).
_____, YM (Farsa del mundo y moral).
_____, YC (Farsa de la concordia).
_____, YS (Farsa sacramental).

Francisco de Madrid, FM (Egloga de tres pastores).

Gómez Manrique, MR (Representacion).

Iñigo de Mendoza, MV (Vita Christi).

Andrés Ortiz, AO (A Play of the Battle of Pavia).

Juan de París, JP (Farsa).

Bachiller de la Pradilla, BP (Egloga real).

Rodrigo de Reynosa, RC (Coplas de unos tres pastores).

Salazar, SEB (Egloga de Breno).

Santillana, S (Obra sobre el nascimiento del principe don Felipe).

Bartolomé de Torres Naharro, TNID (introito--Diálogo del nascimiento).
_____, TND (Diálogo del nascimiento).
_____, TNA (Addición del diálogo).
_____, TNIT (introito--Comedia Trophea).
_____, TNT (Comedia Trophea).

Pedro Manuel de Urrea, U I-V (Eglogas).

Gil Vicente, VV (Auto de la visitación).
_____, VPC (Auto pastoril castellano).
_____, VRM (Auto de los reyes magos).
_____, VSC (Auto de la sibila Casandra).
_____, VCT (Auto de los cuatro tiempos).

ADMONITION FOR SILENCE: Occurring only in works having an introito (see TITLE-PROLOGUE): E XIV (84-87); TNID (123-124); TNIT (301-304).

ALBRICIAS:
(a) Awarded: E V (209-213); AEI (51-57).
(b) Requested: YN (392); FDF (122); JP (495).

ALLEGORY:
(a) Throughout: YM (religious morality); YC (political morality); FM (political pastoral); CD (love).
(b) Partial: E X (1-200), E XI (141-430)--love; VCT (109-576)--pastoral; TNT ( I and V)--political.
(See, also, PASTORAL METAPHOR.)

ANGEL'S CHRISTMAS MESSAGE:
(a) Spoken by angel: E IX (193-209); VPC (254-256); FDF (113-130); LRF (25-36--in terms of the Ave Maria); MV (Bv-r); MR (p. 54).
(b) Described by shepherds: E II (74-91); FEF (Diii-r, Div-r and v); VPC (257-261); VRM (41-57); YN (17-18); AEI (93-100).

(c) Employed in non-Nativity works: YC (I, 55-64); AO (21-22).

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NATIVITY:
(a) By angels: VCT (1-108--through a speech of praise). See, also, ANGEL'S CHRISTMAS MESSAGE.
(b) By shepherds: E II (7-13); FAF (Fii-r-Fiii-r); AEI (2-5). See, also, ANGEL'S CHRISTMAS MESSAGE.
(c) By others: FEF (Dii-v--hermit, Macario); VSC (430-435--Casandra).

ARGUMENT:
(a) Arising from courtship: E VII (69-208); FCC I (Biii-v and Biv-r); U II (311-432)--see, also, TOWN AND COUNTRY CONTRASTED; DD (115-146, 282-370, 380-559).
(b) From difference in status: See, this category, disputes with men of religion, and TOWN AND COUNTRY CONTRASTED.
(c) Disputes with men of religion: FEF (Dii-v); VRM (77-244); YM (279 ff.); DD (115-146, 282-370, 380-559); U II (385-432).
(d) From genealogy: See GENEALOGY.
(e) From insults: See PULLAS.
(f) With love: CD (dispute between Amor and viejo provides the substance of the work); E X (101-200).
(g) Miscellaneous: E XII (203-424); FC (Aiii-v-Aiv-v); FEF (Dii-r and v); VV (1-10); VCT (286-326); YC (III, 1-232; IV, 1-110; V, 77-298); DA (47-120, 761-834); AEP (711-765); RC (172-297).
(h) Over rustic abilities: See RUSTIC ABILITIES.
(i) Over sharing of drink: E VI (171-200); LRF (269-276); DA (683-704); DD (622-639).

