Vélez de Guevara as Dramatic Collaborator, with Specific Reference to *También la afrenta es veneno* (I. Vélez II. Coello III. Rojas Zorrilla)

Ann L. Mackenzie

It is an important fact of literary history that dramatic collaboration was not widely practised in Golden Age Spain until the early 1630s, when Calderón and his disciples, young playwrights like Rojas Zorrilla, Antonio Coello, and many others, developed a remarkable fondness for joint composition.[1] They collaborated in large numbers of plays, generally working in teams of three; but sometimes as many as six or even nine authors took part in a single drama.

Luis Vélez de Guevara was one of the few members of the School of Lope who remained active as a dramatist well into the time of Calderón. Moreover, of all Lope's followers, Vélez was perhaps the one most nearly Calderonian in artistic temperament. Above all, his deep interest in reconstructing old plays distinguished him from most Lopean playwrights and linked him artistically to Calderón's School. Spencer and Schevill once described the practice of adapting old plays as "a peculiar kind of collaboration with an unsuspecting fellow-playwright."[2] Conversely, one might argue that dramatic collaboration involves its exponents in a peculiar process of adapting the work of other authors. Certainly, it seems in no way surprising that Vélez, long an eager *refundidor* of plays, became infected in the early 1630s by the Calderonian School's enthusiasm for collaborating; to such an extent that in the period 1630-44 he apparently collaborated almost as often as did Rojas, or Coello, or Calderón himself.

Seven of the plays in which Vélez cooperated during this period have survived. A brief survey of these brings to light two interesting aspects of Vélez as dramatic collaborator.

First, there is Vélez's noteworthy preference for composing the opening acts. Vélez is the author of the first acts of four plays out of seven: namely, *La Baltasara, También tiene el sol menguante, También la afrenta es veneno,* and *El pleito que tuvo el diablo con el cura de Madrilejos.* In a fifth play, *La*

Luna africana, Vélez collaborated with no fewer than eight other playwrights, with the result that he was not required to compose a whole act, but only some five hundred verses. Significantly, these verses form part of Act I. The sixth and seventh dramas are *Enfermar con el remedio,* in which Vélez wrote Act II, and *El catalán Serrallonga,* the only work in which he composed a final act. This preference of his for first acts when writing in collaboration would appear to indicate that he had a remarkable degree of artistic self-knowledge; for most critics are agreed that he had a special aptitude for dramatic exposition, but a tendency to manage *desenlaces* less effectively.[3]

Another of Vélez's interesting characteristics as dramatic collaborator is his special liking for the professional company of Rojas Zorrilla. Rojas did not collaborate in *La Luna africana,* nor in *Enfermar con el remedio;*[4] but he did work with Vélez, and Mira, in the composition of *El pleito que tuvo el diablo.* Rojas was Vélez's partner in *También tiene el sol menguante,*[5] and he collaborated with Vélez and Antonio Coello in *La Baltasara, El catalán Serrallonga,* and *También la afrenta es veneno.*[6]

Vélez and Rojas had certain dramatic tastes in common, which might help to explain why they chose to work together. For example, both dramatists were much attracted to sensational subjects; both enjoyed portraying extraordinary characters; both had a weakness for creating startling or extravagant theatrical effects. *El pleito que tuvo el diablo, La Baltasara,* and *El catalán Serrallonga* are the three plays in which Vélez and Rojas most obviously indulge their mutual tastes. *El pleito que tuvo el diablo* is a particularly sensational composition. Loosely based on an event which took place in Madrilejos in 1607, the work presents an improbable heroine who is supposedly possessed by the devil, an excuse for spectacular stage effects from Vélez and Rojas, and, indeed, also from Mira. *La Baltasara* and *El catalán Serrallonga* are likewise *piezas de circunstancias. La Baltasara* dramatizes the remarkable story of the early seventeenth-century actress Baltasara de los Reyes, who suddenly abandoned her stage career and a dissolute way of life to become a religious recluse. *El catalán Serrallonga* treats of the violent life and death of the notorious bandit Serrallonga, who was hanged in 1633. These two plays are, however, much more worthy of serious critical attention than *El pleito que tuvo el diablo,* thanks mainly to Vélez's first act of *La Baltasara,* and to his final act of *El catalán Serrallonga.* Unlike his fellow collaborators in *La Baltasara,* Vélez succeeds in making the extraordinary behaviour of the heroine seem credible, imaginatively conveying her inner conflict through what might be termed a stage-within-the-stage technique. Vélez sets his act inside the famous Corral de la Olivera in Valencia. La Baltasara appears on the stage-within-the-stage as heroine of an ostentatious *comedia* called *Saladino.* She fluffs her entrance and speaks the wrong lines, prevented from concentrating on her role by her own real desire to give up acting and devote her life to God. In *El catalán Serrallonga* Vélez's stage effects are much less ingenious and original

than those he devised in *La Baltasara.* Nevertheless, in this play also he succeeds in penetrating deep into the inner confusion of his strange protagonist. For instance, the scene in which Serrallonga plunges down into his father's tomb and encounters his father's ghost is excessively sensational. But, later there is an excellent prison scene in which Serrallonga ponders over his experience with the ghost, attempting to rationalize it and dismiss it as a dream:

> . . . sin duda, lo que tuve
> por verdad, fueron especies
> que durmiendo atrae al alma
> la imaginativa siempre.[7]

Although Vélez and Rojas collaborated regularly with each other and clearly had certain dramatic tastes in common, it would be wrong to regard them as the Golden Age counterparts of, for example, Beaumont and Fletcher. Their contemporary, John Aubrey, observed a "wonderful consimility of phansey" in the collaboration of Beaumont and Fletcher. In contrast, the plays in which Vélez and Rojas were partners offer no evidence that any such profound artistic affinity existed between the two Spanish dramatists. On the contrary, these plays indicate in general, and, as we shall see, *También la afrenta es veneno* demonstrates in particular, that Vélez and Rojas were two vigorously individualistic creative talents.

También la afrenta es veneno

Of the plays in which Vélez collaborated, *También la afrenta es veneno* is perhaps the one most worthy of critical attention. Yet, critics to date have shown little interest in the drama. It still lacks a scholarly edition, and until now has never been studied in detail.[8] Owing to the limited space at my disposal, my analysis of the drama will, of course, be far from exhaustive. In this paper I shall not attempt, for instance, to discuss adequately the collaborators' literary style and vocabulary—their imagery, verbal patterns, etc. Instead, I propose to make some comments on the sources of the play, and then to concentrate on such aspects as its dramatic structure, its tensions, and, above all, its characterization.

