

## A "History of Spanish Literature" by Luis Vélez de Guevara†

Hannah E. Bergman

*In Memoriam*

Fausto Pereira Esteves

In Tranco VII of the *Diablo Cojuelo* Fortune appears attended by her lackeys, "que son los mayores ingenios que ha tenido el mundo," twenty-seven illustrious writers, of whom five are Iberians. The passage has not aroused much interest in commentators on the novel, except for one, who mentions it only to dismiss it as hopelessly superficial.<sup>1</sup> A recently published manuscript of an earlier work by Luis Vélez shows, however, that the *topos* "great writers of the past" had engaged his attention previously, to a far greater degree.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, a comparison between this text and some others of a similar nature makes it evident that his compilation reflects independent meditation on the subject.

The manuscript is entitled "Juicio final de todos los poetas españoles muertos y vivos" and was written for an *academia burlesca* held at court on February 11, 1638. It is part of a codex containing the poems and *vejámenes* which were read at this academy, as well as two burlesque plays performed at Carnival; some of this material has been published elsewhere from other sources. The manuscript, now in the Biblioteca Nacional, Lisbon, is not an original but a copy, with several egregious errors and some garbled passages; it is, however, to the best of my knowledge the only extant text of the "Juicio final." Although not in itself a great piece of literature, the "Juicio final" has a special interest for students of Vélez de Guevara because it is his first

---

† Permission to publish the late Prof. Hannah Bergman's article has kindly been granted by her husband, Mr. John Bergman, as executor of her estate.

experiment with connected narration in prose, and some of its stylistic and thematic motifs were reworked in the famous novel.

As the title leads us to expect, the opening sequence sets the stage for Judgement Day, in a brilliant parody of apocalyptic texts. With a technique that anticipates the fluidity of the modern motion picture, Vélez situates his action in a locale that is simultaneously the valley of Jehosaphat, the court of Apollo on Parnassus, and the court of Philip IV in Madrid—the court in which the piece was actually read, in the presence of the king himself. At the sound of the trumpet,<sup>3</sup> “se levantaron los poetas muertos y los vibos, tomando sus escriptos para ser juzgados” (pp. 586-87). We must note at the outset that this statement, and the title of the work itself, are misleading. As it turns out, the poets of the past are not judged but enumerated, each with a characterizing phrase or the title of a notable work. Their major intervention, once they have filed into the seat of judgement, is as plaintiffs against their commentators:

Tras de los quales benía un gran número de poetas comentadores contándoles los [vocablos] con plumas en las manos y quadernos y leuantándoles a los montes en sus comentarios [lo] que no les hauía passado por la imaginación, y ellos pidiendo [a] Apolo a uoces que los sacase de penar en aquellos poetas y castigasse los testimonios y mentiras que avían [dicho] dellos; y dando Apolo por buenos a los unos, y a los otros por testigos falsos les mandó sacar los dientes, confiscar las plumas, y arar sus consonantes de sal. (p. 591)

From this point on they recede into the background to remain as witnesses to the judgements passed on the living writers, who constitute the real objects of the satire. Vélez does not name these living writers and groups them for the most part into categories (those who write *villancicos* for the nuns or friars, those who compose *motets* for palace gallantry, those who write plays in collaboration, etc.), although in some cases he clearly has a specific individual in mind. The brunt of the satire falls not on real poets but on poetasters, the ones who give the profession a bad name. The good poets still living make only a brief group appearance:

Alborotó en esto el juicio vn paxarote que entró volando vestido de vanos y hermosos penachos de colores diferentes, y muchos poetas de los insignes y conocidos corriendo tras él. Apolo preguntó qué aue era aquélla y todos juntos le respondieron:

—De rrapiña, señor, —y prossiguieron diciendo: —Este páxaro es la cornexa que de nuestras plumas y estilos se a uestido y nos a [usurpado] los aplausos que nosotros merecíamos. Háganos Vuestra Magestad justicia y desengañe a la fama con su castigo.

Apolo mandó que cada vno tomase lo que era suyo, dejándole en cueros tan bergoncosamente que las Musas se cubrían con los manguitos los oxos, y Apolo le enbió a nadar. (pp. 591-92)

The review of the great poets of the past is thus only one motif in the "Juicio final," but it is far more fully developed than the corresponding passage in the *Diablo Cojuelo*, which, I believe, it illuminates to some degree. In the "Juicio final" we again have twenty-seven writers, this time all Iberian, presented in a roughly chronological order: as it were, a brief "history of Spanish literature." While Vélez does not have much to say about them, the roll call itself is instructive in its coincidences and divergencies from similar enumerations by his contemporaries, such as the *Viaje del Parnaso* by Cervantes, the *Panegyrico por la poesía* by don Fernando de Vera, Lope's *Laurel de Apolo*, the *República Literaria* by Saavedra Fajardo, and the *Hospital das letras* by the Portuguese satirist Francisco Manuel de Melo.<sup>4</sup> The last-named work, incomparably more complex and thoughtful than the "Juicio final," is of particular interest because there is some evidence linking Melo to the 1638 Academy, and I believe it possible that he may have been the original owner of the manuscript in which our text is preserved.<sup>5</sup>