AUDIENCE-ACTOR RELATIONSHIP:
(a) Entire action incorporating reality of the audience into the fiction: E I, E V, E VI, E VIII, VV, TNT, FM, BP, S, AEP.
(b) Relationship established through eulogy: AEI (296-357); DA (529-576); SEB (461-570). See, also, PRAISE OF PATRONS.
(c) Through an introito or introduction: E XIV (1-88); AEI (1-20); LRF (1-24); TNID; TNIT. See, also, INTRODUCTORY SPEECHES.
(d) Through incidental reference: E IX (41-44, 105-109). (See, also, MULTIPLE IDENTITY, PASTORAL METAPHOR.)

BETROTHAL OR WEDDING: All examples of a betrothal or wedding ceremony occurring in the action are comic: FC (Av-r); FCC II (Cvi-r); DA (713-760); JP (567-592). Agreement to a marriage is reached in U III (436-477), and weddings--not enacted, however--are relevant to E X and SEB. Wedding celebrations are also a frequent topic of incidental reference.

BIBLICAL ALLUSIONS: These are classified by principal occasions of usage, not by chapter and verse.

(a) Scriptural quotation as the basis of dialogue: E II (passim); YN (passim--including marginal notes on sources); TND (245-554); ASS (passim); U V (passim); VCT (577-650).
(b) Prophecy of the Nativity: FEF (Diii-r); FAF (Fiii-r-Fiv-r); VPC (337-428); VRM (271-327); VSC (339-654--including the prophecy of pagan sibyls); AEI (116-120); FDF (139-234); MR (p. 53).
(c) In prefigurements: E X (341-350--of suffering Pelayo); FEF (Dii-v--of sleepy Gil; Diii-r--of birth of Christ); ASS (p. 447--of Eucharist).
(d) Incidental allusion: E IX (70-71); MV (Biv).
(e) Other: S (prophets and sibyl used for secular purpose of eulogizing the new-born prince).
All the religious plays have, ultimately, a Biblical origin (see, MOTIVATION FOR COMPOSITION).

BURLESQUE OF LOVE: Achieved through the rustic personages, who cause the conventions of love to appear ridiculous.
(a) Parody: E VIII (410-465); FC (Aii-r-Aiii-v); FCC II (Ci-r and V).
(b) Conventional rustic ignorance: E X (101-200); FCC I (Bi-r-Biii-v); SEB (111-140); AET (pp. 69-72).
(c) Rustic behaviour belittles conventional love: E XII (107-160, 689-696); E XII (p. 226--suelta); E XIV (1009-24); FCC II (Ciii-r and v); SEB (591-643); AEP (555-584, 806-971).

CHANGE OF CLOTHES: All examples are of shepherds, for causes traceable to love or marriage: E VIII (225-481); YM (177-192). ACD (pp. 3-4); DA (630-640); U I (105-124); U II (335-345); U III (291-330).

COMPASSIONATE NATURE:
(a) Lover's invocation of nature: E XII (73-80); E XIV (225-232); FCC I (Biii-r); SEB (1-10). See, also, WILDERNESS.
(b) Nature reflects a sacred occasion: FAF (Fi-v-Fiii-r); YS (pp. 129-130); ASS (pp. 68-69).
(c) Nature reflects a secular occasion: E V (57-70); VV (58-70); YC (I, 30-39); AO (1-10, 100-108).
(The device is generally accompanied by the rustics' inability to understand the signs they see in Nature.)

COURTSHIP SCENE:
(a) Shepherds: E VIII (1-42); FC (Aii-r-Aiii-v); FCC II (Cv-v-Cvi-r); VSC (23 ff.); U I (245-320); U II (257-280); U III (346-430).
(b) Shepherd and courtly lady: FCC I (Bi-r-Biii-v); JP (345-368, 395-398, 489-493); ACD (p. 3 ff.).
(c) Others: E VII (43-192); E XIV (537-648); DD (30 ff.); ACD (p. 6 ff.); U II (305-310).
(d) Rivalry in courtship: See ARGUMENT.