También la afrenta es veneno is an honour drama based on a subject taken from fourteenth-century Portuguese history. The subject: King Fernando I's notorious passion for Doña Leonor de Meneses, wife of a Portuguese nobleman, Juan Lorenzo de Acuña. King Fernando, it will be remembered, eventually annulled Leonor's marriage to Acuña and made her Queen of Portugal.

The collaborators show considerably more concern for dramatic effect than for historical truth. For example, Leonor, who in history was the King's

mistress long before she became his wife, is presented in the play as a virtuous woman deeply in love with her husband who is abducted by the King and forced to marry him against her will. Of the three collaborators, it is Rojas who departs most strikingly from the facts of the case. Indeed, almost the entire dramatic action of Rojas' third act appears to be the product of his own daringly inventive genius. In history, Leonor became very much the power behind the throne and remained married to Fernando until his death in 1383. As for her ex-husband, Juan Lorenzo, in reality, he prudently lived most of the rest of his life as an exile in Castile. In Rojas' third act, however, the King tires of Leonor after only one night of matrimony, repudiates her, and what is more, compels her former husband to accept her again as his wife. Juan Lorenzo's reaction to this terrible affront offers further proof of Rojas' inventive ability. It is customary, even conventional, for heroes of Golden Age honour dramas to equate their dishonour metaphorically with death. Rojas dares to present a hero who literally dies of dishonour. Juan Lorenzo falls dead at the moment at which he is compelled to give Leonor his hand in marriage, destroyed by no other force but that of his own extreme sense of disgrace.

Despite the fact that much of its plot content is pure invention, nevertheless *También la afrenta es veneno* generates an impressive aura of historical plausibility. If the behaviour of the main characters in the drama but rarely corresponds to their real behaviour in history, at least they are situated most carefully in their correct historical period. The play is rich in authentic historical details regarding, for example, Portugal's relations with Aragón and Castile, Portugal's political and military interests in Africa, etc. Moreover, these details refer not only to the time of Fernando's reign. Some relate to the immediate past—there are allusions to Fernando's father, King Pedro el Cruel. Others even hint at the future: mention is made of a prophecy that Fernando's brother, Maestre de Avís, will one day rule in his stead and be known as "el príncipe perfecto" (p. 590a).

The collaborators doubtless derived some of these authentic details from Mariana, who treats Fernando's reign at some length.[9] Their main historical source, however, appears to have been Manuel de Faria y Sousa's *Epítome de las historias portuguesas* (Madrid, 1628). In his chapter on Fernando I, Faria y Sousa compares the case of Leonor de Meneses with that of Inés de Castro; a comparison which evidently caught the attention of the collaborators, for they draw vigorous dramatic parallels between Fernando's own obsession with Leonor and the passion of his father for the ill-fated Inés.[10] Then, Faria y Sousa is struck by the fact that Fernando contemplated marriage to the princesses of Castile and Aragon, both of them called Leonor, before marrying Leonor de Meneses. The historian comments that the name Leonor seemed to have a fatal attraction for the King. At the beginning of Act I, Vélez's King declares his love for Leonor de Meneses, and adds:

> . . . es este nombre [Leonor]
> tan repetido en los ecos
> de mi amor, que no he tratado
> en Castilla casamiento,
> en Francia, ni en Aragón,
> después que por ésta muero,
> que no hayan sido Leonores
> todas, que parece extremo
> o prodigio de la estrella
> que me inclina a este portento
> de hermosura.
>
> (p. 585c)

Finally, the very heading of Faria y Sousa's chapter on Fernando is clearly echoed in the last lines of the drama. The historian entitled his chapter "Fernando Rei IX," a reference to the fact that Fernando, though in reality Fernando I of Portugal, was that country's ninth King. Rojas ends his act and the play as follows: "Y aquí tiene fin, senado, / este caso verdadero / del Rey don Fernando el Nono, / . . ." (p. 602c).

There is an earlier play called *Allá van leyes, donde quieren reyes*, sometimes attributed to Guillén de Castro, which treats of the same historical subject as *También la afrenta es veneno.*[11] It must be stressed, however, that *También la afrenta es veneno* can in no way be regarded as a *refundición* of the earlier drama. Castro uses the historical subject matter to illustrate a theme, neatly expressed in his title, which is quite unrelated to the striking theme of "también la afrenta es veneno." Moreover, both dramas are markedly dissimilar in plot development, characterization, style, and language. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the collaborators did not know the earlier drama, or that we should discount entirely Castro's work as a possible influence. In fact, there is a scene in Rojas' third act which appears to have been influenced to a certain extent by a scene in the final act of Castro's drama. Both deal with an encounter between Juan Lorenzo and Leonor and take place in the royal palace. In Castro's scene Lorenzo confronts his ex-wife in public, in the presence of Leonor's father, among others. Castro's hero harangues the Queen violently and attempts to persuade her to annul her marriage to Fernando. He makes it clear, however, that were she to do as he asks, he would expect her to enter a convent. Though he loves her still, he could never receive her back as his wife: "porque habiendo sido ajenos / los que mis entrañas rompen, / agora fueran agravios / los que antes eran favores."[12] In contrast, Rojas' scene takes the form of a private encounter between Juan Lorenzo and Leonor. Also, Juan, far from haranguing the Queen, hardly dares address her directly, and speaks mainly in asides. Notwithstanding, Rojas' hero is preoccupied by some of the considerations which troubled Lorenzo in Castro's scene. Rojas' hero recognizes that the

King is already tired of Leonor and is likely soon to repudiate her. Juan Lorenzo still deeply loves Leonor, but, like Castro's protagonist, he is governed by his code of honour. Rojas' Juan Lorenzo expresses, though in different words, the same sentiments pronounced by Castro's Lorenzo: "Ahora de mi nobleza: / aunque el rey la repudiara, / no era possible quererla" (p. 599a). The attitude displayed by Lorenzo in Castro's scene is unimportant for the subsequent development of the plot; for in Castro's play there is no annulment of Leonor's marriage to the King, and Lorenzo ends up going resignedly into exile, as in history. Rojas, on the other hand, gives to the similar attitude of his own Juan Lorenzo a vitally dramatic importance. Juan's behaviour in Rojas' scene serves to prepare us for Juan's extreme reaction when Rojas' King forces Juan to remarry Leonor; that is, it motivates Juan's death from dishonour at the end of *También la afrenta es veneno.*