Critical concepts such as "great writers" and "great works" are in constant evolution; pieces like the "Juicio final" allow us to appreciate how far modern opinion has moved away from the standards of the seventeenth century. Even the concept "Spanish writers" has changed somewhat: Vélez makes no distinction between Castilian, Portuguese, and Catalan poets. But he places a strict construction on the term *poeta*: Miguel de Cervantes does not qualify.<sup>6</sup>

Considering the authors singled out by Vélez not in the order he presents them but by frequency of their appearance in the other works examined, we observe first that not all those named five or six times are sure to be on everyone's list today. Certainly for us—but prior to 1927, probably not—there is general agreement on Góngora. In one brief phrase our author notes his birthplace, stresses his learning, cites his most significant work, and indicates he is worthy of comparison with the ancients: "el culto cordoués don Luis de Góngora, Claudiano andaluz, que murió de sus *Soledades* como de vn tabardillo" (pp. 590-91). Equation of a contemporary with a classical writer as a form of laudatory shorthand is an overworked technique in the Golden Age; Vera and Saavedra Fajardo see in Góngora a new Martial; his first editor, a Homer; his commentator Pellicer, a Pindar. By referring only to the *Soledades* Vélez indicates that the Góngora he esteemed was the serious poet rather than the satirist.<sup>7</sup> We agree, too, on Lope de Vega: his recent death makes him the last of the procession in the "Juicio final": "el fertilísimo Lope de Vega, gusano de la poesía española, hilando tantas comedias que se quedó muerto en una como en un capullo" (p. 591). He turns up again in another section of the "Juicio final" as a bad influence on housewives, causing them to abandon their domestic tasks:

Señor, nosotros nos casamos con estas señoras sin docte [a título] de que eran recoxidas y açendosas, y a pocos días de cassados con ellas se desaparecieron en

cassa las almoadillas y las uastidores y las rruecas, y rremanecieron en lugar de todo esto cada una con un *Arcadia* de Lope y todas las *Partes* de sus comedias ympresas, y [començaron] a hacer sonetos, canciones, déçimas, y otras barias poessias, y aún se arremetieron a jornadas de comedias yntentando que las rrepresentassen; y haciendo el cómputo del tiempo que hauían gastado en esto, pudiera hauer labrado cada una para su cassa vn estrado de cañamal, o colgadura y sillas, y echado cinquenta telas. (pp. 593-94)

In yet another place, Lope's printed plays are the yeast with which actor-versifiers knead the poorly baked bread of their "original" dramas which are ruining the market for the professional playwrights (p. 608).<sup>8</sup> Lope is the only one of the great poets whom the "Juicio final" names more than once.

Garcilaso's prestige in the Golden Age is well known, so it is not surprising that his name appears in all the treatises.<sup>9</sup> For Vélez he is above all the author of the *Second Eclogue*: "Boscán y Garcilasso dadas las manos, con su fuente de [Batres] por quien hiço 'en medio del ibierno está templada' " (p. 589)—a recollection, probably, of a collective homage the major poets had made to Garcilaso, placing tablets bearing their verses around this fountain. I think it not unlikely that Vélez, too, had participated in the ceremony, although corroborative evidence is lacking.<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, the author of *Reinar después de morir* has little to say about Camões, "célebre ingenio lusitano" (pp. 589-90), but we do meet Camões again among the five of the *Diablo Cojuelo*.<sup>11</sup> Hernando de Herrera, "divino" (Cervantes, Lope), has earned this title, the "Juicio final" tells us, not for his original poetry but for his literary criticism: "mereció el nombre de 'divino' con la ylustración de Garcilaso" (p. 590). In contrast, Melo's interlocutors are willing to concede that Garcilaso deserves his preeminent place in Spanish poetry but are not convinced of the "divinity" of Herrera or the need for all that commentary.<sup>12</sup>

The Argensola brothers were held in enormous awe; none of our authors dared to omit them entirely, although some of the references do not express unqualified admiration. As was customary (perhaps because their poems were published posthumously in a joint edition, 1634), Vélez lumps them together, according them only a conventional epithet: "gloria del Hebro" (p. 590). In choosing this phrase over the even more conventional "gloria de Aragón" (Saavedra Fajardo, Lope in *Arcadia*) Vélez may have recalled the arrangement by rivers which prevails in much of *Laurel de Apolo*.<sup>13</sup>