DISCONTENT:
(a) Shepherds' disatisfaction with life: E VIII (245-248); E IX (27-132); FAF (Fi-r); VPC (1-123); DD (3-29); U I (1-160); RC (1-130).
(b) Complaint against the weather: E IX (27-132); VPC (7-9); FAF (Fi-r); VCT (109-326); AMV (passim).
(c) Against trials of the world: E IX (41-85); JP (1-24); U I (1-160).
(d) Various: E V (1-150); E IX (157-158, 185-192); VRM (1-38); VSC (1 ff.); TND 91-14); DD (84-110); AMV (63-65).

ENTRY OF PERSONAGES: Not included here are the appearances of personages at the beginning of plays or acts:
(a) Unannounced entry: E I (46); E V (7, 234); E IX (193); E X (201); E XIV (649, 1071); FC (Aiv-r); FCC I (Bi-r); FCC II (Ci-v, Cii-v); FEF (Di-r); VPC (25); VRM (39); VSC (23); VCT (109, 181, 254, 305, 327, 576); YC (II, 115); AEI (21); FDF (33, 81); LRF (25); TND (65); TNT (II, 125; IV, 337; V, 77); FM (33); BP (153, 692, 900); AEP (555, 585); DD (30, 84, 282, 380); JP (241); ACD (p. 1); U I (49); U IV (272); RC (17, 365).
(b) Unannounced entry as integral part of the action (i.e. change of scene; one character enters in search of another; a character returns following an earlier exit; a character brings news to his fellows; etc.); E XII (601); E XIV (257, 908, 1313, 2187, 2194, 2283, 2466, 2531); FC (Aii-r, Aiii-v); FCC I (Biii-v); FEF (Dii-v, Diii-r); FAF (Fi-v, Fii-r, Fiii-v); VPC (79); VRM (245, 343); VSC (220, 313); YM (25); YC (I, 130; II, 12, 123; III, 283; IV, 128); DA (121, 601, 641, 705, 761); SEB (96, 406); AET (p. 69); JP (217, 273); ACD (pp. 12, 41); U II (41, 369); U III (51, 151, 341).
(c) Entry forseen from earlier dialogue: E X (301); E XI (141); E XII (p. 186--suelta); E XIV (771); YM (281); YC (I, 16; II, 250); FDF (113); LRF (284); TNT (I, 87); FM (284); AO (21); BP (724, 748, 812, 852); ASS (pp. 69, 70); DA (7); SEB (296); AET (p. 70); JP (65); ACD (p. 6); U I (85, 177); U II (142, 249, 297); U III (341); U IV 9132, 178); RC (148).
(d) Entry after sighting and hailing: E VI (109-121); E VII (43-48); E XI (433-435); FCC II (Cv-v); AEI (81); ASS (p. 68); AET (p. 69).
(e) Entry in answer to summons: E VIII (155-160); E IX (1-25); E X (261-262); E XII (185-191, 661-665; p. 226--suelta); E XIV (331, 999-1008, 2314, 2379); FC (Av-v); FAF (Fiv-r); VV (99-112); VPC (133-142); YN (1-64); YM (478); LRF (39, 99); AEP (639, 661, 806); DD (420); JP (381); U I (209, 241); U IV (27); ACD (p. 12); MV (Bv-v-Bvi-r). See, also, VILLANCICOS AND OTHER SONGS.

FESCENNINE TRADITION: FC (Aiii-v-Aiv-v); TNID (1-99); TNIT (47-124); DA (431-463, 505-512, 611-614, 858-960).

FOOD:
(a) In a metaphorical sense: E I (45, 149-162); E II (136-144).
(b) Rustic meal: E VI (passim); LRF (253-280); DA (189-209); DD (560-639). See, also, ARGUMENT--Sharing of drink.
(c) Sharing of fruit: E IX (133-160); AEP (590-600).
(d) Miscellaneous: E V (159-186); FAF (Fi-r); DA (377-388); U II (285-288, 441-452); U IV (364-375); MV (Bvi-r).