Vélez's first act of *También la afrenta es veneno*

There is no doubt that Vélez has composed a first act of exceptional merit. The act unfolds logically in three neatly linked sections. The initial scenes take place at nightfall outside Juan Lorenzo's house, where the King is engaged in serenading Leonor. The sudden return of Juan Lorenzo leads to a tense confrontation between monarch and vassal. For the second part of the act, we follow Juan Lorenzo into his house, where Leonor appears to greet him. Appropriately, the dramatic climax of the act is reached in this middle section; at the moment when the King invades the couple's house and privacy declaring: "No todo os lo habéis de haber, / Señora doña Leonor, / con vuestro esposo" (p. 588c). For the final part of the act, Vélez moves the action to the King's palace early next morning. The best scene in this section is undoubtedly that of the interview between the King and Juan Lorenzo, which terminates the act. Tension between the two men quickly reaches a peak when Juan discovers his wife's portrait in the King's chambers. Fernando subsequently attempts to allay Juan's fears for his honour, informing Juan of his intention to marry the Infanta of Aragon. However, the audience's suspicions are certainly not diminished; rather, they are intensified, not least by the King's insistence that Juan should leave his wife and accompany the Maestre de Avís on his journey to Aragon to bring back the Infanta. So Vélez's act ends with good theatrical effect, leaving the audience keyed to expect the King's abduction of Leonor in the act which follows.

Three aspects of Vélez's dramatic technique are particularly noteworthy in Act I. They are: his skilful use of dramatic irony, his excellent sense of timing, and his powers of dramatic restraint.

The opening scenes of Vélez's act are especially rich in irony. In the first scene, for example, the King is ironically unaware that the woman he is serenading is already married. Fernando discusses Leonor with his friend and favourite, the Prior of Ocrato, and firmly resolves to make her his Queen, despite her lower status. The irony intensifies with the appearance of Juan Lorenzo. He has just come from the palace, having spent hours there petitioning in vain for the favour of an audience with the King.[13] Now at last Juan sees the King, outside Juan's own house. Here Fernando is the petitioner, asking in music and song for the favours of Juan's own wife.

Vélez's sense of dramatic timing is at its best in the important interview between Juan Lorenzo and his wife in the middle of the act. Leonor finds Juan abstracted and melancholy after his encounter with the King and his musicians. She delivers an eloquent speech designed to convince her husband that his honour is safe. Juan is calmed and convinced by his wife's eloquence, as Barreto, the *gracioso,* observes with relief: "Gracias a Dios que parece / que se ha satisfecho ya" (p. 588a). However, hardly has the tension begun to slacken when the King resumes his serenading and is heard broadcasting his feelings for Leonor in a sensuous Portuguese love song. Leonor pronounces a second impassioned speech, and again manages to persuade Juan that the King could never overcome her virtue. But at the very point at which Juan accepts her reassurances, the King once more intrudes upon them, and this time not through music but in person (see pp. 587-88).

Dramatic restraint is by no means a quality always achieved by Vélez. It is exercised in this act, however, to a remarkable degree. Vélez's restraint is evident in two scenes in particular.

Following Juan's confrontation with the King outside Juan's house there is a scene in which Juan is alone on the set, except for the *gracioso,* Barreto. The King has just stormed offstage after abusing Juan in the most extreme language for marrying Leonor. Beside himself with rage and jealousy, the King has even threatened Juan's life. Barreto now confidently expects his master in turn to pour out his feelings in a torrent of eloquence, and says to the audience: "Entre el amor y el honor / bravo soliloquio espero" (p. 587b). In fact, Juan says only a few words before lapsing into anguished silence. While Juan broods, it is the *gracioso* himself who makes the speech, an absurd, but chilling commentary on death. Vélez's use of "silence" here is highly commendable. Juan's brooding taciturnity generates much more dramatic tension at this stage than any impassioned speech could have created. Moreover, Juan's reserve in this scene means that when at last his control breaks, in the interview with his wife, and he gives violent expression to his emotions, his outburst is particularly impressive and convincing.[14]

Vélez's restraint is likewise very effective in the scene which begins with the King's sudden and unwelcome intrusion into Juan's house. For the first time, the three protagonists are onstage together. The King and Juan confront

each other in the presence of the woman they both love. Vélez might have chosen to prolong this confrontation, by involving the trio in emotional speeches of accusation and counteraccusation. But the turbulent emotions of each of these characters are already well known to the audience, thanks to several monologues in previous scenes. Wisely, Vélez avoids the risk of diminishing our interest in his protagonists. He cuts short their meeting, and does so, moreover, in a way entirely acceptable to the audience. Leonor, acting in accordance with her virtuous nature, excuses herself from the King's presence almost as soon as he arrives.

One important aspect of Vélez's first act remains to be discussed, namely, the characterization. In this aspect, also, Vélez has excelled himself. He has succeeded in individualizing his three main characters to a remarkable degree, giving each of them a very vigorous and memorable personality.

His portrayal of the King constitutes an interesting study in abnormal psychology. In short, Fernando is characterized as a pathological egoist with sadistic inclinations. His abnormal egoism manifests itself in the first scene of the act. He makes it clear, as he stands outside Leonor's house and serenades her, that his obsessive passion for Leonor is more rooted in wounded pride than in physical lust. He is provoked and fascinated by her rocklike resistance to his advances. Fernando's subsequent behaviour, when Juan informs him that Leonor is his wife, serves forcefully to verify our impression of the King's unbalanced egoism; for Fernando almost raves with anger at the idea that a mere vassal should have dared to enjoy the woman that he, King of Portugal, desired (pp. 586-87).

But it is in the last section of Vélez's act, in the scenes at the palace, that the King's abnormal personality is exceptionally well explored. In these scenes Fernando seeks to persuade first his brother, the Maestre, and later Juan Lorenzo himself, that he is a changed man, disposed to dominate his passion for Leonor de Meneses and to do his kingly duty by marrying another Leonor, the Infanta of Aragon. The audience, however, is permitted to penetrate his facade of reasonableness and observe his real state of mind. In one scene above all the King reveals his true feelings and intentions: an artist is admitted to the King's presence. He has brought Fernando a portrait of Leonor. The King refuses to look at the portrait at first but soon changes his mind. His reaction to the portrait is immediate and extreme. For a moment his reason becomes completely unhinged. Fernando sees not what is there, but what he wants to be there. He believes that Leonor's portrait is actually Leonor in the flesh and addresses it accordingly:

> Leonor, señora, mi bien,
> hermoso dueño, ángel mío,
> un rey tenéis por esclavo
> a vuestras plantas rendido.
>
> (p. 590b)

The audience, convinced by Fernando's curious hallucination that his unwholesome desire for Leonor still persists, can be in no doubt as to the true significance of his behaviour toward Juan at the end of the act. When the King gives Leonor's portrait to Juan and declares "de otra Leonor soy," he professes to be offering sound proof of his intention to marry the Infanta Leonor. We know, however, that Fernando readily gives up the painted Leonor because he is determined to possess the original, that the "other Leonor" to whom the King refers is, in reality, Juan's wife.