Right with these superstars, still widely represented in anthologies today, rank two poets whom posterity has treated less kindly. Even before introducing the Marqués de Alenquer (Conde de Salinas), "señor de las rredondillas castellanias" (p. 590), Vélez had made a flattering reference to him when Apollo accepted a new saddle for Pegasus from his son the Duque de Híjar "por hijo de tan gran poeta y por tan gran hombre de a caualllo" (p. 587).<sup>14</sup> The works of Alenquer (d. 1630) had not been published, yet were sufficiently well known, and esteemed, for his contemporaries to rank him among the

best poets of the time.<sup>15</sup> Modern publications and criticism place more emphasis on his sonnets than on the poems in traditional Castilian meters.<sup>16</sup> The other writer, Don Diego [Hurtado] de Mendoza, was for the Golden Age one of those great literary lovers who confer immortality on the lady celebrated in their verses. In Lope's *Dorotea* the heroine's attachment to her impoverished poet-lover is scoffed at: "Y ella muy desvanecida de que se canten por el lugar, a bueltas de sus gracias, sus flaquezas. ¡Qué gentil Petrarca para hazella Laura! ¡Qué don Diego de Mendoza, la celebrada Filis!"<sup>17</sup> So Vélez introduces the poet faithful even in death: "don Diego de Mendoza sin auer perdido el tema con Filix" (p. 589). Melo, a diplomat himself, severely takes Mendoza to task for falling in love late in life and forgetting his dignity as a senior diplomat. Nevertheless, his love lyrics had been very popular and widely plagiarized (Lope, Melo); by the time the *Hospital das letras* was written his style had fallen out of fashion.<sup>18</sup>

Vélez is still in substantial agreement with his contemporaries on the importance of some others. Since his discourse is chronologically arranged, the first name is the one we expect to hear: "En descubriéndose en el ayre como avían bajado Apolo y las Musas, fueron entrando por su horden los antiguos poetas muertos. Y el primero fue Juan de Mena con sus *Tresçientas*" (p. 587). Mena is likewise the first of the five Spanish poets cited in the *Diablo Cojuelo*. Saavedra Fajardo puts him first too, for the same historical reason, but Lope does not get around to him until Silva IV, remembering him there appropriately in the context of a little history of the development of Castilian versification. For Melo he is so antiquated that he cannot be appreciated without el Pinciano's commentary.<sup>19</sup> Vélez manages a small witticism on Jorge Manrique, who enters "coxeando con sus coplas de pie quebrado" (p. 589). Not one of his best jokes, but at least showing a first-hand acquaintance with the poetry, by no means apparent in the other critics. Manrique is probably more famous today than he was in 1638; certainly the scribe who copied our manuscript had never heard of him.<sup>20</sup> Boscán, remembered for his friendship with Garcilaso, is admired in his own right for "la *Fábula de Ero y Leandro* en verso suelto" (p. 589), a poem which has few readers today, despite the mischievous seal of approval Lope gives it (p. 202a).

As readers of the *Diablo Cojuelo* will have anticipated, the fellow countryman that Vélez was so proud of is not absent from the "Juicio final." In one of the longest passages of this section of the text we are given full details about the great *cancionero* poet:

Garci Sánchez de Vadajoz—por quien es más celebrada Ezija que por el rrollo—con [las *Liciones*] de *Job* [alegoricadas] a su amor, y con aquella gran copla castellana que dice:

En el infierno los dos  
gloria auemos de tener:

vos en berme padecer,  
y yo en ber que lo beis vos.

que tantos se la an atribuydo a sí sin echar de uer que se queman. (p. 588)

In the description of his hometown (*El Diablo Cojuelo*, Tranco VI) Vélez begins with "el celebrado rollo del mundo" and moves quickly on to the coat of arms, the bridge, the river, and then: "De aquí fué Garci Sánchez de Badajoz, aquel insigne poeta castellano," before continuing with the cotton crop, the wild plants, and the local gentry.<sup>21</sup> On the title of the poem, once more our copyist is in the dark, rendering it as "los Jienos." This time his garbling is forgivable, for the irreverent *Liciones de Job* had been suppressed by order of the Inquisition from the 1535 and 1540 editions of the *Cancionero general*, although it had appeared in the earlier ones.<sup>22</sup> The charming *copla*, a perfect expression of the spirit of courtly love, is not elsewhere attributed to Garci Sánchez. The poem and its musical setting aroused the enthusiasm of Calderón: "Cantaré un tono, aunque antiguo, / por ser la letra extremada. . . ¡Extremado tono y letra!"<sup>23</sup> While in my opinion Calderón's reading ("En un infierno . . .") is more likely to be the authentic one, the comment Vélez makes is appropriate to "el infierno." Evidently by 1638 it was no longer generally known who had first written these lines; does Vélez base his attribution on some local tradition? The *copla* is found in several manuscript collections.<sup>24</sup> Garci Sánchez is one of the five great Spanish poets of the *Diablo Cojuelo*.<sup>25</sup>

Since the purpose of this paper is to show that Vélez brings some original thought to his selection of the names for his "hall of fame," I would like to point out that almost half of his group receive two or less other votes, as it were. This in itself does not make Vélez a great literary critic, but it does exonerate him from the charge of simply repeating what everyone else was saying. To continue, then, with the "popularity contest" arrangement I have put on the passage, the largest fraction of the entire group is constituted by poets who are mentioned in only two of the other works studied: Castillejo, Santillana, Ausiàs March, Montemayer, Saa de Miranda, Miguel Sánchez, Gregorio Silvestre, and Pedro Lifián.