FORGETFULNESS: E XII (689-696); TNID (100-101); TNIT (203-206). The device is characteristic in the later drama of the introito speaker, who forgets why he is before the audience.

FRIENDS, ADVISORS, AND PRECEPTORS:
(a) Men of religion as preceptors: FEF (Diii-r, Div-r); VRM (passim); YM (passim); JP (121-216).
(b) Shepherds as preceptors to fellows: E VIII (passim); FAF (passim); VPC (passim); YN (81-88, 97-100, 185-192, 195-271, 276-279, 304-311, 344-355, 384-391); LRF (25-36, 57-60, 267-268, 285, 341-452); AO (95-314); ASS (p. 69).
(c) Angels as preceptors: YS; FDF (139-321).
(d) Allegorical figures as preceptors: YM (passim); ASS (p. 70 ff.).
(e) Friends sought for advice: E XI (1-30); E XII (9-160, 185-504); E XIV (289-330); U IV (27 ff.).
(f) Friends offer their advice and consolation: E XI (433-580); E XII (429-480); E XIV (364-517, 979-989, 1313-1547, 1533-36); SEB (151-250); U II (105 ff.); U III (51 ff.).

GAMES:
(a) Pares y nones: E IX (161-192); AEI (221-291).
(b) Pullas: See Pullas.
(c) Others: E XIV (1113-76); FAF (Fii-r); VPC (217-245); DA (839-856); DD (156-249); U IV (200-271).

GIFTS:
(a) Given by poet to patron: E I (7-15); E VIII (81-97); BP (900-915).
(b) Given to Christ Child: VPC (321-328); VCT (509-576); YN (408-439); FDF (330-353).
(c) Decision to present gifts to Christ Child, and/or enumeration of them: E IX (225-248); FEF (Div-v); FAF (Fiv-r); VPC (274-282); VRM (328-330); YN (320-327); AEI (136-150); LRF (418-444); MV (Bv-v).
(d) Lovers' tokens: E VII (29-40); FC (Aiii-r).
(e) Dowry and suitor's gifts: E VII (116-160); FC (Av-r); FCC I (Biii-r and v); VPC (196-206); TNID (85-89); DA (479-500); U III (201-260).
(f) Miscellaneous: VSC (322-327); VV (99-108); TNT (IV); ACD (pp. 13 and 16)--the last three examples represent the transference of the traditional Nativity gifts to secular occasions.

GENEALOGY:
(a) As a form of reference: E VI (109); E XI (303-305); FDF (25); AO (115-116); U IV (106-107, 166-167); MV (Biv-v, Bv-v, Bvi-r); RC (131, 331, 332).
(b) As a form of address: E I (46); AEI (163); LRF (160); AEP (631).
(c) As a form of self-identification: E XIV (11-13); TNT (IV, 117-118, 158-159, 183-184, 212-213); AO (13); BP (9-10).
(d) Genealogy of Christ: E II (60-65); FEF (Div-r); YN (193-271).
(e) Genealogy of patrons: E I (22-23); VV (81-98); SEB (481-540).
(f) Genealogy of bride or groom: FC (Aiv-v); VPC (162-190); DA (136-150).
(g) As a cause of argument: E I (46-67); FEF (Dii-r); AEI (21-40). See, also, SHEPHERD'S SELF-JUSTIFICATION.
(h) Miscellaneous: E VIII (229-232, 264-272); AET (p. 69).

GLUTTONY: See FOOD.

GREETINGS: Catalogued only are examples of the characteristic "Dios mantenga", or "Dios salve acá" and their variations:
(a) Actor to audience at beginning of play: E I, E XIV, AEI, LRF, TNID, TNIT, BP.
(b) Between personages at beginning of play: E II, E VII, E XI, AEP.
(The greeting at the beginning of the play, particularly by the speaker of the introito to the audience, later became a characteristic feature of the drama.)
(c) Actor to audience in the course of play: E VIII (81-82); VV (22).
(d) Between personages in the course of play: E IX (25-26); FC (Aii-r); VPC (293-296, 329-330); VRM (245-247); VSC (23-25; 322); VCT (305-306); AEI (91); FDF (131-132); DA (121, 601-603); AET (p. 69); AEP (585); DD (111-114, 282-283, 380, 422); JP (383-384, 507); ACD (pp. 1 and 6); U I (85); U II (142, 249, 297, 369, 377).

