



Manuscripts Attributed to Moreto in the Biblioteca Nacional

Ruth Lee Kennedy

Hispanic Review, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Oct., 1936), 312-332.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0018-2176%28193610%294%3A4%3C312%3AMATMIT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-P>

Hispanic Review is currently published by University of Pennsylvania Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/upenn.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MANUSCRIPTS ATTRIBUTED TO MORETO IN THE BIBLIOTECA NACIONAL¹

AS one reads the manuscripts attributed to Moreto in the Biblioteca Nacional and collates them with early printed editions, it becomes only too evident how evil were the days on which the theatre fell after Philip IV's death.² The scissors and paste were ever at hand. Lines were clipped here or added there;³ a minor character is awkwardly eliminated or a sub-plot bodily removed;⁴ a scene of action is converted into an expository statement or else developed from one⁵—all according to the demands of the moment.

¹ These studies are by way of supplement to a previous one, *The Dramatic Art of Moreto* (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, XIII, Oct., 1931–July, 1932, Northampton, Mass.). At the time I was working on Moreto, it was impossible for me to see all the manuscripts. Photostats of those which I had reason to think different from the printed editions were ordered, but unfortunately even those arrived too late to be of any use to me in the preparation of that work. I have since that time been able to examine all manuscripts in the Nacional (as well as those of importance in the Municipal) and to collate them with the early printed texts. The information acquired will be found embodied in this article and in one recently published in the *Hispanic Review* (1935, III, 295–316): *Concerning Seven Manuscripts Linked with Moreto's Name*.

I take pleasure in expressing here my gratitude to Sr. Artigas and to Sr. Paz of the Nacional, as well as to Sr. Machado of the Municipal. Without their splendid coöperation and their unflinching courtesy, these studies would have been impossible.

² The theatres were closed from Sept. 17, 1665 until May 2, 1667. The dated manuscripts attributed to Moreto in the Nacional, with the exception of *El parecido en la corte* (1652) and *El príncipe perseguido* (1645), belong to the years 1668, 1669, 1670, 1671, 1677, 1678, 1680, 1686, 1689, 1691, 1698, 1700. Those undated appear likewise to be late seventeenth or early eighteenth.

³ See below: *Amor y obligación* (p. 328), *En el mayor imposible nadie pierda la esperanza* (p. 317), *El esclavo de su hijo* (p. 329), *La gran casa de Meca* (p. 321), *El parecido* (p. 324), *La princesa de los montes* (p. 326), *Los siete durmientes* (p. 329).

⁴ See *La gran casa de Meca* (p. 321) and *El parecido* (p. 324), of this study, as well as *La milagrosa elección de San Pio V* (*The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, p. 135, n. 9) and *La renegada de Valladolid* (W. A. Kincaid, *Life and Works of Belmonte Bermúdez*, *Revue Hisp.*, 1928, LXXIV, 129–33),—all examples of plays in which one or more characters has been crudely removed. I now suspect that the loss of the *gracioso*, Vicente, in Acts II and III of *La confusión de un jardín* may have a similar explanation. See *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 142–3.

In *La ocasión hace al ladrón* (1666), Matos has eliminated the sub-plot of Tirso's *La villana de Vallecas*, cutting the play from 3945 lines to 2862. Of the lines left in Matos' work, probably more than 60% are Tirso's.

⁵ See *La gran casa de Meca*, p. 321.

One finds on these manuscripts such expressions as: "Es la buena," "Diferente de la impresa," "Mejor que la impresa," etc. And having made such trifling changes as those indicated, these revisers frequently changed the name of the play as well as the final lines, and either brazenly claimed it as their own or else, if in a modest frame of mind, attributed it to some dramatist who could not or would not protest. In instances where the changes were easy to make, the *autor de comedias* or some member of his company⁶ evidently made them; in other instances the dramatists of the day lent themselves to the plan. Matos' *La ocasión hace al ladrón* is proof of that.⁷ In still other instances, the various editors of the *Escogidas* series and of other collections made at the time, were undoubtedly *particeps criminis*⁸ to the many faulty attributions as well as the changes in title and in final lines that usually accompanied such piracy.⁹ Thus hack-writer, theatrical manager, and editor all com-

⁶ Alonso de Olmedo, it should be remembered, was author of several *entremeses* and *bailes*, and Carlos Vallejo wrote a play, *Las murallas del Casal*. See A. Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, Madrid, 1899, pp. 344 and 697. Both were at one time or another with young Manuel Vallejo, who headed one of the two companies that performed in Madrid after the theatres reopened in 1667. See Rennert, *The Spanish Stage*, pp. 541-542, 615.

⁷ Matos was undoubtedly one of the worst offenders, though the extent of his plagiarism is as yet problematical. If one runs through Paz y Melia's *Catálogo*, one is struck by the frequency of the scholar's interrogation "¿De mano de Matos Fragoso?," which, in twenty or thirty cases, is found beneath titles attributed to others. I have compared with Matos' autographs the handwriting of those manuscripts attributed to Moreto which bear this question (*Industrias contra finezas* and *La cena de Baltasar*, neither of which was published until after Moreto's death), and to one who is not a handwriting expert, they certainly appear to be in Matos' hand. A thorough study of this dramatist's theatre would, I think, throw much light on the dramatic history of the period. Lanini is particularly suspect also.

⁸ For instance Antonio Zafra's *Tercera parte de comedias de . . . Moreto* (Madrid, 1681) is utterly unreliable. Zafra did nothing but gather up the inaccurately printed plays of the *Escogidas* and reprint them with changed titles. All had previously appeared in that series except *La confusión de un jardín* and *La traición vengada*. The latter, according to Cotarelo (*Bibl. de Moreto*, Madrid, 1927, p. 43) is Lope's *Tanto hagas cuanto pagues* and has also been printed under Jacinto Cordero's name as *No hay plazo que no llegue ni deuda que no se pague*. Only two of the twelve, *La confusión de un jardín* and *Los más dichosos hermanos* (*Los siete durmientes*) could be Moreto's, and neither of these is entirely characteristic. See *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 142-143, 157-158.

⁹ All plays ascribed to Moreto in the *Escogidas* series after *Parte XXIV* should be scrutinized with the greatest care. This whole point is one which I have developed at some length in my notes; space, however, does not admit its further elaboration here.

bined to produce the confusion that so perplexes the student of seventeenth century drama.¹⁰

LA CAUTELA EN LA AMISTAD (*Cautelas son amistades, Lo que merece un soldado*)

MERECER PARA ALCANZAR (*La fortuna merecida*)

EMPEZAR A SER AMIGOS (*Hacer del contrario amigo*)¹¹

It seems well to treat these three plays together, partly because their histories are so similar, partly because one's decision as to their authenticity involves the question as to whether or not Moreto served a Lopean apprenticeship¹² in his early youth.