The King's sadistic inclinations emphasize his abnormal personality. The case of the portrait painter well illustrates Fèrnando's capacity for physical cruelty. We learn from the Prior that when Fernando commissioned the artist to paint Leonor's portrait, he grimly promised the painter that he would have him hanged if he did not accomplish the commission within two months. But it is the King's capacity for mental cruelty that Vélez is most concerned to demonstrate. This he does very memorably at one moment of the action. The King is in his chambers, still absorbed in Leonor's portrait, when he is told that Juan is outside, waiting for an audience. Had the King possessed any measure of human compassion, he would have bade his servants remove or cover the portrait before giving permission for Juan to enter. Instead, Fernando chooses to admit Juan to his chambers at once and so deliberately inflicts upon his vassal the most cruel emotional shock. Nor does the King's sadistic behaviour end there. As Juan stands in deep distress before the portrait, Fernando callously contributes to his anguish with the barbed enquiry: "Juan Lorenzo, / ¿Qué es lo que os ha suspendido?" (p. 591a).

Our initial impression of Juan Lorenzo is of a somewhat conventional figure. Certainly, when he angrily challenges the musicians outside his house and is warned that they are the servants of "un hidalgo, / a quien le guardan respeto / en Portugal," he gives exactly the stock response of the Golden Age dramatic hero: "A ninguno se lo debo / del Rey abajo . . ." (p. 586a)—no man, save only the King himself, might offend his honour with impunity. Nevertheless, Juan soon gives us cause radically to change our opinion of him. On discovering that the nobleman concerned is in fact none other than the King in person, Juan seems far from inclined to allow his King to offend his honour. His manner towards Fernando is defiant, almost aggressive. He dares to accuse the King to his face of scandalous conduct unworthy of a ruler (p. 586b-c). Juan Lorenzo shows a similarly unconventional attitude in the final scene of the act, when he sees his wife's portrait in the King's chambers. After the first shock, Juan displays a robust anger and speaks his mind to the King, condemning him in the most violent terms. He calls the King a traitor. He even implies that Fernando is a coward, who relies on his position as ruler to protect him from Juan's vengeance. He goes further: he curses and almost seems disposed to break ". . . el tirano fuero / que ató en sucesos iguales / las manos de los leales" (p. 591b).

Above all, however, it is Juan's behaviour in a scene near the middle of the act which convinces us that Vélez has created a conspicuously original protagonist. In the scene in which Juan is at home with his wife, at the moment when the King's blatantly sensuous love song makes itself heard from outside, Juan reacts in a way that is exceptional in Golden Age heroes. In a strikingly unorthodox monologue he maintains that he has reached the limits of his loyalty and forbearance. He declares:

> . . . estoy por hacer,
> por intentar, aunque arriesgue
> mil vidas, y el interés
> de tanto blasón . . .
> . . . un desatino
> que fama inmortal me dé.
>
> (p. 588b)

These vehement words serve to convince us that here is a nobleman actually willing to put his obligation to honour before duty to his King. It seems that only the timely intervention of Leonor, with her persuasive powers of eloquence, prevents Juan Lorenzo from rushing into the street there and then and avenging the affront done to him by Fernando with a physical attack upon the King's person (p. 588b-c).

We receive our earliest impression of Leonor indirectly, through the comments of the King to the Prior de Ocrato in the first scene of the act. The King describes a woman of extraordinary virtue, likening her to ". . . una roca de acero, / un escollo de diamante" (p. 585a). When Leonor at last appears in person, we discover that she indeed displays a rocklike or diamond-hard determination to resist the King's advances. In the two impassioned speeches which she delivers to convince her husband that his honour is safe in her keeping, she reveals herself as a heroic figure reminiscent in several respects of the tragic heroine of Rojas Zorrilla's *Lucrecia y Tarquino*. She seems, like Lucrecia, excessively proud of her virtue and her devotion to her husband. She seems to underestimate the "tirano poder" of the King, as Lucrecia underestimates the power of Tarquino. Moreover, Leonor appears capable of committing suicide, like Lucrecia, for her honour's sake. In the second of her two speeches to Juan, Leonor asserts in exalted but vigorous terms that should Juan ever doubt her virtue she would kill herself and her husband also.[15]

Considered thus, as it were, in isolation, Vélez's first act clearly merits the highest praise. Yet, if it is viewed within the framework of the drama as a whole, then there is good reason to criticize his part of the collaboration. Specifically, Vélez's portrayal of two of the three principal characters is open to criticism. As I have shown, he gave both Juan and Leonor interesting and well-formed personalities. Unfortunately, their personalities are badly designed for their roles in the rest of the drama.

Let us first take Juan Lorenzo. Vélez has created a daring character who has the makings of a tragic hero on the grand scale. It is easy to imagine his dying heroically for the sake of his honour, brought down by some grandiose act of rebellion against the King. But, in fact, there is no heroic death in store for Juan Lorenzo at the end of Act III. On the contrary, he is destined to die in a most unheroic way, killed by a spasm of helpless anguish in the face of cruel dishonour. Vélez, therefore, ought to have created a man who was the reverse of daring; he ought to have made Juan Lorenzo vulnerable and ineffectual, temperamentally incapable of opposing his King in defence of his honour.

As for Leonor, Vélez has endowed her, also, with a far too courageous personality. Leonor is destined to fulfil an essentially passive role in the rest of the drama. She is to be abducted by the King; she is to be obliged to marry him against her will; she is subsequently to suffer the additional indignity of being repudiated by him. Furthermore, the audience is meant to focus most of its attention, not on Leonor's own responses, but on the reactions of Juan Lorenzo to these misfortunes. Juan Lorenzo's reactions are to be unheroic in the extreme. Leonor, therefore, for her part must not perform "heroics" if she is not to oust Juan from his rightful position at the centre of dramatic interest. Vélez ought to have prepared us for Leonor's largely passive role by giving her a suitably timid disposition. Instead, he has created an extraordinarily resolute and fearless woman, whom we cannot imagine to be capable of acting other than in an heroic and grandiose fashion to protect her virtue or to restore her good name.[16]

There is, of course, no way of knowing exactly how much consultation took place between Vélez and his two partners before they composed *También la afrenta es veneno.* Nevertheless, it is extremely difficult to believe that Vélez composed the first act of the drama in ignorance of the strange kind of death that Rojas had in mind for the hero in Act III. Vélez must surely have known at least as much as Coello of Rojas' intentions. And Coello not only gives Juan Lorenzo a suitably vacillating and vulnerable personality, he also employs the phrase "también la afrenta es veneno" at the end of his second act, to predict precisely the peculiar manner of Juan's destruction in the act to follow.