In the "Juicio final" Castillejo and Santillana, carrying their *Cancioneros*, immediately follow Juan de Mena. If the modern reader is surprised to find only the former in the *Diablo Cojuelo* list, he should consider that Santillana is not mentioned in Lope's *Laurel* at all.<sup>26</sup> The poetry of Ausiàs March, already translated into Castilian, still circulated in the original, so Vélez presents him "con su lengua elemosina" (p. 588).<sup>27</sup> March's translator Jorge de Montemayor appears only in his own right, bringing his *Diana*. If my earlier suggestion that we can explain the absence of Cervantes by a strict interpretation of the term "poet" is to stand, we must assume that Vélez considered

the *Diana* more important for its poetry than for its prose. Montemayor is one of the general group, not part of the little Portuguese subsection which consists only of Camões, "Francisco Rodríguez Lobo y Saa de Miranda con su Texto y Mondego" (p. 590); it is not clear to me whether this alludes specifically to the latter's *Fabula do Mondego*, which is in Castilian, or more generally to the Portuguese lyricists' love for their famous rivers.<sup>28</sup> For the playwright Miguel Sánchez, admired by Cervantes and Lope, Vélez contents himself with trotting out a conventional "Terencio español" (p. 590).<sup>29</sup> On Gregorio Silvestre our author is more precise than either Lope or Melo, for both of whom Silvestre is merely antiquated. Vélez knows his work and singles out the long poem *Cárcel de amor* as worthy to be presented to the judgement of Apollo.<sup>30</sup> The same can be said for Pedro Liñán, who comes to the Last Judgement also bringing a particular poem: "con la pintura de su *Noche*" (p. 590). Lope praises this poem, first published in 1597, in *El marqués de las Navas*.<sup>31</sup>

There are only two extensive quotations of poetry in the portion of "Juicio final" under study. One was ascribed to Garci Sánchez, and this is the other:

Rufos, el jurado de Córdoua, con sus *Apoctemas*, y con aquella gran copla que dize:

No fíes de prometido,  
pues que pecas de contado;  
que quien no paga tentado  
no pagará arrepentido.

(p. 590)

This picaresque bit of advice to a prostitute must have brought down the house when Vélez read it to his distinguished audience of poets and courtiers, including Their Majesties! The citation is exact, its two minor variants ("en prometido," "mal pagará") suggesting that our satirist was quoting from memory.<sup>32</sup> Melo has a few words about Juan Rufo; the others do not include him. Vélez confers immortality on "el canónigo Cayrrasco" for the introduction of *esdrújulos* into Spanish poetry, an unearned distinction for which Lope makes fun of him. Returning now once more to the list of great Spanish poets in the *Diablo Cojuelo*—Juan de Mena, Castillejo, Gregorio Hernández, Garci Sánchez, Camões—readers may wonder how the relatively obscure Gregorio Hernández got on that exclusive list. I submit that Vélez did not choose these five names at random, and that the "Juicio final" provides a clue to the reason for the unexpected inclusion of Hernández. The work that Gregorio Hernández offers to Apollo is "su Birgilio traducido en metro castellano" (p. 588), a translation praised also by Lope in the *Laurel* and elsewhere.<sup>33</sup> Virgil is the first Latin poet in the *Diablo Cojuelo* list. A simple association of ideas brings his translator with him.

Saavedra Fajardo considers Encina's Eclogues unfortunate, mentioning them only to say that Garcilaso's are much better. The others are entirely

silent on the subject. Vélez is not mindful of these plays, whose rustic language so distressed the diplomat, but he does accord their author access to Parnassus by virtue of a different work, comparing it to the macaronic verses of Teófilo Folengo: "Luego entró Juan de la Encina con sus *Disparates* (Merlín Cocayo castellano)" (pp. 588-89).<sup>34</sup> And of all those here considered, Vélez is the only one to pay his respects to another early dramatist: "Torres Naurro con su *Propaladia*" (p. 588).<sup>35</sup>

Summing up, we find that the list of great authors of the past compiled by Vélez coincides in nine names with the *Viaje del Parnaso*, in fourteen each with the *República Literaria* and the *Panegyrico por la poesía*, and in nineteen each with *Laurel de Apolo* and the *Hospital das letras*. His list is much shorter than the others (except the *República Literaria*) and is limited to poets who died before 1638; within these restrictions it is in keeping with the general opinion of the period but far from being a piece of mechanical copywork. Although his comments are brief, they are often more informative than the undifferentiated praise of some of the other treatises. Stylistically the presentation is varied, offering sometimes a title, occasionally a quotation, a biographical detail, a comment on subject matter, a characterization of style. In a few instances his selection comes closer to modern opinion than do those of contemporaries who wrote similar works.