INTRODUCTORY SPEECHES:
(a) Introito: E XIV, TNID, TNIT.
(b) Address to audience: E I, AEI, LRF, BP, MV.

LOST ANIMALS: VPC (80-123); LRF (127-175); DA (11-46); RC (298-364).

LOVE: It would require a concordance to catalogue completely the style of love presented in the early drama. General descriptions of love, including most of the devices of its portrayal, may be encountered in the following locations: E X (1-100); E XIV (1548-2186); FCC I (Biv- and v); FCC II (Ci-r and v, Ciii-r and v); AET (70-71); CD. The predominant characteristics of

the portrayal of love may be catalogued as follows:
(a) Transforming power: E VIII (273-288, 514-557); E X (51-70); E XII (1-16, 25-30, 221-228, 601-602); E XIV (258-264); FCC II (Ci-r and v); SEB (171-174, 261-270, 361-390).
(b) Irresistibility of love: E VIII (514-557); E X (1-10, 246-250, 321-340); E XI (154-270, 386-430); E XIV (265-280); SEB (151-165, 323-360); AET (p. 71); DD (1-2).
(c) Suffering caused by love: E X (11-20, 401-410); E XI (154-270, 386-430); E XIV (865-904, 1193-1216); FCC II (Ci-r and v); SEB (11-95, 111-150); AET (pp. 69-70); JP (77-112, 633-663); U II (85-100); U III )1-50); U IV (1-20).
(d) Paradoxes of pleasure and pain felt through love: E X (21-50, 421-440); SEB (160-165); AET (p. 73); U III (21-30).
(e) Universality of love: E X (71-100, 306-315, 341-360); FCC I (Bii-r and v, Biv-r); FCC II (Ci-v and Cii-r); AET (p. 73). See, also, TOWN AND COUNTRY CONTRASTED.
(f) Precedents for lovers: In Bible: E X (341-350); in rustic life: E X (351-360); FCC I (Bii-r and v); in Classical figures: E XIV (1273-77, 2307-13); FCC I (Bi-v, Bii-r); FCC II (Cii-r); JP (86-104); in contemporary Spanish literature: FCC I (Bi-v); FCC II (Cii-r).
(g) Love as a source of temptation: E XI (334-385); JP (153-216).
(h) Overlapping of Christianity and Paganism: E XI, E XII, E XIV, JP.
(i) Love caused by Fate: E XII (85-94); E XIV (193-200, 209-213); U II (81-84).
(j) Invective against love: E XI (366-380, 392-393); E XII (137-144, 161-184, 525-544); E XIV (157-160, 865-904).
(k) Love the cause of despair: E XII (492-524); E XIV (121-124, 233-248); E XIV (1225-45, 2283-95); FCC I (Bi-v); SEB (11-95, 213-225); AET (pp. 67-68); AEP (675-695); JP (65-72, 113-120, 337-340); U III )61-150).
(l) Cures for love: E XIV (201-205); FC (Aii-v); FCC I (bi-v-Bii-r); FCC II (Ci-r and v, Cii-v, Ciii-r, Civ-v, Cv-v); U II (105 ff.); U III (61-119). See, also, SUICIDE, WILDERNESS.

MATCH-MAKER:
(a) Casamentero: DA, U III.
(b) Tercera: U II (142-208).
(c) Others: FC (Miguel Turra); FCC II (Pascual); JP (553-557--hermit takes on the role of match-maker).