It would appear therefore that Vélez must have agreed with his partners in the first instance to treat their chosen historical subject in such a way that it would illustrate the theme of "también la afrenta es veneno." Later, however, when he began to compose his own act, he evidently formed his own, very different, ideas as to how the subject matter should be treated and elected to realize these ideas rather than fulfil his original brief. In short, Vélez's first act of *También la afrenta es veneno* demonstrates that he was a good dramatist, but it indicates at the same time that he was a poor collaborator.

Acts II and III of *También la afrenta es veneno*

At this point it is worth bearing in mind that Golden Age dramatists were evidently in the habit of employing a chain method of composition when they collaborated. In other words, if three authors were involved in composing a play, as in *También la afrenta es veneno*, the playwright responsible for Act I would compose his allotted part, and then pass it to the second author, who would add his section before handing both acts to the playwright assigned to complete the work. Most plays produced in collaboration are rich sources of internal evidence of this chain method of composing.[17] There is also a convincing body of external evidence, of which the most important item is probably Cubillo's description of three collaborators feverishly composing one after the other, in a poem called *Retrato de un poeta cómico*:

> Corre la primer pluma a lo tudesco,
> entra luego la otra de refresco,
> corre veloz, y cuando está cansada,
> se arrima, y corre la tercer parada.[18]

In view of this chain method of composing, we may assume that Coello and Rojas had read Vélez's first act before they began to compose their own parts of the play. They knew in advance, therefore, that Vélez had given Juan Lorenzo and Leonor unsuitable personalities for their roles in the rest of the drama. Vélez's irresponsibility in this respect meant that the play as a whole was certain to be seriously deficient in unity on the psychological level. Without abandoning their original brief completely, Coello and Rojas could not coherently develop the heroic characters of Vélez's Juan Lorenzo and Leonor. Nevertheless, Coello, as author of Act II, ought at least to have attempted to establish some psychological connection between his presentation of Leonor and Juan and Vélez's treatment of them in the previous act. Unfortunately, Coello made no such attempt. He simply disregarded the heroic Juan Lorenzo and Leonor created by Vélez and presented instead two notably unheroic individuals. As a result, it is impossible to accept Leonor and Juan in Coello's act as the same characters who figured in Act I.

Since Coello delays considerably the entrance of Juan Lorenzo in Act II, our first impression of disunity on the psychological level is produced by Leonor, who makes an earlier appearance. Let us continue, then, by considering Coello's Leonor.

In the final scene of Act I Vélez has led us to expect a highly dramatic abduction scene in Act II; a scene of epic conflict between the courageous Leonor and the tyrannical King Fernando, ending in the triumph of tyranny over virtue.[19] Obviously, Coello, committed to creating a much less courageous

Leonor, cannot give us the type of abduction scene for which Vélez has prepared us. For the sake of the exterior unity of the drama, however, he should certainly have begun his act with some form of abduction scene. Also, he could have used such a scene to promote the interior unity of the play, for in it he could have motivated to some extent the extreme change in Leonor from courage to timidity. As it is, Coello disrupts both the exterior and the interior unity of the dramatic action by failing altogether to dramatize the abduction of Leonor. When Coello's act begins, the King has already accomplished both Leonor's abduction and the annulment of her marriage to Juan; when Leonor first appears in Act II she appears as Fernando's queen. What is more, we discover her character to be as new as her status. Gone all at once is the fearless Leonor of Act I, who eloquently proclaimed her ability to resist the King's will and power. In her place there is an extremely timid woman who does not dare to say a word against the King openly and who confesses sadly in a brief aside: ". . . temo al rey su fiereza" (p. 595a).

Rojas was evidently dissatisfied by Coello's failure to dramatize Leonor's abduction by the King or to motivate in any other way the change in her personality; for he includes in his third act a tense interview between Leonor and Fernando in which Leonor refers back to the time of her abduction. She mentions her feelings then and compares them to her attitude now, attempting to explain why her initial outrage has become resignation. Rojas also strives to bridge the psychological gap between Coello's Leonor and the Leonor of Vélez's act by giving her in his third act a personality which, though mainly passive and unheroic, displays occasional flashes of spirit. For instance, in the interview with Fernando which I have just mentioned, Leonor begins by being loving, almost obsequious in her manner towards the King, her husband. When, however, he hardly deigns to answer her, and she becomes increasingly aware that he is already tired of her, then in her anger she dares to call Fernando to his face: "Cruel, tirano poderoso, / ingrato, desleal" (p. 598b). Unfortunately, Rojas' efforts come too late in the drama to have the desired effect. Indeed, they actually cause a further disintegration in Leonor's character in the play as a whole. Rojas' Leonor, neither conspicuously heroic like Leonor in Act I, nor exceptionally timid like Leonor in Act II, seems to be yet another different person.

Unlike Leonor, Juan Lorenzo undergoes only one change in personality in the course of the play. Coello's Juan Lorenzo is a strikingly different individual from Vélez's character; but, at least, Rojas' Juan Lorenzo impresses us as essentially the same human being to whom Coello introduced us. Nevertheless, because Juan is the hero of the play, the two different Juans disrupt the interior unity of the drama even more than the three Leonors.

The delayed appearance of Juan Lorenzo in Coello's second act allows for a splendid build-up of suspense. While Fernando makes it known to his nobles that Leonor is now his wife, we wait with growing interest for the arrival of the

unsuspecting Juan Lorenzo. He makes a dramatic entry at the point when the nobles are swearing allegiance to their new Queen Leonor. Vélez's characterization of Juan has primed us to expect a violent and defiant reaction from the hero at this moment. However, there is neither violence nor defiance from Coello's Juan. Instead, he shows first helpless disbelief, then impotent anguish; and, submissive to the King's command, pays homage to Queen Leonor. Juan's behaviour in the scene that follows, the last scene of Coello's act, is equally impossible to reconcile with the character created by Vélez in Act I. In this final scene, the Infanta of Aragon and Fernando's brother, the Maestre de Avís, learn from Juan of the King's marriage to Leonor. Both the Infanta and the Maestre also feel that the King has offended their honour by his marriage; for Fernando had promised to marry the Infanta, and the Maestre in good faith had brought her to Portugal to be Fernando's queen. Their reaction to dishonour, however, is in marked contrast to that of Juan. Both threaten violent revenge upon the King. The Infanta of Aragon goes so far as to promise to wage war upon Fernando and Portugal. Moreover, she and the Maestre urge Juan to join forces with them; they urge him to fight against the King who has so cruelly dishonoured him. Vélez's rebellious hero would have allied himself with them forthwith. Coello's Juan Lorenzo is a different human being. Vulnerable and irresolute, he is incapable of rebellion and can see no solution other than his own death.