It is not my intention to claim for the "Juicio final" the honors of a serious work of literary criticism. It was hastily written for a frivolous occasion. Quite probably its author himself was not very satisfied with it. He saved a few of the jokes, expanded some comic ideas into full-fledged episodes—and, when he wanted to name some Iberian writers worthy of rubbing shoulders with Homer, Virgil, and Dante, easily found them in his own little "history of Spanish literature."<sup>36</sup>

### Notes

1 "Tuvo Vélez la pasión de las letras, como todos sus contemporáneos, pero las suyas no fueron las de don Francisco [de Quevedo], ni su carácter tuvo la reciedumbre, dureza y aspereza del de éste. En el *Cojuelo* se echa bien de ver que aunque la literatura le preocupa enormemente, no [figura] en el grupo de los pedantes. Pocas citas, pocas referencias que no [están] al alcance de todos. . . . Otras alusiones [además de la cita de Luciano] a grandes clásicos son de las más trilladas y triviales. Sin comentarios podrá [entenderse] cuanto a los hombres de letras que forman en el séquito de la Fortuna se refiere" (José F. Montesinos, "*El Diablo Cojuelo*," unpublished essay). As I hope to show, some comment may nevertheless be helpful, despite the unanimous silence of the editors (A. Bonilla, 1902 and 1910; F. Pérez González, 1903; F. Rodríguez Marín, 1918; E. R. Cepeda and E. Rull, 1968).

<sup>2</sup> H. E. Bergman, "El 'Juicio final de todos los poetas españoles muertos y vivos' (MS. inédito) y el Certamen Poético de 1638," *BRAE*, 55 (1975), 551-610.

<sup>3</sup> Instead of Gabriel and his horn, Apollo "mandó a un arrendador de los corrales que tocasse a juicio con vn mosquetero en la boca por tronpeta" ("Juicio final," p. 586).

<sup>4</sup> Cervantes, *Viaje del Parnaso*, ed. F. Rodríguez Marín (Madrid, 1935); Fernando Luis de Vera y Mendoza, *Panegyrico por la poesía*, ed. M. Cardenal de Iracheta, *Revista de Bibliografía Nacional*, 2 (1941), 265-342; Lope de Vega, *Laurel de Apolo*, BAE, Vol. 38; Diego de Saavedra Fajardo, *República Literaria*, ed. V. García de Diego (Madrid, 1922); J. Colomès, *Le Dialogue "Hospital das letras" de D. Francisco Manuel de Melo* (Paris, 1970). There are quite a few others.

The Parnassus erected for the entry of Queen Mariana (Nov. 15, 1649) featured nine "Poetas ESPAÑOLES": Seneca, Lucan, Martial, Juan de Mena, Garcilaso de la Vega, Luis de Camões, Lope de Vega Carpio, Luis de Góngora, and Francisco de Quevedo—J. E. Varey and A. M. Salazar, "Calderón and the Royal Entry of 1649," *HR*, 34 (1966), 9-10.

<sup>5</sup> Although Melo's name does not appear anywhere on the manuscript, he not only knew about the 1638 Academy but wrote a sonnet on one of the assigned subjects, a celebration of the hunting prowess of little prince Baltasar Carlos, then eight years old, who killed a boar. Melo took some pride in this poem, which appears in both printed and manuscript collections of his verse, and many years later makes specific reference to it in his *Hospital das letras*: "Mostrei-lhe [a don Antonio de Mendoza] eu . . . aquele soneto que anda nas minhas obras, escrito ao Príncipe de Espanha, e começa: 'No te oferece aquel triunfo hoy solamente' . . ." (p. 78; the sonnet is found in his *Obras métricas*, León de Francia, Horacio Boessat, and George Remeys, 1665, p. 2 [also in the 1649 ed. and in MS. 7644 of the Biblioteca Nacional, Lisbon, fol. 173<sup>v</sup> and again fol. 183<sup>f</sup>, here erroneously dated 1637]. Velásquez's charming portrait of the little prince in hunting costume was done two years earlier). Melo also possessed a copy of the verses which Mendoza had written on the same subject, and composed a rhymed compliment to his friend on their excellence—"A D. A. D. M. por vnos versos con que alabò vn tiro del P. su señor," *Obras métricas*, p. 239; Mendoza's verses in his *Obras poéticas*, ed. R. Benítez Claros (Madrid, 1948), III, 167 and 248. A third poem by Melo, addressed to Mendoza, commemorates the prince's next feat: a few days after the boar hunt, while watching a bullfight, he suddenly stood up in the royal box and shot the bull ("A D. A. D. M. auiendo muerto aquel Principe vn toro despues del jauali," *Obras métricas*, p. 239 and MS. 7644, fol. 175<sup>v</sup>). Melo had spent a good deal of time in Madrid in 1637 and was in the capital again in the spring of 1638: "Après les soulèvements d'Evora, de décembre 1637 et janvier 1638, à la pacification desquels il fut chargé de prendre part, il revient encore une fois à Madrid rendre compte de sa mission au Comte-Duc d'Olivarès. C'est à l'occasion de ce séjour qu'il fait imprimer, dans la capitale espagnole, la *Politica militar en avisos de generales*, qui parut avec une dédicace au puissant ministre, datée du 20 avril 1638" (Colomès, p. xxix). The *Hospital das letras* presents a number of interesting parallels to the "Juicio final" as a whole, not just to its list of great writers.