Comedias with the names *Cautelas son amistades*, *Merecer para alcanzar*, and *Empezar a ser amigos* may all be linked with the decade of the thirties. Juan Martínez represented before the King a drama of the first title on September 13, 1635;¹³ Bartolomé Romero played one entitled *Merecer para alcanzar* before Philip IV on December 8, 1637;¹⁴ and Quiñones de Benavente in his *Loa de Rueda y Ascanio* (1637-'38) lists a play of the third title.¹⁵

Now these three plays were all printed in various collections under Moreto's name. *Cautelas son amistades* became *Lo que merece un soldado* when included in 1650 in the very inaccurate *Parte XLIII de diferentes autores*;¹⁶ *Merecer para alcanzar* appeared under this title in 1678 in the *Parte XLIII* of the *Escogidas*;¹⁷ and *Empezar a ser amigos*, which likewise retained its name, was pub-

¹⁰ There is of course every reason to think that throughout the seventeenth century plays were being altered constantly. In this regard one recalls Lope's various complaints. Moreover, before this epoch titles had been changed and plays incorrectly attributed. But there can be no question but what conditions grew much worse at this time.

¹¹ See *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 124-125, 132, 147-148, for respective studies of these three plays.

¹² See *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 23-25. Here, after outlining the facts that favor such a theory, I concluded: "For myself, however, I must after due deliberation reject the idea of a Lopean apprenticeship . . ."

¹³ See Rennert, *Notes on the Chronology of the Spanish Drama*, *Modern Language Review*, 1907, II, 335.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 47.

¹⁵ See Restori, *Piezas de títulos*, p. 123.

¹⁶ Juan de Ibarra, Zaragoza. Ibarra has wrongly attributed *El demonio en la mujer*, *El príncipe demonio*, *La más hidalga hermosura*, and *A un tiempo rey y vasallo*. The attribution of *Hacer cada uno lo que debe* to Cuéllar may likewise be called into doubt. See la Barrera, *Catálogo*, p. 686 and A. Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, pp. 9 and 224.

¹⁷ Antonio González de Reyes, Madrid.

lished in 1671 in *Parte XXXV*¹⁸ of the *Escogidas*. In 1681, Antonio de Zafra published the three in his *Tercera parte de Moreto*, changing their respective names to *La cautela en la amistad*, *La fortuna merecida*, and *Hazer del contrario amigo*. Except for slight variants, these have the same text as the several *Escogidas* editions.

And, finally, there is in the Biblioteca Nacional a late seventeenth century manuscript¹⁹ which includes these three plays under the same titles as those found in the Zafra edition and with but very slight variants from it.²⁰ These are all on the same paper and in the same copybook handwriting.²¹ The three are in my opinion taken indirectly from Antonio de Zafra's volume.

Internal evidence would place these *comedias* in the epoch of the thirties, rather than in the fifties or the seventies when they were first published. Moreover, it proclaims them all apochryphal in Moreto's theatre. They are poor in plot construction and repugnant in characterization. Of *La cautela en la amistad*, Schaeffer declares (after having pointed out its improbable and complicated plot): "Dem Stile des letztern [Moreto] entspricht es jedoch keineswegs, wohl aber der Schreibweise unsers Godínez in seiner spätern Periode."²² Of the second he has to say: "Auch *Merecer para alcanzar* weist keine Spur der Diction Moreto's auf, ebensowenig zeigt die Construction der Fabel seine Hand. Das Stück liest sich, als ob es gegen Ende der ersten Periode geschrieben wäre."²³ Of the third he wrote: "Geradezu unmöglich aber kann man sie für eine Schöpfung unsers Moreto halten, wenn man eine Anzahl seiner

¹⁸ Lucas Antonio de Bedmar, Madrid.

¹⁹ No. 18074.

²⁰ It is worthy of note that *Hazer del contrario amigo* has kept the spelling of Zafra's edition and that it carries within its final lines the phrase *empezar a ser amigos*.

I have also seen the manuscript (No. 17302) entitled *Merecer para alcanzar* in the Nacional and another *La fortuna merecida* (No. 1-30-13) which is to be found in the Biblioteca Municipal, and collated all manuscripts, as well as the two early texts, with all available *sueltas*. Except for unimportant variants, they are all the same.

²¹ The manuscript *Los hermanos encontrados* (*La princesa de los montes y satisfacer callando*), which has likewise been attributed to Moreto in both the *Escogidas* series and by Zafra (see p. 326 of this study), was manifestly copied at the same time and by the same copyist. It is today apart from the three and bears a separate number (No. 17199), but I suspect that it originally formed part of the same manuscript.

²² Schaeffer, *Geschichte*, I, 437.

²³ *Ibid.*, II, 169. Because of the versification (*romances*, 71%; *redondillas*, 21%) I feel sure it was revised, probably after 1667.

unzweifelhaft echten Comödien hintereinander studirt hat." ²⁴ Such conclusions were reached by Schaeffer without any knowledge on his part of the historical facts which link these plays with the decade of the thirties.

As the German critic has said, it is impossible for one who has read a number of plays that are unquestionably Moreto's to believe these the product of his pen. At the time I was studying Moreto's works, I declared against their authenticity; ²⁵ yet I did not definitely exclude them from his theatre, partly because I had not at that time seen all the manuscripts of these plays in Madrid and thought they might help to solve the situation, partly because I was still toying in my own mind with the idea of a period of apprenticeship when Moreto was following Lopean traditions. But I have restudied the whole problem and to concede this possibility is to concede that Moreto's sense of plot construction, of characterization, of humor, of style, even his ideals of life, were the diametric opposite of what they were to be a few years later (1645) ²⁶ when he was writing *El príncipe perseguido* with Belmonte and Martínez. This I cannot concede, especially of a dramatist whose chief characteristic is his methodical evenness of spirit. Moreover, reflective, even temperaments, such as Moreto's, seldom show great precocity; yet these plays were all written by the time Moreto was twenty.

In the case of *La cautela en la amistad*, there is reason to think the work is by Godínez since we have today a very old *suelta* attributed to him under the title *Cautelas son amistades*. Moreover, Medel ²⁷ lists a play *Los dos Carlos* (attributed to Godínez) which La Barrera concludes is the same, apparently because the two principal characters are both named Carlos. ²⁸ As I have pointed out previously, I do not feel that I know Godínez sufficiently well to assert that the work is his, but the characteristics are certainly those of his epoch rather than of Moreto's. As we have seen, Schaeffer felt that it was by Godínez, and this German critic was almost uncanny in such matters.

In the case of *Merecer para alcanzar* and *Empezar a ser amigos*, there is no such bit of historical evidence to help us find the author,

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 167.

²⁵ See *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 124, 132, 147-148.