In his third act Rojas not only logically continues, he also deepens considerably, the vulnerable personality created for Juan Lorenzo by Coello. Coello's Juan Lorenzo has the makings of an interesting dramatic character, and Rojas admirably fulfils that potentiality. Inevitably, however, in the process Rojas widens still further the psychological gulf between Vélez's hero and the Juan Lorenzo of the rest of the drama.

The exceptional care taken by Rojas in presenting Juan's personality is understandable in view of the peculiar form of self-destruction in store for Juan at the end of Act III. If Juan's death from the anguish of his own dishonour is not to seem unacceptable, but, on the contrary, logical and inevitable, then it must be extremely well motivated; and exterior means of motivation will clearly not be enough. The audience must be allowed to penetrate into the interior of Juan's mind so that it is persuaded in advance of how Juan will react when the King forces him to marry Leonor. Rojas does not neglect exterior means of motivation, but he rightly concentrates on explaining Juan's death by revealing Juan's character.

In two vivid scenes we are shown aspects of Juan's disposition which will make the manner of his death acceptable to us. First, there is the scene in which the King tells Juan Lorenzo of the strange apparition, in the form of Juan Lorenzo, "vivo cuerpo en sombra muerta," which has been disturbing his peace of mind. In his response, Juan reveals that he truly believes in the ghost that the King has seen. He refuses to dismiss it as a figment of Fernando's

imagination. He maintains firmly that in depriving him of honour the King has deprived him of the inner spark necessary to keep him alive. This belief expressed by Juan encourages us to believe likewise that he is doomed to die. The same scene emphasizes another important quality of Juan Lorenzo. The King, infuriated by Juan's declared conviction that affronts can kill, attacks Juan with a dagger. But, even at this moment of extreme danger Juan is unable to offer any resistance to his King. Only the intervention of Leonor prevents the King from murdering his submissive vassal.

The key scene between Juan and Leonor which immediately follows Fernando's murderous attack is used by Rojas to illuminate two further aspects of his hero's mentality. We are able clearly to observe that Juan is temperamentally unable to restore his honour in the way chosen, for example, by Gutierre in Calderón's *El médico de su honra.* Juan is alone with Leonor. He could kill her and so revive his honour at a stroke. But it does not occur to him to harm her. On the contrary, his feelings for her are entirely of love and longing. In this same scene we also discover Juan's attitude to the possibility of remarriage between himself and Leonor. Juan suspects that the King is about to repudiate Leonor. He declares, however, that, much as he still loves her, for his honour's sake he could not take her back. Ironically, when Juan expresses this sentiment he is unaware that the King has already decided to compel him to take back Leonor as his wife.

In the final scene, when the King in fact orders Juan to accept Leonor in marriage, Juan does not immediately obey. Tension builds up as Juan tries to reason with Fernando, then pleads with him. With momentary courage born of desperation he threatens to defy the King. In his anguish Juan even draws his sword against Leonor. But Rojas has prepared the audience well. We know that Juan is incapable of hurting Leonor; we know that he is incapable of disobeying the King's order; as surely as we know that the instant he accepts Leonor's hand will be the instant of his death.

Undoubtedly, Rojas has created in Act III a highly convincing tragic hero. Consciously adopting a limited perspective that excludes Vélez's first act of the play, we can accept Juan's peculiar death as the inevitable consequence of his individual human nature. We are moved to feel a profound sense of waste that a basically good, though weak man should die while the evil King Fernando should survive unpunished. Juan's death even arouses in us a kind of admiration; for, as the King himself grudgingly recognizes at the end, Juan projects a curious sense of honour by dying from the anguish of his dishonour.[20] Unhappily, of course, if we view Juan's peculiar death within the context of the play as a whole, that is, if we take into consideration the resolute and defiant character of Juan Lorenzo in Vélez's first act, then Rojas' careful motivation of Juan's fate loses much of its effect. We cease to appreciate the tragedy of Juan's death and are struck instead by its absurdity.

Of the three main characters of *También la afrenta es veneno,* only the King has been endowed by Vélez with the appropriate personality for his role in the rest of the work. Both Coello and Rojas re-create conscientiously the unbalanced egoism and sadistic urges which Fernando displays in Act I. In consequence, it can at least be said that the King retains substantially the same personality throughout the three acts of the drama.

Coello excellently conveys Fernando's abnormally cruel and egoistic nature in the scene in which Juan discovers that Leonor is no longer his wife. Fernando takes obvious delight in revealing to his unsuspecting vassal in the most public and spectacular fashion, in the throne room, before the highest nobles in the land, that Leonor is now, as crowned Queen of Portugal, entirely the King's possession. Fernando's cruel treatment of Juan heightens in intensity at the end of this scene. The King avoids a confrontation with his brother, the Maestre, and the Infanta of Aragon by withdrawing just before their arrival. However, he orders Juan to remain and inform them that the marriage arranged between the Infanta and the King cannot now take place. That is, Fernando imposes upon Juan the cruel task of personally explaining his dishonour to the only two people at court as yet ignorant of his shame. We are permitted to witness, in the scene that follows, the additional anguish which this task occasions Juan. The Maestre, on entering, greets him with the unconsciously hurtful words: "Juan Lorenzo, honor de Acuña, / gloria ilustre portuguesa . . ." (p. 595b). Also, puzzled that they have not been properly received at the palace, both the Maestre and the Infanta assail Juan with rapid questions. The unhappy hero is conspicuously slow to respond, and when he does manage to speak out displays a desperate reluctance to give a full explanation.

Rojas gives forceful dramatic emphasis to the pathological nature of Fernando's egoism and cruelty. For example, Fernando does not gradually tire of Leonor in Rojas' act; he tires of her in an extremely abrupt and repugnant fashion. When he appears onstage at the beginning of the act, Fernando has just risen from his marriage bed, where he has enjoyed Leonor's body for the first time. It is still not even dawn. Yet, as he reveals to the horrified Don Vasco, he is already determined to repudiate Leonor and to return her to Juan Lorenzo (pp. 596c-97b). Later in the act, first Vasco and, after him, Claudio visit Juan at his house. Each of these two noblemen is in turn so filled with compassion for Juan that neither of them can bring himself to warn him of the King's dreadful intention. The compassion of Vasco and Claudio serves to throw the King's behaviour in the final scene into striking relief; for when Juan is shown into his presence, Fernando without any hesitation or any sign of pity orders Juan to take Leonor back as his wife.