In 1852 the Biblioteca Nacional purchased the private library of D. Francisco de Melo Manuel de Câmara (Cabrinha) and with it, the manuscript of the "Juicio final." This costly acquisition became the subject of a lively polemic revolving around the question of whether or not these books had previously belonged to the illustrious seventeenth-century writer. The matter was thoroughly investigated in 1920 by Raúl Proença, who

reports that he was unable to find any sign on the books of the Cabrinha purchase to indicate former ownership by the author. The writer's only son having died without issue, there were no direct descendants to inherit his belongings; the genealogy of the Cabrinha line traced by Proença takes us back to a second cousin who died in 1719 — "A livreria de D. Francisco Manuel," *Anais das Bibliotecas e Arquivos*, série II, vol. I (1920), pp. 302-06. The records of the Biblioteca Nacional show that the "Juicio final" manuscript was part of the Cabrinha purchase. Is it not possible that, although the bulk of the author's library passed into other hands, this manuscript may have reached the cousin as a gift or loan?

<sup>6</sup> A glaring omission indeed, especially in view of the fulsome praise Cervantes accords Vélez in both *Viaje del Parnaso* and *Ocho comedias*! Or did Vélez perceive, as do some modern critics, an ironic undertone in these compliments? Vélez is praised also by Lope (*Laurel de Apolo* and elsewhere) and by Vera. Melo is more tempered in his appreciation:

—Muito estranhei eu, quando me mostraram esse livro [*El Diabolo Cojuelo*], que um homem de boa opinião, depois de muitos anos de aplauso, uma vez que se pôs a escrever a trancos (como ele chama aos capítulos desta obra) sáísse com cousa tão desigual ao que dele podia esperar-se.

—Fazer livros é tentação e para muitos tão urgente, que há pessoas que têm por tão preciso imprimir um livro como passar, em vida ou morte, pelo buraco de Santiago.

—Sem embargo, Luís Véles teve singular agudeza, graça e despejo em seus escritos e um destemor tão grande, que a todos nos fez ousados na poesia, musa alegre e bem castelhana que poucas igualaram. (p. 60)

<sup>7</sup> So also Lope in *Laurel de Apolo*, where he quotes the opening line of the *Polifemo* (p. 193b), and Melo; Cervantes and Fernando de Vera, speaking more generally, seem to give equal weight to the "burlas" and the "veras." Saavedra Fajardo did not fully approve of the serious works: "En nuestros tiempos renació un Marcial cordovés en don Luis de Góngora, requiebro de las musas i corifeo de las gracias, gran artífice de la lengua castellana, i quien mejor supo jugar con ella i descubrir los donaires de sus equívocos con incomparable agudeza. Cuando en las veras deja correr su natural, es culto i puro, sin que la sutileza de su ingenio haga impenetrables sus conceptos, como le sucedió después, queriendo retirarse del vulgo i afectar la escuridad, error que se disculpa con que aun en esto mismo salió grande i nunca imitable. Tal vez tropezó por falta de luz su *Polifemo*, pero ganó pasos de gloria. Si se perdió en sus *Soledades*, se halló después tanto más estimado, quanto con más cuidado le buscaron los ingenios y explicaron sus agudezas" (pp. 112-13; this passage appears only in the revised version).

<sup>8</sup> Both passages show stylistic parallels to other works by Vélez. Cf. *Academia burlesca* (1637): "Hartos [consonantes] he sudado en quatroçientas comedias que he hecho, sin los niños y viejos (que son los Romanços, Sonetos, Decimas, Canciones, y otras barias poesías . . .)" [Alfred Morel-Fatio, "Académie burlesque célébrée par les poètes de Madrid au Buen Retiro en 1637," *L'Espagne au XVI<sup>e</sup> et au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle: Documents historiques et littéraires* (Paris-Madrid, 1878), p. 615]; "Juicio final": "vn rrepresentante engerto y poetta regoldano" (p. 608); *El Diabolo Cojuelo*: "volvamos a nuestro Astrólogo regoldano y nigromante enjerto" [ed. Francisco Rodríguez Marín, *Clásicos Castellanos* (Madrid, 1918), pp. 87-88].

<sup>9</sup> The amount of space accorded a poet in any of these reviews is not an index of his importance; Garcilaso gets the briefest possible mention in the *Viaje del Parnaso* and

makes only a tangential appearance in the *Panegyrico*. The position of this "príncipe dos poetas castelhanos" (Melo) was too well established to require comment.

10 The scribe wrongly gives "Vaznes." Lope quotes the same line in *Laurel de Apolo* (p. 189b); cf. A. Rodríguez-Moñino, "Poesías ajenas en el *Laurel de Apolo*," *La transmisión de la poesía española en los siglos de oro*, ed. E. M. Wilson (Barcelona, 1976), p. 32. On the ceremony in Batres, see J. M. Blecua's ed. of Lope de Vega, *Obras poéticas* (Barcelona, 1969), I, 1522, where the event is dated ca. 1626. The heading of Góngora's contribution is: "Madrigal para la inscripción de la fuente de quien dijo Garcilaso: 'En medio del invierno' etc." (Blecua, I, 1522, where we can read Lope's poem). Six *décimas* by Francisco de la Torre and one each by Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola, Antonio de Mendoza, and Hortensio Paravicino are included in MS. B 2464 of the Hispanic Society of America. Gabriel de Corral also mentions the fountain—*La Cintia de Aravívez* (Madrid: Imprenta del Reyno, 1629), fol. 90<sup>r</sup>.