²⁶ See W. A. Kincaid, *Life and Works of Belmonte Bermúdez*, p. 182, for this date.

²⁷ See *Indice, Revue Hisp.*, 1929, LXXV, 177.

²⁸ The title would be equally applicable to Mira de Amescua's *Examinarse de rey* (*Más vale fingir que amar*). See a résumé of the plot in Sr. Cotarelo's *Mira de Amescua y su teatro*, Madrid, 1931, p. 85.

but given the strong internal evidence against Moreto's paternity, given the fact that both of these plays existed in the thirties at a time when Moreto was only nineteen years of age; that one of them was considered sufficiently good to be presented before the King;²⁹ that neither of the plays was attributed to him until the seventies, a period in which, as we have said, *autor*, hackwriter, and printer combined to deceive the public; that later editions and manuscripts are of no significance whatsoever in this problem (since they all go back directly or indirectly to those of the *Escogidas*) and that their attribution to Moreto therefore rests entirely on the knowledge and good faith of the two printers of this collection: given these conditions, I have no hesitancy in excluding these plays from Moreto's theatre—and in so doing reject definitely for him the idea of a Lopean apprenticeship.

*EN EL MAYOR IMPOSIBLE NADIE PIERDA LA
ESPERANZA*

Schaeffer³⁰ stated that he possessed a copy of this play with the title *Nadie pierda la esperanza en el mayor imposible*, which, included in a collection of comedies published "around 1640," was attributed to Don Juan de Lemos. I have not seen the volume nor am I able to identify it.

The manuscript *Nadie pierda la esperanza* of the Biblioteca Nacional³¹ of Madrid bears only the name Lemus, not Juan de Lemus, as Sr. Cotarelo mistakenly asserts.³² However, the fact is of no importance either way since ink and handwriting clearly show it to be of much later date than the text, which belongs to the end of the seventeenth century according to Paz y Melia.³³

In Fajardo's index of comedies,³⁴ it is attributed both to Moreto and Juan de Lemus under the title *En el mayor imposible nadie pierda la esperanza*. In ascribing it to Juan de Lemus, Fajardo gives no additional information to substantiate his statement, though the word *impresas*, found in the title of his list, would indi-

²⁹ Even if we should grant that the young Moreto may have been trying out his dramatic wings at a time when he had barely finished his college course, it still seems improbable that he should have written a play which should be thought worthy of being performed in the presence of the King.

³⁰ *Geschichte*, II, 160.

³¹ No. 15564.

³² *Bibl.*, p. 26.

³³ *Catálogo*, p. 349.

³⁴ *Indice de todas las comedias impresas hasta 1716*, ms. 14706, p. 20v., Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid.

cate that he had seen a printed edition—probably the one which Schaeffer had in his possession some centuries later—and not the manuscript. But in attributing it to Moreto, he cites a *suelta* (by Juan Sanz, no doubt)³⁵ which he had seen in the bookstore of one León of Madrid. Medel gives it as Moreto's work with the title *En el mayor imposible nadie pierda la esperanza* and as Lemus' under the name *Nadie pierda la esperanza en el mayor imposible*.³⁶

Finally the *Romance del rey sin reino*,³⁷ written between 1667–1675, mentions the name of Lemus in this connection:

Al renegado del cielo
quiso Lemos imitar,
si *Luis Perez el gallego*
no le dice la verdad.

As the protagonist of the play in question renounces his priesthood in order to marry a certain Doña Ana, the reference is clearly to this same work.

The manuscript version, which Paz y Melia³⁸ declares to be of the last half of the seventeenth century, is much longer than the one reprinted by Fernández-Guerra³⁹ and was probably taken from the edition which Schaeffer possessed. Neither play is Moreto's work in my opinion. It is the easy thing to surmise, given this dramatist's plagiaristic tendencies, that he took the earlier form, reversed the title, truncated the longer speeches, and called it his own. Such was not his usual method of procedure, however, and especially with a play that is so far removed, not only from his ethical and religious ideals but also from his dramatic one.⁴⁰ It seems much more probable, given the fact that the cuts of the third act are so awkwardly made as to rob the play of coherence and that the date of the *Romance del rey sin reino* (1667–1675) would indicate that the name was before the public in those years, that a hack-writer of that period refashioned the play of Lemus, attributing it to Moreto, and that it was printed under his name in a *suelta* of that time.

³⁵ See Cotarelo, *Bibl.*, p. 26. This is the earliest printed edition which Sr. Cotarelo mentions.

³⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 180, 214.

³⁷ See Restori, *Piezas de títulos*, 1903, pp. 38, 41.

³⁸ See *Catálogo*, p. 349.

³⁹ *B. A. E.*, XXXIX, 623–637. This must have been taken from a *suelta*.

⁴⁰ See *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 126–128, for the strong internal evidence against Moreto's authorship.

The concluding lines of the manuscript would indicate that the original play was the work of an amateur, a friend or retainer of some noble named Don Manuel:

Y el autor la escribió a instancias
del mismo don Manuel . . .
.
y pues vemos que se casa
aunque cerquen imposibles,
nadie pierda la esperanza;
ni yo la quiero perder
de alcanzar perdón de faltas.

The poor structure and poorer characterization likewise reveal the unpractised hand. The Portuguese setting (and the author apparently possessed intimate knowledge of the city of Faro) would suggest a Portuguese author. Why then may it not be by Lemus,⁴¹ given the strong historical evidence which supports such a contention?

LA FUERZA DEL NATURAL⁴²

I have repeatedly examined *La fuerza del natural*,⁴³ which is merely the rôle of Julio made for one Francisco Correa in 1668, and I cannot find the heading "Comedia de Mattos (sic) y Cancer" which Paz y Melia includes in his description.⁴⁴ Perhaps an outer page has been lost. At any rate there is not today, so far as I know, a scrap of direct historical evidence to link this play with the name of Matos.

I am nevertheless convinced, because of the peculiarities of versification (triple *laissez* of romances without intervening metre, its lack of *redondillas*, and general paucity of metrical forms) that if Matos did not write the third act, he or some one else with similar dramatic methods altered it before it was printed in the *Escogidas* of 1661.⁴⁵ Its history would then be similar to *El parecido*'s.⁴⁶

⁴¹ Descended perhaps from Juan de Limos, *autor de comedias* in Madrid in 1583-84? See Rennert, *The Spanish Stage*, p. 504. Could the truncated version be by Matos Fragozo? At least he was Portuguese and the method of revision is entirely characteristic. See pp. 312n-313n of this study.

⁴² See *Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 132-3.

⁴³ No. 14612.⁹

⁴⁴ *Catálogo*, p. 206.

⁴⁵ *Parte XV*, Melchor Sánchez, Madrid.

⁴⁶ See below, p. 324.