Rojas' portrayal of the pathological King Fernando is in some degree reminiscent of his characterization of Berenguel in *El Caín de Cataluña.* In this play Rojas succeeded in making Berenguel a credible human being, despite

his patently abnormal personality, by giving him a conscience of sorts. Rojas also gives Fernando a conscience of sorts, one which is as abnormal as the rest of his personality. Fernando's conscience does not work in a normal, interior way, but exteriorizes itself in the form of a ghost visible to nobody except the King. It is the ghost of a man not yet dead, Juan Lorenzo's spirit, which warns Fernando that "también la afrenta es veneno."

Rojas' treatment of the ghost in Act III is excellent in many respects. Nevertheless, he commits a serious error by beginning his act with a scene between Fernando and the ghost of Juan Lorenzo. Such an introduction may theatrically speaking be very effective; but by beginning his act in this way Rojas presents a situation before he has given us the information necessary to interpret it correctly. It is not until the second scene of the act, in an interview between Fernando and Don Vasco, that we learn that the King is proposing to repudiate Leonor and remarry her to Juan Lorenzo; thus we realize that the ghost seen by the King is to be interpreted in the light of this guilty intention. At first, lacking information to the contrary, we assume that Rojas is using the ghost to suggest that the King has a bad conscience on account of evil deeds already perpetrated, to indicate, in fact, that Fernando feels remorse because he cruelly destroyed Juan's marriage and took Leonor by force for his own wife. Since the King has shown no signs of conscience in this regard at any previous point in the play, we begin to believe, of course wrongly, that Rojas is set to characterize the King in a fashion that is not consistent with his personality in the other two acts. This is a pity. It means that Fernando's essential coherence as a character in the drama as a whole does not help to diminish the very strong impression of psychological incoherence conveyed by Juan Lorenzo and Leonor in the way that it might otherwise have done. In other words, Rojas' failure to direct his audience adequately at the start of Act III makes the play appear even more disunified in the interior reaches than in fact it is.

Although the collaborators fail to unite their work satisfactorily in psychological respects, at least it can be said that they achieve in general a commendable degree of unity in the more external dimensions of structure and action.

The important meeting between monarch and vassal in Coello's Act II well illustrates his technique used in exterior dimensions. In this scene Coello uses verbal and even visual parallels to remind us of Juan's previous interview with the King in the final scene of Act I, and in the process tidily links Acts I and II together. For example, when Juan stands shocked before Leonor, now enthroned as Queen of Portugal, the King asks him the same callous question which he put to Juan in the preceding act when Juan stood shocked before his wife's portrait: "¿Qué os ha suspendido?" (p. 595a). Also, Coello consciously draws a close parallel between Leonor's portrait in Vélez's scene and Leonor in person in his own scene. As Juan stands before Leonor in the flesh in Act II, the King tells him to regard Leonor as a holy image or statue which Juan must

now revere and may no longer touch. And, indeed, enthroned in royal splendour, scarcely moving, hardly daring to speak, Leonor seems to us, the audience, more like a portrait or statue than a human being.

Rojas employs essentially the same technique as Coello to link his act in external ways to other parts of the play. For instance, in her interview with the King in Rojas' third act, Leonor makes use of certain words and phrases which are designed to remind us of Leonor's important scene with Juan Lorenzo in Vélez's first act of the drama. In Vélez's scene, Leonor describes herself as "esta roca opuesta al mar" (p. 587c), in her attempt to convince Juan of her capacity to resist the King. In Rojas' scene Leonor resorts to this same metaphor of the "roca opuesta" (p. 598b), in an effort to persuade the King that she no longer has any feelings for Juan Lorenzo. Then, the endearments which Rojas' Leonor uses insincerely to Fernando: "Rey, señor, esposo, amante, / dueño, luz . . ." (p. 598b), vividly recall the sincere words of love which she addresses to Juan Lorenzo in Vélez's scene: "Señor, esposo, mi bien, / adorado dueño mío" (p. 588b).[21]

* * *

The serious lack of unity in the psychological reaches of *También la afrenta es veneno* is a characteristic defect of Golden Age plays written in collaboration. Serrallonga in *El catalán Serrallonga,* Felipa in *El monstruo de la fortuna,* and Juan Basilio in *El príncipe perseguido* are but a few of numerous protagonists from plays of collaboration. Like Juan Lorenzo, they undergo radical and unacceptable changes in personality in the course of each drama concerned. This type of defect appears to be partly the result of the collaborators' tastes in subject matter, and partly the consequence of their methods of joint composition. They evidently disliked dealing with frivolous or comic material and nearly always attempted the much more difficult task of collaborating to dramatize serious, even tragic, human situations. Also, in Golden Age teams of three, each playwright was exclusively responsible for one act and consequently had an excessive amount of freedom to develop his individual ideas, regardless of whether they were compatible with those of his colleagues.

In view of the high merit of Vélez's first act of *También la afrenta es veneno* and, too, the originality of Rojas' Act III, one cannot help regretting that Vélez and Rojas did not each compose an entirely individual dramatization of King Fernando's passion for Juan Lorenzo's wife. Nevertheless, one should not consider that Golden Age playwrights simply wasted time and effort when they collaborated in plays like *También la afrenta es veneno.* There is good reason to believe that playwrights such as Rojas developed and improved their dramatic technique by collaborating with writers like Vélez and Calderón.[22] Of course, Rojas was a young dramatist at a formative stage in his

career when he began to collaborate with Vélez in the early 1630s. Vélez by then was in the last years of his long career. In his case, therefore, it is more difficult to argue that he derived any positive artistic benefit from collaborating. However, it is significant that in several of the acts which he wrote as collaborator, Vélez achieved a higher dramatic quality than he managed to accomplish in the majority of his individual dramas. If Vélez had been born like Rojas in 1607, instead of 1579, and had therefore collaborated at a much earlier stage in his life, perhaps he would more consistently have fulfilled his true potentiality as a dramatist.[23]

Notes

[1] Among the few plays in collaboration which can be definitely dated before 1630 is *Algunas hazañas de las muchas de Don García Hurtado de Mendoza, marqués de Cañete,* composed in 1622 by nine playwrights, one of whom was Luis Vélez de Guevara.