MOTIVATION FOR COMPOSITION: The majority of plays were written for specific occasions, often at the behest of a specific audience or patron. According to their subject-matter and known occasions of performance, therefore, the plays may be classified as follows (it may be noted that some plays fit several categories):
(a) Unknown motivation: E XI, E XII, FCC I, U I, U II, U IV,

AMV, RC, CD.
(b) To honour a patron: E I, E II, E V, E VI, E VII, E VIII, E IX(?), E X, E XIV, VV, VPC, VRM, VSC, VCT, YN, TNT, FM, BP, S, DA, SEB, MR.
(c) As a Christmas celebration (including the Epiphany): E I, E II, E IX, FEF, FAF, VPC, VRM, VSC, VCT, YN, AEI, FDF, LRF, TND, TNA, U V, ARM, MV, MR.
(d) To celebrate Corpus Christi, Carnival, Marian Feasts: E V, E VI, YM, YS, ASS, DD, ACD.
(e) Political works: E V, VV, YC, TNT, FM, AO, BP, S, AEP.
(f) Wedding plays: E X, FC, FCC II, DA, SEB, JP, U III.
(g) Part of a larger work: AET (part of a novel); MV (part of a narrative poem).

MULTIPLE IDENTITY:
(a) Shepherd-Evangelists: E II, VPC (Gil), VSC (shepherds as prophets), U V.
(b) Incorporation of real identity of actor: E I, E V, E VIII, E IX, VPC(?).
(See, also, PASTORAL METAPHOR.)

PASTORAL METAPHOR:
(a) To clothe identity of author: E I, E V, E VIII, E IX, VPC (?).
(b) As a means of presenting allegory: E X, E XI, VCT, YM, YC, FM.
(c) As a disguise for historical events or personages: E V, SEB, AET, FM.
(d) As a disguise for a religious identity: See, MULTIPLE IDENTITY--Shepherd-Evangelists.

PEACE:
(a) As central topic: E V, YC, FM.
(b) Prayers for peace: E V (241-264); FDF (354-363); FM (445-492).

PLEASURE: Included in this category is the shepherds enjoyment of pleasure. One eclogue--E VI--is a sustained piece of rustic merry-making.
(a) Shepherds unite for amusement: E VIII (152-156); E IX (1-25); E XIV (2555-78); FAF (Fi-r); VPC (124-151); DD (640-656). See, also, GAMES and FOOD.
(b) Singing and dancing: The major device in portraying rustic celebration and enjoyment. The villancicos at the end of the plays are often prefaced by a decision to make merry in song and dance: E VIII (188-189); E XI (513-580); FC (Av-v); VV (41-50); VPC (85-105); YN (1-64); YC (I, 70-99, 255-267); AO (315-316); MV (Bv-r-Bvi-v); RC (365-385). See, also, VILLANCICOS and OTHER SONGS.
(c) Pleasure as a cure for troubles: E VIII (188-189); E IX (passim); E XI (513-580); FAF (Fi-r); VPC (10-24, 65-69); AEP (1-20); AEP (520-549); U I (222-224).

POLITICS: See MOTIVATION FOR COMPOSITION.
Incidental reference: AEI (6-20); TND (180-244).

PRAISE OF COUNTRYSIDE: E VIII (330-365); E XI (86-115); E XI (461-475); U I (153-156); U II (1-64).

PRAISE OF PATRONS: E I (4-45); E I (156-180); E V (87-126); E VIII (103-118); VV (81-98); YM (1-8); AEI (296-357); TNIT (167-183); TNT (passim); FM (passim); BP (passim); DA (529-576); SEB (461-570). See, also, MOTIVATION FOR COMPOSITION--To honour a patron.

PRAYER:
(a) Homage at a Nativity scene: VPC (293-336); VSC (689-767); VCT (1-108, 449-650); YN (392-439); FDF (322-353); LRF (453-487); MR (53-55).
(b) Other acts of homage: FEF (Diii-v); FAF (Fiii-v); YS (p. 131); ACD (pp. 15-16).
(c) Other prayers: E XII (589-592); E XIV (1305-12, 1548-2138, 2299-2313); JP (20-48, 281-296). See, also, PEACE.