LOS MÁRTIRES DE MADRID AND RELATED PLAYS ⁴⁷

Thoroughly trite in itself, *Los mártires de Madrid* affords in its various versions a complicated history that is an interesting commentary on the dramatic tastes and procedure of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is known under at least eight different titles and in its historical development it shows five clearly defined chronological stages.

Reduced to its composite elements, this is the life story of a man who has fled from Spain because he has killed another. So identical is he in appearance to the leader of the opposing squadrons that he is persuaded on the death of the latter to usurp his place at the court of the Sultan. When he eventually refuses to abjure either his religion or his beloved, the jealous Sultana cruelly orders that he be impaled, together with his father and his brother who are likewise prisoners. The loyal heroine usually dies of a broken heart, though in other versions she suffers impalement with him.

As I have shown in a previous study,⁴⁸ the first stage in the development of the theme is Lope's *Los mártires de Madrid*,⁴⁹ a disjointed play in which the above story (with a few variations) is but a long *romance* included in the third act.⁵⁰ The second stage is Monroy's (?) *Los tres soles de Madrid*⁵¹ (better known as *Dejar un reino por otro y mártires de Madrid*) which has dramatized this

⁴⁷ Sr. Cotarelo states (*Bibl.*, pp. 24-25) that there are in the Nacional three manuscripts of *Dejar un reino por otro* and three of *No hay reino como el de Dios*, though all bear the title *Los mártires de Madrid* or a variant form. I find only two of the first play (Nos. 16797 and 14814) and four of the latter (Nos. 17100, 16461, 15184, 18074).

⁴⁸ *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 185-186.

⁴⁹ For bibliographical details, see *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 125-126.

⁵⁰ I do not know the source of this story, but it sounds as if it were one of the pious tales scattered abroad in *pliegos de cordel*.

⁵¹ There is a *suelta*, *Los tres soles de Madrid*, attributed to Monroy (Viuda de Joseph de Orga, Valencia, 1761) which is virtually identical in text to the *Dejar un reino por otro y mártires de Madrid*, attributed to Cancer, Villaviciosa, and Moreto in the *Escogidas*, *Parte XLIV*, Roque Rico de Miranda, Madrid, 1678. It seems probable that this *suelta* is a reprint of one published during the first half of the seventeenth century, one now lost to us. Such a *suelta* could explain Medel's knowledge in 1725 of a play of this name attributed to Monroy (see *Indice*, p. 253) and could have served as a basis for the *suelta* of Valencia mentioned above. How else explain why a printer of that late date should attribute it to the relatively obscure Monroy y Silva? Moreover, as I have pointed out (*The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, p. 126), internal evidence shows that the version of the *Escogidas* cannot possibly be Moreto's, even though it is there ascribed to him under a different title. If this play in Monroy's, it was necessarily written before 1649 the year in which he died.

relato of Lope, fusing the life stories of the two brothers into one and creating another brother who is dramatically useless. In this version the three men—protagonist, father, and brother who bear the respective names of Enrique, Feliciano, and Ricardo—are impaled, and the heroine Flora, mistress to Enrique, dies of a broken heart. The third stage is *No hay reino como el de Dios*, a play supposedly written in collaboration by Cancer, Moreto, and Matos according to the final lines of Antonio Sanz' *suelta* of date 1730.⁵² In this version the names of the characters have been changed, the rôles of the father and brother eliminated completely, the comic vein increased, the mistress Flora converted into the faithful wife Leonor. Practically the whole interest here has been centered in the love story. In the end wife and husband are impaled.

The history of the play does not end here. There is in the Nacional a manuscript⁵³ which gives a very good idea of the literary patching that characterized the late Calderonian epoch. It concludes:⁵⁴

Embarcada esté tu alma
amén en *la Casa Grande*
de Meca, junto a Mahoma
para que con él descanses.
FEL. Y aquí la comedia acaba
donde tres plumas iguales
los *Mártires de Madrid* (tachado)
dejar un reino por otro
con granjería tan grande
de Madrid y sus tres mártires (tachado)
copiaron por ser historia
que refieren los anales.⁵⁵

On the front page it bears these words: *La comedia de la/ Gran Casa*

⁵² There is a manuscript of 1670 (No. 16461), a copy made by one Juan García de Iturrose in Lisbon for his *autor*, Jerónimo de Heredia. See Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, p. 314. This manuscript likewise attributes it to Matos, Cancer, and Moreto—and in the order named.

⁵³ No. 16797.

⁵⁴ See Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, p. 314.

⁵⁵ Cf. the lines found on the first page of Calderón's *El mayor monstruo los celos* (Ms. No. R. 79):

El mayor monstruo los celos
como la escribió el autor (tachado)
no como la imprimió el urto,
de quien es su estudio echar
a perder otros estudios.

See Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, p. 323.

de Meca/⁵⁶ Antonio de Granada y Banegas. This title, however, has been crossed out and below it, in another hand, is found: *Mártires de Madrid*.

The many erasures in this manuscript make evident that it is an original, but persistent search among the autograph manuscripts of the Biblioteca Nacional has not enabled me to place the handwriting. It is very similar to Matos Fragoso's, but I cannot quite convince myself that it is his. Nor have I been able to locate Antonio de Granada y Vanegas. As the name was written by the same hand as was the original title, I am inclined to think it the name of the hackwriter who made the changes. Finally, I cannot date it definitely; nevertheless, since it bears as a title (on the first page of the text as well as in the final lines) the words *Los mártires de Madrid y dejar un reino por otro*, it was probably made after 1678, the year when this play was, in so far as we know, first printed with that title.

Moreover, though the manuscript is in general based on that text—probably 60 percent or more of the lines are taken bodily from it—there are details which show that the reviser likewise had before him *No hay reino como el de Dios*. Here, as in Moreto's play, the mistress has been converted into the wife. One can see too that the scenes added in the first act of the manuscript⁵⁷ to the version of the *Escogidas* are primarily those which in *No hay reino como el de Dios* have been summarized in the long expository speech of honor:⁵⁸ Enrique, jealous of an imaginary rival, decides to put his wife to the test by pretending a trip to Alcalá. By chance Enrique's brother Ricardo comes to Madrid at this time and in the dark of the evening he is mistaken for the rival and killed. Hearing voices of the authorities, Enrique lets himself down by the balcony and flees. Flora, his wife, together with Feliciano, the father of Enrique, goes in search of him. There is also another scene in this version⁵⁹ which clearly is a reflection of one found in *No hay reino como el de Dios*.⁶⁰ Here Celín, fearing the wrath of the Sultan Amurates, should the latter learn of the death of his favorite Solimán, forces his prisoner to accept the rôle of the dead warrior.

⁵⁶ *Renegado, rey, y mártir*, attributed to Cristóbal de Morales, which has points in common with this theme as well as with *El esclavo de su hijo*, carries within its lines this title. See Fr. Leefdael's *suelta*, Sevilla, Act II, p. 19.