[2] See Forrest Eugene Spencer and Rudolph Schevill, *The Dramatic Works of Luis Vélez de Guevara: Their Plots, Sources, and Bibliography* (Berkeley, 1937), pp. xxii-xxiii.

[3] See, for example, Ramón de Mesonero Romanos, ed., *Dramáticos contemporáneos de Lope de Vega,* BAE, Vol. 45 (Madrid, 1858), p. xvii: ". . . Vélez de Guevara, que sabía inventar un argumento, desplegarle y conducirle diestramente en la escena, era por manera irresoluto, débil y poco acertado en los desenlaces. . . ."

[4] For a detailed analysis of *La Luna africana* see María Soledad Carrasco Urgoiti, "En torno a *La Luna africana,* comedia de nueve ingenios," *PSA,* 32, No. 96 (1964), 255-98. Vélez's coauthors in *Enfermar con el remedio* were Calderón and Jerónimo de Cáncer y Velasco.

[5] There exists an unpublished critical and annotated edition of *También tiene el sol menguante,* the doctoral thesis of James Stone Rambo, University of New Mexico 1971.

[6] There is an unpublished M.A. thesis by Charles F. Kirk, "A Critical Edition, with Introduction and Notes, of Vélez de Guevara's Act I of *La Baltasara,*" Ohio State University 1940. For an analysis of *El catalán Serrallonga* see J. Givanel Mas, "Observaciones sugeridas por la lectura del drama de Coello, Rojas y Vélez: *El catalán Serrallonga y vandos de Barcelona,*" *Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona,* 18 (1945), 159-92.

[7] *Comedias Escogidas de Don Francisco de Rojas Zorrilla,* ed. Ramón de Mesonero Romanos, BAE, Vol. 54 (Madrid, 1861), p. 581b.

[8] Mesonero Romanos includes *También la afrenta es veneno* in *Comedias Escogidas de Don Francisco de Rojas Zorrilla,* cited in the previous note, pp. 585-602. All references are to this edition.

9 See Juan de Mariana, *Historia general de España,* BAE, Vols. 30-31 (Madrid, 1854), especially 30:512-13, 522-23; 31:10-12.

10 See *Epítome de las historias portuguesas* (Madrid, 1628), ch. x, pp. 431-43; and compare *También la afrenta es veneno,* Act I, p. 585, Act II, p. 593. Critics are generally agreed that Vélez's famous drama *Reinar después de morir* is a late work. The references to Inés de Castro in the collaboration play might perhaps indicate that Vélez's masterpiece was composed as late in his career as was *También la afrenta es veneno*; namely, in the 1630s.

11 Courtney Bruerton does not believe that the play is by Castro–"The Chronology of the *Comedias* of Guillén de Castro," *HR,* 12 (1944), 89-151; see pp. 134-35, 151.

12 See *Obras de Don Guillén de Castro y Bellvís,* ed. by E. Juliá Martínez (Madrid, 1925), I, 277.

13 See p. 586, especially Juan's speech, beginning: "Señor es ésta mi casa, / y cuando a estas horas vengo / de hablar vuestros secretarios . . ."

14 See Juan's speech on p. 588b, beginning: "Ni esto se puede tampoco / sufrir. . . ."

15 See p. 588, especially the lines:

> Que me mate, que me dé
> ponzoña, que del acero
> invencible que traéis
> me pase de parte a parte
> el pecho, donde se ve
> vuestro retrato por alma
> y toda mi vida en él,
> habiendo hecho primero
> en la vuestra, que adoré
> el mismo mortal estrago,
> resuelta, honrada y cruel.

16 M. G. Profeti comments briefly, but interestingly, on the unsuitably heroic character of Vélez's Leonor: "la Leonor di Vélez si mostra tanto sicura della propria forza d'animo e della propria dignità, tanto risoluta nel suo amore, che è difficile immaginarla arrendevole ai desideri del re"–"Note critiche sull'opera di Vélez de Guevara," *Miscellanea di Studi Ispanici,* 10 (Pisa, 1965), pp. 81-82.

17 I am preparing a lengthy study of plays written in collaboration, and therefore have read many such dramas. Most Golden Age joint compositions are far from being well unified on the levels of theme and characterization. In nearly every case, however, they display a remarkable degree of unity in style and plot structure. It follows that most playwrights engaged in collaboration must have used a process which gave them ample opportunity to establish careful stylistic and formal links between their own particular portion of a drama and the sections composed by their partners. In other words, they must normally have employed what I have termed a "chain method of composing." For a close analysis of a typical product of dramatic collaboration in the 1630s see my article: "Examen de *El monstruo de la fortuna*: Comedia compuesta por Calderón (I),

Pérez de Montalbán (II) y Rojas Zorrilla (III)," *Hacia Calderón. Tercer Coloquio Anglogermano. Londres 1973* (Berlin–New York, 1976), pp. 110-25. For further comments on the Golden Age practice of collaborating see my chapter on "The School of Calderón," forthcoming in *Das spanische Theater*, ed. Klaus Pörtl (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt).

18 See A. Cubillo de Aragón, *El enano de las musas* (Madrid, 1654), p. 390. For more evidence see also the closing lines of *La Luna africana*. These lines take the form of a "Memoria de los ingenios que se juntaron a hacer esta comedia," written by Pedro Rosete Niño. Rosete conveys vividly the fact that the nine *ingenios* who collaborated in *La Luna africana* did not really compose together, but rather one after the other: ". . . el primero / Luis de Belmonte; tras él / Luis Vélez, el afamado; / luego don Juan Vélez fue / quien acabó la primera [jornada] ," etc. The full text of Rosete's "Memoria" is quoted by María Soledad Carrasco Urgoiti, pp. 258-59.

19 See p. 591, especially the King's speech, beginning: "Juan Lorenzo, estáis casado / con invencible mujer; / nada tenéis que temer, / aunque en trance tan terrible / mi amor es más invencible, / pues no le puedo vencer."

20 See p. 602c: "Y a *tí*, honor de Portugal, / escríbate en bronce el tiempo, / y para eterna memoria / queda en láminas impreso, / con el buril del dolor / *También la afrenta es veneno.*"

21 Compare Act I, pp. 587-88, with Act III, p. 598.

22 In his definitive study of Rojas' tragedies, Raymond R. MacCurdy expresses the opinion that "Rojas learned much of his craftsmanship from Calderón, as from Vélez"– *Francisco de Rojas Zorrilla and the Tragedy* (Albuquerque, 1958), p. 2.

23 I am much indebted to Ivy L. McClelland, Senior Research Fellow of the University of Glasgow, Scotland, for her comments on the original draft of this paper.