11 Vera is equally brief and Cervantes does not mention him at all, but Saavedra Fajardo recalls him in two different places while Lope, in a rather extensive passage, not only speaks of both epic and lyric works but also laments that recognition came to him only posthumously.

## 12

—Confesso que esse toledano Garcilaso foi suave e que, para os escuros tempos em que madrigou, acendeu uma nova luz de que recebesse claridade o vosso idioma; mas, se se vai a falar verdade, não o tenho por marca de tantos aqui-del-reis como sobre ele levantaram Francisco Sanchez Brocense em suas notas e Fernando de Herrera em seus comentários.

—Levais jeito de duvidar a esse mesmo Herrera o cognomento de "divino," pelo qual é chamado da antiguidade!

—Essa demanda lhe ponha Platão, que para mim me basta conhecer que o divino Herrera foi um clérigo muito humano. . . . (p. 20)

The dialogue goes on to criticize Herrera's own poetry as exceedingly harsh. In the early version of the *República Literaria* the same unfavorable judgement is made of Herrera's poetry, but elsewhere he is cited as an expert on Garcilaso; both passages are omitted in the revised version where, instead, Herrera is the interlocutor who presents the list of Spanish poets (pp. 111n., 216n., and 107 ff. respectively).

13 Cervantes finds opportunity in his *Viaje* to express a personal resentment against the Argensolas, but as poets accords them lavish praise, each individually and as a team (pp. 42-43 and 94-95). Vera expresses a preference for Bartolomé (p. 334), the only one cited by Fajardo (pp. 113 and 145). Melo offers a lengthy and detailed critique, on the whole rather negative (pp. 38-39).

14 Híjar took an active part in the 1638 Carnival festivities and was undoubtedly present when the "Juicio final" was read. There is frequent reference to his equestrian skill; Vélez mentions it again in *El Diablo Cojuelo* (Tranco VIII).

15 See Erasmo Buceta, "La obra poética del Conde de Salinas en opinión de grandes ingenios contemporáneos suyos," *RFE*, 12 (1925), 16-29, and Luis Rosales, "La estimación literaria del Conde de Salinas," *Studia Hispánica in honorem R. Lapesa* (Madrid, 1974), II, 531-47. Vera (p. 333) and Cervantes (p. 30) cite him in the context of titled

nobility who are poets. Lope quotes and glosses one of his verses in the *Laurel* (p. 208a). Melo has preserved several anecdotes (pp. 16, 40-41, 76-77).

16 *Redondillas*, in *Cancioneiro de Corte e de Magnates*, ed. A. L-F. Askins (Berkeley, Calif., 1968). *Glosas*, id., and Gallardo, *Ensayo*, I, 149-52. See also E. M. Wilson, "Poesías atribuidas al Conde de Salinas en el *Cancionero de don Joseph del Corral*," *Homenaje a Casaldueiro* (Madrid, 1972), pp. 485-91; Edward Glaser, *The Cancionero "Manuel de Faria"* (Munster, 1968), pp. 16-29, 36-38. Much material is still in manuscript.

17 Lope de Vega, *La Dorotea*, ed. Edwin S. Morby, 2nd ed. (Madrid, 1968), p. 71.

18 *Hospital das letras*, pp. 41-43. Mendoza rates separate appreciations as lyric poet and as historian from both Melo and Saavedra Fajardo. The excellent biography *Son of the Alhambra* by E. Spivakovsky (Austin and London, 1970) makes no reference to "Filis" or to a late love.

19 *Laurel de Apolo*, p. 202a; *Hospital das letras*, p. 21. The relevant passage of the *República Literaria* is quite clearly intended as a miniature "history of Spanish literature" and more judgemental than the corresponding part of our "Juicio final." The entire passage is one of those reworked for the definitive version, so its date is uncertain; it was not published until after the death of Vélez. Mena is mentioned in both versions, with differences in wording (pp. 106n. and 107).

20 The manuscript reads: "Jorje Marino que." Manrique gets only a quick nod from Melo, Vera, and Fajardo; the latter omits him entirely in the revised version.

21 *El Diablo Cojuelo*, pp. 150-54, with a long note on the *rollo*.

22 Patrick Gallagher, *The Life and Works of Garci Sanchez de Badajoz* (London, 1968), pp. 4-5 and 12.

23 *La cisma de Inglaterra*, in *Obras completas*, ed. A. Valbuena Briones (Madrid, 1966), I, 154-55. Calderón's gloss of the lines distorts their meaning.