⁵⁷ I, 6r-13r.

⁵⁸ I, 3-4.

⁵⁹ I, 13r-17r.

⁶⁰ I, 9-11.

These are the changes in Act I. Those in Acts II and III are due either to the elimination of the character of Ricardo in the first or else to a cut in the length of long speeches, made necessary by the number of lines added to Act I. In this version as in *No hay reino como el de Dios*, Enrique and Flora are impaled. Feliciano together with the *gracioso* Pipote is given permission to return to Spain.⁶¹

The theme was, then, in its various steps: *Los mártires de Madrid* (Lope); *Los tres soles* (Monroy?); *No hay reino como el de Dios* (Cancer, Moreto, and Matos); *Dejar un reino por otro y mártires de Madrid* (with the same text as *Los tres soles* but ascribed to Cancer, Villaviciosa, and Moreto);⁶² *La gran Casa de Meca* (Antonio Granada y Vanegas?).

But even with this, its history is not ended. In the Biblioteca Municipal there are five manuscript copies and two printed ones of *No hay reino como el de Dios* (1-53-1) carrying different dates of 1772, 1774, 1780, 1795. They show an amazing diversity in titles: (1) *Dejar un reino por otro y cautivos de Madrid*; (2) *El parecido de Túñiz*; ⁶³ (3) *No hay reino como el de Dios y mártires de Madrid*; (4) *La dicha por la desgracia y parecido de Túñiz*. Irrefutable proof of the bad taste of the epoch may be found in one of these: "Esta comedia . . . se hizo el día ocho de enero [de 1795], duró trece días y se ganó con ella."

Such was the amazing vitality of this most mediocre play.⁶⁴

⁶¹ The manuscript (No. 14184) entitled *Los mártires de Madrid*, and dated 1705, is likewise a form of *Dejar un reino por otro y mártires de Madrid*, but with a great many variants. It is interesting to note that the name of Flora is frequently marked out and Leonor put in its places, proof surely that the copyist knew Moreto's play.

⁶² It has been ascribed to Moreto alone in an undated *suelta* by Juan López, Murcia. See the Ticknor Library, D173.10, Vol. I.

⁶³ One finds that it was played in Barcelona nine times under this title. See A. Par, *Representaciones teatrales en Barcelona durante el siglo XVIII*, *Bol. de la R. A. E.*, 1929, XVI, 326-346, 492-513, 594-614. In Cotarelo's *Isidoro Máiquez y el teatro de su tiempo* (Madrid, 1902) one finds a *Parecido de Túñiz* which was given three times.

⁶⁴ There is in the Nacional a late eighteenth-century manuscript (No. 15455) entitled *El parecido de Constantinopla y Mejor sol de Madrid* which I have not seen. See Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, p. 389. Both the title and the names of two characters indicated there (Enrique and Amurates) suggest that it is another name for this same play. Nor have I seen Mira de Amescua's *El mártir de Madrid*, but the summary given by Sr. Cotarelo (*Mira de Amescua y su teatro*, pp. 111-115) as well as his comment ("este tema dramático tuvo bastante fortuna, pues lo comenzó Lope de Vega en su comedia *Los mártires de Madrid* . . .") would indicate that it was related to the theme.

EL PARECIDO AND *EL PARECIDO EN LA CORTE*

Fernández-Guerra⁶⁵ assumed that *El parecido en la corte* was Moreto's own revision of *El parecido*. The chronology is incorrect,⁶⁶ and *El parecido* is not, in my opinion, Moreto's work.

As this same critic has pointed out, there are in the Nacional five⁶⁷ manuscripts of *El parecido en la corte*, all with the shortened title *El parecido*. Of one of these,⁶⁸ La Barrera wrote: "tiene todas las apariencias de autógrafo." Fernández-Guerra declared: "Tengo a la vista cinco manuscritos (entre ellos el autógrafo). . . ." I have examined this manuscript repeatedly and compared it with *El poder de la amistad* (1652) and the second act of *El príncipe perseguido* (1645)⁶⁹—both undoubtedly written in Moreto's own hand—and it is neither an autograph nor was any portion of it penned by Moreto.

It is an interesting manuscript, nevertheless, because it is a patched copy which represents the work of at least five copyists,⁷⁰ one whose various dates show it to have been in use from 1652–1686.⁷¹ There are *censuras* for the year 1669 on the fifth page of the third act (Avellaneda's and Sarassa's); and on the first, one reads: "Esta comedia es del Sr. Miguel de Escamilla de Yeste y Pavía." On the fifth page of Act I, the names of J. W. Luis de Robles and Antonio Escamilla are found.

One finds emendations throughout the manuscript made by the

⁶⁵ *B. A. E.*, XXXIX, p. xxxix.

⁶⁶ At the time I made my previous study of these two plays, I stated: "Fernández-Guerra, as well as Cotarelo and Schaeffer, take it for granted that *El parecido* is the primitive version; and while a comparison of the two texts leads me to believe that the chronology they have given is correct, I do not consider the conclusion inevitable." See *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, p. 188, n.

⁶⁷ No. 15492, which offers no special interest; No. 17362, which is dated Sept. 22, 1691 and which belonged to the actor, Juan García; No. 16589, which lacks the last two scenes and which belonged to Miguel de Castro, "autor de comedias por su Majestad"; No. 16605, which was the property of Damián López; No. 16423. The four first offer no interest; they are the same as the *B. A. E.* edition except for slight variants.

⁶⁸ No. 16423.

⁶⁹ Nos. V^a.-7-4 and R. 81.

⁷⁰ The work of those copyists is divided as follows: pp. 1–7; 8; 9–22 (in perhaps the same hand as 1–7); 23–31; 32–33 (part of the page); 33 (part of the page); 34–41 (in the same hand as 23–31).

⁷¹ On the third page of the second act one reads: "acto segundo del *parecido* de Moretto (sic), a trece de enero de 1652 años" and on the first page of the first act a year which has been altered so that it now reads "1686." There are likewise dates of 1669, 1670, and 1683 scattered through the pages, and it was represented in Madrid, in Sigüenza, and in Valencia.

ensor, the actors, etc., but as it finally stands, it is the same text as that included in the *B. A. E.*, with small variants. On the tenth page is found: "Áse de sacar desta comedia a don felis de Guzmán y don pedro de Luján, viejo." It was a suggestion that was never carried out in this particular manuscript, for as we have pointed out above, it is, except for slight variants, the same as the *B. A. E.* text of *El parecido en la corte*.