PROPHETS and PROPHECY: See BIBLICAL ALLUSIONS.

PULLAS:
(a) Exchange of insults in an argument: E I (50-85); E VII (73-88); FC (Aiii-v-Aiv-r); FCC I (Biii-v-Biv-r); FDF (33-80).
(b) Pullas as a game: FDF (33-80); TNA (195-279); TNIT (104-124); TNT (II, 53-124); DA (858-960); DD (464-559); U IV (272-319).

RELIGIOUS PERSONAGES:
(a) Hermit: E XI, FEF, VRM, YM, JP, U II.
(b) Others: DA, AEP, DD.

RELIGIOUS PRAISE:
(a) Acts of adoration and homage: See PRAYER.
(b) Praise of Virgin: FEF (Diii-r, Div-r); FAF (Fiii-v-Fiv-r); VPC (337-428); VSC (passim); YN (344-391); YM (625-815); FDF (235-313); LRF (1-24, 184-253, 453-487); MR (p. 55).
(c) Praise of Eucharist: YS (pp. 131-134); ASS (pp. 70, 448-450).
(d) Praise of Nativity: FEF (Diii-r-Diii-v); VPC (293-336); VRM (90-121, 181-205, 304-327); TND (15-64); U V (passim). See, also, BIBLICAL ALLUSIONS.

RUSTIC ABILITIES:
(a) Bragging, resulting in an argument: E I (68-135); FEF (Di-r and v); FCC II (Civ-r and v--a soldado's boast); JP (401-450).
(b) Abilities listed in courtship: E VII (116-120); FCC I

(Bi-rff.); VSC (256-269); JP (353-368); ACD (pp. 4-6).
(c) Various: E IX (105-132); YM (17-24); FDF (1-32); TNIT (29-46).

RUSTIC IGNORANCE: See BURLESQUE OF LOVE; COMPASSIONATE NATURE; FRIENDS, ADVISORS, and PRECEPTORS, and SACRILEGIOUS HUMOUR.

SACRILEGIOUS HUMOUR:
(a) Parody of Latin: E II (80-81); E IX (218-222); FC (Aiv-r); FEF (Diii-v); FAF (Fii-r and v); VPC (250-253); LRF (267-268); TNA (290-334); MV (Bvi-v).
(b) Parody of rites: E XIV (1548-2138); TNT (II, 1-52); SEB (610-623). See, also, BETROTHAL OR WEDDING.
(c) Ridicule of clergy: E XI (451-460); FEF (Dii-v); VRM (77-89, 122-124, 130-244); TNIT (9-46); DA (815-832); DD (passim); JP (597-616); U II (385-432). See, also, ARGUMENT--Disputes with men of religion.
(d) Various: E XI (76-80); E XII (p. 226--suelta); TND (560-589); TNA (passim).

SALVAJE: LRF (283-324); ACD (p. 6 ff).

SHEPHERDS IN PALACE: As if transferred from his native haunts, the shepherd marvels at his surroundings when appearing in the palace and finds it necessary to explain his presence: E I (47-54); E VIII (1-80, 170-177); E XIV (14-24); VV (23-40); AEI (21-40); BP (2-16).

SLEEP: E XII (107-160); E XIV (2260-2282); FEF (Dii-r and v); FAF (Di-r and v); VPC (246-253); AEI (61-67); DA (117-120, 208-303); U II (137-209); RC (1-16).

SUICIDE:
(a) Attempted: E XII (593-600); E XIV (1305 ff., 2296-2338).
(b) Contemplated: FCC I (Bi-r); FCC II (Civ-v); SEB (11-95); AET (pp. 68-69); JP (113-120); ACD (p. 1 ff.).
(c) Preparation for suicide through disposal of belongings: E XII (553-576); SEB (1-95); AET (p. 68); U I (129-152--in preparation to go to sea).