24 MS. 3700 of the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, fol. 84<sup>r-v</sup>, gives it with a gloss by Barriónuevo. MS. CCVII 354 of the Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence (Fondo Magliabechiano), fol. 434<sup>r</sup>, under the heading "De un Estu<sup>dte</sup> a su dama," with variants in line 2 ("hemos") and line 4 ("Yo en uer q<sup>e</sup> uos lo ueys"). I am grateful to my colleague A. L-F. Askins for the above references. In *Cancionero de 1628* the *copla* appears at the end of a *romance* by Liñán de Riaza, but it is omitted in other versions of the same ballad—Edward M. Wilson and Jack Sage, *Poesías líricas en las obras dramáticas de Calderón* (London, 1964), pp. 55-56.

25 The *Panegyrico* calls him "milagroso, y de grandes pensamiētos, y afectuoso, en esplicarlos" (p. 332)—an accolade which pales in the context, for Fernando de Vera says much the same thing about everyone on his list. Francisco de Melo is much harder to please: "salgadísimo," "um dos homens de maior graça que o mundo teve" (p. 69). In the *República Literaria* he is grouped with the Marqués de Santillana and other *cancionero* poets who wrote at a time when Spanish poetry was still in a deplorably primitive state:

"Después de Juan de Mena florecieron don Jorge Manrique, Marqués de Santillana, García [sic] Sánchez, Costana, Cartagena y otros, los quales declararon sus pensamientos con facilidad, pero sin cultura, ornato, ni elegancia, porque como fueron los primeros que se atrevieron a dar pasos por la poesía, se contentaron con haber hallado alguna senda y con explicar en coplas, como quiera que fuese, sus conceptos; tal era entonces el miedo que se tenía a la villana ley de los consonantes, hallada en medio de la ignorancia quando con la declinación del Imperio se perdieron las buenas letras; pero poco a poco cesando en España la ocupación de las armas, y sucediendo la de las buenas letras, se animaron los ingenios y fueron puliendo sus obras" (pp. 106-07 notes. This is the primitive version; in the later text it is reduced to: "Florecieron después el marqués de Santillana, Garci Sánchez, Costana, Cartagena i otros, que poco a poco fueron limando sus obras" [p. 107], with part of the remainder transferred to the comment on Juan de Mena). O. H. Green affirms that "Garci Sánchez is perhaps the third *cancionero* poet (after Mena and Santillana) in the estimation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries"—"On the *coplas castellanas* in the *siglo de oro*: Chronological Notes," in *Homenaje a Rodríguez-Moñino* (Madrid, 1966), I, 218. By the criterion used in this paper he ranks first of the three.

26 Castillejo's objection to the hendecasyllable introduced by Garcilaso launches Lope into a lengthy discussion of the history of versification (p. 202a). Vera's citation of Santillana is part of his effort to dignify poetry by listing titled nobility who have written some, so that in the context the brief praise of Santillana here is almost counterproductive. For the *República Literaria*, see preceding note.

27 Disguised as "Vsias Mars." We may also credit the scribe with "elemosina"; cf. *República Literaria*: "escribió en lengua lemosina" (p. 108) and Lope: "Castísimos son aquellos versos que escribió Ausias March en lengua lemosina, que tan mal y sin entenderlos, Montemayor tradujo"—cit. E. Juliá Martínez, rev. of *Las obras de Ausias March, traducidas por Jorge de Montemayor*, ed. F. Carreras de Calatayud (Madrid, 1947), in *RFE*, 31 (1947), 237. Melo calls it "sua meia língua," but it is intelligible, and to translate it is foolishness (p. 44).

28 Lobo gets three other votes, Saa de Miranda only two.

29 Miguel Sánchez reminds Lope, too, of Terence (*Laurel de Apolo*, p. 198b).

30 "Juicio final," p. 589. As "La visita de amor," it is found in *Las obras del famoso poeta Gregorio Sylvestre* (Granada: Sebastian de Mena, 1599), fols. 160<sup>r</sup>-184<sup>v</sup>; an alternate title, "La audiencia de amor," is also given here.

31 Julian F. Randolph, *Vida y obra de Pedro Liñán de Riaza*, Ph.D. Diss. University of California, Berkeley, 1970, pp. 47, 315-29.

32 Juan Rufo, *Las seyscientas apotegmas* (Toledo: Pedro Rodriguez, 1596), fol. 47<sup>r</sup>.

33 *Laurel de Apolo*, p. 189b; *La Filomena con otras diuersas Rimas, Prosas, y Versos* (Madrid: Biuda de Alonso Martin, 1621), fols. 50<sup>r</sup> and 174<sup>r</sup>. There were at least seven editions of the Hernández Virgil between 1555 and 1614.

34 Cf. Quevedo, *Sueño de la muerte*, in *Sueños y discursos*, ed. F. C. R. Maldonado (Madrid, 1972), pp. 202-04.

<sup>35</sup> The *Propalladia* was placed on the Index in 1559; an expurgated ed. appeared in 1573—J. E. Gillet, "The *Propalladia* and the Index," in his ed. of *Propalladia* (Bryn Mawr, 1943), I, 64-71.

<sup>36</sup> For their assistance with various aspects of this paper I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the staff of the Biblioteca Nacional, Lisbon, and to my colleagues A. L-F. Askins, M. S. Carrasco, and S. B. Vranich.