But if we compare *El parecido* with *El parecido en la corte*,⁷² we find that in the former these two characters have disappeared. Moreover, we see very definite traces of this cutting in Act I⁷³ of *El parecido*: Don Luis meets Don Fernando and confusing him with Don Lope de Luján, who has long been absent from Madrid, tells him that his father, Don Pedro de Luján, has just died, leaving him 80,000 ducats; but before anything has been said of the death, the *gracioso* Tacón asks without rhyme or reason, "¿Luego es muerto el viejo?" The reviser evidently took his hint from these five lines of *El parecido en la corte*:

Mirad que a tiempo venís
que vuestro padre don Pedro
ha heredado a vuestro tío
y tiene solo en dinero
más de ochenta mil escudos.⁷⁴

This revision was made before 1665, for *El parecido* was printed in 1665 under Moreto's name.⁷⁵ It is, of course, possible that the dramatist himself was asked to make these changes, but—given the awkward way in which it was done, Moreto's distance from Madrid, the conditions of the day, etc.—highly improbable. It is a fair guess that it was entrusted to some hack-writer or even to one of the actors.

The confusion or dishonesty of the printer in publishing the revision (rather than the original) as Moreto's explains Avellaneda's remark: "Vean esta comedia del *Parecido a otro de don Agustín Moreto*."⁷⁶ The censor knew the printed work attributed to Moreto.

⁷² See *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 188–190.

⁷³ Scene 2.

⁷⁴ *B. A. E.*, XXXIX, 313.

⁷⁵ *Escogidas, Parte XXIII*, Joseph Fernández de Buendía, Madrid, 1665. Calderón's *aprobación* of this volume is dated June 10th. *El parecido en la corte* for some inexplicable reason was not printed in a dated edition until 1741 (No. 96, Antonio Sanz, Madrid). However a *suelta* of Juan Sanz, who lived around the close of the seventeenth century (he died before 1729), is still in existence according to Cotarelo. See *Bibl.*, p. 34.

⁷⁶ III, p. 5.

LA PRINCESA DE LOS MONTES Y SATISFACER
CALLANDO

(Los hermanos encontrados)

In a previous study of this play, I pointed out the strong internal evidence against its attribution to Moreto.⁷⁷ Nevertheless I felt I could not definitely exclude it from his theatre without first having seen the three manuscripts of this play which are to be found in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid.⁷⁸ They are, as a matter of fact, of no importance, for two are copied from the edition of Antonio de Zafra and the third (No. 17006) is taken from the *Escogidas*' edition of 1671; ⁷⁹ they therefore in no way substantiate Moreto's claim to this comedia.

As early as 1653 the play had been published in the *Escogidas* ⁸⁰ under Lope's name. Here it was entitled *El satisfacer callando y princesa de los montes*. Given these historical facts, as well as the strong internal evidence against its attribution to Moreto, I no longer hesitate to remove it from his theatre. I agree with Sr. Cotarelo in thinking it is Lope's work.⁸¹

EL SANTO CRISTO DE CABRILLA

(El Cristo de los Milagros)

The history of this play is a repetition of *Cautelas son amistades*, *Merecer para alcanzar*, and *Empezar a ser amigos*, except that we must depend on internal rather than external evidence to link it with the late Lopean period.

In a previous study ⁸² I pointed out that the play was not characteristic of Moreto in its plot structure, situation, characterization,

⁷⁷ See *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, p. 134. "The absurd plot, the poor characterization, the weak rôle of the *gracioso*, the bellicose temperament of the heroine, preclude the possibility of its being the product of Moreto's pen. The verification would point in the same direction."

⁷⁸ Nos. 16623, 17199, and 17006. The last mentioned is named *Satisfacer callando*, the other two *Los hermanos encontrados*.

⁷⁹ *Parte XXXVII*, Melchor Alegre, Madrid, 1671.

⁸⁰ *Parte VI*, Herederos de Pedro Lanaja, Zaragoza, 1653.

⁸¹ See *Obras de Lope*, Nueva Ed. Acad., IX. Sr. Cotarelo has published the edition of 1653 and given the many variants for the edition of 1671. The latter, by comparison with the earlier edition, shows many cuts. This later volume, which was put out under the ægis of Matos Frago, is notoriously inaccurate in its attributions. At least six of the twelve must be questioned. I suspect that Matos "doctored" this play for presentation in the late sixties, but after listing two revisions of his own in this collection, felt some delicacy in attributing a third to himself,—especially when the changes he had made were of so trivial a type.

⁸² *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 143-144.

diction, or versification. I hesitated, however, to exclude it definitely from Moreto's theatre until I had seen the manuscript⁸³ of the Biblioteca Nacional which is attributed to him.

The manuscript was written in the last half of the seventeenth century, but the hand that attached Moreto's name⁸⁴ is a modern one. The text except for very slight variants is the same as that of the *Escogidas*. Its attribution to Moreto, then, rests purely on the knowledge and honesty of José Fernández de Buendía who printed it as *El Santo Cristo de Cabrilla* in his *Escogidas (Parte XXXIV)* of 1670.⁸⁵ He was far from being infallible. The fact that Antonio de Zafra included it in his *Parte III* as *El Cristo de los Milagros* means nothing, as we have seen.⁸⁶

As a matter of fact, this play was written by a good friend of Lope de Vega's at a time when Lope's memory was still fairly fresh. One finds this bit of dialogue:⁸⁷

JUAN	Pues dicen y dicen bien unos castellanos versos que quien ama y no enloquece no tiene sutil ingenio.
CARREÑO	Eso lo dijo el gran Lope de Vega.
CENTENO	Diga "el lucero del Parnaso," aunque a pesar del buen Virgilio y Homero que son los dos obligados destos encarecimientos; nació poeta de chapa y lo fué de pelo en pecho, honra de España y <i>Laurel de Apolo</i> , escrito dél mismo. Es verdad, soy un menguado y aun un desalmado; pero como se hablaba de <i>Lope de Vega</i> , mi amigo un tiempo. . . .

⁸³ No. 15547.

⁸⁴ The second act of the text is in the same handwriting as *Lo que puede la aprensión* (No. 14916) which carries the censor's stamp of 1669. It is likewise by the same scribe as *Los celos de Escarramán* (No. 15529) and *El mentiroso*. See Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, p. 466.

⁸⁵ In his *Parte XXXIX* (1673) of this series, at least five of the twelve attributions may be considered doubtful. See La Barrera, *Catálogo*, pp. 700-701.

⁸⁶ See above, p. 313n.

⁸⁷ Antonio de Zafra, *Tercera parte*, Madrid, 1681, p. 66.

There is in these lines a ring of warm admiration and of sincere sorrow that suggests Montalbán's friendship for Lope.

The play is exceedingly "episodic and disjointed," and "the tricks of Carreño and Centeno virtually amount to an *entremés* which is inserted in the last half of the first act and the first part of the second." This fact would perhaps indicate that the play was reshaped in the late sixties.