SUPERNATURAL BEINGS:
(a) Angels: E IX (193-208); VPC (254-255); VSC (655-671); VCT (1-108); YS (pp. 130-134); FDF (113-363); LRF (25-36); ASS (pp. 68-69); MV (Bv-r); MR (pp. 53-55).
(b) Devil: JP (217-240).
(c) Pagan goda and goddesses: E X (1-200); E XI (141-430); E XIV (2314-2418); VCT (327-578); TNT (V, 1-64).

TITLE-PROLOGUE: The great majority of works have a prose. title-prologue, containing one or more of the following:

(a) Title (egloga, auto, farsa, comedia, representacion, or coplas).
(b) Name of author.
(c) Dedication.
(d) Occasion and circumstances of performance (e.g. Christmas, royal palace, for benefit of patrons, etc.).
(e) List of personages appearing in the work.
(f) Outline of the action.
Exceptions to the above are to be found in the plays begining with a verse introito (see INTRODUCTORY SPEECHES). One eclogue-- U V (p. 68)--has a spoken, prose argumento in addition to the conventional title-prologue.

TOWN and COUNTRY CONTRASTED:
(a) In an argument: E VII (69-164); FCC I (Biii-v-Biv-r); FCC II (Cii-vff,); VRM (256-268); U II (311-360).
(b) In courtship: See COURTSHIP SCENE.
(c) To stress universality of love: E X (301-450); FCC I (passim); FCC II (passim); AET (p. 73).
(d) Rustic suspicion of townsman: E VII (49-68); E XIV (1080-1112); FCC I (Bi-r); FCC II (Ci-v); DD (25-29).
(See, also, CHANGE OF CLOTHES.)

TRANSFORMATION:
(a) From shepherd to evangelist: E I and E II; VPC.
(b) Shepherd to hermit, and vice versa: E XI, U II.
(c) Shepherd to courtier. and vice versa: E VII, E VIII. See, also, CHANGE OF CLOTHES.
(d) By love: See LOVE and CHANGE OF CLOTHES.

VILLANCICOS and OTHER SONGS:
(a) All occur at the end of plays, with the following exceptions, when they are used to divide one scene from another, or introduce new subjects or personages: E VIII (194-224); E XIV (1193-1216); FC (Aiii-r and v); VSC (200-219, 313-321, 655-671, 768-781); VCT (97-108, 109-253, 428); LRF (110-126, 233-253); PB (673-691); DD (1-2--introductory villancico).
The subjects of the songs are as varied as the plays they appear in and are generally related to their subject-matter:
(a) Expressions of delight: E II (181-260); E VIII (194-224); FAF (Fiv-r and v); YN (480-507); AEI (358-381); DD (654-656); U II (458-481).
(b) Nativity: E II (181-260); FEF (Div-v); FAF (Fiv-r and v); VRM (343-352); VSC (655-671, 768-795); VCT (428); U V (265-288); MR (p. 56).
(c) Love: E VIII (514-557); E XI (601-630); E XIV (1193-1216); FC (Aiii-r, Av-v); FCC I (Biv-r and v); FCC II (Cvi-v); FDF (354-363); LRF (110-126, 233-253, 453-487); AET (p. 73); AEP (872-983); DD (1-2); JP (321-341); U III (501-524); U IV (376-399).

(d) Various: E V (241-264); E VI (201-231); E VIII (209-253); VSC (200-219, 313-321); YM (857-873); YC (230-244); YS (p. 134); AEI (358-381); TNT (V, 300-316); AO (320-347); PB (673-691); ASS (p. 450); DA (977-1007). Characteristic of a number of villancicos is the division of singing parts for harmony, or the summoning of others to participate in the celebration or singing (e.g. E V, 237; E XII, P. 226--suelta; FAF, Fiv-r; FC, Av-v).

WILDERNESS: Personages decide to expiate their love in the wilderness, or are presented wandering there afflicted with a great distress: E XIV (201-232, 961-968, 1217-20); FCC I (Bi-r, Biii-r); JP (73-76, 273-280); ACD.