OTHER MANUSCRIPTS

Certain manuscripts remain. For a discussion of *Antes morir que pecar* (No. 16766), *El Eneas de Dios* (No. 17113), *El hijo obediente* (No. 1-35-5, Bibl. Mun.), *El hijo pródigo* (No. 1-34-12, Bibl. Mun.), *La luna africana* (No. 15540), *No puede mentir el cielo* (No. 15242), and *El rey Don Enrique el Enfermo* (No. 15543), see my article already cited: *Concerning Seven Manuscripts*, etc.

Space permits of only a few disconnected comments on the following manuscripts: *Amor y obligación*, *El esclavo de su hijo*, *Nuestra Señora del Pilar*, *El rosario perseguido*, and *Hallar la vida en la cueva y hermanos más dichosos* (*Los siete durmientes*). All five⁸⁸ show important variants if compared with the earliest printed versions.⁸⁹ There are in the case of the two last listed important cuts in long speeches; in the case of the three first mentioned, both additions and subtractions.⁹⁰

It is perhaps worth while to point out that the *sueltas* I have seen⁹¹ of *Amor y obligación* have, with unimportant variants, the same text as that found in the *Escogidas*; that both manuscript and printed versions apparently come from an older and longer text now lost; and that this play has no relation to Don Antonio Solís' work of the same name (Ms. 16848), of which there are two recent editions, one by E. Juliá Martínez and the other by Fischer and Ruppert.⁹²

⁸⁸ Numbered respectively: 16824, 15322, 15363 and 16475, 17088, and 15103. See Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, pp. 30, 179, 370, and 537, 448, 225, and *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 145-147, 151, 140-141.

⁸⁹ With the exception of *El rosario perseguido* (which is found only in *sueltas*), all appeared for the first time in the series of the *Escogidas*, respectively in *Partes XII* (1658), *XXXIV* (1670), *V* (1653), *XIX* (1663).

⁹⁰ There are, as I have indicated above by my numbering, two manuscripts of *Nuestra Señora del Pilar*. This statement applies only to No. 15363, here entitled *La Virgen del Pilar*. See below.

⁹¹ No. 112. Vda. de Joseph de Orga, Valencia, 1766; No. 90, Imprenta de Santa Cruz, Salamanca, without year.

⁹² Sr. Juliá states that the anonymous nineteenth-century play, *Amor y obligación* o *La condesa de Orvigni*, is not indebted to either of the seventeenth century comedies.

In the case of *El esclavo de su hijo* (*El azote de su patria*), it should be noted that the manuscript is a longer and older version than the edition found in the *Escogidas*, that the lines referring to Valencia which occur in the printed work are not included in the manuscript and that therefore my opinion that this play was written by a Valencian is unfounded; that it is reminiscent of Cristóbal de Morales' *Renegado, rey y mártir*; that this play is, as Schaeffer has pointed out in his *Geschichte*, "quite in the manner of Lope," and that *El africano cruel*, name of a play now lost but found in both *Peregrino* lists, would be a very appropriate title for this play.

Neither of the manuscripts having to do with the Virgin of the Pillar helps to solve the matter of the authenticity of this dull play which is in no way characteristic of Villaviciosa, Matos, and Moreto. Though Durán states⁹³ that Cañizares and Lanini wrote plays entitled *Nuestra Señora del Pilar*, I have been able to find no *sueltas* of this name attributed to either. The fact that on manuscript No. 16475 the name of Lanini has been scratched out is of no importance since the notation was clearly added in late years, probably by some one who knew that Medel⁹⁴ attributes a play of this name to him.

El rosario perseguido, listed by Medel as anonymous, is in manuscript 17088, as well as in Alonso del Riego's *suelta*, attributed to Moreto. The name on the manuscript must be disregarded since it was patently added long after the text was written. At one stage in its development, the title of this play must have been other than what it now is since the author, in the last four lines of the manuscript, had to destroy the rhyme of his *redondilla* in order to include the name, *El rosario perseguido* in the final verse. There are many and important cuts.

On the title page of the eighteenth-century manuscript called *Hallar la vida en la cueva y hermanos más dichosos* (*Los siete durmientes* in the *Escogidas*), one finds the name of the copyist Florentín and below the title in a hand of much later date than the text is the name Don Agustín Moreto. In the manuscript some scenes found in the *Escogidas* have been omitted and the character *El demonio* transformed into the allegorical *El engaño*.

In the case of *El bruto de Babilonia* (No. 15041), *Lo que puede la aprensión* (No. 14916), *Trampa adelante* (No. 14921), and *Travesuras son valor* (No. 16463, the primitive version), it is worth while pointing out that all carry the name Vallejo and belonged either to

⁹³ Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, p. 98. See *Columna sobre Columna*, an uninspired *refundición* of the collaborators' play which is attributed to Zamora.

⁹⁴ See *Indice*, p. 219.

Manuel (hijo) or Carlos, and that all except the last are dated 1669. They are, except for slight variants, the same as the early printed editions and therefore offer little interest for our study. The same may be said for *La cena de Baltasar* (No. 16802), *Industria* (sic) *contra finezas* (No. 17135), *No puede ser* (No. 15643, dated 1699), *Oponerse a las estrellas* (No. 16030), and *El valiente justiciero*—this last under the title *Rey valiente y justiciero y Ricohombre de Alcalá* (Nos. 14828 and 16391).

El poder de la amistad (V^a-7-4) and *El príncipe perseguido* (R-81, second act) are in Moreto's own hand. The signature is lacking in the case of the latter, probably because the last pages of this act have been lost. If there are others in Moreto's handwriting, I have not seen them. I cannot agree with La Barrera when he states⁹⁵ that both *El parecido en la corte* and *Oponerse a las estrellas* are "apparently" autographs.

In conclusion, two plays involve such complicated problems that they must be reserved for the future: *La adúltera penitente* (No. 14915), which carries a list of Vallejo's entire cast, as well as the date 1669, and *Los celos de Escarraman* (No. 15529), which is not, as Durán thought, the same play published by Melchor Alegre in 1671 as *Escarramán*,⁹⁶ but instead a totally different one.

In making my previous study of Moreto, I divided his theatre into four groups: those plays which were written by Moreto alone; those which are apochryphal in his theatre; those which were written in collaboration with others; and those whose authenticity was open to question. At that time I indicated that in my opinion many of the plays which I was classifying as "doubtfully attributed" were certainly not Moreto's, but I was unwilling to remove them definitely from his theatre until I should have been able to collate all manuscripts in Madrid with the early printed texts. Moreover, I followed the policy of not excluding any play unless internal evidence against Moreto's authorship was supported by external evidence as well.⁹⁷

If now we follow the same grouping, the plays written by Moreto (without collaborators) are 33: ⁹⁸ (1) *Amor y obligación*, (2) *Antíoco*

⁹⁵ *Catálogo*, pp. 276-277.

⁹⁶ *Parte XXXVII*, Madrid. See Paz y Melia, *Catálogo*, p. 84.

⁹⁷ Only in the case of *El esclavo de su hijo* and *La negra por el honor* did I forswear my rule. Here internal evidence against Moreto's authorship was overwhelming. See *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 145-147, 148 and p. 329 of this study.

⁹⁸ *El hijo obediente* and *No puede mentir el cielo* were not originally included in this list, and *Antes morir que pecar* has been transferred to the list of doubtful

y Seleuco, (3) *El caballero*, (4) *La cena del rey Baltasar*, (5) *Como se vengan los nobles*, (6) *El defensor de su agravio*, (7) *De fuera vendrá*, (8) *El desdén con el desdén*, (9) *El Eneas de Dios* (ms. version), (10) *Fingir y amar*, (11) *La fuerza de la ley*, (12) *Hasta el fin nadie es dichoso*, (13) *El hijo obediente*, (14) *Los jueces de Castilla*, (15) *Industrias contra finezas*, (16) *El licenciado Vidriera*, (17) *El lindo don Diego*, (18) *Lo que puede la aprensión*, (19) *El más ilustre francés*, (20) *El mejor amigo el rey*, (21) *La misma conciencia acusa*, (22) *No puede mentir el cielo*, (23) *No puede ser*, (24) *El parecido en la corte*, (25) *El poder de la amistad*, (26) *Primero es la honra*, (27) *San Franco de Sena*, (28) *Los siete durmientes*, (29) *Trampa adelante*, (30) *Las travesuras de Pantoja*, (31) *El valiente justiciero*, (32) *La vida de San Alejo*, (33) *Yo por vos y vos por otro*.

Those plays which I should definitely exclude from Moreto's theatre are: (1) *La cautela en la amistad* (Godínez), (2) *Dejar un reino por otro y mártires de Madrid* (Monroy?), (3) *Empezar a ser amigos* (?), (4) *El Eneas de Dios* (version of *Escogidas*), (5) *En el mayor imposible nadie pierda la esperanza* (Juan de Lemus?), (6) *El esclavo de su hijo* (?), (7) *Los hermanos encontrados* (*El satisfacer callando y princesa de los montes*, of Lope), (8) *Merecer para alcanzar* (?), (9) *La milagrosa elección de San Pío V* (Montalbán), (10) *La negra por el honor* (?), (11) *El parecido* (?), (12) *El rosario perseguido* (?), (13) *San Luis Beltrán* (Aguilar), (14) *El Santo Cristo de Cabrilla* (?), (15) *Sin honra no hay valentía* (Lope?), (16) *Travesuras son valor* (*Escogidas* version).⁹⁹

plays. See *Concerning Seven Manuscripts*, etc. pp. 295-296, 300-303, 308-311. *El parecido* is apocryphal. See p. 324 of this study. For *Fingir y amar*, see Pérez Pastor's *Doc. para la biografía de . . . Calderon*, Madrid, 1905, pp. 265-266.

⁹⁹ Of these sixteen, I had previously declared six apocryphal: No.'s 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, 16. See *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*. All others except *El parecido*, were included in the list of the doubtfully attributed.

Fernández-Guerra (*B. A. E.*, XXXIX, p. xlvi) had in his study excluded: (1) *La condesa de Belflor* (Lope), (2) *La discreta venganza* (Lope), (3) *El hijo de Marco Aurelio* (Zabaleta), (4) *El Marqués del Cigarral* (Castillo Solórzano), (5) *La más verdadera copia del mejor original* (Juan Sanz Moreno), (6) *El premio en la misma pena* (Lope), and (7) *Quitar el feudo a su patria* (Alonso de Alfaro).

Sr. Cotarelo (*Bíbl.*, pp. 40-43) had added the following seven to the list given by Fernández-Guerra: (1) *Fingir lo que puede ser* (Montero de Espinosa), (2) *No puede mentir el cielo* (Don Rodrigo? Enríquez), (3) *La ocasión hace al ladrón* (Matos), (4) *El secreto entre dos amigos* (*El galán secreto* of Mira de Amescua), (5) *El segundo Moisés, San Froilán* (Matos Frago), (6) *Todo es enredos amor* (Diego de Figueroa y Córdoba), (7) *La traición vengada* (Lope's *Tanto hagas cuanto pagues*).

I cannot agree with Sr. Cotarelo that *No puede mentir el cielo* should be excluded from Moreto's theatre. See *Concerning Seven Manuscripts*, etc., pp. 308-311.

There are left four plays which are in my opinion doubtfully attributed to Moreto: *Antes morir que pecar*, *Los engaños de un engaño*, *Los celos de Escarramán*, and *La gala de nadar*. Two others, supposedly written in collaboration, should be listed here: *El hijo prodigo*¹⁰⁰ (perhaps in collaboration with Matos and Cancer) and *El príncipe prodigioso* (attributed to Moreto in collaboration with Matos but more characteristic of Montalbán, under whose name it has likewise been printed).¹⁰¹

Aside from the two just mentioned, there are nineteen plays attributed to Moreto in collaboration with others: *La adúltera penitente* (publ. 1657), *El bruto de Babilonia* (1668), *Caer para levantar* (1662), *La confusión de un jardín* (1681), *La fingida Arcadia* (1666), *La fuerza del natural* (1661), *Hacer remedio el dolor* (1658), *La mejor luna africana* (undated suelta), *El mejor par de los doce* (1673), *No hay reino como el de Dios* (manuscript of 1670), *Nuestra señora de la Aurora* (1670), *Nuestra Señora del Pilar* (1653), *Oponerse a las estrellas* (1653), *El príncipe perseguido* (1651), *La renegada de Valladolid* (1652), *El rey Don Enrique el Enfermo* (manuscript dated 1689), *Santa Rosa del Perú* (1671), *Travesuras son valor* (revised version 1747), *Vida y muerte de San Cayetano* (1672).¹⁰²

RUTH LEE KENNEDY

Smith College

¹⁰⁰ See *Concerning Seven Manuscripts*, etc., pp. 303-306.

¹⁰¹ See *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 139-140.

¹⁰² I have added *La renegada de Valladolid* to the list found in *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*. See Sr. Juliá Martínez' article, *La renegada de Valladolid* (*Bol. de la Real Acad.*, XVI, 672-679).

If Moreto's part in these plays is ever determined, it will have to be done by a minute study of his tricks of syntax, versification, etc., and his usage in these matters will have to be derived from his one autograph play, *El poder de la amistad* and the second act of *El príncipe perseguido*, undoubtedly written in Moreto's own hand. To that end I am now making a study of *El poder de la amistad* and checking it against the latter play. However, because of the corrupt form in which many of Moreto's texts are found, particularly those published after 1667, the proof may be difficult, perhaps impossible.